

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

SUBMITTED BY (COUNTY): CLACKAMAS

FISCAL YEAR: 2025-2026

QUARTER: Q3

The following information should be submitted 45 calendar days after the end of each quarter, per IGA requirements. When that day falls on a weekend, reports are due the following Monday.

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
<i>Report Due</i>	Nov 15	Feb 15	May 15	Aug 15
<i>Reporting Period</i>	Jul 1 – Sep 30	Oct 1 – Dec 31	Jan 1 – Mar 31	Apr 1 – Jun 30

Please do not change the formatting of margins, fonts, alignment, or section titles.

	Permanent Supportive Housing <i>(Households)</i>	Rapid Re-Housing <i>(Households)</i>	Housing with Services <i>(Households)</i>	Prevention <i>(Households)</i>	Shelter Units
YTD Progress ¹	60	186	69	1,480	246
Goal	20	200	40	1,500	230
SHS Year 1 to Current Date	1,171	568	69	4,815	246

Section 1. Progress narrative

Executive Summary

Supportive Housing Services programs are transforming Clackamas County's residents' lives, from preventing homelessness to stabilizing people in housing for good. By the end of the third quarter of this fiscal year Clackamas County is on track to exceed all of its quantitative goals and fulfill all qualitative goals set forth in the Annual Work Plan. Staff are working on budget development and contract renewals, which will frame our work for the upcoming fiscal year.

¹*The data received each quarter may be slightly different than the revised and most up-to-date information received in the Annual Report. Data from the Annual Report will be used for final year-end figures.*

Training and Engagement

Throughout the fiscal year, Clackamas County has offered a diverse menu of trainings, technical assistance, and professional development opportunities, meeting our annual work plan commitment to do so. Service providers have deepened their expertise in subject matter areas from coordinated entry to case management to health and housing integration. Collectively, these trainings and engagements are advancing system-wide quality of service and reinforcing provider capacity.

The **Program Team** facilitated a range of trainings and technical assistance to address both skill development and day-to-day operational support for providers. Of note, the **Assertive Engagement** training series, in partnership with Clackamas Women's Services, El Programa Hispano Católico, and Northwest Family Services, were well-attended, drawing 45 to 70 trainees at each of the six 90-minute sessions. Assertive Engagement skills augment case management through strengths-based and trauma-informed practices. Attendees have embraced Assertive Engagement practices and reported the approach as helpful in both internal case conferencing and one-on-one meetings in which challenging situations are discussed. Additional trainings have featured topics including **domestic violence**, the social security benefits process, de-escalating interactions, home visit safety, **extreme weather shelter**, hoarding, and financial education. A **suicide prevention** training was also hosted in partnership with the County's Public Health division, teaching staff how to recognize warning signs of suicidality and intervene. Hands-on **technical assistance** was also provided to providers to support onboarding processes, policy review, program navigation, and capacity building.

The **Health-Housing Integration Team** launched new on-demand, self-paced **e-learning modules** for housing case managers on topics like privacy and security, terminations and evictions, and Oregon landlord-tenant law basics. Providers delivering Health-Related Social Needs (HRSN) services are also welcomed to monthly meetings to share best practices and navigate HRSN processes and policy changes; providers share their successes, troubleshoot immediate challenges, and problem-solve for systems level improvement. The Health-Housing Integration Team also provides step-by-step workflows, how-to documents, and standard communication templates with provider partners navigating HRSN service delivery.

Several equity-focused engagement events have reached providers across the county with opportunities to learn, reflect, and apply culturally responsive practices. Three **Equity Connections Lunch & Learn** sessions have focused on topics like elevating unheard voices, identity and belonging in service delivery, and supporting immigrants and refugees in housing systems. The sessions are consistently drawing participation from seven to eight service providers and are strengthening collaboration, peer learning, and practical strategies to incorporate culturally responsive approaches across housing programs. In addition to the Lunch & Learns, two **Housing Services Community Meetings** have engaged more than 50 participants each in structured dialogue on language access, documentation barriers, trauma-informed property management, and fair housing protections.

The **Data Team** hosts **Quarterly Data Quality Meetings**, covering a broad range of topics intersecting with HMIS such as service transactions, client profiles, and releases of information. Top performers in data quality and completeness are recognized and celebrated in the meetings, reinforcing the space as a community of practice. The Data Team also revamped their **HMIS new user orientation**, offering a standardized HMIS orientation with no registration necessary, held weekly, virtually and in-person, in the

mornings and afternoons, and in Spanish. Monthly **booster trainings** supplement learnings on topics like housing move-in dates, households and referrals, and reporting.

Finally, the **Coordinated Housing Access Team** hosted two **Housing First Response** trainings this year. Two cohorts have completed this intensive two-day training covering system mapping, diversion, crisis neuroscience, de-escalation, and resource navigation. By request, the team also offers a System Tour to new community partners, orienting them to the county's coordinated entry system, the By Name List process, and referral workflows.

Health-Housing Case Conferencing

Health-Housing Case Conferencing is helping people experiencing and at risk of homelessness to meet their health needs, increase referrals to primary care, specialty care, and other programs and services, and coordinate care to help case managers and participants to navigate health systems. The forum brings together health system partners, including Health Share, CareOregon, Providence, Kaiser Permanente, OHSU, Trillium, ODHS Aging and People with Disabilities, Veterans Affairs, Clackamas Behavioral Health, and a peer representative from Mental Health & Addiction Association of Oregon, alongside housing providers who bring cases of people needing health services.

Households served typically face heightened barriers to health care access, including individuals who do not use English as their primary language, immigrants and refugees, and people of color. To habituate increased care and attention to these households, Clackamas County implemented a follow-along policy for all participants receiving Health-Housing Case Conferencing, engaging health care partners and housing managers, and ensuring equitable outcomes. In practice the Health-Housing Integration Team follows up with case managers to track past-conferenced participant outcomes and needs. Through Q3, 99% of all Health-Housing Case Conferencing households reported their needs were fully or partially met. The implementation of the follow-along policy marks the achievement of our annual work plan goal, and the results speak to the improvement of health and housing outcomes for some of our most vulnerable community members, while advancing equity and building lasting capacity across the provider network.

Leveraged Funds

Continuum of Care

In April, Clackamas County was awarded \$2M in HUD Continuum of Care renewal funding, supporting our Homeless Management Information System, coordinated entry, and permanent housing and rapid rehousing projects. The renewal funds projects whose funding is expiring and is expected to be a partial award for the year. Funding advances the community-wide goal of ending homelessness by supporting community based organizations in permanent supportive housing and rapid rehousing programs, along with coordinated entry and system planning projects.

Resource Centers

Supported by state funds from Oregon House Bill 5202 and Senate Bill 5011, the Molalla and Estacada Resource Centers represent rural investment in homeless services. Grant agreements for architectural, design, and construction improvements were developed in Q3 and executed early in Q4. The resource centers will serve as a welcoming access point where people experiencing homelessness can connect with shelter placement, permanent housing, recovery services, public benefits, and employment services.

Blossom & Community



Blossom & Community

In Q3 families continued moving into the newly completed Blossom & Community, a 100-unit affordable housing development, including 8 Permanent Supportive Housing units backed by project-based vouchers and services funded by SHS. One resident, a survivor of domestic violence, describes Blossom & Community as “a blessing” for herself and her young daughter, offering the safety and stability they needed after leaving temporary DV housing in Portland. Another resident, a longtime public housing resident in her late 70s, was initially nervous about leaving her old unit but has settled in comfortably and regularly welcomes family into her new apartment. Another resident credits Blossom & Community with transforming her family’s trajectory; after being selected from the waitlist, securing housing allowed her to fulfill the final requirement of her Child Protective Services reunification plan, resulting in dropped charges and a fresh start for her family. Across generations and circumstances, Blossom & Community is providing safe, stable, and affordable housing for the residents who call it home.

Program Highlights

City of Happy Valley HEART Program

The Happy Valley Empathy and Assistance Resource Team Program is a city-led initiative that provides direct engagement, service navigation, and community coordination through a community service officer who encounters individuals experiencing or at risk of homelessness. One recent success story involves L (name redacted for privacy), a chronically homeless individual with substance use challenges. At first, L declined assistance, but the HEART officer maintained a respectful, supportive presence. About two weeks later, L reinitiated contact following a relapse and expressed a genuine willingness to accept help. The HEART officer assessed L’s needs and identified addiction support, a stable environment free from negative influences, and access to reliable communication as priorities. L was connected with LoveOne’s outreach worker Hollie, who initiated services based on L’s needs. HEART has a patient, person-centered approach, meets people where they are, honors their autonomy, and is ready to help when the time is right.

Resource Navigation Program

J (name redacted for privacy) is a Certified Nursing Assistant who was working two jobs 80 miles apart and had been living in his car for two months after leaving an unsafe, unsanitary housing situation that had harmed his health. Clackamas County Resource Navigator Kelley began working with J in January and

quickly recognized that immediate stabilization was essential to preserving his employment. Using SHS flexible funds, Kelley provided practical support, like a gas card for J's long commutes, an ice chest for food storage, and a camp stove for meal preparation. When J's car was towed while he was at work, putting both his belongings and his livelihood at risk, Kelley secured supervisor approval to retrieve the vehicle to prevent further crisis. Through consistent, creative problem-solving and steady engagement, J remained connected to services, and in April, he secured a small accessory dwelling unit, finally giving him a stable foundation from which to, in his own words, "focus on self and future tasks."

Oregon City Caring Court

This fiscal year Oregon City launched its first Caring Court, a city-led initiative combining judicial supervision with coordinated supportive services. Caring Court is designed specifically to connect individuals that commit low level crimes with resources that will help them build accountability, resilience, and life skills, and reduce the rate of recidivism. Participants meet regularly with their support team, which includes their court judge, court staff, prosecutor, attorney, outreach specialists, and treatment providers, following structured plans often including counseling, substance use treatment, mental health care, job training, and community service. Those who meet their goals graduate from the program with greater stability and a significantly reduced risk of returning to the justice system.



Oregon City Caring Court Team

Although Caring Court is relatively new, outcomes align with national research on problem-solving courts. Studies consistently show that participants in these courts are significantly less likely to reoffend than those processed through traditional systems. Oregon City Caring Court has a recidivism rate of 0.03%, an extremely low rate that is reducing strain on law enforcement and emergency services, and increasing overall safety of the community.

Recent graduates illustrate the program's reach: one completed a substance use treatment program, celebrated 60 days of sobriety, reconnected with family, and secured six months of stable housing; another obtained identification and social security cards, reunited with family members, and secured a shelter bed. Another graduate created a resume, found employment, stabilized in housing, and applied to rental assistance waiting lists.

Caring Court has 30 current participants and 15 graduates, with an average court attendance rate of 85%. Average length of court engagement is 12 weeks, with follow-up services and support available for one year.

Caring Court Participants actively contribute to the community by completing community service while building pro-social skills, accountability, and a sense of belonging. Service projects are short in duration and tailored to participant abilities. To date Caring Court participants completed 244 hours of community service and contributed to projects including making cards for Meals on Wheels, assembling naloxone kits, organizing a clothing closet, and painting rocks for the Pioneer Community Garden.

Recognizing the importance of meeting people’s basic needs before they are able to engage in services, every Caring Court session begins with a large sack lunch—200 served to date through a partnership with The Father’s Heart. Additional food support is provided through Clackamas Service Center and a partnership with Ten O’Clock Church Food Pantry and OC Price.

Caring Court also functions as an open-door resource hub, with providers like LoveOne, Parrot Creek, NAMI, DHS, and 4D maintaining a steady presence. Individuals can check on their benefits, access treatment, or get hygiene supplies or a sack lunch. At least one service provider is present at every session, and 21 walk-in guests have accessed services since launch.

Caring Court reflects both the depth of need in the community and the effectiveness of a justice model built on barrier-reducing supportive interventions that meet people where they are.

Section 2. Data and data disaggregation ²

Please use the following table to provide and disaggregate data on Population A, Population B housing placement outcomes and homelessness prevention outcomes. Please use your local methodologies for tracking and reporting on Populations A and B. You can provide context for the data you provided in the context narrative below.

Section 2.A Housing Stability Outcomes: Placements & Preventions

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Permanent Supportive Housing

Number of housing placements-Permanent Supportive Housing	Current Quarter	Year to Date					
	Number	Subset-Population A placed into PSH	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B placed in PSH	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of Annual Goal
Total People	36					118	--

² *The data received each quarter may be slightly different than the revised and most up-to-date information received in the Annual Report. Data from the Annual Report will be used for final year-end figures.*

Total Households	22	53	88.3%	7	11.7%	60	300.0%
-------------------------	----	----	-------	---	-------	----	--------

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	1	2.8%	2	1.7%
Asian or Asian American	--	--	1	0.8%
Black, African American or African	4	11.1%	6	5.1%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	12	33.3%	27	22.9%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	--	--
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	1	0.8%
White	30	83.3%	92	78.0%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	20	55.6%	67	56.8%
Client doesn't know	1	2.8%	1	0.8%
Client prefers not to answer	1	2.8%	1	0.8%
Data Not Collected	1	2.8%	2	1.7%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	25	69.4%	65	55.1%
Persons without disabilities	10	27.8%	50	42.4%
Disability unreported	1	2.8%	3	2.5%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	26	72.2%	76	64.4%
Man (Boy, if child)	10	27.8%	37	31.4%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	--	--	2	1.7%
Transgender	--	--	2	1.7%
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	----	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	----	--
Data not collected	--	--	1	0.8%

(Only if Applicable) Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Housing with Services

Number of housing	Current Quarter	Year to Date
--------------------------	------------------------	---------------------

placements- Housing with Services	Number	Subset- Population A placed into PSH	Percentage: Population A	Subset- Population B placed in PSH	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of Annual Goal
Total People	94					196	--
Total Households	34	9	13.0%	60	87.0%	69	172.5%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	5	5.3%	16	8.2%
Asian or Asian American	--	--	2	1.0%
Black, African American or African	27	28.7%	54	27.6%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	11	11.7%	43	21.9%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	--	--
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	7	7.4%	11	5.6%
White	63	67.0%	139	70.9%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	55	58.5%	89	45.4%
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	--	--
Data Not Collected	--	--	--	--
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	14	14.9%	34	17.3%
Persons without disabilities	80	85.1%	162	82.7%
Disability unreported	--	--	--	--
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	55	58.5%	135	68.9%
Man (Boy, if child)	39	41.5%	61	31.1%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	--	--	--	--
Transgender	--	--	--	--
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	--	--
Data not collected	--	--	--	--

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Housing Only

N/A

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Rapid Re-Housing (all Rapid Re-Housing subtypes)

Number of housing placements- Rapid Re-housing	Current Quarter	Year to Date					
	Number	Subset-Population A placed into PSH	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B placed in PSH	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of Annual Goal
Total People	100					360	--
Total Households	52	19.9%	37	80.1%	149	186	93.0%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	7	7.0%	20	5.6%
Asian or Asian American	--	--	4	1.1%
Black, African American or African	18	18.0%	73	20.3%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	32	32.0%	110	30.6%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	--	--
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	6	6.0%	9	2.5%
White	75	75.0%	237	65.8%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	45	45.0%	142	39.4%
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	3	0.8%
Data Not Collected	--	--	2	0.6%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	47	47.0%	153	42.5%
Persons without disabilities	53	53.0%	202	56.1%
Disability unreported	--	--	5	1.4%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	59	59.0%	211	58.6%
Man (Boy, if child)	37	37.0%	138	38.3%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	1	1.0%	2	0.6%
Transgender	2	2.0%	4	1.1%
Questioning	1	1.0%	1	0.3%
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	1	0.3%
Data not collected	--	--	3	0.8%

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Eviction and Homelessness Prevention

Number of Preventions	Current Quarter	Year to Date					
	Number	Subset-Population A placed into PSH	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B placed in PSH	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of Annual Goal
Total People	886					3,070	--
Total Households	446	89	6.0%	1,391	94.0%	1,480	98.7%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	31	3.5%	121	3.9%
Asian or Asian American	29	3.3%	57	1.9%
Black, African American or African	88	9.9%	368	12.0%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	106	12.0%	608	19.8%
Middle Eastern or North African	1	0.1%	3	0.1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	12	1.4%	47	1.5%
White	638	72.0%	2,085	67.9%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	270	30.5%	949	30.9%
Client doesn't know	8	0.9%	12	0.4%
Client prefers not to answer	43	4.9%	135	4.4%
Data Not Collected	8	0.9%	50	1.6%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	253	28.6%	796	25.9%
Persons without disabilities	516	58.2%	1,875	61.1%
Disability unreported	117	13.2%	399	13.0%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	490	55.3%	1,694	55.2%
Man (Boy, if child)	360	40.6%	1,163	37.9%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	4	0.5%	17	0.6%
Transgender	2	0.2%	14	0.5%
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	2	0.1%
Client prefers not to answer	24	2.7%	139	4.5%

Data not collected	6	0.7%	41	1.3%
--------------------	---	------	----	------

Section 2.B Regional Long-Term Rent Assistance Program

The following data represents a **subset** of the above Housing Placements data. The Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Program (RLRA) primarily provides permanent supportive housing to SHS priority Population A clients (though RLRA is not strictly limited to PSH or Population A).

RLRA data is not additive to the data above. Housing placements shown below are duplicates of the placements shown in the data above.

*Please disaggregate data for the **total number of people in housing using an RLRA voucher during the quarter and year to date.***

Regional Long-term Rent Assistance Quarterly Program Data	Current Quarter	Year to Date				
	Number	Subset - Population A in RLRA	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B in RLRA	Percentage: Population B	Number
Number of RLRA vouchers issued during reporting period	1	4	100.0%	0	--	4
Number of people newly leased up during reporting period	18	36	90.0%	4	10.0%	40
Number of households newly leased up during reporting period	16	25	96.1%	1	3.9%	26
Number of people in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	1,576	1,233	70.4%	519	29.6%	1,752
Number of households in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	840	720	78.2%	201	21.8%	921

Program to Date – Since July 1, 2021						
	Subset - Population A in RLRA	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B in RLRA	Percentage: Population B	Number	
Number of people in housing using an RLRA voucher	1,384	70.6%	575	29.4%	1,959	
Number of households in housing using an RLRA voucher	826	78.6%	225	21.4%	1,051	

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	107	6.8%	126	7.2%
Asian or Asian American	28	1.8%	30	1.7%
Black, African American or African	244	15.5%	282	16.1%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	351	22.3%	388	22.2%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	--	--
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	52	3.3%	60	3.4%
White	1233	78.5%	1372	78.5%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	822	52.3%	904	51.7%
Client doesn't know	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Client prefers not to answer	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Data Not Collected	32	2.0%	33	1.9%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	758	48.2%	823	47.1%
Persons without disabilities	813	51.8%	925	52.9%
Disability unreported	--	--	--	--
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	1007	64.1%	1128	64.5%
Man (Boy, if child)	558	35.5%	611	35.0%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	3	0.2%	5	0.3%
Transgender	--	--	--	--
Questioning	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
Client prefers not to answer	1	0.1%	2	0.1%

Data not collected	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
--------------------	---	------	---	------

Section 2.C Other Data: Non-Housing Numeric Goals

This section shows progress to quantitative goals set in county annual work plans. Housing placement and prevention progress are already included in the above tables. This section includes goals such as shelter units and outreach contacts and other quantitative goals that should be reported on a quarterly basis. This data in this section may differ county to county, and will differ year to year, as it aligns with goals set in county annual work plans.

Instructions: Please complete the tables below, as applicable to your annual work plans in Quarter 2 and Quarter 4 Reports.

Number of people in Shelter*	Current Quarter	Year to Date				
	Number	Subset-Population A placed into PSH	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B placed in PSH	Percentage: Population B	Number
Total People	456					1,235
Total Households	385	543	57.6%	399	42.4%	942

*(Includes Transitional Housing (TH), e.g., Recovery-Oriented Transitional Housing)

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	56	12.3%	157	12.7%
Asian or Asian American	8	1.8%	18	1.5%
Black, African American or African	32	7.0%	101	8.2%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	59	12.9%	235	19.0%
Middle Eastern or North African	1	0.2%	1	0.1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	14	3.1%	39	3.2%
White	266	58.3%	764	61.9%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	235	51.5%	628	50.8%
Client doesn't know	3	0.7%	6	0.5%
Client prefers not to answer	65	14.3%	96	7.8%
Data Not Collected	1	0.2%	3	0.2%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	185	40.6%	563	45.6%
Persons without disabilities	139	30.5%	418	33.8%
Disability unreported	132	28.9%	254	20.6%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	149	32.7%	510	41.3%

Man (Boy, if child)	293	64.3%	669	54.1%
Culturally Specific Identity	1	0.2%	5	0.4%
Non-Binary	1	0.2%	10	0.8%
Transgender	4	0.9%	8	0.6%
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	1	0.1%
Client doesn't know	1	0.2%	2	0.2%
Client prefers not to answer	7	1.5%	28	2.3%
Data not collected	--	--	2	0.2%

Number of people in Outreach **, †	Current Quarter	Year to Date				
	Number	Subset - Population A Engaged	Percentage: Population A	Subset - Population B Engaged	Percentage: Population B	Number
Total People	481					1,603
Total households	399					1,388
Sub-Set – Total people “Engaged” during reporting period	210	589	61.0%	377	39.0%	966
Sub-Set – Total households “Engaged” during reporting period	207	545	60.2%	360	39.8%	905

**The Following Section is only for participants that have a “Date of Engagement”

† Includes Access Centers and Navigation Centers

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	10	4.8%	58	6.0%
Asian or Asian American	3	1.4%	9	0.9%
Black, African American or African	13	6.2%	74	7.7%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	17	8.1%	76	7.9%
Middle Eastern or North African	--	--	2	0.2%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	--	--	16	1.7%

White	173	82.4%	724	74.9%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	38	18.1%	427	44.2%
Client doesn't know	--	--	1	0.1%
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	37	3.8%
Data Not Collected	--	--	19	2.0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	110	52.4%	472	48.9%
Persons without disabilities	58	27.6%	287	29.7%
Disability unreported	42	20.0%	207	21.4%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	105	50.0%	458	47.4%
Man (Boy, if child)	104	49.5%	485	50.2%
Culturally Specific Identity	--	--	--	--
Non-Binary	--	--	2	0.2%
Transgender	1	0.5%	3	0.3%
Questioning	--	--	--	--
Different Identity	--	--	--	--
Client doesn't know	--	--	--	--
Client prefers not to answer	--	--	13	1.3%
Data not collected	--	--	5	0.5%

Section 3. Financial Reporting

Please complete the quarterly financial report and include the completed financial report to this quarterly report, as an attachment.

Glossary:

Supportive Housing Services: All SHS funded housing interventions that include PSH, RRH, Housing Only, Housing with Services, Preventions, and RLRA Vouchers. This also includes shelter, outreach, navigation services, employment services or any other SHS funding to help households exit homelessness and transition into safe, stable housing.

Supportive Housing: SHS housing interventions that include PSH, Housing Only and Housing with Services.

Regional Long Term Rent Assistance (RLRA): provides a flexible and continued rent subsidy that will significantly expand access to housing for households with extremely and very low incomes across the region. RLRA subsidies will be available for as long as the household needs and remains eligible for the subsidy, with no pre-determined end date. Tenant-based RLRA subsidies will leverage existing private market and regulated housing, maximizing tenant choice, while project-based RLRA subsidies will increase the availability of units in new housing developments. RLRA program service partners will cover payments of move-in costs and provide supportive services as needed to ensure housing stability. A Regional Landlord Guarantee will cover potential damages to increase participation and mitigate risks for participating landlords.

Shelter: Overnight shelter, congregate shelter, alternative shelter, motel shelter, tiny houses, pod villages, recuperative centers, shelter, that consists of congregate shelter beds PLUS non/semi-congregate units. Shelter definition also includes Local Alternative Shelters that have flexibility around limited amenities compared to HUD defined overnight shelters. Includes in-reach services.

Recovery Oriented Transitional Housing, Stabilization Transitional Housing, Transitional Housing: Provides temporary lodging and is designed to facilitate the movement of individuals and families experiencing homelessness into permanent housing within a specified period, but normally no longer than 24 months. Requirements and limitations vary.

Navigation Center, Access Center, Day Center, Access Services: Provides indoor shelter during daytime hours, generally between 5am and 8pm. Primarily serve households experiencing homelessness. The facilities help connect people to a wide range of resources and services daily. Including on-site support services such as restrooms, showers, laundry, mail service, haircuts, clothing, nutrition resources, lockers, ID support, etc.

Outreach: Activities are designed to meet the immediate needs of people experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations by connecting them with emergency shelter, housing, or critical services, and providing them with urgent, non-facility-based care. *Metro is using the HUD ESG Street Outreach model. The initial contact should not be focused on data. Outreach workers collect and enter data as the client relationship evolves. Thus, data quality expectations for street outreach projects are limited to clients with a date of engagement.*

Outreach Date of Engagement “Engaged”: the date an individual becomes engaged in the development of a plan to address their situation.

Population A: Extremely low-income; AND have one or more disabling conditions; AND Are experiencing or at imminent risk* of experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness.

Imminent Risk: Head of household who is at imminent risk of long-term homelessness within 14 days of the date of application for homeless assistance and/or has received an eviction. The head of household will still need to have a prior history of experiencing long-term homelessness or frequent episodes of literal homelessness.

Population B: Experiencing homelessness; OR have a substantial risk* of experiencing homelessness.

Substantial risk: A circumstance that exists if a household is very low income and extremely rent burdened, or any other circumstance that would make it more likely than not that without supportive housing services the household will become literally homeless or involuntarily doubled-up.

The following list are HUD HMIS approved Project Types. Metro recognizes SHS programs do not align with these project types exactly, and value that flexibility. However, to ensure the interpretations and findings are based upon correct interpretations of the data in quarterly reports and HMIS reports, we will reference these Project Types by the exact HUD name.

Here are the HUD Standards if needed, <https://files.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/HMIS-Data-Standards-Manual-2024.pdf>

Permanent Supportive Housing, “PH - Permanent Supportive Housing (disability required for entry)”: A long-term intervention intended to serve the most vulnerable populations in need of housing and supportive services to attribute to their housing success, which can include PBV and TBV programs or properties. Provides housing to assist people experiencing homelessness with a disability (individuals with disabilities or families in which one adult or child has a disability) to live independently.

Housing with Services, “PH - Housing with Services (no disability required for entry)”:

A project that offers permanent housing and supportive services to assist people experiencing homelessness to live independently but does not limit eligibility to individuals with disabilities or families in which one adult or child has a disability. May include any other type of housing, not associated with PSH/RRH, that does include supportive services.

Housing Only, “PH - Housing Only”:

A project that offers permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness but does not make supportive services available as part of the project. May include RLRA Only programs.

Rapid Re-Housing, “PH - Rapid Re-Housing” (Services Only and Housing with or without services):

A permanent housing project that provides housing relocation and stabilization services and/or short and/or medium-term rental assistance as necessary to help an individual or family experiencing homelessness move as quickly as possible into permanent housing and achieve stability in that housing. May include Move-In Only programs.

Prevention, “Homelessness prevention”:

A project that offers services and/or financial assistance necessary to prevent an individual or family from moving into an emergency shelter or living in a public or private place not meant for human habitation. Component services and assistance generally consist of short-term and medium-term tenant-based or project-based rental assistance and rental arrears. Additional circumstances include rental application fees, security deposits, advance payment of last month's rent, utility deposits and payments, moving costs, housing search and placement, housing stability case management, mediation, legal services, and credit repair. This term differs from retention in that it designed to assist nonsubsidized market rate landlord run units.

Financial Report (by Program Category)		COMPLETE THE SECTION BELOW EVERY QUARTER. UPDATE AS NEEDED FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT.							
	Annual Budget	Q1 Actuals	Q2 Actuals	Q3 Actuals	Q4 Actuals	Total YTD Actuals	Variance Under / (Over)	% of Budget	Comments
Metro SHS Resources									
Beginning Fund Balance	101,616,275	103,505,192				103,505,192	(1,888,917)	102%	Counties will provide details and context on any unbudgeted amounts in Beginning Fund Balance in the narrative of their report, including the current plan and timeline for budgeting and spending it.
Metro SHS Program Funds	64,320,000	1,725,993	18,616,103	12,997,751		33,339,846	30,980,154	52%	
Interest Earnings ⁽¹⁾	2,000,000			2,494,540		2,494,540	(494,540)	125%	
<i>Insert add'l lines as necessary</i>								N/A	
Subtotal Program Revenue	66,320,000	1,725,993	18,616,103	15,492,291	-	35,834,386	30,485,614	54%	
Total Metro SHS Resources	167,936,275	105,231,185	18,616,103	15,492,291	-	139,339,578	28,596,697	83%	
Metro SHS Requirements									
Program Costs									
Individual Support Costs									
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)									
<i>Support to individuals who have extremely low incomes and one or more disabling conditions, who are experiencing long-term or frequent episodes of literal homelessness or imminent risk of experiencing homelessness</i>									
Permanent Supportive Housing Services	13,270,170	1,805,387	2,151,015	3,204,963		7,161,364	6,108,805	54%	
Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA)	20,978,387	-	8,303,864	4,670,518		12,974,382	8,004,005	62%	
Long-term Rent Assistance Admin	2,097,839	-	214,198	221,808		436,006	1,661,833	21%	Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 3% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term rent assistance.
Subtotal PSH	36,346,395	1,805,387	10,669,077	8,097,288	-	20,571,752	15,774,643	57%	
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)									
<i>Support to individuals experiencing a loss of housing</i>									
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)	20,314,483	824,288	1,246,649	1,564,989		3,635,927	16,678,556	18%	Budget includes \$11,039,688 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments to sustain limited duration programming in future fiscal years and will not be spent in FY 25-26.
Subtotal RRH	20,314,483	824,288	1,246,649	1,564,989	-	3,635,927	16,678,556	18%	
Other Housing and Services Programs (not otherwise listed)									
<i>Support to individuals who are experiencing homelessness or have substantial risk of homelessness</i>									
Housing Only	-	-	-	-		-	-	N/A	
Housing Only - Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA)	-	-	-	-		-	-	N/A	
Housing Only - Long-term Rent Assistance Admin	-	-	-	-		-	-	N/A	
Housing with Services	9,618,522	-	10,971	14,007		24,978	9,593,544	0%	The majority of housing with services expenditures are reported under Regional Strategy Implementation - Coordinated Entry as the TCPB approved \$8.5M of Regional Strategy Funds for the County's housing with services program Housing 4 Success (H4S). The housing with services budget includes \$8,861,853 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments which will not be spent in FY 25-26 to help sustain the H4S program which runs through FY 27-28.
Subtotal Other Housing and Services Programs	9,618,522	-	10,971	14,007	-	24,978	9,593,544	0%	
Eviction & Homelessness Prevention									
<i>Support to individuals experiencing a potential loss of housing</i>									
Eviction & Homelessness Prevention	11,889,546	1,767,929	2,074,101	1,987,723		5,829,753	6,059,793	49%	Budget includes \$1,751,335 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments to sustain limited duration programming in future fiscal years and will not be spent in FY 25-26.
Subtotal Eviction & Homelessness Prevention	11,889,546	1,767,929	2,074,101	1,987,723	-	5,829,753	6,059,793	49%	
Safety On/Off the Street									
<i>Support to individuals unsheltered or in temporary housing</i>									
Shelter and Transitional Housing	13,769,914	1,976,179	1,995,038	3,523,086		7,494,302	6,275,612	54%	Budget includes \$330,800 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments to sustain limited duration programming in future fiscal years and will not be spent in FY 25-26.
Outreach and Access Services	5,386,273	743,157	448,183	908,398		2,099,739	3,286,534	39%	Budget includes \$1,153,151 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments to sustain limited duration programming in future fiscal years and will not be spent in FY 25-26.
Subtotal Safety On/Off the Street	19,156,187	2,719,336	2,443,221	4,431,484	-	9,594,041	9,562,147	50%	
Other Supportive Services (not otherwise listed)									
<i>Other supports to individuals not included in any of the above categories</i>									
Other Supportive Services	1,988,362	135,165	107,255	166,073		408,492	1,579,869	21%	Budget includes \$1,037,385 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments to sustain limited duration programming in future fiscal years and will not be spent in FY 25-26.
Subtotal Other Supportive Services	1,988,362	135,165	107,255	166,073	-	408,492	1,579,869	21%	
System Support Costs									
System Support Costs									
Systems Infrastructure	4,775,581	560,358	411,596	696,779		1,668,733	3,106,848	35%	Budget includes \$500,000 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments to sustain limited duration programming in future fiscal years and will not be spent in FY 25-26.
Built Infrastructure	27,494,472	252,759	569,945	590,764		1,413,468	26,081,004	5%	Budget includes \$21,494,472 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments to sustain construction of large projects into future fiscal years. Given the nature of these projects significant spending will occur in future years as the projects are built and additional projects begin.
Overall System Services	-	-	-	-		-	-	N/A	
Subtotal System Support Costs	32,270,053	813,117	981,541	1,287,543	-	3,082,201	29,187,852	10%	

Financial Report (by Program Category) COMPLETE THE SECTION BELOW EVERY QUARTER. UPDATE AS NEEDED FOR THE ANNUAL REPORT.

	Annual Budget	Q1 Actuals	Q2 Actuals	Q3 Actuals	Q4 Actuals	Total YTD Actuals	Variance Under / (Over)	% of Budget	Comments
Regional Strategy Implementation									
<i>Investments to support SHS program alignment, coordination and outcomes at a regional level</i>									
Coordinated Entry	9,543,130	27,571	169,845	393,986		591,403	8,951,727	6%	Case conferencing staff, point in time count and HMIS migration support, and the new three year Move Forward Program which is a three year housing program to help transition households off of RLRA and help them become self-sufficient. Budget includes \$4,987,988 of SHS Regional Strategy Implementation carryover funds in out-year investments which will not be spent in FY 25-26 to help sustain the Housing 4 Success program which runs through FY 27-28.
Regional Landlord Recruitment	1,394,113	23,644	64,910	70,154		158,708	1,235,405	11%	A landlord hotline pilot program, the risk mitigation program, and a landlord liaison position.
Healthcare System Alignment	595,515	98,036	115,605	175,831		389,473	206,042	65%	Personnel to advance healthcare system alignment with the other counties and the state.
Training	184,276	-	-	6,178		6,178	178,098	3%	One FTE which will oversee the development and administration of various trainings.
Technical Assistance	1,599,690	33,070	47,490	26,125		106,686	1,493,004	7%	Two years of technical assistance for contracted service providers and two years of Coordinated Housing Access (CHA) technical assistance and process improvements. Budget includes \$800,000 of SHS Regional Strategy Implementation carryover funds in out-year investments which will not be spent in FY 25-26 to sustain the second year of technical assistance for service providers and CHA technical assistance in FY 26-27.
Employee Recruitment and Retention	22,179	-	-	-		-	22,179	0%	
Subtotal Regional Strategy Implementation	13,338,903	182,322	397,851	672,274	-	1,252,446	12,086,457	9%	
County Administrative Costs									
County Administrative Costs	6,521,302	747,211	756,979	800,233		2,304,423	4,216,878	35%	Service Provider Administrative Costs (including RLRA) are reported as part of Program Costs above. Counties will provide details and context for Service Provider Administrative Costs in their Annual Program Report. Budget includes \$2,628,350 of SHS carryover funds in out-year investments to sustain limited duration administrative support in future fiscal years and will not be spent in FY 25-26.
Subtotal County Administrative Costs	6,521,302	747,211	756,979	800,233	-	2,304,423	4,216,878	35%	County SHS Administrative Costs equals 6% of County's annual Program Funds.
Subtotal Program Costs	151,443,753	8,994,754	18,687,645	19,021,614	-	46,704,013	104,739,740	31%	
Ending Fund Balance (incl. Contingency and Reserves) 16,492,522 92,635,564									
Budgeted Contingency and Reserves									
Contingency ⁽¹⁾	3,216,000					3,216,000			This section reflects budgeted contingency and reserve figures.
Regional Strategy Implementation Contingency	412,522					412,522			Contingency equals 5% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds.
Stabilization Reserve ⁽²⁾	12,864,000					12,864,000			Stabilization Reserve equals 20% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds.
RLRA Reserves									
Other Programmatic Reserves									
Insert add'l lines as necessary									
Subtotal Contingency and Reserves	16,492,522					16,492,522			
Program Category Descriptions									
Permanet Supportive Housing Services	case management, behavioral health, mental health and addiction services, peer support, other connections to healthcare programs								
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)	RRH services, short-term rent assistance, housing retention, case management								
Housing Only	rent assistance								
Housing Only - Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA)	RLRA rent assistance w/o services								
Housing Only - Long-term Rent Assistance Admin	RLRA administrative costs								
Housing with Services	support services and rent assistance								
Eviction & Homelessness Prevention	short-term rent assistance geared toward preventing evictions, diversion assistance, one-time stabilization assistance, other relevant services								
Shelter and Transitional Housing	congregate shelter, alternative shelter, motel shelter, transitional housing, tiny house, pod villages, recuperative centers, recovery-oriented transitional housing, stabilization transitional housing								
Outreach and Access Services	support and services other than overnight shelter, including access services, case management, hygiene programs, survival gear, day centers, access centers, service centers, resource centers, and navigation to other services								
Other Supportive Services	individualized services that are not captured in any category above which provide auxiliary support to participants for overall stability, including: behavioral/mental health and wellness, recovery, benefits assessment and navigation, employment & financial independence programs, legal assistance, and other services not associated with housing programs that directly support participants, etc								
Systems Infrastructure	service provider capacity building and organizational health, system development/management, Coordinated Access, technical assistance, community engagement, advisory body support, etc.								
Built Infrastructure	property purchases, capital improvement projects, etc								
Overall System Services	broad services which cannot be allocated under individual support costs above, including: Systems Access & Navigation, Housing Navigation, ancillary homeless services that support overall programmatic objectives, etc.								
County Administrative Costs	Costs not specifically attributed to a particular SHS program or program delivery, including: senior management personnel, general facilities costs, general services such as HR, accounting, budget development, procurement, marketing, agency audit and agency insurance, etc								
⁽¹⁾ Per IGA Section 3.4.2 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, Metro recommends, but does not require, that in a given Fiscal Year Administrative Costs for SHS should not exceed 5% of annual Program Funds allocated to Partner; and that Administrative Costs for administering long-term rent assistance programs should not exceed 10% of annual Program Funds allocated by Partner for long-term rent assistance. ⁽²⁾ Per IGA Section 8.3.3 REGIONAL STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION FUND, each County must contribute not less than 5% of its share of Program Funds each Fiscal Year to a Regional Strategy Implementation Fund to achieve regional investment strategies. ⁽³⁾ Per IGA Section 5.5.4 CONTINGENCY, partner may establish a contingency account in addition to a Stabilization Reserve. The contingency account will not exceed 5% of Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year. ⁽⁴⁾ Per IGA Section 5.5.3 PARTNER STABILIZATION RESERVE, partner will establish and hold a Stabilization Reserve to protect against financial instability within the SHS program with a target minimum reserve level will be equal to 10% of Partner's Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year. The Stabilization Reserve for each County will be fully funded within the first three years. ⁽⁵⁾ Per IGA Section 6.1.4 "Program Funds" includes interest earnings. As such, calculations of the % of Program Funds spent on various budget lines will include interest earnings in the formula.									

Metro Supportive Housing Services

Financial Report for Quarterly Progress Report (IGA 7.1.2) and Annual Program Report (IGA 7.1.1)

Clackamas County

FY 2025-2026

Spend-Down Report for Program Costs

This section compares the spending plan of Program Costs in the Annual Program Budget to actual Program Costs in the Financial Report.

Program Costs (excluding Built Infrastructure)	% of Spending per Quarter			Comments
	Budget	Actual	Variance	
Quarter 1	10%	7%	-3%	Clackamas County uses a soft period close and previous quarterly spending will be updated in the Q4 report.
Quarter 2	15%	15%	0%	
Quarter 3	20%	15%	-5%	
Quarter 4	23%	0%	-23%	
Total	68%	37%	-31%	

Explain any material deviations from the Spend-Down Plan, or any changes that were made to the initial Spend-Down Plan. ⁽¹⁾

Built Infrastructure	\$ Spending YTD			Comments
	Budget	Actual	Forecast	
Annual total	27,494,472	1,413,468	6,000,000	Clackamas County used SHS funds to do some final minor upgrades to Clackamas Village and continued progress on the Caring Place in Oregon City.

Provide a status update for below. (required each quarter)

⁽¹⁾ A "material deviation" arises when the Program Funds spent in a given Fiscal Year cannot be reconciled against the spend-down plan to the degree that no reasonable person would conclude that Partner's spending was guided by or in conformance with the applicable spend-down plan.

Note: It is possible for actual spending against the Spend-Down Plan to exceed 100% without exceeding budget authority due to the use of savings in categories excluded from the Spend-Down Report calculation.

Spend-Down Report for Carryover

This section compares the spending plan of investment areas funded by carryover to actual costs.

These costs are also part of the Spend-Down Report for Program Costs above. This section provides additional detail and a progress update on these investment areas.

Carryover Spend-down Plan	\$ Spending by investment area			Comments
	Budget	Actual ⁽²⁾	Variance	
Beginning Fund Balance (carryover balance)	101,616,275	103,505,192	(1,888,917)	Clackamas County budgets interest earnings accrued over the course of the fiscal year as carryover funds.
Interest Earnings	2,000,000			
Describe Investment Area				
Regional Strategies Implementation Fund	822,903	109,630	713,273	Limited-term regional investments in coordinated entry and technical assistance for service providers.
Expanding Capacity	3,438,044	474,716	2,963,327	Limited-term investments in system development and capacity building.
Upstream Investments	6,263,933	2,545,267	3,718,666	Limited-term pilot programs to close system gaps, address unmet needs, and test innovative system integrations and up-stream approaches.
Short-term Rent Assistance	5,000,000	3,494,437	1,505,563	Short-term rental assistance to prevent evictions.
Housing 4 Success Program	3,856,134	572,598	3,283,535	The Housing 4 Success program will support households who are ready to become more self-sufficient by providing them additional support for three years while they transition off of the RLRA program.
Sustain Existing Programming	7,157,718	2,795,771	4,361,947	With the decline of annual SHS revenue Clackamas County is utilizing carryover funds to temporarily sustain multiple programs over the course of three fiscal years to slowly ramp them down and prevent a shock to the system.
Capital Needs	6,000,000	1,413,468	4,586,532	Construction of capital projects such as A Caring Place, but given the nature of these projects significant spending will occur in future year as the projects are built and additional projects begin.
	32,538,731	11,405,888	21,132,843	
Remaining prior year carryover	71,077,544	92,099,304	(23,021,760)	
Estimated current year carryover	6,557,945	6,557,945	-	
Ending Fund Balance (carryover balance)	77,635,489	98,657,249	(23,021,760)	

Provide a status update for each Investment Area line below. (required each quarter)

⁽²⁾ If the actual costs for any carryover investment areas are not tracked separately from existing program categories, use the Comments section to describe the methodology for determining the proportion of actual costs covered by carryover. For example: if service providers received a 25% increase in annual contracts for capacity building, and the costs are not tracked separately, the capacity building portion could be estimated as 20% of total actual costs (the % of the new contract amount that is related to the increase).