SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

SUBMITTED BY (COUNTY): Multnomah
FISCAL YEAR: FY26
QUARTER: Q4

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT TEMPLATE DRAFT

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
Report Due	Nov 15	Feb 15	May 15	Aug 15
Reporting Period	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	Rapid Re-Housing	Housing with Services	Housing Only	Prevention	Shelter Units
YTD Progress [1]	439 people / 383 households	938 people / 512 households	72 people / 42 households	29 people / 17 households	1,806 people / 1,217 households	145 new / 1,680 sustained
Goal	248 households	357 households	34 households	35 households	700 households	283 total new/ 1,224 sustained
SHS Year 1 to Current Date[2]	3,187 people / 2,321 households	5,226 people / 3,058 households	437 people / 313 households	139 people / 81 households	18,847 people / 13,637 households	2,591 total[3]/ 990 new /1,591 sustained

Section 1. Progress narrative

[1] *The data received each quarter may not add up exactly quarter over quarter. The data received each quarter is based on SHS funding percentages which fluctuate throughout the year as expenses occur. Consequently, data reported each quarter may differ from previous reports and may not be cumulative quarter over quarter. Data in the Annual Report will reflect accurate year-end figures.*

[2] *Outcomes in Year 1 of SHS implementation were primarily captured through provider reports due to limitations in capacity for HMIS outcomes reporting. Due to these data limitations and updates to data collection over time, there may be slight duplication across the service types.*

[3] *The shelter units shared represent fully or partially SHS-funded shelter units and are not representative of the entire shelter units available in Multnomah County, as some utilize funding sources other than SHS.*

One of each category/work plan goal must be covered in at least one quarterly report during the year. Metro will assist each county by tracking accordingly to ensure each category is covered throughout the year. In no more than 3-5 pages, please provide an executive summary and additional narrative to include:

- *A high-level snapshot of your quarterly outcomes that tells us if you are on track or not on track with your Annual Work Plan goals. Which can include overall challenges and barriers to implementation, opportunities in this quarter, success in this quarter, emerging challenges and opportunities with service providers.*

- *A focus on **one or two** of the following:*
    - o *Behavioral health*
    - o *New investments*
    - o *Leverage*
    - o *Service systems coordination*
    - o *Any other topic connected to your local implementation plan*

- *A focus on **one** of the three annual work plan categories, with one or two highlights and/or progress updates:*
    - o *Racial equity*
    - o *Capacity building: lead agency/ systems infrastructure,*
    - o *Capacity building: provider capacity.*

- ***Optional** narrative of the following regarding regional coordination:*
    - o *Coordinated Entry*
    - o *Landlord Recruitment*
    - o *Healthcare System Alignment*
    - o *Employee Recruitment and Retention*
    - o *Training*
    - o *Technical Assistance*

  **As an addendum to this report, Metro will attach individual progress reports for each area of regional coordination, which will provide additional details on implementation—including deliverables and milestones, metrics and outcomes, and budget information.*

- *A reflection on your progress for the quarter that includes your investments and programming during the reporting period.*

- *Please also connect any of the above narratives to your data tables, as applicable.*

Executive Summary

What preliminary data tell us about SHS progress in year five

Over this past fiscal year, over a thousand people in Multnomah County were able to end their experience of homelessness and move into housing thanks to the resources of the SHS measure. Represented in that group are children, families, seniors, people with disabilities, and communities of color experiencing homelessness at higher rates due to systemic discrimination—in other words, our neighbors. We were able to surpass our original goal of housing 674 people and households, ending the year with 1,390 people and 914 households (unduplicated) newly in housing thanks to the persistent efforts of our partners and dozens of community providers during a year in which SHS revenues continued to drop and many programs braced for upcoming closures or reductions in year six. In addition, a key external factor affecting SHS work this year has been changes in federal priorities that intensified the strain on our people and our systems. While the flexibility of SHS has allowed us to better navigate this turbulence, it was designed to be leveraged with all other available funding streams in our community to have the most impact—many of which have also seen significant cuts.

In addition to exceeding our housing placements goal, we also met or surpassed the majority of our other quantitative SHS goals for FY26 and made strong progress toward our qualitative goals. While we provide a preview of our efforts in this quarterly report, we look forward to sharing additional details about these goals and their connection to the objectives of the measure in our SHS annual report this fall.

Some of our highlights from Q4 include:

- Surpassing all but one of our housing placement goals for FY26 by housing 383 households year-to-date in PSH (154% of our goal), 512 households in RRH (143% of our goal), and supporting 1,217 households with homelessness prevention (174% of our goal).
- Moving forward with a 200-unit PSH expansion that will bring more culturally specific PSH services to Multnomah County.
- Expanding access to shelter and safety for key populations by opening a new shelter for survivors of domestic and sexual violence (DSV).

While we celebrate these successes, we also acknowledge that SHS is just one piece of the puzzle. Our region is still grappling with a housing crisis causing more people to become homeless than to leave it, and people are still experiencing homelessness on our streets. But the SHS measure has been a critical lifeline in Multnomah County, ensuring that thousands of people have made their way to safe, stable housing and are no longer forced to survive and adapt in places not meant for human habitation.

In alignment with Metro’s guidance, this report highlights Multnomah County’s progress on several quantitative and qualitative goals from our SHS Annual Work Plan, offers a snapshot of our SHS investments and programming in the fourth quarter, and discusses how we are operationalizing the priorities in our Local Implementation Plan.

A note on Q4 data limitations

The data in this report was prepared with incomplete financial information due to differences between Metro’s reporting timelines and the deadline for local governments like Multnomah County to complete their accounting for the fiscal year. The close of a fiscal year is a demanding period for financial reporting, requiring a thorough process to review, balance, and finalize records for both the final quarter and the entire year. Consequently, the results presented in this Q4 report are derived from preliminary fiscal data, which may be subject to adjustments upon the official closing of the books. An update to Q4 data based on finalized financial statements will be provided when Multnomah County releases our FY26 SHS annual report.

Annual Work Plan Progress

SHS Annual Work Plan quantitative goal highlights

In FY26, SHS funding supported 3,809 households (5,864 people) either exit homelessness or sustain their housing in Multnomah County. The table below reflects our progress towards our FY26 quantitative goals at the close of Q4. While we set goals for both households and people, we used households to determine whether we met each goal because that is Metro's preferred metric. The individuals and families below represent those who were *newly* placed or supported with SHS this year; in Multnomah County SHS is supporting thousands more who entered SHS-funded programs in prior years and have remained stably housed thanks to that support.

FY 2026 Annual Housing and Program Quantitative Goals[4]			
Category 1: Regional Metrics	**Year to Date Q1+Q2+Q3+Q4** *Newly Served*	**FY26 Work Plan Goal**	**% Achieved of goal** *Based on newly served households*
Permanent Supportive Housing	439 people 383 households	248 people / 248 households	**154%**
Rapid Re-Housing	938 people 512 households	357 people/ 357 households	**143%**
Housing With Services (Includes Transitional Housing)	72 people 42 households	34 people/ 34 households	**124%**
Housing Only	29 people 17 households	35 people/ 35 households	**49%**
Homeless Prevention (Eviction Prevention)	1,806 people 1,217 households	700 people/ 700 households	**174%**

As noted above, outcomes are tied to SHS spending and are subject to change in the SHS annual report as SHS spending data is finalized.

SHS providing steady housing opportunities and eviction support

The Homeless Services Department (HSD) surpassed all but one of our housing placement goals for FY26. Over the course of the fiscal year, 383 households were placed into permanent supportive housing (PSH), exceeding our placement goal by 154%. PSH offers long term stability to households experiencing

[4] In alignment with Metro requirements, these goals are based on households newly served and do not account for sustained households continuing to be supported with SHS. Sustained households will be reported on across service types in the FY26 Annual SHS Report to be published in November 2026.

chronic homelessness by pairing rent assistance with ongoing support services. Among households newly placed into PSH, 48% identified as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC).

In addition to PSH placements, SHS funding supported 568 unduplicated households in transitioning from homelessness into housing across rapid rehousing (RRH), housing with services, and housing only programs. By the end of Q4, 512 households were placed into RRH, 42 households were placed in programs providing housing with services, and 17 households were placed in programs providing housing only support.

In FY26, SHS supported 97 households composed of 278 people in Housing Only programs, of which 17 households (29 people) were newly placed. We were slightly behind in our Housing Only goal because the program has reached capacity and is no longer accepting new referrals. Additionally, when the goal was set at the beginning of the year we were measuring progress toward our goals by people and not households. This approach has since changed to align with updated Metro guidance and we are now reporting goal progress based on households.

Going into FY27, we will sustain households placed in Housing Only programs but do not anticipate any new placements. Housing Only refers to a broad category of housing programs that provide households with housing-related financial assistance without the support services component of other housing programs. This lighter touch service model represents a small portion of SHS funding and centers around investments in Multnomah County's Department of County Human Services (DCHS).

Beyond housing placements, SHS funding prevented 1,217 households from experiencing homelessness. Of the households served with homeless prevention, 56% identified as BIPOC. While homeless prevention is not the primary focus of SHS, investments in keeping people housed is a funding priority identified in Multnomah County's SHS Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and is a crucial intervention to address the growing number of households experiencing homelessness in our region.

Outreach reporting improvements paint broader outreach picture

At the end of Q4, 640 people were newly engaged in SHS-funded outreach services — achieving 106% of our annual goal. In addition to those newly engaged, outreach providers documented 3,276 total continued engagements for people previously served with outreach services. During Q4 alone, SHS-funded outreach providers reported 6,327 contacts, newly engaged 212 individuals, and 109 continued engagements.

As noted in Q2, HSD has made significant progress in implementing our new outreach strategy. One major development is increased HMIS presence for outreach providers paired with the use of a new geographic information system (ArcGIS) tool that allows outreach workers to input key geographical information in real time when working with people experiencing homelessness in our community. These efforts have resulted in expanded HMIS data that will help us better understand the demographics of who is being served in outreach and the geographic location of where these services are available.

While HMIS usage has increased substantially across outreach providers, HSD is committed to continued improvement to ensure the full breadth of engagements is captured in the system. Although most outreach providers were using HMIS in some capacity by the end of Q4, we recognize that not all outreach engagements for the year were reflected in HMIS as providers continue to integrate HMIS reporting into their workflows. Because of this, the outreach outcomes described above were pulled from HSD's newly implemented ArcGIS reporting tool and the outreach table on pages 23-25 reflects only the demographics for the participants with *new* outreach engagements logged in HMIS.

Since 2020, SHS has brought unprecedented resources and growth to our community and provided life-saving housing and homeless services to thousands of households. The steady number of new households placed and served speaks to the maturation of our system as SHS moves towards sustaining services. Amidst the funding reductions and unpredictable federal impacts ahead, SHS continues to provide stability for people experiencing homelessness and our region as a whole.

SHS Annual Work Plan qualitative goal highlights

In year five, Multnomah County's qualitative annual goals responded to the changing financial landscape of SHS by focusing on solidifying capacity, deepening collaboration, and sustaining critical infrastructure in the midst of budget constraints. We will provide a thorough accounting of each of our six qualitative goals in our year five SHS annual report, due to Metro November 2; in this report we highlight goals from the racial equity and provider capacity section of our Annual Work Plan that we have not previously featured this fiscal year.

SHS racial equity analysis reveals housing successes; ongoing gaps for some populations

The SHS measure places a particular focus on improving housing access and outcomes for the disproportionate number of Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) who experience homelessness as a result of decades of systemic discrimination that has kept these communities out of the housing market and at greater risk for housing instability. While we have made strides toward slightly decreasing the percentage of Black, Indigenous, and people of color experiencing chronic homelessness in Multnomah County during the life of the measure, we know that disparities remain and that understanding the experience of specific populations will allow us to intervene strategically. As a result, we set a goal this year to assess racial and other identity-based disparities in services and outcomes, and do a landscape scan of current Homeless Services Department (HSD) equity initiatives.

HSD staff have delivered this information through our FY25 SHS annual report, published last fall, and will continue to share on this in our upcoming FY26 annual report. The SHS racial equity analysis is updated annually as part of the annual reporting process, and the annual report provides detailed updates on HSD's current initiatives to promote equity.

One key finding from our FY25 SHS annual report is that the Hispanic and Latino/a/e community, which faced increasing economic and other challenges in 2025, represented a growing share of the population experiencing homelessness compared to previous years. In response, in December of 2025 the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners unanimously approved a resolution and budget allocation designed to strengthen the County's sanctuary commitment and leverage $226,000 from Metro to support rent assistance for families affected by immigration enforcement.

Key equity initiatives featured in our FY25 SHS annual report included a grants pilot for culturally specific providers, monthly equity-based trainings for our partner organizations, required organizational equity plans and progress reports for contracted providers, and increased services funding for culturally specific permanent supportive housing (PSH) providers.

We look forward to providing an update on what FY26 data reveal about the state of racial disparities in homelessness in Multnomah County and our current landscape of equity initiatives in our year five SHS annual report this fall.

PSH services funding expands provider capacity amid continued demand

In FY26 we continued to provide an increased level of per-household services funding for permanent supportive housing projects, and successfully met our SHS annual work plan goal to evaluate the impact of the funding on provider capacity.

In FY25 the Homeless Services Department (HSD) achieved our SHS annual work plan goal to increase the amount of wraparound support available to individuals and families served by our network of permanent supportive housing providers. This decision raised the services funding rate to $15,000 per year for permanent supportive housing projects while establishing a premium funding level of $17,500 per household for culturally specific projects, family projects, and PSH buildings with at least 25% of apartments dedicated to PSH. This historic funding increase was designed to provide critical stabilization for Multnomah County's PSH programming and ensure that these programs remain stable and adequately resourced to serve community members who have experienced homelessness and are starting to rebuild their lives in housing.

To understand whether the funds were having their intended impact, PSH staff have been collecting qualitative data for the past two years through a survey, ongoing analysis of provider budgets, quarterly meetings with providers, and a monthly PSH community group. This revealed that while some projects had stabilized and now had enough services funding to meet the needs of their participants, other programs were still struggling. The difference was closely related to whether a program was tenant-based (rent assistance is connected to a person) or site-based (rent assistance is connected to a specific building). The PSH team found that some smaller, site-based PSH buildings were stretched thin to cover building operations and services costs such as 24-hour staffing, security, and behavioral health services. Because site-based programs are funded per unit, smaller buildings have fewer resources to work with.

As these issues emerged, HSD recaptured excess PSH funding and provided additional support for projects with higher needs, including identifying ways to leverage Medicaid-funded benefits and supportive services. We will continue to explore these funding streams and added supports in FY27. While our evaluation has been primarily focused on the impact of the increased services funding on provider capacity, this process has also allowed us to understand some of our partners' non-financial capacity needs. Our monthly HSD-led community group for PSH providers was especially helpful in identifying broader capacity challenges that have continued to exist despite additional funding. Providers voiced a need for more PSH-related training, spaces for peer support, and opportunities to fill each other's gaps in resources and funding. They acted on these challenges by touring each other's PSH programs, learning from each other through peer mentorship, and extending services to one another. For instance, one provider with a behavioral health program adjacent to their PSH programming was able to partner with another PSH provider in great need of these services. Another organization made their Oregon Health Plan Assister available to visit other PSH sites and help participants of other PSH programs navigate the Oregon Health Plan.

In FY27 we will perform a deeper evaluation and work with each provider to understand the true cost of their PSH programs so we can clearly understand their financial needs and make any strategic pivots. Our intent is to continue to explore both opportunities for connection and opportunities to align funding with the reality on the ground.

Investments & Programming

Permanent Supportive Housing system set to launch 200 new units with culturally specific services

In addition to meeting our housing placements goal, our Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) system also celebrated moving forward with a 200-unit expansion dispersed between eight PSH projects that will bring more culturally specific PSH to Multnomah County for communities of color. The project blends two of the top priorities of the SHS measure — increasing supportive housing opportunities for people experiencing chronic homelessness, and aiming to reduce racial disparities by largely supporting populations overrepresented in our homeless community due to institutional and systemic racism. Residents in all units will have access to culturally-specific wraparound services, including those designed for the Latine, Native American, Black/African American, Somali, and broader immigrant and refugee communities.

Providers were identified through a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process that broadened the pool of organizations providing PSH services in Multnomah County and awarded contracts to two culturally specific organizations new to the PSH system. Several culturally specific providers cited the recently increased services cap as one reason they felt comfortable applying to launch PSH programming. In FY25, HSD increased the amount of funding available to PSH providers for wraparound services from $10,000 per household to $15,000 per household, with a premium for culturally specific programs. While we have learned that funding levels do not always meet all provider needs or address increasing acuity, they have proven invaluable in spurring growth for some organizations.

In Q4, HSD staff worked with providers to make allocations, begin executing contracts, and schedule training so that placements in new units can begin in Q1. Based on provider feedback and lessons learned from previous onboarding sessions, HSD designed a cohort model to familiarize new culturally specific providers with the contracting process and the PSH and Coordinated Access systems. Staff have worked closely with each awarded project to identify and address areas for support. All units are supported by SHS Regional Long Term Rent Assistance (RLRA) funding and are slated to come fully online by the end of FY27.

On a larger scale, across the PSH system providers highlighted Q4 successes in housing retention, community building, and connecting residents to wraparound services. For example:

- Services provided by Cascadia at the Beacon supported 20 households to reach their six-month housing stability mark in just one quarter.
- Services provided by Central City Concern at the Starlight successfully connected residents to primary care, detox, and mental health support.
- Successes at Prescott Terrace included a participant earning their GED and another securing employment as a credentialed peer wellness specialist. Community engagement was a strong theme as well, with residents participating in group events, collaborative art, gardening, and community dinners.
- At Kafoury Court, a newly opened project with 40 units, households successfully moved in and were quickly connected to healthcare resources and benefits.
- At Meridian Gardens, a recovery-oriented PSH project, a resident one year into his recovery journey told his Case Manager that his biggest goals were getting his own place and regaining

> custody of his children. Working together, they were able to navigate regaining custody and applying for a new apartment. He now lives in a bigger apartment with his kids.

Along with these successes, PSH programs faced notable challenges, often stemming from property management staffing and unit turnover, safety concerns, and high-acuity behavioral health needs. One of the barriers the veteran system encountered was inconsistent property management. This led to delayed unit turnovers, vacancies, and a backlog for veterans waiting for placement. Similar barriers impacted operations at other sites, where management and staffing issues compounded security challenges. As mentioned in the previous section, one way we are working to address these challenges is through a deeper analysis of PSH services cap funding and strategic adjustments to address higher needs at some PSH sites.

New shelter expands options for survivors of domestic and sexual violence

Amid one of the most challenging budget seasons in recent memory, and facing significant reductions to nearly every funding stream, HSD made the difficult decision to ramp down 522 shelter units in FY27. This will allow us to preserve housing programs and prevent housed participants from returning to homelessness, while making strategic expansions to shelter in the areas of highest need and increasing the resources available to shelters to move people from temporary beds to permanent homes more quickly.

One such example of this is the recent use of SHS funds to expand shelter units and services for survivors of domestic and sexual violence (DSV) in partnership with Bradley Angle. Launched in Q4 and funded in part by SHS, the Lavender shelter added 32 new shelter beds to the DSV system and can house up to 24 families at a time. This investment ensures that more survivors and their children have immediate access to a safe, private space to sleep, paired with 24/7 access to wraparound services that are gender-inclusive and culturally-responsive. Along with this expansion, Bradley Angle has recalibrated their current shelter services to center racial equity given the higher rates that people of color, especially women of color, experience violence and homelessness.

Lavender shelter residents have access to a full range of services, including legal advocacy, programs to build financial independence, and help finding a permanent home. By providing holistic and tailored support, Bradley Angle has had great success in helping participants who have escaped harrowing circumstances move from shelter into stable, permanent housing.

Three families experiencing disabilities move into housing thanks to wraparound support

Although we do not set numeric goals for the majority of wraparound services that SHS funds, these services are nevertheless essential to the identity and success of the measure as a whole. Services can be tailored to the unique needs of a population, person, or family, and make a difference in participants' ability to successfully navigate housing barriers and gain stability.

In Q4, SHS made it possible to provide services for adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD) through our partnership with Multnomah County's Department of County Human Services (DCHS). Staff in this program provide culturally responsive case management for participants experiencing homelessness, facilitate screenings for IDD services, work in coordination with shelters and day centers, and help increase access for underserved populations through specialized outreach.

This quarter, staff worked with three families who successfully obtained permanent housing after experiencing chronic homelessness, noting that without the help of SHS funding this would not have been possible. One mother of a young son with autism is now a proud renter after fleeing domestic violence, living for eight years in shelters and motels, and working with IDD staff to acquire a housing voucher and apply for an apartment. Another family of three who lost their home due to foreclosure and experienced an eviction due to job loss now have an apartment as well as IDD services for a middle schooler with autism and a family member with severe PTSD. Staff coordinated temporary motel stays and emergency food assistance while the family applied for food and medical benefits, and identified an opportunity for rent assistance through the Medicaid Health-Related Social Needs (HRSN) benefit. SHS funds were also leveraged to help pay the family's security deposit, paving the way for a successful move-in.

In combination with these services, the program also used flexible client and rental assistance funds to eliminate immediate housing barriers for many participants. Funds covered critical placement costs such as application fees, security deposits, future rent, utilities, arrears, and historical housing debt. They also addressed urgent basic needs such as temporary motel vouchers, specialized health and disability equipment, weather-appropriate apparel, food, hygiene supplies, storage, phone services, and essential documentation such as birth certificates and state ID cards. Together, all of these supports ensure that participants in SHS programs have the resources they need to rebuild their lives after experiencing homelessness.

Local Implementation Plan

SHS Leveraged to Strengthen HUD Continuum of Care Projects for second year

Multnomah County's Local Implementation Plan (LIP) notes that "The promise of the SHS Measure to substantially reduce homelessness in the region can only be realized if every effort is made to use Measure funds to leverage the full range of federal, state, other County, private sector, community and philanthropic resources that are and become available." SHS is part of the solution to our regional homelessness crisis, but it was not intended to replace other resources, especially given the scale of need in our communities.

One key way we have leveraged SHS in combination with other funding sources for the last two years is by using SHS funding to meet the required 25% local match required by HUD for federally funded Continuum of Care (CoC) programs. In FY25, 97% percent of CoC providers continued to operate a CoC project thanks to the match, and some noted that without these funds their programs could not be operating. In FY26 we continued to provide SHS match funds for all eligible CoC projects despite political turbulence and lawsuits that substantially delayed HUD funding renewals. The matching funds provided by SHS supported these projects' ability to continue serving households despite delays in HUD's contract renewal process.

Being able to leverage SHS as a local, flexible resource for permanent housing has been critical in a time when federal funding is becoming more volatile. As HUD and federal funding has begun to actively target or work against culturally specific providers and the services they offer, SHS funds have also been able to provide the necessary flexibility and support for CoC projects to continue doing the critical work of supporting populations disproportionately impacted by homelessness.

Looking to the future, with Metro's support we are exploring options to use SHS funds to sustain longtime CoC programs that are losing CoC funding and may otherwise have to close, especially as CoC funding requirements are being increasingly tied to transitional housing. We are also exploring creative, yet allowable, avenues of SHS funding to ensure households in CoC projects that are closing are not returning to homelessness.

Conclusion

Over a thousand people previously experiencing homelessness are now sleeping inside in permanent homes thanks to the resources of this measure and the compassion of our community over the past year. In Multnomah County we were able to meet the majority of our annual goals while continuing to grapple with significant changes and challenges in our homeless system of care. With continued changes and constraints on the horizon in FY27, we remain committed to the core values of SHS and to thoughtfully leveraging this essential local resource to bring more people home.

Section 2. Data and data disaggregation [5]

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

Note for all data tables: Race and ethnicity and gender identity responses can be selected alone or in combination, so the raw numbers added up can be greater than the total number of people. In addition, some Q1 percentages are based on a small population size and may experience significant shifts as the year progresses.

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	62					439	177%
Total Households	52	376	98%	7	2%	383	154%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	14	22%	77	18%
Asian or Asian American	0	0%	8	2%
Black, African American or African	11	17%	94	21%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	8	13%	48	11%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%	1	0.2%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	13	20%	22	5%
White	38	61%	273	62%

[5] *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.*

Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	36	56%	255	58%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	3	1%
Client prefers not to answer	0	0%	7	2%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	1	0.2%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	50	19%	356	81%
Persons without disabilities	12	2%	75	17%
Disability unreported	1	44%	8	2%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	28	0%	193	44%
Man (Boy, if child)	33	3%	229	52%
Culturally Specific Identity	0	3%	0	0%
Non-Binary	2	2%	12	3%
Transgender	2	0%	10	2%
Questioning	1	0%	2	0.5%
Different Identity	0	0%	2	0.5%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0.0%
Client prefers not to answer	0	0%	1	0.2%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0.0%

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

Number of housing placements- Housing with Services	**Current Quarter**	**Year to Date**					
	Number	Subset-Population A placed into Housing with Services	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B placed in Housing with Services	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of Annual Goal

Total People	4					72	211%
Total Households	4	32	76%	10	24%	42	124%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	2	50%	6	8%
Asian or Asian American	0	0%	0	0%
Black, African American or African	0	0%	8	11%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	2	50%	13	18%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%	0	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	3	4%
White	2	50%	52	72%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	1	25%	49	68%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client prefers not to answer	0	0%	1	1%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	1	1%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	3	75%	27	38%
Persons without disabilities	0	0%	43	60%
Disability unreported	1	25%	2	3%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	4	100%	37	51%
Man (Boy, if child)	0	0%	31	43%
Culturally Specific Identity	0	0%	0	0%
Non-Binary	0	0%	2	3%

Transgender	0	0%	1	1%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Different Identity	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn’t know	0	0%	0	0%
Client prefers not to answer	0	0%	1	1%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Housing Only

Number of housing placements- Housing Only	**Current Quarter**	**Year to Date**					
	Number	Subset- Population A placed into Housing Only	Percentage: Population A	Subset- Population B placed in Housing Only	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of Annual Goal
Total People	2					29	83%
Total Households	2	12	69%	5	31%	17	49%

Race & Ethnicity	**This Quarter**		**Year to Date**	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	0	0%	6	21%
Asian or Asian American	0	0%	1	3%
Black, African American or African	0	0%	6	21%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	0	0%	13	45%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%	0	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0%	5	17%
White	2	100%	8	28%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	2	100%	6	21%
Client doesn’t know	0	0%	0	0%

Client prefers not to answer	0	0%	0	0%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	0	0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	1	50%	11	38%
Persons without disabilities	1	50%	18	62%
Disability unreported	0	0%	0	0%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	1	50%	15	52%
Man (Boy, if child)	1	50%	14	48%
Culturally Specific Identity	0	0%	0	0%
Non-Binary	0	0%	0	0%
Transgender	0	0%	0	0%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0%
Different Identity	0	0%	0	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client prefers not to answer	0	0%	0	0%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

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 RRH	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B placed in RRH	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of Annual Goal
Total People	212					938	263%

Total Households	108	400	78%	112	22%	512	143%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	25	12%	80	9%
Asian or Asian American	1	0.5%	13	1%
Black, African American or African	79	37%	370	39%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	79	37%	265	28%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%	2	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	6	3%	34	4%
White	101	48%	357	38%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	76	36%	297	32%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0%
Client prefers not to answer	0	0%	8	1%
Data Not Collected	2	1%	3	0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	99	47%	371	40%
Persons without disabilities	93	44%	449	48%
Disability unreported	20	9%	118	13%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	120	57%	468	50%
Man (Boy, if child)	92	43%	412	44%
Culturally Specific Identity	0	0%	45	5%
Non-Binary	3	1%	9	1%
Transgender	0	0%	7	1%

Questioning	0	0%	1	0%
Different Identity	1	0.4%	5	1%
Client doesn’t know	0	0%	0	0%
Client prefers not to answer	1	0.4%	1	0%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0%

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Eviction and Homelessness Prevention

Number of Preventions	Current Quarter	Year to Date					
	Number	Subset-Population A served with HP	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B served with HP	Percentage: Population B	Number	Percentage of Annual Goal
Total People	201					1,809	258%
Total Households	119	824	68%	393	32%	1,217	174%

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	14	7%	108	6%
Asian or Asian American	10	5%	76	4%
Black, African American or African	52	26%	406	22%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	63	31%	408	23%
Middle Eastern or North African	4	2%	49	3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	7	3%	86	5%
White	90	45%	840	46%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	81	40%	752	42%
Client doesn’t know	0	0%	7	0%

Client prefers not to answer	2	1%	30	2%
Data Not Collected	0	0%	18	1%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	83	41%	445	25%
Persons without disabilities	114	56%	684	38%
Disability unreported	6	3%	696	38%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	118	58%	1,052	58%
Man (Boy, if child)	81	40%	734	41%
Culturally Specific Identity	0	0%	0	0%
Non-Binary	3	1%	22	1%
Transgender	3	1%	10	1%
Questioning	1	0.5%	1	0%
Different Identity	2	1%	4	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	1	0%
Client prefers not to answer	0	0%	3	0%
Data not collected	0	0%	4	0%

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	**Current Quarter**	**Year to Date**				
	Number	Subset - Population A in RLRA	Percentage: Population A	Subset-Population B in RLRA	Percentage: Population B	Number

Quarterly Program Data						
Number of RLRA vouchers issued during reporting period	38	123	80.4%	14	9.2%	153
Number of **people** newly leased up during reporting period	89	256	68.4%	68	18.2%	374
Number of **households** newly leased up during reporting period	62	189	81.1%	22	9.4%	233
Number of **people** in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	1,960	1,379	65.5%	581	27.6%	2,105
Number of **households** in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	1,141	990	79.4%	169	13.6%	1,247

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	2,427	1,659	68.4%	599	24.7%	
Number of **households** in housing using an RLRA voucher	1,531	1,243	81.2%	177	11.6%	

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	204	10.4%	218	10.4%
Asian or Asian American	29	1.5%	31	1.5%
Black, African American or African	744	38.0%	808	38.4%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	503	25.7%	530	25.2%
Middle Eastern or North African	5	0.3%	5	0.2%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	63	3.2%	65	3.1%
White	915	46.7%	986	46.8%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	539	27.5%	588	27.9%
Client doesn’t know	21	1.1%	21	1.0%
Client prefers not to answer	57	2.9%	57	2.7%
Data Not Collected	27	1.4%	27	1.3%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	1077	54.9%	1179	56.0%
Persons without disabilities	883	45.1%	926	44.0%
Disability unreported	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	1061	54.1%	1133	53.8%
Man (Boy, if child)	829	42.3%	897	42.6%
Culturally Specific Identity	1	0.1%	1	0.0%
Non-Binary	36	1.8%	37	1.8%
Transgender	29	1.5%	34	1.6%
Questioning	2	0.1%	2	0.1%
Different Identity	1	0.1%	1	0.0%
Client doesn’t know	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Client prefers not to answer	10	0.5%	10	0.5%
Data not collected	2	0.1%	2	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	942					4,454
Total Households	745	3,235	87%	501	13%	3,736

Race & Ethnicity	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	79	8%	397	9%
Asian or Asian American	20	2%	123	3%
Black, African American or African	219	23%	953	21%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	154	16%	671	15%
Middle Eastern or North African	2	0%	28	1%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	57	6%	236	5%
White	508	54%	2,598	58%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	480	51%	2,439	55%

Client doesn't know	4	0%	16	0%
Client prefers not to answer	17	2%	80	2%
Data Not Collected	17	2%	29	1%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	598	63%	66%	66%
Persons without disabilities	308	33%	33%	33%
Disability unreported	40	4%	4%	4%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	402	43%	1,948	44%
Man (Boy, if child)	498	53%	2,372	53%
Culturally Specific Identity	2	0%	10	0%
Non-Binary	20	2%	107	2%
Transgender	19	2%	102	2%
Questioning	0	0%	6	0%
Different Identity	2	0%	8	0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	2	0%
Client prefers not to answer	4	0%	18	0%
Data not collected	15	2%	17	0%

SHS-Funded Outreach

As noted in Q2, Metro has approved HSD to use the narrative section for reporting on SHS-funded outreach while outreach providers work to integrate HMIS reporting into their workflows. **The table below reflects only the number of people newly engaged in outreach services captured in HMIS**. These numbers will not match the outcomes produced by the ArcGIS tool since they are two different data sources used to track outreach engagements across the same population. Please see the Annual Work Plan Progress section of this report for the full outcomes provided by HSD's new geographical information system (ArcGIS) tool.

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	*129*					354
Total households	*125*					343
Sub-Set – Total people “Engaged” during reporting period	*129*	261	74%	92	26%	354
Sub-Set – Total households “Engaged” during reporting period	*125*	253	74%	90	26%	343

**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	16	12%	50	14%
Asian or Asian American	1	1%	3	1%
Black, African American or African	27	21%	63	18%
Hispanic/Latina/e/o	19	15%	35	10%
Middle Eastern or North African	0	0%	1	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4	3%	8	2%
White	51	39%	176	50%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	48	37%	168	47%
Client doesn’t know	2	1%	4	1%

Client prefers not to answer	13	10%	43	12 %
Data Not Collected	2	1%	3	1%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	72	56%	206	58%
Persons without disabilities	20	16%	51	14%
Disability unreported	36	28%	99	28%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Woman (Girl, if child)	54	42%	131	37%
Man (Boy, if child)	64	50%	181	51%
Culturally Specific Identity	1	1%	2	1%
Non-Binary	2	1%	10	3%
Transgender	1	1%	4	1%
Questioning	0	0%	1	0%
Different Identity	0	0%	1	0%
Client doesn't know	1	1%	1	0%
Client prefers not to answer	3	2%	19	5%
Data not collected	0	0%	1	0%

Section 3. Financial Reporting

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

The Q4 financial summary has been attached at the end of this report. Please see pages 28-31.

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 is designed to assist nonsubsidized market rate landlord run units.

Yellow Cell = County to fill in
Blue Cell = Formula calculation

Due Date: The Quarterly Progress Report is due to Metro within 45 days after the end of each quarter (IGA 7.1.2).
The Annual Program Report is due no later than October 31 of each year (IGA 7.1.1).

Metro Supportive Housing Services

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

Multnomah County
FY 2025-2026

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	62,967,179	62,967,180				62,967,180	(1)	100%	*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	136,584,365	3,667,734	39,559,218	27,620,221	78,831,700	149,678,873	(13,094,508)	110%	
Interest Earnings[5]		493,221	440,907	305,467	515,655	1,755,249	(1,755,249)	N/A	
Metro SHS Admin Carryover		-	-	-	226,665	226,665	(226,665)	N/A	**Q4 Note:** Part of Resolution No. 25-5558 to support people at risk of homelessness due to increased immigration enforcement activity.
insert addt'l lines as necessary						-	-	N/A	
Subtotal Program Revenue	136,584,365	4,160,955	40,000,125	27,925,689	79,574,019	**151,660,788**	(15,076,423)	111%	
Total Metro SHS Resources	199,551,544	67,128,135	40,000,125	27,925,689	79,574,019	**214,627,967**	(15,076,423)	108%	
Metro SHS Requirements									
Program Costs									
Individual Support Costs									
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)									
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									
Permanent Supportive Housing Services	39,729,642	2,388,136	6,832,751	9,336,101	12,997,264	31,554,252	8,175,390	79%	
Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA)	19,355,893	1,887,259	4,582,205	4,175,202	4,788,917	15,433,583	3,922,310	80%	
Long-term Rent Assistance Admin	434,110	83,366	194,827	111,598	118,937	508,727	(74,617)	117%	Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 3% of Partner's YTD expenses on long-term rent assistance.
Subtotal PSH	59,519,645	4,358,760	11,609,784	13,622,901	17,905,118	**47,496,562**	12,023,083	80%	
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)									
Support to individuals experiencing a loss of housing									
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)	11,641,206	1,308,294	3,181,687	3,627,002	5,736,802	13,853,785	(2,212,579)	119%	**Q4 Note:** Due to an internal project to reevaluate program categories, the Q1-Q3 totals for this category has changed.
Subtotal RRH	11,641,206	1,308,294	3,181,687	3,627,002	5,736,802	**13,853,785**	(2,212,579)	119%	

Rapid Re-housing (RRH)									
Support to individuals experiencing a loss of housing									
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)	11,641,206	1,308,294	3,181,687	3,627,002	5,736,802	13,853,785	(2,212,579)	119%	**Q4 Note:** Due to an internal project to reevaluate program categories, the Q1-Q3 totals for this category has changed.
Subtotal RRH	11,641,206	1,308,294	3,181,687	3,627,002	5,736,802	**13,853,785**	(2,212,579)	119%	
Other Housing and Services Programs (not otherwise listed)									
Support to individuals who are experiencing homelessness or have substantial risk of homelessness									
Housing Only	5,489,568	575,591	1,356,185	1,078,502	1,285,877	4,296,155	1,193,413	78%	**Q4 Note:** Due to an internal project to reevaluate program categories, the Q2-Q3 totals for this category has changed.
Housing Only - Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	
Housing Only - Long-term Rent Assistance Admin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	N/A	
Housing with Services	5,236,501	550,435	1,489,026	876,550	1,711,008	4,627,019	609,482	88%	
Subtotal Other Housing and Services Programs	10,726,069	1,126,026	2,845,212	1,955,051	2,996,885	8,923,174	1,802,895	83%	
Eviction & Homelessness Prevention									
Support to individuals experiencing a potential loss of housing									
Eviction & Homelessness Prevention	3,794,157	311,421	428,152	432,331	882,235	2,054,138	1,740,019	54%	
Subtotal Eviction & Homelessness Prevention	3,794,157	311,421	428,152	432,331	882,235	**2,054,138**	1,740,019	54%	
Safety On/Off the Street									
Support to individuals unhoused or in temporary housing									
Shelter and Transitional Housing	67,860,484	8,430,678	11,627,804	11,723,529	24,445,580	56,227,591	11,632,893	83%	**Q4 Note:** Due to an internal project to reevaluate program categories, the Q1-Q3 totals for this category has changed.
Outreach and Access Services	7,801,925	1,439,864	2,150,681	1,446,542	2,865,913	7,903,000	(101,075)	101%	**Q4 Note:** Due to an internal project to reevaluate program categories, the Q1-Q3 totals for this category has changed.
Subtotal Safety On/Off the Street	75,662,409	9,870,542	13,778,485	13,170,071	27,311,493	**64,130,591**	11,531,818	85%	
Other Supportive Services (not otherwise listed)									
Other supports to individuals not included in any of the above categories									
Other Supportive Services	7,226,438	1,410,252	2,243,859	1,939,163	2,440,922	8,034,196	(807,758)	111%	**Q4 Note:** Due to an internal project to reevaluate program categories, the Q1-Q3 totals for this category has changed.
Subtotal Other Supportive Services	7,226,438	1,410,252	2,243,859	1,939,163	2,440,922	**8,034,196**	(807,758)	111%	
System Support Costs									
System Support Costs									
Systems Infrastructure	4,315,940	789,297	1,093,432	848,231	1,928,940	4,659,899	(343,959)	108%	
Built Infrastructure	6,850,000	-	-	6,850,000	-	6,850,000	-	100%	**Q2 Note:** This built Infrastructure already been used in January and will be reflected in Q3 Report.
Overall System Services	779,735	305,001	426,814	(44,485)	150,981	838,312	(58,577)	108%	**Q2 Note:** $184,641.55 will be moved to RSIF Landlord Recruitment and $100,899.94 will be moved to Coordinated Entry in Q3. **Q4 Note**: Due to an internal project to reevaluate program categories, the Q2-Q3 totals for this category has changed.
Subtotal System Support Costs	11,945,675	1,094,298	1,520,246	7,653,745	2,079,921	**12,348,210**	(402,535)	103%	

Regional Strategy Implementation									
Regional Strategy Implementation									
Investments to support SHS program alignment, coordination and outcomes at a regional level									
Coordinated Entry	427,709	-	-	167,067	256,603	423,670	4,039	99%	
Regional Landlord Recruitment	3,178,138	112,736	297,838	581,716	670,604	1,662,895	1,515,243	52%	
Healthcare System Alignment	459,390	112,631	113,349	118,298	116,184	460,461	(1,071)	100%	**Q4 Note:** Amount changes in Q1, Q2, and Q3 due to miscategorization. Difference was originally in County Administrative Costs.
Training	470,827	116,166	116,139	121,408	120,070	473,784	(2,957)	101%	**Q4 Note:** Amount changes in Q1, Q2, and Q3 due to miscategorization. Difference was originally in County Administrative Costs.
Technical Assistance	232,252	60,845	60,775	64,837	62,438	248,896	(16,644)	107%	**Q4 Note:** Amount changes in Q1, Q2, and Q3 due to miscategorization. Difference was originally in County Administrative Costs.
Employee Recruitment and Retention	-		-	-	-	-	-	N/A	
Homeless Management Information System	2,480,356	355,419	356,047	408,264	768,872	1,888,603	591,753	76%	**Q4 Note:** Amount changes in Q1, Q2, and Q3 due to miscategorization. Difference was originally in County Administrative Costs.
Subtotal Regional Strategy Implementation	7,248,672	757,798	944,149	1,461,591	1,994,771	5,158,309	2,090,363	71%	
County Administrative Costs									
County Administrative Costs									*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.*
County Administrative Costs	7,621,543	1,837,189	1,669,055	1,743,477	1,473,240	6,722,961	898,582	88%	**Q4 Note:** Due to RSIF miscategorization and an internal project to reevaluate program categories, the Q1-Q3 totals for this category has changed.
Subtotal County Administrative Costs	7,621,543	1,837,189	1,669,055	1,743,477	1,473,240	**6,722,961**	898,582	88%	County SHS Administrative Costs equals 4% of County's annual Program Funds.
Subtotal Program Costs	195,385,814	22,074,580	38,220,627	45,605,332	62,821,388	168,721,926	26,663,888	86%	
Ending Fund Balance (incl. Contingency and Reserves)	4,165,730					**45,906,041**			
Budgeted Contingency and Reserves									*This section reflects budgeted contingency and reserve figures.*
Contingency [3]	-					-			Contingency equals 0% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds.
Regional Strategy Implementation Contingency	251,426					251,426			
Stabilization Reserve[4]	3,292,625					3,292,625			Stabilization Reserve equals 2% of Partner's budgeted annual Program Funds.
RLRA Reserves	621,679					621,679			
Other Programmatic Reserves	-					-			
insert addt'l lines as necessary									
Subtotal Contingency and Reserves	4,165,730					**4,165,730**			

Yellow Cell = County to fill in
Blue Cell = Formula calculation

Due Date: The Quarterly Progress Report is due to Metro within 45 days after the end of each quarter (IGA 7.1.2). The Annual Program Report is due no later than October 31 of each year (IGA 7.1.1).

Metro Supportive Housing Services
Financial Report for Quarterly Progress Report (IGA 7.1.2) and Annual Program Report (IGA 7.1.1)
Multnomah 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.

	% of Spending per Quarter			Comments
Program Costs *(excluding Built Infrastructure)*	**Budget**	**Actual**	**Variance**	*Explain any material deviations from the Spend-Down Plan, or any changes that were made to the initial Spend-Down Plan.[1]*
Quarter 1	5%	12%	7%	
Quarter 2	10%	20%	10%	
Quarter 3	25%	21%	-4%	
Quarter 4	40%	33%	-7%	
Total	80%	86%	6%	

	$ Spending YTD			Comments
Built Infrastructure	**Budget**	**Actual**	**Forecast**	*Provide a status update for below. (required each quarter)*
Annual total	6,850,000	6,850,000		

[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.

	$ Spending by investment area			Comments
Carryover Spend-down Plan	**Budget**	**Actual[2]**	**Variance**	*Provide a status update for each Investment Area line below. (required each quarter)*
Beginning Fund Balance (carryover balance)	62,967,179	62,967,180	(1)	
Describe Investment Area				
Permanent Supportive Housing Services	1,163,687	1,163,687	-	
Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA)	3,257,020	3,257,020	-	
Rapid Re-housing (RRH)	7,533,737	7,533,737	-	
Housing Only	433,680	433,680	-	
Housing with Services	2,531,287	2,531,287	-	
Eviction & Homelessness Prevention	2,031,209	2,031,209	-	
Shelter and Transitional Housing	20,531,624	20,531,624	-	
Outreach and Access Services	4,592,008	4,592,008	-	
Other Supportive Services	780,726	780,726	-	
Systems Infrastructure	1,553,986	1,553,986	-	
Built Infrastructure	6,850,000	6,850,000	-	
Overall System Services	195,495	195,495	-	
RSIF: Coordinated Access	54,459	54,459	-	
RSIF: Regional Landlord Recruitment	2,313,288	1,662,895	650,393	
RSIF: Healthcare System Alignment	459,390	459,390	-	
RSIF: Training	470,827	470,827	-	
RSIF: Technical Assistance	232,252	232,252	-	
RSIF: Homeless Management Information Syst	2,480,356	1,888,603	591,753	
Regional Strategy Implementation Contingenc	251,426	-	251,426	
County Administrative Costs	1,336,418	1,336,418	-	
Stabilization Reserve[4]	3,292,625	-	3,292,625	
RLRA Reserves	621,679	-	621,679	
	62,967,179	57,559,303	5,407,876	
Remaining prior year carryover	-	5,407,877	(5,407,877)	
Estimated current year carryover	-		-	
Ending Fund Balance (carryover balance)	-	5,407,877	(5,407,877)	

[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).