

Supportive Housing Services Regional Policy Oversight Committee (SHS RPOC) agenda

Wednesday, July 8, 2026

3:00 PM

Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers,
Zoom Meeting ID: 992 8075 2363 Meeting
password: 137066 Meeting phone:
971-247-1195 , 888-475-4499;
<https://zoom.us/j/99280752363>

1. Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum & Introductions

1.1 Call to Order and Declaration of Quorum

[COM](#)
[26-1142](#)

Presenter(s): Chair Juan Carlos Gonzalez (he/him), Metro
Raahi Reddy (she/her), Estolano Advisors

2. Consent Agenda

2.1 June Meeting Minutes

[COM](#)
[26-1138](#)

Attachments: [2026-06-10 RPOC meeting minutes](#)

3. Committee Member Communication

3.1 Staff Updates

[COM](#)
[26-1141](#)

Presenter(s): Liam Frost (he/him), Metro

4. Information/Discussion items

4.1 SHS reform: KPIs, KEIs, and Goals

[COM](#)
[26-1139](#)

Presenter(s): Yesenia Delgado (she/her), Metro
Liam Frost (he/him), Metro

Attachments: [Goals, KPI and KEI Agenda Item Summary and Presentation Guide](#)
[Goals, KPI and KEI Summary](#)

- 4.2 SHS reform: Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) framework [COM](#)
[26-1140](#)
- Presenter(s): Cole Merkel (he/him), Metro
- Attachments: [CQI Agenda Item Summary and Presentation Guide](#)
[Continuous Quality Improvement Established Concepts Overview](#)
[Continuous Quality Improvement National examples](#)

5. Public Communication on Agenda Items

Submit written testimony by emailing housingservices@oregonmetro.gov. Written testimony received by 4 p.m. the Friday before the meeting will be shared with the committee in advance. All written testimony received will be added to the meeting record. Written testimony received after the 4 p.m. deadline may be shared with the committee after the meeting.

Those wishing to testify orally are encouraged to sign up in advance by either: (a) contacting the program assistant by email at housingservices@oregonmetro.gov and providing your name and the agenda item on which you wish to testify or (b) if time permits, you may be able to testify without prior notice by letting the facilitator know during the public testimony period in the virtual meeting.

Individuals will have three minutes to testify unless otherwise stated at the meeting.

6. Adjourn

Metro respects civil rights

Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and other statutes that ban discrimination. If any person believes they have been discriminated against regarding the receipt of benefits or services because of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability, they have the right to file a complaint with Metro. For information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a discrimination complaint form, visit oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1890. Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1890 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 5 business days before the meeting. All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. Individuals with service animals are welcome at Metro facilities, even where pets are generally prohibited. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at trimet.org

Thông báo về sự Metro không kỳ thị

Metro tôn trọng dân quyền. Muốn biết thêm thông tin về chương trình dân quyền của Metro, hoặc muốn lấy đơn khiếu nại về sự kỳ thị, xin xem trang www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Nếu quý vị cần thông dịch viên ra dấu bằng tay, trợ giúp về tiếp xúc hay ngôn ngữ, xin gọi số 503-797-1700 (từ 8 giờ sáng đến 5 giờ chiều vào những ngày thường) trước buổi họp 5 ngày làm việc.

Повідомлення Metro про заборону дискримінації

Metro з повагою ставиться до громадянських прав. Для отримання інформації про програму Metro із захисту громадянських прав або форми скарги про дискримінацію відвідайте сайт www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. або Якщо вам потрібен перекладач на зборах, для задоволення вашого запиту зателефонуйте за номером 503-797-1700 з 8.00 до 17.00 у робочі дні за п'ять робочих днів до зборів.

Metro의 不歧视公告

尊重民權。欲瞭解民權計畫的詳情，或獲取歧視投訴表，請瀏覽網站 www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights。如果您需要口譯方可參加公共會議，請在會議召開前5個營業日撥打503-797-1700（工作日上午8點至下午5點），以便我們滿足您的要求。

Ogeysiiska takooris la'aanta ee Metro

Metro waxay ixtiraamtaa xuquuqda madaniga. Si aad u heshid macluumaad ku saabsan barnaamijka xuquuqda madaniga ee Metro, ama aad u heshid warqadda ka cabashada takoorista, booqo www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Haddii aad u baahan tahay turjubaan si aad uga qaybqaadatid kullaan dadweyne, wac 503-797-1700 (8 gallinka hore illaa 5 gallinka dambe maalmaha shaqada) shan maalmo shaqa ka hor kullanka si loo tixgaliyo codsashadaada.

Metro의 차별 금지 관련 통지서

Metro의 시민권 프로그램에 대한 정보 또는 차별 항의서 양식을 얻으려면, 또는 차별에 대한 불만을 신고 할 수 www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. 당신의 언어 지원이 필요한 경우, 회의에 앞서 5 영업일 (오후 5시 주중에 오전 8시) 503-797-1700을 호출합니다.

Metro의 差別禁止通知

Metroでは公民權を尊重しています。Metroの公民權プログラムに関する情報について、または差別苦情フォームを入手するには、www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights。までお電話ください。公開会議で言語通訳を必要とされる方は、Metroがご要望に対応できるよう、公開会議の5営業日前までに503-797-1700（平日午前8時～午後5時）までお電話ください。

សេចក្តីជូនដំណឹងអំពីការមិនរើសអើងរបស់ Metro

ការគោរពសិទ្ធិពលរដ្ឋរបស់ ១ សំណុំគំរោងអំពីកម្មវិធីសិទ្ធិពលរដ្ឋរបស់ Metro ឬដើម្បីទទួលបានការបណ្តឹងរើសអើងសូមចូលទស្សនាគេហទំព័រ www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights។

បើលោកអ្នកត្រូវការអ្នកបកប្រែភាសាដើមលេខ ៥ ឬលើកលែងតែ ៨ ទៅក្នុងការប្រជុំសាធារណៈ សូមទូរស័ព្ទមកលេខ 503-797-1700 (រវាង ៨ ព្រឹកដល់រវាង ៥ ល្ងាច ថ្ងៃច័ន្ទ) ប្រាំពីរថ្ងៃ មុនថ្ងៃប្រជុំដើម្បីឲ្យមានការបកប្រែសមស្របសម្រាប់លោកអ្នក។

إشعار بعدم التمييز من Metro

تحتزم Metro الحقوق المدنية. للمزيد من المعلومات حول برنامج Metro للحقوق المدنية أو لإيداع شكوى ضد التمييز، يُرجى زيارة الموقع الإلكتروني www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. إن كنت بحاجة إلى مساعدة في اللغة، يجب عليك الاتصال مقدماً برقم الهاتف 503-797-1700 (من الساعة 8 صباحاً حتى الساعة 5 مساءً، أيام الاثنين إلى الجمعة) قبل خمسة (5) أيام عمل من موعد الاجتماع.

Paunawa ng Metro sa kawalan ng diskriminasyon

Iginagalang ng Metro ang mga karapatang sibil. Para sa impormasyon tungkol sa programa ng Metro sa mga karapatang sibil, o upang makakuha ng porma ng reklamo sa diskriminasyon, bisitahin ang www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Kung kailangan ninyo ng interpreter ng wika sa isang pampublikong pulong, tumawag sa 503-797-1700 (8 a.m. hanggang 5 p.m. Lunes hanggang Biyernes) lima araw ng trabaho bago ang pulong upang mapagbigyan ang inyong kahilingan.

Notificación de no discriminación de Metro

Metro respeta los derechos civiles. Para obtener información sobre el programa de derechos civiles de Metro o para obtener un formulario de reclamo por discriminación, ingrese a www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Si necesita asistencia con el idioma, llame al 503-797-1700 (de 8:00 a. m. a 5:00 p. m. los días de semana) 5 días laborales antes de la asamblea.

Уведомление о недопущении дискриминации от Metro

Metro уважает гражданские права. Узнать о программе Metro по соблюдению гражданских прав и получить форму жалобы о дискриминации можно на веб-сайте www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Если вам нужен переводчик на общественном собрании, оставьте свой запрос, позвонив по номеру 503-797-1700 в рабочие дни с 8:00 до 17:00 и за пять рабочих дней до даты собрания.

Avizul Metro privind nediscriminare

Metro respectă drepturile civile. Pentru informații cu privire la programul Metro pentru drepturi civile sau pentru a obține un formular de reclamație împotriva discriminării, vizitați www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Dacă aveți nevoie de un interpret de limbă la o ședință publică, sunați la 503-797-1700 (între orele 8 și 5, în timpul zilelor lucrătoare) cu cinci zile lucrătoare înainte de ședință, pentru a putea să vă răspunde în mod favorabil la cerere.

Metro txoj kev ntxub ntxaug daim ntawv ceeb toom

Metro tributes cai. Rau cov lus qhia txog Metro txoj cai kev pab, los yog kom sau ib daim ntawv tsis txaus siab, mus saib www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Yog hais tias koj xav tau lus kev pab, hu rau 503-797-1700 (8 teev sawv ntxov txog 5 teev tsaus ntuj weekdays) 5 hnub ua hauj lwm ua ntej ntawm lub rooj sib tham.

January 2021



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
oregonmetro.gov

Agenda #: 2.1

File #: COM 26-1138

Agenda Date: 7/8/2026

June Meeting Minutes

Meeting Minutes

Meeting: Supportive Housing Services Regional Policy and Oversight Committee
Date/time: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 | 3 p.m. to 6 p.m.
Place: Hybrid meeting (Metro Council Chambers; Zoom)
Purpose: Solicit feedback on SHS goals and regional KPI; learn about how the Regional Strategic Investment Fund is managed and engage in Q&A.

Members Present

Juan Carlos González (he/him/él) (Chair), Metro Council President
Duncan Hwang (he/him) (Vice-chair), Metro Council
Christine Lewis (she/her), Metro Council
Keith Wilson (he/him), City of Portland
Ben West, Clackamas County Board of Commissioners
Shannon Singleton (she/her), Multnomah County Board of Commissioners
Jerry Willey (he/him), Washington County Board of Commissioners
Joe Buck (he/him), City of Lake Oswego, Cities of Clackamas County
Travis Stovall, City of Gresham, Cities of Multnomah County
Adam Brown (he/him), Multnomah County District Attorney's Office
Andrew Rowe (he/him/el), Portland Metro Chamber
Angela Martin (she/her), Here Together
Mindy Stadtlander, Health Share of Oregon
Peter Rosenblatt (he/him), NW Housing Alternatives
Sahaan McKelvey (he/him), Coalition of Communities of Color
Zoila Coppiano (she/ella), Community Action
Gretchen Kent (she/her), Autzen Foundation
Margarat Salazar (she/her), Reach CDC
Mike Savara (he/him), Oregon Housing and Community Services

Alternates Present

John Serra (he/him), Tri-Met

Members Excused

Brigitte Rodríguez (she/her/ella), El Programa Hispano Católica

Mayor Beach Pace, City of Hillsboro

Metro Staff

Liam Frost (he/him), Housing Director

Lizzie Cisneros (she/her), Supportive Housing Services Oversight Manager

Nui Bezaire (she/her), Policy Advisor

Facilitation Team

Raahi Reddi (she/her), Facilitator, Estolano Advisors

Ellen Bini (she/her), Estolano Advisors

Note: The meeting was recorded via Zoom. Please review the recording and archived meeting packet for additional detail and presentation slides.

Summary of Recommendations for Metro Council Consideration

- Refine SHS goals to include greater specificity, measurable baselines and clearer linkage to outcomes.
- Incorporate prevention and population level measures into the framework.

Summary of Meeting Decisions

None at this time.

1. Call to Order and Declaration of a Quorum

Supportive Housing Services Regional Policy and Oversight Committee (SHS RPOC) Chair Juan Carlos González, Metro Council President, called the meeting to order at 3:05pm.

Chair González provided opening remarks. He stressed that the committee had 15 months to develop a long-lasting system change in program concepts that both the committee and communities can confidently support. To support a shift in focus to the time sensitive work, Metro Council will take on some of the committee's administrative oversight responsibilities.

Before concluding, Chair González shared that council has received feedback from the Native community about the lack of American Indian, Alaskan Native and Tribal representation on the committee and apologized for the omission. Housing staff will be working with Metro's Tribal Affairs program to establish a new voting position that should be seated by October.

Michael Garcia, Metro, called the roll and declared a quorum.

2. Staff Updates

Raahi Reddi, Estolano Advisors, welcomed everyone to the meeting and went over the safety protocols and gave a high-level overview of the agenda.

Liam Frost, Metro, reminded the committee that the quarter three reports are in the packet. He asked members send questions to the housing staff directly.

He shared that the new position will be created through a code change, which staff are planning to bring to council by the end of June. Once the ordinance is brought to the council, it takes a full 90 days until it goes into effect. There will be a competitive application process with specialized outreach and recruitment efforts led by the Tribal Affairs staff.

3. Consent Agenda

Motion: Chair Gonzalez moved to approve the May 13, 2026 RPOC meeting minutes, seconded by Mayor Joe Buck.

Action: The consent agenda was unanimously approved.

Amendment Requested: Commissioner Singleton asked for a correction to a typo in her comments on page 5. Metro staff confirmed the correction will be made.

4. Information/Discussion Items

4.1 SHS Reforms: Deep Dive on SHS goals and regional KPI

Chair González, Metro, gave a high-level overview of the purpose of this conversation. He reminded the committee that Metro Council had endorsed the draft five-year goals in December 2025 as part of the first set of SHS reforms. The committee will vote to recommend the package of goals, KPIs and Key environmental impacts (KEIs) to council in August. Metro Council is expected to vote on the final package in September. He stressed the importance of the committee's feedback and asked that the staff presentation be high-level to leave room for richer discussion.

Liam Frost, Metro, walked through the purpose of the regional goals and KPIs. The overarching goal is to figure out how to utilize existing local lenses to feed into a broader region-wide system. The three draft regional goals are:

- Reduce the length of time people experience homelessness
- Increase efficiency and effectiveness in housing placements and service connections; and
- Ensure housing stability and retention for people placed in housing.

Because of the high-level nature of the presentation, metrics have been left off the slides; however, they can be found in the committee's meeting packet.

For the following discussion and Q&A section, the committee was asked to answer three questions:

- What additional information do you need?
- How can the goals be improved?
- What is missing from the goals?

Discussion and Q&A

Note that the discussion was broken into two parts during the meeting; however, for the purposes of this summary, the full discussion is captured in this section.

- Comment: Commissioner Singleton stated that under the second goal there is a need to capture where people are going when they leave transitional or recovery programs because they are still experiencing homelessness when they are there.
- Comment: Mindy Stadtlander, Health Share of Oregon, shared that there were a couple of things that were important for the committee to consider. First, there should be an environmental measure of the overall population of folks who are houseless. She also stated

that transitional housing does not belong in the goal area one, as outreach and shelter are different than recovery housing programs due to the fixed lengths of stays. She shared that it would be critical to build off what the counties have already done to create measurable outcomes.

- Question: Andrew Rowe, Portland Metro Chamber, asked where the 85% retention rate came from.
 - Metro response: Liam Frost shared that there is an average of 85% in SHS permanent supportive housing (PSH) programs. He shared that between July and August, alongside county partners, Metro is working to establish a baseline measure.
- Question: Peter Rosenblatt, Northwest Housing Alternatives, asked if the housing goal is generic: are they still housed 12-24 months later or is it more specific to where they were placed into housing when they left.
 - Metro response: Liam Frost shared that there is inconsistency among the providers and that the hope is to establish regional consistency. He also reiterated that the purpose of the goals is to have more transparency and identify gaps in the system to make it more efficient.
- Question: Commissioner West, Clackamas County, asked how these goals will specifically be achieved. He advocated for the use of SMART goals and a framework with specific data and numbers tied to it. He suggested targeted populations with core action attached to them and that there needs to be clear ownership within the goal that is being measured.
 - Metro response: Liam Frost reassured the committee that housing staff would be coming back with baseline measures on the goals and how to improve upon those numbers. He shared that it is up to the committee to discuss subgoals or other frameworks.
- Question: Margaret Salazar, Reach CDC, asked to clarify where the measure around evictions went.
 - Metro response: Liam Frost affirmed that this was still a metric under the third goal and that there is a plan to bring the goals and KPIs as a package in August.
- Question: Angela Martin, HereTogether, asked to clarify whether the goals nest under the KEIs and KPIs.
 - Metro response: Liam Frost said that they will to an extent. The goals can change over time; however, the KPIs should be working in perpetuity to indicate if the system is working as efficiently as possible.
- Question: Sahaan McKelvey, Coalition of Communities of Color, asked what current, reliable metric there is to tell the committee how long people are experiencing homelessness.

- Comment: Peter Rosenblatt, Northwest Housing Alternatives, stated that it would be helpful to see the full package of goals and KPIs/KEIs together. He shared that it felt that there were things missing in the goals that could go elsewhere and vice versa. He also stated that while he agrees with the goals as they are presented, there is no system change coming from those goals; they are standard operating procedures for Clackamas County. He asked for a clearer idea of what the impact would be on the ground level at the three counties from a contractual standpoint.
 - Metro response: Liam Frost shared that the systems change doesn't have to be exclusively within the goals. He explained that there will be a process of inquiry, exploration, and investigation into why the system is not improving based on the goals that will then lead to conversations about systems change.
- Question: Andrew Rowe, Portland Metro Chamber, asked when there would be a discussion on the KPIs. He shared that he has created a matrix comparing all the KPIs across Metro and the counties, which he would like to be shared before the July meeting if Metro staff think it is helpful for the upcoming discussion.
 - Metro response: Liam Frost stated that the KPI conversation will continue in July.
- Question: Commissioner West, Clackamas County, asked for clarity around the definitions being used across the system including shelter, transitional housing, and stabilization, and asked how the transitions between these system stages will be measured and tracked.
- Comment: Mike Savara, Oregon Health and Community Services, asked for alignment between SHS goals and the existing continuum of care system performance measures and requested a crosswalk be done to understand any differences and avoid duplicative reporting requirements.
- Comment: Peter Rosenblatt, Northwest Housing Alternatives, emphasized his desire for the committee to raise the bar. He stressed the need to understand what the numbers are of people experiencing houselessness within the counties and see how the system is. He asked for clarification on whether the committee was taking the lowest common number or the highest for shared definitions.
- Comment: Commissioner Singleton, Multnomah County, emphasized the importance of capturing qualitative information alongside quantitative metrics and stated that providers should be able to explain why outcomes occur, particularly when goals are not met. She also requested that outcomes for individuals leaving recovery or transitional programs be tracked more clearly.
- Comment: Sahaan McKelvey, Coalition of Communities of Color, stated that the system should demonstrate how it is improving over time and not simply restate existing practices. He emphasized the importance of showing increased efficiency and better results within

limited resources. He also raised concerns about how missing data and untracked outcomes will be handled.

- Comment: Angela Martin, HereTogether, stated that achieving goals requires linking investments to expected outputs and outcomes and emphasized the need for financial clarity regarding what level of investment is required to achieve each goal.
- Comment: Mayor Joe Buck, City of Lake Oswego, proposed adding a fourth goal focused on public trust, noting that cities are providing services that are not currently captured in the system and that public perception depends on visible improvements in community conditions.
- Comment: Gretchen Kent, Autzen Foundation, stated that goals alone will not influence public perception and noted that broader messaging about homelessness and housing systems is necessary. She also questioned whether the goals are intended to influence voters in addition to tracking system performance.
- Comment: Commissioner West, Clackamas County, stated that elected officials share responsibility for the outcomes of the system and expressed concern about public dissatisfaction given the level of investment to date. He emphasized the importance of understanding system capacity, including housing units and workforce availability.
- Comment: Andrew Rowe, Portland Metro Chamber, noted the importance of clearly stating whether overall homelessness is increasing or decreasing, and suggested that the framework includes a clear overarching objective.
- Comment: Mayor Wilson, City of Portland, noted that of the three counties, Multnomah is noticing a steep increase in homelessness whereas the other counties are at a “functional zero”. He shared that while we discuss the topic of homelessness in the region, he would like to keep it local. He stated that he would like the committee to focus on cause and effect, and that now there may be a waterfall effect. He acknowledged his appreciation for the goals and the messaging; however, he stressed the need for a triage system. He stated that if there is going to be a KPI and goal attached, then there should be funding associated with that. He expressed his belief that there should be an agreement to act based upon shared standards and minimum care. He reiterated that if the cities or counties are to be held accountable, there needs to be a shared understanding of what are the causes, “triggers,” and how can the needs be met.

4.2 Regional investment fund and Tri-County Planning Body

Nui Bezaire, Metro, introduced the Regional Investment Fund (RIF), explaining that it represents approximately five percent of SHS funds and is intended to support regional system improvements, including coordination, data systems, workforce development and healthcare alignment.

For the following discussion and Q&A section, the committee was asked to answer three questions:

- What questions or areas of discussion would you like Metro to consider moving forward regarding RIF?
- What information stood out most to you and what additional information would you like us to include in future RIF-related presentations?
- What are some of your key considerations/values advocating for and implementing regional work?

Discussion and Q&A

- Comment: Commissioner Ben West, Clackamas County, described RIF investments in Clackamas County, including coordinated entry and housing programs, and requested transparency regarding how funds are being used in other counties.
- Comment: Andrew Rowe, Portland Metro Chamber, emphasized that RIF investments should prioritize regional infrastructure and cross-county standards rather than isolated programs.
- Comment: Margaret Salazar, Reach CDC, stated that regional systems for landlord coordination and eviction prevention resources are needed and questioned why these are not already consistent across counties.
- Comment: Angela Martin, HereTogether, suggested that the RIF could function as a centralized system improvement fund and raised questions about how “regional” is defined.
- Comment: Adam Brown, Multnomah County, stated that counties should clearly identify barriers and gaps that prevent implementation of regional programs.
- Comment: Commissioner Shannon Singleton, Multnomah County, stated that the RIF framework should allow flexibility to adjust programs over time and emphasized the need to integrate behavioral health supports into housing programs.
- Comment: Peter Rosenblatt, Northwest Housing Alternatives, questioned whether calls for clarity reflect dissatisfaction with current investments and suggested focusing the conversation on alternative uses of funds.
- Question: Zoila Coppiano, Community Action, asked what problem regionalization is intended to solve within the homelessness response system.

5. Public Communication on Agenda Items

Anna Kurnizki, Executive Director of Community Warehouse, requested that SHS-funded furniture bank services be coordinated regionally rather than through separate county contracts and stated that the current approach creates inefficiencies.

6. Closing & Next Steps

Next steps include Housing staff will work to incorporate feedback given by the committee on the SHS goals. In July, staff will present on the KPIs and KEIs.

- Next meeting: Wednesday, July 8, 2026 | 3-6 p.m.

7. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:55p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Finnegan Budd
Housing Department Program Assistant



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
oregonmetro.gov

Agenda #: 4.1

File #: COM 26-1139

Agenda Date: 7/8/2026

SHS reform: KPIs, KEIs, and Goals

Yesenia Delgado (she/her), Metro
Liam Frost (he/him), Metro



SHS Regional Policy and Oversight Committee Agenda Item Summary and Presentation Navigation Tool

Agenda Item Number: 4.1.1

Agenda Item Title: SHS reform: KPIs, KEIs and goals (part 4 of 5)

Presenter: Liam Frost, Housing Director; Yesenia Delgado, SHS Division Director

Executive Summary

This is part four of a five-part series discussion for SHS RPOC to provide final recommendations to Metro Council on updating 5-year goals and KPIs and establishing KEIs for the system. Metro Council endorsed the draft goals, KPIs and KEIs in December 2025 as part of the first SHS reforms package.

The committee is scheduled to recommend the package of goals, KPIs and KEIs in August to Metro Council. In September, Metro Council is expected to vote on the final package.

The goal of the presentation is to provide the committee with more information on:

- The latest progress on KPIs and KEIs
- The intersections between goals, KPIs and KEIs
- Reporting timelines

Preparation Guidance

To prepare for this meeting, please take the time to reflect on the following questions:

- What information would be useful as the committee starts to monitor progress towards the updated SHS goals and KPIs?
- Do you have the necessary information you need to make a decision on the updated SHS goals, KPIs and KEIs?

Requested Action

☐ Information Only

☒ Discussion

☐ Recommendation

☐ Vote/Approval

☐ Other:

Presentation Navigation Tool

Presentation Topic / Discussion Area	Supporting Document	Document Page(s)	Notes
Goals, KPIs, and KEIs	Overview of the Goals, KPIs, and KEIs	Whole document	Outlines the new reform goals and how the draft goals, KPIs and KEIs intersect.

SHS Reform Goals, Key Environmental Indicators, and Key Performance Indicators

Goals

Goal	Outcome	Measure
Goal 1: Reduce the length of time people experience homelessness	Reduce the average length of time people are enrolled in a homeless program (outreach and shelter) Shelter includes Transitional Housing (TH)	The number of days enrolled in a homeless program reduces Baseline number measure needed
Goal 2: Increase efficiency and effectiveness in housing placements and service connections	Increase percentage of households exiting shelter programs who achieve a positive destination	The number of households exiting shelter to positive destination increases Baseline number measure needed
	Reduce the median length of time from household enrollment in a housing program to housing placement	The number of days from enrollment to housing reduces Baseline number measure needed
Goal 3: Ensure housing stability and retention for people placed in housing	85% or more of households housed through Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH) and Housing with Services remain housed at 12 and 24 months	85% or more of households remain housed at 12 and 24 months
	The rate of return to homelessness from PSH, RRH, and Housing with Services will not exceed 15% within 12 months	15% or less of households will return to homelessness from PSH, RRH and Housing with Services

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

KPI	Intervention Areas	What is Measured
Eviction prevention interventions	Eviction Prevention	Number of households (specific to a subset of Population B, who are housed) served with Eviction Prevention
Shelter utilization rates	Emergency Shelter; Transitional Housing	Individuals served relative to total shelter capacity
Exits to housing	Emergency Shelter; Transitional Housing	Number of households with “Permanent Housing” destinations upon exit from shelter
Exits to other positive destinations	Emergency Shelter; Transitional Housing	Number of households with “Temporary Housing,” “Institutional*,” and “Safe Haven” destinations upon exit from shelter <i>(*Not including incarceration)</i>
Housing placements	Permanent Supportive Housing; Rapid Re-Housing; Other Permanent Housing Programs	Number of households newly placed into housing and previously placed into housing but still active in the program
Retention rates	Permanent Supportive Housing; Rapid Re-Housing; Other Permanent Housing Programs	Number of households placed into housing, and who have remained housed at 12- and 24-months after, relative to the number of households placed into housing

Key Environmental Indicators (KEIs)

KEI	Context	What is Measured
Total number of evictions	System inflow; Eviction prevention resources needed	Number of evictions in the Metro jurisdiction
Total number of people and/or households experiencing homelessness	System inflow and outflow	Total people and households experiencing homelessness across the entire homeless services system
Number of people and/or households experiencing homelessness with specialized needs	System inflow and outflow; Need for Supportive Housing	From the above group: People who are age 65 and over; people with disabilities; people with substance use disorders; and people with mental/behavioral health needs.
Median length of time experiencing homelessness by self-report	System inflow and outflow	Median length of time people across the homeless services system have been experiencing homelessness
Vacancy rates	Housing affordability and need; System inflow and outflow	Vacant housing units relative to the overall stock of housing
Median rents	Housing need; System inflow and outflow	Median monthly rent cost across the Metro jurisdiction
Construction rates	Housing need; System inflow and outflow	Number of new permits issued for residential construction across the Metro jurisdiction
Median income	Housing affordability and need	Median income earned by people across the Metro jurisdiction
Housing burden	Housing affordability and need	Median rent cost as a share of median income across the Metro jurisdiction



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
oregonmetro.gov

Agenda #: 4.2

File #: COM 26-1140

Agenda Date: 7/8/2026

SHS reform: Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) framework

Cole Merkel (he/him), Metro



SHS Regional Policy and Oversight Committee Agenda Item Summary and Presentation Navigation Tool

Agenda Item Number: 4.1.2

Agenda Item Title: SHS reform: Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Framework

Presenter: *Cole Merkel, Housing Regional Capacity Manager*

Executive Summary

In March 2026, Metro Council adopted Resolution 26-5567, which included the following directive:

The SHS RPOC will develop and recommend to Metro Council a recognized continuous improvement framework to support systemwide efficiency across Metro counties and providers. Metro and the counties should support capacity for training, technical assistance, and implementation using Regional Investment Fund resources to assist partners with identifying barriers, improving performance, and achieving regional system goals.

Additionally, SHS RPOC will be responsible for assessing its own structure regarding effectiveness in achieving the adopted regional and system performance goals, including transparency, funds sufficiency, and allocation priorities after the two-year mark of the committee. SHS RPOC may propose modifications to its structure and roles, as well as consideration of potential technical committees, for review and determination by Metro Council.

In response to that resolution, Housing Department staff have researched established CQI frameworks, tools and methodologies, which is ongoing.

The goal of the presentation is to establish a shared understanding of CQI frameworks and their potential applications in a homeless services context. Staff will also share a brief high-level landscape analysis of select jurisdictions around the country using CQI frameworks in housing, homeless or social services.

The discussion will focus on gathering feedback on the guiding values or priorities the SHS RPOC would like staff to consider while supporting the development of the committee's CQI recommendation to Council. The discussion will also include areas the committee would like to see CQI applied to strengthen SHS.

This is the first time that this item has been brought to SHS RPOC for discussion.

Preparation Guidance

To prepare for this meeting, please take the time to reflect on the following questions:



- What guiding values or priorities would SHS RPOC members like staff to consider or affirm while supporting the development of the committee's CQI recommendation to Council?
- What areas of the SHS system do RPOC members envision the CQI framework could be applied to?

Requested Action

- ☐ Information Only
- ☒ Discussion
- ☐ Recommendation

- ☐ Vote/Approval
- ☐ Other:

Presentation Navigation Tool

Presentation Topic / Discussion Area	Supporting Document	Document Page(s)	Notes
CQI research	Continuous Quality Improvement: Established concepts overview	Whole document	Outlines several CQI frameworks, tools and methodologies with a crosswalk of various purposes, features and uses.
CQI research	Continuous Quality Improvement: National examples	Whole document	An initial, high-level report of a national scan of how CQI is being used in housing and homeless service and human service systems across the United States.

Continuous Quality Improvement

Established concepts overview

June 2026

Metro conducted preliminary research on Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI). A CQI framework includes data-driven decision-making, iterative testing, stakeholder involvement, and system-level learning over time. Within complex homeless service systems, CQI can provide a structured yet flexible approach to understanding performance and making meaningful improvements.

There are a variety of tools and practices used for quality improvement in different sectors. In this preliminary research phase, staff focused on high-level CQI concepts and details, and how they may play complimentary and reinforcing roles within a CQI framework.

To support a shared understanding of improvement approaches, the following tables illustrate how commonly used and established frameworks, methodologies and methods relate across different levels. These approaches range from broad management systems to improvement philosophies and outcome frameworks. The CQI concepts include structured methodologies, models and methods used to implement change. Together, these various approaches can play complementary and reinforcing roles within a CQI framework.

Table 1. Established CQI concepts

The concepts outlined below are organized into four categories. Some of the concepts may be categorized differently than in other sources; however, for clarity the following definitions are used for the Supportive Housing Services Regional Policy and Oversight Committee (SHS RPOC), we define them as such:

1. **Framework:** Organizes thinking and creates alignment by explaining how change, performance, or systems work. A framework provides a structure but does not prescribe steps.
2. **Methodology:** A structured approach for running improvement or performance management at scale. It defines routines, roles, and expectations.
3. **Method/cycle:** A repeatable sequence of steps used to execute improvement work.
4. **Tool/practice:** A specific technique or practice that supports analysis, learning, or execution.

Concept	Category	Primary focus
Integrated Performance Management (IPM)	Framework	Aligns strategy, performance measurement and decision making to improve outcomes across organizations
Results Based Accountability (RBA)	Framework	Improving population-level outcomes and program performance by connecting data, decision-making and accountability
Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)	Methodology	Structured, data-driven approach for continuously improving processes and outcomes through iterative learning and testing
Lean	Methodology	Focused on eliminating waste and improving flow to maximize value for the customer
Six Sigma	Methodology	Data-driven methodology for reducing variation and defects to improve quality, consistency and process performance
Kaizen	Methodology	Hands-on improvement method focused on continuous, incremental improvements driven by frontline staff to enhance processes and outcomes
Plan-Do-Study-Act / Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDSA/PDCA)	Method/Cycle	Practical, iterative method for testing changes in real-world settings to improve processes and outcomes overtime
Model for Improvement	Method/Cycle	Accelerates improvement by defining aims, measures, and changes and applying rapid-cycle testing

Table 2. CQI concept details

Concept	What it is	Purpose	Key features	Focus	CQI function
Integrated Performance Management (IPM)	Management system	Align goals, data, and improvement	Planning, measurement, and CQI together	Results and systems	Connects CQI to system goals and performance
Results Based Accountability (RBA)	Outcome framework	Define and measure outcomes and performance	"How much, how well, better off...*", population vs. performance accountability	Outcomes	Sets shared goals and measures
Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)	Improvement philosophy / overall improvement approach	Improve systems over time	Uses data, testing, and learning	Processes and systems	Guides ongoing improvement work
Lean	Improvement approach / structured methodology	Improve efficiency and eliminate waste	Value stream mapping, flow, waste reduction	Efficiency	Helps streamline processes
Six Sigma	Data-driven approach / structured methodology	Reduce defects and variation	Data analysis, root cause analysis, structured problem-solving	Quality and accuracy	Used for complex problems needing deep analysis
Kaizen	Improvement philosophy / improvement culture	Encourage small, daily improvements	Everyone contributes ideas	People and processes	Builds a culture that supports CQI
Plan-Do-Study-Act / Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDSA/PDCA)	Testing method	Test and refine changes	Small tests, quick learning	Learning	Used to test and improve changes
Model for Improvement	Improvement model	Guides improvement work	3 questions (aim, measures, changes) + PDSA/PDCA	Process improvement	Helps structure improvement efforts

* "How much did we do? How well did we do it? Is anyone better off?"

Next steps

Metro will continue to build on this initial work to support the Committee's developing recommendations to Metro Council. The process will remain responsive to feedback from the SHS RPOC, with opportunities for input used to refine research questions, guide analysis and inform the development of a CQI framework recommendation. This next phase will focus on gaining a deeper understanding of how different CQI approaches are implemented in practice and how they could be adapted to support a regional system.

In addition to incorporating Committee feedback, this work will include several key activities:

- **Additional research:** Further review of CQI frameworks, methodologies and best practices to better understand how different approaches are applied across sectors and systems. Further exploration could identify which combinations of approaches best support both strong outcomes and broad participation.
- **National outreach:** Engagement with practitioners in government entities and service systems across the country to learn from their CQI implementation efforts, including how systems balance structure, flexibility and scale.
- **Local landscape analysis:** Analysis of current quality improvement efforts in SHS system, including at Metro and the counties.
- **Implementation considerations:** Exploring how CQI approaches could be applied in practice across a multi-jurisdictional, multi-partner system, including factors such as training needs, staffing capacity, data availability, complex client needs, consistency across providers and alignment with system values and goals.

Continuous Quality Improvement

National examples

June 2026

This document provides an initial review of how Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) frameworks are applied in government and homelessness service systems across the country. It's intended to establish a baseline for understanding different approaches and identifying common elements as Metro staff supports the Committee's CQI recommendation for Metro Council consideration.

In addition to reviewing published materials, Metro staff are meeting with practitioners and system leaders in other jurisdictions to learn more about how organizations design and use CQI in practice. The examples in this document draw on both published documentation and information gathered through initial outreach and engagement.

Metro staff are also examining how jurisdictions assess the relationship between CQI frameworks, system performance and outcomes. This document describes key framework components and implementation approaches rather than evaluating effectiveness. Future iterations of this work will include additional information about how jurisdictions measure and report changes in system performance and outcomes associated with CQI efforts.

Examples of CQI frameworks and approaches

Hawaii: Department of Human Services

In 2022, the Homeless Programs Office (HPO) of the Hawaii Department of Human Services implemented a CQI framework to redesign its contract monitoring system (Hawaii Department of Human Services Benefit, Employment, and Support Services Division of the Homeless Programs Office, 2025). HPO partnered with Collaborative Quality Consulting to implement the framework. The framework built on HPO's earlier transition in 2016 to performance-based management, which prioritizes measurable outcomes over compliance-focused oversight.

The CQI framework uses the Plan–Do–Study–Act (PDSA) cycle to support continuous program improvement. Key components include:

- Performance measures aligned with each program's purpose
- Standardized and streamlined data collection tools
- Simplified financial reporting processes

- Consistent CQI practice guidelines
- Reporting templates to improve timeliness and completeness
- Structured collaboration with service providers

HPO and Collaborative Quality Consulting conducted an internal review of existing monitoring tools and processes, followed by structured discussions with providers across service types (e.g., Housing First, shelters, outreach). These sessions were used to review and revise performance measures and to develop updated data collection tools, including performance dashboards, case review tools, organizational self-assessments, and CQI toolkits with guidance documents.

In 2023, HPO continued working with providers to refine the CQI system, pilot tools, and address implementation challenges. The work also included strengthening internal systems, such as the Homeless Data Integration System database, to support data tracking and improvement efforts. CQI implementation is ongoing, with full rollout targeted for July 2026.

North Carolina: City of Raleigh and Wake County

The city of Raleigh, North Carolina's 2025 Unsheltered Homelessness Response Strategy includes a CQI framework to strengthen system performance, coordination and accountability (Sagrado Strategies, Inc., 2026). The goals of this framework are to more effectively move people from unsheltered homelessness into permanent housing by supporting ongoing system improvement and helping the homelessness response adapt over time. CQI is embedded into implementation to ensure the strategy remains data-driven, outcome-focused, and responsive to changing conditions.

The framework uses performance data and stakeholder feedback to continuously improve operations and increase housing outcomes. Key components include:

- Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound (SMART) goals and success measures tied to housing outcomes
- Shared data systems and a dashboard to track progress
- Plan-Do-Study-Act model and regular learning cycles
- CQI leadership and coordination structure
- Continuous refinement of tools and processes based on field and stakeholder input

Development of the CQI approach includes collaboration among the city, county, Continuum of Care (CoC), service providers, and people with lived experience of homelessness to review performance and improve tools and data systems.

CQI will play a central role in the city/county's response to homelessness. One of the three priorities in the Year One Action Plan of the Unsheltered Homelessness Response Strategy is focused on building CQI infrastructure, including leadership roles, goal setting, dashboard development, and practices for ongoing review of the system and processes.

Washington: King County

King County, Washington began using Lean as its main approach to CQI in 2011. Lean was used across the county to improve government services by helping staff identify challenges, simplify processes, and improve how work gets done. Over time, the county updated its approach to better track results and support long-term use.

Key components of their approach included:

- Staff-led efforts to find problems and improve how work is done
- Training and coaching to help staff and managers use Lean tools
- Use of Lean methods across the County to guide improvements
- Systems to track progress and results
- Tools to assess how well departments are using Lean
- Efforts to build skills within departments so improvements can last over time

At first, the County focused heavily on Lean Six Sigma training. However, it found that training alone did not always lead to real improvements (GoLeanSixSigma.com, 2017). In response, the County shifted to a more hands-on approach that focused on applying Lean tools to real work, with support from coaching and project-based learning.

Reviews by the King County Auditor between 2016 and 2019 found several areas for improvement, including the need for clearer goals, a stronger overall strategy, and better tracking of results. In response, the County clarified its goals, improved how it tracked project outcomes, and introduced a way to assess how well departments were using Lean. King County also worked to involve employees by including them in improvement projects, offering ongoing support, and recognizing early successes. This helped build skills across the organization and led to measurable improvements, such as faster processes and more efficient administrative work.

Lean initially had strong support from county leadership, but the overall focus on Lean and CQI decreased following staffing transitions. While some Lean tools and processes are still in use, the lack of consistent leadership support made it hard to maintain momentum across the whole County.

Today, remnants of Lean continue in some departments, but it is no longer a countywide effort. It is unclear what approach the County will use in the future or whether they will continue or replace its CQI work.

Federal: Department of Health and Human Services

The Youth at Risk of Homelessness (YARH) initiative, funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services from 2013 through 2028, uses CQI to improve programs designed to prevent homelessness among youth in the child welfare system. In the second phase of a multiyear grant, six grantees received funding to test and refine interventions to prevent homelessness among youth and young adults in the child welfare system (Davis & Packard Tucker, 2020). YARH highlighted two of the grantees — Alameda County, California, and the Colorado Department of Human Services — who used CQI to regularly review and adjust their programs during implementation.

In this project, CQI was used as an ongoing learning process. Teams regularly reviewed data, identified challenges, tested changes, and checked whether those changes improved results. Key components included:

- Regular data review meetings or reports (often monthly)
- Use of simple dashboards and reports tied to program goals
- Linking CQI measures to the program's theory of change
- Strong partnerships between service providers, evaluators, and public agencies
- Ongoing adjustments to the program based on data analysis

In Alameda County, CQI focused on monthly meetings where partners reviewed data and talked through implementation challenges. Over time, these discussions became more detailed and moved from basic questions like whether youth were enrolling in the program to more complex questions about whether services were delivered as intended and whether they were helping participants. CQI also helped the team look more closely at specific issues. For example, when attendance at a key program activity was lower than expected, the team used surveys to understand why and made changes, such as offering services in more convenient locations.

In Colorado, CQI was supported by a data system that produced monthly reports on program activity and outcomes. These reports were reviewed with state and local partners to track progress and make decisions. CQI findings led to important changes to the program design, such as removing parts of the model that were not being used or were duplicative, and adjusting expectations for caseload size and service intensity.

Across both sites, CQI helped teams adapt their programs over time instead of following a fixed model. This approach required strong collaboration, regular communication and a willingness to adapt as new information emerged.

The YARH project integrated CQI into program design from the start to support continuous improvement and learning about what works. The project emphasized the importance of data use, strong partnerships, and an iterative program in response to new information.

References

- Davis, L., & Packard Tucker, L. (2020). Using Continuous Quality Improvement to Refine Interventions for Youth at Risk of Homelessness. In *United States Department of Health and Human Services*.
<https://acf.gov/opre/report/lessons-field-using-continuous-quality-improvement-refine-interventions-youth-risk>
- Edmonston, H., Garvey, E., Thompson, B., & Dean, D. (2016). Lean in King County: Approach Supports Continuous Improvement, but Actions Are Needed to Improve Strategy and Measurement. In *King County*.
<https://kingcounty.gov/en/independents/governance-and-leadership/government-oversight/auditors-office/reports-papers/reports/2016/lean>
- GoLeanSixSigma.com. (2017, April 20). *King County Improved Lead Time By 54% With GLSS*. GLSS. <https://goleansixsigma.com/success-story-government-agency-achieved-huge-success-re-booting-lean-six-sigma-effort-goleansixsigma-com/>
- Hawaii Department of Human Services Benefit, Employment, and Support Services Division of the Homeless Programs Office. (2025). Housing First Sec 346-378. In *State of Hawaii Department of Human Services Reports Due 2025 Legislature*. State of Hawaii. <https://humanservices.hawaii.gov/reports-due-2025-legislature/>
- King County Auditor's Office. (2017). Follow Up on Performance Audit of Lean in King County. In *King County*. King County. <https://cdn.kingcounty.gov/-/media/king-county/independent/governance-and-leadership/government-oversight/auditors-office/reports/audits/2016/lean/lean-afu-2017.pdf?rev=299dc8cb38744f8daeaf37c769bb96de&hash=70DE56B7BA92F31FBFF5270584E1B9C7>

King County Auditor's Office. (2019). Follow-up on Performance Audit of Lean in King County. In *King County*. King County. <https://cdn.kingcounty.gov/-/media/king-county/independent/governance-and-leadership/government-oversight/auditors-office/reports/audits/2016/lean/lean-afu-2019.pdf>

Sagrado Strategies, Inc. (2026). *Unsheltered Homelessness Response Strategy*. City of Raleigh. [https://cityofraleigh0drupal.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/drupal-prod/COR19/hcd-jan-2026-unsheltered-response-strategy%20\(1\).pdf](https://cityofraleigh0drupal.blob.core.usgovcloudapi.net/drupal-prod/COR19/hcd-jan-2026-unsheltered-response-strategy%20(1).pdf)