

From: [Metro Supportive Housing Services](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: [External sender]New ideas?
Date: Monday, November 23, 2020 4:07:05 PM

Dear Jonathan,

Thank you for providing your input on the Supportive Housing Services Work Plan. Staff will be reviewing all feedback received and providing a summary and updated staff recommendations to Council in response to the combined feedback. We have recorded your response and it will be included in the Metro Council materials as an attachment to the proposed resolution to adopt the Work Plan on December 10th.

We appreciate your engagement,
Metro Housing

-----Original Message-----

From: Jonathan Blatt [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 1:54 PM
To: Metro Supportive Housing Services <HousingServices@oregonmetro.gov>
Subject: [External sender]New ideas?

CAUTION: This email originated from an External source. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Hi, thank you for the difficult work you are doing on an important problem.

I humbly suggest the following idea can help get more people into housing:

1. Since new privately built apartments with inclusionary zoning don't get built fast enough; 2. Since new subsidized housing buildings and a few hotel purchases can't ever get done fast enough; 3. We simply need more ideas or we'll never catch up on housing people.

So here it is:

City, county and state additional money to landlords of already existing buildings in addition to the amount they would receive from housing vouchers, this would Incentivize landlords to take in people who need help. I have been a landlord and rented to someone in need when i was reassured by their family who I knew that they would back them up if needed. Some consideration to guaranteeing landlords for damage should also be considered.

The stock of existing housing vacancies is far far bigger than the very limited number of new units coming online. This is where we can create a huge dent in the problem.

Thank you for consideration of this idea.

Please reply as to your evaluation of this idea and confirm receipt of this email.

Thanks again, respectfully submitted,
Jonathan Blatt

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Metro Supportive Housing Services](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: [External sender]Supportive Housing Services Program Work Plan
Date: Monday, November 23, 2020 4:08:07 PM

Dear Andy,

Thank you for providing your input on the Supportive Housing Services Work Plan. Staff will be reviewing all feedback received and providing a summary and updated staff recommendations to Council in response to the combined feedback. We have recorded your response and it will be included in the Metro Council materials as an attachment to the proposed resolution to adopt the Work Plan on December 10th.

We appreciate your engagement,
Metro Housing

From: Andy Nelson [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 2:12 PM
To: Metro Supportive Housing Services <HousingServices@oregonmetro.gov>
Subject: [External sender]Supportive Housing Services Program Work Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Thanks for the opportunity to review the plan and offer feedback. The plan connects well to the planning work done through the HereTogether Advisory process. My one suggestion is to expand the service strategy to call out culturally-responsive service providers. Culturally-specific organizations ought to be a priority. They won't be able to do the work alone. It's important to set criteria for what is a culturally-responsive organization. The Meyer Memorial Trust's [DEI Spectrum Tool](#) provides an excellent example.

--



ANDY NELSON
Executive Director [IMPACT NW](#)

[REDACTED]
He/Him/His

[Join the movement to prevent homelessness](#)



Metro SHS Staff:

Comments on SHS Program Work Plan, November, 2020

11/20/20

First, I concur with the comments from the Council during the 17 November Work Session to the effect that the proposed Work Plan represents a great deal of overwhelmingly solid work and forethought regarding how the region is to proceed in providing effective supportive services. I am entirely supportive of the goals and urgency to make this happen quickly and effectively.

That said, having listened to the 17 November Council presentation, and having had a bit more time to review the SHS Work Plan, I have a few comments that I feel deserve some additional thought or elaboration. Staff may already have taken these observations into account and I cannot claim to understand all the considerations that have been included.

Comment # 1:

My previous comment (e-mail - 17 November) regarding the tri-county advisory body needs some modification. On further reading I realized that, indeed, the Work Plan envisions an additional group that you have labeled the “tri-county advisory body”. My preliminary comment was the result of some misunderstanding on my part since it would seem that the Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) is also, by design, a “tri-county advisory group”. My first suggestion would be to give the second advisory body a specific name and acronym to avoid confusion. My first suggestion would be: SHS Advisory Group (SHSAG), which is catchy but not easy to pronounce, yet still better than TCSHSAG (tri-county SHS advisory group). I will use SHSAG for convenience.

Comment #2:

I found the apparent overlap between the 2 committees somewhat confusing and the role of the SHSAG somewhat lacking in clarity. The ROC is specifically constituted to “provide policy and programmatic guidance” [S. 3.4] which seems to overlap with the role of the SHSAG to “identify regional goals strategies and outcome metrics and....to inform the SHS program implementation.” [S. 6.1]. In addition, both committees seem to rely on overlapping membership criteria such as lived experiences, experience with critical homelessness issues, ethnic and geographic diversity, and having skills or expertise in such services. I understand that the ROC is largely specified by the ballot measure while the SHSAG must be created by Metro and that some overlap is unavoidable, but on a technical level, it might be clarified at the outset whether individuals may be members of both committees or only one. I assume the size of the SHSAG will be determined at a later date and note that the ROC might be asked to provide input on that matter.

Comment #3:

Perhaps I missed something but the level and type of authority and the channels of communication between the SHSAG and other groups was not very clear. The Work Plan calls for this group to be created by Metro and of course Metro can structure its

responsibilities at a later date, but it would seem valuable to provide an outline of its communication role and responsibilities vis a vis both the ROC and the Local Implementation Partners (LIPs) should be identified in the Work Plan. It would seem the benefits of an additional group (the SHSAG) would be in bringing in both more and more diverse regional “players”. It would seem that close coordination with the ROC might be a benefit to the process and help distill, for the Council, any proposed changes in policies or implementation strategies. It would seem potentially disadvantageous to have two independent groups trying to advise Metro Council on how to move forward. Since the SHSAG also envisions elected members, some formal pathways for interaction with the LIPs might also be needed.

Comment #4:

This is a comment regarding the timing and wording of the “charge” of the SHSAG as noted in 6.1. From a timing standpoint, it would seem that the current Work Plan provides much of the basis for “regional goals, strategies, and outcome metrics”, such that the real role of the SHSAG will be to suggest midcourse corrections. Since funding for full implementation will ramp up over 2021, it would seem that processes and goals (at least on an interim basis) would already be in place by the time the SHSAG has the full support it needs to function. In addition, one or two years of early implementation metrics will indubitably guide their analysis and input.

Comment #5:

Regarding metrics: Although I am by no means more than a novice in the field of SHS, it would be my hope that metrics beyond housing metrics might be developed. These might include the number of persons interacted with and response resource expenditures for services such as counseling, medical interventions, critical transportation, etc. I assume these have been considered but did not see them called out.

Comment #6:

The taxation plan seems quite thorough and well laid out, with suitable alterations to avoid double taxations. I did note one part of the verbal presentation that was not included in the written materials and that was regarding use of a basic calculation assumption based on Portland and Multnomah County vs. the method used by the State of Oregon. My only comment would be to ask for more information on how this calculatory assumption comports with the other larger cities in the region. I cannot comment further since this element does not seem to be covered in the supporting materials.

General Comments:

Overall I find the SHA Work Plan to be very good basis for moving forward and represents a great deal of excellent work. I support it and will work to make its goals into reality. I hope more detail on the structure and charge of the SHSAG will be developed in the early phases of the implementation. I hope these comments are helpful.

Gerritt Rosenthal