

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES QUARTERLY REPORT

SUBMITTED BY (COUNTY): WASHINGTON COUNTY

FISCAL YEAR: FY22/23

QUARTER: Q3

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

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

Section 1. Progress narrative

At the end of the third quarter, the Homeless Services Division is on track to meet most goals of the Supportive Housing Services for this program year. The program is exceeding in permanent supportive housing placements for Population A, or chronically homeless households, and catching up with goals set for Population B households with new programming to provide short and medium-term housing assistance. The program expended 51%, or \$24,113,201, of the program year budget by the end of the third quarter which is on track with forecasted expenditures for this new and rapidly expanding program. The Homeless Services Division also launched several new programs and strategic projects in the third quarter to increase community impact, deliver more equitable outcomes, and better serve our community.

Housing Outcomes:

Housing programs are the foundation of the Supportive Housing Services measure, demonstrating the best practice of solving homelessness with stable, supported, and diverse housing options designed to meet people where they are at. The following highlights are a subset of the overall housing outcomes achieved in the third quarter:

- **Housing Case Manager Services:** This permanent supportive housing program paired with Regional Long Term Rent Assistance (RLRA) vouchers increased capacity in Q3 with 46 of the currently contracted 50 case manager positions filled and working with Population A households. The program has housed 497 households to date and will significantly exceed the goal to housed 500 households before the end of the program year.
- **Rapid Rehousing:** This time limited supportive housing program has housed 127 households and is quickly picking up pace as the program grew in capacity filling 23 of 25 the contracted case manager positions to support housing placements for Population B households.
- **Eviction Prevention:** Using carryover funding from Year 1, the program has increased funding for existing eviction prevention programs operated by Community Action, in partnership with other state and federal funds. The program launched in Q3 and has already prevented homelessness for 53 households.

Capacity Building Investments:

In addition to building and maintaining housing programs, SHS funds were also committed in Q3 to create capacity through one-time capital and capacity building grants:

- The Board of County Commissioners approved **capital grants for seven shelters** totaling nearly \$10 million to expand and strengthen the county's sheltering system. These one-time funds will fund needed improvements in existing shelters and help fund an additional 285 shelter beds throughout the county.
- The Division also released funding for **Technical Assistance and Capacity Building** grants available to all homeless services provider organizations. 12 organizations have already applied in the first month to hire a consultant to conduct organizational assessments and identify capacity-building needs. The project is budgeted to invest more than \$4 million into community-based organizations for capacity building needs over the next two years.

New Program Development:

The Homeless Services Division continues to launch innovative and responsive programming to better meet our community needs. In Q3 the following programming advancements were made:

- **Locally Coordinated Command Centers (LC3)** launched to advance the impact of our outreach services and coordination with city jurisdictions as a component of the Governor's Executive Orders to stand up Multi-Agency Coordination groups (MACG) to respond to unsheltered homelessness. The LC3 project is working collaboratively with local providers and partners to identify the resources, needs, and housing options using a by-name list for each site prioritized for LC3 coordination. The goal of this strategic coordination is to engage, connect and transition unsheltered homeless individuals to shelter and housing options as quickly as possible.
- **Winter shelters become year-round.** In Q3, as a component of MACG coordination, the Department of Housing Services was able to expand all winter-shelter programs to year-round. This is a tremendous expansion of shelter capacity, adding 160 year-round beds immediately to the system, and preventing the closure of three shelter programs previously scheduled to close in May. The City of Beaverton will partner with the County to keep the winter only shelter open year-round until the new site is opened in the summer of 2024, and the Salvation Army will

partner to operate the Hillsboro congregate shelter at their site for three summer months when the Clover Leaf site is needed for the County Fair.

- The **Regional Risk Mitigation Fund** was launched in Q3 in partnership with Multnomah and Clackamas counties and the Housing Development Center (HDC). The new regional risk mitigation fund will provide financial reimbursement to landlords who partner with the RLRA program and experience any financial loss during tenancy. Next, the Counties will work with HDC to develop outreach strategies, education, and marketing materials to recruit and retain landlords as partners in ending homelessness.
- **The Welcome Home Kit** project achieved a significant milestone, delivering move-in supplies for 54 new tenants who are anticipated to move into the new Heartwood Commons (former Aloha Inn.) This partnership with Sunrise Church brought neighbors, volunteers, and donors together to help support new residents moving from shelters and camps into housing.

Program Evaluation:

In addition to funding and supporting programs, the Division is also increasing evaluation and program monitoring activities to ensure equitable and effective outcomes of SHS resources for the community. Q3 program evaluation milestones include:

- The Homeless Services Division completed its first comprehensive **Annual Performance Evaluation and Report** for all Supportive Housing Services contracted providers. Providers reported on contract performance metrics, staff demographics, financial metrics, and pay equity. The participation rate was 100%.
- **The Division continues to evaluate our programs for equitable outcomes, finding in Q3 that** 56% of households served by the Rapid Rehousing program identify as Latino/a/e, and 8% identify as Black. The Eviction Prevention program is also serving predominantly Black and Latino/a/e, with only 34% of households served identifying as non-Hispanic White.

System Improvements and Integration:

Finally, the Homeless Services Division is also working on several efforts to advance system integration partnerships to improve housing outcomes for our community. This quarter, two important developments include:

- A **Healthcare Case Conferencing** project launched in March in partnership with Kaiser Permanente and Providence. Already, these case conferencing sessions have helped twelve individuals in housing programs address healthcare-related needs through care coordination.
- The **One Homeless Services System governance restructure** continues to move forward towards an integrated and aligned advisory body structure to support and oversee Washington County homeless programs. Community leaders from the existing governance structures have convened as the Transition Advisory Group (TAG) to guide the transition in partnership with staff and the larger community. TAG members will be presenting a draft of the new proposed structure at the Homeless Plan Advisory Committee, CoC Board, and Housing and Supportive

Services Network meetings during May and June. The final recommendation is anticipated to be presented for the Board of County Commissioners' consideration in July.

Section 2. Data and data disaggregation

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.

Data disclaimer:

HUD Universal Data Elements data categories will be used in this template for gender identity and race/ethnicity until county data teams develop regionally approved data categories that more accurately reflect the individual identities.

Section 2.A Housing Stability Outcomes: Placements & Preventions

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Supportive Housing

# housing placements – supportive housing*	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Total people	168		641	
Total households	136		497	
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	4	0%	10	2%
Black, African American or African	15	0%	50	8%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	43	0%	173	28%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	16	0%	53	9%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	3	0%	18	3%
White	138	100%	513	84%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	74	46%	293	48%
Client Doesn't Know	2	0%	5	1%
Client Refused	1	0%	8	1%
Data Not Collected	3	0%	13	2%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	114	68%	441	69%
Persons without disabilities	42	25%	151	24%
Disability unreported	12	7%	49	8%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	67	40%	269	42%
Female	89	53%	322	50%

A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	4	2%	9	1%
Transgender	1	1%	4	1%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	0	0%	1	0%
Data not collected	7	4%	36	6%

**Supportive housing = permanent supportive housing and other service-enriched housing for Population A such as transitional recovery housing*

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Rapid Re-Housing & Short-term Rent Assistance

# housing placements – RRH**	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Total people	75		280	
Total households	46		127	
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	2	0%	6	2%
Black, African American or African	13	0%	30	11%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	18	0%	154	56%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	2	0%	23	8%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	5	0%	13	5%
White	52	100%	209	76%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	37	53%	203	74%
Client Doesn't Know	1	0%	8	3%
Client Refused	1	0%	2	1%
Data Not Collected	1	0%	1	0%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	25	33%	83	30%
Persons without disabilities	45	60%	190	68%
Disability unreported	5	7%	7	3%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	31	41%	112	40%
Female	39	52%	160	57%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	0	0%	1	0%
Transgender	0	0%	2	1%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data not collected	5	7%	5	2%

**** RRH = rapid re-housing or short-term rent assistance programs**

Housing Placements By Intervention Type: Other Permanent Housing Programs (if applicable)

If your county does not have Other Permanent Housing, please write N/A: _____

# housing placements – OPH***	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Total people				
Total households				
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American				
Black, African American or African				
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)				
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous				
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander				
White				
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)				
Client Doesn't Know				
Client Refused				
Data Not Collected				
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities				
Persons without disabilities				
Disability unreported				
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male				
Female				
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'				
Transgender				
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused				
Data not collected				

*** OPH = other permanent housing programs (homeless preference units, rent assistance programs without services) that your system operates and SHS funds

Context narrative (optional): In no more than 500 words, please share any additional context about the data you provided above on Housing Placements.

[enter narrative here]

Eviction and Homelessness Prevention

# of preventions	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Total people	143		143	
Total households	53		53	
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	1	0%	1	1%
Black, African American or African	32	0%	32	22%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	60	0%	60	42%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	4	0%	4	3%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	10	0%	10	7%
White	96	100%	96	67%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	95	66%	95	66%
Client Doesn't Know	11	0%	11	8%
Client Refused				
Data Not Collected				
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	22	15%	22	15%
Persons without disabilities	121	85%	121	85%
Disability unreported				
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Maled	58	41%	58	41%
Female	84	59%	84	59%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	1	1%	1	1%
Transgender	0	0%	0	0%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	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 Quarterly Program Data	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Number of RLRA vouchers issued during reporting period	157		424	
Number of people newly leased up during reporting period	239		819	
Number of households newly leased up during reporting period	138		468	
Number of people in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	1249		1273	
Number of households in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period	754		768	
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	11	1%	12	1.6%
Black, African American or African	84	11%	86	11.2%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	165	22%	168	21.9%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	45	6%	45	5.9%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	22	3%	22	2.9%
White	636	84%	648	84.4%
Non-Hispanic White (subset of White category)	454	60%	462	60.2%
Client Doesn't Know	0	0%	0	0.0%
Client Refused				
Data Not Collected				
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	395	52%	403	52.5%
Persons without disabilities	359	48%	365	47.5%
Disability unreported	0	0%	0	0.0%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	324	43%	336	43.8%
Female	417	55%	432	56.3%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	11	2%	0	0.0%
Transgender	2	0%	0	0.0%
Questioning	0	0%	0	0.0%
Client doesn't know	0	0%	0	0.0%
Client refused	0	0%	0	0.0%
Data not collected	0	0%	0	0.0%

Definitions:

Number of RLRA vouchers issued during reporting period: Number of households who were issued an RLRA voucher during the reporting period. (Includes households still shopping for a unit and not yet leased up.)

Number of households/people newly leased up during reporting period: Number of households/people who completed the lease up process and moved into their housing during the reporting period.

Number of households/people in housing using an RLRA voucher during reporting period: Number of households/people who were in housing using an RLRA voucher at any point during the reporting period. (Includes (a) everyone who has been housed to date with RLRA and is still housed, and (b) households who became newly housed during the reporting period.)

Context narrative (optional): In no more than 500 words, please share any additional context about the data you provided above on the RLRA program.

Section 2.C Subset of Housing Placements and Preventions: Priority Population Disaggregation

The following is a **subset** of the above Housing Placements and Preventions data (all intervention types combined), which represents housing placements/preventions for SHS priority population A.

Population A Report	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Population A: Total people placed into permanent housing/preventions	138		494	
Population A: Total households placed into permanent housing/preventions	111		364	
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	3	2%	7	1%
Black, African American or African	19	14%	51	10%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	35	26%	119	24%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	15	11%	57	12%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	4	3%	19	4%
White	111	82%	395	81%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	85	63%	295	60%
Client Doesn't Know	2	1%	4	1%
Client Refused	1	1%	7	1%
Data Not Collected	2	1%	9	2%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	106	77%	384	78%
Persons without disabilities	29	21%	99	20%
Disability unreported	3	2%	11	2%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	55	40%	218	44%
Female	78	57%	257	52%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	2	1%	8	2%

Transgender	1	1%	5	1%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	0	0%	1	0%
Data not collected	2	1%	5	1%

The following is a **subset** of the above Housing Placements and Preventions data (all intervention types combined), which represents housing placements and preventions for SHS priority population B.

Population B Report	This Quarter		Year to Date	
	#	%	#	%
Population B: Total people placed into permanent housing/preventions	248		570	
Population B: Total households placed into permanent housing/preventions	124		313	
Race & Ethnicity				
Asian or Asian American	4	2%	10	2%
Black, African American or African	41	17%	61	11%
Hispanic or Latin(a)(o)(x)	86	36%	268	50%
American Indian, Alaska Native or Indigenous	7	3%	23	4%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	14	6%	22	4%
White	175	74%	423	79%
(Subset of White): Non-Hispanic White	104	44%	199	37%
Client Doesn't Know	12	5%	20	4%
Client Refused	1	0%	3	1%
Data Not Collected	2	1%	5	1%
Disability status				
	#	%	#	%
Persons with disabilities	55	22%	162	28%
Persons without disabilities	179	72%	363	64%
Disability unreported	14	6%	45	8%
Gender identity				
	#	%	#	%
Male	101	41%	221	39%
Female	134	54%	309	54%
A gender that is not singularly 'Male' or 'Female'	3	1%	3	1%
Transgender	0	0%	1	0%
Questioning				
Client doesn't know				
Client refused	0	0%	0	0%
Data not collected	10	4%	36	6%

Context narrative (optional): In no more than 500 words, please share any additional context about the data you provided above on Population A/B.

Section 2.D 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 beds 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:

All counties please complete the table below:

Goal Type	Your FY 22-23 Goal	Progress this Quarter	Progress YTD
Shelter Beds	75	150	220

Section 3. Financial reporting

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

Yellow Cell = County to fill in

Blue Cell = Formula calculation

Due Date: The Annual Program Budget (and any subsequent Amended Budget) is due to Metro within 60 days after the Partner's budget is adopted (or amended) by its governing body (IGA 5.5.2).^[1]

Metro Supportive Housing Services
Annual Program Budget (IGA 5.5.2)
Washington County
FY 22-23

Annual Program Budget (by G/L Account Category)

	Annual Budget	Amended Budget #1 Amendment Date: MM-DD-YYYY	Amended Budget #2 Amendment Date: MM-DD-YYYY	Amended Budget #3 Amendment Date: MM-DD-YYYY	Comments
Metro SHS Resources					
Beginning Fund Balance					
Metro SHS Program Funds	50,328,300				
Interest Earnings					
<i>Insert add'l lines as necessary</i>					
Total Metro SHS Resources	50,328,300	-	-	-	
Metro SHS Requirements					
Program Costs					
Personnel	4,143,527				
Materials & Services	40,995,292				
Capital Outlay					
Debt Service					
Transfers					
Regional Strategy Implementation Fund	2,500,000				
County/DHS Admin Cost	1,862,476				
Amortization Expense	86,025				
Subtotal Program Costs	49,587,320	-	-	-	
Contingency and Ending Fund Balance					
Contingency	740,980				
Ending Fund Balance (Stabilization Reserve)	-				
Subtotal Contingency and Ending Fund Balance	740,980	-	-	-	
Total Metro SHS Requirements	50,328,300	-	-	-	

Annual Program Budget (by Program Category)

	Annual Budget	Amended Budget #1	Amended Budget #2	Amended Budget #3	Comments
Metro SHS Requirements					
Program Costs					
Activity Costs					
Shelter, Outreach and Safety on/off the Street <i>(emergency shelter, outreach services and supplies, hygiene programs)</i>	11,670,429				<i>Shelter programs, Outreach programs, Access Center programs and all related staffing, and program expenditures.</i>
Short-term Housing Assistance (rent assistance and services, e.g. rapid rehousing, short-term rent assistance, housing retention)	7,525,214				<i>Rapid Rehousing, Rapid Resolution, and Eviction Prevention programs, and all related staffing, and program expenditures.</i>
Permanent supportive housing services (wrap-around services for PSH)	9,307,031				<i>Housing Case Management Services and other Permanent Supportive Housing Programs and all related staffing, and program expenditures.</i>
Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA, the rent assistance portion of PSH)	11,396,205				<i>Regional Long-term Rent Assistance (RLRA) and all related staffing, and program expenditures.</i>
Other supportive services (employment, benefits)	3,774,681				<i>Housing Liaisons, Employment Supports, Benefit Supports, Landlord supports, and other wrap-around services programs and all related staffing and program expenditures.</i>
Systems and Capacity Building	1,499,102				<i>Capacity building and technical assistance for service providers and county systems, system management programs for data, training and coordination, capital infrastructure investments and all related staffing and program expenditures.</i>
Subtotal Activity Costs	45,172,662	-	-	-	
Administrative Costs^[1]					
Admin: Long-term Rent Assistance	231,928				Administrative Costs for long-term rent assistance equals 2% of annual Program Funds allocated by Partner for long-term rent assistance.
Admin: Other	1,682,730				Administrative Costs for Other Program Costs equals 4% of total Other Program Costs.
Subtotal Administrative Costs	1,914,658	-	-	-	
Other Costs					
Debt Service	-				
Regional Strategy Implementation Fund^[2]	2,500,000	-	-	-	Regional Strategy Implementation Fund equals 5% of Partner's total Budget.
<i>insert add'l lines as necessary</i>					
Subtotal Other Costs	2,500,000	-	-	-	
Total Program Costs	49,587,320	-	-	-	
Contingency and Ending Fund Balance					
Contingency ^[3]	740,980				Contingency equals 1% of Partner's total Budget.
Ending Fund Balance (Stabilization Reserve) ^[4]	-				Stabilization Reserve equals 0% of Partner's total Budget.
Subtotal Contingency and Ending Fund Balance	740,980	-	-	-	
Total Metro SHS Requirements	50,328,300	-	-	-	
<i>Check vs Requirements by G/L Account Category</i>	(0)	-	-	-	

^[1] Per IGA Section 3.4.2 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, Metro recommends, but does not require, that in a given Fiscal Year Administrative Costs for SHS should not exceed 5% of annual Program Funds allocated to Partner; and that Administrative Costs for administering long-term rent assistance programs should not exceed 10% of annual Program Funds allocated by Partner for long-term rent assistance.

^[2] Per IGA Section 8.3.3 REGIONAL STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION FUND, each County must contribute not less than 5% of its share of Program Funds each Fiscal Year to a Regional Strategy Implementation Fund to achieve regional investment strategies.

^[3] Per IGA Section 5.5.4 CONTINGENCY, partner may establish a contingency account in addition to a Stabilization Reserve. The contingency account will not exceed 5% of Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year.

^[4] Per IGA Section 5.3 PARTNER STABILIZATION RESERVE, partner will establish and hold a Stabilization Reserve to protect against financial instability within the SHS program with a target minimum reserve level will be equal to 10% of Partner's Budgeted Program Funds in a given Fiscal Year. The Stabilization Reserve for each County will be fully funded within the first three years.

Spend-Down Plan (IGA 5.5.2.1)

Description: Please

Estimated Spend-Down by Quarter	Expected % of Budget Spent per Quarter	Comments
Quarter 1		<i>Describe the nature of planned spending per quarter. This should be high-level, 1-2 sentences max.</i>
Quarter 2		
Quarter 3		
Quarter 4		
Total	0%	

Non-Displacement (IGA 5.5.1)

	FY18-19 Budget	FY19-20 Budget	FY2021-22 Prior FY Budget	FY2022-23 Current FY Budget	Variance from Benchmark	Comments
Current Partner-provided SHS Funds (Partner General Funds) ^[1]	N/A	794,401	N/A	1,001,800	207,399	<i>Decrease from FY19-20 amount requires a written waiver from Metro.</i>
Other Funds ^[2]	3,875,537	N/A	4,483,941	4,481,259	605,722	<i>Additional \$275K of HUD CoC grants and \$330K of County Local Option Levy were added in FY2022-23.</i>

^[1] Per IGA Section 5.5.1.2 TERMS, "Current Partner-provided SHS Funds" means Partner's general funds currently provided as of FY 2019-20 towards SHS programs within Partner's jurisdictional limits including, but not limited to, within the Region. "Current Partner-provided SHS Funds" expressly excludes all other sources of funds Partner may use to fund SHS programs as of FY 2019-20 including, but not limited to, state or federal grants.

^[2] Per IGA Section 5.5.1.1 OTHER FUNDS include, but are not limited to, various state or federal grants and other non-general fund sources. Partner will attempt, in good faith, to maintain such funding at the same levels set forth in Partner's FY 2018-19 budget. However, because the amount and availability of these other funds are outside of Partner's control, they do not constitute Partner's Current Partner-provided SHS Funds for purposes of Displacement. Partner will provide Metro with information on the amount of other funds Partner has allocated to SHS, as well as the change, if any, of those funds from the prior Fiscal Year in its Annual Program Budget.

^[3] While the 60 day deadline described in IGA section 5.5.2 only deals with budget amendments, partners agreed it should apply to the initial budget submission as well.