



COORDINATED HOUSELESS RESPONSE OFFICE (CHRO)

Board Meeting Agenda

11:00 – 12:30 PM on Thursday, May 16th, 2024

Deschutes Services Building, Allen Room (2nd floor), 1300 NW Wall St., Bend, OR

Click this link to access the meeting via Zoom:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81425690298?pwd=ZUpTYnVzTEhyVFd0V1FIZXBwMkVkdz09>

To join by phone: 253-205-0468 Meeting ID: 814 2569 0298 Passcode: 026276

Agenda

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------|
| | 11:00 AM 1. Introductions and Agenda Review | Chair Adair |
| | 11:02 AM 2. Approval of Minutes & Review of Financials | Chris Ogren |
| | <i>Attachments A & B</i> | |
| 2&4 | 11:05 AM 3. HLC Response to Data Request | Eliza Wilson |
| | <i>Attachment C</i> | |
| 5 | 11:20 AM 4. BIRCH Update | Gwenn Wysling |
| | 11:35 AM 5. Strategic Plan Discussion | Chris Ogren |
| 3&4 | 11:50 AM 6. RFQ Recommendations and Next Steps | Chris Ogren |
| | <i>Attachment D</i> | |
| | 12:15 PM 7. Community Updates | |
| | 12:25 PM 8. Public Comment | CHRO Board |
| | 12:30 PM 9. Other Items & Adjourn | |



Deschutes County encourages persons with disabilities to participate in all programs and activities. This event/location is accessible to people with disabilities. If you need accommodations to make participation possible, please call (541) 388-6584 or send email to erik.kropp@deschutes.org.

Condado de Deschutes alienta a las personas cualificadas con discapacidad a participar en sus programas y actividades. Esta evento/ubicación es accesible para personas con discapacidad. Si necesita hacer arreglos para hacer posible la participación, llame al (541) 388- 6584 o envíe un correo electrónico a erik.kropp@deschutes.org.

COORDINATED HOUSELESS RESPONSE OFFICE (CHRO) Board Meeting Minutes

11 – 12:30 pm on Thursday, April 25, 2024
Deschutes Services Building, 1300 NW Wall St., Bend, OR

Attendance: Commissioner Adair, Chair, Deschutes County; Councilor Zwicker, City of Redmond; Councilor Blum, City of Sisters; Councilor Perkins, City of Bend; Mayor Richer, City of La Pine; Chris Ogren, CHRO; Eric King, City Manager - City of Bend; Eliza Wilson, Homeless Leadership Coalition; Molly Heiss, NeighborImpact; Mickie Derting, City of Bend; Jean Hrabik, COIC; Kerry Prosser, City of Sisters; Linda Cline, City of Redmond; Brook O'Keefe, City of Bend; Steven Emerson, Deschutes County; Gwenn Wysling, Bethlehem Inn; James Cook, Oasis Village; Geoff Wullschlager, City Manager – City of La Pine; Linda Murrer, Community Member; Councilor Osborne, City of Redmond; John Lodise, Homeless Leadership Coalition; Ben Scott, NeighborImpact; Josh Burgess, Central Oregon Civic Action Project; Rodger Moore, EPIC Property Management; Alex Renirie, Healthy Democracy; Brook Olsen, City of Bend; Dean Harris, Community Member; Denise LaBuda, Community Member; Erik Nelson, COIC; Sharlene Weed, Community Member; Natalie (online).

1. **Call to Order**

Chair Adair called the meeting to order at 11:00.

2. **Approval of Minutes & Review of Financials**

Chair Adair reviewed the minutes from the meeting on March 21, 2024, and the financials. Chair Adair noted that dates were missing from the financials provided, and asked that they be included in financial statements, going forward.

Eliza Wilson issued a statement to correct misstatements made in the public comment from the CHRO Meeting held March 21st, 2024 about the Central Oregon MAC Group. Eliza explained the process regarding the decision-making process, voting, financials, and transparency. Eliza noted that all MAC meetings are open to the public to attend, and invited interested parties to attend the upcoming MAC meeting from 10-11 am on Wednesday, May 1st.

VOTE: Councilor Blum motioned approval of the March 21st Minutes. Mayor Richer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **Point In Time Count Update for Deschutes County**

Ben Scott presented the preliminary Point in Time (PIT) data for Deschutes County. Ben explained the purpose of the PIT Count, and its limitations, cautioning the use of singular data points. Ben explained how the process of conducting the PIT Count works and noted that responses to the survey are voluntary. Councilor Zwicker

asked about how those that decline to participate are counted. Ben explained that while the survey was voluntary, there is an opportunity for PIT volunteers to also submit an observed tally that captures individuals who may not be willing or able to complete a PIT survey at a given time. Molly Heiss provided context to Crook County's increase in PIT Count numbers, noting that Crook County's expanded outreach provider capacity increased the accuracy of their count from prior years when counts were not accurate. Commissioner Adair noted the Board of County Commissioners had requested a presentation about the PIT Count in Deschutes County from NeighborImpact in May.

4. Coordinated Entry System Overview

Ben Scott provided an overview of the Coordinated Entry System (CES) and how the system works to move people experiencing homelessness through a process that ends in a placement in permanent housing. Ben explained how the CES works in reality in Central Oregon, and highlighted some areas of opportunity for improvement. Ben shared the phone number to get access to the CES, 541-630-2533, and noted it is currently staffed on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 12-4pm.

5. Housing Placements in Central Oregon

Rodger Moore, with EPIC property management, and Molly Heiss, CHRO Ex-officio board member and with NeighborImpact, shared an update about the current state of efforts to place individuals experiencing homelessness into permanent housing. Commissioner Adair noted a nearly 10% vacancy rate in Bend market rate rental properties. Rodger Moore shared that the majority of affordable housing properties are not included in the assessment being referenced, and that Housing Works properties all have multi-year waiting lists. Rodger shared some statistics about tenants in Housing Works properties, and shared that Housing Works is on track to add 100 affordable rental housing units per year in Central Oregon. Councilor Zwicker asked Rodger about Mid-town place, noting it was intended to be built for individuals between 60 and 80% Area Median Income (AMI), but has many tenants below 30% AMI. Rodger noted that Housing Works properties across the board have a high percentage of people below 30% AMI because there is very little housing being built in Central Oregon to support people at that income level. Molly shared how traditional supported housing programs operate, namely Rapid Rehousing (RRH). Molly spoke to the challenges and trade-offs with paying rents above HUD's Fair Market Value, which allows providers to help fewer clients given limited resources and does not set clients up for success once the subsidy lapses, typically after two years. Molly noted that this brief discussion was the beginning of a broader conversation about what the CHRO and local government partners can do to expand options for individuals seeking permanent housing in Central Oregon. Commissioner Adair noted the importance of continuing the discussion with the CHRO in the future.

6. CHRO RFQ Update

Chris Ogren shared a brief update about the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process. Chris shared that staff received 7 applications from the process and all applicants were local to Central Oregon. 4 of the applications involved safe parking programs, 2 tiny home villages, and 1 managed camp. Chris shared that a total of \$4.5 million would be necessary to satisfy each requirement and ensure operations through 2025. Chris also noted that some of the applications had some serious challenges, like zoning, cost, expectations/requests from partners, and more. Chris shared that the Review Team would be meeting in late April to finalize recommendations to the CHRO Board.

7. Citizen's Assembly & Central Oregon Civic Action Project

Josh Burgess and Alex Renirie shared information about the Central Oregon Civic Action Project and the concept of Citizen's Assemblies, in general. Josh shared that Citizen's Assemblies have been conducted across the world, but are relatively new to the United States. Josh shared how the process is designed to work, and noted that the topic the group has an interest in exploring further was Youth Homelessness. Alex shared information about the deliberative democracy model, and expressed excitement about a future opportunity to share more with the Board.

8. Public Comment

Katherine Osborne shared her frustrations with an experience trying to help a friend in Redmond try to get access to housing after experiencing housing instability.

Gwenn Wysling shared updates about the BIRCH project in Redmond and shared that it is fully at capacity.

Ed Murrer suggested the CHRO audit the MAC group's spending.

9. Other Items and Adjourn

Chair Adair noted the next CHRO Board Meeting was scheduled for May 16th and adjourned the meeting @ 12:32.

Full Statement from Eliza Wilson:

"In the notes from our last meeting, there was public comment made and I would like to correct the inaccurate information provided and perhaps answer some of the questions raised.

I am on the executive committee of the MAC group and am proud of the work that Central Oregon MAC has accomplished in so short a time. There were various concerns brought up by public comment in our last meeting. Statements made insinuated that there were conflicts of interest impeding the MAC funding process. I wanted to share, while Tammy Baney facilitates some of the MAC meetings, she does not vote or make decisions around funding, the MAC group does. Most decisions have been voted on by all MAC members, but at times the membership has delegated votes to the Executive Committee (comprised of the HLC, The region's housing authority and community action agency).

The original request for \$84,000 for renovations of the BI to the MAC group was voted on by the whole membership, the Executive committee voted by email regarding funding allocation to BI as it related to rent payments for incoming renters of their RRH project and staff to support renters. Voting by email is common practice among boards, even this one. This was not in an effort to be less transparent, but to meet our goals around housing people experiencing homelessness rapidly, in the tight timeline given by the Governor's office.

All funding allocated by the MAC group are a reimbursement model. This means that when an organization spends the money, they invoice the MAC to be reimbursed. We pay for staff who are currently working and housing for people who are in housing. Data related to how many people are served is closely monitored and submitted to The State.

Our MAC meetings are open to the public and we encourage open communication from community partners regarding gaps in the system and in funding. It is common for attendees to express their support for a program, like how Tammy, a former board member for the BI, expressed support for their request for funding. Just as I have expressed support for funding requests in meetings.

Additionally, the public comment from our last meeting insinuated that the MAC had not posted all the videos for past meetings on the website, but in fact all videos are present because the group at times skipped meetings when we were between funding awards.

The only way for our community or any community to make progress with the crisis of homelessness is to put our differences aside and work together to house people. We cannot shelter people out of homelessness, this is why the MAC group backed a shelter shifting from sheltering individuals to providing them housing. We must invest in housing options. As a provider I understand how hard it is to shift programs, how it can take time to get to full capacity and it can be expensive at first with renovations, however running a housing program is going to be less expensive long term than running a

shelter and fills existing gaps. We need to support programs like the BI who was willing to see that they needed to shift their program to fit a need the community has.

I appreciate the questions and encourage interested parties to attend the MAC group meetings. They are virtual and open to the public. The next meeting is 10am next Wednesday.”

DRAFT

DESCHUTES COUNTY - DEPARTMENT BUDGET LEVEL
FISCAL YEAR 2025

5/6/2024

FUND 205 - Joint Houselessness Task Force

| OBJECT - DESCRIPTION ----- | FY 2022 ACTUALS ----- | FY 2023 ACTUALS ----- | FY 2024 ADJ BUDGET ----- | YTD END OF APR '24 ----- | FY 2025 DEPARTMENT ----- | \$ BDGT CHG FR FY 2024 ----- | % BDGT CHG FR FY 2024 ----- |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| * Resources | | | | | | | |
| 301000 - BEG NET WORKING CAPITAL | 0 | 0 | 789,400 | 13,337 | 789,400 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 334012 - State Grant | 0 | 192,705 | 0 | 807,295 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 343013 - Other Revenue - Misc | 0 | 10,633 | 0 | 28,698 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 361011 - Interest-Pooled Investments | 0 | 13,337 | 19,700 | 19,242 | 19,700 | 0 | 0.00 |
| * Total - Resources | 0 | 216,676 | 809,100 | 868,572 | 809,100 | 0 | 0.00 |

DESCHUTES COUNTY - DEPARTMENT BUDGET LEVEL
FISCAL YEAR 2025

5/6/2024

FUND 205 - Joint Houselessness Task Force

| OBJECT - DESCRIPTION ----- | FY 2022 ACTUALS ----- | FY 2023 ACTUALS ----- | FY 2024 ADJ BUDGET ----- | YTD END OF APR '24 ----- | FY 2025 DEPARTMENT ----- | \$ BDGT CHG FR FY 2024 ----- | % BDGT CHG FR FY 2024 ----- |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| * Personnel Services | | | | | | | |
| 410101 - Regular Employees | 0 | 125,566 | 226,301 | 58,994 | 226,301 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 410301 - Overtime | 0 | 2,366 | 0 | 6,753 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 410401 - Time Management | 0 | 11,841 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0.00 |
| 420101 - Health-Dental Ins (ISF) | 0 | 19,010 | 40,882 | 19,255 | 40,882 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 420201 - PERS Employee-Employer | 0 | 11,068 | 53,368 | 15,033 | 53,368 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 420202 - PERS - Fund 575 for D-S | 0 | 960 | 3,452 | 980 | 3,452 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 420301 - FICA | 0 | 11,127 | 17,682 | 4,840 | 17,682 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 420401 - Workers' Comp Insurance | 0 | 157 | 118 | 37 | 118 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 420501 - Unemployment Insurance | 0 | 487 | 706 | 267 | 706 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 420601 - Life-Long Term Disability | 0 | 353 | 638 | 252 | 638 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 420801 - Paid Leave Oregon | 0 | 383 | 907 | 255 | 907 | 0 | 0.00 |
| * Total - Personnel Services | 0 | 183,317 | 344,054 | 107,015 | 344,054 | 0 | 0.00 |
| * Material & Services | | | | | | | |
| 430620 - ISF Facilities | 0 | 0 | 714 | 595 | 714 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 430625 - ISF Administration | 0 | 0 | 2,981 | 2,484 | 2,981 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 430628 - ISF BOCC | 0 | 0 | 717 | 598 | 717 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 430630 - ISF Finance | 0 | 0 | 4,400 | 3,667 | 4,400 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 430631 - ISF Finance-HR Proj Reserve | 0 | 0 | 80 | 67 | 80 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 430650 - ISF Human Resources | 0 | 0 | 2,903 | 2,419 | 2,903 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 450091 - Recruitment | 0 | 10,812 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 450094 - Program Expense | 0 | 1,796 | 225,000 | 1,186 | 225,000 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 450098 - Dept Employee Recognition | 0 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 40 | 0 | 0.00 |

DESCHUTES COUNTY - DEPARTMENT BUDGET LEVEL
FISCAL YEAR 2025

5/6/2024

FUND 205 - Joint Houselessness Task Force

| OBJECT - DESCRIPTION ----- | FY 2022 ACTUALS ----- | FY 2023 ACTUALS ----- | FY 2024 ADJ BUDGET ----- | YTD END OF APR '24 ----- | FY 2025 DEPARTMENT ----- | \$ BDGT CHG FR FY 2024 ----- | % BDGT CHG FR FY 2024 ----- |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| * Material & Services | | | | | | | |
| 450820 - Travel-Accommodations | 0 | 409 | 0 | 276 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 450850 - Travel-Ground Trans-Parking | 0 | 54 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 450860 - Travel-Meals | 0 | 29 | 0 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 450870 - Travel-Mileage Reimb | 0 | 705 | 0 | 295 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 460320 - Meeting Suppl (Food etc.) | 0 | 80 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0.00 |
| 460610 - Computers & Peripherals | 0 | 6,135 | 0 | (1,781) | 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| * Total - Material & Services | 0 | 20,021 | 236,835 | 9,924 | 236,835 | 0 | 0.00 |
| * | | | | | | | |
| 521851 - Reserve for Future Expenditu | 0 | 0 | 228,211 | 0 | 228,211 | 0 | 0.00 |
| * Total - | 0 | 0 | 228,211 | 0 | 228,211 | 0 | 0.00 |
| ===== | | | | | | | |
| *** TOTAL FUND 205 RESOURCES | 0 | 216,676 | 809,100 | 868,572 | 809,100 | 0 | 0.00 |
| ----- | | | | | | | |
| *** TOTAL FUND 205 REQUIREMENTS | 0 | 203,338 | 809,100 | 116,939 | 809,100 | 0 | 0.00 |
| ===== | | | | | | | |

May 10th, 2024

To: Coordinated Houseless Response Office Governing Board

RE: Request for Homelessness Data in Deschutes County

Dear Chair Adair and Vice-Chair Perkins,

This letter is in response to the CHRO's request for data specific to Deschutes County. The Homeless Leadership Coalition (HLC) Board appreciates the CHRO Board's interest in data transparency and shares a desire to improve the community's understanding of Central Oregon's homeless response system through data.

We agree there is a critical need to better communicate and an opportunity to increase understanding of our region's homelessness crisis. It is also necessary that decision-makers have accurate and timely information to take action. A conscientious approach to data sharing is essential. With any public facing data, the HLC commits to prioritize the anonymity of those the data represents. We know that with public facing data that it will be important to help people understand how to appropriately interpret the data. We hope you found NeighborImpact's recent presentation sharing Point in Time Count data specific to Deschutes County helpful and informative. We are grateful to NeighborImpact for their long standing partnership and leadership with our region's homelessness data. It's also important to acknowledge that the HLC's ability to share data is limited as a direct result of under-resourcing this critical function within our region's homeless response system.

At this time, the HLC Board and our colleagues at NeighborImpact are focused on managing the federally mandated reporting requirements that stem from accepting funding from the US Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). and overseeing activities critical to current and future Housing and Urban Development dedicated funding. Those include, completing our HUD submission for the Point in Time Count and Housing Inventory Count, completing our Coordinated Community Plan as part of the Youth Homelessness Demonstration Project for which we were awarded \$953,950, launching an RFP for this process, beginning preparations for the 2024 funding cycle of the annual Continuum of Care (CoC) competition which brings in nearly \$900,000 in funds each year for programs in our region, sustaining our current data quality through our partnership with Built for Zero, and managing an RFP for technical assistance to help our region update the High Desert Home, Plan to End Homelessness. With limited funding dedicated to data, our current staff are at capacity.

In order to respond to your request in a comprehensive way, we will need to take the following steps:

- Confer with HLC's HMIS data lead organization, NeighborImpact, to review your request and determine what capacity constraints they may face with such a request and what support they require to overcome them.
- Evaluate data staffing costs, evaluate if there is a need to purchase data analytics software such as Power BI or Tableau, the annual expense for such software and licensing, and any supplemental costs necessary such as web development fees.
- Prepare a budget for this project for start up and maintenance
- Meet with the HLC's HMIS Data Committee to align on what data is easily available for sharing and create any supplemental data standards required to allow for county level data to be available
- Determine with what frequency updates can be provided specific to Deschutes County in the interim, with NeighborImpact's support, while we work towards our mutual goal of sharing data more widely with the public.

We can commit to keeping you updated on our progress in time for the June meeting of the Coordinated Houseless Response Office.

In the interim, it would be helpful to know of any financial resources that may be available to help us elevate our data analytics and sharing capacities. We are in the final year of funding for our (1FTE) Unhoused Data Manager position. This capacity funding was provided generously by the Central Oregon Health Council. Without additional investments to sustain that role and grow our data capacity, we may be unable to respond to this request due to funding limitations.

In service,



Eliza Wilson, HLC Chair



CHRO RFQ Update

Chris Ogren

Houseless Response Analyst

May 16th, 2024

Fast Facts

7 Submissions

\$4.5m in total requests for start up and one year of operating costs

All local applicants

4 Safe Parking, 2 Tiny Home Village, 1 Managed Camp

All proposing utilization of private property, property from Deschutes County, or City of Bend.

Intergovernmental Review Team (IRT)

- COIC, HLC, City of Bend, City of Redmond, & Deschutes County Staff
- Reviewed and scored all applications
- Recommendations broken out into tiers
 - Tier 1 – Recommended and Shovel Ready
 - Tier 2 – Recommended but Need More Information
 - Tier 3 – Not Recommended to Move Forward at this Time

Project Overview – Oasis Village

- Oasis Village Expansion
- **Location** - Part of current Oasis Footprint, in Redmond
- **Description** - Oasis is requesting funding to add 10 more tiny homes/micro shelters to their established Village. Oasis laid out a clear plan for what improvements are needed to the site and how much they would cost.
- **Amount Requested** - \$494k (startup costs and 1 year of operations)
- **Questions from IRT** – Would shelters from State of Oregon work for this site?
- **Tier 1 – Recommended and Shovel Ready**

Project Overview – Central Oregon Villages

- Safe Parking Program
- **Location** – Bend, off Dean Swift Road in former DAWN’s House Location, private property.
- **Description** – COV proposes to expand their safe parking program to the former DAWN’s House Location. COV has already contacted the property owner. 6 sites.
- **Amount Requested** - \$210k (startup costs and 1 year of operations)
- **Questions from IRT** – There is a reference to mini units in the application, more clarity needed on the use of those would be helpful.
- **Tier 1 – Recommended and Shovel Ready**

Project Overview – Central Oregon Villages

- Tiny Home Village
- **Location** - South of Bend, 61071 Highway 97 South, on City of Bend Property
- **Description** – COV proposes offering a 20-40 unit tiny home village in South Bend. COV would have a phased approach, starting with 10 units and building up. COV also notes there is potential to move the units from their site at Desert Streams Church to this location if their lease is not renewed (max of 40).
- **Amount requested** - \$1m (startup costs and 1 year of operations)
- **Questions from IRT** - Is there a need for 40 high barrier units with limited amenities? Robust opposition prepared already, would partners be willing to support COV with potential legal defense?
- **Tier 2 – Recommended but Need More Information**

Project Overview – Mountainview Community Development

- Expansion of Safe Parking Program
- **Location** – Bend or Redmond, MVCD wants to work with a landowner to decide what is most needed and where.
- **Description** – MVCD submitted an application to indicate their interest in working with local governments to expand safe parking.
- **Amount Requested** – no detailed budget, depends on site.
- **Questions from IRT** – Interested parties will need to have more conversations with MVCD to gauge cost per client, site design, etc.
- **Tier 2 – Recommended but Need More Information**

Project Overview – Gales Brothers LLC

- Development of Safe Parking Program
- **Location** - East of Bend (off Hamby Rd.), outside UGB, on private property
- **Description** – The Gales Brothers want to develop a safe parking site on their private property. They don't have the experience to operate a program at the site, but given their background in construction, they want to help build it. The Gales Brothers also want the County to partner on the site, which would allow up to 20 sites vs. the standard 6.
- **Amount Requested** - \$729k (startup costs and 1 year of operations)
- **Questions from IRT** – Concerns about time involved with zoning change with ARPA funding deadline, More firm partnerships are necessary to ensure success, Is there a plan B if a public agency isn't willing to partner to operate a Safe Parking site?
- **Tier 3 – Not Recommended to Move Forward at this Time**

Project Overview – Home More Network

- Safe Parking Program
- **Location** – Huntington Road in La Pine, on County Property.
- **Description** – HMN proposes offering a Safe Parking program in La Pine. In order to expand the number of units, HMN proposes partnering with local government.
- **Amount Requested** - \$349k (startup costs and 1 year of operations)
- **Questions from IRT** – Is the proposed project allowable under City of La Pine’s code? Is there a site that is less temporary that could work?
- **Tier 3 – Not Recommended to Move Forward at this Time**

Project Overview – Home More Network

- Managed Camp/Long Term Visitor Area (LTVA)
- **Location** – Juniper Ridge, on County property.
- **Description** – HMN proposes established Juniper Ridge as a Long Term Visitor Area. This proposal involves a phased approach, and would create a system to monitor who is residing in the area, as well as provide opportunities for services to be provided.
- **Amount Requested** - \$1.724m (startup costs and 1 year of operations)
- **Questions from IRT** – How many spaces/units would be provided? Would HMN be willing to embark on a more measured approach? Does SquareOne have capacity to physically come to Central Oregon and support creation of the proposed program? Will HMN be able to overcome staffing challenges?
- **Tier 3 – Not Recommended to Move Forward at this Time**

Next Steps

1

Review
Recommendations

2

VOTE: Accept or Reject
IRT Recommendations

3

Staff propose RFP
process is facilitated by
property owner and/or
funder for efficiency,
rather than run the RFP
through the CHRO.

RFQ CED 24-01 Alternatives to Unsanctioned Camping

Intergovernmental Review Team Member Summary Tabulation Page

Evaluator Name: Summary of Groups Feedback

Date: 5/9/2024

| | Total score | Technical Qualifications of Firm and Personnel | Relevant Experience | Statement of Work Proposal | Other Comments |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|---------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Points available:</i> | 80 | 20 | 30 | 30 | |
| Oasis Village | 77.6 | 19.4 | 29.6 | 28.6 | Tier 1 |
| Mountainview Community Development | 68.3 | 17.8 | 28.2 | 22.3 | Tier 2 |
| Gales Brothers LLC | 36.6 | 10.4 | 11 | 15.2 | Tier 3 |
| COV - Safe Parking | 73.2 | 19 | 27.8 | 26.4 | Tier 1 |
| COV - Tiny Home Village | 67.7 | 19.2 | 27.3 | 21.2 | Tier 2 |
| HMN - Safe Parking | 40.4 | 10.6 | 12.8 | 17 | Tier 3 |
| HMN - Managed Camp/LTVA | 44.4 | 11.6 | 13.8 | 19 | Tier 3 |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Tier 1 = 70+ | Recommended and Shovel Ready |
| Tier 2 = 60+ | Recommended but Need More Information |
| Tier 3 = < 60 | Not Recommended to Move Forward at this Time |

RFQ CED 24-01 Alternatives to Unsanctioned Camping

Evaluation Committee Member Scoring Notes Page

Evaluator Name:

Summary of Group's Feedback

5/8/2024

Proposal considered:

Oasis

| | | Notes | | |
|---|----|-------|---|--|
| <p>Technical Qualifications of Firm and Personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer organization strength, experience, and stability • Experience and technical competence • Degree to which proposer meets the required qualifications | 20 | 19.4 | <p>Staff and Firm have technical qualifications and personnel to be successful in this project. Response indicates organizational strength, experience, and stability as well as technical competence through staff (1) and Board of Directors qualifications (4), experience receiving government funds (5), and experience developing and operating similar projects.</p> | |
| <p>Relevant Experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with similar projects – designing and/or operating shelter sites. • Experience working on projects where there is a diverse, multi-agency environment, with a series of community partners to maintain productive relationships with. • Demonstrated experience managing public engagement and outreach. • Demonstrated experience receiving government funds and meeting reporting requirements. | 30 | 29.6 | <p>Proposal demonstrates applicant has experience with similar projects through the development and operations of the initial 15 cabins currently on the site of the proposed project. Applicant's experience with public engagement and outreach (6), management of government funds (including Federal and State funds)(5), and experience collaborating on multi-agency projects is also demonstrated in the proposal. Great multi-agency experience from previous planning and build-out. Years of experience with public engagement and outreach. Good relevant short-term operational experience.</p> | |
| <p>Statement of Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of proposal • Demonstrated understanding of the work to be performed • Rigor of the analytical processes proposed to complete the work • Includes site design proposal, with specifics on number of people to be served, program design, high-level cost estimate, site layout, etc. | 30 | 28.6 | <p>Proposal is complete and demonstrates an understanding of the work to be performed. Proposal includes a rendering of the location of additional 10 units, number of people to be served, program design, and high level cost estimate.</p> | |
| <i>Total score</i> | | 80 | 77.6 | |

Overall notes:

Tier 1 - Recommended to Proceed and Shovel Ready
 The IRT recommends this response move forward to the RFP process because the responder meets the minimum required qualifications, demonstrates relevant prior experience, and has submitted a complete Statement of Work.

RFQ CED 24-01 Alternatives to Unsanctioned Camping

Evaluation Committee Member Scoring Notes Page

Evaluator Name:

Summary of Group's Feedback

Date: 5/8/2024

Proposal considered:

MountainView Community Development

| | | Notes | |
|---|----|-------|---|
| <p>Technical Qualifications of Firm and Personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer organization strength, experience, and stability • Experience and technical competence • Degree to which proposer meets the required qualifications | 20 | 18 | <p>The Applicant meets all minimum required qualifications including being registered to conduct business in the State of Oregon, being committed to DEI principles (22), demonstrating experience serving homeless individuals and families (3), and experience engaging in public outreach (5). The applicant demonstrates organizational strength, experience, and stability as well as technical competence through adequate staffing and on-going staff education (1), experience operating similar programs (3), experience managing government funds, and engaging with public partners (3).</p> |
| <p>Relevant Experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with similar projects – designing and/or operating shelter sites. • Experience working on projects where there is a diverse, multi-agency environment, with a series of community partners to maintain productive relationships with. • Demonstrated experience managing public engagement and outreach. • Demonstrated experience receiving government funds and meeting reporting requirements. | 30 | 28 | <p>Response demonstrates the applicant has prior experience operating similar programs, including ongoing operations of 7 safe parking locations as well as providing case management (3), experience engaging in multi-agency projects and collaborating with community partners (3), engaging in public outreach as outlined by the best practices, and experience managing government funds including local (City of Redmond, 3) and Federal (Deschutes County ARPA, 3) (5).</p> |
| <p>Statement of Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of proposal • Demonstrated understanding of the work to be performed • Rigor of the analytical processes proposed to complete the work • Includes site design proposal, with specifics on number of people to be served, program design, high-level cost estimate, site layout, etc. | 30 | 22 | <p>Proposal demonstrates an understanding of work to be performed and provides a high-level program design and site plan. Proposal does not provide a high level cost estimate, number of units to be provided, or specific site design information.</p> |

Total score

80 68

Overall notes:

Tier 2 - Recommended but Need More Information

The IRT recommends this applicant move forward to the RFP process because the responder meets the minimum required qualifications and demonstrates prior experience developing and operating similar projects, though further development of the Statement of Work through the RFP process is recommended.

RFQ CED 24-01 Alternatives to Unsanctioned Camping

Evaluation Committee Member Scoring Notes Page

Evaluator Name:

Summary of Group's Feedback

Date: 5/8/2024

Proposal considered:

Gales Brothers LLC

| | | Notes | |
|---|----|-------|--|
| <p>Technical Qualifications of Firm and Personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer organization strength, experience, and stability • Experience and technical competence • Degree to which proposer meets the required qualifications | 20 | 10 | <p>The Applicant does not meet the minimum required qualifications, including demonstrating limited prior organizational experience serving individuals and families experiencing homelessness and no prior experience supporting public engagement. Proposal indicates entity does not have prior experience operating similar projects (3) or managing grant funding (4), which indicates respondent's lack of technical competence.</p> |
| <p>Relevant Experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with similar projects – designing and/or operating shelter sites. • Experience working on projects where there is a diverse, multi-agency environment, with a series of community partners to maintain productive relationships with. • Demonstrated experience managing public engagement and outreach. • Demonstrated experience receiving government funds and meeting reporting requirements. | 30 | 11 | <p>Entity demonstrates limited experience engaging with public entities and limited experience engaging with Central Oregon's homeless response system (4). Entity has some prior experience engaging with an organization with experience managing public outreach, but has no direct experience themselves (4). Additionally, the applicant states they have no experience with planning, funding, nor operations.</p> |
| <p>Statement of Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of proposal • Demonstrated understanding of the work to be performed • Rigor of the analytical processes proposed to complete the work • Includes site design proposal, with specifics on number of people to be served, program design, high-level cost estimate, site layout, etc. | 30 | 15 | <p>Response does not demonstrate entity's understanding of the work to be performed. The high-level budget includes information regarding the site development, however, includes limited information regarding annual operating costs. Due to zoning requirements, the identified site is not currently an eligible property type for the County's Safe Parking program and would require a zone change.</p> |

Total score

80 37

Overall notes:

Tier 3 - Not Recommended to Move Forward at this Time

The IRT does not recommend this response move forward to the RFP process at this time because the responder does not meet minimum required qualification, has limited prior experience, and the Statement of Work does not demonstrate entity's understanding of the work to be performed. There is so much unknown about who and how this project would be operated, The Review Team encourages the Gales Brothers to continue to work with the County to request a zoning change to make this a feasible proposal in the future.

RFQ CED 24-01 Alternatives to Unsanctioned Camping

Evaluation Committee Member Scoring Notes Page

Evaluator Name:

Summary of Group's Feedback

Date: 5/8/2024

Proposal considered:

Central Oregon Villages - Safe Parking

| | | Notes | |
|---|----|-------|--|
| <p>Technical Qualifications of Firm and Personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer organization strength, experience, and stability • Experience and technical competence • Degree to which proposer meets the required qualifications | 20 | 19 | <p>The Applicant meets the minimum required qualifications, including being registered to conduct business in the State of Oregon (2), being committed to DEI principles, demonstrating experience serving individuals and families experiencing houselessness (3-4), and experience supporting public engagement and working with public entities (4-6). COV also demonstrates organizational strength, experience and stability as well as technical competence through their board of directors and staff (3), experience developing and operating similar projects (4-5), and experience managing State and Federal funding (6).</p> |
| <p>Relevant Experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with similar projects – designing and/or operating shelter sites. • Experience working on projects where there is a diverse, multi-agency environment, with a series of community partners to maintain productive relationships with. • Demonstrated experience managing public engagement and outreach. • Demonstrated experience receiving government funds and meeting reporting requirements. | 30 | 28 | <p>The Applicant demonstrates relevant experience developing and operating two similar projects through their Safe Parking site at Bend Church and Desert Streams village (4). The Applicant demonstrates experience working on multi-agency projects through experience collaborating with other service providers, including their involvement in the HLC and CES (4) as well as experience working with public entities. The Applicant also demonstrates experience managing public engagement and outreach through the development of their current sites and continued engagement with neighbors.</p> |
| <p>Statement of Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of proposal • Demonstrated understanding of the work to be performed • Rigor of the analytical processes proposed to complete the work • Includes site design proposal, with specifics on number of people to be served, program design, high-level cost estimate, site layout, etc. | 30 | 26 | <p>Response is complete and the Applicant demonstrates an understanding of the work to be performed. The proposal includes a detailed site plan, including the number and type of units to be located at the site (6), program design including eligibility requirements and a case management structure (8), and high-level cost estimate.</p> |

Total score

80 73

Overall notes:

Tier 1 - Recommended to Proceed and Shovel Ready

The IRT recommends this response move forward with the RFP process because the responder meets the minimum required qualifications, demonstrates relevant prior experience, and has submitted a complete Statement of Work.

RFQ CED 24-01 Alternatives to Unsanctioned Camping

Evaluation Committee Member Scoring Notes Page

Evaluator Name: _____ Summary of Group's Feedback _____ Date: 5/8/2024
 Proposal considered: Central Oregon Villages - Tiny Home Village

| | | Notes | |
|---|----|-------|--|
| Technical Qualifications of Firm and Personnel: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer organization strength, experience, and stability • Experience and technical competence • Degree to which proposer meets the required qualifications | 20 | 19 | The Applicant meets minimum required qualifications, including being registered to conduct business in the State of Oregon, being committed to DEI principles, demonstrating experience serving homeless families and individuals (4), and demonstrating experience working with public entities and supporting public engagement through the development of the Desert Streams site and experience managing both federal and state funds (5-7). COV also demonstrates organizational strength, experience, and stability as well as technical competence through, experience developing a similar program to the proposed (5), and having 2 years of experience operating similar projects (5). |
| Relevant Experience: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with similar projects – designing and/or operating shelter sites. • Experience working on projects where there is a diverse, multi-agency environment, with a series of community partners to maintain productive relationships with. • Demonstrated experience managing public engagement and outreach. • Demonstrated experience receiving government funds and meeting reporting requirements. | 30 | 27 | The Applicant demonstrates prior experience developing and operating similar projects through their Desert Streams site and their Bend Church Safe Parking site (5). COV also demonstrates experience working with multi-agency groups, including the HLC as well as collaborating with other service providers (5-6). The Applicant demonstrates experience with public engagement and outreach through the Desert Streams village and ongoing relationship with neighbors (6). While the Applicant's experience is very relevant, this site does pose a few outreach challenges that exceed what was experienced in past attempts to operate a program from this property. |
| Statement of Work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of proposal • Demonstrated understanding of the work to be performed • Rigor of the analytical processes proposed to complete the work • Includes site design proposal, with specifics on number of people to be served, program design, high-level cost estimate, site layout, etc. | 30 | 21 | Submission is complete and includes high level details regarding the development of the site and eventual operations. The applicant shows an understanding of the work to be performed at all levels. The RFQ response outlines a clear public engagement plan (7-8), a detailed site rendering, a plan for development and program design, and a high level cost estimate. A better understanding and more detailed breakdown of the high-level budget would render more information about specific development costs and annual operational costs. A high barrier, 40 unit site with no sewer or water is challenging. Site development costs seem very high for a facility without these. |

Total score 80 68

Overall notes:

Tier 2 - Recommended but Need More Information
 The IRT recommends this response move forward to the RFP process because the responder meets the minimum required qualifications, demonstrates relevant prior experience, and has submitted a complete Statement of Work.

RFQ CED 24-01 Alternatives to Unsanctioned Camping

Evaluation Committee Member Scoring Notes Page

Evaluator Name:

Summary of Group's Feedback

Date: 5/8/2024

Proposal considered:

Home More Network Safe Parking

| | | Notes | |
|---|----|-------|--|
| <p>Technical Qualifications of Firm and Personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer organization strength, experience, and stability • Experience and technical competence • Degree to which proposer meets the required qualifications | 20 | 11 | <p>Despite lived experience and experience providing outreach, The Applicant does not meet minimum required qualifications, including having limited experience serving individuals and families experiencing houselessness and has not yet gained experience supporting public engagement or working with public entities (7). Response indicates organization does not currently have adequate staffing levels to complete the scale of work (3), has no prior experience developing or operating similar programs (5), or have organizational experience managing government funding (7) which would indicate organizational strength, experience, and stability as well as technical competence.</p> |
| <p>Relevant Experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with similar projects – designing and/or operating shelter sites. • Experience working on projects where there is a diverse, multi-agency environment, with a series of community partners to maintain productive relationships with. • Demonstrated experience managing public engagement and outreach. • Demonstrated experience receiving government funds and meeting reporting requirements. | 30 | 13 | <p>Response indicates organization does not have prior experience developing or operating similar projects to the one proposed (5), managing government funding (7), or managing public engagement and outreach. Response indicates organization has limited experience working on projects involving multiple agencies but is actively developing partnerships through the HLC and collaborating with other service providers.</p> |
| <p>Statement of Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of proposal • Demonstrated understanding of the work to be performed • Rigor of the analytical processes proposed to complete the work • Includes site design proposal, with specifics on number of people to be served, program design, high-level cost estimate, site layout, etc. | 30 | 17 | <p>Response indicates organizations understanding of the work to be complete and includes all elements to be considered complete including site and program design, number of people to be served, and a high level cost estimate. Land use and zoning requirements may limit the feasibility of the project as La Pine is not currently included in the County's Safe Parking program. Large investment for a project that is likely quite temporary.</p> |

Total score

80 40

Overall notes:

Tier 3 - Not Recommended to Move Forward at this Time

The IRT does not recommend this response move forward to the RFP process at this time because the responder does not meet minimum required qualifications and Statement of Work does not demonstrate responders understanding of land use requirements that may impact the projects feasibility. There may be an opportunity to trial a safe parking site in La Pine somewhere that is already developed, such as a church parking lot. Standing up a support structure in an undeveloped place is a very hard undertaking for an untested entity.

RFQ CED 24-01 Alternatives to Unsanctioned Camping

Evaluation Committee Member Scoring Notes Page

Evaluator Name:

Summary of Group's Feedback

Date: 5/8/2024

Proposal considered:

Home More Network - LTVA

| | | Notes | |
|---|----|-------|--|
| <p>Technical Qualifications of Firm and Personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposer organization strength, experience, and stability • Experience and technical competence • Degree to which proposer meets the required qualifications | 20 | 12 | <p>Applicant has relevant lived experience as well as outreach experience, however the Applicant does not meet minimum required qualifications, given limited experience serving individuals and families experiencing houselessness and no prior experience supporting public engagement or working with public entities. Response indicates organization does not currently have adequate staffing levels to complete the scale of work (3), does not demonstrate prior experience developing or operating similar programs (5), or have organizational experience managing government funding (7) which would demonstrate organizational strength, experience, and stability as well as technical competence.</p> |
| <p>Relevant Experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience with similar projects – designing and/or operating shelter sites. • Experience working on projects where there is a diverse, multi-agency environment, with a series of community partners to maintain productive relationships with. • Demonstrated experience managing public engagement and outreach. • Demonstrated experience receiving government funds and meeting reporting requirements. | 30 | 14 | <p>Response indicates organization has no prior experience designing or operating similar projects (5) or direct experience managing public engagement and outreach (7). Proposal indicates organization has limited experience working on projects involving multiple agencies but is actively developing partnerships through the HLC and collaborating with other service providers. Proposal indicates entity has no prior experience managing government funds (7).</p> |
| <p>Statement of Work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completeness of proposal • Demonstrated understanding of the work to be performed • Rigor of the analytical processes proposed to complete the work • Includes site design proposal, with specifics on number of people to be served, program design, high-level cost estimate, site layout, etc. | 30 | 19 | <p>Response indicates organizations understanding of the work to be performed and includes most elements to be considered complete, including site design and high-level cost estimate. Proposal includes site design and renderings, however, it does not specify the exact number of spaces/units to be provided which may impact the high level cost estimate provided.</p> |

Total score

80 44

Overall notes:

Tier 3 - Not Recommended to Move Forward at this Time

The IRT does not recommend this response move forward to the RFP process at this time because the responder does not meet minimum required qualifications and has no prior experience developing or operating similar projects. With that being said, there may be opportunities for this applicant to build necessary experience by attempting a phased approach of this plan, starting with outreach and building up to managing and operating a Long Term Visitor Area at Juniper Ridge.