



**OREGON HOUSING *and*
COMMUNITY SERVICES**

725 SUMMER STREET NE, SUITE B | SALEM, OR 97301
503-986-2000 | www.oregon.gov/OHCS

February 19th, 2026

Representative Gomberg, Co-Chair
Senator Golden, Co-Chair
Joint Ways and Means Sub-Committee on Transportation and Economic Development
900 Court Street NE
Salem, OR 97301

RE: Shelter and Eviction Prevention Budget Note Report Presentations, 2/17/26

We at Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS) are grateful for our continued partnership with the Oregon Legislature and your Committee as we continue to respond to and prevent homelessness in our communities. Thank you for your time and thoughtful questions during this week's committee meeting and during our Shelter and Eviction Prevention Budget Note Presentations.

While we were able to respond to most of your questions during the hearing, we wanted to provide additional information via written responses:

For the Shelter Budget Note Presentation:

Sen. McLane requested the number of non-profit organizations and NGO's the agency is currently partnering with to address homelessness, the total number of shelter beds they have operated this biennium with the received state funding, the total amount of funding provided to these non-profits to date, and a complete list of all the non-profits currently involved in these partnerships.

We are attaching a list from the most recent full fiscal year – FY2025 – as some subgrant agreements and allocations for the current fiscal year are still being finalized. We will provide updated information for the current biennium when it is available.

Sen. McLane asked about the systems we have in place to ensure the accuracy of the information we receive from subgrantees regarding shelter bed availability and utilization rates.



OHCS uses a combination of contractual requirements, data systems, and monitoring protocols to ensure accuracy in the information we receive from sub-grantees. Subgrantees are required to report shelter bed availability and utilization through the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), which provides a standardized platform for real-time data entry and validation. This includes submitting detailed “bed and unit inventory” descriptors for each project, such as household type, bed type, seasonal versus year-round availability, initially and updated at least annually for Housing Inventory Count (HIC) accuracy. HMIS includes built-in checks for duplicate entries and capacity limits, and it requires providers to update bed counts daily.

Additionally, OHCS cross-references utilization rates with funding levels and historical trends to identify anomalies. When discrepancies are found, we follow up directly with the provider to investigate further and, if necessary, provide technical assistance or impose corrective action.

Finally, OHCS receives data on participants using shelters and the shelter inventory via HMIS. This allows us to ensure alignment between reported clients and inventory, further ensuring the accuracy of the information we receive. These layered systems are designed to ensure that the information we receive is as accurate and reliable as possible.

Rep. Gomberg asked about the long-term trends of the Point In Time (PIT) Count, the reliability of that data, and whether the recent trends we’ve seen are verifiable trends in the data or more of a one-time aberration.

While there has been regional variation over time, the PIT Count data generally shows that homelessness has been increasing over time. There are, however, instances in which, from one count to the next, the number of people in a subpopulation – e.g. unsheltered families or veterans – has gone down even as the overall population has grown. Unfortunately, it is difficult to say how accurately the PIT Count captures the actual level of homelessness at a given point in time or trends in homelessness over time. There is general agreement that PIT undercounts the unsheltered population for several reasons.

Additionally, there is variation across communities in methodology and available resources to count the unsheltered population. As a result, some communities’ counts are likely to be more accurate than others. And over time, communities adjust their methodologies, typically improving the accuracy of their count. While this is a positive, these changes mean that observed trends may, at least in part, be the result of changes in methodology rather than reflective of real changes in levels of homelessness.



That said, the PIT count remains the best tool we currently have to obtain an apples-to-apples comparison of these changes in levels of homelessness year over year – and the continuous improvements in data collection methodology have generally reduced the likelihood of undercounting our homeless population and increased the accuracy of our findings. Some of these findings between the 2023 and the 2025 PIT Count include:

- The rate of unsheltered homelessness in Oregon has gone down by 4%
- Unsheltered homelessness for families with children is down 40%
- Homelessness is down 4% for Oregon students in the last school year
- The rate of unsheltered homelessness is equal or down in nearly 2 in 3 counties
- Unsheltered homelessness for older adults is equal or down in half of our counties

While we move toward fully implementing HB 3644 (2025), which creates a Statewide Shelter Program, we expect to see additional improvements in the accuracy of our findings as we adopt more uniform data collection, analysis, and reporting practices.

For the Eviction Prevention Budget Note Presentation:

Sen. McLane asked for a list of Eviction and Homelessness Prevention service providers (Community Action Agencies and Culturally Specific Organizations), and to include the following information for each provider: how much funding they received for this biennium, how much has been expended so far, and a narrative on what goals/metrics were set for each of the respective contracts.

The attached spreadsheet includes the requested information for all CAAs and CSOs, as well as for Public Partnerships (PPL), the provider for our Eviction Prevention Rapid Response program. The attachment shows sums invoiced to date. As explained in the document, some grant agreements are still being executed, and others were only executed recently, so several grantees have not been invoiced yet. Invoicing also lags behind spending because the program works on a reimbursement basis.

With respect to outcomes, each grantee has a specific number of households they are tasked with serving pursuant to their grant agreement and allocation amount. They are required to enter service data into our Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) and our fiscal platform OPUS. This, together with regular reporting requirements, allows us to monitor the number of households receiving services. In addition, grantees are required to report on the percentage of households that retain housing after receiving eviction prevention assistance. The specific performance metric for the Oregon Diversion and Prevention (ORE-DAP) program is that 80% of households receiving prevention assistance are expected to be in permanent housing upon exiting the program.



Legislative Fiscal Office asked about the accuracy of one of the figures on Slide 3 of the Eviction Prevention Budget Note Presentation, which stated that ORE-DAP (OR Eviction Diversion and Prevention) funding for the 25-27 Biennium was \$35.5 million.

OHCS received \$33.6 million for ORE-DAP in our agency’s budget for the 25-27 biennium, which was approved as a part of HB 5011 (2025). This represents a nearly 80% reduction in funding, relative to the amount needed to maintain our previous service level. Additionally, HB 5006 (2025) allocated another \$11 million in one-time funding to OHCS for Eviction Prevention services, bringing the total allocation for ORE-DAP and Eviction Prevention services up to \$44.6 million for the 25-27 biennium - representing an approximately 74% funding reduction. The funding amount shown on the slide (\$35.5 million) was inaccurate. We regret this error and apologize for any confusion this caused. The correct funding amount information can be found in the full Eviction Prevention Budget Note Report.

Rep. Gomberg says that the legislature has considered rent controls in recent years. What consequence have rent caps had on rent increases and the rise in evictions?

Oregon currently has a statewide rent cap under Senate Bill 608 (2019). However, the data shows that these caps have not prevented rents from continuing to rise or stopped the increase in evictions. The current rent control cap still allows annual increases of up to 7% plus inflation, with a hard ceiling of 10 percent. During periods of high inflation (like 2022-2024), this can result in rent increases on par with what we see in the absence of rent control laws.

Because the cap limits only the rate of increase and not the starting rent, rents can be reset to market rates when units turn over, which further reduces its effect. Meanwhile, demand for housing continues to outpace supply, so market pressures remain strong. As a result, rents have continued to climb, and evictions have risen sharply - PSU’s *Evicted in Oregon* reported 30,507 eviction filings in 2024, and the state’s own analysis notes that fair market rents have increased year over year despite the cap.

Thank you again for your thoughtful questions about this important subject. We appreciate your dedication to improving the lives of Oregonians, and we are happy to answer any additional questions you may have about our agency and our programs.

In partnership,

Caleb Yant
Deputy Director

Liz Weber
Housing Stabilization Division Director



Oregon Housing and Community Services Oregon Housing and Community Services



Agency - CAA	Region Served	Allocation 25-27	# of HH to be served	Invoiced Through 2/26*	
Community Action Agency					
ACCESS	Jackson	\$1,206,395.00	218	100,389.00	
CAO - Community Action	Washington County	\$2,298,315.00	559	210,179.00	
CAPECO - Community Action Program of East Central Oregon	Umatilla, Wasco	\$513,925.00	172	4,761.00	
CAT - Community Action Team	Columbia, Clatsop, Tillamook	\$721,673.00	262	21,576.00	
CCNO - Community Connection Northeast Oregon	Union, Baker, Wellowa	\$305,054.00	89	32,402.00	
CCSSD - Clackamas County Social Services Division	Clackamas County	\$1,520,710.00	230	0.00	
CINA - Community In Action	Malheur & Harney	\$265,906.00	68	7,728.00	
CSC - Community Services Consortium	Linn, Benton, Lincoln	\$1,719,790.00	443	326,307.00	
KLCAS - Klamath and Lake County Action Services	Klamath and Lake	\$532,398.00	143	66,659.00	
LCHSD - Lane County Human Services Division	Lane County	\$2,552,860.00	450	0.00	
MCCAC - Mid-Columbia Community Action Council	Hood River, Wasco, Sherman	\$258,723.00	86	0.00	
MULTCO - Multnomah County	Multnomah County	\$5,207,491.00	844	426,619.00	
MWVCAA - Mid Willamette Valley Comm. Action Ag.	Marion & Polk	\$2,434,116.00	452	237,447.00	
NIMPACT - Neighbor Impact	Deschutes, Crook, Jefferson, Co	\$1,262,346.00	274	135,506.00	
OHDC - Oregon Human Development Corporation	Multiple	\$1,674,459.00	458	338,686.00	
ORCCA - Oregon Coast Community Action	Coos, Curry, W Douglas	\$569,272.00	148	0.00	
UCAN - United Community Action Network	Douglas & Josephine	\$1,215,307.00	236	0.00	
YCAP - Yamhill Community Action Partnership	Yamhill	\$474,776.00	131	0.00	
CAA Totals		\$24,733,516.00	5263		
Culturally Specific Providers					
ULPDX - Urban League of Portland	Statewide	\$4,448,347.00	658	1,231,405	
IRCO - Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Statewide	\$1,779,339.00	253	0	
OWRC - Oregon Worker Relief Coalition	Statewide	\$4,540,671.00	1081	0	
CSO Totals		\$10,768,357.00	1992		
Eviction Prevention Rapid Response					
PPL	Statewide	\$6,983,065	912	1,803,749	

* A number of grant agreements were only very recently executed or are still being negotiated, thus we see some programs that have not invoiced to date. Invoicing also lags spending as grantees invoice to be reimbursed for incurred program expenses. Invoicing occurs as often as monthly, but in some cases only quarterly.