CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON YOUTH SERVICES

----X

February 27, 2009 Start: 10:22 am Recess: 12:05 pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

LEWIS A. FIDLER Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Elizabeth Crowley Alan J. Gerson

Melissa Mark-Viverito

Miguel Martinez

## A P P E A R A N C E S [CONTINUED]

James Bolas
Director of Education
Empire State Coalition of Youth and Family Services
Chair
New York City Association of Homeless and StreetInvolved Youth Organizations

John Welch Program Director Safe Horizons Streetworks Lower East Side

Karen Remy
Director of Mental Health And Personal Development
The Door - A Center of Alternatives, Inc.

Nancy Downing Director of Advocacy Covenant House New York

Theresa Nolan Divisional Director Green Chimneys Children's Services New York City Division

Joey Lopez Coordinator of Policy and Training Ali Forney Center

Lucky Michaels
Program Director
MCCNY Homeless Youth Services

Charles Taylor Client MCCNY Homeless Youth Services

Paul Sealy Program Director of Independence and Programs SCO Family of Services

## A P P E A R A N C E S [CONTINUED]

Megan Annito Counsel Committee on Youth Services

Michael Benjamin Policy Analyst Committee on Youth Services

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2008.

2 CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: I'm assuming

that we'll be joined by some of my colleagues

4 shortly. I know at least one called to say they

5 were running a little late. About six years ago I

6 chaired the first Youth Services Committee Hearing

on Runaway and Homeless Youth in New York City.

8 We did a little tally. This is actually our  $13^{th}$ 

9 hearing on or related to runaway and homeless

10 youth since that time. It was an eye-opening

11 experience for me but it was also jaw-dropping.

I became determined to open the eyes of other New Yorkers to the stories of the kids that all of you in this room know all too well. You live it every day, both in your victories and unfortunately in those moments when you feel defeated. I know for many of you that the work that we have done together over these past years has made a huge difference. We have increased funding for shelter beds and services and have also made inroads, documenting the numbers and needs of homeless youth, by performing

the Runaway and Homeless Youth Count and Survey of

When I hear your stories of a

2.0

child, abused and neglected at home or on the streets who is able to move in, to get back into school, get off of drugs, get a GED, I know that our determination has paid off. Most importantly I know that that child has finally been treated with dignity and respect. But there is always more that needs to be done, that has to be done.

In this economic climate we are now faced with greater challenges than any of us could have foreseen. I have heard from you and I know that you are being tested. More kids are knocking on the door. And these kids are younger, increasingly more fragile and present with a longer list of needs than in the past. The stresses at home and on the streets have grown forcing many already strained families and children to their breaking points.

As we're being asked to do even more with less, our voices are more important now than they have ever been. No matter what comes our way we cannot be a city that allows our most vulnerable to endure life on the streets. I will stand firm in my support for the runaway and homeless youth in our city and those who serve

them. I remain committed, now more than ever, to seeing the day when every child who needs a bed will have one, to getting them services, and to ending the shameful failures of our city that contributes to the number of kids on the street.

I believe that this is literally a question of life and death.

Today we will hear testimony about proposed changes in State and Federal law contained in Reso number 1227-A that we believe would assist the city's ability to serve our runaway and homeless youth without costing significant new revenue. These are commonsense changes that will make a big difference.

I want to thank all of you, not just for coming today, and for all the work that you do, but for being such a great assistance to me and to the Committee staff in developing this agenda.

Now we do have a number of you signed up to testify. And I'm going to call you up in panels. Let's start with Jim Bolas from the Empire State Coalition, John Welch from Safe Horizons and Karen Remy from The Door.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

[Pause]

[Witnesses getting settled]

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: And one of you just jump in there.

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: You know, we don't even have, you know, like, like Channel 74

TV taping this. And I have to tell you that, I mean I don't want to start off on a downer but it is extraordinarily frustrating to me. You know, yesterday we had a very long and agonizing day at City Hall, especially from an inside baseball kind of way, especially if you were from Brooklyn.

And, you know, every reporter, and the blogs was there, you know, doing, you know, hour by hour of the inside baseball torture over the importance of the City Clerk.

We don't have a reporter in the room here. We don't have--I mean just to me, the sense of priorities about this issue continues to be frustrating. And that is why we continue to have these hearings because every now and then somebody pays attention. So even beyond the, you know, the notion that, you know, today perhaps we

2	can move forward on some of these agenda items.
3	And I do hope to move this Reso at the next Youth
4	Services Hearing 'cause we cannot vote on it on
5	its first hearing, you know, it would be nice, you
6	know, if we got some attention from the rest of
7	the world for this problem. I mean I know that
8	everyone in this room is committed to it, so.
9	Jump in there Jim. Sorry.
10	[Pause]
11	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: And we're even
12	joined by Council Member Mark-Viverito and Alan
13	Gerson. Good. Perfect timing.
14	[Long pause, microphone not on]
15	MR. JAMES BOLAS:and it's not
16	oh there we go. It's [chuckling] It's not that
17	adolescence starts at this particular age and then
18	all of a sudden you hit 21 and you're an adult.
19	You know, we know that it's a period of time, we
20	know that adolescence is about moving from the
21	concrete to abstract thought. That's our job as
J	

We believe that many adolescent youth go beyond the age of 21. As a representative of the National Council on Youth

providers.

22

23

24

25

2.0

2.3

Policy, we believe that this is a condition of
homeless youth in our nation not just in New York
City. So this is all over. And as a
representative of the USas a US representative
of the International Society for Mobile Youth
Work, I also know that this presents as a global
condition as well, so we're not alone in the
thinking in this process.

We did a survey in 2007 and found that each night—it wasn't a head count, so but each night there's at least 3,800 youth that go without housing in New York City. We also found that of those 1,000 youth that we interviewed for that survey, we found that the average age of the young person living on the street was 20. We found that the average age of the young person leaving home was 16. So not a lot of the young people were, you know, fell into the 14-year old runaway and that sort of thing. The majority of them were hitting the older ages. And I'm just summarizing because I know that you like that.

[Laughing]

[Audience laughing]

25 [Off mic]

MR. BOLAS: In the late 80's I was working at the Streetwork project and in the late 1980's we understood, at that time, and this was 20 years ago, that homeless youth don't stop being adolescents at age 21. We also found that homeless youth don't necessarily—that adult homeless services don't necessarily meet the needs of a 22-year old, or for that matter a 24-year old. Right. So adult homeless services aren't necessarily prepared to deal with the adolescent mind, the delayed adolescent mind that a runaway and homeless adolescent is experiencing.

Many youth spent their adolescence compensating to survive. This much we know. And as a result were arrested in their developmental process in order to survive on the street you have to become an adult really fast. And so if you become an adult really fast, you sort of shut aside the adolescence. So a lot of that adolescent development gets sort of squashed or repressed.

And we found at holiday and birthday parties for example, we found these youth from 16 to 24 who were responding to gifts of

stuffed animals and teddy bears and the like in
the same childlike way as someone who was 10 years
younger. We know that, well through—we know
throughout New York State, we know that this is a
condition, not only in New York City, also
throughout our country. This happens in Buffalo.
This happens in Schenectady. It happens in LA,
Chicago, Minneapolis. We're all confronted, all
of these homeless youth are confronted by an
arrested development, grounded in the need to
survive on the streets.

Many homeless youth either their 20's and begin to see the reality of the situation. So coming into that concrete thought—that abstract thinking, they begin to sort of see this is the reality of my situation. Maybe now I need to start making some changes. And it doesn't usually happen until they hit their 20's a lot of the time, on the average. And my colleague can confirm or deny that as well.

And they begin to see the reality of the situation. Unfortunately the eligible age for full access to transitional housing is often cut short due to the laws of Federal age

requirement. So a young person who's spending time being moved from shelter to street to shelter, finally finds themselves ready to structure their lives, and if space is available, goes into some sort of a transitional living component, transitional living program.

However the person who's finally ready at age 21 doesn't get the full benefit of the 18 months allowed by Federal and State runaway and homeless youth regulations for transitional living. And then they're discharged. And usually it's to adult services, if that, where they're not effectively served.

So what then happens is they use this, this can cause them to revert to their past behavior where they often leave adult services and are back on the street beginning to move more rapidly into chronic adult homelessness.

As the Director of Education at Empire State Coalition since 1994, we've been working, you know, in a professional development capacity around the issue of working with youth who are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning. The data from our 2007 survey also

confirmed that approximately 30% of these youth that are homeless are Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual, and that 5% are identified as Transgender. And this is confirmed by national surveys as well. We not sort of like grabbing it out of the box.

We've been talking about the needs of LGBT homeless youth for as long as I've been in this field. At Empire State Coalition we are glad to see this in this resolution. And we believe that it's finally time for the government to officially recognize that at least one-third of these youth who are living on the streets identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender or in many cases of adolescents, are questioning their sexual identity, as a natural step in their adolescent self-identity.

Empire State Coalition, we speak regularly with the homeless youth providers and the homeless youth who--and the homeless youth on a daily basis whether they're calling us to ask us about emancipation issues or whether agencies are calling to ask us about resources for transportation for a young person who needs to get to shelter. We keep an ear to the ground about

policies, about regulations, about trends.

indirectly impact their lives, and by their, we mean both the youth and the professionals that serve them. We don't just talk about in our advocacy, we're not just talking about the youth because we know that in order to effectively serve the youth, there need to be strong providers and strong agencies.

In many cases we recognize the needs of adolescents because the professionals in the agencies who serve them tend to speak up.

It's the agencies that identify the trends and the conditions that these youth face. We don't discover them, you know, just out of nowhere. So we make the changes for the youth but often we leave the functionality of the agencies out of the equation.

It often feels as though the public funders and the regulations established don't understand there are professionals serving these youth, a lot of times. And when the agencies' hands get slapped they don't realize the, the regulators don't always realize that the agencies

2.0

tend to know what they're doing.

The regulators also don't seem to take into consideration the reality of the fiscal and organizational needs required to keep an agency that provides shelter, drop-in or outreach afloat in this economy. An agency can't effectively run by volunteers alone. We've seen that tried and we've seen it fail.

An economic stimulus package isn't going to immediately change the available staff needed at a housing program for 24 hours when the youth are either at work or at school. When there's no youth there, we don't really necessarily see the importance of staff being--a full staff being there.

24 hour staffing is not something that's necessary. Finances are already tightened and with the threat of voluntary homeless youth services being lumped together with mandatory services in Statewide block grants, and cuts in funding, we'll virtually be asphyxiated.

Funders point to foundations and as a result of economic malfeasance, foundations either close their doors or are putting programs

they used to support in an unspecified holding pattern. So everyone's sort of passing the buck. And by easing up on the 24 hour transitional staffing certification requirements which goes beyond the State and Federal requirements, we're able to effectively provide support to the youth most in need of it when they're at our programs.

Many programs have the desire and the models to provide services to homeless youth. With over 3,800 homeless youth each night and only 300 shelter beds, approximately, we need to look at the ways and means to make shelter and housing more available. So between the lack of affordability and limited community support for the development of emergency housing programs wanting to serve homeless youth, we are additionally challenged by the State certification process.

At Empire State Coalition, we understand the need for standards of care and regulations. I mean we train people on it. We train programs and providers on that. We don't want youth sleeping in dangerous situations, of course. We understand the need for professional

2.0

2.3

2	skill	development	for	effectively	serving	these
3	vouth					

But we also need to accept the reality that in order to effectively set up a homeless youth program, an agency, however large or small, needs to be given some leeway in the form of these startup grants in order to effectively meet these comprehensive State regulations. It's never an easy process. We hear that all the time in talking with these programs.

So with--I mean with Empire State

Coalition and its over 30 years of history of

advocating and meeting the needs of homeless youth

in New York City, and as someone with 20 years of

working with this population, and the committed

programs that house and counsel them, we offer our

continued support and commitment to these programs

and the youth and young adults that they serve.

If you have any questions or concerns--

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: [Interposing]
We'll hold questions--

MR. BOLAS: --please feel free to let me know.

25 CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: --until the

whole panel is done. I just before our next
witness testifies, you made some reference to the
State block grant issue, and I just wanted to tell
everyone here and particularly those who
participated in our task force meeting that we
attempted to set up a meeting with the appropriate
legislative stakeholders from Albany for this
afternoon. And we did not succeed.

But I will tell you that I did have a direct conversation with Senator Kruger who chairs the Finance Committee and he was fully conversant with the issue before I even spoke to him about it. And, you know, we're guardedly optimistic that we will not be thrown into that box.

And, you know, I think we need to—because the State situation is far from solidified and probably will get worse before it gets better, you know, we need to continue to press our colleagues in Albany to make sure that we are not competing for resources against mandated programs and other agencies. So. You know, let's stay on top of that.

MR. JOHN WELCH: Good morning. I'm

John Welch, Program Director at Streetworks Lower

East Side, which is a program of Safe Horizon, a

victim assistance agency serving people impacted

by violence in the entire City.

I would like to thank Council

Member Fidler for being a fierce advocate for the homeless young people of New York City and the Youth Services Committee for hearing my testimony today.

Streetwork operates 2 daytime dropin centers, providing support and comprehensive
services to homeless people ages 14 to 24. These
services include concrete supports: food,
clothing, laundry facilities and showers as well
as counseling, case management, legal advocacy,
mental and medical services, and an array of other
services.

We also operate 2 short-term emergency shelter programs, 36 beds in all. The beds in these programs are always full and waiting lists have risen to about 100 per day in our 30-bed program and 45 a day for our 6 bed program for younger kids. We have seen a 30% increase in client visits to our 2 drop-in centers from 2007

2.0

2.3

to 2008 and are seeing on average 140 people per day between the two sites.

At the same time funding cuts have forced us to eliminate 3 case managers and 2 supervisors at our drop-in programs and to cut mental health services in half. Part of the reason Streetwork is overwhelmed with new clients at a time when budgets are eroding is that the current runaway and homeless youth laws cap service eligibility at age 21, and therefore there are far fewer programs and many fewer beds available to absorb what appears to us to be an increase in homeless youth on the streets in the past year.

Streetwork set its age limit at 24 long ago to address the obvious service gap produced by ending youth services at 21. The changes proposed in Resolution 1227-A recognize that homeless youth are not just kids who are temporarily on the outs with their families or having difficulty following rules at home, but are people with multiple and complex problems that usually started very early in their lives, problems that can be adequately addressed, but

will not be resolved sufficiently for them to become independent by 21 or report to adult service programs used by older people.

Streetwork youth, at 21, are both like and unlike more mainstream 21-year-old New Yorkers. They are like them in that they are struggling to make it in one of the most expensive cities in the world while still young and in need of support; unlike them in that they are doing so with no connection to any trustworthy adult whose couch they could safely sleep on if nothing works out, and no history of receiving adequate consistent care from any adult while growing up.

They are like them in that they would rather surround themselves with friends their own age than be among older people; unlike them in that, when things haven't worked out for them by age 21, they are expected to report to prison-like adult shelters full of older people, many of whom try to exploit them.

Like their more mainstream counterparts, homeless youth are developmentally wired to prioritize friendships, romances, sexuality, exploration of self and others, and

testing their abilities and limits, sometimes to the detriment of practical future planning.

They are unlike them in that any safe community or context in which these normal pursuits could be shaped by caring adult guidance, or tempered by reminders of the need to deal with the practical realities is yanked away at 21.

At 21 most of our kids are just beginning to be able to think in a future-oriented way and to plan their lives realistically as they struggle to assimilate and accept all that has happened to them as children. These are people who have not had childhoods, meaning they have not experienced a minimum of emotional and physical safety that would allow them to internalize the basic sense of power over their own lives that most people develop by 21, despite their many difficulties.

Almost all homeless youth have suffered repeated early trauma and need the extra time and support to develop. Many Streetwork clients get housed and work their way into the mainstream economy before they age out of Streetwork but almost none do so before 21. Those

who do are the few whose childhood trauma was less severe or who had high levels of support through trauma.

Ending services at 21 invites
involvement in street life and the street economy,
and this is a danger not only to our young people,
but to public safety, especially in these times
when the City will be losing resources to deal
with unsupported young people living their lives
on the streets, in parks, in Starbucks, on
rooftops, in the subway system, in stores with
cheap computer access, in Penn Station, etc.

To change service eligibility to 24 will let homeless young adults make their mistakes in our shelters and drop-in centers and not on the streets because, at 21, homeless young people will not be reporting to adult service programs that don't feel welcoming to them, but they will be reporting to the streets.

Another realistic and positive change proposed by Resolution 1227-A is the relaxation of the 24-hour staffing requirement in RHY shelters. While 24-hour staffing is the gold standard we would all love to live by, there 3,800

experience.

2	homeless youth in New York City alone on any given
3	night according to Empire State Coalition's 2007
4	Homeless Youth Survey, made was possible through
5	the support of the City Council.
6	And these young people need easy
7	access to nighttime beds first and foremost. To
8	continue to insist on 24 hour staffing is to deny
9	the emergency nature of youth homelessness.
10	Loosening this requirement will allow us to
11	stretch our budgets to take care of the most basic
12	needs first and to cooperate with other providers
13	who may offer services our programs cannot.
14	Thanks for listening.
15	MS. KAREN REMY: Hi I'm Karen Remy,
16	Director of Mental Health at The Door. Myafter
17	I finished writing my testimony at 11:00 o'clock
18	last night my boss reminded me that youor she
19	told me that you liked bullets. Butso I'm
20	trying but I just
21	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: [Off mic]
22	[Interposing] I have no doubt that you will
23	MS. REMY: [Interposing] [Laughing]
24	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER:do ,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. REMY: Okay. Of course I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak today in support of the resolution.

I want to talk to you a little bit about The Door. Since 1972, The Door has provided comprehensive services for young people at a single site, free of charge, and confidentially in a youth-centered environment. The Door has a long history and extensive experience with New York City's population of disconnected young people, including homeless and runaway youth, and is known for developing innovative programs that meet their specific needs. Runaway and homeless youth, as well as LGBTQ youth, parenting youth, young people in the foster care and juvenile justice systems, and other young people at high risk of becoming homeless have always been included in significant numbers in The Door's membership.

In 2008 we saw 11,000 young people from all the City. A little over 7,000 of those were newly enrolled in 2008. 9% of that 7,000 reported that they currently were homeless or in foster care, though the percentage who are at-risk for homelessness is much higher. The risks that

we see for homelessness among our new members are 13.4% identified as LGBTQ although we think that's probably higher, another 5% had children under the age of 3 and 8% reported that they had experienced violence at the hands of someone they lived with or cared about. So that just brings The Door, from our data, 35% of our young people who were newly admitted in 2008 had at least one risk for homelessness.

The Door's experience clearly indicates a need to provide services to young people well beyond the age of 21. Of the 11,000 young people that we served in 2008, 13% were already between 20 and 21, and 12% were over 21, this represents a quarter of our current membership. These young people have experiences—they experienced, you know, multiple system failures and from come from families coping with intergenerational poverty, substance abuse, and mental health issues.

50% of our members who are 20 and over access mental health services, which provides, among other services, crisis, including: counseling, intensive case management, emergency

meals and clothing, and referrals. Over the past eight years, government funding for innovative programming to provide critical youth services, including education and work readiness, has diminished substantially, instead becoming increasingly restrictive and limited in scope.

We were speaking specifically about some of the work-readiness programs that we have that have a very high demand in documentation of income eligibility, you know, address and, you know, those are the kinds of things that runaway and homeless youth are just automatically not eligible for.

Young people who are finally able to access services require substantial time and support in order to become self-sufficient, a process which for a 20-year old will often take much longer than 12 months. Taken as a whole, our experience at The Door demonstrates a compelling need to decrease strict eligibility requirements around program participation, increase the maximum eligible age for services to at least 24 and to align measures regarding length of stay for youth in transitional living programs to correspond with

the achievement of milestones that demonstrate

independent living skills and self sufficiency

rather than the calculation of their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday.

We're currently in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of a contract for discretionary funding through DYCD which supports an outreach program. We do--with this discretionary funding we do outreach, mediation, and harm reduction at the Christopher Street Piers, Pier 45. This program originated as a result of research The Door was tasked with conducting in 2005 on the youth who congregate at the Pier and in the West Village area.

The purpose of the assessment was to get a better sense of who the youth are, where they come from, what services they receive or need, and other variables affecting their activities. We renewed some of our data from the original 2005 assessment during 2008. We completed a survey with LGBTQ youth and the results for housing were pretty much the same as they were in 2005 which was that this group of young people indicated that 22% of them were marginally housed; meaning that 17% of them had moved 2 to 3 times in the previous year and 5%

reported having moved more than 5 times in the previous year. Our survey however did not address quality and appropriateness of those who reported not moving in the previous year.

The Door frequently must refer

LGBTQ young people in crisis to emergency shelters

catering to the general homeless youth population,

okay, and--where anecdotally we can attest that

they are at greater risk for harassment and

violence as a result of their sexuality. The

majority of homeless LGBTQ youth we serve choose

to survive on the streets often through

prostitution, thereby placing them at escalated

risk for HIV infection and in other inadequate and

unsafe conditions rather than to experience

violence and abuse in the shelters. Clearly, this

demonstrates a compelling need to change shelter

guidelines pertaining to LGBTQ youth.

The Door firmly believes that implementing the changes proposed in this resolution is vital to providing the most effective and meaningful level of service to homeless and runaway youth in New York City. Thank you.

your testimony truly speaks for itself. So I just want to ask two questions, kind of the way like, I don't know if devil's advocate is the right word,

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

but thinking out loud, brainstorming, you know,stretching the limits.

On the age cutoff and we know we've heard this and I certainly support the Resolution without questions and we understand the practical benefits as well as the theoretical, but should we? You know, in a more perfect world, which we should, you know, at the same time as we take practical strides aimed to attain, rather than an age cutoff, should we aim to kind of formulate a clinical definition of if you will, the clinical definition for when adolescent type services for homeless young people could--should be deemed complete and that person either no longer homeless or in more of a category of being more appropriately served within the grouping of adult level services?

In other words, should, you know, 24 is also going to be arbitrary. What if, you know, someone who's 25 and I'm sure based on the testimony of what you said in terms of developmental issues, other issues, may not be that different from a 22-year old. I can imagine some 23-year olds might be, you know, more further

2	along and really belong in the category of
3	treatment of 30-year olds.
4	So I'm saying would it make more
5	sense to develop a clinical definition describing
6	the type of young people who should be treated as
7	adolescents and those who should be treated as
8	adults within the universe of people without
9	homes?
10	MR. BOLAS: That's a reallythat's
11	a very good question actually. And I love it when
12	someone plays devil's advocate. [Chuckling].
13	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: You do a
14	good job of that yourself. I know about that.
15	MR. BOLAS: I do too.
16	[Laughing]
17	MR. BOLAS: You know I think it's
18	in a perfect world, yeah maybe. I don't know
19	thatI mean I think at some point there has to be
20	a line. And we know that developmentally, we know
21	from experience if we're talking about
22	adolescence, we have to keep into consideration
23	the transitional process of adolescent to
24	adulthood.

And so I don't think that an

2.0

individual sort of goes, you know, reaches a clinical sort of realization or reaches a clinical point and then sort of moves--always moves forward. We go backward. We go forward. We go around. So I don't think it's a linear process per se.

is just from experience for the past--my experience for the past 20 years, of trying to sort of create more of a transitional means to engage adolescents and not sort of--and sort of create a setting of moving someone into chronic homelessness. So I don't know if that--that really--I'm not sure if that answers your questions completely.

But I don't think it's--there isn't an easy answer. And I think we tend to sort of go down that road of, you know, well let's not have the age thing. Let's talk about, you know, indicators and, you know, yeah, but... I don't think that this City or this country, you know, can really get to that point any time too soon. I mean I think it's good to sort of put it out there. But I think let's start with the age thing

[Interposing] Hum.

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WELCH: --younger. And--but there is -- I think there is some value of having an arbitrary line also because somebody who is, you know, 30 and developmentally still just really not

ready is in a youth program, it's not going to
feel as safe for a 15-year old to beso there's,
you know, you do draw an arbitrary line at 24 but
it just seems from, you know, the work I've done
over the years that that is when people start to
get some things together for themselves. So.
Around that age

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Okay.

MR. WELCH: Those situations.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: And then my second question really goes to the issue of dropping the requirement of 24 hour staffing. And I certainly understand the point that you take care of emergency needs first.

But are we losing anything of value? Are we losing the ability for your organizations and your sister organizations to do the type of follow-up, placement, the type of intervention, work that can only be done during business hours if we don't insist on some staffing around the clock? Keeping in mind that once we drop a requirement, knowing how things work, it's always going to be hard to, you know, bring it back or add on, especially the way things are

2.0

going.

Should we keep the 24 hour requirement and just fight for more--which is also difficult I recognize, more resources during the evening hours when there is that emergency situation? But, or--I mean are we losing anything that cannot be compensated for if you don't have trained personnel able to follow up, you know, during daytime hours?

MR. WELCH: Well actually in my program we have, we have one—an RHY shelter that is a 24 hour staffing, smaller shelter. And then another that's able to be not staffed 24 hours and is just staffed at night. And there is something really valuable about being able to provide that 24 hour staffing.

But also there's with the--our shelter that's only staffed at night, we have drop-in centers that allow us to do the same kind of follow-up work and case management work during the day with the folks who are sleeping in the shelter at night.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: So you could cross fertilize so to speak.

2.0

2.3

2	MR. WELCH: Yeah, and it's just
3	about keeping communication and working together.
1	And I think that can happen between different
5	programs also. I just felt like it's maybe not
5	realistic because of the resources that exist and
7	I just personally feel like

#### COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:

[Interposing] You're probably right.

MR. WELCH: --yeah, like it's-seems most important to, to get people off the
street at night, for starters, you know.

MR. BOLAS: You know, I mean I think there's a difference here between emergency staffing and transitional staffing. You know, and with transitional youth, and there's transitional programs here who can speak to this much more adequately thank I can, but with transitional, the young person is at a point, there—I mean there are standards that the young person needs to meet in order to get into transitional, the transitional services, behaviorally, structurally, etcetera, that the crisis—there's crises but they're not as intense as someone who's coming from the street into an emergency shelter.

2.0

2.3

So in the emergency shelter, maybe
there's more of a necessity for, you know, one or
two overnight people there to deal with the
crises. In transitional, maybe not so much. It's
about transitioning into independence. That's the
important thing to keep in mind.

And if there's an adult always underfoot, or if they always have to report to 24/7, how are they then transitioning? We're not really sort of giving them that transition. And I think that that's something that we sort of need to keep in mind in regards to this. And I was glad to sort of see that this is in there.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: And I just want the record to be clear though that if, you know, we're--if we go this route, we're doing so in response to prioritizing emergencies in a day of very scare resources but no one but--you know, feels there's no value to having, you know, daytime follow-ups in order to break the cycle of emergency, of homelessness among this population. But--

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: [Interposing]
Well Councilman--

2.0

2.3

that additional follow-up	in any way.	Okay thank
you very much Mr. Chair.	Thank you.	Keep up your
good work.		

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Thank you Councilman. Councilwoman Mark-Viverito.

## COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

Thank you Mr. Chair. And I also, you know, want to commend the work that you've been--and the leadership you've taken on, on this issue. I know that this is my fourth year in the Council and I think it might be my fourth or fifth hearing on this issue. And obviously we can never speak about it enough 'cause there's so much work that, you know, still needs to be done. So I really want to thank you for continuing to shed light on the needs.

And I think that these kinds of hearings also demonstrate the crucial role that we have as a City Council to really making sure that regulations lead to most efficient use of our resources and in what ways we can ensure that most effectively we implement services for particular populations. And so I know that these resolutions are important for us because it really helps shape

2.0

2.3

what our priority agenda is going to be with our
counterparts in the State legislature. So these
are things that we take and we move forward and we
really try to ensure that they get implemented in
one way or another. So that's important and these
hearings are important for that

And I only have one question, kind of just on the issue of the 24 hour staffing. Is there, have you as agencies been able to quantify like what, what in terms of resources it is asking of you to continue this regulation of the 24 hour staffing? How much is it costing you versus, you know, obviously being able to invest that money in direct services and other ways? Have you, do you have an idea?

MR. WELCH: I think there are a couple of other people who are going to testify who would have--

# COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

[Interposing] More direct.

MR. WELCH: --that looks like from the faces in the crowd over here, that, you know, you're going to get that information from them.

COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:

2	Great. I look forward to getting that. So that
3	was just my quick question, but yes, if you want
4	MR. BOLAS: [Interposing] I mean I
5	know, you know, from talking with programs and I
6	look forward to hearing from them as well,
7	specifically about the breakdown. You know, but
8	if we remove a staff person from, you know,
9	working, you know, in the evenings and move them
10	to a daytime or move them into a much more
11	tangible role where they're not sitting there and
12	playing babysitter but they're actually doing case
13	management or they're doing referrals or whatever,
14	working on a young person's case, when people are
15	around, you know, that they can make these phone
16	calls, that's much more effective.
17	I mean I don't know the exact
18	dollar amount and I hope that someone out there
19	does. But I think that just strategically that
20	that makes much more sense.
21	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
22	Okay. All right. I appreciate that. I'llwe'll
23	wait for the other advocates to be able to speak
24	to that. Thank you Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Well thank you

2.0

and I want to thank this panel. I	obviously got a
chance to ask most of the question	s I had, well,
when we had our task force meeting	. So that I
appreciate again your testimony and	d your work.
And hang around. All right.	

I'll call up our next panel.

Theresa Nola, Green Chimneys, Nancy Downing from

Covenant House and Joey Lopez from Ali Forney. As

I call up the next panel, as they come--make their

way up here, I see a lot of familiar faces who

have not signed up. I just want to be sure that

everybody who wants to testify, you know, has, you

know, will sign up, so 'cause I only have two

more. So, you know, two more witnesses. So...

yeah, Sergeant at Arms we have some...

[Pause]

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Before you start, I mean I just want to point out that even those of you who have not or are not choosing to testify today verbally, we've gotten many, many responses to the e-mails that we sent out in preparation for this hearing from all of you. And I've read them all. You know, they really have helped create this meeting and, you know, will

2.0

2.3

shape	our	agenda	going	forwa	ard.	I,	you	know,	Ι	do
appred	ciate	e your	coopera	ation	and	assi	istar	nce.		

[Pause]

MS. NANCY DOWNING: Good morning.

My name is Nancy Downing and I'm the Director of

Advocacy for Covenant House New York. I'd like to

thank you for holding this hearing. We certainly

support Resolution 1227-A.

My testimony, my written testimony, I'm not going to read it. It's rather generalized support in terms of the Resolution. What I would like to say and I'll be brief is that most of the youth that we see are probably ages 19 and 20. And it seems like the ages seem to be rising.

In our transitional living program, if someone enters our transitional living program before the age of 21, they can stay for the period of the transitional living program. That's how we run our program. But—and what we're seeing is that we're having more and more youth who are coming to us who need transitional living services and they're already close to the age of 21. So if they can't get into a program that is going to provide them with the supportive services that

they need, they're really stuck back at the adult single shelters.

one young woman who came to our crisis shelter and she was just about 21. She was within a month of turning 21. She in fact turned 21 while she was in our crisis center. We tried to find her transitional living services. We didn't have room in our program at the time. We were able to find a program that would take her up to the age of 24. She being 21 and wanting to make her own decisions decided that she thought it would be better to go to the single adult shelter system which she did despite our counseling for her to go to the supportive transitional living program.

The night--she was there one night. She called the next morning, left a message on my voice mail crying, get me out of here, you have to do something to get me out of here. Young people at the age of 21 don't always make good decisions. We know that. We've been there. Our decision making abilities at that age are still not the best.

And for kids who are runaway and

homeless and at risk youth, they haven't had the role models in their younger life to really develop the skills for making good decisions. So they make bad decisions. They need an opportunity to have a longer span of time to practice making good decisions in a safe, supportive environment. That's what we see with the numbers of kids that we're seeing every night.

I'd also like to speak to the increase in the number of youth that we're seeing. Over the last 6 months of 2008, we, on a nightly basis, served 191.5 average youth. And we didn't have a .5 youth but--[Laughing] but in our shelter. For the same period in 2007 it was 127.5. That's an increase of 64 youth per night. Per night, in our shelter, in our crisis shelter. Where are these kids going? And a lot of them are 19, 20-years old. They're about to be 21.

Where are they going to go?

They're not going to make it in our adult shelter system. They don't make good decisions. We've seen that on a daily basis. So I think it's really critical that we increase the age to 24 and allow the opportunity for them to learn to make

2.0

good decisions in a supportive environment where they're going to be safe.

With respect to--certainly I think, you know, Covenant House has long had a good reputation in terms of dealing with the LGBTQ community. We have worked very hard at improving our ability to serve the LGBTQ community, and I think it is important. They comprise up to a third of the youth who are runaway and homeless. And I think it's important to recognize them, on paper. Let's put it right out there.

Because they do need to be recognized to ensure that staff are properly trained and to ensure that there are provisions of services directed towards their specific needs.

We've learned that, and I think that it needs to be learned, not only Citywide but probably countrywide and worldwide. It's a serious problem and it needs to be addressed.

With respect to 24 hour staffing requirement for residential programs, particularly with respect to transitional living programs. As it's already been said, we're trying to give these young people an opportunity to learn how to behave

responsibly on their own. If we're going to have

4 hour monitoring of them, it doesn't really give

them that opportunity to grow.

I'm not saying that they don't need some supervision at times or let's say case management, to give them the opportunity to speak with an adult, who again in terms of making good decisions and learning to make good decisions, we do need that in place. But 24 hours I think is overly restrictive for the youth, it doesn't give them that opportunity to grow and I think we need to look at that in terms of the transitional living programs.

I think in terms of crisis we do need probably to have 24 hour service 'cause many of these kids are in crisis and there are other issues that come up that need addressing at various times during the day and night, as we have seen.

So that's all I'd like to say at this time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Before you pass the mic to Theresa, I just, I do want to express my appreciation for the comments that you

made about Covenant Houses' recognition of the

LGBTQ population. I know that going back to

before, you know, your tenure when I first visited

Covenant House, I had a significant issue with the

manner in which Covenant House addressed the LGBTQ

population.

And, you know, reputation will follow reality, you know, in time. It always lags but it always will. But I appreciate the fact that you, you know, that there's an attitude change. And I think we all do and it's impossible for you to serve runaway and homeless youth without addressing the fact that one out of three are likely to be LGBTQ, and I just want to thank you and thank Covenant House for coming around on that. Thanks.

MS. THERESA NOLAN: Good morning.

I'm Theresa Nolan, Division Director of Green

Chimneys for our New York City programs. We

operate foster care and runaway homeless youth

programs for LGBTQ youth. We currently 20 beds in

our RHY division which are all transitional

living. Half of them are funded through DYCD and

the other half are Federally funded.

And I just want to express my

appreciation for Council Member Fidler and the

Youth Services Committee around addressing the

issues of youth homelessness in New York City.

I'm not sure how many of those 13 hearings I've

been at, at this point, but I appreciate the

tireless efforts in this area.

Most of what I want to address has been touched on already. But I just want to highlight three particular issues that were part of the resolution that particularly affect the work that we do at Green Chimneys.

One of the State regulation requirements in RHY residential settings is that youth be segregated by gender in their residential setting. This is a particular issue for us.

First of all because we operate an LGBTQ youth program, so when we talk about gender segregation, first of all my biggest concern is that we are expecting youth to pick a gender that they identify with when for some youth they don't necessarily have one that they identify with. So it's pigeon-holing a lot of young people who aren't ready for that.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 The second issue is that it's my 3 assumption, although I wasn't present when the 4 State regulations were created, that gender segregation is a result of peoples' fear of youth 5 engaging in sexual behavior. For obvious reasons 6 7 that's not a concern if we're doing a mixed gender

8 setting when it comes to LGBTQ youth. actually when we segregate gender that we have

10 more of an issue around that.

> And not--it seems relatively silly to me to have to tell a young person I'm sorry I can't put you in the one open bed we have right now because you don't fit the gender requirement. That's kind of ridiculous in my experience. And it also seems like a waste of resources. get money to have a bed, we have to keep it open until we find the right gendered person to fit it, kind of feels wasteful.

My second issue I want to bring up is a DYCD requirement for TIL operation that requires the mandatory 24 hour staffing. some quick math for you Council Member. Our current TIL budget which is our DYCD budget, we spend over \$200,000 a year in personnel expenses

for our direct care staff. Now when we talk about staffing, I just want to specify that I'm referring to those direct care staff that are there onsite 24 hours a day.

We also have staff obviously that are in the office, Social Work, Case Work, Life Skills, Development people that are part of our staffing. The two--I'm not counting them in that \$200,000, that's in excess of that. Ad we would obviously, Council Member, have--those staff would still be there during the day at the office for example.

But it's particularly the glorified babysitting issue that happens in TIL programming. Again it's been brought up but I'd like to emphasize that my Executive Director feels like he's constantly wringing his hands over spending all this money on watching apartments that are sometimes empty because our young people are working and in school but we have to have staff there. And it kind of seems silly.

We have--our Federal requirements do not actually ask us to have 24 hour staffing and allow us to have flexibility in our proposed

model. The DYCD Request for Proposals does not allow any flexibility. They tell you what the model is supposed to be. You write a paper that says you'll give them their model. So I'm just suggesting that potentially DYCD open up the idea for other models.

There are clearly some youth that even in TILs may have been 24 hour staffing. I recognize that. I just think that it'd be much—it would behoove everyone who's involved in the finances to offer other options for that. Our TLP which is our Federal budget for example is our entire budget which includes our rent of our apartments, the food expenses, everything is \$250,000. That's the same amount of beds we serve in our TIL. So we're spending almost as much in direct care staff for our TIL as we spend in our entire TLP budget. So again it's just not a really good use of resources.

And the third point I want to address is sort of a sub-issue under the age limit concern. I won't repeat all the issues around expanding past 21 but what I would like to say is I would think at the very least what we could

potentially do is allow youth that enter TILs, close to their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday, allow them the full 18 months. So even if we can't extend to 23 or 24, that if a young person comes in at 20 years old, they don't only get a year. They have a--at this point they have truncated lengths of stay based solely on their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday, not on how long we usually give anyone that comes into the program.

I would also want to--I just--I appreciate you Council Member Fidler for addressing the block grant issue. I think it's dramatically impacted our colleagues across the State. We haven't had as much of the impact quite yet in the City but I certainly don't want to be one of those people that only addresses it when it becomes a concern for my backyard. I mean I think this is a big issue across the State.

And what it means to me is if programs across the State are closing, some of those youth are eventually going to migrate to the City where there are services. And our programs will be quickly overwhelmed with that.

I want to thank you so much for the

2 opportunity to testify today.

3 CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Thank you.

And we've been joined by Council Member Miguel Martinez.

MR. JOEY LOPEZ: Good morning. My name is Joey Lopez. I'm the Coordinator of Policy and Training for the Ali Forney Center. We're an organization that works with LGBT, homeless, runaway and street involved young people between the ages of 16 and 24.

We'd like to thank the Council and especially the Chairman Fidler on his leadership on this issue for the past 13 hearings. And predece--and, you know, to your predecessors who chaired this Committee before who also began to champion this issue many years ago. This issue is not something that just popped up five years ago. It's been around for a very long time.

I'm here to testify in support of
Resolution 1227-A which would ask the Federal
government and the State government to amend their
age limit of the Federal Runaway Homeless Youth
Act from 21 to 24. But even more importantly we'd
like to thank the Council for adding the language

in Resolution 1227-A which would include the language of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth as its own category within the Runaway Homeless Youth Act which may be able to open up services specifically for that population.

The Ali Forney Center was created in 2002 to fill a gap in services not only just for LGBT youth, but especially for those LGBT youth between the ages of 21 and 24. AFC is a handful—is one of a handful of youth service providers which works with both LGBT young people but also LGBT young people between the ages of 21 and 24.

The services we provide have become very challenging not only due to fiscal climate but also due to the restrictions that we must follow that are pertaining to the guidance of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. Where most of the funding that we get, coming from DYCD, which provides most of our services, it does limit us because we're only allowed to service young people up to 21. And most of the young people that we've been seeing for the past year are now really between the ages of 21 and 24. I couldn't give

2.0

2.3

you a percentage but--off the top of my head, if I had to guess I would say over 50% of the young people fit that age criteria.

We believe in this Resolution, if this Resolution was passed, our ability to serve those between the ages of 21 and 24 with DYCD funding would greatly increase the chances of that young person, that young person's ability to break that chain and that cycle of staying homeless and becoming that chronic homeless adult that we see, not only on the streets and on the subways, but in the adult shelter system.

We've seen first hand the dangers of long term homelessness with deaths of many LGBT young people who were not fortunate to access services and this includes the young person that our program is named after, Ali Forney who was murdered on the streets in 1997 and until this day his murder still goes unresolved.

We've seen young people who are HIV positive, due to their homelessness, come into our programs and become more treatment adherent and become less willing to engage in risky behavior due to having a bed to sleep in every night,

compared to those who don't know where they're going to sleep that night and continue to engage in such behavior.

These examples are just a few of many in which direct services can not only save a young person's life but can help them become productive members of society. You know, first hand, you know, I'm one of those young people who was homeless at one time.

I went to Covenant House. I tried to make it in Covenant House. I couldn't make it in Covenant House and ended up on the street. And through some form of grace, I'm not dead. I'm still alive but I did go through a lot of hardships, you know, prison, I also became infected with HIV. I'm HIV positive, been living with HIV for 12 and a half years.

I've been privileged to be able to turn my life around but many other young people who may be living the same story that I'm living may not have that privilege or that opportunity.

So this is why I feel that the Resolution would be important into helping those young people have that chance to be able to change their lives

2	without having them to put themselves at risk like
3	I did in a dangerous city. You know?
4	And, you know, hopefully the State
5	will come along and follow the guidance of the
6	Council and the Feds will change the regulations
7	and hopefully a lot of young people will be able
8	to change their lives and maybe one day sit in the
9	seats that you sit in and become productive
10	members. Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Thank you.
12	Council Member Mark-Viverito.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
14	Thank you all three for your testimony. I think
15	it's very important to hear that, you know,
16	organizations that are providing the direct
17	service and thank you for sharing your experience.
18	Just going back to the issue of the
19	expenses, right, because did you indicate that
20	\$200,000 is what you're spending for that 24 hour
21	supervision that you could probably reallocate?
22	MS. NOLAN: Absolutely
23	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
24	[Interposing] That's quite significant.
25	MS. NOLAN:for the direct care

1	COMMITTEE ON YOUTH SERVICES 61
2	City
3	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
4	right, the 24 hour.
5	MS. NOLAN: Correct. Correct.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Okay
7	so the State and City don't.
8	MS. NOLAN: The State and the
9	Federal government do not require
10	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
11	[Interposing] Okay. I'm sorry, State and Federal
12	government don't.
13	MS. NOLAN:the City does, right.
14	Right.
15	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
16	Okay. So that definitely, I mean is something
17	thatI was just mentioning to the Chair that we
18	could, you know, discuss at maybe our budget
19	hearings or question that a little bit more. So
20	thanks for that clarification.
21	MS. NOLAN: You're welcome.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO: Okay
23	so that was basically my question. Thank you.

MS. NOLAN: Um-hum.

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: And--

24

25

$\sim$	
2	

# [Off mic]

_	
3	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Before I call
4	on Councilman Gerson, I just want to point out
5	that we did invite DYCD here today and they
6	probably have participated in all prior 12
7	hearings. There was a policy that City agencies
8	do not testify in resolutions and even though we
9	tried to get around that by calling this an
10	oversight hearing, they didn't see it that way and
11	there was a little bit of confusion back and
12	forth.
13	But I did see Commissioner Mullgrav
14	last night at an Inwood House event and I, you
15	know, I have frequently been critical of City
16	agencies. I am not, you know, I'm very
17	appreciative of the efforts that have been made at
18	DYCD under this Commissioner. And I think we
19	probably should open a dialog with her directly on
20	that 24 hour requirement
21	COUNCIL MEMBER MARK-VIVERITO:
22	[Interposing] Um-hum.
23	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER:and I think
24	she gets it. And hopefully we'll be able to make
25	that change.

right. Particularly because -- if we're mandated to

25

provide services to youth up to age 24, the difficulty is there isn't the funding available right now to do that.

But if we have the choice of being able to provide the services then we can do it—as she was saying, when a bed is available, you know, who are we, if we have someone who comes in who's 23 years old, can we fill it with a person who's 23 years old? But if we don't have a bed available, you know, we don't have the services available. So I don't—what I wouldn't want to see is that we're required to provide services but that it be flexible and allow us to do so.

I appreciate that. And I think what you were mentioned before with regards to the lack of flexibility, you know, that DYCD prescribes in its RFPs, I think is an issue, not just with regards to this particular issue. I know it's an issue, you know, overall with regards to other programming and funding. And I know that that's an issue that I'm hoping we can bring up as we discuss the community centers and the NYCHA facilities Mr. Chair, because I know that they're

2.0

2.3

2	being	extremely	rigid	about	their	requirements.

But that seems to be an overall theme with DYCD that we may have to address in a larger way. So thank you very much for your testimony.

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Thank you.

Council Member Gerson?

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: I just-could you describe how you presently deal on a,
you know, practical basis with the ageing-out
phenomenon? What is the kind of exit process that
you implement? What type of referrals? What type
of, you know, counseling, to what extent do you
continue to provide services, post the current
youth or adolescent age cutoff?

And while we're at it, well as we have Ali Forney and Green Chimneys here, could you just give us any brief update on the status of the shelters that you have opened with the funding from the special Council initiatives over the past year? If you have that information?

MS. NOLAN: Well to address the ageing-out issue first. I think, you know, we find that youth that have less time in the program for transitional living specifically that they're

just--I mean it's obvious, they're less prepared to be out on their own when they leave. So they end up seeing--needing a lot more support after they leave the program.

We have a very unfunded philosophy around lifetime aftercare. Now that doesn't necessarily mean we can always, you know, give them a Metro Card if that's what's needed but we have support services and, you know, we do what we can around monetary needs for young people. And it's definitely the youth that are just freshly out of the program. If they haven't had the full time to really develop their plan. Because there was some insight when they created the 18 month model, like, you know, there is an appropriate length of time--

## COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:

[Interposing] But the one thing you're suggesting makes perfect sense in terms of the stop-gap until we get to the 24 cutoff.

MS. NOLAN: Thank you. I--we didn't actually open any recent special funding shelters. We've been doing the TIL program so I can't answer that second part of your question.

2	MR. LOPEZ: In reference to your		
3	question, in reference to have we opened up any		
4	programs, we have finally opened up some beds		
5	'cause we were one of the programs that was not		
6	certified. So we had		
7	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:		
8	[Interposing] That's right.		
9	MR. LOPEZ:to go through that		
10	whole certification process and it took a while.		
11	Last I heard is the program's up and running but		
12	the contracts have not been executed through DYCD		
13	so we have gotten no money.		
14	So when the money comes, which is		
15	now, March, so March, April, May, we'll have less		
16	than four months to spend the contract down.		
17	Because we still haven't received an executed		
18	contract from DYCD. We were told any day now,		
19	from the beginning of maybe January, maybe		
20	February, I'm not 100% sure, but we have not		
21	received the money yet. Soand this is one of		
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:		
23	[Interposing] And how many beds are involved in		
24	that?		
25	MR. LOPEZ: We're talking 6, 12,		

2.0

18,	possible	22	to

$\hat{}$		
2	COUNCIL MEMBER	GERSON
. )		(エいしょう())

4 [Interposing] Um-hum.

MR. LOPEZ: --24 beds. So these beds have been running. They've been operational. We've been paying staff because they have to be run 24 hours with money from other funding streams. And we still haven't received our contract money yet.

So this is one of the other issues that not only our program deals with, I'm pretty sure there are other DYCD funded programs in the audience that deal with the same thing, the execution of contracts and dealing with OMB and that whole process just takes such a long time, you know. Here it is probably what seven, eight months into the contract and we still haven't gotten any money. So.

MS. NOLAN: And can I just add to that statement. I mean I would agree, yes, there are plenty of us that have had that experience.

And some places are able, like Joey's explaining, Ali Forney, can maybe front the money through other sources. But I know there are other smaller

1	COMMITTEE ON YOUTH SERVICES 70		
2	the individual but we don't want to be putting		
3	people out on the streets.		
4	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Thank you		
5	Mr. Chair.		
6	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Well thank the		
7	three of you for your testimony and your		
8	assistance today.		
9	[Applause]		
10	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: I'll call our-		
11	-wow we don't usually get applause for panels.		
12	That's great. We have Lucky Michaels from MCCNY		
13	Homeless Youth Services and Charles Taylor from		
14	the same organization, and Paul Sealy from SCO		
15	Family of Services. Is this the last panel?		
16	Yeah.		
17	[Pause]		
18	[Witnesses getting settled]		
19	CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: One of you		
20	jump in there.		
21	MR. LUCKY MICHAELS: Okay, I		
22	suppose I'll go first. Lucky Michaels, Program		
23	Director of MCCNY Homeless Youth Services which		
24	runs Sylvia's Place which has emergency shelter		
25	and drop-in services for LGBTQ youth. I'm going		

2.0

to my best to summarize a couple of these

paragraphs, the more important ones I'll have to

read.

MCCNY Homeless Youth Services is entering its sixth year of service to LGBTQ homeless and runaway youth. In that time our staff has joined the growing body of support for massive reform to the policies regarding runaway and homeless youth.

opened in 2002, Ali Forney and Sylvia's Place got its birth at the same time in 2002, we have been serving runaway and homeless youth up to the age of 24 and are currently seeing many of our youth move onto places like Ali Forney and then they reach their birthday and are, you know, discharged without being able to get into Green Chimneys because of the age requirement and come back to Sylvia's Place.

MCCNY Homeless Youth Services runs their emergency shelter and drop-in program and are so dependent on other programs and services to provide our clients with longer term transitional housing. We therefore feel the effects of the

current policy that disregards a young person's need for a full 18 months in a transitional independent living program like Green Chimneys.

If the client's birthday falls before the completion of that time period.

Clients who leave are programmed for transitional independent living programs often return to us when they have reached their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday because they are not given the full 18 months usually allocated to establish proper housing.

We assert that this is an unnecessarily and easily repaired problem. By allowing a client a full 18 months without abruptly cutting off services on the day of their birth, the system can ensure youth are given the full opportunity to access the services they need to end the cycle of homelessness. Otherwise the policy is ignoring the reality of securing stable housing and forcing agencies to prematurely discontinue service to homeless youth based on arbitrary data.

As for the OCFS regulations, we are not OCFS regulated. We operate out of a church and are serving in the crisis youth. And right

now we are housing 26 youth in our crisis facility and our drop-in services in the past 3 months have seen over 400 new drop-in clients. So with the swell of population that are currently, you know, living either at Ali Forney Center or on the streets, and we don't have the room to house them. And this is primarily the 21 to 24 that, you know, cannot survive in the adult shelter system.

Finally the issue of recognizing the unique challenges of LGBTQ runaway and homeless youth in Federal and State policies is of special importance to our agency and to the community at large. It is a vast disservice to all homeless youth to ignore the fact that those youth who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual or Transgender often experience challenges that need to be addressed specifically.

According to the New York 2007

Homeless Youth Survey conducted under the

direction of the Empire Coalition of Youth and

Family Services, 28% of those surveyed identified

as Lesbian, Gay or Bisexual, and an additional 11%

were unsure or uncomfortable answering the

question of gender. Of those surveyed 5%

2 specifically identified as transgender.

These numbers are a wakeup call that among the homeless youth community, LGBTQ youth represent a disproportionately high number considering that mainstream society only 10% of population identifies as LGBTQ. So if you look at the 10% versus the, you know, 30-some% of homeless LGBTQ youth, then you see that, you know, it's disproportionately high.

It is irresponsible to ignore these youth or to assume their struggles are being appropriately addressed. MCCNY Homeless Youth Services is insistent that LGBTQ youth are identified in public policy so that the needs of these young people can finally be addressed with the urgency that is required to keep them safe.

So, and I already gave you testimony about our numbers which are, you know, really high at this point. And we're seeing anywhere from 62 or so drop-in clients that we're feeding dinner, giving showers to, put them on the Ali Forney waiting list which it can take anywhere from 3 to 4 months to get them into a bed there.

And in the meantime we are highly dependent on

DYCD funds which we don't get currently. We just submitted the DYCD RFP like everybody else.

And if we don't get that money, we are, you know, in jeopardy of having to close Sylvia's Place which would lose another 26 crisis beds which they wouldn't have a jump-off point essentially to get into Ali Forney Center or to Green Chimneys, depending on what their discharge plan is. And so if we, you know, don't exist, essentially we are discharging them to the streets or to Streetworks, which thankfully, cover the LGBTQ youth in our stead. [Chuckles] And we have a client with us, Charles, he is currently living in Sylvia's Place and is going to give his own testimony.

MR. CHARLES TAYLOR: Hi. It's not easy being homeless, especially at my age.

There's a lot of temptations that come your way but you just have to have to find a reason to-
MR. MICHAELS: [Interposing] Oh,

state your name on the record--

MR. TAYLOR: [Interposing] Charles
Taylor. You have to have a reason to not engage
in those types of activities. There's drugs,

selling drugs, prostitution, but you have to learn how to make a way of your own living, whether you have to go out there and look for a job or, you know, obtain your GED.

Me, myself, I've been having trouble for the last two years obtaining my documentation, my State ID, Social Security Card.

Just this year I recently got a chance to hold onto all that stuff, you know. I'm going to school for my GED so it's a lot of LGBTQ youth out there that need, you know, help.

I mean I have several friends of mine who are either in jail, or, you know, suicidal or, you know, so if nobody doesn't take action for all this that's going on, then who's going to, you know, be the one that's going to take up and say okay well this is what needs to be done so nobody doesn't be on the streets at night or, you know, etcetera, etcetera. So that's just my testimony because that's the situation that I'm in. So.

MR. MICHAELS: And just for the record, Charles is 23. He actually started out in Streetworks and has come to Sylvia's Place and is

on the waiting list for the Ali Forney Center.

MR. PAUL SEALY: Good morning. My name is Paul Sealy and I'm the Program Director of Independence and Programs. We operate currently four transitional independent living programs in Brooklyn and Queens and one drop-in center in Brooklyn.

My testimony essentially, I just want to comment on the, on our perspective based on having the age raised to the age of 24. We currently serve young people up to the age of 21 because our contracts are DYCD contracts.

Essentially as we see it, it's an issue based on the fact that we're dealing with antiquated regulations that result from probably in the last 70's, early 80's, and hasn't essentially adjusted to the times, and also doesn't recognize the complexity of issues of young people that reside in New York City.

Essentially it was probably derived from middle America for a young person that runs away from home for a temporary period of time and returns home soon after that. That's not our reality today.

We're dealing with young people that have a complex amount of issues in New York City, ranging from substance use, emerging mental health needs, young people that are having struggling emotionally based on the trauma that they face as they grow up through the years and resulted in them being ejected from the home around their 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup> birthday. We're seeing a whole—a tremendous amount of young people that on their 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, they're being asked to leave the house. Their parents are choosing their paramour over them.

And for the most part, young--those young people haven't had an opportunity in order to be able to develop and essentially start to assume the responsibility for themselves. In our TILs as we operate them, they're 24 hour supervised, and for me, and my staff, I know we won't like to see it any way different. Like for instance last night I was in a staff meeting with some of our staff that operate our boy's program and we were speaking abut how we could lessen the amount of issues that may result if we didn't supervise young people appropriately in that

2 setting.

We have to remember. Young people are 18, 19 years old. They're young adults.

They're still maturing. So they're going to get into things that routinely kids their age get into, despite the fact that they're working towards self-sufficiency and they're forced to assume the responsibility of an adult. So from our perspective the 24 hour supervision, and as I understand it, over the years that we've operated our programs, is essentially based on your ability to provide adequate supervision for the population that you serve.

We operate larger TILs and we also operate a smaller TIL. In our smaller TIL we have the flexibility to ensure that there's a staff person present when the young people are present. If they're not in the facility, we have the flexibility to not have a staff person scheduled. And I can tell you that's helped us tremendously in terms of operating, in terms of operating that program, because our grant for that program is substantially less than what we operate in our other programs. For me, I think the issue is not-

-and I hope that DYCD continues to revisit the
conversation about looking at more cost effective

models for operating TILs in New York City.

Another 30% is operational costs. So for us, we could clearly, if we could cut back on the staffing, and the staffing all involves around supervision, the majority of it, because our direct care staff line is out of our staffing line is about 80%--probably about 70% of our staffing line are direct care staff line.

So if--and we have successfully operated models with young people under the age of 21 in situations where we had 1 staff person just checking on them once a day, 7 days a week and it cost us substantially less than what it costs for us to operate a 24 hour supervised TIL. But let me stress this point. I think both models are necessary. Not just one but both.

In regards to the age limit being increased to the age of 24. I want to stress I agree with Ms. Nolan's recommendation that young people should be allowed the opportunity to see their plan through. So if a young person comes

into a TIL, based on a present state of affairs, if they come into our TIL at 20 years old, 6 months, our staff rapidly tell them when they're setting up their plan, you have 6 months. We have no time to waste. Every day should essentially be like 2 days for you. So you've got to do 2 day's work in 24 hours because in 6 months we have no other alternative but to discharge you to, 9 times out of 10, to adult situation.

And really and truly, young people are not ready for that opportunity. If you're in a--if you're now starting out and you're learning how to adapt to the world and learn how to be responsible, it's irresponsible for us as a City to throw young people in a fray with adults that are chronically homeless for most of their lives, have essentially resorted to seeing life as a life of entitlement.

At the end, we steer young people away from that. We have them focus on self-reliance and based on hard work and assuming responsibility for themselves because at the end of the day, each adult has to assume responsibility for themselves. But we should give

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

them an opportunity to demonstrate and based on our current affairs, we're not giving them that opportunity. We're telling them when you turn 21, well, whatever is out there, you got to find it.

And I don't think that that's appropriate.

For me, also to--based on the fact--and I think that this filters into a disproportionate amount of young people ages 21 through 24, ended up on the streets is because their lack of affordable housing opportunities for our young people in New York City. I could tell you, we do, I tell my staff all the time, I'm amazed by the things that we're able to accomplish with young people in the 18--the 12 to 18 months that they spend with us. And at times, based on the regulation and there are loopholes, there's some rigidity within the State regs, but there are some loopholes, and in TILs, you can discharge a young person, have them come back, and they could say for more than 18 months with you.

But--and I could tell you we've had young people that have stayed with us for that period of time and it's proven to be successful.

Because what it gives, it allows them to do, it

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

allows them an opportunity, one, to essentially achieve their educational goal, because about 60% of the young people that come to us don't have a high school diploma or equivalency. And as we know it, in order for them to get an appropriate paying job so that they could afford the rents that are demanded in New York City, they need to have the minimum requirement.

I mean I hear people talk about oh there are a lot of job opportunities for young people. They're not real jobs. Because I could tell you, two things that I had a conversation about with my staff in the last week was, there's a disproportionate amount of young people that we have that we get to the point that they're working. We have young people that have \$6,000, \$7,000 in the bank. And based on the fact that they have a job that pays them maybe \$10 an hour, and they make \$300 a week, it disqualifies them from HRA benefits under Medicaid and they have no medical insurance. That's ridiculous. And then they're asked to pay a portion of that \$300 towards them having some minimal level of health insurance. That's ridiculous. And for me that's

not teaching a young person that being responsible for yourself is the way to go.

Also with the housing opportunities and I want to stress this and I want to put this on the record, and I agree with Council Member Fidler that DYCD has been a partner. I can say the current administration has done a great—a whole lot more than any administration has done for RHY young people in New York City. We have a long way to go. But I can say they've done a whole lot more.

And recently, within this year, they have been able to establish a relationship with DHS that allows runaway and homeless TIL young people to apply for Section 8 vouchers under the emergency applications. I could tell you, I was very disturbed about a year and a half ago when our young people's priority went from two all the way down to four on Section 8 priority list. They're now back at zero, they're higher than DV women, today. And DHS has committed for this Fiscal Year, 50 Section 8 vouchers to young people that are residing in TIL programs.

But one of the things that--the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

problems that we found out last week that a lot of our young people are running into is that they're not being able to meet the income requirement based on the fact that the jobs that they have are not adequate. We have young people like for instance I had a young lady, she was working at Shea Stadium. And dedicated, went to work everyday. But when it came to it at the time, she had an application in to NYCHA housing, and at the time, when she went to NYCHA housing, she said well I have a job. I have savings. She was disqualified based on the fact that when the Mets are out of town, she's not making any money and then she was put into a hole and say well, your income is insufficient. It was very deflating for her.

So for me, I feel there are greater issues that we have to address that are contributing factors to the fact that we're having so many young people over the age of 21, between the ages of 21 and 24, that still remain on the street. And for a lot of those young people, I could tell you, if they've come through our programs, what we've done in the past with young

2.0

people that have reached the age of 21, we have no other recourse but to call our friends at Covenant House and say to them, well, we have a young person. They're working. They've achieved their high school diploma. Would you take them into your ROP program?

And then they'll tell us well you need to get them down here before they turn 21. So we're hustling to get them over there so that they can get in there, get some extended stay. It shouldn't be. I feel that they should be allowed to remain—they should be able to have an opportunity to finish what they've started. That's my recommendation.

Oh and just one more thing
[laughs]. I just--for the folks in the room that
have discretionary contracts and have
discretionary awards, I totally agree. The
vetting process is way too lengthy for you to be
able to operate a program. The monies that you
guys bestowed on us, so generously over the past
few years, takes so long before--to go through the
process in order for you to be able to operate a
program it's ridiculous. Like Joey was saying,

2.0

we're now seven months into the year, and we just had the opportunity to be able to submit our discretionary contracts.

And another—I mean another problem that we're experiencing here that we didn't experience in the past, but this is a fiscal issue. And what the fiscal issue is, if you have DYCD contracts that originated from the RFP, they're stand—alone contracts and you get awards at the beginning of the Fiscal Year. If you now have a discretionary contract, it's set up as a separate contract. Based on the fact that it's set up on a—as a separate contract, it creates a smorgasbord of fiscal issues for you.

So I mean if anyone is having any issues, I've had a conversation with Assistant Commissioner Haskell in regards to us finding ways that it'll give us an opportunity to be at a--to be better be able to spend our monies without having any conflicts with the original contract. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: Now the DYCD, first of all, it may come as a surprise to some of you, or maybe not, that DYCD runs more contracts

2.0

than any other City agency. And they run, you
know, the gamut from very small to very large.
And we have continued to discuss with DYCD their
contracting process and streamlining it.

Of course the point/counterpoint to that is making sure that that money is accounted for transparently and appropriately. You should know that a great deal of the funding that—well at least some of the \$5,000,000 that comes from the City Council which is affectionately referred to by the New York Post as pork. And they, apologies to the — Place, sorry—

## [Laughter]

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: But, you know, the fact of the matter is, you know, that they're, you know, there are people in the City who look at that money as dirty money and money that, you know, we need to inspect every, you know, penny because, you know, there's some corrupt motivation and an improper motivation in its allocation. And we need to make sure that the public has confidence in the money that is being spent. So that's the push/pull.

I know that on the Council side we

are streamlining our processes so that the process by which you ask the Council for money, for those of you seeking discretionary money directly from Council Member allocations, it will be streamlined this year. And if you were approved last year, your form will basically say everything is the same as last year, check this box.

And so maybe if we can get DYCD moving along those lines, and maybe even more importantly, the Mayor's Office of Contracts and then OMB to understand, you know, the difficulties, you know, we'll make some progress. And at the budget hearings I do intend to ask the Commissioner what her staffing is in terms of the contracting processes.

No matter what the topic is when it comes to DYCD I hear this complaint. Whether it's after schools, runaway and homeless youth, any of the DYCD programs, and, you know, I sympathize with them to some degree but, you know, I understand the practical hardship that it causes all of you. Council Member Gerson.

COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Just to follow up on this completion of the cycle of the

2	18 month period point which several of you have
3	made now. And I think it's a very valid point as
4	I've said. In your opinions, could DYCD on its
5	own, allow or even mandate that once the person is
6	admitted into a program they have to be enabled to
7	complete the full 18 month period irrespective of
8	their age? And if we were to do so, if the City
9	were to do so, is that something that your
10	programs could accommodate without additional
11	funding?
12	MR. SEALY: I mean I couldI'm
13	certainly I could speak for everybody in the room.
14	We do a whole lot of stuff thatwithout getting
15	funded for it.
16	[Audience agreeing]
17	MR. SEALY: So, forget it being
18	adequate.
19	[Audience laughing]
20	MR. SEALY: We have a deep
21	commitment to the young people that we serve.
22	And
23	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:
24	[Interposing] So if we allow this, you could do
25	it.

2	MR. SEALY: If, if you allow it,
3	but based on allowance, it has to go through the
4	State because DYCD follows the State regulation
5	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON:
6	[Interposing] I see.
7	MR. SEALY:and they will always,
8	when you raise it to them, they will always resort
9	back to the fact that OCFS has the call on that
10	MR. MICHAELS: [Interposing] Yep.
11	MR. SEALY:so the State law
12	needs to haveneeds to recognize some level of
13	flexibility to give programs an allowance to do
14	that, granted that you might not be getting paid
15	to, to carry out those services.
16	Like for instance with the Section
17	8 vouchers that we got, we had to commit to a 2
18	year follow-up for each young person that goes
19	into an apartment. We're not getting paid for
20	that but everybody in the room agreed to it
21	because it's necessary for our young people.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER GERSON: Okay. Well
23	I'm certain that this Committee will follow up on
24	this point. Thank you very much.
25	MR. SEALY: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON FIDLER: And I just, we want to thank you for your testimony and we want to thank everyone for their testimony and their participation. I particularly want to thank

Council Member Gerson who has been a partner in this through all 13 of these hearings, and my counsel, Megan Annito and my Policy Analyst, Mike Benjamin.

Just on the where we go from here,

I intend to ask counsel to rewrite small parts of
this resolution to make it clear which level of
government we're asking what of. So that our
agenda is very clearly stated. I think that's the
one thing in re-reading the resolution before this
hearing that it occurred to me.

So if any of you have any suggestions that are substantively, you know, different from what's in the Resolution, please get them to Megan as soon as possible. It's also my hope that they'll permit me to calendar a vote on an amended resolution on the day that we do our oversight hearing for the budget in March for DYCD so that we can move this to the floor of the Council.

23

24

2	Lots of things are happening in
3	Washington. And lots of things are happening in
4	Albany. It's, I think it behooves us to pass this
5	resolution at a time when they're in session and
6	possibly paying attention. I also, you know, want
7	to make another effort to reconvene at least the
8	State elected officials that you've identified for
9	this Committee as your point people. There is a
10	woeful absence of dialog amongst us and this
11	resolution I think would set out an agenda for
12	that meeting that might prove productive for all
13	of us.
14	So since we're about being
15	productive and we know that stimulus packages
16	aside money is not something that I'd be
17	optimistic about augmenting this year. You know
18	we do what we can in that environment and I
19	appreciate all your efforts, all your cooperation,
20	and we will continue to march forward. Thank you
21	and we are adjourned.

[Gavel Banging]

[END TAPE 1002]

[Applause]

## CERTIFICATE

I, Laura L. Springate certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

Lama L. Springate

Signature \_\_Laura L. Springate\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_March 9, 2009\_\_\_\_\_