CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

of the

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

----X

April 15, 2008 Start: 1:19pm Recess: 4:35pm

HELD AT: Council Chambers

City Hall

B E F O R E:

ANNABEL PALMA Chairperson

## COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Gale A. Brewer
Thomas White, Jr.
Brad S. Lander
Stephen T. Levin
Ydanis A. Rodriguez
James G. Van Bramer

## A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Robert Hess Commissioner Department of Homeless Services

Robert Doar Commissioner Human Resource Administration

Steven Banks Attorney-in-Chief The Legal Aid Society

Anya Maddow-Zimet
The Legal Aid Society

K. N.
Client
The Legal Aid Society

Christy Parque Executive Director Homeless Services United

Erin Feely-Nahem Executive Director New York City Coalition of Domestic Violence Residential Providers

Yarrow Regan Community Voices Heard

Stephanie Gendell
Associate Executive Director, Policy & Public Affairs
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Good afternoon	,
everyone and welcome to the oversight of the DHS	
Advantage New York and HomeBase Programs General	
Welfare Committee. I am Council Member Annabel	
Palma, Chair of the General Welfare Committee.	

I'd like to welcome Commissioner
Robert Hess, from the Department of Homeless
Services, and Commissioner Robert Doar from the
Human Resource Administration, and all the other
interested parties who are here today.

I'd like to start today by thanking the staff who prepared today's hearing, Migna

Taveras, Molly Murphy, Staff of the General

Welfare Committee, Crystal Coston, from the

Finance Division, and Brendan Shaney [phonetic]

from the Policy Division.

The Committee planned this hearing to get updated information from DHS about the Advantage New York HomeBase programs. These programs were rolled out in 2007. They provided rental subsidies to Advantage New York clients, to help them move from shelters into permanent housing. Clients are eligible for Advantage if they are working, if they have child welfare cases

with Administration for Children's Services, if
they are on fixed incomes such as SSI, or if they
are domestic violence survivors. The Advantage
program replaced the flawed Housing Subsidy Plus
program. In 2007 the Committee held a hearing to
examine DHS plans for Advantage, and recognized
some positive things. For example, Advantage is
not tied to people's public assistance cases, and
DHS matched savings that people were able to
accrue during their time in Advantage.

However, the Council also had concerns about how effective the program would be in keeping people in stable and permanent housing, how realistic it is that participants will be able to live independently within two years. Were people who were employed able to keep their jobs in this fragile economy? How many people were truly able to save money and how much? How many Advantage participants have returned to shelter, if any? In addition, because Advantage relies heavily on Section 8 vouchers, what would happen to the program without their availability? Finally, HomeBase is meant to provide crucial supports in helping Advantage clients transition

from the program to independent living, yet the

Committee has heard repeated concerns that

specific services HomeBase provides are unclear or

people can't access them.

In short, we wanted to understand how effective the Advantage Program truly is, especially because homelessness has risen to record highs in the last few years. Just a couple of days ago we learned that the Department of Homeless Services is proposing to significantly change the way Advantage operates. So we are now faced with a new set of questions. Under the new plan, the children and fixed income programs will be eliminated, and that's of huge concern to us.

And everyone who will eventually end up participating—everyone will eventually end up participating in one program. People with income who qualify for a subsidy must be working at least 20 hours per week and will pay 30% of their income towards rent in their first year. To be eligible for a second year, people must be working 35 hours per week, and will have to pay 50% of their rent, or 30% of their gross income, whichever is higher. The savings component of the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

program has dropped out entirely. While we have concerns about the original Advantage program, and expected that DHS would have to make revisions because of the loss of Section 8 vouchers, DHS's new plan increases those concerns greatly.

The new income contributions are unrealistic, given that people in shelter have limited resources and that jobs in today's economy are few and far between. It is hard to imagine how the new advantage program will help anyone sustain permanent housing. Instead, I am concerned that the numbers of homeless will continue to rise, because they may cycle back in after two years. In addition, we learn that DHS plans to reinstitute the requirement that homeless families with children pay for shelter. People without a home have extremely limited resources, and they need to keep every penny in order to move out of shelter and into permanent housing. hard to imagine how charging homeless families rent for shelter is going to help them become self-sufficient, and I am confident that the administration will be able to shed some light on these new proposals. And I'm looking forward to

working with the Department of Homeless Services and this administration to make sure that we're actually helping folks become self-sufficient.

all these concerns, and about the Agency's vision for new programs, including what they based their decisions on. I now welcome Commissioner Hess and Commissioner Doar for their testimony. But before you begin, let me recognized the members of this committee. Council Member Ydanis Rodriguez, from Manhattan; and Council Member Brad Lander from the Bronx--from Brooklyn. I adopted him. I've adopted you to the Bronx, from Brooklyn. Thank you, and Commissioners, you may start your testimony.

ROBERT HESS: Good afternoon,

Chairwoman Palma and members of the Committee. I

am Robert Hess, Commissioner for the Department of

Homeless Services, and I am pleased to be here

today with my colleague, Human Resources

Commissioner Robert Doar. Thank you for the

opportunity to testify before you about

modifications to our Advantage New York Program

and to update you on our HomeBase program and the

services we provide to HomeBase clients and the community at large.

In 2007, the New York State Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance authorized DHS to create an Advantage New York pilot program to invest in homeless families and individuals by giving them the rent support they need to move towards independence.

Advantage New York provided a strong motivation to work, while empowering clients to move from shelter back to the community. The two-year pilot concluded in late 2009, and since then we have been evaluating our data to build on the successes of and further enhance the program. We're pleased to report that the results have been promising. Since the program's inception, advantage has helped more than 18,000 households exit shelter and return to the community. Currently DHS continues to serve 14,580 active participants in our advantage program.

In 2009, one family Advantage Lease was signed every 15 minutes of the business day, for an average of 136 family lease signings per

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

week. In 2010, the Department is experiencing even greater family lease signings from shelter, averaging over 175 per week for the past month, with a peak of 199 leases being signed the week ending March 26th of 2010, a record. Today more families than ever are moving from shelter back into the community and homes of their own, which is the best possible outcome for all involved.

Just as importantly, many advantage participates have defied the common wisdom that homeless families cannot obtain or maintain employment. More than 80% of the Work Advantage participants demonstrated strong employment records during the first year, and qualified for a second year in the program. For those who were able but unwilling to work under the previous program structure, it presented a missed opportunity to enhance their skill set, build savings and move further toward the path to selfsufficiency. The conclusion of the two-year pilot program has given the City an opportunity to make what has already been a very promising program even better. Consequently, we will expand and strengthen the Advantage program's focus on

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

employment with new work requirements and related rules that will go into effect July 1st of 2010, pending State approval.

Following two years of a pilot in which the Work Advantage program proved to be the most effective model, Advantage New York will continue to help families and individuals transition from temporary emergency shelter back to self-sufficiency through a focus on employment. As is currently the case, the revised Advantage New York program will offer one or two years of rental assistance to households in need as they exit the shelter system and return to their communities. Supporting our objective to decrease the clients' overall length of stay in shelter, Advantage New York will now be available to families and individuals who have been in shelter for at least 60 days. We believe that this is an improvement to the previous 90-day requirement of the current Advantage program, which will provide clients the opportunity to move even more quickly into a home of their own.

The City will continue to supplement rent contributions in an effort to

2 foster independence and responsibility in clients.

3 Beginning July 1st, however, the majority of

4 Advantage clients will be required to engage in

work or work-related activities fully time as a

6 condition to receiving a rental subsidy.

Eligibility requirements for the revised program

8 are as follows.

Clients entering year one of the Advantage program will be required to be employed for at least 20 hours per week, and participate in an additional 15 hours per week of housing search or HRA approved work activities. Clients will also be required to contribute 30% of their gross monthly income toward rent during the first year of participation in the program.

For year two, the subsidy will be available for those who are employed 35 hours per week and remain compliant with program rules. The revised program has raised the income threshold as well, to where clients must continue to have income that is less than 200% of the federal poverty level. This is a big improvement over the previous program, which set the cap at 150% of the poverty level.

2.0

2 During the second year,

participants will be required to contribute the greater of half of their monthly rent or 30% of their income toward housing costs. While the new work requirements are critical in enabling clients to be self-sufficient, we also recognize that a small number of households are unable to work due to disability. To be eligible for the Advantage New York, these families must also be in shelter for at least 60 days, with all adult members who are unable to work either receiving SSI, SSDI or federal disability benefits, or needed at home as a caregiver to a disabled family member as determined by HRA.

Advantage New York clients will continue to have access to citywide prevention services through HRA job centers and diversion units, DHS after care services, legal service providers and community based HomeBase programs, funded by HDS. While on Advantage, tenants can access services and information on a full range of issues in a way that best suits their needs and preferences.

First and foremost, an Advantage

tenant can call 311 and be directed to the
community based provider or government agency that
can most effectively address their inquiry.

Families can also walk in to their local job
center or call their community HomeBase or legal
services provider to make an appointment for
benefits screening, job readiness, job search
assistance, legal advice and counsel, landlord
mediation services, information about tenants'
rights and responsibility and renewed assistance.

DHS has also created an aftercare helpline that answers tenants' questions regarding Advantage, directs tenants to helpful resources and makes community referrals. In addition, DHS sends tenants a quarterly newsletter highlighting program guidelines and helpful resources.

When the Advantage program ends, tenants can continue to access HomeBase, our legal service providers for employment support, legal assistance, applications, and for FEPS program, and short term financial assistance and arrears.

DHS and HRA have also worked closely with housing court administrators to plan for an upcoming

Advantage training for judges and staff, and to

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

establish service referral procedures for advantage tenants. Advantage leases require that landlords inform DHS when commencing an eviction proceeding, and DHS proactively conducts outreach to those tenants at risk of eviction, and provides services and legal referrals.

While for some families homelessness is a short term setback that is quickly remedied, for others the road to long term housing stability is longer and requires varying levels of support at the many critical points along the way. When we began to expand our prevention services in 2004, DHS did not have aftercare services for former shelter clients. One of the lessons we've learned over the past six years is that homelessness prevention services need to incorporate aftercare, and also that aftercare cannot come in a one-size fits all approach. We enhance the city's homelessness prevention network to make certain that at-risk families are accessing the full range of benefits that help ensure housing stability in the long term.

After care services need to be

available not only on demand of those tenants who are actively seeking such services, but also as a safety net integrated into the community, the courts and the shelter door, front door, for those who do not reach out for assistance prior to making it to the shelter front door.

For example, although some families at high risk for shelter entry require intensive case work and short term financial assistance offered by HomeBase, the resource has also expanded its reach by providing housing and benefits advice through individual sessions or group activities. Also, Advantage families can attend financial literacy workshops, childcare fares, tax preparation sessions and benefits screenings. HomeBase works closely with other community organizations and city agencies that offer services and goods that can serve as outreach and engagement tools, drawing families to our program.

During this fiscal year, HomeBase has already enrolled over 1,000 Advantage tenants. Since opening for business last August, the DHS after care help line has assisted over 20,000

25

callers, 70% of whom have been Advantage clients.

3 I wanted to update you about the 4 implementation of our flex fund to assist the 2,589 households who lost their Section 8 vouchers 5 this winter. At a hearing last month before this 6 Committee, DHS was pleased to announce the 7 8 creation of the flex fund, seeded with \$1 million of HPRP funding. On March 4th, DHS mailed 9 10 outreach letters to the 2,589 families who lost their Section 8 vouchers, and directed them to 11 12 call HomeBase if they were in need of assistance. To date, a total of \$22,226 from the \$1 million 13 flex fund has been spent on rent arrears or 14 15 utility payments for 13 of those revoked Section 8 voucher holders. Two of the clients were DHS Work 16 17 Advantage clients, five were clients from the 18 community and six were clients known to DHS. 19 addition, 25 of the 2,589 households have entered 20 the shelter system to date. This fund is 21 available at our HomeBase offices to assist clients who find themselves in difficult times and 22 23 in need of assistance due to unique circumstances. 24 When anyone from NYCHA's Section 8

affected list calls HomeBase, they will be

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assessed and served according to their risk of homelessness and available resources. callers will likely qualify for the family eviction prevention supplement or FEPs. They will be referred to HRA to apply, and invited to call back if any issues arise. HomeBase will also assist those who do not qualify for FEPs with services such as budgeting and accessing public benefits, advice and coordination with HRA regarding one shot payments, maximizing household income through employment or higher wage employment, and reducing household housing expenses by finding roommates and other methods. In addition, those who are at eminent risk of homelessness and can stabilize their housing situation through a short term subsidy, will receive financial assistance. DHS will continue to monitor the overall level of funding and the citywide demand.

DHS will also continue to provide this committee with regular updates on the use of the flex funds to assist clients affected by the Section 8 voucher situation, including the number of such clients served by the fund. As I

2.0

2.3

previously stated, thus far less than one percent have entered shelter.

Despite our best efforts, we know from experience and the findings of researchers that some families will return to shelter. While a certain level of recidivism is to be expected, historically about 30% over ten years, we have continually enhanced our services at the shelter front door to address this demand. HRA diversion workers successfully help thousands of families return to housing each year, and have nearly doubled their presence at our family intake center in the past several years.

DHS has also posted social workers from Paths Community Resource Room to help bridge Advantage families back to the community through services and community linkages. We will continue to monitor this data as we work to enhance integrate a flexible safety net.

The flex fund is one way we're using HPRP funds to prevent homelessness. But let me update you on some of our other efforts. As you know, we've set aside approximately half of our HPRP funds for prevention programs, funds we

2.0

expect to have exhausted by next summer. First anti-eviction legal services are widely recognized as a valuable tool to prevent homelessness. So far this year, DHS funded community based legal providers have provided over 2,900 households with legal advice and representation. Also, because of HPRP funds, they have been able to serve single adults for the first time. Similarly, our sister agency, DOHMH, has funded legal service providers who have served 458 HIV-positive households at risk of homelessness.

Second, HPRP funds have been allocated--have allowed us to continue to expand our HomeBase homelessness prevention programs.

Since July 2009 through the end of March, HomeBase has served over 5,000 households. Of this number, 3,000 were enrolled for case management, and 2,000 received housing advice and referrals to community and public resources. Of all the households served, well over 90% have avoided homelessness and remained in the community.

Federal HPRP prevention dollars must be targeted to families who would have entered the shelter but for homelessness

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prevention services. HomeBase providers use specific data from DHS, and over five years of on the ground experience, to assess and serve those who come to their door. Once clients are found eligible, HomeBase is able to leverage the City's substantial prevention focus Tans (phonetic) dollars, for subsidy and arrears payments to assist them. I fact, in order to serve as many families as possible, the funding for casework services is much larger than the HomeBase financial assistance pool. That said, so far this year, HomeBase has granted over \$2 million of financial assistance providing short term rental assistance as well as assistance with other housing costs. For example, Ms. W called 311 just last week. She is employed, but has had a very difficult time of paying her rent of \$1,394, and is sending a very high percentage of her earnings to her landlord. She had received a Section 8 voucher, but had the voucher revoked in December. Ms. W will be working with CAMBA Workforce Development Program to find a higher paying, more stable job, and consequently increase her ability to afford her rent in the long term. In addition,

Ms. W will also participate in CAMBA's Going On My Own program, which will provide her with money and household management skills that will help prevent reentry into the shelter system. HomeBase will offer up to six months of financial assistance to supplement her rent payments, and help her fulfill the requirements of her current lease. If she cannot afford her rent after participating in the program, CAMBA will help her relocate to an apartment with lower rent.

Thousands of individuals and families like Ms. W are successfully served each year by our homeless prevention programs, demonstrating that we are willing and able to work together with our community partners to meet the needs of families in these challenging times. I am grateful to have a partner like Commissioner Doar, who will update you next on policy changes involving the contribution requirements for households seeking temporary shelter.

I am confident that the enhancements that we have made to the advantage program will best assist our clients in returning to our communities and preparing them for the

2.0

2.3

challenges of independent living during these
difficult economic times. I look forward to
working with members of this Committee and your
fellow colleagues in the City Council, as we
continue to move forward in our efforts to
reducing homelessness, and encouraging self-
sufficiency in New York City. Thank you for the
opportunity to testify before you today.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you,

Commissioner. Before we hear Commissioner Doar's

testimony let me just recognize Council Member Tom

White, Council Member Stephen Levin, Council

Member Gale Brewer and Council Member Jimmy Van

Bramer. Thank you.

ROBERT DOAR: Good afternoon

Chairwoman Palma and members of the General

Welfare Committee. I am pleased to be here today

with my colleague, Robert Hess. Commissioner Hess

and I work very closely together to help the

residents of the City's shelter system.

As you know, the Human Resources

Administration is charged with the administration

of key public benefits, such as cash assistance,

food stamps and Medicaid. We also administer

programs that provide needed support to some of our most vulnerable citizens. This includes eviction prevention, specialized emergency housing assistance and training and employment support. I want to take a moment to briefly explain these services in order to illustrate the depth of knowledge and range of experience our staff and managers bring to bear on the upcoming policy changes in the DHS shelter system.

Our Homeless Diversion Unit, in operation since 1992, is in every HRA job center in the City, in housing courts in all five boroughs, at Path and at the Bellevue Adult Family Shelter, to help low-income individuals avoid eviction and or reconnect them to their former housing. With eviction being a key element in approximately 50% of referrals to our adult protective services program, we have APS staff in housing court in all boroughs but Staten Island, to assist those courts and where needed petitions for guardians ad litum on behalf of our clients.

To prevent evictions, the APS financial management unit acts as representative payee for approximately 2,300 particularly

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

vulnerable clients, making sure their federal social security benefit is used to pay rent and utilities every month. We also oversee the City's domestic violence shelter system of 50 shelters that serve more than 3,000 individuals a day.

To support the employment needs of homeless cash assistance recipients who face particular barriers to employment, HRA has developed a specialized approach. HRA primarily services residents of DHS shelters from its East River Job Center. This allows for a closer working relationship between HRA Job Center Staff and DHS staff to jointly address the needs of This approach has proven successful, and clients. in fact, the East River Job Center has the highest number of job placements of all HRA centers. This calendar year alone, from January 1st until the end of last month, this jobs center has documented more than 2,000 placements.

DHS and HRA have also developed a specialized outreach to these families by pairing our Back to Work vendors directly with shelters.

Through resources provided by these Back to Work vendors, shelter candidates are referred to

appropriate job openings, prepared for offsite short term training and are provided with follow up after referral and job placement. These efforts, combined with our longstanding experience in administering public benefits for the City, place HRA in an ideal role to assist DHS by having an expanded role in the implementation of the client income contribution requirement for shelter residents who have earned income.

As Commissioner Hess mentioned, the City intends to institute an income contribution requirement for families with income in the family shelter system, as mandated in State law and regulations. Initially we approached the State Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance to hone our approach under State law and to include client contributions to restricted savings accounts. OTDA informed us our approach was not consistent with State law, and that we are required to follow the official State approach, as we do already in the domestic violence shelter system.

To assist in the development of a successful contribution program, DHS and HRA have

worked together to address the programmatic challenges of implementing the income contribution requirement. First, I want to take a step back and provide a context to the term family shelter system.

Much credit is due Commissioner

Hess for his accomplishments in transforming this system, making sure that children and families get the support they need in shelter, resulting in record placements back into the community. While in shelter, each family has their own unit, and almost all have access to cooking facilities.

Many have common areas and recreation space.

Through DHS contracted non-profit entities, they also have access to social services. DHS has calculated that the average length of stay in the family shelter system is currently eight and a half months and the average cost of shelter is \$100 a day, \$3,000 a month or \$36,000 a year.

Many of the families in this system are also eligible and receive cash assistance,

Medicaid, food stamps, childcare and other

government supports. For a family of three, the

monthly average food stamp benefit is

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

approximately \$394. Transitional childcare, monthly, is \$1,200 dollars. Cash assistance is \$321. And the average monthly cost for Medicaid coverage is \$1,356. If they have earned income, they will likely qualify for the federal, state and City refundable earned income tax credit, and potentially the federal and Empire State tax credit and New York City Childcare Credit, which are also refundable. For example, at the minimum, a mother of two children, earning \$13,195 per year, would receive approximately \$2,790 or \$233 per month in food stamp benefits, and \$6,507 in EITC benefits, more than \$4,800 in federal EITC, more than \$1,400 in state EITC and more than \$240 in City EITC. This is an additional \$9,303 in income.

I want to be very clear, that this income contribution requirement applies to a very small percentage of the family shelter systems. Those with no income are not being asked to contribute. Those families with very minimal income are also not being asked to contribute. This requirement is only likely to apply to approximately 15% of shelter clients, those who

have employment income over a certain level,

depending on family size, but approximately \$9,000

a year for a family of three. Under the state

formula, a significant percentage of income that

falls below the poverty line is not factored into

the contribution calculation. As a result, in

many cases, those with incomes below the poverty

line may pay only a modest percentage of income

towards shelter costs. As income rises above the

poverty line, the contribution as a percentage of

income increases.

For example, the family I just described, who has more than \$1,300 in annual earnings and \$9,303 in government benefits, would pay \$120 per month. They're being asked to contribute a significantly lower percentage of their income towards housing costs than most New Yorkers pay. In fact, between shelter costs and adding in just the food stamp and the EITC benefits as described in the above example, this family is receiving at least \$45,000 a year in government provided benefits, while being required to contribute slightly more than \$1,400 annually towards shelter.

requirement will not interfere with a family's ability to move out of shelter. While the required contribution is a modest amount, the City pays moving expense, broker fees and rental deposits for shelter clients. As an example, for an apartment with a monthly rent of \$1,070, the City will pay the first month's rent, one month security deposit and one month rent towards broker's fee, equaling \$3,210, plus moving costs that average \$800, for a total of approximately \$4,000.

As Commissioner Hess has testified, the program will also pay ongoing rental costs for eligible families under the Advantage program.

Families who go to work are provided with substantial assistance to exit the shelter system, and the income contribution is not a barrier to their leaving shelter. All Path families will be given information that notifies them of the contribution requirement for eligible families with income. Those families with income entering the shelter system will receive material from HRA explaining the contribution. Monthly invoices

will be sent directly to the clients in the shelter, and they will be required to start making monthly contributions at the beginning of the second month after entering shelter. Presently, through this process, community providers will be alleviated of the burden of collecting the income contribution, and therefore will be held harmless from amounts uncollected.

Families subject to the requirement can contest the amount of contribution required through OTDA--through the OTDA fair hearing process. Clients who refuse to contribute will be subject to a sanction on a case by case basis, in accordance with the Department of Homeless Services Independent Living Plan. However, if they ultimately do not comply with their requirement, HRA will take its responsibility to hold clients accountable seriously, and will reach out directly to them to seek the contribution.

Before closing, I do want to reiterate the importance of this requirement on moving families towards self-sufficiency and out of shelter. It is one of the fundamental tenets of public assistance, that those receiving

2.0

2.3

assistance have the same responsibility towards
their own self-sufficiency, whether they are in
their communities or in the shelter. Thank you
and I look forward to your questions

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you,

Commissioner for your testimony. I have a couple
of questions, as do my colleagues. So I'll start
with Commissioner Hess. In your testimony, you
said DHS helped 18,000 households more into
housing with Advantage, and you continue to serve
14,580 people. I'm trying to understand if this
means that 3,420 are no longer receiving the
subsidy?

ROBERT HESS: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Are they still housed in the same apartments? Are they not requiring any other...?

ROBERT HESS: Chairwoman, once they have exhausted their benefit, we would not know whether they've stayed in the same apartment or moved to a different location. The only time we would come in contact with them would be for the small percentage that might sadly find their way back to the shelter system.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: I'm tryi	ing to
figure out if we're tracking these folks.	In your
testimony you also mentioned the hotline.	Would
that be a place where these folks would be	
calling?	

ROBERT HESS: We certainly get a percentage of folks that have exhausted their Advantage benefits that may go to HomeBase or call the helpline. And we are generally able to assist them in one way or another, and every circumstance, as you know, is very unique, and we have to deal with unique circumstances.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Right.

ROBERT HESS: But very few, relatively small percentage, of the Advantage clients have returned to shelter.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: So because there's no real tracking mechanism for these over 3,000 people; we wouldn't know if they're still in the same jobs, we would just have to wait.

ROBERT HESS: No. The only time that we track the jobs is at renewal. And so when they're moving towards the end of the first year, we receive certain information from them to know

2.0

2.3

2	whether they're working or not, and if they are
3	working, how many hours they're working and what
4	their current wages are. And so, all those
5	numbers have been very promising at the end of the
6	first year. But since the benefit is exhausted
7	after two years, we don't have any way to stay in
8	touch with them and collect similar data in the
9	out years.

10 CHAIRPERSON PALMA: And--

ROBERT HESS: (Interposing) Mr.

12 Doar may have--

ROBERT DOAR: (Interposing) Could I just add? The fact that they are no longer in the Advantage program does not necessarily mean that they are not receiving food stamp benefits perhaps or earned income tax credit--

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: (Interposing)
That was going to be my next question.

ROBERT DOAR: --or public health insurance. So the theory of the Advantage program was it was a way for folks to get stabilized in the community, to develop earnings history, so that they could then retain the housing without the ongoing assistance of a rental assistance

2.0

2.3

program after the second year. So to the extent
that we haven't seen them back in the shelter
system and we don't havethen it seems to me they
might be knitting together those various other
aspects of public assistance, plus earnings, and
are moving forward and staying further away from
the homeless system.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: so when they go to HRA they may be asked, or they may disclose that they were in Advantage and then they--

ROBERT DOAR: (Interposing) well, that may come up. If it's after Advantage it wouldn't be necessary for them to tell us that. If it's during Advantage, I think in calculating the rent situation or in evaluating their public assistance situation, it might come up. But when you talk about whether there was a connection to the families necessarily, while there's not a DHS or Homeless Services connection, which I think we like--

ROBERT HESS: (Interposing) We're happy about that.

ROBERT DOAR: --there may be an ongoing public assistance relationship that HRA

25

2	has, either through public health insurance or
3	food stamps or… and then of course there is the
4	Earned Income Tax Credit which hopefully they are
5	applying for and receiving.
6	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: But HRA
7	wouldn't have a clear number or clear answer, if I
8	may, if the 3,420-so people are actually
9	ROBERT DOAR: Well, one of the
LO	issues we want to tackle going forward is
11	evaluating the Advantage program post assistance.
12	So we've not done a study that looked at public
L3	assistance received post-Advantage. It's a good
L4	suggestion. It's something we should look at.
15	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: I'm glad that
L6	you think it's a good suggestion. So I think we
L7	should get together and talk about it and see how
18	we can implement it.
L9	ROBERT DOAR: Yes, we should,
20	Chairwoman.
21	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Commissioner,
22	of the 80% of the Work Advantage participants, who
23	you stated demonstrated strong employment records

during the first year, I just want to get a better

understanding of what that actually means.

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

hour.

2	ROBERT HESS: What it means,
3	Chairwoman, is at the end of the first year,
4	during the renewal process, we were able to
5	determine that over 80% of our family head of
6	households were still workingwhich I think is
7	remarkable, frankly having looked at the results
8	of employment training programs in many cities for
9	many years. I've never seen any program achieve
10	this level of job retention at the end of a year,
11	even during these very difficult economic times
12	we've seen over 30 hours a week still being
13	worked. And if memory serves me correctly, the

average wages are between \$9.00 and \$10.00 an

difficult economic time. Hours and wages have

still gone up just a little bit.

Modest, but again, that's during a very

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: And do we know if there are any other benefits attached to these wages? Is it just simply income or does it come with a benefit--

ROBERT HESS: (Interposing) No, sadly, we don't know whether that might include things like health insurance or dental insurance or pension plans or those kinds of things.

2.0

2.3

frankly, did not ask those questions at recertification. At recertification we were trying to determine were the families still working and were they trying to grow their hours and grow their income in a way that if we gave them a second year of the benefit, that by the end of the second year they might be able to piece together the benefits they might be entitled to and their wages in a way that would help them remain in the community and not need to reenter the shelter system.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: And the participants in year one of the new Advantage New York program will, you said, will have to participate in the 15 hour housing searches or HRA work related activities. Again, you know, what does that exactly mean? Because if someone is already in an apartment, what constitutes housing searches for them?

ROBERT HESS: Well, no, I think the housing search component was mean to mean that once someone was working 20 hours a week, at minimum, and then spending up to 15 hours a week on a housing search or other work-related

And it's work, that they have employment. And the incentive to get and retain employment is quite strong, given the value of the housing assistance. I think that's one of the reasons why Commissioner Hess could credit a high rate of employment over other types of programs, because the benefit from

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

staying working is a quite substantial assistancein their housing payments.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Commissioner

Doar, I'm curious to know, when folks that are
eligible for the Advantage go through your working
programs, what is--you know, what are--the jobs,
are they readily available? What industry?

ROBERT DOAR: In the past year, as I testified at previous times, we've talked about this, in the past year we achieved about 75,000 total placements in employment last year, which was about the same as we achieved in the previous year. And we have quite a lot of, a high degree of placements from folks who are in the job center that is assigned to the DHS shelter system. for DHS placements alone, in 2009 we did 8,500. In 2008 we did 7,000. In 2007 we did 5,100. we have a targeted specialized job center that has very--because they are related to the DHS system and they are interested in Advantage, they have clients that are very focused on getting into employment, and as a result they have.

Now you asked about the quality of jobs, we're talking about \$8 an hour jobs.

2.0

They re not high wage jobs, but we have round ruck
in the health services business, in the retail
business and in social services and education.
Those have been the areas where we've had the most
luck, which is also indicated in the Citywide jobs
numbers. Those are areas that have not been as
badly hit by the recession. And in six-month
retentions have remained over 70% and 12-month
retentions have remained over 65%. So

ROBERT HESS: (Interposing) Those are citywide numbers?

ROBERT DOAR: I think those numbers are specifically for the East River population.

So, and again, we at HRA sort of deal with the economy that we're dealt with and the jobs that we can find. But then we're very focused on helping people remain attached to other work supports, like public health insurance and food stamps, childcare subsidies and the Earned Income Tax

Credit. So, it's the total value of that package that allows someone to remain in work. And then you add the housing assistance, and stay in their apartments.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: And for those

clients who do not possess the skills to be able
to, you know, move into an \$8, \$9, \$10 an hour job
because they require certain skills, is going to
school or a training program or workforce
development center considered as part of the work
activity?

ROBERT DOAR: We require a minimum of 20 hours of employment, and then they can get up to the 35 hours using the other kinds of activities that you talk about. But the expectation is a minimum of some employment, of 20 hours. And then at renewal it's 35 hours of employment.

And as you know, Councilwoman, there was a lot of talk in welfare policies, that folks applying for public assistance really weren't able or capable of securing jobs and staying in jobs. And our experience in HRA, or their experience, has been actually that they are and they've done better than anyone thought they would.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Commissioner
Hess, I want to ask, do you have a sense of the
clients in Advantage program, what their current

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: And do we know,

2.0

2.3

_						1 ^
2	rents	on	an	average	may	be?

			ROBER	ľΤ	HESS:		The	cur	re	nt	rent	on
an	average	is	about	\$	1,000	а	mont	th,	a	li	ttle	more
t.ha	an that.											

in which neighborhoods do the majority of the clients of Advantage New York, like are residing?

ROBERT HESS: Not by neighborhood,

Councilwoman. I will tell you that they're

literally all over the five boroughs, fewer in

Manhattan I would suspect. I would say Brooklyn

and the Bronx probably have the largest share, but
a significant number in Queens and a growing

number in Staten Island.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Do you think that's something that the Department in the future can look at in terms of, like, breaking down to get a better sense of where the majority of--

ROBERT HESS: (Interposing) Yeah, I think we have some better data on that, that we can share with you, and I'd be happy to do that.

I'm--sadly it's not in my head.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: I wouldn't expect it to be, but I welcome you sharing it with

2.0

the Committee or myself.

ROBERT HESS: Happy to do that.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: And in terms of the client contribution program, we understand that the City suggested the alternative contribution program to the State that would include a savings component, but the State rejected it. Does that mean that the City agrees that putting Earned Income towards savings is more productive than paying for shelter costs?

means, Councilwoman, is that we are open to some discussion and hope to have some productive discussion with the State legislature on this subject. I would like to think that, you know, reasonable minds having some more discussion on this subject could be productive.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: And I know that last year we tried to—when I say we, you know, the administration tried to implement sort of doing the client contribution program and had to pull back because of certain concerns, one being that the clients weren't properly notified. So I'm just wondering, you know, this time moving

2	forward, how are the clients being notified? How
3	are the formulas being worked that, you know,
4	which will determine how people make their
5	contributions? How will the contributions be
6	collected? Would it solely be on the HRA part
7	ROBERT DOAR: (Interposing) We have
8	looked at the issues of the last time and we feel
9	strongly that we are able to make the correct
10	calculations, provide the appropriate
11	notification. And then the one significant change
12	from what we intended to do in the past in
13	complying with this state requirement was that we
14	werewe've now changed the responsibility for
15	collecting from the providers of the shelter
16	system, and shifted it to HRA. And we think that
17	will make the process go more smoothly.
18	ROBERT HESS: I think the other
19	thing to note, Councilwoman, is this has been
20	announced this week, but I think we've said that
21	we would anticipate whatever we roll out to roll
22	out in the fall. So there is a fair amount of
23	time to prepare for properly the mechanics.
24	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Commissioner

Doar, I think almost towards the end of your

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testimony you mentioned that HRA would do whatever needs to be done to collect the contributions if any client is not in compliance. What does that mean? I mean I know that if, you know, if I don't pay rent to my landlord, I'll eventually face eviction. Is that, you know...?

ROBERT DOAR: Well, there are two issues there. One is that there's a sort of client responsibility requirement in the DHS system, and Commissioner Hess is more appropriate to address that system. And then there is our efforts to collect, and they would involve letters and notices and perhaps visits. And we feel that given the amount of the--and we're talking about people with income -- and people's desire to comply. I mean people, when they're told a rule is a rule, they generally comply. So we're hopeful that that will be the extent of what we need to do. not envisioning anything beyond a lot of notification and reaching out and talking to clients, plus the responsibilities that are inherent with being in the shelter system.

ROBERT HESS:

client responsibility, Councilwoman, as I thought

With respect to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about this, it seems to me that we first have to recognize that any client contribution plan, given the minimal or very modest incomes of families in shelter, probably at least 80% of families in shelter will never have to pay anything. So I think that's the first piece.

The second piece is, we're then narrowing in on, you know, somewhere between 15 and 20% of families that have pretty significant income that would be asked to pay a portion of their shelter cost. Now under that scenario, to the extent--I agree with Commissioner Doar. Most people will play by the rules and do what they need to do. If they're not paying, I don't view it as kind of like an eviction proceeding that a landlord might view it as a relationship with a I would view it more as kind of tenant. symptomatic of something else that might be going on within that family unit. And I would think that from a social work and casework perspective, we would have to view it that way and dig a little deeper and better understand kind of what's going on there and how can we help prepare that family for success and help them deal with whatever those

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

issues are. And that would have to be done, I think, on a very case by case basis. And so that would be my expectation as to how we would deal with that situation, should it occur at some point in time in the future.

ROBERT DOAR: And I would also add that the practice of paying or making a contribution or taking dollars out of your income and contributing towards rent is one of the practices that someone needs in order to live in the community outside of the shelter system. we're trying to inculcate that habit and that practice. Because that's what's going to happen even in the Advantage program that provides subsidies; they're going to have to make a contribution, which actually may be greater. So it's getting in the practice and establishing the expectation that the basis for success comes from personal initiative, in this case, at least the start; and then we'll help.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Implementing this contribution program now. I'm wondering; is there going to be any cost savings to the City at all through this implementation?

2.0

2.3

ROBERT DOAR: It's minimal, and
it's not the reason why we're interested in doing
it. It's not going to solve our budget
difficulties. I will assure you of that. And to
the extent that it's still a requirement, it will
allow us to avoid potential fiscal sanctions from
the state for not doing something that other
counties are doing

ROBERT HESS: And I would point out that we have already been penalized the amount of \$2.4 million by the State for not implementing the program up until now. \$2.4 million, that would be very helpful for a State legislator to get back for us. And so we have already incurred significant penalties as a result of our delay in implementation.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Commissioner, when you say that families earning a significant amount of income, significant amount being the same amount that Commissioner Doar mentioned in his testimony, of anyone earning \$9,000 or more?

ROBERT HESS: I believe that a family of three, for example, a family of three that is earning \$10,000 would have a contribution

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

income.

of something like \$36 a month. And then obviously
as folks earn more the contribution is greater.
Frankly, we have very few people living in the
shelter system that have, you know, significant

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: I probably have a couple of more questions, but I want to give my colleges the opportunity to ask some questions.

Council Member Van Bramer?

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Commissioners. Commissioner Doar, there's a line in your testimony that, with all due respect, struck me as a little unfair. And that is folks through this program would be asked to contribute a significantly lower percentage of their income towards housing costs than most New Yorkers. of course, we also know that most New Yorkers are not in the shelter system. And so I think comparing those who, for whatever tragic circumstances in their lives, have found themselves in the shelter system to those of us who are lucky enough not to be is completely unfair. And, you know, it's a bit of apples and

2.0

2.3

oranges.

What I think is the case, and you can certainly correct me if I'm wrong, is many people who find themselves in the shelter system have had significant traumatic events in their lives, whether it be domestic violence issues or substance abuse. And to have come to the system, for the most part, means they're the most vulnerable among us. Would you agree with...?

ROBERT HESS: I would actually,

Councilman, say to you that in my experience, the

number one reason that anyone enters the shelter

system is because they lack the economic means to

pay their bills in the community. And I would

suggest that many New Yorkers and in fact many

Americans have other issues as well, but if they

have the economic means, then their substance

abuse or their mental health difficulties or their

tragic involvement in domestic violence situations

does not cause them to enter a shelter system.

What causes them to enter a shelter system,

generally, in my opinion and experience, is a lack

of economic means.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: Sure.

But I would argue that those things are all related. And you don't simply get to be in a situation where you don't have money, you know, for no reasons. Often those things are related. And someone comes to that place having experienced a range of things in their lives that render them without funds and without the ability to pay rent and those sorts of things. So I just wanted to say that, and say that what you deem a pretty significant income, which you said in your testimony, I think you said it was, you know \$10,000 for a family of three. 

ROBERT HESS: I think what I was trying to address, Council Member, is that the vast majority, the overwhelming majority of families in our shelter system, have little or no income. And that \$10,000 would be on the significant side given the very, very little income that most families in the shelter system have. That said, I would never suggest that \$10,000 in income is the kind of income that we would hope families would have or wish families would have, or would pay the bills in New York City.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 ROBERT DOAR: And all I was saying, 3 with regard to this issue of the issues that bring 4 people to the shelter system, is that those issues that you talked about may be a factor, but this 5 policy is applied to those who are working, that 6

8

able to retain and keep a job and to have earning.

have--whatever those issues were, they were still

And then the other factor is, the resources available to them to get through their daily life is more than just the income from earnings. There's also the Earned Income Tax Credit and the Food Stamp benefits, childcare subsidies and the refundable tax credits I mentioned. So that's all we're trying to say; is again for those with no income and facing those problems and as a result have no income and no earnings, we're not charging. There's no charge. But if you have earnings and then as a result of those earnings you also have other resources, we think that you should get in the practice of contributing towards the cost of your shelter some amount.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: I mean, I think, you know a lot of the folks, and

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I certainly know some folks who have been in the shelter system, you know, at one time were in rental apartments and paying their rent just like the rest of us who are renters. And then for various reasons, unfortunately, got into a position where that changed and ultimately found themselves in the shelter system. And of course the goal is then to transition them back out of the system where they'll be paying rent again. And you know, I think again at this point where people have sort of hit, you know, rock bottom and are in need of a lot of the supportive services that you are providing, that allowing them to keep and hopefully save the very limited income that they do have seems like a better way of transitioning them to a better place where once they're lucky enough to get permanent housing, they'd be able to have a little bit of money for their families and for their children. You know, \$10,000, \$13,000 for a mother and three or four children is a very, very small amount of money to live with.

And I guess I wanted to talk a little bit about if they're unable to pay or they

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

don't pay, it seems to me particularly cruel if after having been homeless or having found shelter, and if they're not able to pay this rent, that somehow you would be evicted from a shelter and returned to the very status that got you there in the first place. And I know there will be review processes that you all have to work out, but is that how it would work? And doesn't that strike you as counterproductive?

ROBERT HESS: I think, and as I tried to explain earlier, my personal view on this is that most people will comply with the rules. For those that don't, my first reaction to that is it's not like we would address a landlord tenant situation and send a letter and go to court and create an eviction. It's to me symptomatic of something else that might be going on within that family, and I think we have to approach it from that perspective and have our caseworkers approach it from that perspective and try to better understand kind of what's going on and why that decision is being made, and how we can assist the family get to a better place.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: And I

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

2 think that's great, and I think having the holistic approach, you know, is terrific. But if 4 at the end of the day they don't pay their \$36, \$72, \$120, will you move to evict them from their 5 shelter?

ROBERT HESS: Every case will be unique. We'll approach every case on its own We probably will have some cases where merits. somebody may not pay and they may move out. And they certainly will be entitled to do that as well. Is it possible that there will be a case that despite all of our best efforts and despite all of the best casework and social work that we can do, and all of the support that we can provide, that someone has so disregarded this and other shelter requirements, that we may end up going down the client responsibility path? it's possible. Do I expect that that would happen in many cases? No, I don't.

COUNCIL MEMBER VAN BRAMER: So in those few cases that it does, then they're returned to the streets?

ROBERT HESS: Well, I don't know that that's true at all. That's not been the

majority of the cases that we've taken to client responsibility on the single adult side—have not ended up with that outcome. And in fact in some cases, just the fact of moving to sanction someone and they may then have legal representation, and that whole process creates a dialogue and discussion that often, I think, ends up in a resolution of the problem before an administrative law judge makes a determination.

And so, again, I think every case will be different and every case will have to be handled on its own merits.

right. You know I have great respect for the work that you both do, and obviously you have a level of expertise in these issues that I don't possess, but you know, but I do think that charging those in shelters rent is something that seems to me, you know, counter-intuitive and something that is not, along with a whole host of other services that you provide which I think are helpful in transitioning families to permanent housing, you know, this is definitely not one of them, in my opinion. And I certainly hope that over the next

2	several months, obviously you have until the fall
3	when you possibly might implement this, that we
4	can come up with better solutions. Thank you.
5	ROBERT HESS: Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you,
7	Council Member. Council Member White, followed by
8	Council Member Rodriguez, Lander and Brewer.
9	COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: Thank you
LO	very much, Madam Chairperson. What I'd like to
11	ask is, the 2,500 individuals or families who lost
12	Section 8, what actually happened to them?
13	ROBERT HESS: They aremost,
L4	Councilman, remain housed. We've sent letters to
L5	all of them, saying if their housing situation is
L6	at-risk, that they should call us and that we will
L7	provide what assistance we can through HomeBase
18	and through the vast array of resources available
L9	at HRA and Legal Services, contracts that we

We do know that 25 of those 2,582 I think, have ended up in the shelter system, and we're working to re-house those individuals as quickly as we can. The balance, of the balance, I think we've had about 100 that have come into

support and all the rest.

understanding of the voucher revocation was, was that these were pending vouchers to get apartments; they were not vouchers that were allowing them to afford the apartments they were

24

25

currently in. Is that the--

[Crosstalk]

4 ROBERT DOAR: --the originally

2,500 was—and so to the extent that they faced a housing crisis where whatever rental situation that they had in their situation led them to face an eviction potential, the availability of our eviction protection services, whether in the housing courts or at HRA offices was there, and they could have taken advantage of it. I have not received reports of the number of those particular cases.

COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: Okay. Well,
I can cite a number that have come to my office,
and they were on Section 8, and they called NYCHA
asking for direction, and NYCHA said don't call
us, we don't do that anymore, and hung up the
phone. And I hear the testimony of responsibility
about how certain systems are set up. It all
sounds good, but in practice it's not working that
way.

I also had someone come to my office who said that they were on the HRA, and--no, shelter. That they were given apartments, \$80

a day. I said—this was what was told to me, it doesn't make it true—\$80 a day on a lot of these apartments that are high—rises going up, that they have been allowed to live in those apartments that are priced at \$500,000 and above, for \$80 a day, in order that the landlord and the owner of these buildings, did not lose money entirely because they couldn't sell or rent the apartments. Do we have people in the shelter system living in some of these high—rise apartment buildings as families?

ROBERT HESS: We have--Councilman, we will be happy to follow up with your office and get the specifics of what you were told and investigate that. I can tell you that we do have a handful of failed condo buildings that have been offered to us at relatively modest cost, given the sale price or the rents that were anticipated when these properties were built. And that a couple of them, we are using as shelter. And frankly, I think it's a good temporary use of buildings that, but for our use, would be remaining vacant during these difficult economic times. And so, we're not paying more for them than we would pay for any

answer is yes.

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: Okay, so.

1	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 62
2	Madam Chair? Can we get a list of those
3	apartments, those buildings that are being used by
4	DHS and do a price comparison?
5	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: You're
6	requesting for the Department of Homeless Services
7	to provide the Committee
8	COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE:
9	[Interposing] Yes.
LO	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Yes.
11	COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: Can we have
L2	that, sir?
L3	ROBERT HESS: We can certainly
L4	provide that general information to the Committee,
15	yes.
L6	COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: Okay. The
L7	reason why I'm want to know, now I'm going to get
18	back to the modest amount of money that a family
L9	of three or four, if they're working, when they
20	reach a certain point they have to pay \$30, \$50,
21	\$100. And there seems to be, until I take a look
22	at it, something to look at in terms of someone
23	living in condo, who may be working, what would
24	they pay as opposed to a person living in a
25	shelter, making X amount of dollars?

2	ROBERT HESS: Council Member, the
3	failed condo buildings thatthe few failed condo
4	buildings that we're utilizing, we're utilizing as
5	shelter. And so they are shelters that have the
6	full range of services and supports that all of
7	our facilities have. And so, you know, in that
8	respect they're not different than our other
9	shelters in the system.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: No, you have
11	designated them as shelters.
12	ROBERT HESS: Yes.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: I understand
14	that. But the amenities of those particular
15	buildings are not the same kind of amenities that
16	you have in all the shelters, is what I'm saying.
17	Am I correct?
18	ROBERT HESS: That's fair.
19	COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: Okay. So
20	that's why I was just asking that question. But
21	I'm very much concerned about the gap between the

that's why I was just asking that question. But
I'm very much concerned about the gap between the
people who no longer have Section 8, the people
who have a limited stay on the Advantage program,
and the gap between your agency and your agency,
in terms of you don't know how many, because you

do not keep track of that, of how many people that were dropped from him that came over to you. You said that you don't ask that question, I believe you said.

ROBERT DOAR: But I do know that we do significant efforts in eviction protection services, and we do significant interest in rental assistance and arrears payments; and I can report that to you. We can gather a report on the amount of work that we do every day in an effort to help people retain their housing. And I'm proud of that work, and I think it's good work. And I think it's helping people stay out of the shelters and retain their homes. So I do know that. Now how many of them are this particular population? We'll see what data we can find. But we are not—we are available to them, just as we are available to others that face housing difficulties.

COUNCIL MEMBER WHITE: I understand that, and you've answered my question. And--not having that information, I would strongly suggest that that be part of the intake questionnaire of individuals seeking assistance, so that that could be one of the questions. And you would

apartments; but I'm a strong believer that these

25

2.0

2.3

apartments are sitting there vacant and they will probably sit there vacant for many more years to come, and so--

ROBERT HESS: [Interposing] It's a good question, Chairwoman. That's always our first approach. If we can find a building, a failed condo that's vacant, that the landlord would accept as an Advantage apartment building, we would offer it to Advantage clients first, because we would prefer it to be permanent housing. But in the cases where a landlord will not agree to that, but offers us the building in a way that makes sense for shelter, we have to seriously consider those buildings; we are using a number of them. But permanent housing is always our first and best use if we can convince a landlord to allow us to do that.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you.

Council Member Rodriguez.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Thank you, Commissioner. How much is the budget reduction that the City has proposed by the administration that you will have for the 2010-2011 for the Homeless Services?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ROBERT HESS: In Homeless Services, all of our capacity is legally mandated and therefore is funded. So whatever our capacity needs are, our capacity needs will be funded and

we will meet the demand.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: So, in the administration proposed in the budget for 2010-2011, there is not any cut on Homeless Services?

ROBERT HESS: As you recall from the budget hearing, this happens every year at the budget hearing, in the original budget, our capacity needs are never fully recognized in the original budget proposal. And that's true this year as well. So although it looks like in the budget that there's been a reduction, it's only because, as in every other year, our full capacity needs have not been recognized in the budget. But, because we live in a city with a right to shelter, we will receive the funding that we need to provide the housing resources necessary to shelter everyone that comes to us. And so our shelter will be adjusted as necessary to make that happen.

many? 7,500 families, and so 15% if I--I'll do the rough math, please forgive me, I think would be about 1,000 of the 7,500 families would have some contribution under the current plan.

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: Commissioner, you said that a family of three--how much is the income you said, the average, they have?

2	ROBERT DOAR: There are various
3	scenarios. But a family of three, for instance,
4	was making \$7.25 an hour and working part time,
5	say 25 hours; they would have\$7,500 in gross
6	earnings. They'd get \$3,100 in food stamp
7	benefits. They would receive transitional
8	childcare and Medicaid support for their health
9	insurance coverage. They would be eligible for
10	\$4,400 in the Earned Income Tax Credit benefits.
11	And, that family I just described, because they
12	fall below the minimum income requirement on
13	earnings in the program we're implementing would
14	pay nothing.
15	But a family that say, same wage,
16	working full time, now is making \$13,000 a year,
17	they would get \$27,000 in food stamp benefits.
18	They'd be covered by Medicaid, they'd have

they would get \$27,000 in food stamp benefits.

They'd be covered by Medicaid, they'd have childcare. They'd get an EITC benefit of \$6,500.

So their total, sort of cash, or spendable income, would be more than \$22,000. And they'd pay \$120.

So then, you go another way. \$10 an hour, working full time, they're earnings are now \$18,200. They're still eligible for food stamp benefits of more than \$2,000 a year, still

eligible for Medicaid coverage. They still get an EITC of more than \$5,800. So they also have cash, disposable dollars in their pocket. And their contribution would be \$368, monthly. So, it varies by income level. And when we look at it we think it's fair to look at it in the entire picture, the entire picture, not just of earnings but of supports that are tied to low income earners. And that's not even factoring into account the \$36,000 a year cost in shelter costs.

COUNCIL MEMBER RODRIGUEZ: I just would like to end saying that even a family making \$45,000 a year, we all--when we combine all the services that they get, extra income, they are struggling to survive. And I've got to tell you that in this City, especially like in the working class community, living with a \$45,000 or \$60,000 when people pay their rents and they have to spend for services that they need for their children and any other school expenses, any other medical expenses that they also have--I believe that this could be a good initiative, probably for a new administration. After four years, I would say probably we're going to be in a better economic

time, but I believe that as we are also looking at ways of how we incentive our economy, I don't think that this is a good initiative right now.

ROBERT DOAR: Well, Councilman the family that you described, making that income, you're absolutely right. They are struggling in New York City; it's a tough place t live at those incomes. But that family is not actually likely to be in the shelter system. I mean that kind of income is not very frequent.

Sorry, this is my last thing. I agree with you, that they are not the same as living in shelter. But you know what? I'm pretty sure that those families, they don't have the money to have their child going to one of the programs; the family can't have the child in Chelsea Piers in sports, in cultural programs. They don't have the money to bring the children to movies. They don't have the money to bring their children to see a play on Broadway. They don't. Thank you.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Thanks,

Madam Chair, and thanks Commissioners Hess and

Doar for being here with us today. My six year

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

old daughter, Rose, and I, are reading the American Girl doll series of books. We're working our way through the series, and we're currently reading about a girl named Kit, whose family lives in the Great Depression. And the father has lost his job, he was a salesman. And they've had to take in boarders; they've gone on relief, and you know, they're within inches of losing their home; they can't pay their electric bill, you know. so, in the recent chapters, they've been doing everything they possibly can to scrimp and save. Kit, who is eight or nine, has gone to work. She's volunteering to get some little income from her uncle; they're gardening the front and back, everything they can possibly do to scrimp and save every penny to pay that next electricity bill, to pay the mortgage in their case, every penny. So it's all about what they're doing to save to prevent themselves from being homeless.

So last night, I said to my daughter Rose, Mayor Bloomberg is proposing that homeless people have to pay rent in the shelter system. And she said, Daddy, that makes no sense; they have to be saving, right? Kit's family is

2.0

2.3

saving; they are saving every penny they possibly
can for their housing. And I guess, before I get
to some numbers, my simple question for you is,
isn't she right? Shouldn't we be encouraging
every one of those families to save every penny
they can, and not take money that they're earning
working for jobs that pay \$7.25 an hour to give to
either the City or the State?

ROBERT DOAR: I would hate,

Councilman, I would just hate to ever disagree

with your daughter. I want to be clear about

that--

## COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER:

[Interposing] So help me explain to her why she's wrong and you're right?

ROBERT DOAR: --or in any way imply that she does not have, you know, brilliant thinking on these issues.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I'm not sure that's brilliance.

ROBERT DOAR: But, the family you described, first of all, is in a different period, in a different time set, and a different array of government assistance program. And what they are

2.0

2.3

2	doing, the family you described, is trying to
3	address their issues. And that's what we're
4	trying to do with the income contribution as well,
5	is to try to get folks in the habit of making a
6	contribution from themselves to support their
7	housing. That's one.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So why wouldn't that be better as a savings contribution towards future housing expense?

ROBERT DOAR: And two; we did propose, we asked the State, we are interested in a savings component. But that was not accepted as a possible way of doing it. So we're open to discussion about a savings component, but I do want to just say that we're trying to encourage—we found at HRA that if we encourage and require personal responsibility and then support that, it happens. And that's what this contribution requirement is about.

ROBERT HESS: So Councilman, I think, I think that it would really be very, very helpful, very helpful, if I could have the opportunity to spend a little time with your daughter before the next hearing. I think it

would much better prepare us--

## COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER:

[Interposing] I think it might be helpful too.

ROBERT HESS: --for the hearing.

That said, what Commissioner Doar said is correct. Our initial request to the State included a savings component. We've said a couple times today that we are open to and look forward to a discussion with our State legislators about how we might move forward with something that included a savings component. In the meantime, I think we can't lose sight of the fact that we have been fined \$2.4 million. I mean, that's real.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So if there were an arrangement with our State legislators and our governor, where there was no fine for the City, where you were allowed to set up some savings contribution, hopefully a match savings contribution program of some kind that could be used toward housing expenses when people move out of the shelter, and that included the State resources that are needed for the shelter system, would you agree, as part of that agreement, to take off the table charging people rent for being

10 COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okav.

those negotiations might be now.

Well--11

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

ROBERT DOAR: [Interposing] I should also say that until the law changes, we can't take it off the table. So they would need to change the law.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I'm in favor of changing the law, as Senator Squadron and Assemblyman Wright have introduced, to change the law so that the City is not allowed to charge rent for homelessness. If that can be worked out in a way that involves a match savings program, I think that would be fantastic. And if you guys could help contribute to that--

ROBERT HESS: [Interposing] But Councilman, to be fair--

2.0

2				COUNCIL	MEME	BER	LANDE	:R:	out	come	,
3	and	help	the	governor	come	to	that	as	well,	I	

4 | think that would be great.

ROBERT HESS: Councilman, to be fair, there is no bill out there now that includes a savings component. We offered the idea up. It seems to be beginning to get some traction. We are open to that discussion. I think some discussions may have already started, and we're certainly looking forward to continuing that process.

But, to Commissioner Doar's point, until the State law is different than it is today, we're faced with the reality of today.

that's helpful. I mean I think we'd be glad, I don't want to speak for any others, I'm glad to-we stood out this morning on the steps with
Senator Squadron; I talked to Assemblyman Wright
yesterday. My sense is they also want to reach a situation that works for everyone. And I think if we could reach a solution that took off the table rent for homelessness and instead moved to a savings contribution program, and have the State

2.0

2.3

stop fining us, that that would be a good place to
end this discussion. I would be glad to take this
back to them.
ROBERT HESS: I hope we include in

ROBERT HESS: I hope we include in any discussion the State returning the \$2.4 million it took them.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I'm for every penny we can get from the State, that's for sure.

ROBERT DOAR: So are we.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay, thank you. Just a couple of questions on the details, then I'll--I have a few more actually on Advantage and on the Section 8 families, but let me finish on the rent for shelter and then I'll yield to Gale, and then come back and ask those second time around.

I just want to--I have to say that I find the throwing around of public benefit numbers in order to inflate income a little mystifying. So for this family earning \$13,195, and you get them up to \$45,000, how much of that is Medicaid?

ROBERT DOAR: The value of

1	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 80
2	Medicaidthe cost of Medicaid for health
3	insurance for that family is \$16,272.
4	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay. So
5	that's a lot of money; that's more than they're
6	making. That's of no use toI mean it's good
7	they have health insurance
8	ROBERT DOAR: [Interposing] It's
9	not disposable income.
10	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: right. But
11	I mean it's not…
12	ROBERT DOAR: It isn't. Yeah.
13	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And how
14	much is childcare assistance?
15	ROBERT DOAR: \$9,900.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay.
17	Again, an important subsidy and I'm glad it's
18	being provided. But it seems to me that the
19	fundamental, and I agree entirely with what
20	Commissioner Hess said, the reason that folks are
21	in the shelter system is because there's a
22	mismatch between their income and the cost of
23	rent. Right? And so to me that's the thing to be
24	looking at. How much can a family afford to be
25	spending on rent? So, you know, somebody earning

\$13,195, if you take 30% of their income, they can afford about \$300 in rent, which is why they're in the shelter. So if our goal is to get them back in an apartment, I still don't get how we're helping them get back in an apartment by keeping some of their money?

establishing a pattern of personal responsibility, and I think that the issue you describe with regard to the cost of rent, that's still going to be there when they leave the shelter. I don't see any hope for that tomorrow. We want people to understand that there is an aspect of affording your rent that is part of their own contribution.

that if that family is really, if that mother, assuming it's a mother, is working 35 hours a week for \$7.25 an hour, boy she is illustrating responsibility. So she's in the shelter because she could not find a place to live for \$300 a month in the City of New York, not because there's a bad pattern of personal responsibility in play.

And let me go to then the \$25,000 family. This is the one I really need some help

2.0

2.3

on. The Timesyou haven't spoken to thisbut
yesterday's Times article says that a family
earning \$25,000 would be asked to pay \$926 a
month. And by my calculation, that's 44% of their
income. That 30% of that family's income, what we
would charge them on Section 8, is \$625. Again,
they'd have a hard time finding an apartment in
New York for \$625, even earning \$25,000. But I
thinkmaybe The Times was mistakenbut you're
going to charge them \$926 or 44% of their income.

ROBERT DOAR: That is what the State law requires. And we also in our discussions with the State asked if we could vary to a flat rate that would avoid that kind of payment in that circumstance, and that's also outside of the parameters of the statute. So I think that quotation is correct, and it is what is done, or applied in shelter situations around the State. Not in New York City, because we don't do it. But that's--

## COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER:

[Interposing] Don't you think it's wrong, though, to charge them 44% of their income for rent?

25 ROBERT DOAR: We asked the State if

2.0

we could do it a different way. We're under negotiations with the State with regard to changing the legislation, and I'll leave it at that.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay.

Thank you. All right. And my final question on rent for shelter just comes back to this final question on what happens if somebody doesn't and you move through a process of conversation. And I guess I've been wondering whether, and again, I hope this never happens. I hope we reach an agreement that we never wind up charging rent for shelter, so we never have to move the legal process through. But if we do, understanding that you don't want to see it as a housing court process, would you still agree to give shelter eviction notices to both households and to Legal Aid or some legal representative to make sure that their rights are protected in that process?

ROBERT HESS: We have a rather rigorous process. And I believe that there is a variety of information on the--as I recall the back of certain of our forms that give people options to call if they seek representation, and

that's fine. And so, again, I don't see evicting people like a landlord tenant arrangement. What I see is a symptomatic issue that we'll do our best to resolve. But at the end of the date, if you take it out through the old processes, is there a possibility of a sanction? In, I suspect, relatively few cases, that is possible. As they get before - - fair hearing and along the way, is there an opportunity to be represented? And the answer is yes.

by saying, respectfully, if you don't want to--if you want to charge them rent I think you ought to step up to the responsibilities, the legal responsibilities, of being a landlord. And if you don't want to treat it as a landlord tenant situation, then you shouldn't charge them rent.

So, thank you for coming again. I'll yield to Gale. I have a few more questions on Advantage, which I appreciate all the details you provided and would like to ask some more specifics about in a minute.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you,
Council Member. Council Member Brewer?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you.
3 I know that you're both tired of this issue of

contributions for rent, but it makes everybody so crazy. And I would venture to say, I happen to know that half the people in the Mayor's office think it's insane; and I bet half of your staff thinks it's insane, if not everybody. In fact, I know most of your staff, and they think it's insane. So my question is you're negotiating something. And I understand that we can't know the negotiations. And I assume by the fall we won't be having these conversations and there will be a change. But when Michelle Goldstein was head of your legislative office, she wrote a memo in opposition to this concept. Now, is Micah Lasher, the new Michelle Goldstein, writing a program in support of bills that would move the State from this insane idea to savings accounts? Is that something that you have actually put your stamp of approval on?

This is a piece of paper that says we are opposed to the Wright Squadron legislation.

ROBERT DOAR: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: But what

2.0

2.3

2	position.	The	other	questionsince	I	have	his
3	home email						

The other question I have is regarding the numbers of people who come through the system who might be members of the NYCHA community, in other words living in NYCHA housing now and end up in your system. I mention that, I know it's not something that's specifically on the agenda, but that's a group of people that we're trying really hard to keep out of the DHS system.

ROBERT HESS: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: So I'm just wondering, how that fits in to all of this, if you know how many?

ROBERT HESS: I do not. We would have to--we'll look into that and have to get back to you.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay.

ROBERT HESS: I can tell you that you're right. There historically has been, you know, a significant number of folks that sadly have come from the public housing into the shelter system for a variety of reasons. And you're right, that everything we can do to minimize that

2.0

is obviously in the best interests of the families and our best interests.

council Member Brewer: Okay. The other--I know that Council Member Lander talked about Medicaid, which is not income, childcare which is not--the broker's fees. How many--you mentioned that as part of what is the package.

But I'm wondering, do many of the persons who are leaving shelter to go to permanent housing, hopefully, do they have to pay a broker fee, or are you in direct contact with the owners and that's not necessarily something that is really a part of that package?

ROBERT HESS: It's a combination.

In many cases we do receive apartments through brokers, and we do pay the brokers' fees for the families.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay. When it's given such a large number as what the families get as a reason why they need to be paying into some kind of rent, it does seem to me that it's a bit of an exaggeration. Because I know a lot of families that the owner and DHS are in negotiation and there isn't a broker's fee, so

2.0

many.

I'll just throw that out.

ROBERT HESS: To the extent that there is no broker's fee, then obviously none is paid. But to the extent that there is a broker's fee, we do pay it on behalf of the family.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Okay. And then I think you mentioned in your testimony, I think it was, you know, a small number of families are coming back--not many, you're working really hard with HomeBase and other opportunities to not return. I think it was 25--some number like 25.

ROBERT HESS: 25 out of the 2,582.

Correct.

Okay. So, what in the future do you think you need to do to try to get that number to zero?

Because obviously one family is one family too

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER:

ROBERT HESS: A great question.

And, you know, we think that we've got a pretty strong array of potential services between

HomeBase and HRA and Legal Services and all the rest. However, for this specific group we also created the flex fund of \$1 million to be able to support families that lost their vouchers, that

are about to become homeless, if none of the other existing systems' funding streams can support them. And so we created yet another one to kind of catch, kind of a final safety net. It's been used modestly so far, but it's early. Right? We only sent the letters out to the 2,582 what, a month ago? But, you know, we've received contact from about 100 of those families. 13 of them have actually received funding out of the flex fund, because they did have a unique situation that other funding sources couldn't support them with. So we used the flex fund for that purpose and will continue to do that.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Now one of the great aspects of HRA are the staff who work in the One Shot office. They are phenomenal. We talk to them all day long, and they are responsive, and they work as hard as they can. You always need a third party there, obviously, in order to get a One Shot. So is the fact that some families don't have a third party when they're about to be evicted a challenge in terms of keeping them in their homes? Because I do think that some of the folks who end up in the shelter

2	system areHRA has done everything possible to
3	keep them out of the shelter system, to keep them
4	in their apartment, but the lack of that third
5	party is sometimes a challengein other words
6	there's nobody to guarantee the rent into the
7	future. And I mention that because if some of
8	this flex fund or other kinds of funding can be
9	used as a third party, I don't know.
10	ROBERT HESS: Do you have a little
11	experience on this personally, Council Member?
12	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: I know one
13	person, but there's about ten every day that we
14	try to work with HRA on.
15	ROBERT DOAR: Well, I appreciate
16	your compliments to my staff. The two leaders of
17	that unit, Mark and Rick, are here
18	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER:
19	[Interposing] We love them.
20	ROBERT DOAR:they are great
21	public servants.
22	COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: They
23	certainly are.
24	ROBERT DOAR: And with regard to
25	the third party, I'll look into that.

alternative PEG or what's going to happen?

before now. We may have just alerted OMB, so by

ROBERT HESS: It hasn't come up

23

24

25

	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 9
2	the time I get back to the office I might have to
3	deal with that.
4	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Okay.
5	ROBERT HESS: Thank you, Madam
6	Chair. It hasn't come up as of now.
7	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: So I helped
8	OMB; okay. I'm glad it hasn't come up. So we
9	shouldn't have OMB
10	ROBERT HESS: [Interposing] Molly
11	gave you that question. Ask her not to do that
12	again.
13	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Some quick
14	questions on short term rental assistance. Under
15	what circumstances is short term rental assistance
16	provided, and like, who is eligible? I don't know
17	if you answered that.
18	ROBERT HESS: Yeah, the short term
19	rental assistance component of the current
	Advantage package, we have not requested to
20	
20	extend. So we don't see that as part of the new
	extend. So we don't see that as part of the new Advantage program, largely because it was very,
21	

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Yeah.

ROBERT HESS: But, you remember initially it was the first part of the Advantage program that we rolled out. And the first summer I think we had 300 or 400 families that had moved out on short term Advantage. Since then, once the full array of Advantage programs were rolled out, I think that almost no one took us up on the offer of the short term Advantage. And so we did not request to continue that moving forward.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: But under the HomeBase program.

ROBERT HESS: Oh, the HomeBase program. Under HomeBase, to the extent that there is a plan for a family to be able to afford the rent after a period of time--I think the example that I gave in the testimony, Ms. W, is one of those situations where she has a number of months to go in her current lease and we're working with her in a variety of ways to be able to increase her income. And we'll provide her a financial short term subsidy to get to the end of the lease. And then if she has a plan where she can afford the current rent in place, if not, we'll help her find another apartment at a lower rent, that she

1	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 9
2	will be able to meet her ongoing obligations.
3	Under that kind of scenario, we will provide a
4	short term rental subsidy, and we are, through
5	HomeBase. I'm sorry? So far, we have spent about
6	\$2 million this fiscal year in that kind of
7	assistance.
8	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: So, you would
9	say, you know, maybe cap thatif someone needs
10	help up to six months, but not going over the six
11	months?
12	ROBERT HESS: It's case by case.
13	It can go longer than six months. I don't think
14	it often does.
15	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Okay. And the
16	HRP funds being used for the rental subsidies
17	ROBERT HESS: [Interposing] Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: These are the
19	only funds that are being used for that? There
20	are no other funds?
21	ROBERT HESS: No, it's a mixture.
22	You know, HUD had an opportunity to really use the
23	stimulus money in a very flexible way. Sadly
24	we're grateful for the money and very appreciative

that we're able to use it the way we're able to

23

24

25

2	use itbut it did come with a fair amount of
3	strings attached and reporting requirements and
4	regulation associated with it. And so we have to
5	kind of blend money and figure out what we can
6	appropriately spend the stimulus money on. And if
7	we make expenditures that don't fit exactly into
8	that kind of box, then we have to use other funds
9	that are appropriate for whatever that
10	expenditures is. So it gets a little complicated,
11	but the answer is that the bulk of our prevention
12	activities are currently funded using stimulus
13	dollars.
14	CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Okay. And then
15	one last request I have is, can DHS partner up
16	with HRA to conduct a data match for any of the
17	clients who are using the eviction prevention
18	services and HomeBase services after the two-year
19	program mark has come to an end?
20	ROBERT HESS: We can certainly look

ROBERT HESS: We can certainly look at that.

22 ROBERT DOAR: Right.

ROBERT HESS: We're happy to provide data and work with HRA. I will say that in my experience, the relationship between DHS and

2.0

2.3

HRA has grown by leaps and bounds over the last
number of years. And really it's daily
communication and daily coordination between the
agency in a way that I think we can be proud of.
So these kinds of requests are fairly routine now,
whereas once they may not have been.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Great.

I want to ask a few questions about the proposed changes to Advantage. So, first--and some of this is as a result of taking a look at the Advantage report that you guys produced in March 2009, so maybe there's more updated data, but that's what we were able to have. And you mentioned this earlier. I think your median Advantage participant is working 32 hours per week.

ROBERT HESS: It actually dropped a little bit in the last year from I think 32 to about 30.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: But the new requirements would require that people work 35 hours a week. So does that mean essentially that half of current Advantage participants would be ineligible or violating the rules of the program?

9

11

18

ROBERT HESS: No, the current

3 advantage participants, as we see it, will

4 continue under essentially the same rules that

5 they're under now. When the program starts, we

6 think July 1st, the new participants would have to

7 be working at least 20 hours a week when they

8 leave shelter, and at the renewal point, which

would be a year out, would have to be at the 35

10 hour mark.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I mean,

don't you think they're working the number of

13 hours they can get from their employers, and it's

14 their employers that are setting their hours more

than it's their choice to work? You know, so many

16 employers, unfortunately, keep people at or below

17 | 35 to deny them benefits, a whole range of

reasons. So if people are working, you know, as

19 full time a set of hours that they can get from

20 their employers, you know, which your numbers

21 suggest they are, but falling short of 35--I guess

22 I'd ask you to look again at whether it really

23 makes sense to require 35 even in that second year

24 for a cutoff. They're not the one setting their

own hours, so.

25

_	COMMITTED ON CHINERIE WEELTING 191
2	ROBERT HESS: I think we won't know
3	until we set out the expectation and we measure
4	the results.
5	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: You think
6	it's the expectationI mean you think they're
7	setting their own hours, sufficient that if they
8	want to work 35 they could get it.
9	ROBERT HESS: I don't have an
10	opinion on what people are currently doing. We
11	know what the facts are in terms of the number of
12	hours that they're working and the wages and so
13	forth. And we know that they've made great
14	progress from when they left shelter. And we
15	think that's very promising.
16	ROBERT DOAR: And it's a work based
17	program that intends to incentivize and require
18	work so that at the end of the second year they
19	can afford the rent that they are going to have to
20	pay. And to that extent, the more work they're
21	doing, the greater their income and the greater
22	their ability to afford that rent.
23	COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Although

there's a big difference between an incentive

based program and the one that says if you aren't

working 35 hours, then you're not eligible for the program entirely; and even if your employer systematically keeps people at 30, 32, 33 hours, you're out of luck. So I guess I'd ask you to take that into consideration and figure it out before you wind up cutting people off who are working just as many hours as they can possibly get.

The same report said that basically of the Advantage universe, only 19% met Work

Advantage requirements, and then another 17% met

Children Advantage or Fixed Advantage. And so I

want to understand the universe of people who are

being essentially moved into these work

requirements and what you think they're doing

today and why you believe the new program will

make them able to work where they aren't now?

ROBERT DOAR: Well on the Fixed

Advantage, the issue was there were children-household members who were not on SSI, who could
work, and were not being required to work in order
to achieve the benefit. And we felt that we ought
to--they're able to work, they're not on SSI,
they're not being required at home to care for an

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SSI child or family member, we ought to require the--to tie the program more to work and the importance of work. And so that was one requirement. And the Children's, it was also our determination that the mere existence of an ACS case did not necessarily mean that the adults in the household were not able to work and couldn't work and weren't working. And so we felt that we ought to, again, make the program as tied to the importance of employment as possible. And that's why both those changes were made. And there are some--I don't know the numbers off the top of my head, perhaps Mr. Hess does, but there are cases that were once eligible for one or the other of those two, and now will only be eligible if they achieve the work expectation.

about someone who, you know, with an adult who is able to work, but has another member of their household who requires a very high level of care or assistance, even if that--

ROBERT DOAR: [Interposing] I think there is an exception with regard to--that we have already an HRA policy--if the need is such that

month or more or less, right? ROBERT HESS: Yes.

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: But that the average income of the families, at least as I have it, is about \$1,300 a month.

ROBERT DOAR: Yes.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: So in that second year, I mean even for the average family, not somebody who is paying a particularly high amount of rent, they're going to be required to pay \$500 a month for their rent, you know, which is, I don't know, probably closing in on 40, 40 plus percent of their income.

ROBERT DOAR: The expectation of the program and of the State regulatory framework that we're in is that it's a short term program. This is not a lifetime commitment to pay the difference between their income and their rental obligation. So we are trying to make it clear, you know, we are concerned about the cliff at the end of two years. So we're trying to make it clear that clients who receive the benefit need to work and or receive other, you know, maybe other contributors to the rent in the household, so they can afford the rent on a go-forward basis.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Okay. I

2	mean again, that feels to me like it implies that
3	the reason that they're going to be homeless is a
4	lack of responsibility as opposed to a lack of
5	ability to afford the rent. I mean, certainly
6	that familyand let's talk about after the cliff.
7	This is not a problem of your making or their
8	making. So they reach the end of two years.
9	They're still making \$1,300 a month, and now
10	they're supposed to pay \$1,000 a month for rent,
11	right? I mean that's what would naturally happen
12	in the average case here. It's impossible. It's
13	not a question of personal responsibility. They
14	can't pay \$1,000 a month out of \$1,300 income.
15	ROBERT DOAR: There are limitations
16	to the extent to which we can create a City funded
17	or State funded rental assistance program. There
18	are limitations to what we can do and what we can
19	afford, and we have to acknowledge that. So we're
20	trying to target it and require expectations that
21	will allow us to be short term in nature.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I'm just afraid that's what's actually going to happen, even if we hope it won't. It was my understanding

Otherwise, this program will swamp us completely.

2	that obviously one goal was for that exact family
3	that I'm talking about, that let's say they're
4	working with HomeBase, they're doing everything
5	they can, but they can't get a better job.
6	They're making that \$1,300 a month. You've helped
7	them find a \$1,000 a month apartment. That's the
8	average case. That's, as I understand it, the
9	exact, typical case. It's not an outlier. We're
10	in trouble if that's the Advantage caseload and we
11	don't have a Section 8 certificates at the end of
12	that two-year period. So this is notand leaving
13	aside whether the changes are good or bad or
14	whether the policy is good or bad, if that's the
15	typical advantage case, aren't we in fact headed,
16	as a City, for a cliff when the HPRP funds run out
17	and we don't have any more Section 8 certificates?
18	ROBERT DOAR: That's one of the
19	reasons why we wanted to make a change and make it
20	more focused on work requirements and more
21	targeted, as opposed to leaving it the way it
22	currently is, which is the similar circumstances
23	you're describing. That's true today. And I also
24	should point out that both in the previously

existing Jiggetts program and in family eviction

protection program, where we do make an effort to help people stay in apartments that may not be exactly commensurate with their income, but that has not--once they get settled and transitioned--that not has resulted in people remaining in those programs year after year, after year, after year. They do find other resources, perhaps find other housing, and they do not necessarily come back to the shelter. And we have that same hope and expectation here.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And I hope you're right and I'm wrong. But I'm just looking at the typical—the information that you've given us, and it leads me to be very afraid for what will happen at the end of this time. When I first asked these questions of Commissioner Hess a few months ago, it was my understanding that there would be some Section 8 certificates to help us out of that, but that's seems like an entirely unrealistic expectation now. Boy, I hope you're right, but it seems to me that we're going to be very likely back here with a significant new problem.

But let me ask Commissioner Hess a

couple of more questions then, and let you off the hook for a minute. Just, my final questions are back on this question of the revoked Section 8s, and I appreciate you're giving us an update on the flex fund, and I'm glad a few people have been able to take advantage of that.

It's my understanding that DHS was willing to do what this Council had asked you to look into last time, and is considering doing legislatively, which is to refer people to NYCHA, so that they would be top priority on the NYCHA waiting list, which is fully within the DHS power, but that NYCHA doesn't want you to, essentially. And I'm concerned about a lack of coordination between DHS and NYCHA, which I think runs the risk of being much worse, again, if they decide to just yank another 10,000—if it's fully within their power, without consulting with you to pull 10,000 Section 8 certificates, you're going to have a lot of families at your door.

ROBERT HESS: It appears that the situation at NYCHA with respect to Section 8 generally is still a little fluid. I know that they outlined some kind of worst case scenario

that they might have to go through. I think they're still grappling with that. I don't think that the issue of the 2,582 lost voucher holders has been completely resolved. I'm not aware that anything has been taken completely off the table at this point. I think it's still a fairly fluid situation. And so, we have a lot of dialogue with NYCHA. We will continue to have that dialogue. This is an issue that the administration remains concerned about. I think we all want to figure out how to get the Section 8 spigot turned back on as soon as possible. I haven't heard anyone opposed to that.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: 100%.

ROBERT HESS: And so, I think we'll all work toward that ultimate goal. But it feels to me like NYCHA is still kind of reviewing their internal situation and the impact that this is really having and what's going to be necessary. But again, I'm not aware of anything that's been taken off the table as a discussion item.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: I
appreciate that. I would just urge you, I think
it's in the DHS's interest as well, and all of our

interests in preventing homelessness, to use every possible resource as smartly as we can.

ROBERT HESS: Oh, no question.

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: And

inasmuch as to some extent NYCHA has created that problem with the Section 8 pipeline, the resource that they have of public housing units for some of those 2,500 to be able to move into, which doesn't cost anybody any extra money, so we can focus what extra resources we come up with—whether those are HPRP or whatever is necessary—to make sure that we don't wind up evicting another 10,000 families by yanking their Section 8 certificates.

And I guess the last thing I would-just, my final question is, I appreciate all the-I'm one of those people who is a big believer in
homelessness prevention. And I think the new
prevention programs and HomeBase programs you've
put in place are a very good step toward that. At
the same time, if we're really at risk as a result
of a temporary shortfall on the Section 8 side of
the ledger, which will go down as there's
attrition and they'll go back to a reasonable
point of view, and a one-time infusion of cash is

2.0

2.3

what's needed to prevent as many as 10,000
families becoming homeless, it seems to me that
would quickly rise up our priority list for how to
use our homelessness prevention funds. And so I'm
just eager that DHS and NYCHA really figure out
how to do this. I appreciate the fact that there
was DHS openness to make those referrals. And I
hope you'll help work with us to make sure that
NYCHA is also helping us to avoid a mass
homelessness crisis.

ROBERT HESS: We'll continue to do everything we can to avoid any New Yorker from experiencing homelessness.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you,

Council Member. Commissioner, the domestic

violence survivors who are part of the Advantage

program. I know the rules for them are after 42

days in shelter, then they're eligible for the

subsidy. Are any of the rules that they fall

under, are they going to change?

ROBERT DOAR: Under the proposal that we have before the State we have remained—that the shorter timeframe has remained in place from the 60-day requirement in the DHS system to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the 42-day requirement in the domestic violence, in recognition of the shorter timeframe for the stay in the domestic violence shelter generally. But we have also imposed the work requirement that is in existence in Work Advantage here as well. Where before domestic violence residents of our shelter system were not required to meet the work requirement before being given the voucher and being found an apartment, we're now going to say we need to meet that 20-hour requirement before the voucher will be issued. And many residents of the domestic violence shelter are working and have achieved the work requirement after they've left the shelter. And we have belief that they will be able to do that with this more stringent requirement.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Okay. Thank

you. I want to thank both commissioners for your

time and, you know, the work that you have done

around HRA and DHS. They're not easy issues to

deal with, and we recognize that. And you know,

we're here to work with you. And I'm confident

that at the end of the day, you know, echoing the

words of Council Member Brewer, I hope not to be

testimony from one of our clients, [phonetic] who

25

is here to testify with us today. And I'm up here a well with Anya Maddow-Zimet from the Legal Aid Society. Let me introduce K. N. to you, and let her begin the testimony.

With me today is K. N., who like thousands of other New Yorkers in Advantage program apartments face evictions, because the program as currently constituted will not enable her family to remain in her apartment. Ms. K. N. is a survivor of domestic violence who became homeless because the Administration for Children's Services told her that her apartment was not big enough to accommodate her nieces and her nephews, all of whom have special needs, that she had to take in, when their mother was unable to care for them.

She eventually found a new apartment through the Children's Advantage Program, which the City announced this week it will discontinue. But her family has now reached the City's imposed two-year time limit for the program, and Ms. K. N. has no other way to pay her rent, and the HomeBase program has also proved unable to help her. I think that her testimony

2.0

2.3

will illuminate some of the issues that were very
cogently presented by the questions of the
Committee. And then following her testimony we're
happy to both answer questions and make some
generalized comments. Thank you very much, and we
appreciate your sensitivity in allowing us to
present the testimony in this way.

K. N.: Good afternoon, everyone.
I am a survivor of domestic violence and a
participant in the Advantage program. I do not
want to use my real name, because I do not want my
batterer to find me; but you can call me

I became disabled in 2006 when I injured my back while working as a home health aide. I have been unable to work since, and have difficulty doing basic daily tasks. I also suffer from high blood pressure and chronic back pain. For the last two years I have lived in an Advantage apartment with my daughter, two nieces and two nephews.

I became homeless in 2007. I had to move out of my apartment at that time in order to take custody of my nieces and nephews. The City's Administration for Children's Services,

ACS, had removed them from the custody of their mother, my sister, after my six-year-old niece was left at home, alone, with her siblings and accidentally started a fire in the home by putting a blanket over a space heater to keep warm, because she was cold.

Matter contacting every family
member who I thought could take the children in,
because my apartment was too small, everyone said
no, they could not take them in. My sister asked
me if I would care for the children until she got
herself together. Because I did not want my
nieces and nephews to go into foster care, I
decided to take them into my home. However, after
three months, ACS said that my apartment was too
small, and that if I wanted to keep my nieces and
nephews, I would have to leave my apartment and
enter a homeless shelter.

Of course I did not want to leave

my own apartment where I had lived with my

daughter for four years and go into a shelter.

But I knew that my nieces and nephews had no one

else who would take care of them, and I was not

willing to let them go into foster care. All four

of them have special needs and they were clearly traumatized by years of abuse. For the children to be the ages they were, 15, 14, 12 and 6, they did not have the basic skills that a child of ages 1 through 5 has. I felt like after all they hadsorry. I felt like after all they had been through I could not just abandon them or trust that they would be taken care of in foster care, so I did what ACS said, left my own apartment and entered a homeless shelter in March 2007. After a few months of living with my nieces and nephews, they trusted me enough to tell me that my—I hate this part—my niece had been sexually abused by their mother's boyfriend.

## [Pause]

K. N.: I contacted ACS and the police, and the boyfriend was put in jail. The children's mother was charged with abuse and neglect in both family court and criminal court. She is on parole and has supervised visits with her children, once a week.

My family and I resided in a homeless shelter from March 2007 until January 2008. This was one of the worst experiences of

2.0

mine and their lives, the children's lives. I

pray never to go back into a shelter. The shelter

where we were placed was a one-bedroom, even

smaller than the two-bedroom apartment from which

ACS had told us to leave, with horrible

conditions. The apartment was infested with

roaches and rats. The windows could not be left

open because rats would come in through the

window. When we would come home at night, we

would find rats on our bed. One of the first

days--on the first day that we got there, the

supervisor showed me how it was possible to break

open my front door using a credit card.

We were robbed seven times during our stay there. When I complained to the management company, I was told that I had to learn to take the good with the bad. I decided I would take the good. During the time that I was in the shelter, I was certified for the Children's Advantage program, and told to find an apartment for \$1,316 for my family of six.

It was not easy, but we found a place to live. We moved in to our own apartment on Staten Island in January 2008. My shelter

worker told me that the Advantage program would pay my rent for one year, and during that time I would be certified for Section 8. However, within the year I had not received anything from Section 8. I went in person to the Section 8 office with my caseworker, my New York - - household to check on the status of my application. When I got there I was told that I had been denied Section 8 because my daughter had been arrested for a fight when she was school, high school. I did not understand why this would have any effect on my Section 8 application, because she was a minor at that time, and all charges against her had been dropped.

I never received any written
notification that I had been denied Section 8, and
would never had known if I hadn't gone in person.
I was told that I would have to fill out a new
Section 8 application and would have to start the
process over again. The Section 8 worker told me
to send in a new application, which I did
immediately. However, I never received any
response on my new Section 8 application either.
The Advantage program continued to pay my rent for

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a second year. After two years in my apartment, I expected to receive a Section 8 voucher, but I still have not been certified for Section 8 to date.

I contacted 311 to complain about Section 8 and was given a complaint number. I was contacted a few days later by DHS and was told that I would be receiving a letter in the mail telling me that my Advantage subsidy would be extended. To date, I have never received any letter. My advantage voucher expired in December 2009 and my landlord told me that he was raising the rent to \$1,500. Since my Advantage voucher expired four months ago, I have no way to pay the My family's only income is my disability money and my family's SSI, the total of which is only slightly higher than our monthly rent. Since I have taken my nieces and nephews into my home, I have been struggling to financially support them. For the first time in my life I took out credit cards to pay my bills and buy food, since the food stamps that I get are not enough to last until the end of the month. Now I am in debt.

My landlord recently served me with

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

a notice saying that I have to move out by today, April 15th, 2010, or he will evict me. He also told me that he sold the house to someone else, and that the new owner would be moving into my apartment and I have to leave. He said if I just leave I would not owe him anything. He told me this after I asked him to give me a legal notice of eviction.

I was told that I should go to a HomeBase office in my neighborhood to see if they could help me. However when someone from my church and I contacted them to explain my situation, they said that there was a list that had everyone that was waiting for a Section 8 They said that because my name was not on the list, I would not receive an extension on my rental subsidy. They told me to try Project Hospitality, and to look for a two-bedroom apartment. They said they could only help me if I was able to pay the rent going forward, and even if I applied for a One Shot deal, they would require the same thing. Other than that, there was nothing they could do to help me.

Because of her conviction, my

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sister is not going to be able to get custody of my nieces and nephews again, at least not any time Last weekend, she suffered a heart attack at age 39, and a shunt was placed into her heart. She and I discussed me adopting the children. am absolutely terrified that my family and I will be evicted and will have to go back into a shelter. I am constantly stressed thinking about how I will pay my rent and keep my family in my I am trying to keep my blood pressure from rising again. Over the last year I have been hospitalized four times because of my blood pressure and my chronic back pain. However, I know I have to stay healthy and positive, because I am the only person my nieces and nephews can rely on. I cannot even think about making my nieces and nephews, who have already been through so much trauma, go back into a shelter.

I plan to continue to support and fight for these children, but I cannot do it alone. Advantage and HomeBase programs do not have any answers for me, and I am wondering what we can do next. I am asking you to please help me to help them. I need an apartment or house that

will accommodate my family. Please help us. No one should have to live in a shelter that is not fit to live in. The shelters of New York need so much improvement, and someone who really cares about the needs of the people who are in need.

I was given a vision - - of a place called K. N. Haven's House, which is a place of safety. I believe that God gave these children to me to keep them safe, and that is what I'm going to do. I love my nieces and nephews, and I want the best for them. So please help us and anyone else who has been put in the same situation that we have. Thank you and God bless you.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: K. N., thank you so much for your courage and your testimony. You know, it's not easy coming out and, you know, giving your life story. And so we appreciate you sharing what you've been through with us, especially, you know, what you have to endure.

I wish I had the answers for you.

Unfortunately, we're trying to figure out a solution on how we can best work as government to, you know, continue to provide the truth and resources to families like yours to, you know,

question for the wonderful person who has testified, and also for Steve Banks. I guess my

real question is, do you hit this insanity of one

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agency, in this case ACS, not understanding that they should talk to DHS before they make an insane assessment that somebody--I mean I know that we're always stuck in the situation of you don't have enough bedrooms, so therefore you can't bring in the foster children. I've heard that a million times. Of course, many of us live in one bedroom and our kids go to Ivy League schools and everybody's just fine. So it's always been a crazy, crazy discussion. I assume that your client had an apartment, lived in a neighborhood where people knew her, loved her, and I can see she's incredibly articulate. So what in the world is ACS thinking? So I'm just wondering if that is something Legal Aid has had to deal with in the past, in the future, just that one aspect of two agencies not talking to each other?

K. N.: That's a good question.

The best way I can answer is that, yes, I lived in a community and everyone loved me. Actually, I lived in Georgia and I came here to take care of the children, because no one else would. As far as ACS, I really believe that ACS, Human Resources and all the other agencies don't talk to one

another, because I even applied for Human

Resources Public Assistance, and was denied that

also. And so, in answer to that question, no,

they don't help each other. And they didn't help

me.

Ms. K. N.'s case illustrates the problem of communication. Frequently we have a situation on the other side where there really is a dangerous situation and ACS has made a determination that the housing is improper, and they communicate that to DHS, and DHS in the eligibility process ignores it and says you can continue to live there. Here was an example where a family, like many families in the City, are kind of caught up in the alphabet soup of City agencies not necessarily working together.

But it's not necessarily so that communication would have helped. Communication only may have resulted in one agency saying you must do this, and another agency saying, no, no, you can't, which is all too often what's happening to our clients.

COUNCIL MEMBER BREWER: Thank you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER LANDER: Ms. K. N.,

I also want to thank you for the courage to come out and testify. And Steve, I guess I'd like to ask you--the one challenge here, so for K. N. it seems like a long term rental subsidy is needed. A work program isn't going to work. But for right now we don't have any Section 8 certificates to give out. You know, as you well know, we're over. We've given out a couple of thousand more than we can. You know, have you guys thought about what sort of program the City could put in place that would help address situations like the one we're talking about in a way that -- obviously the City can't create an open-ended, you know, long term rental subsidy program given the cost. So how do you think we should approach this problem?

STEVE BANKS: Sure. I appreciate—first of all, we appreciate certainly the interest of this committee and certainly the leadership of the Chair, and also Council Member Lander and Brewer. You've been longstanding, before you were on the Council, while you're on the Council, people have focused on these issues. And we greatly appreciate that.

You've got our testimony for the record, which highlights a number of concerns we have about the City's plans, which really--your questions we couldn't put it any better, frankly, than your questions to the Commissioners. You really laid out what the underlying problem is here, which is that we have programs that are proposed by the City that assume that the economy is not the current economy, and assume the housing market is not the current housing market.

And we're in a period of extreme economic distress, the worst since the Great Depression. We have high housing costs, high unemployment, and our solution—and record homelessness. And our solution is to say we're going to have a program that assumes that people can find jobs that pay enough to pay rent on apartments. And there's something wrong with that. I think that it really—Council Member Lander, your question really is to the heart of this, which is a program that assumes we're in boom economic times is not going to address the problems of K. N. and other families that we represent.

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

12

1314

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But what is going to address their problems is to look at this for what it is, which is there's a short term problem with respect to the Section 8 supply and that it will work itself out over time, and what can we do in the short term to avoid thousands of families -- the 10,000 that have now been told that their Section 8 certificates may be pulled from them, they're in place and in housing; the 2,500 families that were told--that had Section 8 packages but then have had those pulled from them; the families like Ms. K. N., who were going to get a Section 8 certificate to make that apartment that they were moved into on the theory that they were going to get Section 8, because it would not be affordable on an ongoing basis -- those thousands of families. Nobody wants to see all of those families converge upon the shelter system because they have no other place to go but to shelter.

You've heard Ms. K. N. speak eloquently, aside from the public policy issues, the human cost for her kids and so many thousands of other kids coming in to the system. So, I know you've analyzed the testimony we presented at the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prior hearing regarding Section 8, there are short term steps that can be taken to extend Advantage, keep these families in place, while the federal, state and local governments work for a more long term solution. Instead what we've created is the potential for 10,000 families with Section 8 to be homeless. We have to have a policy that gives them some type of assistance until there are enough Section 8 type of certificates reissued to keep them in place. The 2,500 families that we know of, they have to be stabilized too. That's an Advantage cost as well. The families like Ms. K. N., who are sort of hanging there in a sort of state of limbo in eviction zone, that they're going to get evicted over time. Yes, these things cost money, but they cost far less than the shelter cost of continuing to expand the shelter system.

When the City first said, we're going to delink homelessness from Priority for Public Housing, there were about 2,000 fewer families in the shelter system. They said at that time, and we were in this room, they said at that time that they had to do that to create a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

disincentive for families seeking shelter. And
we've got more families seeking shelter since that
time, even before the economic downturn.

In January 2010, we had 150 families seeking shelter beyond the number of families that sought shelter the January before. 1,544 families. Yes, it's great that we can shelter families as they seek shelter, but what an indication of the great need out there. So rather than say, oh, the City could never possibly have an open-ended subsidy program, as some might have said, one has to look at this for the short term crisis it is, in order to try to keep the crisis from becoming worse. If we think it's going to cost money to extend Advantage, imagine what it's going to cost if every few months we're going to continue to have these increases in families seeking shelter at tremendous public expense, and tremendous trauma for the families that are involved.

The second policy that I just want to briefly touch on is the shelter for rent policy. I feel like with Council Member Brewer, if it's May it must be the City's going to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

implement the rent charging plan. And at some point, this program has got to end. I think it's unfortunate that -- I appreciate some of the forthright answers from the City Commissioners that they're actually open to some discussion. But it is unfortunate, a lot of the public discourse that makes the City out to be an innocent here, when the City asked for the issuance of the regulation and has been vigorously opposing a legislative solution, which could have averted the fine that seems to be at the root of all this. And I would hope that in the legislative process the support from the Council has been critical, and Assembly Member Wright and Senator Squadron have been tremendous leaders on this issue. We would hope that this issue can be dealt with. A question was asked though, what

A question was asked though, what would happen if it's not? And families would be subject to sanctions. And I think eventually that was the answer that you got. And what has happened with the sanctions on the single adult side is indicative of what might happen here. In the first 70 or so cases, the Legal Aid Society,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

together with the Coalition for the Homeless provided representation -- the Coalition advocacy, the Legal Aid Society, legal representation. all but one case, those individuals were not removed from the shelter system. In the one case in which the individual was removed, eventually we were able to get the person housing. almost all those cases the individuals had mental health issues that rendered them unwilling as opposed to unable to comply. And the fortunate thing there, is by court order, the Legal Aid Society is provided with notices of sanctions in the single adult litigation. In the families area, although there is now a permanent injunction requiring the provision of shelter, there is no court order requiring that families with children who are about to be sanctioned would have their notices sent to The Legal Aid Society. It's verv nice to say on a piece of paper there's an indication you can call any legal services organization and get help. But I must say, when that was argued before the New York State Court of Appeals last May, when the City tried to get out of the court order in the singles case, the Court

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of Appeals saw it for what it was--detached from the reality of what families, like Ms. K. N., may go through in terms of the importance of coming immediately and providing legal intervention to keep a family from ending up on the streets, which would certainly be the case that doesn't make any sense at all.

Lastly, there was a lot of discussion about how the economy has been such that tremendous numbers of families have been able to retain their employment and pay the rent, even as you said, Council Member Lander, that you've got the typical case earning \$1,300 with \$1,000 rent, and miraculously that family has been able to keep their apartment. We would urge you, and we know you will, to really ask for the kind of data that shows whether or not those families are really employed and what it is that they're really earning. There was a very forthright answer given by Commissioner Hess, that they didn't know what happened to the families that were no longer in the program. And I think, unfortunately, what we do know, that the families that are still employed are in their housing, if they're employed at a

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

level that allows them to keep their housing. But we also know, from common sense, is that if you don't have enough money to pay the rent, you're not going to keep your housing, you're going to end up in the shelter system.

In fact, a Freedom of Information Law request by the Legal Aid Society will tell you that at around the time the families began to hit the two-year max in the Advantage program, that the City has begun to receive substantial numbers of reapplications from Advantage families, 1,000 families who had--1,000 applications from families that had Advantage. What the City's data doesn't show is how many of those were unduplicated families. And your request for information may have greater luck than ours, to be able to sort out exactly how many families are coming back in, requesting shelter, by month, from Advantage apartments--which would tell a quite different story than has been told in the past, and I think would amplify what Ms. K. N. has said about the reality that she is facing right now.

It was also said that a lot of families were leaving welfare because they're able

to find jobs in the areas of health, education and social services. I recommend anyone who thinks that those will be fruitful areas for further employment to read the State budget and look at the massive cuts in each of those areas. And we cannot expect the kind of jobs that one might think to be available in those areas.

Last but not least, HomeBase was a terrific program in that it focused on prevention. But unfortunately, the workers in HomeBase have been diverted to provide services to families without kids in hotels, in order to replace City workers who were laid off in the last round of budget cuts. And this has, on the one hand, kept services going for the families in those circumstances, but greatly limited what the HomeBase programs can actually do. And I think that that has had a negative impact on the ability to prevent homelessness. I'm happy to take questions or leave where we are.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you,

Steve, for always keeping us informed of what's

going on out there. I want to again thank K. N.

for your testimony for the courage to come and

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

share your story with us. And I believe that, you know, God did put you in the lives of your nieces and nephews, and you will prevail. You are surrounded by people who will help you find a way and make sure that you and your family will get permanent housing and a place to live.

STEVE BANKS: Thank you. Ms. K. N. asked me if she could just make one other comment. CHAIRPERSON PALMA:

Okay.

MS. K. N.: I have a question. sat here today and I listened to a lot of the comments that were made today about the Advantage program and charging people who are in shelter My question is, people have come into the rent. shelter because -- for various reasons. I went into the shelter not for any of those reasons. I went in because the children needed help, and so I willingly went in to a shelter. Now, if I had to pay rent and I couldn't pay the rent in the shelter, I was hoping that the question would have been answered, but I saw that they were avoiding the answer. No one really answered it to my satisfaction. What actually happens to those people in the shelter? If there's 37,000 people

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

who are homeless, look at what just happened to the people in that hospital that lost their jobs. I perceive that it's going to be more than 37,000 people homeless, coming in to the shelter. So if they have to pay rent and they can't afford it, where do they go? The very system that they came to for help to seek solace will now put them back into the streets. Do they start the procedure back over again? That's my question.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: And those are the answers we are also trying to get, K. N., the question to what is going to happen to those folks that are going to be affected by the implementation of this rule, and how do we prevent them from--you know, I've been using this quote I have this new quote I have. How do we prevent them from becoming homeless to the second power? You know? Homeless two times. Because vou've heard the members say people who have become homeless, they go into the shelter because they can't afford to pay the rent, and you know, we're sort of hitting them again with another barrier. So we're not going to rest until we get our answers to the questions we're asking. So I thank

rest of the Council members that were here and asked very good questions, and also the time that DHS and HRA took to answer your questions.

I'm going just take the time today just to bring up some areas of concern that we have as providers, who ultimately when the new policies happen, we're the ones that are responsible for how these policies will actually be implemented. And we have, I think, a unique perspective that we're also looking at the impact on our client, but also how does the system as a whole run, because we're the ones that are running the system.

want to go first to the changes I Advantage. And one of the suggestions that, after speaking with our—we have about 55 members, and speaking to many of our members over the past few days, one of our concerns that though there was—we were heard about the fact that the time in shelter requirement, it was 90 days to get Advantage; they've recognized and honored our request that they would try to bring it down to 60 days. We'd request that actually that would be even shorter,

and maybe on par with Domestic Violence Advantage program, just, I think also for clarity of the program.

A couple of--just an overview of how the system works and just to go back historically. Every time there is a change to how the system is operated, even a positive change like when the Advantage vouchers were first made available, we see a lag in when people move out, mostly because there is a communication error. There is a coordination between various State agencies that don't always coordinate the flow of information as well as the could be; but also, in this case, when Advantage was first rolled out there was a communication that needed to be made to the landlords. And that's a really vital communication connection that has to be in place.

And so DHS has recognized in the past that when these vouchers were made available that there was a six month lag in move outs, and it took that much time to build the confidence of the landlords and the brokers for them to really understand that this is a program, this is good for them, it's good for the City, good for the

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

neighbors and also good for the clients. we're very concerned on every time there is a change there is a real lag on how information gets conveyed, but also the impact on the system, so that we would ask that there be consideration given to that when we're looking how shelters are held responsible for meeting performance targets. And I know that this is not a budget hearing, but it also has an impact on how services are delivered. And again, every time you have a change, ultimately that change is responsibly implemented by out very dedicated non-profit providers; but what's going to happen is we are seeing an economy that is very, very difficult. And even though the Commissioner has just testified earlier that the City has a right to shelter, shelters will be made available, or shelters will be made available for those who present in need--the very real fact, as you know, is that during the budget process the shelters last year took a budget cut, and we are slated to take another budget cut.

And we are under very strong performance contracts. And so when a system

changes such as this, and the length of stay increases, and move outs slow down, that means we cannot make our performance targets. And the dollar amount of us not making our performance targets isn't what we're focusing on. What those dollars equal are our ability to provide services. It's not looking at our budgets as a bottom line or a dollar figure; but we translate those into how do we increase our housing services; how do we provide more case management to help those families, this increased need that we're seeing in the city, so that every time we have these changes, we get financially penalized because of such high performance targets.

So, I would ask that as new systems be put in place that performance targets be considered either held flat or put on hold so that both the systems, the clients and even the City agencies have a chance to understand the system and allow the system to catch up to the any new changes that are promoted, whether it be good or bad changes, it doesn't matter whoever's perspective it is on it; it doesn't matter. Any change affects how the system flows. And so that

is one of our biggest concerns, is that as we know more and more people are coming in, record high numbers, there's less opportunity for people to move out. We have people struggling who had Section 8 vouchers. So now we're going to have this perfect storm of people who can't get out of the shelter, have no place to go and our shelter services to address their needs are being cut.

And, you know, we want to make sure that our very experienced non-profit contractor providers have all the services and supports they need in place to address the needs of their clients.

our concern about HomeBase. We think that
HomeBase is a fantastic program. And if you look
at how that was originally designed, it's a
fantastic idea. You bring the services to the
community where they're most needed. However, at
this point because of such an immense need in the
City with people presenting as homeless, folks
are—at least staffing levels—are really pointed
much more towards people who are being housed in
basically hotel shelters. And the folks in
HomeBase are now really focusing their efforts on

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that. And what's happening at this point is that
the people in the community who really need those
services, it's difficult for the HomeBase
providers to use what little resources they have
to actually target towards those people. And our
concern is that those people are going to
eventually end up knocking on the door if we don't
do something.

And similarly, to underscore the need for something like HomeBase, the City did a fantastic job. They identified the areas where those communities were in need. However, we're concerned about how the budget gets baselined for the City budget for HomeBase. That we think it's a fantastic use of stimulus money. We think it's important to preserve this program. We laud the City on figuring out a way to meet that budget However, we encourage the City Council in the upcoming budget negotiations to figure out a way to give them further support and keep them permanently in the budget so they can also do what they were originally designed to do, which is to help the people in the community, as well as targeting the resources for the people who have

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

already reached, as people are unfortunately using the phrase, the cliff. They've already reached that cliff. Let's try and help people before they get to that edge.

On the income contribution, again, we want to recognize again that we were heard about holding the shelters harmless; that it is not in the interest of the client shelter relationship to have the shelters be responsible for collecting funds from clients. And we thank, you know, both the State and the City for recognizing that's a role that, again, we should not be responsible for having. However, we are looking again at how the system works. And what we do know is that at any given time, HRA has about 30% of folks on sanction status because of, frequently, because of bureaucratic errors. what happens is then shelter staff are required to give additional support to clients, either accompanying them or making a lot of advocacy efforts to get those resolved, so that folks can get out of the shelter, they can get their PA case opened, the sanction removed, they can get their Advantage vouchers, they can get ready to do their

lease signing and move back into the community and begin regaining their life, control of their life again.

However, we are very concerned that with a component that involves client contribution that there will be further errors, bureaucratic errors, or further collection errors that will result in many more folks being sanctioned, public assistance sanctioned, because they have not been able to, you know, get the system in place.

So we--you know, please take all the time they need. Take all the time you need to get this right, because we can't afford to have what happened last year.

One of the areas too that, again, speaking to the system, that we have concerns about, is that if we are responsible for operating the system on a day to day basis with our clients, if the system is not clear, if it's not perceived as being a fair system or transparent, for example, how the formula is designed, it will be very difficult to have clients become complaint if we ourselves don't understand it, and if the agencies don't understand it, that's not enough

for us. It has to be a system that's clear,
transparent and not perceived as punitive, but as
something that will really, truly help folks.

So we really ask and encourage that the State and the City take a chance and talk to the providers, talk to the people who would actually have to implement this, talk to the clients, and rethink this policy. Because we, as we've testified before you, that we think it's--we don't support this policy, mostly at this point because we don't think it could be implemented well, and the formula has never been clear or transparent.

Finally, I want to say, you know, we are those—I represent those agencies that help get those 18,000 people moved out of the shelter, and I am proud to represent those folks. We want to make sure that whatever Advantage program we're responsible for administering, that's something we can all as a City can be proud of, something that says to New York City, you know, you needed help, we gave you the help. Let's make sure we develop a system that will really, truly end homelessness for the family and not create an increase in

about what would happen in the second year with these folks, especially given that many of them don't have GEDs, and the likelihood that they would even make \$10 to \$12 an hour--it is very unlikely that that would be the average person. So, we have many concerns. And this will be implemented based on an average or a dollar wage that we feel is unrealistic for people in their second year to actually keep that up and keep paying their rent and be able to maintain their level of housing situation without having to return to shelter.

So, our testimony will include many more of these points, but again, we want to say thank you again for your support. And, you know, we're grateful that this is an opportunity, we believe, for HRA, DHS, OTDA, the City Council, the State and the Senate to sit down and work with us to come up with real solutions to homelessness.

Because overall, that's not just the mission of Homeless Services United, it's the mission of all of the 55 agencies I represent. So, thank you.

ERIN FEELY-NAHEM: Good afternoon

and thank you for staying and hearing us. My name is Erin Feely-Nahem, and I offer this testimony on behalf of the New York City Coalition of Domestic Violence Residential Providers, an organization that represents all of New York City's licensed, non-profit domestic violence shelters, which provide thousands of battered individuals and children every year.

Thank you for holding this hearing today on the Advantage programs and allowing us to testify as to how the proposed changes to the program will affect domestic violence victims, a group that comprises about 30% of New York City's homeless families. The families who we do serve in the HRA shelter system are unique. They come into our shelter for safety first and foremost, a violence-free environment for their families.

How many times have you heard someone ask why a domestic violence survivor doesn't just leave an abusive relationship? What is usually a very complicated nuance answer to that question—she's worried, she'll lose custody of her children, she's scared the abuser will retaliate, she has no economic resources—is now a

very simple one: there's no place to go. We know statistically that more of the deaths and escalation of domestic violence happen when a woman tries to leave and then has to return home. So, it's a perfect example.

And the point on the system not being put together properly is also a good point. It does allow--these changes in the different housing subsidies does delay the process. People don't know what the subsidy is. Landlords don't understand it. And HRA does not have an outreach program, unlike DHS. We don't have people who go out to landlords, give us leasings. Yet, we have a very short period of time to work with our women.

In an already very challenging housing environment, with the loss of Section 8 vouchers this year, the City is now threatening to eliminate a program referred to as HRA Advantage with a Domestic Violence exception, which is one of the only remaining permanent housing options for families exiting domestic violence shelters. This program helps survivors of domestic violence stabilize their families in an apartment where

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

they can heal, develop independence, and utilize any necessary support services for six months before being required to secure employment. This is particularly important for our population, because there are so many things that a woman has to do. First of all, the courage it takes to leave your situation, your family, your home, your neighborhood is amazing. I mean, to give up everything and not be able to return home is something that takes a lot of courage. Then you have to look at the fact, she needs to transfer all services. She can no longer use her family to take care of the children. She can no longer go to the PA center, she has to transfer her children, get a new daycare, transfer her children's schools, medical--there are court If she's applying for PA, as you dates. mentioned, there is many mistakes in the PA system where they will close the case erroneously and she'll have to reapply. This is all within the 135 day system that that we have.

A story, Marta's story exemplifies the success of the Domestic Violence Advantage

Program. Marta is a 31-year old woman who has a

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ninth grade education and is the mother of two boys, ages 11 and 13. The older child required special education for developmental and vision Marta entered domestic violence shelter delays. after a man she was dating started abusing her and threatened to kill her. After 42 days in shelter, Marta became eligible for HRA advantage. She was very motivated and wanted to have a safe place for herself and two children. Marta was able to move out of shelter into an Advantage apartment. months later, Marta called to speak to her former shelter caseworker. She reported that she was doing well and had found a steady job cleaning She was happy that her children were apartments. safe and settled, and that her special needs child was properly evaluated and receiving the education and services that he needed in, once again, a new school. Marta described feeling safe and content for the first time in a long time.

Now again, this is the third time that these children will have to move into a new school, a new system. If the woman finds the services she needs around the shelter, she's still going to have to transfer them again once she gets

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to permanent housing, which takes more time. So how is she supposed to find a job so quickly?

The standard image of domestic violence, that it consists of occasional punches and outbursts of rage, that's it. But that's not an accurate picture. Abusers use whatever power they have to control their partners and victims are prevented from obtaining independence through variety of escalating coercive tactics, ranging from threats to physical, sexual and economic and legal abuses. Abusers often destroy their victim's credit, maliciously report child abuse, steal documents needed for employment and subject their victims to physical and sexual violence for every step towards freedom that they try to take. Victims are punished for attempting to work, or not allowed to keep their paychecks if they work, prevented from going to school, learning English and making friends or business contacts.

We have a case where the woman was kept totally isolated while the man handled all of the social responsibilities. She became sick, and he continued to use that as a way why no one else would want her, continued to get her pregnant, but

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

handled every social situation so that she was totally isolated. He took the phone out. She didn't have any contact with her mother or with her family. He was her only means of any socialization.

Because of this, victims are often force to rely on public services when they first emerge from these relationships. Such services, in particular stable affordable housing, are absolutely crucial to someone fleeing a violent partner. Without HRA advantage, domestic violence shelter residence would be left with Work Advantage, the program designed for homeless shelter residents. To be eligible for Work Advantage, an individual must have held a job continuously for a period of at least one month. For a DV victim, that means finding a job by their 12th day in order to be eligible for the Advantage certificate on the 42nd day. They've agreed now to give us our 42 days back. But if you look at it, to have to find a job on the first day, while you still have to apply for PA, change services, go to court, get your order of protection, three different appointments for PA, transfer your

children's school, find whatever services your child may need if they need extra services. And then you're left with 93 days to find an apartment.

While they're in our shelters, because it's a highly enriched shelter service, it's a provider of a lot of services, they're also expected to go to case management, counseling, DV support group, parenting group. We have nutrition, we have computer program Tuesdays and Thursdays, plus they're generally asked to go back to work. So when are they supposed to find the time to do all this, plus go to court, and go to PA and get daycare?

All right. Also, domestic violence shelter residents often lack a high school diploma or prior work experience. This, coupled with the task of recovering from years of isolation and trauma, applying for PA, attending court appointments, transferring services to a safe area, usually render it impossible for them to locate employment within the 135 days they are permitted to stay in the domestic violence shelter.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If they do not obtain housing in this timeframe, far less than the allotted homeless shelter stay, they are left with few options: entering the homeless shelter system, or returning to the abuser.

Domestic violence is incredibly expensive. In 2008, for example, New York City Police Officers responded to 234,988 domestic violence incidents, well over 600 a day. estimated 80% of juvenile offenders have backgrounds with domestic violence. As mentioned earlier, 30% of New York City's homeless population consists of domestic violence victims. This City must pay to house them in the homeless shelter every time they try to flee the abusers. Victims utilize the City's emergency rooms. may end up with chronic health problems. If they have no income, the City foots the bill. really, which is cheaper, to get them permanent housing or to continue to keep them in the shelter system? Or have them recycled back into the homeless system--which they tried to say they don't have the stats. That's because they don't want to keep the stats.

2.0

Having a safe apartment in which to rebuild can go a long way towards breaking the expensive cycle of abuse. Given sufficient time for healing, evaluating options, obtaining medical care and other services, most domestic violence survivors, like Marta, will make strides in their journey towards independence. Families should not have to choose between being homeless and being abused; but that is exactly what they will be forced to do with the elimination of housing programs.

Financially as well as morally it makes more sense to maintain programs that take into account the additional barriers that victims face in achieving independence. They provide survivors with the opportunity they need to become self-sufficient. And they ultimately safe the City money, because in the long run, as they keep these families out of shelter and the emergency—because in the long run they keep them out of shelter and in the emergency rooms.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you so much.

ERIN FEELY-NAHEM: Sorry, I sort of

for Children.

24 [Pause]

2.3

25 STEPHANIE GENDELL: Good afternoon.

I'm Stephanie Gendell, the Associate Executive
Director at Citizens' Committee for Children.
Given the time, I'm going to be as brief as
possible. For obvious reasons we are opposed to
paying rent for live in shelter, for the reasons
that have already been discussed today. And we
are also concerned about the changing payment
structure for Advantage, for the reasons most
notably brought out by Council Member Lander,
where the numbers just don't add up and make
sense.

But what I want to focus on is the elimination of the Children's Advantage Program and how that impacts families who are reunifying from foster care. For the children that we're talking about and the families, they've been in foster care and in the homeless service systems, so these are probably the most vulnerable families we have in New York City. The children who reunify from foster care have been separated from their parents and have been living somewhere else. And when they return to them, they return into a homeless shelter. And then, if they're young children and their parents need to work to comply

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with Work Advantage, these children will then have
to get placed with some other stranger for most of
the day in a new childcare arrangement, through a
new voucher through the Administration for
Children's Services, which already doesn't have
enough money to pay for childcare. So it just
doesn't make sense from a family perspective or
from a financial perspective.

We are concerned that when the determination is made about whether the family works, there is no child welfare determination; it's just a disability determination. So no one is looking at whether this will impact the attachments that need to be reformed between the parent and the child due to the foster care relationship that had happened previously. so, there are only a couple options that could happen here. One is that it's a success and it works and we pay for childcare. But the other options are that the family ends up either staying in shelter or coming back to shelter, or the child ends up coming back into foster care, all of which are more damaging for the family and much more expensive for this City. So, for all of those

2.0

reasons, we're really concerned about the
dissolution of the Children's Advantage Program
and hope to work with the Council on protecting
it Thank you

YARROW REGAN: So, my name is-that's it? Hi, my name is Yarrow Regan. Thank
you for remaining here after everyone else has
fled. I'm from Community Voices Heard.

On Thursday, April 6th, 2010, I attended a meeting regarding Section 8 vouchers at the Economic Justice and Social Justice Network.

I had been approved for NYCHA Section 8 voucher in April 2008, and had not yet been given my voucher number. I originally applied for Section 8 in October of 1994. In March of 2007, I was told by NYCHA that I would be one of the first people to get their voucher. To date this has not happened.

At the meeting, a social worker stood up and said with great conviction that homeless people and those in danger of becoming homeless should go to the HomeBase program, and that was how they would get housing and housing vouchers. My ears perked up, as I am living in a vermin-infested--that means rats--illegal boarding

house. In early March, my landlord informed me that he is in the process of selling the house. I could be homeless again, as I was illegally evicted twice in 2009.

Three weeks ago, not far from my home a man was stabbed to death. Illegal drugs are sold openly; music is broadcasted until 3:00 or 4:00 a.m. each day. This is not a good neighborhood to live in. I have been turned down for many apartments. As to date, I have not been given my NYCHA Section 8 voucher yet.

On April 6th, 2010, at around 3:00, I called the Bronx Works, formerly Citizens' Advice Bureau HomeBase program at 1130 Grand Concourse, Bronx. I was told that I am not eligible for the program, as I am not currently in housing court. I spoke with Wandi Paredes [phonetic]. I asked her what the application process is, and if I could get the denial in writing. She told me to come in to their location, next to the Bronx Housing Court, Mondays through Thursdays from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. I went there Monday, April 12th at about 12:40 a.m. I was told by Vicky, the receptionist, that the

cutoff is seven people, that they reached their quota for the day. You should have been here at 8:00 in the morning, and besides, this isn't your district office, you have to go to District 7.

I told her that I had spoken at length with Ms. Paredes and had been prescreened over the telephone. I wanted to know if I could get the denial in writing. Vicky, the receptionist, put me on the phone with Wandi Paredes. She then told me I could come back on Thursday, today, but suggested that I go to the other location in my district the same day, April 12th. I reminded her that we had spoken and that she was going to give me the denial in writing. Every HomeBase has different prescreening methods; you have to go to that one.

I was told to go to Help, 1780

Grand Concourse, Bronx. I requested car fare.

They told me they don't do that, however, they did have a phone available to call the district office that they wanted me to go to. When I spoke to a young man there, he could not give me travel directions. I asked what subway stop it was near and how far it was from the subway. He said he

had no idea and could not tell me, but to come in to be prescreened and I would be given another appointment anyway.

I took the bus. When I got off the bus, I saw the D train stop at 175th Street was right next to the entrance of Help. This scared me, and I was worried that I was not going to get any assistance, if this was an indication of their professionalism and commitment to homeless New Yorkers. If they couldn't get the travel directions straight, how would they navigate the voucher applications process?

No one else was in the waiting room, which surprised me, as so many people are homeless now and in need of help. I meet such people every single day in addition to myself.

The very pleasant young lady behind the desk told me that they don't do that anymore, refer people to vouchers. We only do eviction prevention with back rent grants if you are in housing court. I asked when they stopped getting referrals from the shelters. I was told on December 31st, 2009. I explained that I needed my denial in writing, so she told me to sit and wait.

There was a manila folder with

apartments for rent scrawled in handwriting and a

Xeroxed newspaper ad for Flatbush Garden

Apartments taped to the wall. This was

discouraging and depressing.

I met with a young lady who had me fill out an application. She told me that she is a new trainee, has been training to three weeks. The office was deadly quiet, except for a staff member, who excitedly spoke on the phone about ordering her graduation gown. They had me fill out an application an asked me routine questions. The young lady checked the DHS database to see if Ms. Paredes had entered me in there—she had not.

The staff member got her supervisor, Mr. Larry Hardison. He began questioning me, asking me if I had family members who could help me. And when I informed him that I did not, he asked me if I could increase my income, then would ask if I would go into a shelter as Larry Hardison claimed that they only took referrals from the shelter. This was more conflicting information, as the receptionist told me that they no longer referred people from the

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

shelters. How about moving into another room, he asked me. I said, why would I do that? I need an apartment. I asked him if this is the same agency that owns the building on 13th Street, since I had applied for an apartment there. He claimed he knew nothing about any apartment buildings.

Sorry. This was discouraging. claimed that he did not have the map that Bronx Works had given me. He asked me if he could photocopy it. Of course I said yes. But why would I, someone in danger of becoming homeless, and coming in off the street, provide a City agency with information? I told the young lady that it was probably on their website, and with my assistance she found it online and printed it out. Mr. Hardison came back and requested my ID and proof of address. I gave it to him. I asked him what the maximum limit for eviction prevention grants was, and he couldn't tell me. He asked me for an emergency contact, which I gave him. young lady had very little knowledge of housing court procedures and the eviction process. said she had to ask her supervisor.

This was discouraging, that I knew

more than the paid staff. I asked Mr. Hardison about the Fixed Income Advantage Voucher. He said he didn't know anything about that. Ms. Paredes had indicated that I might be eligible for it.

They finally printed out a denial letter, with no end date, alleging that my case is pending. If this is anything like the NYCHA Section 8 voucher that is pending, it seems like I could drop dead before any housing assistance is given to me.

operation is a waste of money, unprofessional and not effective in preventing eviction. I question their verbal statements regarding who is eligible for their programs. Where is any of that criteria in writing? I am concerned that once this horrible vermin-infested boarding house is sold, I will have no recourse but to sleep on the subway or street. If this is the case, HomeBase will have been successful in creating yet another homeless New Yorker. I am very upset about this, as New York is my home. For better or worse, the boarding house is a roof over my head.

I am told a huge amount of stimulus money is poured into HomeBase. Where is that

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

2	money going?	I have not	benefitted	from	this
3	program and d	oubt that I	ever will.		

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Thank you for your testimony. From the questions that were raised here today, you know, we're still trying to get many answers that go--you know, many answers to the questions that still go unanswered. Hopefully we can continue to ask the administration to give us some concrete numbers on how these programs are helping people like yourself. I tell you that this Council and this-you know, the Council Members are committed to making sure that -- are committed to helping lift New Yorkers out of poverty and into permanent housing. And I know that I won't stop as long as I am in the position that I am, to make sure that these programs are really working to benefit homeless New Yorkers and New Yorkers as a whole. So thank you for coming--

YARROW REGAN: [Interposing] May I be permitted to say one thing?

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Yes, you may.

YARROW REGAN: Well, I heard Mr.

Hess's testimony, and I feel like there's a

reality gap between what he's stating and what's
really happening. And I would like to suggest
that the Council send more people like myself to
apply for this program, to see what's happening in
reality. Because there's someyou know, Mr. Hess
is not the person who is applying for HomeBase,
but he has some distorted illusion of what is
actually happening.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: Right. We need to definitely get a sense of how many people are actually applying and not getting the services that the program was intended to deliver. So, I thank you for your recommendation. And again, thank you for your testimony.

YARROW REGAN: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON PALMA: This hearing is now adjourned.

I, Erika Swyler, 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.

the state of	-
--------------	---

Signature\_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_April 27, 2010\_\_\_\_\_