CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

----- X

October 25, 2021 Start: 10:07 a.m. Recess: 12:26 p.m.

HELD AT: Remote Hearing - Virtual Room 2

B E F O R E: Stephen T. Levin

Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Darma V. Diaz

Vanessa L. Gibson Barry S. Grodenchik

Brad S. Lander Antonio Reynoso

Rafael Salamanca, Jr.

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

Elizabeth Sutter [sp?]
New York City Action Board

Key King [sp?]
New York City Action Board

Lyndon Hernandez New York City Action Board

Alexander Perez New York City Action Board

Stephanie Gendell Deputy Commissioner of External Affairs at ACS

Erin Drinkwater Deputy Commissioner of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs at DSS

Julie Farber Deputy Commissioner ACS

Alan Sputz Deputy Commissioner ACS

Angel Mendoza ACS Chief Medical Officer

Louis Watts Senior Assistant Commissioner for Detention Services at ACS

Randy Scott Assistant Commissioner

Tracey Thorne RHY Director

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

Jamie Powlovich Coalition for the Homeless

Anna Blondell Legal Aid Society Juvenile Justice Rights Practice

Julia Davis Children's Defense Fund

John Sentiger Covenant House New York

Nadia Swanson Ali Forney Center

Deborah Berkman NYLAG

Jimmy Meagher Safe Horizon

Josefa Silva WIN NYC

	4

vulnerable populations in New York City. It is my

hope that this legislation introduced by myself and

24

2	many of my colleagues honors the lived experience of
3	those closest to these issues and for whom these
4	services effect on a daily basis. I'm proud to
5	introduce I'm sorry. I'm proud to sponsor Intro.
6	2405 which would expand eligibility of runaway and
7	homeless youth for rental assistance programs by
8	allowing their time spent in RHY shelter to count
9	towards eligibility for CityFHEPS vouchers. This
10	bill would also preclude DSS from requiring youth to
11	live outside of a youth shelter as a condition of
12	eligibility. It is my intention that this bill will
13	help young people facing homelessness to more swiftly
14	and easily secure housing for young people to avoid
15	prolonged stays in multiple systems to get the help
16	that they need. The next two bills, which I also
17	sponsor, will shine a light on the foster care system
18	to ensure that children are in appropriate
19	placements. Intro 2419 require ACS to do quarterly
20	reporting of time spent in Children's Center or
21	temporary placement facilities. Intro 2420 require
22	ACS to conduct quarterly audits of foster care
23	placement notifications to ensure that a child's
24	attorney is notified of placement in a timely manner
25	as required by state law. We must make certain that

applies for shelter. The practice of requiring

2	children to be present at PATH has been suspended
3	during the for the duration of the pandemic, and
4	this has been a welcome change. There is no
5	practical reason to have children in attendance, and
6	it is unfair and burdensome to families to revert
7	back to this policy. Judging whose families who are
8	applying for assistance from the city should be able
9	to remain in their schools and at their activities as
10	their peers would. I want to thank advocates and
11	members of the public who are joining us today. I
12	want to thank representatives from the Administration
13	for joining us, and I look forward to hearing from
14	you on these critical issues. At this time, I would
15	like to acknowledge my colleagues who are here this
16	morning. We're joined by let's see. Council
17	Member Barry Grodenchik is here. Council Member
18	Darma Diaz is here. Council Member Antonio Reynoso
19	is here and we expect to be joined by other Council
20	Members throughout the course of the hearing. I'd
21	also like to thank my staff, Jonathan Buche [sp?],
22	Chief of staff, my co-Legislative Directors Elizabeth
23	Adams and Cole Hunt, as well as committee staff
24	Amenta Killawan [sp?], Cyrstal Pond [sp?] Amenta
25	Killawan, Senior Counsel, Cyrstal Pond, Senior Policy

forward to positive outcomes. Thank you, Chair.

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you very much Council Member Diaz, and with that, I'll turn it over to Amenta Killawan who's the Counsel to the Committee to administer the oath to the Administration. I look forward to hearing their testimony.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you, Chair

My name is Amenta Killawan, Senior Counsel to the Committee on General Welfare at the New York City Council. Today I'm going to be moderating the hearing and calling on panelists to testify. We are actually going to begin with a public panel. we begin, please remember that everyone is going to be on mute until I call on you to testify. After you are called on you will be unmuted by a member of our staff. Note that there will be a delay of a few seconds before you are unmuted and we can hear you. Again, for public testimony I will call up individuals in panels. Please listen for your name and I will periodically call the next two panelists. Once I call your name, a member of our staff ill unmute you. The Sergeant at Arms will set a clock and give you the go ahead to begin your testimony. All public testimony will be limited to three minutes. After I call your name please wait for the

2 | Sergeant at Arms to announce that you may begin

1

10

24

25

3 before starting your testimony. And for today's

4 hearing the first panel will include public testimony

5 from Youth of New York City Action Board. In the

6 following order: Elizabeth Sutter, Key King [sp?],

7 Linden Hernandez [sp?], Alexander Perez and Naisha

8 | Humphry [sp?]. And we are going to being with

9 Elizabeth Sutter.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Your time will begin.

11 ELIZABETH SUTTER: Good morning to the

12 panelists and the committee. My name is Elizabeth

13 | Sutter. I am 23 years old, and I'm urging Council to

14 pass Intro 2405. I, myself, was in DYCD shelters

15 roughly for three and a half years, almost four

16 years, and that experience was very much

17 | traumatizing. I was once in DYCD shelters, then to

18 ∥ HUD, and-- and just-- this will just make it easier

19 | to me to get this for youth because based off my own

20 experience, my own peers' experience. It's

21 | traumatizing. It is belittling in a sense, and even

22 | after my experience staying in these shelters, I

23 ended up back on the streets, back in the drop-ins,

back with staying with family friends, families, you

know, and I'm just being recently placed out of all

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

that time into my own home. And to me, being youth
having access within a DHS shelters through this
voucher, that's great, great opportunity. But youth
who are in DYCD shelters just deserve as much chance.
The systems are very similar, and just because youth
are in the DHL's [sic] does not make their experience
any more mature, any more of an importance, so I
please, please urge Council to pass this bill of
Intro 2045 so all of my peers do not have to worry
about where they're sleeping, where they could
possibly go if they're experience are invalid and
they can have permanent stability in housing.
COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you so much,
Elizabeth. We're going to move now to Key King.
SERGEANT AT ARMS: Your time will begin.

KEY KING: Hello, I'm Key King. I'm--

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Key, you muted yourself

back.

KEY KING: I'm Key King, pronouns she/her/they/them. I am a youth with lived experience in DYCD shelters, and I believe that homeless youth should have the same vouchers as any other homeless person in DHS shelters because it is the same experience and in a homeless youth shelter

me the opportunity to speak. I'll be limiting my

testimony only to Intro. 2045 which would finally 2 3 give youth in the Department of Youth and Community 4 Development shelters access to CityFHEPS vouchers 5 which has been provided since 2016. I resided in both DYCD and DHS shelters while being homeless and 6 7 also a parenting youth. I understood that in order to be provided access to permanent housing and 8 vouchers such as CityFHEPS and SOTA [sic], you needed to reside in a DHS facility. Prior to meeting the 10 11 mother of my child I was an individual first came into contact with DHS shelter on 30th Street in 12 13 Manhattan. I was then transferred to Covenant House 14 and shortly after was placed in a transitional 15 independent living facility with DYCD. When I first came back into contact with the DHS system was after 16 17 I met my spouse who had also been living at Covenant 18 House during the time where we both decided to get a 19 domestic partnership in order to be provided services 20 through PATH as a couple, where shortly after we were expecting my son to be born. After months of working 21 2.2 with case management we finally got a permanent 2.3 housing option in New Jersey. Allowing vouchers to be provided to youth in DYCD facilities would have 24 allowed me to have more sustainable housing options 25

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

in a shorter amount of time, instead of having to
self-discharge from where I was residing to be
provided with better housing options that are only
offered through DHS facilities. The unfairness call
to youth in our city is the reason we still face a
homeless crisis, due to the lack of housing options
offered to youth residing in New York City. to allow
youth the opportunity to take time residing in DHS
and DYCD and allow those youth the same access to
vouchers others have access to would give the
opportunity for more youth to exit homeless and
provide a better community for all of our youth
today. I really appreciate your time.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Mr. Hernandez, I'd like to just ask where are you now? Where are you living right now?

LYNDON HERNANDEZ: Currently, I'm living with a relative who is at the moment threatening to evict my living situation.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And are you in New Jersey or in New York?

LYNDON HERNANDEZ: Currently I'm in New York City. I was residing in New Jersey but my lease expired in June.

raise the age for youth receiving access to youth

	shelters.											idea
3	of having	to	acce	ss t	the a	adu	lt s	shelter	sys	tem	n.	

However, I was told over and again that this was the only way, and I was told horrible stories about my fellow youth about these adult shelters and the harm that could happen specifically towards being queer, Trans, and youth in these spaces. I testified because I know how harmful having to access multiple systems for young people can be, and it not only increases harm and time on the streets, it is just plain dangerous. Allowing youth to have access to these vouchers can only -- just feels fair and reduces harm. I urge the City Council to pass Intro 2405 so that youth experiencing homelessness can finally have a

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you very much for your testimony, Alexander. I want to acknowledge that Council Member Diaz has her hand raised. Council Member Diaz we're going to take the last panelist for this panel, and then we will turn to you for questions of your statement. We now move to Naisha Humphrey for testimony.

fair chance at getting stable and a permanent place

1

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

to live. Thank you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

NAISHA HUMPHREY: Good morning everybody.

I hope you all had a great weekend and this testimony finds you well. My name is Naisha Humphrey. I am 22 years old, and today will be testifying on behalf of Intro 2405 which will finally give youth in Department of Youth and Community Development shelters, access to CityFHEPS vouches, which has been promised since 2016. Less is a child that has their own. I am a homeless survivor. I have experienced what it's like to be a homeless youth in New York City, firsthand. I understand what it's like to be susceptible to drugs and crime. Due to the dearth of stability. Not knowing where you will go after you age out of the DYCD shelter at 21 discourages youth to return to a lifestyle that they were running away There are great benefits for the city from. community if Intro 2405 is approved, and it will encourage youth to be more responsible and productive because they have something to look forward to. there are more productive members of society, there will be less crime and healthier mentally, because people will have time to sit still and take a broad analyzation of their own mental and physical health.

Having access to vouchers will help youth to have

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

their own and they will be able to be grateful and appreciative of what they have instead of looking at their situation now as something that's just unfortunate. They can look up and see the light. Thank you all for your consideration, for hearing me out, and for your compassion. Have a great day.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you very much, Naisha, and thanks so much to this entire panel. am now going to turn it back over to Chair Levin.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you very much to this entire panel. It's remarkable that you all are doing such amazing jobs in terms of your lives despite having these major obstacles that have been put in front of you, and trying to navigate this City which can be tough for anybody to navigate, but you have done a remarkable job, and I want to thank you for your very moving testimony, very impactful testimony. I think it's really important that we at the Council here and the Administration hear about your lived experience and understand that you know that a commitment was made in 2016 to make CityFHEPS available to youth who are aging out of the RHY system as well as youth who are aging out of the foster care system, and that the City up to now has

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

2.2

2.3

not honored that in any meaning [sic]. And that
now's the time that we have to do something, have
legislation to [inaudible] that, that these programs
are available to young people who are aging out of
their RHY [inaudible]. With that, I'm going to turn
it over to Council Member Diaz. I think she has a
[inaudible].

Levin. I want to thank the youth that spoke here today. Having been an employee at a shelter system, I fought for many of your battles as you came into my shelter. So I know your stories personally. [inaudible] saddened to hear that the system was mistreating you, because at the end of the day, that's what happens. Because your stories seem to indicate you fell through the cracks, and that's not what this system was created for. I'd like to ask Mr. Hernandez a question, if you would allow me, in reference to the voucher that was used to you could be housed in Jersey.

LYNDON HERNANDEZ: I used the SOTA voucher.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Do you mind sharing-- you were there for a year?

what it is to be a 20-year-old young man who has

lived through the shelter system, meets someone, has

24

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2	a child, moves to another state to further
3	[inaudible]. We have to do better. DHS, you just
4	have to do better. Thank you my colleagues for
5	allowing you to testify today. Thank you, Mr.
6	Hernandez, for sharing your story.

LYNDON HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Council.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: I'm done.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you, Council Member Diaz. I also want to acknowledge that we have been joined by Council Member Brad Lander. I'm now going to call our second panel for today. Our second panel will include representatives from the Administration for Children's Services and the Department of Social Services, followed by Council Member questions and then public testimony. I am now going to call on Stephanie Gendell, Deputy Commissioner of External Affairs at the Administration for Children's Services, and Erin Drinkwater, Deputy Commissioner of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs at the Department of Social Services to testify. Deputy Commissioners Gendell and Drinkwater are also joined by several members of the Administration who will be available for questions and answers. I'm now going to administer

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 23
the oath to the Administration. When you hear your
name, please respond once a member of our staff
unmutes you. Do you affirm to tell the truth, the
whole truth, and nothing but the truth before this
committee and to respond honestly to Council Member
questions? Deputy Commissioner Gendell?
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: I do.
COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Deputy
Commissioner Drinkwater?
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER: I do.
COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Deputy
Commissioner, Julie Farber?
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: I do.
COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Deputy Commissioner
Alan Sputz [sp?]?
DEPUTY COMMISSIONER SPUTZ: I do.
COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Chief
Medical Officer Angel Mendoza?
CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER MENDOZA: I do.
COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Senior
Assistant Commissioner for Detention Louis Watts?
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER WATTS: I do.
COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you. Assistant

Commissioner Randy Scott?

advocates' continued interest in the safety and well-

secure or non-secure detention facility, administered 24

in whole or in part by ACS." ACS operates two secure 25

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

detention facilities, Horizon in the Bronx and Crossroads in Brooklyn. ACS also contracts with nonprofit service providers to operate seven non-secure detention facilities. As of October 18, 2021, there were 60 youth at Horizon; 79 youth at Crossroads and 25 youth in non-secure detention. Prior to the pandemic, ACS hosted many scheduled tours of Horizon and Crossroads for elected officials, and we also included elected officials in our summer Freedom School Harambee event, where elected officials read stories and had the opportunity to dance with our youth in detention. We always did this in a manner that was safe for the youth, our staff, and our guests, and in a manner that was intentional about protecting the confidentiality of the youth in our care. It is important to us that elected officials and others are able to see our detention facilities, meet our staff, see the programming offered, see and meet the medical and mental health teams, and see DOE's Passages Academy. We have worked very hard to make our detention facilities as positive and supportive as possible, and to give youth the services and supports they need, and we certainly want Council Members and the Public Advocate to see

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and experience this. Given our interest in ensuring the safety and security of the youth in detention, ACS has limited the number of people coming to the facility throughout the pandemic, which has included reducing the number of tours. This was done to protect the youth and staff from the spread of COVID-19 as much as possible. As the community spread decreases and more and more New Yorkers have been vaccinated, ACS has opened the facilities back up to both in-person family visits and in-person programming. We would be happy to schedule opportunities for elected officials to visit our sites in the coming months. State law does not allow elected officials to make unannounced visits to secure or non-secure juvenile detention facilities. Horizon, Crossroads, and the non-secure detention facilities are licensed and regulated by the state. State regulations1 for secure and non-secure detention are quite specific as to which people are permitted to make inspections or visits to juvenile detention facilities, and elected officials are not included in the regulations. Intro. 1992-2020 would require ACS to create a pilot program to train at least five percent of the frontline child protection

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

specialists, CPS, in how to provide reasonable
accommodations that people with developmental,
intellectual and physical disabilities may require,
such as providing more time for case conferences and
casework contacts; special assistance with travel to
appointments; time management guidance; and referring
to classes available for parents with developmental,
intellectual or physical disabilities. Eighteen
months after the start of the pilot, ACS would need
to submit a report to the Council and Mayor about the
pilot and recommendations on how the program could
continue or be expanded. ACS appreciates the
Council, particularly Council Member Ayala who
sponsored the bill, for the interest in ensuring that
parents with developmental, intellectual or physical
disabilities, who are working with our CPS, are
receiving the services and supports most appropriate
for their needs. We agree that this is essential for
both the parents and children who come into contact
with the child welfare system. ACS currently
implements a model similar to what is envisioned in
the legislation. ACS provides all of our Child
Protection Specialists access to expert consultation
in intellectual, developmental and physical

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

disabilities. This includes medical consultants as well as an ACS team that is specifically dedicated to providing expert guidance to direct [inaudible] staff working with families with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. We refer to the unit as DDU. Every DCP borough office has on-site consultants providing CPS staff with expertise when needed. The Clinical Consultants include a domestic violence consultant, a Credentialed Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Counselor, or CASAC, and a Medical Consultant. The Medical Consultants are Nurse Practitioners contracted through Health + Hospitals, and part of their role is to provide expertise and training regarding individuals with physical disabilities. Medical Consultants also participate in case conferences and help CPS understand and implement the ways to minimize safety risks when parents have disabilities. The ACS DDU, within the Office of Child and Family Health, is a technical assistance unit that can refer CPS to experts in intellectual and developmental disabilities and are available for consultation with CPS at any time. In addition to providing consultation in individual cases, the DDU staff are available to participate in

family team conferences, serve as a liaison between
the parent and the DD service provider, and maintain
connections with DD service providers throughout the
City. The ACS DDU also coordinates Parenting Skills
Classes that are specifically tailored for parents
with known or suspected intellectual and/or
developmental disabilities. Unlike the Office for
People with Developmental Disabilities, or OPWDD,
services funded by the state, parents do not have to
meet threshold eligibility requirements for these
ACS-funded services. Parents in this program are
also linked to other supports, including Health
Homes, whenever possible. The DDU can also assist
parents in getting assessed by our contractor for
OPWDD-provided parenting skills classes and then with
enrolling if they are eligible. The DDU also engages
staff, providers and communities in numerous ways
aimed at providing education about the best ways to
support those with intellectual, developmental and
physical disabilities through webinars, lunch and
learn sessions and resource fairs throughout the
boroughs. Finally, the ACS Workforce Institute
offers a training open to all ACS staff, entitled,
"Engaging Parents with Cognitive and Other

Developmental Limitations," in which over 800 ACS and 2 3 provider staff have participated over the past year. 4 Intro. 2419-2021 would require ACS to create quarterly reports regarding the number of days 5 children are placed at the Nicholas A. Scoppetta 6 7 Children's Center, the Youth Reception Centers, or 8 YRC, and the Rapid Intervention Centers, or RIC. ACS operates the Nicholas A. Scoppetta Children's Center, and contracts with four providers to operate YRCs. 10 11 ACS's pre-placement continuum includes the Children's 12 Center with a capacity of 100 and four YRCs with a 13 total capacity for 45 children. When children must 14 be removed from a parent due to imminent risk to the 15 child's health and safety, ACS makes every effort to 16 immediately identify a foster home setting to meet 17 the child's needs, with priority for kinship 18 placements. We have established pre-placement 19 settings to make sure we can immediately meet the 20 needs of a child following removal or reentry to 21 care, in a safe and nurturing environment, while we 2.2 expeditiously work to find an appropriate longer-term 2.3 placement. Our goal is always to make sure stays at the Children's Center or YRCs are as short as 24 25 possible. The YRCs include the Sheltering Arms

Reception Center, which has 15 beds to serve boys and
girls age 0-12; Mercy First Virginia Residence, which
is a 12 bed co-ed facility for youth ages 14 and up;
the Good Shepherd Services Shirley Chisholm Center
which is a 10 bed facility serving girls ages 14 and
up; and Heartshare [sp?] St. Vincents Fox Hills,
which is an eight bed co-ed facility for youth ages
14 and up. YRCs are settings where youth can be
engaged in a trauma-focused, strengths-based,
clinical assessment and case planning process that
will result in the implementation of a safe,
supportive, timely out of home placement or family
reunification plan. ACS also contracts for three
Rapid Intervention Centers, or RICs, which are not
pre-placement facilities, but provide respite and
residential care for youth in foster care who need
crisis stabilization and/or assessments. RICs
provide a short-term stabilizing and safe environment
where individualized assessments and strengths-based
treatment plans tailored to youth and family needs
are developed. The Children's Center is a 24/7
temporary foster care placement facility where we
provide care and support for some of New York City's
most vulnerable children and youth who enter foster

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

care due to abuse or neglect, or other family
disruptions. The Children's Center serves
approximately 1,230 unique children and youth each
year, from newborns up to age 21. Eighty percent of
the children are at the Children's Center for seven
days or less and 60 percent of the children are there
for less than three days. Just five percent of the
children are at the Children's Center for 30 days or
more. Additional monthly data regarding the
Children's Center is available on our web site in our
monthly Flash report. There you will see that for
Year to Date Calendar Year 2021, the average daily
population at the Children's Center was 62 children.
The Children's Center is staffed with child care
specialists, social workers, programming and wellness
staff, and engagement and visiting specialists.
There is also an on-site full-time pediatrician and
nursing staff, the ACS-Bellevue Mental Health Team,
and JCCA provides additional clinical services to
youth with high needs. ACS also contracts with Safe
Horizon to provide consultants specialized in
engaging youth who are at risk or who have victims
been of sex trafficking. In addition, we have on-
site Cure Violence Credible Messenger Mentors, Youth

2	Advocate Program Family Finders/Advocates, a CASAC
3	and ACS Peace Officers who help maintain safety. ACS
4	has taken a number of steps to improve the experience
5	of children and youth at the Children's Center,
6	including the creation of four additional programming
7	spaces for children to use for community meetings and
8	developmentally appropriate programming workshops and
9	recreation, and a multi-faith room which offers
10	children a private, quiet area to practice their
11	faith. Programming offers youth healthy prosocial
12	and emotional outlets, provides enrichment and
13	recreation, and helps reduce the impact of trauma.
14	This year, ACS doubled the number of programming
15	staff at the Children's Center. Children's Center
16	programming ranges from therapeutic art classes
17	taught from our community partners such as the
18	National Arts Club, Culture for One, and A Place to
19	Be programs that focus on life skills, music,
20	performing arts, fitness, healthy relationships and
21	safer sex, youth voice and empowerment, health
22	education, and much more. Staff also chaperone youth
23	to off-site activities such as NYC cultural
24	institutions, sporting events, college and employment
25	fairs, aquariums, and with the fall weather, for

example, apple picking two weekends ago and Fright
Fest at Great Adventure this past weekend. The team
also organizes events for children to learn about and
celebrate cultural events; for instance, in October,
the Children's Center held events to recognize LGBTQ
History, Spanish Heritage, and the Mid-Autumn
Festival. Over the past two summers, programming
also introduced the Children's Defense Fund Freedom
School model. This year, the Children's Center also
partnered with DOHMH and Zero to Three to develop and
deliver Compassionate Response training for all
direct care staff. Additionally, a new partnership
with Bridge Kids New York added a new training for
direct care staff regarding caring for children with
special needs. Intro. 2420-2021 would require ACS to
conduct quarterly random audits of a statistically
significant sample of foster care placement change
notices to document how often ACS failed to produce
the notice, how long it took to send the notice to
the attorney for the child from when the placement
change occurred, and whether it included all legally
required information, and if not, what was missing.
This bill requires quarterly reports of the quarterly
audits. ACS appreciates the importance of timely

Τ.	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 36
2	notification to attorneys for children regarding
3	where children are placed and whether there is or may
4	be a change in the child's placement. ACS has a
5	process in place for this purpose. While placement
6	change notification requirements passed into law in
7	2020, ACS has been providing placement change
8	notifications since 2010. In 2010, ACS adopted a
9	policy requiring CPS and foster care agency case
10	planners to notify the attorney for the child of any
11	planned placement changes 10 days in advance of any
12	planned change or as soon as a decision is made to
13	change the placement, or no later than the next day
14	after an emergency move. In 2012, a new process was
15	implemented to improve this process by establishing a
16	mailbox for CPS and case planners to email our Family
17	Court Legal Services or FCLS division with
18	anticipated and actual placement changes. The FCLS
19	notification unit is responsible for taking the
20	emails from the mailbox, looking up the contact
21	information for the attorneys, and sending out a
22	notice to the appropriate attorney for the child.
23	Legal Aid and Lawyers for Children also set up a
24	central mailbox to receive the notices and distribute

to their staff. In 2020, the Family Court Act and

2	Social Services Law were amended to create a
3	statutory requirement regarding placement change
4	notifications. Under the 2020 law, which went into
5	effect at the height of the pandemic, notices are now
6	also sent to the attorneys for the parents and to the
7	court. Notifications from the central mailbox are
8	not the only means by which attorneys and the court
9	are notified of anticipated and actual placement
10	changes. CPS, case planners and FCLS attorneys also
11	provide information on placement location and moves
12	to attorneys for children, parents' attorneys and the
13	court at court hearings, in court reports and in
14	other communication between parties throughout the
15	pendency of cases. Notices are sent to the ACS
16	mailbox from the Children's Center, the ACS Office of
17	Placement Services, the foster care providers and the
18	Division of Child Protection when there is an initial
19	placement, an anticipated placement change, and an
20	actual placement change. Notification of initial
21	placements was added to the statutory requirements in
22	September 2021 as part of the Family First
23	legislation. Prior to this statutory change, ACS
24	notified attorneys for children, parents and the
25	court of children of initial placements for children

2	leaving the Children's Center. Notices include the
3	docket number, child's first name and first letter of
4	last name in keeping with ACS information security
5	protocols, date of placement, agency with whom the
6	child is placed, the type of placement, meaning
7	kinship home, foster boarding home, or other
8	placement type, contact name and number for the
9	agency case planner, and the FCLS attorney. On
10	September 29, 2021, the Family First provisions
11	became effective in New York. Building upon the
12	existing placement change notification process, ACS
13	is now also required to provide notice of initial
14	placements as well as notice and then a motion to the
15	parties and the court whenever we believe that a
16	child may be placed in a Qualified Residential
17	Treatment Program or QRTP. ACS is using the training
18	opportunity that comes with Family First, to
19	reinforce to DCPA, the Office of Placement, the
20	Children's Center staff and our foster care
21	providers, that they must send the notification to
22	the placement change notification mailbox so that the
23	attorneys and the court can be notified promptly. In
24	conclusion, I want to once again thank the Council,
25	the advocates and the legal providers for their

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

interest in ensuring that the children, youth and families served by ACS receive the highest quality care. As a government agency charged with promoting the safety and well-being of the City's children, we agree that transparency and accountability are essential. We look forward to discussing these bills further with the Council and we are happy to take your questions.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you, Deputy Commissioner Gendell. We are now going to turn to Deputy Commissioner Drinkwater for testimony from the Department of Social Services.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER: Good morning, I want to thank the General Welfare Committee and Chair Levin for holding today's hearing and the opportunity to testify. My name is Erin Drinkwater and I am the Deputy Commissioner for Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs at the Department of Social Services. The committee is reviewing several bills today impacting DSS and we look forward to learning the sponsors' intent and discussing them further. As we discuss these proposals today, we request that the Committee consider the impact that they would have on our

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

existing programs and services, particularly around capacity, client safety, and improvements made to date. With this in mind, we look forward to today's discussion. Introduction 2379 would require the Department of Social Services to create a domestic violence shelter specifically designated for men. look forward to working with the sponsor to better understand the bill's intent. DSS is the administering agency for New York State's Office of Children and Family Services domestic violence shelters in New York City. Under State Law, we are required to provide domestic violence shelters and services to all who qualify regardless of gender identity. In calendar year 2021 to date, the Human Resources Administration Domestic Violence shelter system has served 77 households headed by individuals who identify as male. As drafted, the bill presents challenges that could have a negative impact on the capacity of our shelter system and the safety of those we serve. First, regarding capacity, we are obligated to provide domestic violence shelter and services to all who qualify and creating a men-only domestic violence shelter would limit access to survivors who would, apart from their gender

2 identity, be eligible to enter this shelter, 3 consequently reducing our ability to help those in need given the limitations presented by this 4 proposal. Regarding client safety, establishing this type of shelter could exclude men who are not safe in 6 7 the proposed shelter's area due to borough 8 preclusions needed to be considered in placement determinations. Multiple men-only shelters would have to be created to address this safety concern, 10 11 which in addition to fiscal concerns associated with 12 expansion would be compounded by the low demand for a men-only domestic violence shelter based on system 13 14 wide use by men. Lastly, the bill requires a report 15 analyzing the impact and effectiveness of such 16 shelter. Given federal requirements in relation to client confidentiality, there would be additional 17 18 steps required for client data collection. We look 19 forward to working with the sponsor and advocates to 20 ensure that the domestic violence system continues to 21 serve clients irrespective of gender identity in 2.2 culturally competent and trauma informed approaches. 2.3 Introduction 1829 would preclude the Department of Homeless Services from requiring a child's presence 24 at an intake when a family with children applies for 25

2 shelter, regardless of individual case circumstances. 3 To provide some background, before the pandemic, as a result of the Mayor's 90-day review of homeless 4 services, DHS reformed the requirements for children to be present during intake at PATH to streamline the 6 7 application process for families with children. The intent of this reform, which applied to families 8 reapplying for temporary housing within 30 days, was to preserve as much educational stability as possible 10 11 for children 0-17 years old by removing the 12 requirement to return to PATH with the adult head of 13 household for follow up appointments. We took this 14 reform further during the pandemic to ease the 15 shelter intake process for families with children. 16 Since the pandemic, families with children applying 17 for shelter must make an initial visit to PATH to 18 apply, but children are not required to accompany the 19 parent. Parents can use FaceTime or Skype to provide 20 PATH staff an opportunity to observe the children, 21 with follow up assessments being allowed in similar fashion. While we have implemented these systemic 2.2 2.3 reforms -- while we have implemented these systemic reforms and do not intend to reverse them, there are 24 particular individual case circumstances that arise 25

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

when having a child physically present at intake is needed in the placement process. For example, to confirm that the applicant actually has the children in their care and custody when there is a concern that they do not. DHS has made significant reforms at PATH to ensure safety and welcoming environment for all as families seek shelter. We have taken particular focus in serving children who come to PATH and have on-site play areas as well as a mobile activity center intended to minimize the potential trauma when applying for shelter. We look forward to working with the sponsor on these matters. Introduction 2405 is in relation to the eligibility for rental assistance for runaway and homeless youth. We appreciate the Council's support of the 12-month pilot program the City launched in the summer to connect youth to CityFHEPS rental assistance vouchers. Given that the pilot just launched, the City needs time to assess the impact of these vouchers in connecting youth to housing and to consider any adjustments needed. We look forward to updating the Council on the progress of the pilot as we consider this bill. Thank you for the opportunity to present our testimony today. We look forward to

2 reviewing these bills and I welcome questions you may 3 have.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you to the members of the Administration for your testimony today. I am now going to turn it over to Chair Levin.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you very much to members of the Administration for your testimony. I apologize everybody, I was-- there was an accident on the subway this morning, and so I was finding other ways of getting [inaudible]. I do appreciate everyone's testimony so far. The first question is on the RHY CityFHEPS bill. So, there was two pilot programs. I mean, I guess we could take a step back and say that initially when the CityFHEPS program rules were promulgated, this would have been in 2018, I believe-- 2017, 2018-- there was provisions that in that-- in the rules that allowed for the Commissioner of ACS and the Commissioner of DYCD to refer cases to DSS to consider for a CityFHEPS voucher. How many times did that happen with both ACS and DYCD?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: I think I'm unmuted but I-- Erin, are you going to take this question, or do you want me--

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

for ACS if that's helpful. I realize it's not what

the bill's about, but I'm happy to update on the

3

pilot.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Yeah, no, I'm-- I mean, I'm really. Sorry, excuse me, Amenta Killawan needs to chime in for a second.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Just, I just want to chime in as a reminder the members of the Administration if you can remain unmuted during this entire segment. It'll just be easier on the back-end to ensure that you can chime in as necessary. So if you can please remain unmuted, all panelists from the Administration, during this question and answer period. And also a reminder to Council Members who may have questions to use the Zoom raise hand function, and we will call on you after the Chair has finished his line of questions. Thanks, Chair Levin.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you, Counsel. Yeah, so I'm trying to get a clear picture. I mean, just to put all the parts on the table. We had introduced this bill, or we had talked about introducing this bill a long time ago, and we had introduced the ACS bill, the companion ACS bill, a long time ago. So it was always my intention to make it clear in law that youth that are aging out of

foster care and youth that are aging out of DYCD, RHY
shelters, don't have to go into the DHS or DSS system
in order to qualify for a voucher. Like, simple,
straightforward, no kid that ages out of a system
should be having to go into another system designed
for adults to get access to the voucher. Simple,
straightforward. I didn't do the bill because it was
being addressed in the rule. The rule said that we
would allow referrals from the Commissioners, and
presumably that would then take place. So, I mean,
there's an intervening period between that rule and
when these pilot programs came out, that where that
rule was in place. The reason I did not do a bill
was because that rule is in place. And so it would
be really it's really important for me in
considering this legislation, to know how effective
that rule was. And so that's why that's in place.
Now, I guess I could I want to ask about the pilot
then. Can you can Director Thorne maybe speak to
the RHY pilot and how that's been going? How many
referrals have been made? How many youth have been
connected to a CityFHEPS voucher to date?

DIRECTOR THORNE: Hi, good morning.

Thank you so much for the question and also bringing

from ACS is discharged to homeless. That was the

case during the pandemic, prior to the pandemic, and it continues to be the case. We're always ensuring that our youth have a permanent place to go when they leave foster care, where we let them stay in foster care after their 21st birthday. The pilot is very new. So we were due to start in July, and we did start in July and then we gave out five CityFHEPS shopping letters in July, but then when the Council, which we greatly appreciate and thank you for your leadership on, of increasing the value of the voucher. We wanted to ensure that our young people had access to the higher rates of the voucher, and so we gave out the remaining vouchers throughout September. And so we currently have all 50 of the shopping letters with young people pursuing housing through CityFHEPS as well as continued to pursue housing through other opportunities.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay. And I appreciate that. I mean, I think that—— and I appreciate that no youth is aging out into homelessness. Does ACS track over the course of like five years after aging out whether young people end up in the DHS system?

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

1	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 50
2	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: We
3	definitely track what's in Local Law 145 which I
4	think it was up to two years after they leave foster
5	care was pushed to five, and it's a very small
6	number. I don't know it off the top of my head, and
7	I don't know if Julie does, but it's a very small
8	number.
9	CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Or if there was I
10	mean, I would housing insecure or unstably housed,
11	not just in the I mean, I know that you, you know,
12	young people are doubling up, are couch surfing.
13	Doubling up is fine if they have like a room [sic],
14	but couch surfing or, you know, staying with family

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: Right.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Or other, other type of unsafe living circumstances.

that might not be appropriate or safe.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: I can see if Julie wants to chime in, but I'll just say that we work very hard and are very planful [sic] about all of these discharges [inaudible]. I'll let-- I can see Julie wants to chime in.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: Sure thank Thank you, Council Member, for these questions, you.

2

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and as Stephanie referenced, we do not exit young people to homelessness. We are always working to ensure that they have stable housing. We're very pleased that we have all 50 of the FHEPS letters with young people and they're working on finding apartments with our support and support from the foster care agencies. We also, as Stephanie mentioned, we do collect data on young people that show up in the shelter system. I know we do it after one year, and maybe also after two years, and that number is very, very small and also has been going down over the last five or six years. We also, you know, have staff here that support young people, even when they have left the system, and we also coordinate with DHS when we see young people, you know, in the relatively rare occurrence when they show up in the shelter system.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay, so I'm just going to-- there's a little bit of a disconnect for me on this discussion, which is why-- what reason is there possibly out there to not make vouchers available to youth aging out of either the DYCD RHY system or the foster care system? What reason could there possibly be to say this is a bad idea? I just--

2.2

2.3

I can't even think of a reason why it's a bad idea,

even a theoretical reason.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: I mean, so I think that, you know, DYCD and ACS talked about the work that they're doing with the pilot, and part of that pilot is to also, you know, look at that and conduct an analysis following that pilot to understand the impact of those vouchers, and I think using that information will be very helpful moving forward.

time for that. I'm out of office in two months
[sic]. So I only have-- I only have-- I mean, you
know, it's not like we just started talking about
this. We started talking about this, you know, year
ago, three, four years ago. So, you know, I just
don't have the time. You know, I hope you understand
that. I just don't have the time to kind of further
analyze this. Again, I can't even think of a
theoretical reason, you know, why somebody aging out
shouldn't have immediate access to a voucher. I
can't even think of a theoretical reason. I mean, I
understand we have to-- you know, it's good to
analyze it, but like, again, we started talking about

2	this like years ago. The rule allowed for it to be
3	I mean, I'm just being totally honest. I mean, like,
4	the City told me that when the the rule would take
5	care of things. Like that was the response I got at
6	the time. Don't do the bill because we have a rule.
7	The rule will address the issue. And you know, and
8	then there was like a gap between the rule and the
9	pilot program of like a couple of years, and we don't
10	even know how man referrals came in from the
11	Commissioners of DYCD and ACS. I don't know why we
12	don't know, but I just like, you know, I don't I'm
13	debating whether to channel my inner Lou Fiddler
14	right now, because you know, I could just imagine if
15	Lou was here right now, how absolutely routinely
16	upset he would be, you know, as the former Chair of
17	the Youth Services, and a big champion of RHY. And
18	to think that there's an option available that's just
19	not [inaudible]. It's out there but it's not
20	available unless you go into a DHS shelter meant for
21	adults, single adults, which may be in congregate in
22	the middle of a pandemic. So, I mean, I just if
23	there's any bills of mine that I think are just open
24	and shut cases, these are the bills. I'll turn it
25	over to any of my colleagues for questions they may

2 have. Council Member Diaz, do you have questions?
3 You're on mute.

1

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: I apologize. working from home. One of the few times I do my iPad is not my friend today. It just -- I want to -- rooms. To me, rooms are not the most ideal place for an individual to live. You're sharing space, and if our youth could have lived in rooms with their family there wouldn't be in the situation they are today. Rooms are not the way to go. I hear rooms, rooms, rooms. Chair Levin, it just leads to more conflict and more discourse. We have to figure out -- if I hear conversations with SRO, which at least you're not sharing space. You share kitchen space, that's one conversation, but to know-- we're so happy and excited to know that we're exiting, which I see more pushing our young people to live in a shared space, that probably got them in this place to begin with. So while I appreciate the conversation of trying to make something happen, rooms is not a voucher that we should be pushing. We should figure out a way-stable homes, that they do not return back into the system, whether it's the shelter system, DYCD. of our youth began our conversation. He hopped.

2 was exited as a youth into a room, became a parent. 3 As a couple went into an apartment. Ended up in 4 Jersey, and is back basically on the streets. 5 are not an answer. Chair, I apologize [inaudible] angry and antsy, but having worked the system for 6 7 thirteen and a half years, I come from a different 8 space, a different picture. Rooms is not the way to go. And let's be clear, if the youth want to-- if anyone that wants to get out of shelter, they'll 10 11 accept a room, but we have to assure that the leases 12 are real, they would do real inspections. 13 moving into a room to then leave the room because of 14 the discourse or the services that were supposed to 15 have been provided weren't provided, that's an issue. 16 I had someone that moved into a room and once she was 17 there was told she couldn't have a TV. That's 18 basics. Forget you're in COVID. Could you just 19 imagine? You're living in a room. You're sharing a 20 refrigerator. You're sharing your bathroom, all your amenities and you can't have something basic as a TV? 21 2.2 We need to do better. And I'm gonna [sic] say on and 2.3 on throughout this hearing, we should do better. With New York, millions and trillions of dollars are 24 spent on housing. Housing is a human right. Let's 25

of the ratio of staff, children to staff?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL:

Yeah, the

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24 25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And that's been maintained despite, you know, increases or decreases in the population?

> DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: Yeah, we

have the ability to bring in addition staff if

needed, people who work for ACS in other capacities

who have been trained to also work there who are

temps if ever we needed it based on the census so

that we can maintain the ratio.

ratio is one to three.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Do you keep detailed

data on length of stay of -- you know, in terms of --

obviously in the -- you do keep the data, but I mean,

do you aggregate it in a way that you can analyze and

understand what's causing increases and decreases?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: Yeah, we

have a-- you know, we're always keeping track of how

many children are at the Children's Center and their

length of stay, and you know, most importantly, we're

always working to do everything we can so that

children are placed in the most appropriate placement

out of the Children's Center, whether that's

returning home to their family, going to a foster

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2 2.3

24

home or in some instances a residential provider. We're always looking to ensure they, you know, get out of the Children's Center into the most appropriate placement.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And is that something that you make public in any way right now, in terms of average length of stay? Is there any other kind of metrics from the Children's Center? Are you publicly reporting on any of that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: So we currently publicly report in the monthly flash that's available on our website that we update each month where we keep track-- we provide calendar year to date monthly averages of children at the Children's Center and some of the information that you're asking about, length of stay. I also in my testimony talked about some of the length of stay numbers including that 80 percent of the young people and children are there for seven days or less.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: I mean, one thing that we're very concerned about are the outliers. So, young people that are-- so do we have a sense of how many young people right now have been there, for

September of 2021 there were 101 children who exited

J

2.2

after 20 days, and 55 percent of those were 11 or older, and 45 percent were under.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Sorry, can you-- 55

percent were over 11. So there's-- do you see a

disparity in terms of-- or what are you able to glean

from that data in terms of the relationship between

length of stay and either special needs status or

[inaudible].

think one of the things that's just important to keep in mind as we think about the children coming in and out of the Children's Center is it changes from one day to the next. Since most of the children are there for such a short time, there's constantly different children that we would be talking about each day. Luckily, not a lot of children, but removals are way down, too. But you know, it's not the same from one day to the next. I don't know if Julie has anything she would want to add about the trend data that you're asking.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: Yeah, so as Stephanie mentioned, the numbers I have in front of me says 60 percent, right, leave within three days, 80 percent within seven days, 90 percent less than 15

days. So the vast majority, obviously, of children
are leaving to placement relatively quickly. The
other thing that I know you're familiar with, Chair,
is that our first focus is on placing children with
kin. So, we're keeping many, many children out of
the Children's Center through those efforts. And so
at this point, of the children who are coming into
care due to abuse and neglect, about 50 percent of
those children are being placed with kin. So that is
a huge focus for us, and then obviously we are always
working to move children who can't be immediately
placed with kin. We continue to look for kin, and
then when kin really cannot be found, we work to
place them in the, you know, the foster home that
hest meets their needs

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: I'm sorry, I'm just—
I do want to focus kind of on the children that are
kind of an outlier cases. Are there instances where
there are children that are there for longer than 60
days or longer than that? Ninety—

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: There are sometimes, and you know, we're working always very hard to find them the most appropriate.

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

2.2

2.3

2	CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Are there any
3	children there now that have been there for longer
4	than 60 days.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: Longer than 60 days?

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Yeah.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: I would guess so from the data I'm looking at, but I don't have that for sure. So we'd need to get back.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: I mean, what are circumstances that would cause a child to be there for longer than 60 days, considering that 90 percent are there for no longer than 14 days.

know, when we're placing a child we're considering a lot of different factors. We're considering geography. We're considering the child's needs.

We're considering clinical issues. there are some, and you know, these are outliers, you know, as you have said Council Member, but sometimes when young people have a placement but don't want to go to their placement, and so we're working, you know, with young people in those situations, and of course, want to value young people's perspective, particularly

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

2 teenagers, and so there are certain instances, you 3 know, such as that, but can contribute to longer 4 lengths of stay, but we're always working to find the 5 right match, the right fit, you know, the right foster parents, if the child needs clinical and 6 7 therapeutic treatment in a residential program. 8 We're working to, you know, place a child in the right place, and in the meantime when they're at the Children's Center, as Deputy Commissioner Gendell 10 11 noted, there is a significant amount of programming 12 and clinical and therapeutic services in place at the

Children's Center.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Right. I think that, you know, it's—but it's in—it's not an appropriate setting for a—you know, it's never meant to be a even medium term placement. It's there to be temporary. So any—I mean, I think that obviously it's good to hear that the vast majority of children are there for a short period of time. I do worry about even if it's only, you know, small number of children there that were there for longer periods of time [inaudible] the lack of access to, you know, socialization with other children, you know, longer term relationships, familial relationships, you know,

1

3

4

5

67

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

[inaudible] very seriously. They're in quarantine due to exposure to COVID. And I'm going to turn it over to Doctor Mendoza to talk more about.

CHIEF MENDOZA: Yeah, so we-- once of

course, we follow all DOHMH guide -- and state [inaudible] guidelines and CDC guidelines in terms of quarantine and isolation. I'm glad to say that we are just a day away from releasing the child who was positive from isolation and just I believe four days away from releasing the rest of the quarantine. also, while they're in quarantine they stay with their quarantine groups. So they are interacting with those who are in the same group. So we try to keep them in that infection control "bubble" and they are also engaged in different activities within the bubble. They have visits, virtual visits with their families as well, and as much as possible, we also maintain other kinds of activities that we can while they're still safe within that quarantine bubble. We are so proud to say that we have had very, very, very low cases of COVID-19 positivity rates at the Children's Center. In fact, even when the city was at high transmission rates, the Children's Center was averaging in the low transmission rate, and we

_

2.2

2.3

continue to average low transmission rates. We feel that this is because of our strict adherence to infection control practices.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you [sic],

Doctor Mendoza. Sorry. I'm going to move over to

another piece of legislation, 2420, which would

require an audit report on foster care placement

notices. We've heard, and I'm wondering if this is

true, that ACS has a shortage of therapeutic foster

homes to meet the needs that are currently existing

in the foster care system.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: Thank you.

I wasn't sure-- I didn't think that's what you're

going to ask about that legislation, but that's okay.

I'm now going to turn it over to Julie to answer.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: Sure. Thank you very much for that question. So our foster care providers are working very hard, as I mentioned, to increase the proportion of young people who are placed with kin, right? So that happens both by the Division of Child Protection and then also by our foster care agencies, and then at the same time obviously the agencies are also focused intensively on foster parent recruitment and support. And so

pandemic.

prior to the pandemic we drastically increased new foster home recruitment across all different types of foster care, including therapeutic foster care that you asked about, Council Member. The pandemic did have a little bit of an impact on foster home recruitment, but I am very pleased that in this past year we are now rising out of that impact and moving back to foster home recruitment levels prior to the

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Can you speak to maybe some of the challenges that you face in recruiting foster parents for older youth or youth with disabilities?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: Yeah, so wethe strategy that we use and that has really been
most effective in recruiting foster parents for older
youth and for children with special needs is focusing
on recruiting from existing experienced foster
parents. So we have foster parents to come in and
they are in what's considered sort of regular foster
care, and then there's therapeutic foster care and
specialized foster care. And while some foster
parents can be recruited directly from the community
to those higher needs groups, we have found that the

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: Oh, sorry,

24

25

go ahead, Chair.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: I'm sorry. Is that entirely within your jurisdiction or is that an OCFS [inaudible] work on with OCFS in terms of the boarding rates?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: We have some control over it. Obviously, state funding is a piece of it, but as I think you know, Chair, the City far out-spends the foster care block grant that the state provides. So that's obviously an important piece of the financing. But in terms of the payment rates that are provided to foster parents are certainly a piece of the puzzle, in addition to emotional support, moral support, training, and so forth.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Are you ever-- do you ever face a situation where a child is placed in a group setting simply for a lack of a foster home, or group setting? Go head, sorry.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: Yeah, no, go ahead Chair.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Or I going to say or group setting placements entirely due to the appropriateness of the setting. Is there ever a situation where a foster home is preferable, it's just not available?

3

4

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER:

R: So, we are--

you know, we have an entire function at ACS that determines what's called the appropriate level of care and whether a child needs a regular foster home, a therapeutic foster home, a specialized foster home, or do they need, you know, services and stabilization in a residential program. And so those determinations are made by that function, and obviously that relates directly to the new Family First Law that has gone into place, and so we now have what's called the QI, qualified individuals, who make those decisions and they are firewalled from the folks who actually make the placements, and so the focus is always on finding the most appropriate placement according to what the level of care is that has been identified. I don't know if -- I can see that Stephanie wants to say something more about Family First.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL: Sure, I can do that. I think-- to answer your question, we are always seeking to find the most appropriate placement for children, but we now under Family First have additional layers before a child would be in what's now called a Qualified [sic] Residential Treatment

Program which is essentially our residential parent providers. That qualified individual that Julie mentioned require to use an evidence-based tool that we've just implemented called a CASIE [sic] and they also are -- they're required to speak with what's called a Permanency Team which is the child, their family, the child's lawyer, and other people involved in the child's life, and they put that all together to make the recommendation about whether or not residential care or QRTP is the appropriate level of That will now have an additional court review. So, I think adding on the new Family First requirements, had this ever been occurring before should really prevent it from happening again. And if we do have a young person in congregate [sic] care, who the QI says that's not the right level of care, we would no longer receive federal funding for that [inaudible].

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So, that as a-- that would be enough of a deterrent or enough of an obstacle. Essentially, if it's not-- if it's not determined you're staying under this evidence-based framework as being an appropriate placement, then there would be no federal reimbursement for--

25

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

2

1

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL:

[interposing] That's correct. I don't know that necessarily the lack of federal funding would be the deterrent. We really were very focused on finding the most appropriate placement, and I think these enhanced processes [inaudible] both the assessment by the qualified individual and the court review are really what would provide the additional layers of ensuring who are residential care or youth who have therapeutic need to be there.

> CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Okay.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: definitely. The staff who are making the level of care determinations and making the placements, they have no focus whatsoever on federal funding reimbursement. Their focus is entirely on the needs of the child.

Right. So then-- I CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: mean, I guess my question then would be are you saying that it never happens, or under the current Families First Law, it-- there's no circumstance where that would happen?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: I think that

there is--25

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

2 DEPUTY COMMISSIONER GENDELL:

[interposing] Should never.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: Right, well, it certainly should never happen. I think there is also the fact that, you know, there can be different viewpoints on, you know, the best possible setting for a young person which is also—

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: [interposing]

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: the benefit of having the QI. There's also the young person's view, the parent's view, the court's view, and so you know, it is not always sort of one way or the other. The other piece is that, you know, circumstances can change. Children's needs can change, and evolve. So, you know, obviously our focus is on placing children in the setting that will best meet their needs. We have, you know, very low rate in New York City of placement in residential care. It's about eight or nine percent of all kids in foster care, so it is not something that happens very often, and it is something that we are extremely focused on continuing to reduce. And of course you know, Council Member, that we are currently in the process of re-RFP-ing [sic], re-procuring the entire foster

bill. Is there any reason why DSS would ever revert

)

long ago, certainly saw some of the efforts made particularly around, you know, children who are at PATH and would be happy to offer the same to Council Member Ayala [sic] and certainly work with her on the bill.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Just for the record,

Council Member Diaz and I went to PATH. It was not—

it was sparsely attended. I mean, it was— there was

a not a lot of— there were not a lot of families

there. It was on a, you know, a weekday morning.

You know, that's— there's probably a number of

reasons why that's the case, but obviously we—

that's a good thing. We don't want to see more

families [inaudible]. Okay, I appreciate the— I'll

convey this to Council Member Ayala.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FARBER: Wonderful.

GHAIRPERSON LEVIN: And we'll see if we get somewhere on this bill. Okay, that's it for me. I know that there's other pieces of legislation that Council Member Ayala sponsored, and I-- and she can speak with the Administration offline about that as well, but I also want to acknowledge Council Member Salamanca joined. And put it to my colleagues once more, if anyone has any questions before we move on

testimony. I want to again remind everyone that I'm

2.2

2.3

going to call up individuals in panels. Once your name is called a member of our staff will unmute you and you may begin your testimony once the Sergeant at Arms sets the clock and gives you the cue. All testimony will be limited to three minutes, and please remember that there is a few seconds delay when you are unmuted before we can hear you. Please wait for the Sergeant at Arms to announce that you may begin before starting your testimony. And our next panel, which will be comprised of public testimony, in the order of speaking will be Jamie Powlovich, Anna Blondell, and Julia Davis. We are going to begin with Jamie.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Your time will begin.

JAMIE POWLOVICH: Good morning. My name is Jamie Powlovich and I'm the Executive Director of the Coalition for Homeless Youth. Thank you to Chair Levin for holding today's hearing. I'll be limiting my testimony to Intro 2405, which CHY is in full support of. Despite many broken promises, youth in the DYCD system still do not have equal access to CityFHEPS vouchers. I would like to outline the history that has led to the need for this bill. In April 2016, the first promise of voucher access for

2.2

2.3

24

25

homeless youth was made when the Mayor released his review of homeless service agencies and programs report. This promise was echoed in February 2017 and the Turning the Tide on homelessness in New York City report which stated, "In 2017, the City will expand these rental assistance programs to include for the first time youth living in DYCD youth shelters at risk of entering DHS shelters." Fast-forward to April 2017 at the General Welfare Oversight Hearing regarding reforms to homeless services one year When Commissioner Banks testified regarding DYCD youth getting access to vouchers that it, "is expected to be finalized in the summer of 2017." During questioning Chair Levin asked Commissioner Banks, "When do you expect that the first young person will have a voucher in hand?" To which Commissioner Banks responded under oath, "in the fall." In Fiscal Year 17 1,804 youth exited the DYCD shelter system into homelessness. In September 2017 at the Youth Services Oversight Hearing, DYCD Commissioner Chung testified under oath that, "We are working with HRA to help eliminate young eliqible youth apply for access link housing subsidies." This was untrue, as DYCD youth never have access to LINC

2	vouchers. In June 2018 the Mayor announced the
3	creation of the New York City Youth Homelessness
4	Taskforce. In Fiscal Year 18 another 1,466 youth
5	exited into homelessness. In January 2019 the
6	taskforce released its report that has still not been
7	acknowledged by the Administration that commissioned
8	it which included the recommendation to "determine
9	and implement the eligibility and community referral
10	process for homeless youth residing in DYCD programs
11	to access CityFHEPS." In March 2019 when CHY asked
12	DYCD what the status of getting access to CityFHEPS
13	for runaway and homeless youth was, they responded
14	via email that, "We have had some very productive
15	meetings with HRA and are close to finalizing."
16	However, in April 2021, CHY obtained a copy of an MOU
17	that DYCD signed with HRA on October 4, 2019 that
18	would force DYCD residents to go into DHS shelters
19	prior to being found eligible for CityFHEPS vouchers.
20	In Fiscal Year 19, another 1,235 youth
21	SERGEANT AT ARMS: [interposing] Time
22	expired.

JAMIE POWLOVICH: exited into 24 homelessness.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: You can continue

3 Jamie.

JAMIE POWLOVICH: Thank you. In July 2019, the Mayor again announced that the city was, "working with the DYCD to connect certain eligible young people transitioning out of DYCD shelter and entering DHS shelter with CityFHEPS rental assistance." In Fiscal Year 20 and Fiscal Year 21 another 2,430 youth exited into homelessness. Since initially promising youth in DYCD shelters access to vouchers in 2016, 6,935 youth have remained homeless, that we know of. That is almost 7,000 missed opportunities the city had to change the outcome for youth experiencing homelessness. We urge you to pass Intro. 2405. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Jamie, can I just ask you-- so, not all of those young people aged out into the DHS system, but very few, if any, are aging out into a stable housing situation, correct?

JAMIE POWLOVICH: So, the numbers that I quoted are from FOIL data as well as the Local Law 86 reports when they were started being produced, and they incorporate young people that were discharged

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

from shelter into shelter or shelter onto the streets. So remained homeless.

2.2

2.3

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So you laid out in much clearer fashion than I did what we were trying to get at. Why do you think this has been the case for so--

JAMIE POWLOVICH: Well, I think to put it frankly, it's because people don't like to share, right? I think it has to do with money and that we consider folks homeless based on the systems that they're a part of and the money that's being spent in those systems instead of actually considering homelessness as an experience and a trauma, and then making resources available to everyone that meets that definition.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: So, Council Member

Diaz has questions for DHS, so I'm going to turn it

over to her, but I'm going to ask you for a favor for

us here, is if you can continue to over the coming

months, coming weeks really, make as much noise about

this issue and this bill as you can. We'd greatly

appreciate it. I think that we need to make this. We

need everybody in this city to understand what's

happening. Collectively channel our inner Lou

^

2.2

Fiddler's [sic] and, you know, kind of like do this in his honor. It'd be a good thing. Imagine— maybe I'll actually reach out to his family [inaudible], so that we could recruit them, but it's— you know, it's an outrage. There's this option available. It's now at a market rate, so they're actually usable vouchers now. And you know, we could— it is— it's the right thing to do [inaudible]. If we could work together and really make some noise at this point it would be great.

JAMIE POWLOVICH: Definitely. We're happy to make noise, and I just want to thank you again for all of your leadership with this issue. Since as far back as I can remember, you've never missed an opportunity at a hearing or another forum to advocate for young people to get vouchers. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you, Jamie.

Thanks. I'll turn it over to Council Member Diaz,

and then I have to actually step out for a few

minutes because I'm joining another hearing, but I'm

here and I'll be back, but I'm going to turn it over

to Council Member Diaz.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Your time will begin.

report. I have to go back to my notes. I'll send you

1	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 85
2	the report itself, but I was given so I'm working
3	from home. I'm multitasking.
4	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER: No
5	problem.
6	COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: It was
7	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER:
8	[interposing] Yeah, I just I don't want to comment
9	on a report if it's a DHS report
10	COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: [interposing] Yes,
11	yes, yes.
12	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER: I'm
13	referring to the HRA domestic violence shelter system
14	and there were 77 in calendar year 21 year-to-date,
15	77 male head of households or single adult men.
16	COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: I'm going to send
17	you what was sent to me a couple of months ago.
18	Because if I'm correct, it's the same reporting
19	mechanism that DHS uses, that's where the data was
20	taken from.
21	DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER: Yeah,
22	I'm happy to look at it. Just to make clear
23	COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: [interposing] Okay.

2.2

2.3

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER: If this is—— I'm referring to the HRA domestic violence shelter system, not DHS.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Okay, thank you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER: DHS

doesn't administer the DV system.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: I understand.

Thank you. Now, you mentioned that there would be perhaps a federal compliance issue.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER DRINKWATER: Correct.

So there is very strict requirements under federal guidelines as it relates to information that can be shared from survivors who are receiving services.

And so in terms of the reporting requirement that's reported in the bill, it's one additional layer that we would need to take into consideration as we're exploring the bill.

research over the weekend and it seems that Texas, in Dallas, they were able to figure out a way to work with men. It seems to be the first state that has addressed the issue for domestic violence and men in particular. So I'd like to work on that so we can figure out how to do that. And then you mentioned

the center of child welfare matters in Family Court

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

and many are children placed in foster care and held in temporary placement facilities. Legal Aid has submitted joint testimony with the Coalition for the homeless on the shelter-related bills before the council and seeded our testimony time to the young people with lived experience who have testified so powerfully in support of the CityFHEPS bill before you today. But I want to speak to you regarding two bills, Intro 2419 and 2420 and to demonstrate why they would create transparency and improve the experience of children in foster care. As ACS just testified, ACS is already obligated by law, regulations, ACS policy to notify a child's attorney before the child is moved through the foster care system, but attorneys for children almost always receive notice after ACS has already removed the child. For instance, ACS giving notice at a court hearing or in a court report is too late. The child has already been moved. I'll give you just one example of how this hurts children in care. represent five-year-old boy who has been thriving in a foster home for a year. This fall, his foster mother needed to enroll him in school so that she could go back to work. She wanted to continue to care

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

for this boy, but no one at the agency was helping to enroll him in school, and so with her back against the wall, she put in her notice asking for him to be removed. Our staff was not notified by ACS, but luckily we found through the attorney for the parent, and we moved rapidly to intervene. We helped enroll the child in school quickly, preserved the placement, and this five-year-old boy did not need to be moved through the system, and that is it. It sounds incredibly simple, but it was deeply significant for this five-year-old child. Advance notice, as already required, allows us to do our job, assist our clients and avid needless disruptions. Without timely notice countless children have been denied needed advocacy. This happens daily and children are unnecessarily traumatized. Data on the length of placement at the Children's Center and other temporary placement facilities, Intro 2419, is equally critical, as there are too many kids held for too long without adequate care. ACS testified before City Council this June that at least 153 children have been held at the Children's Center for over 20 days, and while the Children's Center census did plummet at the beginning of the pandemic, they're back to pre-pandemic levels.

at temporary placement facilities instead of homes

testimony and are happy to address any questions.

where they belong. We ask you to review our written

2.2

2.3

1

3

4

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you very much, Anna, for your testimony. We will now turn to Julia Davis.

JULIA DAVIS: Good after--

SERGEANT AT ARMS: [interposing] Your time will begin.

JULIA DAVIS: Good afternoon Chair Levin and members who are joining us today. Thank you for holding this hearing. Thank you for revisiting all this much-needed legislation. I'm Julia Davis. I'm the Director of Youth Justice and Child Welfare at the Children's Defense Fund New York. We advocate for young people across the state and in the city and detention is a special issue for us, in part because our Freedom Schools operate in juvenile detention in New York City. We support 2419 which is the bill that our colleagues from Legal Aid just discussed with regard to information about children who are staying at the Children's Center, and we stand with the Coalition for Homeless Youth and Legal Aid on 2405. I want to focus for a moment on the bill that we haven't spent a lot of time on today, which is 1304 which allows City Council Members and the Public Advocate to visit youth detention centers in the

opportunity to make that connection to be in these

2

3

4

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

spaces with young people and to know more about what they need to thrive and to move forward. so I want to thank you all today and remind you that detention is not only an issue for young people, it's an issue of freedom, and it is also a critical issue related to racial disparity. Ninety-four percent of young people in detention in the city today are black and Latinx. This is a crucial group of young people that need to hear you and see you and need to have you in the buildings. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify today.

> CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you, Julia.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you so much to this entire panel for your testimony. I am now going to call up our next panel. Our next panel will be in the following order: John Sentigar, Nadia Swanson, and Deborah Berkman, and we are going to begin with John Sentigar.

JOHN SENTIGAR: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is John Sentigar, and I am a member of the Advocacy Team at Covenant House New York where we serve youth experiencing homelessness ages 16 to 24 years old. I'd like to thank the Committee on General Welfare and Chairperson Steven

Levin for the opportunity to submit testimony today. 2 3 I am limiting my testimony to Intro. 2405. You heard earlier from Jamie Powlovich about the city's 4 5 repeated promises to reform homeless services to accommodate youth getting access to vouchers, but 6 7 this has still not happened. Time and time again our dedicated and experienced aftercare housing managers 8 struggle to find housing options for young people who are about to leave our transitional housing programs, 10 even when the client has met all of their individual 11 12 and program goals. This creates a bottleneck in our 13 programs, as a young person in our shelter won't be 14 able to move into a TIL until there's a bed 15 available. But we won't release that bed until we can be sure that the young person exiting our TIL has 16 an appropriate place to stay. This needs to change 17 18 and this is why Covenant House New York is in full 19 support of Intro. 2405. While the pilot program 20 initiated the summer that provides 50 CityFHEPS 21 housing vouchers to youth is a good start, it's 2.2 nowhere near enough. Covenant House New York will 2.3 ideally be provided 10 of those vouchers for youth in our programs, but as of today, or this week when I 24 checked, we've already had 43 youth sign up for this 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

assistance. So this means we'll have to turn many of them away and determine another plan for them. Fiscal Year 2020, only 29 of the 2,791 young people discharged from a DYCD shelter moved in to unsubsidized housing. Many had no other option but to become homeless. The city needs to provide more funding to help administer these programs, and while we are grateful that these 50 vouchers made available, it amounts also to a lot of additional staff time without additional funding. Ultimately, youth experiencing homelessness in New York City need much more than 50 vouchers from the city. Meaningful change needs to take place. Time spent in a youth shelter must be counted towards time spent as homeless by the DSS. Youth homelessness is an epidemic and it is at crisis levels in New York City and across the country. Young people definitely need access to affordable and sustainable housing, and the numbers clearly affect this. Counting their time spent in a youth shelter towards eligibility for CityFHEPS will be an essential tool in making that It does not make sense that because a young person is accessing services through a different city agency, one that specializes in developmentally

2.2

2.3

appropriate services they should be denied a major pathway to achieving housing stability. I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to testify today. We know the city has difficult decisions to make, but young people experiencing homelessness are already marginalized and the current economic realities make it even harder for them to break free from poverty. Passing Intro. 2405 will go a long way towards ensuring homeless youth in New York City are better able to obtain independent and permanent housing. This change to benefit young New Yorkers facing homelessness will ensure positive outcomes and promote positive systemic change in the face of a continuing homeless crisis. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thanks so much.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you, John, for your testimony. Going to turn now to Nadia Swanson who will be followed by Deborah Berkman. Over to Nadia.

NADIA SWANSON: Good morning. My name is Nadia Swanson and I'm the National Technical Assistance and Advocacy Consultant at the Ali Forney Center. Thank you to the Committee and Chair Levin for this hearing and for this committee's ongoing

2	support of youth experiencing homelessness in New
3	York City. The Ali Forney Center and myself are in
4	full support of Intro. 2405, a bill which will
5	provide runaway and homeless youth in DYCD shelters
6	access to FHEPS. As a member of Coalition for
7	Homeless Youth, we support their testimony as well.
8	I specifically wnt to thank the youth who spoke
9	earlier. The Ali Forney Center is the nation's
10	largest and most comprehensive service for LGBTQ
11	youth experiencing homelessness. We believe that
12	housing is a human right and that youth should never
13	need to experience homeless, let alone have increased
14	barriers to accessing permanent housing. We know
15	that youth, especially LGBTQ+ young people experience
16	immense amounts of trauma when needed to access DHS
17	shelters. I know the longer you stay in the shelter
18	system, it greatly increases the risk of
19	decompensation [sic] which makes them less likely to
20	be able to thrive independently. We need to be
21	giving youth permanent housing as quickly as possible
22	after accessing homeless services. Young people's
23	experiences in DHS are so damaging that AFC [sic]
24	youth do not even considering going to DHS in order

to get a voucher, creating a several year-long delay

to accessing permanent housing. At AFC we serve over
2,000 youth a year, and in the last 10 years of our
agency, we only know of a few young people that were
successful in obtaining a voucher through DHS. In
2017, Mayor de Blasio promised youth access to
vouchers, and we're still waiting. There's no reason
why time in DYCD shelter should not count as time
spent in a shelter for a voucher, but it does for
supportive housing. Not all youth qualify for
supportive housing and deserve support to stability.
As a city we need to be doing everything in our power
to reduce the amount of trauma and violence that face
LGBTQ youth and denying them access to CityFHEPS
vouchers for their time spent on the street or in
DYCD shelter with a direct link to the violence they
ultimately face. By passing this Intro 2405 you'll
be giving all youth the ability to thrive
independently, prevent and heal from trauma, and
reach their individual goals beyond survival. Thank
you.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you very much,
Nadia. We will turn now to Deborah Berkman for
testimony.

DEBORAH BERKMAN: Thank you.

1

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Your time will begin.

3

DEBORAH BERKMAN: Chair Levin, Council

4

opportunity to speak to the Committee on General

5

Welfare. My name is Deborah Berkman, and I'm the 6

7

Coordinating Attorney of the Shelter Advocacy

8

Initiative at the New York Legal Assistance Group or

Members and staff, good morning. Thank you for the

at NYLAG. The Shelter Advocacy Initiative provides

10

legal services and advocacy to low-income people in and trying to access the shelter system. Based on my

11 12

experience working with families and young people

13

experiencing homelessness, I appreciate this

14

opportunity to testify about the dramatically

16

15

positive impact Intros Number 1829 and 2405 would have on my client's lives. I'll start with Intro

17

1829. Since the COVID crisis began, DHS has been

18

temporarily allowing families with children to apply

19

for shelter at PATH without the children being

20

present, but as you know, has indicated that this may

21

not be a permanent change. Prior to COVID-19,

2.2

families with children applying for shelter would

2.3

spend 10 to 20 hours in PATH every time they applied.

24

Having a policy that mandates children spend 10-20

25

hours in an office necessarily precludes them from

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

regularly attending school, and it's been wellestablished that students experiencing homeless test well behind our housed peers. Forcing these children to be present at PATH [inaudible] disparity, and we're not talking about one missed day of school. Many of my clients are deemed ineligible for shelter based on administrative issues with their applications and they have to apply again and again. prior to COVID, reapplying would entail restarting the process from the beginning having the entire family including the children go back to PATH and spend another 10-20 hours completing a new application for shelter, typically identical to the prior application, and then waiting on-site for a new temporary shelter placement. So, some of my client's children would miss a day of school every 10 days and that would force them to fall further and further behind housed children. This is unacceptable hardship for children how are experiencing homelessness, and missing school is only part of the problem with having children be present at PATH. Many of my clients reported that while waiting at PATH Families were provided very little if any food, and that there are no outlets to charge their phones

8

or other devices so their children could be kept busy 2 3 while they waited. They were also warned not to 4 leave, less they would lose their places in line, and none of these factors create an appropriate 5 environment for children. Additionally, applicants 6 7 for family shelter have to provide extremely detailed accounts of why they can't currently stay at any of the places they've lived for the last two years. [inaudible] sensitive topic such as domestic violence 10 11 or domestic abuse. Most of my clients don't want 12 their children to have to hear about these disturbing and painful personal experiences, and they shouldn't 13 14 have to. And I just want to take a moment to address 15 whatever the Commissioner Drinkwater said about 16 having to make sure that there being instances where 17 PATH staff has to make sure that the parent is in the 18 custody. If the policy has been in place for 18 19 months and that hasn't been the case, why would that 20 be the case in the future? Moreover if the child is 21 not actually in the custody of the applying parent, 2.2 it will become immediately obvious once a family 2.3 shelter placement is made because that child won't show up at the placement. So it just doesn't make 24 25 sense what -- that reason. I also want to support

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you very much

Deborah, and thank you for this entire panel for your

24

2.2

testimony. I'm now going to call up our next panel.

Our next panel will be in the following order, Jimmy

Meagher and Josepha Silva [sp?], and we are going to

begin with Jimmy. Oh, I see that Council Member Diaz

has her hand raised. Over to Council Member Diaz.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: Thank you again for the opportunity. My question is to Ms. Nadia Swanson. Hi, it's in reference to the 2010 E application. You mentioned that not all within your population qualify. Can you give me an example as to why-- what category they're not meeting?

NADIA SWANSON: Yeah, so normally it would be having to have serious persistent mental health diagnosis, HIV, other serious chronic medical condition. And so usually we can do PTSD or something like that, but it's not always accepted. So, someone who doesn't have a serious persistent mental health diagnosis might not qualify for the supportive housing.

COUNCIL MEMBER DIAZ: My understanding is that if we could prove that they were displaced within the last five years, no high school diploma, mental illness, displacement— that falls down under mental illness. I'm just really curious as to why

for a year, okay.

NADIA SWANSON: They've hit a year but they want a stronger diagnosis. There's just like other factors that they keep-- they'll shoot back, but we do get a lot of people placed in supportive housing.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you, Council Member Diaz, and thank you Nadia for responding to Council Member Diaz's questions. I'm now going to call up Jimmy Meahger.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts now.

JIMMY MEAGHER: Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Jimmy Meagher. My pronouns are he/him/his, and I'm policy Director at Safe Horizon, the nation's largest nonprofit victim services organization. Safe Horizon offers a client-centered trauma-informed response to 250,000 New Yorkers each year who have experienced violence or abuse, and we are increasingly using a lens of racial equity to guide our work with clients, with each other, and in developing the public positions we hold. Safe Horizon has programs across New York City's five boroughs where we provide critical support and services to victims and survivors of all forms of violence and abuse. Across

2	all of our programs, whether they serve survivors of
3	domestic violence, family violence, trafficking,
4	etcetera, one of the top needs for our clients has
5	always been and continues to be housing. I'm here
6	today to enthusiastically endorse two critical pieces
7	of legislation, Intro. 2405 which will provide RHY in
8	the DYCD shelter system access to CityFHEPS rental
9	assistance program and Intro. 1829 which would
10	preclude DHS from requiring that every member of a
11	family be present at its intake center when that
12	family seeks placement at a shelter. Both bills
13	right unjust policies that have harmed the young
14	people we serve and show care and understanding to
15	the most vulnerable members of the communities. So,
16	first, Intro. 2405. Our Street Work Project works
17	with homeless and street-involved young people up to
18	age 25 to help them find safety and stability. Many
19	homeless young people face a day to day struggle to
20	survive which can lead to physical and emotional
21	harm. Homeless youth may have experienced family
22	abuse, violence, rejection, and instability that led
23	to their homelessness. We welcome these young
24	folks, help them navigate complex systems, and
25	provide essential resources at our drop-in centers,

2 at our overnight shelter, and through our street 3 outreach teams. This work can be incredibly challenging, but also rewarding. Street Work did not 4 pause during this pandemic, rather, our dedicated team continued to respond to homeless and at-risk 6 7 young people in need of shelter, services, and 8 understanding. Street Work has been doing this community-based work for decades. We know that young people experiencing homelessness need and deserve 10 11 housing and economic justice, that is why we support 12 Intro. 2405. We support policies that will make 13 permanent, safe, and affordable housing accessible to 14 young people experiencing homelessness and unstable 15 housing. For years we and our community of service 16 providers have encouraged the City to count time in 17 youth shelters as homeless time for the purpose of 18 eligibility for housing resources and vouchers. 19 We've been advocating that our clients have equal 20 access to the same housing resources as other 21 homeless New Yorkers. This bill is critical, 2.2 necessary, and the right step for its connecting RHY 2.3 to stable housing. And for Intro 1829, our programs offer information, referrals, and advocacy for 24 shelter and permanent housing. Our clients tell us 25

expired.

all the time how difficult and challenging the intake process for shelter is. Entering shelter can be extremely disruptive, and we join advocates and unhoused New Yorkers in demanding that we make this process as trauma-informed, simple, safe, and-
SERGEANT AT ARMS: [interposing] Time

JIMMY MEAGHER: I just have one-- two

more sentences.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Please go ahead and finish.}$

that we make this process as trauma-informed, simple, safe, and undisruptive as possible. Ordinarily, DHS requires that children under the age of 21 be present with their adult family members at the facility that processes shelter applications. This bill would allow these families to complete the application process without disrupting children's schooling or other daily activities. The City currently exempts children from PATH due to the pandemic. This bill is an opportunity to make permanent this temporary change so that families have flexibility and children no longer have to experience the stress and trauma of

COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE

2.2

2.3

going to PATH. Pass this bill. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you, Jimmy.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you very much Jimmy. And I apologize for getting your last name wrong. I think it's the second time that I've done that. I am now going to turn it over to the Josefa Silva.

SERGEANT AT ARMS: Time starts now.

JOSEFA SILVA: Thank you. Good
afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity today to
speak in support of Intro. 1829, which would preclude
DHS from requiring parents to bring their minor
children to the intake center known as PATH who may
apply. As we've heard, this bill will make permanent
DHS' current exemption of children from the center.
My name is Josefa Silva, and I'm the Director of
Policy and Advocacy at WIN, New York City's largest
provider of shelter and supportive housing for
families with children. I'm testifying today because
of the heart-wrenching accounts that we hear from
families at WIN about their experiences [inaudible]
intake center. We'd like to thank Council Member
Ayala for listening to families who have experienced

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

24

25

homelessness and for responding with action and intention to alleviate some of the hardship [sic] they face. I'm going to begin by saying something that we already know, but that is important context for families experiences PATH. In order to access shelter, families have to apply to DHS, and they have to prove that they have nowhere else to stay. families with minor children, that very intrusive and very high stakes process of applying begins by going to PATH, located in the Bronx. Families have described going through PATH as grueling and harsh at best, and most often described it as being punitive and re-traumatizing. Before COVID-19, DHS required parents to bring their children when they applied for the first time. As we understand it and heard today, this requirement was in place to allow DHS to certify the family composition and to assess children for unmet needs. We don't believe that these reasons justify requiring children to be present at PATH. Both of these things have always been done when a family arrives at shelter, and in 2021 these reasons are even less justified. As we know, DHS is moving to conducting assessments remotely and the needs of children and families have been met effectively and

Т	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 111
2	safely since then. The truth is that the needs of
3	children are best met [inaudible] being a child
4	[inaudible] similar environments, not at PATH. And
5	after eh academic and social distancing that children
6	have gone through, we cannot revert to pre-pandemic
7	practices that disrupted relationships and routines,
8	and that forced children to miss school. The current
9	exemption of children from [inaudible]. The
10	Administration has not indicated any intention of
11	returning to pre-pandemic practices, but they have
12	not agreed to make them permanent either. That's why
13	we ask you to support Intro. 1829 and allow it to
14	pass. This would make the current practice permanent
15	and will protect children who experience homelessness
16	in the future from a harmful and archaic
17	administrative requirement. I'd also like to add that
18	[inaudible] supports Intro. 2405 so you can access
19	CityFHEPS without entering DHS shelter. We'd like to
20	thank Chair Levin for his leadership in ensuring with
21	the understanding that we all had years ago with
22	regard to fair, streamlined access to CityFHEPS is
23	actually important [sic]. Thank you very much.
24	CHAIRPERSON LEVIN. Thank you Josefa

thank you.

J

COMMITTEE COUNSEL: Thank you, Josefa, for your testimony. And thank you, Chair Levin. At this point we have now heard from everyone who signed up to testify today. We appreciate all of your time and presence. If we inadvertently missed anyone who would like to testify, please use the Zoom raise hand function now and I will call on you in the order in which your hands are raised. Seeing no one else, I would like to note that written testimony which will be reviewed in full by committee staff may be submitted to the record up to 72 hours after the close of this haring by emailing it to testimony@council.nyc.gov. Chair Levin, we have concluded public testimony for this hearing.

CHAIRPERSON LEVIN: Thank you so much,

Counsel Killawan, to all the staff in the hearing

today, committee staff, our Sergeant at Arms, and my

colleagues, Council Member Diaz, thank you. And to

my other colleagues that had legislation, Council

Member Ayala, in this package today, and we hope that

we can get these bills passed into law. we have-
you know, we have a short time frame to do it, but

this is important, and I think the testimony from the

young people who have had lived experience, from

1	COMMITTEE ON GENERAL WELFARE 113
2	Jamie and John detailing clear data, exactly what
3	the what happens to young people when they age out
4	of the DYCD systems. It's really incumbent upon us
5	to do something here and just to pass this
6	legislation. So, I want to thank you all, and I look
7	forward to working with you, and let's get this done.
8	With that, this hearing is adjourned.
9	[gavel]
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

${\tt C} \ {\tt E} \ {\tt R} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt F} \ {\tt I} \ {\tt C} \ {\tt A} \ {\tt T} \ {\tt E}$

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date November 10, 2021