



Government of the District of Columbia
Department of Human Services
Family Services Administration
Family Rehousing and Stabilization (FRSP) Task Force

Family Rehousing and Stabilization Program (FRSP) Task Force
Meeting 3 – Annotated Notes
October 30, 2019
DHS Headquarters
64 New York Ave, NE, Sixth Floor

Orientation for Customers 10:00-10:30AM

Barbara Poppe and Darrel Cason met with six Family Advocates/Customer Representatives who serve on the FRSP Task Force. The Family Advocates were given an overview of the charge for the Task Force, meeting dates, logistics, voting process and the customer presentation of draft recommendations.

Pre-Meeting Gathering: 10:00-10:30am

- Registration
- Meet and greet other Task Force members
- Meeting materials at each seat:
 - Agenda
 - Customer developed draft recommendations
 - Task Force membership roster with contact information
 - Task Force #2 Meeting notes
 - Meeting summaries: Task Force #2 Listening Session
 - Themed Suggestions
 - Customer Suggestions

Task Force Meeting: 10:30AM-1:30PM

Task Force member attendees:

Blaine Stum	Chairman Mendelson's Office
Imani Stutley	CFSA
Kathy Zeisel	Children's Law Center
Kelly Sweeney McShane	Community of Hope
Sue Marshall	Community Partnership
Kevin Craver	Community Partnership
Sheryl Chapman	NCCF
George Jones	Bread For the City

Kate Coventry	DC Fiscal Policy Institute
Ebony Thomas	DC Housing Authority
Jannie Lebby	DC Housing Authority
Tamitha Rama Davis	DHS
Noah Abraham	DHS
Davis Ross	DHS
Dana Looper	DHS
Jazamine Stallings	DHS
Darrell Cason	DHS
Jenny Shin	Echelon Community Services
Karen Cunningham	Everyone Home DC
Kimberly Harris	Family Advocate
Yvette Barnes	Family Advocate
Jewel Stroman	Family Advocate
Sammira Robinson	Family Advocate
Danisha West	Family Advocate
Shauna Gray	Family Advocate
Travonna Brooks	Family Advocate
Uchenna Egenti	Family Advocate
Roslyn Roberts	Housing up
Kimberly Walker	ICH
Rachel Rittlemann	Legal Aid DC
Sharon McDonald	National Alliance to End Homelessness
Patty Fugere	Washington Legal Clinic

Non TF member

attendees:

Lorraine Nwaoko	DHS
Hersh Gupta	DHS
Brian Campbell	DHS
Christy Evans	DHS
Nancy Blackwell	DHS
Larry Handerhan	DHS
Tai Meah	DHS
Sarah Roenfeldt	COH
Jane Oh	TCP
Jamey Burden	COH
Allen (For Jessica Smith)	DMHHS
Samantha Beckett	Bread for the City
Warda Davis	Echelon Community Services
Erika Duthely	OPLA
Jennifer Boston	SOME
Carolyn Perez	Washington Legal Clinic

Facilitator: Barbara Poppe

Welcome

Tamitha welcomed everyone to the FRSP Task Force session. She informed Task Force members that DHS has received a lot of feedback from the different listening sessions and the last two task force meetings. She stated DHS is grateful to our FRSP customers who serve on this Task Force – many who came together yesterday to create a set of recommendations for task force member’s recommendation today. She encouraged members to listen carefully and with an open mind when these are presented today.

Recap: DHS is launching the FRSP Task Force to collaboratively work with stakeholders to assess what is working and not working in the program and develop recommendations to improve the experiences and outcomes of families related to housing sustainability. Essential to our approach is recognizing the strengths of each family and facilitating meaningful connections to resources that support participants to grow their incomes and address their needs while reinforcing what is working well in their lives.

Agenda Review and Introductions

Barbara Poppe reviewed the agenda and the expectations for the flow of the meeting.

Customer Presentation

Shauna Gray, Travonna Brooks, Uchenna Egenti and Kimberly Harris

The presentation referenced the handout in the meeting folder and the slides.

FRSP Bridge Model presented by Travonna Brooks

Travonna reminded everyone to think of the FRSP Bridge model as: #FRSPmovingforward

Clarifying questions:

- Is there a case load difference between the TAH and PSH subsidy?
 - Caseload in PSH is 1/17; where as
 - TAH currently has a higher caseload around 1:50, but the case management will be resized to 1/20 for the FRSP bridge phase.
- Does the 30% include utilities?
 - Yes both TAH and PSH subsidies include utility allowance as housing cost
- Can modifications to the draft recommendations be made?
 - Yes. Task Force members can email their comments/suggestions to DHS by Monday, November 4, 2019.
- How closely does this model mirror the existing TAH/PSH criteria?

- It is similar except prioritization factors for length of time homeless and FSPDAT scores
- Can you explain why there is an additional 3-month for enrollment during initial FRSP phase?
- The additional 3-month is to make it possible to enroll households who do not initially appear to be eligible. That is because we want to capture anyone who was missed during shelter enrollment.
- Is CM solely provided by DHS?
 - DHS staff will continue to provide case management for TAH and PSH services will also continue to be provided by contracted providers.
- How will customers have access to TAH and PSH if they don't have access FRSP?
 - DHS makes limited referral to TAH/PSH directly from shelter.

Additional written comments (Received 11/4/19):

- Coordinate the Bridge Model with the TAH/PSH lease up timeline
- Clients eligible for TAH/PSH may be identified later in the process, how can families move between models
- There are a limited number of annual vouchers, what happens to families who do not get a voucher?
 - Families who are deemed eligible for TAH and PSH will remain in FRSP until they are matched with a voucher.
- How will we serve dually diagnosed complex families?
 - DHS will follow the current screening process to determine eligibility
- How can families from prevention enter the program?
 - Families in shelter and the first three months of FRSP will qualify for the bridge model
- Lease in place cannot be a requirement for families

FRSP TANF Housing model presented by Shauna Gray

Clarifying questions:

- Is joint FRSP TEP case management and TEP programming feasible?
 - That will be discussed during today's session.
- Does the fixed term based on family strengths and barriers with single 6 months' work?
 - That will be discussed during today's session.
- Does the CFSA involvement include aging out of the foster care system?
 - Yes, if a family has had any CFSA involvement and have the other barriers mentioned, they will be included in the group.
- Are the bullets in the criteria for length of program "and" or "or"?
 - The criteria are intended as "and". DHS will further work with stakeholders to clarify the eligibility criteria to determine the length of stay in the program.
- Why do you want case management services enhanced?

- Case managers are not providing quality services in the opinion of the customers.
- What is the TEP client to case management ratio?
 - David confirmed that TEP Case management is 1:75

Additional written comments (received on 11/4/19):

- Is there another pathway for families not eligible for PSH/TAH and not on TANF?
 - The model assumes providing TANF services for families who are working but not earning enough to exit FRSP. DHS will also work with stakeholders to determine exceptions (including POWER) for families who will not fall in the two categories and the details of their case management services.
- How will you address families on exemptions/POWER
 - See response above
- How will this work with CAHP?
 - DHS will consider this with ICH and TCP to provide a response.
- If and how will extensions work?
 - Extension process will be similar to the current extension process following due process. DHS will work with stakeholders to identify areas of improvement in the current process.
- Are TANF incentives counted as income?
- Concerns about the quality of case management services
- Concerns about the TEP vendors
- Completing the assessment at VW during a crisis increases a family's score on the SPDAT
- The integrated TEP/FRSP model through the same agency with two case managers working closely together is favorable
- Two generation model can be intense, staff need lower caseloads
- Need clear criteria for recommended program timelines:
 - 12, 24, 36 months
- Standards for case management services
- Increased income is not aligned with HUD 30% standard income requirement
- Escrow rent or allow families to have matched savings account
- No DC voucher should be taken outside of DC

Program Improvements and Vision/Values presented by Uchenna Egenti and Kimberly Harris

Clarifying Questions:

- Did you talk about the impact of budget and intensive case management?
 - DHS will complete a feasibility study during the month of November.

Additional written comments (receive 11/4/19):

- No mention of time limited services
- “Families will have safe, stable, and affordable housing with timely individualized and family-centered services that promote dignity and independence, increase their financial security and income and not return to homelessness.”

- “By providing safe, stable, and affordable housing with timely individualized and family-centered services that promote dignity and independence through services, supports and resources, families will increase their financial security through enhanced education, housing assistance and job skills, thereby achieving and sustaining stability in permanent housing and avoiding a return to homelessness.”

Task Force Deliberations

Barbara reviewed process for the deliberations by encouraging everyone to consider these questions:

- How will it improve customer experience and/or outcomes?
- How is it efficient and effective for customers?
- How efficient and feasible for:
 - Landlords
 - FRSP providers
 - DCHA
 - TCP
 - DHS
 - Other partners
- Why is it likely to be cost-neutral and have neutral impact on ES demand flow?

It was noted that due to the breadth of the recommendations under consideration, and the limited time frame for the meeting, the Task Force would be using a combination of paper voting, small group discussions, and large circle decision making to provide a set of draft recommendations from this meeting. During November, DHS staff will conduct a feasibility review on these factors and provide a report back to the Task Force in December.

- Cost implications
- Continued flow of families through the shelter system
- Operational feasibility
- Regulatory changes
- Legislative changes required

Straw Poll:

A paper ballot was distributed to all TF members to provide the following input:

- ___ Yes, I agree with moving forward to further analysis
- ___ No, I disagree with this concept and will not support it
- ___ Maybe, if the following changes were made

On these areas:

- 1) Bridge to TAH/PSH
- 2) Program improvements – Administrative
- 3) Program improvements – Assessment
- 4) Program improvements – Data and evaluation

- 5) Program improvements – Housing and financial assistance
- 6) Program improvements – Program services and offerings
- 7) Vision/values

After the ballots were collected, Barbara invited task force members to participate in small groups to answer three questions, also referred as “Wicked Questions” that were advanced by the Customer Planning Session.

Small Groups: Wicked Questions for FRSP TANF Housing Model

Topic 1: Fixed term concept

- Does the fixed term bases on family strengths and barriers with single +6 month work?
 - Maybe
 - Yes. To make this work there needs to be:
 - Strong initial assessment
 - Opportunity for reevaluation/re-assessment
 - Flexibility to move from one category to another of you meet criteria
 - Possibility of more than one six month extension
 - Effective case management
 - Hold vendors accountable
 - Allocate resources to place of greatest impact with enhanced customer outcomes in mind
 - Agreement to share information
 - Adequate resources; financial, structural. Symbolic, feasible and long term review planning, managing expectations realistically for all stakeholders.
 - Expansion of service criteria.
 - No; Families don’t consistently fit in one category
- What are the pros?
 - If vendors are helping families achieve affordable sustainable housing, reallocate funds to expand availability of permanent subsidies
 - Responsive to customer leadership
 - Evolve the model practice in DC
 - Build on current practices and policies e.g., data exchange and assessment approval
 - Families know the length of time they have in the program
 - Case management adjusted to particular timeframe
- What are the cons?
 - Resources will not be cost neutral
 - Customers could change during the timeframe
 - Lease agreement for 12 months

- What are alternatives?
 - Widen timeframes, no extensions, 12 months more feasible to stabilize

Topic 2: Joint FRSP/TEP case management

Is joint FRSP/TEP case management and TEP programming feasible?

- Report out
 - Good approach however caseloads on both TEP/FRSP programs would need to decrease in effort to accommodate this initiative
 - Skeptical because FRSP and TEP is currently not working, but intrigued
 - Needs to happen
 - Clear roles & accountability
 - Decreased caseloads for TEP and FRSP
 - One case manager for TEP and one case manager for FRSP
 - Allow for more flexibility
 - Switch education to job placement
 - Closer program assignment
 - TEP and FRSP rules
 - DHS needs more staff to coordinate
 - Consistency is key
 - Having customers report to multiple people is a downside
 - Syncing joint case planning
 - Specialized employment teams that work with RRH
 - Have a consistent relationship who can feed in to other resources
 - Co-locating
 - Endure data integration
 - Specialists working with this population (only 10-15% of TANF caseload or less)
 - Primary location welfare office with familiarity
 - Incentive for the TEP providers
 - Monthly conference calls

Topic 3: Participants share of housing costs

What should participant be required to pay as share of rent?

- Participants should pay no more than 30% of income, including rent & utilities (if paid by tenant)
- Income, but like progressive tax structure, percentage increases w/income, but with cap should be high.

What are pros and cons of basing amount on % of income v. % rent?

- Cash bonus to incentivize at the end of the subsidy
- Rent likely to lead to high rent burden for participant as they enter program

Should a portion of participant housing payments be set aside for rebate at end of the program completion?

- Yes, it will allow clients to exit with something

- Not a popular solution but can ease transition
- Pair with budgeting to help understand “crisis” savings “deductions”.
- Build in flexibility for case worker
- Money can be used for other things other than rent

What are the pros and cons?

- Greater fairness/cushion to exit
- Not practical

Should utilities be included in housing cost calculation?

- Yes include utilities costs in rent calculation

At the end of the small group discussion, Barbara provided an overview of the counted ballots. Following are the specific comments that were submitted and tabulated after the meeting:

Ballot Votes:

Bridge to TAH/PSH:

- 12 Yes, I agree with moving forward to further analysis
- No, I disagree with this concept and will not support it
- 12 Maybe, if the following changes were made

Feedback from task force members:

- Clear beginnings are certainly needed
- Like PSH families identifies early and connected to PSH providers early
- Terrific concept. Some changes are needed to make it compliant with tenants meetings, DCHA process etc...
- Eligibility should go beyond first 3 months in shelter
- There may need to be flexibility to “transition people from RRH to TAH/PSH after 3 months
- Assessment criteria clarified in writing for TAH & PSH
- TAH as defined here is too narrow, many FRSP participants will do everything right and still be unable to afford rent. There needs to be a bridge for those people too
- Eligibility for different program length being individual/requirement might be too open ended i.e., having a GED (only) may be just enough to extend to 24 months
- If there is a better understanding as to what occurs when there are more families qualifying for resources available
- If there are resources available to match the number of families needing/qualifying for TAH/PSH
- A lot of operational changes to support or think through
- We oppose all mandatory participation of services requirements
- Need to reconcile with actual practices with voucher expiration and placement
- We oppose the limited way to first 90 days because meaningful changes often happens later
- It is expensive and not consistent with NAEH housing first best practices

- The client should have more case management not light touch especially since the clients are in need of assistance from the city.
- What if there are not enough resources
- Intensive caseloads for PSH should be lower than 1:17
- Want to do away with going into PSH/TAH after 3 months because needs may not be identified until later.
- Only once decisions are also made re: The Bridge to TANF/FRSP model. Also there needs to be some discussion about what happens when TAH/PSH resources run out
- Services should be voluntary
- Structural assessment of PSH/TAH
- Families should be granted longer than three months of FRSP under extraordinary circumstances
- There may be value in trying longer w/ some families before reverting to TAH/PSH
- Concerned about the requirements to program in TAH
- Concerned about PSH. The caseloads are lowered as proposed
- Assessment & match to PSH/TAH should be completed before transition to FRSP w/no lag time in case management
- Depends on TANF housing model decisions
- Case management should also be optional
- Not sure about participant requirements;

Program improvements – Administrative:

- 19 Yes, I agree with moving forward to further analysis
 ___ No, I disagree with this concept and will not support it
4 Maybe, if the following changes were made

Feedback from task force members:

- The client needs to be held accountable to meet with the case manager and employment, training etc. to improve their circumstances.
- I feel the client does not have to be accountable for their situation. Enact making eligibility to transition “explore” at 3 months may push providers to make a referral sooner
- Need more time to analyze
- Need more time to analyze but like the framework
- Maybe if the caseloads are lowered as proposed
- Maybe- Need more clarity on how recommendations will work. For instance who are outside oversight? How would accountability be measured (standards)?

Program improvements – Assessment:

- 18 Yes, I agree with moving forward to further analysis
 ___ No, I disagree with this concept and will not support it

6__ Maybe, if the following changes were made

Feedback from task force members:

- Yes- Strongly agree everything including a set training needs to start at the shelter level not wait until they move in because they are not taking the process seriously
- There needs to be more staff dedicated to oversight of case coordination
- How is information shared? There should be an assessment that is not totally based on self-report. It should be something that can be measured
- Maybe – Assessments should happen sooner and those eligible for permanent subsidies should never be in FRSP exits: no one should be exited if housing not sustainable
- Maybe – Assessment appears to remove objective process (VI-SPDAT)
- Maybe - Are all providers working with the family/customer have access to CATCH system?
- Maybe - If DHS adopts a structured assessment tool that is validated such as the initial adult assessment.
- Maybe – Like framework but need more time to analyze
- Maybe- How did customers determine case managers are not trained? Why end VI-SPDAT (Singles tool)? Are customers clear on purpose of SPDAT tools?

Program improvements – Data and evaluation:

- 20 Yes, I agree with moving forward to further analysis
- No, I disagree with this concept and will not support it
- 4 Maybe, if the following changes were made
- 1 Zero vote

Feedback from task force members:

- Clearer reporting requirements for providers and clear reporting requirements for DHS to council
- Like framework but would like more time to analyze
- Maybe- If the client has not met the first quarter goals or with their case manager then they should be brought in to have a conversation with DHS, Landlord, Case Manager- a teaming effort to show the service needs.

Program improvements – Housing and financial assistance:

- 15 Yes, I agree with moving forward to further analysis
- 1 No, I disagree with this concept and will not support it
- 9 Maybe, if the following changes were made
- 1 Zero vote

Feedback from task force members:

- DHS should be sure to partner with other government agencies that provide some services – for example, DISB does credit improvement and budgeting
- Shouldn't be moving people to MD/VA at expense of their public benefits
- Have concerns about apartment options (E.g. rent in MD & VA)
- Really support expansion to MD & VA
- Case assistance should be much more flexible and consider calculations deductions such as disability, utilities, etc. Currently "one size fits all"
- Agree with the apartment options
- The client has to have some sort of responsibility, nothing in life is free. They should pay a third of the fee.
- Families should be able to use their voucher if they have another family member who is in shelter so that funds that were supposed to be used for shelter can be allocated to another family that doesn't have the same support
- Concerned about expanding to MD & VA and the extent to which that displaces community member from their hometown
- I think City Council might consider restrictions at application fees
- Maybe – Some change recommendations are Continuum of Care (COC) controlled.
- Landlords need to agree.
- Job cap is not realistic. Customers will not be prepared to assume full market rent at transition. Escrow is not realistic to lease holding customers.

Program improvements – Program services and offerings:

- 19 Yes, I agree with moving forward to further analysis
- No, I disagree with this concept and will not support it
- 5 Maybe, if the following changes were made
- 1 Zero vote

Feedback from task force members:

- Non mandatory case management for people who do not need it
- Need more oversight/requirement of the coordination of multi-agency case planning
- Clearly define the responsibilities for TEP and FRSP case manager responsibility to avoid service duplication
- If FRSP caseloads are lowered
- Need to discuss FRSP Case manager to customer ratio

Vision/values:

- 18 Yes, I agree with moving forward to further analysis
- 1 No, I disagree with this concept and will not support it
- 4 Maybe, if the following changes were made
- 1 Zero vote

Feedback from task force members:

- Just be sure it is not used as legal requirement to provide long term affordable housing

- Maybe – Sustainability of housing
- Maybe - Only if sustainable is added to draft of the vision statement
- Maybe – I agree with the vision/values, if all the questions raised are clarified.
- Maybe – with some tweaks regarding what we want achieved at ending homelessness and a platform to meet these other goals
- No – Not sure what that is exactly

General Comments and Suggestions

Barbara invited Task Force members to share any final reflections, suggestions, and comments before voting on the broad package of recommendations. The following was offered:

- Intrigued by the TANF model. Believes it needs work.
- Lack of consistency around expectations from the customers. Didn't hear any suggestions around customer expectations.
- Is the assessment going to be qualifying criteria?
- The two models are not cost neutral.
- Will DHS have a call (in between meeting) to review the comments?
 - DHS will setup a Webinar before the fourth task force meeting
- Is there an opportunity to have a listening session with advocates?
 - Barbara and DHS team met with advocates at the beginning of the task force launch. Advocates are encouraged to submit their comments on the items discussed today to DHS by November 4, 2019.
- Will we be able to keep in the forefront of the ICH goal to end family homelessness?
 - Yes, DHS's homeless services programs follow ICH's roadmap.

Final Voting

Barbara invited Task Force members to use up/down vote with goal of consensus on the following three questions:

- Should the concept of 2 pathways be forwarded for feasible review?
- Should the program improvements be forwarded for feasibility review?
- Should we have vision/values included?

There was consensus support for “yes” on the first two items; no consensus was reached for third item, so a hand vote was taken. There was a majority of Task Force members voting yes.

Closing

Task Force members are invited to provide additional comments on the “draft Customer recommendations” document by November 4, 2019 (note that the comments received from the task force members on 11/4/19 are included in the notes above). The MS Word version will also be provided but should not be used for commenting.

A provider/landlord listening session is being conducted in the afternoon to consider questions advanced from the Customer Planning session. The notes from this meeting will be shared with Task Force.

DHS staff will review the TF meeting notes, listening session notes, and submitted comments when it completes its feasibility review. A full report will be provided in advance of the next TF meeting. DHS will also review the timeline to determine how it can be adjusted to provide time for the TF to discuss the feasibility review in advance of the meeting.

A Customer planning session will again be held to develop customer recommendations for the TF deliberations.

The final meeting is set for December 18, 2019.

Barbara invited each member to respond to the question: “What are my hopes for the next meeting?” Below are some of the recurring themes of hopes shared by TF members:

- Progress
- Customer
- Moving forward
- Progress
- Project feasibility
- Solution
- Flexibility
- Productivity
- Clarity
- Feeling like people haven’t been heard
- Clear path forward with tangible and concrete next steps.