



**Working Group: To Inform a Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Hardship  
 Extension Policy for DC (Meeting #2)  
 Wednesday, August 30 @ 11 am to 2 pm  
 DHS Headquarters - 64 New York Ave, Sixth Floor**

**Committee Members Present (voting and non-voting)**

<b>Names</b>	<b>Organizations</b>
6 individuals	Customers
Brian Campbell	DHS
Curt Campbell	Legal Aid
Jennifer Tiller (non-voting)	America Works
Sharra Greer	Children's Law Center
Susanne Groves	DC Council
Anthea Seymour	DHS
Tai Meah	Councilmember Nadeau
Kelly Sweeny Mcshane	Community of Hope
Jen Budoff	DC Council
Jeremy Lares (non-voting)	Grant Associates
Ed Lazere	DC Fiscal Policy Institute
Yulonda Barlow	Councilmember Yvette Alexander
David Ross	DHS
Christina Okonkwo	DHS
Monique Graham	FSFSC
Andrea Gleaves	DC Coalition Against Domestic Violence
Won-ok Kim	DHS
Ginger Moored	OCFO
Lisa Simmons	Maximus

**Community Members Present**

Melissa McClure	Legal Aid Society of DC
Kathy Haines	DMHHS
Chris Vera	DHS
Ann Pierre	DHS
Kate Coventry	DC Fiscal Policy Institute
Renee Murphy	Children's Law Center
Jennifer Mezey	DC Legal Aid
Ruth Rich	DHS/OWO
Linnea Lassiter	DC Fiscal Policy Institute
Kelly Hunt	Councilmember Silverman
Monica Kaman	FBC
Debbie Fox	DC Coalition Against Domestic Violence

**Other participants:** Donna Pavetti, CBPP; Barbara Poppe, Barbara Poppe and Associates; Kelsey Weber, Barbara Poppe and Associates.

**Welcome** – Anthea Seymour, ESA Administrator DHS

- Many different voices are represented in the room – Council, DHS, advocates, service providers, TANF customers – thank you for participating.

**Agenda review and introductions**– Barbara Poppe (facilitator)

- Reminder of the Scope/Charge of Working Group: Develop recommendations to DHS Director Laura Zeilinger for TANF hardship exemption policy by September 30, 2016
  - Working group held Meeting 1 on 8/18, and a few requests were made which have been taken into consideration. These requests were
    - An interim mark to support policy objective be included into the budget assumptions.
    - An additional meeting be held to further discuss and develop recommendations. This will be put to a vote at the end of this meeting.
- Review of process timeline (August 2016 – September 2016 formation of working group, listening sessions, community dialogues, data analysis).
  - August, 2016, listening sessions were conducted with TANF participants, advocates, service providers and city council in advance of the first Working Group meeting.
  - August – September, 2016: Community Dialogues are being held.
  - August – September, 2016: Data Analysis to understand TANF participation characteristics, needs, barriers to employment and program participation.
  - September 30, 2016: Final Report to DHS Director with recommendations for TANF hardship policies.
- Review of working group meeting
  - Meeting #1 (8/18/16): Completed. We set the stage, listened to session reports, reviewed data about families and cost examples, and started preliminary policy idea for hardship exemptions from time limits.
  - Meeting #2 (8/30/16): community dialogue report, national expert presentation, financial impact of time limits, risks & benefits if all families are exempted from time limits, organize policy ideas within budget marks,
    - Based on recommendations from Meeting 1, we will NOT develop recommendations for service for families exiting due to time limits during today's meeting. This will be completed during Meeting 3 to allow for the policy discussion to be completed today.
  - Meeting #3 (9/13/16): community dialogue report, develop recommendations for services for families exiting due to time limits, fine tune all recommendations, vote on final recommendations and priorities.
  - All working members will have opportunity to comment on final report before submission.

- Time to begin our work together. Everyone is an expert on TANF in some way, therefore we would like everyone to share. Last session many people did not feel respected by other members of the working group. We want to ensure everyone is able to express their views and feels respected in doing so. There are a wide range of views, which we encourage and want to remind everyone to explore all ideas with an open mind. Please listen and understand others, do not try to convince others of your perspective.
- Barbara Poppe, as facilitator, commits to listen and be responsive to everyone during this process. Quite a few changes based on suggestions from Meeting # 1. She will continue to update and adjust the process as we move forward. As with meeting 1 a meeting record will be shared. Please let Barbara know if you want to propose any adjustments to the Meeting 1 record.
- Today's Agenda:
  - Setting the stage with panel discussion and a national expert on TANF,
  - Key drivers: review of cost analysis for potential unintended consequences and policy options
  - Rolling up our sleeves to discuss risks and benefits of policy options and evaluating cost scenarios of all policy options. This is the important work we need to complete so we can have deliverables to move forward into Meeting #3. Based on feedback following Meeting 1 this activity will be organized by constituent group to ensure all groups feel comfortable and heard. We will complete with a share out to ensure all perspectives are heard.

#### Questions:

- No questions on the Agenda

**Activity:** Introductions and check-in: Turning to your neighbor, "Who am I? What did I learn so far from this process that I am bringing forward to this meeting deliberations?"

#### **Update on Community Dialogues – Barbara Poppe**

- Two community dialogues are completed. They were not well attended but they were deeply attended which caused a shift in the focus of these dialogues. They will be shifted away from public locations, in favor of locations where TANF customers are more likely to be engaged.
  - There are two community dialogues tomorrow, one at America Works (10:00 – 11:30 am) open to the public, one at DC General Family Shelter (1:00-2:30 pm) not open to general public due to the shelter rules.
  - DC General community dialogue was added based on the extensive conversation regarding homeless individuals that was expressed during prior dialogues.
  - The final dialogue was moved to Community College Prep Academy (9/12 10:30-11:30 am) because many TANF customers participate in this program.

#### **4. Panel Discussion on the "Value of TANF" customer and advocate perspectives.**

- This panel was included into the meeting in response to working group feedback. Members felt that it was important not to lose sight of the value of TANF, understand the community wide perspective and the customer perspective.
- Panelists: Matthew and Mona, TANF Customers; Curt and Monica, Advocate representatives.
- Questions to Mona and Matthew: What has TANF meant to you and your family?

- Matthew: TANF has meant a supplemental income. Without work and being unable to receive unemployment benefits, this is the only thing to fall back on. So with TANF I can use it to help provide for my family; without TANF, I am not sure what I would have done or how I would have made it this far.
- Mona: As a single parent of three children it means a lot. I was working and getting unemployment but had to resort to TANF because the job market changed and I needed a degree to get a better job. It has been helpful to my family, to support me and my kids. It's hard to live in DC so if we can use it in a way to get people situated and grounded it will help to them get to the next level.
- Questions to Curt and Monica: Why is TANF a resource to the DC area?
  - Curt: I will come at this from two angles so just to give you some background. I work in legal aid, but was on TANF as a child in Hoboken, NJ. Like DC, Hoboken was rapidly gentrifying and becoming a difficult place to live. DC is one of the most expensive places to raise a child. He and his wife, who are both well employed, are about to have their first child. They are already feeling overwhelmed with the prospect of providing well for their child. If they have these concerns and anxieties, then how do others feel? Others who cannot find stable employment, fear leaving their home due to domestic violence, or are just scraping by to feed and clothe their family. My family had been through TANF and it provided a sense of stability, allowed him and his siblings not to miss school and participate in after school programs because there was transportation support. This allowed him and his sibling to succeed, get degrees and go to college. There was recent a Radio program talking about triage, i.e. the need to prioritize medical resources in war zones. The doctors in these areas were making increasingly questionable decisions about who to help and who to leave behind based on the best use of limited resources. This realization led to creating working groups for developing guidelines on who to help when resources are tight. They developed a system which would help people with the best chances of having a high quality of life and leaving others behind eg, those who usually have chronic illnesses and would not have a high quality of life. The doctor speaking said she saw this system acted out in Haiti after the earthquake where a chronically ill patient was triaged into an area that was targeted to be helped last. The patient slowly received less and less resources (this case being oxygen) until she would eventually pass. Thankfully the doctor interceded and the patient was transferred to a different hospital. However, our approach to TANF is much like this view of triage in low resource areas. When we are talking about the exemptions and deciding on who would qualify, it is important to think about the people who would be left out. What if your family was on the verge of homelessness, need transportation to a job interview or had children who may end up going to school hungry? DC is NOT a war zone, we do NOT need to triage TANF. We can find creative solutions to help as many people as possible.
  - Monica: I work for the Fair Budget Coalition, where we address a variety of human needs. Running the full gamut from health care, to employment, etc. In this work we see how all systems are working together to leave people out. The economy is not creating adequate jobs,;there are only low income jobs available where people cannot survive on the wages. The housing market is shoving people out. People are only able to access reactive health care such as ER services. People live in areas with limited access to groceries stores and adequate health food options. All of these different issues are keeping people at the bottom. TANF should be a net to catch

families with the systems fail. We recognize that all humans deserve a certain quality of life, which include education, health care, a home, etc. If systems don't provide this, then TANF is a safety net to provide it. While it is important to continue to look at the big picture system reform, a safety net is needed as an interim to ensure people have basic dignities. Especially to ensure all children in the city are protected, have a quality of life and all pipeline of opportunities.

- Questions to Mona and Matthew: What do you want the working group to think about when making decisions on the 60 month TANF timeline and setting priorities of who should be exempt and extended.
  - Mona: you should be thinking "what would I want if this were me, my child, my grandchild, what will my future hold?" Think of the future and become problem solvers. We need to start putting ourselves in people's shoes. This happened to me. I used to give my cousins a hard time for being on TANF, never did I think I would be here. As a parent you don't know what is in front of you. You want to make sure you get back on track and go higher. It's important to make sure you have morals and values when you think about TANF and everyone, because this is not just about me or you, it is about everyone.
  - Matt: What Mona said is exactly correct. This could be any of you. Many people are only one pay check away. You never know what could happen to you in your life.

#### **Presentation by national TANF expert.- Donna Pavetti, CBPP**

Brian introduced Donna: She has been a leading national voice for over 20 years. When states and cities want to adjust their programs they go to LaDonna first. She helped DC 12 years ago, then again 6 years again and is here today to help us turn the page and look at things critical.

- Want to ensure everyone is clear on the rules and regulation of TANF.
  - Federal law set a 60 month time limit on federally funded TANF benefits but does not state that people cannot be served after this period. DC can use federal funds to serve 20% of people after 60 months and can use local funds to support all families and still be in compliance with federal regulations. DC has been providing extensions for 20 years and has not gone against federal policy in doing so.
- Understanding the history of the time limits.
  - Time limits on cash, when originally proposed, came with the guarantee of a job at the end of the timeline, however this job guarantee did not remain in the legislation. It was never the intend of the federal law to take away safety nets, but rather to provide them with a sense of urgency for TANF agencies and participants to secure employment. Additionally, when this law was drafted we knew far less about the characteristics and needs of families on TANF. We now know much more and can use this knowledge to our benefit.
- Things to consider
  - Think about what it means to be on TANF for 60 months. People tend to go on and off TANF over the years resulting in a combined time of 60 months. There is also a broad range of circumstances that cause individuals to go on and off of TANF.
  - What we've learned from other programs that implemented time limits is that the likelihood of employment is about 30% at the best. If people are cut off of benefits they are not likely to find jobs on their own, and these results were found during a

much better job market. If extensions are not put in place there will be a group of families that continue to be unemployed after losing their benefits.

- There is a very low likelihood of individuals who will receive other benefits (i.e. SSI). We know that enrolling in SSI is very difficult. Most families on TANF long term have multiple barriers in their lives but not one barrier large enough to qualify them for SSI. At best 10% of participants will receive SSI benefits.
  - Ethnographic research has shown that when families have no available cash they resort to desperate measure to meet their basic needs. This can mean anything from moving into situations or homes that individuals know are unhealthy to engaging risky work. Many families may scrape together money to meet their needs but these opportunities are never steady, creating daily uncertainty and stress. Cash is a necessity for all families because other options are not enough to meet needs with consistency.
  - TANF is a service that catches many people and provides opportunity and options. It provides services that most people do not have access to otherwise, such as child care.
  - A study was done in Washington State on tightening extensions for time limits. As a result, they saw an increase in percentage of people who were homeless, an increase in child maltreatment resulting in an increase in foster care and children in the child welfare systems. Additionally, if children are in unstable situations and exposed to harm there are life time health consequences which result in huge costs in the health care system.
  - It is important to consider what will happen when the next recession hits. A lot of families have been on TANF for more than 60 months. If there is a recession this number will increase but budgets will already be limited.
- Key Elements of the Path Forward
    - Most initial assessments do not accurately identify the existence of significant employment barriers. Incoming TANF customers are asked to divulge a large amount of personal information. This is uncomfortable, even intimidating, therefore first assessment is usually not reflective of the actual situation. How do we do a better job assessing needs and identifying barriers initially and over time?
    - Exemptions- View this as people who cannot be expected to find work due to signification barriers (mental health, physical, a combination of issues, etc.)
    - Extension- View this as people who have the potential of gaining employment and moving forward but it will take them a bit more time. There can be many reasons for this and we need to consider all factors, such as the current job market, personal circumstances and what will happen to the children if benefits are stopped.
    - It is very important to think of alternative pathways to employment. DC has made incredible progress in employment services, but it is not geared towards people who are not quick to gain work. Some individuals need more time to work on mental health or other barriers and these are individuals are not well served by current programs. Realistically some adults may only be able to participate in services at 1 or 2 days a week; 20 -30 hours of work is too high of a bar to set for many individuals at the beginning, therefore we are setting people up to fail.

- For example, there is a community based program called MOMS partnership. This program met with women on TANF, in their community, to assess their needs. Based on their requests an 8-week stress reduction program was created. It was so successful, with 80% completion rate, that a job component has recently been added. This demonstrates that for some groups other issues need to be addressed and work completed prior to entering the workforce.
- It is very important to understand that data does not show that removing benefits leads people to work if there is not a good job market. People often do not have jobs due to the lack of skills and resources, the lack of a job may be there aren't sufficient job openings that fit the schedule as parents. TANF is an important safety net that will catch people when the labor market and economic systems do not work.
- Questions
  - Thank you for clearing up the law regarding the timeline of TANF. I understand what you said about exemptions versus extension but what is the actual definition of these terms?
    - Donna- Exemptions stop the clock and say an individual is not expected to participate in the required activities but will still receive TANF. An extension provides additional time on TANF to someone who has already reached the time limit and continues to work with them on moving forward and completing required activities.
  - In terms of local framework, is the goal that we meet the budgetary markers indicated? What are we trying to align the policy recommendations with?
    - Barbara- Consider that DC has a hard stop for all households receiving TANF for more than 60 months. Which of these households or individuals should be extended and try to offer those recommendations within the noted fiscal marks.
  - The TANF grant has not increased since 1996. So how much additional local funding do we expected to be included?
    - Donna- DC is in line with the national average for the funding amount allocated to cash assistance. However, it has also put a large amount of TANF funding towards child care services. In comparison to other states, DC has stayed within pretty narrow range of how TANF funding is used.

## 6. Stand Up Exercise: Barbara Poppe

- We want to talk a bit about values. In this topic there can be constant conflict between morals and values, therefore it helps to know where the group and our individual values are grounded.
  - Activity: In this topic there are two conflicting values "Servicing more families to assure a greater number of people receive some assistance" and "Helping those who help themselves or those who cannot help themselves as much as others." The working group members will put themselves on a continuum between the two juxtaposing values to indicate what they value the most, one the other or somewhere in between.

- Comment by Ed – Please remember during this exercise that the two values only indicate the actions of needs of the parents, it does not take into account the children.
- Results: Members were grouped closer to the “Servicing more families” value. However, members are looking for solutions that provide balance between the two values.
  - Comment by Rita- When looking at recommendations we need to prepare for the future. Prepare DHS better for the customers that they receive and ensure customers are preparing for their future.
  - Ed – It is my experience that most people want to help themselves and do not like the implication, by this wording, that some people do not want to help themselves. It is better to think about the barriers people face that will explain why it is perceived that they are not helping themselves.
    - Barbara – There are all kinds of values held on this topic and the “helping themselves” value is held people in the community. I agree with your reservations, but this has been included to make sure we are all thinking about the conflicting and varied public values that are held regarding TANF.

#### **7. Presentation: Cost Analysis: Policy Options. – Anthea Seymour**

- Presentation on the additional cost analysis was completed since the working group meeting 1.
- Analysis of Dot Exercise:
  - In meeting 1 Members were asked to vote with dots on policies from the idea sheets for DHS to cost and bring back to the next meeting. Each voting member of the working group was given five dots.
  - Parents who “play by all the rules” and Nadeau Bill received the most votes at 19 each. With Advocates heavily supporting the Nadeau Bill and customers and city staff supporting parents who “play by all the rules.”
  - All minor children regardless of parent participation received 18 votes with an even mix of support from customers and city council/staff.
  - We can see that unemployment without high school education and families who are at risk of child entering foster care received no votes
  - This shows where which policies people most supported but this does not mean we are aligning our policy with this exercise outcome.
- Feedback on the Nadeau Bill: Anthea explained the genesis of the Nadeau bill and what policies it proposes.
  - This was a collaboration between some councilmembers and advocates, and proposes to:
    - Continue benefits for children in households that have reached the time limit,
    - Fund the POWER categories to include individuals in an education program and individual with a child under 6 months of age.

- Extend benefits for the entire family beyond 60 months under the following circumstances
      - Those complying with their Individual Responsibility Plan;
      - A lack of employment opportunities within the District for individuals without a high school diploma;
      - Those affected by significant barriers to employment (low literacy, learning disabilities, or physical or mental impairment);
      - Individuals that are homeless or at risk of homelessness; and
      - Children are at risk of entering foster care.
- Assumptions for cost projections
  - Projections were done by DHS alone with many assumptions built in to the projections. Remember these are not bottom line numbers, as we still need to speak with the OCFO, and DHS cannot provide final costs without working in partnership with the OCFO.
    - Average of TANF cash benefit per family in FY17 is an average of \$450 per month at full benefits (less than 60 months) and an average of \$150 per month at reduced benefits (more than 60 months). These amounts fluctuate per household but are averages across the program.
    - FY17 start in October and projections are based on FY18, with the inclusion of the 3 COLA increased to be expected over the next 3 years.
    - The TANF extension will include other benefit in addition to cash assistance but today we are only discussing the cash assistance portion. These are the amount projected and the other benefits will be included back into the extension proposal.
    - Cost Projection for “No Time Limit Group” focuses on families projected to exceed 60 months. The assumptions for each criteria are listed.
      - CHILD only coverage – for sanction process the head of household is removed. We assume remove 20% and keep 80% coverage
      - Full benefits to all families – 100% benefit for all
      - Reduced benefits with COLA for all families– recalculation reduced benefit but with COLA increase. We also reduced the number of families to 5,800.
      - Reduced benefits without COLA for families – this is currently extended to all families
    - Play by the rules group – These include conservative estimates of the projected families.
      - Not Sanctioned – conservative estimate of 75% of 5,800
      - Full and partial compliance- again conservative estimate of projected families
      - Enrolled in Education/Training programs- conservative estimate of projected families
      - Employed (including part-time)- This includes all types of employment.
    - Other Criteria

- Homeless or at risk of becoming homeless – about 25% is projected, but this number is likely to change.
  - Household heads with low literacy– original projected number of families was low; therefore, it was increased to 45% based on article by American University
  - Nadeau bill
    - The comparative slide shows the projected number of families that can be served within budget limits. This does not mean we need to fit within these budget limits they are just hypothetical situations that allows us to visualize the numbers and fiscal implications.
    - Some categories were not costed due to time constraints and lack of working group priority, these were families who are at risk of child entering foster care, unemployment without high school education, POWER families, families who do not have childcare and two generational approach.
- Question:
  - On the no time limit group, 5,800 is the projected number of families that will exceed 60 months. Does this number fluctuate?
    - Anthea – Yes, it does fluctuate. It was previously 6,200 but this projection is not much lower and we will continue to monitor the projection. The final number will be updated before the final report
  - Would like to clarify why unemployment without high school education not costed.
    - It was not costed because we do not want to redefine unemployment for DC as a whole, which currently included individuals with college degrees. In the Nadeau bill it is only representing individuals with high school diplomas or lower because they are most adversely affected by a recession.
  - In regards to the cost of extending TANF services beyond cash assistance, will this be a large fiscal cost as well? I am meaning services such as case management and transportation services.
    - We do need to spend time to analyze the cost of these additional services and include them into any future budget proposal. We would also like to look at other services families should receive outside of cash assistance or if they no longer receive cash assistance.
  - Where did the assumptions come from for the project number of families on the Play by the Rules group?
    - These percentages of the projected number of families was an estimate correlated to the data we provided in meeting 1. However, those projections were quite conservative and we felt it was beneficial to increase the projections to ensure we are fully covered in our budget projections.
    - In our analysis we do not have full data on 60% of participants because they were not engaged in the services. By increasing the projected the number of families compared to the data, we are ensuring that we account for individuals for whom we do not have full data. For the final data and projections, we will be working with the OCFO.
  - How do we measure or deal with families that fall under two or more categories? What does that do for these projections?
    - Barbara- This is actually a good thing to think about during the small groups exercise. So reserve that questions for a bit later.
- In projecting the negative impact, societal cost and negative outcomes on families if TANF is stopped after 60 months we drew from experience in other states. From this we know that there is an increased risk for families if they lost TANF, which include food insecurity, child

maltreatment, housing issues and homelessness, access to medical care and other support services.

- We also need to do a better job of ensuring families that qualify for SSI are moved on to this program.
- Bottom line on cost analysis is that we were not able to analyze and project unintended costs of the program, but DHS is open to any suggestions to include additional cost into the analysis.

### **Small Group Dialogues – Barbara Poppe**

Activity: The working group members are broken in to 4 small groups based on constituency, (customers, providers, city council/staff, and advocates). Each group will discuss the benefits and risk of policy options including no time limits and then develop scenarios of policy options with in the suggested budget markers. Please note that the advocacy group will not be doing the budget activity because they feel it is more important to decide on the necessary policy and would not want budget markers to influence their policy decisions. Other groups are welcome to do this as well, if they do not want to follow the budget markers set out on the sheets.

Report out from small groups:

**Providers:** Decided not to go by the budget marks because further clarification is needed to make budget and policy options decisions and had a few questions/concerns.

- Risk and Benefits
  - For all scenarios exempt/extended families should receive full benefits. Advocates also support extensions for periods of high unemployment in DC, families with children under 6 months and families at risk of foster care placement.
  - No time limit
    - Added the benefit that domestic violence victims do not have to risk safety and privacy by having to disclose status as a victim
    - Disagreed with the risk of financial stability because DC can afford the proposed extension. They also would like to know if there is evidence of taxpayer frustration and in-migration of families.
    - Studies show (per LaDonna) that most families do not find work after TANF benefits are cut, which suggest that time limits are not an incentive. Furthermore, most families go on and off of TANF showing that the time limit is not an incentive.
  - Child only
    - All risks were removed except the risk of increase in homelessness and associated cost along with families may face food insecurities and greater housing instability (including right to shelter in this jurisdiction).
    - Added the risk of increased trauma and stress for parents, increase in foster care and will take away an important protective factor for children recovering from complex trauma. There is also a risk of increase health care costs in the long term due to ACEs and in mothers that return to abusers for financial reasons.
    - This option should include the option for parents to reengage to receive full benefits.
- Policy options within in budget limits
  - Is there a reduced amount option for the Nadeau bill? No

- No budget option can be chosen until assessment are addressed
  - Family assessment, which make sure the full family is included, could lead to less than 5,000 projected families. This assessment may require a different tool than that currently being used.
  - Service plan/assessment inclusive of all services is need in order to make decisions about the fiscal implications.
- The policy options are presented as singular but they are not. Many households/individuals may fall under multiple options.
  - A lot more discussion needs to be had and feels that discussion cannot be limited to these working groups. There is concern about the time limits and unintended consequences, such as unstable housing/homelessness. A discussion should also be held on expanding the POWER categories.

**City Council and City Staff:** Did not go by the budget marks but rather spend time discussion the policy options presented especially no time limits, play by the rules no sanction, play by the rules IRP and focus on 2 generational approach. The group struggled with prioritizing playing by the rules IRP which promotes the work and the child only option because protecting children an important value. These are two juxtaposing issues so what is the core value of TANF, having resources in the home or a program for parents to avail themselves?

- Risk and benefits
  - Nadeau bill
    - Added the benefit that it is cheaper than hotels
    - Added the risk that it would be difficult to implement
  - No time limit
    - Added the benefit that it is less expensive to extend benefits because other service systems (housing) are more expensive.
    - Added the risks that it removes pressure to improve service delivery and sanctions families with high risk factors.
  - Child Only
    - Strongly agreed that families may face food insecurity and greater housing instability/homelessness.
    - Added the risks that no services for workforce development, cannot sanction household heads and individual are not eligible for stipends and incentives.
  - Play by the rules following IRP
    - Added the benefit of compliance based on customer needs and HCA model= capacity
    - Added the risk of who will decide compliance?

**Advocates:** Did not follow the budget marks but rather discussed the pros and cons of each possibility. Who would this help? What are the cost/benefits to the city? What are the values on the bill? What do we think is important for the citizen of the city? Is this protecting children and prevent homelessness? Looked at all outcomes to find the best solution. Did not come to a conclusion as to the best options and want additional conversations with everyone about the programs.

- Risk and Benefits

- Household heads with low literacy
  - Cost should not be a factor in making decisions on options.
  - The risk that parents are not incentivized to participate fully in education/training is not true as they can still be expected to fully participate.
  - Added the risk that if people are not protected then they will face closed doors and significant barriers to employment
- Play by the rules enrolled in education/training
  - Again cost should not be a factor
  - Added the risk that parents who are not playing by the rules may be suffering from PTSD caused by domestic violence.
- Unstable housing/homeless
  - In risks we must think about the families. With this option we do not agree that parents are not incentivized, that there is tax payer frustration and in-migration of families.
- Final thought: Are we focusing on incentivizing people to work or do we want to protect children?

**Customers:** Discussed what would best benefit the home and feel the best option to ensure everyone has assistance because each household or individual has their own set of barriers. However, prioritizing parents who play by the rules and child only coverage were the most important of the specific policy options. However, TANF also needs to be managed better with the better communication, services and structure to ensure people trying can actually succeed.

- Risks and Benefits Identified were as such:
  - Nadeau bill
    - Benefit of cost savings in other services.
    - Deleted all risks provided and had questions regarding the financial sustainability for DC
  - No time limit
    - Agreed with the benefits of families facing time limits may have multiple barriers (physical, education etc.), recognizes that a permanent exit from TANF is difficult for some families even work-focused, and believe that stuff happens in everyone's life.
    - Agreed with all provided risks. They know of families migrating in to DC to utilize TANF and one person has experienced discrimination because she is on TANF.
  - Play by the rules following IRP
    - Agreed with all provided benefits and included that it gives people the chance to be economically successful
    - No comments on risk
- Policy Options within budget limits were as such
  - <\$10 M – providing either reduced benefit for all with no time limits (option A) or providing full benefits to parents who play by the rules and are enrolled in education/training programs
  - <\$17.5 M – a few scenarios were given.
    - Full benefits for play by rules who are enrolled in education/training programs and Unstable housing/homeless
    - Child only and Unstable housing/homeless
    - Child only and play by the rules working part-time

- Families of household heads with low literacy
  - <\$25 M – a few scenarios were given
    - Play by the rules not sanctioned
    - Reduced benefits for child only and play by the rules following IRP
    - Reduced benefits for child only and families of household heads with low literacy
  - <\$35 M – a combination of providing full benefits for play by the rules not sanctioned and reduced child only is the most important. We should prioritize covering everyone but also providing better TANF services and structured IRPs to ensure those “playing by the rules” are actually able to succeed.
  - All covered – providing coverage to everyone is the best options because each family has their own barriers however only 80% of benefits should be provided.
- Final Thought: If all coverage is given then the program needs to be managed better. Currently people get shuffled around until they are over 60 months. It is important to ensure the all the services in the TANF program are better communicated and customers provided with all of the available resources.

Questions and final comments:

- Do you feel if we chose child only option that the money would get to the child?
  - Latoya- in most cases probably not but that is not all households. Perhaps with a better structured program this would not be the case. Sometime the household head is not the one running the household. Many times there is a 2<sup>nd</sup> person that needs to be brought into the program. Benefits need to be provided to the full household to ensure children’s needs are met.
  - Mona- Some customers have not seen people in TANF that are doing all of the necessary steps. I like to have resources and research options, and even still it is hard to understand/know all of the services available. I am working towards my degree and try to encourage others to do the same. Sometimes a seed just needs to be planted.
- Participant – We do feel clear and concise coordination of TANF needs to happen. We are a group of smart people here so I know this can happen.
- Ed – Today we heard a lot of people with really goodwill to make sure children are getting protected and help people move forward. We need to have a policy conversation which asks what options should be considered rather than trying to meet the arbitrary budget numbers.

**Closing and next steps – Barbara Poppe**

- As people are leaving please assess if there is a need for an additional meeting/time.
  - 11 people voted - all indicating the need for an additional meeting.
- The next meeting will include:
  - Report out from community dialogues sessions
  - Review results from small group exercise
    - Benefits and risks of options
    - Organize options/scenarios within budget breaks
  - Discuss recommendations for households who will not receive a “TANF hardship exemption” and will not receive continuing TANF cash assistance