

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

TEXAS INTERAGENCY COUNCIL
FOR THE HOMELESS

Brown Heatly Building
Room 3501
4900 N. Lamar Blvd.
Austin, Texas

November 17, 2016
10:05 a.m.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

MICHAEL DOYLE, Chair
BROOKE BOSTON
VALINDA BOLTON
AMY FELKER
FRANCES GATTIS
KELLY KRAVITZ
TODD NOVAK (via telephone)
PAM MAERCKLEIN
EMILY SASSER-BRAY
NAOMI TREJO

ADVISORY MEMBERS PRESENT:

CHRISTINE GENDRON
ERIC SAMUELS
DENNIS M. SCHOLL (via telephone)
JEANNE STAMP
MOLLY VOYLES (via telephone)

ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT:

TERRI RICHARD (TDHCA)
ELIZABETH YEVICH (TDHCA)
MEGAN SYLVESTER (TDHCA)

I N D E X

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. Welcome and Introductions	3
II. Remarks from Chair	6
III. Approval of draft minutes from the Sept 21, 2016 TICH Quarterly Meeting	6
IV. Final Discussion of Report on <i>Homelessness among Youth in Texas</i> per House Bill 679	7
V. Final Discussion of Report on <i>Homelessness among Veterans in Texas</i> per Senate Bill 1580	58
VI. Use of \$10,000 provided by Texas Workforce Commission for Continuum of Care Coordination by Texas Homeless Network	65
VII. Public Comment	none
VIII. Closing comments/next quarterly meeting scheduled for:	69
(a) Tuesday, January 31, 2017	
IX. Adjourn	69

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. DOYLE: Welcome, everybody, those that are
3 on the phone with us and those that are present. Let me
4 call this meeting to order, the special meeting of the
5 Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless, for the
6 purpose of hearing the reports from Senate Bill 80 on
7 veterans homelessness and youth homelessness that Naomi is
8 going to present to us in just a second.

9 First, let's kind of go around and introduce
10 each other so that people on the phone will know who all
11 are here. I'll start. I'm Mike Doyle from Fort Worth,
12 and I represent the Governor's Office.

13 DR. NARENDORF: Sara Narendorf, University of
14 Houston.

15 MS. TREJO: Naomi Trejo, TDHCA.

16 MR. SAMUELS: Eric Samuels, Texas Homeless
17 Network.

18 MS. KRAVITZ: Kelly Kravitz, Texas Education
19 Agency.

20 MS. FELKER: Amy Felker, HHSC.

21 MS. STAMP: Jeanne Stamp, Texas Homeless
22 Education Office.

23 MS. GATTIS: Frances Gattis, TDCJ.

24 MS. HISSAN: Jessica Hissan, DSHS/HHSC.

25 MS. BOSTON: Brooke Boston, TDHCA.

1 MS. RICHARD: Terri Richard, TDHCA.

2 MR. DOYLE: Elizabeth.

3 MS. YEVICH: Elizabeth Yevich, TDHCA.

4 MS. SYLVESTER: Megan Sylvester, Federal
5 Compliance Counsel for TICH and TDHCA.

6 MS. HARVEY: Robin Harvey from Representative
7 Reynolds' office.

8 MS. HERZOG: Julia Herzog, also from
9 Representative Reynolds' office.

10 MR. GOURIS: Tom Gouris, TDHCA.

11 MS. HALL: Brenda Hall, TDHCA.

12 MS. MOLINARI: And Jennifer Molinari from
13 TDHCA.

14 MS. MAERCKLEIN: Pam Maercklein with the Texas
15 Veterans Commission.

16 MR. DOYLE: And then I think we have Todd Novak
17 on the phone and Dr. Dennis Scholl on the phone. Is that
18 correct?

19 MR. NOVAK: Yes, sir, that is correct.

20 DR. SCHOLL: That is correct.

21 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Well, welcome everyone.

22 MS. VOYLES: Molly Voyles with the Texas
23 Council on Family Violence.

24 MR. DOYLE: Thank you. Well, I appreciate all
25 of your attendance. We have more than a quorum and that's

1 great for us, so we're off to a good morning.

2 Along with the introductions, I'm going to ask
3 Brooke to kind of give an update on the organizational
4 chart for TDHCA and how it applies to this council and to
5 the homeless work that's going on. So Brooke.

6 MS. BOSTON: Thank you. I had just wanted to
7 mention, I'm one of the voting members of the TICH and
8 will continue to be, but I also for years had been the
9 deputy executive director that oversaw all of the
10 homelessness activity. And so Naomi Trejo has been the
11 homelessness coordinator, she reported to the director
12 Michael DeYoung, for Community Affairs, and then he
13 reported to me. We recently went through a
14 reorganization, so all homelessness issues are staying
15 with Naomi, but Naomi and homelessness issues have moved
16 into a new division that's called the HOME and
17 Homelessness Programs, which is run by Jennifer Molinari,
18 who was the HOME director before.

19 So HOME and ESG are both programs under HUD
20 that are operated through their Community Planning and
21 Development Program, CPD, and so they follow the same
22 regulations and there's a lot of synergies there, they use
23 the same HUD reporting system. And so effectively, all
24 homelessness programs have moved from under the Community
25 Affairs Division into the HOME and Homeless Programs

1 Division, and then also, that division where Jennifer is
2 now under a different deputy which is Tom Gouris right
3 there. So Naomi has been the constant but it's kind of
4 the chain above that has changed.

5 I am actually still going to remain on the TICH
6 because the division that staffs administratively the TICH
7 is the Housing Resource Center, which Elizabeth runs, and
8 that division has now been moved under me, so it kind of
9 still gives me entree, so to speak, to stay on the TICH,
10 which is what I'd like to do. So over time we may see how
11 that evolves, but anyway, I just wanted to make sure
12 people knew that. I know we talk a lot about the
13 different programs and contracts that TDHCA runs, and so I
14 thought it was helpful for you to know about that.

15 MR. DOYLE: Wonderful. Thank you so much.

16 Okay. I don't have any remarks other than
17 thank you for being here, and I know it's going to get
18 busy with the legislative session coming up. I know that
19 there are some legislative issues that are on the agenda
20 that I've already heard about that I'm sure some of you
21 will be asked to testify about, so keep that in mind that
22 some of these are very, very important and we'll be
23 getting those to you at some point in time before the
24 session or shortly after the session starts.

25 So we need a motion to approve the draft

1 minutes that you should have seen online, so if somebody
2 would make a motion.

3 MS. BOSTON: So moved.

4 MR. DOYLE: So moved by Brooke. Is there a
5 second?

6 MS. MAERCKLEIN: Second.

7 MR. DOYLE: Second by Pam. Any corrections,
8 additions, discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 MR. DOYLE: All in favor say aye.

11 (A chorus of ayes.)

12 MR. DOYLE: Opposed same sign.

13 (No response.)

14 MR. DOYLE: That does pass.

15 Okay, here we go. Dr. Narendorf, you're going
16 to tell us about House Bill 679's requirement of the
17 report on homeless youth.

18 DR. NARENDORF: All right. Great. Well,
19 thanks for having me.

20 So I'm going to spend some time, I know you
21 guys have probably heard quite a bit about the veterans
22 report and this is sort of your big introduction to this
23 one, so I'm going to spend some time walking you all
24 through our process in generating this report and then
25 also just what's in the report.

1 So the report is obviously in response to House
2 Bill 679. There were sort of four things that were asked
3 for as part of that, and this report is the result of the
4 third phase of the three-phase process. So the first
5 thing that the bill asked for was to collect data on the
6 number of homeless youth in the state, and so that
7 happened through phases one and two of the project which
8 TNOYS oversaw, and so phase three we actually are
9 analyzing the data and pulling together multiple sources
10 to come up with this report. So this report focuses sort
11 of on two, three and four in here, as well, which were to
12 examine the needs of homeless youth, the degree to which
13 current programs are meeting those needs, identify sources
14 of funding, and then develop a strategic plan that
15 established steps to be taken and timelines for the steps.
16 So that is what the report responds to.

17 So the process that we took to get here, we
18 started in June so there it was a pretty rushed time frame
19 to collect that data for phases one and two, and then
20 quite a lot has happened, we brought a lot together to get
21 here from June. So the first thing we did was start with
22 data analysis, so we had three sources of data that
23 informed the report, data sets. We have other data that
24 we collected as well to bring in, but our three data sets
25 that we're looking at and I talk about in Chapter 1 of the

1 report related to the number of homeless youth in Texas.

2 One is from TEA administrative data. TEA
3 identifies homeless youth under the McKinney-Vento
4 definition. The definition for the legislation is a
5 little bit different than that, it's provided in here,
6 focusing on young people under 19. So the TEA data was
7 given to us by county, we had three school years of data
8 from 2012 to 2015 by county, so not by school district but
9 by county, and so that's the way we reported the data in
10 Chapter 1.

11 Then we have data from DFPS. Certain parts of
12 the legislation talk about kids that are awaiting foster
13 care placement, those that have been abandoned in
14 hospitals, and so DFPS looked at that definition and
15 identified some categories in their data that would
16 provide information about that. So we had four different
17 populations that they identified which the largest group
18 was young people that were runaway or in emergency
19 shelters. And then there were also young people
20 identified as having a referral due to a refusal to accept
21 parental responsibility. There's just a handful that came
22 through as Baby Moses which would be babies that are
23 abandoned in a hospital. And then some for mental health
24 specific reasons that ended up in hospitals. So not a
25 large number of young people were identified through those

1 categories, and those are reported separately in the
2 report.

3 And then the third source of data is from the
4 actual original data collection in phases one and two
5 which was a statewide survey of young people conducted in
6 conjunction with the point in time counts across the
7 state. So 16 communities participated in that we had data
8 from across those.

9 So our process was we analyzed that data
10 beginning in June, and then in August, in conjunction with
11 the TNOYS conference, statewide conference which was held
12 in Houston, a pre-conference workshop where we presented
13 some of our initial findings, and then we had a whole
14 afternoon where stakeholders from across the state went
15 through a process of giving us feedback on what they
16 thoughts the needs of homeless youth were, what was
17 interesting about the data, what they're seeing in their
18 own practice, so their perspective. We had people from
19 across the state attend that session, we had 53 people
20 there.

21 And so from that then we generated five broad
22 areas of recommendation that we then started talking with
23 people more, specifically around those: are these the
24 right recommendation areas, what should be the specific
25 things underneath each of those overarching areas. We had

1 two additional stakeholder feedback sessions. One was a
2 virtual roundtable, we had 30 people participate in that,
3 and then we presented at the Texas Homeless Network
4 Conference in September and got feedback from people after
5 that.

6 We also had individual interviews with a number
7 of people. Both Christine Gendron and myself talked to
8 some members of the TICH working group on youth
9 homelessness, as well as key informants and providers in
10 the community that we thought can give us more specific
11 information to help us with the recommendations. And then
12 there were two additional sources of data. So we
13 contracted with TNOYS to help us identify providers across
14 the state, funding sources, and then they help conduct a
15 provider survey which went out to their list and was
16 advertised on their website and had 55 people respond to
17 that. And also a survey of homeless liaisons that went to
18 all the homeless liaisons across the state, and 392 of
19 them responded so we got some feedback from them as well.

20 We also conducted a literature review, really
21 focused on the last five years. There were certain
22 domains in terms of identifying the needs of homeless
23 youth that were identified. Chapter 2 is sort of broken
24 down across these data sources by those needs areas. We
25 conducted literature searches specific to those areas, not

1 a systematic comprehensive literature review but we
2 definitely wanted to get the most current and sort of
3 bring together the literature to inform us.

4 So those are the sources that informed the
5 report. We sort of spent October trying to bring those
6 sources together. We really had a team of people that
7 worked on this report so several key people from TNOYS
8 that were our subcontractors on it, as well as Katherine
9 Barillas from One Voice Texas, and my team included some
10 young people who have experienced homelessness that worked
11 on the project, and Diane Santa Maria at UT School of
12 Nursing.

13 So that's sort of how we got these
14 recommendations and what is in front of you comes out of
15 that process. So I can walk you through just quickly
16 what's in the report and then sort of walk through the
17 recommendations which is probably the point where you guys
18 have the most questions and maybe have some feedback for
19 us.

20 MR. DOYLE: Can I interject just a second?
21 Does anybody have any questions at this point for Sarah,
22 other than me?

23 DR. NARENDORF: Jump on in.

24 MR. DOYLE: So I'm just thinking about the
25 Governor's Office and legislators, that are here, offices

1 that are represented, saying that the TEA estimated
2 111,881 homeless youth, the youth in time count by the
3 Continuum of Care showed 758. That's a big difference
4 between 111,000 and 758. Are the recommendations going to
5 have anything to do with trying to make -- one person is
6 going to hear 111,000, another is going to hear 758, the
7 one that hears 758 is going to say there's no need for any
8 more money, there's only 758 of them, the one with 111,000
9 is going to say we need more money. So someplace in
10 between there, how do we do that?

11 DR. NARENDORF: I mean, I think the way that I
12 tried to present the data in the report is we have these
13 different sources of data, and our first recommendation
14 really is about trying to get those sources of data to
15 speak to one another. So they're using different
16 measurement questions, operationalizing those differently
17 in terms of what does homelessness look like from a school
18 definition, from a point in time definition, at different
19 periods of time, over different periods of time. So
20 111,000 is over the course of an entire school year, or a
21 much broader definition of homelessness. And then the 758
22 number is on one single night.

23 MR. DOYLE: So even with an annualized number,
24 though, the 758 annualized is not going to be more than
25 5,000.

1 MR. SAMUELS: I don't think it will be that
2 high, but the definition is the key, that's the big
3 difference.

4 MR. DOYLE: So then here's my question for you,
5 Eric, I guess, primarily, or for you, Brooke, or Naomi.
6 The hard fact was supposed to bring those things close
7 together, it doesn't look like they're very close together
8 to me.

9 MR. SAMUELS: They're not too close together
10 right now. The school district definition is a wider
11 definition and the HUD Continuum of Care definition is
12 very narrow and it's a point in time.

13 MS. GENDRON: We're talking to legislative
14 offices about this, and I agree the definition is a huge
15 issue but I don't think it's just that. We know that
16 point in time counts are not the best way to measure youth
17 homelessness, and I think everybody knew that going into
18 this. The exciting thing about this is that we got to
19 actually survey the 758 youth and young adults to find out
20 what they're dealing with, and you're not able to do that,
21 get that information in school district data. But I think
22 it's okay to tell people, well, we know this isn't the
23 right method for understanding the numbers of youth who
24 are homeless, this is a good method for understanding
25 those needs.

1 MR. DOYLE: That's a good point. I don't think
2 anybody would argue, at least I don't think anybody in
3 this room would argue whatever need there is, whether it's
4 111-, those kids that are living on somebody else's couch
5 that aren't counted in the HUD definition need help,
6 nobody is arguing that. But when it comes to the
7 legislative session and you've got numbers this opposingly
8 different, usually it's let's figure this out and we'll
9 talk about it in two years, and we don't want to do that.

10 So I think as the TICH we have to have some
11 kind of explanation that says they're both right but from
12 a different definition and a different methodology, and I
13 think we have to lean towards the bigger number to make
14 sure we've got resources to help. Are they in each
15 other's number, are the 758 in the 111,000?

16 MR. SAMUELS: They are, but the 758 is a point
17 in time and the 111,000 --

18 MS. GENDRON: A lot of them aren't in the
19 111,000, half of them are beyond the age of being in
20 school and some of them in school probably dropped out.
21 So I wouldn't even say the 758 is an estimate of the
22 number who are homeless, I would say we interviewed 758
23 about what they need and this is what they said.

24 MR. DOYLE: That's a good point.

25 MS. YEVICH: And I hate to interrupt. For

1 administrative purposes for the people on the phone and
2 for the court reporter, if you could introduce yourselves
3 before you speak so we know.

4 MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Elizabeth.

5 DR. NARENDORF: I can also just speak a little
6 bit. So 111,000 is like the biggest number, these are
7 kids from age three to twenty which is what the
8 legislation provided super broadly, and so there are
9 different ways to talk about that. So about 15,000 of
10 those are unaccompanied young people, and so that maybe
11 suggests a different intervention or maybe a different set
12 of supports than 111,000. Eighty percent of them are
13 double dots from unstable housing situations, we're
14 talking about a lot of family homelessness reflected in
15 this data, and so the legislation defines this very
16 broadly and so we followed up on that.

17 But I think absolutely in talking about this,
18 there are some sub-groups within that large number. And
19 the 758 is probably much more close to people that are in
20 homeless service providing agencies right now, in a
21 shelter today, it's one night, versus over the course of a
22 school year every kind that's identified. And I think one
23 of the strikes that I see in is we have 111,000 kids who
24 are being identified, so the 758 you've got the huge
25 problem of identification. Kids are hard to identify in

1 point in time counts, there's all kinds of under-counting
2 that happens in that, and a lot of attention focused on
3 trying to find them and count them, but schools are
4 identifying them all the time.

5 So is there a way to sort of bring the two
6 systems together a little better around service delivery,
7 which is some of what our recommendations are focused on,
8 at least trying to capitalize on identification to connect
9 them with services. The recommendation around schools is
10 related to trying to screen a little bit more and connect
11 them with housing service agencies.

12 MR. SAMUELS: and this is Eric Samuels, Texas
13 Homeless Network.

14 I think that's the focus. The argument about
15 these numbers, creating these mechanisms where you can
16 make those connections, you can identify these kids when
17 they become homeless and get them into the systems that
18 they need to be into. Ultimately, 758 is too high of a
19 number; if it's 758, that's way too high. So the
20 importance in this thing, I think, is getting those
21 connections made and pointing out that those connections
22 aren't being made.

23 MR. DOYLE: Someone on the phone had a
24 question.

25 DR. SCHOLL: Mr. Chairman. It's Dr. Scholl

1 down on Somerset.

2 I want to endorse both your question and your
3 approach. Having done this kind of stuff in a different
4 state and with the legislature, they're really not
5 interested and sometimes you don't have the time to delve
6 into the processes and the issues of how you get different
7 under showing data for your recommendations. In fact,
8 I've read the whole report -- of course, the attachments
9 weren't all there -- and frankly, from the Governor's
10 Office perspective that you're representing in terms of a
11 comprehensive and integrated approach to youth
12 homelessness in Texas, the kind of recommendation -- even
13 the 111,000 is under-reporting, from my perspective --
14 that you'd be better off recommending a comprehensive and
15 integrated program for about 125,000 across the state and
16 then state that there were various sources of information
17 used.

18 All of this has shortcomings, but from the key
19 informants that are represented on the TICH that you would
20 recommend a budget for 125,000 youth in homeless type
21 situations that need some kind of services. The cleanup
22 data, they don't want to dwell about where you got your
23 data, they want a hard number to work from.

24 MR. DOYLE: An thank you, Dennis. And I just
25 want to encourage the TICH members and advisory members

1 that if you get asked the question which one of these
2 numbers do you support, our answer is both, we support
3 both of them, and we want reacted based on the methodology
4 by which they were obtained. We don't want to start
5 getting into legislators calling I'm on this side, I'm on
6 this side. That's not what it's about. We're on the side
7 of helping these kids stay out of homelessness. The point
8 in time and the study with the kids at the school
9 districts really just gives us a point of reference to how
10 big is the scope, but it's still a problem.

11 DR. SCHOLL: I'll just add real quick, the
12 point in time being in January, et cetera, to me that's
13 flagrantly set up to provide some kind of under-reporting,
14 and again, to present too much information does become an
15 opportunity for the legislature to say, hey, this program
16 still isn't integrated, they still don't know what they
17 really need, let's study it for two more years, and you
18 don't get as much done.

19 MR. DOYLE: Well, the point in time is really
20 more for adults. You count the children because you want
21 to know it but it's really more for adults, particularly
22 chronic adults. And obviously the January count hopes
23 that they drive them into the shelters so it's easier to
24 count. That's a different strategy altogether than year-
25 round homelessness in schools.

1 MS. HOWARD: Mr. Chairman, Ann Howard.

2 MR. DOYLE: Hi, Ann.

3 MS. HOWARD: How are you? With the Travis
4 County-Austin CoC, Continuum of Care.

5 I love seeing the data. What I think would be
6 so helpful for those of us working to get resources that
7 really address the need of certain ages because the
8 younger children are in families or out of families and
9 involved in the foster care system, the older kids may be
10 aged out of the foster care system, and there are state
11 grants that go to different age groups, there's the
12 federal government that we know today does address the
13 different populations. And so for example, right now all
14 of the cities in Austin are applying for a multimillion
15 dollar demonstration grant coming out of HUD, and it's
16 specifically for age -- they call it youth but youth to
17 them is 17 to 24, and we're doing all this work to figure
18 out the data and to have such a large number that says
19 just students won't match with any of the data we're
20 working on.

21 So I would really appreciate if we could break
22 this out in the report by the ages because we address it
23 as different sort of groups because they have different
24 needs. And so I think the big number is fine but it
25 doesn't really help us get resources unless it's more

1 narrowly defined.

2 MR. DOYLE: And I agree with Ann that that
3 would be very helpful, Sarah, but I think that your report
4 only went to age 20, didn't it, so you're still going to
5 have five years on the top that's lopped off there that
6 you're not going to have any data from this particular
7 report.

8 DR. NARENDORF: Well, in school data, everybody
9 in that data, it goes up to 21 and there were no 21-year-
10 olds in there. We can certainly break it down more
11 specifically by age. I'm not sure how fine-grained would
12 be helpful to you.

13 MS. HOWARD: Just something above like 17 and
14 up or 15 and above. Christine, I don't know what you
15 think.

16 MS. GENDRON: So I agree with what Ann is
17 saying and I'll even add a little to that. So one of the
18 challenges of this was coming up with that minimum age
19 range because anyone who is homeless and on their own we
20 wanted to be counted. There's not an official age range
21 at which you become an unaccompanied youth, but they tend
22 to be older, 16 would probably work. So TNOYS is one of
23 the organizations that lobbied for this bill. Obviously
24 the text changed before it was final, it's a little more
25 complicated than we had hoped. But what we wanted to see

1 from this is looking at all these data sources together,
2 because even though they all have strengths and they all
3 have limitations, none of them give us the full picture.

4 And so I'm not even sure I would accept this
5 111- as the high number, I think it's something we need to
6 build on an add to. And personally, I'm more interested
7 in unaccompanied youth than the homeless with families,
8 which I think the PIT sometimes does a better job of
9 capturing family homelessness. But regardless, we know
10 that the school district data doesn't include data on
11 youth that have dropped out of school, it doesn't include
12 data on youth who have aged out of foster care because
13 most of them are no longer in high school. And so we want
14 to use the school district data as part of the most
15 crucial data that we have, but I would argue that in
16 addition to breaking that out, that then we should be
17 adding things on top of that.

18 I don't know off the top of my head how many
19 kids aged out of foster care last year but we can easily
20 get that from DFPS data book, and research overwhelmingly
21 suggests that about a quarter of them end up homeless, and
22 we even now have some data on that in Texas, so adding
23 them to the number. And we're not going to come up with a
24 number that we know for a fact is right, but we'll come up
25 with a good ballpark and we'll be able to break that out

1 by different populations to get a good understanding of
2 the issue.

3 And I want to highlight why I think both the
4 education data and the PIT data are important. So for
5 example, one of my concerns has been that obviously we
6 want to let people know that there are almost 16,000
7 unaccompanied homeless youth identified by school
8 districts because we need services for those youth, we
9 don't really have anything. But at the same time, we
10 don't want people to think that means we have 16,000 youth
11 on the street right now and start opening shelters for all
12 those youth because that's probably not what we need.
13 Whereas, the data collected through the PIT methodology,
14 that gives us a sense of how many are on the street on a
15 given night and we do need emergency beds for them.

16 So the point I'm trying to make is I think all
17 the data is important and I think it would be helpful to
18 drill down into it more, as well as instead of looking at
19 these as different estimates, kind of adding them up.

20 MR. DOYLE: Well, I think at this point in
21 time -- and I agree with everything you said, Christine --
22 I think this report when it becomes final is what's going
23 to be reported due to legislation, what we have to do for
24 our legislation. We need to be there if there's any open
25 discussions about that, bring these points of view to the

1 table, but I think this is what we're going to go with.
2 And what I really want us to understand as members of the
3 TICH, if you're called is that we agree that this is a
4 minimal number but that it's somewhat accurate based on
5 the research that the University of Houston has done. So
6 I just want us to not say it's wrong, not say it's
7 absolutely right. I think our point of view from us would
8 be it's a great start in getting a more accurate number
9 and to at least this.

10 MR. SAMUELS: This is Eric Samuels, Texas
11 Homeless Network.

12 I think when we're talking about the numbers, a
13 little time educating where that number came from is a
14 good idea.

15 MR. DOYLE: Again, I love our legislators but
16 they're going to see numbers and they're going to hear
17 their staff quote numbers and that's all they're going to
18 remember unless we are there to make sure they understand
19 what the good and the bad of those calculations are.

20 Yes, ma'am.

21 MS. STAMP: This is Jeanne Stamp with the Texas
22 Homeless Education Office.

23 One other complication that 15,608 number for
24 unaccompanied homeless youth, there's no lower age limit
25 on that, so we've been talking about 15-year-olds, 17-

1 year-olds, these could be three-year-olds, five-year-olds,
2 eight-year-olds, ten-year-olds because the school district
3 is going to count them as unaccompanied if they're not
4 with a parent or a legal guardian, they're not in their
5 physical custody. So it includes all those younger age
6 groups as well, kids that aren't going to be on the street
7 most likely, and as Christine said, aren't going to need
8 shelter beds on their own.

9 MR. DOYLE: And how many liaisons do you have
10 now in the school districts?

11 MS. STAMP: There's one in every school
12 district in Texas.

13 MR. DOYLE: So that would be how many?

14 MS. STAMP: Well, we've got a little over 1,200
15 school districts in Texas, and that fluctuates because we
16 count public charter schools and they come and go,
17 sometimes school districts come and go.

18 MR. DOYLE: If we're asked by a legislator
19 about the liaisons, we can legitimately say there's a
20 homeless liaison in every school district in Texas.

21 MS. STAMP: It's required by law, that's what
22 we can say, it's required by law. If you go both into
23 TEA's Ask TED database and then our online directory, you
24 can find the ones that we have that have been identified
25 that have been sent in by school district, alphabetical

1 order, so you can figure out who that person is, along
2 with their contact information. But I'm sure that we
3 don't have them for all of them.

4 MR. DOYLE: But by law we're supposed to.

5 MS. STAMP: Yes.

6 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Well, let me move us to the
7 recommendations and I'm sure we'll have more questions as
8 these come about.

9 MS. KRAVITZ: Could I add one more thing just
10 to piggyback on the data piece? Kelly Kravitz, TEA.

11 We also know that there's an under-reporting of
12 students in homeless situations in schools, so the older
13 students significantly ramps up schools' need to identify
14 students. We know by looking at our data, I believe when
15 we look at our socioeconomic status, economically
16 disadvantaged that we're reporting 60 percent probably of
17 students in homeless situations in the schools. So when
18 you talk about that being the higher number, I would argue
19 that there is a higher number, and that the 111- or the
20 113- is the best that we have but we need to do better.

21 MR. DOYLE: Good point.

22 MR. DOYLE: Dennis.

23 DR. SCHOLL: Just real quick, Mr. Chairman. I
24 was wondering if when the reports have been finalized
25 you're actually going to be sending them with a

1 transmittal letter from yourself and that you did approve
2 the general type figures where your data supports or the
3 TICH data supports there being X number of homeless of
4 which at least or more of this percent is youth and this
5 percent is veterans. Essentially this one paragraph of
6 your letter of transmittal capturing everything else
7 behind it. I don't know if you do that, a transmittal
8 letter or not.

9 MR. DOYLE: I don't know. That sounds to me
10 like somebody -- like I'm going to get a lot of phone
11 calls, I'm not sure about that. And I would certainly not
12 send out anything over my letterhead without the
13 Governor's Office approving that that letter is okay.

14 But I've not heard any plans, Naomi, that
15 there's going to be anything coming out from the TICH as
16 this is the official, is there? Brooke?

17 MS. BOSTON: I was just going to say we're
18 required to submit them all to the legislative offices by
19 December 1, and so other than a very basic transmittal
20 letter probably just under Tim's signature, you know,
21 attached find compliant with bill whatever. Not to say if
22 you wanted to that wouldn't be fine, but I think from us
23 it's probably going to be just a transmittal letter.

24 MR. DOYLE: Here it is, here's the final thing.

25 MS. TREJO: And both of the studies are under

1 TDHCA with TICH input, so they're not officially from the
2 TICH

3 MR. DOYLE: Did you catch that, Dennis?
4 They're not officially from the TICH, they'll be from
5 TDHCA, but Tim Irvine is going to send out a communiqué
6 with the final reports that says this is what we found
7 out.

8 MS. BOSTON: And I think they're both coming to
9 our Board in December.

10 MS. YEVICH: As a report item, but not for
11 approval, after the fact.

12 MS. BOSTON: Right, right.

13 MS. BOLTON: This is Valinda Bolton from DFPS.
14 Will any of the nonprofits or advocacy groups be visiting
15 with the legislators about this report?

16 MS. GENDRON: We have been and we will be. We
17 have specific requests that this supports but that aren't
18 in here, so we have specific asks that we definitely want
19 to talk to you about it.

20 MS. BOLTON: So are you doing like a one-pager
21 or something to leave with them?

22 MS. GENDRON: We have a one-pager. We'll be
23 adding to it once this is officially released. So we've
24 been going around telling people this is coming out, this
25 identifies a need for funding for services, and then we've

1 got some ideas related to funding for services that we're
2 promoting. And there are others here and others not here
3 who are also working on it.

4 MR. DOYLE: But that will come from TNOYS.
5 Right? That will just come from you, you're not going to
6 send it out as a matter of fact.

7 MS. GENDRON: It has nothing to do with the
8 TICH.

9 MR. DOYLE: Right.

10 MS. GENDRON: It's TNOYS and then our partners.
11 Yes.

12 MR. DOYLE: So if there's another group that
13 wanted to glean from that data, could you make that
14 executive summary available to them so they could point to
15 it when they may be asked for comments?

16 MS. GENDRON: I would be thrilled to work with
17 anyone who wants to partner on this. Yes.

18 MR. SAMUELS: And we absolutely will be about
19 homelessness in general, including youth homelessness.

20 MS. GENDRON: Eric and I talked about this.

21 MR. DOYLE: Could that possibly be on the
22 websites so that we could draw that?

23 MR. SAMUELS: It could. We don't have our
24 legislative agenda done yet, so we don't have anything on
25 the website yet.

1 MS. GENDRON: I think ours is on the website;
2 if it's not, it will be.

3 MR. DOYLE: Or maybe we could just take these
4 final executive summaries and put them on the website.

5 MR. SAMUELS: On the TICH website.

6 MS. TREJO: The report will be on the TICH
7 website.

8 MR. DOYLE: So that's where they would access
9 that if they wanted to see data that they could use with
10 their own local legislators, representatives and senators,
11 would be on the TICH website.

12 Okay. Recommendations.

13 DR. NARENDORF: Okay. So I'll go through sort
14 of each one and then maybe you guys have questions about
15 them.

16 So this comes from us sort of synthesizing
17 across sources. So the first one is around improving data
18 sources for counting homeless youth or maybe counting is
19 the wrong word. So the first one is about standardizing
20 data collection tools to accompany point in time counts.
21 It comes specifically out of some of the efforts that
22 happened in phase one and two. There was a standardized
23 instrument developed, it was distributed to communities,
24 and we got data that was very inconsistent across
25 communities, people didn't use it. So at a very baseline,

1 trying to get everybody to measure really basic
2 information about homelessness in the same way.

3 The first recommendation related to point in
4 time counts. That's the first one, so even very basic
5 information about age, about where did you stay last
6 night, that isn't consistent across communities. So
7 people are trying to capture the same thing but they're
8 asking different questions to get there, so you can
9 imagine that that's kind of a nightmare from a data
10 analysis perspective. And I think when you think about
11 that 758 number, how people got in varied a lot across
12 communities, so I would say any time anybody is asking
13 about that 758 number, I would just be really clear that
14 it's really more like a survey than it is any kind of --
15 it's not like there are more homeless people in Corpus
16 Christi because we got more surveys in Corpus Christi,
17 it's about how people surveyed in various communities. So
18 I think that's really important to keep in mind in terms
19 of that 758, I would push back really hard about that.

20 MR. DOYLE: So let me just stop right there for
21 just a second. So how do we get all the CoCs who are
22 doing the point in times to use the same questions?

23 MR. SAMUELS: So we have talked about that and
24 in our conference we talked some more about that, and
25 that's difficult. I mean, that's something I ran into

1 with the vet analysis. You ask questions in different
2 ways to get the same answer. Age, for example, is asked
3 in several different ways, but you wouldn't think it would
4 be.

5 MR. DOYLE: How do you ask age?

6 MR. SAMUELS: Some people will say are you 16
7 and 20, other people just ask for your age.

8 MR. DOYLE: So they don't ask just your age.

9 DR. NARENDORF: They ask birthdays, they ask
10 their age.

11 MR. SAMUELS: And when you're doing an
12 analysis, you can't compare those two -- or you can't do
13 it very accurately in most cases.

14 So we would like to get there, and I and a few
15 others sat down and talked and we want to work towards
16 that, and I'm really pessimistic that it would happen in
17 2017.

18 MR. DOYLE: That's a little quick.

19 DR. NARENDORF: So I threw out a dream scenario
20 in which communities are given a computerized programmed
21 tablet with the questions on it to facilitate the same
22 questions being asked and sort of clean exit on the data,
23 because another thing we had is paper surveys, people
24 asking questions, self-administered. There's all kinds of
25 various in how questions are administered even if they are

1 the same questions. So any efforts to standardize is just
2 something to put on the radar there.

3 The next recommendation is round aligning
4 school eligibility determinations with the PIT count
5 criteria. So the schools also identify students. There
6 are not standardized questions that are used, they have
7 standardized elements that they report, there's a standard
8 definition, but in terms of the questions specifically
9 that are asked to determine that, and then how that aligns
10 with the questions that are happening in PIT counts,
11 there's just lots and lots of variation and it becomes
12 hard for those numbers to speak to each other. So if
13 everyone were asking the same questions, that would
14 facilitate, even if you're going to define it broadly, at
15 least we could have the option to define it narrowly and
16 see what that number would look like in schools and be
17 able to compare that a little more closely to PIT count
18 numbers.

19 So there are some efforts. I know in Houston
20 we have our CoC working with the school district where the
21 school district is using HMIS, and so there's a lot of
22 challenges to doing that but maybe the dream scenario is
23 communities use more the Homeless Management Information
24 System, is there a way to get school districts also to be
25 able to use those and sort of have a standardized

1 eligibility determination. So these are all really
2 challenging things to accomplish but we're putting them
3 out there. So that's the second one.

4 And then the third one is a recommendation that
5 is probably a federal issue, the point in time count
6 happens in January which just doesn't facilitate a close
7 connection with schools. Schools are doing their
8 eligibility determination primarily in the fall, October
9 is kind of the peak time. If you could do the point in
10 time count at the same time that all the schools are
11 assessing eligibility, at least it's happening at the same
12 time. So that's a recommendation that that would be the
13 ideal scenario. I know there are a lot of things way
14 above that feed into that but just wanted to acknowledge
15 that.

16 And then collecting data on homelessness across
17 administrative sources also using consistent questions, so
18 DFPS, Juvenile Justice, there are probably additional
19 sources. Lots of systems see people that are in homeless
20 situations, and it would be wonderful if you could just
21 administratively talk about across any system that sees
22 young people, how many of them in their system are
23 homeless, using the same questions. So it's really sort
24 of about getting consistent assessment.

25 So those are the four recommendations around

1 data. I don't know if people have any comments or
2 questions about those.

3 MR. DOYLE: Let's go ahead and go through the
4 report.

5 DR. NARENDORF: Do you want me to do the whole
6 thing?

7 MR. DOYLE: Yes. I don't want to get us
8 behind, so let's go through the report. Write your
9 questions down on the paper and we'll come back to them.

10 MS. TREJO: And just to interrupt, this is
11 Naomi Trejo. Just to let you know that the veterans
12 summary will not be as in-depth as this.

13 MR. DOYLE: Okay, good. Thanks.

14 MS. TREJO: You'll have more time for the youth
15 one.

16 DR. NARENDORF: Okay. So the second
17 recommendation is providing a full continuum of supports
18 to promote housing stability. Thinking about service
19 providers and the different communities as we were talking
20 to them, people identified sort of different gaps,
21 different service needs.

22 And so the first recommendation is a solution
23 to that seemed to be just to identify some of the specific
24 funding. Christine can speak a little bit better to this,
25 but there isn't really a youth-specific funding source, or

1 there's various ones that kind of feed into this, that's
2 in Chapter 4, but money that's given to communities for
3 housing that could be designated specifically for youth to
4 help communities fill in gaps in the continuum that
5 they've identified. That's the first recommendation
6 there.

7 MS. GENDRON: Can we get the thoughts of those
8 who've read this on that, because we worked really hard to
9 include information on every funding stream that relates
10 to this issue in some way so people know that we've done
11 our homework, that we know what we're talking about. But
12 I'm afraid it looks like there is a lot available because
13 there's a lot listed here, but for example, we list
14 Homeless Housing and Services Programs, that doesn't
15 support services for unaccompanied youth. But we want
16 people to know that we've done our homework, we've
17 overturned every rock.

18 I mean, what do you guys think? Did anybody
19 look at this? I'm just kind of curious about what the
20 take-away was.

21 MR. SAMUELS: I can say that these are where
22 you would get the funding, and just like with youth and
23 any other population, it's not sufficient. It looks like
24 you've covered all the bases.

25 DR. NARENDORF: I think it's hard to put a

1 number on how much money is really out there for this.
2 There's some money that's impacting the schools but it's
3 not really specifically for that.

4 MS. GENDRON: I'm concerned. Like we put it
5 all in here because we want to show the whole picture, but
6 I'm concerned the legislative offices see you've got four
7 pages of stuff, what are you talking about, you know.

8 MS. TREJO: This is Naomi Trejo. So how we
9 dealt with this in the veterans study, we had two
10 different funding source appendices. One was for funding
11 sources that could be used by anyone experiencing
12 homelessness, including veterans, and then another one
13 that specific had a set-aside or preference for veterans.

14 And so the one that was for everyone experiencing
15 homelessness, that was a very long list, but the one that
16 was specific to veterans was a page. So that's how we
17 differentiated that.

18 MR. DOYLE: That would be a good contrast for a
19 visual.

20 MR. SAMUELS: I was going to say a graph would
21 really show this.

22 MS. GENDRON: That's good to know. Thank you.

23 And this is a little tricky because like the Federal
24 McKinney-Vento funding, the funds don't actually house
25 people who are homeless but it's related. And STAR is

1 family counseling, that's kind of like the current use,
2 but it can reunite runaways with their parents. So like
3 these connect but they don't really get at the heart of
4 it.

5 So we struggled with this so figuring out how
6 to lay it out, and so I'm just kind of curious.

7 MR. SAMUELS: You could break it into of
8 funding that is specific to housing or shelter and
9 separate that from these other funding sources so it
10 doesn't look as diluted, I guess.

11 DR. NARENDORF: So we're trying to incorporate
12 the idea that the focus of the legislation was under 19,
13 that the primary solution is housing, housing is certainly
14 part of it, and it changes as developmental age, but
15 certainly family counseling is an important part of
16 preventing homelessness or addressing homelessness in 14-
17 and 15-year-olds or 13- and 14-year-olds. So I think
18 that's one of the challenges with the really broad
19 definition that we have in these numbers that incorporate
20 lots of young people with kind of a wide variety of needs.

21 So that's part of our rationale for putting in
22 the continuum language is sort of like can we prevent
23 homelessness, can we intervene, can we reunite, but then
24 what about shelters, what about transitional housing
25 programs, things like that.

1 MR. SAMUELS: And it would be interesting just
2 to focus on the prevention. I think that's a huge part of
3 this with this population compared to other sources of
4 prevention funding. I don't know what that would look
5 like but it might be interesting to see that.

6 DR. NARENDORF: So the prevention funding that
7 we have listed here is not homelessness. And I think
8 homelessness intersects with so many other issues, which
9 is one of the reasons we'd love to track it across all
10 kinds of service agencies

11 So we heard a lot about mental health needs.
12 That come out pretty strongly in the survey data, young
13 people self-identifying that mental health was something
14 that related directly to them. So it seemed to fit best
15 in offering that in conjunction with all the different
16 levels of housing supports. Health care, similar, not as
17 much self-identified, dental care was self-identified a
18 lot, but preventative health care services it seems like
19 is an important piece of this too.

20 Recommendation 2.4 seems to make sense with
21 what I heard from a lot of different people in a lot of
22 different ways around licensing requirements. It created
23 barriers to housing young people, and so it came across in
24 a number of different ways in terms of shelters saying we
25 can't accept younger young people because we can't house

1 18-year-olds with 17-year-olds. Foster homes, talking
2 about licensing requirements that when a young person
3 turns 16 they don't want to keep them in a foster home be
4 because then they have to find a different bedroom, or
5 things like that. Young people that were challenging had
6 particularly problematic issues maybe not getting accepted
7 in group homes or residential treatment facilities because
8 they were a risk and that had to do with licensing.

9 So we heard about licensing in a variety of
10 ways and there are sort of two aspects of that: one is the
11 actual licensing regulations and then there was a second
12 piece that was the enforcement or the education of the
13 licensing reps who were giving information to agencies
14 about those recommendations. So it seems that people have
15 some misinformation in terms of what the actual
16 recommendations are and then what people perceive them to
17 be. It seemed that people in Houston might have a
18 different perception of who they can serve in their
19 emergency shelter than people in Austin, for example. So
20 some of that seems to be about information and
21 implementation, and then some of it may also be about the
22 regulations themselves.

23 So this is just a recommendation that those
24 regulations be reviewed specifically with an eye towards
25 how they impact this issue of youth homelessness because

1 we kept hearing about it but it was sort of not one clear
2 cut like change this licensing requirement, but it seemed
3 to come up in various places as a barrier. So that is
4 what that recommendation is about.

5 The next set is around increasing service
6 delivery and supports to youth identified through schools,
7 so I sort of touched on this earlier. Lack of
8 identification, the first recommendation is offering
9 screening in conjunction, so schools identify young
10 people, they need to remove educational barriers for young
11 people -- that's what McKinney-Vento requires them to do.

12 There isn't any broader identification of needs or
13 connection with services that's a part of that. Some
14 school districts around the state do that, do a lot of
15 that, but there isn't any sort of systematic way that that
16 happens. So this is a recommendation to try and
17 disseminate out some screening that could be used to
18 identify the needs and connect young people to services in
19 the community in a more systematic way.

20 3.2 basically is kind of the corollary to that
21 is developing closer partnerships in terms of
22 identification and referral to places in the community.
23 So I mentioned Houston CoC working with the school
24 district even through their determining eligibility. That
25 sort of gave them direct entry into the service system

1 when needs were identified. So it's sort of aiming
2 towards these closer partnerships so that when a school
3 identifies a need, they have a really quick easy
4 facilitated process to get it filled.

5 3.3 is about those older unaccompanied young
6 people who are transitioning. Other young people are in
7 foster care, people in special education system have
8 transition planning that's various things required for
9 them. Young people who are homeless often don't have that
10 adult support, needing some more specific designated
11 transition planning could be provided through the
12 counselor or homeless liaison. And so that's what that
13 one is about.

14 So the fourth one is specifically around
15 preventing homelessness by addressing the needs of youth
16 in foster care and juvenile justice. There is quite a bit
17 of legislation for young people aging out of foster care
18 specifically, not as much for juvenile justice, but the
19 issues are pretty similar in some ways. We have a system
20 that has an opportunity to intervene and facilitate a
21 process out of the system that doesn't result in a
22 homeless episode.

23 So we divided the recommendations here and
24 they're a bit more specific because there is more specific
25 legislation out there where people have identified this

1 part is marking but then there's a gap here or there. So
2 increasing housing options available at the time of
3 transition. So young people who exit the foster system
4 can stay in care longer, you can extend care. There are
5 certain requirements around that that are described in the
6 report, so some of it's around working and being in
7 school. But there is also a housing component so if you
8 stay in care longer, then you have access to housing
9 support.

10 A lack of housing options seems to be resulting
11 in young people not staying in extended care. Some of
12 that was about capacity, so there's a problem with
13 capacity that we heard about, not just for young people
14 exiting foster care but even high needs young people in
15 the foster care system. And so not having any kind of a
16 housing option, like a supportive independent living,
17 heard a lot about those, not having enough of those, that
18 sort of a structured transition program for young people,
19 so increasing capacity there was one recommendation.

20 There's an after-care allowance for six months.
21 Young people can get like \$500 a month for six months
22 after they leave. Young people were leaving to take
23 advantage of that so they could get housing because they
24 couldn't find other housing options potentially. And
25 these are all sort of reports from people, this isn't

1 something that comes across in the DFPS data, so bear that
2 in mind. But maybe extending the amount of money or time
3 that that could be used, and really thinking
4 systematically about other ways to incentivize foster
5 parents to take young people for longer, things like that,
6 so trying to increase those housing options.

7 In terms of juvenile justice, there isn't a lot
8 available for young people exiting those systems
9 specifically. There's a small TJJD talked about, they
10 have some limited amount of funding for transitioning
11 young people into independence there, but not a lot of
12 resources available specifically for that population, and
13 that ends when they exit parole. So facilitating some
14 closer connections with housing systems might address
15 that, but trying to think about more housing option for
16 those young people, that's what that is.

17 Improving transition planning itself in foster
18 care. There's legislation specifically targeting this.
19 There isn't for juvenile justice as much, so juvenile
20 justice, the recommendations there they could look at the
21 foster care system as a model for potentially putting some
22 more in place there.

23 For foster care, the role of the courts came
24 out as something that might be helpful in terms of
25 increasing the frequency of hearings in that last year as

1 young people are getting ready to turn 18 to make sure
2 that all the benefits that they have access to that young
3 people are actually knowing about and accessing those
4 benefits and having a good plan for transition. There are
5 some models for doing that. Also, young people currently
6 have to ask to stay in extended care. Some places there's
7 just sort of a default that you will stay in extended care
8 and you have to leave, so that tends to result in more
9 young people staying in care longer which tends to be
10 better for their housing situations. So that's those.

11 Increasing placement options for young people
12 with high levels of need. This is related more
13 specifically to young people who are in the system and
14 have challenging behaviors. These are young people who
15 will end up in that runaway or emergency shelter category
16 and foster youth that we were talking about, high risk
17 when they leave, and currently there is a lack of
18 capacity, it seems, to address those needs. So that
19 definitely was part of the equation and trying to think
20 about how to increase those placement options for those
21 young people, particularly young people who have like an
22 assault or something like that that there are barriers.
23 There tended to be a group that tended to end up with just
24 no good housing situations for those young people.

25 In juvenile justice a barrier that was noted

1 was juvenile records and some issues around juvenile
2 records sealing, so there's some legislation around
3 juvenile records sealing, but there's concerns about it.
4 It actually takes some proactive action that isn't funded
5 so people think that they're records are getting sealed
6 but it's not actually happening, so some recommendations
7 around looking at that process and making it more
8 automatic. It also two years after you complete before
9 that is sealed, and in that time young people encounter
10 barriers in getting placements, finding an apartment,
11 things like that, so maybe shortening the time frame and
12 making the process more automatic.

13 Recommendation five is around removing barriers
14 to exiting homelessness. This is more targeted at those
15 like 18-year-olds moving on into the higher definition.
16 We are trying to keep these to under 19 but there's
17 definitely this transition period. And things like
18 documentation, so trying to get access to birth
19 certificates, IDs, state IDs, things like that. There's
20 some foster care legislation that sort of could serve as
21 the mode in terms of having a variety of people who could
22 help you get identification, if you're unaccompanied and
23 don't have a parent who can do that and waiving some of
24 the fees.

25 Transportation, a huge identified issue. A

1 corollary is helping young people to get driver's
2 licenses. Texas CASA had some recommendations
3 specifically around that -- CASA is a group that advocates
4 for young people in foster care -- for making that process
5 easier for young people. And I'm not sure precisely how
6 it would happen, but if there are ways to facilitate in
7 people having access to public transportation.
8 Transportation was identified as a barrier.

9 Increasing access to employment, job training
10 and post-secondary education, all of those were identified
11 as barriers to young people exiting homelessness, things
12 that were encountered, service providers, young people
13 noted those things. Trying to partner and include those
14 things specifically in conjunction with housing services.

15 And then the last one is around connecting
16 young people with positive adults so the literature
17 supports mentoring.

18 Mr. DOYLE: Okay. Thank you for holding the
19 questions. Are there some more questions? I have a
20 question and then we'll get into comments.

21 Todd, are you still on the phone?

22 MR. NOVAK: Yes, sir, I am.

23 MR. DOYLE: Are people in the youth facilities
24 homeless?

25 MR. NOVAK: We see it very rarely but we don't

1 want to see it at all.

2 Mr. DOYLE: By definition, while they're in
3 there are they homeless?

4 MR. NOVAK: Oh, while they're in there, I would
5 say no.

6 MR. DOYLE: Youth Detention facilities, are
7 they homeless?

8 MR. SAMUELS: Are they wards of the state?
9 They're not considered homeless under HUD's definition, I
10 can tell you that.

11 MS. STAMP: Beginning in December, the
12 definition for foster includes anybody who is a ward of
13 the state and those kids are not McKinney-Vento eligible.

14 Prior to that we've been looking at even if they were
15 wards of the state, if they were placed in an emergency
16 shelter, we were counting them homeless at that point.
17 That will all go away in December, though, with the new
18 re-authorization. So we will be just looking at those are
19 totally separate of this plan.

20 MS. GENDRON: I think anyone in child welfare
21 or housing would argue they are not homeless even if CPS
22 has them in an emergency shelter. The problem is the
23 legislature used language in the bill that was vague and
24 suggests they wanted some kids in shelters to be counted,
25 and so I think that's why TDHCA for all three phases of

1 youth count has asked us to include those youth. As far
2 as I'm concerned, they're not homeless.

3 MR. DOYLE: So would it be the same, and you
4 went to 20 in your research, right, age 20?

5 DR. NARENDORF: That's what TEA does, and DFPS,
6 I think they go to 21 in their data because young people
7 are still in DFPS.

8 MR. DOYLE: So what about those in Windham that
9 are 18 to 21?

10 DR. NARENDORF: That are in a TDCJ facility?
11 They would not be considered homeless.

12 MR. DOYLE: They're not homeless.

13 DR. NARENDORF: So the problem comes at exit,
14 at the time of exit, those young people are
15 disproportionately likely to become homeless, and that's
16 why we've framed those recommendations around preventing
17 homelessness because we know that the foster care system,
18 in spite of all the things that are in place, and the
19 juvenile justice system kind of feed into homelessness.
20 So we have this window of opportunity.

21 MR. DOYLE: That's just clarification.

22 DR. NARENDORF: I think it's a little bit
23 tricky, and there are sort of related things, people talk
24 to us about we have a kid that's in a detention center,
25 they can leave, but we don't have any parents to come pick

1 them up. Are they homeless at that point? So there are
2 these situations that kind of hit the radar as sort of
3 homeless situations, even though there are systems
4 involved, so it's complicated and they certainly are
5 related, so that's sort of the backdrop for working on
6 this recommendation.

7 MS. GENDRON: I think it's an important thing
8 to discuss, so on page 19 there's this table and it's got
9 populations in DFPS data who meet homeless definitions of
10 HB 679. Well, this emergency shelter runaway column, I
11 would not call them homeless, I don't think DFPS would
12 call them homeless, I don't anyone who thinks they're
13 homeless except there's some wording in HB 679 who
14 suggests they're included in the legislature's definition.

15 MR. SAMUELS: When we're saying emergency
16 shelter in this case, we're talking about not like a
17 Salvation Army emergency shelter.

18 MS. GENDRON: Like Lifeworks is a shelter, they
19 have CPS placement, and they have homeless community kids.
20 This is DFPS data so this is CPS placement.

21 MR. SAMUELS: Yeah, CPS placement.

22 DR. NARENDORF: Yeah, they're in the same
23 place. It doesn't matter who, does somebody have
24 ownership for them.

25 MR. SAMUELS: I worked at a facility just like

1 that and we had our beds we differentiated in our minds so
2 we had emergency shelter or CPS beds.

3 MR. DOYLE: Well, anybody that's working with a
4 population that has an issue with housing and they're not
5 considered homeless are figuring out ways to try to make
6 them homeless so they can have access to housing. That's
7 reality but that's what we try to do. If we can make you
8 homeless, we can get you in -- maybe.

9 MS. BOLTON: So that kind of takes me back to
10 your earlier question about breaking out these funding
11 sources. So I actually am a former legislator, I served
12 in the Texas House, and so I'm trying -- this is my
13 official capacity -- I'm trying to put that that on for
14 just a minute and kind of look at this, and this
15 overwhelms me. And if it's a House member, the senators
16 have bigger staffs, but the House members have two or
17 three people, and they're going to take all these reports
18 from every agency and every entity and have to try to make
19 sense of them. So if this chart was like, okay, here's
20 funding about prevention. I mean, I know these all have
21 different things they do, but if you could pull out the
22 thing they are mostly focused on, like this is mostly
23 about prevention and this is mostly about actual housing,
24 and kind of prioritize that.

25 And then when you're talking to the

1 legislators, which the advocacy groups can do, which the
2 agencies can't do in the same way, what is the most
3 important thing you want them to know about all of this.
4 Which doesn't mean you're not telling them the truth.
5 Obviously, you're going to stick with what the truth and
6 the facts are, but you can highlight the things like
7 there's plenty of this kind of money but not enough of
8 this. Anyway, that's just trying to filter this chart, I
9 was just like, that's a lot of money but what does it all
10 do.

11 MS. GENDRON: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. DOYLE: Any other comments?

13 MR. SAMUELS: I was going to say I love a lot
14 of these recommendations. The 3.2, I think Jeanne and I
15 and our agencies tried to do a little bit of that at the
16 Texas Annual Conference on Ending Homelessness, and that's
17 getting Continuum of Care leaders together with homeless
18 liaisons, and I think we had some success in doing that,
19 some communities more than others. So I think that's
20 something that's happening. We need to bolster our
21 efforts in that, I believe.

22 MR. DOYLE: I agree.

23 MR. SAMUELS: Because if we can get those
24 school districts involved in the coordinated entry process
25 and their communities can make a little difference.

1 Houston is using HMIS, Waco is using HMIS, their school
2 districts, and I think if we can do more of that, that
3 will really help a lot. And I think it's doable for us to
4 have a common point in time, it's going to take a lot of
5 back and forth but it's doable.

6 And on point four, getting all the state
7 agencies to use the same definitions, that's something
8 we've looked at over the years several times, and maybe
9 I'm too optimistic, I think it is doable but it's far, far
10 from the fact right now.

11 And I had another one on point two, but I
12 forgot what it was -- oh, that was about the -- I forgot
13 what it was.

14 I think the recommendations were great.

15 MR. DOYLE: Good job, Sara.

16 MS. KRAVITZ: Something to just add to how it
17 appears, even like the caveat regarding the funding, if
18 there was some kind of visual graphic at the start that
19 explained the different funding pots and the constraints
20 and the numbers, something that highlights these are the
21 funding sources, these are the areas where things are
22 lacking. Something to help you visually when you're
23 thumbing through a report and you're trying to find some
24 action items, I think adding that would be very helpful
25 for folks understanding it and then not getting lost in

1 the weeds.

2 MR. SAMUELS: I'm sorry. I had one more
3 question. I'm not saying my name, Eric Samuels. The
4 110,000, the estimate --

5 MR. DOYLE: Hundred and eleven.

6 MR. SAMUELS: That's the TEA. What I was
7 referring to was the 110-, there was an estimate, right,
8 somewhere in here that we assert 110,000. So can that be
9 broken down into the categories that are under the TEA
10 columns?

11 DR. NARENDORF: Which categories, the types of
12 housing?

13 MR. SAMUELS: Yeah.

14 MR. DOYLE: What's the 110,000?

15 MR. SAMUELS: Somewhere in there it says an
16 assertion can be made that there's at least 110,000. So
17 what I'm thinking is if we can break down that number, we
18 might have something that will be a little bit more
19 comparable to the point in time. It's still not going to
20 be comparable really, but the difference won't be quite as
21 vast as the TEA.

22 MS. GENDRON: That goes back to the discussion
23 we had earlier that a lot of us think it's more than
24 110,000.

25 MS. STAMP: This is Jeanne Stamp again, Texas

1 Homeless Education Office.

2 So the Urban Institute did a study saying that
3 they felt like 10 percent of poverty level children would
4 be homeless at any given time in a school year. So for
5 2015, that would be over 160,000 kids in Texas if we look
6 at the Texas poverty level. The reason I know this, we're
7 working on our year-end report and we've got all kinds of
8 really good data charts that break down by grade and type
9 of housing with the four slots that we have to report to
10 USDE, to TEA and USDE. So I can get those charts to you
11 if you think those would be any of help to you at all in
12 looking at a breakdown in any of this.

13 DR. NARENDORF: Sure. I mean, I guess my
14 concern at this point is jut time frame. We're basically
15 out all next week for Thanksgiving and then we need it the
16 next week. If people could give me some sort of target.
17 Kelly, if you have a specific visual that you could say if
18 you could do this. If there's something like make this
19 graph, I can do that, try to figure out which graph to
20 make. That is a little bit more challenging. Anything
21 that's super specific that you guys would like to see in
22 the report, the breakdown by age, we can certainly do
23 that. Maybe we can talk more if there's one or two things
24 that you think would really help on the report, that would
25 be wonderful.

1 MR. DOYLE: Okay. We're going to move on to
2 veterans. This was not a voting item but I would like for
3 the voting members of the TICH to just by acclimation
4 confirm that we are in support of this report
5 fundamentally. I think that would be good for the TDHCA
6 Board to know, and for Brooke or whoever carries that,
7 that the TICH has seen this and has affirmed that we think
8 it's a good report. So can we just affirm by acclimation
9 from the voting members that you affirm that this report
10 has our approval at this point, say aye.

11 (A chorus of ayes.)

12 MR. DOYLE: Opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 MR. DOYLE: Okay. So we have a unanimous
15 affirmation.

16 MS. KRAVITZ: I have one question just kind of
17 regarding some of the recommendations. Like possibly
18 there's some things we can't do because of certain
19 constraints, like the TEA, what we can tell districts to
20 do or not do, and so it's like I don't want to set folks
21 up to then we'll pass a law where it's like then we have
22 competing federal law or that's actually not something we
23 could do. Do you know what I mean? And I'm wondering at
24 this kind of late stage if any edits regarding any of that
25 is something you would want, or do you want this to go

1 kind of forward as is and then we get into maybe
2 constraints later as folks are getting more into the
3 details of the report.

4 MR. DOYLE: Do we have to report on this every
5 year?

6 MS. BOSTON: No.

7 MR. DOYLE: So just one time. Then what we can
8 is we can point to it in the discussions going forward as
9 the University of Houston report and we can amend that as
10 we go forward. We can always find something.

11 DR. NARENDORF: If there's anything that jumps
12 out right away, please send me anything that just, well,
13 this is a problem. It needs to happen pretty fast to do
14 any major changes, but absolutely if there are certain
15 things that change the wording or put in this disclaimer
16 or something like that, I think we can definitely do that
17 at this point.

18 MR. DOYLE: Okay, Naomi.

19 MS. TREJO: So everyone take a deep breath.
20 We're going to change gears here.

21 MR. DOYLE: Just one second.

22 (Audience member requested recess.)

23 MR. DOYLE: Let's take a break, restroom break,
24 coffee break, whatever you need to break for.

25 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

1 MR. DOYLE: All right. Let's reconvene,
2 please.

3 Are you still there on the phone?

4 MR. NOVAK: Yes, sir.

5 MR. DOYLE: Thanks, Todd.

6 Okay. Naomi, you're going to report out on the
7 veterans homelessness.

8 MS. TREJO: Right. So at this point in terms
9 of the TICH discussion, it appears that the veterans study
10 and the youth study have switched roles because at
11 previous meetings it was mainly about the veterans study,
12 and we've presented and it talks about all for the
13 recommendations at the last at least three meetings and
14 before that we also had an update, so the TICH has been
15 working on the veterans study for over a year, so I'm not
16 going to go into as much depth as Dr. Narendorf has.

17 You have the report on homelessness among
18 veterans in front of you, and the TICH representatives and
19 advisory members have spent times during the last three
20 meetings discussing recommendations from the public on how
21 to end veteran homelessness, and your input is and has
22 been incorporated in the final report and the study.

23 I'm going to talk a bit about what the TICH has
24 done over this past year. So you also approved a contract
25 with the Texas Homeless Network to conduct analysis of

1 point in time counts over the last three years, and this
2 analysis is detailed in Appendix B of the report and
3 study, which revealed several facts, such as veterans
4 experiencing homelessness were more likely to experience
5 repeated episodes of homelessness.

6 Special thanks goes out to the TICH veteran
7 work group which reviewed the entire report and study
8 before it was presented to the TICH membership as a whole.

9 The TICH veteran work group also created a survey,
10 administered by the Health and Human Services Commission,
11 for the eight cities that had taken the federal challenge
12 to end veteran homelessness. The survey found several
13 trends. We had talked about homeless liaisons before and
14 how there's one in every school district. One of trends
15 we found in this survey for the eight cities was that many
16 of them use the veterans housing service officers which
17 are in almost every county by law. So a correlation there
18 in terms of function.

19 HHSC also pulled data from 211 information and
20 referral service network for the last three years for the
21 cities that took the challenge to end veteran
22 homelessness. An analysis again showed several trends,
23 such as callers who were veterans most commonly stated
24 that they had served in the Army, and that analysis is in
25 Appendix F.

1 Finally, the TICH also contributed to the list
2 of programs and the funding sources available for veterans
3 experiencing or at risk of homelessness, and these
4 programs and these programs and their funding sources are
5 included in appendices L and M.

6 So as you can hear, the report is supported by
7 the study which consists of over a dozen appendices with
8 detailed data and information gathered by the TICH, TICH
9 veteran work group, and TDHCA. So the study is composed
10 of six different parts, the first one is determining the
11 definition of homeless veteran, and we went over the HUD
12 definition with the point in time count for that one
13 because unlike youth, the point in time count is focused
14 on adults and also captures veteran homelessness over
15 several different years, so that is the most consistent
16 data source that we have.

17 We also talked about the status of homeless
18 veterans in Texas so that's section two, with data from
19 the Texas Veterans Commission, HHSC, needs of veterans and
20 a summary of the mayor's challenge because there have been
21 some federal initiatives to end veteran homelessness, so
22 that is the status. We were pleased that Houston was the
23 first city in Texas to effectively end veteran
24 homelessness, and since then, San Antonio and Austin have
25 also met those federal benchmarks, so we reported those in

1 the study.

2 Sections three and four is about the entities
3 serving and funding sources to serve homeless veteran
4 populations, so that again includes the spreadsheets
5 created by the TICH about funding sources and programs,
6 again in two separate charts, one for everyone
7 experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness, and
8 then again the second chart specifically for set-asides or
9 programs just for veterans. And then we also talked about
10 nonprofit providers with data that we purchased from the
11 Lone Star Foundation with five star and 211.

12 Sections five and six are the recommendations
13 which we spent a lot of time talking about here. We
14 gathered the recommendations from the public. So TDHCA
15 and TVC hosted two roundtables, one last year at the Texas
16 Conference on Ending Homelessness, and one this year at
17 the Texas Veterans Summit, so stakeholders included
18 veterans, service providers, nonprofits, for-profits,
19 apartment associations, and others. TDHCA also hosted an
20 online forum where we gathered recommendations from the
21 public on how to effectively end veteran homelessness.

22 We grouped these recommendations into five
23 broad categories and also then also presented all the
24 recommendations to the TICH and considered consequences
25 and ramifications of each recommendation. So the five

1 broad categories and what's going to be in the study and
2 the report is: number one, increase partnerships with the
3 rental market; number two, identify veterans, share
4 information and increase coordination; number three,
5 increase housing and service resources; number four,
6 improve access to employment resources; and number five,
7 improve access to mental and physical health resources.

8 So in the report we have samples of what those
9 recommendations from the public look like and all the
10 recommendations from the public are included in the
11 appendices, which I think that one appendix is over 30
12 pages long because of all the considerations that go into
13 each recommendation.

14 So the report is required to be submitted to
15 the Texas Legislature no later than December 1. The
16 legislature may then take their prerogative regarding any
17 of the recommendations.

18 Any questions?

19 MR. DOYLE: This was a Senate bill. Will it go
20 to the House members?

21 MS. TREJO: Most likely it will go to TDHCA's
22 oversight committees, and so that's the Senate and the
23 House, Urban Affairs on the Senate and Intergovernmental
24 Relations on the House side.

25 MS. STAMP: I have just a quick question. Did

1 it come up at all around access to education and training?

2 MS. TREJO: We did have that. I think we put
3 that under services, increase housing and resource
4 services, so education was included as one of the
5 recommendations that we considered.

6 MS. STAMP: Because I can see that going with
7 the employment piece as well.

8 MS. TREJO: That's true.

9 MR. DOYLE: Except that the VA, in their
10 wisdom, is now not supported sheltered workshops any
11 longer. We had one close down in Fort Worth. Very
12 successful, the vets were getting \$8.84 an hour average
13 wage for doing piecemeal work. We were getting a lot of
14 them to move from there into permanent employment through
15 the workforce centers, and then they decided to unfund
16 sheltered workshops which was that piecemeal training
17 piece. And so now our community is looking to how in the
18 world do we sustain that which was such a great program
19 through the VA.

20 DR. SCHOLL: Mr. Chairman.

21 MR. DOYLE: Yes.

22 DR. SCHOLL: Just a quick question. This is
23 Dr. Scholl from Somerset.

24 I know from reading the report that this item
25 essentially alluded or stated they were looking for

1 recommendations to increase the effectiveness of the
2 approach of the state addressing veterans homelessness.
3 I'm just wondering whether or not the other board members
4 feel that that item, the fifth item of the assignment from
5 Bill 1580, was addressed.

6 MR. DOYLE: Is that on page 23? Is that where
7 you're looking, Dennis? Improve access to mental health
8 and physical resources.

9 DR. SCHOLL: In the bill language, the fifth
10 item.

11 MR. DOYLE: Oh, in the bill language.

12 DR. SCHOLL: Recommendations to increase the
13 effectiveness of the state's approach. Here's why I'm
14 asking that. When I see something like that in
15 legislation, I read between the lines where they're
16 saying: Hey, I think the state approach to this problem
17 is not adequately effective; what can be done to make it
18 more effective? I'm just wondering if you feel that the
19 recommendations with regard to answering that item, the
20 relative ineffectiveness to what they have spent, perhaps,
21 has been answered in the report.

22 MR. DOYLE: Naomi, do you have a comment on
23 that?

24 MS. TREJO: Well, one thing that we found
25 overall, and it is mentioned in the report, is that many

1 of the recommendations focused on things that we actually
2 already do as a state. So I'm not sure that we can
3 highlight any ineffectiveness in the report insofar as
4 specific programs, but we can say and have said that there
5 could be a greater outreach with the existing programs
6 that we have.

7 MR. DOYLE: Good. Thank you, Dennis.

8 Any other comments on this? We've gone through
9 it at several meetings. Would you like us to affirm this
10 was well? Would that be helpful to be able to say that?
11 So I would ask the voting members of the council then to
12 affirm by acclamation that this veterans report has been
13 seen by us, reviewed, and we are in support of the report.

14 Is there any comments or questions about the way that was
15 phrased?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. DOYLE: Then if you would affirm this
18 report say aye.

19 (A chorus of ayes.)

20 MR. DOYLE: Not affirm same sign.

21 (No response.)

22 MR. DOYLE: And that's unanimous.

23 Thank you, Naomi. It's been a great project
24 for a while and you've done a great job on it

25 Item number VI, the use of the \$10,000 from

1 Texas Workforce Commission, who's reporting on that?

2 MR. SAMUELS: Well, we don't have the Texas
3 Workforce Commission here.

4 MS. BOSTON: I mean, I think what we had talked
5 about at the last TICH when we were at the conference was
6 the idea -- there had been some synergy around the idea of
7 THN potentially working to help coordinate all of the CoCs
8 together, and that that was not de facto, that's been
9 something that they have the role on, but that wasn't
10 something that they were required to do or that anyone was
11 funding them to do. And so I think one of the ideas was
12 that we could provide the \$10,000 to them for that effort.

13 MR. SAMUELS: That's exactly what we talked
14 about, and the Continuum of Care representatives in the
15 room talked about how maybe that could benefit them. One
16 of them happens to be a board member of mine. Yeah,
17 that's what it was for, but the Texas Workforce connection
18 to it, it would be nice to hear the feelings from that
19 side.

20 MR. DOYLE: Well, serving on our local
21 workforce board, not on the commission itself, of course,
22 but I can tell you that if, in fact, this money is used to
23 build better pathways to the local continuums, which can
24 build better pathways to the local workforce boards in
25 those continuum areas, including balance of state, that

1 would, in my mind, increase the possibility of that
2 population finding work. And I think you can make a solid
3 line from that \$10,000 to jobs for homeless people.

4 MR. SAMUELS: I think that would be underneath
5 the coordination on the state level with CoCs.

6 MR. DOYLE: The best use would be to use it to
7 coordinate with the CoCs and ask them to coordinate it
8 with the jobs effort through their local workforce boards.

9 MS. BOSTON: Is that an existing need?

10 MR. SAMUELS: We as the CoC for the Texas
11 Balance of State, we saw that as an existing need, of
12 course, because we have a pilot project around that very
13 issue. So I would assume that's an issue with all of the
14 CoCs; I can't say right now without talking to each one of
15 those.

16 MR. DOYLE: Well, I can tell you, too, this
17 summer TWC issued an RFP, Texas Workforce Commission sent
18 out a request for proposal for a jobs initiative for
19 homeless people, and I would certainly think in the
20 context of their thinking let's find jobs for homeless
21 people, this \$10,000 to coordinate with local continuums
22 to do that would be a great use of their money.

23 MR. SAMUELS: I'd personally like for it to
24 include that and overall coordination, of course, because
25 it's not just needed for veterans, as you know, it's

1 needed for everybody.

2 MS. BOSTON: Perhaps what we could do, so that
3 we aren't held up until January when George is here, is
4 that -- because obviously, TWC and TDHCA sign the
5 agreement, so perhaps what we could do is if we could get
6 approval from the group that that's the general purpose
7 and then follow up if everyone is okay that we'll make
8 sure Mike has signed off on the actual document -- not
9 sign the document, the document is signed by Tim Irvine as
10 our E-D, and TWC -- that this kind of went the direction
11 that we discussed. Because that way we can work on the
12 document getting into play and signed and moved forward
13 between now and the January meeting.

14 MR. DOYLE: So can we entertain a motion that
15 we would instruct Brooke and TDHCA to work with TWC on a
16 document based on the conversation we just had, and that
17 before documents are signed, I'll be able to look at it
18 and make sure that it reads the way we think the council
19 would like for it to read before signature, something like
20 that? Members, are you all okay with that? So then I'll
21 entertain a motion to that effect.

22 MS. BOSTON: So moved.

23 MR. DOYLE: Is there a second to that motion?

24 MS. MAERCKLEIN: Second.

25 MR. DOYLE: Second by Pam.

1 Any further discussion or questions?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. DOYLE: All in favor say aye.

4 (A chorus of ayes.)

5 MR. DOYLE: Opposed same sign.

6 (No response.)

7 MR. DOYLE: That passes and we'll move forward
8 on working on that.

9 Any public comment?

10 (General talking and laughter.)

11 MR. DOYLE: We are on that part of the agenda.
12 The next date is Tuesday, January 31, 2017, but we don't
13 know if it's going to be at the Omni.

14 (General talking and laughter.)

15 MR. DOYLE: Is there any other comments?

16 (No response.)

17 MR. DOYLE: Okay. Thank you. We are
18 adjourned.

19 (Whereupon, at 11:46 a.m., the meeting was
20 adjourned.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

MEETING OF: Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless

LOCATION: Austin, Texas

DATE: November 17, 2016

I do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers 1 through 70, inclusive, are the true, accurate, and complete transcript prepared from the verbal recording made by electronic recording by Nancy H. King before the Texas Interagency Council for the Homeless.

/s/ Nancy H. King 11/25/2016
(Transcriber) (Date)

On the Record Reporting
3636 Executive Cntr Dr., G22
Austin, Texas 78731