



NOTES FROM THE 06/27 PRE-MEETING FEEDBACK STATIONS

PURPOSE

To document feedback and highlight themes from the 06/27 ICH Full Council Pre-Meeting Feedback Stations.

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

In collaboration with the Department of Human Services (DHS) and the ICH Consumer Engagement Workgroup (CEWG), the ICH Team hosted three (3) feedback stations at the Pre-Meeting: 1) General Comments & Concerns, 2) Planning for Fiscal Constraints, and 3) New Opportunities Funded in FY24.

NOTES & FEEDBACK

The table below captures the direct written feedback from community members participating in the pre-meeting.

Discussion Question	Feedback (as written)
Comments and Concerns	
Do you need help with a situation specific to you or another client?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eviction prevention • Social housing pilot program • Impacts of climate change – implications for those staying outside; environmental justice, shelter and affordable housing
What is your general comment or concern?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can people with lived experience increase engagement with the program side of things? • How can clients with lived experience connect with DHS? • Increase resources at shelter: housing resources, job opportunities, housing people from encampments, status of housing • Create a roundtable for partners, like Pathways.
We are most concerned about planning for fiscal constraints and the new opportunities. Are there other planning areas we should be prioritizing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for staff: training, pay, benefits.
Planning for Fiscal Constraints	
What does “fiscal constraint” mean to you?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability. Agency accountability. • Fiscal constraint means not having enough vouchers or moving on • To permanently remove DHS staff (Director, Administrators – Deputy Directors) that have committed heinous abuses, torture and crimes

Discussion Question	Feedback (as written)
	<p>against chronically homeless men/women DHS PSH consumers and federal criminal charges should be pressed against them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not having enough qualified case managers or the \$\$ to hire them. • Build more SROs. • If the housing is deplorable and unlivable, that is a fiscal constraint. • Pla for sustainability – “graduate” and “move on” resources. • The word “program” in and of itself is problematic.
<p>Do you agree that we should prioritize connecting clients to mainstream resources?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize DHS and DCHA synergy. • Newsletters posted in shelters helps get the word out. • Need to create pipeline of resource so that individuals can move on from PSH, SROs to more independence. • Variety of SROs/services • Workbeds and escrow are successful models • What is the timeline for people? We can not leave people for 20, 30 years.
<p>What else should we be doing in response to fiscal constraints? How should we respond as a system?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address abuse and unit issues in DCHA and all programs. • Build rooming houses (group homes). Requires working with OP on zoning • Understand occupancy rates and room rentals • Stop the tax abatements. • Availability of affordable housing. • Clarifying local versus federal vouchers and ability to move and renew voucher • Create ability to port the voucher! • Clarify difference between project- and unit-based vouchers. • Monitor and flag landlords, especially those with multiple outstanding infractions • Clairty on voucher types: Section 3, pathway to homeownership, etc. • Heighten standards and expectations of case managers, landlords, etc. • Make an MOU for DHS/DCHA to share information • Get the tax scoff (sp?) laws (the guy living on the boat claiming he lives in VA). • Utilize a varity of approaches to address needs. Designing demonstration kits collaborating with other organizations to offer similar services. • Inspections and maintenance!
<p>New Opportunities Funded in FY24</p>	
<p>What are the most important lessons from PEPV and Bridge Housing to adopt?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site based non-congregate shelter <u>with</u> medical and support onsite. Need this for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Short-term medical respite ○ Medically supervised shelter ○ PSH Plus with medical • System flexibility to help promote stability in transition period. • Desirability of non-congregate shelter. • Continuity of care.

Discussion Question	Feedback (as written)
<p>Are you in agreement with these groups? Who else should we be targeting?</p> <p><i>We will not have enough NCS for everyone, so we will target three populations:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Medically vulnerable,</i> • <i>Matched to housing and need housing navigation supports/services, and/or</i> • <i>Cannot be appropriately served in the existing congregate and non-congregate shelter options.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think you should include chronic status of 3 years or more as an additional criteria or tiebreaker. • Strong emphasis on medically vulnerable population with medical onsite.
<p>We have identified locations but face community pushback. What are the most significant concerns we must plan for and address?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DBH/DHS collaboration in services. • Privacy, safety, security. • Lack of progressive engagement in singles system. • Staff treatment in shelters. • End of eviction prevention resources • Day services
<p>Is there another newly funded program we should highlight and plan for?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer mentorship.