



Fredericksburg Area Continuum of Care 2011 Point-In-Time (PIT) Report

Communities across the country seek to address homeless issues through government agencies and non-profit organizations working together as a Continuum of Care (CoC). Each CoC is required to undertake community-wide efforts to collect information on the number and characteristics of individuals and families experiencing homelessness. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires CoCs to use a method called a Point-In-Time (PIT) count at least every two years during the last ten days of January. The Fredericksburg Regional CoC conducts a PIT every year, to more accurately track the number and the needs of the region's homeless population.

The PIT is an important tool in collecting good data on the number, characteristics, and service needs of individuals, families, and unaccompanied children experiencing homelessness. The resulting data is a critical component of local homeless planning and program development. Accurate data helps communities to:

- Understand changes in trends among homeless populations;
- Adjust the types of programs and services available according to need in order to use resources as efficiently as possible;
- Justify requests for additional resources and/or programming modifications;
- Comply with reporting requirements from HUD, other funders, and local stakeholders;
- Raise public awareness about the issue of homelessness; and
- Measure community progress towards preventing and ending homelessness.

Nationally, the PIT count process is used as the primary data source for federal agencies to understand homelessness trends and track progress against the goals and objectives contained in *Opening Doors*, the Federal Strategic Plan to End Homelessness. Additionally, the Congressionally-mandated Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) is prepared using PIT and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data.

Part I. 2011 Point-In-Time Count Background

On January 27th and 28th, 2011, members of the Fredericksburg Regional CoC conducted its local PIT count of the homeless population. Over a 36-hour period service providers and volunteers visited soup kitchens and outdoor locations to gather information from people who are homeless and near-homeless in the Fredericksburg area. School Homeless Liaisons from the region also coordinated with the CoC to calculate the number of school-aged homeless persons. Over 185 individual survey questionnaires were completed. After a review of the surveys and removal of duplicates, 162 unique surveys were available to evaluate homeless adults living in Planning District 16 on the night of the count. An additional 17 surveys were completed by adults who were not homeless the night of the count, but are considered at-risk of future instances of homelessness. In addition to counting homeless individuals and families, the survey

also provides information on the needs and characteristics of the population to better provide services in the future. Getting homeless persons to provide personal information can be challenging, but in 2011, the CoC was able to offer incentives for completing the surveys through the generosity of the community. These gifts included free FRED Bus tickets donated by FREDericksburg Regional Transit, toiletry kits donated by the Salvation Army, free gift cards for phone minutes, food, and a service fair offering intake and referral information from various CoC agencies and the U.S. Veterans Administration (VA) was sponsored by Micah Ecumenical Ministries.

Part II. 2011 PIT Summary Table for Submission to HUD

Fredericksburg Regional CoC-2011 Point-In-Time Count Results (Schedule K) January 27, 2011				
Households with Dependent Children	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Households	14	7	0	21
Number of Persons (adults and children)	37	19	0	56
Households without Dependent Children	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Households	86	0	138	224
Number of Persons (adults and unaccompanied youth)	86	0	138	224
All Households/ All Persons	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Total Households	100	7	138	245
Total Persons	123	19	138	280

Part 2J Homeless Adult Sub-Populations			
	Sheltered	Unsheltered	Total
Chronically Homeless	40	27	67
Severely Mentally Ill	36	12	48
Chronic Substance Abuse	23	5	28
Veterans	14	3	17
Persons with HIV/AIDS	6	2	8
Victims of Domestic Abuse	12	2	14
Unaccompanied Child (Minor)	0	89	89

Part III. Comparative Analysis of 1-Year Changes (2010 vs. 2011)

A. Overall Population:

1. HUD Defined Homeless

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development defines homeless as, “Individuals and families in shelters, in transitional housing, and sleeping in places not meant for human habitation (parks, alleys, all night establishments such as restaurants, hospitals, Laundromats, in vehicles, etc.).”

2011

HUD Defined Homeless (Surveyed):

150 adult HUD homeless

130 children HUD homeless

280 total HUD homeless

2010

HUD Defined Homeless (Surveyed):

184 adult HUD homeless

104 children HUD homeless

288 total HUD homeless

Analysis:

Overall, the number of homeless persons counted in Planning District 16 decreased by eight persons from 2010 to 2011. The slight decrease in the overall homeless can be attributed to several successful efforts by CoC member agencies. Micah Ecumenical Ministries has moved forward with its Journey Program, successfully providing permanent supportive housing opportunities for previously chronic homeless individuals. Thurman Brisben Center (TBC) has been able to re-house several families while preventing new cases of homelessness since 2010 through the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Program (HPRP). Transitional housing programs of Hope House and the Rappahannock Area Council on Domestic Violence (RCDV) have high success rates in transitioning formerly homeless persons/families into permanent housing. Other CoC agencies, such as Quin Rivers, Central Virginia Housing Coalition, and the Salvation Army also serve the public in preventing new cases of homelessness.

Although the total number of homeless persons dropped, the percentage of homeless children increased, from 36 percent of the overall homeless population in 2010, to 46 percent in 2011. The rise in homeless children is a growing trend as shown by the number of unaccompanied youth being identified by the public schools. This population is of great concern for the CoC because many of these youth will be living in the community as homeless adults once they turn 18.

2. Additional HEARTH Act Defined Homeless

The HEARTH Act of 2009 expands HUD’s definition to include situations where a person is at imminent risk of homelessness or where a family or unaccompanied youth is living in unstable conditions. Imminent risk includes situations where a person must leave his or her current

housing within the next 14 days with no other place to go and no resources or support networks through which to obtain housing. Instability includes families with children and unaccompanied youth who: 1) are defined as homeless under other federal programs (such as the Department of Education's (DOE) Education for Homeless Children and Youth program), 2) have lived for a long period without being able to live independently in permanent housing, 3) have moved frequently, and 4) will continue to experience instability because of disability, history of domestic violence or abuse, or multiple barriers to employment.

The Department of Education's Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program defines the term "homeless children and youth" in accordance with the McKinney-Vento Act, which identifies individuals who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence as homeless. More specifically, the term includes:

- Children and youth who are:
 - sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason (sometimes referred to as *doubled-up*);
 - living in motels, hotels, trailer parks, or camping grounds due to lack of alternative adequate accommodations;
 - living in emergency or transitional shelters;
 - abandoned in hospitals; or
 - awaiting foster care placement;
- Children and youth who have a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings;
- Children and youth who are living in cars, parks, public spaces, abandoned buildings, substandard housing, bus or train stations, or similar settings; and
- Migratory children who qualify as homeless because they are living in circumstances described above.

Once HUD revises its definition of homelessness in accordance with the HEARTH Act of 2009 the following persons will be added to the numbers above:

2011:

HEARTH Act Defined Homeless:

12 adults (surveyed) who were not homeless on the night of the PIT, but anticipated being homeless within 14 days following the PIT

588 children who are defined as homeless under the DOE

600 HEARTH homeless

2010

HEARTH Act Defined Homeless:

376 children were defined as homeless under the DOE

376 HEARTH homeless

Analysis:

The number of school-aged children who are defined as homeless under the Department of Education continues to climb as parents have lost employment and can no longer provide stable housing for their families. These families are frequently forced to double up with friends/family or live in hotels and motels. CoC agencies have tried to coordinate efforts to identify and re-house families with children through the HPRP but there is still a tremendous need.

B. Homeless by Previous Fixed Address

The 2011 PIT Survey included two questions to help identify the jurisdiction in which a respondent was housed before becoming homeless. The first question asked for a specific zip code of the person's last previous fixed address and a follow up question asked for the actual jurisdiction name. Some respondents answered both questions. Some only chose to provide the jurisdiction name. Ten of the thirty-two HUD homeless adults (with no children) indicated that their previous fixed address was a Fredericksburg address, but did not provide the zip code to confirm residency within the actual City-limits. For this reason, a footnote has been added to the table below which clarifies that these individuals could have actually lived in Spotsylvania or Stafford Counties, but had a Fredericksburg mailing address.

2011

Homeless Population by Previous Fixed Address	HUD Homeless Adults	HUD Homeless Children	HUD Homeless Subtotal	% of HUD Homeless Subtotal	HEARTH Homeless Adults	HEARTH Homeless Children	HEARTH Homeless Subtotal	% of HEARTH Homeless Subtotal	Grand Total of HUD + HEARTH Homeless	% of HUD + HEARTH Homeless
Caroline	9	6	15	5.4%	0	44	44	7.3%	59	6.7%
Fredericksburg*	24	2	26	9.3%	8	43	51	8.5%	77	8.8%
King George	11	1	12	4.3%	1	64	65	10.8%	77	8.8%
Spotsylvania	39	71	110	39.3%	0	223	223	37.2%	333	37.8%
Stafford	33	47	80	28.6%	1	214	215	35.8%	295	33.5%
Other VA	19	3	22	7.9%	2	0	2	0.3%	24	2.7%
Outside VA	15	0	15	5.4%	0	0	0	0.0%	15	1.7%
Total	150	130	280	100.0%	12	588	600	100.0%	880	100.0%

*A Fredericksburg mailing address could be located in portions of Stafford or Spotsylvania Counties.

2010

Homeless Population by Previous Fixed Address	HUD Homeless Adults	HUD Homeless Children	HUD Homeless Subtotal	% of HUD Homeless Subtotal	HEARTH Homeless Children	% of HEARTH Homeless Subtotal	Grand Total of HUD + HEARTH Homeless	% of HUD + HEARTH Homeless
Caroline	7	5	12	4.2%	37	9.8%	49	7.4%
Fredericksburg*	57	12	69	24.0%	57	15.2%	126	19.0%
King George	10	0	10	3.5%	22	5.9%	32	4.8%
Spotsylvania	28	62	90	31.3%	105	27.9%	195	29.4%
Stafford	43	19	62	21.5%	155	41.2%	217	32.7%
Other VA	18	1	19	6.6%	0	0.0%	19	2.9%
Outside VA	21	5	26	9.0%	0	0.0%	26	3.9%
Total	184	104	288	100.0%	376	100.0%	664	100.0%

*A Fredericksburg mailing address could be located in portions of Stafford or Spotsylvania Counties

Analysis:

The distribution of homeless persons by previously fixed address shows that the majority of HUD homeless persons were last previously housed within the Planning District and that the percentage actually increased from 84.4% in 2010 to 86.7% in 2011. A much lower percentage of HUD homeless persons were previously housed in the City of Fredericksburg (24.0% in 2010 and 9.3% in 2011), while a much larger percentage originated from the surrounding counties. The 2011 PIT results note that the largest number of homeless children, defined by the Department of Education (HEARTH Homeless Children), are identified in Stafford and Spotsylvania School Systems; however the number of school aged homeless has almost doubled in King George County from 5.9% in 2010 to 10.8% in 2011. As previously noted, this is unfortunately a growing trend for the region.

C. Chronically Homeless

Following the 2010 PIT Count, HUD revised its definition of chronically homeless to include both individuals and families. Specifically, an unaccompanied homeless individual (18 or older) with a disabling condition or a family with at least one adult member (18 or older) who has a disabling condition who has either been continuously homeless for a year or more OR has had at least four (4) episodes of homelessness in the past three (3) years is considered to be chronically homeless.

2011

Of the 280 HUD homeless:

68 adults are chronically homeless individuals as defined by HUD

5 households (5 adults and 7 children) are defined as chronically homeless families by HUD

82 adults and 123 children were homeless, but met neither definition for chronically homeless

2010:

Of the 288 HUD homeless:

83 adults were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

7 adults and 11 children were defined as chronically homeless under the HEARTH Act of 2009

94 adults and 93 children were homeless, but met neither definition for chronically homeless

Analysis:

The number of chronic homeless adults has decreased by 15 from 2010 to 2011. This reduction is likely related to efforts of local agencies to move long-standing street homeless into permanent housing. As of April 4, 2011, Micah Ecumenical Ministries has assisted 70 different individuals through a permanent supportive housing Journey program. Only four individuals have returned to homelessness and three were institutionalized. Nine persons have graduated from needing the support services and three left the program to live with family or friends.

D. Families with Children

Ending homelessness among households with children, particularly for those households living on the streets or other places not meant for human habitation, is a specific HUD priority.

2011

Of the 150 HUD homeless completed surveys:

21 households are families with children (21 adults with 35 children)

129 are individuals with no children

2010

Of the 184 HUD homeless completed surveys:

22 households were families with children (22 adults with 42 children)

162 were individuals with no children

Analysis:

The number of HUD homeless households with children was reduced by one. While this trend is positive, the CoC recognizes that many more families are living in unstable conditions (doubled up or in hotels/motels) as noted by the number of homeless children identified through the

Department of Education. The CoC continues to target homeless families with children for rehousing efforts through the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing and other programs.

E. Unaccompanied Children

For the 2011 PIT count, HUD is relabeling the “unaccompanied youth” category to “unaccompanied children.” HUD decided to change the terminology to clarify that its definition only refers to a person who is under age 18.

2011

Of the 130 HUD homeless children:

89 children are identified as unaccompanied children (minors)

2010

Of the 104 HUD homeless children:

50 children were identified as unaccompanied children (minors)

Analysis:

The number of unaccompanied minors continues to rise from 50 in 2010 to 89 in 2011. Many of these children are still enrolled in public schools but have either left their families or been abandoned by them. McKinney-Vento School Liaisons in each school district work to ensure that these children remain in school until graduation, by coordinating transportation and providing counseling. Two area school districts, Spotsylvania and Stafford Counties, have accessed an expanded Project HOPE - Virginia program (funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act) which allows each jurisdiction to provide part-time case managers who are dedicated to providing assistance to homeless families and children. These case managers assist homeless clients to access available programs for housing, food, school supplies, and transportation throughout the region.

F. Veterans

In past years, data on the number of veterans experiencing homelessness often differed across data sources (e.g., HUD PIT, VA CHALENG). This inconsistency was largely because of different methodological approaches to collecting the information. In 2011, HUD and the VA have agreed to use the HUD PIT count as the definitive federal estimate of veteran homelessness. The 2011 PIT count was the first year that HUD required CoCs to try to count all homeless veterans – both those living in shelters and those sleeping in places not meant for human habitation (e.g., on the street, in cars, in encampments); however the Fredericksburg CoC has routinely captured both sheltered and unsheltered veteran data.

2011

Of the 150 HUD homeless adults:

17 adults identified themselves as Veterans

Of the 17 HUD homeless adult Veterans:

3 adults had 4 children

9 adults are chronically homeless as defined by HUD

2010Of the 184 homeless adults:

19 adults identified themselves as Veterans

Of the 19 HUD homeless adult Veterans:

1 adult had 1 child

11 adults were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

Analysis:

The number of HUD homeless veterans decreased from 19 in 2010 to 17 in 2011. Likewise, the number of HUD homeless veterans who are considered chronically homeless decreased. This change can be attributed to additional veteran resources now available in the Planning District. The Wounded Warrior Foundation has an office available through the Rappahannock Area Community Services Board to serve local residents, including the homeless veterans. This agency coordinates with the Veterans Administration in Richmond to provide VASH vouchers, which can provide housing assistance for homeless veterans. In an effort to reduce the number of homeless and at-risk veterans even further, in March of 2011, Quin Rivers applied for Veteran Families (SSVF) Program funds. The agency designated at least 65 percent of the requested funding to provide case management, outreach, and direct services (transportation, utility deposits, security deposits, rental payments, or similar services) to veterans and their families who are living in Planning District 16, have an immediate need of permanent housing, and earn at or below 50 percent of the area median income.

Part IV. Additional 2011 Data and Characteristics

150 Homeless Survey Respondents (Adults)

Gender: 32% Female 68% Male

Race: 57% White 33% Black 4% Native American
1% Asian 4% Mix/Other 5% Hispanic/Latino

Veterans: 11% (17)

Age: Minimum: 18 Maximum: 67
Average/Mean: 40

Number who have children under 18 with them:
21 total (14% of those surveyed)
Of these, 66% have 1 child with them (14)
33% have 2 or more children with them (7)

Foster Care: 11% (17)
Of the 17 respondents, 9 left foster care for reunification or adoption

Highest Level of Education Completed:

28%	Less than high school completion (41)
40%	High School Diploma (59)
7%	GED (11)
16%	Some college (23)
6%	Bachelor's Degree (9)
3%	Trade School/Vocational (4)

Enrolled in Special Education/Special Classes: 26% (38)

Transportation: 35% FRED (53) 4% Friend/Relative (6)
45% Walk (68) 3% None (5)
22% Car (34) 1% Taxi (2)
5% Bike (8)

Employment: Employed Part-time: 11% (17) No Job Noted: 70% (106)
Employed Full-time: 11% (16)
Day Labor: 7% (11)

Length of Time Living in This Area:
Minimum: 3 days Maximum: 59 Years
Average/Mean: 16 years

6 months or less:	10% (15)	Greater than 10 years:	50% (73)
6-12 months:	10% (14)		
1-5 years:	20% (29)		
6-10 years:	10% (14)		

Reason for being in/coming to the area:

Born here:	19% (25)	Fresh start:	4% (6)
Family:	41% (54)	DV/abusive situation:	<1% (1)
Job:	13% (17)	Relocate:	4% (6)
Cost of living/housing costs:	3% (4)	Liked Fredericksburg	3% (4)
Homeless services:	<1% (1)	Other:	11% (15)

Where Respondent Slept Last Night:

Cold Weather Shelter:	23% (35)	Hope House	5% (7)
Thurman Brisben	33% (49)	Motel	<1% (1)
Outdoors	21% (31)	RCDV	3% (4)
Vehicle	6% (9)	Hospital	1% (2)
Friend/Relative	2% (3)	Other	1% (2)
Respite	5% (7)		

Where Respondent Will Sleep Tonight:

Cold Weather Shelter:	25% (37)	Hope House	5% (7)
Thurman Brisben	34% (51)	Motel	<1% (1)
Outdoors	21% (31)	RCDV	3% (4)
Vehicle	5% (8)	Unsure	2% (3)
Other	<1% (1)		
Respite	5% (7)		

How Long has the Respondent been Homeless?

Minimum: 2 days	Maximum: 36 years		
Average/Mean:	2.4 years		
Less than 1 month:	22% (32)	1-2 years:	18% (27)
1-3 months:	17% (25)	3-5 years:	11% (17)
4-6 months:	13% (20)	6-10 years:	7% (10)
7-11 months:	7% (10)	10 years +:	5% (7)

First Time Homeless?

Yes:	41% (59)
No:	59% (85)

Of those who were previously homeless, the number of times homeless in last 3 years:
(49 answered)

1 time:	31% (15)	4-5 times:	6% (3)
2-3 times:	53% (28)	Greater than 5 times:	10% (5)

Chronically homeless: 45% (68)

Factors Contributing to Homelessness: (not exclusive categories, can choose more than one)

Unemployment	52% (77)	Criminal History	18% (26)
Wages/Underemployment	8% (12)	Credit	4% (6)
Eviction/Foreclosure	28% (42)	Substance Abuse	12% (18)
Domestic Violence	9% (14)	Divorce	7% (10)
Illness	17% (25)		

Number who said they have the following services:

Emergency Shelter	75	Disability Assistance	10
Permanent Housing	2	Dental	8
Transitional Housing	8	Medical	32
Legal Aid	3	HIV/AIDS services	5
Substance Abuse Services	13	Employment training	2
Mental Health	20	Social Security benefits	15
Domestic Violence	6	Unemployment benefits	2
Child care	6	TANF	2
Food	48	Food Stamps	84
Transportation	25		

Number who said they need the following services:

Emergency Shelter	31	Disability Assistance	36
Permanent Housing	120	Dental	77
Transitional Housing	50	Medical	45
Legal Aid	30	HIV/AIDS services	3
Substance Abuse Services	15	Employment training	49
Mental Health	28	Social Security benefits	38
Domestic Violence	8	Unemployment benefits	18
Child care	14	TANF	12
Food	37	Food Stamps	32
Transportation	64		