



## Fredericksburg Regional Continuum of Care 2014 Point-In-Time (PIT) Report

Communities across the country need 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 annually for sheltered homeless persons and every two years for unsheltered homeless persons during the last ten days of January. The Fredericksburg Regional CoC conducts a PIT every year, for both populations, 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 toward 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. 2014 Point-In-Time Count Background**

On January 30 and 31, 2014 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. McKinney-Vento homeless liaisons from the region's School Districts also coordinated with the CoC to calculate the number of homeless children enrolled in schools.

Over 227 individual survey questionnaires were completed. After a review of the surveys and removal of duplicates and those completed by non-homeless persons, 163 unique surveys were available to evaluate homeless adults living in Planning District 16 (PD16), which includes the City of Fredericksburg and the Counties of Caroline, King George, Spotsylvania, and Stafford. An additional 64 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. Engaging homeless persons to provide personal information can be challenging, but in 2014, 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 and assorted toiletries and blankets supplied by Hope House. The CoC sponsored a Services Fair offering intake and referral information from CoC agencies and other outside homeless services providers. A representative was even on hand to provide information on registering for the Affordable Care Act, and even set appointments with a number of homeless participants to complete the process.

## Part II. 2014 PIT Summary Table for Submission to HUD

<b>Fredericksburg Regional CoC 2014 Point-In-Time Count Results - January 30, 2014</b>				
Persons in Households with at Least One Adult and One Child	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Households	18	10	0	28
Number of Persons (Adults and Children)	52	31	0	83
Number of Persons (Under age 18)	30	21	0	51
Number of Persons (18-24)	3	1	0	4
Number of Persons (Over age 24)	19	9	0	28
<b>Persons in Households with Only Children</b>				
Persons in Households with Only Children	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Households	0	0	0	0
Number of Persons (Unaccompanied Children Only)	0	0	0	0
<b>Persons in Households without Children</b>				
Persons in Households without Children	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Number of Households	88	0	30	118
Number of Persons (18-24)	6	0	3	9
Number of Persons (Over age 24)	82	0	27	109
<b>All Households/ All Persons</b>				
All Households/ All Persons	Sheltered		Unsheltered	Total
	Emergency	Transitional		
Total Households	106	10	30	146
Total Persons	140	31	30	201
Number of Persons (Under age 18)	30	21	0	51
Number of Persons (18-24)	9	1	3	13
Number of Persons (Over age 24)	101	9	27	137

<b>Homeless Adult Subpopulations</b>			
	Sheltered	Unsheltered	Total
<b>Chronically Homeless Subpopulations</b>			
Chronically Homeless Individuals	25	17	42
Chronically Homeless Families (Total Persons in Households)*	1 (3)	(0)	1 (3)
<b>Other Homeless Subpopulations</b>			
Veterans	10	8	18
Severely Mentally Ill	35	16	51
Chronic Substance Abuse	19	4	23
Persons with HIV/AIDS	1	1	2
Victims of Domestic Abuse	19	1	20
Unaccompanied Children (Under 18)	0	0	0

\*Per HUD's Guidance, Chronically Homeless Individuals/Families in Transitional Housing were not included in the PIT Chronic Homeless numbers.

### **Part III. Comparative Analysis of 1-Year Changes (2014 vs. 2013)**

#### **A. Overall Population:**

##### 1. HUD Defined Homeless

On December 5, 2011, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development revised its [definition of homelessness](#) in accordance with the HEARTH Act of 2009. The definition expanded the number of households who will qualify for federally funded homeless programs; however the definition did not change those who are counted during the PIT. HUD's [2014 PIT Guidance](#) directs CoCs to report only persons and households sleeping in emergency shelters, transitional housing, and Safe Haven programs or any persons living in a place not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, abandoned buildings, or on the street on the night designated for the count.

#### **2014**

##### HUD Defined Homeless (Surveyed):

150 adult HUD homeless

51 children HUD homeless

**201 total HUD homeless**

#### **2013**

##### HUD Defined Homeless (Surveyed):

146 adult HUD homeless

43 children HUD homeless

**189 total HUD homeless**

#### **Analysis:**

Overall, the number of homeless persons counted in PD16 increased by 12 persons from 2013 to 2014. The increase can be attributed to several factors. First, the CoC expanded its field canvassing efforts to Stafford County and offered additional incentives at the Services Fair. A second speaks to growing trends in housing instability that the HUD definition of homelessness and the HEARTH definition of those at imminent risk for homelessness do not cover – those

staying in hotels or doubled up in housing with friends and/or family. The Department of Education's definition encompasses this expanded scope in its coverage of school-aged children and their families. The 2014 rise in the number of families with children in emergency shelters shows that unstable housing situations resulted in homelessness for more at-risk families in 2013 than in previous years. The percentage of respondents claiming that they had been homeless less than a year rose six points over the 2013 count, as did the percentage of those reporting that they were experiencing their first case of homelessness. Finally, 27 percent of all homeless respondents reported that "Eviction/Foreclosure" contributed to their homelessness, compared to only 14 percent last year.

PIT 2014 showed the highest number of at-risk households of any previous counts, many of which were formerly homeless prior to being rapidly re-housed or placed in permanent supportive housing. Volunteers surveyed the majority of these at the services fair and the community dinner. The at-risk populations in attendance were at a pivotal point in the housing battle, and looked for opportunities to offset the cost of living expenses that would have otherwise jeopardized their ability to sustain housing.

In 2014, regional homeless services providers continue to refine a system that prevents and diverts at-risk households from homelessness and couples rapid re-housing resources with services that promote self sufficiency. They also look for ways to streamline a network of emergency shelter and permanent supportive housing options for those with higher barriers to housing. In 2013, Micah Ecumenical Ministries grew its Journey Program, successfully providing permanent supportive housing opportunities for previously chronic homeless individuals. Thurman Brisben Center (TBC) continued to re-house families and prevent new cases of homelessness through its state and community-funded programs. Hope House and Empowerhouse (formerly the Rappahannock Council on Domestic Violence) expanded their rapid re-housing programs while reporting high success rates in transitioning formerly homeless persons/families into permanent housing. Quin Rivers, Inc. and the Central Virginia Housing Coalition partnered to provide homelessness diversion and prevention services to the at-risk community.

## 2. Additional HEARTH Act Defined Homeless

The HEARTH Act of 2009 expanded 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.

As noted above, HUD revised its homeless definition in accordance with the HEARTH Act of 2009 to open homeless programs and services to a broader population. HEARTH Act defined homeless persons counted the night of the PIT are documented below and would be eligible to receive homeless assistance; however, the population did not meet HUD’s definition for homeless persons to be reported during the PIT count.

## **2014**

### HEARTH Act Defined Homeless:

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

9 children identified with adult surveys

950 children who are defined as homeless under the DOE\*

**972 HEARTH homeless**

## **2013**

### HEARTH Act Defined Homeless:

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

11 children identified with adult surveys

801 children who were defined as homeless under the DOE\*

**833 HEARTH homeless**

\* The category, “children who are defined as homeless under the DOE,” includes all children who have been identified as homeless by PD16 School Districts since the start of the 2013-2014 school year. This is a cumulative number, not a single night count.

### **Analysis:**

Eight fewer adults, who claimed to be without housing and no place to go within 14 days following the PIT, were identified in 2014. The number of school-aged children who were defined as homeless under the Department of Education remains high as parents have lost employment, may suffer from poor credit, and/or can no longer provide stable housing for their

families. As mentioned, these families are frequently forced to double up with friends/family or live in hotels and motels. CoC agencies continue to coordinate efforts to identify and re-house families with children through the Pursuit of Housing and Home for the Holidays campaigns jointly administered by Hope House, Thurman Brisben Center, Empowerhouse, and Micah Ecumenical Ministries, but there is still a tremendous need. In February 2014, the CoC applied to reallocate funding to Hope House to provide more rapid re-housing beds for families with children. In April 2014, CoC agencies applied for additional rapid re-housing and homeless diversion and prevention funding from the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development to quickly place homeless persons into housing and to prevent homelessness for persons in imminent danger of losing theirs.

## **B. Homeless by Previous Fixed Address**

The 2014 PIT Survey included two questions to help identify the jurisdiction in which a respondent was permanently 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. Five adults (with no children) did not indicate a zip code and therefore their response defaulted to a Fredericksburg address. 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.

### **2014**

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	6	5	11	5.4%	0	64	64	6.6%	75	6.4%
Fredericksburg*	33	8	41	20.3%	3	82	85	8.8%	126	10.8%
King George	6	0	6	3.0%	4	131	135	14.0%	141	12.0%
Spotsylvania	41	16	57	28.2%	0	480	480	49.5%	537	45.9%
Stafford	27	9	36	17.8%	1	197	198	20.4%	234	20.0%
Other VA	18	10	28	13.9%	3	0	3	0.1%	29	2.5%
Outside VA	17	3	20	10.0%	2	5	7	0.6%	26	2.2%
Unknown	2	0	2	1.5%	0	0	0	0.0%	2	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>972</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,173</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**2013**

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

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	4	0	4	2.1%	2	56	58	7.0%	62	6.1%
Fredericksburg*	31	6	37	19.6%	2	60	62	7.4%	99	9.7%
King George	1	0	1	0.5%	5	45	50	6.0%	51	5.0%
Spotsylvania	34	18	52	27.5%	3	407	410	49.2%	462	45.2%
Stafford	26	1	27	14.3%	3	239	242	29.1%	269	26.3%
Other VA	19	9	28	14.8%	3	2	5	0.6%	33	3.2%
Outside VA	29	9	38	20.1%	2	3	5	0.6%	43	4.2%
Unknown	2	0	2	1.1%	1	0	1	0.1%	3	0.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>812</b>	<b>833</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1022</b>	<b>100.00%</b>



**Analysis:**

The distribution of homeless persons by previously fixed address shows that the majority of HUD homeless persons (Seventy-five percent) were last permanently housed within PD16, mostly from Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania and Stafford, and the number who reported a last fixed address from outside of the region decreased.

The 2014 PIT notes an increase in homeless children as defined by HUD from forty-three in 2013 to fifty-one in 2014. The 2014 PIT results also note that the largest number of homeless children, defined by the Department of Education (HEARTH Homeless Children), are identified in Stafford and Spotsylvania School Districts; however the number of school aged homeless has increased in all jurisdictions.

### **C. Chronically Homeless**

HUD revised its definition of chronically homeless to include both individuals and families who are living in a place not meant for human habitation or in emergency shelter. 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.

#### **2014**

##### Of the 201 HUD homeless:

42 total persons were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

159 adults and children were homeless, but were not chronically homeless

##### Of the 42 persons who were chronically homeless as defined by HUD:

40 adults were chronically homeless individuals as defined by HUD

1 family with children (1 adults and 2 children) were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

#### **2013**

##### Of the 189 HUD homeless:

56 total persons were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

133 adults and children were homeless, but were not chronically homeless

##### Of the 56 persons who were chronically homeless as defined by HUD:

50 adults were chronically homeless individuals as defined by HUD

2 families with children (3 adults and 3 children) were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

#### **Analysis:**

The total number of chronically homeless persons decreased by thirteen, from fifty-six persons in 2013 to forty-two persons in 2014. The reduction included a fifty percent decline in the number of chronically homeless families with children from two families in 2013 to only one in 2014. The decrease is likely related to efforts of the CoC to move long-standing street homeless into permanent housing and to rapidly re-house families with children avoiding a prolonged or repeated episode of homelessness. Micah Ecumenical Ministries applied in February 2014 for federal funding to expand its available permanent supportive housing beds and maintains an inventory of approximately fifty permanent housing beds with varying levels of support and case management. Additionally, the Home for the Holidays campaign resulted in approximately fifty rapidly re-housed families from November 2013 to February 2014. The same Pursuit of Housing campaign agencies project that they will rapidly re-house 135 homeless households in 2014/2015.

## **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.

### **2014**

Of the 150 HUD homeless completed surveys:

28 households are families with children (32 adults with 51 children)

118 are individuals with no children

### **2013**

Of the 146 HUD homeless completed surveys:

23 households were families with children (24 adults with 43 children)

122 are individuals with no children

### **Analysis:**

The number of HUD homeless households with children increased by five, from 23 in 2013 to 28 in 2014. The overall number of homeless children increased from forty-three in 2013 to fifty-one in 2014. The CoC recognizes that many families are homeless or 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 re-housing efforts through the Pursuit of Housing Campaign and is redoubling efforts in 2014 to prevent and divert more families from entering homelessness. Finally, the CoC recognizes the important part that supportive services play in leading to self sufficiency in permanent housing. It is prioritizing access to mainstream supportive resources through its current strategic planning process, provider training to access SOAR benefits, and a pilot program to explore the application of TANF funding in rapid re-housing efforts.

## **E. Unaccompanied Children**

The term “unaccompanied children” refers to homeless persons who are under age 18 and living independently of any family or adult caregiver.

### **2014**

Of the 51 HUD homeless children:

0 children are identified as unaccompanied children (minors)

### **2013**

Of the 43 HUD homeless children:

0 children are identified as unaccompanied children (minors)

### **Analysis:**

In 2013 and 2014, the number of reported HUD homeless unaccompanied children was zero. McKinney-Vento liaisons within the School Districts have identified unaccompanied youth under the Department of Education definition of homelessness, however the location of

residence (ie, sheltered, unsheltered, housed, etc) for the children could not be verified on the night of the PIT count and therefore cannot be included in the report to HUD.

## **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 agreed to use the HUD PIT count as the definitive federal estimate of veteran homelessness. In 2014, the CoC requested veteran respondents to provide their discharge year in an effort to determine if there is any correlation between it and instances of homelessness.

### **2014**

#### Of the 150 HUD homeless adults:

18 adults identified themselves as Veterans

#### Of the 18 HUD homeless adult Veterans (can be in multiple categories):

2 adults each had 1 child

2 adults were women

8 adults are chronically homeless as defined by HUD

10 adults were sheltered and 8 adults were unsheltered

### **2013**

#### Of the 146 HUD homeless adults:

21 adults identified themselves as Veterans

#### Of the 21 HUD homeless adult Veterans (can be in multiple categories):

1 adult had 1 child

5 adults were women

7 adults are chronically homeless as defined by HUD

16 adults were sheltered and 5 adults were unsheltered

### **Analysis:**

The number of HUD homeless veterans decreased by four, from twenty-one in 2013. This is the lowest number of homeless veterans since the 2012 PIT report which accounted for fifteen cases. This change is attributed to the continued efforts of the region's veteran services agencies. The Wounded Warrior Foundation has an office available through the Rappahannock Area Community Services Board to serve local residents, including homeless veterans. This agency coordinates with the VA in Richmond to provide VASH vouchers, which can provide housing assistance for homeless veterans. The VA also has a regular presence at Micah to better connect homeless veterans with resources including medical care and mental health services, since only eleven percent of homeless veterans reported to receive care at the VA hospital in Richmond.

In an effort to reduce the number of homeless and at-risk veterans, CoC agencies continue to target homeless veterans in their CoC funded programs. In February 2013, Quin Rivers Inc. applied for Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) funding to provide supportive services to very low-income homeless Veteran families living in or transitioning to permanent

housing. Quin Rivers Inc., projects that it will serve 50 veteran households with this funding by fiscal year end, including rapidly re-housing 13 veteran families in the program's first four months. Quin Rivers applied again in February 2014 for another year of SSVF funding. The application is still pending. Micah Ecumenical Ministries will also provide permanent supportive housing assistance for homeless veterans during 2014-2015 through its Journey Program.

## **Part IV. Additional 2014 Data and Characteristics**

This data is derived from 150 Homeless Respondent (Adult) surveys unless otherwise noted.

### **A. General**

Gender: 60% Male 40% Female

Race: 54% White 40% Black/African American .7% Other  
3% White and Black .7% Native American 0% Asian  
/African American

Ethnicity: 96% Non-Hispanic  
4% Hispanic

Veterans: 12% (18)

Age: Minimum: 18 Maximum: 68  
Average/Mean: 42

Households with children under age 18 with them: 28

(Note: one household has three adult members.)

Of these, 54% (15) have 1 child with them  
25% (7) have 2 children with them  
21% (6) have 3 or more children with them

Of the total number (51) of children,  
51% (26) are children ages 4 and under  
49% (25) are children ages 5-17

Foster Care: 12% (18)

Of 18 respondents, 9 left foster care for reunification or adoption

Highest Level of Education Completed (149 respondents):

High School Diploma	42% (63)
Less than High School Completion	21% (32)
GED	9% (14)
Some College	11% (16)
Associates Degree	7% (11)
Bachelor's Degree	5% (8)
Trade School/Vocational	2% (3)
Master's Degree/Doctorate	1% (2)

Enrolled in Special Education/Special Classes: 17% (26)

Transportation:

FRED	40% (60)
Walk	22% (33)
Automobile	19% (28)
Bike	7% (11)
None	8% (12)
Friend/Relative	3% (5)
Taxi	1% (1)

Employment (149 respondents):

No Job Noted	70% (104)
Employed Full-time	11% (16)
Employed Part-time	17% (26)
Day Labor	2% (3)

Years Living in Area: Minimum: 1 Month    Maximum: 63 years    Average/Mean: 12 years

<6 months	14%
6-12 months	14%
1-5 years	21%
6-10 years	15%
>10 years	35%

Reasons for Coming to the Area (Overall Population):

Family/Friends	32%
Born here	16%
Other	5%
Job/Work	16%
Homeless services	7%
DV/Abusive situation	2%
Released from Prison	2%
Traveling/Got Stuck	5%
Cost of Living	1%
School	0%

Where Respondents Slept Last Night:

Thurman Brisben Center	37%
Cold Weather Shelter	22%
Outdoors	14%
Hope House	7%
RCDV	7%
Friend/relative	1%
Respite	5%
Motel – Paid by Church/ Organization	1%
Vehicle/Bus	4%
Hospital	1%
Jail	1%
Other	1%

Where Respondents will Sleep Tonight:

Thurman Brisben Center	37%
Cold Weather Shelter	21%
Outdoors	13%
Hope House	7%
RCDV	7%
Respite	5%
Vehicle	6%
Motel – Paid by Church/ Organization	0%
Other	4%
Don't know	1%

**B. Factors of Homelessness**

First Time Homeless?

Yes:	49%
No:	51%

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

1 time:	34%	4-5 times:	8%
2-3 times:	52%	Greater than 5 times:	6%

Chronically Homeless: 40% (60)

How long has the Respondent been Homeless?

Less than a year	68%
1-2 years	15%
3-5 years	13%
6-10 years	3%
10+ years	1%

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

Unemployment	50% (76)
Eviction/ Foreclosure	27% (41)
Domestic Violence	16% (24)
Wages/ Underemployment	8% (12)
Criminal History	13% (20)
Substance Abuse	11% (16)
Illness	10% (15)
Credit	5% (8)
Divorce	5% (7)

**C. Services**

Number who said they have the following services (2013 PIT in brackets):  
(not exclusive categories, can choose more than one)

Emergency Shelter	106 (91)	Disability Services	17(13)
Permanent Housing	4 (4)	Dental	10 (6)
Transitional Housing	13 (16)	Medical	32 (21)
Legal Aid	5 (2)	HIV/AIDS Services	2 (2)
Substance Abuse Services	17 (14)	Employment Training	17 (6)
Mental Health Services	20 (16)	Social Security Benefits	22 (18)
Domestic Violence	15 (11)	Unemployment Benefits	2 (2)
Child Care	7 (7)	TANF	15 (9)
Food	78 (53)	Food Stamps	92 (77)
Transportation	23 (20)		

Number who said they need the following services (2013 PIT in brackets):  
(not exclusive categories, can choose more than one)

Emergency Shelter	21 (23)	Disability Assistance	33 (35)
Permanent Housing	133 (128)	Dental	83 (64)
Transitional Housing	56 (41)	Medical	53 (53)
Legal Aid	32 (30)	HIV/AIDS	0 (2)
Substance Abuse Services	6 (15)	Employment Training	40 (49)
Mental Health	25 (31)	Social Security Benefits	36 (13)
Domestic Violence	5 (9)	Unemployment Benefits	9 (19)
Child Care	19 (17)	TANF	15 (7)
Food	44 (50)	Food Stamps	27 (40)
Transportation	97 (86)		



## **D. Medical**

### Insurance:

None	57.3% (86)
Medicaid	26.0% (39)
Medicare	8.0% (12)
Veterans' Aid	4.0% (6)
Private	4.7% (7)

### How many times to the hospital emergency room in the last three months?

None	62%
Once	17%
Twice or more	21%

### Inpatient in the hospital in the last year?

None	70%
Once	20%
Twice or more	10%

### Where do you go when you need to see a doctor?

Hospital/ER	41%
Moss Free Clinic	13%
Nowhere	7%
Primary Care Physician	20%
Urgent Care	4%
VA Clinic – Richmond	1%
Other in PD16	9%
Other outside PD16	2%
RACSB	1%