



Fredericksburg Area Continuum of Care 2012 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 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. 2012 Point-In-Time Count Background

On January 26 and 27, 2012, 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 Fredericksburg area. School Homeless Liaisons from the region also coordinated with the CoC to calculate the number of school aged homeless persons. Over 182 individual survey questionnaires were completed. After a review of the surveys and removal of duplicates, 142 unique surveys were available to evaluate homeless adults living in Planning District 16 on the night of the count. An additional 39 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 2012, 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. 2012 PIT Summary Table for Submission to HUD

| Fredericksburg Regional CoC-2012 Point-In-Time Count Results (Schedule K) January 26, 2012 | | | | |
|--|-----------|--------------|-------------|-------|
| Persons in Households with at Least One Adult and One Child | Sheltered | | Unsheltered | Total |
| | Emergency | Transitional | | |
| Number of Households | 14 | 12 | 2 | 28 |
| Number of Persons (Adults and Children) | 49 | 30 | 5 | 84 |
| | | | | |
| 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 |
| | | | | |
| Persons in Households without Children | Sheltered | | Unsheltered | Total |
| | Emergency | Transitional | | |
| Number of Households | 67 | 0 | 42 | 109 |
| Number of Persons (Adults Only) | 67 | 0 | 42 | 109 |
| | | | | |
| All Households/ All Persons | Sheltered | | Unsheltered | Total |
| | Emergency | Transitional | | |
| Total Households | 65 | 12 | 60 | 137 |
| Total Persons | 100 | 30 | 63 | 193 |
| | | | | |

| Part 2J Homeless Adult Sub-Populations | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|--------|
| | Sheltered | Unsheltered | Total |
| Chronically Homeless Individuals | 13 | 27 | 47 |
| Chronically Homeless Families (Total Persons in Households) | 5 (11) | 2 (5) | 7 (16) |
| Veterans | 10 | 5 | 15 |
| Severely Mentally Ill | 28 | 11 | 39 |
| Chronic Substance Abuse | 19 | 6 | 25 |
| Persons with HIV/AIDS | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Victims of Domestic Abuse | 18 | 4 | 22 |
| Unaccompanied Children (Under 18) | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part III. Comparative Analysis of 1-Year Changes (2012 vs. 2011)

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 new definition expands 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 [2012 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.

2012

HUD Defined Homeless (Surveyed):

137 adult HUD homeless

56 children HUD homeless

193 total HUD homeless

2011

HUD Defined Homeless (Surveyed):

150 adult HUD homeless

41 children HUD homeless

191 total HUD homeless

Analysis:

Overall, the number of homeless persons counted in Planning District 16 increased by two persons from 2011 to 2012. The slight increase in the overall population can be attributed to better surveying techniques and continued economic hardship experienced by many in the Fredericksburg region. The number did not climb significantly due 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) was able to re-house thirty-two families while preventing one hundred seventeen new cases of homelessness since the fall of 2009 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.

The percentage of homeless children increased, from twenty-one percent of the overall homeless population in 2011, to twenty-nine percent in 2012. The rise in homeless families with children is a growing trend. This population is of great concern for the CoC because many of the 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.

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.

2012

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

803 children were defined as homeless under the DOE*

815 HEARTH homeless

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

677 children who are defined as homeless under the DOE*

689 HEARTH homeless

* The category, “children who are defined as homeless under the DOE,” includes all children who have been identified by PD 16 School Districts as homeless since the start of the 2011-2012 School Year. This is a cumulative number, not a single night count.

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 former Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Rehousing Program and now the new CoC funded FISH Program, both administered by Thurman Brisben Center, but there is still a tremendous need.

B. Homeless by Previous Fixed Address

The 2012 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 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.

2012

| 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 | 4 | 10 | 5.18% | 0 | 36 | 36 | 4.42% | 46 | 4.56% |
| Fredericksburg* | 39 | 14 | 53 | 27.46% | 5 | 47 | 52 | 6.38% | 105 | 10.42% |
| King George | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1.55% | 0 | 101 | 101 | 12.39% | 104 | 10.32% |
| Spotsylvania | 33 | 19 | 52 | 26.94% | 1 | 380 | 381 | 46.75% | 433 | 42.96% |
| Stafford | 29 | 13 | 42 | 21.76% | 0 | 238 | 238 | 29.20% | 280 | 27.78% |
| Other VA | 17 | 6 | 23 | 11.92% | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0.61% | 28 | 2.78% |
| Outside VA | 10 | 0 | 10 | 5.18% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.25% | 12 | 1.19% |
| Total | 137 | 56 | 193 | 100.00% | 12 | 803 | 815 | 100.00% | 1008 | 100.00% |

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

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 | 7.85% | 0 | 44 | 44 | 6.39% | 59 | 6.70% |
| Fredericksburg* | 24 | 0 | 24 | 12.57% | 8 | 45 | 53 | 7.69% | 77 | 8.75% |
| King George | 11 | 1 | 12 | 6.28% | 1 | 64 | 65 | 9.43% | 77 | 8.75% |
| Spotsylvania | 39 | 15 | 54 | 28.27% | 0 | 279 | 279 | 40.49% | 333 | 37.84% |
| Stafford | 33 | 16 | 49 | 25.65% | 1 | 245 | 246 | 35.70% | 295 | 33.52% |
| Other VA | 19 | 3 | 22 | 11.52% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.29% | 24 | 2.73% |
| Outside VA | 15 | 0 | 15 | 7.85% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 15 | 1.70% |
| Total | 150 | 41 | 191 | 100.00% | 12 | 677 | 689 | 100.00% | 880 | 100.00% |

*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 (82.9 percent) were last housed within the Planning District, mostly from Fredericksburg, Spotsylvania and Stafford. The 2012 PIT notes an increase in homeless children as defined by HUD from forty-one in 2011 to fifty-six in 2012. The 2012 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 Systems; however the number of school aged homeless has almost doubled for the second year in a row in King George County from sixty-four children in 2011 to one hundred and one children in 2012. As previously noted, this is unfortunately a growing trend for the region.

C. Chronically Homeless

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.

2012:

Of the 193 HUD homeless:

47 adults were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

7 families with children (7 adults and 9 children) were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

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

2011

Of the 191 HUD homeless:

67 adults were chronically homeless individuals as defined by HUD

5 families with children (5 adults and 7 children) were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

82 adults and 123 children were homeless, but were not chronically homeless

Analysis:

The number of chronically homeless adults decreased by twenty from sixty-seven individuals in 2011 to forty-seven individuals in 2012. This reduction is likely related to efforts of local agencies to move long-standing street homeless into permanent housing. As of February 2012, Micah Ecumenical Ministries assisted one hundred and six different (chronic and non-chronic) individuals with permanent supportive housing. Only eight individuals have returned to homelessness and five were institutionalized. Fourteen persons have graduated from needing the support services and six left the program to live with family or friends. The number of chronically homeless families has increased from five households with children in 2011 to seven households with children in 2012. This population will be served by the new CoC funded FISH Program in an effort to reduce the numbers of chronically homeless families with children.

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.

2012

Of the 137 HUD homeless completed surveys:

28 households were families with children (28 adults with 56 children)

109 were individuals with no children

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

Analysis:

The number of HUD homeless households with children increased by seven. 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 FISH Program and other programs.

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.

2012**Of the 56 HUD homeless children:**

0 children were identified as unaccompanied children (minors)

2011**Of the 41 HUD homeless children:**

0 children are identified as unaccompanied children (minors)

Analysis:

The initial 2011 PIT report documented eighty-nine unaccompanied children. However, in June 2011, HUD requested that the CoC remove these children from the official HUD homeless numbers because the location of residence (ie, sheltered, unsheltered, housed, etc) for the eighty-nine children, as reported by the School Districts, could not be verified on the night of the PIT count. In 2012, the number of reported homeless unaccompanied children was zero.

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. This continues with the 2012 PIT.

2012**Of the 137 homeless adults:**

15 adults identified themselves as Veterans

Of the 15 HUD homeless adult Veterans:

1 adult had 1 child

4 adults were chronically homeless as defined by HUD

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

Analysis:

The number of HUD homeless veterans decreased by two, from seventeen in 2011 to fifteen in 2012. 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 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, two CoC agencies will target homeless veterans in their CoC funded programs. Thurman Brisben Center will provide assistance to re-house at least two homeless veterans during 2012-2013 through the FISH program. Micah Ecumenical Ministries will provide permanent supportive housing assistance for at least three homeless veterans during 2012-2013 through its Journey Program.

Part IV. Additional 2012 Data and Characteristics

137 Homeless Survey Respondents (Adults)

A. General

Gender: 51% Male 49% Female

Race: 89% White 26% Black 11% Other
8% Hispanic/Latino 7% Native American 1% Asian

Veterans: 11% (15)

Age: Minimum: 18 Maximum: 76
Average/Mean: 42

Number who have children under 18 with them: 20% (28)
Of these, 35% have 1 child with them
65% have 2 or more children with them

Foster Care: 11% (15)
Of 15 respondents, 7 left foster care for reunification or adoption

Highest Level of Education Completed:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------|
| High School Diploma | 34% (47) |
| Less than High School Completion | 27% (37) |
| Some College | 19% (26) |
| GED | 10% (14) |
| Bachelor's Degree | 7% (9) |
| Trade School/Vocational | 3% (4) |

Enrolled in Special Education/Special Classes: 19% (26)

Transportation:

| | |
|-----------------|----------|
| Walk | 37% (50) |
| Car | 29% (40) |
| FRED | 25% (34) |
| Bike | 3% (4) |
| Friend/Relative | 2% (3) |
| None | 2% (3) |
| Taxi | 2% (2) |

Employment:

| | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| No Job Noted | 76% (104) |
| Employed Full-time | 12% (17) |
| Employed Part-time | 10% (14) |
| Day Labor | 2% (3) |

| | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| Years living in area: | Minimum: unknown | Maximum: 68 years | Average/Mean: 13 years |
| Less than a year | 27% | | |
| 1-5 years | 22% | | |
| 6-10 years | 12% | | |
| >10 years | 40% | | |

Reasons for coming to the area:

| | |
|----------------------|-----|
| Family/Friends | 32% |
| Other | 24% |
| Job | 15% |
| Born here | 13% |
| Relocation | 5% |
| DV/Abusive situation | 3% |
| Fresh start | 3% |
| Homeless services | 3% |
| Cost of living | 1% |
| Like Fredericksburg | 1% |

Where respondents slept last night:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Outdoors | 30% |
| Thurman Brisben Center | 29% |
| Hope House | 9% |
| Other | 9% |
| Vehicle | 7% |
| RCDV | 6% |
| Friend/relative | 4% |
| Respite | 3% |
| Motel | 2% |
| Hospital | 1% |

(Note: The Cold Weather Shelter was not open the night before the PIT count.)

Where respondents will sleep tonight:

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Thurman Brisben Center | 33% |
| Outdoors | 23% |
| Hope House | 9% |
| Other | 8% |
| RCDV | 7% |
| Don't know | 6% |
| Respite | 6% |
| Vehicle | 6% |
| Cold Weather Shelter | 3% |

B. Factors of Homelessness

First Time Homeless?

Yes: 37%
No: 63%

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

1 time: 48% (25) 4-5 times: 8% (4)
2-3 times: 38% (20) Greater than 5 times: 6% (3)

Chronically Homeless: 34% (47)

How long has the Respondent been Homeless?

Less than a year 59%
1-2 years 18%
3-5 years 15%
6-10 years 3%
10+ years 4%

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

Unemployment 54% (73)
Eviction/ Foreclosure 26% (35)
Illness 17% (23)
Wages/ Underemployment 16% (22)
Domestic Violence 13% (18)
Criminal History 11% (15)
Divorce 10% (14)
Credit 9% (12)
Substance Abuse 9% (12)

C. Services

Number who said they have the following services (2011 PIT in brackets):

(not exclusive categories, can choose more than one)

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|---------|
| Emergency Shelter | 71 (75) | Disability Services | 16 (10) |
| Permanent Housing | 7 (2) | Dental | 17 (8) |
| Transitional Housing | 16 (8) | Medical | 27 (32) |
| Legal Aid | 13 (3) | HIV/AIDS Services | 5 (5) |
| Substance Abuse Services | 16 (13) | Employment Training | 18 (2) |
| Mental Health Services | 22 (20) | Social Security Benefits | 20 (15) |
| Domestic Violence | 14 (6) | Unemployment Benefits | 11 (2) |
| Child Care | 8 (6) | TANF | 15 (2) |
| Food | 67 (48) | Food Stamps | 76 (84) |
| Transportation | 48 (25) | | |

Number who said they need the following services (2011 PIT in brackets):
(not exclusive categories, can choose more than one)

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|---------|
| Emergency Shelter | 32 (31) | Disability Assistance | 31(36) |
| Permanent Housing | 112 (120) | Dental | 79 (77) |
| Transitional Housing | 54 (50) | Medical | 50 (45) |
| Legal Aid | 33 (30) | HIV/AIDS | 0 (3) |
| Substance Abuse Services | 9 (15) | Employment Training | 43 (49) |
| Mental Health | 19(28) | Social Security Benefits | 35 (38) |
| Domestic Violence | 8 (8) | Unemployment Benefits | 20 (18) |
| Child Care | 15 (14) | TANF | 7 (12) |
| Food | 39 (37) | Food Stamps | 20 (32) |
| Transportation | 56 (64) | | |

D. Medical

Insurance:

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| None | 64% |
| Medicare | 19% |
| Medicaid | 7% |
| Private | 4% |
| Not given | 4% |
| Veterans' Aid | 2% |

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

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| None | 47% |
| Once | 27% |
| Twice or more | 26% |

Inpatient in the hospital in the last year?

| | |
|---------------|-----|
| None | 70% |
| Once | 17% |
| Twice or more | 13% |

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

| | |
|-------------------|-----|
| Hospital/ER | 51% |
| Family Doctor | 26% |
| Urgent Care | 10% |
| Nowhere | 9% |
| Health Department | 3% |
| Other/To God | 2% |