

Foothills Housing Network 2017-2018 Action Plan

Background and Planning Process

Background

The Foothills Housing Network (FHN) is a partnership of organizations working to prevent and end homelessness within the Rappahannock-Rapidan Region, comprised of Culpeper, Fauquier, Madison, Orange, and Rappahannock Counties. With the combination of impending turnover at a key leadership and administrative position; the implementation of new and expanded PSH programming; and the increasing scarcity of affordable housing units available to the area’s housing providers, The FHN leadership recognized major changes approaching in the near future. So in 2016, the Foothills Housing Network (FHN) approached the Virginia Housing Alliance (VHA) to assist in developing short-term, actionable strategies to guide the region’s homeless response system and affordable housing network through 2017 and 2018.

Plan Development

Beginning in December 2016, FHN convened a Planning Leadership Team to champion the six-month planning process and to lead community stakeholders through the development of the 2017-2018 action plan.

First, the Planning Leadership Team requested feedback from FHN member agencies, referral and partner agencies, and homeless/formerly homeless clients on where FHN was excelling in addressing homelessness and where there is room for growth. Four survey instruments were sent to Local Planning Group and housing/service provider leadership, front-line staff and case managers, and clients with first-hand experience of experiencing homelessness in the Rappahannock-Rapidan region. During this period, the Planning Leadership Team also instructed VHA to complete a high-level data analysis of the region’s homeless response system and affordable housing needs.

VHA aggregated the survey responses, completed the data analysis, and provided each of three planning working group with the results relevant to their subject areas. Over the next six-months working groups met three times to develop outcome-oriented strategies and action plans around specific components of the region’s homelessness response and affordable housing system.

This document summarizes the themes from the survey results and data analysis and outlines the goals and action steps that will guide Foothills Housing Network in 2017-2018.

By the Numbers: Homelessness and Affordable Housing in the Foothills Region

The most successful housing and homeless response systems emphasize data and performance to ensure that shelters, housing, service capacity, and funding are aligned to permanently end homelessness and provide safe and affordable housing options for everyone experiencing housing instability in the community.

The Virginia Housing Alliance completed a data analysis prior to the FHN planning sessions to equip the planning workgroups with the region’s latest homeless services and housing data. The following section outlines the themes presented in the data around the need for homeless service and affordable housing options; the costs of serving homeless and at-risk households within the FHN system; and the effectiveness of the system to quickly and permanently ending homelessness for these households.

Housing

Housing instability in the Rappahannock-Rapidan region is on the rise, especially for those in severe poverty. The percentage of extremely low-income renter households ($17,080 average annual household income) where housing costs exceed 50 percent of the total household income (severe housing cost burden/unaffordability) has risen by roughly 13 percent since 2010. These are the lowest income households most in jeopardy of losing their housing due to unforeseen financial crisis. To exacerbate the issue, affordable housing development/subsidies are not keeping pace with increasing housing burden among these poorest households.

HUD-assisted and other affordable housing options are limited relative to the number of extremely low income households. The regional rate of HUD-assisted units per 10,000 housing units is 37% of the average for localities across Virginia. There are roughly as many severely cost-burdened extremely low income households in the Rappahannock-Rapidan Region (2,040 households) as there are HUD-assisted or Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units (2,056 units). In other words, there are nearly as many low or moderate income households currently residing in affordable units (paying less than 30% of their income to maintain the housing) as there are households most in need of an affordable housing opportunity. Not accounting for housing needs of low or moderate income households, the region would need to double the number or HUD-assisted and LIHTC units just to meet current demand among its poorest households. *See Appendix II: Housing Data for more detail.*

Homeless Systems

The following analysis of FHN’s homeless response system’s data is presented in three categories: Need vs. capacity vs. investment.

Need

Every year the Foothills Housing Network conducts a regional survey of those experiencing homelessness during a 24-hour period on the last Thursday of January. This Point-in-Time (PIT) count is designed to provide a snapshot of the demographics and needs of those experiencing homelessness in the community, as well as, a glimpse into how effective the services that are available to these households are in ending their homelessness. The following are highlights from the past five years of FHN PIT counts:

**2013** – 155 individuals (12 unsheltered) 84 children

**2014** – 159 individuals (3 unsheltered adults) 156 in Emergency Shelter (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), or hotels/motels paid by a homeless service provider

* 36 families with a total of 74 children
* 7 chronically homeless individuals

**2015** – 112 homeless individuals in 26 families with a total of 82 persons (4 unsheltered single adults – 1 with a serious mental illness)

* 1 chronically homeless individual (Culpeper Shelter Ministry – Heat Shelter)
* 4 chronically homeless persons in 1 family household (Sheltered in Fauquier Family Shelter)
* Higher amount of persons sheltered in Victory Transitional Housing – 40 (10 households/33 persons and 7 singles)

**2016** – 74 sheltered/11 adult only households; 5 unsheltered (0 chronically homeless)

* No Count:
	+ MESA – Barbara’s TH (18 people in 2015)
	+ Fauquier DSS Motel Vouchers (2 people in 2015)
	+ Culpeper Heat Shelter (11 people in 2015)

**2017** – 132 individuals (32 families – 1 unsheltered) 3 unsheltered males (1 unaccompanied youth)

* + 26 family households in TH (80 people total in TH)/5 in shelter)
	+ 22 single households in shelter/9 in TH
	+ 3 chronically homeless singles (no families)
	+ 1 unsheltered family

Capacity and Investment

To get a sense of the regional capacity to meet the housing and service needs of those experiencing homelessness, VHA analyzed project level performance and cost data from the prevention/diversion, emergency shelter, transitional housing, rapid rehousing, and permanent supportive housing providers that partner to prevent and end homelessness in the Rappahannock-Rapidan region. Reflecting the latest Annual Performance Reports (APR), Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data, and information from FHN’s 2016 Virginia Homeless Solutions Program (VHSP) application, the following page provides highlights of this capacity analysis by program type.

Prevention/Diversion

Prevention services assist households at imminent risk of homelessness to remain housed through limited financial support. In the unfortunate event that a household cannot stave off homelessness, diversion services are designed to help them reconnect with a safe housing option if possible, instead of entering an emergency shelter or housing program. Research shows that these services are ideal, cost-effective (prevention costs per household are the system’s lowest at $1,749) options for lower need or transitionally homeless households - those that with limited service interaction can exit homelessness and likely never return.

As shown on the graphic on page 6, from 2016-2017 revealed that 88 percent of households entering emergency shelter, transitional housing, or rapid rehousing program accessed the system for the first time in at least two years – indicating that these were not the high need persons that often cycle through the shelter system. The data also shows that FHN’s prevention services are high-functioning. 83% of households that received prevention services from 2015-2016 remained housed in a rental setting with no ongoing subsidy.

Emergency Shelter

Playing a pivotal role in a housing first homeless response system, emergency shelter:

1. Provides access when and if needed as part of a coordinated community system for persons in crisis
2. Addresses the immediate basic need for shelter, food, and security in a safe, supportive environment
3. Triages need and connects people with an appropriate housing intervention as effectively and as quickly as possible.

Shelters provide time-limited support for homeless persons on their way back to permanent housing and are measured by the length of time persons remain in shelter and the effectiveness with which people exit into a permanent setting. Of the shelters recording HMIS data, the average length of time that people spend in shelter is 40 days – very close to the industry best practice standard of 30 days. The data also showed a clear break between lower and higher need clients within the shelter system – with nearly 60 percent of the clients exiting well before the 30-day average. Those that stayed longer, often stayed much longer – indicating that they may have had higher barriers to reentering permanent housing. See more highlights on the graphic on page 6.

Rapid Rehousing

A housing intervention for homeless clients with moderate needs, rapid rehousing programs provide short-term rental and service support to help quickly end clients’ homelessness and stabilize in their own permanent housing. The average rapid rehousing costs per household served within the FHN system is $5,448 – the third most expensive housing intervention. As a more expensive solution for ending a household’s homelessness, rapid rehousing is prioritized to clients that are unable to end their homelessness without a deep housing subsidy and more intensive case management engagement. As seen in the graphic on page 6, 53 percent of clients in FHN RRH programs had monthly income greater than $1,000, with 20 percent earning income greater than $2,000. Although this does not immediately indicate that these higher earners are not appropriate for RRH resources, it may point to an opportunity to more fully prioritize these resources for higher need clients.

Permanent Supportive Housing

Permanent Supportive Housing resources are directed at the highest need, often chronically homeless individuals in a community. Typically the most expensive per household intervention, PSH is designed to provide a housing unit, intensive case management and clinical resources to homeless individuals with disabling conditions (i.e. serious mental illness, substance abuse disorders, physical disabilities, etc.) for as long as necessary. PSH resources are new to FHN in 2017. Anecdotally, the need is high, although not necessarily represented in the community’s PIT numbers with just a total of 11 chronically homeless individuals surveyed since 2013. However, providers argue that the PIT numbers underrepresent the true need around the region.

Transitional Housing

Transitional Housing is a homelessness intervention consisting of up to two year stays in a temporary setting where clients are provided onsite services and then graduate out to permanent housing upon readiness. Transitional Housing has historically been shown to offer similar rates of long-term housing stability at a higher cost per household than client self-resolution, emergency shelter, and/or rapid rehousing. The most expensive intervention in the FHN system, transitional housing constitutes 34 percent of the total funds dedicated to homeless services in the region.



FHN Housing/Service Program Capacity vs. Investment

Survey Highlights

The following section provides the highlights and themes resulting from the consumer, service provider/case management staff, and Local Planning Group (LPG) leadership surveys conducted from February through April 2017.

Homeless/Formerly Homeless Clients

From February 2017 through early April 2017, 47 current and formerly homeless consumers with experience in navigating the FHN homelessness response system provided, through survey, their thoughts on where the system was functioning well and where it could improve its response to housing crisis. Of the consumers that responded to the survey, 10 were currently housed and had accessed their permanent housing through the FHN homeless service system. The remaining 37 respondents were homeless, either in transitional housing or emergency shelter, at the time of the survey. Of those in shelter or transitional housing awaiting housing assistance, roughly 40 percent expected to find permanent housing in the next three to six months, and roughly half did not know when they would find housing. The majority (66 percent) indicated that the last place that they stayed before falling into homelessness was either with a family or friend or in a hotel/motel unit, with another roughly 30 percent exiting a rental unit into homelessness.

To understand how the assistance that FHN offers households to end their homelessness aligns with the help that clients say they need, homeless and currently homeless clients were both asked a variation of the question, “What services or assistance do/did they need the most to end their homelessness,” as well as a variation of, “What services or assistance were you/have you been offered to end your homelessness.” (Top responses below in descending order of frequency):

|  |
| --- |
| What services or assistance did/do you need to end your homelessness and get you into permanent housing? |
| Formerly Homeless Clients (10 responses) | Currently Homeless Clients (30 responses) |
| Rental Assistance | Rental Assistance |
| Funding for assistance other than rent – things like deposits, utilities, rental applications, or other financial assistance | Help finding an apartment |
| Case management | Funding for assistance other than rent – things like deposits, utilities, rental applications, or other financial assistance |
| Shelter | Transitional Housing |
| Help with paperwork (Getting an ID, getting social security card, filling out rental applications, etc.) | Case Management |

|  |
| --- |
| What services or assistance did/have you received to end your homelessness and get you into permanent housing? |
| Formerly Homeless Clients (10 responses) | Currently Homeless Clients (30 responses) |
| Rental Assistance | Rental Assistance |
| Funding for assistance other than rent – things like deposits, utilities, rental applications, or other financial assistance | Help finding an apartment |
| Case management | Funding for assistance other than rent – things like deposits, utilities, rental applications, or other financial assistance |
| Shelter | Transitional Housing |
| Help with paperwork (Getting an ID, getting social security card, filling out rental applications, etc.) | Case Management |

When asking those that were currently housed what services they needed the most to maintain their housing, the top five answers listed in descending order were:

* Help with budgeting/money management;
* Case management;
* Help paying rent;
* Help accessing affordable and nutritious food;
* Help with life skills (e.g. paying bills, cooking, or looking after an apartment).

Consumer respondents reported that rental assistance and supportive services were essential in addressing their current housing crisis. They specifically noted financial mentoring as a prominent tool to help maintain long-term housing stability. The majority of respondents had income, with 77 percent employed and 15 percent receiving SSI or SSDI benefits. However, many respondents expressed a need for consistent employment including a living wage in order to maintain housing stability. Of the respondents, 73 percent were satisfied with the assistance that they received once becoming homeless and 58 percent agreed that it was easy for them to locate or access these services when they became homeless. *See Appendix for complete analysis of survey results.*

Service Provider Front-Line and Case Management Staff

The second survey went out to FHN provider front-line and case management staff, the individuals working directly with homeless consumers. Three staff members responded to questions covering awareness and expertise of best practice service methods; awareness of system-wide processes to prevent and end homelessness; and perceptions of where the system is excelling in housing and stabilizing persons, and where they recognize room for growth. Respondents agreed that all service providers work together to coordinate efforts and implement system-level processes to end homelessness, including involvement in community case conferencing, prioritization tools, and providing rapid responses to individuals experiencing housing crisis.

Respondents unanimously agreed that diversion efforts are being used to prevent episodes of homelessness. However, no one agreed that they are effectively reaching homeless individuals who are most in need of housing and services. Respondents suggested bringing in additional staff to support outreach initiatives, specifically, coordinating efforts with law enforcement officials and other community members who may interact with people experiencing homelessness. There was a general consensus that low-barrier, affordable housing was often difficult to obtain, but crucial for consumers to achieve housing stability. Staff maintained a need for affordable housing and permanent supportive housing programs to serve chronically homeless individuals.

Finally, the staff were asked to provide a self-assessment of their knowledge, training, and expertise on a number of best practice programs and service delivery models. The results showed that respondents felt strongest about their training abilities in Diversion, Rapid Re-housing, Coordinated Entry, and Housing Stabilization case management. However, all respondents reported little or basic knowledge of Permanent Supportive Housing programs.

Local Planning Group and Agency Leadership

The FHN leadership had similar responses as the front-line case management staff regarding system-level process, best practices, and areas for growth. The majority of leadership (85 percent) either agreed or strongly agreed that community providers effectively coordinate to deliver services, implement best practices, and share the same vision for ending homelessness. None of the LPG leadership agreed that the community is reaching those in the most need of housing and services. Almost all the respondents identified outreach as a crucial strategy to effectively engage and connect people with housing and services. Educating partner organizations about existing FHN programs was also suggested to help garner support with outreach efforts.

When asked, “What does homelessness look like in the region from your perspective? What is the extent of the problem?” responses included:

* Individuals and families doubled up, often in inadequate living arrangements;
* Couch surfing, moving from one temporary situation to another;
* Individuals living in places not meant for habitation such as tent cities, cars, and dilapidated housing;
* Public areas serving as protection from weather;
* Scarce resources for single men;
* Lack of adequate employment and transportation.

Overall, LPG leadership identified three major challenges facing the FHN homeless response system including; lack of sufficient funding (both competitive grants and local government contributions); getting services to those who need it the most; and accessibility of affordable, permanent housing.

Referral and Partner Agencies

The set of surveys went out to partnering and referral agencies with varying interaction with homeless individuals and families including; service providers, Department of Social Services representatives, rental assistance providers, medical and mental health providers. Of the 17 respondents, roughly 70 percent agreed or strongly agreed that their agency’s experience with the region’s homeless service agencies has been positive. Roughly 80 percent of respondents were aware of the process for connecting homeless people to services, and 70 percent understood the regional homeless response system.

Partnering agencies were asked to describe what homelessness looks like in their regions. Responses were similar to that of LPG leadership, but went further to include families living in motels, individuals released from incarceration, and low-income households at risk of homelessness. Common barriers included; mental health impairing ability to advocate for housing, scarce employment opportunities, accessibility of services, transportation, limited shelter capacity, and lack of permanent supportive housing.

Responses were not consistent with LPG leadership and front line staff when asked about reaching those with the most need. Roughly 40 percent of respondents do not agree that all homeless individual who are most in need are being reached (35 percent neither disagree or agree and 24 percent agree or strongly agree). When asked how to improve outreach and engagement strategies, suggestions included:

* Engage people in hotels/motels;
* Connect with schools to refer families;
* Locate hard to reach individuals who may not frequent shelters;
* Coordinate wrap around services (mental health, medical, SSA, DSS, etc.).

There was an overall consensus across all respondents regarding the challenges facing homeless service agencies (funding, affordable housing, outreach, etc.). However, partnering agencies placed greater emphasis on providing holistic, wrap around services to address underlying causes and barriers to obtaining housing such as mental health and substance abuse services. In addition to coordinated services, community education and public involvement was perceived as necessary to challenge the stereotypes and stigma often associated with the homeless population.

2017-2018 Goals and Action Steps

Presented with the results of the data analysis and surveys, FHN called three working groups to develop goals and actionable strategies to address the most pressing needs facing the housing network in 2017-2018. The goals and action steps listed here are the community’s most-informed strategies and are FHN’s consensus priorities for the upcoming year.

Working Groups

This action plan was made possible by the commitment of working group participants, both from within FHN member agencies and the surrounding community. Each group focused on one of three subject areas: homeless systems, housing, or LPG leadership and governance. Participants were led in facilitated conversation to develop realistic and impactful action steps to undertake through 2018.

Homeless Systems

The Homeless Systems working group focused on strategies to enable people at greatest risk of homelessness to maintain permanent housing and, when homelessness cannot be avoided, connecting people with appropriate resources to stabilize them in housing as quickly and effectively as possible. Recognizing an opportunity in the community’s new permanent supportive housing resources; the need to increase local government and philanthropic resources to account for threats to federal and state funding; and a need to increase data coverage across FHN homeless services, the working group established goals to fill all CoC-funded PSH units, increase local funding by 25 percent in 2017-2018, and bring an additional service provider into the HMIS system. See page 12 for action steps, timelines, and responsibility for meeting these goals.

Housing

Affordable housing options are highly scarce throughout the Rappahannock-Rapidan region. Given the immediate need and short-term scope of this planning effort, the housing working group agreed that FHN had to prioritize strategies to make more existing rental options available to the community’s housing providers now, while also working on longer-term development and policy options to increase the scope and scale of future developments around the region.

LPG Leadership and Governance

The Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission’s (RRRC) Lead agency duties for the Foothills Housing Network have evolved and grown in recent years. In addition to the typical duties of lead Continuum of Care agencies, RRRC has now assumed many of the day-to-day grant management responsibilities most often assigned to housing and service providers. Condensing these tasks under one coordinator position has resulted in time and resource strains that jeopardize RRRC’s ability to adequately fulfill either role. The LPG Leadership and Governance working group agreed that RRRC needs to be relieved of its grant management responsibilities to more effectively lead the Foothills Housing Network in 2017. Strategies for achieving this goal are listed on page 14.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Homeless Systems | **Goals**  | **Action Steps** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| By June 30, 2017, lease up all Continuum of Care funded PSH units | Identify units for the two chronically homeless individuals who are document ready as of May 9, 2017 (two additional individuals in the process) | FHN Housing Locator  | ASAP |
| Put Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) in place with People, Inc. to establish ongoing program management and fiscal agent responsibilities for administration of PSH grant | Cathy Zielinski | ASAP |
| Provide office space and staff capacity to People, Inc. as they recruit and onboard staff to manage the grant administration duties going forward | Cathy/RRRC | Through June 30, 2017 |
| To fill the remaining two PSH units, reach out to regional departments of social services (DSS); Rappahannock Rapid Community Services (RRCS); “First Call for Help” at Piedmont United Way; and others to receive referrals | Lisa Peacock – Madison/Orange | Through June 20, 2017 |
| Laura Brown – Fauquier  |
| Jan Selbo/Brandi Day – RRCS |
| By April 2018, increase local funding (Local government, philanthropic, and business) by 25 percent | Establish baseline dollar amount to measure 25 percent increase goal against | Cathy/Jan | By the end of July 2017 |
| Convene FHN agencies to develop fundraising campaign. Complete the following prior to the initial convening:* Establish “who will ask for what”
* Develop a breakdown of federal, state, and local support/program eligibility
* Develop “approaching the ask” resources:
	+ Data
	+ System orientation
	+ Personal stories
* Invite representatives from Madison and Orange Counties to attend and offer support for fundraising campaign (John Shanley)
 | Cathy/Brandi | September or October 2017 |
| By the end of December 2017, at least one new/formerly participating service provider is using HMIS | Convene potential HMIS participants to explore agency of best fit to be the first to engage or reengage. Complete the following prior to the convening:* Establish what data elements need to be collected to report on system performance measures (Cathy)
 | Cathy | Between June 30th and December 2017 |
| Locate funding for staff resources to offset data entry burden | Jan – Approach PATH Foundation | By June 30, 2017 |
| Approach SAFE and Fauquier DSS DV about collecting allowable VA-DATA information similar to HMIS | Cheryl Carter/Laura | TBD |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Housing  | **Goals**  | **Action Steps** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| By April 2018, FHN will make an additional 40 units of existing affordable housing units available for use by housing providers | Approach “Mintbrook” senior housing about working with senior clients experiencing homelessness  | Felicia Champion | By the end of May 2017 |
| Coordinate and conduct landlord engagement event in partnership with RRRCS. Complete the following prior to the event:* Create incentive/promotional materials to provide to prospective landlords at the engagement event
	+ Stability outcome data (% stably housed through RRH)
	+ Request landlord data (rents, unit vacancy, etc.)
	+ Focus on simply stating to landlords the incentives to renting with FHN agencies
 | Ginger, Anne, and Cathy | Late July 2017 |
| By December 2019, FHN will create an additional 40 units of new affordable housing within the region | Explore SRO opportunities with small “Mom and Pop” motel/hotel owners* Look into habitability requirements for PSH/SRO
* Explore grant funding to assist in the transition from motel/hotel owner to landlord
 | Cathy and Housing Working Group Participants | TBD |
| Explore redevelopment opportunity in the Department of Corrections’ property * Contact Marshall at Virginia CARES to explore project feasibility
 | People, Inc. lead with FHN in support | ASAP |
| By April 2018, all comprehensive plans that are up for renewal in the region will include affordable housing incentives | Develop calendar of comprehensive plan proceedings in all localities (specific focus on Culpeper, Fauquier, Madison, and any others up for renewal in 2017-2018) | Patrick Mauney  | TBD |
|  | Complete a regional affordable housing assessment. Tasks include:* Reach out to VHDA to extend capacity building grant deadline
* Access People, Inc.’s market study data for the region
* Explore consultant options for completing the assessment
 | Cathy | By end of September |
|  | After completion of regional affordable housing assessment, People, Inc. will use the results to initiate and lead advocacy planning | People, Inc. | Upon completion of AH assessment |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| LPG Leadership and Governance  | **Goals**  | **Action Steps** | **Responsible** | **Deadline** |
| By July 1, 2017, have fully implemented a new grant administration structure that removes project management duties from the FHN lead agency and relocates them with the grantee/fiscal agent(s) and direct service providers | Convene meeting with CHASS; People, Inc.; Community Touch, Inc.; and RRRC to clearly define grant and service roles going into FY2018  | Cathy | By June 15, 2017 |
| Prior to convening providers listed above:* People, Inc. will review internal staffing roles to evaluate capacity to take on program management duties
* RRRC will provide historical breakdown of grant spending, units filled, etc. to inform conversation
 | Cathy | Prior to meeting on/before June 15, 2017 |
| Develop Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between People, Inc. and CHASS and Community Touch, Inc. to define grant and service roles. To be included in the MOA:* Clear expectations for Housing Locator position
 | Cathy | Following meeting on/before June 15, 2017 |

Appendix I: Survey Results

**Homeless/Formerly Homeless Consumers**

* 47 respondents (10 of which are currently living in permanent housing)
	+ 15 living/sheltering in Culpeper
	+ 24 in Fauquier
	+ 2 in Orange
	+ 1 in Manassas
	+ 1 in Prince William
	+ 1 in Warren
* Of those in housing:
	+ 40% (4) moved in 1-3 months ago
	+ 30% (3) 7-9 months ago
	+ 20% (2) 10-12 months ago
	+ 10% (1) more than a year ago
* Of those not currently housed:
	+ 14 did not know when they would find housing
	+ 12 expected that it would be within 3-6 months
	+ 2 expected it would be more than 6 months
	+ 1 expected it would be next month
	+ 1 expected it would be next month
* 70% were satisfied with their current housing
* 50% of respondents indicated that the individual was not offered or placed in permanent housing within the first 30 days of homelessness.
	+ Reasons given for taking longer to find permanent housing:
		- High cost of rentals
		- Criminal record
		- Credit history
		- Difficulty finding a rental
* When asked, “What services or assistance did you need the most to get into permanent housing? The most frequent responses (in descending order):
	+ Rental assistance
	+ Help finding an apartment
	+ Funding assistance other than rent – things like deposits, utilities, rental applications, or other financial assistance
	+ Transitional housing
	+ Case management
	+ Help finding a job
	+ Mental health treatment
	+ Shelter
* When asked, “What services were you offered to get into permanent housing?”

The most frequent responses (in descending order):

* Case management
* Transitional housing
* Help finding an apartment
* Funding assistance other than rent – things like deposits, utilities, rental applications, or other financial assistance
* Rental assistance
* Shelter
* Help finding a job
* Mental health treatment
* Help to reconnect with family and/or friends
* When asked, “What services or assistance have you needed the most to keep your housing and not become homeless again?” The most frequent responses (in descending order)
	+ Help with budgeting/money management
	+ Case management
	+ Help paying rent
	+ Help accessing affordable and nutritious food
	+ Help with life skills (e.g. paying bills, cooking, or looking after an apartment)
	+ Mental health supports
	+ Health care
	+ Childcare
	+ Additional supports/treatment
* 31 of 40 respondents answered yes to having a paying job
* 6 of 40 indicated that they were receiving SSI or SSDI benefits
* When asked, “Think about you most recent time being homeless, what could have prevented you from becoming homeless?” The most frequent responses (in descending order)
	+ Rental assistance
	+ Other financial resources
	+ Help with budgeting
	+ Help finding a job
	+ Health care
	+ Mental health treatment
	+ Help reconnecting with family or friends

**Front-Line Staff and Case Managers**

* 100% strongly agreed that service providers plan and coordinate well to end homelessness
* 100% agreed or strongly agreed that services offered are ones that consumers need to quickly sustain housing
* 100 % agreed or strongly agree that the community uses a standard assessment tool to prioritize housing placement and services based on vulnerability and need.
* 100% agreed or strongly agreed that their organization supports and participates in joint meetings/case conferences regarding specific consumers to coordinate efforts with other service provider in the community
* 100% strongly agreed that the community employs strategies to prevent people from losing their housing and diverts them away from the shelter system.
* 50% disagreed that the community is reaching individuals who are most in need of housing and services (50% neither agreed or disagreed).
* 100% agreed or strongly agreed that case managers are appropriately trained and adequately skilled to stabilize formerly homeless households in permanent housing.
* 100% strongly disagreed that the community has an adequate supply of affordable permanent and permanent supportive housing units to accommodate each household’s needed level of support.
* 33% of respondents had “Little to no knowledge, expertise, or training” in Permanent Supportive Housing. 66% had “Basic knowledge with little to no expertise or training”.
* 100% had “Advanced or Expert knowledge, expertise, and training” in Diversion/Prevention, Rapid Re-Housing, Income Supports/Mainstream benefits, Coordinated Entry, and Housing Stabilization Case Management.

**Agency and LPG Leadership**

* Nearly 85% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that providers plan and coordinate well to end homelessness (15% neither agreed or disagreed).
* Nearly 85% agreed or strongly agreed that funding and service decisions are based on best practices in preventing and ending homelessness. (15% neither agreed nor disagreed).
* 85% agreed or strongly agreed that all essential partners are around the table and share the same vision for ending homelessness. (15% neither agreed nor disagreed)
* 58% disagreed or strongly disagreed that the community is reaching individuals who are most in need of housing services (42% neither agreed or disagreed).
* 66% agreed that services are designed to get consumers into permanent housing quickly.
	+ 17% neither agreed nor disagreed
	+ 17% disagreed
* 34% disagreed that high performing service providers and best practice programs are rewarded.
	+ 33% neither agreed nor disagreed
	+ 33% agreed
* 83% agreed or strongly agreed that priorities are focused toward meeting HUD’s goals for ending veteran, chronic, and family homelessness (17% neither agreed nor disagreed).
* 83% agreed or strongly agreed that the community uses a standard assessment tool to prioritize housing placement and services based on vulnerability and need (17% neither agreed nor disagreed).
* 100% agreed or strongly agreed that the community employs strategies to prevent people from losing their housing and diverts them away from the shelter system.
* 50% agreed that case managers are appropriate trained and adequately skilled to stabilize formerly homeless households in permanent housing. (50% neither agreed nor disagreed).
* 50% neither agreed nor disagreed that consumers successful in remaining housed.
	+ 33% agreed
	+ 17% disagreed
* 83% agreed or strongly agreed that the community has been successful engaging landlords to house formerly homeless persons.
* Aside from funding, respondents indicated that outreach, affordable and permanent supportive housing were continued challenges facing the FHN homeless response system.

**Referral and Partner Agencies**

* 70% agreed or strongly agreed that their experience with homeless service agencies have been positive.
	+ 24% neither agreed nor disagreed
	+ 6% disagreed
* 82% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew how/where to connect people experiencing homelessness to housing and services in the region
	+ 12% neither agreed nor disagreed
	+ 6% disagreed
* 71% agreed or strongly agreed that they understood the process by which the region’s homeless service agencies work together to permanently end people’s homelessness.
	+ 17% disagreed
	+ 12% neither agreed nor disagreed
* 65% agreed or strongly agreed that the essential partner are around the table and share the same vision for ending homelessness.
	+ 35% neither agreed or disagreed
* In response to what other partners need to be around the table to be able to end homelessness in the region, one respondent suggested that county administration needs to engage in a more active partnership.
* 40% do not believe that all homeless individuals who are most in need are being reached with housing and services. In response to how the community can improve outreach and engagement techniques, suggestions included:
	+ Engage with people in motels/hotels;
	+ Connect with schools;
	+ Locate hard to reach individuals who may not frequent shelters;
	+ Coordinate wrap around services (mental health, medical, SSA, DSS, etc.)
	+ Gather landlords and property owners
	+ Educate community providers, provide further outreach.
* Ongoing challenges/opportunities facing homeless service agencies include funding, limited shelter space, lack of jobs or reliable transportation, limited affordable housing stock for those with high barriers (credit, poor rental history, legal issues).

Appendix II: 2017 FOOTHILLS PLANNING: SURVEY THEMES AND HOUSING DATA

*Descriptions of data points, tables, and charts in this summary are courtesy of People, Inc.*

***…They usually can’t afford the monthly housing rental rates in our community.”***

**Housing Cost Burden (30%)**

This indicator reports the percentage of the households where housing costs exceed 30% of total household income. This indicator provides information on the cost of monthly housing expenses for owners and renters. The information offers a measure of housing affordability and excessive shelter costs. The data also serve to aid in the development of housing programs to meet the needs of people at different economic levels.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report Area | Total Households | Cost Burdened Households (Housing Costs Exceed 30% of Income) | Percentage of Cost Burdened Households | Total Renter Households | Cost Burdened Renter Households  | Percentage of Cost Burdened Renter Households  |
| Report Area | 60,075 | 18,639 | 31.02% | 13,675 | 5,804 | 42.44% |
| Culpeper County | 16,040 | 5,900 | 36.78% | 4,330 | 2,145 | 49.54% |
| Fauquier County | 23,130 | 6,665 | 28.56% | 4,600 | 1,670 | 36.30% |
| Madison County | 5,025 | 1,310 | 26.06% | 990 | 385 | 38.88% |
| Orange County | 12,620 | 3,839 | 30.42% | 3,045 | 1,314 | 43.15% |
| Rappahannock County | 3,260 | 925 | 28.37% | 710 | 290 | 40.84% |

Data Source: US Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Averages. Source geography: County |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Severe Housing Cost Burden (50%) – Extremely Low-Income Renters** | **Cost Burdened Households (Housing Costs Exceed 30% of Household Income), Percent by Tract, ACS 2010-14** Over 35.1% 28.1 - 35.0% 21.1 - 28.0% Under 21.1% No Data or Data Suppressed  Report Area |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report Area | Total Renter Households\* | Number of Severely Cost Burdened (Over 50% of Income) Renter Households with Income ≤ 30 HAMI in 2010\*\* | Number of Severely Cost Burdened (Over 50% of Income) Renter Households with Income ≤ 30 HAMI in 2013\* | Percent Change |
| Report Area | 13,675 | 1,800 | 2,040 | 13.33% |
| Culpeper County | 4,330 | 650 | 750 | 15.38% |
| Fauquier County | 4,600 | 680 | 670 | -1.47% |
| Madison County | 990 | 135 | 50 | -62.96% |
| Orange County | 3,045 | 255 | 485 | 90.19% |
| Rappahannock County | 710 | 80 | 85 | 6.25% |

\*US Census Bureau, 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Averages

\*\*US Census Bureau, 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Averages

***Housing - LIHTC***

*The Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program gives State and local LIHTC-allocating agencies the equivalent of nearly $8 billion in annual budget authority to issue tax credits for the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of rental housing targeted to lower-income households. This indicator reports the total number of housing units benefiting from Low Income Housing Tax Credits.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Report Area* | *LIHTC Properties* | *LIHTC Units*  |
| *Report Area* | *22* | *1,276* |
| *Culpeper County* | *7* | *537* |
| *Fauquier County* | *8* | *467* |
| *Madison County* | *1* | *16* |
| *Orange County* | *6* | *256* |
| *Rappahannock County* | *0* | *0* |
| *Virginia* | *905* | *81,842* |
| *United States* | *35,399* | *2,358,947* |

*Data Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2013. Source geography: County*

***Assisted Housing Units - HUD Programs - by Assistance Program***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Report Area* | *Housing Choice Voucher Units* | *Project-Based Section 8 Units* | *Section 236 Units**(Federal Housing Authority Projects)* | *Public Housing Authority Units* | *Section 202 Units**(Supportive Housing for the Elderly)* | *Section 811 Units**(Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities)* | *Other Multi-Family Program Units**(RAP, SUP, Moderate Rehab, Etc.)* |
| *Report Area* | *547* | *190* | *0* | *0* | *23* | *20* | *0* |
| *Culpeper County* | *193* | *121* | *0* | *0* | *23* | *5* | *0* |
| *Fauquier County* | *154* | *68* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *5* | *0* |
| *Madison County* | *33* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| *Orange County* | *162* | *1* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *10* | *0* |
| *Rappahannock County* | *5* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* | *0* |
| *Virginia* | *51,392* | *29,281* | *426* | *18,881* | *2,336* | *677* | *847* |
| *United States* | *2,447,016* | *1,231,377* | *45,514* | *1,119,864* | *123,980* | *34,299* | *36,527* |

***“Inability to access housing/services outside of their immediate counties due to transportation/accessibility issues…”***

*This indicator reports the number and percentage of households with no motor vehicle based on the latest 5-year American Community Survey estimates.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report Area | Total Occupied Households | Households with No Motor Vehicle | Percentage of Households with No Motor Vehicle |
| Report Area | 60,405 | 2,663 | 4.41% |
| Culpeper County | 16,436 | 833 | 5.07% |
| Fauquier County | 23,162 | 770 | 3.32% |
| Madison County | 5,093 | 260 | 5.11% |
| Orange County | 12,433 | 612 | 4.92% |
| Rappahannock County | 3,281 | 188 | 5.73% |
| Virginia | 3,041,710 | 194,153 | 6.38% |
| United States | 116,211,088 | 10,594,153 | 9.12% |

Data Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey. 2010-14. Source geography: Tract | Percentage of Households with No Motor Vehicle Report Area (4.41%) Virginia (6.38%) United States (9.12%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ***Households with No Vehicle, Percent by Tract, ACS 2010-14****Over 8.0%**6.1 - 8.0%**4.1 - 6.0%**Under 4.1%**No Data or Data Suppressed**Report Area* |

**Households with No Motor Vehicle by Tenure**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report Area | Owner-Occupied Households with No Vehicle | Percentage of Owner-Occupied Households with No Vehicle | Renter-Occupied Households with No Vehicle | Percentage of Renter-Occupied Households with No Vehicle |
| Report Area | 1,034 | 2.22% | 1,629 | 3.5% |
| Culpeper County | 293 | 2.43% | 540 | 4.49% |
| Fauquier County | 373 | 2.03% | 397 | 2.16% |
| Madison County | 85 | 2.13% | 175 | 4.39% |
| Orange County | 141 | 1.48% | 471 | 4.94% |
| Rappahannock County | 142 | 5.46% | 46 | 1.77% |
| Virginia | 54,940 | 2.71% | 139,213 | 6.86% |
| United States | 2,515,737 | 3.36% | 8,078,416 | 10.8% |

***“…so they have to find jobs within walking distance.”***

**PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Report Area* | *Total Population Employed Age 16*  | *Population Using Public Transit for Commute to Work* | *Percent Population Using Public Transit for Commute to Work* |
| *Report Area* | *78,896* | *892* | *1.13%* |
| *Culpeper County* | *21,457* | *166* | *0.77%* |
| *Fauquier County* | *33,471* | *430* | *1.28%* |
| *Madison County* | *6,075* | *29* | *0.48%* |
| *Orange County* | *14,463* | *191* | *1.32%* |
| *Rappahannock County* | *3,430* | *76* | ***2.22%*** |
| *Virginia* | *3,964,601* | *178,442* | *4.5%* |
| *United States* | *141,337,152* | *7,157,671* | *5.06%* |

*Data Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey. 2010-14. Source geography: Tract* | *Percent Population Using Public Transit for Commute to Work* *Report Area (1.13%)* *Virginia (4.5%)* *United States (5.06%)* |

**WALKING OR BIKING**

*This indicator reports the percentage of the population that commutes to work by either walking or riding a bicycle.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Report Area* | *Population Age 16*  | *Population Walking or Biking to Work* | *Percentage Walking or Biking to Work* |
| *Report Area* | *78,896* | *1,333* | *1.69%* |
| *Culpeper County* | *21,457* | *319* | *1.49%* |
| *Fauquier County* | *33,471* | *583* | *1.74%* |
| *Madison County* | *6,075* | *62* | *1.02%* |
| *Orange County* | *14,463* | *252* | *1.74%* |
| *Rappahannock County* | *3,430* | *117* | *3.41%* |
| *Virginia* | *3,964,601* | *109,681* | *2.77%* |
| *United States* | *141,337,152* | *4,764,868* | *3.37%* |

*Data Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey. 2010-14. Source geography: Tract* | *Percentage Walking or Biking to Work* *Report Area (1.69%)* *Virginia (2.77%)* *United States (3.37%)* |

***“…Homelessness is living on someone's couch for a few weeks here and there…”***

**OVERCROWDED HOUSING**

This indicator reports data on overcrowded housing from the latest 5-year American Community Survey. The Census Bureau has no official definition of crowded units, but this report considers units with more than one occupant per room to be crowded.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report Area | Total Occupied Housing Units | Overcrowded Housing Units | Percentage of Housing Units Overcrowded |
| Report Area | 52,399 | 1,033 | 1.97% |
| Culpeper County | 13,544 | 367 | **2.71%** |
| Fauquier County | 20,647 | 216 | 1.05% |
| Madison County | 4,553 | 79 | 1.74% |
| Orange County | 10,591 | 328 | **3.1%** |
| Rappahannock County | 3,064 | 43 | 1.4% |
| Virginia | 2,225,551 | 60,632 | 2.72% |
| United States | 90,364,208 | 3,852,710 | 4.26% |

Data Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey. 2010-14. Source geography: Tract | Percentage of Housing Units Overcrowded Report Area (1.97%) Virginia (2.72%) United States (4.26%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Overcrowded Housing (Over 1 Person/Room), Percent by Tract, ACS 2010-14** Over 4.0% 2.1 - 4.0% 1.1 - 2.0% Under 1.1% No Data or Data Suppressed  Report Area |

***“…or living in a "shack" on someone's property out in the country.”***

**SUBSTANDARD HOUSING**

This indicator reports the number and percentage of owner- and renter-occupied housing units having at least one of the following conditions: **1) lacking complete plumbing facilities, 2) lacking complete kitchen facilities, 3) with 1.01 or more occupants per room, 4) selected monthly owner costs as a percentage of household income greater than 30 percent, and 5) gross rent as a percentage of household income greater than 30 percent.** Selected conditions provide information in assessing the quality of the housing inventory and its occupants. This data is used to easily identify homes where the quality of living and housing can be considered substandard.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report Area | Total Occupied Housing Units | Occupied Housing Units with One or More Substandard Conditions | Percent Occupied Housing Units with One or More Substandard Conditions |
| Report Area | 60,405 | 19,012 | 31.47% |
| Culpeper County | 16,436 | 6,131 | 37.3% |
| Fauquier County | 23,162 | 6,409 | 27.67% |
| Madison County | 5,093 | 1,568 | 30.79% |
| Orange County | 12,433 | 3,971 | 31.94% |
| Rappahannock County | 3,281 | 933 | 28.44% |
| Virginia | 3,041,710 | 988,998 | 32.51% |
| United States | 116,211,088 | 41,333,888 | 35.57% |

Data Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey. 2010-14. Source geography: Tract | Percent Occupied Housing Units with One or More Substandard Conditions Report Area (31.47%) Virginia (32.51%) United States (35.57%) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | ***Substandard Housing Units, Percent of Total by Tract, ACS 2010-14****Over 34.0%**28.1 - 34.0%**22.1 - 28.0%**Under 22.1%**No Data or Data Suppressed**Report Area* |

**HOUSING UNIT AGE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Median Year Structure Built by Tract, ACS 2010-14** Newer than 1985 1976 - 1985 1966 - 1975 Older than 1966 No Data or Data Suppressed  Report Area |

**Renter-Occupied Housing Units by Age, Percentage**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Report Area | Before 1960 | 1960-1979 | 1980-1999 | 2000-2010 | After 2010 |
| Report Area | 30.14% | 25.37% | 30.3% | 12.99% | 1.2% |
| Culpeper County | 25.22% | 23.31% | 35.41% | 15.47% | 0.59% |
| Fauquier County | 30.9% | 24.99% | 30.14% | 12.48% | 1.5% |
| Madison County | 55.81% | 22.41% | 12.51% | 5.04% | 4.23% |
| Orange County | 23.49% | 29.62% | 30.73% | 15.4% | 0.76% |
| Rappahannock County | 42.88% | 28.05% | 25.7% | 3.38% | 0% |
| Virginia | 22.2% | 31.15% | 31.27% | 13.94% | 1.44% |
| United States | 30.66% | 29.12% | 26.36% | 12.73% | 1.14% |