

**HOMELESS IN SONOMA COUNTY  
2007**

**THE SONOMA COUNTY POINT IN TIME HOMELESS COUNT**

**NUMBERS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF HOMELESS  
PEOPLE SURVEYED IN SONOMA COUNTY  
January 26 through 31, 2007**

**By**

**The Sonoma County Task Force for the Homeless  
Georgia Berland  
Executive Officer**

**For  
The Sonoma County Continuum of Care**

**May 24, 2007**

# HOMELESS IN SONOMA COUNTY 2007

## CONTENTS

i.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v.
I.	OVERVIEW/SUMMARY .....	1
II.	OUR STUDY .....	3
	A. HUD MANDATE .....	3
	B. METHODS .....	3
	C. SPONSORS & COSTS .....	4
	D. PURPOSE AND GOALS .....	5
	E. WHO IS “HOMELESS” AND WHO IS INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT? .....	5
	F. ACCURACY AND CHALLENGES .....	6
	1. Comparisons to 2005 and Earlier Studies .....	6
	2. Impact of Permanent Supportive Housing .....	7
	3. Impact of Multiple “Sweeps” and “Raids” on the Count .....	8
III.	WHERE WERE HOMELESS PEOPLE FOUND? .....	9
	A. COMMUNITIES .....	9
	B. REGIONS .....	10
	C. TYPES OF PLACES WHERE PEOPLE SLEPT .....	10
	D. SHELTERED, UNSHELTERED, FRIENDS/FAMILY/CO-WORKERS 1. Sheltered/Institutionalized .....	11
	2. Unsheltered .....	11
	3. People Staying with Friends, Family, Co-Workers .....	11
IV.	HISPANIC ETHNICITY AND LANGUAGE .....	12
V.	GENDER .....	12
VI.	AGE .....	13
	A. Ages .....	13
	B. Homeless Children And Youth .....	13
	C. Homeless Seniors .....	14
VII.	WHERE PEOPLE LIVED BEFORE BECOMING HOMELESS .....	14
	A. Cities/Regions .....	14

<b>B. Types of Places .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>VIII. EDUCATION .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>IX. VETERANS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>X. DISABILITES .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>A. Mental Illness .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>B. Chronic Drug and Alcohol Abuse .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>C. Physical and Medical Disabilities .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>D. Dual and Triple Diagnoses .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>E. Developmental Disabilities .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>F. HIV/AIDS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>XI. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>XII. INCOME .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>A. Income Sources .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>B. Income Amounts .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>XIII. MEDI-CAL ENROLLMENT .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>XIV. LENGTH OF TIME HOMELESS .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>XV. FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO HOMELESSNESS .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>XVI. CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>XVII. FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>XVIII. USING THE COUNT TO MAKE CHANGE .....</b>	<b>22</b>

# APPENDICES

Pagination will be added when all Appendices are completed (July 2007).

## A.I. THE COUNT PROCESS

- A. Methods (Summary Events, Outreach, Shelter & Transitional Housing Counts, Ways of Gathering Information)
- B. Who we Included – Separate Figures for HUD-eligible (*note PSH not included*)
- C. Personnel – Staff and Volunteers, Homeless Participation
- D. Publicity/Outreach
- E. Incentives for Participation
- F. Sheltered Count
- G. Unsheltered Count
  - 1.) Events
  - 2.) Outreach

## A.II. PRODUCTION/DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT

- A. Continuum of Care Oversight
- B. Task Force Coordination
- C. Cost and Revenue Sources
- D. Submission to Jurisdiction
- E. Regional Reports for Local Planning

## A.III. VOLUNTEERS

- A. Volunteer Recruitment & Coordination
- B. Volunteer Lists

## A.IV. VOLUNTEER EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

## A.V. SURVEYS AND INSTRUCTIONS

- A. Survey Development And Pilot Testing
- B. English Survey & Instructions
- C. Spanish Survey & Instructions

## A.VI. ORGANIZATIONS CONTRIBUTING DATA

## A.VII. THANK YOU (INCENTIVE) GIFTS

- A. Purposes
- B. Process
- C. Items and Quantities

## A.VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009 AND FUTURE COUNTS

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*Homeless in Sonoma County 2007, the Point-In-Time Count* was a collaborative community effort. Over 400 dedicated volunteers, both housed and homeless, contributed their time, skills, and caring, as did over fifty service programs, churches, and community organizations, and the over 2000 homeless people who agreed to share their personal information for the survey. Each volunteer, staff member, and survey respondent played a crucial role. **WE ARE DEEPLY GRATEFUL TO EVERYONE, ONLY SOME OF WHOM ARE NOTED BELOW, WHO CONTRIBUTED TO THIS EFFORT TO REACH OUT TO, LEARN FROM, AND ASSIST SONOMA COUNTY'S HOMELESS RESIDENTS.**

**The Board of Directors of the Task Force for the Homeless** for taking on this intensive project and contributing space, equipment, energy, and staff & board time. Board members, including Nancy Lisk, Nathan Acuña, Gale Brownell, Jan De Wald, and Toni Fitzpatrick, gave substantial time as volunteers.

**The Sonoma County Continuum of Care & Steering Committee** for oversight, planning, funding, volunteer, project implementation, and report support.

**Continuum of Care Coordinator Jenny Helbraun Abramson**, for partnership in planning, survey design, data analysis, project implementation, and report input.

**The Sonoma County Community Development Commission**, for coordination, collaboration, meeting space, data analysis, funding, oversight, and support.

**Mark Krug** of the **Sonoma County Community Development Commission** for leadership, collaboration and support.

**Nolan Alexander** of the **Sonoma County Community Development Commission** for consultation on survey design, overseeing data entry, and producing literally hundreds of technical data reports.

**Funders, contributors, and donors of goods and services for making the Count possible.** (*A partial list. Please see Appendix II.*)

**County of Sonoma Community Development Commission**

**City of Cloverdale**

**City of Cotati**

**City of Healdsburg**

**City of Petaluma**

**City of Rohnert Park**

**City of Santa Rosa**

**City of Sebastopol**

**City of Sonoma**

**Town of Windsor**

**Individual Private Donors**

**Santa Rosa Active 20-30 Club**

**Hopper Self-Storage (Ron Coburn, Manager)** for use of a storage unit for storing and disbursing gift items.

**Peter Peyser** for translation of surveys and Instructions

**Event Producers, Venues, Site Managers, and Outreach Team Leaders**

- °**Nathan Acuña – California Human Development Corporation, North County Outreach, Spanish-Speaking Outreach & Publicity**
- °**Brian Bennett – Santa Rosa Outreach**
- °**Loretta Binder-Wheeler – Count Planning, West County Outreach**
- °**Brown Bag Program, Elizabeth Kemp, Three Events & Outreach, assisted by La Luz and Vineyard Worker Services - Sonoma, Boyes Springs, Glen Ellen**
- °**Gale Brownell – Sebastopol Event and Outreach**
- °**City of Rohnert Park, Cas and Dirk Ellena – Event & Outreach, Rohnert Park/Cotati**
- °**Committee on the Shelterless (Elizabeth Hale and Don Louvier) – Survey Pilot Testing, Event, & Outreach – Petaluma**
- °**Community Church of Sebastopol (Rev. Gene Nelson and Karin Seder) – Sebastopol**
- \***Cloverdale Community Outreach Committee (Jerry and Eleanor Webster) – Event and Outreach**
- °**St. Peters Church, Cloverdale Event**
- °**Jan DeWald – Monte Rio to Coast Outreach**
- °**Nancy Lisk – Guerneville Event**
- °**Susan Lowry – Monte Rio/Coast Outreach, Guerneville Event Assistance**
- °**Mary Agatha Furth Center of Our Lady of Guadalupe Church – Mark Morrissette, Father Angelito, Windsor Event**
- °**North County Community Services and St. Paul’s Church – Yvonne Milligan, Healdsburg Event**
- °**Social Advocates for Youth, Mearra Spencer, Santa Rosa Youth Event.**
- °**Unitarian Universalist Congregation, (Linda Harlow) – Santa Rosa**

**Homeless Count Committee and Subcommittee Members** listed in Appendix III.

**Shelters and Service Agencies** Listed in Appendix VI, for supplying invaluable data.

**California Human Development Corporation**, for meeting space.

**Cathy Carr, Philip Tapia, Loretta Binder-Wheeler and additional staff of Community Support Network and Buckelew Programs** for training Count Volunteers on safe and effective outreach practices.

**2007 Homeless Count Staff**

- Georgia Berland** – Project Coordination, Survey Design, Report Production
- Jesika Jennings** – Report Production Assistance, Administrative Support
- Shanna & Tucker Peterson** - Volunteer Coordination
- Laura Edwards** - Logistics Coordination
- Sandra Haggin** – Administrative Support
- Carl Chase** – Administrative Support

# HOMELESS IN SONOMA COUNTY 2007

## I. OVERVIEW/SUMMARY

**1974 homeless people** were surveyed in Sonoma County by over **400 community volunteers** and service agency staff between January 25 and 31, 2007. This is 258 (11.5%) less than the 2232 people counted in 2005. Possible reasons for the decline are noted in Section IIF of the report.

**1314 (67%)** of the 1974 homeless people counted were **eligible to be included in official HUD figures for the Continuum of Care Action Plan** (i.e. counted on January 31, and staying the prior night in a shelter, transitional housing, or place not meant for human habitation).

**Homelessness is a Sonoma County issue. Over 77% of homeless people surveyed lived in Sonoma County before becoming homeless. At least 120 still work here despite being homeless.**

**Homeless people live throughout the county, with the highest concentrations in Santa Rosa (57.5%), Petaluma (14%), and the Russian River Area (13%).** There are very few services at the River and homeless people there are generally unsheltered.

**356 people (31%) report Illness or Disability, with related limitations on income, had contributed to their homelessness. 30%-36% reported Mental Illness,** about the same proportion as in the 2005 Count. Rates for **Chronic Substance Abuse,** were **45% to 48%,** with **34% to 36% reporting Physical and/or Medical Disability,** both a few points above 2005. **314 (16%) report two types of disabilities.** In 2005 15% to 18% had dual disabilities. **An additional 135 (7%) report all three a 5% increase from 2005. Only 295 reported receiving Disability Income (22% of those who answered, and 15% of all counted).**

**45 % of the homeless counted were Sheltered, and another 3% in hospitals, jails, or treatment programs but scheduled for release within one week.**

**274 (15.5%) were “precariously housed”, either with friends, family, or co-workers, (262 people) or briefly in hotels /motels (12 people).**

**638 (36%) were Unsheltered,** staying in vehicles, emergency rooms, churches, short term in motels, in agricultural or industrial buildings, on the streets, or outside.

The **177 homeless families** represented a **55% decline in families** counted, from 394. There were **606 family members,** vs. 1114 in 2005.

**86% (153 out of 177) of families\* surveyed, and 83% of Unaccompanied Youth** were sheltered or institutionalized\*\*, compared with only **45% of Single Adults.**

**The Count of Homeless Children declined 38% to 284 (15%) in 2007 from 464 (21%) in 2005.**

A surprising and welcome **91% drop** was seen the number of **Unsheltered Children**. 360 were counted in 2005 and **only 31 in 2007**. **HUD did shift 18 year-olds into the adult category**, (lowering the children's count by the **23 18-year olds, all sheltered, counted this year**), along with an overall decline in numbers surveyed. But this dramatic a decline indicates that either many homeless families with children have left the county or shelters and services are helping them access housing.

**71 new Family Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) Beds, and 134 individual PSH beds (a total of 205)** that opened since 2005 moved people out of homelessness. The County now has 616 PSH beds -179 for families and 437 for individuals, 197 for chronically homeless. 204 beds are in development, 159 for families and 45 for individuals, including 12 for chronically homeless). Work by **shelter and service programs to assist families** to find affordable housing also may have made a difference.

**504 people (83%) were in 177 Families with Children, and 102 (17%) in Families of Adults Only. The Average Family size is 3.4 people.**

**158 (10.5%)** of 1500 respondents reported being **military veterans**. This is a **28% decline from 220 in 2005 vs. the 11.5% decline in the overall homeless number**. This may be due to increased employment and housing services for veterans. **74 (47%) of the veterans were Chronically Homeless**, about the same proportion as in 2005.

**Chronically Homeless numbers remain steady at 468 (24% of responses)** vs. 467 in 2005, despite a decline in 2007's overall homeless numbers. This may indicate the Count reached a larger proportion of chronically homeless with outreach to encampments.

**Comparisons may not easily be made between numbers in this and previous studies**, since Count timing, methods, and survey topics differ, as do community circumstances.

**In addition to the positive impact of 205 new Permanent Supportive Housing beds**, serious effects were also felt on this year's numbers due to **multiple encampment sweeps and immigration raids** that substantially lowered the number of homeless people willing to participate.

**People were counted over a full week**, which differed from the 24-hour study in 2005. **1314 (67%)**, including Sheltered people and those in Transitional Housing, were counted on the 2007 HUD Count Day, January 31, from which data was drawn for the annual Continuum of Care Action Plan. **Outreach** workers surveyed homeless people all week, though some primarily encouraged them to attend one of **twelve Count Events** on the 31<sup>st</sup>. Event turnout was low in certain areas, so some were never counted.

**24-hour Homeless Counts every two years in the last week of January are mandated** for all communities applying to HUD for Continuum of Care funding. Sonoma County has received up to c. \$2Million annually in HUD funding for transitional and permanent supportive housing and services.

## II. OUR STUDY

---

### **A. HUD MANDATE**

In 2005 The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) began to require all communities competing for Continuum of Care funds to conduct 24-hour “Point-In-Time Counts of sheltered and unsheltered homeless people in the last week in January every two years. Count results are included in the Continuum of Care Action Plan submitted annually to HUD to apply for the nearly \$2 Million received each year for transitional and permanent supportive housing and services in Sonoma County. The Count also gathers baseline and updated information for the county’s Ten Year Homeless Action Plan developed through the Continuum of Care.

HUD accepts statistics only for people seen in person on Count Day who were staying in a shelter, transitional housing, or a place not meant for human habitation on the night prior to the Count. This excludes people staying that night on a friend’s couch or in a motel.

Besides these definitional limits, 24-hour counts are noted in HUD’s Guide to Counting Homeless People as being severe undercounts. This is especially true in a large and geographically diverse County like Sonoma.

The Continuum of Care therefore decided to meet the HUD requirements for data collection, but to also collect data on those who are excluded from the HUD Count. Our communities could then effectively plan housing and services for the full range of people experiencing homelessness. The Count expanded to a full week (January 25-31, 2007), to reach more people in this huge and geographically challenging area. Outreach workers often interviewed people in encampments, on the streets, and at gathering places during the week. They returned to re-contact them on HUD’s Count Day (January 31), encouraging and sometimes transporting them to a Count Event to be included in the HUD figures. This report is on the Overall Homeless population counted. Figures for the HUD-qualified count are available as part of the 2007 Continuum of Care Action Plan to be submitted in June 2007. That Plan will be posted on the web site of Sonoma County’s Community Development Commission (<http://www.sonoma-county.org/cdc/homlescofc.htm>).

### **B. METHODS**

Sonoma County combined several recommended methodologies for its Homeless Counts to exceed the standards set by HUD. Every person was interviewed if possible. People were counted in shelters and service programs and in Transitional Housing by agency staff, sometimes verifying or adding data from records. Twelve Count Events were held in eleven towns, offering hot meals, gifts, welcoming volunteers, and service assistance such as legal advice, medical check-ups, haircuts, and veterans’ services, for

people to come in and to share personal and often sensitive information. Churches, community groups, and local government produced the events themselves, contributing volunteers and gift items. The Count coordinated and partially supported the events.

Outreach workers combed their assigned districts for up to six weeks in advance, locating and developing contact with homeless people and informing them of the Count. They went back during Count Week (January 25 – 31) to interview them and/or invite them to attend Count events. Outreach workers also interviewed people at meal programs, town plazas, labor centers, and public gathering places. A detailed description of methods including Outreach, Events, Incentive gifts, Logistics Survey design, Volunteers, and Data Collection and Processing is in Appendix II.

### **C. SPONSORS, STAFF, & COSTS**

The Homeless Count is a community project sponsored by the Sonoma County Continuum of Care, which is supported by the County of Sonoma and the Cities of Santa Rosa and Petaluma, and includes jurisdictions as well as public and private organizations and individuals in its Planning Group. The Count and report were produced by the Sonoma County Task Force for the Homeless, the non-profit coalition of public and private service providers, business, community and religious organizations working to end homelessness in Sonoma County through Advocacy, Community Education, Funding, Collaborative Program Development, and Research such as the Count.

Staff included Georgia Berland, the Count Coordinator and Executive Officer of the Task Force, Shanna and Tucker Peterson, Volunteer Coordinators, and Laura Edwards, Logistics Coordinator, purchasing and distributing Count supplies and Incentive gifts. All were part time.

The Sonoma County Community Development Commission contracted with the Task Force for the Homeless for \$38,800 to coordinate and produce the Count, and spent an additional \$25,220 for data entry, planning support, and technical report production at the Community Development Commission. Each of the eight Sonoma County cities and the Town of Windsor contributed \$16,652 in total to the remainder of project costs in proportion to their population. In addition a contribution of \$500 was received from an individual in the community, bringing the total cash budget for the Count to **\$81,172**, as shown in Appendix III, where revenue and expenditures are itemized.

The organizations and churches produced the twelve Count events. They and over 400 volunteers contributed substantial in-kind resources that were crucial to making the Count happen. The active participation of homeless service and support agencies in Count planning and implementation also represents a major in-kind contribution.

Homelessness does not discriminate – anyone can suffer  
misfortune resulting in loss of home. (Guerneville Volunteer)

## **D. PURPOSE AND GOALS**

**Goals for THE 2007 HOMELESS COUNT PROJECT were:**

1. **To collect and accurately report data requested by HUD** on the homeless population in Sonoma County, whether in shelters, transitional housing, or unsheltered during the Count period. This will help preserve about \$2 Million in annual funding from HUD for local housing, shelter and homeless services.
2. **To collect and report data countywide and to each city or region** regarding its homeless population. This will allow each jurisdiction and its residents to better plan and garner funds for housing and services for people experiencing homelessness. HUD-required data will be separately available for the Continuum of Care Action Plan, but the Count Report will cover the Overall Homeless population.
3. **To foster contact, communication, and connection between project volunteers, participating organizations, and homeless people.** To build interpersonal connections, a stronger sense of community, more awareness of the realities of homelessness, and broader involvement in creating effective solutions.
4. **To assist homeless residents** encountered during the Count with **services and referrals**, and to provide **gifts** of survival gear and food in exchange for sharing their personal information with us.
5. To develop **recommendations for future Homeless Counts.**

**This report covers countywide data. The Task Force will publish additional Count data, including some Appendices , more detailed Subpopulation Analyses, and Regional Reports in summer of 2007.**

## **E. WHO IS HOMELESS AND WHO IS INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT?**

The Continuum of Care determined that the scope of this report should exceed the standards set by The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), to provide the best data possible for local planning and program development. This report defines a homeless person as **anyone without a place to live to which they have a legal right.** It includes people staying temporarily in a motel, or with friends, relatives, or co-workers, who tend to move in and out of housing over time, but generally report they were without a home. We include people counted any time during Count week, January 25 through January 31, 2007, the last being official HUD Count Day. People who were staying the prior night in any of the circumstances on the survey, except in their own home or apartment, were counted, unless otherwise noted.

In its *Guide to Counting Unsheltered Homeless People (Revised September 29, 2006)*, HUD defines a homeless person as one who sleeps in a shelter, transitional housing, or place not meant for human habitation (e.g. the streets, abandoned buildings, vehicles, encampments, etc.). It defines “families facing eviction or households living with friends or family” as “**at risk**” or “**precariously housed**” and does not include them as homeless. In contrast to the 2005 Count, HUD will no longer accept data on homeless individuals in jails, hospitals, or treatment facilities who will be released within one week. We did count these individuals for the overall report but did not include them in HUD statistics. HUD accepts only Count data collected during one 24 hour period, in this case January 31, 2007. Only HUD-accepted data may be included in the Continuum of Care Action Plan.

## **F. ACCURACY AND CHALLENGES**

### **1. Comparisons to 2005 and Previous Studies**

Count surveys must meet changing HUD guidelines, and support local program planning. Changing definitions, requirements, study topics, methods, and circumstances make it difficult to directly compare **numerical** results of homeless studies year to year. Topics are intentionally modified for each Count to gather needed information over time while keeping surveys short enough to be easily and quickly completed. Comparisons of the **circumstances**, as opposed to the numbers, of homeless people over time do give us a sense of how the **nature** of the homeless population may be changing. Some dramatic changes, such as the reduction in families and unsheltered children counted, have occurred. However we can only compare factors we examined in previous studies. We have done so in the sections on those topics.

**The Sheltered Homeless Count is relatively accurate**, coming from interviews with residents on site as well as service records. **The unsheltered count is 59 lower** than in 2005. This is likely in part due to new supportive housing becoming available (see sec. E. 2 and 3. below), among other factors.

**Homeless Counts will likely never reach everyone, especially the unsheltered, in such a large and geographically diverse county.** HUD’s own research guidelines acknowledge this. Our weeklong Outreach efforts were intended to reach more deeply into the unsheltered population. The Count’s accuracy was impaired however by numerous “sweeps” (physical removal of encampments) just before and during Count Week (see section E.3 below), substantially impacting the number of people who consented to speak with us. Based on detailed reports from numerous Outreach and Event workers, **we believe Unsheltered Homeless people were substantially undercounted in 2007.**

## 2. Impact of Permanent Supportive Housing

Permanent Supportive Housing is affordable housing for people with disabilities that includes services to assist residents achieve stability and retain their homes. This long-term solution has proved extremely effective both nationwide and locally in ending homelessness for many disabled people who have been outside for years. Sonoma County currently has 616 Permanent Supportive Housing beds (179 in 55 units for families and 437 individual units, 197 for chronically homeless according to HUD definitions (see Section XVII below). 204 additional beds are in development (159 for families and 45 for individuals, including 12 for chronically homeless people). 205 of the current Permanent Supportive Housing beds became available after the 2005 Homeless Count.

None of the formerly homeless people living in Permanent Supportive Housing have been included in this study. Therefore the 205 beds added since the 2005 Count and the 616 beds overall can be assumed to have reduced the number of long-term homeless people we might otherwise have included in the Count.

Still, the number of chronically homeless has not varied despite a decline in the total people counted. This may be because the stronger and lengthier 2007 outreach component found disabled long-term homeless people in distant encampments who do not usually present themselves for services and may not have been reached in prior years.

“There were less the half the number in 2005. I suspect it was because of the badly timed ‘sweeps.’”

-Santa Rosa Event Volunteer

## 3. Impact of Multiple “Sweeps” and “Raids” on the Count

For the month prior to the Count, Outreach workers conferred with law enforcement, postal workers, local business and homeless people to find and contact unsheltered homeless people to inform and involve them.. The plan was to return to encampments during Count Week to interview people and encourage them to attend Count Events.

The Count Committee of the Continuum of Care, lead by the Sonoma County Task Force for the Homeless, was concerned from the outset about the delicacy of the effort to find and establish rapport with unsheltered people in encampments, especially those with many fears and few or no contacts with services. The initial trust these workers were building, as well as their ability to locate people and accomplish an accurate Count, might be disrupted by “sweeps” (physical removal of encampments) by agencies responsible for ameliorating the environmental, sanitation, public use, or trespassing impacts of encampments.

Efforts were made to ensure that “sweeps” would not displace people prior to the Count, or create an atmosphere of distrust of outreach workers. City/Town Managers

were aware of the Count since each jurisdiction contributed funding support. Every Police Chief and the Sheriff's Department, as well as the Santa Rosa Public Utility Department, was contacted regarding sweeps. Each agency was requested not to sweep encampments for the two weeks prior to and after the Count. Law enforcement might need to visit encampments as part of criminal investigations or in pursuit of suspects, but there were no plans for people in encampments to be otherwise displaced.

These organizations did not conduct sweeps, but at least five different sets of sweeps or raids did occur in the two weeks prior to and during Count week by agencies not previously understood by Count staff to conduct sweeps. The California Highway Patrol and both the Santa Rosa Public Works and Parks Departments removed over 25 encampments in the two weeks prior to the Count, some of which had existed for years. These encampments had disappeared and their residents departed when our Outreach workers went back to survey them, and many people with whom the workers had made contact now refused to speak with them. Homeless people in areas where sweeps had occurred went into "hiding", distrusting Count workers, in some cases thinking they had called in the sweeps. Turnout at Count Events in these areas was lower than expected.

"The sweeps undoubtedly affected attendance negatively."  
-Santa Rosa Event Volunteer

In addition, railway operators evidently used a machine to clear brush along the tracks between Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park on the day before and/or day of the official HUD Count, displacing encampments before our Outreach workers could survey the residents. And federal Immigration Control and Enforcement (ICE) conducted "raids" the week before and during the Count in San Francisco and in St. Helena in neighboring Napa County, leading many undocumented homeless residents to decline to participate.

The impact of sweeps and raids on Count results cannot be specifically quantified. Yet respondents, especially in areas affected by sweeps, or where undocumented homeless people reside (e.g. Santa Rosa, Sonoma Valley), were substantially fewer than anticipated based on numbers normally served in these areas, on reports of Count Outreach worker contacts prior to Count Week, and on the 2005 numbers. Many homeless people who are regularly served in these areas did not participate. Based on Outreach worker reports, the numbers not counted due to sweeps and raids are in the hundreds. Unfortunately, this lack of information makes the development of long-term solutions for these people, and for the community concerned about encampments, more difficult.

People often return to the same or nearby places after a short time. They know these places, and their alternatives are limited. The Task Force, in cooperation with Outreach Workers from several agencies, has made contact with organizations conducting sweeps to begin to explore cooperation toward permanent solutions for the community and for those encampment residents who seek them.

### III. WHERE WERE HOMELESS PEOPLE FOUND?

#### A. COMMUNITIES

Homeless people were spread throughout the County. More than half (57%) were surveyed in Santa Rosa, followed by Petaluma (14%), and Guerneville (10%, or 13% for the River Area from Guerneville to the Coast). The Santa Rosa homeless numbers are often inflated in the winter since vineyard, farm, construction, and tourism work is scarce in outlying towns and people gravitate to Santa Rosa where they have a better chance of finding work and help. The first chart below shows the number and percent of people found in and around each community. The second shows regional areas.

SURVEY LOCATIONS		
BOYES SPRINGS:	3	(0.2%)
CLOVERDALE:	19	(1%)
COTATI:	8	(0.4%)
FULTON:	41	(2.1%)
GEYSERVILLE:	10	(0.5%)
GLEN ELLEN:	6	(0.3%)
GRATON:	20	(1%)
GUERNEVILLE:	203	(10.3%)
HEALDSBURG:	38	(1.9%)
MONTE RIO:	42	(2.1%)
PETALUMA:	274	(13.9%)
RIO NIDO:	4	(0.2%)
ROHNERT PARK:	97	(4.9%)
SANTA ROSA:	1136	(57.5%)
SEBASTOPOL:	13	(0.7%)
SONOMA:	9	(0.5%)
WINDSOR:	2	(0.1%)
<b>Unknown/Other:</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>(2.5%)</b>
TOTAL	1974	

“One of the outreach workers was so committed to getting the information about the event to the homeless she took off her shoes and socks to wade across the creek to reach an encampment and put latex gloves on her feet before crossing.”

-Rohnert Park

**B. REGIONS WHERE PEOPLE WERE FOUND – (In order of homeless people counted)**

Santa Rosa:		<b>1136 (57.5%)</b>
Petaluma:		<b>274 (13.9%)</b>
River Area:	Guerneville, Monte Rio, Rio Nido, Cazadero, Bodega, Bodega Bay, Coast:	<b>249 (12.6%)</b>
North County:	Cloverdale, Fulton, Geyserville, Healdsburg, Windsor:	<b>110 (5.6%)</b>
Rohnert Park/Cotati:		<b>105 (5.3%)</b>
Sebastopol/Graton:		<b>33 (1.7%)</b>
Sonoma Area:	Boyces Springs, Glen Ellen, Sonoma:	<b>18 (0.9%)</b>

*(Note: 49 Unknown Region)*

**C. TYPES OF PLACES WHERE PEOPLE SLEPT**

The majority had slept the night before in an **Emergency Shelter (26%)** or on the **Streets/Outside (25%)**. **19% were in Transitional Housing**, and **15% with Friends, Relatives, or Co-Workers**. **47 (2.6%) were in hospitals, jails, or treatment programs** — and scheduled for release within one week.

<b>PLACES PEOPLE SLEPT</b>		
A) My own House, Apartment, etc.	<b>29</b>	<i>(not part of homeless total)</i>
B) Hotel/Motel	<b>12 (6.8%)</b>	
C) Hotel/Motel w/Voucher	<b>7 (0.4%)</b>	
D) Friends/Relatives/Co-Workers	<b>262 (15%)</b>	
E) Transitional Housing	<b>330 (19%)</b>	
F) Emergency Shelter	<b>459 (26%)</b>	
G) Vehicle	<b>151 (8.5%)</b>	
H) Streets or Outside	<b>439 (25%)</b>	
I) Public Place (ER, Church, etc)	<b>18 (1%)</b>	
J) Jail	<b>11 (0.6%)</b>	
K) Hospital	<b>6 (0.3%)</b>	
L) Detox/Treatment Facility	<b>30 (2%)</b>	
M) Agricultural/Industrial Bldg	<b>27 (1.5%)</b>	
N) Don't know	<b>3 (0.1%)</b>	
O) Other	<b>7 (4%)</b>	<i>(1762 total responses)</i>
No Answer Given	<b>212</b>	
<b>TOTAL HOMELESS</b>		<b>1974</b>

## **D. SHELTERED, UNSHELTERED, FRIENDS/FAMILY/CO-WORKERS**

### **1. Sheltered/Institutionalized:**

**796 (45% of respondents) were sheltered the night prior to the Count. 7 were in a Hotel or Motel with a service agency Voucher, 330 in Transitional Housing, and 459 in Emergency Shelter**

**An additional 47 (3%) were homeless people institutionalized in hospitals, jails, or treatment facilities, scheduled to be released within one week. While temporarily “sheltered”, many of these people will likely be without shelter on release.**

“An amazing difference in types of people, life experience “  
-Santa Rosa Volunteer)

### **2. Unsheltered:**

**638 (36% of respondents) were unsheltered**, including those who were in vehicles, public places like emergency rooms or churches, in agricultural or industrial buildings, didn’t remember, or were on the streets or living outside.

### **3. People Staying with Friends, Family, and Co-Workers or in Motels**

**262 (15% of respondents) were staying with Friends, Relatives or Co-Workers the night prior to the Count.** These people are termed “**precariously housed**” by HUD, since they generally have a place to sleep that is habitable. A disproportionate number of them are Hispanic, due, most likely, to cultural traditions of mutual and family assistance as well as groups of laborers staying together. Still they report themselves as homeless, since they are only temporary and sometimes intermittent guests in these homes and are otherwise homeless. Some call them “couch surfers”. However they are categorized, they were counted because they would benefit from housing and homeless services. An additional **12 (0.7%)** were “precariously housed” in hotels or motels\*.

## IV. HISPANIC ETHNICITY & LANGUAGE

---

While only **9%** (180) of the Count Surveys were completed in **Spanish**, **27%** (448) of those who responded to this question identified themselves as **Hispanic**. The survey only recorded ethnicity as Hispanic or non- Hispanic, adopting a HUD convention to respond to data needs for program planning in the community.

- **448 (27%)** of respondents who answered identified themselves as **Hispanic** , and 1188 reported they were not Hispanic.

- **35%** of 446 **Hispanic interviews were in Spanish**, vs. 9% in Spanish for all homeless.

- **70% of Hispanic homeless were male, and 28% were female\***, vs. 65% male and 35% female in the non-Hispanic homeless population. *\*(9 did not answer the gender question).*

- Of 345 Hispanics who answered the question, **241 (70%) had lived in Sonoma County prior to becoming homeless** this time. An additional 44 lived elsewhere in California, for a total of **83% having last lived in California**. **Only 46 (13%) reported having last lived in Mexico or Central America**.

- **47% last lived in their own house or apartment**. Another 23% reported they last lived with friends, relatives, or co-workers.

- A larger proportion of Hispanic homeless were counted in **North County** than for the overall homeless (**16%** vs. 6% for all) and in **Sebastopol/Graton (5%** vs. 2%). This may be due to the Labor Centers that have established relationships with Hispanic workers and were able to reach deeply into that community. **45%** of Hispanics were counted in **Santa Rosa**, **15%** in **Petaluma**, and **10%** in **Guerneville**. **9%** were in **Fulton**, **6%** in **Healdsburg**, and **5%** in **Rohnert Park** and in **Graton**.

- **16% of Hispanics were Chronically Homeless vs. 29% of those reported as not Hispanic** and **24% in the overall homeless population** who answered the relevant questions.

## V. GENDER

---

**Two thirds of the homeless people counted were male**, though the ratio varies with age and circumstance. Among **sheltered children under 18, and children whose families were staying with friends, family or co-workers, boys and girls are relatively equal**. Among **unsheltered children 61% are male and 39% female**.

Sheltered adults are **57% male and 43% female**. It is among **unsheltered adults** that the gap widens dramatically, with **401 (76%) men** of the 527 who answered the question and whose gender was known, and only **126 (24%) female**. **24 (80%)** of the 30 **institutionalized** adults counted in hospitals, jails, and detoxification programs were **male** as well. Among **sheltered seniors**, 9 out of 10 (**90%**) were **male**, as were **74% of those who were unsheltered**. Only one older man was counted in a hospital. Adult and senior **men** outnumbered women **staying with friends, family and co-workers by 70% to 30%**.

<b>GENDER</b>	
Male =	<b>1192 (65% of known gender)</b>
Female =	<b>635 (35% of known gender)</b>
Total where gender is known =	<b>1827</b>
Unknown/Not shown =	<b>147 (7.4% of total records)</b>

## **VI. AGE**

### **A. AMONG HOMELESS PEOPLE WHO ANSWERED THE QUESTION REGARDING AGE**

Under 1 =	28 ( <b>1.4%</b> )
1 to 5=	98 ( <b>5%</b> )
6 to 12 =	97 ( <b>5.1%</b> )
<b>Total under 12 =</b>	<b>223 (11.7% of known age)</b>
13 to 17 =	61 ( <b>3.2%</b> )
<b>Total under 18 =</b>	<b>284 (14.9%)*</b>
18 to 30 =	282 ( <b>14.8%</b> )
31 to 50 =	901 ( <b>47.5%</b> )
51 to 61 =	365 ( <b>19.2%</b> )
62 and over	63 ( <b>3.3%</b> )
<b>TOTAL where age is known =</b>	<b>1895</b>
Age Unknown =	79 ( <b>4% of total</b> )

*\*The percentage of children among the homeless declined from 21% in 2005.*

### **B. HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH**

Both the number and percent of homeless children and youth counted has declined substantially from 2005, when 464 homeless children and youth were counted vs. **284** counted in 2007. The decline in overall numbers of people surveyed impacted the **number** counted in this age group. Another reason for counting fewer children and

youth is a **change in age categories** to align with HUD’s Continuum of Care requirements, **moving 18-year-olds into the adult group** (18-30). Additional reasons for the decline in the **percent** of children and youth counted (from 21% in 2005 to 15% in 2007) may be partially ascribed to the opening of **additional Permanent Supportive Housing units for families** since 2005 as well as both new and existing **shelter and service programs assisting families** to find permanent affordable housing.

“Most of those interviewed do not want to be homeless. One man is raising his two young grandchildren and became homeless because his wife had a terminal illness. She recently died and all his savings went to her care. Services were not available to assist him and his two grandchildren. They are currently living in a vehicle.”  
-Guerneville

### **C. HOMELESS SENIORS**

The 63 seniors counted as homeless is just over the 61 counted in 2005, but this number **likely indicates a larger number and/or higher proportion of seniors than were counted in the past**, since this age category was also changed to conform with HUD requirements counting **only those over age 62** as seniors **rather than age 60 as in 2005**. **47 people age 60-61, mostly unsheltered, were categorized as adults for this count**. Of those in this year’s senior category (age 62+) who answered this question **the majority 34 (54%) were unsheltered**, living in camps, vehicles, or on the streets, and **10 (16%) were in shelter or transitional housing**. **One (1.6%) was in a hospital**. **10 (16%) were staying with friends, family, or co-workers**. It is likely we reached a large number of unsheltered seniors due to the enhanced outreach component of this Count.

## **VII. WHERE PEOPLE LIVED BEFORE BECOMING HOMELESS**

### **A. CITIES/REGIONS**

**Homelessness is clearly a local problem**, dispelling myths of large numbers of homeless people coming here from other areas for services.

**Over 77% (1026) of the 1326 people who answered the question lived in Sonoma County prior to becoming homeless this time.**

**92% (1215) of 1326 who answered the question had lived in California prior to this incident of homelessness, many in the Bay Area.** The rest came from other parts of the country, with 48 from Mexico, and one each from Guatemala, Honduras, and Germany.

**Percentages are basically the same as above for Chronically Homeless people. The percentages for Hispanic homeless are 70% in Sonoma County and 83% in California.**

**A. TYPES OF PLACES**

**576 (40%)** of the 1432 homeless who answered this question **had lived in their own home or apartment prior to this incident of homelessness. 18%** had lived **with friends, relatives, or co-workers**, a common progression into homelessness. Some may have changed their circumstances (e.g. gone into a shelter), but had been officially “homeless” prior to this incident, living in a car, on the streets, or in other places not meant for human habitation.

**159 (11%)** had been living in **Emergency Shelters before this incident of homelessness.** This is not unusual, since it often takes a more than one cycle of assistance to stabilize or find permanent solutions for homeless people. **35 (2%)** reported having lived in **Transitional Housing**, but now were homeless again.

**115 (8%)** had been living in **Jails, Hospitals, or Substance Abuse Treatment facilities before becoming homeless this time. This implies a need to comprehensively review discharge planning at local institutions, a goal of the 10-Year Plan for Ending Homelessness.**

<b>LIVING SITUATIONS BEFORE BECOMING HOMELESS THIS TIME</b>		
Own House or Apt.	576	40%
Hotel/Motel	31	2%
Hotel/Motel with Voucher	30	2%
Friends/Relatives/Co-Workers	247	18%
Transitional Housing	35	2%
Emergency Shelter	159	11%
Vehicle	65	4.5%
Streets or Outside	95	7%
Public Place (ER, Church, etc.)	5	0.3%
Jail	38	3%
Hospital	6	0.4%
Detox/Treatment	71	5%
Agricultural/Industrial Bldg.	10	0.7%
Don't Know	4	0.6%
Other	37	3%
Didn't Answer	542 (27% of overall homeless)	

## VIII. EDUCATION

76% of those who answered had achieved at least a **high school education**, though 24% had not.

### **HIGHEST EDUCATION ACHEIVED:**

A. Elementary	332 (24% of responses)
B. High School/GED	690 (49.5% of responses)
C. Jr. College	183 (13% of responses)
D. Trade/Voc. School	92 (7% of responses)
E. B.A.	61 (4% of responses)
F. <u>Advanced Degree</u>	35 (2.5% of responses)
	= (1393 responses – 70.6% of total)
G. Unknown	<u>+581</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1974</b>

## IX. VETERANS

158 (10.5% of 1500 respondents) reported being military **veterans**, as opposed to 220 (15% of prime contacts) in 2005. This is a **28% decline vs. the 11.5% decline in the overall homeless number** counted. This is possibly due to increased services to assist veterans with employment and housing, or could be a result of a general undercount of unsheltered homeless people as noted above. **74 (47%) of veterans counted are Chronically Homeless. More information on Veterans and other subpopulations will be released in summer of 2007.**

## X. DISABILITES

Homeless people often live with disabling conditions. Disability rates stayed basically the same over the last two years. 2007 Count disability questions were modified to ask each person about both personal experience of and treatment or services for various disabilities. In 2005 the survey asked whether the person or someone in their family had received treatment or services for mental illness, chronic drug or alcohol abuse, or physical or medical disability.

HIV and Developmental Disability were newly added to the 2007 survey.

“It can be a challenge to field the  
barrage of issues some people have.”  
-Santa Rosa Volunteer

#### **A. MENTAL ILLNESS**

**406 (30%)** of 1348 respondents had **experienced mental illness**, and **308 (36%)** of 858 respondents had **received treatment or services** for it. These proportions are comparable to the **31%** reporting such treatment in 2005.

#### **B. CHRONIC DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE**

**640 (45%)** of 1434 respondents had experienced chronic drug or alcohol abuse. **461 (48%)** had received treatment or services. These proportions are slightly higher than the **41%** reporting treatment in 2005.

#### **C. PHYSICAL AND MEDICAL DISABILITIES**

**460 (34%)** of 1338 respondents had experienced a physical and/or medical disability. **321 (36%)** have received treatment or services. **33%** reported treatment for such disabilities in 2005.

#### **D. DUAL AND TRIPLE DIAGNOSES**

**314 (16%)** of all people counted reported experience and/or treatment of two different types of disabilities. This is the same proportion reporting dual disabilities in 2005.

- **98 (5%)** of all counted reported both **Mental Health & Physical/Medical Disabilities**.
- **110 (6%)** reported both **Mental Health & Substance Abuse Disabilities**.
- **106 (5%)** reported both Substance Abuse and Physical/Medical Disabilities.

**135 (7%)** of all people counted reported **all three** types of disabilities. This compares to **9%** with **triple diagnoses** in 2005.

#### **E. DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES**

**115 (9%** of 1299) respondents reported a developmental disability, and **68 (9%** of 779) respondents had received related treatment or services.

#### **F. HIV/AIDS**

**22 (2%)** of 1260 respondents reported HIV, and **14 (2%)** of 746 respondents reported receiving treatment or services.

## XI. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Domestic Violence has been a part of the lives of about **30%** of homeless people surveyed, whether they are in families or on their own. Of **Single Adults** who answered these questions, **31% reported they had experienced domestic violence**, and **20% reported they had received some treatment or assistance** related to domestic violence. Among the six **Unaccompanied Minors**, two (**33%**) reported experience and the same percentage reported receiving assistance.

Among Homeless Families **27% of the 585 people in families** answering the question reported **experience with domestic violence**. The level for **Families with Children** was **31.5%**, though it drops to **17% for Families of Adults only**.

**25% of Families overall and 30% of Families with Children** say they have received treatment or assistance for Domestic Violence, with a drop to **14% for Families of Adults Only**.

**39% of Homeless people counted note Divorce, Family Dissolution, or Family Problems as one causative factor**. This does not imply violence in all these situations, but it is a likely component in many.

## XII. INCOME SOURCES AND AMOUNTS

### A. INCOME SOURCES

The income source most reported was **Employment/Business at 345 (26%)**, followed by **Disability Income at 295 (22%)** **Public Aid at 285 (22%)**.

SOURCES	YES*	NO*	NO ANS.**
<b>DISABILITY INCOME</b> (SSI/SSDI/SDI/Insurance)	295 (22.4%)	1023 (77.6%)	656 (33.2%)
<b>VETERANS BENEFITS</b> (Pension, Disability)	40 (3.2%)	1216 (96.8%)	718 (36.4%)
<b>EMPLOYMENT/BUSINESS</b>	345 (26.2%)	971 (73.8%)	657 (33.3%)
<b>PUBLIC AID</b> (TANF/GA/ Unemployment/Food Stamps++)	285 (21.6%)	1033 (78.4%)	654 (33.1%)
<b>RETIREMENT</b> (Soc. Sec./Pension/etc.)	38 (3%)	1219 (97%)	717 (36.3%)
<b>SAVINGS/INHERITANCE/ TRUST/FAMILY/FRIENDS</b>	93 (7.4%)	1167 (92.6%)	713 (36.1%)

\* % is of responses \*\* % is of total records



#### XIV. LENGTH OF TIME HOMELESS

A. UNDER 3 MO.	322 (21.1%)*
B. 3 TO 6 MO.	250 (16.4%)*
C. 6 MO. TO 1 YR.	260 (17.1%)*
D. OVER 1 YR	692 (45.4%)*
<i>(Total Responses)</i>	<i>(1524 or 77.2%)**</i>
E. NO ANSWER	450 (22.8% OF Total)
<b>Total 1974</b>	

<b>FOUR OR MORE TIMES IN LAST THREE YEARS?</b>	
YES	470 (34.8%)*
NO	881 (65.2%)*
<i>(Total Responses)</i>	<i>(1351 or 68.4% of total)**</i>
UNKNOWN	623
<b>Total 1974</b>	

#### XV. FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO HOMELESSNESS

The 2007 Count sought information on some of the specific factors that contributed to people becoming homeless. Not every possibility could be taken into account on a one-page form, so only certain factors were surveyed which were key to current program assessment and planning. This data, as all in the study, is dependent upon self-report, and people were asked to indicate all factors listed that contributed to their homelessness. Homeless people often have multiple problems, and most indicated more than one contributing factor.

Understandably, **856 (69%)** noted **Lack of Deposit/Funds** as a contributing factor, followed by **Substance Abuse or Mental Health** problems at **507 (41.5%)**, **Divorce/Family Dissolution** at **463 (39%)**, **Bad Credit** at **377 (33%)**, **Illness/Disability** at **356 (31%)** and **Eviction** at **292 (25%)**. Only one person (0.2%) indicated **Job Loss/Unemployment** as a cause.

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS	YES	NO	Responses	No Ans.
<b>Lack Of Deposit/Funds</b>	<b>856 (69%)*</b>	<b>388 (31%)*</b>	<b>1244 (63%)**</b>	<b>729</b>
<b>Bad Credit</b>	<b>377 (33%)*</b>	<b>765 (67%)*</b>	<b>1142 (58%)**</b>	<b>832</b>
<b>Job Loss/Unemployment</b>	<b>1 (0.2%)*</b>	<b>576 (99.8%)*</b>	<b>577 (29%)*</b>	<b>715</b>
<b>Illness/Disability</b>	<b>356 (31%)*</b>	<b>808 (69%)*</b>	<b>1164 (59%)*</b>	<b>810</b>
<b>Divorce/Fam.Dissolution</b>	<b>463 (39%)*</b>	<b>718 (62%)*</b>	<b>1181 (60%)*</b>	<b>792</b>
<b>Substance Abuse/Mental Health</b>	<b>507 (41.5%)*</b>	<b>715 (58.5%)*</b>	<b>1222 (62%)*</b>	<b>751</b>
<b>Eviction</b>	<b>292 (25%)*</b>	<b>860 (75%)*</b>	<b>1152 (58%)*</b>	<b>822</b>

## XVI. CHRONIC HOMELESSNESS

---

Chronically Homelessness person is specifically defined by HUD as someone single with a disability who has been homeless more than one year or four times in the last three years. Local advocates see many people in families who, other than the criteria of being single, meet the standard for chronically homeless and benefit from similar intensive services. A more complete discussion of Chronic Homelessness will

**468 people (24% of 1958 responses) met the HUD definition of Chronically Homeless.** This number is one above the 467 Chronically Homeless counted in 2005, despite a lower overall Count number. This may indicate either that chronic homelessness may have increased somewhat, or more likely that we reached and counted a higher proportion of Chronically Homeless than others this year by reaching more deeply into encampments.

A more complete report on Chronic Homelessness will be issued with Regional and Special Population Reports in the Summer of 2007.

## XVII. FAMILIES AND INDIVIDUALS

---

**606 Family Members were surveyed in 177 Families. 504 people (83%) were in Families with Children, and 102 (17%) in Families of Adults Only. The Average Family size is 3.4 people.**

**1391 Single Adults were Counted, and six Unaccompanied Youth (two twelve or under).**

**2 Families, along with 23 Individual Adults and one Unaccompanied Youth had stayed in their own home or apartment the night before.**

**86%** (153 out of 177) of families\* surveyed, and **83%** of Unaccompanied Youth were sheltered or institutionalized\*\*, compared with only **45%** of Single Adults.

**WHERE FAMILIES, INDIVIDUALS, AND UNACCOMPANIED YOUTH SLEPT**

	<b>Families</b>	<b>Individuals</b>	<b>Unaccompanied Youth</b>
My own Apt./House	2	23	1
Hotel/Motel	2	4	
Hotel/Motel w/ Voucher		3	
With Friends/Relatives/Co-W	20	190	2
Transitional Housing	71	122	
Emergency Shelter	59	242	2
Vehicle	9	115	
Streets or Outside	4	409	1
Public Place (ER, Church, etc.)		16	
Jail	1	10	
Hospital		5	
Detox/Treatment Facility	1	29	
Agricultural/Industrial Buildi	4	19	
Don't Know	1	2	
No Answer Given	3	195	
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>1391</b>	<b>6</b>

*This data includes people who reported sleeping in their own house or apartment the night before. Some reported becoming homeless on the day they were interviewed.*

*\* Includes the number of families, not the number of individuals in families.*

*\*\*Includes those who slept in their own homes, Hotel/Motel with voucher; those with friends, family, or co-workers; transitional housing, emergency shelter, jails, and hospitals.*

**XVIII. USING THE COUNT TO MAKE CHANGE**

Additional Count data that can be analyzed for subpopulation facts and comparisons is available from the Task Force. The Task Force will publish Reports in summer of 2007 on the unique character of families, veterans, chronically homeless, and other subpopulations. Regional reports on homelessness in geographical regions will also be produced to inform local planning. Count data will be used to update the Ten Year Homeless Action Plan overseen by the Continuum of Care, and is included in numerous funding applications for services to address documented needs.

## APPENDICES

**NOTE: APPENDICES I, II.B. & D., III.B., V., VII., and VIII. WILL BE ADDED AT A LATER DATE.**

### A.I. THE COUNT PROCESS

---

- A. Methods (Summary Events, Outreach, Shelter & Transitional Housing Counts, Ways of Gathering Information)**
- B. Who we Included – Separate Figures for HUD-eligible** *(note PSH not included)*
- C. Personnel – Staff and Volunteers, Homeless Participation**
- D. Publicity/Outreach**
- E. Incentives for Participation**
- F. Training**
- G. Sheltered Count**
- H. Unsheltered Count**
  - 1.) Events**
  - 2.) Outreach**

### A.II. PRODUCTION/DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT

---

#### **A. Continuum of Care Oversight**

The Sonoma County Continuum of Care set the parameters for the Count and provided the structure upon which the project was built as well as oversight and support. It selected the Task Force for the Homeless to implement the project. The Continuum of Care Planning Group had input on the content of the survey and the scope of the Count, and solicited City/Town funding support from each jurisdiction. Many of the volunteers on the several Count planning committees (e.g Outreach, Training) came to the project through the Continuum. The Steering Committee reviewed preliminary data and gave suggestions on the report. The Coordinator, Jenny Helbraun Abramson, writes the annual Continuum of Care Plan submitted to HUD in a national competitive funding process. The Plan requires data collected from the Count. Ms. Abramson collaborated on data to be collected, and assisted in soliciting data from programs.

#### **B. Task Force Coordination**

#### **C. Costs and Revenue Sources**

The 2007 Homeless Count cost a **total of \$81,172**, as shown in the 2007 Homeless Count Budget chart below. \$64,020 was funded through the Sonoma County Community Development Commission, including a grant of \$38,800 to the Sonoma County Task Force for the Homeless and \$25,220 of in-house personnel, printing, and supply costs. The eight Sonoma County cities and the Town of Windsor contributed a total of \$16,652, as shown in the City Revenue chart below. An individual in the community, Margaret Olwell, contributed \$500.

<b>Sonoma County 2007 Homeless Count Budget</b>			
	<b>SCCDC Funded</b>	<b>Funded by Cities and Towns</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b><u>COUNTY CDC COMPONENT:</u></b>			
<b>Personnel Costs</b>	\$24,720.00		\$24,720.00
<b>Printing, copying, office supplies</b>	\$500.00		\$500.00
<b><u>TASK FORCE COMPONENT:</u></b>			
<b>Project Coordination*</b>			
850 hrs. x \$ 38.24/hour	\$32,500.00		\$33,000.00
420 hrs. x \$15/hour	\$6,300.00		\$6,300.00
<b>Count Events</b>		\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00
<b>Incentives</b>		\$10,652.00	\$10,652.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$64,020.00</b>	<b>\$16,652.00</b>	<b>\$80,672.00</b>

\* Includes incidentals, supplies, and travel.

<b>CONTRIBUTIONS FROM CITIES AND TOWNS FOR 2007 HOMELESS COUNT FUNDING</b>				
	<b>2000 Census</b>		<b>Proposed Funding, pro rata basis</b>	
	<b>Population</b>	<b>Percent of Population</b>	<b>Incentives and Count Events</b>	<b>2005 Contributions</b>
Cotati	6,471	2.10%	\$350.00	\$500.00
Cloverdale	6,831	2.22%	\$369.00	\$0.00
Sebastopol	7,774	2.52%	\$420.00	\$0.00
Sonoma	9,128	2.96%	\$494.00	\$500.00
Healdsburg	10,722	3.48%	\$580.00	\$0.00
Windsor	22,744	7.38%	\$1,229.00	\$0.00
Rohnert Park	42,236	13.71%	\$2,283.00	\$3,000.00
Petaluma	54,548	17.71%	\$2,949.00	\$4,000.00
Santa Rosa	147,595	47.91%	\$7,978.00	\$5,000.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>308,049</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$16,652.00</b>	<b>\$13,000.00</b>

**D. Regional Reports for Local Planning**

Regional Reports will be completed in July 2007.

## **A.III. VOLUNTEERS**

---

### **A. Recruitment — By Shanna Peterson, Volunteer Coordinator**

The 2007 Homeless Count involved over 400 community, student, government, non-profit and homeless volunteers. Each was assigned a specific function at a count event or on an outreach team. As volunteers contacted the Volunteer Coordinator by phone or email, we discussed their experience working with people in crisis, availability for the event or outreach, and area of interest in volunteering. She worked closely with event coordinators to establish volunteer needs and assign individuals accordingly.

A crucial part of recruiting volunteers were the flyers that were posted throughout the community. Flyers listed the Count Event locations and contact information for volunteers. Another great source of volunteers came from local newspapers like “The Bohemian” and the “Press Democrat”. Other avenues for recruitment included local churches, fraternity and sorority groups, high schools, colleges and homeless service organizations.

The events that seemed to go especially well were ones with established teams or groups. The Rohnert Park event was produced by a representative of the City of Rohnert Park. She recruited many volunteers from within her organization and among close friends. They all were focused on exceeding prior year count statistics and having a fun time. The Santa Rosa event used many volunteers from the Unitarian Universalist Congregation, making it a familiar and comfortable location for those involved. The Petaluma event used their usual Petaluma Kitchen crew with a few extra volunteers for the day.

Most volunteers seemed to have a great time. Unfortunately, some felt under-used or wanted to participate for longer periods of time. Several volunteers attended the interviewer training and then were only able to participate as interviewers for 2 hours or less due to low event turnout. With the abundance of volunteers in some locations, event coordinators tried to give everyone the opportunity to participate in their desired areas of service - which often turned out to be short periods of time.

In future volunteer recruitment, one area of improvement would be coordination at local colleges. The Volunteer Coordinator was unable to count any homeless students or staff in these locations, although it is believed that many exist. One problem at the colleges was the schedule of the Count. Students were just returning from winter break and not very anxious to volunteer while adjusting to their new schedules. Professors had established curriculum for the semester and the Homeless Count seemed to fall at a bad time. Contacting these professors earlier in the fall could possibly make a difference so a project like this could be part of their curriculum in the spring semester. An area that produced excellent results was churches. Many volunteers came from churches in groups to volunteer. This is a great area to continue recruitment in future.

## B. Volunteer List

### A.IV. VOLUNTEER EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

Every count volunteer was given an Evaluation and Feedback form, which were returned with survey data. Below is a compilation of all comments and ratings.

#### **VOLUNTEER EVALUATION/FEEDBACK Unsheltered Homeless Count**

Your input and experience is crucial to:

- Help us learn from and build on this experience.
- Give depth, humanity, and color to the information we have gathered.

**Thanks for sharing your experience.  
Results of Volunteer Evaluations**

1. As a volunteer I:

Average # hours: 8.01

- 22 Helped plan/coordinate
- 14 Solicited donations
- 35 Sorted or inventoried gift items
- 23 Prepared or served food
- 36 Help prepare, set-up, or clear up a site
- 20 Transported donations, supplies or gifts items
- 7 Transported homeless people to or from events
- 27 Distributed thank you gifts
- 35 Hosted/greeted/assisted guests
- 62 Interviewed homeless guests at events
- 19 Interviewed in Outreach
- 12 Provided a service to homeless guests: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5 Coordinated a site or team
- \_\_\_\_ Other: Provided information about free clinic  
Security  
Homeless Resource guide/Noah information  
Provided information about Sonoma County Mental Health Services  
Provided quilts and hats  
In charge of showers and signs

2. I am a (check all that apply)

- 9 Student
- 23 Nonprofit service provider
- 24 Member of a community group providing or planning services
- 69 Member of a participating church
- 5 Local government employee
- 61 Community volunteer
- 7 Volunteer who is or has been homeless or without housing

3. What did you learn from the experience?

#### CLOVERDALE

- Compassion.
- That the homeless are present. That things need to be organized well in advance. That the form instructions could be rewritten.
- I was disappointed that Hispanics did not come.

#### GUERNEVILLE

- How many homeless people there are in the Guerneville area.
- Homeless situations vary widely from person to person.
- How special our community is.

- The tremendous need.
- It's a difficult time of year (winter) to do an accurate homeless count, too many are trying to survive by snuggling into their hiding spots – not as many couch surfers out and about.
- How easy it is to become homeless.
- Was able to assist a few visitors.
- We need more Hispanic community outreach.
- Homeless meetings.
- Homelessness does not discriminate – anyone can suffer misfortune resulting in loss of home.
- How giving and caring the community is.
- That the people I interviewed don't want to be homeless.
- That many people working together with a shared focus can really make a difference.
- Great Understanding of the homeless condition and real issues facing the homeless in my community.
- I'm glad I'm not homeless anymore.
- Humility "If not for the grace of God there walk-ith I."
- There are a lot of people in need and we have a giving community.

#### INTERLINK

- To appreciate my condition and home life.
- It was a very rewarding experience since I got to oversee the giving out of the gifts. Everyone was appreciative, some were hesitant to take much and it touched me to hear them say things like "someone else may need that more than me."
- I learned the basics the homeless survive on.
- A positive attitude makes a difference.
- More time needs to be devoted to interviews.

#### ROHNERT PARK

- I learned to appreciate my life and to volunteer more often.
- The big number of people in need of services.
- I learned about the work of other service providers.
- There is quite a variety of services needed.
- I learned to appreciate what I have and how I can support people that are in need.
- I learned that many people are sleeping in their cars because they do not have a home. Also, sleeping in different places: barns, friends, etc.
- There is a great need in the area.
- That something as minuet as a hair-cut can change the way someone's day is going.
- There are more homeless people than I realized.
- There is a definite need for local services.
- Where to look for folks in Rohnert Park.
- Turn this building into a homeless shelter.
- I learned how amazing things can happen with more people that are willing to give.
- We need to provide transitional housing for the homeless.
- That we can all do little things for those we are providing a service to.
- The great need.
- So many people in Sonoma County are just a step from homelessness.
- That people who volunteered really had judgments regarding homeless people. Comments made were not appropriate.
- A wonderful feeling that comes from helping others.
- About the other services.
- That homeless are just like us.
- We need a day shelter in Rohnert Park.
- The desperate need for more health, housing and rehab services.
- How to help the homeless.
- There is definitely a need for homeless shelter/services in Rohnert Park.
- People are so nice and giving. Willing to help people less fortunate.

#### SANTA ROSA

- Met a lot of nice people, including some of the homeless community.
- I learned more about the serious problem we have with homelessness and need for more supportive services.
- Putting a face on the word "homeless."
- It raised my awareness and outrage.
- A little about the struggles of homeless for day to day survival.
- The importance of organization to create a welcoming environment.
- It can be a challenge to field the barrage of issues some people have.
- The homeless are of all types. Also homelessness creates great psychological problems, or is the result of such problems.
- I will volunteer again next time they do the count.
- That without yellow neck banks, homeless people are no different (outside) than the people trying to help. That it's impossible to live on \$40/week.
- That many people homeless situations stems from mental illness and being here illegally.
- To be flexible. I was trained to interview – those services not needed.
- We seem to have a lot of homeless and many individuals willing to volunteer.
- Homeless are just like everyone else.
- We have really great people working here.
- Felt good to know others and see friends.

- I arrived at 3pm. We did not have enough people at that time.
- How alert and coherent many of the homeless were - in spite of living under conditions that would completely throw me.
- Homelessness can happen to any and all. No one is beyond.
- An amazing difference in types of people, life exp.
- Everyone interviewed was “different” from each other in needs and not stereotypical.
- There is a lot of goodwill in the world.
- Severity of drug and alcohol abuse.
- How enjoyable it is to be in contact with these people.
- How to stir chili, ha!
- A little more about homeless.
- Most of those I interviewed are not interested in getting “off the streets.”
- There were more volunteers than work for them.
- Lots of homeless
- Even people without homeless are cheerful and positive.
- Planning is everything.
- From the Unitarian Universalist congregation.
- The site was overstaffed with interviewers. I did 7 interviews in the first 40 minutes and then nothing.
- It took tons of planning.
- How lucky I am.
- All the different ways people become homeless.
- That people are homeless for many different reasons.
- That there are a lot of people who are trying to help.

SAY

- Learned about experiences of homeless youth.

WINDSOR

- For our area, more advertising, radio bilingual KBBF.
- There is an organized effort to provide various assistance to the homeless.
- Somehow we need to get the word out.
- What an excellent job the church did to welcome the homeless.
- The willingness of people to help.
- Need to get the word out, provide transportation to homeless to attend, go to the homeless sites.
- Hard to get homeless participation
- Church
- That this was the wrong time of year. We only had one family.
- That people are willing to volunteer their time.

4. What did the project do particularly well?

CLOVERDALE

- Mix and mingle with the homeless.
- Welcoming atmosphere.
- Food, interaction between everyone involved helpfulness of all.
- Well organized.

GUERNEVILLE

- Notifying the homeless of the event.
- Coordinated scheduling and information via the internet.
- Provided much needed clothes, food and other items to a community in need.
- Treat people warmly.
- It was an incredible effort on everyone’s part to coordinate this.
- Gather information – the number of homeless.
- Greet and provided contact.
- Very well organized from training through event.
- Coordination.
- Feed the folks a good meal. Gave out needed supplies and clothing.
- Coordinate service – manage flow.
- Let these people feel they have worth.
- Greet, welcome and work with, love and care.
- Service and care.
- Give out gifts and feed people and be real nice.
- Getting the count done.
- Did everything in orderly fashion. Better outreach.

INTERLINK

- I think the set up between the room for the interviews and the room for the gifts was good and the flow went well.
- Gave necessities.
- Pass out thank-you gifts.
- Everything went well with the Interlink process of interviews and distributing items to the needy.

ROHNERT PARK

- Welcomed clients warmly, respectively assisted and provided services.
- Everybody felt accepted and served.

- Provided many resources in a welcoming environment.
- Gave away food and blankets and necessary items.
- Everything excellent.
- Everything that the project provided was excellent, food, clothing, hair-cuts, showers, resources.
- Identify needs.
- Show that there are people willing to help those in need.
- Provided a real interface for less fortunate.
- Everything.
- Give out food and clothing to the homeless.
- Well coordinated event.
- Gifts/give-aways.
- Lots of outreach through flier-ing, thus lots of traffic at event! Great job!!!
- Good traffic flow.
- Make people feel comfortable and cared for.
- Great outreach and the services provided were excellent.
- Organizing the event, planning and organizing.
- Coordination among volunteers.
- Have lots of items to give away.
- The wide range of services.
- Got word out – lots of people.
- Planning and execution.
- Good volunteer turnout, good spirit.
- Routed people to informational tables regarding various services, housing/shelter info.
- Bringing people to the event.
- Everything I saw was done very well. Organized.

#### SANTA ROSA

- Brought many supplies to the distribution site quickly and sorted them for display or for consumption efficiently.
- The logistics – interview, flu shots, food, etc. – seemed to flow.
- Coordination of services (i.e. hair-cuts, flu shots, food, clothing, that the homeless people needed and appreciated.)
- Provide services and goods.
- Beautifully organized. I'm very impressed with the U.U. Congregation.
- Provided food and variety of services.
- Organization.
- Having lots of help/volunteers.
- Served good food with a friendly attitude.
- Organize volunteers.
- Provided a smooth system to get folks through the process.
- Site organization. Outstanding (at UUCSR)
- Organized services very well.
- Welcomed homeless guests, they all treated everyone with respect.
- Well organized, excellent volunteer recruitment.
- Orientation and interviewing was excellent.
- Everything, highly organized and as personal as possible.
- Well organized.
- Organized flow.
- Organized.
- Everything.
- Greet people.
- It was well organized.
- Training.
- Provided lots of clothing and sleeping bags.
- Recruit lots of volunteers.
- Services.
- Better planned than last time.
- Kept aware of helping people along.
- Organization of event was outstanding.
- I was well trained.
- Everything was well planned and executed.
- Organized lots of valuable resources. Lots of volunteers.
- Attracted homeless.
- Very well organized – excellent facilities and planning.
- Get information and help needy people.
- Food service.
- Yes.
- Made the homeless feel welcome and important.
- Got donations.
- It all seemed great.
- Good range of services. Nice, casual, warm atmosphere.

- The set-up was clean and attractive, volunteers were friendly.
- Gifts, food.
- Good organization for donations and volunteers.
- Well organized, except something needs to be done to shorten the line for gifts.

#### SAY

- Lots of gifts.
- Surveyed to gather information, serve food, give resources and gift items.

#### SEBASTOPOL

- Not sure.
- Offer kindness and a warm, friendly experience for the homeless community.
- Provided great meal, hair-cuts, gave out sleeping bags and clothes.
- Provide hair-cuts, good food, friendly people.

#### WINDSOR

- They were well prepared.
- Provided food, clothing, supplies to anyone in need.
- Communication and training. Great selection of gifts.
- Set up the parish hall with a wonderful supper, canned goods, and items to help the homeless, also warm clothing.
- Not many homeless participated. Plenty of helpers.
- Planning and coordinating.
- Set-up and planning.
- Prepared give-aways, gifts and food.
- Project was well prepared.

#### 5. What did the site or outreach team do particularly well?

##### CLOVERDALE

- Organize the event.
- Food preparation, food provided.
- Food, welcome, organization.
- Get word out to the homeless.

##### GUERNEVILLE

- Organize on site.
- Event coordinators were warm and welcoming.
- Honored fellow human beings.
- Did the best they could to find and count the homeless.
- At the site, things seem well planned. With lots of volunteers. Cannot think of anything they could do better.
- Good site.
- Very welcoming to guests, lots of help.
- Exposure to event.
- Good organization and prep work. Nancy Lisk did a great job.
- Everything! They trained volunteers, organizes site, and helped to make everyone feel welcome.
- Listen, cared, encouraged.
- Continuing organization and oversight throughout the lengthy event.
- They were compassionate.
- Everything.
- Worked very well with each other.

##### INTERLINK

- We had a big crowd waiting when we opened and the interviewers were very good at informing them of the process and getting them through quickly.

##### ROHNERT PARK

- The site allowed clients privacy during interview, eating, seeking services.
- The welcome and services.
- Organization.
- They have done a well done job.
- Well organized.
- Worked well together.
- Give needed people a step up.
- Give out food and clothing to the homeless. Plus getting information and data and providing service.
- Very welcoming.
- Reached objective.
- Prepare and stock.
- They made the homeless feel comfortable enough to participate in the count.
- Establish the areas where they would go do outreach to the clients and bringing agencies together.
- Networked.
- Good job!
- We were ready to serve lots of people with a kind personality and knowledge.
- Preliminary PR.
- Great folks and had lots of things for people – clothes, food, etc.

- Everything.
- Coordination of multiple efforts. Outreach prior to event significantly increased attendance.
- Worked as a team.
- Brought people to the event that may not have attended otherwise by providing encouragement and information.
- They were kind.

#### SANTA ROSA

- Directed people to the starting point with good signage.
- The logistics – interview, flu shots, food, etc – seemed to flow.
- Enthusiastically welcome participants.
- The training for interviewers.
- Provide the services, food and gifts.
- Kept volunteers well supplied and kept us informed. I was replaced right on time.
- Plenty of volunteers.
- Offered English and Spanish.
- Provided useful services.
- Interviewed, fed and provided services.
- Services.
- Be friendly.
- Hospitality.
- Everything was well planned and executed.
- All went well as far as I could tell.
- Well planned.
- Coordination.
- Interviewing and give gifts.
- Food service.
- Everything.
- Expressed compassion, kindness, efficiency and good will.
- Excellent coordination and traffic flow.
- Triaged guests quickly to interviewers.
- Friendly, grateful.
- Very well organized.
- Welcoming.

#### SAY

- Organized a plan and implemented accordingly.

#### SEBASTOPOL

- Made everyone feel welcome.

#### WINDSOR

- They work hard.
- Made the items available.
- Set-up was great. Food was delicious. Nice selection of gifts.
- Set up the parish hall with a wonderful supper, canned goods and items to help the homeless and warm clothing.
- Well organized.
- Receiving food and supplies. Volunteers and organizing.
- Inform volunteers.
- Many volunteers.

#### 6. What could the project do better next time?

##### CLOVERDALE

- We were well organized and had plenty of volunteers.
- Attract Hispanics, organize gifts sooner.
- Work harder to get Hispanics to come.

##### GUERNEVILLE

- Nothing.
- Everything went smoothly from my perspective.
- I have no suggestions.
- Spring, summer or fall count might bring in a more accurate count. Better written forms.
- Noise control.
- We need more Hispanic community outreach.
- Don't waste time sitting around inside the colleges. I saw 12 people – hours wasted.
- Provide means for people to locate shelter.
- Organizers did great.
- Even more outreach to bring more people who can benefit from the event.
- Get more/better donations/gifts a lot sooner than 5 months ahead.
- Maybe more time. We need to be able to give out gifts over a few day period.
- Get more people in.

##### INTERLINK

- If there is any way to change the time of year to do this, I think the count would be more accurate – especially in the summer.

- Have more bags.
- Outreach.

#### ROHNERT PARK

- Somehow convince homeless groups not to fear being the center of attention – “to be counted.”
- More space for interviews and privacy.
- I don’t know.
- Doing it again.
- No better ideas at this time.
- Maybe set up some private areas for interviews and medical exams.
- Keep going the way it is.
- Need women’s supplies – tampons, pads.
- Arrange the food sit down tables in the dining room so people could move more easily. The food service and provider was excellent.
- Communication/coordination! We did not know our “role” until afternoon before we participated and we still do not know what to do for second volunteer site at 2pm 1/31/07. We are trained outreach workers and know how to be safe and approach clients in non-traditional spaces. Those with substance use (active) and mental health issues. Next time, we will probably offer help on day(s) prior to event. Felt under-used. In general, unfortunately, coordination was poor, and left us as volunteers, frustrated. We want to help and take part!! Next time, we can also offer give-away health packets to put in incentive bags.
- Start much earlier 6-7am. Have folks who do community outreach give presentation on “how to’s.” Clarify plans for outreach/sites at least 2 weeks in advance in detail.
- More promoting for more people.
- We forgot feminine products.
- At this moment it is hard to say because this has been such a good event so far.
- More coordinated effort, earlier hours.
- Plan ahead more and return calls regarding the sites we are working at.
- Different – more open site, too cramped.
- Availability of ADA.
- Provide women’s sanitary pads, diapers.
- Put in the flyers a map and time in the same page, put it in Spanish and English in the same page in the front page.
- Don’t know, event went extremely well.

#### SANTA ROSA

- Interviews: 1 – More coordinated position, e.g. door person, interview requestor and name tag person. 2 – Person counting people as they came in – many people asked how many people had come through, but we weren’t counting. 3 – Have a “mini refresher” training on the interview form before interview begins.
- Provide dental screening.
- Be sure to include plenty of good fabric bags or even backpacks as a standard universal gift item.
- Nothing.
- Practice interviews (like mock interviews) during training to encourage standardized results.
- The training for interviews.
- Interviewer training should be separate from outreach training.
- Direct people to food from interviews.
- We need to advertise more.
- Get more flyers out? Provide transportation to events? Coordinate with more agencies to hold off sweeps.
- Short on room for clothing.
- Better training and create a better inventory form.
- Get more volunteers early on.
- More room for trying on shoes, clothes.
- I think it was done as well as possible. Maybe a bit more training in the form of interviews.
- Use gloves.
- Provide gloves.
- Forms could be a little easier to complete.
- Better distribution system.
- Drug counselors on site.
- Fewer interviewers. It doesn’t look good for guests to see 10 pair of interviewers standing around talking only to each other.
- Organization seemed mystifying.
- More press in need for donations; more outreach to faith community for possible interest.
- Let each interviewers roll-play and interview and have someone check the entries on the form.
- 

#### SEBASTOPOL

- Make sure that the homeless know it is a “safe” event (i.e. no INS or police, etc.)
- Offer transportation to church. Get word out to more homeless people. Have service providers available. (Shelters, etc.)
- Make signs ahead of time.
- Large signs posted outside church a week prior might help. Several homeless commented how far we are from town – maybe the site should be moved to the center of town.

#### WINDSOR

- More advertising.

- Reaching out to the homeless population.
- More posting of signs around town.
- Find a better time for Our Lady of Guadalupe to serve and /or find local homeless to come to the count.
- Need to get the word out, provide transportation to homeless to attend, go to the homeless sites.
- Offer additional ways to help.
- Communication to homeless areas. Earlier hour of day.
- Advertise more.
- Do this survey when we have more migrant workers in the area.
- There was non-participation from the homeless. Perhaps let them know by whatever means they employ.

7. What could the site or outreach team do better next time?

CLOVERDALE

- Attract Hispanics

GUERNEVILLE

- Nothing.
- Everything went smoothly from my perspective.
- I have no suggestions.
- A better checks and balances effort so volunteers know in advance what specific areas might be overlooked.
- At the site, things seem well planned. With lots of volunteers. Cannot think of anything they could do better.
- I don't know.
- Coordinate more outreach outside of event.
- Even more outreach to bring even more people who can benefit from the event.
- More flyers and notification of events with more reasons why it's important to homeless.
- Nothing, did a great job.

INTERLINK

- I thought everyone on the team here worked very well together. But we need to get a Spanish speaking person, even though this time we were ok without one.
- Start sooner.

ROHNERT PARK

- Teams could begin throughout the year to chat and explain the purpose of the count.
- No ideas at this time.
- I don't know.
- Continuing supporting people.
- Maybe pick up and drop off at homeless sites.
- Advertise more for hair-cuts.
- Arrange the food and sit down tables in the dining room so people could move more easily. The food service was excellent.
- More advance planning.
- Do outreach in churches.
- Site should have enough food when flyers say food.
- Have more designated areas.
- Contact the schools, especially teens that are homeless.
- Nothing, everything was great.
- I think the outreach team was very effective.

SANTA ROSA

- Someone posted outside to answer questions (those of us unloading goods were not well enough informed to answer)
- If there are extra volunteers, have maintenance or other volunteer jobs available.
- We need to outreach and advertise earlier.
- Allow more space for gifts. Make sure there are more vehicles for transportation of gifts (i.e. vans or trucks.) Ask in advance in church announcements.
- Fewer volunteers, more homeless.
- It did as well as possible.
- Make sure that everyone wears their yellow wrist bands.
- Run the lines so they don't block the bathroom doors.
- More clipboards.

SEBASTOPOL

- They were wonderful.
- Post large signs around site during preceding week.

WINDSOR

- Perhaps let homeless stay 1 night, sign in, do paperwork and have staff or volunteers stay and supervise. (I know insurance) Just a thought.
- Reaching out.
- Post a sign in front of the site.
- Nothing I know of.
- Need to get the word out, provide transportation to homeless to attend, go to the homeless sites.
- Maybe do the dinner earlier (before dark) or do in fall (after harvest)
- Finding areas where homeless will be staying and forward information regarding sites.
- Make it more well advertised.

- Better “advertise” by whatever means the outreach team employs.

8. Who, how many, and where might we have missed or undercounted people?

CLOVERDALE

- Spanish speaking homeless.
- Hispanics.
- Hispanics did not come.

GUERNEVILLE

- Not sure.
- I encountered one instance where someone was hostile toward being counted.
- It’s hard to get an accurate count in such cold weather.
- Do not know. Was not involved with outreach.
- Hispanics living in substandard and extremely crowded conditions, apartments, trailers houses,
- I don’t know.
- Latino population.
- Not sure, the event was well advertised.
- Wish I had the expertise answer.
- Each homeless person knows at least a couple more people that no one else knows, word of mouth.
- Maybe with the Hispanic people. The young living on people’s couches, etc.

INTERLINK

- We might have missed some of the people who come here who are mentally ill and very distrustful of anything they think had to do with the “government.”

ROHNERT PARK

- Groups and/or individuals who are afraid to be noticed.
- Some teenagers never showed.
- I don’t know.
- Good survey.
- Possible younger group.
- Need to do outreach on day of early a.m. Had 4 very experienced outreach staff in area of low visibility of clients. Feel we could have been utilized much more! (1) training. A gentleman came today at the event as an “expert” working with the homeless – yet he stereotyped description saying “if they have clean, crisp clothes, probably not homeless.” Looking for dirty people with dirty clothes because “they” usually don’t wash their clothes. All of our staff were greatly offended and would never approach folks in this manner.
- We needed to go out much earlier.
- Handled well.
- Early hours when people are still at homeless sites.
- To be out early in the morning to reach people early on.
- Don’t know, but seems there would be more if they could get to location.
- Teenage in “A” park under bridge.
- Under 18 population.
- Have Spanish speaking volunteers in the Spanish speaking community near predominately Spanish stores, churches.

SANTA ROSA

- No sweeps.
- There were less than half the number in 2005. I suspect it was because of the badly timed “sweeps.”
- Sweeps – BAD. Outreach – very good.
- The sweeps undoubtedly affected attendance negatively.
- My son is homeless, but he and his friends don’t count themselves as homeless because they have people they can bunk with – they rotate from homes and cars, after a few days at each site.
- I saw two older men this week that didn’t come to the event.
- Santa Rosa
- Did we get people near Kings Buffet?
- Doubt you missed mobile people.
- Everywhere. Many friends of our daughters do not consider themselves homeless.

SAY

- Not sure.

SEBATOPOL

- Graton, Occidental
- Those who couldn’t reach shelter.
- There must be more than the 11 people we interviewed in Sebastopol.

WINDSOR

- No one appeared for assistance.
- Windsor
- Possibly due to dark, cold, they did not come in.
- Don’t know.

9. Please rate the following from 10 (high) to 0 (low)

a) For Event Volunteers:

- \_\_\_ Physical site
- \_\_\_ Food (quality, amount)
- \_\_\_ Food (service)
- \_\_\_ Hosting/Welcoming
- \_\_\_ Guest flow/movement to different activities
- \_\_\_ Services available
- \_\_\_ Interview process – Survey format, length, guest participation level
- \_\_\_ Gift items available
- \_\_\_ Gift distribution process
- \_\_\_ Collection, oversight, return of survey forms
- \_\_\_ Adequate Spanish-speakers
- \_\_\_ Referrals or service assistance received by homeless guests.
- \_\_\_ Other (describe) \_\_\_\_\_

b) For Outreach Volunteers:

- \_\_\_ Clarity on where to look to find people
- \_\_\_ Completeness of area coverage
- \_\_\_ Ability to find people
- \_\_\_ Accessibility of locations
- \_\_\_ Cooperation of interviewees
- \_\_\_ Gift items available
- \_\_\_ Gift distribution process
- \_\_\_ Collection, oversight, return of survey forms
- \_\_\_ Adequate Spanish-speakers

Cloverdale	Guerneville Outreach Event	Interlink	Rohnert Park	Santa Rosa	S.A.Y.	Sebastopol	Windsor								
															A)
9.80	9.56	9.67	7.37	9.73	8.00	10.0	9.70								Physical Site
10.0	9.67	6.75	8.96	8.95	9.00	10.0	10.0								Food (Quality, amount)
10.0	9.92	10.0	9.04	9.52	10.0	9.75	10.0								Food (Service)
10.0	9.38	8.60	9.56	9.38	10.0	10.0	9.89								Hosting/Welcoming
9.20	8.00	8.67	8.41	8.64	9.00	9.00	10.0								Guest flow/movement to different activities
8.75	8.54	9.00	9.12	9.32	10.0	9.00	6.00								Services Available
9.60	6.89	9.00	8.74	8.89	8.50	10.0	6.33								Interview process-Survey format, length, guest participation level
9.00	9.36	9.17	9.36	9.58	10.0	9.00	9.63								Gift items available
9.80	9.36	9.17	9.39	8.67	10.0	9.33	9.75								Gift distribution process
9.67	9.38	9.33	9.55	9.08	10.0	-	9.67								Collection, oversight, return of survey forms
10.0	8.00	2.33	9.21	8.86	7.00	10.0	10.0								Adequate Spanish-speakers
7.50	8.11	8.33	8.63	8.61	9.00	5.00	7.33								Referrals or service assistance received by Homeless guests
															Other (Describe) -Need much more community service – housing (Guerneville) -Able to offer assistance here at later times (help filling out forms, applying for other services, etc. (Interlink)
															B)
10.0	3.60	8.00	8.09	-	-	5.00	0.00								Clarity on where to look to find people
10.0	6.20	7.00	8.60	-	-	5.00	0.00								Completeness of area coverage
10.0	6.20	10.0	6.10	-	-	5.00	0.00								Ability to find people
10.0	6.60	10.0	6.80	-	-	-	-								Accessibility of locations
-	6.00	-	7.50	-	-	10.0	0.00								Interview process – Survey format, length, participation level
10.0	8.25	-	8.33	-	-	10.0	0.00								Cooperation of interviewees

-	9.20	10.0	9.50	-	-	10.0	-							Cooperation/Teamwork of Outreach team
9.50	8.75	9.50	9.63	-	-	10.0	10.0							Gift items available
10.0	9.00	9.50	9.88	-	-	10.0	10.0							Gift Distribution process
-	9.33	8.00	9.75	-	-	-	-							Collection, oversight, return of survey forms
10.0	6.00	8.50	7.89	-	-	-	10.0							Adequate Spanish-Speakers
-	9.00	9.50	10.0	-	-	5.00	-							Referrals or service assistance received by Homeless guests
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							Other (Describe)

10. Do any experiences or encounters stand out for you that might help give the data we gathered depth, humanity, clarity, or color? If so, please describe this experience.

**CLOVERDALE**

- The homeless in our community were anxious to participate and be counted.

**GUERNEVILLE**

- No.
- No one specific story, but I can't tell you how many times people expressed gratitude for the coats and other warm items we gave.
- Teens are very under-represented in the homeless count.
- All my interviewees were cooperative, polite and grateful for any help given to them.
- Most of those interviewed do not want to be homeless. One man is raising his two young grandchildren and became homeless because his wife had a terminal illness. She recently dies and all his savings went to her care. Services were not available to assist him and his two grandchildren. They are currently living in a vehicle.
- Making a good, strong, heart connection with interviewees when beginning interview.
- A lot of homeless look at this event as a "rescue attempt" as opposed to a HUD count. Lots of homeless are drug users who wish to remain in their "peril" to continue their lifestyle. We need hotels like in the European countries – always a place to stay if they need it.
- Each person that I interviewed had a story. All of them touching.

**INTERLINK**

- The ones that touched me were those who turned down some of the gifts, saying they already had whatever the particular item was. These were usually the ones that looked like they needed the most. This was in opposition to those who came in and wanted everything and more.
- I was amazed at how many people slept outside.

**ROHNERT PARK**

- Some heartbreaking situations, hard to describe.
- The leaders, organizers and volunteers were very pleasant and cordial to each other and the homeless participants.
- Sonoma County Cal Works evicting 2 clients from an encampment on day of count!! Clients couldn't participate in event.
- Officials for the county (possibly public works) were evacuating some homeless folks out of their encampment which not only made it extremely difficult to survey them and provide any other services they many have needed, but apparently there had been an agreement between the county and the Homeless Task Force that evacuations/harassment of homeless folks would be postponed until later months to ensure the bi-annual homeless count would run smoothly and for the benefits of the whole community.
- These people that came in to take advantage of this project are amazing people and they feel they are not worth our help sometimes, but I believe they deserve more than me.
- More media coverage.
- Training for people working with the homeless. We were told by this man is the one to talk to – how to find homeless people, he stated, oh you'll know they're homeless cause they wore dirty pants- talk about judgment! He needs class.
- I just feel that the planning could have been much better. We are outreach workers and if our services are used we have the knowledge.
- I was struck by the number of people who were on the verge of tears – either because of their own situation or because of the amount of help offered. It's moving to reach people through the material things we can provide, most especially through our hearts.
- One of the outreach workers was so committed to getting the information about the event to the homeless she took off her shoes and socks to wade across the creek to reach an encampment and put latex gloves on her feet before crossing.

**SEBASTOPOL**

- It seems to help to have someone sitting at the table with them when they (the homeless) are eating. I was there and a couple of people did a lot of talking and said they felt much better for it.
- One woman in particular stands out. She was shy and somewhat nervous but after awhile she relaxed and ate. She got a haircut and opened up. She smiled and showed me a picture of her child. We spoke and I enjoyed meeting her very much. She was a kind sweet woman down on her luck. I wished her well. I won't forget her!
- One homeless person spoke about how we could be using existing buildings and parking lots for trailers, cars, etc. Like the Sonoma County Fairgrounds! Instead of spending money on new buildings.

**WINDSOR**

- I just wish I had the energy to help more.
- No opportunity to comment since there was no attendance.

- I'm sorry to say I had no one to interview.

11. Any ideas generated for solutions to homelessness/affordable housing needs?

CLOVERDALE

- No – unfortunately.

GUERNEVILLE

- Bring the politicians to the camp sites and let them see for themselves.
- I have heard some wonderful ideas and they slip into a category of “study” – here we are 2 years after 2005 count and what’s done, tangible.
- I wish.
- These people need shelter from the elements. Why can’t we house them in the Vets Building?
- Lower rents in trailer parks. Affordable rentals for families.
- One homeless woman brought a mini tape recorder interviewing police response to the individual homeless persons.
- Gave a group of homeless – set them up in a big monitored house – have them work various hours doing community based chores (i.e. trash pick up, carpentry, etc.)
- Yes, get money here on the river for on-site residents and other on site services (i.e. DAAC, Legal, etc.)

INTERLINK

- It seemed to me many people dropped out of the process of applying for services, aid (SSI or medical) because of confusion over forms, lack of permanent address or inability to follow through.
- HUD and resource guide.

ROHNERT PARK

- Single women or men might be able to share rentals after interview process. 2 families on SSI might afford rentals.
- Not at this time.
- Provide once monthly services if possible to homeless in this area.
- For Rohnert Park to provide a homeless shelter and to provide monthly services like today to the homeless.
- Mobile health care.
- More info about job opportunities and drug and alcohol treatment.
- Permanent shelter - Rohnert Park to provide permits building together and construction volunteers, use this site. Rehab.
- I think they need onsite counseling.
- More outreach counts, not just once a year.
- Build a shelter in buildings that are vacant and not used.
- Have city provide money to pay electric or water. Have city provide vouchers to Goodwill. Do this event once a year.
- Folks talking about how to live in your car when it’s illegal.
- Set up a couple of store fronts for drop-in services such as health, job and housing services. Mental health services much needed too.
- Secure a parcel of land west of Redwood drive. Work with multiple non-profit agencies to construct a homeless shelter and service center using salvaged mobile homes.

SEBASTOPOL

- Offer hotel rooms (vouchers) to get a bed or shower.
- Discussed: Area churches need to discuss shelter and food possible – get together.

WINDSOR

- More shelters.
- At this time, the number /condition of the homeless appear indeterminate.

12. Other comments or suggestions?

CLOVERDALE

- Questionnaire confusing and directions worse. Should be simplified – poorly designed.

GUERNEVILLE

- None.
- Shelter for the homeless – accessible to all. Currently, St. Herbert’s is a step in the right direction – unless you have a child or you’re under 18 years of age.
- I am grateful for a chance to help. Really thankful.
- Thank you for the honor to serve my community.
- Not enough room, even a whole page! Ha! Ha! Ha!
- Thank you so much for giving me this opportunity.

ROHNERT PARK

- Keep up the good work.
- Have quarterly meeting to coordinate groups and city services.
- Could have used more private space for some intake working (i.e. mental health)
- Thanks for your hard work.
- Job information.
- It was a pleasure to help, hope to continue being involved every year.
- We would like to offer this drop-in on a monthly basis.

SAY

- I think the homeless count is a fabulous idea.

SEBASTOPOL

- One lady told me she didn’t feel like such an outcast after being there.

- Offer this meal/service monthly.
- WINDSOR
- Good luck! God bless you for all your work.
  - I was impressed by the organized efforts made in the attempt to aid the homeless.
  - Provide transportation for volunteers to go to sites.
  - Distribute give-aways to homeless sites. Do survey at known homeless sites.
  - Somehow get the word out to the homeless.

## **A.V. SURVEYS AND INSTRUCTIONS**

---

- A. Survey Development And Pilot Testing**
- B. English Survey & Instructions**
- C. Spanish Survey & Instructions**

## **A.VI. ORGANIZATIONS CONTRIBUTING DATA FOR REPORT**

---

Catholic Charities  
Brookwood Shelter

Catholic Charities  
Community Turning Point

Catholic Charities  
Family Support Center

Catholic Charities  
Family Support Center Transitional Housing

Catholic Charities  
Homeless Services Center

Catholic Charities  
Samuel Jones Hall Shelter

Catholic Charities  
Russell Avenue Shelter

Cloverdale Community Outreach Committee  
Wallace House

Committee on the Shelterless  
Family Center

Committee on the Shelterless

Family Shared Transitional Housing

Committee on the Shelterless  
Mary Isaac Center Emergency Shelter

Committee on the Shelterless  
Mary Isaac Center Transitional Housing

Committee on the Shelterless  
Mary Isaac Center Petaluma Kitchen

Community Action Partnership Sonoma County  
Aston Avenue House

Community Action Partnership Sonoma County  
Giffen House

Community Action Partnership Sonoma County  
Earle Street House

Community Action Partnership Sonoma County  
Caring Communities Outreach

Community Action Partnership Sonoma County  
Sloan House Emergency Women's Shelter

Community Church of Sebastopol

Community Support Network  
Opportunity House

Glen Ellen Community Church

Interfaith Shelter Network  
Transitional Housing Program

Interlink Self Help Center

Kaiser Hospital

La Luz

Redwood Gospel Mission

Saint Paul's Church Healdsburg

Saint Peter's Church Cloverdale

Social Advocates for Youth  
Coffee House Teen Shelter

Sonoma County Department of Health  
Mental Health Division

Orenda Center  
Alcohol and Other Drug Services  
Sonoma County Department of Human Services

Sonoma County Sheriff's Department  
Main Adult Detention Facility

Sonoma County Sheriff's Department  
North County Detention Facility

Sutter Medical Center Santa Rosa

The Living Room

Unitarian Universalist Congregation

Vietnam Veterans of California  
North Bay Veterans Resource Center

Y.W. C.A.  
Domestic Violence Shelter

**A.VII. THANK YOU (INCENTIVE) GIFTS**

---

**Section to be completed July 2007.**

**A.VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR 2009 AND FUTURE COUNTS**

---

**Section to be completed July 2007.**