

**4/28/08 Draft
Fort Monroe Federal Area Development Authority
LRA Application
(32 CFR Part 176.30)**

Section (a) Redevelopment Plan

The Redevelopment Plan for Fort Monroe is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Section (b) Homeless Assistance Submission

(1) Homelessness in the Communities in the Vicinity of Fort Monroe

(i) Political Jurisdictions which Comprise the LRA

As of the date of (a) the surplus notice for Fort Monroe as issued by the Army (May 9, 2006), pursuant to 32 CFR 176.20, (b) the publication by the Department of Defense, Office of Economic Adjustment ("OEA") designating the local redevelopment authority ("LRA") for Fort Monroe as the Federal Area Development Authority ("FADA"), and (c) the end of the 180 day period for the receipt of notices of interest by the FADA, (December 19, 2006) under 176 CFR (c) (1), the City of Hampton, Virginia, was the only political jurisdiction that comprised the LRA. Please note that (i) in May of 2007, the FADA was reconstituted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia as the Fort Monroe Federal Area Development Authority ("FMFADA") and the Board was expanded to include representation of the Commonwealth of Virginia, (ii) Fort Monroe is located entirely in the City of Hampton, Virginia, and (iii) the FMFADA was recognized by OEA as the successor to the FADA as the LRA for Fort Monroe on _____.

(ii) Gaps in the Continuum of Care System in the Commonwealth and the Virginia Peninsula

a. Commonwealth of Virginia

Every year each jurisdiction across the Commonwealth of Virginia participates in an annual point-in-time count of sheltered and unsheltered persons experiencing homelessness. Sheltered persons are any individuals (including children and unaccompanied youth) sleeping in emergency shelters, transitional housing, or using a hotel/apartment voucher.

The January 2007 statewide point-in-time count identified 9,644 individuals as experiencing homelessness. About 44 percent of these individuals were in emergency shelters, 34 percent were in transitional shelter programs, and 22 percent were unsheltered.

As one would expect, the homeless concentration varies by area of the State. The following Table from the 2006-2007 Report on Virginia's Homeless, *Department of Housing and Community Development* illustrates the statewide distribution of homeless concentration based on the 2007 Continuum of Care point-in-time count. While the proportion of homeless persons

per square mile in the Virginia Peninsula is not among the highest in the Commonwealth, as Table_ indicates, a significant homeless population exists on the Peninsula.

Table __: Continuum of Care in Virginia with Highest Proportions Of Homeless Persons Per Square Mile

Continuum of Care	Persons/Square Mile
Alexandria	24.35
Arlington County	17.70
Norfolk	8.60
Portsmouth	5.22
Fairfax County	3.84
Virginia Peninsula	1.85
Prince William County	1.70
Virginia Beach	1.57
Richmond Regional	.53
RADCO (Fredericksburg)	.39

In recognition of the plight of the homeless, in July 2003, Governor Warner directed agencies serving Virginia’s homeless population to represent Virginia at a Policy Academy on Chronic Homelessness. The academy is part of a national initiative to implement a plan to end chronic homelessness in 10 years. The Governor subsequently approved the action plan, “*Virginia: A Common Wealth to End Homelessness*,” which was then submitted for comment to the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness in January 2004. A copy of the updated plan, as well as other resource material, can be found at www.endhomelessnessva.org.

The Policy Academy evolved into the Policy Committee of the existing Virginia Inter-Agency Council on Homelessness (VIACH). Its mission is to implement the established action plan; its vision is that of an integrated, community-based system of individualized opportunities, services, and housing to end homelessness in Virginia. The plan incorporates the following priorities:

1. Affordable continuum of suitable and appropriate housing options
2. Accessible supportive services
3. Prevention initiatives that reduce homelessness
4. Sufficient financial resources for meeting housing and other needs
5. An understanding of chronic homelessness at all levels

The action plan represents the most comprehensive initiative to-date in combating chronic homelessness and ensuring coordinated services for Virginia’s homeless or those at risk of becoming homeless. VIACH members include policy-level representatives from governmental, non-profit organizations, and associations that can influence the plan’s success. State agencies

include the Virginia Departments of Housing and Community Development, Medical Assistance Services, Corrections, Health (Vital Records), Rehabilitative Services, Division of Motor Vehicles, Social Services, Juvenile Justice Services, Employment, Veterans' Services, and Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services. Other representatives include a previously homeless individual, the Virginia Coalition for the Homeless, Virginia Municipal League, Virginia Supportive Housing, Virginia Sheriff's Association, Virginia Interfaith Center for Public Policy, Virginia Hospital and Healthcare Association, Virginia Housing Development Authority, and Homeward, a local Continuum of Care (1).

b. Greater Virginia Peninsula Continuum of Care Council

At the local level, the lead entity for overall planning and coordination of local homeless issues for the City of Hampton and the Virginia Peninsula is the Greater Virginia Peninsula Continuum of Care Council (GVPCCC). It is comprised of more than 100 listed member organizations, agencies, individuals, programs and businesses. There are representatives from six (6) participating governmental jurisdictions – the cities of Hampton, Newport News, Poquoson, and Williamsburg, and the counties of York and James City. One of the committees under the umbrella of the GVPCCC is the Homeless Task Force. This entity focuses on issues, needs and resources related to the homeless population in the Virginia Peninsula, including the City of Hampton. Members meet to identify priority needs for the region based upon point-in-time surveys, HUD priorities and initiatives, and local/regional planning activities.

c. Unmet Needs Analysis

In terms of needs identification, each year the GVPCCC conducts a “point in time” survey conducted on the Virginia Peninsula of individuals and families experiencing homelessness. The following table illustrates the summary of unmet needs of the homeless in 2007 which was included in the 2007 Continuum of Care Statement and the City of Hampton 2007 Annual Consolidated Plan update.

[Tables 1 and 2 from the Consolidated Plan will be included]

Table __: 2007 Unmet Needs of the Homeless

Emergency Shelter (Individuals)	Emergency Shelter (Families)	Transitional Housing (Individuals)	Transitional Housing (Families)	Permanent Supportive Housing (Individuals)	Permanent Supportive Housing Units (Families)
60	25	0	0	359	20

The Virginia Peninsula Continuum of Care has developed the following priorities, which align with the Commonwealth's homeless intervention and prevention strategies outlined in the Virginia State Plan to End Chronic Homelessness:

- Satisfy the need for year-round emergency shelter space;

- Satisfy the need for a centralized, year-round day service center;
- Expand permanent supportive housing in the region; and
- Raise the level of consciousness on the Peninsula to the issues and solutions around homelessness.

Each year, the City of Hampton and the GVPCCC submits the above information as well as Consolidated Plans and Action Plans to HUD. According to the 2006-2007 Consolidated Plan, the primary reasons for the unmet needs of the homeless on the Virginia Peninsula are as follows:

- Diminished federal funding, and insufficient State and local funding to support homelessness initiatives;
- Lack of accessible supportive services;
- Insufficient affordable and supportive housing; and
- The cost of housing exceeds the population’s ability to pay (wages).

One of the past obstacles to meeting the needs of the homeless on the Virginia Peninsula has been the uncoordinated approach to identifying regional solutions to meet the needs of the homeless. This condition has improved due to the creation of the Mayors and Chairs Commission on Homelessness. The nine (9) jurisdictions Commission, formed by the top elected officials of the participating cities and counties, holds much promise for developing and implementing a coordinated regional plan that emphasizes the assets of the region and identify distinctive needs of each participating locality. This type of leadership combined with the effective provider network at the Continuum of Care level, would enable the development of strategies that are more fully coordinated throughout the region, that are appropriate for the type of locality, and that emphasizes a more equitable distribution of resources.

d. Required Funding to Address Gaps in the Continuum of Care

Based on information obtained from Virginia Peninsula Continuum of Care providers of homeless services, the funding to fulfill the unmet needs of the homeless on the Virginia Peninsula identified in the 2007 Statement is _____. The details of this funding computation are as follows:

- The first row in Table_ shows the unmet needs of the homeless on the Virginia Peninsula as identified in Consolidated Plan statements. The identification of the unmet need is important because the primary emphasis in the base closure process is funding the “unmet needs”, not all homeless needs;

**Table __: Annual Operational Costs to Address Gaps
In Continuum of Care in the Virginia Peninsula**

	Emergency Shelter (Individuals)	Emergency Shelter (Families)	Transitional Housing (Individuals)	Transitional Housing (Families)	Permanent Supportive Housing (Individuals)	Permanent Supportive Housing Units (Families)
2007	60	25	0	0	359	50

Unmet Needs						
Unit Cost (Annual)						
Total Cost			\$0	\$0		
Total			-0-	-0-		

**Table __: Capital Costs to Address Gaps
In Continuum of Care in the Virginia Peninsula**

	Emergency Shelter (Individuals)
2007 Unmet Needs	60
Unit Cost	
Total Cost	

Thus far, for the Virginia Peninsula, the following figures represent the total funding requirement of _____

e. Vicinity of the Installation Proportional Share

The “vicinity of the installation” has been defined (since the time of DoD’s recognition of the Local Reuse Authority) as the jurisdiction in which the “BRAC-closed” facility is located, namely Hampton, Virginia. However, the above data represents the funding required to address gaps in the Continuum of Care across multiple jurisdictions on the Virginia Peninsula. In order to arrive at the “vicinity of the installation” proportional funding requirements, Hampton’s proportionate share of the Virginia Peninsula population was used. As the following table shows, Hampton’s population share represented 30.7% of the total.

Table _: Population Distribution, Virginia Peninsula

Locality	2006 Population	% of Total
Hampton	145,708	30.70%
Newport News	181,416	38.22%
James City County	59,183	12.47%
York County	63,139	13.30%
Poquoson	11,852	2.50%
Williamsburg	13,330	2.81%
Total	474,628	100%

(2) Notices of Interest

(i) Proposal Specifics

a. Relationship of Notices of Interest to Consolidated Plans, including Priorities and Costs

The LRA received two (2) Notices of Interest ("NOIs") from homeless service provider members of the Greater Virginia Peninsula Continuum of Care Council. The first NOI proposes the development of a Homeless Trust Fund to finance the development of affordable housing and a myriad of support services to homeless individuals and families on the Virginia Peninsula. This funding mechanism would be a catalyst in creating an on-going and locally-controlled source of revenues for area homeless service providers.

The second NOI proposes the acquisition and use of three (3) buildings on the installation in order to operate a comprehensive day program and an overnight, year round shelter. The day program location would be a permanent place to which the homeless can come in order to address a myriad of needs.

Both proposals are consistent with meeting the higher priority goals set forth in the Consolidated Plan to address the unmet needs of the homeless. The Trust fund proposal would create alternative funding sources to address the unmet needs in the Continuum, while the Day center and overnight shelter would offer a permanent, reliable place to which the homeless can come and fulfill their needs.

Based on discussions with providers and analysis, an off-site funding solution may be proposed as opposed to the use of buildings or property on the installation by homeless service providers. This recommendation would be more compatible with the FMFADA's plans for redevelopment of the installation and with the long-term viability of providing homeless services for the following reasons:

- Trust fund proceeds will be used by both providers (GVPCCC and the LINK consortium) to meet the needs of the homeless (as defined by the McKinney-Vento Act) to support the expansion of emergency shelter space and day service center facilities as well as permanent supportive housing, the primary gaps in the Virginia Peninsula Continuum of Care.
- According to the proposal which calls for the creation of a trust fund, off-site funding allows the location of supportive housing and services for the homeless in an integrated manner throughout the community and not clustered in one area of the community. Concentrating homeless facilities at one location on Fort Monroe would isolate these facilities from employment and mainstream services, including health care and social service providers.
- The three (3) buildings requested by one provider for a day center and overnight shelter are located in an area of the installation (4-2) where the ownership by the federal government or the Commonwealth may be unresolved for a long time. Also, even if the land does not revert to the Commonwealth, the Redevelopment Plan does not call for retaining these "Butler Style" buildings because the subject area will be developed as a new residential neighborhood in order to preserve the historic and urban fabric of Fort Monroe.

- Due to the small size of the base (600 acres) very little federal property remains when one accounts for the deduction of areas 4-1 and 4-2 (areas where ownership issues are unresolved), federal submerged lands, and approximately 51 acres called for in the plan in response to strong community desire for open space;
- The location of homeless support services at such an insular site as Fort Monroe would not be in the best interest of clients;
- The location of homeless support services at Fort Monroe could prove to be a prohibitively expensive endeavor due to the high potential of rebuilding after a flood event, and the cost of adhering to historic district restrictions.

b. Proposed Funding of Trust Fund

As discussed in section 1, d-e, the proportionate share of the total funding required to fulfill the unmet needs of the homeless in the vicinity of the installation (Hampton) is

_____.

c. Proposed Uses of Funds

[To be negotiated with the Providers. The services to be provided must exclusively serve "homeless persons" as defined by the McKinney-Vento Act, and should target the highest priority gaps in the Virginia Peninsula Continuum of Care.]

(ii) Copies of Notices of Interest

Copies of the two NOIs received are attached hereto at Exhibit _____.

(iii) Community Impact

Fort Monroe is a 570 acre site that is for the most part, surrounded by water bodies, and connected to the City of Hampton by two bridges. The integration of this property with the City and region does not happen by chance and thus, calls for careful and well thought-out reuse planning.

In creating the reuse plan, which embodies planning essentials that support the City's Comprehensive plan, community involvement was an essential component. This public engagement ensured that the impact of the plan on the Phoebus and Buckroe sections of Hampton would be positive. One such positive result involves the planning of improved vehicular and pedestrian access from these sections of Hampton to the base. Also, the Redevelopment Plan calls for a mix of retail and residential uses that will be complementary to those in existence and planned in downtown Phoebus and Buckroe in an effort to not destabilize the retail market in Phoebus and the housing market in Buckroe.

Due to the small size of the base, the high degree of needed historic protection and preservation, and the need to generate sufficient revenues (to offset maintenance of historic structures, and losses in Hampton's economy), the Redevelopment Plan reflects the challenges of providing on-site homeless support services/infrastructure. Accordingly, the Redevelopment Plan provides balance for the homeless in that it calls for the establishment of a Homeless Trust

Fund capitalized through the value of Federal Surplus Parcels. The trust fund provision is in keeping with the City of Hampton's consolidated plan and the goals of the Continuum of care since there is flexibility in targeting funds for services in geographic and specialty areas where the potential for fulfilling the unmet needs are greatest.

(3) Legally Binding Agreement (Exhibit ____)

(4) Balance Statement

The recommendations contained in the Fort Monroe Redevelopment Plan are the result of extensive public input from citizens, stakeholders, and community leaders. From July, 2006 to _____, 2008 community members came together in an open planning process to identify the ideas, needs, and concerns regarding the future of Fort Monroe.

One significant input to the planning process is the result of a military impact study commissioned by the Greater Peninsula Workforce Investment Board in November, 2006. The report indicated the following major findings:

- The closure of Fort Monroe will cause a loss of approximately \$539 million in gross city product (decrease of 7.4%) by 2020; and
- Hampton will lose over 5,000 jobs as a result of the Fort's closure.

Clearly, the closure of the base will have a substantially negative impact on Hampton's economy.

As a result of the above-mentioned inputs, the Plan lists the following goals and desires of the community, referred to as Fort Monroe "Planning Essentials":

- Protect the historic place and keep it vital;
- Open it up to the public;
- Establish a large – scale open space park;
- Seek economic sustainability; and
- Allow new development, within strict limits.

Additionally, the FMFADA received extensive comments from area homeless providers on the need to fulfill the unmet needs of the homeless. The primary reasons for the unmet needs are insufficient funding, lack of accessible supportive services, and the lack of emergency shelter space. The proposed Redevelopment Plan addresses the fulfillment of these unmet needs as well as the planning essentials recommended by the community at large.

The proposed Redevelopment Plan includes ____? single family and multi-family units, ? square feet of non-residential users such as office, retail, lodging, etc., and ____? acres of open space devoted to passive and active recreational pursuits. [Park Service involvement] The implementation of this plan will take many years and may require public subsidies as a result, in order to pay for the expensive up keep of historic structures on the base, as well as city services elsewhere in the City of Hampton (due to lost taxes). Studies that accompany the Redevelopment Plan indicate that [jobs created, economic benefits/tax revenue generated, subsidies required, etc.] Given these significant challenges, the proposed accommodation to

the homeless is fair (and even generous), and is targeted to specific identified continuum of care gaps that are best provided for off the base.

(5) Outreach