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I Introduction

UCM engaged the Center for the Study of Social Policy (CSSP) in January 2019 as a part of an initial planning effort for the Communities of Opportunity Grant from the Northern Virginia Health Foundation. The foci of the planning process were the neighborhoods along Buckman Road, specifically Creekside Village and Colchester Towne which are located in census tract 4215; zip code 22306. The Sequoyah development, located in census tract 4216, was also included. The short term outcomes expected from this process were (1) a shared understanding among identified stakeholders (the Sponsorship Team) of the social determinants of health and their roles in addressing these factors to improve community health and well-being, and (2) to prepare the Sponsorship Team to participate in a process for identifying recommended systems changes in their respective institutions/organizations to support opportunity and improved outcomes for residents in the Colchester and Creekside communities. This report accompanies the final presentation materials shared with the Sponsorship Team April 11, 2019 and briefly summarizes the findings, conclusions and recommendations for further research, planning, and action. Appendix A includes a description of the work completed and reference materials used. The Northern Virginia Mediation Services interviewed residents and documented the results in a separate report to UCM.

II Findings

Our health is affected by many different factors, including genetics, access to health care and the choices we make. However, as illustrated in Figure 1, half of our health is affected by factors over which we have limited or no control – the physical environment in which we live and the socioeconomic factors that affect our opportunities. Figure 2, developed by the Bay Area Health Inequities Initiative (BAHII), illustrates the concept of “downstream” and “upstream” interventions that can affect the quality of our health. We use this illustration to frame the findings from our interviews, data collection, research and observations as they are grouped in the following three categories:

- **Downstream health indicators** such as Risk Behaviors, Disease, Mortality
- **Living Conditions**, such as the Physical Environment, Economic & Work Environment, Social Environment, and Service Environment
- **Upstream Factors** such as
- **Institutions**: Corporations & Businesses, Government Agencies, Schools, Laws & Regulations, Not-for-Profit Organizations
- **Social Inequities**: Class, Race/Ethnicity, Immigration Status, Gender, Sexual Orientation

**Figure 1**

![Socioeconomic Factors and Health Behaviors](source: Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement, Going Beyond Clinical Walls: Solving Complex Problems (October 2014))

**Figure 2**

![A Public Health Framework for Reducing Health Inequities](Bay Area Regional Health Inequities Initiative)
A. Downstream Health Indicators

Examples of downstream health indicators for Creekside Village and Colchester Towne include the following readily available data from County and Northern Virginia Health Foundation websites.

- **Asthma.** Age-Adjusted Hospitalization Rate due to Asthma for zip code 22306 was 10.4 in 2014-2016, the highest among 34 zip codes and compares to an average of 3.8 for all 34 zip codes and 1.7 in zip code 22182 (Wolf Trap/Tyson’s Corner).¹

- **Diabetes.** Age-Adjusted Hospitalization Rate due to Diabetes for zip code 22306 was 20.4 in 2014-2016, the highest among 39 zip codes and compares to an average of 6.6 for all 39 zip codes and 2.3 in zip code 22101 (McClean).²

- **Life expectancy.** In census track 4215 (Creekside and Colchester) it is 78 years and in census tract 4216 (Sequoyah) it is 82 years, compared to 89 years in Reston Town Center and Tyson’s Corner.³

B. Living Conditions

The living conditions experienced by the residents include the safety, physical environment, economic environment, and service environment, also gathered from interviews and readily available data. First, however, we provide some historical context.

- **Richmond Highway/Route One Corridor History**

  The land on which the neighborhoods along Buckman Road were developed and surrounding areas were once owned by George Washington and George Mason. Richmond Highway follows a trail used for centuries by Native Virginians. Over time, this land was subdivided into small farming parcels and the highway became a paved commercial corridor.⁴ An oral history of the corridor during the 1960s and 1970s can be found at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6jKn4Cho4F4&index=3&list=PL6LESHbCT9NnoEVhY_OoiXEDtzoT8ELq

  Land consolidation of the farms in Hybla Valley began in the early 1900s as a developer conceived of the George Washington Air Junction and landing area for Zeppelins.⁵ However, it never was developed, with the land returning, instead, to dairy farming. Fairfax County purchased the site for a dollar in 1975 and it was eventually developed into the Huntley Meadows Park.⁶

  South County appears to have been dotted with small airfields in addition to the plans for the George Washington Air Junction. There was Alexandria Airport just north of Gum Springs⁷ and Hybla

¹ Retrieved from http://www.livehealthyfairfax.org/indicators/index/view?indicatorId=14&comparisonId=7299&localeId=40998
² Retrieved from http://www.livehealthyfairfax.org/indicators/index/view?indicatorId=147&periodId=1077&localeId=40998
³ Northern Virginia Health Foundation, https://novahealthfdn.org/interactive-map-opportunity/
⁵ Wikipedia https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Washington_Air_Junction
⁶ Ibid
⁷ http://www.airfields-freeman.com/VA/Airfields_VA_Fairfax_SE.htm
Valley became home to a private airport that was used by the US government for pilot training in the early days of World War II.\(^8\) It operated as an airport until 1956 and the land was sold to developers.

Creekside Village and Colchester Towne were developed between 1970 and 1973. Creekside Village was sold to a developer in the mid-2000s through a Low-Income Housing Tax Credit arrangement. The area known as Gum Springs is just a few miles away from the neighborhoods, but on the other side of Richmond Highway – a barrier to easy access. Gum Springs is “an original black community that can trace its roots to the beginning of the nation.”\(^9\)

- **Safety**
  - Most recently, in the last six months or so, there have been no police reports recorded for Creekside Village or Colchester Towne.
  - All Colchester residents interviewed reported an increased sense of safety and a reduction in fear of walking outside as a result of working lights being placed in apartment building hallways and outdoors. However, there is still a perspective that illegal activity such as drug dealing is occurring and residents are afraid to talk with police and report criminal behavior for fear of retaliation. Some want more law enforcement presence in the neighborhood.

- **Physical Environment**
  - Both neighborhoods are somewhat isolated by physical, built, and institutional imposed barriers.
    - Along one side of Creekside Village is Little Huntington Creek.
    - Janna Lee Avenue connects the communities to Buckman Road which leads to Richmond Highway. It is the only way in or out of Creekside Village and Colchester Towne as Audubon Ave has been blocked-off by a chain link fence since the mid-2000s. This barrier makes it impossible for residents to easily access the Walmart and Costco and other businesses located on Richmond Highway. When the fence was brought to the attention of zoning authorities, it was reportedly determined to be a violation.
    - Two kinds of fencing separate the two communities, ornamental in some places and chain link in other places.
    - Creekside Village elementary age children do not attend the same elementary school as those living in Colchester Towne or those living in Sequoyah as they live within separate school boundaries and are bussed to Fort Hunt. Reportedly this is to better integrate Fort Hunt and keep its student census higher to prevent closing.
  - Residents and stakeholders note insufficient public transit and lengthy commutes.

- **Economic Environment**
  - About a third of the families in both neighborhoods have incomes below 200% of the federal poverty level with about 20% experiencing severe housing burden.
  - Approximately three-quarters of the adults have a high school diploma.\(^10\)

---

\(^8\) Wikipedia [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hybla_Valley_Airport](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hybla_Valley_Airport)


\(^10\) Ibid
According to Coordinated Services Planning data from the Department of Community and Neighborhood Services, these neighborhoods are the “epicenter” of basic needs requests in South County.

- **Social Environment**
  - In Colchester Towne, 44% of the units are held by three owners (county, community agency, private developer). These units are rented. Only 25% of the 200 units are owner occupied. About one third of the units have multiple owners and are rented. The Home Owners Association does not have current owner representation except for the three primary owners. Eighteen units are rented by the Office to Prevent and End Homelessness for use as family homeless shelters served by Facets.
  - Creekside Village has one primary owner. There is a community center that is staffed by UCM and supported by the Department of Neighborhood and Community Services. The community center provides afterschool programming and services as a community resource.
  - There are many **children and youth** in the two communities as measured by the number of school buses that transport them in and out of the neighborhoods each day. For example, three school buses transport Creekside Village elementary school children alone. According to data compiled by the Northern Virginia Health Foundation, 83% of the 3 year to 4 year olds in census track 4215 are not in preschool. Observation reveals that the play areas for young children are inadequate and residents interviewed believe there are insufficient afterschool activities for youth. There is two story building in Creekside Village that reportedly once housed a day care center but it is not currently being used because it is not ADA compliant.

- **Service Environment**
  - Multiple county and community-based agencies serve the families in these neighborhoods. However, Facets does not have space on-site at Colchester Towne to house the case managers who serve the families in the units used as family homeless shelters.

**C. Upstream Factors**

Although multiple individual and community factors are at play in creating the conditions families experience in the neighborhoods along Buckman road, there are also **systemic and institutional factors** that contribute to these conditions. Furthermore, systemic factors are not limited to public agencies. They are also found in community-based organizations – public or private – as they tend to standardize practice with families because of resource constraints and contractual limitations in mind rather than the individual needs of families. In CSSP’s methodology for the Institutional Analysis, we say that these practices can privilege institutional needs for operations and survival over the needs of individuals and families. Therefore addressing “upstream factors” is not a matter of implementing a new program. It requires some self-examination for working and engaging families differently.

---

11 Northern Virginia Health Foundation
• Public Sector Institutional Policies and Operations
  o Access to health care is reasonably good but not well known
    ▪ Medicaid expansion in Virginia as of January 2019 has already increased the number of individuals with health insurance statewide.
    ▪ There are several health care locations within a 3 mile radius of the neighborhoods, operated by the Federally Qualified Health Center.
    ▪ However, the residents interviewed believe there is a need to increase access to health care resources.

  o Colchester Towne is the site of a County designated scattered-site family homeless shelter, creating a challenge for these families and their neighbors to form sense of community with one another.
    ▪ 18 units are used for “30-day” scattered-site family shelters for homeless families (11 Units owned by County; 7 Units owned by private landlords); however, families frequently stay longer as affordable housing is limited.
    ▪ This approach to sheltering homeless families came about when OPEH lost the use of a building in South County for families.
    ▪ Fairfax County appears to be one of the few jurisdictions in the country using a scatter-site homeless shelter model. New York City and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have implemented such an approach. New York is reportedly abandoning the model but scatter-site shelters are prevalent in Massachusetts.\(^{12}\)
    ▪ This approach reportedly provides families with more independence and the County greater flexibility than a single-site congregate facility affords.

  o Fairfax County Public School boundaries can present challenges to children and parents taking advantage of opportunities to participate in the life of school communities. It can be difficult for children to stay after school to participate in after school activities and parents can find it difficult to attend parent meetings and events.

  o The fence across Audubon is a solution to a decade old problem. Reportedly installed to limit criminal activity and reduce the nuisance of abandoned grocery carts, the validity of the fence has not been revisited. The investigation of zoning violations is a complaint-based system and reportedly no one has complained.

  o Lack of affordable housing in Fairfax County. Homeless families are encouraged to seek housing wherever it is available, even if that means moving to Wise County because vouchers for subsidized housing are more available and reportedly easier to obtain than in Fairfax County.

In conjunction with a county strategic housing plan, the Affordable Housing Resource Panel submitted a report to the Fairfax Board of Supervisors in March 2019. Phase I of the strategic housing plan “identifies 25 specific strategies that can be implemented in the near future to strengthen the production and preservation of affordable and workforce

\(^{12}\) Boston foundation, p. 16
Phase 2 of the plan “outlines goals and long-term implementation strategies to build and preserve affordable housing which rely on additional resources for implementation.”

A key conclusion of Phase I was “the need for approximately 15,000 additional homes, affordable to households earning up to 60 percent of the Area Median Income (AMI) over the next 15 years.” However, given the high cost of housing production in the county and recognizing the fiscal constraints, the AHRP agreed to recommend a goal of 5,000 new units, affordable to those at 60 percent or less of AMI, over the next 15 years. The AHRP also agreed that this goal is a “floor, not a ceiling” to be supplemented with additional financing mechanisms and tools to potentially increase the new production of affordable units above the goal of 5,000 units, with the aspiration of fulfilling the demand of 15,000 units.

Development activity may hold both promise and challenges for these neighborhoods and the preservation of affordable housing. There are several initiatives underway to promote economic opportunity and improve transportation along the Richmond Highway/Route 1 Corridor. This includes the Opportunity Zone development and the Embark transportation plans. In addition, Zoning regulations are being overhauled and the revised regulations are allowing increased food options for the area by relaxing regulations on farmers markets.

Federal and state Low Income Housing Tax Credit regulations. The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) which was used to support the purchase of Creekside Village has been a very successful program nationwide. It has been a useful strategy to maintaining affordable housing stock. The federally mandated affordability restrictions are typically 30 years. This places them at risk of keeping their affordable status for many families if strategies are not developed before the expiration of restrictions and the neighborhoods become more attractive for higher-income renters and home buyers. Thus, as neighborhoods like those along Buckman Road increase in opportunity and desirability due to improvements along the Richmond Highway corridor, they may lose some of the current affordable housing in the approaching years.

Fairfax County Policy Initiatives. Fairfax County has recently embarked on several policy efforts that may have implications for addressing the community conditions.

---

13 Affordable Housing Resource Panel, p1
14 Ibid
15 Ibid, p. 2
16 Ibid
17 See https://novahealthfdn.org/refreshing-zoning-regulations-fairfax-county/
OneFairfax and Equity Strategies

One Fairfax defines expectations for consideration of racial and social equity, and in particular, meaningful community involvement when planning, developing, and implementing policies, practices, and initiatives. It provides a framework to advance equity in alignment with our stated visions and priorities. This policy informs all other policies and applies to all publicly delivered services in Fairfax County Government and Fairfax County Public Schools.20

Health in All Policies

The Fairfax County Department of Health has recently launched a Health in all Policies approach and established the position of Health in all Polices Manager. According to materials from the Health Department, this is a “collaborative approach to improving the health of all people by incorporating considerations into decision-making across sectors and policy areas.”21 This initiative, like OneFairfax, brings new tools that are being applied nationwide. One such tool is the Health Impact Assessment.

Private Sector (both Non Profit and Profit making entities) Institutional Policies and Operations

- Accountability to foster community. The service providers: Good Shepherd Housing, Facets, UCM, and the private sector developers AHP Virginia, LLC appear to have primarily focused on serving individuals but not the community as a whole. Colchester Towne property, for example, was allowed to become neglected because the property management was not held accountable to the property owners as a whole, not just the designated Home Owners Board. The tot lots in Creekside Village are in need of refurbishment and no one has taken responsibility for upgrading the available space to enhance community programming options such as afterschool or day care. In addition, the lack of space reportedly prevents Facets from having on-site case managers readily available to assist the homeless families in Colchester Towne units.

- Nascent civic engagement. Two of the participating service providers on the Sponsorship Team with a significant presence in these communities have initiatives that directly engage residents. UCM, with the support of the Department of Neighborhood and Community Services (NCS) has a full time community coordinator in Creekside Village. Good Shepherd Housing is expanding its investment presence in Colchester Towne and it is piloting a “Building Captain Initiative.” This initiative is intended to “train, organize, and coordinate the captains to provide welcome information to new residents, community news to all residents, participate in neighborhood-watch activities, and manage resident-directed community meetings.”22

20 OneFairfax Policy
21 Fairfax County Health Department, undated power point presentation
22 Project description supplied by Good Shepherd Housing
• Social Factors:
  o These neighborhoods are predominantly Black and Latino. Over half of the residents in census track identify as Hispanic. In addition, almost half are foreign born. The two primary geographic areas of origin are Africa and Latin America.
  o In April 2019, the families housed in the “shelter” units had the following profile:
    ▪ 21 families, 79 individuals
    ▪ Most families have a single parent
    ▪ Family size ranged from 2 to 7 people.
    ▪ Children ranged in ages from newborn to age 17
    ▪ 16 of the families are African American, 1 Middle Eastern, 2 Latino and 2 are Caucasian.

III. Conclusions, Recommendations and Questions for Further Consideration

A. Sponsorship Team Conclusions and Action Commitments

On April 11, 2019, after reflecting on the presented information, some participants shared the following observations:

• We started this process thinking it was just an issue of affordable housing, but there are so many more layers to the situation.
• The community thinks “the Government” acts in concert and strategically, but, in fact there is no “government” strategy.
• Now that we have this picture, know this information, we can do something – we can think of both short and long term actions, individual and collective actions.
• The comprehensive plan for county does not reflect this information, is focused more on High Tech, and there is a disconnect and a lack of resident voice and root causes.

Two potential areas of opportunity were identified:

• The much-needed refurbishment of a playground onsite. Stakeholders discussed how this particular issue could be used as an example of what a collaborative process to impact change in the neighborhood could look like.
• The currently non-ADA-compliant building alongside the pool in Creekside Village was another issue identified with the potential for stakeholders to come together around to turn it into a community amenity.

An expanded list of stakeholders who should potentially be engaged in future action was created. This list includes:
  • leadership from the faith community;
  • property owners;
  • the Office to Prevent and End Homelessness (OPEH);
  • the Department of Family Services (DFS);
  • the Community Services Board (CSB);
  • local schools; and,

23 Email communication from Joe Fay, FACETS
the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).

Referring again to Figure 2, participants were asked to consider strategies for changing living conditions and institutional and social inequities and commit to individual organizational and collective actions they could take.

- **Strategies for Community Capacity Building, Community Organizing, and Civic Engagement**
  The following suggestions emerged:
  - A proposed a five-part framework to organize future action:
    - Examine: as this process has done, interview, collect information to understand the issues.
    - Expose: Share this information with everyone
    - Explain: The conditions are not result of intentional actions
    - Energize: Get everyone in action
    - Evolve: Change, everyone move beyond where they are now
  - Community organization to build capacity and resident voice, education both for residents to learn about how to participate in civic action and for the County to learn from the community, building trust across communities for collaborative engagement, and increasing transparency with sharing information with residents.
    - Need to include the voice of residents in the solutions
    - Centering work on changing community conditions. County can have conversation about neighborhood, better align strategies and better partner with community
    - More service/case management integration – think of this as a “network,” not individual providers
    - With community, develop a community vision to keep an eye on and create/support a governance structure (for example, HOA). Need to build/increase trust
  - Yolanda Thompson, UCM Community Center Coordinator, committed to working with Creekside Village property management to launch a monthly tenant forum.

- **Strategic Partnerships for Advocacy**
  - Karla Bruce, Fairfax County Chief Equity Officer, committed to learning who needs to be involved in conversations about (1) acquiring and/or expanding community space in the neighborhood, and convening that group and (2) how County initiatives can be better coordinated and leveraged for neighborhoods like these. Develop a vision/outcome.
  - Chris Leonard, Director of Department of Neighborhood and Community Services with the support of Tom Fleetwood, Director of Housing and Community Development, Good Shepherd Housing and UCM, offered to talk with the owner of Creekside and use the playground refurbishment as a pilot process for engaging community.

**B. Additional Considerations**

Reflecting on the gathered information, the Sponsorship Team arrived at many of the same observations and conclusions as the CSSP team. However, we take this opportunity to add some additional considerations and raise questions.
• More work needs to be done focusing all Sponsorship Team members on the “upstream” strategies. The social determents of health appear to be conceptually understood. However, there is a tendency to think programatically about addressing the immediate needs of individuals and families rather than thinking of the community as a whole and how the residents could be supported to acknowledge and use their power to advocate for different conditions. The County staff leadership at the meeting began to reflect on how County policies and actions may have influenced the conditions of the neighborhoods and what is within their sphere of influence to change. They also acknowledged that trust building with the residents is a first step.

• Those entities who have invested significantly in the communities need to ensure contracted property management is accountable to the residents. Both Creekside Village and Colchester Towne now have professional, on-site property management. The residents of Colchester Towne have experienced a turn-around in the environmental quality as a result of the new property managers and Creekside Village residents note their well-maintained exteriors. These are both good signs that property managers are being good stewards of owner investments. However, the owners who have the most authority in these communities should ensure that the property managers are accountable to all residents no matter their standing in the community. This would be important for all communities, but it would seem to be particularly important in these neighborhoods where the significant property owners appear to be more mission-driven than revenue-driven.

• Community service contracts could be examined as a vehicle for supporting the service sector in also engaging in “upstream” activities. We did not examine current contracts or contracting process, but it may be an activity the county and service providers want to undertake to determine how the contracts can encourage “upstream” thinking and outcomes. This suggestion is prompted because it seems community-based organizations seemed to have difficulty identifying actions they could currently and funding constraints may create challenges to change.

• Multiple initiatives, well intentioned to serve Fairfax County residents, may actually inhibit effective coordination, coherence and authentic community engagement. These initiatives can be better aligned and actions suggested on April 11 can begin to achieve this alignment. As noted, two very important initiatives, OneFairfax and Health in All Policies are examples of initiatives that are complimentary and need to be implemented together to avoid being siloed. Furthermore, there is a proposal to “create a housing in all policies” manager to coordinate with the County’s planning and regulatory/development agencies in a manner similar to the Health in All Policies manager at the Health Department.”

PolicyLink calls the Health Impact Assessment, a tool already in use by the Health Department, an important tool for advancing health and equity as it helps inform decision makers about the impact of policies. It also refers to the tool as an “important instrument for building power in communities; for engaging community members in decisions that affect their health and well-being; for integrating community knowledge, insights, and leadership into public decision-making processes; for building consensus around decisions; and for creating lasting relationships and collaborations across disparate constituencies. Significantly, the HIA process also provides

---

24 Fairfax County Affordable Housing Report, March 2019
opportunities for communities, especially those that endure health inequities, to ensure that
decision-making processes reflect their health concerns and aspirations.”25

- There are practices around the country that may be of interest for the Sponsorship Team to examine further
  - **Equitable Development.** As part of the Government Alliance on Race & Equity (GARE), Fairfax has access to sister jurisdictions around the country that are implementing new policies for county budgeting, land use and other government responsibilities. In Equitable Development as a Tool to Advance Racial Equity, GARE lays out different frameworks for equitable development that may be useful for Fairfax to consider. None of these can be implemented solely by the Office of the Chief Equity Officer. They all require a collaborative county effort.26
  
  - **Housing and Health Equity.** PolicyLink has written about numerous practices that can advance health equity, two such practices that may be of interest to the Sponsorship Team include:
    - When children arrive at hospitals in Alameda County with asthma or elevated blood toxicity levels, the Alameda County Public Health Department inspects their homes. The program then addresses home repairs to reduce allergens and other asthma triggers. PolicyLink suggests that programs such as this one directly tie together health and housing channel health prevention funding toward housing to achieve system wide savings.27
    - Other medical centers are purposefully bringing in housing organizations to achieve better health outcomes. In order to fulfill its Community Health Needs Assessments under the ACA, the Bellevue Hospital Center in New York released an implementation strategy that included addressing patients’ housing needs as part of a coordinated effort to shelter “high-utilizers” of emergency services. This approach was realized through the participation of housing service providers at the needs assessment table.28
  
  - **Scattered-Site Family Homeless Shelters.** Studies of the Massachusetts approach suggest that it is important that scattered-site family homeless shelters have several features in place: (1) A focus on strong, individually tailored services; (2) Approaches that build relationships with families; (3) Effective staffing structure; (4) Strong partnerships with community-based organizations; (5) Balance between rules and service flexibility; (6) Continued focus on data collection and improving data quality.29 In addition, the studies noted that, “When scattered site units can be located all on the same property, with staff present for most hours of the day, and possibly a front desk and space

28 Ibid, p. 21
to run workshops, more frequent contact with both adults and children is possible. A checklist that might be useful to Facets and other providers is included at the end of Appendix A.

- **The power of authentic community engagement cannot be underestimated.** We heard from a number of stakeholders that the County does not effectively engage residents early in planning processes. In our research on best practices for centering equity in community change initiatives, we came across a few strategies for engaging community participation. These resources emphasize the importance of an explicit focus in policies, materials, and discussion on the issues faced by residents in communities of color and low-income communities. For example, the National League of Cities has described successful efforts in Minneapolis to promote affordable housing development by “up zoning” the city to increase housing density and the opportunity for more affordable housing. The effort had four key elements:
  - a dedicated city council;
  - effective, community-based activist groups;
  - multi-year effort to engage residents outside of typical venues; and,
  - taking the conversation out of city planning and into the community.

There are a number of ways to engage communities in authentic, sustainable ways. In similar, equity focused initiatives, stakeholders have worked closely with existing community groups to build the capacity of partners from low-income communities of color to engage with, and advocate for themselves within zoning processes, land-use decision making, and local politics. Additionally, other groups have found success in making intentional efforts to share findings and assessments with the most impacted and vulnerable communities. This sharing of information can happen throughout the process, and care should be taken to ensure that it is communicated in culturally competent ways.

- **The Consolidated Community Funding Pool may merit re-examination** as a mechanism for more authentic community engagement and a more equitable, and innovative funding distribution to meet county needs, both downstream and upstream.

- **The Sponsorship Team and the community should engage the School District** to reconsider the boundaries that segregates Creekside Village elementary students.

- **The Sponsorship Team should better understand the timeline of the Creekside Village LIHTC arrangements** to be prepared to help preserve the affordable housing in Creekside.

Subsequent to the April 11, 2019 meeting, we learned of two developments that are important to the neighborhoods along Buckman Road and the Sponsorship Team should become more familiar with them. These are:

- April 30 Community conversation sponsored by UCM, Good Shepherd Services and the local chapter of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People (NACCP)
- The sale of the tennis club and associated open space on Audubon Ave is both an opportunity and a challenge.

---

30 Ibid p. 7
31 National League of Cities. (February 2019). Affordable Housing & Health p. 8
APPENDIX A

Planning Phase Activities

CSSP co-designed and facilitated two convenings, in February and in April, of the Sponsorship Team and presented a preliminary report to the Northern Virginia Health Foundation on April 2, 2019. We also interviewed identified stakeholders, collected and analyzed pertinent data and conducted research into issues that arose during the interviews.

- **February 14, 2019 Sponsorship Team meeting.** The objectives of the first Sponsorship Team meeting was threefold. One was to share with those present the process for the planning grant – interviews and data collection. A second objective was to begin to build a picture of the neighborhoods along Buckman road -- their history and the structural contributors to the current conditions. Finally, the meeting served to get a general sense of participants understanding of the social determinants of health and the concepts of “downstream” versus “upstream” interventions that can address the determinants. To meet this third objective, participants were asked to rate their knowledge of social determinants of health on a scale of 1-5, and while most expressed some familiarity with the concept, the follow up conversation during the meeting mostly reflected more “downstream” thinking – interventions that have or could be implemented with individuals. The power point presentation used for this meeting has been transmitted to UCM separately. Exhibit C is the meeting agenda.

- **April 11, 2019 Sponsorship Team Meeting.** The desired results for this meeting included (1) participants be familiar with the results of the planning phase of the work, and (2) they be prepared to take action, both within their spheres of responsibility and also collectively, to improve the health and quality of life in the Creekside and Colchester communities. CSSP presented a visual display of the findings (from review of public documents and interviews). (See Exhibits A and B, pictures from the session). During the 3-hour session, the Sponsorship Team was given the opportunity to review the displayed information and comment on what was surprising, missing, or inaccurate.
The Northern Virginia Mediation Services also provided a recap some of their main findings from focus groups with residents to ground the discussion. Main reflections from conversations included with residents included the need for greater access to space and resources, a desired focus on youth, a real interest in greater involvement. CSSP facilitated discussion about opportunities for upstream change. The understanding of the social determinants of health was not measured again. However, the discussion suggested that there had been some increased understanding of their implications for these neighborhoods as there were some commitments to “upstream” actions at the end of the meeting. The power point presentation used for the meeting has been transmitted to UCM separately. Exhibit D is the meeting agenda.

**Exhibit B April 11 Sponsorship Team Meeting**

- **Interviews.** During February and March, CSSP also interviewed 20 individuals representing 10 different County or community agencies. The list of individuals interviewed is presented in Exhibit E.
- **Research.** CSSP compiled available data from Fairfax County, the Northern Virginia Health Foundation, and national programs. We reviewed information about practices that are being implemented in Fairfax County and have implications for the neighborhoods along Buckman Road including (1) Scattered Site Family Homeless Shelters; (2) Health in All Policies; (3) Affordable Housing; and (4) Race Equity strategies and tools. With the help of the Fairfax County Office of Equity and the Department of Neighborhood Services, CSSP gathered information about the history of the neighborhood.

Focus groups to gather the lived experience of residents of Creekside Village and Colchester Towne and other neighborhoods along Buckman Road were also conducted by the Northern Virginia Mediation Services (NVMS). Twenty-five residents participated in those focus groups. NVMS prepared a separate report on this work.
Communities of Opportunity Grant Sponsorship Team Kickoff Meeting
UCM Sacramento Neighborhood Center
8792 Sacramento Drive Alexandria, VA 22309
February 14, 2019
1:00pm to 4:00pm

Agenda

Desired Results for Meeting
At the end of the meeting, participants will

- Be familiar with the vision and planned approach, schedule and anticipated results for this phase of the work.
- Have a shared understanding of the history and context of current conditions of the neighborhoods along Buckman Road
- Affirm their roles and contribution to the process
- Have started to formulate hypotheses about structural contributors to the current conditions in the neighborhoods along Buckman Road

The Work to Get to the Results
1:00 - 1:45 Welcome and Settling In
During this time we will meet one another, consider the vision for this work, our individual and agency roles and the contributions we all can make. We hope this time will help everyone get greater clarity on why we have assembled

1:45 – 2:00 Work Plan and Schedule
The Center for the Study of Social Policy (CSSP) will review the work plan and time schedule to complete the tasks of this phase and the partnership with Northern Virginia Mediation Services (NVMS). We hope this time will help everyone understand the expectations of CSSP, NVMS and the expectations of their time commitment.

2:00 – 2:10 Short Break

2:10 – 2:30 Social Determinants of Health and Social Mobility: Challenges and Opportunities
CSSP will provide a brief review of the research and facilitate a conversation to ground us in an understanding of the Social Determinants of Health and Social Mobility and what can be done to influence them. We hope this time will help everyone become grounded in some key concepts and open possibilities for future thinking.

2:30-3:30 The Neighborhoods along Buckman Road: Challenges and Opportunities
CSSP will facilitate a conversation about what participants (1) believe are the current conditions in these neighborhoods: strengths and impediments, (2) understand of the history of the neighborhoods that that have contributed to these current conditions and (3) has worked well or not worked to improve conditions. We hope this time will help us frame some initial hypotheses about the structural contributors are and possibilities for the path forward.

3:30 – 4:00 Wrap up and Reflections
This will be an opportunity for participants to raise questions or offer reflections on the afternoon. The next steps will be established
Communities of Opportunity Grant Sponsorship Team Results Meeting
Old Mount Vernon High School
8333 Mt Vernon Highway
Conference Room in Annex
April 11, 2019
9am to Noon

Desired Results for Meeting
At the end of the meeting, participants will

- Be familiar with the results of the planning phase work
- Be prepared to take action within their spheres of responsibility to improve the health and quality of life in the neighborhoods
- Be prepared to act collectively
- Plot next steps

The Work to Get to the Results
9:00-9:30 Welcome and Settling In
During this time we will review what we want to accomplish in the meeting and share the status of the planning phase and some area history.

9:30-10:15 Review and Reflect on Findings
We will become familiar with the information that has been compiled by having their own “journey of discovery” and consider what might be missing, what needs to be amended.

10:15-11:15 So What? And Now What?
We will consider what is important about what has been learned and what directions are suggested by the learning.

11:15-11:45 Opportunities and Action Commitments
We will consider priorities and make commitments for individual organization/agency actions and collective actions. We will also identify expansion of stakeholder group.

11:45 –Noon Wrap up
The following is a list of interviews that CSSP conducted throughout February and March:

- Tom Fleetwood, Director, Fairfax County Housing and Community Redevelopment
- Samantha Gallo, Fairfax County Housing and Community Redevelopment
- Alison DeCourcey, Executive Director, United Community Ministries
- Yolanda Thompson, Community Center Coordinator, UCM, Creekside Village Community Center
- Basim Khan, Executive Director, Neighborhood Health
- Jane Knops, Community Partnerships and Communications, Neighborhood Health
- Leslie Hatch, Vice President, Good Shepherd Housing & Family Services, Inc.
- David Levine, President and CEO, Good Shepherd Housing & Family Services, Inc.
- Ann Harbour, Governmental Relations, iNOVA Health System
- Joe Fay, Executive Director, FACETS
- Phaedra Sampson, Program Manager, FACETS
- Chris Revere, Deputy Director, Innovation and Planning Fairfax County Health Department
- Dr. Gloria Addo-Ayens, Director, Fairfax County Health Department
- Karla Bruce, Chief Equity Officer, Fairfax County Office of the County Executive
- Chris Leonard, Director, Fairfax County Neighborhood and Community Services
- Sarah Allen, Division Director Access, Fairfax County Neighborhood and Community Services
- Pallas Washington, Region 1 Manager, Fairfax County Department of Neighborhood and Community Services
- Lloyd Tucker, Division Director, Regional Services, Fairfax County Department or Neighborhood and Community Services
- Dean Klein, Director, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
- Sharon Singer, Office to Prevent and End Homelessness
## Reference Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Resource</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location/Retrieve from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Improvement Plan</td>
<td>Live Healthy Fairfax</td>
<td><a href="http://www.livehealthyfairfax.org/content/sites/fairfax/chip-goka.pdf">http://www.livehealthyfairfax.org/content/sites/fairfax/chip-goka.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Equity through the Practice of Health Impact Assessment</td>
<td>PolicyLink</td>
<td><a href="https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/Programs/Community-Health/HIA-Promoting-Equity.pdf">https://www.naccho.org/uploads/downloadable-resources/Programs/Community-Health/HIA-Promoting-Equity.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Scattering of Thoughts on Scattered Sites (July 2012)</td>
<td>Homes for Families</td>
<td><a href="https://homesforfamilies.wordpress.com/2012/07/18/a-scattering-of-thoughts-on-scattered-sites/">https://homesforfamilies.wordpress.com/2012/07/18/a-scattering-of-thoughts-on-scattered-sites/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning the Tide on Homelessness in New York City (2017)</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td><a href="https://www1.nyc.gov/site/dhs/about/tide.page">https://www1.nyc.gov/site/dhs/about/tide.page</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Assessment of Program Performance &amp; Comparison to Other Federal Affordable Rental Housing Subsidies</td>
<td>Novogradac &amp; Company</td>
<td><a href="http://www.novoco.com">www.novoco.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Communities of Opportunity: An Equity Blueprint to Address America’s Housing Challenges.</td>
<td>PolicyLink</td>
<td><a href="http://www.policylink.org">www.policylink.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable Development as a Tool to Advance Racial Equity</td>
<td>Government Alliance on Race &amp; Equity</td>
<td><a href="http://www.racialequityalliance.org">www.racialequityalliance.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Homes for Families Scattered Site Agency Checklist\textsuperscript{32}

This list is intended to help your organization identify and prioritize areas of focus for your scattered site program. Check the areas that apply to your program.

- We have completed a trauma informed service delivery self assessment
- Our staff have participated in intensive trauma informed service delivery trainings
- We have time at intake, or within the first two weeks, to fully explain services, supports, expectations and rules
- We have an assessment process with families that helps to identify candidates for rapid rehousing and households that may require most intensive and/or clinical supports
- We always make time in meetings to ask “how are you?”
- We have contact with families at least 3 times per week; we have frequent interactions with the children
- We use technology, such as cell phone, Wi-Fi hot spots, tablets/laptops
- We connect with families around basic needs such as food, transportation, clothes, health care and information; we make linkages with community supports
- We facilitate group workshops and events
- We have funding for incentives
- We have funding for addressing barriers
- We have internal formal staff training, including on model specific issues
- We provide opportunities for staff to attend trainings
- We frequently analyze our budget to address staffing levels and resources to meet contractual obligations
- We do satisfaction surveys and/or have ways to collect feedback from families
- We have strong partnerships for referrals for key services
- Our housing staff explore alternative housing options such as reunification with family members and relocation
- We introduce families to landlords/property managers
- We engage in landlord education around HomeBASE and unit repairs
- Sites are in relatively clustered geographic areas for efficiencies in service delivery
- We engage in advocacy for more permanent housing and other resources