

The 2009 Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Community Planning and Development



This page intentionally left blank

The 2009 Annual Homeless Assessment Report

June 2010

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Community Planning and Development

Corrected June 18, 2010

This page intentionally left blank



FOREWORD

I am pleased to submit the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) 2009 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress. The tragedy of homelessness is faced by every community. To tackle this challenge, we need the best data available and a coordinated federal response.

Indeed, this year's AHAR is delivered at a critical moment – as the Federal government continues to shift its focus toward preventing homelessness and on the eve of the first-ever federal plan to *end* homelessness. The fifth in a series of annual reports about homelessness in the United States, the 2009 AHAR for the first time, captures a large portion of the economic crisis in its reporting period. It provides real evidence that the economic downturn is impacting the housing stability of low-income and vulnerable Americans – as we see a rise in family homelessness for the second consecutive year.

By adding data on sheltered homeless people for another full year, this year's report builds on last year's, allowing for a comparative analysis of homelessness that spans three years—2007, 2008, and 2009. Specifically, the 2009 AHAR draws on two types of national estimates of homelessness to provide a portrait of homelessness nationwide. The first is point-in-time (PIT) estimates, which provide the total number of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons on a *single-night* in January. The report also provides *one-year* estimates of the total sheltered population based on information from local Homeless Management Information Systems. These estimates account for individuals who used a homeless residential program at any time during a 12-month period.

In addition, this year's report marks another significant increase in the capacity of communities nationwide to participate in the AHAR. Between 2008 and 2009, the number of communities participating in the AHAR increased by more than 66 percent, marking another step forward in our ability to collect critical information on homelessness and inform public policies. All told, this report compiles data from 2,988 counties and 1,056 cities. I applaud these communities for their hard work and commitment to helping end homelessness.

By building on the remarkable innovations demonstrated at the local level nationwide, the Obama Administration is committed to providing all Americans—from the most capable to the most vulnerable—the opportunity to reach their full potential. With essential research tools like AHAR and a new strategy that makes ending and preventing homelessness a priority for every federal agency, that opportunity is closer than ever for all Americans.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Shaun Donovan', with a stylized, flowing script.

Shaun Donovan

Secretary

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This 2009 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) was developed by a team of researchers from Abt Associates Inc. and the University of Pennsylvania Center for Mental Health Services and Research. The team was led by Principal Investigators, Dr. Jill Khadduri (Abt) and Dr. Dennis Culhane (University of Pennsylvania). Dr. Alvaro Cortes (Abt) served as project director and was responsible for leading the data collection and analysis effort. Additional team members include: Christopher Blaine, Larry Buron, RJ de la Cruz, Tracy D'Alanno, Lauren Dunton, Justin Epner, Nichole Fiore, Lindsay Fox, Tyronda Gibson, John Griffith, Mary Joel Holin, Emily Holt, Bulbul Kaul, Michelle Klausner, Joshua Leopold, Saty Patrabansh, Maura Pillsbury, Louise Rothschild, Kate Ryan, Brian Sokol, K.P. Srinath, Jennifer Turnham, Joshua Vaughn, Jeff Ward, Michelle Woodford, Matt White, and Jeff Smith (all from Abt Associates) and Stephen Poulin (University of Pennsylvania).

This year's report also benefited greatly from the contributions of a number of HUD staff. Julie Hovden and Michael Roanhouse of the Office of Community Planning and Development, and Anne Fletcher of the Office of Policy Development and Research have provided overall leadership and vision. The project has also benefited from the support of other HUD staff in the Office of Community Planning and Development, especially Mark Johnston and Ann Oliva.

Finally, this project and this report could not have been possible without the participation of staff from Continuums of Care, local government agencies and nonprofit agencies responsible for HMIS implementation in communities across the country as well as HMIS software solution providers. Their continued commitment is greatly appreciated.

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Point-in-Time Estimates of Homeless People.....	i
One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Homeless People	iii
Sheltered Homeless People in 2009	iii
Trends in Sheltered Homelessness, 2007-2009	iv
The Nationwide Capacity of Residential Programs for Homeless People.....	v
Looking Ahead.....	v
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 History of the AHAR	1
1.2 AHAR Estimates for 2009	3
1.3 This Report	4
1.4 Trends in Homelessness and the Economic Crisis.....	5
Chapter 2 National Estimates of All Homeless People, Sheltered and Unsheltered	7
2.1 One-Day Count of Homeless People.....	7
2.2 Trends in PIT Counts of Homeless People	8
2.3 Where People were Homeless on the Night of the PIT Count	12
2.4 PIT Counts of Homeless Subpopulations.....	14
2.5 Estimates of Sheltered Homeless Individuals and Families during a One-Year Period	17
2.6 Summary of the National Estimates of All Homeless People	18
Chapter 3 Sheltered Homeless People in 2009	21
3.1 Characteristics of People Using Homeless Shelters, 2009	21
3.2 Location of Homeless Service Use, 2009.....	31
3.3 Patterns of Homeless Service Use, 2009	35
3.4 Summary of All Sheltered Homeless People in 2008.....	38
Chapter 4 Trends in Sheltered Homelessness between 2007 and 2009	41
4.1 Changes in the Sheltered Homeless Population between 2007 and 2009	41
4.2 Changing Patterns of Becoming Homeless, 2007-2009	51
4.3 Changing Use of the Residential System for Homeless People, 2007-2009.....	54
4.4 Summary of Trends in Sheltered Homelessness between 2007 and 2009.....	59
Chapter 5 The Nationwide Capacity of Residential Programs for Homeless People	61
5.1 Inventory of Residential Programs and Beds, 2009.....	62
5.2 Geographic Location of Beds, 2009	65
5.3 Bed Utilization and Turnover Rates, 2009	67
5.4 Changes in the National Inventory and Utilization of Beds, 2006-2009.....	69
5.5 Summary of the Nationwide Capacity of Residential Programs for Homeless People	72
Chapter 6 Looking Ahead.....	75
6.1 The 2010 AHAR	76

Appendix A: List of 2009 AHAR Sample Sites and Contributing Communities

Appendix B: Data Collection and Analysis Methodology

Appendix C: Continuum of Care Point-in-Time Counts of Homeless Persons

Appendix D: Counts of Homeless Sheltered Persons Using HMIS Data

Executive Summary

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is pleased to present the 2009 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR), the fifth in a series of reports on homelessness in the United States. The reports respond to a series of Congressional directives calling for the collection and analysis of data on homelessness.

The AHAR reports provide the latest counts of homelessness nationwide—including counts of individuals, persons in families, and special population groups such as veterans and chronically homeless people. The report also covers the types of locations where people use emergency shelter and transitional housing; where people were just before they entered a residential program; how much time they spend in shelters over the course of a year; and the size and use of the U.S inventory of residential programs for homeless people.

With the 2009 AHAR, we now have three complete years of data on the numbers and characteristics of sheltered homeless people, how they became homeless, and how they used the homeless services system. This is important, because we can begin to see discernable trends in homelessness, including the effects of the recession and of changes over time to the homeless services system.

The 2009 AHAR also marks continued improvement in both sources of estimates of homelessness used in the reports. A larger number of communities are reporting Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data to the AHAR, which is used in the analysis of patterns of homelessness over a year's time. In 2009, 334 communities—representing 2,988 counties and 1,056 cities—reported usable HMIS data to the report, a sizable increase from last year's report (222 communities). At the same time, the point-in-time (PIT) counts essential for estimating the numbers and characteristics of *all* homeless people, both sheltered and unsheltered, are improving as communities use more rigorous methodologies for conducting the counts.

For the first time, this 2009 AHAR includes information from in-person interviews with local service providers located in nine communities nationwide. This qualitative information provides a contextual backdrop for understanding how homelessness is changing.

Point-in-Time Estimates of Homeless People

On a single night in January 2009, there were an estimated 643,067 sheltered and unsheltered homeless people nationwide. More than 6 in 10 people who were homeless at a single point-in-time were in emergency shelters or transitional housing programs, while 37 percent were unsheltered on the “street” or in other places not meant for human habitation. The total number of people homeless on a single night has remained fairly stable from year to year, but over time a smaller share of all homeless people is unsheltered, and a larger share is

found in emergency shelters or transitional housing. This may in part reflect better “street counts,” but it probably also reflects community success in getting people off the streets and into shelters or housing.

Data Sources Used in the AHAR

The AHAR is based on two data sources:

1. **Continuum of Care applications** are submitted to HUD annually as part of the competitive funding process and provide one-night, Point-in-Time (PIT) counts of both sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations. The PIT counts are based on the number of homeless persons on a single night during the last week in January, and the most recent PIT counts for which data are available nationally were conducted in January 2009.
2. **Homeless Management Information System (HMIS)** are electronic administrative databases that are designed to record and store client-level information on the characteristics and service needs of homeless persons. HMIS data is used to produce counts of the sheltered homeless population over a full year—that is, people who used emergency shelter or transitional housing programs at some time during the course of a year. The 2009 AHAR uses HMIS data for the most recent, one-year reporting period and compares these data to previous HMIS-based findings.

Nearly two thirds of the people homeless on a single night were homeless as individuals (63 percent), while more than a third (37 percent) were homeless as part of a family. Family members were much less likely than individuals to be unsheltered. Only 21 percent of all homeless family members were unsheltered on the night of the point-in-time count, while almost half of homeless individuals were unsheltered.

Information from CoC applications includes counts of particular homeless subpopulations, including people whose homelessness is chronic—that is, individuals with disabilities and long or frequent patterns of homelessness. National policy has focused on ending chronic homelessness through funding incentives to develop permanent supportive housing and through the dissemination of best practice strategies for reducing chronic homelessness. The January 2009 PIT estimate of chronic homelessness is 110,917 people, more than a 10 percent drop from the PIT count of 124,135 chronically homeless people in 2008. All of the decrease occurred among unsheltered chronically homeless people. While measuring the scope of chronic homelessness remains challenging, a majority of CoCs (53 percent) reported a decrease in chronic homelessness between 2008 and 2009.

Homelessness is heavily concentrated in large coastal states, with California, New York, and Florida accounting for 39 percent of the PIT count in 2009. On a single night in January 2009, the states with the highest concentrations of homeless people were Nevada, where .85 percent of the total population was homeless, followed by Oregon, Hawaii, California, and

Washington. Kansas, South Dakota, and West Virginia had the nation's lowest concentrations of homeless persons.

One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Homeless People

Nearly 1.56 million people used an emergency shelter or a transitional housing program during the 12-month period (October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009). Two thirds were homeless as individuals, and one-third were homeless as members of families.

For the second straight year, the number of sheltered homeless families increased, while the number of sheltered homeless individuals dropped. In 2009, approximately 1,035,000 individuals used sheltered or transitional housing at some time during the year, as did 535,000 people who were there as part of a family. A family is a household that includes an adult 18 years of age or older and at least one child. All other sheltered homeless people are considered individuals. Considered as households rather than separate people, slightly more than 170,000 families were sheltered homeless in 2009, about a 30 percent increase since 2007.

Sheltered Homeless People in 2009

A typical sheltered homeless person in 2009 was an adult male, a member of a minority group, middle-aged, and alone. Men are overrepresented in the sheltered homeless population--63.7 percent of homeless adults are men, compared to 40.5 percent of adults in poverty. African Americans make up 38.7 percent of the sheltered homeless population, about 1.5 times their share of the poverty population. Only 2.8 percent of the sheltered homeless population is 62 years old or older. Homeless people have higher rates of disability than either the poverty population or the total U.S. population; slightly over two-thirds of sheltered homeless adults have a disability, according to HMIS data.

People who are homeless by themselves are very different from those who are homeless with children. Sheltered individuals are overwhelmingly male. More than three quarters are over 30, more than 10 percent are veterans, and more than 40 percent have a disability. In contrast, adults in sheltered homeless families are overwhelmingly female, most are under age 31, and very few are veterans or have a disability. Three-fifths of the people in homeless families are children, and more than half of the children are under age 6.

The geographic distribution of homelessness is markedly different from the distribution of the nation's poverty and total populations. The share of sheltered homeless people in principal cities in 2009 is nearly twice the share of the poverty population in these areas, 68.2 vs. 35.6 percent. Homeless individuals are particularly likely to be in urban areas. Nearly three-quarters of all sheltered individuals (72.2 percent) accessed a homeless residential program in a principal city, compared with 61.2 percent of persons in families.

Almost two-fifths of people entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program during 2009 came from another homeless situation. Among those already homeless, almost two thirds were in shelter rather than in a place not intended for human habitation.

Another two-fifths of people who entered shelter in 2009 came from a housed situation (in their own or someone else's home), and the remaining one-fifth were split between institutional settings or other situations such as hotels or motels. Families were particularly likely to be housed the night before becoming homeless: more than 6 in 10 were either in their own housing unit (20 percent), staying with family (29 percent), or staying with friends (14 percent).

More than three quarters of sheltered homeless people in 2009 used only emergency shelter, 77 percent. Families were more likely than individuals to use transitional housing either alone or in combination with emergency shelter, 30 vs. 19 percent. Most people had relatively short lengths of stay in emergency shelters: the median length of stay was 17 days for individuals and 36 days for persons in families.

Trends in Sheltered Homelessness, 2007-2009

The overall number of sheltered homeless people increased slightly between 2007 and 2008 before dropping slightly—by about 2 percent or 35,000 people—between 2008 and 2009. The continued rise in family homelessness across the three years, from 131,000 families in 2007 to 170,000 families in 2009, is almost certainly related to the recession. However, the increase was more pronounced between 2007 and 2008, even through unemployment rates remained high during the 2009 reporting period (October 2008 through September 2009). It may be that many families already at risk of becoming homeless lacked sufficient support networks and became homeless almost immediately after the economy turned down. A much larger group turned to family and friends and may be doubled up and still at great risk of becoming homeless. The percentage of adults in families who reported that they had been staying with families before entering shelter increased steadily over the three-year period, from 24.2 percent in 2007 to 29.4 percent in 2009, as did the total percentage reporting that they had been in some sort of “housed” situation before becoming homeless, reaching 62.5 percent in 2009.

All of the increase in family homelessness in 2009 compared with 2008 was in the use of emergency shelter by family members, rather than transitional housing. Families stayed longer in shelters in 2009 than in 2008, with the median number of nights rising from 30 to 36. Not only did family homelessness continue to increase between 2008 and 2009, it also seems to have become more severe in the sense that it took the typical family longer to leave shelter.

More individuals—adults entering shelter by themselves—reported that their previous living situation was a place not meant for human habitation in 2009 compared with 2008. This may suggest that communities are having some success in getting people off the “street” and into

shelter or other forms of housing, especially since the overall number of unsheltered homeless individuals reported by communities in the PIT count did not go up.

Few changes occurred in the demographic characteristics of sheltered homeless people. A slight aging of the adult homeless population (more people over 50) is consistent with other research that points to the aging of a cohort of people who became susceptible to homelessness when they were younger. Both families and individuals identifying themselves as African American have dropped steadily, from a high starting point. Adults in sheltered homeless families were more likely in 2009 to be men (20.4 percent) than they were in 2007 (18.0 percent). This likely reflects the pressures of the recession and is consistent with reports from the in-person interviews with providers conducted for this report.

The Nationwide Capacity of Residential Programs for Homeless People

In their annual applications to HUD, CoCs submit information on their inventories of residential beds for homeless people. In 2009, CoCs reported a total of 643,423 year-round beds nationwide in 20,065 separate emergency shelter, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, and safe haven programs.

For several years, one of HUD's policy priorities has been the development of permanent supportive housing programs that provide a combination of housing and supportive services to people who were formerly homeless and with disabilities. In 2009 for the first time, the number of beds in permanent supportive housing surpassed the numbers of beds in emergency shelter or transitional housing. Permanent supportive housing increased by almost 60,000 beds between 2006 and 2009. More than half the growth was in the last year, from just under 196,000 beds in 2008 to more than 219,000 in 2009.

Although there may be other factors that contributed to the decline in unsheltered homelessness and chronic homelessness in the PIT counts—including improved enumeration strategies—we believe the reported reductions reflect this increase in permanent supportive housing.

Looking Ahead

The 2010 AHAR will continue to provide Congress and the nation with updated counts of homelessness nationwide, including counts of individuals, persons in families, and special population groups such as chronically homeless people and persons with disabilities. These topics will be explored using data from an ever-expanding group of communities that participate in the AHAR, which now includes the majority of Continuums of Care nationwide. The 2010 AHAR also will add another full-year of HMIS data to further highlight trends in homelessness and identify any long-term impacts of the economic recession.

The 2010 AHAR will be the first to include data on people served in permanent supportive housing programs, in addition to the data from emergency shelter and transitional housing programs that have constituted the first five AHARs. The slight decrease in the number of people using transitional housing programs in 2009 may have been a result of communities moving families directly from emergency shelters to permanent supportive housing. The 2010 AHAR will be able to assess this question, among many others, in a more nuanced fashion. The 2010 AHAR will also be the first to examine trends in homelessness among veterans, comparing the 2009 supplemental report on homeless veterans (to be released later in 2010) with the 2010 supplemental report.

HUD continues to view the AHAR as the primary resource for up-to-date information about homelessness based on locally-derived HMIS data and is exploring ways to make these data readily accessible to states, localities, and the general public. Based on the AHAR, policymakers and practitioners alike will be able to better understand homelessness in their communities, allocate local homeless assistance funds effectively, improve program operations, and work toward the ultimate goal of ending homelessness.

Chapter 1

Introduction

This report is the fifth Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) on homelessness in the United States. The report provides estimates of the prevalence of homelessness nationwide, the demographic characteristics of homeless people, and the way homeless people use the residential services system. The estimates include the most recent counts of homeless individuals, persons in families, and special population groups such as veterans and persons experiencing chronic homelessness. The report also covers the types of locations where people use emergency shelter and transitional housing; where people were just before they entered a residential program; how much time they spent in shelters over the course of a year; and the size and use of the U.S inventory of residential programs for homeless people.

This report builds on last year's report by adding data on sheltered homeless people for another full year, allowing for a comparative analysis of homelessness that spans three years—2007, 2008, and 2009. The inclusion of data for a third year is important because it marks the establishment of discernable trends in homelessness. This report is also the first to include information from in-person interviews with local service providers located in nine communities nationwide.¹ The qualitative information provides a contextual backdrop for understanding how homelessness is changing throughout the nation. Finally, the report adds Point-in-Time (PIT) counts of sheltered and unsheltered persons and of homeless subpopulations for another year, providing trend data for 2006 through 2009.

The trend information reported in the AHAR is useful for several reasons. Trend information can help federal, state and local policymakers understand whether the nation's policy responses are making a difference. They also show how the portrait of homelessness is changing over time, which may suggest a need to provide additional assistance to particular homeless subpopulations. Finally, trend information on the use of the nation's homeless residential system may suggest the need reallocate funds to support programs that are in high demand.

1.1 History of the AHAR

At the direction of Congress, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) initiated a process to collect and analyze data on homelessness nationwide. HUD created uniform, national data definitions for local Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS), which are designed primarily to be case management tools for local service providers

¹ The nine Continuums of Care are: Cincinnati-Hamilton County CoC, Detroit CoC, Idaho Balance of State CoC, Iowa Balance of State CoC, Memphis CoC, New York City CoC, Phoenix-Maricopa County CoC, San Francisco CoC, and Seaside-Monterey County CoC. The interview participants were local service providers located within each of these communities. The interviews in Idaho and Iowa were with service providers located throughout the state.

and communities. HMIS are maintained by localities, and the geographic coverage of HMIS systems varies considerably. Some systems cover just a city, others a city together with the rest of a metropolitan area. Still others are statewide or cover several counties in a state.. HUD instructed programs receiving HUD McKinney-Vento funding to report to the HMIS and encouraged all programs for homeless people—regardless of their funding source—to report as well. HMIS implementations have grown stronger over the past several years, and participation among local providers in these systems is rising. Currently, about 68 percent of all beds that are available for homeless and formerly homeless people are included in HMIS.²

In concert with the implementation and support of HMIS, HUD established a nationally representative sample of communities and began working with them to produce unduplicated estimates of the sheltered homeless population (i.e., people in emergency shelters and transitional housing).³ These estimates were supplemented by data from additional communities willing to provide their HMIS data. Since 2005, sample communities and others have been submitting unduplicated counts of shelter users, as well as other information about their demographic characteristics and patterns of service use for analysis and reporting in the AHAR.

Five reports have been submitted to Congress since HUD launched this effort:

- The 2005 AHAR covered a three-month period in 2005 and was based on HMIS data reported by 63 communities.
- The 2006 AHAR covered six months, January through June 2006, and included information from 74 communities.
- The 2007 AHAR was the first report to cover an entire year, October 2006-September 2007, and serves as the baseline for analyzing trends over time. For this report, 98 communities provided useable data.
- The 2008 AHAR covered the next 12-month period, October 2007 through September 2008, and used HMIS data from 222 communities.
- This report, or the 2009 AHAR, covers the October 2008 to September 2009 period and includes data from 334 communities— representing 2,988 counties and 1,056 cities.⁴ The report is based on 570,335 person records that were aggregated and reported to the AHAR.

² This includes all year-round and seasonal beds, but excludes overflow or voucher beds. HMIS-bed coverage is lowest among emergency shelters (65.2 percent) and highest among permanent supportive housing (72.9 percent) and safe havens (96.3 percent).

³ An unduplicated estimate means that each person is counted once during a given time period, even if the person is served multiple times during that period.

⁴ Some Continuums of Care submitted data for the sample site located within its jurisdiction, as well as data for the balance of the CoC. The unduplicated count of CoCs that participated in the 2009 AHAR is 296.

HUD also requires CoCs to report point-in-time (PIT) data collected for a single night in January as part of their annual applications for McKinney-Vento funding. The PIT data provide a one-night “snapshot” of homelessness within each CoC, including both the sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations. For several years, HUD has provided extensive technical assistance to communities on how to conduct these PIT counts and, as a result, the reliability of PIT data has improved greatly over time. The CoC applications also provide information on the inventory of residential programs, beds, and units for homeless and formerly homeless people.

Definitions of Key Terms

1. **Homeless Management Information System (HMIS):** HMIS is a software application designed to record and store client-level information on the characteristics and service needs of homeless persons.
2. **Individuals:** The HMIS-based estimates of sheltered homeless individuals include single adults, unaccompanied youth, persons in multi-adult households, and persons in multi-child households. A multi-adult household is a household composed of adults only—no children are present. A multi-child household is composed of children only (e.g., parenting youth)—no adults are present.
3. **One-Year Sheltered Counts:** 12-month counts of homeless persons who use an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at any time from October through September of the following year. The one-year counts are derived from communities’ administrative databases, or Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS).
4. **Persons in Families:** The HMIS-based estimates of homeless persons in families include persons in households with at least one adult and one child.
5. **Point-in-Time (PIT) Counts:** One-night counts of both sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations. The one-night counts are reported on CoC applications and reflect a single-night during the last week in January.
6. **Principal City:** Following guidance from the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, the AHAR replaces the term “central city” with “principal city.” The largest city in each metropolitan or micropolitan statistical area is designated a principal city, and other cities may qualify if specified requirements (population size and employment) are met.
7. **Sheltered:** A homeless person who is in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program for homeless persons.
8. **Unsheltered:** A homeless person who is living in a place not meant for human habitation, such as the streets, abandoned buildings, vehicles, parks, and train stations.

1.2 AHAR Estimates for 2009

The AHAR provides two types of estimates. Estimates that are based on CoC PIT data provide one-night counts of all people who are homeless either in shelters or in places not meant for human habitation (colloquially, “the street”). Estimates that are based on HMIS data provide counts of all people who are sheltered homeless at any time during a year. Both types of estimates are important:

- The PIT data provide a total count of all homeless people on a single night in January and describe the share of people who are sheltered (i.e., in emergency shelter or transitional housing) or unsheltered (i.e., in a place not meant for human habitation) on that night.
- The HMIS data provide longitudinal counts of shelter use over a 12-month period, offer a more detailed demographic profile of sheltered homeless people, and described their use of the residential services system.

At this time, neither PIT nor HMIS-based data support an unduplicated estimate of the total number of people who are sheltered and unsheltered homeless over the course of a year.⁵ However, given the information provided in this report, we can estimate that roughly 2 million people were homeless—sheltered and unsheltered—at some time during 2009.

1.3 This Report

Chapter 2 provides more detail on the counts of homeless persons. The counts reported in chapter 2 include both the PIT estimates of people who are in shelters and on the streets and the HMIS-based estimates of people who access a shelter at some time during 2009. The counts are presented separately for people who are homeless as individuals and those who are part of a family. The chapter describes trends in the PIT estimates over a four-year period, 2006-2009, and also provides detail on how homelessness varies from state to state.

Chapter 3 describes the sheltered homeless population in 2009. The chapter focuses on the demographic characteristics of sheltered homeless people and compares this profile to the characteristics of people living in poverty and the total U.S. population. The chapter also discusses the types of locations where people use residential programs for homeless people and how they use programs—for example, do they use emergency shelter or transitional housing programs and how long do they stay?.

Chapter 4 focuses on trends in sheltered homelessness between 2007 and 2009. The chapter describes shifts in the homeless population between individuals and families, the changing geography of homelessness, and changes in the use of the residential system for homeless people. The chapter also reports changes in the patterns of becoming homeless—that is, where people said they were the night before entering an emergency shelter or a transitional housing program and how long they had been there.

⁵ Adding the unsheltered count from the Point-in-Time estimate to the HMIS-based one-year count would miss people who were unsheltered on some other night during the year but not when the “street count” was conducted. On the other hand, adding the unsheltered count also would double-count the large fraction of the people who are unsheltered homeless on a particular night but who go to emergency shelters at some time during a year and are already counted in the HMIS data.

Chapter 5 documents the numbers and locations of residential programs for homeless people, including permanent supportive housing, as well as emergency shelters and transitional housing programs. The chapter also reports how intensively emergency shelters and transitional housing programs are used and how that has changed over time.

Appendix A provides a list of the communities providing useable data to this 2009 AHAR. Appendix B describes the methodology for selecting the nationally representative sample of communities, collecting and cleaning the data, and for weighting and adjusting the data to create the national estimates. Appendix C presents the PIT estimates for each state and CoC. Appendix D consists of detailed tables based on the HMIS data. The tables provide counts of sheltered homeless people in numerous categories for 2009 and are intended to supplement the information provided in the body of the report. Tables for 2007 and 2008 may be found in the appendices to those AHAR reports.

1.4 Trends in Homelessness and the Economic Crisis

This report captures information on the use of the homeless residential system during the height of the economic and foreclosure crisis, which began in December 2007. The three-year changes documented in this report provide some evidence of how the recession has affected homelessness in America.

The one-year estimates of shelter use show that almost 62,000 more family members were in shelter at some point during 2009 than had been during 2007, making up almost 40,000 families. The continued growth in sheltered family homelessness almost certainly reflects the ongoing effect of the recession. When compared to 2008, a slightly higher proportion of families came from housed situations, most commonly staying with family. The fragile economic circumstances of the relatives of struggling parents may mean that, as soon as job losses begin in an economic downturn, support networks for families at risk of homelessness fall apart. Doubled-up housing situations cannot be sustained, cash is no longer available to help others with rent payments, and families turn to homeless shelters as the only way of keeping a roof over their heads.

The data also show that adults in families were somewhat more likely to be men in 2009 than they were in 2007. Because of the recession, more families with two adults may have become homeless, as well as more families with only a father present. Local service providers in six of the nine communities visited for this report said they had seen an increase in two-parent families and male-headed families. Providers attribute the increase in two-parent families to the effects of the recession, which is making it difficult for even one parent to find a job.

Looking ahead, the long-term impacts of the recession are unclear. A recent study found that the recession has caused a dramatic increase, almost five-fold, in the rate of overcrowding, suggesting that many families are doubling up in response to the economic downturn.⁶ If some of these family support networks already are struggling to make ends meet, some of the doubled-up families may find their way into the homeless residential service system during 2010. On the other hand, as the nation comes out of the recession and as the stimulus funding made available through the Homelessness Prevention and Re-housing Program (HPRP) starts helping families in crisis avoid shelter, it also is possible that family homelessness will decline during the next reporting period. Indeed, as of May 2010, HPRP has already served more than 300,000 people and approximately 75 percent of the funds have been used for prevention services.

⁶ Painter, Gary. 2010. What Happens to Household Formation in a Recession? Research Institute for Housing America and the Mortgage Bankers Association.

Chapter 2

National Estimates of All Homeless People, Sheltered and Unsheltered

This chapter provides the 2009 national estimates of the prevalence of homelessness on a single night and during a 12-month period (October 2008 to September 2009). Using point-in-time (PIT) and HMIS data reported by Continuums of Care, this chapter:

- *Presents the PIT counts of all sheltered and unsheltered homeless people*, distinguishing between sheltered and unsheltered homeless people and between people who are homeless as individuals and as members of families. The chapter also describes how these estimates changed between 2006 and 2009 and describes which states have disproportionate numbers of homeless people compared with the state's overall population.
- *Presents the PIT counts of homeless "subpopulations,"* including people who are chronically homeless; people with severe mental illness; people with substance abuse issues; veterans; unaccompanied youth; and people living with HIV/AIDS.
- *Presents the one-year estimates of sheltered homeless people based on HMIS data.* This chapter summarizes the estimates for 2009 and prior years that are discussed in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4.

2.1 One-Day Count of Homeless People

On a single night in January 2009, all Continuums of Care across the country were required to conduct a thorough enumeration of the homeless.⁷ In total, the 452 CoCs found 643,067 people who were literally homeless on the night of the count. Sixty-three percent of those counted were sheltered—sleeping in emergency shelters or transitional housing—while the other 37 percent were unsheltered—sleeping on the streets, in their cars, in abandoned buildings, or in other places not meant for human habitation. Nearly two-thirds (63 percent) of people who were homeless on the night of the PIT count were individuals. Although the PIT count was conducted in the middle of winter, nearly half of all homeless individuals were unsheltered. Persons in families—households

On a single night in January 2009, there were 643,000 homeless people in shelters or on the streets.

⁷ CoCs are required by HUD to conduct an annual count of their sheltered and unsheltered homeless population every other year, starting in 2007, then 2009, and so on. Many CoCs, however, voluntarily choose to conduct a PIT count each year. In 2008, a third of CoCs did not conduct a new count, but rather reported their 2007 data for the 2008 counts.

with at least one adult and one child—accounted for 37 percent of those homeless on the night of the PIT count. Less than a quarter of homeless persons in families were unsheltered.

The results of the 2009 PIT count confirm that homelessness is still a serious problem that affects far too many people. However, the percentage of all people in the U.S. who are literally homeless on any night is very small. On the night of the January 2009 PIT count roughly one in every 500 people and one in every 75 people living below the poverty line was literally homeless. This suggests that the long-stated goal of eliminating homelessness could be achieved with adequate and effectively targeted resources.

Exhibit 2-1: Homeless Persons and Households by Sheltered Status, Single Night in 2009

Household Type	Number	Percentage
Total People		
Sheltered	403,308	62.7%
Unsheltered	239,759	37.3%
Total	643,067	100.0%
Individuals		
Sheltered	215,995	53.3%
Unsheltered	188,962	46.7%
Total	404,957	100.0%
Persons in Families		
Sheltered	187,313	78.7%
Unsheltered	50,797	21.3%
Total	238,110	100.0%
Total Family Households		
Sheltered	60,843	77.5%
Unsheltered	17,675	22.5%
Total	78,518	100.0%

Source: 2009 Continuum of Care Applications: Exhibit 1, CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Charts

2.2 Trends in PIT Counts of Homeless People

Exhibit 2-2 shows the change in the PIT count of all homeless people between January 2008 and January 2009. The top panel of the exhibit includes all 452 CoCs that submitted data in 2009, while the bottom panel excludes 3 CoCs that experienced important methodological issues in either 2008 or 2009 that merit special attention. The top panel shows a 3.2 percent decrease in the total PIT count of all homeless people from January 2008 to January 2009, from 664,414 to 643,067. The decline includes a 2.5 percent decrease in the number of homeless individuals and a 4.5 percent decrease in the number of homeless persons in families. The exhibit also shows a 4.3 percent increase in the number of sheltered homeless people that was offset by a 13.7 percent decline in the number of people who were unsheltered.

The decline in homelessness in 2009 was driven primarily by a single city with a large homeless population, the City of Los Angeles. Between 2007 and 2009, the total count of homeless people on a single night in Los Angeles decreased from 68,608 to 42,694, and the city's unsheltered homeless count decreased by almost half from 57,166 to 28,644.⁸ In addition to Los Angeles, two other cities experienced significant methodological issues with their annual PIT count of homeless people—New Orleans and Detroit.⁹ Removing these three cities from both the 2008 and 2009 counts reveals a much different trend—the count of sheltered and unsheltered people on a single night in January 2008 and 2009 increases by 2.1 percent. The increase in homelessness includes a 4.1 percent increase in sheltered homelessness and a 1.7 percent decrease in unsheltered homelessness. The removal of these large cities from the PIT counts and the resulting shift in trends illustrates the need to interpret changes in one-night PIT counts carefully. Unlike HMIS-based counts (presented in chapters 3 and 4), one-night PIT counts are particularly sensitive to dramatic changes within the nation's largest cities and to evolving enumeration strategies.

⁸ Los Angeles' point-in-time totals were based on four sources. First, a street count of unsheltered homeless persons conducted over a three-day period in January, covering over 40 percent of the city's census tracts. Several "hot spot" census tracts were selected with certainty (the same hot spots identified in the 2007 PIT count), and all other tracts were selected through stratified random sampling. The results from selected census tracts were extrapolated to provide estimates for the entire CoC. Between 2007 and 2009 the number of people found living in unsheltered locations within Los Angeles decreased from 35,333 to 17,750. Second, the CoC conducted a count of sheltered persons in all of Los Angeles' 452 emergency shelters and transitional housing programs. The number of persons in the sheltered count increased from 11,442 in 2007 to 14,050 in 2009. Third, an enumeration of the "hidden homeless" was conducted via a telephone survey to estimate the number of homeless persons who were sleeping on private property outside a place of residence' (e.g., a car or encampment) at the time of the PIT count. A total of 4,288 households within the Los Angeles CoC responded to the telephone survey and the results were extrapolated to provide a CoC-wide estimate of the hidden homeless. This estimate was included in city's unsheltered count. The 'hidden homeless' estimate decreased from 20,746 in 2007 to 9,968 in 2009. Finally, a separate count of unsheltered homeless youth was conducted in March. The count was organized by eight providers of services to homeless youth, and the enumeration took place in neighborhoods where homeless youth are typically found. Unlike the unsheltered street count, the CoC did not extrapolate the estimates of homeless youth. The homeless youth count declined from 1,087 in 2007 to 926 in 2009. Taken together, these four sources indicated that the total count of homeless people on a single night in Los Angeles decreased from 68,608 to 42,694 between 2007 and 2009.

⁹ The City of New Orleans did not conduct a new PIT count of homeless people in 2008, reporting their 2007 data in their 2008 application. However, the city's 2007 data were highly unreliable because the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina and Ike made it very difficult to produce an accurate PIT count of homeless people. As a result, the change in the number of homeless people from 2007 to 2009 increased dramatically, from 1,619 to 8,725. In the City of Detroit, the city applied an extrapolation factor to their 2008 data to account for people who may have been missed during their count of unsheltered people. The city chose not to apply this extrapolation factor to their 2009 counts, reporting their raw 2009 count without the extrapolation. As a result, the PIT count of homeless people declined dramatically, from 18,062 (in 2008) to 3,694 (in 2009).


Exhibit 2-2: Changes in PIT Counts of Homeless People by Sheltered Status and Household Type, 2008-2009

	2008 Count	2009 Count	Percent Change 2008-2009
All Continuums of Care			
Sheltered Status			
Sheltered	386,361	403,308	+4.3%
Unsheltered	278,053	239,759	-13.7%
Household Type			
Individuals	415,202	404,957	-2.5%
Persons in Families	249,212	238,110	-4.5%
Total	664,414	643,067	-3.2%
Excluding Three Continuums of Care ^a			
Sheltered Status			
Sheltered	369,191	384,486	+4.1%
Unsheltered	206,934	203,468	-1.7%
Household Type			
Individuals	350,523	356,222	+1.6%
Persons in Families	225,602	231,732	+2.7%
Total	576,125	587,954	+2.1%

^a The three CoCs are The City of Los Angeles CoC, the City of Detroit CoC and the City of New Orleans CoC. These CoCs were excluded from the analysis because there were significant methodological issues related to their 2008 or 2009 PIT count of homeless persons.

Source: 2009 Continuum of Care Applications: Exhibit 1, CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Charts excluding Los Angeles, Detroit, and New Orleans data from both 2008 and 2009.

Exhibit 2-3 shows a gradual decline from 2006 to 2009 in the number of individuals and persons in families who were homeless on the night of the annual PIT count. The largest decline occurred between 2006 and 2007 and the counts have been fairly stable since then. While the decline is welcome news, particularly given overall changes to the economy and the housing market, it is difficult to disentangle the effects of successful policy interventions from nationwide improvements in PIT enumeration methods that have lead to greater accuracy.




Source: 2006 through 2009 Continuum of Care Application: Exhibit 1, CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Charts

In addition, these national trends mask some of the changes that occurred within CoCs. As shown in Exhibit 2-4, one-third of CoCs reported an increase in both individual and family homelessness, one-quarter reported a decrease in both categories, and the remainder reported an increase in one category and a decrease in the other. A majority of CoCs reported an increase in sheltered homelessness (58 percent) but a decrease in unsheltered homelessness (53 percent) (see Exhibit 2-5). The increase in the proportion of sheltered homeless people could suggest that communities are successfully moving people off of the streets and into shelter or other forms of housing. HMIS data (reported in Chapter 4) also show that more individuals report sleeping in a place not suitable for human habitation before entering shelter.

Exhibit 2-5 also shows considerable fluctuations in the magnitude of change in CoC's PIT counts of homeless people. Forty percent of CoCs reported an increase or decrease of 50 percent or more in their unsheltered count, and only 14 percent reported such large changes in their sheltered counts. Unsheltered counts are more prone to large shifts from one year to the next for several reasons. First, shelters have capacity constraints that limit how many people they can serve on any night. Unless CoCs change their capacity by adding or reducing shelter beds, their sheltered counts can fluctuate only within a limited range. In contrast, there is no fixed limit on how many people can be living in unsheltered conditions at any time. Also, conducting a count of sheltered people can be relatively straightforward

Exhibit 2.4 Change in Homelessness Among CoCs, 2008-2009



CoCs Reporting:

- Increase in family and individual homelessness
- Increase in families; decrease in individuals
- Increase in individuals; decrease in families
- Decrease in both individual and family homelessness

while conducting accurate counts of unsheltered people can be very challenging. Street count methodologies differ greatly by CoC and year, and even marginal changes to these methodologies can result in substantial impacts on the counts. Finally, inclement weather conditions can hamper CoCs abilities to conduct thorough street counts on any given year, and thus lead to considerable changes in their counts of unsheltered homeless persons.

For the 2009 PIT count, HUD contacted any CoC that reported either a greater than 100 percent increase or a greater than 50 percent decrease in its unsheltered homeless count between 2008 and 2009. Of the 79 CoCs contacted, 41 (or 52 percent) attributed the change to a change in their methodology, 23

(or 29 percent) to a change in the weather, and 15 (or 19 percent) believed the change was an accurate reflection of the number of unsheltered homeless people in their CoC. These results highlight the need for caution when attempting to attribute changes in the data to larger policy or economic factors.

Exhibit 2-5: Magnitude of Change in PIT Counts of Homeless People by Sheltered Status and Household Type, 2008-2009

	Decrease of more than 50%	20-50% Decrease	Decrease of less than 20%	No Change	Increase of less than 20%	20-50% Increase	Increase of more than 50%
Sheltered Status							
Sheltered	3%	11%	26%	2%	32%	15%	11%
Unsheltered	20%	19%	14%	1%	13%	13%	20%
Household Type							
Individuals	4%	16%	24%	1%	28%	13%	12%
Persons in Families	6%	15%	25%	2%	21%	16%	15%
Total Persons	4%	13%	27%	<1%	32%	14%	10%

Source: 2008 and 2009 Continuum of Care Applications: Exhibit 1, CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Charts

2.3 Where People were Homeless on the Night of the PIT Count

Exhibit 2-6 shows the percentage of the homeless and total U.S. population within each census region. Compared to their portion of the total population, people in the West are over-represented within the homeless population and people in the Midwest and South are under-represented. Between 2008 and 2009 the number of homeless people stayed the same in the Northeast, decreased in the Midwest and West, and increased in the South.

Exhibit 2-6: PIT Count of Homeless People by Census Region, 2009

	Percent of Homeless Population	Percent of Total U.S. Population
Northeast	18%	18%
Midwest	12%	22%
South	32%	37%
West	37%	23%


Source: 2009 Continuum of Care Application: Exhibit 1, CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Chart. Total population count comes from 2006-2008 weighted averages from the American Community Survey.

Appendix C provides the results of the 2009 homeless PIT counts for each state. The data show that, while homelessness occurs everywhere throughout the United States, it is particularly concentrated in large coastal states. Thirty-nine percent of people counted as homeless on the night

of the PIT count were located in California, New York, or Florida. These three states account for 25 percent of the total U.S. population. The disproportionate presence of homelessness in these states could be because of high housing costs in these states.

States that have large shares of homeless people when compared to their total state populations include some smaller states as well (see Exhibit 2-7). Excluding Washington, DC, which is not a state, Nevada has the highest number of homeless people per capita, followed by Oregon, Hawaii, California, and Washington State. All of these states are located in the West and, as discussed in chapter 5, have the largest bed per capita rates in the nation. Their high percentages of homeless people could reflect a high percentage of total population found in principal cities (Nevada), high housing costs (California and Hawaii), or a high percentage of adult men without family attachments (Oregon and Washington). Kansas, South Dakota, and West Virginia had the lowest reported rates of homelessness.

Exhibit 2-7: Percentage of National Homeless Population by State




2.4 PIT Counts of Homeless Subpopulations

The PIT data also provide information on the number of homeless people who are in particular subpopulations. CoCs are required to collect information on the number of chronically homeless people (for both sheltered and unsheltered locations) and on other subpopulations, such as veterans and people with severe mental illness (for sheltered conditions only).

Chronic Homelessness

The 2009 PIT count identified 110,917 individuals who met the definition of chronic homelessness.¹⁰ The majority of chronically homeless individuals (58 percent) were unsheltered. Overall, 27 percent of all homeless individuals, 21 percent of sheltered homeless individuals, and 35 percent of unsheltered homeless individuals experienced chronic homelessness.

¹⁰ A chronically homeless person is defined as an unaccompanied homeless individual with a disabling condition who has been either continuously homeless for a year or more or who has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years. To be considered chronically homeless, a person must have been on the streets or in emergency shelter (e.g., not in transitional or permanent housing) during these stays. Prior to the passage of the HEARTH Act persons in families could not be considered chronically homeless.



Source: 2006 through 2009 Continuum of Care Applications: Exhibit 1, CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Charts

As shown in Exhibit 2-8, the number of chronically homeless individuals decreased by 10.6 percent from 2008 to 2009, from 124,135 to 110,917. The number of sheltered chronically homeless individuals stayed the same, while the number of unsheltered homeless individuals decreased. As in the overall PIT counts, the majority of the decline in chronic homelessness occurred within the City of Los Angeles. Excluding the City of Los Angeles from both the 2008 and 2009 counts, there was a 1.1 percent decline in chronic homelessness.

A slight majority of CoCs (53 percent) reported a decrease in chronic homelessness between 2008 and 2009 (see Exhibit 2-9). As the exhibit suggests, only 13 percent of CoCs reported a 50 percent or greater decline in chronic homelessness, but this small proportion of CoCs accounted for more than 23,000 fewer chronically homeless people between 2008 and 2009.

Exhibit 2-9: Magnitude of Change in PIT Counts of Chronically Homeless People, 2008-2009

	Decrease of more than 50%	20-50% Decrease	Decrease of less than 20%	No Change	Increase of less than 20%	20-50% Increase	Increase of more than 50%
Percent of CoCs	13%	20%	20%	4%	13%	14%	16%
Total Change	-23,116	-9,166	-2,255	0	775	4,749	15,320

Source: 2008 and 2009 Continuum of Care Applications: Exhibit 1, CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Charts

Other Subpopulations

CoCs were also asked to report on the number of sheltered homeless people on a single night in January who are veterans, have severe mental illness, chronic substance abuse problems, HIV/AIDS, are victims of domestic violence, or who are unaccompanied youth (see Exhibit 2-10).¹¹ Based on these PIT estimates, one-third of sheltered homeless persons were reported to have a chronic substance abuse problem and one-quarter reportedly had a severe mental illness on a single night in January 2009. Thus, a large percentage of the homeless population has issues that go beyond a temporary housing crisis, and supportive services maybe needed to address those issues. However, contrary to the perceptions that some people have of homelessness, a majority of homeless shelter users do not have chronic substance abuse problems or severe mental illness.


Thirteen percent of sheltered homeless adults were veterans, a lower percentage than has been reported elsewhere. There are several possible explanations for this discrepancy. First, the PIT data on veteran status are only for sheltered homeless people, and homeless veterans may be more likely to be unsheltered than other homeless people. If so, the percentage of sheltered homeless people who are veterans would be lower than the percentage of all homeless people who are veterans. Second, in some areas of the country, residential programs for the homeless that are funded through the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs do not report data to the CoC. Finally, there is anecdotal evidence that homeless veterans sometimes do not divulge their veteran status to homeless program staff.

Victims of domestic violence constituted twelve percent of the sheltered homeless population, four percent had HIV/AIDS, and only one percent consisted of unaccompanied people less than 18 years of age.

The percent of the sheltered population with any of these characteristics or experiences in January 2009 was lower than it was in January 2008 or in January 2006. The reasons for the

¹¹ Veterans status was only asked of adults. Substance abuse, mental illness, and HIV/AIDS status was asked of all adults and unaccompanied youth but not children in families.

decrease are difficult to pinpoint. One possible factor is the development of permanent supportive housing specifically targeted to certain subpopulations (HIV/AIDS, veterans, chronic substance abusers, people with severe mental illness). Second, improvements in methodology may have contributed to the decline, as CoCs have stopped including substance abuse programs, orphanages, or other programs with residents who should not be considered homeless in their PIT counts. Finally, the recession may be causing an increase in the number of people who are homeless for purely economic reasons.



Source: 2006 – 2009 Continuum of Care Applications: Exhibit 1, CoC Point-in-Time Homeless Population and Subpopulations Charts

2.5 Estimates of Sheltered Homeless Individuals and Families during a One-Year Period

This section shifts from information based on CoC PIT data to longitudinal estimates of the number of people using emergency shelters and transitional housing at any time during the one-year period from October 1, 2008 to September 30, 2009. These estimates are based on CoCs' HMIS data. Unlike the PIT counts, CoCs are not required to participate in the AHAR, and thus some CoCs do not submit HMIS data to HUD. Participation in the AHAR is growing immensely, from 222 communities in 2008 to 334 communities in 2009, spurred by the inclusion of AHAR-related questions in the CoC competitive scoring process for McKinney-Vento funds. Altogether, the 334 communities that participated in the 2009 AHAR submitted usable data on 570,335 person records. These data were statistically

adjusted to produce the national estimates that are summarized here and presented in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4.¹²

Roughly 1.56 million people, or one in every 200 Americans, spent at least one night in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program in 2009. Two-thirds of sheltered persons were individuals and one-third were persons in families. The total number of homeless shelter users declined by nearly 30,000 people from 2008 to 2009. However, for the second straight year the number of homeless families increased: 473,541 in 2007; 516,724 in 2008; and 535,447 in 2009. Overall, family homelessness increased by about 7 percent between 2008 and 2009 and 30 percent from 2007 to 2009. As a result of this increase, along with the drop in the number of individual homeless people, the percentage of sheltered homeless people who were homeless as part of families rather than by themselves increased from 29.8 percent in 2007 to 34.1 percent in 2009.

Exhibit 2-11: Estimates of Sheltered Homeless Individuals and Persons in Families During a One-Year Period, 2007-2009

	2007		2008		2009	
	Total Number	% of Sheltered Homeless Population	Total Number	% of Sheltered Homeless Population	Total Number	% of Sheltered Homeless Population
Total Number of Sheltered Persons ^a	1,588,595 ^c		1,593,794 ^c		1,558,917 ^c	
Individuals ^b	1,115,054	70.2%	1,092,612	67.9%	1,034,659	65.9%
Persons in families	473,541 ^d	29.8%	516,724 ^d	32.1%	535,447 ^d	34.1%
Number of Sheltered Households with Children	130,968 ^d	-	159,142 ^d	-	170,129 ^d	-

^a These estimated totals reflect the number of homeless persons in the 50 states and the District of Columbia who used emergency shelters or transitional housing programs during the one-year period from October 1 through September 30 of the following year. The estimates do not cover the U.S. Territories and Puerto Rico and do not include persons served by "victim service providers." The estimated totals include an extrapolation adjustment to account for people who use emergency shelters and transitional housing programs but whose jurisdictions do not yet participate in their respective HMIS. However, a homeless person who does not use an emergency shelter or transitional housing during the 12-month period is not included in this estimate. Percentages may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

^b This category includes unaccompanied adults and youth as well as multi-adult households without children.

^c This estimate includes unaccompanied individuals and persons in households. In 2007, the 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated number of sheltered homeless persons in the population was 1,043,775 to 2,133,415 persons (or +/- 544,820 persons). In 2008, the 95 percent confidence interval is 1,180,758 to 2,006,830 (or +/- 413,036 persons). In 2009, the 95 percent confidence interval is 1,265,075 to 1,922,513 (or +/- 328,719).

^d In 2007 - 2009, approximately 1 percent of homeless persons were served both as an unaccompanied individual and a person in a family. In this exhibit, such people appear in both categories in 2008, so the total number of sheltered persons is slightly less than the sum of individuals and families.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

¹² See Appendix B for a description of the weighting techniques used to produce national estimates from HMIS data.

Chapter 3 provides information on the characteristics of people who used emergency shelter and transitional in 2009, and Chapter 4 provides detailed information on the trends in sheltered homelessness across the three years from 2007 to 2009.

2.6 Summary of the National Estimates of All Homeless People

Results from the single-night PIT count:

- On a single night in January 2009, 643,000 people were homeless. Nearly two-thirds stayed in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program and the other third were living on the street, in an abandoned building, or another place not meant for human habitation.
- The number of homeless persons on the night of the PIT count decreased 3.2 percent from January 2008 to January 2009. However, this decline reflects a steep decline in the homeless population of a single city, Los Angeles. Removing Los Angeles from both counts, the total number of homeless people increased although the number of unsheltered homeless people still decreased.
- A majority of CoCs reported an increase in sheltered homelessness and a decrease in unsheltered homelessness. Communities may be successfully moving people of the street and into shelter or other forms of housing.
- Large coastal states—California, New York, and Florida—accounted for 39 percent of people who were homeless on the night of the PIT count. Several other western states, besides California, had large shares of homeless people compared to their total state populations.
- Chronic homelessness seems to have continued a long-term pattern of decline between 2008 and 2009.

Results from one-year estimates from HMIS data:

- Nearly 1.56 million people spent at least one night in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program between October 1, 2008 and September 30, 2009.
- Nearly 35,000 fewer people used emergency shelter or transitional housing in 2009 than in 2008. However, the number of families in homeless programs increased by nearly 11,000. Since 2007 there has been a nearly 30 percent increase in the number of sheltered families.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 3

Sheltered Homeless People in 2009

This chapter provides a profile of the estimated 1.56 million sheltered homeless people in 2009. The chapter is based on HMIS data reported by 334 jurisdictions nationwide and weighted to represent the entire nation. The data were collected on anyone who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at some time from October 2008 through September 2009.

As in past reports, the profile of sheltered homeless people focuses on three topics:

- ***The demographic characteristics of sheltered homeless people.*** Who were the sheltered homeless? How did the characteristics of homeless people compare to those of the overall population living in poverty and the U.S. population as a whole?
- ***The location of homeless service use.*** In what types of communities (urban, suburban or rural) did people use emergency and transitional housing programs? Where did they stay before using residential homeless services?
- ***The patterns of homeless service use.*** How did people use emergency and transitional housing programs? How long did people stay in homeless residential facilities?

These topics are discussed for the total, sheltered homeless population and separately for individuals and for persons in families. Most *individuals* are unaccompanied adults. For the purposes of this report, a *family* includes persons in households with at least one adult and one child, so all other households (e.g., unaccompanied youth and two adults who are homeless together but without children) are considered to be homeless as individuals.

Definition of Sheltered Homeless Individuals and Persons in Families

- **Sheltered homeless individuals** include single adults, unaccompanied youth, persons in multi-adult households, and persons in multi-child households.
- **Sheltered homeless persons in families** include persons in households with at least one adult and one child.

3.1 Characteristics of People Using Homeless Shelters, 2009

Characteristics of All Sheltered Persons

Homelessness can befall people of all genders, races and ages. A portrait of the estimated 1.6 million people who used a shelter between October 2009 and September 2010 is provided in Exhibit 3-1. In 2009, a typical sheltered homeless person had the following characteristics:

A typical homeless person is a middle-aged, adult male who is a member of a minority group and is by himself.

- *Adult*—78 percent of all sheltered homeless persons are adults.
- *Male*—61 percent are male.
- *Minority*—62 percent are members of a minority group.
- *Middle-age*—38 percent are 31 to 50 years old.
- *Alone*—64 percent are in one-person households.
- *No special needs*—62 percent do not have a disability.

Exhibit 3-1 also compares the characteristics of the sheltered homeless population with those of the U.S. poverty and total populations, highlighting several important differences. When compared to these populations, homeless people are much more likely to be adult males, African-Americans, not elderly, alone, veterans, and disabled.

Adult males. Adult men are overrepresented in the sheltered homeless population. An estimated 63.7 percent of homeless adults are men, compared to 48.7 percent of the overall population and 40.5 percent of the poverty population. As noted in previous reports, the large proportion of adult men in the shelter system is likely associated with several factors: gaps in the Unemployment Insurance program; an inability to qualify for the largest safety net programs (e.g., Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and Social Security);¹³ higher rates of substance abuse than among women; and a greater likelihood that men have institutional histories that are related to homelessness (e.g., incarceration).¹⁴

¹³ Single men who are poor may be more vulnerable to homelessness because of large gaps in the Unemployment Insurance program and because the largest safety net programs, such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Social Security, are for families or elderly people. The share of unemployed workers receiving unemployment insurance has declined in recent decades and the gap may be particularly perilous for men because poor women are likely to be accompanied by children and thus eligible for TANF. Adult poor men also have higher rates of substance abuse than women, but substance abuse has not been a categorical eligibility criterion for SSI since 1996. Thus, some women may fall through one social safety net but be caught by another; men may miss them all. See the 2008 Annual Homeless Assessment Report. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington D.C.

¹⁴ The share of individual sheltered homeless men reported in the HMIS may be artificially high. First, the HMIS data do not include adults served by domestic violence providers, most of whom are women, because domestic violence providers are prohibited by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (reauthorized in 2000 and 2005) from participating in HMIS. Second, some shelters have policies prohibiting men over a certain age from sleeping in family shelters, requiring men and teenage boys to stay at men's shelters alone.

A study of patterns of homelessness among families in four communities—Houston TX, Washington DC, Kalamazoo MI, and upstate South Carolina—tracked people from their first entry into the homeless services system (based on HMIS data) for 18 months (30 months in DC) and found that many adults who were homeless as part of a family during part of the tracking period used shelters for individuals at other times during the tracking period. Brooke Spellman, Jill Khadduri, Brian Sokol, and Josh Leopold, *Costs Associated with First-Time Homelessness for Families and Individuals*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, March 2010.

Exhibit 3-1: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons in 2009 Compared to the 2008 U.S. and Poverty Populations

Characteristic	Percentage of All Sheltered Homeless Persons, 2009	Percentage of the 2008 U.S. Poverty Population	Percentage of the 2008 U.S. Population
Gender of Adults			
Male	63.7%	40.5%	48.7%
Female	36.3%	59.5%	51.3%
Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic/non-Latino	80.5%	75.1%	84.6%
Hispanic/Latino	19.5%	24.9%	15.4%
Race			
White, Non-Hispanic	38.1%	46.2%	65.4%
White, Hispanic	11.6%	15.0%	9.6%
Black or African American	38.7%	22.1%	12.4%
Other Single Race	4.7%	13.8%	10.3%
Multiple Races	7.0%	2.9%	2.3%
Age^a			
Under age 18	22.2%	33.9%	24.3%
18 to 30	22.3%	23.8%	18.2%
31 to 50	38.3%	21.9%	28.2%
51 to 61	14.4%	9.2%	13.9%
62 and older	2.8%	11.3%	15.4%
Household Size^b			
1 person	64.1%	16.6%	13.0%
2 people	10.0%	18.4%	25.6%
3 people	10.2%	17.1%	18.9%
4 people	7.9%	18.5%	20.9%
5 or more people	7.9%	29.4%	21.6%
Special Populations			
Veteran (adults only) ^c	11.1%	5.2%	9.7%
Disabled (adults only) ^c	37.8%	26.2%	15.5%

^a Age is calculated based on a person's first time in shelter during the one-year reporting period.

^b If a person is part of more than one household or the household size changed during the reporting period, the household size reflects the size of the first household in which the person presented during the one-year reporting period. For all population types, past reports counted each person in a multi-adult or multi-child household as an individual household composed of one person. In this report, persons in these households are counted as one household composed of multiple people. For example, a household composed of two adults with no children is counted as one household with a household size equal to two, rather than two households with each household size equal to 1.

^c Veteran and disability status are recorded only for adults in HMIS. The percentage calculations shown indicate the percent of homeless adults with this characteristic. Some records were missing information on disability status (10.5 percent) and veteran status (5.3 percent) in 2009. The percentage calculations are for those whose disability and veteran status was known.

Sources: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009; 2008 American Community Survey

African Americans. African Americans represent 38.7 percent of the sheltered homeless population, more than 3 times their share of the U.S. population and about 1.75 times their share of the poverty population. The overrepresentation of African Americans in the homeless population is related to urban concentrations of homelessness. According to 2008 data from the U.S. Census Bureau, about 46 percent of the African American population and 57.7 percent of the poor African American population lives in principal cities. By contrast, only 16 percent of the white non-Hispanic population and 35 percent of the white Hispanic population lives in these areas.¹⁵

Non-elderly. Only 2.8 percent of the sheltered homeless population is 62 years old or older, compared to 11.3 percent of the poverty population and 15.4 percent of the total U.S. population. The lower rate of elderly people among the shelter population is likely associated with two factors. First, an array of social safety-net programs in the United States for people aged 65 or older—including Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security, Medicare, and public and other assisted housing for seniors—should help many vulnerable persons avoid shelter. Second, medical morbidity rates—or the incidence of a disease, mental health issues, or substance abuse disorders—are much higher among homeless people, especially chronically homeless persons.¹⁶ High medical morbidity rates, in turn, place homeless people at higher risk of mortality than their housed counterparts. Homeless people are 3 to 4 times more likely to die prematurely than the general population.¹⁷

Alone. Nearly two-thirds of the total sheltered population (64.1 percent) are in single-person households, nearly 4 times the proportion of such households in the poverty population and about 5 times the proportion in the national population.¹⁸ Since most homeless individuals are men, the reasons both single-person households and men are disproportionately represented in the sheltered homeless population are likely the same.

¹⁵ Steven Ruggles, J. Trent Alexander, Katie Genadek, Ronald Goeken, Matthew B. Schroeder, and Matthew Sobek. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 5.0 [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2010.

¹⁶ Burt, Martha, Laudan Aron, Edgar Lee and Jesse Valente. 2001. *Helping America's Homeless*. Urban Institute Press. Washington DC; Caton, Carol, Carol Wilkins, and Jacquelyn Anderson. 2007. "People Who Experience Long-Term Homelessness: Characteristics and Interventions." *Toward Understanding Homelessness: The 2007 National Symposium on Homelessness Research*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Washington DC.

¹⁷ O'Connell, James J. "Premature Mortality in Homeless Populations: A Review of the Literature," *National Health Care for the Homeless Council*. December 2005.

¹⁸ Past reports counted each person in a multi-adult or multi-child household as an individual household composed of one person (i.e., a 1-person household). In this report, persons in these household compositions are counted as one household composed of multiple people. For example, a household composed of two adults with no children is counted as one household with a household size equal to two, rather than two households with household size equal to one each.

Veterans. Veterans are slightly more likely to be represented in the sheltered homeless population than the general population. Veterans represent about 11.1 percent of all sheltered adults, compared to 5.2 percent of the poverty population and 9.7 percent of the total U.S. adult population. Many veterans confront the same issues that lead others into homelessness, such lack of affordable housing and inadequate income and savings. But they also have barriers that can be particularly acute among service-men and -women returning from active duty, such as the lingering effects of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and substance abuse. These issues can make it difficult for veterans to find and maintain gainful employment, which in turn can make it difficult to pay for housing.

When compared to their counterparts nationwide, homeless people are much more likely to be adult males, African-Americans, non-elderly, alone, veterans, and disabled.

Disabled. Nearly four in ten sheltered adults (37.8 percent) has a disability, compared to 26.2 percent of the poverty population and 15.5 percent of the total U.S. population.¹⁹ Thus, a homeless adult is nearly 2.5 times more likely to have a disability than an adult in the U.S. population. The higher disability rates among the homeless population are expected because a disability, particularly one relating to substance abuse or mental health, can make it difficult to work enough to afford housing. People with disabilities also have higher rates of housing discrimination and, therefore, may have difficulties finding suitable housing.²⁰

Finally, as noted in the 2008 AHAR, the ability of SSI and SSDI to avert homelessness among persons with disabilities is uncertain. A disabled person whose only income in 2009 was a monthly SSI payment in 2009 was well under the poverty level for a single-person household. The average annual SSI payment is about 44 percent below the poverty level.²¹ Even so, only an

¹⁹ In the HMIS Data and Technical Standards (69 FR 45888, July 30, 2004), a disabling condition includes a diagnosable substance abuse disorder, in order to match the definition found in the regulations implementing the McKinney-Vento Act's Supportive Housing and Shelter Plus Care programs. However, the U.S. Census Bureau does not include substance abuse disorders as a form of disability, and thus the broader definition used by HUD is likely to result in larger estimates of homeless persons with disabilities compared to the U.S. poverty and general population.

²⁰ Turner, Margery, Carla Herbig, Deborah Kaye, Julie Fenderson, and Diane Levy. 2005. *Discrimination Against Persons with Disabilities*. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Washington DC.

²¹ In 2009, the average monthly SSI payment was \$504 (or about \$6,048 annually) and the poverty level for a single-person household was \$10,830. U.S. Social Security Administration Office of Retirement and Disability Policy. *Monthly Statistical Snapshot*, March 2009. Available at http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/quickfacts/stat_snapshot/. See also: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *The 2009 HHS Poverty Guidelines*. Washington, DC. Available at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/09poverty.shtml>.

estimated 10 to 15 percent of homeless people received SSI or SSDI assistance.²² Many homeless people who qualify for assistance do not apply or fail to complete the application process because the process is daunting and particularly difficult for people with severe mental illness. Also, several common types of disabilities among homeless people, such as substance abuse issues and personality disorders, are not eligibility criterion for SSI.

Among all people in the United States, about 1 in 195 used a homeless residential facility at some time during the 12 month reporting period. The likelihood of using a residential homeless facility is much higher for some population groups (Exhibit 3-2). The highest risk groups are African Americans (1 in 67) and adult men (1 in 145). Among all those who are poor, about 1 in 25 is likely to enter shelter at some time during the year, and the variations among particular types of poor people are equally striking. Veterans (1 in 10), adult men (1 in 14), and African Americans (1 in 15) in poverty are at highest risk of becoming homeless.

Exhibit 3-2: Odds of Becoming Part of the Sheltered Homeless Population, 2009

Group	Odds Within the Total U.S. Population	Odds Within the U.S. Poverty Population
All Persons	1 in 195	1 in 25
Persons in Families	1 in 296	1 in 45
Children	1 in 214	1 in 38
All Adults	1 in 190	1 in 21
Adult Men	1 in 145	1 in 14
Adult Women	1 in 269	1 in 35
All Minorities	1 in 105	1 in 21
African Americans	1 in 67	1 in 15
Veterans	1 in 176	1 in 10

Sources: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009

Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Individuals and Persons in Families


Among the estimated 1.56 million homeless people in shelter, about two-thirds are homeless as individuals (66 percent) and about one-third are persons in families (34 percent). Considered as households rather than separate people, there were about 170,000 sheltered families, or 14.3 percent of all sheltered homeless households.²³ As shown in Exhibit 3-3, the overwhelming majority of homeless individuals are unaccompanied adult men. Only a quarter of

²² See the SSI/SDI Outreach, Access and Recovery (SOAR) Initiative:
http://www.prainc.com/SOAR/soar101/what_is_soar.asp

²³ There were 1,034,659 homeless individuals, nearly all of whom were individual adult males, individual adult females, or unaccompanied youth. There were also 25,216 adults in multi-adult households. Assuming 2 adults per multi-adult household and each individual as a household, the percent of households that were families is 14.3 percent (or 170,129 divided by 1,189,294).

are unaccompanied adult females. However, the profile of the individual homeless population varies from community to community, and the site visits conducted for this report provided an opportunity to explore some of this variation (see side bar on “Local Faces of Individual Homelessness”).

As Exhibit 3-3 suggests, very few people are homeless only with other adults or are people under age 18 without accompanying adults.²⁴ Together, these groups represent only 4 percent of all sheltered homeless individuals. About three fifths of homeless people in families are children under age 18 (61 percent); the rest are adults (39 percent).



The portrait of homelessness differs significantly by household type—that is, people who are homeless by themselves are very different than those who are homeless as part of a family. In 2009, sheltered homeless individuals and persons in families looked different along several key characteristics (see Exhibit 3-4 for more details).

²⁴ The percentage of unaccompanied youth in the shelter system may be higher if facilities that specifically target homeless youth—such as Runaway and Homeless Youth programs funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services—are disproportionately not participating in HMIS. Bed inventory information reported by CoCs for 2009 suggests that 62.3 percent of all beds targeted to homeless youth currently participate in HMIS, compared to 74.5 percent of all beds in the national inventory. Thus, it is possible that the one-year estimates slightly undercount the total number of homeless youth in shelters.

Characteristic	Sheltered Individuals	Sheltered Persons in Families
Gender of Adults	• Overwhelmingly male	• Overwhelmingly female adults
Race	• Nearly as likely to be a non-minority	• Almost half are African-Americans
Age	• Three-quarters are over 30	• More than four-fifths are under 31
Veterans	• More than 1 in 10 are veterans	• Very unlikely to be a veteran
Disabled	• More than 4 in 10 are disabled	• Low rates of disability

Gender of Adults. Most sheltered homeless individuals are men. In 2009, 71 percent of all sheltered individuals were adult men and only 25 percent were adult women staying alone. Assuming that most homeless persons are poor before using a shelter, the high rate of men among individuals suggests that for every 14 men living by themselves with incomes below the poverty line, 1 is likely to access a homeless shelter at some time during the year. Only 1 of every 35 women living alone in poverty access the homeless shelter system. By comparison, adults who become homeless together with children are usually, but not always, women. In 2009, 79.6 percent of adults in families with children were women. Women in families with incomes below the poverty line are 2 times more likely to use a shelter than their male counterparts.

Race. Even though the majority of all sheltered people are minorities, almost half of all individuals (45.4 percent) are white and not Hispanic. By contrast, less than one-quarter of persons in families are non-Hispanic and white (23.6 percent) and nearly half are African American (47.9 percent). Thus, people of different racial and ethnic groups may experience homelessness differently—non-minorities more often as single persons and minorities more often with accompanying children.

The profile of homeless individuals and persons in families differs considerably, especially in terms of gender, race, age, and veteran and disability status.

Age. Half of all homeless individuals in shelter are 31-50 years old and three-quarters are over age 30. Sheltered families are much younger. Three-fifths of all persons in families are children (under age 18), and more than half (55.2 percent) of the adults in families are between age 18 and 30. Homeless children in shelters are also fairly young. More than half (52.6 percent) are under age 6; 32.5 percent are age 6 to 12, and 14.8 percent are age 13 to 17.

Veteran Status. A much larger proportion of adult individuals are veterans compared to adults in families. An estimated 13.0 percent of adult individuals are veterans compared to 2.1 percent of adults in families. The higher rate of veterans among individuals is expected because the overwhelming majority of sheltered individuals are men and men are more likely to be in the military.

Disability. More than 4 in 10 individual homeless adults (42.9 percent) have disabilities, compared to 14 percent of adults in families. The significantly higher prevalence of disabilities among homeless individuals is likely explained by the disproportionate presence of older people and men in individual homeless households. Many epidemiologic survey studies have shown

that rates of drug and alcohol disorders are consistently higher among men than among women. For example, the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC) surveyed more than 40,000 adults and found that men are twice as likely as women to abuse drugs and three times more likely to abuse alcohol.²⁵

Local “Faces” of Individual Homelessness

City of Detroit. The typical homeless individual in Detroit is similar to the national average: he is an African-American man between the ages of 31 and 50. However, providers in Detroit also described other types of individuals in need of housing. Senior citizens, for example, comprise an increasing share of Detroit’s homeless population. As described further in Chapter 4, some of these seniors have been homeless for much of their adult lives, while others only became homeless after retirement. Detroit providers also report that the city has a large population of homeless teens (aged 17 to 20) who have trouble leasing housing on their own, struggle in doubled-up situations, and are turned away from shelters that cannot accommodate teenage boys.

Seaside and Monterey Counties. In Seaside and Monterey Counties, on the central Californian coast, homeless individuals are more likely to be white and female. They are also somewhat more likely to be young, between the ages of 18 and 30. But providers also report that the number of older single women accessing homeless services is on the rise. Most of these women are single following a divorce or as a result of domestic violence, and many have recently lost their jobs. Some became homeless after their apartment building went into foreclosure. Locally, there are few services dedicated to serving senior homeless women, and providers that typically serve individuals struggle to accommodate their needs.

Phoenix and Maricopa County. Phoenix and Maricopa County (Arizona) also have a relatively large proportion of single homeless women. Providers suggest that they have seen a significant increase in single adult homelessness and that this trend is likely to continue into the next year. They report that single women are more likely than women in families to have severe mental disabilities and a history of drug addiction. They also suggest that single women are hard to engage in housing and services when transitional housing and permanent supportive housing programs require treatment compliance.

Idaho Balance of State. In contrast to the national average, the individual homeless population in the Idaho Balance of State Continuum of Care is predominantly white and mostly between the ages of 18 and 30. The majority of homeless individuals are men, but women make up about one-third of the emergency shelter population and about one-fifth of the transitional housing population.

²⁵ Conway KP, Compton W, Stinson FS, Grant BF. “Lifetime comorbidity of DSM-IV mood and anxiety disorders and specific drug use disorders: results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions.” *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2006;67: 247-257.

Exhibit 3-4: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons by Household Type, 2009

<i>Characteristic</i>	Percentage of All Sheltered Homeless Population	Percentage of Individuals	Percentage of Persons in Families
Gender of Adults			
Male	63.7%	72.7%	20.4%
Female	36.3%	27.3%	79.6%
Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic/non-Latino	80.5%	83.9%	74.2%
Hispanic/Latino	19.5%	16.1%	25.8%
Race			
White, Non-Hispanic	38.1%	45.4%	23.6%
White, Hispanic	11.6%	10.4%	13.9%
Black or African-American	38.7%	34.1%	47.9%
Other Single Race	4.7%	3.8%	6.2%
Multiple Races	7.0%	6.4%	8.5%
Age ^a			
Under age 18	22.2%	2.2%	60.6%
18 to 30	22.3%	22.6%	21.8%
31 to 50	38.3%	49.7%	16.4%
51 to 61	14.4%	21.3%	1.1%
62 and older	2.8%	4.2%	0.1%
Household Size ^b			
1 person	64.1%	97.2%	0.0%
2 people	10.0%	2.5%	24.4%
3 people	10.2%	0.2%	29.4%
4 people	7.9%	0.1%	23.0%
5 or more people	7.9%	0.0%	23.1%
Special Populations			
Veteran (adults only) ^c	11.1%	13.0%	2.1%
Disabled (adults only) ^c	37.8%	42.9%	14.0%

^a Age is calculated based on a person's first time in shelter during the one-year reporting period.

^b If a person is part a household consisting of more than one person or the household size changed during the reporting period, the household size reflects the size of the first household in which the person presented during the one-year reporting period.

^c Veteran and disability status are recorded only for adults in the HMIS. The percentage calculations are for homeless adults with this characteristic. Some records were missing information on disability status (10.5 percent) and veteran status (5.3 percent) in 2009. The percentage calculations include only persons whose disability or veteran status was known.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2008

In addition to these characteristics, sheltered families are also larger than individual households, as expected. A typical homeless family consists of a mother and two children (the average number of children per family is 1.9). As demonstrated in Exhibit 3-5, homeless families have smaller household sizes than both the poverty population and the total U.S. population. Fewer than one-quarter of sheltered families (23.1 percent) have large families (5 or more people), compared with about 4 in 10 families in poverty. The household sizes among homeless families suggest that some homeless families could be appropriately housed in a two-bedroom apartment or house.²⁶

Exhibit 3-5: Household Sizes of Sheltered Homeless Families and Poor Families 2008			
Household Size	Percentage of Sheltered Homeless Families	Percentage of Poor Families	Percentage of All Families in the U.S.
2 people	24.4%	7.6%	4.2%
3 people	29.4%	20.4%	22.2%
4 people	23.0%	26.4%	34.3%
5 or more people	23.1%	45.5%	39.3%

Sources: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009

3.2 Location of Homeless Service Use, 2009

Geographic Location of Sheltered Homeless Persons


Sheltered homelessness is concentrated in urban areas (see Exhibit 3-6). About 68.2 percent of all sheltered homeless people are located in principal cities, and less than one-third (31.8 percent) are in suburban or rural jurisdictions. Homeless individuals are particularly likely to be in urban areas. Nearly three-quarters of all sheltered individuals (72.2 percent) accessed a homeless residential program that is located in a principal city, compared with 61.2 percent of persons in families.

The geographic distribution of sheltered homelessness is markedly different than the distribution of the nation's poverty and total populations. The share of sheltered homeless people in principal cities is nearly twice the share of the poverty population in these areas (68.2 versus 35.6 percent) and almost three times the share of the entire U.S. population (68.2 percent versus 24.3 percent). About 1 in every 92 persons living in a principal city in the United States was homeless in emergency shelter or transitional housing, compared with about 1 in every 415 persons living in a suburban or rural area.

²⁶ Homeless families may have additional children who are not with them in a residential program for homeless people because they have been left with relatives or friends or experienced out-of-home placements by the child welfare system.

As noted in previous reports, the concentration of homeless people in urban areas is related to several issues:

- Principal cities have high rates of unemployment and lack of affordable housing, which are risk factors for homelessness.
- The social service system in large cities may be saturated or experiencing large funding reductions, which may limit the ability of these systems to adequately serve persons at risk of becoming homeless.
- The majority of homeless residential services are located in principal cities—approximately 51.6 percent of all programs and 65.4 percent of beds for homeless persons are located in these areas.²⁷ The location of homeless residential services in principal cities may produce a “magnet effect,” attracting homeless people to the area because services are more accessible than elsewhere. While plausible, this interpretation is complicated by the difficulty in establishing cause-and-effect: do homeless people move to service-rich areas or are homeless service providers purposively located where the demand for services is greatest? Future analysis in the AHAR will explore ways to disentangle these issues.



Sources: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009

²⁷ This includes 2,853 emergency shelters (150,965 beds), 3,961 transitional housing facilities (124,804 beds), and 87 Safe Havens (1,448 beds).

Movement into the Shelter System

Communities participating in the AHAR provided information on where people stayed the night before they entered an emergency shelter or transitional living facility. The information is associated with each person's first program entry during the 12-month reporting period. Thus, this information is intended to suggest how people flow into the homeless residential system, rather than how people churn through the system.

In 2009, the night before entering shelter, almost two-fifths of all sheltered persons (38.5 percent) came from another homeless situation. Among those who were already homeless, more than one-half came from an emergency shelter (54.9 percent), nearly two-thirds came from an unsheltered situation (38.6 percent), and a few came from transitional housing (6.6 percent). Another two-fifths of all sheltered persons (41.1 percent) moved from a housed situation (their own or someone else's home), and the remaining one-fifth were split between institutional settings (e.g., a substance abuse facility or jail) and hotels, motels, or other unspecified living arrangements (see Exhibit 3-7). The most common prior living arrangement among all sheltered people was with friends or family (29.5 percent) and staying in another homeless residential service facility (23.7 percent).

Exhibit 3-7: Previous Living Situation of People Using Homeless Residential Services, 2009 ^a

Living Arrangement the Night before Program Entry	Total	Percentage of Individual Adults ^b	Percentage of Adults in Families
Total Already Homeless	38.5%	41.1%	26.0%
Place not meant for human habitation	14.8%	17.1%	4.0%
Emergency shelter or transitional housing	23.7%	24.0%	22.0%
Total from "Housing"	41.1%	36.6%	62.6%
Rented or owned housing unit ^c	11.5%	9.8%	19.7%
Staying with family	17.3%	14.8%	29.4%
Staying with friends	12.2%	12.0%	13.5%
Total from Institutional Settings	12.5%	14.5%	2.7%
Psychiatric facility, substance abuse center, or hospital	7.2%	8.3%	2.1%
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention	4.8%	5.8%	0.4%
Foster care home	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%
Total from Other Situations	8.1%	7.9%	8.7%
Hotel, motel (no voucher) or "other"	8.1%	7.9%	8.7%
Number of Homeless Adults	1,235,236	1,034,659	210,510

^a The exhibit reports on adults and unaccompanied youth only because the HMIS Data and Technical Standards require the information to be collected only from these persons. About 11 percent of the records in HMIS were missing this information in 2009.

^b This category includes unaccompanied adults and youth as well as multiple-adult households without children.

^c Includes a small percentage in permanent supportive housing.

Sources: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009

A comparison of living arrangements between sheltered individuals and persons in families reveals several striking differences. More than 6 in 10 persons in families (62.6 percent) came from a housed situation, including almost one-third (29.4 percent) who were staying with family and one-fifth who came from a rented or owned housing unit (19.7 percent) prior to entering the shelter system. Slightly over one-quarter of persons in families were already homeless prior to entering the shelter system during the one-year reporting period (26 percent). A very small proportion of persons in families were in institutional settings (2.7 percent). By comparison, homeless individuals were much more likely than family members to be already homeless and come from institutional settings. Fewer than 4 in 10 individuals came from a housed situation (36.6 percent), and more than 1 in 10 were in a medical or correctional facility (14.5 percent) just prior to entering the shelter system. Thus, for individuals, the most common pathway into the shelter system during the one-year reporting period was another homeless location, whereas among persons in families it was from their own housing or someone else's.

The most common pathway into the shelter system for homeless individuals was another homeless location, whereas among persons in families it was from a housed situation.

Focusing on people who were not homeless prior to entering shelter, less than one-fifth came from their own housing unit (18.7 percent) nearly one-half were staying with family or friends (48.0 percent), about one-fifth were previously in an institutional setting (19.6 percent), and the rest were in other locations (13.7 percent). Thus, for people who were not already homeless, more than two thirds were “housed” in their own unit or someone else's, and the single most common pathway into the shelter system was staying with family or friends.

But here, again, the pathway into homelessness for those who were not previously homeless varies dramatically by household type. Less than one-half of individuals had been staying with family or friends (45.4 percent), compared with 58.0 percent of adults in families. Only 16.7 percent of individuals had been in their own housing unit, compared with 26.6 percent of families. Many more individuals than families came from institutional settings, 24.6 percent vs. 3.6 percent.

About 85 percent of adults in families who were not previously homeless were staying with family and friends or living in their own place just prior to entering the shelter system. This finding is especially useful to local programs that are designing targeted approaches to preventing homelessness among families. The finding suggests that homelessness prevention programs may be particularly successful at staving off homelessness among families with services that help families retain their existing housing, such as emergency rental assistance or family mediation services.

3.3 Patterns of Homeless Service Use, 2009

Emergency Shelters or Transitional Housing


A long-standing assumption about how homeless people use a community-wide, homeless residential service system is that people flow linearly through the shelter system—entering first into an emergency shelter, moving on to transitional housing, and then eventually finding a permanent (or permanent supportive) housing arrangement. The 2009 estimates further support previous findings that few sheltered homeless persons follow a linear progression through the shelter system during a 12-month period.

As shown in Exhibit 3-8, very few sheltered persons use multiple program types. In 2009, more than three-quarters of the estimated 1.56 million homeless people in shelter used an emergency shelter only (77.4 percent), less than one-fifth used a transitional housing program only (18.3 percent), and a small proportion of people used both types of homeless residential facilities (4.3 percent).

These estimates do not describe the potential “churning” that may exist within the homeless residential system—that is, people who repeatedly cycling in and out of emergency shelters or transitional housing during the one-year reporting period. Nonetheless, the estimates

reinforce findings from previous studies that concluded, similarly, that few homeless persons use the shelter system sequentially and some use the system in unpredictable ways (e.g., starting in transitional housing and then entering an emergency shelter).²⁸ Others find ways to resolve their homeless episode fairly quickly and, as a result, do not use transitional housing.²⁹

Exhibit 3-8: Type of Program Used Among All Sheltered Homeless People, 2009



Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009

²⁸ Spellman, Khadduri, Sokol, and Leopold, *Costs Associated with First-Time Homelessness for Families and Individuals*, *op. cit.*

²⁹ Culhane, D.P., S. Metraux, J.M. Park, M.A. Schretzmen, and J. Valente. 2007. Testing a Typology of Family Homelessness Based on Public Shelter Utilization in Four U.S. Jurisdictions: Implications for Policy and Program Planning. *Housing Policy Debate*, 18(1): 1-28. Kuhn, R., and D.P. Culhane. 1998. Applying Cluster Analysis to Test of a Typology of Homelessness: Results from the Analysis of Administrative Data. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 17(1): 23-43.

Service use patterns vary slightly by household type. Homeless individuals are more likely than persons in families to use an emergency shelter only (81.2 percent versus 70.1 percent) and less likely to use a transitional housing program only (14.5 percent versus 25.0 percent). Homeless individuals and persons in families are equally likely to use both types of programs (4.3 percent versus 4.9 percent). The slight difference in service use patterns among household types is explained in part by the relative supply of different types of residential homeless programs for individuals and families, a topic discussed in chapter 5. It also is possible that families try to avoid emergency shelters if possible because these facilities are particularly unsuitable for children. Some families may try to bypass shelters altogether and go directly to transitional housing.

Length of Stay in Emergency Shelters and Transitional Housing

Many sheltered homeless people experience short-term episodes of homelessness and only use emergency shelter for a few days. The short-term nature of sheltered homelessness is demonstrated in Exhibit 3-9, which shows the number of nights in residential homeless programs by household type. The estimates represent the cumulative amount of time spent in residential programs—meaning that if a person had three program stays in emergency shelter, for example, and each stay was 7 nights, then the person experienced 21 nights of homelessness in emergency shelters.

Exhibit 3-9: Number of Nights in Shelter by Program and Household Type, 2009

Length of Stay ^a	Emergency Shelters			Transitional Housing		
	Total	Individuals	Persons in Families	Total	Individual	Persons in Families
Percentage of People						
1 week or less	33.5%	37.9%	23.9%	5.0%	6.5%	3.2%
1 week to < 1 month	26.6%	28.0%	23.5%	11.2%	13.3%	8.6%
1 month to < 6 months	33.4%	29.4%	42.1%	44.0%	47.6%	39.5%
6 months to < 1 year	5.4%	4.0%	8.5%	24.9%	21.2%	29.3%
Entire year	1.2%	0.8%	2.0%	15.0%	11.4%	19.3%
Average (Median) Time						
# of nights	22	17	36	133	107	174

^a The length of stay reported in this exhibit accounts for the total number of nights in shelters during the 12-month reporting period. Some people may have lengths of stay longer than a year if they entered a residential program prior to the start of the data collection period or remained in the program after the end of the data collection period.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009

During the one-year reporting period, one-third of all people in emergency shelters (33.5 percent) stayed for less than 1 week, and three-fifths (60.1 percent) stayed less than a month. Very few people stayed 6 months or more (6.6 percent). Individuals in emergency shelters stayed the shortest amount of time—nearly 4 in 10 stayed less than 1 week (37.9 percent), and almost two-thirds stayed less than one month (65.9 percent). The median length of stay for individuals in emergency shelters was 17 days. By comparison, families in emergency shelters stayed longer—about one-quarter stayed 1 week or less (23.9 percent) and less than half stayed less than one month (47.4 percent). Twice as many persons in families than individuals stayed for 6 months or more, and the median length of stay among family members was 36 days.

As described in previous reports, the longer lengths of stay among families is expected because unsheltered homelessness can be particularly dangerous for families with children, and families may have a more difficult time finding affordable and appropriately-sized housing. (As shown in Exhibit 3-5, about 4 in 10 sheltered persons in families have 4 or more household members.)

People in transitional housing programs generally stay for much longer periods of time, which is expected because these programs are designed to serve clients for up to two years while helping them transition to permanent housing. In 2009, the average (median) length of stay in transitional housing was 133 nights (or about four and one-half months), and about 40 percent of all persons stayed in transitional housing for 6 months or more (39.9 percent). A considerable proportion of people stayed for the full 12-month reporting period (15.0 percent). Here again, persons in families stay longer than individuals. The median number of days among persons in families was 174 compared to 107 for individuals, and nearly 1 in 5 persons in families stayed for 12 months (19.3 percent) compared to about 1 in 10 individuals (11.4 percent).

“Heavy Users” of Emergency Shelters

Communities participating in the 2009 AHAR were asked to report the number and the characteristics of “heavy users” of the homeless services system, or people who stayed in emergency shelters for six months or longer during the one-year reporting period. These heavy users represent only 6.5 percent of all persons who used emergency shelters in 2009 (or about 83,000 people out of the 1.27 million shelter users). Heavy users are nearly as likely to be individuals as persons in families.

As shown in Exhibit 3-10, heavy users of emergency shelters look very different from those who use shelters less intensely. Heavy users are much more likely to be minorities (Hispanics and African Americans). They also are more likely to be in families—that is, to have children under age 18 and to have larger families than all people in emergency shelters.

Exhibit 3-10: Demographic Characteristics Associated with Staying in Emergency Shelters More than Six Months, 2009

Race	All Persons in Emergency Shelters in 2009	Long-Term Stayers in Emergency Shelters in 2009		
		Total ^a	Individuals	Persons in Families
Hispanic/Latino Ethnicity	19.8%	31.2%	17.4%	44.9%
Black or African American	38.6%	56.0%	45.2%	68.8%
Children under Age 18	20.2%	30.5%	1.2%	59.4%
Household with 5 or more People	7.4%	13.3%	0.0%	26.6%
Number of People	1,274,301	82,978	41,835	42,140

^a The number of long-term stayers who were individuals and persons in families will not sum to the total number of long-term stayers because a small proportion of persons (about 1 percent) were served as both individuals and as persons in families during the 12-month reporting period.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009

3.4 Summary of All Sheltered Homeless People in 2009

The estimates of the sheltered homeless population in 2009 indicate that:

- A typical sheltered homeless person—whether an individual or a member of a family—is a middle-aged, adult male who is a member of a minority group and is homeless by himself. Chances are that he does not have any type of disability.
- When compared to their counterparts nationwide, sheltered homeless people are much more likely to be adult males, African-Americans, non-elderly, alone, veterans, and disabled.
- Homeless sheltered individuals most often are male, over age 30, disabled, and experiencing homelessness alone. By contrast, family households in the shelter system are very likely to be headed by a minority woman without a male partner, under age 30, and in a household with 2 or 3 members.
- About 68.2 percent of all sheltered homeless people are located in principal cities, and less than one-third (31.8 percent) are located in suburban or rural jurisdictions.
- About 1 in every 92 persons living in principal cities in the United States was homeless, compared with about 1 in every 415 persons living in suburban or rural areas.
- The share of sheltered homeless people in principal cities is nearly twice the share of the poverty population in these areas (68.2 versus 35.6 percent) and almost three times the share of the entire U.S. population (68.2 percent versus 24.3 percent).

- In 2009, the night before entering shelter, almost two-fifths of all sheltered persons came from another homeless situation, another two-fifths moved from a housed situation (their own or someone else's home), and the remaining one-fifth were split between institutional settings and hotels, motels, or other unspecified living arrangements.
- The most common pathway into the shelter system for homeless individuals was another homeless location, whereas among persons in families it was from a housed situation.
- During the one-year reporting period, one-third of all people in emergency shelters stayed for less than 1 week, and three-fifths stayed less than a month. About 40 percent of all persons in transitional housing stayed for 6 months or more.
- Heavy users of emergency shelters look very different than those who use shelters less intensely. Heavy users are much more likely to be minorities (specifically Hispanics and African Americans), have children under age 18, and have larger families than all people in emergency shelters.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 4

Trends in Sheltered Homelessness between 2007 and 2009

The 2008 AHAR was the first to describe year to year changes in the sheltered homeless population. Now, in this 2009 AHAR, we can look across three years of HMIS data and present both changes that occurred between the most recent two years, 2008 and 2009, and changes across the three year period from 2007 through 2009.

The chapter focuses on three types of changes:

- *Changes in the sheltered homeless population between 2007 and 2009*, including the number of people, the types of locations in which they are homeless, and their demographic characteristics.
- *Changes in the patterns of becoming homeless*, based on information about where people were the night before they became homeless and how long they had been there.
- *Changes in how people use the homeless services system* and, specifically, whether they use emergency shelter or transitional housing and how long they stay in residential programs for homeless persons during a 12-month period.

The HMIS-based estimates discussed in this chapter are considerably more robust than those based on PIT data. Unlike PIT data, HMIS data are not influenced heavily by unexpected events that may occur on the night of the point-in-time count, such as a winter storm, or by variations in enumeration strategies. HMIS is now a widely used tool, and communities are increasingly capable of collecting and reporting reliable HMIS data to the AHAR. As a result, the precision of the HMIS-based estimates has continued to improve with each successive report. More importantly, the HMIS-based estimates presented in this chapter begin to show a few consistent patterns that we believe are real, despite the fact that some communities were unable to provide complete data and thus the estimates have wide confidence intervals (Exhibit 4-1).

4.1 Changes in the Sheltered Homeless Population between 2007 and 2009

Overall sheltered homelessness declined slightly between 2008 and 2009, by about 35,000 people or 2 percent of the number of sheltered homeless people in 2008 (Exhibit 4-1). Individual sheltered homelessness dropped by almost 58,000 people or 5 percent, while sheltered homeless persons in families increased by almost 19,000 people or 3.6 percent.

When families are considered as households rather than as the separate people in the households, the increase was almost 11,000 families between 2009 and 2008, a 7 percent increase over the 159,142 sheltered homeless families in 2008.

Exhibit 4-1: Changes in Total Sheltered Homeless Individuals and Persons in Families, 2008-2009


Household Type	2008	2009	Change 2008-2009	Percent change 2008-2009
	Total Number	Total Number		
Total Number of Sheltered Persons ^a	1,593,794 ^c	1,558,917 ^c	-34,877	-2.2%
Individuals ^b	1,092,612 ^d	1,034,659 ^d	-57,953	-5.3%
Persons in Families	516,724 ^d	535,477 ^d	+18,723	+3.6%
Number of Sheltered Households with Children	159,142	170,129	+10,987	+6.9%

- ^a These estimated totals reflect the number of homeless persons in the 50 states and the District of Columbia who used emergency shelters or transitional housing programs during the one-year period of October 1 through September 30 of the following year. The estimates do not cover the U.S. Territories and Puerto Rico and do not include persons served by “victim service providers.” The estimated totals include an extrapolation adjustment to account for people who use emergency shelters and transitional housing programs but whose jurisdictions do not yet participate in their HMIS. People who are homeless but do not use an emergency shelter or transitional housing program during the 12-month period are not included. Percentages may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.
- ^b This category includes unaccompanied adults, unaccompanied people under 18 years, and multi-adult households without children.
- ^c In 2009, the 95 percent confidence interval for the estimated number of sheltered homeless persons in the population was 1,230,198 to 1,887,636 persons (or +/- 328,719 persons). In 2008, the 95 percent confidence interval was 1,180,758 to 2,006,830 (or +/- 413,036 persons).
- ^d In both 2008 and 2009, approximately 1 percent of homeless persons were served both as an individual and as a person in a family. In this exhibit, such people appear in both categories, so the total number of sheltered persons is slightly less than the sum of individuals and families.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

The overall number of sheltered homeless people had increased slightly between 2007 and 2008 before dropping slightly in 2009, as shown in Exhibit 4-2. The drop in sheltered homelessness among individuals was 80,000 people or about 7 percent across the three-year period from 2007 through 2009. The decline in the numbers of people in emergency shelters or transitional housing as individuals probably reflects community success in getting people out of shelters and into permanent supportive or other housing and also perhaps placing them into permanent housing directly from the street. Indeed, as shown in chapter 5, the inventory of beds in permanent supportive housing programs has increased dramatically, from about 177,000 to 219,000 beds.

Exhibit 4-2: Trends in Homelessness by Household Type, 2007-2009



Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

In contrast, in 2009, almost 62,000 more family members were in emergency shelter or transitional housing at some point during the year than had been in 2007. Considered as households rather than as separate people, the growth in sheltered family homelessness over the three years was almost 40,000 families or a 30 percent increase. The continued growth in sheltered family homelessness almost certainly reflects the ongoing effect of the recession.

Somewhat surprisingly, the increase in sheltered homeless families was more pronounced between 2007 and 2008 than between 2008 and 2009, even though the 2008 reporting period (October 2007 through September 2008) was fairly early in the recession, and unemployment rates remained high during the 2009 reporting period (October 2008 through September 2009).³⁰ It may be that some families who were already at risk of becoming homeless and lacked sufficient support networks to ease the impact of the recession became homeless almost immediately. But a much larger group of families turned to family and friends to stave off the effects of the recession. Indeed, a recent study found that the recession has caused a dramatic increase, almost five-fold, in the rates of overcrowding, indicating that

³⁰ According to the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics, the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate increased from 6.6 percent to 9.8 percent between October 2008 and September 2009. By December 2009 (after the study period for this report), it had increased to 10.0 percent. See Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, Databases, "Tables & Calculators by Subject: Unemployment," <http://www.bls.gov/data/#unemployment> (accessed May 11, 2010).

may families are doubling up in response to the economic downturn.³¹ Thus, the fortunes of many struggling families may still be in the balance. For some of these families, the fragile economic circumstances of the relatives and friends of struggling parents may mean that, as soon as job losses begin in an economic downturn, support networks for families at risk of homelessness fall apart. Doubled up housing situations cannot be sustained, cash is no longer available to help others with rent payments, and families turn to homeless shelters as the only way of keeping a roof over their heads. Then, as the recession continues, the flow of fragile families into homelessness remains at a high level but does not increase.


Alternatively, as the nation comes out of the recession and as the stimulus funding made available through the Homelessness Prevention and Re-housing Program (HPRP) begins to serve families, some of these at-risk families may avoid shelter altogether. (HPRP funding only started to become available in October 2009, the month after the 2009 AHAR reporting period ended). It is also possible that some of these families may find a way to regain their financial footing on their own and become self sufficient.

As a result of the slight drop in homelessness among individuals and the increase among families, family members represent a larger percentage of sheltered homeless people each year, rising from 29.8 percent in 2007 to 34.1 percent in 2009, as shown on Exhibit 4-3.

Changes in the Geography of Homelessness

The types of locations in which homeless people were found in emergency shelters or transitional

Exhibit 4-3: Change in the Household Composition of Homelessness, 2007-2009



Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

³¹ Painter, Gary. 2010. "What Happened to Household Formation in a Recession?" Research Institute for Housing America and the Mortgage Bankers Association.

Impact of the Economic Downturn on Family Homelessness

From rural Iowa to New York City, providers report increases in family homelessness they attribute to the recession. In San Francisco, for example, the waiting list for family shelter increased 30 percent between 2008 and 2009. In eight of the nine continuums visited for this report, providers noted a significant jump in the number of families in shelters or transitional housing who are homeless for the first time, mostly as a result of unemployment. In Phoenix, nearly half (47.9 percent) of families entering shelter in 2009 had not been homeless before, and in New York City, the rate of first-time homelessness among families is about 30 percent.

The Idaho Balance of State CoC has not yet seen a major increase in the number of homeless families, but providers expect this might be coming. Several Idaho providers noted an increase in the number of families accessing homeless services for the first-time and in the number of formerly “middle class” families seeking assistance. Memphis providers comment that families are increasingly being admitted to shelter with high debts, coming from expenses incurred while the family had employment.

Five of the communities reported longer stays by families in shelters as it takes longer to find employment that would allow them to secure permanent housing. For example, one transitional housing provider in Marshalltown, Iowa, reported that prior to 2008, her facility served about two families per year, and these families would stay between two and four weeks. Since 2008, the facility has served 9 to 12 families per year, with an average length of stay of approximately four months.

Lack of employment opportunities and affordable housing are among the most common reasons cited by local providers for the rise in family homelessness. Although the typical homeless family is composed of a mother with children, providers in Iowa, Monterrey, and Phoenix also report an increase in the number of two-parent families being served, signaling that the lack of employment is a critical factor in the growth of family homelessness. Also, the lack of affordable housing continues to play an important role in family homelessness in most communities, even though the recession has generally put downward pressure on rents. In some markets, such as Memphis, Tennessee, and Ames, Iowa, the supply of affordable housing has decreased in recent years due to public housing transformation, Section 8 opt outs, and the redevelopment of alternative housing options, such as trailer parks. In other parts of the country, costs for rental housing remain high in spite of the recession. In San Francisco, for example, 20 to 25 percent of families in shelter have one adult who is working, suggesting that the lack of affordable housing is the major problem.


housing were almost exactly the same in 2009 as in 2008. About 68 percent of all sheltered homeless people were in principal cities and 32 percent in suburban and rural areas in both years, as shown in Exhibit 4-4. Between 2008 and 2009, the share of individuals in principal cities grew very slightly, from 71.0 percent to 72.2 percent, while the share of family members in suburban and rural areas grew by half a percentage point to 38.8 percent in 2009.

Exhibit 4-4: Change in the Geographic Location of the Sheltered Homeless Population, 2008-2009

Geographic Location	Homeless Persons in 2008		Homeless Persons in 2009		Change from 2008 to 2009 in Percentage Points
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
All Sheltered Persons					
Principal Cities	1,084,335	68.0%	1,063,613	68.2%	0.2%
Suburban and Rural Areas	509,459	32.0%	495,304	31.8%	-0.2%
Individuals					
Principal Cities	775,977	71.0%	746,563	72.2%	1.1%
Suburban and Rural Areas	316,634	29.0%	288,096	27.8%	-1.1%
Persons in Families					
Principal Cities	318,683	61.7%	327,758	61.2%	-0.5%
Suburban and Rural Areas	198,041	38.3%	207,689	38.8%	0.5%

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2008-2009

These very small changes in the locations of sheltered homeless people between 2008 and 2009 followed a much larger shift in the geography of sheltered homelessness between 2007 and 2008. Sheltered homelessness became markedly more suburban and rural between 2007 and 2008. In contrast the continued growth in family homelessness between 2008 and 2009 did not occur disproportionately in suburban and rural areas. Exhibit 4-5 shows the pattern across the three-year period.



Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

Changes in the Demographic Characteristics of Homeless Individuals and Families

Overall, the demographic characteristics of sheltered homeless people did not change much over the three-year period from 2007 through 2009. The following exhibits (4-6 through 4-8) show a few notable changes: the aging of homeless population, the number of veterans and people with disabilities, the racial composition of sheltered homelessness, and the composition of homeless families.³²

Aging of the Homeless Population

Exhibit 4-6 shows a slight increase in the percentage of all homeless people who give their age as greater than 50. This is consistent with other research that shows an increase in homelessness among a relatively older population as the baby boom generation ages.³³ It is also consistent with the information gathered through interviews with homeless assistance providers in nine communities across the country. San Francisco, for example, has a large population of individuals who have been homeless for a long time and whose physical health

³² See Appendix Exhibit D-4 in this report for other demographic characteristics of sheltered homeless families in 2009. The appendices in the 2007 and 2008 Annual Homeless Assessment Reports provide the demographic characteristics of sheltered persons for these years.

³³ Culhane, Dennis P., Stephen Metraux, and Jay Bainbridge. "The Age Structure of Contemporary Homelessness: Risk Period or Cohort Effect?" Working Paper: The University of Pennsylvania.

needs have increased over time. Providers in Detroit also commented on the aging of the homeless population.

Exhibit 4-6 Change in the Ages and Veteran and Disabled Status of Sheltered Homeless Adults, 2007-2009			
Characteristic	Percentage of All Sheltered Homeless Adults		
	2007	2008	2009
Age ^a			
18 to 30	26.2%	28.0%	28.7%
31 to 50	52.7%	50.9%	49.2%
51 to 61	17.4%	17.6%	18.5%
62 and older	3.8%	3.5%	3.6%
Veteran (adults) ^a			
	13.2%	11.6%	11.1%
Disabled (adults) ^a			
	37.1%	42.8%	37.8%

^a Age is calculated based on a person's first time in shelter during the covered time period. A child is defined as a person age 17 or under, and an adult is defined as a person age 18 or older.

Veteran status and whether a person had a disabling condition are recorded only for adults in HMIS. The percentage calculations shown indicate the percent of homeless adults with this characteristic. The number of records missing information on disability status dropped from 32.4 percent in 2007 to 22.0 percent in 2008 and 10.6 percent in 2009. Similarly, the percent of adults with missing information on veteran status dropped from 15.9 percent in 2007 to 7.5 percent in 2008 and to only 5.4 percent in 2009. The percentage calculations include only persons whose disability and veteran status was recorded.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

Veterans and People with Disabilities in the Sheltered Homeless Population

Exhibit 4-6 also shows the percentages of homeless adults who reported being veterans and who reported having a disability in 2007, 2008, and 2009. Over time the rates of missing information for disability and veteran status have declined considerably, and as a result, the accuracy of these estimates has improved substantially. The slight drops between 2008 and 2009 in the percentages of all adults who report that they are veterans or that they have a disability may reflect more accurate estimates or may reflect the increase in family homelessness over the three-year period. Homeless adults in families are much less likely than individual adults to be veterans (because they are younger and less likely to be men) and also less likely to report having a disability. Substantial differences in disability rates and veterans status by household type have been observed repeatedly in past AHAR reports.

Interviews with homeless assistance providers conducted for this report suggest that veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts have not yet become homeless in great numbers, perhaps because it takes some years for the mental disabilities associated with war to become acute. However, several providers suggested that the average age of homeless veterans is decreasing. In Phoenix, for example, the average age of homeless veterans in 2009 was 47,

down from 57 only five years earlier.³⁴ Providers also noted that they are seeing a “higher level of impairment” among homeless veterans, including more cases of substance abuse, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), traumatic brain injury and other mental and physical impairments. Several providers, including those in San Francisco, Monterrey and Phoenix, reported seeing an increase in homeless veteran families related to worsening economic conditions. As one California provider noted, “there are just no jobs when they are discharged.”

Race and Ethnicity of Sheltered Homeless People

Homelessness became somewhat more prevalent among people who are white and not Hispanic over the three-year period from 2007 to 2009. The share of sheltered homeless individuals who do not identify themselves as members of minority groups increased from 42.6 percent in 2007 to 45.4 percent in 2009, and the share of sheltered homeless family members who were not minorities increased from 21.3 to 23.6 percent between 2007 and 2008 and held steady in 2009, as shown in Exhibit 4-7.

Exhibit 4-7 Change in the Race and Ethnicity of Sheltered Homeless Individuals and Persons in Families, 2007 - 2009^a

Sheltered Individuals			
Race	% of Individuals 2007	% of Individuals 2008	% of Individuals 2009
White, non-Hispanic/Latino	42.6%	44.6%	45.4%
White Hispanic, Latino	14.1%	11.0%	10.4%
Black or African American	33.2%	37.0%	34.1%
Other Racial Groups ^b	10.1%	7.5%	10.2%
Sheltered Persons in Families			
Race	% of Persons in Families 2007	% of Persons in Families 2008	% of Persons in Families 2009
White, non-Hispanic/Latino	21.3%	24.4%	23.6%
White Hispanic, Latino	9.8%	13.1%	13.9%
Black or African American	55.2%	50.9%	47.9%
Other Racial Groups ^b	13.6%	11.6%	14.7%

^a Percentages may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

^b Includes persons who identify as multiple races.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007- 2009

³⁴ The AHAR data collected for this report do not permit estimates of the age ranges of sheltered homeless veterans. A supplementary effort collected 2009 data just on veterans in the standard AHAR reporting categories, and an analysis of that information will be published later in 2010.

While African-American families and individuals have higher rates of homelessness than in the U.S. population as a whole or in the poverty population (see chapter 3), the share of sheltered homeless family members identifying themselves as black or African American decreased steadily over the three year period—for example, from 55.2 percent of persons in families in 2007 to 47.9 percent in 2009 (Exhibit 4-7).

More Men in Sheltered Homeless Families

The ratio between adults and children in sheltered homeless families changed very little over the 2007-2009 time period. However, adults in families were somewhat more likely to be men in 2009 than they were in 2007, 20.4 percent vs. 18.0 percent, as shown in Exhibit 4-8. This probably accounts for the slight increases in the percentages of 3 and 4 person households shown on the exhibit, despite the lack of change in the percentage of people in sheltered homeless families who are children. Because of the recession, more families with two adults may have become homeless, as well as more families with only a father present.

Providers in six of the nine communities visited for this report said they had seen an increase in two-parent families and male-headed families. Providers generally attribute the increase in two-parent families to the effects of the recession, which is making it difficult for even one parent to find a job. According to one provider in Monterey, California, two-parent households now represent about half of all families seeking shelter. Located on the ocean, Monterey has very high housing costs and in recent years has lost affordable rental housing due to foreclosures. According to this provider, “You can’t afford to make the rent working at Starbucks.” Providers in northeast Iowa also commented on the increase in two-parent households seeking shelter, which they attribute to the lingering effects of the closure of a major manufacturing plant a couple of years ago.

Providers had fewer explanations for the increase in male-headed families. Providers in Detroit suggested that it could reflect higher rates of drug abuse or incarceration among women, or be related to local efforts to encourage men to take a greater role in raising their children.

Providers in several communities noted that it can be harder for male-headed and two-parent families to access shelter, because most facilities are geared toward serving single women and their children.

Exhibit 4-8: Changes in the Composition of Sheltered Homeless Families, 2007-2009^a

Characteristic	Percentage of Sheltered Homeless Persons in Families 2007	Percentage of Sheltered Homeless Persons in Families 2008	Percentage of Sheltered Homeless Persons in Families 2009
Adults and Children			
Adults	38.4%	39.7%	39.4%
Children	61.6%	60.3%	60.6%
Gender of Adults			
Women	82.0%	80.9%	79.6%
Men	18.0%	19.2%	20.4%
Household Size			
2 people	26.6%	25.0%	24.4%
3 people	27.9%	29.6%	29.4%
4 people	22.1%	21.8%	23.0%
5 or more people	23.4%	23.7%	23.1%

^a Percentages may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

4.2 Changing Patterns of Becoming Homeless, 2007-2009

The pathways through which people entered shelters or transitional housing changed to some extent between 2008 and 2009. Exhibits 4-9 and 4-10 show the trends over the 2007 through 2009 period separately for sheltered homeless individuals (Exhibit 4-9) and for adults in homeless families (Exhibit 4-10).

Sheltered Homeless Individuals

People in emergency shelter or transitional housing as individuals were more likely to have come from a place not meant for human habitation in 2009 than was the case in 2007 or 2008, as shown on Exhibit 4-9. According to Continuum of Care point-in-time counts, the number of unsheltered individuals dropped between 2008 and 2009 (see chapter 2). Therefore, the increase of about 31,000 in the number of individuals coming into the shelter system from the “street” between 2008 and 2009 may reflect the success of the homeless services system in reducing unsheltered homelessness rather than a growth in street homelessness.

Overall, the share of homeless individuals coming into shelter from some type of housing (their own housing unit or someone else’s) was essentially unchanged over the three-year period, but the share coming from their own housing unit went down slightly, while the percentage who had been staying with friends or family increased from 24.3 percent in 2007 to 25.8 percent in 2008 and 26.8 percent in 2009.

Exhibit 4-9: Change in Previous Living Situation of Individuals Using Homeless Residential Services, 2007-2009

Living Arrangement the Night before Program Entry	Percentage Distribution 2007	Percentage Distribution 2008 ^a	Percentage Distribution 2009 ^a
Total Already Homeless	43.3%	39.5%	41.1%
Place not meant for human habitation	14.8%	14.7%	17.1%
Emergency shelter	25.2%	22.0%	21.4%
Transitional housing	3.2%	2.7%	2.6%
Total from Some Type of Housing	36.5%	37.0%	36.6%
Rented housing unit ^b	10.3%	9.2%	8.0%
Owned housing unit	1.9%	2.0%	1.9%
Staying with family	15.2%	14.2%	14.8%
Staying with friends	9.1%	11.6%	12.0%
Total from Institutional Settings	12.1%	13.6%	14.6%
Psychiatric facility	1.6%	1.7%	1.5%
Substance abuse treatment center	3.6%	4.4%	5.3%
Hospital (non-psychiatric)	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention	5.0%	5.6%	5.8%
Foster care home	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Total from Other Situations	8.2%	9.9%	8.4%
Hotel, Motel (no voucher) or "other"	8.2%	9.9%	8.4%
Number of Homeless Adults	1,115,054	1,092,612	1,034,659

^a The percentage of HMIS records missing this information dropped from 32 percent in 2007 to 21 percent in 2008 and to 11 percent in 2009.

^b Includes a small percentage in permanent supportive housing.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

A growing number of people homeless in shelters or transitional housing as individuals came there from substance abuse or detoxification centers over the three-year period. As shown on Exhibit 4-9, the percentage of homeless individuals coming into shelter from that type of institutional setting grew from 3.6 percent in 2007 to 5.3 percent in 2009. In 2009, the number was 48,645, compared with 27,131 in 2007.

As part of the site visits conducted for this report, providers of homeless services in several communities reported that some individuals exhibited mental health problems of greater severity than in previous years. This could be interpreted as a success in reaching the most needy unsheltered people or, alternatively, could reflect budget-related declines in mental health services reaching unsheltered homeless people. Many state and local governments have made significant cuts to social services as a result of budget shortfalls. Providers in several of the communities visited described the impact of those cuts on the size and nature of the homeless populations they serve.

State Funding Cuts and Homelessness

In California, the state fiscal crisis has led to sharp decreases in mental health funding and a lack of discharge planning from state institutions, as well as what one San Francisco provider described as an “erosion of community resources.” In 2007, funding was eliminated for the state’s Integrated Services for Homeless Adults with Serious Mental Illness program, and in 2009, the state faced a \$42 billion budget gap resulting in cutbacks in many social services usually provided at the county level. According to providers, these reductions have limited provision of services to those with the most severe cases of mental illness. Others with only slightly less severe illness cannot be served and end up in the homeless system. As a result, homeless service providers indicated a much higher proportion of their population is afflicted with mental illness. San Francisco providers note that, although they have not seen a substantial increase in the homeless population overall, those they are serving have greater needs.

Providers in Phoenix and Maricopa County told a similar story. The recession has resulted in fewer state and local government resources for safety net services; particularly behavioral health services. In 2009, the City of Phoenix reduced the number of human service one-stop service centers from five to three. The State of Arizona cut Medicaid-funded drug treatment services, and the result has been longer lengths of stay in treatment and fewer available slots opening up for new clients to enter treatment. Many of those who are unable to enter treatment are homeless and remain in the homeless system.

Sheltered Homeless Persons in Families

There were few changes in the prior living arrangements of persons in families between 2007 and 2009 (Exhibit 4-10). Perhaps the most interesting finding is that the percentages coming from housing units they owned or rented were very little different in 2009 than they were in 2008. The effect of the foreclosure crisis on homelessness seems to be mainly indirect, reflected by the increase in the percentage of families that had been staying with relatives before they became homeless. The change between 2008 and 2009 in the number who said they had been staying with family before becoming homeless was about 9,500, and the three-year change between 2007 and 2009 was 27,330.

Families were less likely to report that they were already homeless when they entered an emergency shelter or transitional housing program in 2009 than they were in 2007, suggesting that much of the increase in family homelessness in recent years has been for families becoming homeless for the first time.

A slightly higher percentage of adults in families said that they had been in substance abuse treatment centers in 2009 compared with 2008. A slightly lower percentage reported that they had been living unsubsidized in a hotel or motel, continuing a pattern of decline in the use of this type of living arrangement by families at risk of homelessness also observed between 2007 and 2008.

Exhibit 4-10: Change in Previous Living Situation of Adults in Families Using Homeless Residential Services, 2007-2009

Living Arrangement the Night before Program Entry	Percentage of Adults in Families 2007	Percentage of Adults in Families 2008	Percentage of Adults in Families 2009
Total Already Homeless	30.3%	25.9%	26.0%
Place not meant for human habitation	3.6%	4.0%	4.0%
Emergency shelter	23.3%	19.8%	19.5%
Transitional housing	3.4%	2.2%	2.5%
Total from Some Type of Housing	54.4%	61.5%	62.5%
Rented housing unit ^a	13.0%	16.8%	17.1%
Owned housing unit	3.8%	2.4%	2.6%
Staying with family	24.2%	27.8%	29.4%
Staying with friends	13.4%	14.5%	13.5%
Total from Institutional Settings	2.3%	2.4%	2.7%
Psychiatric facility, substance abuse center, or hospital	1.9%	1.8%	2.1%
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%
Foster care home	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
Total from Other Situations	13.0%	10.2%	8.7%
Hotel, motel (no voucher) or "other"	13.0%	10.2%	8.7%
Total Homeless Adults in Families	179,401	203,199	210,510

^a Includes a small percentage in permanent supportive housing.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

4.3 Changing Use of the Residential System for Homeless People, 2007-2009

All of the increase in family homelessness in 2009 compared with 2008 was in the use of emergency shelters by family members, rather than transitional housing. Exhibit 4-11 shows the number of persons in families using only emergency shelter, only transitional housing, or both programs during the course of a year. The number of persons in families staying just in emergency shelters grew by more than 20,000 people, while the numbers using transitional housing alone or in combination with emergency shelter dropped slightly. This pattern may reflect efforts by communities to help families move quickly to permanent housing rather than using a transitional housing program first. Also, it could reflect a shift in the types of families becoming homeless, with a smaller number needing the additional stabilizing services offered by transitional housing programs. Adult family members who reported that they had a disability dropped from 18.4 percent in 2008 to 14.0 percent in 2009, consistent with the idea that the growth in family homelessness over the two-year period was driven by economic factors.

Exhibit 4-11 Family Members in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing, 2008 - 2009

	All Sheltered Persons in Families		
	2008	2009	Change 2008-2009
Emergency shelter only	354,997	375,334	+20,337
Transitional housing only	134,678	134,069	-609
Both emergency shelter and transitional housing	27,050	26,044	-1006
Total	516,724	535,447	+18,723

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2008-2009

Changes in Lengths of Stay in the Homeless Services System

Exhibit 4-12 shows median lengths of stay in emergency shelter and transitional housing separately for individuals and persons in families. The median number of nights in emergency shelter increased from 14 to 18 for individuals from 2007 to 2008 and then dropped back to 17 nights in 2009. In contrast, the median number of nights in emergency shelter for persons in families was 30 in both 2007 and 2008 and then increased to 36 nights in 2009. Not only did family homelessness continue to increase between 2008 and 2009, it also seems to have become more severe in the sense that it took the typical family longer to leave shelter.


The differing patterns for individuals and family members hold for lengths of stay in transitional housing as well, with the median number of nights for individuals remaining constant between 2008 and 2009 but growing for persons in families, from 161 nights in 2008 to 174 nights in 2009. Growing lengths of stay for families in transitional housing are more difficult to interpret. Six months may be an appropriate stay in transitional housing for families that need the intensive services that transitional housing programs are supposed to provide.

Exhibit 4-12: Change in Median Length of Stay, by Shelter and Household Type, 2007-2009

	Median Nights in Shelter		
	2007	2008	2009
Emergency Shelters			
Individuals	14 nights	18 nights	17 nights
Persons in Families	30 nights	30 nights	36 nights
Transitional Housing			
Individuals	91 nights	107 nights	107 nights
Persons in Families	151 nights	161 nights	174 nights

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

In 2009 as in previous years, many people homeless as individuals spent a week or less in emergency shelter over the course of a year. That percentage dropped from 42 percent in 2007 to 37 percent in 2008, but then remained almost the same (38 percent) in 2009, as shown on Exhibit 4-13. The percentage of homeless individuals spending between one and six months in emergency shelter rose from 26 percent in 2007 to almost 30 percent in 2008 and then stayed about the same between 2008 and 2009.



Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

Exhibit 4-14 focuses on those individuals who stayed in emergency shelter for six months or more during a year, a group that made up less than 5 percent of all individuals using emergency shelters in 2009. The comparison of the demographic characteristics of these “heavy users” of the shelter system across the three years—2007, 2008, and 2009—show a steady increase in the percentage of non-minority individuals (white and not Hispanic). This change may be related to bringing more non-minority individuals off the streets and into shelters. (The increasing percentage of heavy users of emergency shelter identifying themselves as belonging to “other” racial groups mainly reflects the growing tendency of people to identify themselves as belonging to several races.)

Exhibit 4-14 shows a dramatic increase in the percentage of heavy users of emergency shelter who are individuals older than 50 years of age, from 30.6 percent in 2008 to 40.5 percent in 2009. This is consistent with other information on the aging of a cohort of individuals that began to exhibit patterns of chronic homelessness in the 1980s.³⁵ The percentage of heavy users with a disability dropped slightly, but this may simply reflect more precise estimates resulting from the lower rate of missing data on disability in 2009 than in 2008.

Exhibit 4-14: Individuals Who Stayed in Emergency Shelter More Than 180 Days, 2007-2009			
Characteristics	Percentage of Long-Stayers 2007	Percentage of Long-Stayers 2008	Percentage of Long-Stayers 2009
Gender			
Male	73.5%	77.0%	72.1%
Female	26.5%	23.0%	27.9%
Race/Ethnicity			
White, non-Hispanic/Latino	31.9%	34.8%	36.9%
White, Hispanic/Latino	11.0%	12.8%	8.1%
Black or African American	49.9%	45.4%	45.2%
Other racial groups	7.3%	7.1%	9.8%
Age^a			
18 to 30	12.6%	16.7%	11.3%
31 to 50	50.3%	51.9%	47.0%
51 and older	34.9%	30.6%	40.5%
Veteran (adults only)^b	--	15.4%	14.3%
Disabled (adults only)^b	--	39.7%	34.6%


^a Age categories do not sum to 100 percent because of the small numbers of people homeless alone who were under 18 years of age.

^b Because of the very different rates of missing data between 2007 and 2008 for veteran and disability status, the comparison to 2007 is not shown for these characteristics.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

Families are much less likely than individuals to stay in emergency shelter for a week or less. The percentage doing so stayed essentially the same over the three-year period, between 23 and 24 percent. As shown in Exhibit 4-15, the increase in median lengths of stay for families in shelter between 2008 and 2009 resulted mainly from more persons in families spending between two and six months in shelter.

³⁵ Culhane, Dennis P., Stephen Metraux, and Jay Bainbridge. "The Age Structure of Contemporary Homelessness: Risk Period or Cohort Effect?" Working Paper: The University of Pennsylvania.



Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

Just as is the case for individuals, the percentage of people staying in emergency shelter as families for more than six months of a year who are not members of minority groups increased steadily over the three-year period, from less than 7 percent in 2007 to almost 12 percent in 2009. Long stayers still were more likely to be African American than all sheltered homeless families in 2009, 68.8 percent vs. 47.9 percent (see Exhibit 4-16).

Exhibit 4-16: Change in Race and Ethnicity of Persons in Families Who Stayed in Emergency Shelters More Than 180 Days, 2007-2009			
Characteristic	Percentage of Long-Stayers 2007	Percentage of Long-Stayers 2008	Percentage of Long-Stayers 2009
White, non-Hispanic/Latino	6.8%	8.0%	11.9%
White, Hispanic/Latino	2.6%	9.5%	8.6%
Black or African American	87.9%	70.6%	68.8%
Other single- and multi-race groups	2.7%	11.9%	10.7%

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

4.4 Summary of Trends in Sheltered Homelessness between 2007 and 2009

The major changes that occurred in sheltered homelessness that occurred between 2007 and 2009 were:

- A small overall decline in the number of sheltered homeless people between 2008 and 2009. About 35,000 fewer people were homeless at some time during 2009 than during 2008.
- A 7 percent drop in the number of people homeless as individuals across the three-year period between 2007 and 2009. About 80,000 fewer people were in emergency shelter or transitional housing as individuals in 2009 compared to 2007. This may reflect community success in getting people out of shelters and into permanent housing.
- A continued increase in family homelessness between 2008 and 2009, following a larger increase between 2007 and 2008. In 2009, more than 170,000 families (including more than 535,000 people) were in shelters or transitional housing, a 30 percent increase over the 2007 number of sheltered homeless families. The sustained high level of family homelessness in 2009 reflects the ongoing effect of the recession.
- A slight aging of the adult homeless population, consistent with other research that points to the aging of a cohort of people who became susceptible to homelessness when they were younger.
- A steady decrease (from a high starting point) in the percentage of sheltered homeless families and individuals identifying themselves as African American.
- A slight increase (from a low starting point) in men who are homeless as part of families.
- An increase between 2008 and 2009 in the percentage of individuals reporting that their previous living arrangement was a place not meant for human habitation. Communities may be having some success in getting people off the “street” and into shelters.
- A continued increase between 2008 and 2009 in the percentage of adults in families who reported that they had been staying with family before becoming homeless. However, there was no further increase between 2008 and 2009 in the percentage who said they came from an owned or rented housing unit. The effect of the continuing foreclosure crisis on family homelessness seems to be indirect, as families stay with friends or relatives before entering shelters.
- An increase in the use of emergency shelters by families, and a slight decrease in the use of transitional housing.
- An increase in the median number of nights that family members stayed in emergency shelter, from 30 nights in 2008 to 36 nights in 2009. Family homelessness both increased between 2008 and 2009 and became more severe in the sense that it

took the typical family longer to leave shelter. Looking ahead to the 2010 AHAR, it is possible that lengths of stay will go down as a result of the use of HPRP funds for rapid re-housing.

Chapter 5

The Nationwide Capacity of Residential Programs for Homeless People

This chapter describes the nation's capacity to provide shelter or permanent supportive housing for homeless and formerly homeless people. The inventory of beds is reported for four types of residential programs: emergency shelters, transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, and safe havens. The chapter presents information on:

- *The 2009 inventory of beds* by residential program type, by whether the beds are for individuals or persons in families, and by specific homeless subpopulations: unaccompanied youth, veterans, and victims of domestic violence.
- *The geographic location of beds in 2009*, focusing on the total number of beds by state and the proportion of beds located in urban and suburban or rural areas.
- *The frequency of bed use (or the bed utilization rate)* for emergency shelters and transitional housing programs in 2009.
- *Changes in the nation's capacity to provide shelter or permanent supportive housing* for homeless and formerly homeless persons from 2006 to 2009.

With one exception, all of the information presented in this chapter was reported by CoCs in a bed inventory that is part of their annual application for funding. The bed utilization and turnover rates use the HMIS-based data on the number of shelter users and beds.

Types of Residential Programs

1. **Emergency Shelter:** A facility with the primary purpose of providing temporary shelter for people who otherwise would be forced to stay in a place not fit for human habitation.
2. **Transitional Housing:** A residential program intended to facilitate the movement of homeless people into permanent housing. Homeless people may live in transitional housing for up to 24 months and receive services that prepare them to obtain and retain permanent housing.
3. **Safe Havens:** A form of supportive housing that serves hard-to-reach homeless people with severe mental illnesses who are on the streets and have been unable or unwilling to participate in supportive services.
4. **Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH):** Long-term, subsidized housing with supportive services for formerly homeless people with disabilities to enable them to live as independently as possible in a permanent setting.

5.1 Inventory of Residential Programs and Beds, 2009

Total Number of Residential Programs and Beds

In 2009, the nation's capacity to house homeless and formerly homeless people included an estimated 20,065 residential programs and 643,423 year-round beds³⁶ (see Exhibit 5-1). The number of beds is divided almost evenly among emergency shelters, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing, but—for the first time—the number of permanent supportive housing beds is larger than each of the other types of beds.

Exhibit 5-1: National Inventory of Residential Programs and Year-Round Beds, 2009^a

Program Type	Programs		Beds	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Emergency Shelter	6,009	29.9%	214,425	33.3%
Transitional Housing	7,229	36.0%	207,589	32.3%
Permanent Supportive Housing	6,701	33.4%	219,381	34.1%
Safe Haven	126	0.6%	2,028	0.3%
Total Number^b	20,065	100%	643,423	100%

^a Year-round beds are available for use throughout the year and are considered part of the stable inventory of beds for homeless persons. The inventory includes beds in Puerto Rico, the U.S. Territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands.

^b The 2009 inventory includes beds that were reported by CoCs as part of their current and new inventories. The current inventory was available for occupancy on or before January 31, 2008. The new inventory was available for occupancy between February 1, 2008 and January 30, 2009.

Source: 2009 Continuum of Care Application: Exhibit 1, CoC Housing Inventory

Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing

In 2009, the national inventory of year-round beds for homeless persons was split almost evenly between emergency shelter and transitional housing programs. However, whereas emergency shelters dedicated slightly more than half of their beds to homeless individuals, transitional housing programs dedicated slightly more than half of their beds to homeless families (see Exhibit 5-2). Family beds are located within units—such as apartments or single rooms that are occupied by one family. Programs that served families had 67,083 family units with an average 3.2 beds per unit.

In addition to their year-round beds, CoCs must report their inventories of seasonal beds and overflow or voucher beds. These beds are exclusively for emergency shelter and are typically used during inclement weather conditions. The 2009 national bed inventory had 20,419 seasonal beds and 30,565 overflow or voucher beds. (See Text Box: Types of Beds

³⁶ Year-round beds are available for use throughout the year and are considered part of the stable inventory of beds for homeless persons.

Reported in a CoC Housing Inventory.) Adding these beds to the total number of year-round shelter beds in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs increases the nation's peak bed capacity for homeless persons by 12 percent, to 475,026 beds. Including these beds also increases the average size of emergency shelters from 36 beds per program to just over 44 beds per program. Considering the short-term and more congregate housing settings of emergency shelters compared to transitional housing, it is not surprising that bed capacity per program is much larger than the approximately 29 beds per program in transitional housing.

Types of Beds Reported in a CoC Housing Inventory

1. **Year-round beds:** Beds available for use throughout the year and considered part of the stable inventory of beds for homeless persons.
2. **Seasonal beds:** Beds usually available during particularly high-demand seasons (e.g., winter months in northern regions and summer months in southern regions), but not available throughout the year.
3. **Overflow beds:** Beds typically used during emergencies (e.g., a sudden drop in temperature or a natural disaster that displaces residents). Their availability is sporadic.
4. **Voucher beds:** Beds made available, usually in a hotel or motel. They often function as overflow beds. Some communities, especially rural communities, use vouchers instead of fixed shelters, and thus these beds also can also be year-round beds.
5. **Family units:** Housing units (e.g., apartments) that serve homeless families. Each family unit includes several beds.

Safe Havens

HUD funds safe haven programs designed to serve people with severe mental illness. Safe haven programs resemble permanent housing in that homeless individuals may stay in these 24-hour residences for an unspecified duration in private or semi-private accommodations. Safe havens are designed to stabilize a person's housing situation so that his mental health issues can be treated and he can obtain permanent housing. Occupancy in safe havens is limited to no more than 25 people and the average is just under 17 beds per program.

In 2009, 126 safe haven programs containing 2,028 beds made up less than one-half percent of the total bed inventory for serving homeless people.

Permanent Supportive Housing

For several years, one of HUD's policy priorities has been the development of permanent supportive housing programs that provide a combination of housing and supportive services to formerly homeless people with disabilities. In 2009, the nation's permanent supportive housing inventory included more than 219,000 beds, more beds than in either emergency shelters or transitional housing (Exhibit 5-2). The large number of permanent supportive housing beds reflects the continuing efforts by HUD and communities to end homelessness among chronically

homeless people. About 60 percent of these beds (131,663) served unaccompanied individuals, and the remaining 40 percent served families (87,718). The inventory of permanent supportive housing beds for families was distributed across approximately 31,000 family units, with an average of 2.9 beds per unit. The average size of a permanent supportive housing program is almost 33 beds, in between the size of emergency shelters and transitional housing.

Exhibit 5-2: Number of Beds and Units in Homeless Assistance System Nationwide, 2009						
	Year-Round Beds			Total Year-Round Family Units	Other Beds	
	Total Year- Round Beds	Family Beds	Individual Beds		Seasonal	Overflow or Voucher
Emergency Shelters						
Inventory	214,425	103,531	110,894	31,964	20,419	30,565
Transitional Housing						
Inventory	207,589	110,064	97,525	35,119	0	0
Safe Havens						
Inventory	2,028	0	2,028	0	0	0
Sub-Total: Beds for Currently Homeless Persons						
Inventory	424,042	213,595	210,447	67,083	20,419	30,565
Permanent Supportive Housing (Beds Serving Formerly Homeless Persons)						
Inventory	219,381	87,718	131,663	30,649	0	0

Source: 2009 Continuum of Care Application: Exhibit 1, CoC Housing Inventory

Inventory of Beds for Homeless Subpopulations

Emergency shelter and transitional housing programs reserve a portion of their beds for a variety of homeless subpopulations with special characteristics and needs. In 2009, about 82 percent of beds were available to the general homeless population, with the remainder of beds reserved for specific subpopulations: approximately 13 percent for victims of domestic violence; 3 percent for veterans; 2 percent for unaccompanied youth; and almost 1.5 percent for persons living with HIV/AIDS (Exhibit 5-3).³⁷

While both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs target about one-fifth of their beds to specific populations, the target population varies slightly by program type. A larger proportion of beds were available for victims of domestic violence in emergency shelters (16 percent) than in transitional housing (9 percent). Transitional housing programs reserved more beds for veterans (5 percent) and for persons living with HIV/AIDS (2 percent), compared to

³⁷ The CoC application reports beds dedicated to unaccompanied youth separately from beds dedicated to victims of domestic violence, veterans, or persons living with HIV/AIDS. The exhibit assumes that beds dedicated to unaccompanied youth are mutually exclusive from beds dedicated to these other subpopulations.

emergency shelters (0.8 percent for both population types). The share of beds for unaccompanied youth was the same for both emergency shelters and transitional housing programs (2 percent).

5.2 Geographic Location of Beds, 2009

Distribution of Beds by State

Exhibit 5-4 shows the total number of beds by state. The exhibit also provides the number of beds per 1,000 people in the state. In 2009, there were 2.0 beds for homeless and formerly homeless persons for every 1,000 people in the United States.

With 17.1 beds per 1,000 persons, the District of Columbia has three times higher a ratio of beds to persons as the highest state, New York, which has a ratio of 4.8 beds per 1,000 persons. New York also has the largest inventory of beds in the country, with approximately 94,500 beds, followed by California with 88,688. No other state has more than 32,000 beds, and New York and California combined have 29 percent of the nation's bed capacity. Wyoming has the fewest beds of any state (835 beds), but Mississippi has the fewest beds per 1,000 persons (0.6). Kansas is the only other state with less than 1 bed per 1,000 persons.

Distribution of Beds by Urban and Suburban or Rural Areas

According to information submitted by CoCs in 2009, more than half of all programs and almost two-thirds of all beds are located in a principal city (Exhibit 5-5). The distribution of programs and beds varies by program type. Transitional housing and permanent supportive housing programs follow a similar distribution as the inventory of beds. In contrast, while 70 percent of emergency shelter beds are located in principal cities, less than half of the programs are located in these areas because emergency shelter programs tend to be larger in principal cities than in suburban and rural areas. The average size of an emergency shelter in principal cities was 53 beds, compared to 20 beds in suburban and rural areas.

Exhibit 5-3: Year-Round Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Beds by Homeless Subpopulation 2009




Exhibit 5-4: Inventory of Year-Round Beds and Beds Per Capita Rate by State, 2009¹

Rank	State	# of Beds	Beds Per Capita Rate	Rank	State	# of Beds	Beds Per Capita Rate
1	District of Columbia	10,091	17.1		Colorado	8,713	1.8
2	New York	94,449	4.8	28	Florida	31,862	1.7
3	Hawaii	5,141	4.0		Louisiana	7,633	1.7
4	Nevada	10,191	3.9		Utah	4,693	1.7
5	Oregon	14,547	3.8		Delaware	1,488	1.7
6	Washington	24,519	3.7		New Hampshire	2,231	1.7
7	Massachusetts	23,376	3.6		Iowa	5,079	1.7
8	Maine	4,570	3.5	34	Wyoming	835	1.6
9	Alaska	2,204	3.2	35	Idaho	2,326	1.5
10	Minnesota	14,245	2.7		Georgia	14,674	1.5
11	Rhode Island	2,737	2.6		Montana	1,438	1.5
12	California	88,688	2.4		Indiana	9,477	1.5
13	Connecticut	8,112	2.3	39	Wisconsin	8,076	1.4
14	Michigan	21,641	2.2		North Carolina	12,607	1.4
15	Nebraska	3,764	2.1	41	Alabama	6,199	1.3
16	South Dakota	1,636	2.0		Tennessee	8,172	1.3
	Arizona	12,992	2.0		West Virginia	2,311	1.3
	Vermont	1,235	2.0		Virginia	9,895	1.3
	North Dakota	1,266	2.0	45	South Carolina	5,461	1.2
	New Mexico	3,891	2.0		Arkansas	3,366	1.2
21	Maryland	10,801	1.9		Texas	28,650	1.2
	Pennsylvania	23,748	1.9	48	Oklahoma	4,145	1.1
	Ohio	21,657	1.9		New Jersey	9,393	1.1
24	Kentucky	7,871	1.8	50	Kansas	2,094	0.7
	Illinois	23,363	1.8	51	Mississippi	1,758	0.6
	Missouri	10,586	1.8		Total	628,155	2.0

¹ The beds per capita rate is the number of residential beds per 1,000 people in the state. Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories are not included: Guam (294 beds and 1.60 beds per capita), Virgin Islands (175 beds and 1.6 beds per capita), and Puerto Rico (3,057 beds and 0.8 beds per capita).

Sources: 2009 Continuum of Care Application: Exhibit 1, CoC Housing Inventory; 2008 American Community Survey

Exhibit 5-5: Distribution of Bed Inventory by Geographic Area, 2009

Type of Program	Total Number		Percentage of Total	
	Principal City	Suburban and Rural Areas	Principal City	Suburban and Rural Areas
Emergency Shelter				
Number of programs	2,853	3,156	47.5%	52.5%
Number of year-round beds	150,965	63,460	70.4%	29.6%
Transitional Housing				
Number of programs	3,961	3,268	54.8%	45.2%
Number of year-round beds	124,804	82,785	60.1%	39.9%
Safe Havens				
Number of programs	87	39	69.0%	31.0%
Number of year-round beds	148,783	70,598	67.8%	32.2%
Permanent Supportive Housing				
Number of programs	3,905	2,796	58.3%	41.7%
Number of year-round beds	148,783	70,598	67.8%	32.2%
Total				
Number of programs	10,806	9,259	53.9%	46.1%
Number of year-round beds	426,000	217,423	66.2%	33.8%

Source: 2009 Continuum of Care Application: Exhibit 1, CoC Housing Inventory

5.3 Bed Utilization and Turnover Rates, 2009

This section describes the average daily bed utilization and bed turnover rates by residential program type and geographic area. The bed utilization and turnover rates use one-year estimates of shelter users based on HMIS data together with bed inventory information reported by CoCs in their annual applications. The HMIS data provide information on the total number of people who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing facility at any point from October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009.

Emergency Shelters

Between October 2008 and September 2009, almost 89 percent of emergency shelter beds were occupied on an average day (Exhibit 5-6). Emergency shelter beds dedicated to individuals had a slightly higher utilization rate than beds for persons in families. Turnover rates were much higher for beds used by individuals than by persons in families. Eight homeless people per year were served in beds for individuals compared with 4.7 people per bed for persons in families. This is consistent with the longer lengths of stay for families in emergency shelters compared to individuals reported in chapter 3.

Types of Bed Utilization Rates

1. **Average daily utilization rate:** The percentage of available year-round equivalent beds occupied on an average night during the 12-month reporting period. Year-round equivalent beds include seasonal beds that have been pro-rated for the portion of the year that they are available. Vouchers have been pro-rated based on the bed nights paid for with vouchers during the year.
2. **Turnover rate:** The total number of people served per year-round bed during the 12-month reporting period.

Emergency shelters located in suburban and rural areas have a higher utilization rate than shelters in principal cities, especially for homeless individuals: 95 percent of emergency shelters beds for individuals in suburban or rural areas were occupied on an average night, compared to 88 percent of these beds in principal cities. Suburban and rural area shelters also had higher turnover rates for individual and family beds than their counterparts in principal cities.

Exhibit 5-6: Average Daily Utilization and Turnover Rate of Year-Round Equivalent Beds by Program and Household Type and Geographic Area, 2009

Rate ^a	Emergency Shelters			Transitional Housing		
	Total	Individual	Family	Total	Individual	Family
Overall						
Utilization rate	88.5%	89.9%	86.7%	82.4%	82.5%	82.3%
Turnover rate	6.5	8.1	4.7	1.8	2.1	1.6
Principal City						
Utilization rate	87.9%	88.2%	87.5%	82.7%	82.6%	82.9%
Turnover rate	6.5	7.9	4.5	1.9	2.1	1.7
Suburban and Rural Areas						
Utilization rate	90.0%	95.3%	85.2%	82.0%	82.3%	81.7%
Turnover rate	6.7	8.6	5.1	1.7	2.0	1.5

^a The rates reported in the exhibit are based on year-round *equivalent* beds. A year-round equivalent bed is equal to the total number of year-round beds plus the total number of seasonal beds in proportion to the amount of time these beds were available plus the total number of vouchers in proportion to how many “voucher beds” were used during the one-year reporting period.

^b The exhibit provides two types of bed utilization rates—average daily bed utilization rates and bed turnover rates. The average daily bed utilization rate is calculated by dividing the average daily census during the study period by the total number of year-round beds in the current inventory and then converting it to a percentage. The turnover rate measures the number of persons served per available bed over the 12-month period. It is calculated by dividing the number of persons served by the number of year-round beds.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2009

Transitional Housing

Compared to emergency shelters, transitional housing programs have lower bed utilization and turnover rates. About 82 percent of transitional housing beds were occupied on an average day, and this did not vary much by whether the beds were dedicated to individuals or families or by the location of the beds. Not surprisingly, bed turnover rates in transitional housing were much lower than those of emergency shelters. Transitional housing programs are designed to serve people for up to two years. During the one-year reporting period, a transitional housing bed typically serves a little less than two people.

These data reinforce two patterns that have been observed consistently in other studies: (1) emergency shelters have higher average daily utilization rates and turnover rates than transitional housing programs, and (2) beds for unaccompanied individuals have higher average daily utilization rates and turnover rates than beds for persons in families.³⁸ Duration in a shelter and frequency of bed use both affect turnover rates. The shorter the average length of stay and the faster a program can fill a vacant bed, the higher the turnover rate. These findings also are consistent with the information reported in chapter 3, which shows that people who stay in emergency shelters have shorter lengths of stay than those who stay in transitional housing programs, and that individuals who stay in either program type have shorter lengths of stay than families in the same program type.

5.4 Changes in the National Inventory and Utilization of Beds, 2006-2009

Changes in the Total Number of Beds


From 2006 to 2009, the total number of beds available in residential programs throughout the United States increased by almost 60,000 beds (or 10 percent), reflecting an increase in beds across all program types (Exhibit 5-7). The number of emergency shelter beds increased by 7,548 (3.6 percent), the number of transitional housing beds increased by 7,880 (3.9 percent), and the number of permanent supportive housing beds increased by more than both other programs combined by 42,551 (24.1 percent). More than half the growth in permanent supportive housing beds occurred in the last year, from just under 196,000 in 2008 to more than 219,000 in 2009. In the same one-year period, the number of permanent supportive housing programs grew by 555, to 6,701 in 2009.

The increase in the inventory of permanent supportive housing programs and beds is particularly noteworthy because it is consistent with HUD's emphasis on expanding the stock of supportive housing. In collaboration with the Interagency Council on Homelessness, HUD has placed

³⁸ Burt, Martha and Sam Hall. 2008. *Transforming the District of Columbia's Public Homeless Assistance System*. Washington D.C.: Urban Institute.

federal policy and funding behind local efforts to end homelessness through permanent supportive housing. Hundreds of city governments have responded by developing “10 year plans” that place a priority on expanding permanent supportive housing in their communities. HUD has also partnered with the Department of Veterans Affairs to administer jointly a new federal Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) program. The HUD–VASH program combines rental assistance for homeless veterans with case management and clinical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs at its medical centers and in the community.

As reported in Chapter 2, the number of persons who were chronically homeless decreased substantially from 2006 to 2009. During the same time period, over 42,000 permanent supportive housing beds were added to the nation’s inventory. These findings suggest that HUD’s efforts to move chronically homeless people off the streets or other places not meant for human habitation and into permanent housing are starting to pay off.




Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2007-2009

Changes in the Inventory of Beds for Homeless Subpopulations

The overall proportion of beds dedicated to homeless individuals and persons in families has remained fairly constant since 2006. The percentage of emergency shelter beds dedicated to homeless persons in families has increased slightly, from 46 to 48 percent, and also in transitional housing, from 52 to 53 percent (Exhibit 5-8). In contrast, the percentage of permanent supportive housing beds for families has decreased since 2006, from 44 percent to 40 percent in 2009, likely

reflecting the increased number of new units resulting from an emphasis on ending chronic homelessness through permanent supportive housing programs. By definition, all chronically homeless persons are individuals.



Changes in Average Daily Utilization and Turnover Rates

The average daily utilization rate for emergency housing in 2009 returned to the 2007 level of 88.5 percent after an increase in 2008. The utilization rate in transitional housing increased between 2007 and 2008 and maintained the higher rate in 2009 (82.4 percent). The bed turnover rate remained constant during this period for transitional housing, suggesting that the increased utilization rate is being driven by retaining the clients longer rather than serving more clients per bed over the year.

Changes in bed utilization patterns varied depending on the geographic location of programs and beds. In emergency shelters, the utilization rate in principal cities increased by about five percentage points between 2007 and 2008, but decreased by about four percentage points in suburban and rural areas. By 2009, both types of geographic locations had nearly returned to the rate in 2007. In transitional housing, the utilization rate in principal cities increased steadily between 2007 and 2009, from 78.6 to 82.7 percent. The utilization rate in suburban or rural areas increased considerably from 2007 to 2008 (about 10 percentage points), and then stabilized in 2009, to 82 percent.

Exhibit 5-9: Average Daily Utilization and Turnover Rate of All Year-Round Equivalent Beds by Program and Household Type, 2007–2009 ^a

Rates ^b	Total			Principal City			Suburban/Rural		
	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
Average Daily Utilization Rate									
Emergency Shelter	88.5%	91.0%	88.5%	87.6%	93.1%	87.9%	91.4%	85.8%	90.0%
Transitional Housing	76.9%	82.7%	82.4%	78.6%	81.8%	82.7%	73.7%	83.9%	82.0%
Turnover Rate									
Emergency Shelter	7.3	6.9	6.5	7.5	6.7	6.5	6.6	7.3	6.7
Transitional Housing	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.5	1.8	1.7

^a The rates reported in the exhibit were based on year-round *equivalent* beds. A year-round equivalent bed is equal to the total number of year-round beds plus the total number of seasonal beds in proportion to the amount of time these beds were available during the one-year reporting period.

^b The exhibit provides two types of bed utilization rates—average daily bed utilization rates and bed turnover rates. The average daily bed utilization rate is calculated by dividing the average daily census during the study period by the total number of year-round beds in the current inventory and then converting it to a percentage. The turnover rate measures the number of persons served per available bed over the 12-month period. It is calculated by dividing the number of persons served by the number of year-round beds.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, 2006 – 2009

5.5 Summary of the Nationwide Capacity of Residential Programs for Homeless People

The number of emergency shelter and transitional housing beds for serving homeless people increased by nearly 15,000 beds between 2006 and 2009. The added supply has not gone unused: almost 90 percent of emergency shelter beds are filled on an average night, as are about 82 percent of transitional housing beds. The number of permanent supportive housing beds for serving formerly homeless person has grown even more rapidly, increasing by 24 percent since 2006. There are now more permanent supportive housing beds than either emergency shelter or transitional housing beds.

The bed inventory data reported by CoCs show that:

- The 2009 national inventory of residential programs and year-round beds serving homeless and formerly homeless people included an estimated 20,065 residential programs and an estimated 643,423 beds.
- The 2009 national bed inventory included 20,065 seasonal beds and 30,565 overflow or voucher beds. If these beds are added to the total number of year-round shelter beds in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs, the nation's peak capacity for homeless persons in 2009 was 475,026 beds.

- Between 2006 and 2009, the total number of beds available in residential programs throughout the United States increased by approximately 60,000 (10 percent), reflecting an increase in beds across all program types.
- The increase in permanent supportive housing beds (about 43,000) accounts for two-thirds of the increase in beds for homeless and formerly homeless people between 2006 and 2009.
- Between 2008 and 2009, the average daily bed utilization rate remained constant in transitional housing (82 percent), but returned to the 2007 level in emergency shelters (89 percent).

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 6

Looking Ahead

This report builds on last year's report by adding data on sheltered homeless people for another full year, allowing for a comparative analysis of homelessness that spans three years—2007, 2008, and 2009. The inclusion of data for a third year is important because it marks the establishment of discernable trends in homelessness. This report is also the first to include information from in-person interviews with local service providers located in nine communities nationwide. The qualitative information provides a contextual backdrop for understanding how homelessness is changing throughout the nation. Finally, the report adds Point-in-Time (PIT) counts of sheltered and unsheltered persons and of homeless subpopulations for another year, providing trend data for 2006 through 2009.

The trends observed in this AHAR reinforce some of the findings from previous reports. Homelessness remains predominately an urban phenomenon, and most people are homeless as individuals rather than as members of families. But trends reported in this 2009 AHAR also provide an indication of how homelessness may be changing over time and whether the current economic and foreclosure crisis has led to higher rates of homelessness. Overall, the number of sheltered homeless persons has remained relatively unchanged between 2007 and 2009, at about 1.6 million people over the course of each year, but the composition of the sheltered homeless population has shifted. During the three-year period, the number of sheltered persons in families increased by 13 percent, and families now represent more than one-third of the entire sheltered population, up from 29 percent in 2007. From 2007 to 2008, the share of the overall sheltered homeless population living in suburban and rural areas increased from 23 percent to 32 percent. From 2008 to 2009, even though the share of the sheltered homeless population in suburban and rural areas remained at 32 percent, the number of sheltered persons in families still increased by nearly 4 percent in suburban and rural areas.

So far, both the PIT and HMIS-based estimates of homeless people do not suggest that the economic recession has created a surge in homelessness, but signs of the recession's impact are present. The continued growth in sheltered family homelessness almost certainly reflects the ongoing effect of the recession. Also, because of the recession, more families with two adults may have become homeless, as well as more families with only a father present. But the long-term effects of the recession are unclear. Many families are doubling up in response to the economic downturn, and data in the 2009 AHAR reinforce this point. Between 2007 and 2008, as well as between 2008 and 2009, there was an increase in the share of people coming to shelters who were living with family or friends the night before entering a homeless residential facility. If some of these family support networks already are struggling to make ends meet, some of the doubled-up families may find their way into the homeless residential service system during 2010. On the other hand, as the nation comes out of the

recession, and as the stimulus funding made available through the Homelessness Prevention and Re-housing Program (HPRP) starts helping families in crisis avoid shelter, it also is possible that family homelessness will decline over the coming months. Thus, the fortunes of many families who were affected by the recession may still be in the balance.

The 2009 AHAR is the first to include a companion report on homeless veterans, which will be published later in 2010. The report on homeless veterans comes at a time when many service men and women are returning from active duty in Iraq and being deployed to Afghanistan. This report will provide an important baseline understanding of homelessness among veterans that, in turn, can be used to assess how homelessness among veterans may change over time.

6.1 The 2010 AHAR

The 2010 AHAR will continue to provide Congress and the nation with updated counts of homelessness nationwide, including counts of individuals, persons in families, and special population groups such as chronically homeless people and persons with disabilities. These topics will be explored using data from an ever-expanding group of communities that participate in the AHAR, which now includes the majority of Continuums of Care nationwide. The 2010 AHAR also will add another full-year of HMIS data to further highlight trends in homelessness and identify any long-term impacts of the economic recession.

The 2010 AHAR will be the first to include data on people served in permanent supportive housing programs, in addition to the data from emergency shelter and transitional housing programs that have constituted the first five AHARs. The slight decrease in the number of people using transitional housing programs in 2009 may have been a result of communities moving families directly from emergency shelters to permanent supportive housing. The 2010 AHAR will be able to assess this question, among many others, in a more nuanced fashion. The 2010 AHAR will also be the first to examine trends in homelessness among veterans, comparing the 2009 supplemental report on homeless veterans (to be released later in 2010) with the 2010 supplemental report.

HUD continues to view the AHAR as the primary resource for up-to-date information about homelessness based on locally-derived HMIS data and is exploring ways to make these data readily accessible to states, localities, and the general public. Based on the AHAR, policymakers and practitioners alike will be able to better understand homelessness in their communities, allocate local homeless assistance funds effectively, improve program operations, and work toward the ultimate goal of ending homelessness.

Appendix A:
List of 2009 AHAR Sample Sites
and Contributing Communities

This page intentionally left blank

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Sample Sites									
1	AK-501	Alaska Balance of State CoC	Hoonah-Angoon	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
2	AL-502	Florence/Northwest Alabama CoC	Lawrence County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
3	AZ-500	Arizona Balance of State CoC	Flagstaff	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
4	AZ-502	Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County Regional CoC	Phoenix	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
5	CA-501	City and County of San Francisco	San Francisco	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
6	CA-506	Monterrey County	Seaside	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*
7	CA-507	Marin County CoC	Marin County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8	CA-510	Turlock/Modesto/Stanslaus County CoC	Modesto	Sample	No	No	No	No	No
9	CA-514	Fresno/Madera County CoC	Fresno	Sample	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
10	CA-600	County of Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Sample	No	No	No	No	No
11	CA-600	County of Los Angeles	Los Angeles County	Sample	No	No	No	No	No
12	CA-600	County of Los Angeles	Pico Rivera	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
13	CA-601	City of San Diego	San Diego	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14	CA-602	Orange County CoC	Mission Viejo	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
15	CA-607	Pasadena CoC	Pasadena	Sample	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
16	CA-608	County of Riverside CoC	Moreno Valley	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
17	CO-500	State of Colorado CoC	Crowley County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Sample Sites									
18	CO-500	Colorado Balance of State	Saguache County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
19	CO-503	Metropolitan Denver Homeless Initiative	Adams County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	*
20	CT-502	Hartford CoC	Hartford	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	CT-503	Bridgeport CoC	Stratford	Sample	Yes	*	Yes	*	*
22	DC-500	District of Columbia CoC	Washington DC	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	DE-500	Wilmington CoC	Wilmington	Sample	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
24	DE-500	Delaware Statewide	Sussex County	Sample	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
25	FL-500	Sarasota, Bradenton, Manatee Counties CoC	Sarasota	Sample	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	*
26	FL-516	Winterhaven/Polk County CoC	Polk County	Sample	Yes	*	Yes	*	Yes
27	FL-504	Daytona Beach/Daytona/Volusia, Flagler Counties CoC	Deltona	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
28	FL-514	Ocala/Marion County	Marion County	Sample	No	No	No	No	No
29	GA-500	Atlanta/Roswell/DeKalb, Fulton Counties CoC	Atlanta	Sample	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
30	GA-501	Georgia Balance of State	Macon County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
31	GA-501	Georgia Balance of State	Oconee County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
32	GA-501	Georgia Balance of State	Putnam County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
33	GA-501	Georgia Balance of State	Seminole County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
34	GA-504	Augusta CoC	Augusta-Richmond	Sample	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Sample Sites									
35	IA-501	Iowa Balance of State CoC	Monona County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
36	ID-501	Idaho Balance of State CoC	Oneida County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
37	IL-510	Chicago CoC	Chicago	Sample	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
38	IL-511	Cook County CoC	Cook County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
39	IL-513	Springfield CoC	Sangamon County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
40	KS-507	Kansas Balance of State CoC	Barton County	Sample	No	No	*	No	No
41	KY-500	Kentucky Balance of State CoC	Hardin County	Sample	Yes	*	*	*	Yes
42	LA-502	Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest CoC	Bossier City	Sample	Yes	*	Yes	*	Yes
43	LA-506	Slidell/Southeast Louisiana CoC	Slidell	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*
44	LA-506	Slidell/Southeast Louisiana CoC	St. Tammany Parish	Sample	Yes	*	*	*	Yes
45	MA-500	Boston CoC	Boston	Sample	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
46	MA-512	Lawrence CoC	Lawrence	Sample	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
47	MA-519	Attleboro/Taunton/Bristol County CoC	Attleboro	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
48	MD-601	Montgomery County CoC	Montgomery County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
49	ME-500	Maine Balance of State CoC	York County	Sample	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
50	MI-500	Michigan Balance of State CoC	Delta County	Sample	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Sample Sites									
51	MI-500	Michigan Balance of State CoC	Berrien County	Sample	No	*	*	*	No
52	MI-501	City of Detroit CoC	Detroit	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
53	MI-503	Macomb County CoC	Macomb County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
54	MI-504	Pontiac/Royal Oak/Oakland County CoC	Farmington Hills	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
55	MI-508	Lansing/East Lansing/Ingham County CoC	Lansing	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
56	MI-509	Washtenaw County CoC	Washtenaw County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	Yes
57	MN-500	Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC	Hennepin County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	*
58	MN-501	St. Paul/Ramsey County CoC	St. Paul	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	Yes
59	MN-502	Rochester/Southeast Minnesota CoC	Rochester	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
60	MN-506	Northwest Minnesota CoC	Norman County	Sample	No	No	*	*	*
61	MN-508	West Central Minnesota CoC	Moorhead	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
62	MN-512	Washington County CoC	Washington County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	Yes
63	MS-501	Mississippi Balance of State CoC	Hattiesburg	Sample	No	No	*	No	No
64	MS-501	Mississippi Balance of State CoC	Humphreys County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
65	MS-501	Mississippi Balance of State	Sunflower County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
66	MT-500	State of Montana CoC	Billings	Sample	No	No	No	No	No
67	MT-500	State of Montana CoC	Great Falls	Sample	No	No	No	No	No

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Sample Sites									
68	NE-501	City of Omaha	Council Bluffs	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
69	NE-501	Omaha/Council Bluffs	Douglas County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
70	NJ-501	Bergen County	Bergen County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
71	NJ-503	Camden City/Camden County	Camden	Sample	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
72	NJ-510	Ocean County CoC	Brick Township	Sample	Yes	*	Yes	*	Yes
73	NV-500	Southern Nevada CoC	Clark County	Sample	No	No	No	No	No
74	NY-501	Chemung County CoC	Elmira	Sample	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	Yes
75	NY-505	Syracuse County CoC	Onondaga County	Sample	Yes	*	*	*	Yes
76	NY-512	Troy/ Rensselear County	Rensselaer County	Sample	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	*
77	NY-509	Allegany County	Allegany County	Sample	Yes	No	*	No	Yes
78	NY-600	New York City Coalition/CoC	New York City	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
79	NY-603	Nassau/Suffolk Coalition for the Homeless	Islip Town	Sample	Yes	Yes	*	*	No
80	OH-502	Cleveland/Cuyahoga County/Cleveland CoC	Cleveland	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
81	OH-507	Lancaster/Ohio Balance of State	Lancaster	Sample	No	No	No	No	*
82	OH-507	Springfield/Ohio Balance of State	Springfield	Sample	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
83	OH-507	Putnam/Ohio Balance of State	Putnam County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
84	OK-500	North Central Oklahoma	Pawnee County	Sample	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	*

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Sample Sites									
85	OK-503	Oklahoma Balance of State CoC	Midwest City	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
86	PA-500	Philadelphia CoC	Philadelphia	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
87	PA-507	Altoona/Central Pennsylvania CoC	Lycoming County	Sample	Yes	*	*	*	Yes
88	PA-507	Altoona/Central Pennsylvania CoC	Snyder County	Sample	Yes	*	Yes	No	No
89	PA-601	Southwest PA	Westmoreland County	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*
90	SD-500	South Dakota	Hamlin County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
91	TX-600	Dallas City & County/Irving CoC	Dallas	Sample	No	No	No	No	No
92	TX-700	Houston/Harris County CoC	Houston	Sample	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
93	TX-603	El Paso CoC	El Paso	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
94	VA-500	Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover Counties CoC	Chesterfield County	Sample	No	*	No	*	No
95	VA-507	Portsmouth CoC	Portsmouth	Sample	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
96	VT-501	Chittenden County	Chittenden County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
97	WA-500	Seattle-King County CoC	Seattle	Sample	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
98	WA-501	Washington Balance of State CoC	Skagit County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
99	WA-501	Washington Balance of State CoC	Franklin County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
100	WA-501	Washington Balance of State CoC	Adams County	Sample	No Shelter Providers	*	*	*	*
101	WA-507	Yakima City and County	Yakima	Sample	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
102	WI-500	Forest County/State of Wisconsin CoC	Forest County	Sample	Yes	*	Yes	Yes	*

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
103	AK-500	Anchorage CoC	Anchorage	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
104	AL-500	Birmingham/Jefferson, St. Clair, Shelby Counties CoC	Metropolitan Birmingham	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
105	AL-501	Mobile City & County/Baldwin County CoC	Mobile	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
106	AL-504	Montgomery City & County CoC	Montgomery	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
107	AR-500	Little Rock/Central Arkansas CoC	Little Rock CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
108	AR-501	Fayetteville/Northwest Arkansas CoC	Fayetteville/Northwest Arkansas CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
109	AR-505	Southeast Arkansas	Southeast Arkansas	Contributing	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	*
110	AR-506	Johnson, Pope, Yell Counties CoC	Arkansas Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	No	*	Yes	*
111	AZ-501	Tucson/Pima County	Tucson/Pima County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
112	AZ-502	Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County Regional CoC	Maricopa County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
113	CA-500	San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	Santa Clara County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
114	CA-504	Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County	Sonoma County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
115	CA-505	Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	Contra Costa County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
116	CA-506	Salinas/Monterey County CoC	Monterey County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
117	CA-512	San Mateo County	San Mateo County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
118	CA-513	Visalia, Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	Kings/Tulare	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
119	CA-519	Chico/Paradise/Butte County CoC	Butte County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
120	CA-609	San Bernardino County	San Bernardino County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
121	CA-610	San Diego County	San Diego County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
122	CA-612	Glendale CoC	City of Glendale	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*
123	CO-504	Colorado Springs/El Paso County CoC	Colorado Springs/El Paso County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
124	CT-503	Greater Bridgeport	Bridgeport	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
125	CT-505	Connecticut Balance of State	Connecticut Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	No	*	Yes	No
126	CT-506	Greater Norwalk Area	Greater Norwalk Area	Contributing	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	*
127	CT-507	New London	New London	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
128	CT-508	Stamford/Greenwich CoC	Stamford	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
129	CT-509	New Britain CoC	New Britain	Contributing	Yes	No	*	No	Yes
130	CT-510	Bristol CoC	Bristol	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
131	FL-501	Tampa/Hillsborough County	Tampa/Hillsborough County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
132	FL-502	St. Petersburg/Clearwater/Largo/Pinellas County CoC	Pinellas	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
133	FL-503	Lakeland CoC	Lakeland	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
134	FL-504	Daytona Beach/Daytona/Volusia, Flagler Counties CoC	Daytona Beach/Daytona/Volusia/Flagler County	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	Yes	No
135	FL-506	Tallahassee/Leon County CoC	Tallahassee/Leon	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
136	FL-507	Orlando/Orange/Osceola/SeminoleCounty	Orlando/Orange/Osceola/SeminoleCounty	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
137	FL-509	Fort Pierce/St. Lucie, Indian River, Martin Counties CoC	Ft.Pierce/Saint Lucie/Indian River County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
138	FL-511	Pensacola/Escambia/Santa Rosa County	Pensacola/Escambia/Santa Rosa County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
139	FL-512	St Johns County	St Johns County	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	No	*
140	FL-520	Citrus, Hernando, Lake, Sumter Counties CoC	Citrus, Hernando, Lake, Sumter Counties	Contributing	Yes	*	No	No	Yes
141	FL-603	Ft Myers/Cape Coral/Lee County CoC	Lee County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
142	GA-500	Atlanta/Roswell/DeKalb, Fulton Counties CoC	Atlanta Suburban (Fulton-DeKalb Counties)	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	*	No
143	GA-501	Georgia Balance of State	Georgia Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
144	GA-503	Athens/Clark County	Athens/Clark County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
145	GA-505	Columbus/Muscogee	Columbus/Muscogee	Contributing	Yes	No	*	No	Yes
146	GA-506	Cobb	Cobb	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
147	GA-507	Savannah/Chatham	Savannah/Chatham	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
148	GU-500	Guam	Guam	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
149	HI-500	Hawaii Balance of State CoC	Hawaii State	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
150	HI-501	Honolulu CoC	Honolulu CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
151	IA-500	Sioux City/Dakota, Woodbury Counties CoC	SiouxCity/Dakota County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
152	IA-501	Iowa Balance of State CoC*	Iowa CoC*	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
153	IA-502	Des Moines/Polk County	Des Moines	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
154	ID-500	Boise/Ada County CoC	Boise City	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
155	ID-501	Idaho Balance of State CoC	Idaho Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
156	IL-502	North Chicago/Lake County CoC	Waukegan/N.Chicago/Lake County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
157	IL-504	Madison County	Madison County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
158	IL-505	Evanston CoC	Evanston CoC	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
159	IL-506	Joliet/Bolingbrook/WillCounty	Joliet/Bolingbrook/WillCounty	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
160	IL-508	E. St.Louis/Belleville/Saint Clair County	E. St.Louis/Belleville/Saint Clair County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
161	IL-509	City of Dekalb CoC	City of Dekalb CoC	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	*
162	IL-512	Central Illinois	Central Illinois	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
163	IL-513	Springfield/Sangamon County	Springfield/Sangamon County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
164	IL-514	DuPage County	DuPageCounty	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
165	IL-517	Kane County	Kane County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
166	IL-520	Southern Illinois	Southern Illinois	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
167	IN-500	St. Joseph County CoC	St. Joseph County/South Bend	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
168	IN-502	Indiana Balance of State CoC	State of Indiana	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
169	KS-505	Overland Park/Johnson County CoC	Johnson County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
170	KS-507	Kansas Balance of State	Kansas Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
171	KY-500	Kentucky Balance of State	Commonwealth of Kentucky/Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
172	KY-501	Louisville/Jefferson County	Louisville/Jefferson County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
173	LA-500	Lafayette/Acadiana CoC	Acadiana	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
174	LA-503	New Orleans/Jefferson Parish	New Orleans/Jefferson Parish	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
175	LA-504	Baton Rouge CoC	Baton Rouge	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
176	LA-505	Monroe/Northeast Louisiana CoC	Northeast Louisiana	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
177	LA-508	Houma-Terrebonne/Thibodaux CoC	Houma/Terrebonne	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
178	MA-503	Cape Cod/Islands CoC	Cape Cod/Islands	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
179	MA-506	Worcester City & County CoC	Worcester County Area	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
180	MA-508	Lowell CoC	City of Lowell	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
181	MA-509	Cambridge CoC	Cambridge CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
182	MA-511	Quincy/Weymouth	Quincy/Weymouth	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
183	MA-515	City of Fall River	City of Fall River	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
184	MA-516	Massachusetts Balance of State	MassachusettsBalance of State	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
185	MA-518	Brookline/Newton CoC	Brookline/Newton	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
186	MA-520	Brockton/Plymouth City & County CoC	Brockton/Plymouth	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
187	MD-501	Baltimore City CoC*	Baltimore City CoC*	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
188	MD-503	Anne Arundel County	Anne Arundel County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
189	MD-504	Howard County	Howard County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*
190	MD-505	Baltimore County CoC	Baltimore County CoC	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
191	MD-506	Carroll County	Carroll County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	No

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
192	MD-508	Charles, Calvert, St.Mary's Counties CoC	Charles/Calvert/St. Mary's County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
193	MD-509	Frederick City/County	Frederick City/County	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	No	No
194	MD-511	Mid-Shore Regional	Mid-Shore Regional	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
195	MD-513	Wicomico/Somerset/Worcester County	Wicomico/Somerset/Worcester County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
196	MD-600	Prince George`s County/Maryland	Prince George`s County/Maryland	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
197	ME-500	Maine Balance of State CoC	Statewide CoC	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
198	ME-501	Greater Penobscot/Bangor	Greater Penobscot/Bangor	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
199	ME-502	Portland CoC	Portland (ME)	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
200	MI-500	Michigan Balance of State	Michigan Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	*
201	MI-502	Dearborn/Dearborn Heights/Westland/Wayne County CoC	Out-Wayne Cty	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
202	MI-503	St. Clair Shores/Warren/Macomb County	Macomb County (C)	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
203	MI-504	Pontiac/Royal Oak/Oakland County CoC	Oakland County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
204	MI-505	Flint/Genessee County CoC	Flint/Genessee County (MI)	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
205	MI-506	Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County	Grand Rapids CoC*	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
206	MI-507	Portage/Kalamazoo City & County	Kalamazoo	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
207	MI-508	Lansing/Ingham County CoC	Lansing/Lansing/Ingham County CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	Yes
208	MI-510	Saginaw County	Saginaw County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
209	MI-511	Lenawee County	Lenawee County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
210	MI-512	Grand Traverse/Antrim, Leelanau Counties	Traverse City/Antrim/Leelanau County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
211	MI-514	Battle Creek/Calhoun County	Battle Creek/Calhoun County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
212	MI-516	Muskegon City and County	Muskegon City and County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
213	MI-517	JacksonCity/County	JacksonCity/County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
214	MI-518	Livingston County	Livingston County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
215	MI-519	Holland/Ottawa County	Holland/Ottawa County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
216	MI-523	Eaton County	Eaton County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
217	MN-500	Minneapolis/Hennepin County	Minneapolis/Hennepin County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
218	MN-501	St. Paul/Ramsey County	St. Paul/Ramsey County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	*
219	MN-502	Rochester/Southeast Minnesota CoC	Southeast Minnesota	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
220	MN-503	Dakota County	Dakota/Anoka County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
221	MN-504	Northeast Minnesota CoC	Northeast Minnesota	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
222	MN-505	St Cloud Central Minnesota	Central Minnesota	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*
223	MN-506	Northwest Minnesota	Northwest Minnesota	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
224	MN-508	Moorehead/West Central Minnesota	West Central Minnesota	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	*	Yes
225	MN-509	Duluth/St. Louis County	Duluth/St. Louis County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
226	MN-510	Scott, Carver Counties	Scott/Carver/Washington Counties	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
227	MN-511	Southwest Minnesota	Southwest Minnesota	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
228	MO-500	St. Louis County CoC*	St. Louis County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
229	MO-501	City of St.Louis	City of St.Louis	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
230	MO-600	Greater Springfield	Greater Springfield	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
231	MO-602	Jasper/Newton County	Jasper/Newton County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
232	MO-603	St. Joseph/Andrew, Buchanan, DeKalb Counties CoC	Greater St.Joseph	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
233	MO-604	Kansas City/Independence/ Lee's Summit/Jackson County CoC	Kansas City/Jackson County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
234	MO-606	Missouri Balance of State	Missouri Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
235	MS-500	Jackson/Hinds County	Jackson/Hinds County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
236	MS-503	Gulf Port/Gulf Coast Regional	Gulf Port/Gulf Coast Regional	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
237	MT-500	Montana	Montana	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
238	NC-501	Asheville-Buncombe	Asheville-Buncombe	Contributing	Yes	No	*	No	Yes
239	NC-504	Greensboro	Greensboro	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
240	NC-505	Charlotte-Mecklenberg	Charlotte-Mecklenberg	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
241	NC-506	Wilmington Tri-County	Wilmington Tri-County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
242	NC-508	Anson/Moore/Montgomery/Richmond	North Carolina Balance of State	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
243	NC-509	Gaston/Lincoln/Cleveland	Gaston/Lincoln/Cleveland	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
244	NC-516	Northwest NC	Northwest NC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
245	ND-500	North Dakota Statewide CoC	North Dakota	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
246	NE-500	North Central Nebraska/Heartland	North Central Nebraska/Heartland	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	No	Yes
247	NE-501	Omaha/Council Bluffs CoC	Omaha Area	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
248	NE-502	Lincoln CoC	Lincoln	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
249	NE-503	Southwest Nebraska	Southwest Nebraska	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	Yes	No
250	NE-504	Southeast Nebraska	Southeast Nebraska	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
251	NE-505	Panhandle of Nebraska	Panhandle of Nebraska	Contributing	Yes	*	No	No	Yes
252	NH-500	New Hampshire BOS	New Hampshire BOS	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
253	NH-501	Manchester CoC	City of Manchester	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
254	NH-502	Greater Nashua CoC	Greater Nashua CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
255	NJ-502	Burlington County	Burlington County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
256	NJ-504	Essex County	Essex County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
257	NJ-505	Gloucester County	Gloucester County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
258	NJ-506	Jersey City/Bayonne/Hudson County CoC	Jersey City/Hudson County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
259	NJ-507	New Brunswick/Middlesex County CoC	Middlesex County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
260	NJ-508	Monmouth County	Monmouth County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*
261	NJ-510	Ocean County	Ocean County	Contributing	Yes	No	*	No	Yes
262	NJ-511	Passiac County	Passiac County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
263	NJ-512	Salem County	Salem County	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	*	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
264	NJ-513	Somerset County	Somerset County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
265	NJ-514	City of Trenton/Mercer County	City of Trenton/Mercer County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
266	NJ-515	Union County	Union County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
267	NJ-520	Cumberland County	Cumberland County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	*
268	NV-501	Reno/Sparks/Washoe County CoC	Washoe/Reno Alliance	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
269	NY-500	Rochester/Irondequoit/Greece/Monroe County CoC	Rochester/Monroe County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
270	NY-503	Albany City & County CoC	City/Countyof Albany	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
271	NY-507	Schenectady City & County CoC	City/Countyof Schenectady	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
272	NY-508	Buffalo/Erie County	Buffalo/ErieCounty	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
273	NY-510	Tompkins County	Tompkins County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
274	NY-511	Binghamton/Union Town/Broome County CoC	BroomeCounty/City of Binghamton	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
275	NY-512	City of Troy and Rensselaer	City of Troy	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
276	NY-518	Utica-Oneida County	Utica-Oneida County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
277	NY-523	Glen Falls/Saratoga Springs/Saratoga County CoC	Saratoga	Contributing	Yes	Yes	*	Yes	No
278	NY-601	Poughkeepsie/Dutchess County	Dutchess County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
279	NY-603	Islip/Babylon/Huntington/Suffolk County	Babylon/Huntington/Suffolk County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
280	NY-608	Ulster County	Ulster County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
281	OH-500	Cincinnati-Hamilton County CoC*	Cincinnati-Hamilton County CoC*	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
282	OH-501	Greater Toledo	Greater Toledo	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
283	OH-503	Columbus/Franklin County	Columbus/Franklin County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
284	OH-504	Youngstown/Mahoning County CoC	Youngstown/Mahoning County CoC	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
285	OH-505	Dayton/Kettering/MontgomeryC ounty	Dayton/Kettering/MontgomeryCo unt	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
286	OH-506	Akron/Baberton/Summit County	Akron/Baberton/Summit County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
287	OK-501	Tulsa CoC	Tulsa CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
288	OK-502	Oklahoma City	Oklahoma City	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
289	OR-500	Lane County	Lane County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
290	OR-501	Portland-Grasham-Multnomah County CoC	Portland-Gresham-Multnomah County CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
291	OR-503	Central Oregon	Central Oregon	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
292	OR-505	Rural Oregon	Rural Oregon	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
293	OR-506	Washington County, OR	Washington County, OR	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
294	OR-507	Clackamas County	Clackamas County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	Yes
295	PA-502	Upper Darby/Chester/Haverford/Delaw are County CoC	Delaware County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
296	PA-503	Wilkes-Barre/Hazleton/Luzerne County CoC	Luzerne County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
297	PA-504	Lower Marion/Norristown/Abington/Mo ntgomery County CoC	Montgomery County PA	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
298	PA-505	Chester County	Chester County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
299	PA-506	Reading/Berks County	Reading/Berks County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
300	PA-508	Scranton/Lackawana PA	Scranton/Lackawana PA	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
301	PA-510	Lancaster City/County	Lancaster City/County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
302	PA-511	Bucks County	Bucks County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
303	PA-600	Pittsburgh/McKeesport/Penn Hills/Allegheny County CoC	Allegheny County/Pittsburg	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
304	PA-601	Southwest Pennsylvania	Southwest Region of PA	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
305	PA-602	Northwest Pennsylvania	Northwest Region of PA	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
306	PA-603	Beaver County	Beaver County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	Yes
307	PA-605	Erie City & County CoC*	Erie County CoC*	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
308	RI-500	Rhode Island CoC	Rhode Island	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
309	SC-501	Greenville/Anderson/Spartanburg Upstate CoC	Upstate CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	*
310	SC-502	Columbia/Midlands CoC	Midlands	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
311	SC-503	Myrtle Beach/Sumter County	Myrtle Beach/Sumter County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
312	TN-500	Chattanooga CoC*	Chattanooga CoC*	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
313	TN-501	Memphis-Shelby CoC	Memphis-Shelby CoC	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
314	TN-502	Knoxville/Knox County	Knoxville/Knox County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
315	TN-503	South Central TN	South Central TN	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
316	TN-504	Nashville/Davidson County	Nashville/Davidson County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
317	TN-506	Upper Cumberland	Upper Cumberland	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	No	*

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
318	TN-507	Jackson West TN	Jackson West TN	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
319	TN-509	Appalachian Region	Appalachian Region	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
320	TX-503	Austin/Travis County	Austin/Travis County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
321	TX-504	Dewitt, Lavaca, Victoria Counties CoC	Victoria	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
322	TX-601	Fort Worth/Arlington/Tarrant County	Tarrant County/Ft. Worth	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
323	TX-604	Waco/McLennan County CoC	Waco	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	Yes	Yes
324	TX-610	Denton City & County CoC	Denton	Contributing	Yes	*	Yes	No	*
325	TX-611	Amarillo	Amarillo	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
326	TX-701	Bryan/College Station/Brazos Valley CoC	Twin City Mission, Inc.	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
327	TX-704	Galveston/Gulf Coast CoC	The Gulf Coast Coalition	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
328	VA-500	Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover Counties CoC	Richmond/Henrico County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
329	VA-501	Norfolk CoC	City of Norfolk	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
330	VA-503	Virginia Beach CoC	Virginia Beach	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
331	VA-509	Petersburg CoC	Petersburg	Contributing	Yes	Yes	*	No	No
332	VA-512	Chesapeake	Chesapeake	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	*	*
333	VA-514	Fredericksburg/Spotsylvania, Stafford Counties CoC	Frederickburg	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
334	VA-601	Fairfax County	Fairfax County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
335	VA-602	Loudon County	Loudon County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

#	CoC Code	Continuum of Care Name	AHAR Jurisdiction Name	AHAR Site Type	Participated in the AHAR? 1	Reporting Categories Used in the AHAR			
						Emergency Shelters for Families	Transitional Housing for Families	Emergency Shelters for Individuals	Transitional Hosing for Individuals
Contributing Communities									
336	VI-500	Virgin Islands	Virgin Islands	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
337	VT-500	Vermont	Vermont	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
338	WA-502	Spokane CoC*	Spokane CoC	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
339	WA-503	Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County	Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
340	WA-508	Vancouver/Clark County	Vancouver/Clark County	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
341	WI-500	Wisconsin	Wisconsin	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
342	WI-501	Milwaukee	Milwaukee	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
343	WI-502	Racine City & County	Racine City/County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
344	WI-503	Madison/Dane County	Madison/Dane County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
345	WV-500	Wheeling-Weirton Area CoC*	Wheeling-Weirton County	Contributing	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
346	WV-501	Cabell/Huntington/Wayne	Cabell/Huntington/Wayne	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
347	WV-503	Charleston/Kanawha, Putnam, Boone, Clay Counties CoC	Charleston/Kanawha County	Contributing	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
348	WY-500	Wyoming Statewide CoC	Wyoming	Contributing	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

¹ A community designated as a "complete zero provider" does not have any emergency shelters or transitional housing programs located in their jurisdiction.

* Indicates a zero-provider reporting category, meaning that the community does not have any programs in the category.

Appendix B:

Data Collection and Analysis Methodology

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix B

Data Collection and Analysis Methodology

B.1 Introduction

This document summarizes the methodology for producing the 2009 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR). Abt Associates and the University of Pennsylvania Center for Mental Health Policy and Services Research (the AHAR research team) developed the methodology.

The 2009 AHAR is based on two primary sources of data:

1. *Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS)*. The HMIS data were collected from a nationally representative sample of communities¹ and cover a one-year reporting period, October 1, 2008 to September 30, 2009. The data contain information on homeless persons who used emergency shelters or transitional housing at any point during this time period. Data are unduplicated at the community-level and reported in the aggregate. HMIS data include information on the number, characteristics, and service-use patterns of homeless persons.

Each AHAR incorporates HMIS data for the most recent, one-year reporting period and compares these data to previous findings. The 2009 AHAR provides comparisons of HMIS data from 2007-2008 (first reported in the 2008 AHAR) to data from 2008-2009.

2. *Continuum of Care (CoC) applications*. The CoC application data were collected from all CoCs in 2009, and the 2009 AHAR compares these data to data from the previous two years. The CoC application data complement the HMIS-based data by including an estimate of the number of unsheltered homeless persons on a single night in January. They also include an estimate of the number and basic demographic characteristics of sheltered homeless persons on that night and the number of emergency shelter and transitional housing beds available to serve homeless persons. The information comes from the CoC applications that all CoCs must complete to be eligible for HUD McKinney-Vento Act funding.

¹ Data from AHAR sample sites is supplemented with data from other Continuums of Care that were not selected as part of the original sample but chose to contribute their HMIS data for the AHAR. These communities are called 'contributing communities'; unlike AHAR sample sites, contributing communities only represent themselves in the national estimates, meaning their data is not weighted to represent other communities to produce the national estimate.

The remainder of this appendix describes the AHAR sample data in more detail. Section B-2 discusses the population represented by the AHAR sample and the information collected about persons experiencing homelessness. Section B-3 describes how the nationally representative sample was selected and the number of communities that were able to contribute local HMIS data to the AHAR. Section B-4 presents the results of the data cleaning process and describes how usable data were identified for the final AHAR analysis file. Section B-5 describes the process for developing the analysis weights for each site to produce nationally representative estimates.

B.2 Data and AHAR Reporting Categories

This section describes the target population for inclusion in the AHAR sample, the source of data, and the data collection process.

Target Population for the AHAR Sample

The HMIS-based data in the AHAR sample includes information on all persons experiencing homelessness who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing facility at any time during a one-year period, from October 1, 2008 through September 30, 2009.

The sample does not include individuals who are homeless but live in an area not within a Continuum of Care, or individuals who live in a CoC community but do not use an emergency shelter or transitional housing program. However, given that CoCs cover 97 percent of the U.S. population, including all areas thought to face a high rate of homelessness, few homeless persons are likely to live outside CoC communities. The target population also excludes CoCs in Puerto Rico and other U.S. Territories. Hence, the estimates represent the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The unsheltered homeless population—persons who live on the streets or other places not meant for human habitation—is not represented by the HMIS data in the sample if such persons do not use an emergency shelter or transitional housing facility at any time during the one-year data collection period.

One caveat associated with the use of HMIS data for national reporting is that an important subset of homeless service providers is not permitted to participate fully in data collection. The 2005 Violence against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act prohibits “victim service providers”² from entering personally identifying information into an HMIS. Even though CoCs were required to include these programs as part of their housing inventory in their funding application, we excluded their beds from our extrapolations; thus, the

² The term victim service provider is defined as “a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization, including rape crisis centers, battered women’s shelters, domestic violence transitional housing programs, and other programs whose primary mission is to provide services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking” (72 FR 5056, March 16, 2007).

national estimate of the sheltered homeless population does not include persons using residential “victim service” providers.

Homeless Management Information System Data

The information on homeless persons in the AHAR sample is based on HMIS data collected by local homeless assistance providers. HMIS are computerized data collection applications operated by CoCs that store data on homeless individuals and families who use homelessness assistance services.

HMIS data have some important features. First, they have been standardized nationally in accordance with HUD’s National HMIS Data and Technical Standards Notice (Data Standards).³ All HUD McKinney-Vento–funded homeless programs are required to collect 14 universal data elements from every client served.⁴ The Data Standards define each data element. The universal data elements include information on a client’s demographic characteristics (e.g., date of birth, ethnicity and race, gender, veteran status, and disability status) and recent residential history (e.g., residence before program entry, program entry and exit dates, and zip code of last permanent address). The data are essential to obtaining an accurate picture of the extent, characteristics, and patterns of service use of the local homeless population.

Second, HMIS data include personally identifying information that allows local communities to produce an accurate de-duplicated count of homeless persons in their communities. For each person served, programs must collect a client’s full name and Social Security Number. The personally identifying information may be used in combination with other client-level information to calculate the number of unique users of homeless services and to identify persons who use several types of services.

Third, HMIS data may be manipulated to produce a more comprehensive picture of homelessness when compared to older data collection systems (e.g., paper records). Given that the data are stored electronically in sophisticated software applications, data users may produce cross-tabulations and other outputs that were impractical or impossible before the advent of HMIS. As a result, HMIS data offer new opportunities to study the nature and extent of homelessness.

AHAR Reporting Categories

To facilitate the AHAR reporting process, the AHAR research team developed five reporting categories that are used to collect information from participating communities. All of the

³ 69 FR 45888, July 30, 2004.

⁴ Two of the universal data elements (Veterans Status and Disabling Condition) are asked of adults only; two other data elements (Residence Prior to Program Entry and Zip Code of Last Permanent Address) are asked of adults and unaccompanied youth only.

information required in the reporting categories is based on the universal data elements specified in the HMIS Data Standards. The five reporting categories are:

1. Individuals served by emergency shelters (ES-IND)
2. Individuals served by transitional housing facilities (TH-IND)
3. Families served by emergency shelters (ES-FAM)
4. Families served by transitional housing facilities (TH-FAM)
5. A summary table

Reporting categories 1 through 4 contain several sections. The first section is an extrapolation worksheet for estimating the total number of individuals or persons in families that used an emergency shelter or transitional housing facility during the data collection period. This section guides the community through a process for estimating the number of individuals or persons in families served by providers participating in HMIS as well as by nonparticipating providers. A limited amount of data from the HMIS and communities' bed inventory is required to complete the extrapolation. The remaining sections in each set of reporting categories are designed to capture information about the homeless population in the community. Each set of reporting categories is designed with embedded codes to check for data errors, such as missing values or inconsistent information. A summary sheet of data errors is automatically generated as communities complete the reporting categories, prompting communities to review and correct any errors.

The final set of reporting categories—the summary tables—is designed to save time and increase data accuracy. The tables provide estimates of the total unduplicated count of persons who used a participating and nonparticipating emergency shelter or transitional housing program in each jurisdiction during the data collection period. The summary tables also show estimates of the demographic characteristics of the service-using population, patterns of program use, and the average daily utilization rate among persons accessing shelters and transitional housing. The summary tables automate many calculations and are designed with embedded data quality checks that list error messages when inconsistent information is entered.

The data submission process is channeled through the AHAR Exchange, a web-based data collection instrument designed specifically for the AHAR. Communities login to the AHAR Exchange using a unique username and password and submit the data by either typing the aggregate data into each reporting category or by uploading all their data via an XML schema into the appropriate reporting category. Each community is assigned a data quality reviewer (a member of the research team) who reviews each submission and works collaboratively with representatives from the community to fix any data quality issues. A public version of the AHAR Exchange is available for viewing and local use: <http://sandbox.hmis.info/>.

B.3 Sample Selection

This section describes the procedures for selecting a nationally representative sample of 102 jurisdictions for the AHAR.⁵

CDBG Jurisdictions Are Primary Sampling Units

The AHAR uses the geographic areas defined for the allocation of CDBG funds as the primary sampling unit. The four types of CDBG jurisdictions are:

- Principal cities⁶
- Cities with 50,000 or more persons (that are not principal cities)
- Urban counties
- Rural areas or non-entitlement jurisdictions

CDBG jurisdictions constitute the basic building blocks of CoCs. In some cases, the CDBG jurisdiction and the CoC represent the same geographic area (e.g., principal cities are often a single CoC), but, in other situations, the CDBG jurisdiction is a geographic subunit of the CoC (e.g., a small city with 50,000 or more persons may be a subunit of a countywide CoC). The selection of 102 CDBG jurisdictions ensures the inclusion of a wide range of sites in the AHAR as well as the reasonably precise measurement of the characteristics of homeless persons and their patterns of service use.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development provided a sampling frame for the selection of CDBG jurisdictions. The sampling frame is a list of all 3,142 CDBG

⁵ The initial AHAR sample consisted of 80 jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions from the original sample—especially jurisdictions representing rural areas—were unable to provide data to the AHAR because of HMIS implementation issues or other data quality concerns. In addition, several of the rural sample sites did not have any homeless residential service providers located in their jurisdiction. As a result, we were unable to report data by geography. In an effort to improve the scope and quality of data from rural jurisdictions, 22 additional rural jurisdictions were added to the AHAR sample. Thus, there are now 102 AHAR sample sites.

⁶ The original file from which the sample was selected used the category of “central city” for CDBG jurisdictions rather than “principal city.” However, the CDBG program moved to designation of principal city rather than central city following the OMB guidance, and the definition of central city and principal city are slightly different (see 24 CFR Part 570). Of the 482 CDBG central city jurisdictions that existed both before and after the definition change, 327 central city jurisdictions (68%) became principle cities with the definition change. A small number of non-central cities (85 out of 2,501) in the original file were categorized as principal cities in the 2007 CDBG file. In our analysis by CDBG jurisdiction and in procedures for adjusting the sampling weights, we used the community’s current CDBG jurisdiction to ensure that our results accurately represented the current system for designating CDBG jurisdictions.

jurisdictions within the 430 CoCs in the 50 states as of 2002.⁷ The next section describes the decision to stratify the sites based on geographic type, along with the procedures for selecting certainty and non-certainty sites.

Stratifying the Sample by Type of Geographic Area

A CDBG jurisdiction may be a large principal city of a metropolitan area, a smaller city with a population of 50,000 or more, one or more suburban or urban fringe counties, or a rural area. As such, the number of homeless persons in each jurisdiction varies considerably.

Using the relative size of the homeless population in each CDBG jurisdiction to select a sample may increase the precision of the estimates for any particular sample size. However, with the number of homeless persons in each CDBG jurisdiction unknown, the study team assumed that the total population in each CDBG jurisdiction provided a measure of relative size of the homeless population for purposes of sample selection. The study team premised the assumption on the likelihood that the number of homeless persons is correlated with the total population in the area served by the CDBG jurisdiction. The team further refined the assumption by dividing the sample into strata based on the expected rate of homelessness.⁸

Earlier research on homelessness indicates that the rate of homelessness varies by type of geographic area. For example, Burt (2001) found that 71 percent of the homeless persons using homeless-related services are located in principal cities but that only 30 percent of the total U.S. population lives in principal cities.⁹ By contrast, rural areas account for 9 percent of the homeless population, but 20 percent of the overall population. Further, suburban/urban fringe areas represent 21 percent of homeless persons, but 50 percent of the overall population. These findings suggest that, before using the total population as a proxy

⁷ HUD provided a file called “COC_GeoAreasInfo.xls” with a list of 3,219 CDBG jurisdictions, jurisdiction type, and population of each jurisdiction. Geographic areas in the U.S Territories and Puerto Rico and three duplicate records were eliminated, resulting in a sampling frame of 3,142 CDBG jurisdictions. In addition, four CDBG areas in Massachusetts and one in New Hampshire included overlapping geographic areas and double-counted the population; therefore, the population was evenly divided across the overlapping CDBG jurisdictions before sampling.

⁸ Sampling based on the expected rate of homelessness is an attempt to obtain more precise estimates than those yielded by a simple random sample. If the proxy for the expected rate of homelessness is not correlated with the actual rate of homelessness, the resulting estimates will still be unbiased; however, the extra precision gains go unrealized.

⁹ Burt, Martha. 2001. Homeless Families, Singles, and Others: Findings from the 1996 National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients. *Housing Policy Debate*, V12 (4), 737-780. This report presents the share of the homeless population by urban/rural status. The share of the population in each type of geographic area comes from the author’s calculations based on March 1996 Current Population Survey data. The results from the Burt study were based on central cities rather than principal cities, but we refer to them as principal cities here because of the high degree of overlap and to make the discussion easier to follow.

for the relative size of the homeless population, the CDBG jurisdictions should be stratified by type of geographic area to account for the fact that the ratio of homeless persons to the population varies across geographic areas. Hence, the study team divided the CDBG jurisdictions into four groups based on their classification for the allocation of CDBG funds: principal cities, other cities larger than 50,000, urban counties, and rural areas (i.e., counties that are part of non-entitlement areas). Such stratification increases the precision of estimates.

Very Large CDBG Jurisdictions Selected with Certainty

Given that the size of the population across CDBG jurisdictions is skewed by a few very large jurisdictions covering areas with several million residents, a useful strategy for reducing sampling variability in the estimated number and characteristics of homeless persons is to select very large jurisdictions in the sample with certainty. Selecting a CDBG jurisdiction with certainty means that the CDBG jurisdiction represents only itself in the sample estimates but ensures that the sample does not exclude the largest jurisdictions, whose number and characteristics of the homeless population could substantially affect national estimates. Exhibit B-1 lists the 18 CDBG jurisdictions selected with certainty.

For selecting the certainty sites, the study team divided the CDBG jurisdictions into the four geographic-type strata. Assuming the rate of homelessness was the same in each area within each stratum, the study team calculated the standard deviation (square root of the variance) of the number of homeless persons for the entire stratum. The team then recalculated the standard deviation by excluding the largest site (as if that site were taken with certainty) to obtain a relative estimate of the reduction in the variance of the estimates that would occur if that site were selected with certainty. In the event of substantial reduction in the variance due to the selection of the certainty unit, the overall variance of the sample estimates will be smaller as the variance contribution to the estimate from the certainty sites is zero. The process of selecting the next-largest site as a certainty site continued until the reduction of the variance or standard deviation was small or marginal. The process resulted in the identification of 11 certainty sites consisting of eight principal cities, one other city larger than 50,000, and two urban counties (but no non-entitlement areas).

Exhibit B-1: Geographic Characteristics and Population of 18 Certainty Sites					
	Geographic Area	Type of CDBG Entity	Size of Housed Population	Census Region	CoC Name
1	NEW YORK CITY	Principal City	8,008,278	Northeast	New York City Coalition/CoC
2	LOS ANGELES	Principal City	3,694,820	West	County of Los Angeles, CA
3	CHICAGO	Principal City	2,896,016	Midwest	Chicago CoC
4	HOUSTON	Principal City	1,953,631	South	Houston/Harris County
5	PHILADELPHIA	Principal City	1,517,550	Northeast	City of Philadelphia
6	PHOENIX	Principal City	1,321,045	West	Maricopa CoC
7	SAN DIEGO	Principal City	1,223,400	West	City of San Diego Consortium
8	DALLAS	Principal City	1,188,580	South	Dallas Homeless CoC
9	DETROIT	Principal City	951,270	Midwest	City of Detroit CoC
10	SAN FRANCISCO	Principal City	776,733	West	City and County of San Francisco
11	BOSTON	Principal City	589,141	Northeast	City of Boston
12	WASHINGTON, DC	Principal City	572,059	South	District of Columbia Homeless Services
13	SEATTLE	Principal City	563,374	West	Seattle-King County CoC
14	CLEVELAND	Principal City	478,403	Midwest	Cuyahoga County/Cleveland CoC
15	ATLANTA	Principal City	416,474	South	Atlanta Tri- Jurisdictional
16	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	Urban County	2,205,851	West	County of Los Angeles, CA
17	COOK COUNTY	Urban County	1,712,784	Midwest	Cook County CoC
18	ISLIP TOWN	City >50,000	322,612	Northeast	Suffolk County CoC Group

Based on earlier research findings showing that homeless persons are disproportionately located in principal cities, the study team identified 7 additional principal cities as certainty sites, for a total of 15 principal cities in the certainty sample (and 18 certainty sites in total). The team selected the 7 additional principal cities with certainty because the cities had among the largest populations of persons living in emergency and transitional shelters in the

1990 and 2000 Census counts.¹⁰ All 7 certainty sites had one of the 10 largest counts in either 1990 or 2000.¹¹ Given that so many homeless persons live in these cities, it is important to include them with certainty in a nationally representative sample.

Selection of Non-Certainty Sample

There are currently 102 AHAR sample sites. The selection of the non-certainty sites occurred in two phases. Phase one was completed in 2005 and included 62 non-certainty sites. The 62 non-certainty sites and the 18 certainty sites (80 total sample sites) constituted the original sample for the 2005, 2006, and 2007 AHARs. Phase 2 was completed for the 2008 AHAR and added 22 non-certainty sites to the original sample.

Phase 1: Selecting 62 Non-Certainty Sites. To select the 62 non-certainty sites for the original sample, the study team divided the 3,124 CDBG jurisdictions into 16 strata based on the four types of geographic areas and Census regions. As discussed earlier, the team divided the sample into strata based on the type of geographic area because earlier research indicated that the rate of homelessness is higher in principal cities than in other areas. The team further divided the sample into Census regions because business cycles might affect regions differently and result in variation in rates of and trends in homelessness across regions. Dividing the sample into strata that are more similar in terms of the rate of homelessness and the characteristics of homeless persons than the overall population reduces the variance of the sample estimates for a particular sample size. Stratified sampling also eliminates the possibility of some undesirable samples. For example, with a simple random sample, one possible sample might include sites only in rural areas or sites only in the Northeast, both of which are undesirable samples.

One possibility considered for the non-certainty sample was allocation of the sample to the stratum in proportion to the population in each stratum. However, such an approach ignores the research indicating that a disproportionate share of the homeless is located in principal cities. Ignoring information on the location of the homeless population would lead to a relatively high degree of imprecision in national estimates such that 20 of the 62 non-certainty sites would be allocated to principal cities, 6 to non-principal cities, 16 to urban counties, and 20 to rural areas. The same number of rural areas as principal cities would be selected even though earlier research suggests that only 9 percent of the homeless population lives in rural areas whereas 70 percent lives in principal cities.

¹⁰ For 1990 counts, see U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. “Allocating Homeless Assistance by Formula.” A Report to Congress, 1992. For 2000 counts, see U.S. Census Bureau. “Emergency and Transitional Shelter Population: 2000.” A Census 2000 Special Report.

¹¹ The other 8 certainty sites in principal cities were all ranked in the top 15 in the 1990 or 2000 Census counts.

Another possibility under consideration for the non-certainty sample was allocation of the total non-certainty sample of 62 CDBG jurisdictions to each of the 16 strata in proportion to the adjusted population in each stratum, where the adjustment accounts for different rates of homelessness across geographic areas. This allocation method produces the highest degree of precision of national estimates for a given sample size. The adjusted population is the population of persons living in an area multiplied by an adjustment factor for the expected rate of homelessness in that area. With the rate of homelessness in principal cities roughly five times that of other areas,¹² the study team multiplied the population in principal cities by five so that the adjusted populations would reflect the relative number of homeless persons expected in each stratum. If the adjusted population were used to allocate the non-certainty sites across the strata, 39 of the 62 original non-certainty sample sites would have been allocated to principal cities, 4 to non-principal cities, 8 to urban counties, and 11 to rural areas. While optimal for national estimates, the number of sites in the non-principal city stratum was too small for subnational estimates.

The sampling allocation procedure ultimately used for AHAR data collection strikes a balance between the most precise national estimates possible with a sample of 62 non-certainty sites and reasonably sized samples from each of the four types of geographic areas. The study team allocated the 62 original non-certainty sample sites across the 16 strata based on the square root of the adjusted population. The result is a sample allocation between the allocation in proportion to the population and the allocation in proportion to the adjusted population. Accordingly, 27 of the 62 original non-certainty sites are in principal cities, 8 are in non-principal cities, 13 are in urban counties, and 14 are in rural areas. The allocation means lower variances of the estimates than either simple random sampling or sampling in direct proportion to the population and provides better representation of non-principal city areas than the allocation in proportion to the adjusted population.

To select the non-certainty sites in each stratum, the study team divided the sites into groups based on size and then randomly selected one site from each group. The number of non-certainty sites allocated to each stratum determined the number of groups, and each group in a stratum contained the same number of sites. Sampling from groups based on population size is beneficial in that it ensures that the sample has a similar distribution of CDBG jurisdiction sizes as the population. Given that the size of the homeless population is expected to correlate with the total population within strata, similarity in distribution is an important feature of the sample.

¹² The ratio was determined as follows. Burt (2001) found that 71 percent of the homeless population lived in central cities in 1996. At the same time, Current Population Survey data indicate that only 30 percent of the overall population lived in central cities at that time. The ratio of the share of the homeless population to the share of the overall population in central cities is 2.36. The ratio is 0.42 for non-principal city portions of Metropolitan Statistical Areas and 0.46 for rural areas. Dividing the principal city ratio by the rural ratio (2.36/0.46) equal 5.1, suggesting that the rate of homelessness is about five times higher in central cities than in rural areas.

Phase 2: Adding 22 Rural Non-Certainty Sites. The data collection results from the 2005-2007 AHAR reports indicated that many rural communities (or non-entitlement CDBG areas) did not have emergency shelters or transitional housing programs located in these jurisdictions. Among the few rural sample sites that did have emergency shelters and/or transitional housing programs, many of those programs were not entering data into an HMIS. As a result, previous AHAR reports did not capture information from many rural jurisdictions, and the lack of data increased the variance of the AHAR estimates and made the analysis of rural/suburban versus urban homelessness less reliable.

In 2008, 22 new rural communities were added to the AHAR sample, increasing the total number of rural jurisdictions to 36 and the total number of AHAR sample sites to 102. The 22 AHAR sample sites that were added in 2008 were selected in the same manner as the original non-certainty sample sites. The original 2002 sampling frame of 3,142 CDBG jurisdictions within the 430 CoCs in the 50 states was used to select the new rural communities. However, the original file was compared with an updated 2006 CDBG list of jurisdictions to remove from the sampling frame jurisdictions that had either merged with other jurisdictions since 2002 or had changed their status from non-entitlement (rural) areas to entitlement areas.

The sample was stratified to ensure that each of the four census regions was represented. The goal was to select at least three rural communities from each census region that had at least one emergency shelter or transitional housing program. In some cases, more than three communities for a particular region were selected if inventory information reported by CoC suggested that the communities did not have any emergency shelters or transitional housing programs. That is, from each region, we randomly selected rural jurisdictions until we had at least three rural jurisdictions with at least one emergency shelter or transitional housing program. In total, 22 new rural sample sites were added in 2008; three from the Northeast region; seven from the South region; seven from the Midwest region; and five from the West region.

The final AHAR sample contains 102 sample sites, and Exhibit B-2 shows the total number of certainty and non-certainty sites selected from each region-CDBG type stratum. The sample sites contain over 40 million persons, or approximately 16 percent of the population living within CoC communities and 14 percent of the U.S. population. The expectation is that the sample will contain an even higher proportion of the U.S. homeless population because the selection procedures intentionally oversampled areas with a high rate of homelessness (i.e., principal cities). About two-fifths of the selected sites (42 sites) are principal cities, even though only one-third of the total population lives there. The other 60 sample sites were distributed across the three remaining CDBG jurisdictions: non-principal cities with a population over 50,000 (9 sites), urban counties (15 sites), and non-entitlement/rural areas (36 sites). Appendix A lists all CDBG jurisdictions in the sample.

Exhibit B-2: Number of Sites in Universe and Sample by Region-CDBG Type				
Stratum	Number of Geographic Areas in Universe	Number of Certainty Sites in Sample	Number of Noncertainty Sites in Sample	Total Sample
Northeast Principal City	86	3	5	8
South Principal City	151	4	8	12
Midwest Principal City	124	3	7	10
West Principal City	106	5	7	12
Northeast City >50,000	81	1	2	3
South City >50,000	48	0	2	2
Midwest City >50,000	55	0	1	1
West City >50,000	114	0	3	3
Northeast Urban County	33	0	3	3
South Urban County	54	0	4	4
Midwest Urban County	33	1	3	4
West Urban County	34	1	3	4
Northeast Non-entitlement County	148	0	6	6
South Non-entitlement County	812	0	11	11
Midwest Non-entitlement County	890	0	11	11
West Non-entitlement County	373	0	8	8
Total	3,142	18	84	102

Addition of Contributing Sites

In addition to the 102 sample sites selected for the study, many other communities nationwide volunteered to provide data for the report to help produce more precise national estimates. The additional communities are entire Continuums of Care and are termed “contributing sites.” In the 2009 AHAR, 246 contributing communities provided data for use in the AHAR report. As with the sites selected with certainty, data from the contributing sites represent themselves in the national estimates. Appendix A lists the sample and contributing communities in the 2009 AHAR.

B.4 AHAR Data Cleaning

This section presents the data cleaning results for the AHAR. For each AHAR sample site and contributing community, the study team reviewed each reporting category (e.g., ES-IND) for reporting irregularities, focusing on three indicators:

- HMIS-bed coverage rate
- Average daily bed utilization rate
- Proportion of missing variables

Bed Coverage Rate

HMIS-bed coverage rate refers to the proportion of beds in a community that participate in HMIS. The HMIS-bed coverage rate is equal to the total number of HMIS-participating beds divided by the total number of beds in a community. The indicator is important because the accuracy of the extrapolation technique depends on obtaining reasonably high bed coverage rates.¹³ The study team evaluated each reporting category on its own merits—that is, calculated an HMIS-bed coverage rate for ES-IND, ES-FAM, TH-IND, and TH-FAM separately—and excluded from the final AHAR analysis any reporting category with an HMIS-bed coverage rate below 50 percent.

Average Daily Bed Utilization Rate

Average daily bed utilization rate refers to the frequency of bed use on an average day. It is equal to the number of homeless persons who use a program on an average day during a specified period divided by the total number of year-round equivalent beds¹⁴ in the current inventory during the same period. Utilization rates above 100 percent typically indicated missing exit dates in the HMIS; unusually low utilization rates often suggested that providers did not enter data on all clients served into HMIS. In situations where unusually high or low utilization rates could not be explained or confirmed as accurate by the community, the study team excluded from analysis all data from the reporting category.

Proportion of Missing Variables

Missing data limit the ability to present a complete picture of homelessness. Exhibit B-3 presents the proportion of missing values for the weighted 2009 AHAR data. The data element most constrained by missing values was length of stay in prior living arrangement, which was missing for 24 percent of adult clients. Though still a high rate, 2009's rate of missing disability status is considerably lower than the missing disability rate in the 2008 AHAR (28.9 percent). The missing data rates for disability status (10.6 percent) and prior living situation (10.9 percent) were around half the rate in earlier AHARs. Missing rates have also declined for most other data elements but still remain high for data that

¹³ Before releasing the AHAR reporting requirements, the study team tested the extrapolation procedures with data from Philadelphia and Massachusetts under a variety of coverage rate assumptions, taking a random sample of providers (to match 50, 75, and 90 percent HMIS bed-coverage rates) and comparing the extrapolated estimates to the true population counts for these jurisdictions. The findings show that extrapolation estimates were accurate for HMIS bed-coverage rates above 50 percent and were more precise with higher coverage rates. The threshold of an HMIS bed-coverage rate of 50 percent was as representative as possible of a set of participating sample sites. (See 2004 National HMIS Conference Breakout Session Materials “Extrapolation Methods” for more information on the extrapolation testing, available at www.hmis.info.)

¹⁴ A year-round equivalent bed counts seasonal beds as partial beds in direct proportion to the length of the covered period for which the provider makes the bed available. For example, a bed from a provider with a seasonal bed open in January, February, and March would count as one-fourth of a bed if the covered period were 12 months.

communities were not required to collect before release of HUD’s Data Standards, such as ZIP code of last permanent address (19.1 percent).

Exhibit B-3: Proportion of Missing Values across All AHAR Reporting Categories (weighted data), 2009			
Variable		Percentage Missing	
Variable		Percentage Missing	
1. Gender of adults	0.2	8. Disability status	10.6
2. Gender of children	0.2	9. Household type	0.3
3. Ethnicity	2.5	10. Living arrangement before program entry	10.9
4. Race	6.7	11. Length of stay in earlier living arrangement	24.2
5. Age	0.5	12. ZIP code of last permanent address	19.1
6. Household size	0.2	13. Number of nights in program (adult males)	.1
7. Veteran status	5.4	14. Number of nights in program (adult females)	.1

The study team did not exclude reporting categories from the AHAR analysis file because of missing data. Instead, the estimates are based on non-missing data, and the team has marked estimates in the AHAR report based on data elements with missing rates over 20 percent.

Based on the data-quality indicators, the study team classified all sample sites and the contributing communities into five categories describing the usability of their AHAR data. Exhibit B-4 summarizes the findings. Overall, 334 communities participated in the AHAR, including 88 sample sites and 246 contributing communities. Overall, 137 communities (42 sample sites and 95 contributing communities) provided usable data across all four reporting categories; 171 communities (20 sample sites and 151 contributing communities) submitted usable data for only some of their reporting categories; and 26 had no emergency shelter or transitional housing providers located within the sample site.¹⁵

¹⁵ These sites still contribute to the national count of homelessness because they represent other communities with no providers.

Exhibit B-4: 2009 AHAR Participation Status of Sample and Contributing Communities				
Status	Total		Number of Sample Sites	Number of Contributing Communities
	Percentage	Number		
Participating in the AHAR				
All table shells	30	137	42	95
Partial table shells	37	171	20	151
Complete Zero Providers	6	26	26	-
Subtotal	72	334	88	246
Not Participating in the AHAR				
Submitted unusable data	14	63	9	54
No data submitted	14	66	5	61
Subtotal	28	129	14	115
Total Communities	100	463	102	361

In total, 14 of the 102 sample sites (14 percent) were unable to participate in the AHAR, in most cases because implementation issues prevented the site from producing information from their HMIS. A few of the sites were far enough along to submit data but were still working through implementation problems or had recently made major changes to their system that raised questions about the data quality. The study team judged data to be unusable if the bed coverage rate was below 50 percent; if the bed utilization rates were unreasonably high/low and could not be properly explained; if the community contact expressed concern over data accuracy; or if the other quality control procedures raised issues that site staff could not rectify.

The 2009 AHAR witnessed a year-over-year increase of 112 communities contributing useable data (from 222 in 2008 to 334), an increase of 50 percent. Moreover, the number of usable reporting categories increased from 507 in the 2008 AHAR to 794 in the 2009 AHAR. (Exhibit B-5 shows the number of usable reporting categories for the 2009 AHAR.) In total, there were 607,140 person-records reported across the AHAR reporting categories and used to generate the national estimates.

Exhibit B-5: Number of Usable Reporting Categories by Program-Household Type, 2009			
Program-Household Type	Total	Sample Sites	Contributing Communities
Emergency shelters for individuals	179	33	146
Transitional housing for individuals	198	45 (44)	153
Emergency shelters for families	185	39	146
Transitional housing for families	232	44	188
Total	794	161	633

Note: The tallies include only the reporting categories where the site has providers in a given category and provides usable data. The table does not include the 29 complete zero provider sites.

B.5 AHAR Weighting and Analysis Procedures

This section describes the process of obtaining national estimates from the raw HMIS data submitted by participating communities. The estimates of the number and characteristics of the homeless population using homelessness services are based on weighted data. The study team designed the sampling weights to produce nationally representative estimates from the sites that provided data. The steps for obtaining the final estimate are listed here and described in more detail below.

- **Step 1:** Staff from the AHAR sample sites filled out reporting categories with information (raw data) from emergency shelters and transitional housing providers that had entered data into their local HMIS.
- **Step 2:** The raw data were adjusted by reporting category within each site to account for providers that did not participate in the site's HMIS.
- **Step 3:** Base sampling weights were developed for all selected sites based on the assumption that 100 percent of the AHAR sample sites provided information.
- **Step 4:** Base sampling weights were adjusted to account for contributing sites.
- **Step 5:** Weights were adjusted for nonresponse to determine the preliminary analysis weights.
- **Step 6:** Based on national totals of emergency and transitional housing beds, a post-stratification adjustment was made to arrive at the final analysis weights.
- **Step 7:** A final adjustment factor was derived to account for people who used more than one type of homeless service provider.
- **Step 8:** National estimates were calculated by using the final weight (Step 6) and the final adjustment factor (Step 7).

Step 1: Staff from AHAR sites filled out reporting categories with information from emergency shelters and transitional housing providers that had entered data into their local HMIS.

Participating communities logged into the AHAR Exchange—the web-based data collection tool designed for the AHAR—and entered the information (raw data) on the number of homeless persons, their characteristics, and their patterns of service use. The information was reported separately for each reporting category: individuals using emergency shelters (ES-IND); persons in families using emergency shelters (ES-FAM); individuals using transitional housing (TH-IND); and persons in families using transitional housing (TH-FAM). The information was then aggregated into a fifth set of tables, the summary tables, to provide total cross-program estimates for the site. A public version of the AHAR Exchange is available for viewing and local use: <http://sandbox.hmis.info/>.

Step 2: The raw data were adjusted by reporting category within each site to account for providers that did not participate in the site's HMIS.

Where participation in the HMIS was less than 100 percent, the raw data at each site were upwardly adjusted to account for nonparticipating providers (i.e., providers that did not submit data to HMIS). This adjustment, or extrapolation, was carried out separately by reporting category within each site. The extrapolation technique assumes that nonparticipating providers serve the same number of unique persons per available bed as participating providers during the study period. It makes a small adjustment for the overlap between users of participating and nonparticipating providers.¹⁶

The post-extrapolation results for each site are estimates of the homeless population served by each reporting category and the total sheltered homeless population at all emergency shelters and transitional housing in the entire site during the study period.

Step 3: Base sampling weights were developed on the assumption that 100 percent of the AHAR sample sites provided information.

The study team selected the largest sites (i.e., the CDBG jurisdictions with the largest populations) with certainty. As such, each site's base sampling weight is 1.0, meaning that each respective site's data represent only that site. The study team divided the noncertainty sites into 16 strata based on the four Census regions (East, West, Midwest, and South) and four CDBG types (three types of entitlement communities—principal city, urban county, other city with population greater than 50,000—and one type of non-entitlement community). The base sampling weights for the noncertainty sites are the inverse of the probability of selection. For example, if 1 out of 100 sites was selected in a stratum, the base sampling weight for selected

¹⁶ Given that data from nonparticipating providers were not available, it is impossible to verify this assumption. However, it is the most reasonable assumption in that it is accurate when nonparticipating providers are missing at random or at least not systematically missing in a way correlated with the number of people they serve per available bed.

sites in that stratum would be 100 (the inverse of $1/100 = 100$). Each noncertainty site in a stratum had the same chance of being selected; therefore, each has the same weight.

If all the sample sites provided full AHAR data (in the absence of contributing sites), national estimates of the homeless population would be calculated by multiplying each site's base sampling weight by the extrapolated number of persons with each characteristic at the site and then aggregating across sites.

Step 4: Base sample weights were adjusted to account for contributing sites.

Two hundred forty-six communities volunteered to provide their HMIS-based data for the 2009 AHAR. The data from these communities—or contributing communities—increase the reliability of the AHAR estimates. The study team treated all of these sites as certainty sites and assigned them a weight of 1.0 such that each site would represent only itself in the national estimates. The study team adjusted the base sampling weights of the noncertainty sites downward to represent only the noncontributing sites in their respective stratum. For example, assume that there were two sample sites in a stratum and that both originally had a base weight of 100. If the contributing sites represented 10 CDBG jurisdictions in that stratum, the sample weight for each sample site would be downwardly adjusted to 95. In other words, the two sample sites originally represented 200 sites in their stratum, but, with the contributing sites now representing 10 of those 200 sites, the sample site needs to represent 190 sites. The addition of the contributing sites did not affect the base sampling weights of the certainty sites.

If all the sample sites and contributing sites provided full AHAR data, the study team would calculate national estimates of the homeless population by multiplying each site's base weight by the extrapolated number of persons with each characteristic at the site and then aggregating across sites.

Step 5: The base weights were adjusted for nonresponse to derive the preliminary analysis weights.

The above base weights assume that all the sample and contributing sites provided data for all four reporting categories except for those for which they have no providers in their jurisdiction. Unfortunately, 14 sample sites were not able to provide any usable data, and 20 other sample sites were unable to provide data for all their reporting categories (i.e., they provided partial data). One hundred fifty-one contributing sites also provided only partial data. In addition, 26 sample sites had no providers (i.e., no emergency shelters or transitional housing programs). The 'zero provider sites' are part of the estimate (because they represent themselves and all nonsample zero provider sites in the population) but need to be treated differently from the other sites. Once the study team confirmed that the site had no providers, it needed no further information. Given that the zero provider sites did not have any information for the AHAR reporting categories, none of them was a nonrespondent.

Recognizing that some participating sites provided only partial data (i.e., data on some but not all of their reporting categories) and that the data proved useful for the AHAR report, the study team carried out the nonresponse adjustment to the weights separately for each of the four reporting categories. That is, each site contributing data to the AHAR has four analytic weights—one for each reporting category. However, for any reporting category for which a site was not able to provide data, the analytic weight is zero. The respondent sites for that reporting category represent the site. (Step 8 describes the procedure for aggregating across reporting categories to arrive at national estimates.)

Below is a description of how the weight for each type of site was adjusted for nonresponse to derive the final analysis weights.

- (a) The weights of the **contributing sites** did not change; each contributing site continued to represent itself with an analytic weight of 1.0 for each program-household type for which it provided data.
- (b) The weights of the **no-provider sites** did not change. Their weight remained the base weight calculated in Step 4 because all zero provider sites in the sample are considered respondents. In essence, the no-provider sites produced a response of 100 percent. Stated differently, since none of the *non-response* sites has no providers, the no-provider sites would not appropriately represent them.
- (c) For the **certainty sites** providing data, base weights were adjusted so that the analytic weights represented all certainty sites. The adjustment was made separately for each program-household type within four weighting classes based on region: North, South, East, and Midwest.¹⁷ The nonresponse adjustment was based on the relative number of shelter beds in the nonrespondent sites and accounts for the possibility of a high degree of size variation among certainty sites. The nonresponse adjustment formula follows:

Total number of beds within a reporting category at certainty sites in region	$\div$	Number of beds within reporting category at respondent certainty sites in region
---	--------	--

For example, assume that six of the seven certainty sites in the West provided TH-IND data and that one site did not. If the nonrespondent certainty site had 1,000 TH-IND beds and the six participating certainty sites had 5,000 beds, the weight of the six participating certainty sites would be multiplied by 6/5 (6,000 divided by 5,000).

¹⁷ Fifteen of the 18 certainty sites are principal cities; therefore, the nonresponse adjustment essentially occurs within CDBG type.

The adjustment assumes that the nonrespondent certainty sites would serve approximately the same number of persons per bed as the participating certainty sites. The nonresponse adjustment for certainty sites was derived separately by region based on the judgment that homeless providers in principal cities in the same region were more likely than principal cities overall to serve persons with similar characteristics.

- (d) For the **noncertainty sites**, the weights of the participating sites were upwardly adjusted to represent all the sites meant to be represented by the nonrespondent sample sites. The adjustment was carried out separately for each program-household type within 16 weighting classes based on type of CDBG jurisdiction and region: (1) principal city, (2) city with greater than 50,000 population, (3) urban counties, and (4) and nonentitlement areas. The nonresponse adjustment was the same as that used for certainty sites--the ratio of total number of beds in the weighting class divided by number of beds in participating sites.

Step 6: A post-stratification adjustment was carried out to create final analysis weights.

A post-stratification adjustment based on national totals of emergency and transitional housing beds accounted for new CDBG jurisdictions added since 2002 as well as for any differences in the average size of sample and nonsample sites. This final adjustment to the analysis weights applied only to noncertainty sample sites. The preliminary analysis weight (from Step 5) is the final analysis weight for certainty sites, no-provider sites, and contributing sites.

The initial AHAR sample was drawn from the number of CDBG jurisdictions in existence in 2002. Since that time, however, the number of CDBG jurisdictions has increased from 3,142 to 4,115.¹⁸ Therefore, the study team adjusted the analysis weights to account for the expansion. The increase in CDBG jurisdictions was not evenly distributed; most of the growth occurred in the South, particularly in the rural South. Thus, we adjusted the weights separately for each of the 16 strata. The adjustment factor was the ratio of total number of beds in the strata in 2009 (after excluding beds from certainty and contributing communities) to the weighted number of beds in the noncertainty sample sites in the strata providing usable data. The number of beds for the adjustment was based on the housing inventory chart submitted as part of the 2009 CoC application.

The adjustment both corrected for the difference in the number of CDBG jurisdictions in CoCs between 2002 and 2009 and adjusted for any differences in the number of beds per CDBG sample site and CDBG nonsample site in the same stratum.

¹⁸ The 4,115 CDBG jurisdictions also include nonfunded CDBG jurisdictions not part of the original sampling frame.

The Step 6 weights are the final analysis weights for use with the sample and data provided to produce separate national estimates of the homeless population for each reporting category. However, to aggregate the data across reporting categories, a further adjustment is needed to account for persons who used more than one program type during the study period.

Step 7: Final adjustment factor was derived to account for users of several program types.

To calculate national estimates that require data aggregation across the four reporting categories, an adjustment is needed for persons who used more than one program-household type during the study period. That is, if a person used an emergency shelter for individuals and then a transitional housing program for individuals, the person will appear in more than one set of reporting categories for the study period; aggregation of the numbers from the four reporting categories would double count that person. The needed adjustment is the same type of adjustment embedded in the AHAR summary table for sites providing data on all four reporting categories. For the 137 participating sites (42 sample sites and 95 contributing communities) providing data on all four reporting categories, the adjustment factor was the actual adjustment factor calculated from how much overlap the sites reported with their HMIS data. However, for the 171 participating sites that provided only partial data, it was not possible to calculate the overlap adjustment factor from their data. Instead, for all partial reporting sites, the study team used the average overlap adjustment factor from the 137 sites providing full data. Thus, for partial reporting sites, the overlap adjustment factor was assumed to be 0.956.

The overlap adjustment factor was calculated as follows:

Total unduplicated number of persons served at the full-reporting sites	÷	Total number of persons served at the full-reporting sites before accounting for persons served by more than one program-household type
--	----------	--

Step 8: Calculate national estimates.

To calculate national estimates, the study team first calculated the total number of persons with each characteristic within each of the four reporting categories. Then, within each reporting category, the team multiplied the final analysis weight (from Step 7) for each site by the number of persons with that characteristic in that site's reporting category. Next, the team summed the number of persons in each site across sites to arrive at the estimated number of persons with that characteristic who were served in that reporting category. For estimates of the number of persons served by all four reporting categories, the team summed totals across the four reporting categories and then multiplied by the adjustment factor from Step 7. Percentage calculations followed the same procedures by calculating both the numerator and denominator of the desired percentage.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix C:
Continuum of Care Point-in-Time
Counts of Homeless Persons

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
AK-500	Anchorage CoC
AK-501	Alaska Balance of State CoC
AL-500	Birmingham/Jefferson, St. Clair, Shelby Counties CoC
AL-501	Mobile City & County/Baldwin County CoC
AL-502	Florence/Northwest Alabama CoC
AL-503	Huntsville/North Alabama CoC
AL-504	Montgomery City & County CoC
AL-505	Gadsden/Northeast Alabama CoC
AL-506	Tuscaloosa City & County CoC
AL-507	Alabama Balance of State CoC
AR-500	Little Rock/Central Arkansas CoC
AR-501	Fayetteville/Northwest Arkansas CoC
AR-502	Conway/Arkansas River Valley CoC
AR-504	Delta Hills CoC
AR-505	Southeast Arkansas CoC
AR-506	Johnson, Pope, Yell Counties CoC
AR-507	Eastern Arkansas CoC
AZ-500	Arizona Balance of State CoC
AZ-501	Tucson/Pima County CoC
AZ-502	Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County Regional CoC
CA-500	San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC
CA-501	San Francisco CoC
CA-502	Oakland/Alameda County CoC
CA-503	Sacramento City & County CoC
CA-504	Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County
CA-505	Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC
CA-506	Salinas/Monterey County CoC
CA-507	Marin County CoC
CA-508	Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC
CA-509	Mendocino County CoC
CA-510	Turlock/Modesto/Stanslaus County CoC
CA-511	Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC
CA-512	Daly/San Mateo County CoC
CA-513	Visalia, Kings, Tulare Counties CoC
CA-514	Fresno/Madera County CoC
CA-515	Roseville/Placer County CoC
CA-516	Redding/Shasta County CoC
CA-517	Napa City & County CoC
CA-518	Vallejo/Solano County CoC
CA-519	Chico/Paradise/Butte County CoC
CA-520	Merced City & County CoC
CA-521	Davis/Woodland/Yolo County CoC
CA-522	Humboldt County CoC
CA-523	Colusa/Glenn/Tehama/Trinity Counties Coc
CA-524	Yuba City, Marysville/Sutter, Yuba Counties CoC
CA-525	El Dorado County CoC
CA-526	Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador Counties CoC
CA-527	Nevada County CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
CA-600	Los Angeles City & County CoC
CA-601	San Diego CoC
CA-602	Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC
CA-603	Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County
CA-604	Bakersfield/Kern County CoC
CA-605	San Buena Ventura/Ventura County
CA-606	Long Beach CoC
CA-607	Pasadena CoC
CA-608	Riverside City & County CoC
CA-609	San Bernardino City & County CoC
CA-610	San Diego County CoC
CA-611	Oxnard CoC
CA-612	Glendale CoC
CA-613	Imperial County CoC
CA-614	San Luis Obispo County CoC
CO-500	Colorado Balance of State CoC
CO-503	Metropolitan Denver Homeless Initiative
CO-504	Colorado Springs/El Paso County CoC
CT-500	Danbury CoC
CT-501	New Haven CoC
CT-502	Hartford CoC
CT-503	Bridgeport/Stratford/Fairfield CoC
CT-504	Middletown/Middlesex County CoC
CT-505	Connecticut Balance of State CoC
CT-506	Norwalk/Fairfield County CoC
CT-507	Norwich/New London City & County CoC
CT-508	Stamford/Greenwich CoC
CT-509	New Britain CoC
CT-510	Bristol CoC
CT-512	City of Waterbury CoC
DC-500	District of Columbia CoC
DE-500	Delaware Statewide CoC
FL-500	Sarasota, Bradenton, Manatee Counties CoC
FL-501	Tampa/Hillsborough County CoC
FL-502	St. Petersburg/Clearwater/Largo/Pinellas County CoC
FL-503	Lakeland CoC
FL-504	Daytona Beach/Daytona/Volusia, Flagler Counties CoC
FL-505	Fort Walton Beach/Okaloosa, Walton Counties CoC
FL-506	Tallahassee/Leon County CoC
FL-507	Orlando/Orange, Osceola, Seminole Counties CoC
FL-508	Gainesville/Alachua, Putnam Counties CoC
FL-509	Fort Pierce/St. Lucie, Indian River, Martin Counties CoC
FL-510	Jacksonville-Duval, Clay Counties CoC
FL-511	Pensacola/Esca/Santa Rosa County CoC
FL-512	Saint Johns County CoC
FL-513	Palm Bay/Melbourne/Brevard County CoC
FL-514	Ocala/Marion County CoC
FL-515	Panama City/Bay, Jackson Counties CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
FL-516	Winterhaven/Polk County CoC
FL-517	Hendry, Hardee, Highlands Counties CoC
FL-518	Columbia, Hamilton, Lafayette, Suwannee Counties CoC
FL-519	Pasco County CoC
FL-520	Citrus, Hernando, Lake, Sumter Counties CoC
FL-600	Miami/Dade County CoC
FL-601	Ft Lauderdale/Broward County CoC
FL-602	Punta Gorda/Charlotte County CoC
FL-603	Ft Myers/Cape Coral/Lee County CoC
FL-604	Monroe County CoC
FL-605	West Palm Beach/Palm Beach County
FL-606	Naples/Collier County CoC
GA-500	Atlanta/Roswell/DeKalb, Fulton Counties CoC
GA-501	Georgia Balance of State CoC
GA-503	Athens/Clarke County CoC
GA-504	Augusta CoC
GA-505	Columbus-Muscogee/Russell County CoC
GA-506	Marietta/Cobb County CoC
GA-507	Savannah/Chatham County CoC
GU-500	Guam CoC
HI-500	Hawaii Balance of State CoC
HI-501	Honolulu CoC
IA-500	Sioux City/Dakota, Woodbury Counties CoC
IA-501	Iowa Balance of State CoC
IA-502	Des Moines/Polk County CoC
ID-500	Boise/Ada County CoC
ID-501	Idaho Balance of State CoC
IL-500	McHenry County CoC
IL-501	Rockford/Winnebago, Boone Counties CoC
IL-502	North Chicago/Lake County CoC
IL-503	Champaign/Urbana/Rantoul/Champaign County CoC
IL-504	Madison County CoC
IL-505	Evanston CoC
IL-506	Joliet/Bolingbrook/Will County CoC
IL-507	Peoria/Perkin/Fulton, Peoria, Tazewell, Woodford CoC
IL-508	East Saint Louis/Belleville/Saint Clair County CoC
IL-509	DeKalb City & County CoC
IL-510	Chicago CoC
IL-511	Cook County CoC
IL-512	Bloomington/Central Illinois CoC
IL-513	Springfield/Sangamon County CoC
IL-514	Dupage County CoC
IL-515	South Central Illinois CoC
IL-516	Decatur/Macon County CoC
IL-517	Aurora/Elgin/Kane County CoC
IL-518	Rock Island/Moline/Northwestern Illinois CoC
IL-519	West Central Illinois CoC
IL-520	Southern Illinois CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
IN-500	St. Joseph County CoC
IN-502	Indiana Balance of State CoC
IN-503	Indianapolis CoC
KS-501	Kansas City/Wyandotte County CoC
KS-502	Wichita/Sedgwick County CoC
KS-503	Topeka/Shawnee County CoC
KS-505	Overland Park/Johnson County CoC
KS-507	Kansas Balance of State CoC
KY-500	Kentucky Balance of State CoC
KY-501	Louisville/Jefferson County CoC
KY-502	Lexington/Fayette County CoC
LA-500	Lafayette/Acadiana CoC
LA-501	Lake Charles/Southwestern Louisiana CoC
LA-502	Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest CoC
LA-503	New Orleans/Jefferson Parish CoC
LA-504	Baton Rouge CoC
LA-505	Monroe/Northeast Louisiana CoC
LA-506	Slidell/Southeast Louisiana CoC
LA-507	Alexandria/Central Louisiana CoC
LA-508	Houma-Terrebonne/Thibodaux CoC
MA-500	Boston CoC
MA-501	Holyoke/Franklin, Hampden, Hampshire Counties CoC
MA-502	Lynn CoC
MA-503	Cape Cod Islands CoC
MA-504	Springfield CoC
MA-505	New Bedford CoC
MA-506	Worcester City & County CoC
MA-507	Pittsfield/Berkshire County CoC
MA-508	Lowell CoC
MA-509	Cambridge CoC
MA-510	Gloucester/Haverhill/Salem/Essex County CoC
MA-511	Quincy/Weymouth CoC
MA-512	Lawrence CoC
MA-513	Malden/Medford CoC
MA-515	Fall River CoC
MA-516	Massachusetts Balance of State CoC
MA-517	Somerville CoC
MA-518	Brookline/Newton CoC
MA-519	Attleboro/Taunton/Bristol County CoC
MA-520	Brockton/Plymouth City & County CoC
MD-500	Cumberland/Allegany County CoC
MD-501	Baltimore City CoC
MD-502	Harford County CoC
MD-503	Annapolis/Anne Arundel County CoC
MD-504	Howard County CoC
MD-505	Baltimore County CoC
MD-506	Carroll County CoC
MD-507	Cecil County CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
MD-508	Charles, Calvert, St.Mary's Counties CoC
MD-509	Frederick City & County CoC
MD-510	Garrett County CoC
MD-511	Mid-Shore Regional CoC
MD-512	Hagerstown/Washington County CoC
MD-513	Wicomico/Somerset/Worcester CoC
MD-600	Prince George's County CoC
MD-601	Montgomery County CoC
ME-500	Maine Balance of State CoC
ME-501	Bangor/Penobscot County Coc
ME-502	Portland CoC
MI-500	Michigan Balance of State CoC
MI-501	Detroit CoC
MI-502	Dearborn/Dearborn Heights/Westland/Wayne County CoC
MI-503	St. Clair Shores/Warren/Macomb County
MI-504	Pontiac/Royal Oak/Oakland County CoC
MI-505	Flint/Genesee County CoC
MI-506	Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County
MI-507	Portage/Kalamazoo City & County
MI-508	Lansing/East Lansing/Ingham County
MI-509	Ann Arbor/Washtenaw County CoC
MI-510	Saginaw City & County CoC
MI-511	Lenawee County CoC
MI-512	Grand Traverse/Antrim, Leelanau Counties
MI-513	Marquette, Alger Counties CoC
MI-514	Battle Creek/Calhoun County CoC
MI-515	Monroe City & County CoC
MI-516	Norton Shores/Muskegon City & County
MI-517	Jackson City & County CoC
MI-518	Livingston County CoC
MI-519	Holland/Ottawa County CoC
MI-522	Alpena, Iosca, Presque Isle/NE Michigan CoC
MI-523	Eaton County CoC
MN-500	Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC
MN-501	Saint Paul/Ramsey County CoC
MN-502	Rochester/Southeast Minnesota CoC
MN-503	Dakota County CoC
MN-504	Northeast Minnesota CoC
MN-505	St. Cloud/Central Minnesota CoC
MN-506	Northwest Minnesota CoC
MN-508	Moorehead/West Central Minnesota CoC
MN-509	Duluth/Saint Louis County CoC
MN-510	Scott, Carver Counties CoC
MN-511	Southwest Minnesota CoC
MO-500	St. Louis County CoC
MO-501	St. Louis City CoC
MO-503	St. Charles, Lincoln, Warren Counties CoC
MO-600	Springfield/Greene, Christian, Webster Counties CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
MO-602	Joplin/Jasper, Newton Counties CoC
MO-603	St. Joseph/Andrew, Buchanan, DeKalb Counties CoC
MO-604	Kansas City/Independence/ Lee's Summit/Jackson County CoC
MO-606	Missouri Balance of State CoC
MS-500	Jackson/Rankin, Madison Counties CoC
MS-501	Mississippi Balance of State CoC
MS-503	Gulf Port/Gulf Coast Regional CoC
MT-500	Montana Statewide CoC
NC-500	Winston Salem/Forsyth County CoC
NC-501	Asheville/Buncombe County CoC
NC-502	Durham City & County CoC
NC-503	North Carolina Balance of State CoC
NC-504	Greensboro/High Point CoC
NC-505	Charlotte/Mecklenburg County CoC
NC-506	Wilmington/Brunswick, New Hanover, Pender Counties CoC
NC-507	Raleigh/Wake County CoC
NC-509	Gastonia/Cleveland, Gaston, Lincoln Counties CoC
NC-511	Fayetteville/Cumberland County CoC
NC-513	Chapel Hill/Orange County CoC
NC-516	Northwest North Carolina CoC
ND-500	North Dakota Statewide CoC
NE-500	North Central Nebraska CoC
NE-501	Omaha/Council Bluffs CoC
NE-502	Lincoln CoC
NE-503	Southwest Nebraska CoC
NE-504	Southeast Nebraska CoC
NE-505	Panhandle of Nebraska CoC
NE-506	Northeast Nebraska CoC
NH-500	New Hampshire Balance of State CoC
NH-501	Manchester CoC
NH-502	Nashua/Hillsborough County CoC
NJ-500	Atlantic City & County CoC
NJ-501	Bergen County CoC
NJ-502	Burlington County CoC
NJ-503	Camden City & County CoC
NJ-504	Newark/Essex County CoC
NJ-505	Gloucester County CoC
NJ-506	Jersey City/Bayonne/Hudson County CoC
NJ-507	New Brunswick/Middlesex County CoC
NJ-508	Monmouth County CoC
NJ-509	Morris County CoC
NJ-510	Lakewood Township/Ocean County CoC
NJ-511	Paterson/Passaic County CoC
NJ-512	Salem County CoC
NJ-513	Somerset County CoC
NJ-514	Trenton/Mercer County CoC
NJ-515	Elizabeth/Union County CoC
NJ-516	Warren County CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
NJ-518	Ocean City/Cape May County CoC
NJ-519	Sussex County CoC
NJ-520	Cumberland County CoC
NM-500	Albuquerque CoC
NM-501	New Mexico Balance of State CoC
NV-500	Las Vegas/Clark County CoC
NV-501	Reno/Sparks/Washoe County CoC
NV-502	Nevada Balance of State CoC
NY-500	Rochester/Irondequoit/Greece/Monroe County CoC
NY-501	Elmira/Steuben, Allegany, Chemung, Schuyler Counties COC
NY-502	Auburn/Cayuga County CoC
NY-503	Albany City & County CoC
NY-504	Cattaraugus County CoC
NY-505	Syracuse/Onondaga County CoC
NY-506	Fulton, Montgomery, Schoharie Counties CoC
NY-507	Schenectady City & County CoC
NY-508	Buffalo/Erie County CoC
NY-509	Oswego County CoC
NY-510	Tompkins County CoC
NY-511	Binghamton/Union Town/Broome County CoC
NY-512	Troy/Rensselaer County CoC
NY-513	Wayne, Ontario, Seneca, Yates Counties CoC
NY-514	Jamestown/Dunkirk/Chautauqua County CoC
NY-515	Cortland County CoC
NY-516	Clinton County CoC
NY-517	Orleans County CoC
NY-518	Utica/Rome/Oneida County CoC
NY-519	Columbia/Greene County CoC
NY-520	Franklin County CoC
NY-522	Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence Counties CoC
NY-523	Glen Falls/Saratoga Springs/Saratoga County CoC
NY-524	Niagara CoC
NY-600	New York City CoC
NY-601	Poughkeepsie/Dutchess County CoC
NY-602	Newburgh/Middletown/Orange County CoC
NY-603	Islip/Babylon/Huntington/Suffolk County CoC
NY-604	Yonkers/Mount Vernon/New Rochelle/Westchester County CoC
NY-605	Nassau County CoC
NY-606	Rockland County CoC
NY-607	Sullivan County CoC
NY-608	Kingston/Ulster County CoC
OH-500	Cincinnati/Hamilton County CoC
OH-501	Toledo/Lucas County CoC
OH-502	Cleveland/Cuyahoga County CoC
OH-503	Columbus/Franklin County CoC
OH-504	Youngstown/Mahoning County CoC
OH-505	Dayton/Kettering/Montgomery CoC
OH-506	Akron/Baberton/Summit County CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
OH-507	Ohio Balance of State CoC
OH-508	Canton/Massillon/Alliance/Stark County CoC
OK-500	North Central Oklahoma CoC
OK-501	Tulsa City & County/Broken Arrow CoC
OK-502	Oklahoma City CoC
OK-503	Oklahoma Balance of State CoC
OK-504	Norman / Cleveland County
OK-505	Northeast Oklahoma CoC
OK-506	Southwest Oklahoma CoC
OK-507	Southeastern Oklahoma Regional CoC
OR-500	Eugene/Springfield/Lane County CoC
OR-501	Portland/Gresham/Multnomah County CoC
OR-502	Medford/Ashland/Jackson County CoC
OR-503	Central Oregon CoC
OR-504	Salem/Marion/Polk Counties CoC
OR-505	Oregon Balance of State CoC
OR-506	Hillsboro/Beaverton/Washington County CoC
OR-507	Clackamas County CoC
PA-500	Philadelphia CoC
PA-501	Harrisburg/Dauphin County CoC
PA-502	Upper Darby/Chester/Haverford/Delaware County CoC
PA-503	Wilkes-Barre/Hazleton/Luzerne County CoC
PA-504	Lower Merion/Norristown/Abington/Montgomery County CoC
PA-505	Chester County CoC
PA-506	Reading/Berks County CoC
PA-507	Altoona/Central Pennsylvania CoC
PA-508	Scranton/Lackawanna County CoC
PA-509	Allentown/Northeast Pennsylvania CoC
PA-510	Lancaster City & County CoC
PA-511	Bristol/Bensalem/Bucks County CoC
PA-600	Pittsburgh/McKeesport/Penn Hills/Allegheny County CoC
PA-601	Southwest Pennsylvania CoC
PA-602	Northwest Pennsylvania CoC
PA-603	Beaver County CoC
PA-605	Erie City & County CoC
PR-502	Puerto Rico Balance of Commonwealth CoC
PR-503	South/Southeast Puerto Rico CoC
RI-500	Rhode Island Statewide CoC
SC-500	Charleston/Low Country CoC
SC-501	Greenville/Anderson/Spartanburg Upstate CoC
SC-502	Columbia/Midlands CoC
SC-503	Myrtle Beach/Sumter City & County CoC
SC-504	Florence City & County/Pee Dee CoC
SD-500	South Dakota Statewide CoC
TN-500	Chattanooga/Southeast Tennessee CoC
TN-501	Memphis/Shelby County CoC
TN-502	Knoxville/Knox County CoC
TN-503	South Central Tennessee CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
TN-504	Nashville/Davidson County CoC
TN-506	Oak Ridge/Upper Cumberland CoC
TN-507	Jackson/West Tennessee CoC
TN-509	Appalachian Regional CoC
TN-510	Murfreesboro/Rutherford City CoC
TN-512	Morristown/Blount, Sevier, Campbell, Cocke Counties CoC
TX-500	San Antonio/Bexar County CoC
TX-501	Corpus Christi/Nueces County CoC
TX-503	Austin/Travis County CoC
TX-504	Dewitt, Lavaca, Victoria Counties CoC
TX-600	Dallas City & County/Irving CoC
TX-601	Fort Worth/Arlington/Tarrant County
TX-603	El Paso City & County CoC
TX-604	Waco/McLennan County CoC
TX-607	Texas Balance of State CoC
TX-610	Denton City & County CoC
TX-611	Amarillo CoC
TX-613	Longview/Marshall Area CoC
TX-624	Wichita Falls/Wise, Palo Pinto, Wichita, Archer Counties CoC
TX-700	Houston/Harris County CoC
TX-701	Bryan/College Station/Brazos Valley CoC
TX-702	Montgomery County CoC
TX-703	Beaumont/Port Arthur/South East Texas CoC
TX-704	Galveston/Gulf Coast CoC
UT-500	Salt Lake City & County CoC
UT-503	Utah Balance of State CoC
UT-504	Provo/Mountainland CoC
VA-500	Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover Counties CoC
VA-501	Norfolk CoC
VA-502	Roanoke City & County/Salem CoC
VA-503	Virginia Beach CoC
VA-504	Charlottesville CoC
VA-505	Newport News/Hampton/Virginia Peninsula CoC
VA-507	Portsmouth CoC
VA-508	Lynchburg CoC
VA-509	Petersburg CoC
VA-510	Staunton/Waynesboro/Augusta, Highland Counties CoC
VA-512	Chesapeake CoC
VA-513	Winchester/Shenandoah, Frederick, Warren Counties CoC
VA-514	Fredericksburg/Spotsylvania, Stafford Counties CoC
VA-517	Danville/Martinsville CoC
VA-518	Harrisburg/ Rockingham County CoC
VA-519	Suffolk CoC
VA-521	Virginia Balance of State CoC
VA-600	Arlington County CoC
VA-601	Fairfax County CoC
VA-602	Loudoun County CoC
VA-603	Alexandria CoC

Appendix C-1	
2010 List of Continuums of Care	
CoC Number	CoC Name
VA-604	Prince William County CoC
VI-500	Virgin Islands CoC
VT-500	Vermont Balance of State CoC
VT-501	Burlington/Chittenden County CoC
WA-500	Seattle/King County CoC
WA-501	Washington Balance of State CoC
WA-502	Spokane City & County CoC
WA-503	Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County CoC
WA-504	Everett/Snohomish County CoC
WA-507	Yakima City & County CoC
WA-508	Vancouver/Clark County CoC
WI-500	Wisconsin Balance of State CoC
WI-501	Milwaukee City & County CoC
WI-502	Racine City & County CoC
WI-503	Madison/Dane County CoC
WV-500	Wheeling/Weirton Area CoC
WV-501	Huntington/Cabell, Wayne Counties
WV-503	Charleston/Kanawha, Putnam, Boone, Clay Counties CoC
WV-508	West Virginia Balance of State CoC
WY-500	Wyoming Statewide CoC

Appendix C-2							
Changes in Point-In-Time Estimates of Homeless Population by State, 2007-2009							
State	2009 Total Homeless Population	2008 Total Homeless Population	2007 Total Homeless Population	2008-2009 Total Change	2008-2009 Percent Change	2007-2009 Total Change	2007-2009 Percent Change
Alabama	6,080	5,387	5,452	693	12.86%	628	11.52%
Alaska	1,992	1,646	1,642	346	21.02%	350	21.32%
Arizona	14,721	12,488	14,646	2,233	17.88%	75	0.51%
Arkansas	2,852	3,255	3,836	-403	-12.38%	-984	-25.65%
California	133,129	157,277	159,732	-24,148	-15.35%	-26,603	-16.65%
Colorado	15,268	14,747	14,225	521	3.53%	1,043	7.33%
Connecticut	4,605	4,627	4,482	-22	-0.48%	123	2.74%
Delaware	1,130	933	1,061	197	21.11%	69	6.50%
District Of Columbia	6,228	6,044	5,320	184	3.04%	908	17.07%
Florida	55,599	50,158	48,069	5,441	10.85%	7,530	15.66%
Georgia	20,360	19,095	19,639	1,265	6.62%	721	3.67%
Guam	1,088	725	725	363	50.07%	363	50.07%
Hawaii	5,782	6,061	6,070	-279	-4.60%	-288	-4.74%
Idaho	1,939	1,464	1,749	475	32.45%	190	10.86%
Illinois	14,055	14,724	15,487	-669	-4.54%	-1,432	-9.25%
Indiana	6,984	7,395	7,358	-411	-5.56%	-374	-5.08%
Iowa	3,380	3,346	2,734	34	1.02%	646	23.63%
Kansas	1,892	1,738	2,111	154	8.86%	-219	-10.37%
Kentucky	5,999	8,137	8,061	-2,138	-26.28%	-2,062	-25.58%
Louisiana	12,504	5,481	5,494	7,023	128.13%	7,010	127.59%
Maine	2,444	2,632	2,638	-188	-7.14%	-194	-7.35%
Maryland	11,698	9,219	9,628	2,479	26.89%	2,070	21.50%
Massachusetts	15,482	14,506	15,127	976	6.73%	355	2.35%
Michigan	14,005	28,248	28,295	-14,243	-50.42%	-14,290	-50.50%
Minnesota	7,718	7,644	7,323	74	0.97%	395	5.39%
Mississippi	2,797	1,961	1,377	836	42.63%	1,420	103.12%
Missouri	6,959	7,687	6,247	-728	-9.47%	712	11.40%
Montana	1,196	1,417	1,150	-221	-15.60%	46	4.00%
Nebraska	3,718	3,985	3,531	-267	-6.70%	187	5.30%
Nevada	14,478	12,610	12,526	1,868	14.81%	1,952	15.58%
New Hampshire	1,645	2,019	2,248	-374	-18.52%	-603	-26.82%
New Jersey	13,169	13,832	17,314	-663	-4.79%	-4,145	-23.94%
New Mexico	3,475	3,015	3,015	460	15.26%	460	15.26%
New York	61,067	61,125	62,601	-58	-0.09%	-1,534	-2.45%
North Carolina	12,918	12,411	11,802	507	4.09%	1,116	9.46%
North Dakota	773	615	636	158	25.69%	137	21.54%
Ohio	12,700	12,912	11,264	-212	-1.64%	1,436	12.75%
Oklahoma	4,838	3,846	4,221	992	25.79%	617	14.62%
Oregon	17,309	20,653	17,590	-3,344	-16.19%	-281	-1.60%
Pennsylvania	15,096	15,378	16,220	-282	-1.83%	-1,124	-6.93%
Puerto Rico	4,070	3,012	4,309	1,058	35.13%	-239	-5.55%
Rhode Island	1,607	1,196	1,372	411	34.36%	235	17.13%
South Carolina	4,473	5,660	5,660	-1,187	-20.97%	-1,187	-20.97%
South Dakota	731	579	579	152	26.25%	152	26.25%
Tennessee	10,532	9,705	11,210	827	8.52%	-678	-6.05%
Texas	36,761	40,190	39,788	-3,429	-8.53%	-3,027	-7.61%
Utah	3,795	3,434	3,011	361	10.51%	784	26.04%
Vermont	1,214	954	1,035	260	27.25%	179	17.29%
Virgin Islands	471	602	559	-131	-21.76%	-88	-15.74%
Virginia	8,852	8,469	9,746	383	4.52%	-894	-9.17%
Washington	22,782	21,954	23,379	828	3.77%	-597	-2.55%
West Virginia	1,667	2,016	2,409	-349	-17.31%	-742	-30.80%
Wisconsin	6,525	5,449	5,648	1,076	19.75%	877	15.53%
Wyoming	515	751	537	-236	-31.42%	-22	-4.10%
TOTAL	643,067	664,414	671,888	-21,347	-3.21%	-28,821	-4.29%

Appendix C-3					
Point-In-Time Estimates from January 2009 of Homeless Population by State					
State	Total Sheltered Population	Total Unsheltered Population	Total Homeless Population	State Population	Homeless Rate
Alabama	3,913	2,167	6,080	4,708,708	0.13%
Alaska	1,665	327	1,992	698,473	0.29%
Arizona	8,366	6,355	14,721	6,595,778	0.22%
Arkansas	1,730	1,122	2,852	2,889,450	0.10%
California	50,777	82,352	133,129	36,961,664	0.36%
Colorado	9,031	6,237	15,268	5,024,748	0.30%
Connecticut	4,103	502	4,605	3,518,288	0.13%
Delaware	1,083	47	1,130	885,122	0.13%
District of Columbia	5,907	321	6,228	599,657	1.04%
Florida	21,867	33,732	55,599	18,537,969	0.30%
Georgia	9,419	10,941	20,360	9,829,211	0.21%
Guam	182	906	1,088	178,430	0.61%
Hawaii	3,268	2,514	5,782	1,295,178	0.45%
Idaho	1,477	462	1,939	1,545,801	0.13%
Illinois	11,851	2,204	14,055	12,910,409	0.11%
Indiana	5,206	1,778	6,984	6,423,113	0.11%
Iowa	3,221	159	3,380	3,007,856	0.11%
Kansas	1,696	196	1,892	2,818,747	0.07%
Kentucky	5,299	700	5,999	4,314,113	0.14%
Louisiana	4,118	8,386	12,504	4,492,076	0.28%
Maine	2,406	38	2,444	1,318,301	0.19%
Maryland	7,446	4,252	11,698	5,699,478	0.21%
Massachusetts	14,476	1,006	15,482	6,593,587	0.23%
Michigan	11,298	2,707	14,005	9,969,727	0.14%
Minnesota	6,772	946	7,718	5,266,214	0.15%
Mississippi	1,221	1,576	2,797	2,951,996	0.09%
Missouri	5,469	1,490	6,959	5,987,580	0.12%
Montana	833	363	1,196	974,989	0.12%
Nebraska	3,079	639	3,718	1,796,619	0.21%
Nevada	7,792	6,686	14,478	2,643,085	0.55%
New Hampshire	1,406	239	1,645	1,324,575	0.12%
New Jersey	11,871	1,298	13,169	8,707,739	0.15%
New Mexico	2,108	1,367	3,475	2,009,671	0.17%
New York	57,454	3,613	61,067	19,541,453	0.31%
North Carolina	8,473	4,445	12,918	9,380,884	0.14%
North Dakota	765	8	773	646,844	0.12%
Ohio	10,929	1,771	12,700	11,542,645	0.11%
Oklahoma	3,307	1,531	4,838	3,687,050	0.13%
Oregon	7,442	9,867	17,309	3,825,657	0.45%
Pennsylvania	13,819	1,277	15,096	12,604,767	0.12%
Puerto Rico	1,325	2,745	4,070	3,967,179	0.10%
Rhode Island	1,556	51	1,607	1,053,209	0.15%
South Carolina	3,036	1,437	4,473	4,561,242	0.10%
South Dakota	667	64	731	812,383	0.09%
Tennessee	7,133	3,399	10,532	6,296,254	0.17%
Texas	21,658	15,103	36,761	24,782,302	0.15%
Utah	3,540	255	3,795	2,784,572	0.14%
Vermont	1,057	157	1,214	621,760	0.20%
Virgin Islands	76	395	471	109,825	0.43%
Virginia	7,284	1,568	8,852	7,882,590	0.11%
Washington	16,237	6,545	22,782	6,664,195	0.34%
West Virginia	1,278	389	1,667	1,819,777	0.09%
Wisconsin	5,465	1,060	6,525	5,654,774	0.12%
Wyoming	451	64	515	544,270	0.09%
TOTAL	403,308	239,759	643,067	311,261,984	0.21%

Continuum of Care Sheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Sheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Sheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
1	AK-500	Anchorage CoC	1,110	921	842	1,042	189	20.5%	79	9.4%	-200	-19.2%	68	6.5%	66.67%
2	AK-501	Alaska Balance of State CoC	555	531	545	544	24	4.5%	-14	-2.6%	1	0.2%	11	2.0%	33.33%
3	AL-500	Birmingham/Shelby Counties CoC	1,069	1,240	1,240	1,653	-171	-13.8%	0	0.0%	-413	-25.0%	-584	-35.3%	27.32%
4	AL-501	Mobile City & County/Baldwin County	411	341	410	482	70	20.5%	-69	-16.8%	-72	-14.9%	-71	-14.7%	10.50%
5	AL-502	Florence/Northwest Alabama CoC	213	178	131	109	35	19.7%	47	35.9%	22	20.2%	104	95.4%	5.44%
6	AL-503	Huntsville/North Alabama CoC	574	637	756	928	-63	-9.9%	-119	-15.7%	-172	-18.5%	-354	-38.1%	14.67%
7	AL-504	Montgomery City & County CoC	263	327	331	373	-64	-19.6%	-4	-1.2%	-42	-11.3%	-110	-29.5%	6.72%
8	AL-505	Gadsden/Northeast Alabama CoC	307	262	104	95	45	17.2%	158	151.9%	9	9.5%	212	223.2%	7.85%
9	AL-506	Tuscaloosa City & County CoC	261	192	332	177	69	35.9%	-140	-42.2%	155	87.6%	84	47.5%	6.67%
10	AL-507	Alabama Balance of State	815	666	492	263	149	22.4%	174	35.4%	229	87.1%	552	209.9%	20.83%
11	AR-500	Little Rock/Central Arkansas CoC	973	1,176	1,187	12,495	-203	-17.3%	-11	-0.9%	-11,308	-90.5%	-11,522	-92.2%	56.24%
12	AR-501	Fayetteville/Northwest Arkansas CoC	191	273	244	170	-82	-30.0%	29	11.9%	74	43.5%	21	12.4%	11.04%
13	AR-502	Conway/Faulkner, Perry Counties CoC	34	59	59	1,048	-25	-42.4%	0	0.0%	-989	-94.4%	-1,014	-96.8%	1.97%
14	AR-504	Delta Hills CoC	459	374	391	681	85	22.7%	-17	-4.3%	-290	-42.6%	-222	-32.6%	26.53%
15	AR-505	Southeast Arkansas CoC	51	120	120	53	-69	-57.5%	0	0.0%	67	126.4%	-2	-3.8%	2.95%
16	AR-506	Johnson, Pope, Yell Counties CoC	22	18	18	0	4	22.2%	0	0.0%	18	-	22	-	1.27%
17	AZ-500	Arizona Balance of State CoC	1,172	956	1,013	998	216	22.6%	-57	-5.6%	15	1.5%	174	17.4%	14.01%
18	AZ-501	Tucson/Pima County CoC	2,223	1,251	2,010	1,938	972	77.7%	-759	-37.8%	72	3.7%	285	14.7%	26.57%
19	AZ-502	Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County	4,971	4,763	5,595	5,416	208	4.4%	-832	-14.9%	179	3.3%	-445	-8.2%	59.42%
20	CA-500	San Jose/Santa Clara City & County	2,103	2,101	2,101	2,623	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	-522	-19.9%	-520	-19.8%	4.14%
21	CA-501	San Francisco CoC	2,881	2,400	2,912	2,749	481	20.0%	-512	-17.6%	163	5.9%	132	4.8%	5.67%
22	CA-502	Oakland/Alameda County CoC	2,378	2,342	2,342	2,590	36	1.5%	0	0.0%	-248	-9.6%	-212	-8.2%	4.68%
23	CA-503	Sacramento City & County CoC	1,606	1,349	1,447	1,584	257	19.1%	-98	-6.8%	-137	-8.6%	22	1.4%	3.16%
24	CA-504	Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County	1,025	782	782	954	243	31.1%	0	0.0%	-172	-18.0%	71	7.4%	2.02%
25	CA-505	Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	887	903	903	993	-16	-1.8%	0	0.0%	-90	-9.1%	-106	-10.7%	1.75%
26	CA-506	Salinas/Monterey County CoC	779	509	509	539	270	53.0%	0	0.0%	-30	-5.6%	240	44.5%	1.53%
27	CA-507	Marin County CoC	597	602	602	575	-5	-0.8%	0	0.0%	27	4.7%	22	3.8%	1.18%
28	CA-508	Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County	729	486	486	674	243	50.0%	0	0.0%	-188	-27.9%	55	8.2%	1.44%
29	CA-509	Mendocino County CoC	235	285	284	142	-50	-17.5%	1	0.4%	142	100.0%	93	65.5%	0.46%
30	CA-510	Turlock/Modesto/Stanslaus County	801	634	634	678	167	26.3%	0	0.0%	-44	-6.5%	123	18.1%	1.58%
31	CA-511	Stockton/San Joaquin County	2,840	2,051	2,176	2,772	789	38.5%	-125	-5.7%	-596	-21.5%	68	2.5%	5.59%
32	CA-512	Daly/San Mateo County CoC	764	704	704	740	60	8.5%	0	0.0%	-36	-4.9%	24	3.2%	1.50%
33	CA-513	Visalia, Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	210	189	280	1,330	21	11.1%	-91	-32.5%	-1,050	-78.9%	-1,120	-84.2%	0.41%
34	CA-514	Fresno/Madera County CoC	1,888	1,951	2,735	2,553	-63	-3.2%	-784	-28.7%	182	7.1%	-665	-26.0%	3.72%
35	CA-515	Roseville/Placer County CoC	382	450	450	375	-68	-15.1%	0	0.0%	75	20.0%	7	1.9%	0.75%
36	CA-516	Redding/Shasta County CoC	194	201	250	205	-7	-3.5%	-49	-19.6%	45	22.0%	-11	-5.4%	0.38%
37	CA-517	Napa City & County CoC	186	219	219	194	-33	-15.1%	0	0.0%	25	12.9%	-8	-4.1%	0.37%
38	CA-518	Vallejo/Solano County CoC	403	457	457	561	-54	-11.8%	0	0.0%	-104	-18.5%	-158	-28.2%	0.79%
39	CA-519	Chico/Paradise/Butte County CoC	303	322	936	370	-19	-5.9%	-614	-65.6%	566	153.0%	-67	-18.1%	0.60%
40	CA-520	Merced City & County CoC	148	135	221	221	13	9.6%	-86	-38.9%	0	0.0%	-73	-33.0%	0.29%
41	CA-521	Davis/Woodland/Yolo County CoC	202	228	228	230	-26	-11.4%	0	0.0%	-2	-0.9%	-28	-12.2%	0.40%
42	CA-522	Humboldt County CoC	355	322	322	366	33	10.2%	0	0.0%	-44	-12.0%	-11	-3.0%	0.70%
43	CA-523	Colusa/Glenn/Tehama/Trinity Counties Coc	74	0	54	-	74	-	-54	-100.0%	-	-	-	-	0.15%
44	CA-524	Yuba City, Marysville/Sutter, Yuba Counties CoC	303	483	299	202	-180	-37.3%	184	61.5%	97	48.0%	101	50.0%	0.60%
45	CA-525	El Dorado County CoC	63	75	91	0	-12	-16.0%	-16	-17.6%	91	-	63	-	0.12%
46	CA-526	Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador Counties CoC	150	79	79	0	71	89.9%	0	0.0%	79	-	150	-	0.30%
47	CA-527	Nevada County	190	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.37%
48	CA-600	Los Angeles City & County CoC	14,050	11,442	11,442	9,878	2,608	22.8%	0	0.0%	1,564	15.8%	4,172	42.2%	27.67%
49	CA-601	San Diego CoC	2,470	2,618	2,469	3,623	-148	-5.7%	149	6.0%	-1,154	-31.9%	-1,153	-31.8%	4.86%
50	CA-602	Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC	2,609	2,578	2,578	2,101	31	1.2%	0	0.0%	477	22.7%	508	24.2%	5.14%
51	CA-603	Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County	1,148	1,480	1,480	1,147	-332	-22.4%	0	0.0%	333	29.0%	1	0.1%	2.26%
52	CA-604	Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	667	905	905	681	-238	-26.3%	0	0.0%	224	32.9%	-14	-2.1%	1.31%
53	CA-605	San Buena Ventura/Ventura County	205	359	359	419	-154	-42.9%	0	0.0%	-60	-14.3%	-214	-51.1%	0.40%
54	CA-606	Long Beach CoC	2,154	1,679	1,679	1,670	475	28.3%	0	0.0%	9	0.5%	484	29.0%	4.24%
55	CA-607	Pasadena CoC	403	434	434	754	-31	-7.1%	0	0.0%	-320	-42.4%	-351	-46.6%	0.79%
56	CA-608	Riverside City & County CoC	1,323	1,330	1,330	1,654	-7	-0.5%	0	0.0%	-324	-19.6%	-331	-20.0%	2.61%
57	CA-609	San Bernardino City & County CoC	768	1,220	1,220	945	-452	-37.0%	0	0.0%	275	29.1%	-177	-18.7%	1.51%
58	CA-610	San Diego County CoC	1,511	1,799	1,512	2,799	-288	-16.0%	287	19.0%	-1,287	-46.0%	-1,288	-46.0%	2.98%
59	CA-611	Oxnard CoC	256	192	67	318	64	33.3%	125	186.6%	-251	-78.9%	-62	-19.5%	0.50%

Continuum of Care Sheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Sheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Sheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
60	CA-612	Glendale CoC	138	233	233	104	-95	-40.8%	0	0.0%	129	124.0%	34	32.7%	0.27%
61	CA-613	El Centro/Imperial County CoC	157	156	113	0	1	0.6%	43	38.1%	113	-	157	-	0.31%
62	CA-614	San Luis Obispo County CoC	242	281	187	222	-39	-13.9%	94	50.3%	-35	-15.8%	20	9.0%	0.48%
63	CO-500	Colorado Balance of State CoC	1,087	1,233	1,093	1,578	-146	-11.8%	140	12.8%	-485	-30.7%	-491	-31.1%	12.04%
64	CO-503	Metropolitan Denver Homeless Initiative	7,053	4,951	5,185	5,390	2,102	42.5%	-234	-4.5%	-205	-3.8%	1,663	30.9%	78.10%
65	CO-504	Colorado Springs/EI Paso County CoC	891	693	693	752	198	28.6%	0	0.0%	-59	-7.8%	139	18.5%	9.87%
66	CT-500	Danbury CoC	126	116	127	258	10	8.6%	-11	-8.7%	-131	-50.8%	-132	-51.2%	3.07%
67	CT-501	New Haven CoC	717	722	641	858	-5	-0.7%	81	12.6%	-217	-25.3%	-141	-16.4%	17.48%
68	CT-502	Hartford CoC	1,205	1,251	891	829	-46	-3.7%	360	40.4%	62	7.5%	376	45.4%	29.37%
69	CT-503	Bridgeport/Stratford/Fairfield CoC	269	311	324	338	-42	-13.5%	-13	-4.0%	-14	-4.1%	-69	-20.4%	6.56%
70	CT-504	Middletown/Middlesex County CoC	206	187	201	289	19	10.2%	-14	-7.0%	-88	-30.4%	-83	-28.7%	5.02%
71	CT-505	Connecticut Balance of State CoC	512	387	492	399	125	32.3%	-105	-21.3%	93	23.3%	113	28.3%	12.48%
72	CT-506	Norwalk/Fairfield County CoC	186	183	213	191	3	1.6%	-30	-14.1%	22	11.5%	-5	-2.6%	4.53%
73	CT-507	Norwich/New London City & County	273	288	248	250	-15	-5.2%	40	16.1%	-2	-0.8%	23	9.2%	6.65%
74	CT-508	Stamford/Greenwich CoC	265	255	252	403	10	3.9%	3	1.2%	-151	-37.5%	-138	-34.2%	6.46%
75	CT-509	New Britain CoC	127	103	91	162	24	23.3%	12	13.2%	-71	-43.8%	-35	-21.6%	3.10%
76	CT-510	Bristol CoC	58	62	59	58	-4	-6.5%	3	5.1%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	1.41%
77	CT-512	City of Waterbury CoC	159	155	132	171	4	2.6%	23	17.4%	-39	-22.8%	-12	-7.0%	3.88%
78	DC-500	District of Columbia CoC	5,907	5,666	4,980	5,286	241	4.3%	686	13.8%	-306	-5.8%	621	11.7%	100.00%
79	DE-500	Delaware Statewide CoC	1,083	862	854	876	221	25.6%	8	0.9%	-22	-2.5%	207	23.6%	100.00%
80	FL-500	Sarasota, Bradenton, Manatee Counties	348	530	494	945	-182	-34.3%	36	7.3%	-451	-47.7%	-597	-63.2%	1.59%
81	FL-501	Tampa/Hillsborough County CoC	726	1,050	1,050	6,241	-324	-30.9%	0	0.0%	-5,191	-83.2%	-5,515	-88.4%	3.32%
82	FL-502	St. Petersburg/Pinellas County CoC	1,691	1,305	1,305	2,214	386	29.6%	0	0.0%	-909	-41.1%	-523	-23.6%	7.73%
83	FL-503	Lakeland/Highlands Counties CoC	366	499	487	420	-133	-26.7%	12	2.5%	67	16.0%	-54	-12.9%	1.67%
84	FL-504	Daytona Beach/Flagler Counties CoC	593	576	569	514	17	3.0%	7	1.2%	55	10.7%	79	15.4%	2.71%
85	FL-505	Fort Walton Beach/Walton Counties CoC	309	330	105	116	-21	-6.4%	225	214.3%	-11	-9.5%	193	166.4%	1.41%
86	FL-506	Tallahassee/Leon County CoC	536	495	495	580	41	8.3%	0	0.0%	-85	-14.7%	-44	-7.6%	2.45%
87	FL-507	Orlando/Orange/Seminole Counties CoC	2,454	2,366	2,003	2,308	88	3.7%	363	18.1%	-305	-13.2%	146	6.3%	11.22%
88	FL-508	Gainesville/Alachua, Putnam	301	279	263	278	22	7.9%	16	6.1%	-15	-5.4%	23	8.3%	1.38%
89	FL-509	Fort Pierce/St. Lucie/Martin Counties CoC	289	298	458	494	-9	-3.0%	-160	-34.9%	-36	-7.3%	-205	-41.5%	1.32%
90	FL-510	Jacksonville-Duval, Clay Counties CoC	2,019	1,492	1,585	1,462	527	35.3%	-93	-5.9%	123	8.4%	557	38.1%	9.23%
91	FL-511	Pensacola/Esca/Santa Rosa County CoC	412	375	347	294	37	9.9%	28	8.1%	53	18.0%	118	40.1%	1.88%
92	FL-512	Saint Johns County CoC	106	106	106	163	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-57	-35.0%	-57	-35.0%	0.48%
93	FL-513	Palm Bay/Brevard County CoC	1,002	502	502	1,002	500	99.6%	0	0.0%	-500	-49.9%	0	0.0%	4.58%
94	FL-514	Ocala/Marion County CoC	297	312	312	331	-15	-4.8%	0	0.0%	-19	-5.7%	-34	-10.3%	1.36%
95	FL-515	Panama City CoC	249	211	211	226	38	18.0%	0	0.0%	-15	-6.6%	23	10.2%	1.14%
96	FL-516	Winterhaven/Polk County CoC	0	209	0	0	-209	-100.0%	209	-	0	-	0	-	0.00%
97	FL-517	Hardee/Highlands Counties CoC	101	101	664	2,531	0	0.0%	-563	-84.8%	-1,867	-73.8%	-2,430	-96.0%	0.46%
98	FL-518	Columbia/Suwannee CoC	165	92	85	110	73	79.3%	7	8.2%	-25	-22.7%	55	50.0%	0.75%
99	FL-519	Passo County	1,674	1,500	1,379	2,499	174	11.6%	121	8.8%	-1,120	-44.8%	-825	-33.0%	7.66%
100	FL-520	Citrus/Hernando/Lake	236	216	192	411	20	9.3%	24	12.5%	-219	-53.3%	-175	-42.6%	1.08%
101	FL-600	Miami/Dade County CoC	3,339	3,227	3,012	2,955	112	3.5%	215	7.1%	57	1.9%	384	13.0%	15.27%
102	FL-601	Ft Lauderdale/Broward County CoC	2,425	2,453	2,453	2,672	-28	-1.1%	0	0.0%	-219	-8.2%	-247	-9.2%	11.09%
103	FL-602	Punta Gorda/Charlotte County CoC	394	450	450	123	-56	-12.4%	0	0.0%	327	265.9%	271	220.3%	1.80%
104	FL-603	Ft Myers/Cape Coral/Lee County CoC	515	386	433	706	129	33.4%	-47	-10.9%	-273	-38.7%	-191	-27.1%	2.36%
105	FL-604	Monroe County CoC	324	477	477	437	-153	-32.1%	0	0.0%	40	9.2%	-113	-25.9%	1.48%
106	FL-605	West Palm Beach/Palm Beach County	740	727	727	860	13	1.8%	0	0.0%	-133	-15.5%	-120	-14.0%	3.38%
107	FL-606	Collier County CoC	256	160	365	277	96	60.0%	-205	-56.2%	88	31.8%	-21	-7.6%	1.17%
108	GA-500	City of Atlanta CoC	4,855	4,725	4,725	4,368	130	2.8%	0	0.0%	357	8.2%	487	11.1%	51.54%
109	GA-501	Georgia Balance of State CoC	2,134	2,267	1,971	3,319	-133	-5.9%	296	15.0%	-1,348	-40.6%	-1,185	-35.7%	22.66%
110	GA-503	Athens/Clarke County CoC	248	303	333	388	-55	-18.2%	-30	-9.0%	-55	-14.2%	-140	-36.1%	2.63%
111	GA-504	Augusta CoC	512	496	451	532	16	3.2%	45	10.0%	-81	-15.2%	-20	-3.8%	5.44%
112	GA-505	Columbus-Muscogee/Russell County CoC	254	244	188	246	10	4.1%	56	29.8%	-58	-23.6%	8	3.3%	2.70%
113	GA-506	Marietta/Cobb County CoC	354	329	329	330	25	7.6%	0	0.0%	-1	-0.3%	24	7.3%	3.76%
114	GA-507	Savannah/Chatham County CoC	1,062	501	344	316	561	112.0%	157	45.6%	28	8.9%	746	236.1%	11.28%
115	GU-500	Guam CoC	182	103	103	258	79	76.7%	0	0.0%	-155	-60.1%	-76	-29.5%	100.00%
116	HI-500	Hawaii Balance of State CoC	823	746	755	926	77	10.3%	-9	-1.2%	-171	-18.5%	-103	-11.1%	25.18%
117	HI-501	Honolulu CoC	2,445	1,957	1,957	1,050	488	24.9%	0	0.0%	907	86.4%	1,395	132.9%	74.82%

Continuum of Care Sheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Sheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Sheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
118	IA-500	Sioux City/Dakota County CoC	259	260	159	165	-1	-0.4%	101	63.5%	-6	-3.6%	94	57.0%	8.04%
119	IA-501	Iowa Balance of State CoC	1,891	1,824	1,340	1,746	67	3.7%	484	36.1%	-406	-23.3%	145	8.3%	58.71%
120	IA-502	Des Moines/Polk County CoC	1,071	1,003	942	1,209	68	6.8%	61	6.5%	-267	-22.1%	-138	-11.4%	33.25%
121	ID-500	Boise/Ada County CoC	644	553	472	133	91	16.5%	81	17.2%	339	254.9%	511	384.2%	43.60%
122	ID-501	Idaho Balance of State CoC	833	697	653	997	136	19.5%	44	6.7%	-344	-34.5%	-164	-16.4%	56.40%
123	IL-500	McHenry County CoC	247	195	235	177	52	26.7%	-40	-17.0%	58	32.8%	70	39.5%	2.08%
124	IL-501	Rockford/Winnebago, Boone Counties	347	525	525	448	-178	-33.9%	0	0.0%	77	17.2%	-101	-22.5%	2.93%
125	IL-502	North Chicago/Lake County CoC	368	430	486	405	-62	-14.4%	-56	-11.5%	81	20.0%	-37	-9.1%	3.11%
126	IL-503	Champaign/Urbana/Champaign County CoC	530	416	416	295	114	27.4%	0	0.0%	121	41.0%	235	79.7%	4.47%
127	IL-504	Madison County CoC	161	189	203	308	-28	-14.8%	-14	-6.9%	-105	-34.1%	-147	-47.7%	1.36%
128	IL-505	Evanston CoC	93	93	93	95	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-2	-2.1%	-2	-2.1%	0.78%
129	IL-506	Joliet/Bolingbrook/Will County CoC	331	299	379	345	32	10.7%	-80	-21.1%	34	9.9%	-14	-4.1%	2.79%
130	IL-507	Peoria/Perkin/Woodford CoC	330	342	336	362	-12	-3.5%	6	1.8%	-26	-7.2%	-32	-8.8%	2.78%
131	IL-508	East Saint Louis/Saint Clair County CoC	242	218	442	349	24	11.0%	-224	-50.7%	93	26.6%	-107	-30.7%	2.04%
132	IL-509	DeKalb City & County CoC	84	106	106	67	-22	-20.8%	0	0.0%	39	58.2%	17	25.4%	0.71%
133	IL-510	Chicago CoC	5,356	4,346	4,346	4,969	1,010	23.2%	0	0.0%	-623	-12.5%	387	7.8%	45.19%
134	IL-511	Cook County CoC	1,034	1,069	1,069	1,024	-35	-3.3%	0	0.0%	45	4.4%	10	1.0%	8.73%
135	IL-512	Bloomington/Central Illinois CoC	482	399	399	339	83	20.8%	0	0.0%	60	17.7%	143	42.2%	4.07%
136	IL-513	Springfield/Sangamon County CoC	248	228	245	297	20	8.8%	-17	-6.9%	-52	-17.5%	-49	-16.5%	2.09%
137	IL-514	Dupage County CoC	587	642	642	538	-55	-8.6%	0	0.0%	104	19.3%	49	9.1%	4.95%
138	IL-515	South Central Illinois CoC	234	235	214	127	-1	-0.4%	21	9.8%	87	68.5%	107	84.3%	1.97%
139	IL-516	Decatur/Macon County CoC	150	167	167	180	-17	-10.2%	0	0.0%	-13	-7.2%	-30	-16.7%	1.27%
140	IL-517	Aurora/Elgin/Kane County CoC	392	418	418	452	-26	-6.2%	0	0.0%	-34	-7.5%	-60	-13.3%	3.31%
141	IL-518	Rock Island...Northwestern Illinois CoC	348	268	506	676	80	29.9%	-238	-47.0%	-170	-25.1%	-328	-48.5%	2.94%
142	IL-519	West Central Illinois CoC	127	99	148	140	28	28.3%	-49	-33.1%	8	5.7%	-13	-9.3%	1.07%
143	IL-520	Southern Illinois CoC	160	796	796	401	-636	-79.9%	0	0.0%	395	98.5%	-241	-60.1%	1.35%
144	IN-500	South Bend/Mishawaka/St. Joseph County CoC	527	681	584	0	-154	-22.6%	97	16.6%	584	-	527	-	10.12%
145	IN-502	Indiana Balance of State CoC	3,412	3,878	3,878	5,086	-466	-12.0%	0	0.0%	-1,208	-23.8%	-1,674	-32.9%	65.54%
146	IN-503	Indianapolis CoC	1,267	1,364	1,634	1,993	-97	-7.1%	-270	-16.5%	-359	-18.0%	-726	-36.4%	24.34%
147	KS-501	Kansas City/Wyandotte County CoC	180	109	130	100	71	65.1%	-21	-16.2%	30	30.0%	80	80.0%	10.61%
148	KS-502	Wichita/Sedgwick County CoC	352	445	473	394	-93	-20.9%	-28	-5.9%	79	20.1%	-42	-10.7%	20.75%
149	KS-503	Topeka/Shawnee County CoC	198	316	226	457	-118	-27.3%	90	39.8%	-231	-50.5%	-259	-56.7%	11.67%
150	KS-505	Overland Park/Johnson County CoC	166	147	147	157	19	12.9%	0	0.0%	-10	-6.4%	9	5.7%	9.79%
151	KS-507	Kansas Balance of State CoC	800	483	483	2,026	317	65.6%	0	0.0%	-1,543	-76.2%	-1,226	-60.5%	47.17%
152	KY-500	Kentucky Balance of State CoC	2,688	2,416	2,421	3,611	272	11.3%	-5	-0.2%	-1,190	-33.0%	-923	-26.6%	50.73%
153	KY-501	Louisville/Jefferson County CoC	1,361	2,537	2,407	1,465	-1,176	-46.4%	130	5.4%	942	64.3%	-104	-7.1%	25.68%
154	KY-502	Lexington/Fayette County CoC	1,250	1,242	1,112	841	8	0.6%	130	11.7%	271	32.2%	409	48.6%	23.59%
155	LA-500	Lafayette/Acadiana CoC	538	457	457	508	81	17.7%	0	0.0%	-51	-10.0%	30	5.9%	13.06%
156	LA-501	Lake Charles/Southwestern Louisiana	29	54	219	158	-25	-46.3%	-165	-75.3%	61	38.6%	-129	-81.6%	0.70%
157	LA-502	Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest CoC	739	898	723	605	-159	-17.7%	175	24.2%	118	19.5%	134	22.1%	17.95%
158	LA-503	New Orleans/Jefferson Parish CoC	1,340	990	990	1,460	350	35.4%	0	0.0%	-470	-32.2%	-120	-8.2%	32.54%
159	LA-504	Baton Rouge CoC	739	675	801	722	64	9.5%	-126	-15.7%	79	10.9%	17	2.4%	17.95%
160	LA-505	Monroe/Northeast Louisiana CoC	187	201	262	316	-14	-7.0%	-61	-23.3%	-54	-17.1%	-129	-40.8%	4.54%
161	LA-506	Slidell/Livingston/Southeast Louisiana CoC	217	210	203	246	7	3.3%	7	3.4%	-43	-17.5%	-29	-11.8%	5.27%
162	LA-507	Alexandria/Central Louisiana CoC	104	93	140	1,379	11	11.8%	-47	-33.6%	-1,239	-89.8%	-1,275	-92.5%	2.53%
163	LA-508	Houma-Terrebonne CoC	225	122	122	135	103	84.4%	0	0.0%	-13	-9.6%	90	66.7%	5.46%
164	MA-500	Boston CoC	4,882	5,014	4,798	4,956	-132	-2.6%	216	4.5%	-158	-3.2%	-74	-1.5%	33.72%
165	MA-501	Franklin/Holyoke County CoC	1,336	1,013	911	517	323	31.9%	102	11.2%	394	76.2%	819	158.4%	9.23%
166	MA-502	Lynn CoC	580	350	208	189	230	65.7%	142	68.3%	19	10.1%	391	206.9%	4.01%
167	MA-503	Cape Cod/Islands CoC	407	424	368	510	-17	-4.0%	56	15.2%	-142	-27.8%	-103	-20.2%	2.81%
168	MA-504	Springfield CoC	762	676	1,020	410	86	12.7%	-344	-33.7%	610	148.8%	352	85.9%	5.26%
169	MA-505	New Bedford CoC	408	299	356	384	109	36.5%	-57	-16.0%	-28	-7.3%	24	6.3%	2.82%
170	MA-506	Worcester City & County CoC	1,361	1,257	1,268	1,149	104	8.3%	-11	-0.9%	119	10.4%	212	18.5%	9.40%
171	MA-507	Pittsfield/Berkshire County CoC	191	210	315	288	-19	-9.0%	-105	-33.3%	27	9.4%	-97	-33.7%	1.32%
172	MA-508	Lowell CoC	298	390	418	314	-92	-23.6%	-28	-6.7%	104	33.1%	-16	-5.1%	2.06%
173	MA-509	Cambridge CoC	594	424	376	405	170	40.1%	48	12.8%	-29	-7.2%	189	46.7%	4.10%
174	MA-510	Gloucester...Essex County	744	625	584	516	119	19.0%	41	7.0%	68	13.2%	228	44.2%	5.14%
175	MA-511	Quincy/Weymouth CoC	309	233	246	221	76	32.6%	-13	-5.3%	25	11.3%	88	39.8%	2.13%

Continuum of Care Sheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Sheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Sheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
176	MA-512	Lawrence CoC	252	270	291	140	-18	-6.7%	-21	-7.2%	151	107.9%	112	80.0%	1.74%
177	MA-513	Malden/Medford CoC	282	123	115	140	159	129.3%	8	7.0%	-25	-17.9%	142	101.4%	1.95%
178	MA-515	Fall River CoC	144	138	139	143	6	4.3%	-1	-0.7%	-4	-2.8%	1	0.7%	0.99%
179	MA-516	Massachusetts Balance of State CoC	642	373	599	357	269	72.1%	-226	-37.7%	242	67.8%	285	79.8%	4.43%
180	MA-517	Somerville CoC	128	177	196	215	-49	-27.7%	-19	-9.7%	-19	-8.8%	-87	-40.5%	0.88%
181	MA-518	Brookline/Newton CoC	135	118	128	205	17	14.4%	-10	-7.8%	-77	-37.6%	-70	-34.1%	0.93%
182	MA-519	Attleboro/Taunton/Bristol County CoC	113	103	229	230	10	9.7%	-126	-55.0%	-1	-0.4%	-117	-50.9%	0.78%
183	MA-520	Brockton/Plymouth City & County CoC	908	591	573	543	317	53.6%	18	3.1%	30	5.5%	365	67.2%	6.27%
184	MD-500	Cumberland/Allegany County CoC	203	83	141	161	120	144.6%	-58	-41.1%	-20	-12.4%	42	26.1%	2.73%
185	MD-501	Baltimore City CoC	2,191	1,978	1,978	2,321	213	10.8%	0	0.0%	-343	-14.8%	-130	-5.6%	29.43%
186	MD-502	Harford County CoC	128	132	132	95	-4	-3.0%	0	0.0%	37	38.9%	33	34.7%	1.72%
187	MD-503	Annapolis/Anne Arundel County CoC	232	240	218	208	-8	-3.3%	22	10.1%	10	4.8%	24	11.5%	3.12%
188	MD-504	Howard County CoC	133	135	151	153	-2	-1.5%	-16	-10.6%	-2	-1.3%	-20	-13.1%	1.79%
189	MD-505	Baltimore County CoC	1,114	393	576	510	721	183.5%	-183	-31.8%	66	12.9%	604	118.4%	14.96%
190	MD-506	Carroll County CoC	123	161	161	186	-38	-23.6%	0	0.0%	-25	-13.4%	-63	-33.9%	1.65%
191	MD-507	Cecil County CoC	146	139	117	80	7	5.0%	22	18.8%	37	46.3%	66	82.5%	1.96%
192	MD-508	Charles, Calvert, St.Mary's CoC	536	253	302	370	283	111.9%	-49	-16.2%	-68	-18.4%	166	44.9%	7.20%
193	MD-509	Frederick City & County CoC	257	224	214	198	33	14.7%	10	4.7%	16	8.1%	59	29.8%	3.45%
194	MD-510	Garrett County CoC	4	63	63	42	-59	-93.7%	0	0.0%	21	50.0%	-38	-90.5%	0.05%
195	MD-511	Mid-Shore Regional CoC	138	139	139	75	-1	-0.7%	0	0.0%	64	85.3%	63	84.0%	1.85%
196	MD-512	Hagerstown/Washington County CoC	110	192	209	219	-82	-42.7%	-17	-8.1%	-10	-4.6%	-109	-49.8%	1.48%
197	MD-513	Wicomico/Somerset/Worcester CoC	240	214	178	157	26	12.1%	36	20.2%	21	13.4%	83	52.9%	3.22%
198	MD-600	Bowie/Prince George's County CoC	771	798	823	890	-27	-3.4%	-25	-3.0%	-67	-7.5%	-119	-13.4%	10.35%
199	MD-601	Montgomery County CoC	1,120	910	1,016	991	210	23.1%	-106	-10.4%	25	2.5%	129	13.0%	15.04%
200	ME-500	Maine Balance of State CoC	1,276	1,341	1,358	1,277	-65	-4.8%	-17	-1.3%	81	6.3%	-1	-0.1%	53.03%
201	ME-501	Bangor/Penobscot County CoC	465	523	486	539	-58	-11.1%	37	7.6%	-53	-9.8%	-74	-13.7%	19.33%
202	ME-502	Portland CoC	665	724	732	773	-59	-8.1%	-8	-1.1%	-41	-5.3%	-108	-14.0%	27.64%
203	MI-500	Michigan Balance of State CoC	1,874	1,319	1,319	1,377	555	42.1%	0	0.0%	-58	-4.2%	497	36.1%	16.59%
204	MI-501	Detroit CoC	3,432	4,738	4,738	4,311	-1,306	-27.6%	0	0.0%	427	9.9%	-879	-20.4%	30.38%
205	MI-502	Dearborn/Wayne County CoC	422	618	618	503	-196	-31.7%	0	0.0%	115	22.9%	-81	-16.1%	3.74%
206	MI-503	St. Clair Shores/Warren/Macomb County	292	251	251	314	41	16.3%	0	0.0%	-63	-20.1%	-22	-7.0%	2.58%
207	MI-504	Pontiac/Royal Oak/Oakland County	381	402	402	598	-21	-5.2%	0	0.0%	-196	-32.8%	-217	-36.3%	3.37%
208	MI-505	Flint/Genesee County CoC	193	227	213	293	-34	-15.0%	14	6.6%	-80	-27.3%	-100	-34.1%	1.71%
209	MI-506	Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County	834	752	807	814	82	10.9%	-55	-6.8%	-7	-0.9%	20	2.5%	7.38%
210	MI-507	Portage/Kalamazoo City & County	971	783	593	411	188	24.0%	190	32.0%	182	44.3%	560	136.3%	8.59%
211	MI-508	Lansing/East Lansing/Ingham County	396	391	391	347	5	1.3%	0	0.0%	44	12.7%	49	14.1%	3.51%
212	MI-509	Ann Arbor/Washtenaw County CoC	307	357	357	252	-50	-14.0%	0	0.0%	105	41.7%	55	21.8%	2.72%
213	MI-510	Saginaw City & County CoC	278	274	274	268	4	1.5%	0	0.0%	6	2.2%	10	3.7%	2.46%
214	MI-511	Lenawee County CoC	109	85	85	85	24	28.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	28.2%	0.96%
215	MI-512	Grand Traverse/Antrim, Leelanau Counties	279	216	216	109	63	29.2%	0	0.0%	107	98.2%	170	156.0%	2.47%
216	MI-513	Marquette/Alger Counties CoC	63	37	37	78	26	70.3%	0	0.0%	-41	-52.6%	-15	-19.2%	0.56%
217	MI-514	Battle Creek/Calhoun County CoC	185	164	117	98	21	12.8%	47	40.2%	19	19.4%	87	88.8%	1.64%
218	MI-515	Monroe County CoC	136	131	131	56	5	3.8%	0	0.0%	75	133.9%	80	142.9%	1.20%
219	MI-516	Norton Shores/Muskegon City & County	145	171	147	223	-26	-15.2%	24	16.3%	-76	-34.1%	-78	-35.0%	1.28%
220	MI-517	Jackson City & County CoC	304	344	282	328	-40	-11.6%	62	22.0%	-46	-14.0%	-24	-7.3%	2.69%
221	MI-518	Livingston County CoC	108	58	58	57	50	86.2%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	51	89.5%	0.96%
222	MI-519	Holland/Ottawa County CoC	297	291	306	0	6	2.1%	-15	-4.9%	306	-	297	-	2.63%
223	MI-522	Alpena, Iosca, Presque Isle/NE Michigan CoC	157	67	67	0	90	134.3%	0	0.0%	67	-	157	-	1.39%
224	MI-523	Eaton County CoC	135	105	105	110	30	28.6%	0	0.0%	-5	-4.5%	25	22.7%	1.19%
225	MN-500	Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC	3,025	2,813	2,428	3,058	212	7.5%	385	15.9%	-630	-20.6%	-33	-1.1%	44.67%
226	MN-501	Saint Paul/Ramsey County CoC	1,284	1,170	1,170	809	114	9.7%	0	0.0%	361	44.6%	475	58.7%	18.96%
227	MN-502	Rochester/Southeast Minnesota CoC	413	413	413	420	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-7	-1.7%	-7	-1.7%	6.10%
228	MN-503	Dakota County CoC	545	476	303	264	69	14.5%	173	57.1%	39	14.8%	281	106.4%	8.05%
229	MN-504	Northeast Minnesota CoC	120	114	116	90	6	5.3%	-2	-1.7%	26	28.9%	30	33.3%	1.77%
230	MN-505	St. Cloud/Central Minnesota CoC	343	313	313	306	30	9.6%	0	0.0%	7	2.3%	37	12.1%	5.06%
231	MN-506	Northwest Minnesota CoC	225	199	235	99	26	13.1%	-36	-15.3%	136	137.4%	126	127.3%	3.32%
232	MN-508	Moorehead/West Central Minnesota	192	165	165	160	27	16.4%	0	0.0%	5	3.1%	32	20.0%	2.84%
233	MN-509	Duluth/Saint Louis County CoC	356	294	294	333	62	21.1%	0	0.0%	-39	-11.7%	23	6.9%	5.26%

Continuum of Care Sheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Sheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Sheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
234	MN-510	Scott, Carver Counties CoC	188	188	106	75	0	0.0%	82	77.4%	31	41.3%	113	150.7%	2.78%
235	MN-511	Southwest Minnesota CoC	81	125	80	37	-44	-35.2%	45	56.3%	43	116.2%	44	118.9%	1.20%
236	MO-500	St. Louis County CoC	414	396	290	326	18	4.5%	106	36.6%	-36	-11.0%	88	27.0%	7.57%
237	MO-501	St. Louis City CoC	973	1,173	1,173	930	-200	-17.1%	0	0.0%	243	26.1%	43	4.6%	17.79%
238	MO-503	St. Charles CoC	549	305	227	133	244	80.0%	78	34.4%	94	70.7%	416	312.8%	10.04%
239	MO-600	Springfield/Webster Counties CoC	383	506	478	495	-123	-24.3%	28	5.9%	-17	-3.4%	-112	-22.6%	7.00%
240	MO-602	Joplin/Jasper/Newton County CoC	285	307	298	232	-22	-7.2%	9	3.0%	66	28.4%	53	22.8%	5.21%
241	MO-603	St. Joseph/Buchanan County CoC	155	131	100	88	24	18.3%	31	31.0%	12	13.6%	67	76.1%	2.83%
242	MO-604	Kansas City/Lee's Summit CoC	1,390	1,560	1,445	3,590	-170	-10.9%	115	8.0%	-2,145	-59.7%	-2,200	-61.3%	25.42%
243	MO-606	Clay, Platte Counties CoC	1,320	1,229	1,050	914	91	7.4%	179	17.0%	136	14.9%	406	44.4%	24.14%
244	MS-500	Jackson/Rankin, Madison Counties CoC	426	795	440	514	-369	-46.4%	355	80.7%	-74	-14.4%	-88	-17.1%	34.89%
245	MS-501	Mississippi Balance of State CoC	660	344	344	1,665	316	91.9%	0	0.0%	-1,321	-79.3%	-1,005	-60.4%	54.05%
246	MS-503	Gulf Port/Gulf Coast Regional CoC	135	67	67	454	68	101.5%	0	0.0%	-387	-85.2%	-319	-70.3%	11.06%
247	MT-500	Montana Statewide CoC	833	1,007	855	879	-174	-17.3%	152	17.8%	-24	-2.7%	-46	-5.2%	100.00%
248	NC-500	Winston Salem/Forsyth County CoC	421	423	479	1,001	-2	-0.5%	-56	-11.7%	-522	-52.1%	-580	-57.9%	4.97%
249	NC-501	Asheville/Buncombe County CoC	426	429	448	418	-3	-0.7%	-19	-4.2%	30	7.2%	8	1.9%	5.03%
250	NC-502	Durham City & County CoC	502	554	502	460	-52	-9.4%	52	10.4%	42	9.1%	42	9.1%	5.92%
251	NC-503	North Carolina Balance of State	2,009	1,732	1,460	645	277	16.0%	272	18.6%	815	126.4%	1,364	211.5%	23.71%
252	NC-504	Greensboro/High Point CoC	948	879	980	880	69	7.8%	-101	-10.3%	100	11.4%	68	7.7%	11.19%
253	NC-505	Charlotte/Mecklenburg County CoC	2,044	1,550	1,648	1,448	494	31.9%	-98	-5.9%	200	13.8%	596	41.2%	24.12%
254	NC-506	Wilmington/Brunswick/Pender CoC	468	427	419	285	41	9.6%	8	1.9%	134	47.0%	183	64.2%	5.52%
255	NC-507	Raleigh/Wake County CoC	905	1,071	973	875	-166	-15.5%	98	10.1%	98	11.2%	30	3.4%	10.68%
256	NC-509	Gastonia/Cleveland/Lincoln CoC	224	257	214	204	-33	-12.8%	43	20.1%	10	4.9%	20	9.8%	2.64%
257	NC-511	Fayetteville/Cumberland County CoC	263	266	313	331	-3	-1.1%	-47	-15.0%	-18	-5.4%	-68	-20.5%	3.10%
258	NC-513	Chapel Hill/Orange County CoC	151	177	183	205	-26	-14.7%	-6	-3.3%	-22	-10.7%	-54	-26.3%	1.78%
259	NC-516	Northwest North Carolina CoC	112	162	168	116	-50	-30.9%	-6	-3.6%	52	44.8%	-4	-3.4%	1.32%
260	ND-500	North Dakota Statewide CoC	765	596	577	537	169	28.4%	19	3.3%	40	7.4%	228	42.5%	100.00%
261	NE-500	North Central Nebraska CoC	492	840	167	240	-348	-41.4%	673	403.0%	-73	-30.4%	252	105.0%	15.98%
262	NE-501	Omaha/Council Bluffs CoC	1,201	1,125	1,632	1,443	76	6.8%	-507	-31.1%	189	13.1%	-242	-16.8%	39.01%
263	NE-502	Lincoln CoC	947	865	838	833	82	9.5%	27	3.2%	5	0.6%	114	13.7%	30.76%
264	NE-503	Southwest Nebraska CoC	95	72	72	80	23	31.9%	0	0.0%	-8	-10.0%	15	18.8%	3.09%
265	NE-504	Southeast Nebraska CoC	144	177	101	149	-33	-18.6%	76	75.2%	-48	-32.2%	-5	-3.4%	4.68%
266	NE-505	Panhandle of Nebraska CoC	85	79	122	179	6	7.6%	-43	-35.2%	-57	-31.8%	-94	-52.5%	2.76%
267	NE-506	Northeast Nebraska CoC	115	69	75	67	46	66.7%	-6	-8.0%	8	11.9%	48	71.6%	3.73%
268	NH-500	New Hampshire Balance of State CoC	719	830	769	612	-111	-13.4%	61	7.9%	157	25.7%	107	17.5%	51.14%
269	NH-501	Manchester CoC	337	373	307	484	-36	-9.7%	66	21.5%	-177	-36.6%	-147	-30.4%	23.97%
270	NH-502	Nashua/Hillsborough County CoC	350	332	197	212	18	5.4%	135	68.5%	-15	-7.1%	138	65.1%	24.89%
271	NJ-500	Atlantic City & County CoC	339	398	425	396	-59	-14.8%	-27	-6.4%	29	7.3%	-57	-14.4%	2.86%
272	NJ-501	Bergen County CoC	1,354	1,514	1,210	993	-160	-10.6%	304	25.1%	217	21.9%	361	36.4%	11.41%
273	NJ-502	Burlington County CoC	949	780	780	742	169	21.7%	0	0.0%	38	5.1%	207	27.9%	7.99%
274	NJ-503	Camden City & County CoC	425	446	639	595	-21	-4.7%	-193	-30.2%	44	7.4%	-170	-28.6%	3.58%
275	NJ-504	Newark/Essex County CoC	1,539	884	1,906	1,262	655	74.1%	-1,022	-53.6%	644	51.0%	277	21.9%	12.96%
276	NJ-505	Gloucester County CoC	190	176	137	200	14	8.0%	39	28.5%	-63	-31.5%	-10	-5.0%	1.60%
277	NJ-506	Jersey City/Hudson County CoC	1,650	1,976	2,678	2,677	-326	-16.5%	-702	-26.2%	1	0.0%	-1,027	-38.4%	13.90%
278	NJ-507	New Brunswick/Middlesex County CoC	583	545	728	468	38	7.0%	-183	-25.1%	260	55.6%	115	24.6%	4.91%
279	NJ-508	Monmouth County CoC	638	676	757	1,064	-38	-5.6%	-81	-10.7%	-307	-28.9%	-426	-40.0%	5.37%
280	NJ-509	Morris County CoC	257	189	229	330	68	36.0%	-40	-17.5%	-101	-30.6%	-73	-22.1%	2.16%
281	NJ-510	Lakewood Township/Ocean County	406	309	381	515	97	31.4%	-72	-18.9%	-134	-26.0%	-109	-21.2%	3.42%
282	NJ-511	Paterson/Passaic County CoC	207	314	831	856	-107	-34.1%	-517	-62.2%	-25	-2.9%	-649	-75.8%	1.74%
283	NJ-512	Salem County CoC	146	302	454	178	-156	-51.7%	-152	-33.5%	276	155.1%	-32	-18.0%	1.23%
284	NJ-513	Somerset County CoC	283	285	343	450	-2	-0.7%	-58	-16.9%	-107	-23.8%	-167	-37.1%	2.38%
285	NJ-514	Trenton/Mercer County CoC	1,020	851	1,242	648	169	19.9%	-391	-31.5%	594	91.7%	372	57.4%	8.59%
286	NJ-515	Elizabeth/Union County CoC	1,077	1,072	1,072	1,267	5	0.5%	0	0.0%	-195	-15.4%	-190	-15.0%	9.07%
287	NJ-516	Warren County CoC	397	394	215	230	3	0.8%	179	83.3%	-15	-6.5%	167	72.6%	3.34%
288	NJ-518	Cape May County CoC	221	286	242	259	-65	-22.7%	44	18.2%	-17	-6.6%	-38	-14.7%	1.86%
289	NJ-519	Sussex County CoC	104	260	355	354	-156	-60.0%	-95	-26.8%	1	0.3%	-250	-70.6%	0.88%
290	NJ-520	Cumberland County CoC	86	203	106	84	-117	-57.6%	97	91.5%	22	26.2%	2	2.4%	0.72%
291	NM-500	Albuquerque CoC	1,071	989	989	1,168	82	8.3%	0	0.0%	-179	-15.3%	-97	-8.3%	50.81%

Continuum of Care Sheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Sheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Sheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
292	NM-501	New Mexico Balance of State CoC	1,037	759	759	881	278	36.6%	0	0.0%	-122	-13.8%	156	17.7%	49.19%
293	NV-500	Las Vegas/Clark County CoC	7,004	3,844	3,844	2,774	3,160	82.2%	0	0.0%	1,070	38.6%	4,230	152.5%	89.89%
294	NV-501	Reno/Sparks/Washoe County CoC	645	765	765	377	-120	-15.7%	0	0.0%	388	102.9%	268	71.1%	8.28%
295	NV-502	Nevada Balance of State CoC	143	254	209	185	-111	-43.7%	45	21.5%	24	13.0%	-42	-22.7%	1.84%
296	NY-500	Rochester/Monroe County	663	591	602	666	72	12.2%	-11	-1.8%	-64	-9.6%	-3	-0.5%	1.15%
297	NY-501	Elmira/Chemung County CoC	178	176	174	158	2	1.1%	2	1.1%	16	10.1%	20	12.7%	0.31%
298	NY-502	City of Auburn/Cayuga County CoC	39	33	33	44	6	18.2%	0	0.0%	-11	-25.0%	-5	-11.4%	0.07%
299	NY-503	Albany City & County CoC	604	466	539	361	138	29.6%	-73	-13.5%	178	49.3%	243	67.3%	1.05%
300	NY-504	Cattaraugus County CoC	57	54	104	559	3	5.6%	-50	-48.1%	-455	-81.4%	-502	-89.8%	0.10%
301	NY-505	Syracuse/Onondaga County CoC	785	675	729	737	110	16.3%	-54	-7.4%	-8	-1.1%	48	6.5%	1.37%
302	NY-506	Fulton/Montgomery/Schoharie	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03%
303	NY-507	Schenectady City & County CoC	196	129	209	253	67	51.9%	-80	-38.3%	-44	-17.4%	-57	-22.5%	0.34%
304	NY-508	Buffalo/Erie County CoC	747	859	1,008	1,036	-112	-13.0%	-149	-14.8%	-28	-2.7%	-289	-27.9%	1.30%
305	NY-509	Oswego County CoC	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.03%
306	NY-510	Tompkins County CoC	65	62	62	72	3	4.8%	0	0.0%	-10	-13.9%	-7	-9.7%	0.11%
307	NY-511	Broome County/City of Binghamton	202	-	167	190	-	-	-	-	-23	-12.1%	12	6.3%	0.35%
308	NY-512	Troy/Rensselaer County CoC	260	134	166	237	126	94.0%	-32	-19.3%	-71	-30.0%	23	9.7%	0.45%
309	NY-513	Wayne County CoC	81	88	98	40	-7	-8.0%	-10	-10.2%	58	145.0%	41	102.5%	0.14%
310	NY-514	Jamestown/Dunkirk/Chautauqua County CoC	123	63	67	0	60	95.2%	-4	-6.0%	67	-	123	-	0.21%
311	NY-515	Cortland County CoC	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
312	NY-516	Clinton County CoC	124	48	48	0	76	158.3%	0	0.0%	48	-	124	-	0.22%
313	NY-517	Orleans County CoC	25	34	34	28	-9	-26.5%	0	0.0%	6	21.4%	-3	-10.7%	0.04%
314	NY-518	Utica/Rome/Oneida County CoC	326	300	300	314	26	8.7%	0	0.0%	-14	-4.5%	12	3.8%	0.57%
315	NY-519	Columbia/Greene County CoC	260	172	311	311	88	51.2%	-139	-44.7%	0	0.0%	-51	-16.4%	0.45%
316	NY-520	Franklin County CoC	5	6	27	27	-1	-16.7%	-21	-77.8%	0	0.0%	-22	-81.5%	0.01%
317	NY-522	Jefferson County CoC	275	292	0	144	-17	-5.8%	292	-	-144	-100.0%	131	91.0%	0.48%
318	NY-523	Saratoga	164	117	146	234	47	40.2%	-29	-19.9%	-88	-37.6%	-70	-29.9%	0.29%
319	NY-524	Niagara CoC	168	138	161	155	30	21.7%	-23	-14.3%	6	3.9%	13	8.4%	0.29%
320	NY-600	New York City CoC	47,015	46,955	46,617	51,664	60	0.1%	338	0.7%	-5,047	-9.8%	-4,649	-9.0%	81.83%
321	NY-601	Poughkeepsie/Dutchess County CoC	404	463	463	457	-59	-12.7%	0	0.0%	6	1.3%	-53	-11.6%	0.70%
322	NY-602	Newburgh/Middletown/Orange County CoC	345	217	227	302	128	59.0%	-10	-4.4%	-75	-24.8%	43	14.2%	0.60%
323	NY-603	Islip/Suffolk County CoC	1,735	1,661	1,661	2,532	74	4.5%	0	0.0%	-871	-34.4%	-797	-31.5%	3.02%
324	NY-604	Yonkers/Westchester County CoC	1,365	1,693	1,693	1,878	-328	-19.4%	0	0.0%	-185	-9.9%	-513	-27.3%	2.38%
325	NY-605	Nassau County CoC	595	690	690	1,124	-95	-13.8%	0	0.0%	-434	-38.6%	-529	-47.1%	1.04%
326	NY-606	Rockland County CoC	77	84	435	214	-7	-8.3%	-351	-80.7%	221	103.3%	-137	-64.0%	0.13%
327	NY-607	Sullivan County CoC	366	109	267	225	257	235.8%	-158	-59.2%	42	18.7%	141	62.7%	0.64%
328	NY-608	Ulster County CoC	167	207	158	255	-40	-19.3%	49	31.0%	-97	-38.0%	-88	-34.5%	0.29%
329	OH-500	Cincinnati/Hamilton County CoC	1,097	1,061	987	1,145	36	3.4%	74	7.5%	-158	-13.8%	-48	-4.2%	10.04%
330	OH-501	Toledo/Lucas County CoC	727	705	631	597	22	3.1%	74	11.7%	34	5.7%	130	21.8%	6.65%
331	OH-502	Cleveland/Cuyahoga County CoC	2,105	2,091	2,001	2,059	14	0.7%	90	4.5%	-58	-2.8%	46	2.2%	19.26%
332	OH-503	Columbus/Franklin County CoC	1,251	1,224	1,259	1,168	27	2.2%	-35	-2.8%	91	7.8%	83	7.1%	11.45%
333	OH-504	Youngstown/Mahoning County CoC	177	225	232	239	-48	-21.3%	-7	-3.0%	-7	-2.9%	-62	-25.9%	1.62%
334	OH-505	Dayton/Kettering/Montgomery CoC	823	814	719	523	9	1.1%	95	13.2%	196	37.5%	300	57.4%	7.53%
335	OH-506	Akron/Baberton/Summit County CoC	658	636	632	833	22	3.5%	4	0.6%	-201	-24.1%	-175	-21.0%	6.02%
336	OH-507	Ohio Balance of State CoC	3,758	3,225	2,498	4,392	533	16.5%	727	29.1%	-1,894	-43.1%	-634	-14.4%	34.39%
337	OH-508	Canton/Stark County CoC	333	396	421	399	-63	-15.9%	-25	-5.9%	22	5.5%	-66	-16.5%	3.05%
338	OK-500	North Central Oklahoma CoC	172	215	173	173	-43	-20.0%	42	24.3%	0	0.0%	-1	-0.6%	5.20%
339	OK-501	Tulsa City & County/Broken Arrow	797	694	594	524	103	14.8%	100	16.8%	70	13.4%	273	52.1%	24.10%
340	OK-502	Oklahoma City CoC	1,103	1,013	1,278	1,293	90	8.9%	-265	-20.7%	-15	-1.2%	-190	-14.7%	33.35%
341	OK-503	Oklahoma Balance of State CoC	289	151	149	138	138	91.4%	2	1.3%	11	8.0%	151	109.4%	8.74%
342	OK-504	Norman / Cleveland County	289	178	322	201	111	62.4%	-144	-44.7%	121	60.2%	88	43.8%	8.74%
343	OK-505	Northeast Oklahoma CoC	264	202	150	177	62	30.7%	52	34.7%	-27	-15.3%	87	49.2%	7.98%
344	OK-506	Southwest Oklahoma CoC	252	152	226	77	100	65.8%	-74	-32.7%	149	193.5%	175	227.3%	7.62%
345	OK-507	Southeastern CoC	141	198	197	160	-57	-28.8%	1	0.5%	37	23.1%	-19	-11.9%	4.26%
346	OR-500	Eugene/Springfield/Lane County CoC	999	1,365	1,560	1,184	-366	-26.8%	-195	-12.5%	376	31.8%	-185	-15.6%	13.42%
347	OR-501	Portland/Gresham/Multnomah	2,494	2,284	2,284	2,749	210	9.2%	0	0.0%	-465	-16.9%	-255	-9.3%	33.51%
348	OR-502	Medford/Ashland/Jackson County CoC	854	628	351	199	226	36.0%	277	78.9%	152	76.4%	655	329.1%	11.48%
349	OR-503	Central Oregon CoC	310	270	315	352	40	14.8%	-45	-14.3%	-37	-10.5%	-42	-11.9%	4.17%

Continuum of Care Sheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Sheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Sheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
350	OR-504	Salem/Marion/Polk County CoC	666	581	581	570	85	14.6%	0	0.0%	11	1.9%	96	16.8%	8.95%
351	OR-505	Oregon Balance of State CoC	1,780	4,289	2,804	2,212	-2,509	-58.5%	1,485	53.0%	592	26.8%	-432	-19.5%	23.92%
352	OR-506	Hillsboro/Beaverton/Washington County	212	363	268	245	-151	-41.6%	95	35.4%	23	9.4%	-33	-13.5%	2.85%
353	OR-507	Clackamas County CoC	127	166	166	167	-39	-23.5%	0	0.0%	-1	-0.6%	-40	-24.0%	1.71%
354	PA-500	Philadelphia CoC	5,798	6,414	7,193	6,477	-616	-9.6%	-779	-10.8%	716	11.1%	-679	-10.5%	41.96%
355	PA-501	Harrisburg/Dauphin County CoC	365	355	358	394	10	2.8%	-3	-0.8%	-36	-9.1%	-29	-7.4%	2.64%
356	PA-502	Upper Darby/Delaware County	727	610	659	700	117	19.2%	-49	-7.4%	-41	-5.9%	27	3.9%	5.26%
357	PA-503	Wilkes-Barre/Luzerne County	199	161	165	154	38	23.6%	-4	-2.4%	11	7.1%	45	29.2%	1.44%
358	PA-504	Lower Marion/Montgomery	431	455	407	576	-24	-5.3%	48	11.8%	-169	-29.3%	-145	-25.2%	3.12%
359	PA-505	Chester County CoC	334	286	300	247	48	16.8%	-14	-4.7%	53	21.5%	87	35.2%	2.42%
360	PA-506	Reading/Berks County CoC	378	429	681	392	-51	-11.9%	-252	-37.0%	289	73.7%	-14	-3.6%	2.74%
361	PA-507	Altoona/Central Pennsylvania CoC	1,076	974	952	818	102	10.5%	22	2.3%	134	16.4%	258	31.5%	7.79%
362	PA-508	Scranton/Lackawanna County CoC	228	222	202	214	6	2.7%	20	9.9%	-12	-5.6%	14	6.5%	1.65%
363	PA-509	Allentown/Northeast Pennsylvania CoC	695	672	597	547	23	3.4%	75	12.6%	50	9.1%	148	27.1%	5.03%
364	PA-510	Lancaster City & County CoC	649	668	549	511	-19	-2.8%	119	21.7%	38	7.4%	138	27.0%	4.70%
365	PA-511	Bristol/Bensalem/Bucks County CoC	440	481	254	346	-41	-8.5%	227	89.4%	-92	-26.6%	94	27.2%	3.18%
366	PA-600	Pittsburgh, Allegheny County CoC	1,136	1,088	1,132	1,216	48	4.4%	-44	-3.9%	-84	-6.9%	-80	-6.6%	8.22%
367	PA-601	Southwest Pennsylvania CoC	555	523	570	508	32	6.1%	-47	-8.2%	62	12.2%	47	9.3%	4.02%
368	PA-602	Northwest Pennsylvania CoC	256	272	274	268	-16	-5.9%	-2	-0.7%	6	2.2%	-12	-4.5%	1.85%
369	PA-603	Beaver County CoC	202	131	131	109	71	54.2%	0	0.0%	22	20.2%	93	85.3%	1.46%
370	PA-605	Erie City & County CoC	350	338	317	306	12	3.6%	21	6.6%	11	3.6%	44	14.4%	2.53%
371	PR-502	Puerto Rico Balance of Commonwealth	868	8	566	499	860	10750.0%	-558	-98.6%	67	13.4%	369	73.9%	65.51%
372	PR-503	South/Southeast Puerto Rico CoC	457	802	802	927	-345	-43.0%	0	0.0%	-125	-13.5%	-470	-50.7%	34.49%
373	RI-500	Rhode Island Statewide CoC	1,556	1,142	1,323	1,332	414	36.3%	-181	-13.7%	-9	-0.7%	224	16.8%	100.00%
374	SC-500	Charleston/Low Country CoC	347	482	482	2,436	-135	-28.0%	0	0.0%	-1,954	-80.2%	-2,089	-85.8%	11.43%
375	SC-501	Greenville/Anderson/Spartanburg Upstate	1,008	1,100	1,100	1,202	-92	-8.4%	0	0.0%	-102	-8.5%	-194	-16.1%	33.20%
376	SC-502	Columbia Midlands CoC	929	946	946	1,241	-17	-1.8%	0	0.0%	-295	-23.8%	-312	-25.1%	30.60%
377	SC-503	Myrtle Beach/Sumter City & County	639	431	431	460	208	48.3%	0	0.0%	-29	-6.3%	179	38.9%	21.05%
378	SC-504	Florence City & County/Pee Dee CoC	113	127	127	125	-14	-11.0%	0	0.0%	2	1.6%	-12	-9.6%	3.72%
379	SD-500	South Dakota Statewide CoC	667	538	538	987	129	24.0%	0	0.0%	-449	-45.5%	-320	-32.4%	100.00%
380	TN-500	Chattanooga/Southeast Tennessee CoC	306	72	307	382	234	325.0%	-235	-76.5%	-75	-19.6%	-76	-19.9%	4.29%
381	TN-501	Memphis/Shelby County CoC	1,544	1,482	1,744	1,582	62	4.2%	-262	-15.0%	162	10.2%	-38	-2.4%	21.65%
382	TN-502	Knoxville/Knox County CoC	842	816	830	709	26	3.2%	-14	-1.7%	121	17.1%	133	18.8%	11.80%
383	TN-503	South Central Tennessee CoC	181	239	281	248	-58	-24.3%	-42	-14.9%	33	13.3%	-67	-27.0%	2.54%
384	TN-504	Nashville/Davidson County CoC	1,838	1,751	1,766	1,486	87	5.0%	-15	-0.8%	280	18.8%	352	23.7%	25.77%
385	TN-506	Oak Ridge/Upper Cumberland CoC	196	196	196	382	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-186	-48.7%	-186	-48.7%	2.75%
386	TN-507	Jackson/West Tennessee CoC	1,126	251	254	243	875	348.6%	-3	-1.2%	11	4.5%	883	363.4%	15.79%
387	TN-509	Appalachian Regional CoC	641	345	345	314	296	85.8%	0	0.0%	31	9.9%	327	104.1%	8.99%
388	TN-510	Murfreesboro/Rutherford City CoC	112	75	290	260	37	49.3%	-215	-74.1%	30	11.5%	-148	-56.9%	1.57%
389	TN-512	Morristown/Tennessee Valley CoC	347	433	433	0	-86	-19.9%	0	0.0%	433	-	347	-	4.86%
390	TX-500	San Antonio/Bexar County CoC	1,583	2,518	1,798	1,278	-935	-37.1%	720	40.0%	520	40.7%	305	23.9%	7.31%
391	TX-501	Corpus Christi/Nueces County CoC	346	163	163	334	183	112.3%	0	0.0%	-171	-51.2%	12	3.6%	1.60%
392	TX-503	Austin/Travis County CoC	1,418	1,305	1,395	1,171	113	8.7%	-90	-6.5%	224	19.1%	247	21.1%	6.55%
393	TX-504	Dewitt, Lavaca, Victoria Counties CoC	118	309	309	60	-191	-61.8%	0	0.0%	249	415.0%	58	96.7%	0.54%
394	TX-600	Dallas City & County/Irving CoC	3,525	3,345	3,041	2,984	180	5.4%	304	10.0%	57	1.9%	541	18.1%	16.28%
395	TX-601	Fort Worth/Arlington/Tarrant County	1,986	2,473	2,675	2,814	-487	-19.7%	-202	-7.6%	-139	-4.9%	-828	-29.4%	9.17%
396	TX-603	El Paso City & County CoC	964	968	968	1,017	-4	-0.4%	0	0.0%	-49	-4.8%	-53	-5.2%	4.45%
397	TX-604	Waco/McLennan County CoC	226	259	259	202	-33	-12.7%	0	0.0%	57	28.2%	24	11.9%	1.04%
398	TX-607	Texas Balance of State CoC	2,569	5,503	5,503	2,669	-2,934	-53.3%	0	0.0%	2,834	106.2%	-100	-3.7%	11.86%
399	TX-610	Denton City & County CoC	93	90	111	184	3	3.3%	-21	-18.9%	-73	-39.7%	-91	-49.5%	0.43%
400	TX-611	Amarillo CoC	439	486	298	330	-47	-9.7%	188	63.1%	-32	-9.7%	109	33.0%	2.03%
401	TX-613	Longview/Marshall Area CoC	429	334	260	136	95	28.4%	74	28.5%	124	91.2%	293	215.4%	1.98%
402	TX-624	Wichita Falls/Archer County CoC	235	231	214	0	4	1.7%	17	7.9%	214	-	235	-	1.09%
403	TX-700	Houston/Harris County CoC	5,457	5,017	5,017	0	440	8.8%	0	0.0%	5,017	-	5,457	-	25.20%
404	TX-701	Bryan/College Station/Brazos	181	219	219	0	-38	-17.4%	0	0.0%	219	-	181	-	0.84%
405	TX-702	Conroe/Montgomery County CoC	168	131	0	0	37	28.2%	131	-	0	-	168	-	0.78%
406	TX-703	Beaumont/South East Texas	795	468	468	0	327	69.9%	0	0.0%	468	-	795	-	3.67%
407	TX-704	Galveston/Gulf Coast CoC	1,126	261	184	0	865	331.4%	77	41.8%	184	-	1,126	-	5.20%

Continuum of Care Sheltered Point-in-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Sheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Sheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
408	UT-500	Salt Lake City & County CoC	1,699	2,138	1,881	2,202	-439	-20.5%	257	13.7%	-321	-14.6%	-503	-22.8%	47.99%
409	UT-503	Utah Balance of State CoC	1,586	827	630	834	759	91.8%	197	31.3%	-204	-24.5%	752	90.2%	44.80%
410	UT-504	Provo/Mountainland CoC	255	213	187	211	42	19.7%	26	13.9%	-24	-11.4%	44	20.9%	7.20%
411	VA-500	Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover Counties CoC	1,078	907	1,014	727	171	18.9%	-107	-10.6%	287	39.5%	351	48.3%	14.80%
412	VA-501	Norfolk CoC	486	441	436	536	45	10.2%	5	1.1%	-100	-18.7%	-50	-9.3%	6.67%
413	VA-502	Roanoke City & County/Salem CoC	586	497	528	363	89	17.9%	-31	-5.9%	165	45.5%	223	61.4%	8.05%
414	VA-503	Virginia Beach CoC	394	406	430	335	-12	-3.0%	-24	-5.6%	95	28.4%	59	17.6%	5.41%
415	VA-504	Charlottesville CoC	185	224	237	163	-39	-17.4%	-13	-5.5%	74	45.4%	22	13.5%	2.54%
416	VA-505	Newport News/Virginia Peninsula CoC	514	486	569	622	28	5.8%	-83	-14.6%	-53	-8.5%	-108	-17.4%	7.06%
417	VA-507	Portsmouth CoC	193	177	165	217	16	9.0%	12	7.3%	-52	-24.0%	-24	-11.1%	2.65%
418	VA-508	Lynchburg CoC	211	211	98	98	0	0.0%	113	115.3%	0	0.0%	113	115.3%	2.90%
419	VA-509	Petersburg CoC	67	29	39	69	38	131.0%	-10	-25.6%	-30	-43.5%	-2	-2.9%	0.92%
420	VA-510	Staunton/Waynesboro/Augusta, Highland Counties CoC	99	94	94	0	5	5.3%	0	0.0%	94	-	99	-	1.36%
421	VA-512	Chesapeake CoC	17	38	86	21	-21	-55.3%	-48	-55.8%	65	309.5%	-4	-19.0%	0.23%
422	VA-513	Shenandoah/Warren Counties CoC	57	127	218	827	-70	-55.1%	-91	-41.7%	-609	-73.6%	-770	-93.1%	0.78%
423	VA-514	Fredericksburg/Stafford Counties CoC	95	127	515	413	-32	-25.2%	-388	-75.3%	102	24.7%	-318	-77.0%	1.30%
424	VA-517	Danville, Martinsville CoC	56	77	69	59	-21	-27.3%	8	11.6%	10	16.9%	-3	-5.1%	0.77%
425	VA-518	Harrisburg/ Rockingham County CoC	111	61	108	89	50	82.0%	-47	-43.5%	19	21.3%	22	24.7%	1.52%
426	VA-519	Suffolk CoC	50	30	21	9	20	66.7%	9	42.9%	12	133.3%	41	455.6%	0.69%
427	VA-521	Virginia Balance of State	377	359	505	474	18	5.0%	-146	-28.9%	31	6.5%	-97	-20.5%	5.18%
428	VA-600	Arlington County CoC	304	231	243	218	73	31.6%	-12	-4.9%	25	11.5%	86	39.4%	4.17%
429	VA-601	Fairfax County CoC	1,601	1,623	1,439	1,337	-22	-1.4%	184	12.8%	102	7.6%	264	19.7%	21.98%
430	VA-602	Loudoun County CoC	108	136	114	103	-28	-20.6%	22	19.3%	11	10.7%	5	4.9%	1.48%
431	VA-603	Alexandria CoC	303	238	283	271	65	27.3%	-45	-15.9%	12	4.4%	32	11.8%	4.16%
432	VA-604	Prince William County CoC	392	376	356	318	16	4.3%	20	5.6%	38	11.9%	74	23.3%	5.38%
433	VI-500	Virgin Islands CoC	76	115	72	94	-39	-33.9%	43	59.7%	-22	-23.4%	-18	-19.1%	100.00%
434	VT-500	Vermont Balance of State CoC	524	439	516	575	85	19.4%	-77	-14.9%	-59	-10.3%	-51	-8.9%	49.57%
435	VT-501	Burlington/Chittenden County CoC	533	257	204	167	276	107.4%	53	26.0%	37	22.2%	366	219.2%	50.43%
436	WA-500	Seattle/King County CoC	6,089	5,808	5,680	5,964	281	4.8%	128	2.3%	-284	-4.8%	125	2.1%	37.50%
437	WA-501	Washington Balance of State CoC	4,750	4,660	4,968	4,370	90	1.9%	-308	-6.2%	598	13.7%	380	8.7%	29.25%
438	WA-502	City of Spokane CoC	1,072	1,080	889	1,030	-8	-0.7%	191	21.5%	-141	-13.7%	42	4.1%	6.60%
439	WA-503	Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County CoC	1,853	1,478	1,342	952	375	25.4%	136	10.1%	390	41.0%	901	94.6%	11.41%
440	WA-504	Everett/Snohomish County CoC	1,246	1,205	2,150	1,579	41	3.4%	-945	-44.0%	571	36.2%	-333	-21.1%	7.67%
441	WA-507	Yakima City & County CoC	300	345	541	458	-45	-13.0%	-196	-36.2%	83	18.1%	-158	-34.5%	1.85%
442	WA-508	Vancouver-Clarke County CoC	927	880	1,164	1,120	47	5.3%	-284	-24.4%	44	3.9%	-193	-17.2%	5.71%
443	WI-500	Wisconsin Balance of State CoC	3,207	2,817	2,817	2,907	390	13.8%	0	0.0%	-90	-3.1%	300	10.3%	58.68%
444	WI-501	Milwaukee City & County CoC	1,317	1,295	1,295	1,308	22	1.7%	0	0.0%	-13	-1.0%	9	0.7%	24.10%
445	WI-502	Racine City & County CoC	353	258	250	278	95	36.8%	8	3.2%	-28	-10.1%	75	27.0%	6.46%
446	WI-503	Madison/Dane County CoC	588	564	723	990	24	4.3%	-159	-22.0%	-267	-27.0%	-402	-40.6%	10.76%
447	WV-500	Wheeling/Weirton Area CoC	87	85	96	61	2	2.4%	-11	-11.5%	35	57.4%	26	42.6%	6.81%
448	WV-501	Huntington/Cabell, Wayne Counties	190	232	273	227	-42	-18.1%	-41	-15.0%	46	20.3%	-37	-16.3%	14.87%
449	WV-503	Charleston/Kanawha/Clay Counties CoC	331	264	263	326	67	25.4%	1	0.4%	-63	-19.3%	5	1.5%	25.90%
450	WV-508	West Virginia Balance of State CoC	670	841	1,515	354	-171	-20.3%	-674	-44.5%	1,161	328.0%	316	89.3%	52.43%
451	WY-500	Wyoming Statewide CoC	451	619	397	337	-168	-27.1%	222	55.9%	60	17.8%	114	33.8%	100.00%
TOTAL			403,308	386,361	391,401	427,971	16,947	4.4%	-5,040	-1.3%	-36,570	-8.5%	-24,663	-5.8%	-

1 Only active 2009 CoCs are reported in this table. All inactive or closed CoCs have been included in the national totals for 2006, 2007 and 2008, but are not individually reported.

Continuum of Care Unsheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Unsheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Unsheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
1	AK-500	Anchorage CoC	157	102	132	246	55	53.9%	-30	-22.7%	-114	-46.3%	-89	-36.2%	48.01%
2	AK-501	Alaska Balance of State CoC	170	92	123	195	78	84.8%	-31	-25.2%	-72	-36.9%	-25	-12.8%	51.99%
3	AL-500	Birmingham/Shelby Counties CoC	1,204	864	864	775	340	39.4%	0	0.0%	89	11.5%	429	55.4%	55.56%
4	AL-501	Mobile City & County/Baldwin County	336	183	239	302	153	83.6%	-56	-23.4%	-63	-20.9%	34	11.3%	15.51%
5	AL-502	Florence/Northwest Alabama CoC	68	71	134	112	-3	-4.2%	-63	-47.0%	22	19.6%	-44	-39.3%	3.14%
6	AL-503	Huntsville/North Alabama CoC	90	77	74	44	13	16.9%	3	4.1%	30	68.2%	46	104.5%	4.15%
7	AL-504	Montgomery City & County CoC	114	117	125	106	-3	-2.6%	-8	-6.4%	19	17.9%	8	7.5%	5.26%
8	AL-505	Gadsden/Northeast Alabama CoC	126	36	15	9	90	250.0%	21	140.0%	6	66.7%	117	1300.0%	5.81%
9	AL-506	Tuscaloosa City & County CoC	9	4	13	7	5	125.0%	-9	-69.2%	6	85.7%	2	28.6%	0.42%
10	AL-507	Alabama Balance of State	220	192	192	144	28	14.6%	0	0.0%	48	33.3%	76	52.8%	10.15%
11	AR-500	Little Rock/Central Arkansas CoC	452	635	635	576	-183	-28.8%	0	0.0%	59	10.2%	-124	-21.5%	40.29%
12	AR-501	Fayetteville/Northwest Arkansas CoC	30	40	35	21	-10	-25.0%	5	14.3%	14	66.7%	9	42.9%	2.67%
13	AR-502	Conway/Faulkner, Perry Counties CoC	112	104	104	135	8	7.7%	0	0.0%	-31	-23.0%	-23	-17.0%	9.98%
14	AR-504	Delta Hills CoC	510	443	510	888	67	15.1%	-67	-13.1%	-378	-42.6%	-378	-42.6%	45.45%
15	AR-505	Southeast Arkansas CoC	0	10	10	69	-10	-100.0%	0	0.0%	-59	-85.5%	-69	-100.0%	0.00%
16	AR-506	Johnson, Pope, Yell Counties CoC	18	3	3	0	15	500.0%	0	0.0%	3	-	18	-	1.60%
17	AZ-500	Arizona Balance of State CoC	2,064	1,984	1,984	1,642	80	4.0%	0	0.0%	342	20.8%	422	25.7%	32.48%
18	AZ-501	Tucson/Pima County CoC	1,373	1,108	1,191	642	265	23.9%	-83	-7.0%	549	85.5%	731	113.9%	21.61%
19	AZ-502	Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County	2,918	2,426	2,853	2,063	492	20.3%	-427	-15.0%	790	38.3%	855	41.4%	45.92%
20	CA-500	San Jose/Santa Clara City & County	4,983	5,101	5,101	4,389	-118	-2.3%	0	0.0%	712	16.2%	594	13.5%	6.05%
21	CA-501	San Francisco CoC	2,942	2,771	2,791	2,655	171	6.2%	-20	-0.7%	136	5.1%	287	10.8%	3.57%
22	CA-502	Oakland/Alameda County CoC	1,963	2,496	2,496	2,539	-533	-21.4%	0	0.0%	-43	-1.7%	-576	-22.7%	2.38%
23	CA-503	Sacramento City & County CoC	1,194	1,266	1,005	645	-72	-5.7%	261	26.0%	360	55.8%	549	85.1%	1.45%
24	CA-504	Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County	2,222	532	532	783	1,690	317.7%	0	0.0%	-251	-32.1%	1,439	183.8%	2.70%
25	CA-505	Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	1,872	3,159	3,159	5,278	-1,287	-40.7%	0	0.0%	-2,119	-40.1%	-3,406	-64.5%	2.27%
26	CA-506	Salinas/Monterey County CoC	1,628	893	893	1,067	735	82.3%	0	0.0%	-174	-16.3%	561	52.6%	1.98%
27	CA-507	Marin County CoC	429	400	400	442	29	7.3%	0	0.0%	-42	-9.5%	-13	-2.9%	0.52%
28	CA-508	Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County	1,536	2,303	2,303	2,679	-767	-33.3%	0	0.0%	-376	-14.0%	-1,143	-42.7%	1.87%
29	CA-509	Mendocino County CoC	967	1,138	1,138	1,509	-171	-15.0%	0	0.0%	-371	-24.6%	-542	-35.9%	1.17%
30	CA-510	Turlock/Modesto/Stanislaus County	999	959	959	935	40	4.2%	0	0.0%	24	2.6%	64	6.8%	1.21%
31	CA-511	Stockton/San Joaquin County	165	303	303	588	-138	-45.5%	0	0.0%	-285	-48.5%	-423	-71.9%	0.20%
32	CA-512	Daly/San Mateo County CoC	803	1,094	1,094	491	-291	-26.6%	0	0.0%	603	122.8%	312	63.5%	0.98%
33	CA-513	Visalia, Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	756	851	826	668	-95	-11.2%	25	3.0%	158	23.7%	88	13.2%	0.92%
34	CA-514	Fresno/Madera County CoC	2,457	1,556	1,512	0	901	57.9%	44	2.9%	1,512	-	2,457	-	2.98%
35	CA-515	Roseville/Placer County CoC	234	137	137	91	97	70.8%	0	0.0%	46	50.5%	143	157.1%	0.28%
36	CA-516	Redding/Shasta County CoC	146	62	46	87	84	135.5%	16	34.8%	-41	-47.1%	59	67.8%	0.18%
37	CA-517	Napa City & County CoC	128	146	146	143	-18	-12.3%	0	0.0%	3	2.1%	-15	-10.5%	0.16%
38	CA-518	Vallejo/Solano County CoC	426	1,499	1,499	2,979	-1,073	-71.6%	0	0.0%	-1,480	-49.7%	-2,553	-85.7%	0.52%
39	CA-519	Chico/Paradise/Butte County CoC	386	270	542	620	116	43.0%	-272	-50.2%	-78	-12.6%	-234	-37.7%	0.47%
40	CA-520	Merced City & County CoC	224	2,320	2,420	2,420	-2,096	-90.3%	-100	-4.1%	0	0.0%	-2,196	-90.7%	0.27%
41	CA-521	Davis/Woodland/Yolo County CoC	289	186	186	460	103	55.4%	0	0.0%	-274	-59.6%	-171	-37.2%	0.35%
42	CA-522	Humboldt County CoC	1,000	585	585	1,481	415	70.9%	0	0.0%	-896	-60.5%	-481	-32.5%	1.21%
43	CA-523	Colusa/Glenn/Tehama/Trinity Counties Coc	123	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.15%
44	CA-524	Yuba City, Marysville/Sutter, Yuba Counties CoC	108	111	63	326	-3	-2.7%	48	76.2%	-263	-80.7%	-218	-66.9%	0.13%
45	CA-525	El Dorado County CoC	83	75	16	0	8	10.7%	59	368.8%	16	-	83	-	0.10%
46	CA-526	Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador Counties CoC	222	321	321	0	-99	-30.8%	0	0.0%	321	-	222	-	0.27%
47	CA-527	Nevada County	248	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.30%
48	CA-600	Los Angeles City & County CoC	28,644	57,166	57,166	72,413	-28,522	-49.9%	0	0.0%	-15,247	-21.1%	-43,769	-60.4%	34.78%
49	CA-601	San Diego CoC	1,868	1,736	1,016	1,849	132	7.6%	720	70.9%	-833	-45.1%	19	1.0%	2.27%
50	CA-602	Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC	5,724	1,071	1,071	747	4,653	434.5%	0	0.0%	324	43.4%	4,977	666.3%	6.95%
51	CA-603	Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County	2,973	2,773	2,773	2,911	200	7.2%	0	0.0%	-138	-4.7%	62	2.1%	3.61%
52	CA-604	Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	832	632	632	625	200	31.6%	0	0.0%	7	1.1%	207	33.1%	1.01%
53	CA-605	San Buena Ventura/Ventura County	1,309	931	931	563	378	40.6%	0	0.0%	368	65.4%	746	132.5%	1.59%
54	CA-606	Long Beach CoC	1,755	2,150	2,150	2,805	-395	-18.4%	0	0.0%	-655	-23.4%	-1,050	-37.4%	2.13%
55	CA-607	Pasadena CoC	741	549	535	411	192	35.0%	14	2.6%	124	30.2%	330	80.3%	0.90%
56	CA-608	Riverside City & County CoC	2,043	3,178	3,178	3,131	-1,135	-35.7%	0	0.0%	47	1.5%	-1,088	-34.7%	2.48%
57	CA-609	San Bernardino City & County CoC	1,258	5,749	5,749	3,530	-4,491	-78.1%	0	0.0%	2,219	62.9%	-2,272	-64.4%	1.53%
58	CA-610	San Diego County CoC	2,146	2,302	2,329	2,232	-156	-6.8%	-27	-1.2%	97	4.3%	-86	-3.9%	2.61%
59	CA-611	Oxnard CoC	423	479	604	324	-56	-11.7%	-125	-20.7%	280	86.4%	99	30.6%	0.51%

Continuum of Care Unsheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Unsheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Unsheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
60	CA-612	Glendale CoC	168	63	63	185	105	166.7%	0	0.0%	-122	-65.9%	-17	-9.2%	0.20%
61	CA-613	El Centro/Imperial County CoC	348	237	229	0	111	46.8%	8	3.5%	229	-	348	-	0.42%
62	CA-614	San Luis Obispo County CoC	3,587	569	2,221	2,186	3,018	530.4%	-1,652	-74.4%	35	1.6%	1,401	64.1%	4.36%
63	CO-500	Colorado Balance of State CoC	4,180	3,955	3,357	8,736	225	5.7%	598	17.8%	-5,379	-61.6%	-4,556	-52.2%	67.02%
64	CO-503	Metropolitan Denver Homeless Initiative	1,699	3,531	3,513	3,271	-1,832	-51.9%	18	0.5%	242	7.4%	-1,572	-48.1%	27.24%
65	CO-504	Colorado Springs/El Paso County CoC	358	384	384	407	-26	-6.8%	0	0.0%	-23	-5.7%	-49	-12.0%	5.74%
66	CT-500	Danbury CoC	9	7	25	32	2	28.6%	-18	-72.0%	-7	-21.9%	-23	-71.9%	1.79%
67	CT-501	New Haven CoC	27	94	137	319	-67	-71.3%	-43	-31.4%	-182	-57.1%	-292	-91.5%	5.38%
68	CT-502	Hartford CoC	19	18	16	0	1	5.6%	2	12.5%	16	-	19	-	3.78%
69	CT-503	Bridgeport/Stratford/Fairfield CoC	46	31	32	40	15	48.4%	-1	-3.1%	-8	-20.0%	6	15.0%	9.16%
70	CT-504	Middletown/Middlesex County CoC	25	89	101	22	-64	-71.9%	-12	-11.9%	79	359.1%	3	13.6%	4.98%
71	CT-505	Connecticut Balance of State CoC	249	184	155	53	65	35.3%	29	18.7%	102	192.5%	196	369.8%	49.60%
72	CT-506	Norwalk/Fairfield County CoC	39	15	49	8	24	160.0%	-34	-69.4%	41	512.5%	31	387.5%	7.77%
73	CT-507	Norwich/New London City & County	23	16	37	110	7	43.8%	-21	-56.8%	-73	-66.4%	-87	-79.1%	4.58%
74	CT-508	Stamford/Greenwich CoC	20	51	49	23	-31	-60.8%	2	4.1%	26	113.0%	-3	-13.0%	3.98%
75	CT-509	New Britain CoC	13	54	74	21	-41	-75.9%	-20	-27.0%	53	252.4%	-8	-38.1%	2.59%
76	CT-510	Bristol CoC	17	19	32	47	-2	-10.5%	-13	-40.6%	-15	-31.9%	-30	-63.8%	3.39%
77	CT-512	City of Waterbury CoC	15	29	104	35	-14	-48.3%	-75	-72.1%	69	197.1%	-20	-57.1%	2.99%
78	DC-500	District of Columbia CoC	321	378	340	347	-57	-15.1%	38	11.2%	-7	-2.0%	-26	-7.5%	100.00%
79	DE-500	Delaware Statewide CoC	47	71	207	213	-24	-33.8%	-136	-65.7%	-6	-2.8%	-166	-77.9%	100.00%
80	FL-500	Sarasota, Bradenton, Manatee Counties	1,651	831	518	385	820	98.7%	313	60.4%	133	34.5%	1,266	328.8%	4.89%
81	FL-501	Tampa/Hillsborough County CoC	6,747	5,433	5,433	3,630	1,314	24.2%	0	0.0%	1,803	49.7%	3,117	85.9%	20.00%
82	FL-502	St. Petersburg/Pinellas County CoC	1,728	1,221	1,221	1,389	507	41.5%	0	0.0%	-168	-12.1%	339	24.4%	5.12%
83	FL-503	Lakeland/Highlands Counties CoC	309	156	315	413	153	98.1%	-159	-50.5%	-98	-23.7%	-104	-25.2%	0.92%
84	FL-504	Daytona Beach/Flagler Counties CoC	1,320	1,225	909	2,146	95	7.8%	316	34.8%	-1,237	-57.6%	-826	-38.5%	3.91%
85	FL-505	Fort Walton Beach/Walton Counties CoC	2,137	1,433	2,074	2,065	704	49.1%	-641	-30.9%	9	0.4%	72	3.5%	6.34%
86	FL-506	Tallahassee/Leon County CoC	104	95	95	111	9	9.5%	0	0.0%	-16	-14.4%	-7	-6.3%	0.31%
87	FL-507	Oriando/Orange/Seminole Counties CoC	1,516	1,368	1,820	1,989	148	10.8%	-452	-24.8%	-169	-8.5%	-473	-23.8%	4.49%
88	FL-508	Gainesville/Alachua, Putnam	623	465	415	487	158	34.0%	50	12.0%	-72	-14.8%	136	27.9%	1.85%
89	FL-509	Fort Pierce/St. Lucie/Martin Counties CoC	1,661	1,205	1,276	1,819	456	37.8%	-71	-5.6%	-543	-29.9%	-158	-8.7%	4.92%
90	FL-510	Jacksonville-Duval, Clay Counties CoC	423	1,093	1,158	1,263	-670	-61.3%	-65	-5.6%	-105	-8.3%	-840	-66.5%	1.25%
91	FL-511	Pensacola/Esca/Santa Rosa County CoC	618	653	282	894	-35	-5.4%	371	131.6%	-612	-68.5%	-276	-30.9%	1.83%
92	FL-512	Saint Johns County CoC	1,131	1,132	1,132	834	-1	-0.1%	0	0.0%	298	35.7%	297	35.6%	3.35%
93	FL-513	Palm Bay/Brevard County CoC	219	1,397	1,397	663	-1,178	-84.3%	0	0.0%	734	110.7%	-444	-67.0%	0.65%
94	FL-514	Ocala/Marion County CoC	194	168	168	1,079	26	15.5%	0	0.0%	-911	-84.4%	-885	-82.0%	0.58%
95	FL-515	Panama City CoC	38	102	102	833	-64	-62.7%	0	0.0%	-731	-87.8%	-795	-95.4%	0.11%
96	FL-516	Winterhaven/Polk County CoC	50	285	0	0	-235	-82.5%	285	-	0	-	50	-	0.15%
97	FL-517	Hardee/Highlands Counties CoC	4,119	2,867	240	546	1,252	43.7%	2,627	1094.6%	-306	-56.0%	3,573	654.4%	12.21%
98	FL-518	Columbia/Suwannee CoC	949	190	165	82	759	399.5%	25	15.2%	83	101.2%	867	1057.3%	2.81%
99	FL-519	Passo County	2,853	2,574	881	1,178	279	10.8%	1,693	192.2%	-297	-25.2%	1,675	142.2%	8.46%
100	FL-520	Citrus/Hernando/Lake	789	888	1,827	1,001	-99	-11.1%	-939	-51.4%	826	82.5%	-212	-21.2%	2.34%
101	FL-600	Miami/Dade County CoC	994	1,347	1,380	1,754	-353	-26.2%	-33	-2.4%	-374	-21.3%	-760	-43.3%	2.95%
102	FL-601	Ft Lauderdale/Broward County CoC	800	701	701	442	99	14.1%	0	0.0%	259	58.6%	358	81.0%	2.37%
103	FL-602	Punta Gorda/Charlotte County CoC	147	280	280	3,191	-133	-47.5%	0	0.0%	-2,911	-91.2%	-3,044	-95.4%	0.44%
104	FL-603	Ft Myers/Cape Coral/Lee County CoC	416	513	1,949	1,372	-97	-18.9%	-1,436	-73.7%	577	42.1%	-956	-69.7%	1.23%
105	FL-604	Monroe County CoC	716	644	644	544	72	11.2%	0	0.0%	100	18.4%	172	31.6%	2.12%
106	FL-605	West Palm Beach/Palm Beach County	1,407	1,039	1,039	714	368	35.4%	0	0.0%	325	45.5%	693	97.1%	4.17%
107	FL-606	Collier County CoC	73	129	119	236	-56	-43.4%	10	8.4%	-117	-49.6%	-163	-69.1%	0.22%
108	GA-500	City of Atlanta CoC	2,164	2,115	2,115	2,115	49	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	49	2.3%	19.78%
109	GA-501	Georgia Balance of State CoC	7,807	7,073	8,284	9,162	734	10.4%	-1,211	-14.6%	-878	-9.6%	-1,355	-14.8%	71.36%
110	GA-503	Athens/Clarke County CoC	206	159	131	87	47	29.6%	28	21.4%	44	50.6%	119	136.8%	1.88%
111	GA-504	Augusta CoC	44	32	38	37	12	37.5%	-6	-15.8%	1	2.7%	7	18.9%	0.40%
112	GA-505	Columbus-Muscogee/Russell County CoC	204	374	352	220	-170	-45.5%	22	6.3%	132	60.0%	-16	-7.3%	1.86%
113	GA-506	Marietta/Cobb County CoC	126	208	208	330	-82	-39.4%	0	0.0%	-122	-37.0%	-204	-61.8%	1.15%
114	GA-507	Savannah/Chatham County CoC	390	269	170	343	121	45.0%	99	58.2%	-173	-50.4%	47	13.7%	3.56%
115	GU-500	Guam CoC	906	622	622	792	284	45.7%	0	0.0%	-170	-21.5%	114	14.4%	100.00%
116	HI-500	Hawaii Balance of State CoC	1,321	1,565	1,565	1,522	-244	-15.6%	0	0.0%	43	2.8%	-201	-13.2%	52.55%
117	HI-501	Honolulu CoC	1,193	1,793	1,793	1,085	-600	-33.5%	0	0.0%	708	65.3%	108	10.0%	47.45%
118	IA-500	Sioux City/Dakota County CoC	30	11	5	26	19	172.7%	6	120.0%	-21	-80.8%	4	15.4%	18.87%

Continuum of Care Unsheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Unsheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Unsheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
119	IA-501	Iowa Balance of State CoC	71	126	189	497	-55	-43.7%	-63	-33.3%	-308	-62.0%	-426	-85.7%	44.65%
120	IA-502	Des Moines/Polk County CoC	58	122	99	1,530	-64	-52.5%	23	23.2%	-1,431	-93.5%	-1,472	-96.2%	36.48%
121	ID-500	Boise/Ada County CoC	142	58	109	11	84	144.8%	-51	-46.8%	98	890.9%	131	1190.9%	30.74%
122	ID-501	Idaho Balance of State CoC	320	156	515	310	164	105.1%	-359	-69.7%	205	66.1%	10	3.2%	69.26%
123	IL-500	McHenry County CoC	10	4	18	16	6	150.0%	-14	-77.8%	2	12.5%	-6	-37.5%	0.45%
124	IL-501	Rockford/Winnebago, Boone Counties	105	50	50	1,219	55	110.0%	0	0.0%	-1,169	-95.9%	-1,114	-91.4%	4.76%
125	IL-502	North Chicago/Lake County CoC	2	9	10	9	-7	-77.8%	-1	-10.0%	1	11.1%	-7	-77.8%	0.09%
126	IL-503	Champaign/Urbana/Champaign County CoC	4	13	13	13	-9	-69.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-9	-69.2%	0.18%
127	IL-504	Madison County CoC	41	25	37	79	16	64.0%	-12	-32.4%	-42	-53.2%	-38	-48.1%	1.86%
128	IL-505	Evanston CoC	95	90	90	89	5	5.6%	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	6	6.7%	4.31%
129	IL-506	Joliet/Bolingbrook/Will County CoC	9	10	18	43	-1	-10.0%	-8	-44.4%	-25	-58.1%	-34	-79.1%	0.41%
130	IL-507	Peoria/Perkin/Woodford CoC	67	8	98	124	59	737.5%	-90	-91.8%	-26	-21.0%	-57	-46.0%	3.04%
131	IL-508	East Saint Louis/Saint Clair County CoC	294	452	357	757	-158	-35.0%	95	26.6%	-400	-52.8%	-463	-61.2%	13.34%
132	IL-509	DeKalb City & County CoC	31	24	24	29	7	29.2%	0	0.0%	-5	-17.2%	2	6.9%	1.41%
133	IL-510	Chicago CoC	884	1,633	1,633	1,702	-749	-45.9%	0	0.0%	-69	-4.1%	-818	-48.1%	40.11%
134	IL-511	Cook County CoC	156	168	168	61	-12	-7.1%	0	0.0%	107	175.4%	95	155.7%	7.08%
135	IL-512	Bloomington/Central Illinois CoC	33	68	68	47	-35	-51.5%	0	0.0%	21	44.7%	-14	-29.8%	1.50%
136	IL-513	Springfield/Sangamon County CoC	9	7	15	58	2	28.6%	-8	-53.3%	-43	-74.1%	-49	-84.5%	0.41%
137	IL-514	Dupage County CoC	108	124	124	19	-16	-12.9%	0	0.0%	105	552.6%	89	468.4%	4.90%
138	IL-515	South Central Illinois CoC	95	35	32	141	60	171.4%	3	9.4%	-109	-77.3%	-46	-32.6%	4.31%
139	IL-516	Decatur/Macon County CoC	26	180	180	197	-154	-85.6%	0	0.0%	-17	-8.6%	-171	-86.8%	1.18%
140	IL-517	Aurora/Elgin/Kane County CoC	53	56	56	54	-3	-5.4%	0	0.0%	2	3.7%	-1	-1.9%	2.40%
141	IL-518	Rock Island...Northwestern Illinois CoC	52	84	94	126	-32	-38.1%	-10	-10.6%	-32	-25.4%	-74	-58.7%	2.36%
142	IL-519	West Central Illinois CoC	0	130	157	138	-130	-100.0%	-27	-17.2%	19	13.8%	-138	-100.0%	0.00%
143	IL-520	Southern Illinois CoC	130	74	74	218	56	75.7%	0	0.0%	-144	-66.1%	-88	-40.4%	5.90%
144	IN-500	South Bend/Mishawaka/St. Joseph County CoC	716	317	0	0	399	125.9%	317	-	0	-	716	-	40.27%
145	IN-502	Indiana Balance of State CoC	875	1,028	1,028	2,504	-153	-14.9%	0	0.0%	-1,476	-58.9%	-1,629	-65.1%	49.21%
146	IN-503	Indianapolis CoC	187	127	234	147	60	47.2%	-107	-45.7%	87	59.2%	40	27.2%	10.52%
147	KS-501	Kansas City/Wyandotte County CoC	42	57	57	75	-15	-26.3%	0	0.0%	-18	-24.0%	-33	-44.0%	21.43%
148	KS-502	Wichita/Sedgwick County CoC	32	28	53	195	4	14.3%	-25	-47.2%	-142	-72.8%	-163	-83.6%	16.33%
149	KS-503	Topeka/Shawnee County CoC	19	25	1	19	-6	-24.0%	24	2400.0%	-18	-94.7%	0	0.0%	9.69%
150	KS-505	Overland Park/Johnson County CoC	44	87	87	80	-43	-49.4%	0	0.0%	7	8.8%	-36	-45.0%	22.45%
151	KS-507	Kansas Balance of State CoC	59	41	41	1,452	18	43.9%	0	0.0%	-1,411	-97.2%	-1,393	-95.9%	30.10%
152	KY-500	Kentucky Balance of State CoC	486	1,611	1,895	476	-1,125	-69.8%	-284	-15.0%	1,419	298.1%	10	2.1%	69.43%
153	KY-501	Louisville/Jefferson County CoC	154	145	180	602	9	6.2%	-35	-19.4%	-422	-70.1%	-448	-74.4%	22.00%
154	KY-502	Lexington/Fayette County CoC	60	186	46	50	-126	-67.7%	140	304.3%	-4	-8.0%	10	20.0%	8.57%
155	LA-500	Lafayette/Acadiana CoC	193	174	174	172	19	10.9%	0	0.0%	2	1.2%	21	12.2%	2.30%
156	LA-501	Lake Charles/Southwestern Louisiana	43	40	28	36	3	7.5%	12	42.9%	-8	-22.2%	7	19.4%	0.51%
157	LA-502	Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest CoC	91	144	134	143	-53	-36.8%	10	7.5%	-9	-6.3%	-52	-36.4%	1.09%
158	LA-503	New Orleans/Jefferson Parish CoC	7,385	629	629	591	6,756	1074.1%	0	0.0%	38	6.4%	6,794	1149.6%	88.06%
159	LA-504	Baton Rouge CoC	379	331	241	22	48	14.5%	90	37.3%	219	995.5%	357	1622.7%	4.52%
160	LA-505	Monroe/Northeast Louisiana CoC	41	75	51	78	-34	-45.3%	24	47.1%	-27	-34.6%	-37	-47.4%	0.49%
161	LA-506	Slidell/Livingston/Southeast Louisiana CoC	162	312	231	154	-150	-48.1%	81	35.1%	77	50.0%	8	5.2%	1.93%
162	LA-507	Alexandria/Central Louisiana CoC	47	35	48	147	12	34.3%	-13	-27.1%	-99	-67.3%	-100	-68.0%	0.56%
163	LA-508	Houma-Terrebonne CoC	45	41	41	65	4	9.8%	0	0.0%	-24	-36.9%	-20	-30.8%	0.54%
164	MA-500	Boston CoC	219	184	306	261	35	19.0%	-122	-39.9%	45	17.2%	-42	-16.1%	21.77%
165	MA-501	Franklin/Holyoke County CoC	58	77	53	40	-19	-24.7%	24	45.3%	13	32.5%	18	45.0%	5.77%
166	MA-502	Lynn CoC	30	39	28	3	-9	-23.1%	11	39.3%	25	833.3%	27	900.0%	2.98%
167	MA-503	Cape Cod/Islands CoC	204	317	329	498	-113	-35.6%	-12	-3.6%	-169	-33.9%	-294	-59.0%	20.28%
168	MA-504	Springfield CoC	12	20	33	37	-8	-40.0%	-13	-39.4%	-4	-10.8%	-25	-67.6%	1.19%
169	MA-505	New Bedford CoC	102	81	34	50	21	25.9%	47	138.2%	-16	-32.0%	52	104.0%	10.14%
170	MA-506	Worcester City & County CoC	36	34	34	23	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	11	47.8%	13	56.5%	3.58%
171	MA-507	Pittsfield/Berkshire County CoC	95	27	59	67	68	251.9%	-32	-54.2%	-8	-11.9%	28	41.8%	9.44%
172	MA-508	Lowell CoC	11	8	14	28	3	37.5%	-6	-42.9%	-14	-50.0%	-17	-60.7%	1.09%
173	MA-509	Cambridge CoC	43	62	56	44	-19	-30.6%	6	10.7%	12	27.3%	-1	-2.3%	4.27%
174	MA-510	Gloucester...Essex County	69	31	22	54	38	122.6%	9	40.9%	-32	-59.3%	15	27.8%	6.86%
175	MA-511	Quincy/Weymouth CoC	13	23	34	35	-10	-43.5%	-11	-32.4%	-1	-2.9%	-22	-62.9%	1.29%
176	MA-512	Lawrence CoC	22	30	19	12	-8	-26.7%	11	57.9%	7	58.3%	10	83.3%	2.19%
177	MA-513	Malden/Medford CoC	8	7	22	18	1	14.3%	-15	-68.2%	4	22.2%	-10	-55.6%	0.80%

Continuum of Care Unsheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Unsheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Unsheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
178	MA-515	Fall River CoC	10	5	14	11	5	100.0%	-9	-64.3%	3	27.3%	-1	-9.1%	0.99%
179	MA-516	Massachusetts Balance of State CoC	8	28	24	15	-20	-71.4%	4	16.7%	9	60.0%	-7	-46.7%	0.80%
180	MA-517	Somerville CoC	4	2	15	10	2	100.0%	-13	-86.7%	5	50.0%	-6	-60.0%	0.40%
181	MA-518	Brookline/Newton CoC	0	3	2	11	-3	-100.0%	1	50.0%	-9	-81.8%	-11	-100.0%	0.00%
182	MA-519	Attleboro/Taunton/Bristol County CoC	29	30	63	90	-1	-3.3%	-33	-52.4%	-27	-30.0%	-61	-67.8%	2.88%
183	MA-520	Brockton/Plymouth City & County CoC	33	54	81	102	-21	-38.9%	-27	-33.3%	-21	-20.6%	-69	-67.6%	3.28%
184	MD-500	Cumberland/Allegany County CoC	15	49	21	26	-34	-69.4%	28	133.3%	-5	-19.2%	-11	-42.3%	0.35%
185	MD-501	Baltimore City CoC	1,228	629	629	583	599	95.2%	0	0.0%	46	7.9%	645	110.6%	28.88%
186	MD-502	Harford County CoC	24	13	13	20	11	84.6%	0	0.0%	-7	-35.0%	4	20.0%	0.56%
187	MD-503	Annapolis/Anne Arundel County CoC	94	50	71	99	44	88.0%	-21	-29.6%	-28	-28.3%	-5	-5.1%	2.21%
188	MD-504	Howard County CoC	47	24	24	29	23	95.8%	0	0.0%	-5	-17.2%	18	62.1%	1.11%
189	MD-505	Baltimore County CoC	406	33	58	66	373	1130.3%	-25	-43.1%	-8	-12.1%	340	515.2%	9.55%
190	MD-506	Carroll County CoC	28	13	13	29	15	115.4%	0	0.0%	-16	-55.2%	-1	-3.4%	0.66%
191	MD-507	Cecil County CoC	27	13	2	45	14	107.7%	11	550.0%	-43	-95.6%	-18	-40.0%	0.63%
192	MD-508	Charles, Calvert, St.Mary's CoC	2,024	1,685	1,671	240	339	20.1%	14	0.8%	1,431	596.3%	1,784	743.3%	47.60%
193	MD-509	Frederick City & County CoC	67	22	9	14	45	204.5%	13	144.4%	-5	-35.7%	53	378.6%	1.58%
194	MD-510	Garrett County CoC	7	19	19	12	-12	-63.2%	0	0.0%	7	58.3%	-5	-41.7%	0.16%
195	MD-511	Mid-Shore Regional CoC	6	171	172	219	-165	-96.5%	-1	-0.6%	-47	-21.5%	-213	-97.3%	0.14%
196	MD-512	Hagerstown/Washington County CoC	27	22	3	23	5	22.7%	19	633.3%	-20	-87.0%	4	17.4%	0.63%
197	MD-513	Wicomico/Somerset/Worcester CoC	43	37	37	62	6	16.2%	0	0.0%	-25	-40.3%	-19	-30.6%	1.01%
198	MD-600	Bowie/Prince George's County CoC	82	145	345	401	-63	-43.4%	-200	-58.0%	-56	-14.0%	-319	-79.6%	1.93%
199	MD-601	Montgomery County CoC	127	240	123	173	-113	-47.1%	117	95.1%	-50	-28.9%	-46	-28.6%	2.99%
200	ME-500	Maine Balance of State CoC	29	31	40	26	-2	-6.5%	-9	-22.5%	14	53.8%	3	11.5%	76.32%
201	ME-501	Bangor/Penobscot County CoC	5	8	13	23	-3	-37.5%	-5	-38.5%	-10	-43.5%	-18	-78.3%	13.16%
202	ME-502	Portland CoC	4	5	9	0	-1	-20.0%	-4	-44.4%	9	-	4	-	10.53%
203	MI-500	Michigan Balance of State CoC	922	931	931	713	-9	-1.0%	0	0.0%	218	30.6%	209	29.3%	34.06%
204	MI-501	Detroit CoC	262	13,324	13,324	10,516	-13,062	-98.0%	0	0.0%	2,808	26.7%	-10,254	-97.5%	9.68%
205	MI-502	Dearborn/Wayne County CoC	6	247	247	240	-241	-97.6%	0	0.0%	7	2.9%	-234	-97.5%	0.22%
206	MI-503	St. Clair Shores/Warren/Macomb County	585	518	518	261	67	12.9%	0	0.0%	257	98.5%	324	124.1%	21.61%
207	MI-504	Pontiac/Royal Oak/Oakland County	280	609	609	695	-329	-54.0%	0	0.0%	-86	-12.4%	-415	-59.7%	10.34%
208	MI-505	Flint/Genesee County CoC	82	18	141	1,899	64	355.6%	-123	-87.2%	-1,758	-92.6%	-1,817	-95.7%	3.03%
209	MI-506	Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County	34	42	105	55	-8	-19.0%	-63	-60.0%	50	90.9%	-21	-38.2%	1.26%
210	MI-507	Portage/Kalamazoo City & County	14	79	21	1	-65	-82.3%	58	276.2%	20	2000.0%	13	1300.0%	0.52%
211	MI-508	Lansing/East Lansing/Ingham County	20	17	17	68	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	-51	-75.0%	-48	-70.6%	0.74%
212	MI-509	Ann Arbor/Washtenaw County CoC	35	56	56	180	-21	-37.5%	0	0.0%	-124	-68.9%	-145	-80.6%	1.29%
213	MI-510	Saginaw City & County CoC	27	87	87	17	-60	-69.0%	0	0.0%	70	411.8%	10	58.8%	1.00%
214	MI-511	Lenawee County CoC	5	8	8	24	-3	-37.5%	0	0.0%	-16	-66.7%	-19	-79.2%	0.18%
215	MI-512	Grand Traverse/Antrim, Leelanau Counties	2	25	25	141	-23	-92.0%	0	0.0%	-116	-82.3%	-139	-98.6%	0.07%
216	MI-513	Marquette/Alger Counties CoC	5	0	0	9	5	-	0	-	-9	-100.0%	-4	-44.4%	0.18%
217	MI-514	Battle Creek/Calhoun County CoC	53	110	88	49	-57	-51.8%	22	25.0%	39	79.6%	4	8.2%	1.96%
218	MI-515	Monroe County CoC	4	11	11	49	-7	-63.6%	0	0.0%	-38	-77.6%	-45	-91.8%	0.15%
219	MI-516	Norton Shores/Muskegon City & County	321	180	185	63	141	78.3%	-5	-2.7%	122	193.7%	258	409.5%	11.86%
220	MI-517	Jackson City & County CoC	19	70	181	19	-51	-72.9%	-111	-61.3%	162	852.6%	0	0.0%	0.70%
221	MI-518	Livingston County CoC	13	5	5	31	8	160.0%	0	0.0%	-26	-83.9%	-18	-58.1%	0.48%
222	MI-519	Holland/Ottawa County CoC	2	0	13	0	2	-	-13	-100.0%	13	-	2	-	0.07%
223	MI-522	Alpena, Iosca, Presque Isle/NE Michigan CoC	0	38	38	0	-38	-100.0%	0	0.0%	38	-	0	-	0.00%
224	MI-523	Eaton County CoC	16	92	92	20	-76	-82.6%	0	0.0%	72	360.0%	-4	-20.0%	0.59%
225	MN-500	Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC	256	556	556	357	-300	-54.0%	0	0.0%	199	55.7%	-101	-28.3%	27.06%
226	MN-501	Saint Paul/Ramsey County CoC	93	124	124	0	-31	-25.0%	0	0.0%	124	-	93	-	9.83%
227	MN-502	Rochester/Southeast Minnesota CoC	4	33	33	48	-29	-87.9%	0	0.0%	-15	-31.3%	-44	-91.7%	0.42%
228	MN-503	Dakota County CoC	86	72	60	182	14	19.4%	12	20.0%	-122	-67.0%	-96	-52.7%	9.09%
229	MN-504	Northeast Minnesota CoC	90	116	116	47	-26	-22.4%	0	0.0%	69	146.8%	43	91.5%	9.51%
230	MN-505	St. Cloud/Central Minnesota CoC	108	76	76	88	32	42.1%	0	0.0%	-12	-13.6%	20	22.7%	11.42%
231	MN-506	Northwest Minnesota CoC	36	31	31	11	5	16.1%	0	0.0%	20	181.8%	25	227.3%	3.81%
232	MN-508	Moorehead/West Central Minnesota	80	77	77	76	3	3.9%	0	0.0%	1	1.3%	4	5.3%	8.46%
233	MN-509	Duluth/Saint Louis County CoC	148	207	207	18	-59	-28.5%	0	0.0%	189	1050.0%	130	722.2%	15.64%
234	MN-510	Scott, Carver Counties CoC	21	64	46	44	-43	-67.2%	18	39.1%	2	4.5%	-23	-52.3%	2.22%
235	MN-511	Southwest Minnesota CoC	24	18	89	10	6	33.3%	-71	-79.8%	79	790.0%	14	140.0%	2.54%
236	MO-500	St. Louis County CoC	229	62	46	80	167	269.4%	16	34.8%	-34	-42.5%	149	186.3%	15.37%

Continuum of Care Unsheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Unsheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Unsheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
237	MO-501	St. Louis City CoC	333	213	213	108	120	56.3%	0	0.0%	105	97.2%	225	208.3%	22.35%
238	MO-503	St. Charles CoC	281	288	271	351	-7	-2.4%	17	6.3%	-80	-22.8%	-70	-19.9%	18.86%
239	MO-600	Springfield/Webster Counties CoC	35	207	40	59	-172	-83.1%	167	417.5%	-19	-32.2%	-24	-40.7%	2.35%
240	MO-602	Joplin/Jasper/Newton County CoC	37	73	8	147	-36	-49.3%	65	812.5%	-139	-94.6%	-110	-74.8%	2.48%
241	MO-603	St. Joseph/Buchanan County CoC	4	28	0	0	-24	-85.7%	28	-	0	-	4	-	0.27%
242	MO-604	Kansas City/Lee's Summit CoC	197	534	154	203	-337	-63.1%	380	246.8%	-49	-24.1%	-6	-3.0%	13.22%
243	MO-606	Clay, Platte Counties CoC	374	675	346	148	-301	-44.6%	329	95.1%	198	133.8%	226	152.7%	25.10%
244	MS-500	Jackson/Rankin, Madison Counties CoC	496	507	278	71	-11	-2.2%	229	82.4%	207	291.5%	425	598.6%	31.47%
245	MS-501	Mississippi Balance of State CoC	582	41	41	338	541	1319.5%	0	0.0%	-297	-87.9%	244	72.2%	36.93%
246	MS-503	Gulf Port/Gulf Coast Regional CoC	498	207	207	139	291	140.6%	0	0.0%	68	48.9%	359	258.3%	31.60%
247	MT-500	Montana Statewide CoC	363	410	295	452	-47	-11.5%	115	39.0%	-157	-34.7%	-89	-19.7%	100.00%
248	NC-500	Winston Salem/Forsyth County CoC	68	29	24	39	39	134.5%	5	20.8%	-15	-38.5%	29	74.4%	1.53%
249	NC-501	Asheville/Buncombe County CoC	92	80	187	80	12	15.0%	-107	-57.2%	107	133.8%	12	15.0%	2.07%
250	NC-502	Durham City & County CoC	34	36	37	42	-2	-5.6%	-1	-2.7%	-5	-11.9%	-8	-19.0%	0.76%
251	NC-503	North Carolina Balance of State	812	777	961	573	35	4.5%	-184	-19.1%	388	67.7%	239	41.7%	18.27%
252	NC-504	Greensboro/High Point CoC	130	108	202	228	22	20.4%	-94	-46.5%	-26	-11.4%	-98	-43.0%	2.92%
253	NC-505	Charlotte/Mecklenburg County CoC	550	438	328	1,143	112	25.6%	110	33.5%	-815	-71.3%	-593	-51.9%	12.37%
254	NC-506	Wilmington/Brunswick/Pender CoC	162	69	209	388	93	134.8%	-140	-67.0%	-179	-46.1%	-226	-58.2%	3.64%
255	NC-507	Raleigh/Wake County CoC	247	73	70	106	174	238.4%	3	4.3%	-36	-34.0%	141	133.0%	5.56%
256	NC-509	Gastonia/Cleveland/Lincoln CoC	356	663	438	588	-307	-46.3%	225	51.4%	-150	-25.5%	-232	-39.5%	8.01%
257	NC-511	Fayetteville/Cumberland County CoC	702	808	444	510	-106	-13.1%	364	82.0%	-66	-12.9%	192	37.6%	15.79%
258	NC-513	Chapel Hill/Orange County CoC	5	18	25	32	-13	-72.2%	-7	-28.0%	-7	-21.9%	-27	-84.4%	0.11%
259	NC-516	Northwest North Carolina CoC	1,287	1,152	901	860	135	11.7%	251	27.9%	41	4.8%	427	49.7%	28.95%
260	ND-500	North Dakota Statewide CoC	8	19	59	77	-11	-57.9%	-40	-67.8%	-18	-23.4%	-69	-89.6%	100.00%
261	NE-500	North Central Nebraska CoC	499	335	90	159	164	49.0%	245	272.2%	-69	-43.4%	340	213.8%	78.09%
262	NE-501	Omaha/Council Bluffs CoC	61	72	238	189	-11	-15.3%	-166	-69.7%	49	25.9%	-128	-67.7%	9.55%
263	NE-502	Lincoln CoC	26	286	128	614	-260	-90.9%	158	123.4%	-486	-79.2%	-588	-95.8%	4.07%
264	NE-503	Southwest Nebraska CoC	1	13	13	19	-12	-92.3%	0	0.0%	-6	-31.6%	-18	-94.7%	0.16%
265	NE-504	Southeast Nebraska CoC	18	7	7	4	11	157.1%	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	14	350.0%	2.82%
266	NE-505	Panhandle of Nebraska CoC	31	42	47	100	-11	-26.2%	-5	-10.6%	-53	-53.0%	-69	-69.0%	4.85%
267	NE-506	Northeast Nebraska CoC	3	3	1	32	0	0.0%	2	200.0%	-31	-96.9%	-29	-90.6%	0.47%
268	NH-500	New Hampshire Balance of State CoC	50	156	531	632	-106	-67.9%	-375	-70.6%	-101	-16.0%	-582	-92.1%	20.92%
269	NH-501	Manchester CoC	171	203	197	771	-32	-15.8%	6	3.0%	-574	-74.4%	-600	-77.8%	71.55%
270	NH-502	Nashua/Hillsborough County CoC	18	125	247	370	-107	-85.6%	-122	-49.4%	-123	-33.2%	-352	-95.1%	7.53%
271	NJ-500	Atlantic City & County CoC	122	78	89	252	44	56.4%	-11	-12.4%	-163	-64.7%	-130	-51.6%	9.40%
272	NJ-501	Bergen County CoC	79	113	182	502	-34	-30.1%	-69	-37.9%	-320	-63.7%	-423	-84.3%	6.09%
273	NJ-502	Burlington County CoC	30	116	116	238	-86	-74.1%	0	0.0%	-122	-51.3%	-208	-87.4%	2.31%
274	NJ-503	Camden City & County CoC	154	272	214	401	-118	-43.4%	58	27.1%	-187	-46.6%	-247	-61.6%	11.86%
275	NJ-504	Newark/Essex County CoC	191	152	420	420	39	25.7%	-268	-63.8%	0	0.0%	-229	-54.5%	14.71%
276	NJ-505	Gloucester County CoC	16	14	30	28	2	14.3%	-16	-53.3%	2	7.1%	-12	-42.9%	1.23%
277	NJ-506	Jersey City/Hudson County CoC	129	251	164	296	-122	-48.6%	87	53.0%	-132	-44.6%	-167	-56.4%	9.94%
278	NJ-507	New Brunswick/Middlesex County CoC	213	247	268	182	-34	-13.8%	-21	-7.8%	86	47.3%	31	17.0%	16.41%
279	NJ-508	Monmouth County CoC	38	87	73	112	-49	-56.3%	14	19.2%	-39	-34.8%	-74	-66.1%	2.93%
280	NJ-509	Morris County CoC	45	35	63	37	10	28.6%	-28	-44.4%	26	70.3%	8	21.6%	3.47%
281	NJ-510	Lakewood Township/Ocean County	47	28	43	41	19	67.9%	-15	-34.9%	2	4.9%	6	14.6%	3.62%
282	NJ-511	Paterson/Passaic County CoC	99	204	231	140	-105	-51.5%	-27	-11.7%	91	65.0%	-41	-29.3%	7.63%
283	NJ-512	Salem County CoC	2	8	11	8	-6	-75.0%	-3	-27.3%	3	37.5%	-6	-75.0%	0.15%
284	NJ-513	Somerset County CoC	15	17	23	35	-2	-11.8%	-6	-26.1%	-12	-34.3%	-20	-57.1%	1.16%
285	NJ-514	Trenton/Mercer County CoC	42	138	356	186	-96	-69.6%	-218	-61.2%	170	91.4%	-144	-77.4%	3.24%
286	NJ-515	Elizabeth/Union County CoC	39	116	116	297	-77	-66.4%	0	0.0%	-181	-60.9%	-258	-86.9%	3.00%
287	NJ-516	Warren County CoC	5	23	7	1	-18	-78.3%	16	228.6%	6	600.0%	4	400.0%	0.39%
288	NJ-518	Cape May County CoC	3	14	8	7	-11	-78.6%	6	75.0%	1	14.3%	-4	-57.1%	0.23%
289	NJ-519	Sussex County CoC	8	16	4	17	-8	-50.0%	12	300.0%	-13	-76.5%	-9	-52.9%	0.62%
290	NJ-520	Cumberland County CoC	21	43	57	66	-22	-51.2%	-14	-24.6%	-9	-13.6%	-45	-68.2%	1.62%
291	NM-500	Albuquerque CoC	931	287	287	2,481	644	224.4%	0	0.0%	-2,194	-88.4%	-1,550	-62.5%	68.11%
292	NM-501	New Mexico Balance of State CoC	436	980	980	726	-544	-55.5%	0	0.0%	254	35.0%	-290	-39.9%	31.89%
293	NV-500	Las Vegas/Clark County CoC	6,334	7,573	7,573	9,424	-1,239	-16.4%	0	0.0%	-1,851	-19.6%	-3,090	-32.8%	94.74%
294	NV-501	Reno/Sparks/Washoe County CoC	55	98	98	83	-43	-43.9%	0	0.0%	15	18.1%	-28	-33.7%	0.82%
295	NV-502	Nevada Balance of State CoC	297	76	37	147	221	290.8%	39	105.4%	-110	-74.8%	150	102.0%	4.44%

Continuum of Care Unsheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Unsheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Unsheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
296	NY-500	Rochester/Monroe County	0	4	10	16	-4	-100.0%	-6	-60.0%	-6	-37.5%	-16	-100.0%	0.00%
297	NY-501	Elmira/Chemung County CoC	6	1	1	28	5	500.0%	0	0.0%	-27	-96.4%	-22	-78.6%	0.17%
298	NY-502	City of Auburn/Cayuga County CoC	0	12	22	73	-12	-100.0%	-10	-45.5%	-51	-69.9%	-73	-100.0%	0.00%
299	NY-503	Albany City & County CoC	35	72	80	46	-37	-51.4%	-8	-10.0%	34	73.9%	-11	-23.9%	0.97%
300	NY-504	Cattaraugus County CoC	17	15	38	90	2	13.3%	-23	-60.5%	-52	-57.8%	-73	-81.1%	0.47%
301	NY-505	Syracuse/Onondaga County CoC	6	11	11	12	-5	-45.5%	0	0.0%	-1	-8.3%	-6	-50.0%	0.17%
302	NY-506	Fulton/Montgomery/Schoharie	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.11%
303	NY-507	Schenectady City & County CoC	62	66	79	69	-4	-6.1%	-13	-16.5%	10	14.5%	-7	-10.1%	1.72%
304	NY-508	Buffalo/Erie County CoC	115	208	161	138	-93	-44.7%	47	29.2%	23	16.7%	-23	-16.7%	3.18%
305	NY-509	Oswego County CoC	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.72%
306	NY-510	Tompkins County CoC	10	16	16	34	-6	-37.5%	0	0.0%	-18	-52.9%	-24	-70.6%	0.28%
307	NY-511	Broome County/City of Binghamton	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.30%
308	NY-512	Troy/Rensselaer County CoC	38	59	46	222	-21	-35.6%	13	28.3%	-176	-79.3%	-184	-82.9%	1.05%
309	NY-513	Wayne County CoC	0	0	0	2	0	-	0	-	-2	-100.0%	-2	-100.0%	0.00%
310	NY-514	Jamestown/Dunkirk/Chautauqua County CoC	5	2	8	0	3	150.0%	-6	-75.0%	8	-	5	-	0.14%
311	NY-515	Cortland County CoC	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.00%
312	NY-516	Clinton County CoC	12	5	5	0	7	140.0%	0	0.0%	5	-	12	-	0.33%
313	NY-517	Orleans County CoC	5	5	5	20	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-15	-75.0%	-15	-75.0%	0.14%
314	NY-518	Utica/Rome/Oneida County CoC	17	16	16	36	1	6.3%	0	0.0%	-20	-55.6%	-19	-52.8%	0.47%
315	NY-519	Columbia/Greene County CoC	7	0	14	14	7	-	-14	-100.0%	0	0.0%	-7	-50.0%	0.19%
316	NY-520	Franklin County CoC	9	4	1	1	5	125.0%	3	300.0%	0	0.0%	8	800.0%	0.25%
317	NY-522	Jefferson County CoC	1	5	0	34	-4	-80.0%	5	-	-34	-100.0%	-33	-97.1%	0.03%
318	NY-523	Saratoga	31	49	109	135	-18	-36.7%	-60	-55.0%	-26	-19.3%	-104	-77.0%	0.86%
319	NY-524	Niagara CoC	9	6	8	4	3	50.0%	-2	-25.0%	4	100.0%	5	125.0%	0.25%
320	NY-600	New York City CoC	2,328	3,306	3,755	3,843	-978	-29.6%	-449	-12.0%	-88	-2.3%	-1,515	-39.4%	64.43%
321	NY-601	Poughkeepsie/Dutchess County CoC	70	84	84	89	-14	-16.7%	0	0.0%	-5	-5.6%	-19	-21.3%	1.94%
322	NY-602	Newburgh/Middletown/Orange County CoC	105	94	187	83	11	11.7%	-93	-49.7%	104	125.3%	22	26.5%	2.91%
323	NY-603	Islip/Suffolk County CoC	207	67	67	196	140	209.0%	0	0.0%	-129	-65.8%	11	5.6%	5.73%
324	NY-604	Yonkers/Westchester County CoC	166	136	136	89	30	22.1%	0	0.0%	47	52.8%	77	86.5%	4.59%
325	NY-605	Nassau County CoC	102	91	91	91	11	12.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	12.1%	2.82%
326	NY-606	Rockland County CoC	62	57	53	0	5	8.8%	4	7.5%	53	-	62	-	1.72%
327	NY-607	Sullivan County CoC	3	30	76	32	-27	-90.0%	-46	-60.5%	44	137.5%	-29	-90.6%	0.08%
328	NY-608	Ulster County CoC	144	188	201	147	-44	-23.4%	-13	-6.5%	54	36.7%	-3	-2.0%	3.99%
329	OH-500	Cincinnati/Hamilton County CoC	43	55	59	199	-12	-21.8%	-4	-6.8%	-140	-70.4%	-156	-78.4%	2.43%
330	OH-501	Toledo/Lucas County CoC	218	254	114	142	-36	-14.2%	140	122.8%	-28	-19.7%	76	53.5%	12.31%
331	OH-502	Cleveland/Cuyahoga County CoC	131	151	184	210	-20	-13.2%	-33	-17.9%	-26	-12.4%	-79	-37.6%	7.40%
332	OH-503	Columbus/Franklin County CoC	108	117	114	189	-9	-7.7%	3	2.6%	-75	-39.7%	-81	-42.9%	6.10%
333	OH-504	Youngstown/Mahoning County CoC	6	11	17	7	-5	-45.5%	-6	-35.3%	10	142.9%	-1	-14.3%	0.34%
334	OH-505	Dayton/Kettering/Montgomery CoC	14	30	66	0	-16	-53.3%	-36	-54.5%	66	-	14	-	0.79%
335	OH-506	Akron/Baberton/Summit County CoC	162	104	192	195	58	55.8%	-88	-45.8%	-3	-1.5%	-33	-16.9%	9.15%
336	OH-507	Ohio Balance of State CoC	1,012	1,300	1,023	2,780	-288	-22.2%	277	27.1%	-1,757	-63.2%	-1,768	-63.6%	57.14%
337	OH-508	Canton/Stark County CoC	77	513	115	358	-436	-85.0%	398	346.1%	-243	-67.9%	-281	-78.5%	4.35%
338	OK-500	North Central Oklahoma CoC	144	26	39	33	118	453.8%	-13	-33.3%	6	18.2%	111	336.4%	9.41%
339	OK-501	Tulsa City & County/Broken Arrow	29	35	72	49	-6	-17.1%	-37	-51.4%	23	46.9%	-20	-40.8%	1.89%
340	OK-502	Oklahoma City CoC	372	322	456	133	50	15.5%	-134	-29.4%	323	242.9%	239	179.7%	24.30%
341	OK-503	Oklahoma Balance of State CoC	51	6	82	96	45	750.0%	-76	-92.7%	-14	-14.6%	-45	-46.9%	3.33%
342	OK-504	Norman / Cleveland County	296	400	272	218	-104	-26.0%	128	47.1%	54	24.8%	78	35.8%	19.33%
343	OK-505	Northeast Oklahoma CoC	371	168	155	140	203	120.8%	13	8.4%	15	10.7%	231	165.0%	24.23%
344	OK-506	Southwest Oklahoma CoC	20	16	24	19	4	25.0%	-8	-33.3%	5	26.3%	1	5.3%	1.31%
345	OK-507	Southeastern CoC	248	70	32	18	178	254.3%	38	118.8%	14	77.8%	230	1277.8%	16.20%
346	OR-500	Eugene/Springfield/Lane County CoC	1,233	772	772	109	461	59.7%	0	0.0%	663	608.3%	1,124	1031.2%	12.50%
347	OR-501	Portland/Gresham/Multnomah	1,591	1,634	1,634	2,355	-43	-2.6%	0	0.0%	-721	-30.6%	-764	-32.4%	16.12%
348	OR-502	Medford/Ashland/Jackson County CoC	45	26	273	571	19	73.1%	-247	-90.5%	-298	-52.2%	-526	-92.1%	0.46%
349	OR-503	Central Oregon CoC	432	1,466	1,714	472	-1,034	-70.5%	-248	-14.5%	1,242	263.1%	-40	-8.5%	4.38%
350	OR-504	Salem/Marion/Polk County CoC	1,700	1,416	1,416	921	284	20.1%	0	0.0%	495	53.7%	779	84.6%	17.23%
351	OR-505	Oregon Balance of State CoC	2,631	3,574	1,630	1,048	-943	-26.4%	1,944	119.3%	582	55.5%	1,583	151.0%	26.66%
352	OR-506	Hillsboro/Beaverton/Washington County	536	409	412	416	127	31.1%	-3	-0.7%	-4	-1.0%	120	28.8%	5.43%
353	OR-507	Clackamas County CoC	1,699	1,410	1,410	1,601	289	20.5%	0	0.0%	-191	-11.9%	98	6.1%	17.22%
354	PA-500	Philadelphia CoC	506	457	447	176	49	10.7%	10	2.2%	271	154.0%	330	187.5%	39.62%

Continuum of Care Unsheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Unsheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Unsheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
355	PA-501	Harrisburg/Dauphin County CoC	56	66	54	85	-10	-15.2%	12	22.2%	-31	-36.5%	-29	-34.1%	4.39%
356	PA-502	Upper Darby/Delaware County	51	43	37	31	8	18.6%	6	16.2%	6	19.4%	20	64.5%	3.99%
357	PA-503	Wilkes-Barre/Luzerne County	3	10	23	7	-7	-70.0%	-13	-56.5%	16	228.6%	-4	-57.1%	0.23%
358	PA-504	Lower Marion/Montgomery	38	24	119	53	14	58.3%	-95	-79.8%	66	124.5%	-15	-28.3%	2.98%
359	PA-505	Chester County CoC	17	28	87	41	-11	-39.3%	-59	-67.8%	46	112.2%	-24	-58.5%	1.33%
360	PA-506	Reading/Berks County CoC	7	67	58	31	-60	-89.6%	9	15.5%	27	87.1%	-24	-77.4%	0.55%
361	PA-507	Altoona/Central Pennsylvania CoC	94	65	65	146	29	44.6%	0	0.0%	-81	-55.5%	-52	-35.6%	7.36%
362	PA-508	Scranton/Lackawanna County CoC	52	38	20	83	14	36.8%	18	90.0%	-63	-75.9%	-31	-37.3%	4.07%
363	PA-509	Allentown/Northeast Pennsylvania CoC	43	48	48	42	-5	-10.4%	0	0.0%	6	14.3%	1	2.4%	3.37%
364	PA-510	Lancaster City & County CoC	17	39	40	50	-22	-56.4%	-1	-2.5%	-10	-20.0%	-33	-66.0%	1.33%
365	PA-511	Bristol/Bensalem/Bucks County CoC	34	4	8	51	30	750.0%	-4	-50.0%	-43	-84.3%	-17	-33.3%	2.66%
366	PA-600	Pittsburgh...Allegheny County CoC	282	220	248	81	62	28.2%	-28	-11.3%	167	206.2%	201	248.1%	22.08%
367	PA-601	Southwest Pennsylvania CoC	7	58	58	60	-51	-87.9%	0	0.0%	-2	-3.3%	-53	-88.3%	0.55%
368	PA-602	Northwest Pennsylvania CoC	13	9	9	5	4	44.4%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	8	160.0%	1.02%
369	PA-603	Beaver County CoC	18	82	82	2	-64	-78.0%	0	0.0%	80	4000.0%	16	800.0%	1.41%
370	PA-605	Erie City & County CoC	39	41	76	90	-2	-4.9%	-35	-46.1%	-14	-15.6%	-51	-56.7%	3.05%
371	PR-502	Puerto Rico Balance of Commonwealth	907	699	1,438	1,335	208	29.8%	-739	-51.4%	103	7.7%	-428	-32.1%	33.04%
372	PR-503	South/Southeast Puerto Rico CoC	1,838	1,503	1,503	1,603	335	22.3%	0	0.0%	-100	-6.2%	235	14.7%	66.96%
373	RI-500	Rhode Island Statewide CoC	51	54	49	108	-3	-5.6%	5	10.2%	-59	-54.6%	-57	-52.8%	100.00%
374	SC-500	Charleston/Low Country CoC	69	57	57	278	12	21.1%	0	0.0%	-221	-79.5%	-209	-75.2%	4.80%
375	SC-501	Greenville/Anderson/Spartanburg Upstate	156	506	506	611	-350	-69.2%	0	0.0%	-105	-17.2%	-455	-74.5%	10.86%
376	SC-502	Columbia Midlands CoC	439	623	623	1,412	-184	-29.5%	0	0.0%	-789	-55.9%	-973	-68.9%	30.55%
377	SC-503	Myrtle Beach/Sumter City & County	677	1,339	1,339	1,477	-662	-49.4%	0	0.0%	-138	-9.3%	-800	-54.2%	47.11%
378	SC-504	Florence City & County/Pee Dee CoC	96	49	49	372	47	95.9%	0	0.0%	-323	-86.8%	-276	-74.2%	6.68%
379	SD-500	South Dakota Statewide CoC	64	41	41	42	23	56.1%	0	0.0%	-1	-2.4%	22	52.4%	100.00%
380	TN-500	Chattanooga/Southeast Tennessee CoC	207	15	757	303	192	1280.0%	-742	-98.0%	454	149.8%	-96	-31.7%	6.09%
381	TN-501	Memphis/Shelby County CoC	69	84	70	194	-15	-17.9%	14	20.0%	-124	-63.9%	-125	-64.4%	2.03%
382	TN-502	Knoxville/Knox County CoC	117	114	126	155	3	2.6%	-12	-9.5%	-29	-18.7%	-38	-24.5%	3.44%
383	TN-503	South Central Tennessee CoC	45	89	79	140	-44	-49.4%	10	12.7%	-61	-43.6%	-95	-67.9%	1.32%
384	TN-504	Nashville/Davidson County CoC	398	466	390	496	-68	-14.6%	76	19.5%	-106	-21.4%	-98	-19.8%	11.71%
385	TN-506	Oak Ridge/Upper Cumberland CoC	1,033	508	508	744	525	103.3%	0	0.0%	-236	-31.7%	289	38.8%	30.39%
386	TN-507	Jackson/West Tennessee CoC	1,088	1,936	2,001	1,630	-848	-43.8%	-65	-3.2%	371	22.8%	-542	-33.3%	32.01%
387	TN-509	Appalachian Regional CoC	199	214	214	208	-15	-7.0%	0	0.0%	6	2.9%	-9	-4.3%	5.85%
388	TN-510	Murfreesboro/Rutherford City CoC	92	148	148	84	-56	-37.8%	0	0.0%	64	76.2%	8	9.5%	2.71%
389	TN-512	Morristown/Tennessee Valley CoC	151	471	471	0	-320	-67.9%	0	0.0%	471	#DIV/0!	151	#DIV/0!	4.44%
390	TX-500	San Antonio/Bexar County CoC	1,107	1,545	449	353	-438	-28.3%	1,096	244.1%	96	27.2%	754	213.6%	7.33%
391	TX-501	Corpus Christi/Nueces County CoC	312	114	114	2,766	198	173.7%	0	0.0%	-2,652	-95.9%	-2,454	-88.7%	2.07%
392	TX-503	Austin/Travis County CoC	1,223	2,146	3,886	1,854	-923	-43.0%	-1,740	-44.8%	2,032	109.6%	-631	-34.0%	8.10%
393	TX-504	Dewitt, Lavaca, Victoria Counties CoC	38	178	178	257	-140	-78.7%	0	0.0%	-79	-30.7%	-219	-85.2%	0.25%
394	TX-600	Dallas City & County/Irving CoC	176	213	367	376	-37	-17.4%	-154	-42.0%	-9	-2.4%	-200	-53.2%	1.17%
395	TX-601	Fort Worth/Arlington/Tarrant County	195	203	201	350	-8	-3.9%	2	1.0%	-149	-42.6%	-155	-44.3%	1.29%
396	TX-603	El Paso City & County CoC	296	273	273	198	23	8.4%	0	0.0%	75	37.9%	98	49.5%	1.96%
397	TX-604	Waco/McLennan County CoC	86	172	172	258	-86	-50.0%	0	0.0%	-86	-33.3%	-172	-66.7%	0.57%
398	TX-607	Texas Balance of State CoC	8,270	5,133	5,133	10,257	3,137	61.1%	0	0.0%	-5,124	-50.0%	-1,987	-19.4%	54.76%
399	TX-610	Denton City & County CoC	31	78	96	286	-47	-60.3%	-18	-18.8%	-190	-66.4%	-255	-89.2%	0.21%
400	TX-611	Amarillo CoC	127	54	133	837	73	135.2%	-79	-59.4%	-704	-84.1%	-710	-84.8%	0.84%
401	TX-613	Longview/Marshall Area CoC	106	158	114	0	-52	-32.9%	44	38.6%	114	-	106	-	0.70%
402	TX-624	Wichita Falls/Archer County CoC	7	49	49	0	-42	-85.7%	0	0.0%	49	-	7	-	0.05%
403	TX-700	Houston/Harris County CoC	2,119	5,346	5,346	0	-3,227	-60.4%	0	0.0%	5,346	-	2,119	-	14.03%
404	TX-701	Bryan/College Station/Brazos	84	70	70	0	14	20.0%	0	0.0%	70	-	84	-	0.56%
405	TX-702	Conroe/Montgomery County CoC	295	26	0	0	269	1034.6%	26	#DIV/0!	0	-	295	-	1.95%
406	TX-703	Beaumont/South East Texas	408	242	242	0	166	68.6%	0	0.0%	242	-	408	-	2.70%
407	TX-704	Galveston/Gulf Coast CoC	223	110	83	0	113	102.7%	27	32.5%	83	-	223	-	1.48%
408	UT-500	Salt Lake City & County CoC	112	158	198	203	-46	-29.1%	-40	-20.2%	-5	-2.5%	-91	-44.8%	43.92%
409	UT-503	Utah Balance of State CoC	99	51	86	73	48	94.1%	-35	-40.7%	13	17.8%	26	35.6%	38.82%
410	UT-504	Provo/Mountainland CoC	44	47	29	158	-3	-6.4%	18	62.1%	-129	-81.6%	-114	-72.2%	17.25%
411	VA-500	Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover Counties CoC	72	166	144	214	-94	-56.6%	22	15.3%	-70	-32.7%	-142	-66.4%	4.59%
412	VA-501	Norfolk CoC	91	61	104	64	30	49.2%	-43	-41.3%	40	62.5%	27	42.2%	5.80%
413	VA-502	Roanoke City & County/Salem CoC	11	7	38	18	4	57.1%	-31	-81.6%	20	111.1%	-7	-38.9%	0.70%

Continuum of Care Unsheltered Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Unsheltered PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of Statewide Unsheltered Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
414	VA-503	Virginia Beach CoC	39	78	46	293	-39	-50.0%	32	69.6%	-247	-84.3%	-254	-86.7%	2.49%
415	VA-504	Charlottesville CoC	14	15	28	94	-1	-6.7%	-13	-46.4%	-66	-70.2%	-80	-85.1%	0.89%
416	VA-505	Newport News/Virginia Peninsula CoC	55	40	339	257	15	37.5%	-299	-88.2%	82	31.9%	-202	-78.6%	3.51%
417	VA-507	Portsmouth CoC	110	45	52	54	65	144.4%	-7	-13.5%	-2	-3.7%	56	103.7%	7.02%
418	VA-508	Lynchburg CoC	44	45	191	191	-1	-2.2%	-146	-76.4%	0	0.0%	-147	-77.0%	2.81%
419	VA-509	Petersburg CoC	23	45	41	25	-22	-48.9%	4	9.8%	16	64.0%	-2	-8.0%	1.47%
420	VA-510	Staunton/Waynesboro/Augusta, Highland Counties CoC	1	15	1	0	-14	-93.3%	14	1400.0%	1	-	1	-	0.06%
421	VA-512	Chesapeake CoC	20	14	43	186	6	42.9%	-29	-67.4%	-143	-76.9%	-166	-89.2%	1.28%
422	VA-513	Shenandoah/Warren Counties CoC	40	50	47	26	-10	-20.0%	3	6.4%	21	80.8%	14	53.8%	2.55%
423	VA-514	Fredericksburg/Stafford Counties CoC	107	67	46	34	40	59.7%	21	45.7%	12	35.3%	73	214.7%	6.82%
424	VA-517	Danville, Martinsville CoC	76	133	118	22	-57	-42.9%	15	12.7%	96	436.4%	54	245.5%	4.85%
425	VA-518	Harrisburg/ Rockingham County CoC	21	7	9	3	14	200.0%	-2	-22.2%	6	200.0%	18	600.0%	1.34%
426	VA-519	Suffolk CoC	21	18	9	65	3	16.7%	9	100.0%	-56	-86.2%	-44	-67.7%	1.34%
427	VA-521	Virginia Balance of State	182	111	103	201	71	64.0%	8	7.8%	-98	-48.8%	-19	-9.5%	11.61%
428	VA-600	Arlington County CoC	207	179	219	142	28	15.6%	-40	-18.3%	77	54.2%	65	45.8%	13.20%
429	VA-601	Fairfax County CoC	129	212	154	228	-83	-39.2%	58	37.7%	-74	-32.5%	-99	-43.4%	8.23%
430	VA-602	Loudoun County CoC	35	24	97	81	11	45.8%	-73	-75.3%	16	19.8%	-46	-56.8%	2.23%
431	VA-603	Alexandria CoC	32	68	92	108	-36	-52.9%	-24	-26.1%	-16	-14.8%	-76	-70.4%	2.04%
432	VA-604	Prince William County CoC	238	174	258	180	64	36.8%	-84	-32.6%	78	43.3%	58	32.2%	15.18%
433	VI-500	Virgin Islands CoC	395	487	487	354	-92	-18.9%	0	0.0%	133	37.6%	41	11.6%	100.00%
434	VT-500	Vermont Balance of State CoC	125	194	280	195	-69	-35.6%	-86	-30.7%	85	43.6%	-70	-35.9%	79.62%
435	VT-501	Burlington/Chittenden County CoC	32	64	35	52	-32	-50.0%	29	82.9%	-17	-32.7%	-20	-38.5%	20.38%
436	WA-500	Seattle/King County CoC	2,863	2,693	2,222	1,946	170	6.3%	471	21.2%	276	14.2%	917	47.1%	43.74%
437	WA-501	Washington Balance of State CoC	1,807	1,971	2,027	1,634	-164	-8.3%	-56	-2.8%	393	24.1%	173	10.6%	27.61%
438	WA-502	City of Spokane CoC	157	290	194	505	-133	-45.9%	96	49.5%	-311	-61.6%	-348	-68.9%	2.40%
439	WA-503	Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County CoC	230	265	254	239	-35	-13.2%	11	4.3%	15	6.3%	-9	-3.8%	3.51%
440	WA-504	Everett/Snohomish County CoC	1,110	956	1,303	1,662	154	16.1%	-347	-26.6%	-359	-21.6%	-552	-33.2%	16.96%
441	WA-507	Yakima City & County CoC	146	141	143	152	5	3.5%	-2	-1.4%	-9	-5.9%	-6	-3.9%	2.23%
442	WA-508	Vancouver-Clarke County CoC	232	182	228	271	50	27.5%	-46	-20.2%	-43	-15.9%	-39	-14.4%	3.54%
443	WI-500	Wisconsin Balance of State CoC	785	288	288	357	497	172.6%	0	0.0%	-69	-19.3%	428	119.9%	74.06%
444	WI-501	Milwaukee City & County CoC	220	175	175	548	45	25.7%	0	0.0%	-373	-68.1%	-328	-59.9%	20.75%
445	WI-502	Racine City & County CoC	1	1	6	27	0	0.0%	-5	-83.3%	-21	-77.8%	-26	-96.3%	0.09%
446	WI-503	Madison/Dane County CoC	54	51	94	94	3	5.9%	-43	-45.7%	0	0.0%	-40	-42.6%	5.09%
447	WV-500	Wheeling/Weirton Area CoC	0	7	22	54	-7	-100.0%	-15	-68.2%	-32	-59.3%	-54	-100.0%	0.00%
448	WV-501	Huntington/Cabell, Wayne Counties	5	32	58	85	-27	-84.4%	-26	-44.8%	-27	-31.8%	-80	-94.1%	1.29%
449	WV-503	Charleston/Kanawha/Clay Counties CoC	51	99	62	76	-48	-48.5%	37	59.7%	-14	-18.4%	-25	-32.9%	13.11%
450	WV-508	West Virginia Balance of State CoC	333	456	120	124	-123	-27.0%	336	280.0%	-4	-3.2%	209	168.5%	85.60%
451	WY-500	Wyoming Statewide CoC	64	132	140	192	-68	-51.5%	-8	-5.7%	-52	-27.1%	-128	-66.7%	100.00%
TOTAL			239,759	278,053	280,487	331,130	-38,294	-13.8%	-2,434	-0.9%	-50,643	-15.3%	-91,371	-27.6%	

¹ Only active 2009 CoCs are reported in this table. All inactive or closed CoCs have been included in the national totals for 2006, 2007 and 2008, but are not individually reported.

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009

#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of 2009 Statewide Total Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
1	AK-500	Anchorage CoC	1,267	1,023	974	1,288	244	23.9%	49	5.0%	-314	-24.4%	-21	-1.6%	63.60%
2	AK-501	Alaska Balance of State CoC	725	623	668	739	102	16.4%	-45	-6.7%	-71	-9.6%	-14	-1.9%	36.40%
3	AL-500	Birmingham/Jefferson, St. Clair, Shelby Counties CoC	2,273	2,104	2,104	2,428	169	8.0%	0	0.0%	-324	-13.3%	-155	-6.4%	37.38%
4	AL-501	Mobile City & County/Baldwin County CoC	747	524	649	784	223	42.6%	-125	-19.3%	-135	-17.2%	-37	-4.7%	12.29%
5	AL-502	Florence/Northwest Alabama CoC	281	249	265	221	32	12.9%	-16	-6.0%	44	19.9%	60	27.1%	4.62%
6	AL-503	Huntsville/North Alabama CoC	664	714	830	972	-50	-7.0%	-116	-14.0%	-142	-14.6%	-308	-31.7%	10.92%
7	AL-504	Montgomery City & County CoC	377	444	456	479	-67	-15.1%	-12	-2.6%	-23	-4.8%	-102	-21.3%	6.20%
8	AL-505	Gadsden/Northeast Alabama CoC	433	298	119	104	135	45.3%	179	150.4%	15	14.4%	329	316.3%	7.12%
9	AL-506	Tuscaloosa City & County CoC	270	196	345	184	74	37.8%	-149	-43.2%	161	87.5%	86	46.7%	4.44%
10	AL-507	Alabama Balance of State CoC	1,035	858	684	407	177	20.6%	174	25.4%	277	68.1%	628	154.3%	17.02%
11	AR-500	Little Rock/Central Arkansas CoC	1,425	1,811	1,822	13,071	-386	-21.3%	-11	-0.6%	-11,249	-86.1%	-11,646	-89.1%	49.96%
12	AR-501	Fayetteville/Northwest Arkansas CoC	221	313	279	191	-92	-29.4%	34	12.2%	88	46.1%	30	15.7%	7.75%
13	AR-502	Conway/Arkansas River Valley CoC	146	163	163	1,183	-17	-10.4%	0	0.0%	-1,020	-86.2%	-1,037	-87.7%	5.12%
14	AR-504	Delta Hills CoC	969	817	901	1,569	152	18.6%	-84	-9.3%	-668	-42.6%	-600	-38.2%	33.98%
15	AR-505	Southeast Arkansas CoC	51	130	130	122	-79	-60.8%	0	0.0%	8	6.6%	-71	-58.2%	1.79%
16	AR-506	Johnson, Pope, Yell Counties CoC	40	21	21	0	19	90.5%	0	0.0%	21	-	40	-	1.40%
17	AZ-500	Arizona Balance of State CoC	3,236	2,940	2,997	2,640	296	10.1%	-57	-1.9%	357	13.5%	596	22.6%	21.98%
18	AZ-501	Tucson/Pima County CoC	3,596	2,359	3,201	2,580	1,237	52.4%	-842	-26.3%	621	24.1%	1,016	39.4%	24.43%
19	AZ-502	Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County Regional CoC	7,889	7,189	8,448	7,479	700	9.7%	-1,259	-14.9%	969	13.0%	410	5.5%	53.59%
20	CA-500	San Jose/Santa Clara City & County CoC	7,086	7,202	7,202	7,012	-116	-1.6%	0	0.0%	190	2.7%	74	1.1%	5.32%
21	CA-501	San Francisco CoC	5,823	5,171	5,703	5,404	652	12.6%	-532	-9.3%	299	5.5%	419	7.8%	4.37%
22	CA-502	Oakland/Alameda County CoC	4,341	4,838	4,838	5,129	-497	-10.3%	0	0.0%	-291	-5.7%	-788	-15.4%	3.26%
23	CA-503	Sacramento City & County CoC	2,800	2,615	2,452	2,229	185	7.1%	163	6.6%	223	10.0%	571	25.6%	2.10%
24	CA-504	Santa Rosa/Petaluma/Sonoma County	3,247	1,314	1,314	1,737	1,933	147.1%	0	0.0%	-423	-24.4%	1,510	86.9%	2.44%
25	CA-505	Richmond/Contra Costa County CoC	2,759	4,062	4,062	6,271	-1,303	-32.1%	0	0.0%	-2,209	-35.2%	-3,512	-56.0%	2.07%
26	CA-506	Salinas/Monterey County CoC	2,407	1,402	1,402	1,606	1,005	71.7%	0	0.0%	-204	-12.7%	801	49.9%	1.81%
27	CA-507	Marin County CoC	1,026	1,002	1,002	1,017	24	2.4%	0	0.0%	-15	-1.5%	9	0.9%	0.77%
28	CA-508	Watsonville/Santa Cruz City & County CoC	2,265	2,789	2,789	3,353	-524	-18.8%	0	0.0%	-564	-16.8%	-1,088	-32.4%	1.70%
29	CA-509	Mendocino County CoC	1,202	1,423	1,422	1,651	-221	-15.5%	1	0.1%	-229	-13.9%	-449	-27.2%	0.90%
30	CA-510	Turlock/Modesto/Stanislaus County CoC	1,800	1,593	1,593	1,613	207	13.0%	0	0.0%	-20	-1.2%	187	11.6%	1.35%
31	CA-511	Stockton/San Joaquin County CoC	3,005	2,354	2,479	3,360	651	27.7%	-125	-5.0%	-881	-26.2%	-355	-10.6%	2.26%
32	CA-512	Daly/San Mateo County CoC	1,567	1,798	1,798	1,231	-231	-12.8%	0	0.0%	567	46.1%	336	27.3%	1.18%
33	CA-513	Visalia, Kings, Tulare Counties CoC	966	1,040	1,106	1,998	-74	-7.1%	-66	-6.0%	-892	-44.6%	-1,032	-51.7%	0.73%
34	CA-514	Fresno/Madera County CoC	4,345	3,507	4,247	2,553	838	23.9%	-740	-17.4%	1,694	66.4%	1,792	70.2%	3.26%
35	CA-515	Roseville/Placer County CoC	616	587	587	466	29	4.9%	0	0.0%	121	26.0%	150	32.2%	0.46%
36	CA-516	Redding/Shasta County CoC	340	263	296	292	77	29.3%	-33	-11.1%	4	1.4%	48	16.4%	0.26%
37	CA-517	Napa City & County CoC	314	365	365	337	-51	-14.0%	0	0.0%	28	8.3%	-23	-6.8%	0.24%
38	CA-518	Vallejo/Solano County CoC	829	1,956	1,956	3,540	-1,127	-57.6%	0	0.0%	-1,584	-44.7%	-2,711	-76.6%	0.62%
39	CA-519	Chico/Paradise/Butte County CoC	689	592	1,478	990	97	16.4%	-886	-59.9%	488	49.3%	-301	-30.4%	0.52%
40	CA-520	Merced City & County CoC	372	2,455	2,641	2,641	-2,083	-84.8%	-186	-7.0%	0	0.0%	-2,269	-85.9%	0.28%
41	CA-521	Davis/Woodland/Yolo County CoC	491	414	414	690	77	18.6%	0	0.0%	-276	-40.0%	-199	-28.8%	0.37%
42	CA-522	Humboldt County CoC	1,355	907	907	1,847	448	49.4%	0	0.0%	-940	-50.9%	-492	-26.6%	1.02%
43	CA-523	Colusa/Glenn/Tehama/Trinity Counties Coc	197	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.15%
44	CA-524	Yuba City, Marysville/Sutter, Yuba Counties CoC	411	594	362	528	-183	-30.8%	232	64.1%	-166	-31.4%	-117	-22.2%	0.31%
45	CA-525	El Dorado County CoC	146	150	107	0	-4	-2.7%	43	40.2%	107	-	146	-	0.11%
46	CA-526	Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador Counties CoC	372	400	400	0	-28	-7.0%	0	0.0%	400	-	372	-	0.28%
47	CA-527	Nevada County CoC	438	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.33%
48	CA-600	Los Angeles City & County CoC	42,694	68,608	68,608	82,291	-25,914	-37.8%	0	0.0%	-13,683	-16.6%	-39,597	-48.1%	32.07%
49	CA-601	San Diego CoC	4,338	4,354	3,485	5,472	-16	-0.4%	869	24.9%	-1,987	-36.3%	-1,134	-20.7%	3.26%
50	CA-602	Santa Ana/Anaheim/Orange County CoC	8,333	3,649	3,649	2,848	4,684	128.4%	0	0.0%	801	28.1%	5,485	192.6%	6.26%
51	CA-603	Santa Maria/Santa Barbara County	4,121	4,253	4,253	4,058	-132	-3.1%	0	0.0%	195	4.8%	63	1.6%	3.10%
52	CA-604	Bakersfield/Kern County CoC	1,499	1,537	1,537	1,306	-38	-2.5%	0	0.0%	231	17.7%	193	14.8%	1.13%
53	CA-605	San Buena Ventura/Ventura County	1,514	1,290	1,290	982	224	17.4%	0	0.0%	308	31.4%	532	54.2%	1.14%
54	CA-606	Long Beach CoC	3,909	3,829	3,829	4,475	80	2.1%	0	0.0%	-646	-14.4%	-566	-12.6%	2.94%
55	CA-607	Pasadena CoC	1,144	983	969	1,165	161	16.4%	14	1.4%	-196	-16.8%	-21	-1.8%	0.86%
56	CA-608	Riverside City & County CoC	3,366	4,508	4,508	4,785	-1,142	-25.3%	0	0.0%	-277	-5.8%	-1,419	-29.7%	2.53%
57	CA-609	San Bernardino City & County CoC	2,026	6,969	6,969	4,475	-4,943	-70.9%	0	0.0%	2,494	55.7%	-2,449	-54.7%	1.52%

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009

#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of 2009 Statewide Total Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
58	CA-610	San Diego County CoC	3,657	4,101	3,841	5,031	-444	-10.8%	260	6.8%	-1,190	-23.7%	-1,374	-27.3%	2.75%
59	CA-611	Oxnard CoC	679	671	671	642	8	1.2%	0	0.0%	29	4.5%	37	5.8%	0.51%
60	CA-612	Glendale CoC	306	296	296	289	10	3.4%	0	0.0%	7	2.4%	17	5.9%	0.23%
61	CA-613	Imperial County CoC	505	393	342	0	112	28.5%	51	14.9%	342	-	505	-	0.38%
62	CA-614	San Luis Obispo County CoC	3,829	850	2,408	2,408	2,979	350.5%	-1,558	-64.7%	0	0.0%	1,421	59.0%	2.88%
63	CO-500	Colorado Balance of State CoC	5,267	5,188	4,450	10,314	79	1.5%	738	16.6%	-5,864	-56.9%	-5,047	-48.9%	34.50%
64	CO-503	Metropolitan Denver Homeless Initiative	8,752	8,482	8,698	8,661	270	3.2%	-216	-2.5%	37	0.4%	91	1.1%	57.32%
65	CO-504	Colorado Springs/El Paso County CoC	1,249	1,077	1,077	1,159	172	16.0%	0	0.0%	-82	-7.1%	90	7.8%	8.18%
66	CT-500	Danbury CoC	135	123	152	290	12	9.8%	-29	-19.1%	-138	-47.6%	-155	-53.4%	2.93%
67	CT-501	New Haven CoC	744	816	778	1,177	-72	-8.8%	38	4.9%	-399	-33.9%	-433	-36.8%	16.16%
68	CT-502	Hartford CoC	1,224	1,269	907	829	-45	-3.5%	362	39.9%	78	9.4%	395	47.6%	26.58%
69	CT-503	Bridgeport/Stratford/Fairfield CoC	315	342	356	378	-27	-7.9%	-14	-3.9%	-22	-5.8%	-63	-16.7%	6.84%
70	CT-504	Middletown/Middlesex County CoC	231	276	302	311	-45	-16.3%	-26	-8.6%	-9	-2.9%	-80	-25.7%	5.02%
71	CT-505	Connecticut Balance of State CoC	761	571	647	452	190	33.3%	-76	-11.7%	195	43.1%	309	68.4%	16.53%
72	CT-506	Norwalk/Fairfield County CoC	225	198	262	199	27	13.6%	-64	-24.4%	63	31.7%	26	13.1%	4.89%
73	CT-507	Norwich/New London City & County CoC	296	304	285	360	-8	-2.6%	19	6.7%	-75	-20.8%	-64	-17.8%	6.43%
74	CT-508	Stamford/Greenwich CoC	285	306	301	426	-21	-6.9%	5	1.7%	-125	-29.3%	-141	-33.1%	6.19%
75	CT-509	New Britain CoC	140	157	165	183	-17	-10.8%	-8	-4.8%	-18	-9.8%	-43	-23.5%	3.04%
76	CT-510	Bristol CoC	75	81	91	105	-6	-7.4%	-10	-11.0%	-14	-13.3%	-30	-28.6%	1.63%
77	CT-512	City of Waterbury CoC	174	184	236	206	-10	-5.4%	-52	-22.0%	30	14.6%	-32	-15.5%	3.78%
78	DC-500	District of Columbia CoC	6,228	6,044	5,320	5,633	184	3.0%	724	13.6%	-313	-5.6%	595	10.6%	100.00%
79	DE-500	Delaware Statewide CoC	1,130	933	1,061	1,089	197	21.1%	-128	-12.1%	-28	-2.6%	41	3.8%	100.00%
80	FL-500	Sarasota, Bradenton, Manatee Counties CoC	1,999	1,361	1,012	1,330	638	46.9%	349	34.5%	-318	-23.9%	669	50.3%	3.60%
81	FL-501	Tampa/Hillsborough County CoC	7,473	6,483	6,483	9,871	990	15.3%	0	0.0%	-3,388	-34.3%	-2,398	-24.3%	13.44%
82	FL-502	St. Petersburg/Clearwater/Largo/Pinellas County CoC	3,419	2,526	2,526	3,603	893	35.4%	0	0.0%	-1,077	-29.9%	-184	-5.1%	6.15%
83	FL-503	Lakeland CoC	675	655	802	833	20	3.1%	-147	-18.3%	-31	-3.7%	-158	-19.0%	1.21%
84	FL-504	Daytona Beach/Daytona/Volusia, Flagler Counties CoC	1,913	1,801	1,478	2,660	112	6.2%	323	21.9%	-1,182	-44.4%	-747	-28.1%	3.44%
85	FL-505	Fort Walton Beach/Okaloosa, Walton Counties CoC	2,446	1,763	2,179	2,181	683	38.7%	-416	-19.1%	-2	-0.1%	265	12.2%	4.40%
86	FL-506	Tallahassee/Leon County CoC	640	590	590	691	50	8.5%	0	0.0%	-101	-14.6%	-51	-7.4%	1.15%
87	FL-507	Orlando/Orange, Osceola, Seminole Counties CoC	3,970	3,734	3,823	4,297	236	6.3%	-89	-2.3%	-474	-11.0%	-327	-7.6%	7.14%
88	FL-508	Gainesville/Alachua, Putnam Counties CoC	924	744	678	765	180	24.2%	66	9.7%	-87	-11.4%	159	20.8%	1.66%
89	FL-509	Fort Pierce/St. Lucie, Indian River, Martin Counties CoC	1,950	1,503	1,734	2,313	447	29.7%	-231	-13.3%	-579	-25.0%	-363	-15.7%	3.51%
90	FL-510	Jacksonville-Duval, Clay Counties CoC	2,442	2,585	2,743	2,725	-143	-5.5%	-158	-5.8%	18	0.7%	-283	-10.4%	4.39%
91	FL-511	Pensacola/Esca/Santa Rosa County CoC	1,030	1,028	629	1,188	2	0.2%	399	63.4%	-559	-47.1%	-158	-13.3%	1.85%
92	FL-512	Saint Johns County CoC	1,237	1,238	1,238	997	-1	-0.1%	0	0.0%	241	24.2%	240	24.1%	2.22%
93	FL-513	Palm Bay/Melbourne/Brevard County CoC	1,221	1,899	1,899	1,665	-678	-35.7%	0	0.0%	234	14.1%	-444	-26.7%	2.20%
94	FL-514	Ocala/Marion County CoC	491	480	480	1,410	11	2.3%	0	0.0%	-930	-66.0%	-919	-65.2%	0.88%
95	FL-515	Panama City/Bay, Jackson Counties CoC	287	313	313	1,059	-26	-8.3%	0	0.0%	-746	-70.4%	-772	-72.9%	0.52%
96	FL-516	Winterhaven/Polk County CoC	50	494	0	0	-444	-89.9%	0	0.0%	0	-	50	-	0.09%
97	FL-517	Hendry, Hardee, Highlands Counties CoC	4,220	2,968	904	3,077	1,252	42.2%	2,064	228.3%	-2,173	-70.6%	1,143	37.1%	7.59%
98	FL-518	Columbia, Hamilton, Lafayette, Suwannee Counties CoC	1,114	282	250	192	832	295.0%	32	12.8%	58	30.2%	922	480.2%	2.00%
99	FL-519	Pasco County CoC	4,527	4,074	2,260	3,677	453	11.1%	1,814	80.3%	-1,417	-38.5%	850	23.1%	8.14%
100	FL-520	Citrus, Hernando, Lake, Sumter Counties CoC	1,025	1,104	2,019	1,412	-79	-7.2%	-915	-45.3%	607	43.0%	-387	-27.4%	1.84%
101	FL-600	Miami/Dade County CoC	4,333	4,574	4,392	4,709	-241	-5.3%	182	4.1%	-317	-6.7%	-376	-8.0%	7.79%
102	FL-601	Ft Lauderdale/Broward County CoC	3,225	3,154	3,154	3,114	71	2.3%	0	0.0%	40	1.3%	111	3.6%	5.80%
103	FL-602	Punta Gorda/Charlotte County CoC	541	730	730	3,314	-189	-25.9%	0	0.0%	-2,584	-78.0%	-2,773	-83.7%	0.97%
104	FL-603	Ft Myers/Cape Coral/Lee County CoC	931	899	2,382	2,078	32	3.6%	-1,483	-62.3%	304	14.6%	-1,147	-55.2%	1.67%
105	FL-604	Monroe County CoC	1,040	1,121	1,121	981	-81	-7.2%	0	0.0%	140	14.3%	59	6.0%	1.87%
106	FL-605	West Palm Beach/Palm Beach County	2,147	1,766	1,766	1,574	381	21.6%	0	0.0%	192	12.2%	573	36.4%	3.86%
107	FL-606	Naples/Collier County CoC	329	289	484	513	40	13.8%	-195	-40.3%	-29	-5.7%	-184	-35.9%	0.59%
108	GA-500	Atlanta/Roswell/DeKalb, Fulton Counties CoC	7,019	6,840	6,840	6,483	179	2.6%	0	0.0%	357	5.5%	536	8.3%	34.47%
109	GA-501	Georgia Balance of State CoC	9,941	9,340	10,255	12,481	601	6.4%	-915	-8.9%	-2,226	-17.8%	-2,540	-20.4%	48.83%
110	GA-503	Athens/Clarke County CoC	454	462	464	475	-8	-1.7%	-2	-0.4%	-11	-2.3%	-21	-4.4%	2.23%
111	GA-504	Augusta CoC	556	528	489	569	28	5.3%	39	8.0%	-80	-14.1%	-13	-2.3%	2.73%
112	GA-505	Columbus-Muscogee/Russell County CoC	458	618	540	466	-160	-25.9%	78	14.4%	74	15.9%	-8	-1.7%	2.25%
113	GA-506	Marietta/Cobb County CoC	480	537	537	660	-57	-10.6%	0	0.0%	-123	-18.6%	-180	-27.3%	2.36%

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of 2009 Statewide Total Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
114	GA-507	Savannah/Chatham County CoC	1,452	770	514	659	682	88.6%	256	49.8%	-145	-22.0%	793	120.3%	7.13%
115	GU-500	Guam CoC	1,088	725	725	1,050	363	50.1%	0	0.0%	-325	-31.0%	38	3.6%	100.00%
116	HI-500	Hawaii Balance of State CoC	2,144	2,311	2,320	2,448	-167	-7.2%	-9	-0.4%	-128	-5.2%	-304	-12.4%	37.08%
117	HI-501	Honolulu CoC	3,638	3,750	3,750	2,135	-112	-3.0%	0	0.0%	1,615	75.6%	1,503	70.4%	62.92%
118	IA-500	Sioux City/Dakota, Woodbury Counties CoC	289	271	164	191	18	6.6%	107	65.2%	-27	-14.1%	98	51.3%	8.55%
119	IA-501	Iowa Balance of State CoC	1,962	1,950	1,529	2,243	12	0.6%	421	27.5%	-714	-31.8%	-281	-12.5%	58.05%
120	IA-502	Des Moines/Polk County CoC	1,129	1,125	1,041	2,739	4	0.4%	84	8.1%	-1,698	-62.0%	-1,610	-58.8%	33.40%
121	ID-500	Boise/Ada County CoC	786	611	581	144	175	28.6%	30	5.2%	437	303.5%	642	445.8%	40.54%
122	ID-501	Idaho Balance of State CoC	1,153	853	1,168	1,307	300	35.2%	-315	-27.0%	-139	-10.6%	-154	-11.8%	59.46%
123	IL-500	McHenry County CoC	257	199	253	193	58	29.1%	-54	-21.3%	60	31.1%	64	33.2%	1.83%
124	IL-501	Rockford/Winnebago, Boone Counties CoC	452	575	575	1,667	-123	-21.4%	0	0.0%	-1,092	-65.5%	-1,215	-72.9%	3.22%
125	IL-502	North Chicago/Lake County CoC	370	439	496	414	-69	-15.7%	-57	-11.5%	82	19.8%	-44	-10.6%	2.63%
126	IL-503	Champaign/Urbana/Rantoul/Champaign County CoC	534	429	429	308	105	24.5%	0	0.0%	121	39.3%	226	73.4%	3.80%
127	IL-504	Madison County CoC	202	214	240	387	-12	-5.6%	-26	-10.8%	-147	-38.0%	-185	-47.8%	1.44%
128	IL-505	Evanston CoC	188	183	183	184	5	2.7%	0	0.0%	-1	-0.5%	4	2.2%	1.34%
129	IL-506	Joliet/Bolingbrook/Will County CoC	340	309	397	388	31	10.0%	-88	-22.2%	9	2.3%	-48	-12.4%	2.42%
130	IL-507	Peoria/Perkin/Fulton, Peoria, Tazewell, Woodford CoC	397	350	434	486	47	13.4%	-84	-19.4%	-52	-10.7%	-89	-18.3%	2.82%
131	IL-508	East Saint Louis/Belleville/Saint Clair County CoC	536	670	799	1,106	-134	-20.0%	-129	-16.1%	-307	-27.8%	-570	-51.5%	3.81%
132	IL-509	DeKalb City & County CoC	115	130	130	96	-15	-11.5%	0	0.0%	34	35.4%	19	19.8%	0.82%
133	IL-510	Chicago CoC	6,240	5,979	5,979	6,671	261	4.4%	0	0.0%	-692	-10.4%	-431	-6.5%	44.40%
134	IL-511	Cook County CoC	1,190	1,237	1,237	1,085	-47	-3.8%	0	0.0%	152	14.0%	105	9.7%	8.47%
135	IL-512	Bloomington/Central Illinois CoC	515	467	467	386	48	10.3%	0	0.0%	81	21.0%	129	33.4%	3.66%
136	IL-513	Springfield/Sangamon County CoC	257	235	260	355	22	9.4%	-25	-9.6%	-95	-26.8%	-98	-27.6%	1.83%
137	IL-514	Dupage County CoC	695	766	766	557	-71	-9.3%	0	0.0%	209	37.5%	138	24.8%	4.94%
138	IL-515	South Central Illinois CoC	329	270	246	268	59	21.9%	24	9.8%	-22	-8.2%	61	22.8%	2.34%
139	IL-516	Decatur/Macon County CoC	176	347	347	377	-171	-49.3%	0	0.0%	-30	-8.0%	-201	-53.3%	1.25%
140	IL-517	Aurora/Elgin/Kane County CoC	445	474	474	506	-29	-6.1%	0	0.0%	-32	-6.3%	-61	-12.1%	3.17%
141	IL-518	Rock Island/Moline/Northwestern Illinois CoC	400	352	600	802	48	13.6%	-248	-41.3%	-202	-25.2%	-402	-50.1%	2.85%
142	IL-519	West Central Illinois CoC	127	229	305	278	-102	-44.5%	-76	-24.9%	27	9.7%	-151	-54.3%	0.90%
143	IL-520	Southern Illinois CoC	290	870	870	619	-580	-66.7%	0	0.0%	251	40.5%	-329	-53.2%	2.06%
144	IN-500	St. Joseph County CoC	1,243	998	584	0	245	24.5%	414	70.9%	584	-	1,243	-	17.80%
145	IN-502	Indiana Balance of State CoC	4,287	4,906	4,906	7,590	-619	-12.6%	0	0.0%	-2,684	-35.4%	-3,303	-43.5%	61.38%
146	IN-503	Indianapolis CoC	1,454	1,491	1,868	2,140	-37	-2.5%	-377	-20.2%	-272	-12.7%	-686	-32.1%	20.82%
147	KS-501	Kansas City/Wyandotte County CoC	222	166	187	175	56	33.7%	-21	-11.2%	12	6.9%	47	26.9%	11.73%
148	KS-502	Wichita/Sedgwick County CoC	384	473	526	589	-89	-18.8%	-53	-10.1%	-63	-10.7%	-205	-34.8%	20.30%
149	KS-503	Topeka/Shawnee County CoC	217	341	227	476	-124	-36.4%	114	50.2%	-249	-52.3%	-259	-54.4%	11.47%
150	KS-505	Overland Park/Johnson County CoC	210	234	234	237	-24	-10.3%	0	0.0%	-3	-1.3%	-27	-11.4%	11.10%
151	KS-507	Kansas Balance of State CoC	859	524	524	3,478	335	63.9%	0	0.0%	-2,954	-84.9%	-2,619	-75.3%	45.40%
152	KY-500	Kentucky Balance of State CoC	3,174	4,027	4,316	4,087	-853	-21.2%	-289	-6.7%	229	5.6%	-913	-22.3%	52.91%
153	KY-501	Louisville/Jefferson County CoC	1,515	2,682	2,587	2,067	-1,167	-43.5%	95	3.7%	520	25.2%	-552	-26.7%	25.25%
154	KY-502	Lexington/Fayette County CoC	1,310	1,428	1,158	891	-118	-8.3%	270	23.3%	267	30.0%	419	47.0%	21.84%
155	LA-500	Lafayette/Acadiana CoC	731	631	631	680	100	15.8%	0	0.0%	-49	-7.2%	51	7.5%	5.85%
156	LA-501	Lake Charles/Southwestern Louisiana CoC	72	94	247	194	-22	-23.4%	-153	-61.9%	53	27.3%	-122	-62.9%	0.58%
157	LA-502	Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest CoC	830	1,042	857	748	-212	-20.3%	185	21.6%	109	14.6%	82	11.0%	6.64%
158	LA-503	New Orleans/Jefferson Parish CoC	8,725	1,619	1,619	2,051	7,106	438.9%	0	0.0%	-432	-21.1%	6,674	325.4%	69.78%
159	LA-504	Baton Rouge CoC	1,118	1,006	1,042	744	112	11.1%	-36	-3.5%	298	40.1%	374	50.3%	8.94%
160	LA-505	Monroe/Northeast Louisiana CoC	228	276	313	394	-48	-17.4%	-37	-11.8%	-81	-20.6%	-166	-42.1%	1.82%
161	LA-506	Slidell/Southeast Louisiana CoC	379	522	434	400	-143	-27.4%	88	20.3%	34	8.5%	-21	-5.3%	3.03%
162	LA-507	Alexandria/Central Louisiana CoC	151	128	188	1,526	23	18.0%	-60	-31.9%	-1,338	-87.7%	-1,375	-90.1%	1.21%
163	LA-508	Houma-Terrebonne/Thibodaux CoC	270	163	163	200	107	65.6%	0	0.0%	-37	-18.5%	70	35.0%	2.16%
164	MA-500	Boston CoC	5,101	5,198	5,104	5,217	-97	-1.9%	94	1.8%	-113	-2.2%	-116	-2.2%	32.95%
165	MA-501	Holyoke/Franklin, Hampden, Hampshire Counties CoC	1,394	1,090	964	557	304	27.9%	126	13.1%	407	73.1%	837	150.3%	9.00%
166	MA-502	Lynn CoC	610	389	236	192	221	56.8%	153	64.8%	44	22.9%	418	217.7%	3.94%
167	MA-503	Cape Cod Islands CoC	611	741	697	1,008	-130	-17.5%	44	6.3%	-311	-30.9%	-397	-39.4%	3.95%
168	MA-504	Springfield CoC	774	696	1,053	447	78	11.2%	-357	-33.9%	606	135.6%	327	73.2%	5.00%
169	MA-505	New Bedford CoC	510	380	390	434	130	34.2%	-10	-2.6%	-44	-10.1%	76	17.5%	3.29%

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of 2009 Statewide Total Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
170	MA-506	Worcester City & County CoC	1,397	1,291	1,302	1,172	106	8.2%	-11	-0.8%	130	11.1%	225	19.2%	9.02%
171	MA-507	Pittsfield/Berkshire County CoC	286	237	374	355	49	20.7%	-137	-36.6%	19	5.4%	-69	-19.4%	1.85%
172	MA-508	Lowell CoC	309	398	432	342	-89	-22.4%	-34	-7.9%	90	26.3%	-33	-9.6%	2.00%
173	MA-509	Cambridge CoC	637	486	432	449	151	31.1%	54	12.5%	-17	-3.8%	188	41.9%	4.11%
174	MA-510	Gloucester/Haverhill/Salem/Essex County CoC	813	656	606	570	157	23.9%	50	8.3%	36	6.3%	243	42.6%	5.25%
175	MA-511	Quincy/Weymouth CoC	322	256	280	256	66	25.8%	-24	-8.6%	24	9.4%	66	25.8%	2.08%
176	MA-512	Lawrence CoC	274	300	310	152	-26	-8.7%	-10	-3.2%	158	103.9%	122	80.3%	1.77%
177	MA-513	Malden/Medford CoC	290	130	137	158	160	123.1%	-7	-5.1%	-21	-13.3%	132	83.5%	1.87%
178	MA-515	Fall River CoC	154	143	153	154	11	7.7%	-10	-6.5%	-1	-0.6%	0	0.0%	0.99%
179	MA-516	Massachusetts Balance of State CoC	650	401	623	372	249	62.1%	-222	-35.6%	251	67.5%	278	74.7%	4.20%
180	MA-517	Somerville CoC	132	179	211	225	-47	-26.3%	-32	-15.2%	-14	-6.2%	-93	-41.3%	0.85%
181	MA-518	Brookline/Newton CoC	135	121	130	216	14	11.6%	-9	-6.9%	-86	-39.8%	-81	-37.5%	0.87%
182	MA-519	Attleboro/Taunton/Bristol County CoC	142	133	292	320	9	6.8%	-159	-54.5%	-28	-8.8%	-178	-55.6%	0.92%
183	MA-520	Brockton/Plymouth City & County CoC	941	645	654	645	296	45.9%	-9	-1.4%	9	1.4%	296	45.9%	6.08%
184	MD-500	Cumberland/Allegany County CoC	218	132	162	187	86	65.2%	-30	-18.5%	-25	-13.4%	31	16.6%	1.86%
185	MD-501	Baltimore City CoC	3,419	2,607	2,607	2,904	812	31.1%	0	0.0%	-297	-10.2%	515	17.7%	29.23%
186	MD-502	Harford County CoC	152	145	145	115	7	4.8%	0	0.0%	30	26.1%	37	32.2%	1.30%
187	MD-503	Annapolis/Anne Arundel County CoC	326	290	289	307	36	12.4%	1	0.3%	-18	-5.9%	19	6.2%	2.79%
188	MD-504	Howard County CoC	180	159	175	182	21	13.2%	-16	-9.1%	-7	-3.8%	-2	-1.1%	1.54%
189	MD-505	Baltimore County CoC	1,520	426	634	576	1,094	256.8%	-208	-32.8%	58	10.1%	944	163.9%	12.99%
190	MD-506	Carroll County CoC	151	174	174	215	-23	-13.2%	0	0.0%	-41	-19.1%	-64	-29.8%	1.29%
191	MD-507	Cecil County CoC	173	152	119	125	21	13.8%	33	27.7%	-6	-4.8%	48	38.4%	1.48%
192	MD-508	Charles, Calvert, St.Mary's Counties CoC	2,560	1,938	1,973	610	622	32.1%	-35	-1.8%	1,363	223.4%	1,950	319.7%	21.88%
193	MD-509	Frederick City & County CoC	324	246	223	212	78	31.7%	23	10.3%	11	5.2%	112	52.8%	2.77%
194	MD-510	Garrett County CoC	11	82	82	54	-71	-86.6%	0	0.0%	28	51.9%	-43	-79.6%	0.09%
195	MD-511	Mid-Shore Regional CoC	144	310	311	294	-166	-53.5%	-1	-0.3%	17	5.8%	-150	-51.0%	1.23%
196	MD-512	Hagerstown/Washington County CoC	137	214	212	242	-77	-36.0%	2	0.9%	-30	-12.4%	-105	-43.4%	1.17%
197	MD-513	Wicomico/Somerset/Worcester CoC	283	251	215	219	32	12.7%	36	16.7%	-4	-1.8%	64	29.2%	2.42%
198	MD-600	Prince George's County CoC	853	943	1,168	1,291	-90	-9.5%	-225	-19.3%	-123	-9.5%	-438	-33.9%	7.29%
199	MD-601	Montgomery County CoC	1,247	1,150	1,139	1,164	97	8.4%	11	1.0%	-25	-2.1%	83	7.1%	10.66%
200	ME-500	Maine Balance of State CoC	1,305	1,372	1,398	1,303	-67	-4.9%	-26	-1.9%	95	7.3%	2	0.2%	53.40%
201	ME-501	Bangor/Penobscot County Coc	470	531	499	562	-61	-11.5%	32	6.4%	-63	-11.2%	-92	-16.4%	19.23%
202	ME-502	Portland CoC	669	729	741	773	-60	-8.2%	-12	-1.6%	-32	-4.1%	-104	-13.5%	27.37%
203	MI-500	Michigan Balance of State CoC	2,796	2,250	2,250	2,090	546	24.3%	0	0.0%	160	7.7%	706	33.8%	19.96%
204	MI-501	Detroit CoC	3,694	18,062	18,062	14,827	-14,368	-79.5%	0	0.0%	3,235	21.8%	-11,133	-75.1%	26.38%
205	MI-502	Dearborn/Dearborn Heights/Westland/Wayne County CoC	428	865	865	743	-437	-50.5%	0	0.0%	122	16.4%	-315	-42.4%	3.06%
206	MI-503	St. Clair Shores/Warren/Macomb County	877	769	769	575	108	14.0%	0	0.0%	194	33.7%	302	52.5%	6.26%
207	MI-504	Pontiac/Royal Oak/Oakland County	661	1,011	1,011	1,293	-350	-34.6%	0	0.0%	-282	-21.8%	-632	-48.9%	4.72%
208	MI-505	Flint/Genesee County CoC	275	245	354	2,192	30	12.2%	-109	-30.8%	-1,838	-83.9%	-1,917	-87.5%	1.96%
209	MI-506	Grand Rapids/Wyoming/Kent County	868	794	912	869	74	9.3%	-118	-12.9%	43	4.9%	-1	-0.1%	6.20%
210	MI-507	Portage/Kalamazoo City & County	985	862	614	412	123	14.3%	248	40.4%	202	49.0%	573	139.1%	7.03%
211	MI-508	Lansing/East Lansing/Ingham County	416	408	408	415	8	2.0%	0	0.0%	-7	-1.7%	1	0.2%	2.97%
212	MI-509	Ann Arbor/Washtenaw County CoC	342	413	413	432	-71	-17.2%	0	0.0%	-19	-4.4%	-90	-20.8%	2.44%
213	MI-510	Saginaw City & County CoC	305	361	361	285	-56	-15.5%	0	0.0%	76	26.7%	20	7.0%	2.18%
214	MI-511	Lenawee County CoC	114	93	93	109	21	22.6%	0	0.0%	-16	-14.7%	5	4.6%	0.81%
215	MI-512	Grand Traverse/Antrim, Leelanau Counties	281	241	241	250	40	16.6%	0	0.0%	-9	-3.6%	31	12.4%	2.01%
216	MI-513	Marquette, Alger Counties CoC	68	37	37	87	31	83.8%	0	0.0%	-50	-57.5%	-19	-21.8%	0.49%
217	MI-514	Battle Creek/Calhoun County CoC	238	274	205	147	-36	-13.1%	69	33.7%	58	39.5%	91	61.9%	1.70%
218	MI-515	Monroe City & County CoC	140	142	142	105	-2	-1.4%	0	0.0%	37	35.2%	35	33.3%	1.00%
219	MI-516	Norton Shores/Muskegon City & County	466	351	332	286	115	32.8%	19	5.7%	46	16.1%	180	62.9%	3.33%
220	MI-517	Jackson City & County CoC	323	414	463	347	-91	-22.0%	-49	-10.6%	116	33.4%	-24	-6.9%	2.31%
221	MI-518	Livingston County CoC	121	63	63	88	58	92.1%	0	0.0%	-25	-28.4%	33	37.5%	0.86%
222	MI-519	Holland/Ottawa County CoC	299	291	319	0	8	2.7%	-28	-8.8%	319	-	299	-	2.13%
223	MI-522	Alpena, Iosca, Presque Isle/NE Michigan CoC	157	105	105	0	52	49.5%	0	0.0%	105	-	157	-	1.12%
224	MI-523	Eaton County CoC	151	197	197	130	-46	-23.4%	0	0.0%	67	51.5%	21	16.2%	1.08%
225	MN-500	Minneapolis/Hennepin County CoC	3,281	3,369	2,984	3,415	-88	-2.6%	385	12.9%	-431	-12.6%	-134	-3.9%	42.51%

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of 2009 Statewide Total Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
226	MN-501	Saint Paul/Ramsey County CoC	1,377	1,294	1,294	809	83	6.4%	0	0.0%	485	60.0%	568	70.2%	17.84%
227	MN-502	Rochester/Southeast Minnesota CoC	417	446	446	468	-29	-6.5%	0	0.0%	-22	-4.7%	-51	-10.9%	5.40%
228	MN-503	Dakota County CoC	631	548	363	446	83	15.1%	185	51.0%	-83	-18.6%	185	41.5%	8.18%
229	MN-504	Northeast Minnesota CoC	210	230	232	137	-20	-8.7%	-2	-0.9%	95	69.3%	73	53.3%	2.72%
230	MN-505	St. Cloud/Central Minnesota CoC	451	389	389	394	62	15.9%	0	0.0%	-5	-1.3%	57	14.5%	5.84%
231	MN-506	Northwest Minnesota CoC	261	230	266	110	31	13.5%	-36	-13.5%	156	141.8%	151	137.3%	3.38%
232	MN-508	Moorehead/West Central Minnesota CoC	272	242	242	236	30	12.4%	0	0.0%	6	2.5%	36	15.3%	3.52%
233	MN-509	Duluth/Saint Louis County CoC	504	501	501	351	3	0.6%	0	0.0%	150	42.7%	153	43.6%	6.53%
234	MN-510	Scott, Carver Counties CoC	209	252	152	119	-43	-17.1%	100	65.8%	33	27.7%	90	75.6%	2.71%
235	MN-511	Southwest Minnesota CoC	105	143	169	47	-38	-26.6%	-26	-15.4%	122	259.6%	58	123.4%	1.36%
236	MO-500	St. Louis County CoC	643	458	336	406	185	40.4%	122	36.3%	-70	-17.2%	237	58.4%	9.24%
237	MO-501	St. Louis City CoC	1,306	1,386	1,386	1,038	-80	-5.8%	0	0.0%	348	33.5%	268	25.8%	18.77%
238	MO-503	St. Charles, Lincoln, Warren Counties CoC	830	593	498	484	237	40.0%	95	19.1%	14	2.9%	346	71.5%	11.93%
239	MO-600	Springfield/Greene, Christian, Webster Counties CoC	418	713	518	554	-295	-41.4%	195	37.6%	-36	-6.5%	-136	-24.5%	6.01%
240	MO-602	Joplin/Jasper, Newton Counties CoC	322	380	306	379	-58	-15.3%	74	24.2%	-73	-19.3%	-57	-15.0%	4.63%
241	MO-603	St. Joseph/Andrew, Buchanan, DeKalb Counties CoC	159	159	100	88	0	0.0%	59	59.0%	12	13.6%	71	80.7%	2.28%
242	MO-604	Kansas City/Independence/ Lee's Summit/Jackson County CoC	1,587	2,094	1,599	3,793	-507	-24.2%	495	31.0%	-2,194	-57.8%	-2,206	-58.2%	22.81%
243	MO-606	Missouri Balance of State CoC	1,694	1,904	1,396	1,062	-210	-11.0%	508	36.4%	334	31.5%	632	59.5%	24.34%
244	MS-500	Jackson/Rankin, Madison Counties CoC	922	1,302	718	585	-380	-29.2%	584	81.3%	133	22.7%	337	57.6%	32.96%
245	MS-501	Mississippi Balance of State CoC	1,242	385	385	2,003	857	222.6%	0	0.0%	-1,618	-80.8%	-761	-38.0%	44.40%
246	MS-503	Gulf Port/Gulf Coast Regional CoC	633	274	274	593	359	131.0%	0	0.0%	-319	-53.8%	40	6.7%	22.63%
247	MT-500	Montana Statewide CoC	1,196	1,417	1,150	1,331	-221	-15.6%	267	23.2%	-181	-13.6%	-135	-10.1%	100.00%
248	NC-500	Winston Salem/Forsyth County CoC	489	452	503	1,040	37	8.2%	-51	-10.1%	-537	-51.6%	-551	-53.0%	3.79%
249	NC-501	Asheville/Buncombe County CoC	518	509	635	498	9	1.8%	-126	-19.8%	137	27.5%	20	4.0%	4.01%
250	NC-502	Durham City & County CoC	536	590	539	502	-54	-9.2%	51	9.5%	37	7.4%	34	6.8%	4.15%
251	NC-503	North Carolina Balance of State CoC	2,821	2,509	2,421	1,218	312	12.4%	88	3.6%	1,203	98.8%	1,603	131.6%	21.84%
252	NC-504	Greensboro/High Point CoC	1,078	987	1,182	1,108	91	9.2%	-195	-16.5%	74	6.7%	-30	-2.7%	8.34%
253	NC-505	Charlotte/Mecklenburg County CoC	2,594	1,988	1,976	2,591	606	30.5%	12	0.6%	-615	-23.7%	3	0.1%	20.08%
254	NC-506	Wilmington/Brunswick, New Hanover, Pender Counties CoC	630	496	628	673	134	27.0%	-132	-21.0%	-45	-6.7%	-43	-6.4%	4.88%
255	NC-507	Raleigh/Wake County CoC	1,152	1,144	1,043	981	8	0.7%	101	9.7%	62	6.3%	171	17.4%	8.92%
256	NC-509	Gastonia/Cleveland, Gaston, Lincoln Counties CoC	580	920	652	792	-340	-37.0%	268	41.1%	-140	-17.7%	-212	-26.8%	4.49%
257	NC-511	Fayetteville/Cumberland County CoC	965	1,074	757	841	-109	-10.1%	317	41.9%	-84	-10.0%	124	14.7%	7.47%
258	NC-513	Chapel Hill/Orange County CoC	156	195	208	237	-39	-20.0%	-13	-6.3%	-29	-12.2%	-81	-34.2%	1.21%
259	NC-516	Northwest North Carolina CoC	1,399	1,314	1,069	976	85	6.5%	245	22.9%	93	9.5%	423	43.3%	10.83%
260	ND-500	North Dakota Statewide CoC	773	615	636	614	158	25.7%	-21	-3.3%	22	3.6%	159	25.9%	100.00%
261	NE-500	North Central Nebraska CoC	991	1,175	257	399	-184	-15.7%	918	357.2%	-142	-35.6%	592	148.4%	26.65%
262	NE-501	Omaha/Council Bluffs CoC	1,262	1,197	1,870	1,632	65	5.4%	-673	-36.0%	238	14.6%	-370	-22.7%	33.94%
263	NE-502	Lincoln CoC	973	1,151	966	1,447	-178	-15.5%	185	19.2%	-481	-33.2%	-474	-32.8%	26.17%
264	NE-503	Southwest Nebraska CoC	96	85	85	99	11	12.9%	0	0.0%	-14	-14.1%	-3	-3.0%	2.58%
265	NE-504	Southeast Nebraska CoC	162	184	108	153	-22	-12.0%	76	70.4%	-45	-29.4%	9	5.9%	4.36%
266	NE-505	Panhandle of Nebraska CoC	116	121	169	279	-5	-4.1%	-48	-28.4%	-110	-39.4%	-163	-58.4%	3.12%
267	NE-506	Northeast Nebraska CoC	118	72	76	99	46	63.9%	-4	-5.3%	-23	-23.2%	19	19.2%	3.17%
268	NH-500	New Hampshire Balance of State CoC	769	986	1,300	1,244	-217	-22.0%	-314	-24.2%	56	4.5%	-475	-38.2%	46.75%
269	NH-501	Manchester CoC	508	576	504	1,255	-68	-11.8%	72	14.3%	-751	-59.8%	-747	-59.5%	30.88%
270	NH-502	Nashua/Hillsborough County CoC	368	457	444	582	-89	-19.5%	13	2.9%	-138	-23.7%	-214	-36.8%	22.37%
271	NJ-500	Atlantic City & County CoC	461	476	514	648	-15	-3.2%	-38	-7.4%	-134	-20.7%	-187	-28.9%	3.50%
272	NJ-501	Bergen County CoC	1,433	1,627	1,392	1,495	-194	-11.9%	235	16.9%	-103	-6.9%	-62	-4.1%	10.88%
273	NJ-502	Burlington County CoC	979	896	896	980	83	9.3%	0	0.0%	-84	-8.6%	-1	-0.1%	7.43%
274	NJ-503	Camden City & County CoC	579	718	853	996	-139	-19.4%	-135	-15.8%	-143	-14.4%	-417	-41.9%	4.40%
275	NJ-504	Newark/Essex County CoC	1,730	1,036	2,326	1,682	694	67.0%	-1,290	-55.5%	644	38.3%	48	2.9%	13.14%
276	NJ-505	Gloucester County CoC	206	190	167	228	16	8.4%	23	13.8%	-61	-26.8%	-22	-9.6%	1.56%
277	NJ-506	Jersey City/Bayonne/Hudson County CoC	1,779	2,227	2,842	2,973	-448	-20.1%	-615	-21.6%	-131	-4.4%	-1,194	-40.2%	13.51%
278	NJ-507	New Brunswick/Middlesex County CoC	796	792	996	650	4	0.5%	-204	-20.5%	346	53.2%	146	22.5%	6.04%
279	NJ-508	Monmouth County CoC	676	763	830	1,176	-87	-11.4%	-67	-8.1%	-346	-29.4%	-500	-42.5%	5.13%
280	NJ-509	Morris County CoC	302	224	292	367	78	34.8%	-68	-23.3%	-75	-20.4%	-65	-17.7%	2.29%
281	NJ-510	Lakewood Township/Ocean County CoC	453	337	424	556	116	34.4%	-87	-20.5%	-132	-23.7%	-103	-18.5%	3.44%

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009														
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009							
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% of 2009 Statewide Total Count
282	NJ-511	Paterson/Passaic County CoC	306	518	1,062	996	-212	-40.9%	-544	-51.2%	66	6.6%	-690	-69.3%
283	NJ-512	Salem County CoC	148	310	465	186	-162	-52.3%	-155	-33.3%	279	150.0%	-38	-20.4%
284	NJ-513	Somerset County CoC	298	302	366	485	-4	-1.3%	-64	-17.5%	-119	-24.5%	-187	-38.6%
285	NJ-514	Trenton/Mercer County CoC	1,062	989	1,598	834	73	7.4%	-609	-38.1%	764	91.6%	228	27.3%
286	NJ-515	Elizabeth/Union County CoC	1,116	1,188	1,188	1,564	-72	-6.1%	0	0.0%	-376	-24.0%	-448	-28.6%
287	NJ-516	Warren County CoC	402	417	222	231	-15	-3.6%	195	87.8%	-9	-3.9%	171	74.0%
288	NJ-518	Ocean City/Cape May County CoC	224	300	250	266	-76	-25.3%	50	20.0%	-16	-6.0%	-42	-15.8%
289	NJ-519	Sussex County CoC	112	276	359	371	-164	-59.4%	-83	-23.1%	-12	-3.2%	-259	-69.8%
290	NJ-520	Cumberland County CoC	107	246	163	150	-139	-56.5%	83	50.9%	13	8.7%	-43	-28.7%
291	NM-500	Albuquerque CoC	2,002	1,276	1,276	3,649	726	56.9%	0	0.0%	-2,373	-65.0%	-1,647	-45.1%
292	NM-501	New Mexico Balance of State CoC	1,473	1,739	1,739	1,607	-266	-15.3%	0	0.0%	132	8.2%	-134	-8.3%
293	NV-500	Las Vegas/Clark County CoC	13,338	11,417	11,417	12,198	1,921	16.8%	0	0.0%	-781	-6.4%	1,140	9.3%
294	NV-501	Reno/Sparks/Washoe County CoC	700	863	863	460	-163	-18.9%	0	0.0%	403	87.6%	240	52.2%
295	NV-502	Nevada Balance of State CoC	440	330	246	332	110	33.3%	84	34.1%	-86	-25.9%	108	32.5%
296	NY-500	Rochester/Irondequoit/Greece/Monroe County CoC	663	595	612	682	68	11.4%	-17	-2.8%	-70	-10.3%	-19	-2.8%
297	NY-501	Elmira/Steuben, Allegany, Chemung, Schuyler Counties COC	184	177	175	186	7	4.0%	2	1.1%	-11	-5.9%	-2	-1.1%
298	NY-502	Auburn/Cayuga County CoC	39	45	55	117	-6	-13.3%	-10	-18.2%	-62	-53.0%	-78	-66.7%
299	NY-503	Albany City & County CoC	639	538	619	407	101	18.8%	-81	-13.1%	212	52.1%	232	57.0%
300	NY-504	Cattaraugus County CoC	74	69	142	649	5	7.2%	-73	-51.4%	-507	-78.1%	-575	-88.6%
301	NY-505	Syracuse/Onondaga County CoC	791	686	740	749	105	15.3%	-54	-7.3%	-9	-1.2%	42	5.6%
302	NY-506	Fulton, Montgomery, Schoharie Counties CoC	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.04%
303	NY-507	Schenectady City & County CoC	258	195	288	322	63	32.3%	-93	-32.3%	-34	-10.6%	-64	-19.9%
304	NY-508	Buffalo/Erie County CoC	862	1,067	1,169	1,174	-205	-19.2%	-102	-8.7%	-5	-0.4%	-312	-26.6%
305	NY-509	Oswego County CoC	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.07%
306	NY-510	Tompkins County CoC	75	78	78	106	-3	-3.8%	0	0.0%	-28	-26.4%	-31	-29.2%
307	NY-511	Binghamton/Union Town/Broome County CoC	213	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.35%
308	NY-512	Troy/Rensselaer County CoC	298	193	212	459	105	54.4%	-19	-9.0%	-247	-53.8%	-161	-35.1%
309	NY-513	Wayne, Ontario, Seneca, Yates Counties CoC	81	88	98	42	-7	-8.0%	-10	-10.2%	56	133.3%	39	92.9%
310	NY-514	Jamestown/Dunkirk/Chautauqua County CoC	128	65	75	0	63	96.9%	-10	-13.3%	75	-	128	-
311	NY-515	Cortland County CoC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
312	NY-516	Clinton County CoC	136	53	53	0	83	156.6%	0	0.0%	53	-	136	-
313	NY-517	Orleans County CoC	30	39	39	48	-9	-23.1%	0	0.0%	-9	-18.8%	-18	-37.5%
314	NY-518	Utica/Rome/Oneida County CoC	343	316	316	350	27	8.5%	0	0.0%	-34	-9.7%	-7	-2.0%
315	NY-519	Columbia/Greene County CoC	267	172	325	325	95	55.2%	-153	-47.1%	0	0.0%	-58	-17.8%
316	NY-520	Franklin County CoC	14	10	28	28	4	40.0%	-18	-64.3%	0	0.0%	-14	-50.0%
317	NY-522	Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence Counties CoC	276	297	0	178	-21	-7.1%	0	0.0%	-178	-100.0%	98	55.1%
318	NY-523	Glen Falls/Saratoga Springs/Saratoga County CoC	195	166	255	369	29	17.5%	-89	-34.9%	-114	-30.9%	-174	-47.2%
319	NY-524	Niagara CoC	177	144	169	159	33	22.9%	-25	-14.8%	10	6.3%	18	11.3%
320	NY-600	New York City CoC	49,343	50,261	50,372	55,507	-918	-1.8%	-111	-0.2%	-5,135	-9.3%	-6,164	-11.1%
321	NY-601	Poughkeepsie/Dutchess County CoC	474	547	547	546	-73	-13.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.2%	-72	-13.2%
322	NY-602	Newburgh/Middletown/Orange County CoC	450	311	414	385	139	44.7%	-103	-24.9%	29	7.5%	65	16.9%
323	NY-603	Islip/Babylon/Huntington/Suffolk County CoC	1,942	1,728	1,728	2,728	214	12.4%	0	0.0%	-1,000	-36.7%	-786	-28.8%
324	NY-604	Yonkers/Mount Vernon/New Rochelle/Westchester County CoC	1,531	1,829	1,829	1,967	-298	-16.3%	0	0.0%	-138	-7.0%	-436	-22.2%
325	NY-605	Nassau County CoC	697	781	781	1,215	-84	-10.8%	0	0.0%	-434	-35.7%	-518	-42.6%
326	NY-606	Rockland County CoC	139	141	488	214	-2	-1.4%	-347	-71.1%	274	128.0%	-75	-35.0%
327	NY-607	Sullivan County CoC	369	139	343	257	230	165.5%	-204	-59.5%	86	33.5%	112	43.6%
328	NY-608	Kingston/Ulster County CoC	311	395	359	402	-84	-21.3%	36	10.0%	-43	-10.7%	-91	-22.6%
329	OH-500	Cincinnati/Hamilton County CoC	1,140	1,116	1,046	1,344	24	2.2%	70	6.7%	-298	-22.2%	-204	-15.2%
330	OH-501	Toledo/Lucas County CoC	945	959	745	739	-14	-1.5%	214	28.7%	6	0.8%	206	27.9%
331	OH-502	Cleveland/Cuyahoga County CoC	2,236	2,242	2,185	2,269	-6	-0.3%	57	2.6%	-84	-3.7%	-33	-1.5%
332	OH-503	Columbus/Franklin County CoC	1,359	1,341	1,373	1,357	18	1.3%	-32	-2.3%	16	1.2%	2	0.1%
333	OH-504	Youngstown/Mahoning County CoC	183	236	249	246	-53	-22.5%	-13	-5.2%	3	1.2%	-63	-25.6%
334	OH-505	Dayton/Kettering/Montgomery CoC	837	844	785	523	-7	-0.8%	59	7.5%	262	50.1%	314	60.0%
335	OH-506	Akron/Baberton/Summit County CoC	820	740	824	1,028	80	10.8%	-84	-10.2%	-204	-19.8%	-208	-20.2%
336	OH-507	Ohio Balance of State CoC	4,770	4,525	3,521	7,172	245	5.4%	1,004	28.5%	-3,651	-50.9%	-2,402	-33.5%
337	OH-508	Canton/Massillon/Alliance/Stark County CoC	410	909	536	757	-499	-54.9%	373	69.6%	-221	-29.2%	-347	-45.8%

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of 2009 Statewide Total Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
338	OK-500	North Central Oklahoma CoC	316	241	212	206	75	31.1%	29	13.7%	6	2.9%	110	53.4%	6.53%
339	OK-501	Tulsa City & County/Broken Arrow CoC	826	729	666	573	97	13.3%	63	9.5%	93	16.2%	253	44.2%	17.07%
340	OK-502	Oklahoma City CoC	1,475	1,335	1,734	1,426	140	10.5%	-399	-23.0%	308	21.6%	49	3.4%	30.49%
341	OK-503	Oklahoma Balance of State CoC	340	157	231	234	183	116.6%	-74	-32.0%	-3	-1.3%	106	45.3%	7.03%
342	OK-504	Norman / Cleveland County	585	578	594	419	7	1.2%	-16	-2.7%	175	41.8%	166	39.6%	12.09%
343	OK-505	Northeast Oklahoma CoC	635	370	305	317	265	71.6%	65	21.3%	-12	-3.8%	318	100.3%	13.13%
344	OK-506	Southewst Oklahoma CoC	272	168	250	96	104	61.9%	-82	-32.8%	154	160.4%	176	183.3%	5.62%
345	OK-507	Southeastern Oklahoma Regional CoC	389	268	229	178	121	45.1%	39	17.0%	51	28.7%	211	118.5%	8.04%
346	OR-500	Eugene/Springfield/Lane County CoC	2,232	2,137	2,332	1,293	95	4.4%	-195	-8.4%	1,039	80.4%	939	72.6%	12.90%
347	OR-501	Portland/Gresham/Multnomah County CoC	4,085	3,918	3,918	5,104	167	4.3%	0	0.0%	-1,186	-23.2%	-1,019	-20.0%	23.60%
348	OR-502	Medford/Ashland/Jackson County CoC	899	654	624	770	245	37.5%	30	4.8%	-146	-19.0%	129	16.8%	5.19%
349	OR-503	Central Oregon CoC	742	1,736	2,029	824	-994	-57.3%	-293	-14.4%	1,205	146.2%	-82	-10.0%	4.29%
350	OR-504	Salem/Marion/Polk Counties CoC	2,366	1,997	1,997	1,491	369	18.5%	0	0.0%	506	33.9%	875	58.7%	13.67%
351	OR-505	Oregon Balance of State CoC	4,411	7,863	4,434	3,260	-3,452	-43.9%	3,429	77.3%	1,174	36.0%	1,151	35.3%	25.48%
352	OR-506	Hillsboro/Beaverton/Washington County CoC	748	772	680	661	-24	-3.1%	92	13.5%	19	2.9%	87	13.2%	4.32%
353	OR-507	Clackamas County CoC	1,826	1,576	1,576	1,768	250	15.9%	0	0.0%	-192	-10.9%	58	3.3%	10.55%
354	PA-500	Philadelphia CoC	6,304	6,871	7,640	6,653	-567	-8.3%	-769	-10.1%	987	14.8%	-349	-5.2%	41.76%
355	PA-501	Harrisburg/Dauphin County CoC	421	421	412	479	0	0.0%	9	2.2%	-67	-14.0%	-58	-12.1%	2.79%
356	PA-502	Upper Darby/Chester/Haverford/Delaware County CoC	778	653	696	731	125	19.1%	-43	-6.2%	-35	-4.8%	47	6.4%	5.15%
357	PA-503	Wilkes-Barre/Hazleton/Luzerne County CoC	202	171	188	161	31	18.1%	-17	-9.0%	27	16.8%	41	25.5%	1.34%
358	PA-504	Lower Marion/Norristown/Abington/Montgomery County CoC	469	479	526	629	-10	-2.1%	-47	-8.9%	-103	-16.4%	-160	-25.4%	3.11%
359	PA-505	Chester County CoC	351	314	387	288	37	11.8%	-73	-18.9%	99	34.4%	63	21.9%	2.33%
360	PA-506	Reading/Berks County CoC	385	496	739	423	-111	-22.4%	-243	-32.9%	316	74.7%	-38	-9.0%	2.55%
361	PA-507	Altoona/Central Pennsylvania CoC	1,170	1,039	1,017	964	131	12.6%	22	2.2%	53	5.5%	206	21.4%	7.75%
362	PA-508	Scranton/Lackawanna County CoC	280	260	222	297	20	7.7%	38	17.1%	-75	-25.3%	-17	-5.7%	1.85%
363	PA-509	Allentown/Northeast Pennsylvania CoC	738	720	645	589	18	2.5%	75	11.6%	56	9.5%	149	25.3%	4.89%
364	PA-510	Lancaster City & County CoC	666	707	589	561	-41	-5.8%	118	20.0%	28	5.0%	105	18.7%	4.41%
365	PA-511	Bristol/Bensalem/Bucks County CoC	474	485	262	397	-11	-2.3%	223	85.1%	-135	-34.0%	77	19.4%	3.14%
366	PA-600	Pittsburgh/McKeesport/Penn Hills/Allegheny County CoC	1,418	1,308	1,380	1,297	110	8.4%	-72	-5.2%	83	6.4%	121	9.3%	9.39%
367	PA-601	Southwest Pennsylvania CoC	562	581	628	568	-19	-3.3%	-47	-7.5%	60	10.6%	-6	-1.1%	3.72%
368	PA-602	Northwest Pennsylvania CoC	269	281	283	273	-12	-4.3%	-2	-0.7%	10	3.7%	-4	-1.5%	1.78%
369	PA-603	Beaver County CoC	220	213	213	111	7	3.3%	0	0.0%	102	91.9%	109	98.2%	1.46%
370	PA-605	Erie City & County CoC	389	379	393	396	10	2.6%	-14	-3.6%	-3	-0.8%	-7	-1.8%	2.58%
371	PR-502	Puerto Rico Balance of Commonwealth CoC	1,775	707	2,004	1,834	1,068	151.1%	-1,297	-64.7%	170	9.3%	-59	-3.2%	43.61%
372	PR-503	South/Southeast Puerto Rico CoC	2,295	2,305	2,305	2,530	-10	-0.4%	0	0.0%	-225	-8.9%	-235	-9.3%	56.39%
373	RI-500	Rhode Island Statewide CoC	1,607	1,196	1,372	1,440	411	34.4%	-176	-12.8%	-68	-4.7%	167	11.6%	100.00%
374	SC-500	Charleston/Low Country CoC	416	539	539	2,714	-123	-22.8%	0	0.0%	-2,175	-80.1%	-2,298	-84.7%	9.30%
375	SC-501	Greenville/Anderson/Spartanburg Upstate CoC	1,164	1,606	1,606	1,813	-442	-27.5%	0	0.0%	-207	-11.4%	-649	-35.8%	26.02%
376	SC-502	Columbia/Midlands CoC	1,368	1,569	1,569	2,653	-201	-12.8%	0	0.0%	-1,084	-40.9%	-1,285	-48.4%	30.58%
377	SC-503	Myrtle Beach/Sumter City & County CoC	1,316	1,770	1,770	1,937	-454	-25.6%	0	0.0%	-167	-8.6%	-621	-32.1%	29.42%
378	SC-504	Florence City & County/Pee Dee CoC	209	176	176	497	33	18.8%	0	0.0%	-321	-64.6%	-288	-57.9%	4.67%
379	SD-500	South Dakota Statewide CoC	731	579	579	1,029	152	26.3%	0	0.0%	-450	-43.7%	-298	-29.0%	100.00%
380	TN-500	Chattanooga/Southeast Tennessee CoC	513	87	1,064	685	426	489.7%	-977	-91.8%	379	55.3%	-172	-25.1%	4.87%
381	TN-501	Memphis/Shelby County CoC	1,613	1,566	1,814	1,776	47	3.0%	-248	-13.7%	38	2.1%	-163	-9.2%	15.32%
382	TN-502	Knoxville/Knox County CoC	959	930	956	864	29	3.1%	-26	-2.7%	92	10.6%	95	11.0%	9.11%
383	TN-503	South Central Tennessee CoC	226	328	360	388	-102	-31.1%	-32	-8.9%	-28	-7.2%	-162	-41.8%	2.15%
384	TN-504	Nashville/Davidson County CoC	2,236	2,217	2,156	1,982	19	0.9%	61	2.8%	174	8.8%	254	12.8%	21.23%
385	TN-506	Oak Ridge/Upper Cumberland CoC	1,229	704	704	1,126	525	74.6%	0	0.0%	-422	-37.5%	103	9.1%	11.67%
386	TN-507	Jackson/West Tennessee CoC	2,214	2,187	2,255	1,873	27	1.2%	-68	-3.0%	382	20.4%	341	18.2%	21.02%
387	TN-509	Appalachian Regional CoC	840	559	559	522	281	50.3%	0	0.0%	37	7.1%	318	60.9%	7.98%
388	TN-510	Murfreesboro/Rutherford City CoC	204	223	438	344	-19	-8.5%	-215	-49.1%	94	27.3%	-140	-40.7%	1.94%
389	TN-512	Morristown/Blount, Sevier, Campbell, Cocke Counties CoC	498	904	904	0	-406	-44.9%	0	0.0%	904	-	498	-	4.73%
390	TX-500	San Antonio/Bexar County CoC	2,690	4,063	2,247	1,631	-1,373	-33.8%	1,816	80.8%	616	37.8%	1,059	64.9%	7.32%
391	TX-501	Corpus Christi/Nueces County CoC	658	277	277	3,100	381	137.5%	0	0.0%	-2,823	-91.1%	-2,442	-78.8%	1.79%
392	TX-503	Austin/Travis County CoC	2,641	3,451	5,281	3,025	-810	-23.5%	-1,830	-34.7%	2,256	74.6%	-384	-12.7%	7.18%
393	TX-504	Dewitt, Lavaca, Victoria Counties CoC	156	487	487	317	-331	-68.0%	0	0.0%	170	53.6%	-161	-50.8%	0.42%

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009																
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of 2009 Statewide Total Count	
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09		
394	TX-600	Dallas City & County/Irving CoC	3,701	3,558	3,408	3,360	143	4.0%	150	4.4%	48	1.4%	341	10.1%	10.07%	
395	TX-601	Fort Worth/Arlington/Tarrant County	2,181	2,676	2,876	3,164	-495	-18.5%	-200	-7.0%	-288	-9.1%	-983	-31.1%	5.93%	
396	TX-603	El Paso City & County CoC	1,260	1,241	1,241	1,215	19	1.5%	0	0.0%	26	2.1%	45	3.7%	3.43%	
397	TX-604	Waco/McLennan County CoC	312	431	431	460	-119	-27.6%	0	0.0%	-29	-6.3%	-148	-32.2%	0.85%	
398	TX-607	Texas Balance of State CoC	10,839	10,636	10,636	12,926	203	1.9%	0	0.0%	-2,290	-17.7%	-2,087	-16.1%	29.49%	
399	TX-610	Denton City & County CoC	124	168	207	470	-44	-26.2%	-39	-18.8%	-263	-56.0%	-346	-73.6%	0.34%	
400	TX-611	Amarillo CoC	566	540	431	1,167	26	4.8%	109	25.3%	-736	-63.1%	-601	-51.5%	1.54%	
401	TX-613	Longview/Marshall Area CoC	535	492	374	136	43	8.7%	118	31.6%	238	175.0%	399	293.4%	1.46%	
402	TX-624	Wichita Falls/Wise, Palo Pinto, Wichita, Archer Counties CoC	242	280	263	0	-38	-13.6%	17	6.5%	263	-	242	-	0.66%	
403	TX-700	Houston/Harris County CoC	7,576	10,363	10,363	0	-2,787	-26.9%	0	0.0%	10,363	-	7,576	-	20.61%	
404	TX-701	Bryan/College Station/Brazos Valley CoC	265	289	289	0	-24	-8.3%	0	0.0%	289	-	265	-	0.72%	
405	TX-702	Montgomery County CoC	463	157	0	0	306	194.9%	157	0.0%	0	-	463	-	1.26%	
406	TX-703	Beaumont/Port Arthur/South East Texas CoC	1,203	710	710	0	493	69.4%	0	0.0%	710	-	1,203	-	3.27%	
407	TX-704	Galveston/Gulf Coast CoC	1,349	371	267	0	978	263.6%	104	39.0%	267	-	1,349	-	3.67%	
408	UT-500	Salt Lake City & County CoC	1,811	2,296	2,079	2,405	-485	-21.1%	217	10.4%	-326	-13.6%	-594	-24.7%	47.72%	
409	UT-503	Utah Balance of State CoC	1,685	878	716	907	807	91.9%	162	22.6%	-191	-21.1%	778	85.8%	44.40%	
410	UT-504	Provo/Mountainland CoC	299	260	216	369	39	15.0%	44	20.4%	-153	-41.5%	-70	-19.0%	7.88%	
411	VA-500	Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover Counties CoC	1,150	1,073	1,158	941	77	7.2%	-85	-7.3%	217	23.1%	209	22.2%	12.99%	
412	VA-501	Norfolk CoC	577	502	540	600	75	14.9%	-38	-7.0%	-60	-10.0%	-23	-3.8%	6.52%	
413	VA-502	Roanoke City & County/Salem CoC	597	504	566	381	93	18.5%	-62	-11.0%	185	48.6%	216	56.7%	6.74%	
414	VA-503	Virginia Beach CoC	433	484	476	628	-51	-10.5%	8	1.7%	-152	-24.2%	-195	-31.1%	4.89%	
415	VA-504	Charlottesville CoC	199	239	265	257	-40	-16.7%	-26	-9.8%	8	3.1%	-58	-22.6%	2.25%	
416	VA-505	Newport News/Hampton/Virginia Peninsula CoC	569	526	908	879	43	8.2%	-382	-42.1%	29	3.3%	-310	-35.3%	6.43%	
417	VA-507	Portsmouth CoC	303	222	217	271	81	36.5%	5	2.3%	-54	-19.9%	32	11.8%	3.42%	
418	VA-508	Lynchburg CoC	255	256	289	289	-1	-0.4%	-33	-11.4%	0	0.0%	-34	-11.8%	2.88%	
419	VA-509	Petersburg CoC	90	74	80	94	16	21.6%	-6	-7.5%	-14	-14.9%	-4	-4.3%	1.02%	
420	VA-510	Staunton/Waynesboro/Augusta, Highland Counties CoC	100	109	95	0	-9	-8.3%	14	14.7%	95	-	100	-	1.13%	
421	VA-512	Chesapeake CoC	37	52	129	207	-15	-28.8%	-77	-59.7%	-78	-37.7%	-170	-82.1%	0.42%	
422	VA-513	Winchester/Shenandoah, Frederick, Warren Counties CoC	97	177	265	853	-80	-45.2%	-88	-33.2%	-588	-68.9%	-756	-88.6%	1.10%	
423	VA-514	Fredericksburg/Spotsylvania, Stafford Counties CoC	202	194	561	447	8	4.1%	-367	-65.4%	114	25.5%	-245	-54.8%	2.28%	
424	VA-517	Danville/Martinsville CoC	132	210	187	81	-78	-37.1%	23	12.3%	106	130.9%	51	63.0%	1.49%	
425	VA-518	Harrisburg/ Rockingham County CoC	132	68	117	92	64	94.1%	-49	-41.9%	25	27.2%	40	43.5%	1.49%	
426	VA-519	Suffolk CoC	71	48	30	74	23	47.9%	18	60.0%	-44	-59.5%	-3	-4.1%	0.80%	
427	VA-521	Virginia Balance of State CoC	559	470	608	675	89	18.9%	-138	-22.7%	-67	-9.9%	-116	-17.2%	6.31%	
428	VA-600	Arlington County CoC	511	410	462	360	101	24.6%	-52	-11.3%	102	28.3%	151	41.9%	5.77%	
429	VA-601	Fairfax County CoC	1,730	1,835	1,593	1,565	-105	-5.7%	242	15.2%	28	1.8%	165	10.5%	19.54%	
430	VA-602	Loudoun County CoC	143	160	211	184	-17	-10.6%	-51	-24.2%	27	14.7%	-41	-22.3%	1.62%	
431	VA-603	Alexandria CoC	335	306	375	379	29	9.5%	-69	-18.4%	-4	-1.1%	-44	-11.6%	3.78%	
432	VA-604	Prince William County CoC	630	550	614	498	80	14.5%	-64	-10.4%	116	23.3%	132	26.5%	7.12%	
433	VI-500	Virgin Islands CoC	471	602	559	448	-131	-21.8%	43	7.7%	111	24.8%	23	5.1%	100.00%	
434	VT-500	Vermont Balance of State CoC	649	633	796	770	16	2.5%	-163	-20.5%	26	3.4%	-121	-15.7%	53.46%	
435	VT-501	Burlington/Chittenden County CoC	565	321	239	219	244	76.0%	82	34.3%	20	9.1%	346	158.0%	46.54%	
436	WA-500	Seattle/King County CoC	8,952	8,501	7,902	7,910	451	5.3%	599	7.6%	-8	-0.1%	1,042	13.2%	39.29%	
437	WA-501	Washington Balance of State CoC	6,557	6,631	6,995	6,004	-74	-1.1%	-364	-5.2%	991	16.5%	553	9.2%	28.78%	
438	WA-502	Spokane City & County CoC	1,229	1,370	1,083	1,535	-141	-10.3%	287	26.5%	-452	-29.4%	-306	-19.9%	5.39%	
439	WA-503	Tacoma/Lakewood/Pierce County CoC	2,083	1,743	1,596	1,191	340	19.5%	147	9.2%	405	34.0%	892	74.9%	9.14%	
440	WA-504	Everett/Snohomish County CoC	2,356	2,161	3,453	3,241	195	9.0%	-1,292	-37.4%	212	6.5%	-885	-27.3%	10.34%	
441	WA-507	Yakima City & County CoC	446	486	684	610	-40	-8.2%	-198	-28.9%	74	12.1%	-164	-26.9%	1.96%	
442	WA-508	Vancouver/Clark County CoC	1,159	1,062	1,392	1,391	97	9.1%	-330	-23.7%	1	0.1%	-232	-16.7%	5.09%	
443	WI-500	Wisconsin Balance of State CoC	3,992	3,105	3,105	3,264	887	28.6%	0	0.0%	-159	-4.9%	728	22.3%	61.18%	
444	WI-501	Milwaukee City & County CoC	1,537	1,470	1,470	1,856	67	4.6%	0	0.0%	-386	-20.8%	-319	-17.2%	23.56%	
445	WI-502	Racine City & County CoC	354	259	256	305	95	36.7%	3	1.2%	-49	-16.1%	49	16.1%	5.43%	
446	WI-503	Madison/Dane County CoC	642	615	817	1,084	27	4.4%	-202	-24.7%	-267	-24.6%	-442	-40.8%	9.84%	
447	WV-500	Wheeling/Weirton Area CoC	87	92	118	115	-5	-5.4%	-26	-22.0%	3	2.6%	-28	-24.3%	5.22%	
448	WV-501	Huntington/Cabell, Wayne Counties	195	264	331	312	-69	-26.1%	-67	-20.2%	19	6.1%	-117	-37.5%	11.70%	
449	WV-503	Charleston/Kanawha, Putnam, Boone, Clay Counties CoC	382	363	325	402	19	5.2%	38	11.7%	-77	-19.2%	-20	-5.0%	22.92%	

Continuum of Care Total Point-In-Time Homeless Counts, 2006-2009															
#	CoC Number	CoC Name ¹	Total PIT Counts				Change 2006 to 2009								% of 2009 Statewide Total Count
			2009	2008	2007	2006	Total Change 08-09	% Change 08-09	Total Change 07-08	% Change 07-08	Total Change 06-07	% Change 06-07	Total Change 06-09	% Change 06-09	
450	WV-508	West Virginia Balance of State CoC	1,003	1,297	1,635	478	-294	-22.7%	-338	-20.7%	1,157	242.1%	525	109.8%	60.17%
451	WY-500	Wyoming Statewide CoC	515	751	537	529	-236	-31.4%	214		8	1.5%	-14	-2.6%	100.00%
	TOTAL		643,067	664,414	671,888	759,101	-21,347	-3.2%	-6,185	-0.9%	-87,213	-11.5%	-116,034	-15.3%	

¹ Only active 2009 CoCs are reported in this table. All inactive or closed CoCs have been included in the national totals for 2006, 2007 and 2008, but are not individually reported.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix D:
Counts of Homeless Sheltered Persons
Using HMIS Data

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix D

Counts of Homeless Sheltered Persons Using HMIS Data

Appendix D-1: Estimate of Sheltered Homeless Individuals and Families during a One-Year Period, October 2008–September 2009	
Household Type	Number of Sheltered Persons
All Sheltered Persons...	1,558,917
...in emergency shelters only	1,207,229
...in transitional housing only	284,616
...in both emergency shelters and transitional housing	67,072
Individuals...	1,034,659
...in emergency shelters only	840,394
...in transitional housing only	149,760
...in both emergency shelters and transitional housing	44,504
Persons in Families...	535,447
...in emergency shelters only	375,334
...in transitional housing only	134,069
...in both emergency shelters and transitional housing	26,044
Households with Children	170,129

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-2: Sheltered Homeless Persons by Household Type, October 2008–September 2009	
Household Type	Number
Number of Homeless Persons	1,558,917
Individuals	1,034,659
Single adult male households	722,030
Single adult female households	261,805
Unaccompanied youth and several-children households	22,722
Several-adult households	25,216
Unknown	2,885
Persons in Families	535,447
Adults in households with children	210,510
Children in households with adults	323,325
Unknown	1,613

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-3: Seasonal Point-in-Time Count of Sheltered Homeless Persons by Household Type, October 2008–September 2009			
Number of Sheltered Homeless Persons	All Sheltered Persons	Individuals	Persons in Families
On a single night in			
October 2008	322,380	168,461	153,919
January 2009	348,274	191,223	157,051
April 2009	332,603	177,200	155,403
July 2009	333,387	177,217	156,170
On an average night	331,568	176,784	154,784

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-4: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons by Household Type, October 2008–September 2009			
Characteristics	All Sheltered Persons	Individuals	Persons in Families
Number of Homeless Persons	1,558,917	1,034,659	535,447
Gender of Adults	1,212,539	1,011,819	210,511
Female	439,320	275,616	167,454
Male	770,491	733,685	42,824
Unknown	2,728	2,518	233
Gender of Children	344,660	22,714	323,322
Female	170,795	12,330	159,167
Male	173,260	10,354	163,571
Unknown	605	30	584
Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic/non-Latino	1,224,858	844,909	388,952
Hispanic/Latino	295,902	162,504	135,233
Unknown	38,157	27,246	11,263
Race			
White, non-Hispanic/non-Latino	553,942	442,652	115,173
White, Hispanic/Latino	168,396	101,072	68,162
Black or African American	562,964	333,211	233,882
Asian	10,434	6,414	4,134
American Indian or Alaska Native	47,267	27,490	19,713
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	9,519	3,096	6,357
Several races	102,393	61,980	41,408
Unknown	104,001	58,744	46,618
Age			
Under 1	39,555	1,842	37,918
1 to 5	133,416	1,768	132,204
6 to 12	107,247	2,503	105,093
13 to 17	64,277	16,518	48,020
18 to 30	346,044	232,516	116,101
31 to 50	594,323	511,461	87,455
51 to 61	223,594	219,639	6,099
62 and older	43,338	43,033	765
Unknown	7,122	5,379	1,793
Persons by Household Size			
1 person	996,705	1,005,500	0
2 people	154,978	25,455	130,251
3 people	158,594	2,480	156,711
4 people	122,953	610	122,855
5 or more people	122,969	182	123,306
Unknown	2,718	433	2,323

Appendix D-4: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons by Household Type, October 2008–September 2009			
Characteristics	All Sheltered Persons	Individuals	Persons in Families
Veteran (adults only)	1,212,539	1,011,818	210,511
Yes	127,634	124,744	4,072
No	1,019,490	836,760	190,740
Unknown	65,415	50,314	15,699
Disabled (adults only)	1,212,538	1,011,820	210,510
Yes	409,962	385,470	27,078
No	674,473	513,466	166,630
Unknown	128,103	112,884	16,802

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-5: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons in Emergency Shelters, October 2008–September 2009			
Characteristics	Persons in Emergency Shelters	Individuals	Persons in Families
Number of Homeless Persons	1,274,301	884,899	401,378
Gender of Adults	1,016,212	866,306	159,293
Female	346,192	224,533	125,162
Male	667,877	639,805	33,922
Unknown	2,143	1,968	209
Gender of Children	256,789	18,543	240,818
Female	125,884	9,609	117,539
Male	130,449	8,909	122,840
Unknown	456	25	439
Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic/non-Latino	998,899	717,476	290,691
Hispanic/Latino	246,661	146,605	102,459
Unknown	28,741	20,818	8,229
Race			
White, non-Hispanic/non-Latino	448,557	375,464	76,969
White, Hispanic/Latino	137,295	91,528	46,791
Black or African American	454,454	277,186	181,802
Asian	7,983	5,043	3,005
American Indian or Alaska Native	42,237	25,132	17,393
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5,656	2,314	3,379
Several races	82,025	53,778	29,068
Unknown	96,094	54,454	42,972
Age			
Under 1	29,310	830	28,802
1 to 5	98,183	1,266	97,915
6 to 12	79,356	2,242	77,910
13 to 17	49,847	14,124	36,171
18 to 30	279,728	194,575	87,998
31 to 50	498,558	437,137	65,935
51 to 61	193,266	190,263	4,649
62 and older	40,310	40,018	632
Unknown	5,742	4,444	1,367
Persons by Household Size			
1 person	852,278	859,881	0
2 people	117,861	21,960	97,165
3 people	117,894	2283	116,792
4 people	90,384	569	90,738

Appendix D-5: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons in Emergency Shelters, October 2008–September 2009			
Characteristics	Persons in Emergency Shelters	Individuals	Persons in Families
5 or more people	94,390	152	95,222
Unknown	1,493	54	1,462
Veteran (adults only)	1,016,212	866,306	159,293
Yes	105,108	102,941	3,077
No	857,195	722,071	143,036
Unknown	53,909	41,294	13,180
Disabled (adults only)	1,016,212	866,306	159,293
Yes	312,850	298,109	17,608
No	591,160	468,210	128,581
Unknown	112,202	99,987	13,104

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-6: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons in Transitional Housing, October 2008–September 2009			
Characteristics	Persons in Transitional Housing	Individuals	Persons in Families
Number of Homeless Persons	351,688	194,264	160,113
Gender of Adults	248,788	189,240	61,487
Female	112,191	62,711	50,364
Male	135,901	125,853	11,087
Unknown	696	676	36
Gender of Children	102,403	4,942	98,209
Female	52,082	3,124	49,337
Male	50,137	1,811	48,692
Unknown	184	7	180
Ethnicity			
Non-Hispanic/non-Latino	276,741	161,726	117,187
Hispanic/Latino	63,466	24,496	39,421
Unknown	11,481	8,043	3,504
Race			
White, non-Hispanic/non-Latino	129,070	85,330	44,633
White, Hispanic/Latino	40,563	15,347	25,405
Black or African American	132,267	71,081	62,324
Asian	2,980	1,675	1,327
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,420	3,100	3,365
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4,524	973	3,580
Several races	24,466	10,135	14,607
Unknown	11,398	6,624	4,871
Age			
Under 1	11,883	1,084	10,881
1 to 5	41,001	597	40,709
6 to 12	32,530	399	32,365
13 to 17	16,916	2,862	14,179
18 to 30	80,689	47,860	33,425
31 to 50	121,650	96,505	26,098
51 to 61	40,247	38,797	1,781
62 and older	5,129	5,002	165
Unknown	1,644	1,160	509
Persons by Household Size			
1 person	187,677	189,175	0
2 people	43,308	4254	39,397
3 people	47,572	322	47,594
4 people	37,890	65	38,070

Appendix D-6: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons in Transitional Housing, October 2008–September 2009			
Characteristics	Persons in Transitional Housing	Individuals	Persons in Families
5 or more people	33,887	39	34,093
Unknown	1,354	409	958
Veteran (adults only)	248,789	189,240	61,486
Yes	28,388	27,399	1,224
No	206,145	150,605	57,123
Unknown	14,256	11,236	3,139
Disabled (adults only)	248,789	189,240	61,487
Yes	115,684	105,374	11,195
No	111,201	66,496	45,537
Unknown	21,904	17,370	4,755

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-7: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons by Location, October 2008–September 2009

Characteristics	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas
Number of Homeless Persons	1,063,613	495,304
Gender of Adults	854,442	358,097
Female	294,131	145,189
Male	558,471	212,020
Unknown	1,840	888
Gender of Children	207,860	136,800
Female	102,974	67,821
Male	104,487	68,773
Unknown	399	206
Ethnicity		
Non-Hispanic/non-Latino	811,759	413,099
Hispanic/Latino	228,953	66,949
Unknown	22,901	15,256
Race		
White, non-Hispanic/non-Latino	326,917	227,026
White, Hispanic/Latino	128,221	40,175
Black or African American	405,904	157,059
Asian	6,564	3,870
American Indian or Alaska Native	35,339	11,928
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5,286	4,233
Several races	67,075	35,318
Unknown	88,307	15,694
Age		
Under 1	24,825	14,730
1 to 5	82,389	51,028
6 to 12	64,440	42,808
13 to 17	36,057	28,219
18 to 30	235,464	110,580
31 to 50	416,010	178,313
51 to 61	164,800	58,794
62 and older	34,164	9,174
Unknown	5,464	1,658
Persons by Household Size		
1 person	716,662	280,043
2 people	102,287	52,691
3 people	95,023	63,570
4 people	72,812	50,142

Appendix D-7: Demographic Characteristics of Sheltered Homeless Persons by Location, October 2008–September 2009		
Characteristics	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas
5 or more people	74,891	48,079
Unknown	1,939	779
Veteran (adults only)		
Yes	854,443	358,096
No	91,369	36,265
Unknown	716,732	302,758
	46,342	19,073
Disabled (adults only)		
Yes	854,443	358,097
No	261,426	148,537
Unknown	86,807	41,297

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-8: Earlier Living Situation of Persons Using Homeless Residential Services by Household Type, October 2008–September 2009			
Earlier Living Situation	All Sheltered Adults	Individual Adults	Adults in Families
Number of Homeless Adults	1,235,236	1,034,659	210,510
Living Arrangement the Night before Program Entry			
Place not meant for human habitation	162,753	156,447	7,581
Emergency shelter	232,193	196,286	37,425
Transitional housing	28,245	23,706	4,807
Permanent supportive housing	2,542	1,987	558
Psychiatric facility	13,765	13,509	333
Substance abuse treatment center or detox	51,488	48,645	3,250
Hospital (nonpsychiatric)	14,279	13,932	490
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention	53,140	52,682	843
Rented housing unit	102,357	70,955	32,144
Owned housing unit	21,844	16,966	5,072
Staying with family	190,766	135,759	56,309
Staying with friends	134,456	109,529	25,971
Hotel or motel (no voucher)	35,687	26,730	9,231
Foster care home	4,293	4,134	214
Other living arrangement	52,970	45,614	7,528
Unknown	134,458	117,775	18,756
Stability of Previous Night's Living Arrangement			
Stayed 1 week or less	214,216	187,407	28,210
Stayed more than 1 week, but less than a month	149,343	124,170	26,098
Stayed 1 to 3 months	196,577	156,581	40,933
Stayed more than 3 months, but less than a year	167,212	129,107	38,853
Stayed 1 year or longer	208,514	168,051	41,802
Unknown	299,375	269,343	34,614
ZIP Code of Last Permanent Address			
Same jurisdiction as program location	633,029	504,152	135,024
Different jurisdiction than program location	366,863	323,320	47,449
Unknown	235,344	207,187	28,038

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding. Number of adults is equal to the number of adults in families and individuals, including unaccompanied youth.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-9: Earlier Living Situation of Persons Using Homeless Residential Services in Emergency Shelters, October 2008–September 2009

Earlier Living Situation	Adults in Emergency Shelters	Individual Adults	Adults in Families
Number of Homeless Adults	1,034,622	884,898	159,293
Living Arrangement the Night before Program Entry			
Place not meant for human habitation	148,629	144,256	5,595
Emergency shelter	171,575	156,298	16,737
Transitional housing	14,424	13,450	1,114
Permanent supportive housing	2,297	1,825	494
Psychiatric facility	10,012	9,790	307
Substance abuse treatment center or detox	24,726	24,095	870
Hospital (nonpsychiatric)	12,436	12,065	468
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention	41,208	41,040	571
Rented housing unit	95,665	68,544	28,104
Owned housing unit	19,965	15,760	4,431
Staying with family	169,945	122,773	48,750
Staying with friends	123,450	101,948	22,614
Hotel or motel (no voucher)	32,739	25,260	7,711
Foster care home	2,061	2,000	86
Other living arrangement	45,046	39,487	5,944
Unknown	120,444	106,307	15,497
Stability of Previous Night's Living Arrangement			
Stayed 1 week or less	196,068	174,038	23,717
Stayed more than 1 week, but less than a month	117,852	98,937	19,869
Stayed 1 to 3 months	145,487	120,749	25,967
Stayed more than 3 months, but less than a year	122,266	95,757	27,589
Stayed 1 year or longer	184,655	150,097	36,189
Unknown	268,293	245,321	25,962
ZIP Code of Last Permanent Address			
Same jurisdiction as program location	512,411	416,464	101,296
Different jurisdiction than program location	324,524	288,978	38,188
Unknown	197,686	179,456	19,809

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding. Number of adults is equal to the number of adults in families and individuals, including unaccompanied youth

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-10: Earlier Living Situation of Persons Using Homeless Residential Services in Transitional Housing, October 2008–September 2009			
Earlier Living Situation	All Adults in Transitional Housing	Individual Adults	Adults in Families
Number of Homeless Adults	253,772	194,264	61,487
Living Arrangement the Night before Program Entry			
Place not meant for human habitation	22,372	20,035	2,532
Emergency shelter	70,390	48,061	22,861
Transitional housing	15,242	11,370	4,004
Permanent supportive housing	342	257	91
Psychiatric facility	4,335	4,337	39
Substance abuse treatment center or detox	29,285	26,930	2,579
Hospital (nonpsychiatric)	2,447	2,403	64
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention	14,275	14,041	307
Rented housing unit	11,126	5,899	5,297
Owned housing unit	2,734	1,907	852
Staying with family	28,343	18,602	9,952
Staying with friends	16,642	12,256	4,532
Hotel or motel (no voucher)	4,227	2,287	1,971
Foster care home	2,397	2,273	134
Other living arrangement	9,845	8,005	1,935
Unknown	19,770	15,602	4,338
Stability of Previous Night's Living Arrangement			
Stayed 1 week or less	26,377	20,656	5,920
Stayed more than 1 week, but less than a month	38,658	31,407	7,603
Stayed 1 to 3 months	60,202	43,439	17,240
Stayed more than 3 months, but less than a year	52,997	40,343	13,074
Stayed 1 year or longer	33,331	26,293	7,283
Unknown	42,209	32,126	10,367
ZIP Code of Last Permanent Address			
Same jurisdiction as program location	149,795	110,492	40,418
Different jurisdiction than program location	56,453	45,665	11,353
Unknown	47,525	38,107	9,716

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding. Number of adults is equal to the number of adults in families and individuals, including unaccompanied youth.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-11: Earlier Living Situation of Persons Using Homeless Residential Services by Location, October 2008–September 2009

Earlier Living Situation	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas
Number of Homeless Adults	865,692	369,546
Living Arrangement the Night before Program Entry		
Place not meant for human habitation	118,879	43,875
Emergency shelter	171,916	60,277
Transitional housing	19,872	8,373
Permanent supportive housing	1,967	575
Psychiatric facility	7,942	5,823
Substance abuse treatment center or detox	34,119	17,369
Hospital (nonpsychiatric)	9,203	5,076
Jail, prison, or juvenile detention	35,026	18,114
Rented housing unit	72,803	29,554
Owned housing unit	15,698	6,146
Staying with family	126,689	64,078
Staying with friends	81,590	52,866
Hotel or motel (no voucher)	19,405	16,282
Foster care home	2,928	1,365
Other living arrangement	39,624	13,346
Unknown	108,031	26,427
Stability of Previous Night's Living Arrangement		
Stayed 1 week or less	129,708	84,508
Stayed more than 1 week, but less than a month	92,516	56,827
Stayed 1 to 3 months	131,511	65,066
Stayed more than 3 months, but less than a year	109,521	57,691
Stayed 1 year or longer	144,629	63,885
Unknown	257,806	41,569
ZIP Code of Last Permanent Address		
Same jurisdiction as program location	457,846	175,183
Different jurisdiction than program location	216,949	149,914
Unknown	190,896	44,448

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding. Number of adults is equal to the number of adults in families and individuals, including unaccompanied youth.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-12: Length of Stay in Emergency Shelters by Household Type, October 2008–September 2009					
Length of Stay	Persons in Emergency Shelters	Individuals			Persons in Families
		All	Male	Female	
Number of Homeless Persons	1,273,001	884,849	648,714	234,142	400,111
Length of Stay	1,273,002	884,850	648,714	234,143	400,112
1 week or less	426,400	335,017	252,499	81,169	95,419
1 week to 1 month	338,374	247,304	179,294	67,727	93,993
1 to 2 months	186,183	125,246	88,238	36,889	62,596
2 to 3 months	101,572	58,910	42,931	15,932	43,604
3 to 4 months	66,750	36,885	26,779	10,084	30,514
4 to 5 months	40,267	23,546	17,235	6,287	17,151
5 to 6 months	29,342	15,179	11,076	4,088	14,475
6 to 7 months	21,659	10,847	8,118	2,695	11,051
7 to 8 months	14,322	7,236	5,366	1,867	7,252
8 to 9 months	10,001	5,135	3,917	1,207	4,991
9 to 10 months	8,399	3,988	2,777	1207	4,513
10 to 11 months	7,442	3,712	2,647	1062	3,819
11 months to 1 year	6,330	4,020	2,825	1,191	2,386
1 year	14,825	6,898	4,441	2,441	8,129
Unknown	1,136	927	571	297	219

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding. Total homeless persons may not add up to the sum of the length-of-stay counts because length of stay was not collected for persons who could not be designated as adult or children.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

Appendix D-13: Length of Stay in Transitional Housing by Household Type, October 2008–September 2009					
Length of Stay	Persons in Transitional Housing	Individuals			Persons in Families
		All	Male	Female	
Number of Homeless Persons	351,191	194,182	127,664	65,835	159,696
Length of Stay	351,195	194,178	127,666	65,833	159,695
1 week or less	17,646	12,643	8,076	4,547	5,151
1 week to 1 month	39,193	25,774	17,218	8,512	13,719
1 to 2 months	42,144	27,289	17,893	9,371	15,150
2 to 3 months	32,428	20,479	13,921	6,539	12,200
3 to 4 months	32,668	18,726	11,532	7,172	14,192
4 to 5 months	25,940	14,320	9,660	4,595	11,805
5 to 6 months	20,676	11,234	7,138	4,081	9,593
6 to 7 months	20,763	10,021	6,431	3,578	10,891
7 to 8 months	17,080	8,097	5,507	2,586	9,102
8 to 9 months	13,367	6,375	4,090	2,275	7,088
9 to 10 months	12,743	5,635	3,830	1,797	7,212
10 to 11 months	11,200	5,088	3,206	1,881	6,198
11 months to 1 year	11,858	5,789	3,750	2,035	6,149
1 year	52,420	22,067	15,272	6,779	30,799
Unknown	1,069	641	142	85	446

Note: Counts may not add up to total because of rounding. Total homeless persons may not add up to the sum of the length-of-stay counts because length of stay was not collected for persons who could not be designated as adult or children.

Source: Homeless Management Information System data, October 2008–September 2009.

