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Foreword

It is my pleasure to submit to Congress the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) 2015 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) Part 2. The AHAR provides national estimates of homelessness in the United States. As with previous annual reports, this is the second part in a two-part series. The Part 1 report was published in November 2015 and is based on one-night national, state, and local estimates of sheltered and unsheltered homelessness. This report enhances our understanding of homelessness by including one-year national estimates of people in shelter and in-depth information about their characteristics and their use of the homeless services system. Reflecting an increasing national commitment to end homelessness among youth, we include more information this year on parenting youth and on youth aged 18 to 24 who use shelter programs. In partnership with the Department of Veterans Affairs, we also provide supplemental information on veterans served through the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (or HUD-VASH) program.

HUD has released the AHAR each year since 2007, giving policymakers and local service providers the information needed to serve this vulnerable population. At the Federal level, HUD and its partner agencies on the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness are using the AHAR to track progress against the goals set forth by Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness. At the local level, stakeholders are using the AHAR to inform their policy decisions and benchmark their service systems against the national estimates presented in the report. With the knowledge gained through AHAR, we are on the path to ending homelessness in the United States.

The report shows a nationwide decline in people experiencing sheltered homelessness since HUD began tracking this information in 2007. This reduction of 6.5 percent is important—more than 104,000 fewer people are experiencing homelessness in shelter. This progress is attributable to the hard work of local homeless service providers nationwide. HUD and other Federal agencies have continued to target resources and emphasize evidence-based interventions to support this work.

Targeted efforts to end homelessness among veterans and a Housing First approach have resulted in a 36 percent decline in the one-night count of veterans experiencing homelessness between 2010 and 2015. We have learned from this success that we can end homelessness when resources are adequate and focused. We must remember the nearly 1.5 million Americans with no place to call home and judge our Nation’s prosperity by the progress we are making in reducing the number of Americans sleeping in shelters or on the streets. Ending homelessness as we know it is the ultimate goal. To achieve this goal, we need a continued bipartisan commitment to break the cycle of homelessness among our most vulnerable citizens and prevent others from falling into homelessness. Congress must maintain its support of practices and program models that are making a measureable difference, moving our citizens out of shelters and off the streets and into stable housing.

Finally, we must continue to press for comprehensive and accurate data that can be harnessed by policymakers and homeless service providers to advance the most effective approaches to ending homelessness. With ongoing research on how to achieve housing stability for homeless families with children and among youth and young families, we are improving how we count and serve these vulnerable subpopulations. Everyone deserves a chance to thrive and prosper in America, and that begins with a safe place to call home.
Homelessness can be more than addressed; it can be ended. This report shows substantial progress toward ending a social wrong that deprives people of their full potential. Ending homelessness means more than providing a roof over people’s heads. It means giving people the opportunity to address their challenges in a stable and secure environment, providing families with a place to raise their children, and ensuring that our Nation’s veterans can heal in their own homes.

Julián Castro, Secretary
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Key Terms

Note: Key terms are used for AHAR reporting purposes and accurately reflect the data used in this report. Definitions of these terms may differ in some ways from the definitions found in the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento) and in HUD regulations.

Adults are people age 18 or older.

Children are people under the age of 18.

Chronically Homeless Individual\(^1\) refers to an individual with a disability who has been continuously homeless for 1 year or more or has experienced at least four episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years.

Chronically Homeless People in Families refers to people in families in which the head of household has a disability and has either been continuously homeless for 1 year or more or has experienced at least four episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years.

Continuums of Care (CoC) are local planning bodies responsible for coordinating the full range of homelessness services in a geographic area, which may cover a city, county, metropolitan area, or an entire state.

Domestic Violence Shelters are shelter programs for people who are homeless and are domestic violence victims.

Emergency Shelter is a facility with the primary purpose of providing temporary shelter for homeless people.

Family with Children refers to a household that has at least one adult (age 18 and older) and one child (under age 18). It does not include households composed only of adults or only children.

Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) is a software application designed to record and store client-level information on the characteristics and service needs of homeless people. Each CoC maintains its own HMIS, which can be tailored to meet local needs, but must also conform to Federal HMIS Data and Technical Standards.

HMIS Data provide an unduplicated count of people who are experiencing sheltered homelessness and information about their characteristics and service-use patterns over a one-year period of time. These data are entered into each CoC’s HMIS at the client level but are submitted in aggregate form for the AHAR.

Homeless describes a person who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence.

Household Type refers to the composition of a household upon entering a shelter program. People enter shelter as either an individual or as part of a family with children, but can be served as both individuals or family members during the AHAR reporting year. However, the estimates reported in the AHAR adjust for this overlap and thus provide an unduplicated count of homeless people.

Housing Inventory Count (HIC) is produced by each CoC and provides an annual inventory of beds in the CoC.

HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program is a program for formerly homeless veterans that combines Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) rental assistance provided by HUD with case management and clinical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) through VA medical centers (VAMCs) and community-based outreach clinics.

Individual refers to a person who is not part of a family with children during an episode of homelessness. Individuals may be homeless as single adults, unaccompanied youth, or in multiple-adult or multiple-child households.

Living Arrangement before Entering Shelter refers to the place a person stayed the night before the first homeless episode captured during the AHAR reporting year. For those who were already in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at the start of the reporting year, it refers to the place they stayed the night before beginning that current episode of homelessness.

Minority refers to people who self-identify as being a member of any racial or ethnic category other than white, non-Hispanic/Latino. This includes African Americans, Asians, Hispanics/Latinos, American Indians, and people of multiple races. This report uses the term “Hispanic” to refer to people of any race who self-identify their ethnicity as Hispanic or Latino.

Multiple Races refers to people who self-identify as more than one race.

One-Year Shelter Count is an unduplicated count of homeless people who use an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at any time from October through September of the following year. The 1-year count is derived from communities’ Homeless Management Information Systems.

\(^1\) The definition of chronic homelessness changed in 2016, but these changes were not yet in effect for the 2015 data presented in this report.
Other One Race refers to a person who self-identifies as being one of the following races: Asian, American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian, or other Pacific Islander.

Parenting Youth are people under age 25 who are the parents or legal guardians of one or more children (under age 18) who are present with or sleeping in the same place as that youth parent, where there is no person over age 24 in the household.

Parenting Youth Household is a household with at least one parenting youth and the child or children for whom the parenting youth is the parent or legal guardian.

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) is a program designed to provide housing (project- and tenant-based) and supportive services on a long-term basis to formerly homeless people. HUD McKinney-Vento-funded programs require that the client have a disability for program eligibility, so the majority of people in PSH have disabilities.

People in Families with children are people who are homeless as part of households that have at least one adult (age 18 and older) and one child (under age 18).

Point-in-Time (PIT) Count is an unduplicated 1-night estimate of both sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations. The 1-night count is conducted according to HUD standards by CoCs nationwide and occurs during the last 10 days in January of each year.

Principal City is the largest city in each metropolitan statistical area. Other smaller cities may qualify if specified requirements (population size and employment) are met.

Safe Havens are projects that provide private or semi-private long-term housing for people with severe mental illness and are limited to serving no more than 25 people within a facility. People in safe havens are included in the 1-night PIT count but, at this time, are not included from the 1-year shelter count.

Sheltered Homelessness refers to people who are staying in emergency shelters or transitional housing programs.

Shelter Programs include both emergency shelter program and transitional housing programs.

Total U.S. Population refers to people who are housed (including those in group quarters) in the United States, as reported in the American Community Survey (ACS) by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Transitional Housing Programs provide people experiencing homelessness a place to stay combined with supportive services for up to 24 months.

Unaccompanied Children and Youth (under 18) are people who are not part of a family with children or accompanied by their parent or guardian during their episode of homelessness, and who are under the age of 18.

Unaccompanied Youth (18 to 24) are people who are not part of a family with children or accompanied by their parent or guardian during their episode of homelessness, and who are between the ages of 18 and 24.

Unduplicated Count of Sheltered Homelessness is an estimate of people who stayed in emergency shelters or transitional housing programs that counts each person only once, even if the person enters and exits the shelter system multiple times throughout the year within a CoC.

Unsheltered Homeless People are people whose primary nighttime residence is a public or private place not designated for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for people (for example, the streets, vehicles, or parks).

U.S. Population Living in Poverty refers to people who are housed in the United States in households with incomes that fall below the federal poverty level.

Veteran refers to any person who served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States. This includes Reserves and National Guard members who were called up to active duty.

Victim Service Provider refers to private nonprofit organizations whose primary mission is to provide direct services to victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. This term includes rape crisis centers, domestic violence programs battered women’s (shelters and non-residential), domestic violence transitional housing programs, and other related advocacy and supportive services programs.
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PIT data estimate the number of people experiencing sheltered homeless and unsheltered homelessness on a single night during the year.

HMIS data estimate the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness at any time during the year.
Since 2007, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has released an annual report on the extent of homelessness in the United States—the Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR). The report documents how many people are experiencing sheltered homelessness and how many people are experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations often referred to as “the street.” The AHAR is submitted each year to the U.S. Congress, and its contents are used to inform federal, state, and local policies to prevent and end homelessness.

This report is the second part of a two-part series. The first part is called The 2015 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress, Part 1: Point-in-Time Estimates of Homelessness, and was published in November 2015. The Part 1 report provides estimates of homelessness based on the Point-in-Time (PIT) count data gathered by communities throughout the country in late January. The estimates are provided at the national-, state-, and CoC-levels.

Part 2 of the 2015 AHAR builds on the Part 1 report by adding 1-year estimates of sheltered homelessness based on data from Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS). The HMIS estimates provide detailed demographic information about people who use the nation’s emergency shelters and transitional housing projects during a 12-month period.

Types of AHAR Estimates and Data Sources: PIT Count and HMIS

The estimates presented throughout this report are based primarily on aggregate information submitted by hundreds of communities nationwide about the people experiencing homelessness that they encounter and serve. There are two types of estimates: 1-night counts based on PIT data and 1-year counts based on HMIS data (See Exhibit A).

EXHIBIT A: Comparison of Data Sources

**PIT Count and HMIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIT</th>
<th>HMIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE OF ESTIMATE</strong></td>
<td>1-day count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIMARY LEVEL OF ANALYSIS</strong></td>
<td>CoC &amp; state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REPORTING PERIOD</strong></td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION</strong></td>
<td>Sheltered &amp; Unsheltered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIT Count**

The PIT counts offer a snapshot of homelessness—of both sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations—on a single night. The 1-night counts are conducted by CoCs in late January¹ and reported to HUD as part of their annual applications for McKinney-Vento funding. In addition to the total counts of homelessness, the PIT counts provide an estimate of the number of people experiencing homelessness within particular populations, such as people with chronic patterns of homelessness and veterans. Typically, CoCs conduct a PIT count in shelters every year and a street (or unsheltered) count at least every other year. Many CoCs choose to conduct both counts each year. In 2015, PIT estimates were reported by 409 CoCs for both a sheltered and an unsheltered count, covering virtually the entire United States.

Communities across the nation typically conduct their PIT counts during a defined period of time (e.g., dusk to dawn) on a given night to minimize the risk of counting any person more than once. Many CoCs also collect identifying information to help unduplicate their counts of unsheltered homeless people. HUD has standards for conducting the PIT counts, and CoCs use a variety of approved methods to conduct the counts. Researchers reviewed the data for accuracy and quality prior to creating the PIT estimates for this report. The PIT estimates reported in previous years are subject to change in the analysis of year-to-year trends if communities have later adjusted their counting methods.

¹Some CoCs are given permission to conduct counts outside of the last 10 days of January for good cause.
In, 2015, HUD began asking CoCs to collect some demographic characteristics (gender, ethnicity, race, and age) as part of the PIT count. This information was first reported in the 2015 AHAR Part 1. Also in 2015, HUD asked CoCs to report on parenting youth as well as unaccompanied youth.

PIT counts are useful because they account for both sheltered and unsheltered homeless people. However, the estimates of homelessness on a single night can be influenced by changes in local methodologies to count people experiencing homelessness, especially those in unsheltered locations. In addition, the estimates are not designed to count people who experience homelessness throughout the year, and thus provided limited information on how people use the homeless service system.

**HMIS**

The 1-year HMIS estimates provide unduplicated counts of homeless people who use an emergency shelter, transitional housing program, or PSH program at any time from October through September of the following year. In the past few years, HUD has collaborated with its federal partners to increase the participation in HMIS and clarify data collection procedures with communities. These partnerships include the integration of HMIS data for the VA Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program, HHS’ Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) programs, and HHS’ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness (PATH) program. These efforts have improved HUD’s homelessness estimates and will continue to contribute to our understanding of homelessness in this Nation.

The 1-year HMIS estimates in this report provide information about the demographic characteristics of sheltered homeless people and their patterns of service use. The 12-month counts of sheltered homelessness are produced using HMIS data from a nationally representative sample of communities. Data are collected separately by project type (emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing) and for individuals, people in families, and veterans. While this AHAR does not include 1-year estimates for homeless youth and people with chronic patterns of homelessness, HUD plans to update the AHAR data collection requirements so that, starting with the 2017 AHAR, the 1-year estimates will provide information on these populations.

For the 2015 AHAR, the estimates were derived from aggregate HMIS data reported by 384 CoCs nationwide, 93.9 percent of all CoCs nationwide. The data are unduplicated, offering information on 1,216,676 people served by CoCs, and are weighted to provide a statistically reliable estimate of the total number of people who access shelter throughout the year (1,484,576 people in 2015). Excluded from the HMIS-based estimates are people in unsheltered locations, in programs targeting domestic violence victims, and in safe havens.

In combination, the PIT and HMIS estimates provide a comprehensive picture of homelessness in the United States that includes counts of people on the street as well as information on people who use the shelter system. The PIT estimate of homelessness will be smaller than the annual HMIS estimate because the PIT count data capture homelessness on a single night, whereas HMIS estimates capture anyone that is found in the shelter system at any point during the year.

Exhibit B shows the trends in the PIT and HMIS counts since the first AHAR was released in 2007 and places them in a larger historical context.

**Supplemental Data Sources**

Two other data sources are used in the AHAR: Housing Inventory Count (HIC) data and U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS) data. The HIC data provide an inventory of beds dedicated to serve people who are experiencing homelessness and thus describe the nation’s capacity to house such people. The HIC data are compiled by CoCs and represent the inventory of beds in various programs, including programs from all funding sources, within the homeless services system that are available during a particular year.

ACS data are used to provide a profile of the total U.S. population and the U.S. population living in population. The AHAR uses ACS data on gender, age, ethnicity, race, household size, disability status, and type of geographic location to serve as a comparison to the nationally representative HMIS data. The ACS data come in several forms. This report uses the 1-year Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) that corresponds most closely to the HMIS data for any given year.

The AHAR compares the estimate of homelessness with ACS data about all people in housing units or group quarters in the U.S. Through this comparison, the report provides a picture of how people who are homeless differ from, or are similar to, the broader population. This report on sheltered homelessness also compares the sheltered homeless population with the U.S. population living in poverty. Most homeless people are poor, so differences between all people who are poor and people who are homeless may highlight subgroups at greatest risk of becoming homeless.

---

2 People served in permanent supportive housing programs are no longer considered homeless.
In collaboration with the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs (VA), this 2015 report for the first time includes information on the veterans who use the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program (HUD-VASH), a permanent housing program that has been growing rapidly. The 2015 AHAR supplements the HMIS data on veterans in permanent supportive housing with administrative data on HUD-VASH from the VA’s Homeless Operations Management Evaluation System (HOMES).

Data Notes
Information on people’s characteristics and patterns of homelessness collected as part of CoCs’ PIT counts and HMIS records are generally self-reported. This information may be collected using a standard survey or intake form. Some HMIS data may reflect additional supporting documentation if the information is necessary to establish eligibility for services.

PIT and HMIS data quality has improved considerably since HUD began to compile these data resulting in more reliable estimates of homelessness. PIT count methodologies have become more robust, meaning that communities are employing approaches that are improving the accuracy of their counts. HMIS bed-coverage rates, a measure of how many beds within the community contribute data in a CoC’s HMIS, have increased sharply over time, and rates of missing data have declined.

Not all information presented in the narrative in this report is reflected in the exhibits. For example, the exhibits may present the percentage of homeless people within a particular category, while the narrative highlights the percentage change over the years.

The supporting HMIS data used to produce the 2015 figures in the report can be downloaded from HUD’s Resource Exchange at http://www.hudexchange.info/. Those tables are:

1. 2015 AHAR HMIS Estimates of Homelessness.xlsx
2. 2015 AHAR HMIS Estimates of Homeless Veterans.xlsx
3. 2015 AHAR_HMIS Estimates of People in PSH.xlsx
4. 2015 AHAR_HMIS Estimates of Veterans in PSH.xlsx

EXHIBIT B: Historical Context Surrounding Trends in Homelessness
PIT & HMIS 2007-2015

**FEBRUARY 2009**
President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, including $1.5 billion for the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program.

**MAY 2008**
Congress funds and HUD and the VA re-establish the HUD-VA Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) Program.

**MAY 2009**
President Obama signed the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act.

**JUNE 2010**
“Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness” is released.

**SEPTEMBER 2009**
Communities begin to use the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program funding.

One Year Estimate of Sheltered Homelessness
HMIS Data

- 2007: 1,588,595
- 2008: 1,593,794
- 2009: 1,558,917
- 2010: 1,593,150
- 2011: 1,502,196

One Day Estimate of Total Homelessness
PIT Data

- 2007: 647,258
- 2008: 639,784
- 2009: 630,227
- 2010: 637,077
- 2011: 623,788
AUGUST 2012
Release of the Continuum of Care Program Interim Rule.

JULY 2011
The U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs announces the Supportive Services for Veteran Families program (SSVF).

OCTOBER 2014
New HHS Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) providers are required to begin using HMIS.

JANUARY 2015
Zero: 2016, a national campaign to end veteran and chronic homelessness by December 2016, was launched.

JANUARY 2014
HUD and the VA announce SSVF “surge” funds to be awarded to 71 communities, redoubling efforts to end Veteran homelessness.

MARCH 2015
HUD, VA, HHS RHY, and HHS Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration signed a Memorandum of Understanding that outlined their respective roles and responsibilities regarding the use of HMIS.
Broader Perspectives on Housing Instability and Homelessness

For more than a decade, HUD has supported local efforts to collect information about people experiencing homelessness. Together, the PIT count and HMIS data present a detailed picture of who is experiencing homelessness in emergency shelter, transitional housing, or in unsheltered locations; what their demographic characteristics are; and how they make use of the residential services available for homeless people.

HUD and its federal partners use many other data sources to get a full picture of homelessness and housing instability, including data collected and reported by other federal agencies as well as national and local studies and evaluations. Each of these data sources provides an important perspective on homelessness. For example, HUD uses the American Housing Survey (AHS) to produce reports every two years that provide estimates of how many renters have “worst case needs” for housing assistance, because they have very low incomes, no housing assistance, and severe rent burdens or substandard housing. The Department of Veterans Affairs data provide additional crucial information about veterans experiencing homelessness that is not captured in the PIT count.

The AHS for 2013 included supplemental questions on the reasons people had recently moved out of a household or moved into an existing household within the past year. This report includes a section that draws on those data to add to the picture of the housing instability experienced by households throughout the country. It also highlights findings from the Worst Case Housing Needs: 2015 Report to Congress that use 2013 AHS supplemental questions on missed rent payments and evictions. This section also draws on data from the Department of Education on students in public schools who are reported as being homeless, including those who are living with other people because of the loss of housing or economic hardship.

Federal agencies use data to inform a broad set of policy solutions across many different programs to meet the goals of preventing and ending homelessness set forth in Opening Doors. Ending homelessness cannot rely solely on programs that are targeted to persons experiencing homelessness. HUD and its federal partners recognize that homelessness is closely linked to housing affordability, income and employment, health (including physical, behavioral, and mental disabilities), and education. The mainstream programs that address these needs have a substantial role in preventing and ending homelessness.

Domestic Violence Survivors in the U.S. Homeless Residential Services System

According to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) report, nearly 10 million people in the U.S. experienced physical violence by an intimate partner in 2010.4 Many people escaping domestic violence seek assistance outside of the homeless services system, but shelter and housing programs can serve as resources for people in crisis and seeking a safe refuge. The survivors of domestic violence who use homeless services may use either those designated for survivors of domestic violence or those available to a broader population.

In order to protect survivor safety and confidentiality, domestic violence shelter and housing programs in the homeless services system operated by victim service providers are prohibited by law5 from reporting personally identifying client information into HMIS. Thus, the HMIS data used as the basis for the AHAR Part 2 report exclude information on people in domestic violence shelters. The Point-in-Time (PIT) count, another data source for the AHAR Part 2, makes the reporting of people in domestic violence shelter and housing programs optional, and that information is not collected systematically.6 However, the Housing Inventory Count (HIC) contains information on all the projects and beds in the homeless services system, including beds in domestic violence shelters. Thus, the HIC can offer an understanding of how many people who are homeless and survivors of domestic violence may be missed by the national homeless counts in this report. Exhibit C displays the bed counts reported in the 2015 HIC for all projects that have identified domestic violence survivors as the target population. Exhibit D displays

---

6 Based on the 2015 optional PIT count of the homeless population “victims of domestic violence,” 67,690 people were reported as homeless and a victim of domestic violence, with 60.6 percent located in sheltered locations (emergency shelters, transitional housing, and safe havens) and the remaining 39.4 percent in unsheltered locations.
EXHIBIT C: Domestic Violence Beds by Household Type and CoC Type, HIC 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DV Beds</th>
<th>Total Beds</th>
<th>% DV Beds</th>
<th># of CoCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55,686</td>
<td>830,120</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds By Household Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>9,586</td>
<td>433,324</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>46,100</td>
<td>396,796</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds By CoC Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major City CoCs</td>
<td>15,422</td>
<td>398,663</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller City, County, &amp; Regional CoCs</td>
<td>20,779</td>
<td>311,190</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of State and Statewide CoCs</td>
<td>18,819</td>
<td>115,457</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total beds include year-round beds from Emergency Shelter (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), Safe Havens (SH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), and Other Permanent Housing (OPH) projects. Rapid Rehousing Demonstration (DEM) beds are included with RRH.

Note 2: The total beds and beds by household type include Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories. Bed counts by CoC Type do not include Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories. For Puerto Rico, the DV Beds, Total Beds and % DV Beds are: 570; 4,389; and 13%. For Guam, these figures are: 53; 258; and 20.5%. For the U.S. Virgin Islands, these figures are: 43; 163, and 26.4%.

these dedicated beds by projects in the homeless services system in which the clientele using the beds are experiencing homelessness—in emergency shelter (ES), transitional housing (TH), and safe haven (SH) projects—separately from those projects in which the clientele are not or are no longer experiencing homelessness—in rapid rehousing (RRH), permanent supportive housing (PSH), and other permanent housing (OPH) projects.

Based on the 2015 HIC, 55,686 of all the beds in the homeless services system were dedicated to survivors of domestic violence (DV). Of the beds for those experiencing homelessness in emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven projects, 11.6 percent were targeted to survivors of domestic violence. Of the beds that serve families with children in ES, TH, and SH, 11.6 percent were beds in projects targeted to DV clients. Less than 10 percent of all DV beds were in Rapid Rehousing, Permanent Supportive Housing and other permanent housing targeted to survivors of DV.

Exhibits C and D also show how the share of beds in each Continuum of Care (CoC) dedicated to survivors of domestic violence varies by geography. CoCs are divided into three geographic categories: major city CoCs (N=49); smaller city, county, and regional CoCs (N=313); and Balance of State (BoS) or statewide CoCs (N=40).7 The share of the total bed inventory of emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven projects targeted to survivors of domestic violence in smaller city, county, and regional CoCs was 6.7 percent in 2015. Major city CoCs have a smaller share of their total bed inventory in projects targeted to DV survivors (3.9%), while the BoS or statewide CoCs (often rural areas) had substantially more of their emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven bed inventory reserved for survivors of domestic violence (16.3%).

Note 1: Total beds include year-round beds from Emergency Shelter (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), Safe Havens (SH), Rapid Rehousing (RRH), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), and Other Permanent Housing (OPH) projects. Rapid Rehousing Demonstration (DEM) beds are included with RRH.

Note 2: The total beds and beds by household type include Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories. Bed counts by CoC Type do not include Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories.

EXHIBIT D: Domestic Violence Beds by Program Type, Household Type and CoC Type, HIC 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>DV Beds</th>
<th>Total Beds</th>
<th>% DV Beds</th>
<th># of CoCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55,686</td>
<td>830,120</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – ES, TH, SH</td>
<td>50,562</td>
<td>426,267</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds By Family Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>8,949</td>
<td>209,567</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>41,613</td>
<td>216,700</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beds By CoC Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major City CoCs</td>
<td>13,330</td>
<td>202,501</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller City, County, &amp; Regional CoCs</td>
<td>19,165</td>
<td>153,324</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of State and Statewide CoCs</td>
<td>17,530</td>
<td>68,048</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – RRH, PSH, OPH</td>
<td>5,124</td>
<td>403,853</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total beds include year-round beds from Emergency Shelter (ES), Transitional Housing (TH), Safe Havens (SH), separately from Rapid Rehousing (RRH), Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), and Other Permanent Housing (OPH) projects. Rapid Rehousing Demonstration (DEM) beds are included with RRH.

Based on the 2015 HIC, 55,686 of all the beds in the homeless services system were dedicated to survivors of domestic violence (DV). Of the beds for those experiencing homelessness in emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven projects, 11.6 percent were targeted to survivors of domestic violence. Of the beds that serve families with children in ES, TH, and SH, 11.6 percent were beds in projects targeted to DV clients. Less than 10 percent of all DV beds were in Rapid Rehousing, Permanent Supportive Housing and other permanent housing targeted to survivors of DV.

Note 2: The total beds and beds by household type include Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories. Bed counts by CoC Type do not include Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories.

regional CoCs (N=313); and Balance of State (BoS) or statewide CoCs (N=40).7 The share of the total bed inventory of emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven projects targeted to survivors of domestic violence in smaller city, county, and regional CoCs was 6.7 percent in 2015. Major city CoCs have a smaller share of their total bed inventory in projects targeted to DV survivors (3.9%), while the BoS or statewide CoCs (often rural areas) had substantially more of their emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven bed inventory reserved for survivors of domestic violence (16.3%).

7 Major city CoCs cover the 50 largest cities in the U.S.; Smaller city, county and regional CoCs are jurisdictions that are neither one of the 50 largest cities nor Balance of State or Statewide CoCs; Balance of State or statewide CoCs are typically composed of multiple rural counties or cover an entire state.
All states in the U.S. have some of their emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven bed inventory targeted to survivors of domestic violence. In 2015, shares of the state-level total bed inventory for people experiencing homelessness that are dedicated to survivors of domestic violence range from 4.3 percent in Hawaii to 35.8 percent in New Mexico. In addition to New Mexico, five other states had more than 25 percent of their local bed inventory for people experiencing homelessness targeted to domestic violence survivors: Missouri (28.4%), South Dakota (28.3%), Utah (28%), Arkansas (26%), and Mississippi (25.6%).
How to Use this Report
The 2015 AHAR Part 2 is intended to serve as a data reference guide. The body of the report is divided into seven sections:

1. All homeless people,
2. Homeless individuals,
3. Homeless people in families with children,
4. Unaccompanied homeless youth,
5. Homeless veterans,
6. Chronically homeless individuals, and
7. People living in permanent supportive housing (PSH).

Sections 1 to 3 and 5 begin with a summary of the PIT count data and an analysis by state of people who were experiencing homelessness on a single night in January 2015, followed by the HMIS data on people who were experiencing sheltered homelessness at some time during the reporting year. These one-year estimates include information on gender, age, ethnicity, race, household size, disability status, geographic location, characteristics by geography, living situation before entering shelter, length of shelter stay, and bed-use patterns.

Sections 4 and 6 are based only on PIT data, as HMIS data are not yet available for unaccompanied youth or for people with chronic patterns of homelessness. Section 7 is based on HMIS data on residents of PSH and on supplementary data on the HUD-VASH program.

This report is intended for several audiences: Members of Congress, staff at local service providers and CoCs, researchers, policy-makers, and advocates. These audiences may have various reasons for reading this report, but all audiences will find answers to questions that can be useful to them. For example:

At the national level, Congress and policymakers can mark progress on the nation’s Opening Doors initiative to prevent and end homelessness. Key stakeholders can also identify which household types and sub-populations require more attention in this effort and which groups are improving at a slower rate than others.

At the state level, policymakers and state-level CoCs can determine how they compare to other states on a range of important measures. The report shows which states experienced substantial changes in their homeless populations compared to other states, and these comparisons can foster collaborations and propel efforts towards ending homelessness.

At the local level, community leaders and local service providers can assess how their community compares to the nation. This comparison can highlight ways in which the community’s homeless population is similar or different from the national profile of homelessness.

This report can address many questions that may be of interest across all audiences:

1. How many people experience homelessness in the U.S. in any given year? How has this changed over time?
2. Are women more likely to experience homeless than men? How many people experience homelessness as individuals, and how many are in families with children?
3. How many children experience homelessness in the U.S.?
4. What is the race and ethnicity of people who experience homelessness in the U.S.?
5. What is the rate of disability among people who experience homelessness?
6. Where do people experiencing homelessness stay before they enter the shelter system?
7. How long do people stay in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs?
8. How many U.S. veterans experience homelessness? How has that number changed over time?
9. How many people in the U.S. have chronic patterns of homelessness?
10. How many people live in permanent supportive housing, and what are their characteristics? Where were they staying beforehand, and where did they go once they left?
Homelessness in the United States

One-Night Estimates

- On a single night in January 2015, 564,708 people were experiencing homelessness in the United States. This marks the continued decline of homelessness in the nation: a 2 percent decrease since January 2014 and a 13 percent decrease since January 2007. The long-term decline in homelessness has been driven entirely by reductions in the number of people living on the street or in other unsheltered locations, a population that dropped 32 percent between 2007 and 2015.

- California and New York continued in 2015 to account for more than a third of all people experiencing homelessness in the United States.

- Of every ten people experiencing homelessness on a single night in January 2015, seven were staying in sheltered rather than unsheltered locations.

- California and Florida had the largest numbers of unsheltered people.

- The largest increase between 2014 and 2015 in the one-night count was in New York, with most of the increase among people experiencing sheltered homelessness. The largest decrease was in Florida, with most of the decrease in the unsheltered population.

One-Year Estimates

- In 2015, an estimated 1.48 million people experienced sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year. Between 2007 and 2015, the number of sheltered people dropped 7 percent (104,019 fewer people).

- In 2015, African Americans comprised more than 41 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness but only 13 percent of all people in the U.S.

- Adults with disabilities are also at great risk of experiencing sheltered homelessness, more than three times more likely than adults without disabilities.

- Most people experience sheltered homelessness in principal cities (71 percent). The percentage in suburban and rural areas increased between 2007 and 2014 but not between 2014 and 2015.

- The number of adults who were experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations prior to their shelter entry increased 6 percent between 2014 and 2015 and 57 percent between 2007 and 2014.

Homeless Individuals

One-Night Estimates

- On a single night in January 2015, 358,422 people in the United States were experiencing homelessness as individuals. This was 64 percent of all people in the one-night counts.

American Housing Survey Special Supplement for 2013

The American Housing Survey (AHS) is based on a representative sample of housing units in the United States and asks questions about the housing unit, the composition of the household occupying the unit, household income, and housing costs. The AHS is conducted biennially. In 2013, the AHS included a topical supplement called “Doubling Up,” in which a subset of people was asked questions about reasons surrounding residential moves. The 2013 survey also asked renter households about some specific indicators of housing instability, such as threats of eviction, that are not part of the core questionnaire.
Key Findings

Homelessness in the United States

One-Night Estimates
- On a single night in January 2015, 564,708 people were experiencing homelessness in the United States. This marks the continued decline of homelessness in the nation: a 2 percent decrease since January 2014 and a 13 percent decrease since January 2007. The long-term decline in homelessness has been driven entirely by reductions in the number of people living on the street or in other unsheltered locations, a population that dropped 32 percent between 2007 and 2015.
- California and New York continued in 2015 to account for more than a third of all people experiencing homelessness in the United States.
- Of every ten people experiencing homelessness on a single night in January 2015, seven were staying in sheltered rather than unsheltered locations. California and Florida had the largest numbers of unsheltered people.
- The largest increase between 2014 and 2015 in the one-night count was in New York, with most of the increase among people experiencing sheltered homelessness. The largest decrease was in Florida, with most of the decrease in the unsheltered population.

One-Year Estimates
- In 2015, an estimated 1.48 million people experienced sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year. Between 2007 and 2015, the number of sheltered people dropped 7 percent (104,019 fewer people).
- In 2015, African Americans comprised more than 41 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness but only 13 percent of all people in the U.S.
- Adults with disabilities are also at great risk of experiencing sheltered homelessness, more than three times more likely than adults without disabilities.
- Most people experience sheltered homelessness in principal cities (71 percent). The percentage in suburban and rural areas increased between 2007 and 2014 but not between 2014 and 2015.
- The number of adults who were experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations prior to their shelter entry increased 6 percent between 2014 and 2015 and 57 percent between 2007 and 2014.

Homeless Individuals

One-Night Estimates
- The number of individuals experiencing homelessness was essentially unchanged between 2014 and 2015, declining by less than one percent. The long-term trend shows a significant reduction in this population—a 13 percent drop in the one-night estimates of all individuals experiencing homelessness between 2007 and 2015, and a 24 percent drop in the number of individuals in unsheltered locations.
- More than half of all individuals experiencing homelessness did so in sheltered locations on a single night in January 2015. However, the 43 percent found in unsheltered locations made individuals experiencing homelessness more than 7 times more likely to be unsheltered than people in families with children.
- California accounted for about a quarter (26%) of all individuals experiencing homelessness and nearly half (46%) of all unsheltered individuals in the nation, with almost three in four individuals experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations. However, California also had the largest long-term decline in unsheltered homelessness of any state, with more than 12,000 fewer unsheltered individuals in 2015 than in 2007.

One-Year Estimates
- An estimated 987,239 individuals used a shelter program in the United States at some point during the year 2015. That number was a slight increase from 2014, less than one percent (3,112 people). However, between 2007 and 2015, the number dropped 12 percent (127,815 people).
- While still a small share of the overall population of individuals using shelters, the share who are elderly (age 62 or older) continued to increase between 2014 and 2015, for the fifth year in a row.
- Almost half (46%) of individuals using shelters identified themselves as white and not Hispanic. Somewhat more than a third (37%) were African American.
- Between 2007 and 2015, the share of sheltered individuals with disabilities increased from 40 percent to 45 percent. This is in contrast to a declining share of people with disabilities in the U.S. population living in poverty, where the share decreased from 39 percent to 31 percent over the same period.
- Between 2007 and 2015, the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness in cities dropped 16 percent (143,780 fewer people), while it rose 7 percent (16,055 more people) in suburban and rural areas.

Homeless Families with Children

One-Night Estimates
- Of all people experiencing homelessness on a single night in January 2015, 206,286, or 37 percent, were in families with children.

---

8 The term “Individuals” refers to people that are not part of a family with at least one adult and one child. See the Key Terms on pages iv-v for more information.
About This Report

Between the 2014 and 2015 one-night counts, the number of people experiencing homelessness in families with children dropped 5 percent (9,975 fewer people). The number of family households experiencing homelessness also dropped 5 percent (3,416 fewer households).

Of all people experiencing homelessness in families with children on a single night in 2015, 90 percent were in sheltered rather than unsheltered locations. Between 2007 and 2015, the number of sheltered people in families with children on a single night increased 4 percent, while the number of unsheltered dropped 64 percent. The net result was a 12 percent decline in homelessness among people in families with children.

New York and Massachusetts had notable increases in the numbers of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness, both between 2014 and 2015 and over the 8-year period between 2007 and 2015. As of 2015, Oregon was the only state where the majority of people experiencing homelessness in families with children was found in unsheltered locations.

One-Year Estimates

In 2015, 502,521 people used a shelter as part of a family with children at some point during the reporting year. Families with children comprised about a third of all people experiencing sheltered homelessness. The number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of a family declined 3 percent between 2014 and 2015, following an increase between 2013 and 2014. Over a longer period, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of a family grew 6 percent, from 473,581 in 2007 to 502,521 in 2015.

The adults and children experiencing sheltered homelessness together were in 154,380 family households. Homeless families tend to be relatively small and young. Three in five people in families were children under 18 years of age, and about 10 percent of the children were infants. Relatively younger adults (between ages 18 and 30) in families with children are at substantially greater risk of experiencing sheltered homelessness than are adults who are living with children and are 31 years or older.

While women still represent a substantial majority of the adults experiencing sheltered homelessness with accompanying children, the number of men in these families increased 34 percent between 2007 and 2015.

The most common living arrangement before people in families with children entered a shelter was staying with family or friends.

About 21 percent of adults experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of a family with children have a disability. This is a higher rate than adults in families in the total U.S. population (9%) or in the U.S. population living in poverty (15%).

Unaccompanied Homeless Youth

One-Night Estimates

36,907 people were experiencing homelessness as unaccompanied youth (under age 25) on a single night in January 2015. Of these, 87 percent were ages 18 to 24, and 13 percent were under the age of 18.

Among unaccompanied youth experiencing homelessness, 46 percent were found on the street or other places not meant for human habitation, with the remaining 54 percent in a sheltered locations.

9,901 people were experiencing homelessness as parenting youth on a single night in January 2015. Of these, about one percent was under 18, with the remaining 99 percent ages 18 to 24. Including their accompanying children, 23,143 people experienced homelessness as part of parenting youth households.

Most children and parents experiencing homelessness in parenting youth households (96%) were found in sheltered rather than unsheltered locations.

California alone accounted for more than one quarter of all unaccompanied homeless youth, while New York had the largest number of parenting youth of any state.

Homeless Veterans

One-Night Estimates

On a single night in January 2015, 47,725 veterans were experiencing homelessness in the United States, 9 percent of all people experiencing homelessness and 11 percent of all adults experiencing homelessness.

Two-thirds of veterans experiencing homelessness were counted in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs in 2015, and about one-third were in unsheltered locations.

Fewer veterans were homeless in January 2015 than in 2014. Veterans experiencing homelessness declined by 4 percent or 1,964 fewer veterans. More than two-thirds of this decline was attributable to a drop in the unsheltered population (1,350 fewer people).

Between 2009 and 2015, the number of veterans experiencing homelessness dropped 35 percent, or 25,642 fewer veterans. The decline in veterans experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations (46% or 13,738 fewer veterans) was larger than the decline among those in sheltered locations (27% or 11,904 fewer veterans).
One-Year Estimates

- In 2015, 132,847 veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the year. Although this represents a modest increase (less than one percent) from the prior year, the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped 11 percent (16,788 fewer veterans) between 2009 and 2015.
- Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2015 were more likely to identify as members of a racial or ethnic group other than white, non-Hispanic (just over 50%) or to be disabled (53%) than were all veterans in the U.S. (21% and 28%). And although the majority of all veterans in the U.S. (55%) were over the age of 61, only 15 percent of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2015 were over 61.
- Most veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (74%) were located in principal cities, while among all U.S. veterans, most (72%) were living in suburban and rural areas, as were two-thirds (67%) of veterans in the U.S. population living in poverty.
- Most veterans using emergency shelter and transitional housing programs are men, as are most veterans in the U.S. (91% in both cases). In 2015, three percent of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were accompanied by children.
- The proportion of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness who stayed in transitional housing (either exclusively or in addition to stays in emergency shelters) rose from 23 percent in 2009 to 34 percent in 2015.

People in Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

One-Year Estimates

- 347,776 people lived in permanent supportive housing during 2015. Just under two-thirds of PSH residents are individuals and a third are people in families with children. The share of people living in PSH who are individuals has been increasing over time.
- The number of PSH beds continued to rise, reaching 319,212 in 2015, a 6 percent increase from 2014.
- Of adults living in PSH during 2015, more than three quarters (79%) were already homeless before they moved in, and about 4 percent came from institutional settings.
- The share of long-term stayers (more than five years) in PSH continued to rise, from 18 percent in 2010 to 25 percent in 2015. The share of those living in PSH a year or less continued to drop, from 31 percent in 2010 to 24 in 2015.
- Individuals who moved out of PSH were less likely to move into other housing than families with children (60% versus 76%) and individuals were more likely to go to institutional settings (9% versus 3%).
- In 2015, 75,331 veterans lived in permanent supportive housing in the U.S.
- Veterans using HUD-VASH housing subsidies in 2015 typically were between 51 and 61 years of age (47%), with a quarter (25%) age 62 or older, and very few (4%) between 18 and 30 years of age.

Chronically Homeless Individuals

One-Night Estimates

- On a single night in January 2015, 83,170 people in the United States were experiencing chronic homelessness as individuals. This was about a quarter (23%) of all homeless individuals. About two-thirds of these chronically homeless individuals (66%) were found in places not meant for human habitation.
- Between January 2014 and January 2015, the number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness fell 9 percent (2,848 fewer people), while the number in unsheltered locations rose 4 percent (2,029 additional people).
- Between January 2007 and January 2015, the number of chronically homeless individuals fell by 31 percent. Over this same time period, the proportion of homeless individuals who were chronically homeless fell from 29 percent to 23 percent.
- California alone accounted for 47 percent of the total unsheltered chronically homeless population.

\[\text{A chronically homeless individual is an individual (that is, not part of a family with at least one adult and one child) with a disability who has been continuously homeless for 1 year or more or has experienced at least four episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years.}\]
Interpretation of the Findings

The Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress Part 2 supplements each year’s Point-in-Time counts (first presented in Part 1) with information that permits us to understand more about people who experience homelessness over the course of a year. Knowing more about the characteristics of people who experience homelessness, their service-use patterns, and about how to better serve them can lead to critical policy adjustments. This year’s report provides another important check on the goals set by Opening Doors for ending homelessness in the United States.

The 2015 report shows substantial progress in ending homelessness among veterans. The number of veterans experiencing homelessness on a single night declined by 31 percent since 2009, and the number of sheltered veterans during the year dropped by 11 percent since 2009. These declines reflect the substantial commitment by the federal government and local communities in addressing the needs of veterans and placing them in permanent housing. Through Permanent Supportive Housing programs, including the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program, more than 75,000 veterans were living in permanent supportive housing in 2015. These programs are often implemented with a strong emphasis on providing barrier-free access to permanent housing coupled with critical supportive services when needed to sustain the housing for veterans with physical and behavioral health challenges. At the local level, communities are joining the Zero: 2016 campaign to end veteran and chronic homelessness by December 2016. Their goal is to prove that ending homelessness is possible, community by community, until we reach zero nationally. The Mayors Challenge to End Veteran Homelessness—announced by First Lady Michelle Obama in June 2014 and supported by the HUD Secretary, by leaders across HUD, VA, USICH, and by the National League of Cities—is another initiative targeted to end veteran homelessness, calling on mayors to make this a commitment in their cities with the aid of federal resources.

As shown in the 2015 report, people in families with children represent about a third of the homeless population in the United States. Homeless families with children are a priority group in the federal strategic plan to end homelessness because of the lasting impact of homelessness on children and their families. Fortunately, based on our estimates, few families with children sleep in places not suitable for human habitation, as shown by the numbers in this report. Most families experiencing homelessness are in emergency shelter or transitional housing programs rather than in unsheltered locations. Families experiencing homelessness are young, with most parents under age 30 and a large fraction headed by parenting youth between the ages of 18 and 24. Many are trying to care for their first child. Young families are particularly at risk of homelessness, and that parents as well as children need age-appropriate support. Rigorous research conducted by HUD in the Family Options Study shows that the most successful way to end homelessness among families with children is to get them into permanent housing and help them stay there, rather than providing a transitional period with intensive services. Recognition of the limitations of transitional housing in reducing family homelessness is reflected in the nationwide drop in the inventory of transitional housing between 2007 and 2015.

By far the largest numbers of people who experience homelessness are individuals—that is, in households that do not include at least one adult and one child. In 2015, about 987,000 people experiencing sheltered homelessness were not in a family with at least one adult and one child. The typical person experiencing homelessness as an individual is a middle-aged man. However, about 25 percent of those experiencing sheltered homelessness as individuals are under age 30, and a larger number are between 18 and 24 than between 25 and 29. These results imply the need for age-appropriate interventions to help youth experiencing homelessness. As shown in the report, very few people experiencing homelessness at a point in time as minors are unaccompanied children under the age of 18, although the estimates do not count homeless youth who couch surf or stay in locations that are difficult to see and count. At the other end of the age spectrum, high morbidity and mortality rates among older people who experience homelessness means that few are elderly—6.3 percent of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness are 62 or older. Nonetheless, the elderly population experiencing sheltered homelessness has increased over the past 5 years, which also implies the need for age-appropriate support.

The number of individuals whose patterns of homelessness are chronic—that is, they are homeless on the streets or in shelters over long periods of time and are living with a disability—has dropped substantially since 2007. Chronic homelessness on a single night has dropped by 30.6 percent, or 36,643 people, since 2007. This large decline was made possible in part by sizable increases in permanent supportive housing units targeted to chronically homeless populations, which has been an explicit federal priority for many years.

Looking across ages of people experiencing homelessness and their family structures, the AHAR estimates demonstrate that homelessness is a product of disadvantage and vulnerability. Large numbers of people experiencing homelessness have a disability, about 45 percent of those who use shelters as individuals and likely a higher number for those whose only homelessness is on the street. Rates are lower for families with children. The AHAR shows that African Americans also experience
homelessness in numbers that are out of proportion to their overall numbers in the U.S. population.

Characteristics of people experiencing sheltered homelessness may reflect where they experience homelessness. The geography of homelessness has been fairly stable since the AHAR reports began in 2007. Sheltered homelessness is mainly an urban phenomenon, meaning that people who come to shelters do so in the principal cities of metropolitan areas. Not surprisingly, the most populous U.S. states also have the largest numbers of people who experience homelessness, as evidenced by the state-by-state one-night counts. But some patterns are different—for example, among large states, California has very large numbers of people found in unsheltered locations, while the large numbers of people experiencing homelessness in New York are found mainly in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs. These patterns may be attributed in part to climate, but they also may reflect the relative size of emergency shelter systems in different parts of the county.

Sheltered and unsheltered homelessness are extreme forms of housing instability. Many Americans may never become literally homeless but nonetheless move from one unstable situation to the next. Like last year’s AHAR, this report puts homelessness in context by including information about the larger numbers of people whose housing instability reflects a failure of the social safety net to provide adequate supports for vulnerable Americans.

Meanwhile, devoting substantial resources to preventing and ending homelessness as defined by the AHAR has paid off, especially for people with chronic patterns of homelessness and for veterans. That can serve as a model for achieving the goals of Opening Doors for other priority populations.
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Introduction

In addition to the data collected through PIT counts and HMIS are several other sources of information about homelessness and housing instability. This section presents information about people who share housing with others because of the loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason (i.e., doubled up); people who are living in hotels or motels because they have no alternative adequate accommodations; and people who have housing problems such as severe rent burdens or unsafe housing. Information from the American Housing Survey (AHS) and the U.S. Department of Education1 describes:

- People who live with another household and then move out;
- People who move into a unit with a pre-existing household;
- Children who are deemed homeless by U.S. public schools according to the definition of homeless children and youth established in Subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. These data are reported annually by local school administrators to the U.S. Department of Education and includes children and youth sharing the housing of others because of loss of housing, economic hardship, or similar reasons; and
- Low-income renters who are severely rent burdened, have severe housing problems, and have other indicators of instability such as missed rent payments or no good choice for a destination if evicted.

This information sheds light for organizations at the federal, state, and local levels on the broader spectrum of people experiencing homelessness or precarious housing situations. These data also inform the need for mainstream affordable housing and benefits programs that can supplement federal and local homelessness resources. Individuals and families experiencing homelessness often experience multiple types of housing instability.

The data sources—the American Housing Survey and data from local education agencies—have limitations, like all sources of data, but they provide context for understanding forms of homelessness and housing instability in addition to those described in the rest of this report.

American Housing Survey 2013 Supplement: Residents Who Have Moved Out in the Past 12 Months

“Doubling up” can mean many things and sometimes refers to multigenerational households or to people who share housing on a long-term basis in order to save on housing costs. A supplement to the 2013 AHS2 was designed to learn about different forms of doubling up, including those in less stable living situations. Respondents3 were asked a series of questions about household members who had moved out of the housing unit within the past year. The questions were asked about households that stayed for at least two weeks and had no other usual residence.4

In 2013, there were 4.4 million households with at least one member who had moved out in the last year.5 The large number of such households can reflect a variety of circumstances—for example, a college student who was at home during summer break and returned to school; an elderly person who was living with family and moved into assisted living; or someone who moved to a new city and stayed with a friend until finding his or her own place. To more fully understand the nature of the mover’s stay and the mover’s destination, the 2013 AHS supplement asked additional questions. The answers to those questions reveal a subset of people who may be doubled-up and vulnerable to experiencing sheltered or unsheltered homelessness. Exhibit 1 summarizes the reasons household members moved out of the respondent’s housing unit and the household members’ destination upon moving.

---

1 For more information on the U.S. Department of Education’s definition of homeless children and youth, refer to: http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg116.html#sec725.

2 Details about the AHS and the Doubling Up supplement can be found here: http://www2.census.gov/programs-surveys/ahs/2013/ and http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/ahs/. If more than one person or group of people moved into or out of a household, questions were tabulated for the first person or group of in-movers and the first person or group of out-movers listed by the respondent.

3 These questions were asked of a knowledgeable household member age 16 or over. In most cases, the respondent was the head of household.

4 These questions were restricted to occupied housing units where a person or group of people moved out within 12 months prior to the interview or since the current occupants moved in when that was less than a year before the interview. Household members moving out included anyone who stayed in the home for at least 2 weeks and had no other place where he or she usually lived. While respondents were instructed to only include people who had stayed at least two weeks, a small percentage of households were reported with a length of stay less than 2 weeks. They included minors who moved out without a parent or guardian. In cases where more than one person or group of people moved out during the last year, the respondent was instructed to refer to the first person of group of people listed as moving out in the last year.

5 The AHS National Summary Tables (Table S-07_AO) are available at: http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/ahs/data/2013/national-summary-report-and-tables—ahs-2013.html
EXHIBIT 1: Reasons Household Members Moved Out of the Respondent’s Housing Unit and Where They Moved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Housing Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,421,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Stay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Money</td>
<td>1,191,000 27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reasons (not lack of money)</td>
<td>3,200,000 72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked to Leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>320,000 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4,089,000 92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Leaving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>543,000 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding, conflict or violence</td>
<td>250,000 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reasonsa</td>
<td>3,585,000 81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to the home of relatives/friends</td>
<td>1,084,000 25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to homeless situationb</td>
<td>13,000 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to treatment program, hospital, or nursing home</td>
<td>67,000 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to jail or prison</td>
<td>17,000 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to Foster Care</td>
<td>11,000 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved to Another Situationc</td>
<td>3,090,000 72.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table S-07-AO of the 2013 AHS National Summary tables

Note: The number of housing units is rounded to the nearest thousand. Those “not reported” are excluded.

a Other reasons for leaving the housing unit included a major change in the family (e.g. marriage, new relationship, divorce, death, separation), health reasons, to be closer to work or job, school or military, or to establish one’s own household.

b A homeless situation was defined as staying in a shelter program or in a place not meant for human habitation, but a quarter went to stay with friends or relatives rather than to a place of their own. Some household members went to settings that are known precursors to homelessness: institutional health facility, such as a treatment program, hospital, or nursing home (1.6 percent or 67,000 movers), jail or prison (0.4 percent or 17,000 movers), or foster care (0.3 percent or 11,000 movers).

c Other situations included one’s own place, dormitories, or barracks.

Of the households with at least one member that moved out in the past year, 27.1 percent were reported by the respondent to have been staying because of a lack of money to pay for housing. Other questions asked about whether movers left voluntarily and the main reason people moved out. According to the respondent, 7.3 percent (320,000 movers) of household members who moved were asked to leave. When asked about the main reason the household member or members moved out, 5.7 percent were reported to have moved out because of crowding and conflict or violence in the housing unit, and 12.4 percent moved out because of financial reasons.

Few household members who moved out (less than one percent) were reported by the respondent to have gone to a shelter program or a place not meant for human habitation, but a quarter went to stay with friends or relatives rather than to a place of their own. Some household members went to settings that are known precursors to homelessness: institutional health facility, such as a treatment program, hospital, or nursing home (1.6 percent or 67,000 movers), jail or prison (0.4 percent or 17,000 movers), or foster care (0.3 percent or 11,000 movers).

American Housing Survey 2013 Supplement: Residents Who Have Moved In in the Past 12 Months

The AHS supplement also asked questions about households with at least one member who moved into an existing household’s unit in the past year and who was still there at the time of the AHS interview. In 2013, there were 3.3 million such households. The large number of households can reflect a range of circumstances—for example, a new spouse or partner moving into the partner’s unit, a new baby born to the family, a college student who moved home after leaving school, or an elderly person who was living on his or her own and moved in with family. To more fully understand the nature of the mover’s stay and the mover’s prior living situation, the 2013 AHS supplement asked respondents additional questions. The answers to those questions reveal a subset of people who are doubled-up and vulnerable to experiencing sheltered or unsheltered homelessness. Exhibit 2 summarizes the reasons household members moved into an existing household’s unit and the living situation from which they moved.
EXHIBIT 2: Reasons Household Members Moved Into an Existing Household’s Housing Unit and the Situation from Which They Moved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Stay in Current Home</th>
<th># Housing Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of money</td>
<td>787,000</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons (not lack of money)</td>
<td>2,416,000</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asked to Leave Prior Situation</th>
<th># Housing Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,025,000</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Reason for Leaving Prior Situation</th>
<th># Housing Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>599,000</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowding, conflict or violence</td>
<td>227,000</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons(^a)</td>
<td>2,371,000</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Stayed Prior to Current Home</th>
<th># Housing Units</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved from home of relatives/friends</td>
<td>1,056,000</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from a homeless situation(^b)</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from treatment program, hospital, or nursing home</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from jail or prison</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from foster care</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved from another situation(^c)</td>
<td>2,081,000</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HUD-PD&R tabulations of 2013 American Housing Survey data

Note: The number of housing units is rounded to the nearest thousand. Those “not reported” are excluded.

\(^a\) Other reasons for leaving the housing unit included a major change in the family (e.g. marriage, new relationship, divorce, death, separation), health reasons, to be closer to work or job, school or military, or to establish one’s own household.

\(^b\) A homeless situation was defined as staying in a shelter program or in a place not meant for human habitation such as a park, street, sidewalk, car, or abandoned building.

\(^c\) Other situations included one’s own place, dormitories, or barracks.

Of the households with at least one member who moved into an existing household’s unit in the past year, 24.6 percent were reported to have moved in because of a lack of money to pay for housing. Other questions asked about whether they left their prior situation voluntarily and the main reason people left their prior situation. According to the respondent, 5.3 percent (170,000 in-movers) were asked to leave their prior situation. When asked about the main reason for leaving their prior situation, 7.1 percent of people were reported to have experienced crowding, conflict, or violence, and 18.7 percent were reported to have moved for financial reasons.\(^{10}\)

U.S. Department of Education: Data from Local Education Agencies on Children and Youth who are Homeless or Sharing the Housing of Other Persons Due to Loss of Housing, Economic Hardship, or a Similar Reason

In *Opening Doors*, the Administration set a goal of preventing and ending homelessness among families, youth, and children in 2020. The plan notes that children experiencing homelessness have high rates of acute and chronic health problems, as well as exposure to violence. The plan also notes the importance of improving enrollment, retention in, and successful completion of early childhood, elementary, and secondary education for these children.

The U.S. Department of Education collects data from local education agencies (LEAs) about children ages 3 through grade 12 who are enrolled in public schools,\(^{11}\) including public preschool programs, whose primary nighttime residence at any time during a school year was:

1. a shelter, transitional housing, or awaiting foster care placement;
2. unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings);
3. a hotel or motel due to the lack of alternative adequate accommodations; or
4. in housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason (i.e., doubled-up).

The Department of Education uses these primary nighttime residence categories to provide services to students as mandated under Subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

The data reported by the U.S. Department of Education are used by the agency to determine whether states are providing children and youth residing in the primary nighttime residences listed above with access to a free, appropriate public education.

During the 2013-2014 academic year, the U.S. Department of Education reported 1,298,236 children living in the primary nighttime residences categories used to provide services to students as mandated under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, an 8 percent increase from the prior school year (95,729 more children). Among these children, 14.3 percent were in shelters, transitional housing, or awaiting foster care placement; more than three quarters (76.2 percent) were sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason; 3.2 percent were in an unsheltered location; and 6.2 percent were

\(^{10}\) Respondents could have interpreted this as either positive or negative financial reasons.

\(^{11}\) Some students in higher grades are youth over the age of 18.
Local Education Agency Data, HMIS Data, and Point in Time Data

The LEA data reported by the U.S. Department of Education differ from the HMIS and PIT data reported to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in several other ways:

- LEA data are reported by school administrators and generally verified by local liaisons and state Coordinators. HMIS data are reported by homeless service provider staff. PIT count data are reported by communities based on counts of people in shelter programs and unsheltered locations.
- LEA data cover a July 1 to June 30 period; however, data on school children during the summer may be limited. HMIS data used in the AHAR cover a period from October 1 through September 30. PIT count data are for a single night in January.
- LEA data include children and youth living in hotels or motels if they are judged to be there because of a lack of alternate, adequate accommodation. HMIS data include people living in hotels or motels only if those accommodations were subsidized through a homeless assistance program.
- The LEA data reports on information on public school children from ages 3 through grade 12. HMIS and PIT count data include children under age 3. The LEA data include some young adults (18 and older) who are still in public school. The HMIS data and PIT count report all people 18 and over in a separate category from those under 18. The PIT count data report all youth who are ages 18 to 24 in a separate category.

Although these data sources differ, they can and should be used side by side in local planning and policymaking to determine the appropriate array of programs that should be available to people experiencing or at-risk of homelessness within the community.

EXHIBIT 3: Number of Public School Children in Homeless Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,298,236</td>
<td>1,202,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care</td>
<td>186,265</td>
<td>174,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with other people because of housing loss or economic hardshipa</td>
<td>989,844</td>
<td>919,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered locationsb</td>
<td>42,003</td>
<td>39,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying in hotels or motels because of the lack of alternative accommodations</td>
<td>80,124</td>
<td>69,179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


American Housing Survey 2013: Renters with Worst Case Housing Needs and Other Indicators of Housing Instability

HUD submits periodic reports to Congress on renter households with severe needs for housing assistance. Submitted every other year, the reports are based on detailed information in the AHS on the quality and costs of rental housing units and the incomes of the housing’s occupants. Households with worst case needs for housing assistance are defined as renters with incomes below 50 percent of area median income who do not have housing assistance and are living in severely substandard housing, paying more than half their income for housing costs, or both.

In 2015, HUD’s Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) released the fifteenth in a series of Worst Case Needs reports to Congress, showing that 7.72 million renter households fell into the worst category in 2013. Most households with worst case needs have severe rent burdens, and these households may be forced to move or may be evicted because they stop paying rent. To try to learn whether some of these households have immediate indicators of housing instability, the 2013 AHS included supplemental questions about missed rental payments and eviction threats.

Most households (families and individuals) that become homeless have incomes well below the federal poverty standard. The tabulations in the 2013 Worst Case

---

a Children who are sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason.
b E.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, abandoned buildings, or other places not intended for human habitation.
EXHIBIT 4: Housing Instability for Unassisted Renters with Severe Housing Problems


Needs report show that, among renter households with severe housing problems and incomes below 30 percent of area median income (which varies by location, but is roughly equivalent to the poverty level), six percent missed one rent payment in the last three months, another six percent missed two to three rent payments, three percent had their utilities shut off, and another three percent faced the threat of eviction (Exhibit 4).

The 2013 AHS also asked renter households what they thought their housing situation would be should they be evicted (Exhibit 5). Among the households with poverty-equivalent incomes (below 30 percent of area median income) and not currently receiving housing assistance (e.g., not using a Section 8 voucher and not living in public housing), 43.3 percent said they would be able to find another place to live on their own, and 40.1 percent said they could stay with either family (30.1 percent) or friends (10 percent). About 5 percent (4.6 percent or 340,000 households) predicted that they would end up in a shelter program if they were evicted from their current residence.

EXHIBIT 5: Perceived Housing Destination of Unassisted Renters if Evicted
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2015 Homelessness in the United States

Did You Know?

- PIT: On a single night in January 2015, 564,708 people were homeless. This is a 12.8% decline since 2007.
- HMIS: Throughout the year in 2015, 1.48 million individuals experienced sheltered homelessness at some point. This is a 6.5% decline since 2007.

- More than 1 in 3 people experiencing homelessness are in CA or NY.
- 1 in 217 people in the U.S. experienced sheltered homelessness at some point in 2015. African Americans comprised 41.4% of the sheltered homeless population.

- From 2014–2015... People experiencing sheltered homelessness:
  - Cities: 1.0%
  - Suburban & Rural Areas: 3.2%

**Key Term**

Homeless describes a person who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence.
The Point-in-Time (PIT) estimates are one-night counts of people experiencing homelessness in both sheltered and unsheltered locations. The one-night counts are conducted by CoCs nationwide and occur during the last ten days in January. CoCs are required to conduct a point-in-time count in shelters (emergency shelter and transitional housing programs) and a street (or “unsheltered”) count at least every other year. In 2015, both the sheltered and unsheltered counts were required.

On a Single Night in January 2015
- 564,708 people were experiencing homelessness in the United States.
- About three in ten people experiencing homelessness (30.7%) were in unsheltered locations on the night of the PIT count, while seven in ten (69.3%) were in sheltered locations.

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- The one-night estimate of homelessness declined by 2 percent, or 11,742 fewer people.
- The number of unsheltered homeless people declined by 1.2 percent (2,131 fewer people), while the number of sheltered people declined by 2.4 percent (9,611 fewer people). This is the first time since 2012 where an annual decline in the sheltered population outpaced that of the unsheltered population.

Between January 2007 and January 2015
- The one-night estimate of homelessness declined by 12.8 percent, or 82,550 fewer people.
- This long-term drop was driven entirely by reductions in the number of people found in unsheltered locations; there were 82,589 fewer people found on the night of the count, a 32.3 percent decline.
- After growing by more than 10,000 people between 2012 and 2014, the one-night estimate of sheltered homelessness returned to its 2007 level in 2015.

On a single night in January 2015, 564,708 people in the United States were experiencing homelessness.

---

EXHIBIT 1.1: One-Night Counts of Homelessness
PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total Homeless People</th>
<th>Sheltered People</th>
<th>Unsheltered People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Change</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td># Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 to 2015</td>
<td>-11,742</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-9,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 to 2014</td>
<td>-13,914</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>6,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 to 2013</td>
<td>-31,189</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>4,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 to 2012</td>
<td>-2,235</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>-2,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2011</td>
<td>-13,289</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-11,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 to 2010</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 to 2009</td>
<td>-9,557</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>16,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 to 2008</td>
<td>-7,474</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-5,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 to 2015</td>
<td>-82,550</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The PIT estimates from 2007 to 2014 are slightly lower than those reported in past AHARs. The reduction reflects an adjustment to the estimates of unsheltered homeless people submitted by the Las Vegas/Clark County CoC (NV-500). The adjustment removed: 3,884 from 2007 and 2008, 3,389 people in 2009 and 2010, 1,429 people in 2011 and 2012, and 1,404 people in 2013. Changes in NV-500 and the Anchorage CoC in 2014 resulted in 1,974 fewer people. These changes apply to all PIT estimates in this section.

EXHIBIT 1.2: Changes in Homelessness
PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007-2015

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD’s Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.
By State

On a Single Night in January 2015
- Together, California (20.7%) and New York (15.8%) accounted for more than a third of all people experiencing homelessness in the U.S. The state with the next largest share was Florida, with 6.4 percent of the one-night estimate of sheltered homelessness.
- Twenty-four states each accounted for less than one percent of the national homeless population.

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- Homelessness declined by a total of 25,812 people across 33 states and the District of Columbia. This outweighed a total increase of 13,871 people across 17 states.
- The number of homeless people increased most dramatically in New York, where 7,660 more people were experiencing homelessness in 2015 than in 2014, a 9.5 percent increase.
- Florida experienced the largest decrease in homelessness: 5,642 fewer people in 2015 than in 2014, followed by Texas, with a decline of 4,817 people.

Between January 2007 and January 2015
- Homelessness decreased in 32 states, totaling 123,654 fewer people. This outnumbered an increase of 40,652 people in 18 states and the District of Columbia.
- California had the largest overall decline, with 23,248 fewer people, a change of 16.7 percent.
- New York had the largest increase, with 25,649 more homeless people counted in 2015 than in 2007, an increase of 41 percent.

EXHIBIT 1.3: Share of the Total Homeless Population
In the U.S. by State, 2015 (in %)

EXHIBIT 1.4: Total Homelessness by State
Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2015

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2015 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)
By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2015
- California and Florida had the largest numbers of unsheltered homeless people (73,699 and 17,017 people). In four states – California, Oregon, Montana, and Hawaii – more than half of the homeless population was unsheltered.
- In 15 states and the District of Columbia, the vast majority of the homeless population (90% or more) was in sheltered locations. The lowest rates of unsheltered homelessness were in ME, MA, RI, DE, NE, and NY, where less than five percent of people experiencing homelessness were in unsheltered locations.

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- Unsheltered homelessness increased in 31 states and the District of Columbia, by 10,533 more people in total. However, this increase was offset by a larger decrease in 18 states, totaling 12,887 fewer people.
- Florida experienced the largest decline in unsheltered homelessness, with 4,674 fewer people (21.5%), followed by Texas, with 2,781 fewer people (27.1%).
- Thirty-eight states and the District of Columbia experienced decreases in sheltered homelessness.
- Texas experienced the largest decline in sheltered homelessness, with 2,036 fewer people in 2015 than in 2014, a drop of 11.2 percent.

Between January 2007 and January 2015
- Although California experienced a short-term increase in unsheltered homelessness between 2014 and 2015 (2,262 people or 3.2%), over the long-term, between 2007 and 2015, California had the largest drop in unsheltered homelessness (16,766 fewer people, an 18.5% decline). Texas had the largest drop in sheltered homelessness over this longer period, 6,690 fewer people (a 29.2% decline).
- The decline in national homelessness between January 2007 and January 2015 was driven primarily by reductions in the unsheltered population experienced in 39 states.
- Sheltered homelessness increased in 24 states over this period. New York had the largest increase, with 26,947 more people experiencing sheltered homelessness on a single night in January 2015 than in 2007 (a 47% increase).

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
2015 PROFILE

A Man in Shelter* by Himself

62.1% MALE / 64.5% 1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

33.8% WERE AGE
31-50

41.4% WERE
Black or African American

59.4% HAD
No Disability

71.3% WERE IN A
City

PRIOR TO USING A SHELTER, 40.5% WERE
Already Homeless

27
NIGHTS SPENT IN
EMERGENCY SHELTER

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
**2015 One-Year Estimates OF SHELTERED HOMELESSNESS**

The one-year estimates account for all people who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at any time from October 1 through September 30 of the following year. The estimates are based on a nationally representative sample of communities that submit aggregate Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) data to HUD. The estimates statistically adjust for people experiencing sheltered homelessness in programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS—thus providing a complete enumeration of shelter users in each community—and are weighted to represent the entire country. The one-year estimates do not include: (a) shelter users in Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories; (b) people served by victim service providers; and (c) people in unsheltered locations who never accessed a shelter program during the 12-month period.

The 2015 AHAR uses data from 394 CoCs (97 percent of all CoCs) and is weighted to represent the entire United States.

1,484,576 people in the U.S. experienced sheltered homelessness at some time during 2015, a 6.5% decrease since 2007.

**Estimate of People Experiencing Sheltered Homelessness in 2015**
- The estimated number of people who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at any point from October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2015, was 1,484,576.
- One in 217 people in the U.S. experienced sheltered homelessness at some point during that period.

**Changes Over Time**
- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year remained roughly the same, declining by less than one percent (3,889 fewer people).
- Sheltered homelessness declined much more since 2007, the year HUD began tracking this information. Between 2007 and 2015, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped by 6.5 percent (104,019 fewer people).

---

1 People served in Safe Havens are included in the PIT estimates but not in these one-year estimates of shelter users.
2 The 95 percent confidence interval for the total sheltered homeless population in 2015 is 1,364,444 to 1,604,708 (1,484,576 ± 120,132).

---

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2015

**EXHIBIT 1.7a: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Homelessness, 2007–2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th># Change from Previous Year</th>
<th>% Change from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,484,576</td>
<td>-3,889</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,488,465</td>
<td>66,106</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,422,360</td>
<td>-66,011</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,488,371</td>
<td>-13,825</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,502,196</td>
<td>-90,954</td>
<td>-5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,593,150</td>
<td>34,233</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,558,917</td>
<td>-34,877</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,593,794</td>
<td>5,199</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,588,595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 95 percent confidence interval for the total sheltered homeless population in 2015 is 1,364,444 to 1,604,708 (1,484,576 ± 120,132).
Gender and Age

Starting this year, HUD collected age information for youth between the ages of 18 to 24 who experienced sheltered homelessness during the one-year period. Information is collected separately for people between the ages of 25 to 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2015

- Among all adults experiencing sheltered homelessness, men greatly outnumbered women (62.1% of adults versus 37.9%).
- More than one-fifth of people experiencing sheltered homelessness (22.3%) were children (that is, under age 18). Eleven percent were youth between the ages of 18 and 24.
- About one-third of people experiencing sheltered homelessness (33.8%) were ages 31 to 50, the most numerous age group among all people experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- While 17.9 percent of all people in the U.S. were age 62 or older, this population made up only 4.2 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness.

Changes Over Time

- The gender and age of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2015 largely mirrored that of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2014.
- Over a longer period of time, the proportion of people in shelter between the ages of 31 and 50 declined, from 41.2 percent in 2007 to 33.8 percent in 2015. The proportion of 51 to 61 year olds rose, from 13.6 percent in 2007 to 17.2 percent in 2015.
- Overall, between 2007 and 2015, the number of men experiencing sheltered homelessness declined by 11.7 percent (94,280 fewer people), while the number of women experiencing sheltered homelessness increased by one percent (4,458 more people).

Note: We report data for age 18-30 in the exhibit to facilitate comparisons over time. Data for those in age 18-24 and 25-30 are displayed separately in the supporting HMIS data available online (www.hudexchange.info) and are discussed in the text.
Ethnicity and Race

In 2015
- People who identify as Hispanic made up 17.3 percent of both the sheltered homeless population and the total U.S. population.
- More than three in five people experiencing sheltered homelessness identified as either non-white or white, Hispanic. African Americans alone comprised 41.4 percent of the sheltered homeless population but only 12.7 percent of the total U.S. population.
- White, non-Hispanic people represented 38 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness, compared to 61.9 percent of the total U.S. population.

Changes Over Time
- In 2014, the share of Hispanics in the sheltered homeless population was slightly lower (15.8%) than in the total U.S. population (17.1%). In 2015, however, this share grew so that the proportions of Hispanics were the same in the sheltered homeless and total U.S. populations, 17.3 percent. The number of Hispanics experiencing sheltered homelessness increased 8.7 percent since 2014 (20,235 more people), while the number of non-Hispanics declined 2.1 percent (26,135 fewer people).
- As the proportion of people in the U.S. who identified themselves as not white or white and Hispanic grew from 33.8 percent in 2007 to 38.1 percent in 2015, their proportion in the sheltered homeless population remained about the same, 63.6 percent in 2007 and 62 percent in 2015.

Homelessness in the United States

CHARACTERISTICS
SHELTERED HOMELESSNESS

Household Size and Disability Status

In 2015
- Almost two-thirds of people experiencing sheltered homelessness (64.5%) were alone. In contrast, only 12.8 percent of all people in the U.S. were living alone.
- Adults with disabilities were over three times more likely to be experiencing sheltered homelessness than adults without disabilities (one in 86 adults with disabilities was experiencing sheltered homelessness, compared to one in 313 adults without disabilities).

Changes Over Time
- Between 2007 and 2015, the percentage of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of a multi-person household increased from 29.7 percent to 35.5 percent. This parallels the growth in the proportion of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of family households, which rose from 29.8 percent of all people experiencing sheltered homelessness to 33.8 percent over the same period.
- The share of adults experiencing sheltered homelessness who have a disability dropped from 42.2 percent in 2014 to 40.6 percent in 2015.

Adults with disabilities were over three times more likely to experience sheltered homelessness than adults without disabilities in 2015.

Geographic Location

In 2015
- People experienced sheltered homelessness more often in principal cities than suburban or rural areas (71.3% vs. 28.7%). Neither the total U.S. population nor the U.S. population living in poverty, with 32.4 percent and 39.7 percent in principal cities, share this urban concentration among people experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- Although less common outside of principal cities, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas was still sizeable: 425,709 people.

Changes Over Time
- Between 2014 and 2015, sheltered homelessness rose one percent (10,152 more people) in principal cities and declined 3.2 percent (14,041 fewer people) in suburban and rural areas.
- Although the long-term trend between 2007 and 2015 shows people increasingly experiencing homelessness in suburban and rural areas (a 15.8% rise, or 58,158 more people) and less frequently experiencing homelessness in principal cities (a 13.3% decline, or 162,176 fewer people), the trend was reversed in the past year.

Note: In 2012, the ACS changed its approach to tabulating data by geographic area. This exhibit updates the estimates for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. population as a whole to account for this change. The revised estimates result in higher proportions of people in principal cities for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the total U.S. population than shown in past reports. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.
Characteristics by Geography

In 2015
- The profile of homelessness differed by geography. About a quarter of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas (26.4%) were children, compared to 20.7 percent in principal cities.
- Sheltered homeless people in suburban and rural areas were less likely to identify as African American (31.9%) or to be living alone (57.6%) than were sheltered homeless people in principal cities (45.3% and 67.3%).
- On the other hand, sheltered homeless adults in suburban and rural areas were more likely to be women (42.3%) or to be disabled (45.3%) than were sheltered homeless adults in principal cities (36.2% and 38.8%).

Changes Over Time
- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of disabled adults experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities declined by 5.4 percent (17,918 fewer people) and declined by 3.2 percent (4,492 fewer people) in suburban and rural areas. Adults with disabilities experiencing sheltered homelessness remain more common among those in suburban and rural areas (45.3%) than in principal cities (38.8%) in 2015.
- While the share of sheltered homeless people identifying as Hispanic increased 0.8 percentage points (14.0% to 14.8%) in suburban and rural areas between 2014 and 2015, it increased by 1.7 percentage points in principal cities (16.6% to 18.3%).
- The proportion of people experiencing sheltered homelessness who are African American grew in principal cities from 39.7 percent in 2007 to 45.3 percent in 2015.

EXHIBIT 1.16: Characteristics by Geography
Sheltered Homeless People, 2007-2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Homeless People</td>
<td>1,221,044</td>
<td>1,048,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other One Race</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Age 18</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 30</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 50</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 61</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 and Older</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 People</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 People</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 People</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More People</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status of Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2015
Living Situation Before Entering Shelter

Information on where people lived before entering shelter was asked only of adults.

In 2015

- Prior to entering shelter, two in five adults were living in a housed situation, another two in five were already homeless, and about one in five was staying in an institutional or other setting.
- About three-quarters of the adults who were living in a housed situation prior to entering shelter had been staying with either family (42.2%) or friends (32.5%), while about a quarter were staying in housing they either rented (22.5%) or owned (2%). Less than one percent left permanent supportive housing to enter a shelter program.
- About half of the adults who were already homeless before entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program during the reporting year (49.3%) were living in unsheltered locations.
- About a quarter of the adults who entered an emergency shelter or transitional housing program from institutional settings (24.3%) came from substance abuse treatment centers, and 41.7 percent came from correctional facilities.
- Of those not already homeless at shelter entry, about two-thirds were housed (67.9%), while 18.8 percent were in institutions, and 13.3 percent were in other settings.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of adults who were experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations prior to their entry into a shelter increased 5.8 percent.
- Between 2007 and 2015, 84,162 more adults entered the shelter program in which they were found during the reporting year from unsheltered locations, an increase of 56.8 percent.
- Between 2014 and 2015, the number adults who were in a hospital before entering a shelter program increased 16.5 percent (3,379 more people).
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

Emergency shelter and transitional housing programs are designed differently. Emergency shelters are high-volume, high-turnover programs; their primary purpose is to provide temporary shelter for homeless people. In contrast, transitional housing programs offer homeless people shelter as well as supportive services for up to 24 months and intend for people to stay longer than they do in emergency shelters.

In 2015
- The homeless services system nationwide had 264,440 year-round beds in emergency shelters and 159,784 beds in transitional housing programs. Of the 1,484,576 people experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year, 81.2 percent stayed only in emergency shelters, 13.6 percent stayed only in transitional housing programs, and 5.1 percent used both emergency shelter and transitional housing programs during the reporting year.
- The median length of stay over the course of the reporting year was 27 nights for emergency shelter clients and about 4 months (115 nights) for transitional housing clients.
- Only 11.3 percent of emergency shelter clients stayed longer than six months, while about a third of transitional housing clients (34.7%) did so.
- On average, 89.6 percent of emergency shelter beds were occupied per night, while 82 percent of transitional housing beds were occupied per night.

Changes Over Time
- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of year-round, emergency shelter beds increased by 14,943 beds (6%), while the number of people using emergency shelters decreased by 24,316 people (1.9%).
- There were 13,440 fewer transitional housing beds available in 2015 than in 2014 (a 7.8% decrease), and the number of people using transitional housing declined by 23,476 people (7.8%) over the same period.
- Emergency shelter beds served fewer people per available bed in 2015 (5.4 people per bed) than in 2007 (7.3 people per bed) and for longer stays—the median length of stay was 18 nights in 2007 and 27 nights in 2015.
- The average occupancy rate for emergency shelter beds declined from 95.4 percent in 2014 to 89.6 percent in 2015. The average occupancy rate for transitional housing beds remained roughly the same—83.5 percent in 2014 and 82 percent in 2015.

EXHIBIT 1.19: Length of Stay
People in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days or less</td>
<td>354,253</td>
<td>16,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 30 days</td>
<td>332,880</td>
<td>36,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 180 days</td>
<td>446,296</td>
<td>128,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 360 days</td>
<td>78,320</td>
<td>61,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361 to 365 days</td>
<td>65,954</td>
<td>34,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Length of stay accounts for multiple program entries/exits by summing the total number of (cumulative) days in a homeless residential program during the 12-month reporting period. The maximum length of stay is 365 days, corresponding to the total days observed for this reporting period.

EXHIBIT 1.20: Bed-Use Patterns
People in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed-Use Patterns</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median # nights</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # nights</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average occupancy rate (in %)</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed count</td>
<td>211,451</td>
<td>249,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover rate</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The average daily occupancy rate is calculated by dividing the average daily census during the 12-month reporting period by the total of year-round equivalent beds for that year.
Note 2: The total bed count is based on the year-round beds determined at one point in time from the HIC.
Note 3: The turnover rate measures the number of people served per available bed over the 12-month reporting period, and is calculated by dividing the total of year-round equivalent beds for that year.
## EXHIBIT 1.21: Sheltered Homeless Population Compared to Other Populations

### All People
The number of people who were experiencing sheltered homelessness in the U.S. in 2015 is 20% larger than the combined capacity of every single Major League Baseball stadium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>1,484,574</td>
<td>1,240,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Children
The number of children experiencing sheltered homelessness in the U.S. in 2015 was 20% larger than the entire elementary school population of the Los Angeles school system, the second largest school system in the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>330,074</td>
<td>274,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison Populations

- **All People**: Combined seating capacity of all baseball stadiums

- **Children**: Elementary school children in Los Angeles

---

*Data Source: HMIS 2015; Census, 2010; MLB, 2016; LAUSD, 2013; DoD, 2016*


2. [http://notebook.lausd.net/pls/ptl/docs/PAGE/CA_LAUSD/LAUSDNET/OFFICES/COMMUNICATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS_FACTS/11-12FINGERTIPFACTSREVISED.PDF](http://notebook.lausd.net/pls/ptl/docs/PAGE/CA_LAUSD/LAUSDNET/OFFICES/COMMUNICATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS_FACTS/11-12FINGERTIPFACTSREVISED.PDF)
African Americans
In 2015, the sheltered homeless population that is African American or black in the U.S. was larger than the state ranked 20th among all U.S. states in the size of their African American or black population – Indiana with 591,397. This makes the size of the black sheltered homeless population larger than the size of the black within more half of the states in the U.S.

- Number in sheltered population (2015): 594,226
- Number Comparison Population (2010): 591,397

Comparison Population:
Size of the local African American population in Indiana

Veterans
The largest military base in the world, Fort Bragg in North Carolina, has just over 52,000 active-duty military personnel; however, the number of former military who used a shelter program in 2015 in the U.S. was 2.6 times larger.

- Number in sheltered population (2015): 139,855
- Number Comparison Population (2016): 52,280

Comparison Population:
Active duty military in Fort Bragg

\[ \times 2.6 \]

3 https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/00
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2015 Homeless Individuals
IN THE UNITED STATES

Did You Know?

On a single night in January 2015, 358,422 individuals were homeless.

This is a 13.2% decline since 2007.

Over half of all unsheltered individuals were in CA or FL.

Throughout 2015, 987,239 individuals experienced sheltered homelessness at some point.

This is a 11.5% decline since 2007.

Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were 1.4 times more likely to be disabled than individuals living in poverty in the U.S.

Among individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2015...

74.4% CITIES
25.6% SUBURBAN & RURAL AREAS

An Individual refers to a person in a household that does not have both an adult and a child. These households include people who are homeless alone, adult roommates, married or cohabiting couples without children, households comprised of multiple children (e.g., parenting teens), and unaccompanied youth. A person in a “family with children” is in a household with at least one adult and one child.
In 2015, 88.2% of people experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations were individuals rather than in families with children.

### 2015 One-Night Estimates of Homeless Individuals

This section presents the Point-in-Time (PIT) estimates of individuals who experienced homelessness in the U.S. The PIT estimates are one-night counts of people experiencing homelessness in both sheltered and unsheltered locations. The one-night counts are conducted by CoCs nationwide and occur during the last ten days in January. CoCs are required to conduct a point-in-time count in shelters (emergency shelter and transitional housing programs) and a street (or “unsheltered”) count at least every other year. In 2015, both the sheltered and unsheltered counts were required.

#### On a Single Night in January 2015
- 358,422 individuals were experiencing homelessness in the United States. This was 63.5 percent of all people in the one-night counts, with the other 36.5 percent made up of people in families with children.
- More than half of all individuals found by the one-night counts of homeless people (57.4%) were staying in sheltered locations. However, individuals experiencing homelessness were 7.5 times more likely to be unsheltered than people in families with children. Of people found in unsheltered locations, 88.2 percent were individuals.

#### Between January 2014 and January 2015
- The total number of individuals experiencing homelessness was essentially unchanged, declining by less than one percent (1,767 fewer people).
- There was a decrease in the number of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness, by 1.7 percent (3,532 fewer people) after increases in each of the prior two years. There was an increase in the number of unsheltered individuals experiencing homelessness by 1.2 percent (1,765 additional people) after decreases in each of the prior two years.

#### Between January 2007 and January 2015
- The number of individuals who were homeless on a single night in January dropped by 13.2 percent (54,278 fewer people).
- The long-term drops in the one-night counts of individuals experiencing homelessness were found in both unsheltered and sheltered locations. The unsheltered population decreased by 23.5 percent (46,821 fewer individuals), and the sheltered population decreased by 3.5 percent (7,457 fewer individuals).

---

**EXHIBIT 2.1: One-Night Counts of Homeless Individuals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total Homeless Individuals</th>
<th>Sheltered Individuals</th>
<th>Unsheltered Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Change</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td># Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 to 2015</td>
<td>-1,767</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-3,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 to 2014</td>
<td>-7,985</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>6,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 to 2013</td>
<td>-13,982</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>3,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 to 2012</td>
<td>-5,457</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-6,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2011</td>
<td>-7,527</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-6,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 to 2010</td>
<td>3,009</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-3,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 to 2009</td>
<td>-12,394</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>11,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 to 2008</td>
<td>-8,175</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>-8,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 to 2015</td>
<td>-54,278</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td>-7,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The PIT estimates from 2007 to 2014 are slightly lower than those reported in past AHARs. The reduction reflects an adjustment to the estimates of unsheltered homeless people submitted by the Las Vegas/Clark County CoC (NV-500). The adjustment removed: 3,884 from 2007 and 2008; 3,389 people in 2009 and 2010; 1,429 people in 2011 and 2012; and 1,404 people in 2013. Changes in NV-500 and the Anchorage CoC in 2014 resulted in 1,974 fewer people. These changes apply to all PIT estimates in this section.

---

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD’s Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.
By State

On a Single Night in January 2015
- About a quarter (26.3%) of all individuals experiencing homelessness were in California. Only two other states accounted for more than 5 percent of all individuals experiencing homelessness in the nation, New York (10.2%) and Florida (7.4%).
- Individuals represented more than three-quarters of all people experiencing homelessness in the one-night count in four states: Nevada (89.9%), California (80.5%), Louisiana (78.8%) and West Virginia (77.1%). Individuals represented more than half of all people experiencing homelessness in almost all states.

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- While nationally the number of individuals experiencing homelessness remained largely unchanged, this population declined in 31 states and the District of Columbia.
- Texas experienced the largest decrease in the number of individuals experiencing homelessness, with 2,912 fewer people (a 15.2% change), while New York experienced the largest increase, with 3,492 more people (a 10.7% change).

Between January 2007 and January 2015
- The number of individuals experiencing homelessness dropped in 28 states. California had the largest decline, with 17,796 fewer people (a 16% decline). Texas (10,041 fewer people) and Florida (6,715 fewer people) also experienced large decreases over the period.
- Twenty-two states and the District of Columbia had an increase in the number of individuals experiencing homelessness. New York alone accounted for nearly half of this increase (49.5%), with 8,079 additional people.
By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2015

- Nearly half of all unsheltered individuals in the U.S. were in California (45.7%), and three in four individuals experiencing homelessness in California (73.3%) were found in unsheltered locations.
- In eight other states, more than half of all individuals experiencing homelessness were found in unsheltered locations: HI, MT, OR, FL, NV, MS, GA, and WA.
- In contrast, more than 90 percent of individuals experiencing homelessness were found in sheltered rather than unsheltered locations in five states: ME, RI, DE, NE, and MA.

Between January 2014 and January 2015

- The largest increases in the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were in New York (3,572 people, a 12.5% increase) and Oregon (383 people, a 10.5% increase). Missouri had the largest drop, with 1,011 fewer individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- Georgia experienced the largest decline in unsheltered individuals (2,552 fewer people). California and Washington both had substantial increases in unsheltered individuals, but the increase in Washington was much larger in percentage terms (23.2% vs. 3.6% in California).

Between January 2007 and January 2015

- New York had by far the largest increase in individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness, followed by Ohio and Minnesota.
- California had the largest declines in both sheltered individuals (5,654 fewer people) and unsheltered individuals (12,142 fewer people) since 2007.

EXHIBIT 2.5: Sheltered Homeless Individuals by State
Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 to 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 to 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>-1,011</td>
<td>-27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-853</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>-618</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-524</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>-366</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>-618</td>
<td>-13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-524</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>-366</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT 2.6: Unsheltered Homeless Individuals by State
Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014 to 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2007 to 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2,405</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-2,552</td>
<td>-34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-2,388</td>
<td>-25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-1,552</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>-626</td>
<td>-38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>-489</td>
<td>-39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>-12,142</td>
<td>-15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-6,156</td>
<td>-46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-5,976</td>
<td>-29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>176.2</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>-2,873</td>
<td>-51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-1,859</td>
<td>-27.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
2015 PROFILE

A Man in Shelter* by Himself

70.4% MALE / 98.2% 1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

42.5% WERE AGE 31-50

46.3% WERE White, Non-Hispanic

55.2% HAD No Disability

74.4% WERE IN A City

PRIOR TO USING A SHELTER, 42.4% WERE Already Homeless

22 NIGHTS SPENT IN EMERGENCY SHELTER

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
2015 One-Year Estimates
OF SHELTERED INDIVIDUALS

HMIS

These one-year estimates account for all individuals who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at any time from October 1 through September 30 of the reporting year. The estimates are based on a nationally representative sample of communities that submit aggregate Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) data to HUD. The estimates statistically adjust for people experiencing homelessness in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS—thus providing a complete enumeration of sheltered individuals in each community—and are weighted to represent the entire country. The one-year estimates do not include: (a) sheltered individuals in Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories; (b) individuals served by victim service providers; and (c) individuals in unsheltered locations who never accessed a shelter program during the 12-month period.1

987,239 individuals experienced sheltered homelessness at some time during the 2015 reporting year.

Estimate of Individuals Experiencing Sheltered Homelessness in 2015
- An estimated 987,239 individuals used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at some time from October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2015.2

Changes Over Time
- The number of sheltered individuals has increased for the last two years in a row, by 4.2 percent (41,111 people) between 2013 and 2014 and by 0.3 percent (3,112 people) between 2014 and 2015. This is in contrast to declines seen each year from 2011 to 2013.
- Between 2007 and 2015, the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped by 127,815 people, or 11.5 percent.

1People served in Safe Havens are included in the PIT estimates but not in these one-year estimates of shelter users.
2The 95 percent confidence interval for the estimate of sheltered individuals is 881,874 to 1,092,604 (987,239 ± 105,365).

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2015
Gender and Age

Starting this year, HUD collected age information for people between the ages of 18 to 24 who experienced sheltered homelessness during the one-year period. Information is collected separately for people between the ages of 25 to 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2015

- Adult individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were 2.4 times more likely to be men as they were to be women (70.4% versus 29.6%). In contrast, less than half (46.7%) of individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty were men.
- 11.8 percent (115,489 people) of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were between ages 18 and 24, and 11.9 percent (116,558 people) were ages 25 to 30.
- Elderly individuals (ages 62 or older) made up just 6.3 percent of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness, a far lower share than for individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty (25.6%).

The number of children experiencing sheltered homelessness without an adult increased by 20.8% (3,774 children) between 2014 and 2015.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of children experiencing sheltered homelessness who were not part of a family (that is, they were without adults) increased by 20.8 percent (3,774 more children).
- Although the number of adult men experiencing sheltered homelessness declined by 12.7 percent (98,336 fewer people) between 2007 and 2015, men continued to make up the vast majority (more than 70%) of adult individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- The most common age group for individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness remains 31-50, but the share in that age group dropped from 51.9 percent in 2007 to 42.5 percent in 2015, as the shares in other age groups rose.
- The number of sheltered elderly individuals (62 or older) increased by 39.2 percent (17,537 people) between 2007 and 2015. The share of elderly individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness increased each year for the last 5 years (from 4.1% in 2010 to 6.3% in 2015).
Ethnicity and Race

In 2015
- Almost half of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness identified themselves as white and not Hispanic (46.3%). Somewhat over a third (37.2%) were African American. Other races include American Indian or Alaska Native (2.9%), Asian (0.8%), and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (0.7%).
- Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were 2 times more likely to identify as African American than were individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty (37.2% versus 18.9%). The proportion of individuals identifying as Hispanic was slightly less among those experiencing sheltered homelessness than among individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty (12.8% versus 14.4%).

Changes Over Time
- The number of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness identifying as Hispanic increased by 8.4 percent (9,649 people) between 2014 and 2015.
- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness identifying as white and Hispanic increased 13.9 percent, but this group increased only 4.7 percent in the total U.S. population.
- The number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness who identified themselves as belonging to racial groups other than white or as white and Hispanic declined 10.5 percent (60,042 people) between 2007 and 2015, despite a 3 percent increase (15,071 people) between 2014 and 2015.

Just under half of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness were white, non-Hispanic – 46.3%.

Household Size and Disability Status

An “individual” refers to a person in a household that does not have both an adult and a child. These households include people who are homeless alone, adult roommates, married or cohabiting couples without children, multiple children (e.g., parenting teens), and unaccompanied youth.

In 2015

- In the U.S. population, more than three quarters of individuals are in households with two or more people. In contrast, almost all (98.2%) individuals who use shelter programs are experiencing sheltered homelessness by themselves.
- Nearly half (44.8%) of sheltered adult individuals have a disability. This is more than twice the rate among individuals in the U.S. population (19.7%) and 1.4 times the rate for individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty (30.9%).

Changes Over Time

- The share of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness with other people increased from 0.4 percent in 2007 to 1.8 percent in 2015.
- Between 2007 and 2015, the proportion of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness with disabilities increased from 40.4 percent to 44.8 percent. This is in contrast to a decline (from 38.9% to 30.9%) in the share with disabilities among individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty.

44.8% of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness have a disability, about 2.3 times the national rate for individuals.

Geographic Location

In 2015
- Three-quarters of individuals who experienced sheltered homelessness (74.4% or 734,194 people) were located in principal cities. The remaining one-quarter (25.6% or 253,045 people) were in suburban and rural areas.
- Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were 1.8 times more likely to be in cities than were individuals in poverty (74.4% versus 40.7%), and over 2 times more likely than individuals in the U.S. population (74.4% versus 33.1%).

Changes Over Time
- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness in both cities and suburban and rural areas remained relatively stable (a 0.6% increase in cities and a 0.5% decrease in rural areas).
- Between 2007 and 2015, the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness in cities dropped 16.4 percent (143,780 fewer people), while it rose by 6.8 percent (16,055 more people) in suburban and rural areas. As a result, the share of the sheltered individuals in cities dropped from 78.7 percent in 2007 to 74.4 percent in 2015.

EXHIBIT 2.14: Geographic Distribution

Note: In 2012, the ACS changed its approach to tabulating data by geographic area. This exhibit updates the estimates for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. population as a whole to account for this change. The revised estimates result in higher proportions of people in principal cities for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. populations than shown in past reports. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 2.15: Percent Change by Geography

--- | --- | ---
 | Principal Cities | Suburban and Rural Areas | Principal Cities | Suburban and Rural Areas
Sheltered Individuals | 0.6 | -0.5 | -16.4 | 6.8
U.S. Individuals Living in Poverty | -0.1 | 1.0 | 30.4 | 29.7
U.S. Individuals | 2.1 | 1.6 | 14.4 | 12.7

Note: In 2012, the ACS changed its approach to tabulating data by geographic area. This exhibit updates the estimates for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. population as a whole to account for this change. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Characteristics by Geography

In 2015
- Sheltered individuals in suburban and rural areas were more likely to be women than those in cities (32.3% versus 28.7%).
- A smaller share of individual adults experiencing sheltered homelessness in cities had a disability compared individual adults experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas (42.5% versus 51.3%).
- Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness in cities were more likely to identify as belonging to racial groups other than white or as white and Hispanic than those in suburban and rural areas (57.4% versus 43.1%).
- Individuals between the ages of 18 to 24 used shelters in cities and suburban and rural areas at about the same rate (11.0% versus 11.1%).

Changes Over Time
- Between 2007 and 2015, the number of elderly individuals (ages 62 and over) experiencing sheltered homelessness increased from 4.4 percent to 6.6 percent (10,393 more people) in cities, and from 3 percent to 5.6 percent (7,145 more people) in suburban and rural areas.
- While the share of sheltered adult individuals with a disability in suburban and rural areas declined 2.3 percentage points (53.6% to 51.3%) from 2014 to 2015, their share declined 1.7 percentage points in cities (44.2% to 42.5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Individuals</td>
<td>877,974</td>
<td>729,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>734,194</td>
<td>254,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>253,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Adults</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other One Race</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Age 18</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 30</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 50</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 61</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 and Older</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Size</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 People</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 People</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 People</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More People</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Status of Adults</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2015
Living Situation Before Entering Shelter

Information on where individuals lived before entering shelter was asked only of adults.

In 2015
- Prior to entering shelter programs in 2015, 42.4 percent of adult individuals were already homeless, while 37.4 percent came from some kind of housing arrangement. The remaining individuals came from institutional settings (13.3%) or other settings (7.9%).
- Of the 351,388 adult individuals who came into emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from a housed situation, 41.7 percent had been staying with family, 34.7 percent with friends, and 20.6 percent in housing they rented. Only 2.1 percent had been in housing they owned, and 0.9 percent had been staying in permanent supportive housing.
- Of the adult individuals who were not already homeless before entering shelter programs, almost two-thirds (63.9%) came from housing, about a quarter (22.7%) from institutional settings, and the rest (13.4%) from other settings such as motels.

Changes Over Time
- In 2015, 2,404 fewer adult individuals came to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from institutional settings than had done so in 2014. In particular, the number of adult individuals entering shelters from substance abuse and treatment centers declined by 19.4 percent (7,296 fewer people).
- The number of adult individuals who entered shelters from a friend’s place increased substantially between 2007 and 2015, up by 44.3 percent or 38,571 individuals.
- From 2007 to 2015, 9,234 more people (a 64.6% increase) were staying in a hospital and 5,132 more people (a 33.3% increase) were staying in a psychiatric facility before entering shelter.
- While the number of adult individuals coming into shelters from other settings declined by 10.2 percent between 2007 and 2015, the number coming from a hotel or motel increased by 46.2 percent (11,093 people) over the same period.

EXHIBIT 2.17: Places Adult Individuals Stayed
Before Entering Shelter and Change Over Time, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Stayed</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2014–2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>2007–2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already Homeless</td>
<td>397,810</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>-3,392</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-51,325</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered</td>
<td>187,908</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>-12,251</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
<td>-129,382</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>209,902</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>8,859</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>74,705</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>351,388</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4,613</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with family</td>
<td>146,617</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>6,179</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with friends</td>
<td>121,849</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>-3,730</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td>38,571</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented housing unit</td>
<td>72,380</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>-1,254</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>-23,751</td>
<td>-24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned housing unit</td>
<td>7,387</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-12,252</td>
<td>-61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent supportive housing (PSH)</td>
<td>3,155</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-724</td>
<td>-18.2</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Settings</td>
<td>124,989</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>-2,404</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>9,765</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment center</td>
<td>29,478</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>-7,296</td>
<td>-19.4</td>
<td>-6,419</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional facility</td>
<td>52,654</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>22,831</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>9,234</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric facility</td>
<td>20,026</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-288</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Settings</td>
<td>73,800</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9,283</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-9,375</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or motel</td>
<td>33,904</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11,093</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster care home</td>
<td>2,809</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-381</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>-2,886</td>
<td>-49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other living arrangement</td>
<td>37,087</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>8,166</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>-17,582</td>
<td>-28.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To produce comparable trend information, statistical imputations were applied to missing values in this table. See the 2015 AHAR methodology document for more details.

EXHIBIT 2.18: Places Adult Individuals Stayed
Who Were Not Already Homeless
Before Entering Shelter, 2007-2015 (in %)
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

Emergency shelter and transitional housing programs are designed differently. Emergency shelters are high-volume, high-turnover programs; their primary purpose is to provide temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness. In contrast, transitional housing programs offer people experiencing homelessness shelter as well as supportive services for up to 24 months and intend for people to stay longer than they do in emergency shelters.

In 2015
- The homeless services system nationwide had 131,433 emergency shelter year-round beds for individuals and 76,091 year-round beds for individuals in transitional housing programs. Of the 987,239 individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year, 83.6 percent stayed in emergency shelters only, 11.6 percent stayed in transitional housing programs only, and 4.8 percent used both emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
- During the 12-month reporting period, one-third of individuals using emergency shelters (33.4%) stayed one week or less, 60.1 percent stayed one month or less, and 8.2 percent stayed more than six months.
- In contrast, within the reporting year, nearly half of individuals using transitional housing programs (47.3%) stayed between one and six months, 22 percent stayed one month or less, and 30.8 percent stayed more than six months.
- The median length of stay for individuals in emergency shelter was 22 nights, with 6.7 individuals served per bed throughout the year. On average, 87 percent of emergency shelter beds were occupied per night.
- The median length of stay for individuals in transitional housing programs was 101 nights, or over three months, with 2.2 individuals served per bed throughout the year. On average, 82.5 percent of transitional housing beds were occupied per night.

Changes Over Time
- Between 2014 and 2015, the average occupancy rate for emergency shelter beds decreased from 97.7 percent to 87 percent while the turnover rate remained steady at about 7 individuals served per bed throughout the year.
- Between 2007 and 2015, the median number of nights in emergency shelter increased from 14 to 22, and the average number increased from 38 to 56.
- Between 2007 and 2015, the median number of nights in transitional housing increased from 91 to 101, and the average number increased from 130 to 138.

EXHIBIT 2.19: Length of Stay
Individuals in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days or less</td>
<td>290,633</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 30 days</td>
<td>232,000</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 180 days</td>
<td>276,840</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 360 days</td>
<td>42,443</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361 to 365 days</td>
<td>28,606</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Length of stay accounts for multiple program entries/exits by summing the total number of (cumulative) days in a homeless residential program during the 12-month reporting period. The maximum length of stay is 365 days, corresponding to the total days observed for this reporting period.

EXHIBIT 2.20: Bed-Use Patterns
Individuals in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed-Use Patterns</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median # nights</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # nights</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average occupancy rate (in %)</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed count</td>
<td>113,164</td>
<td>126,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover rate</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The average daily occupancy rate is calculated by dividing the average daily census during the 12-month reporting period by the total of year-round equivalent beds for that year.
Note 2: The total bed count is based on the year-round beds determined at one point in time from the HIC.
Note 3: The turnover rate measures the number of people served per available bed over the 12-month reporting period, and is calculated by dividing the total of year-round equivalent beds for that year.
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Did You Know?

On a single night in January 2015, 206,286 people in families were homeless. This is a 12.1% decline since 2007. Over half of all states & D.C. had at least 90% of families in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs. People in families with children in sheltered & unsheltered locations: 9.9% in sheltered & 90.1% in unsheltered locations.

Throughout the year in 2015, 502,521 families with children experienced sheltered homelessness at some point. This is a 6.1% increase since 2007. About 3 in 5 people experiencing sheltered homelessness in families were children. From 2014–2015... People in families experiencing sheltered homelessness in
- Cities: -0.6%
- Suburban & Rural Areas: -6.9%
2015 One-Night Estimates of Homeless Families with Children

PIT

This section presents the Point-in-Time (PIT) estimates of people who experienced homelessness as members of families with children in the U.S. The PIT estimates are one-night counts of people experiencing homelessness in both sheltered and unsheltered locations. The one-night counts are conducted by CoCs nationwide and occur during the last ten days in January. CoCs are required to conduct a PIT count in shelters (emergency shelter and transitional housing programs) and a street (or “unsheltered”) count at least every other year. In 2015, both the sheltered and unsheltered counts were required.

“Families with children” are households composed of at least one adult and one child under age 18. Family households with children have various compositions: single-parent families, two-parent families, and multi-generation families. Most of the estimates in this section describe the people in family households rather than the numbers of households.

On a Single Night in January 2015

- 206,286 people experienced homelessness as part of a family with children. About 37 percent of all people experiencing homelessness on a single night were in family households, and the number of such households was 64,197.
- Of all people counted in family households on a single night, 90.1 percent (185,824 people) were experiencing sheltered homelessness and only 9.9 percent (20,462 people) were in unsheltered locations.

Chronically Homeless People in Families with Children

- Of all people with chronic patterns of homelessness in January 2015, 13.6 percent (13,105 people) are in families.

Homeless Parenting Youth

- On a single night in January 2015, 9,901 people were experiencing homelessness as parenting youth under age 25, together with their 13,242 children. Most parenting youth (98.7%) were ages 18 to 24.

EXHIBIT 3.1: One-Night Counts of Homeless People in Families with Children
PIT Estimates by Shelter Status, 2007-2015

Note: The PIT estimates from 2007 to 2014 are slightly lower than those reported in past AHARs. The reduction reflects an adjustment to the estimates of unsheltered homeless people submitted by the Las Vegas/Clark County CoC (NV-500). The adjustment removed: 3,884 from 2007 and 2008; 3,389 people in 2009 and 2010; 1,429 people in 2011 and 2012; and 1,404 people in 2013. Changes in NV-500 and the Anchorage CoC in 2014 resulted in 1,974 fewer people. These changes apply to all PIT estimates in this section.

1 HUD began collecting data on “parenting youth” in 2015. Section 4 of this report presents more information on this population.

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD’s Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.
Between January 2014 and January 2015
- The number of people experiencing homelessness and counted in families with children dropped by 4.6 percent (9,975 fewer people). The number of homeless family households dropped by 5.1 percent (3,416 fewer households).
- The share of people in homeless families experiencing sheltered homelessness grew from 88.7 percent in 2014 to 90.1 percent in 2015.
- Both sheltered and unsheltered family homelessness declined, with 6,079 fewer sheltered homeless people in families in 2015 than in 2014 (a 3.2% drop) and 3,896 fewer unsheltered homeless people in families (a 16% drop).

Between January 2007 and January 2015
- The number of people experiencing homelessness in families with children on a single night dropped by 12.1 percent (28,272 fewer people), reflecting a large decrease in the number of people in families found in unsheltered locations. A 4.2 percent increase in sheltered family homelessness (7,496 more people) was offset by a much larger decrease in unsheltered family homelessness (63.6%, or 35,768 fewer people).
- Over the eight year period, the number of homeless family households dropped by 18.3 percent (14,338 fewer family households).

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD’s Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.
By State

On a Single Night in January 2015

- Across all states, 36.6 percent of all people experiencing homelessness were in families with children. However, people in families with children were the majority of all people experiencing homelessness in six states: NY (52,115 people), MA (14,757), MN (3,924), WI (3,065), and IA (1,580).
- More than a quarter of all people experiencing homelessness in families with children (25.5%) were in New York. Only two other states each accounted for more than five percent of the nation’s family homeless population: California (11%), and Massachusetts (7.2%).

Chronically Homeless People in Families with Children

- Just over half (54.4%) of all people experiencing chronic homelessness in families with children were located in California, New York, and Massachusetts.

Parenting Homeless Youth

- The state-by-state distribution of parenting youth is very similar to the distribution of all people in families.
- New York accounts for 23.8 percent of all people in parenting youth households, the largest proportion of any state.

Between January 2014 and January 2015

- The one-night count of people experiencing homelessness in families with children increased in 17 states, totaling 5,390 more people. New York comprised 77.3 percent of this increase (4,168 additional people).
- Homelessness among people in families decreased in 33 states and the District of Columbia, totaling 15,210 fewer people. Two states accounted for a third of this decrease: Florida (3,237 fewer people) and Texas (1,905 fewer people).

Between January 2007 and January 2015

- New York and Massachusetts were the only states to have substantial increases in the number of people counted on a single night as experiencing homelessness in families with children. The number increased by 17,570 in New York and by 7,922 in Massachusetts.
- Some states had large decreases in people in families experiencing homelessness over the eight-year period: Texas (6,069 fewer people), Florida (5,454 fewer people) and California (5,452 fewer people). The largest percentage drops were in New Jersey and Oregon, with declines in people in homeless families of more than 50 percent.

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2015 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)
By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2015

- In 29 states and the District of Columbia, at least 90 percent of people experiencing homelessness in families with children were in emergency shelter or transitional housing programs. Oregon was the only state with more than 50 percent of its homeless family population in unsheltered locations.

- Three states accounted for about half of the nation’s population of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness as part of families with children: California (27.8% or 5,386 people), Florida (14.1% or 2,725 people), and Oregon (10.2%, or 1,982 people).

Chronically Homeless People in Families with Children

- Nearly half (48.4%) of all people experiencing chronic homelessness in families with children in unsheltered locations were in California.

- Just over half (54.4%) of all sheltered people experiencing chronic homelessness in families with children were in New York and Massachusetts.

Parenting Homeless Youth

- More than 90 percent of all people in parenting youth households were experiencing sheltered homelessness in 37 states and the District of Columbia. More than 30 percent of parenting youth households were found in unsheltered locations in only four states: Tennessee (46.5%), Montana (40.6%), Oregon (34.8%), and Mississippi (33.3%).

EXHIBIT 3.5: Sheltered Homeless People in Families with Children by State


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 to 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-1,512</td>
<td>-17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>-1,369</td>
<td>-26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>-960</td>
<td>-23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>-858</td>
<td>-18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>-752</td>
<td>-13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 to 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>17,682</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>-3,971</td>
<td>-50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>125.4</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-2,805</td>
<td>-28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>-2,646</td>
<td>-30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>-2,426</td>
<td>-57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>-1,832</td>
<td>-60.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
By State and Sheltered Status

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- The number of sheltered people experiencing homelessness as part of families with children increased in 14 states (5,336 additional people). New York alone accounted for 78.1 percent of the increase.
- The number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of families with children dropped in 36 states and the District of Columbia (11,401 fewer people). The largest decreases were in Texas and New Jersey.
- Florida had the largest decreases in the one-night counts of people in families with children found in unsheltered locations: 3,122 fewer people in 2015 than in 2014.

Between January 2007 and January 2015
- The largest increases in the number of sheltered people in families with children experiencing homelessness were in New York (17,682 additional people) and Massachusetts (8,194 additional people). The largest decreases were in New Jersey and Texas.
- California, Florida, Georgia, and Texas all had substantial decreases in unsheltered family homelessness over this eight-year period. Since the AHAR began in 2007, the District of Columbia’s one-night counts have found no unsheltered homeless families.

Since 2007, the number of unsheltered people in families with children dropped by 63.6%.

### EXHIBIT 3.6: Unsheltered Homeless People in Families with Children by State


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 to 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-3,122</td>
<td>-53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>-454</td>
<td>-85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-393</td>
<td>-46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>-216</td>
<td>-25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>-151</td>
<td>-58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 to 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>271.7</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>-4,634</td>
<td>-46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1400.0</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-4,547</td>
<td>-62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-3,636</td>
<td>-80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-3,264</td>
<td>-87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>-1,528</td>
<td>-43.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The percent change could not be calculated because the count of unsheltered families in 2007 was zero

Note: From 2007 to 2015, the last two rows are depicted with dashes because three states alone had increases.
2015 PROFILE

A Young Mother in Shelter* with a Child

- 77.7% Female / 50.9% 2- or 3-Person Household
- 60.9% Were Under Age 18
- 50.1% Were Black or African American
- 79.3% of Adults Had No Disability

- 65.1% Were in a City

Prior to Using a Shelter, 57% Were Staying in Housing

- 47 Nights Spent in Emergency Shelter

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
Between 2014 and 2015, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of families with children declined by 2.9%.

**Estimate of Families with Children Experiencing Sheltered Homelessness in 2015**

- An estimated 502,521 people used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program as part of a family with children between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015.¹ These adults and children were in 154,380 family households.
- About one-third of all people experiencing sheltered homelessness (33.8%) during the one-year period were in families with children.

**Changes Over Time**

- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of people in families with children using a shelter at some point during the year declined by 2.9 percent (14,896 fewer people). The number of family households declined by 3.7 percent or 5,921 households.
- Over a longer period, the number of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness increased by 6.1 percent (28,980 more people) since 2007, when HUD first began tracking this information. The number of family households experiencing sheltered homelessness over the course of a year grew from 130,968 in 2007 to 154,380 in 2015.

¹ The 95 percent confidence interval for the number of sheltered people in families with children in 2015 is 469,569 to 535,473 (502,521 ± 32,952).

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2015
Gender and Age

Starting this year, HUD collected age information for people between the ages of 18 to 24 who experienced sheltered homelessness during the one-year period. Information is collected separately for people between the ages of 25 to 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2015
- More than three-quarters (77.7%) of adults experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of families with children were women. By comparison, only 64.6 percent of adults in families with children in the U.S. population living in poverty.
- About three in five people in families experiencing sheltered homelessness (60.9%) were children under 18. About half of these children (49.2%) were under six years old, and 10.4 percent were infants less than one year old.
- About two in five of the people in families experiencing sheltered homelessness (39.1%) were adults 18 years of age or older. Of these adults, 16.2 percent (48,077) were youth between the ages of 18 and 24 and 18 percent (53,370) were ages 25 to 30.
- Relatively younger adults in families with children were at greater risk of falling into sheltered homelessness than were older adults living with children. One in 220 adults in the U.S. who were between the ages of 18 and 30 and in families with children used a shelter program at some point during the year. This proportion is more than three times larger than the proportion of adults over age 30 in families with children.

Adults between the ages of 18 and 30 and in families with children were over three times as likely to use shelter programs as older adults accompanied by children.

Changes Over Time
- Though women still represent a substantial majority of adults experiencing sheltered homelessness in families with children, their share of the population has declined as the number of men experiencing sheltered homelessness in families with children increased by 35.5 percent (11,450 more people) between 2007 and 2015.
- The age distribution of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of a family has not changed substantially since HUD began collecting these data in 2007.

Note: We report data for age 18-30 in the exhibit to facilitate comparisons over time. Data for those in age 18-24 and 25-30 are displayed separately in the supporting HMIS data available online (www.hudexchange.info) and are discussed in the text.
Ethnicity and Race

In 2015

- About one-quarter of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (24.9%) identified as Hispanic. While this proportion is similar to the share of Hispanics among all families with children in the U.S. (23.7%), it is lower than the share of Hispanics in families with children in the U.S. population living in poverty (35.4%).
- About half of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (50.1%) identified as African American or black. This proportion is substantially higher than either the share of African Americans among all families with children in the U.S. (13.6%) or the share of African Americans in families with children in the U.S. population living in poverty (23.4%).
- About three-quarters of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (77.6%) identified as being in non-white racial groups or white and Hispanic, a proportion much larger than that among people experiencing sheltered homelessness as individuals (53.7%).

Changes Over Time

- As the proportion of Hispanics in all families with children in the U.S. rose from 19.9 percent in 2007 to 23.7 percent in 2015, so too did the proportion of Hispanics in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness, from 21.8 percent in 2007 to 24.9 percent in 2015.
- The proportion of African Americans in all families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped from 55.2 percent in 2007 to 48.3 percent in 2014 and then rose slightly between 2014 and 2015.

Note: Ethnicity is distinguished among the white race group to facilitate an understanding of minorities and non-minorities. Non-minorities are those who identify their ethnicity as not Hispanic and their race as white.
Household Size and Disability Status

In keeping with the definition of “family” in this report, a family consists of at least one adult and one child; the resulting minimum household size is two people. Family households have various compositions: single-parent families, two-parent families, and multi-generation families.

In 2015

- The household sizes of families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness were smaller than those in the broader U.S. population. About half of the people in families experiencing sheltered homelessness (50.9%) were in households of two or three people. In contrast, only a quarter of people in all families with children in the U.S. (25.1%) were in households of two or three people.
- However, about a quarter of people in families experiencing sheltered homelessness (26%) were in households with five or more people.
- The disability rate among adults in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (20.7%) is 2.4 times higher than among all adults in families with children in the U.S. (8.5%) and 1.4 times higher than among adults in families with children in the U.S. population living in poverty (15%).

Changes Over Time

- The proportion of two-person households among people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness decreased from 26.6 percent in 2007 to 22.6 percent in 2015. Meanwhile, the proportion of households of 5 or more people grew from 23.4 percent in 2007 to 26 percent in 2015.
- The number of disabled adults in families experiencing sheltered homelessness declined by 5.9 percent (2,488 fewer people) between 2014 and 2015.

About a quarter of the people in families experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2015 were in large households of five or more people.

Geographic Location

In 2015

- Almost two-thirds (65.1%) of sheltered families with children experienced homelessness in principal cities. By comparison, 39.1 percent of people in families with children in the U.S. population living in poverty lived in principal cities.
- A larger proportion of the sheltered family population was served in suburban and rural areas (34.9%) than of the sheltered individual population (25.6%).

Changes Over Time

- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness decreased by less than one percent (1,963 fewer people) in principal cities and declined 6.9 percent (12,933 fewer people) in suburban and rural areas.
- Between 2007 and 2015, sheltered people in a family with children experiencing homelessness in principal cities declined by 5.5 percent (19,137 fewer people) but increased 38 percent (48,342 more people) in suburban and rural areas.

EXHIBIT 3.14: Geographic Distribution

Note: In 2012, the ACS changed its approach to tabulating data by geographic area. This exhibit updates the estimates for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. population as a whole to account for this change. The revised estimates result in higher proportions of people in principal cities for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. population than shown in past reports. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 3.15: Percent Change by Geography
Change in the Number of Sheltered People in Families with Children, U.S. Families with Children Living in Poverty, and U.S. Families with Children, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Cities</td>
<td>Suburban and Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Families with Children</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Families with Children Living in Poverty</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Families with Children</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 2012, the ACS changed its approach to tabulating data by geographic area. This exhibit updates the estimates for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. population as a whole to account for this change. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from www.hudexchange.info.
Characteristics by Geography

**In 2015**
- The proportion of Hispanics in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness was higher in principal cities (26.8%) than in suburban and rural areas (21.4%).
- African Americans represented a majority of the sheltered family population in principal cities (57.9%) and more than a third in suburban and rural areas (36.2%).
- White, non-Hispanic people experiencing sheltered homelessness were more heavily represented among families with children in suburban and rural areas (34.4%) than in principal cities (15.6%).
- The disability rate among adults in families experiencing sheltered homelessness was higher in suburban and rural areas (24%) than in principal cities (18.9%).
- For many demographic characteristics (age, gender, and household size), the profile of sheltered people in families did not differ substantially by geography.

**Changes Over Time**
- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of sheltered African Americans in families with children increased 2.3 percent (3,954 more people) in principal cities, and declined 1.8 percent (1,123 fewer people) in suburban and rural areas.
- The proportion of Hispanics in families experiencing sheltered homelessness increased in suburban and rural areas from 13.4 percent in 2007 to 21.4 percent in 2015, while remaining level at about a quarter in principal cities in both 2007 and 2015.
- While the disability rate of adults in families experiencing sheltered homelessness differed little by geography in 2014, a wider gap opened in 2015 as the disability rate fell from 21.7 percent to 18.9 percent in principal cities and grew from 20.5 percent to 24 percent in suburban and rural areas.

---

**EXHIBIT 3.16: Characteristics by Geography**

Sheltered People in Families with Children, 2007-2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Principal Cities 2007</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Homeless People in Families with Children</td>
<td>346,032</td>
<td>127,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other One Race</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Age 18</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 30</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 50</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 61</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 and Older</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 People</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 People</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 People</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More People</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status of Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Living Situation Before Entering Shelter

Information on where people in families with children lived before entering shelter was asked only of adults.

In 2015

- Prior to entering a homeless shelter program, 57 percent of adults in families with children were in a housed situation. Of those adults, only 1.8 percent had been living in a housing unit they owned. Nearly all had been staying with family (43.8%) or friends (25.8%), or in housing they rented (28.5%).
- Another 32.8 percent of sheltered adults in families were already homeless before entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs, and 28.7 percent of these adults were living on the street or in other unsheltered locations prior to entering shelter.
- Of those sheltered adults in families with children who were not already homeless, 84.9 percent were living in a housed situation prior to entering shelter, 2.5 percent were in institutional settings, and 12.6 percent were in other settings (predominantly hotels or motels not subsidized by vouchers).

Changes Over Time

- The number of adults in families entering shelter from the street or other unsheltered locations increased by 30.5 percent (4,310 more people) between 2014 and 2015.
- Although the number of adults in families with children entering shelter from a housed situation remains substantially larger in 2015 than in 2007 (by 38.9%), this population declined by 9.8 percent (12,110 fewer people) between 2014 and 2015.
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

Emergency shelter and transitional housing programs are designed differently. Emergency shelters are high-volume, high-turnover programs; their primary purpose is to provide temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness. In contrast, transitional housing programs offer people experiencing homelessness shelter as well as supportive services for up to 24 months and intend for people to stay longer than they do in emergency shelters.

In 2015
- The homeless services system nationwide had 133,007 beds in emergency shelters for families with children and 83,693 beds in transitional housing programs for families with children. Of the 502,521 people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year, 76.6 percent stayed only in emergency shelters, 16.9 percent stayed only in transitional housing programs, and 6.6 percent used both emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
- People in families with children were less likely than individuals using emergency shelters to have stays of one week or less (15.9% versus 33.4%) and more likely to stay more than 180 days (17.7% versus 8.2%).
- People in families with children used emergency shelters for a median of 47 nights. The median stay in transitional housing was 137 nights (about four and a half months) during the one-year reporting period.
- Over the course of the reporting year, emergency shelters served, on average, 3.8 people in families per available bed. Transitional housing programs served 1.8 people in families per available bed.

Changes Over Time
- The emergency shelter inventory for families with children increased by 25.1 percent (52,989 more beds) from 2007 to 2015, while the transitional housing inventory for families with children decreased by an almost equal quantity (24.4%, or 51,421 fewer beds).
- Likewise, between 2007 and 2015, the number of people in families served in emergency shelters increased by 17.1 percent (60,909 more people), while the number in transitional housing declined by 18.5 percent (26,686 fewer people).
- Though emergency shelters served, in aggregate, more people in families in 2015 than in 2007, these projects served fewer people per available bed (3.8 people per bed in 2015 and 4.9 in 2007), a reflection of both the increase in inventory and the fact that clients were staying in these beds for longer periods of time. The median length of stay for people in families using emergency shelters was a month in 2007 and about a month and a half in 2015.
- Average occupancy rates have increased in emergency shelters, from 85.9 percent in 2007 to 92.6 percent in 2015, and in transitional housing programs from 72.9 percent in 2007 to 81.4 percent in 2015.

2015
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Did You Know?

Unaccompanied youth experiencing sheltered and unsheltered homelessness

9,901 people were experiencing sheltered and unsheltered homelessness as parenting youth

Unaccompanied Youth are people under age 25 who are not accompanied by a parent or guardian and are not themselves a parent staying in the same place as his or her child(ren).

Parenting Youth are people under age 25 who are the parents or legal guardians of one or more children staying in the same place and without someone else present who is 25 or older.

Parenting Youth Household is a household with at least one parenting youth and the child or children for whom the parenting youth is the parent or legal guardian.
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2015 One-Night Estimates
OF UNACCOMPANIED HOMELESS YOUTH

Since 2013, the Point-in-Time (PIT) estimates have included three age categories, 17 and under, 18 to 24, and 25 and older. In 2015 HUD added a new reporting category for parenting youth. This section presents the Point-in-Time (PIT) estimates of unaccompanied youth and parenting youth experiencing homelessness in the U.S. The PIT estimates are one-night counts of people experiencing homelessness in both sheltered and unsheltered locations. The one-night counts are conducted by CoCs nationwide and occur during the last ten days in January. CoCs are required to conduct a point-in-time count in shelters (emergency shelter and transitional housing programs) and a street (or “unsheltered”) count at least every other year. In 2015, both the sheltered and unsheltered counts were required.

Collecting point in time information about youth experiencing homelessness remains a work in progress. Over the past several years, many communities have taken steps—such as targeted youth outreach and collaborating with schools and other youth-serving systems—to improve their PIT count data collection processes with the aim of reflecting more accurately the numbers of youth experiencing homelessness. **HUD and its federal partners have agreed to use the 2017 PIT count to establish a baseline year for measuring progress in ending youth homelessness.**

To measure national and local progress on ending youth homelessness, HUD will generally use 2017 as the initial comparison year. It is critical that communities ensure that this count is as accurate as possible so that they can demonstrate their progress towards ending homelessness among youth in 2018 and beyond.

HUD is in the process of improving and updating its collection of HMIS data on this important population. This report discusses youth age 18 to 24 experiencing homelessness, with more detailed data available online.**1** By October 2015, HHS’ Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) programs had fully integrated their data with local HMIS. This integration is an important step towards a more complete picture of youth experiencing homelessness throughout the year. This year’s AHAR report begins to reflect the integration of that data. Future AHAR reports will also use new age categories to describe the use of shelter programs by unaccompanied youth and parenting youth over the course of a year.

**On a Single Night in January 2015**

- 36,907 youth were unaccompanied and experiencing homelessness in the United States. This is 6.5 percent of the total homeless population and 10.3 percent of all homeless individuals. Of all people under the age of 25 experiencing homelessness, 20.4 percent were unaccompanied youth.
- Among unaccompanied homeless youth, 87.4 percent (32,240 people) were ages 18 to 24, and 12.6 percent (4,667 people) were under 18.

**Exhibit 4.1: One-Night Counts of Homeless Youth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Unaccompanied Homeless Youth</th>
<th>Parenting Youth</th>
<th>Children of Parenting Youth</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>4,667 12.6%</td>
<td>126 1.3%</td>
<td>13,242 100.0%</td>
<td>4,793 10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>32,240 87.4%</td>
<td>9,775 98.7%</td>
<td>0 0.0%</td>
<td>42,015 89.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,907 100.0%</td>
<td>9,901 100.0%</td>
<td>13,242 100.0%</td>
<td>46,808 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit 4.2: PIT Estimates of Unaccompanied Homeless Youth, Homeless Individuals, All Homeless People, and Parenting Youth by Sheltered Status, 2015**

- On a single night in January, 9,901 people were experiencing homelessness as parenting youth, together with their 13,242 children. Most parenting youth (98.7%) were ages 18 to 24.
- Only 4.3 percent of the children of parenting youth, 573 children, were in unsheltered locations.
- Most parenting youth households consisted of one parent and one child.

---

**1**The 2015 HMIS data used to produce the 2015 figures in the report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Data Source: PIT 2015, Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
Unaccompanied Homeless Youth in the United States

By State

On a Single Night in January 2015

- The three states with the largest counts of unaccompanied homeless youth under 18 years of age were California (892), Nevada (825), and Florida (593). Together, these states accounted for nearly half of the nation’s population of unaccompanied homeless youth under 18.

- The three states with the largest numbers of unaccompanied homeless youth ages 18 to 24 were California (9,524), New York (2,493), and Florida (1,778). These states accounted for 43 percent of the total population of unaccompanied youth over the age of 17.

- In four states, more than a quarter of unaccompanied homeless youths were under the age of 18: NV (35.7%), OR (28.7%), NM (28%), and MS (26.9%).

- New York accounts for 23.8 percent of all people in parenting youth households, the largest proportion of any state.

- The state-by-state distribution of parenting youth is very similar to the distribution of all people in families.

EXHIBIT 4.3: Share of Unaccompanied Homeless Youth Under 18
In the U.S. by State, 2015 (in %)

EXHIBIT 4.4: Share of Unaccompanied Homeless Youth 18-24
In the U.S. by State, 2015 (in %)

EXHIBIT 4.5: Share of Homeless People in Parenting Youth Households
In the U.S. by State, 2015 (in %)

Data Source: PIT 2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2014 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)
Unaccompanied Homeless Youth in the United States

By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2015

- Four states accounted for 86 percent of all unsheltered unaccompanied youth under the age of 18: Nevada (816, 34.3%), California (632, 26.6%), Oregon (326, 13.7%), and Florida (272, 11.4%). Seventeen states and the District of Columbia reported no unsheltered unaccompanied youth under 18, and 20 states reported fewer than 10.

- In four states, more than 70 percent of homeless, unaccompanied youth under 18 were unsheltered: Nevada (98.9%), Oregon (84.0%), Tennessee (78.6%), and California (70.9%).

- While overall 45.6 percent of unaccompanied homeless youth between the ages of 18 and 24 were unsheltered, more than 90 percent were sheltered in 7 states and the District of Columbia — ME, (99.2%), IA (98.3%), DE (98.1%), MA (92.7%), NE (91.4%), DC (91.2%), NJ (90.6%), and NH (90.6%).

- For unaccompanied homeless youth between 18 and 24, the unsheltered rate was greater than 70 percent in 4 states: Nevada (81.2%), Montana (77.8%), California (76.9%), and Hawaii (75.6%).

- More than 90 percent of all people in parenting youth households were experiencing sheltered homelessness in 37 states and the District of Columbia. More than 30 percent of parenting youth households were found in unsheltered locations in only four states: Tennessee (46.5%), Montana (40.6%), Oregon (34.8%), and Mississippi (33.3%).

EXHIBIT 4.6: States with Highest and Lowest Rates of Unsheltered Unaccompanied Homeless Youth by Shelter Status, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Sheltered Youth</th>
<th># Unsheltered Youth</th>
<th>% Unsheltered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>7,952</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Sheltered Youth</th>
<th># Unsheltered Youth</th>
<th>% Unsheltered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: PIT 2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2015 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)
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2015 Homeless Veterans
IN THE UNITED STATES

Did You Know?

On a single night in January 2015, 47,725 veterans were homeless.

This is a 35% decline since 2009.

More than 3 in 10 veterans are in CA or FL.

Veterans in sheltered & unsheltered locations: 34% and 66%.

Throughout the year in 2015, 132,847 veterans experienced sheltered homelessness at some point.

This is a 11.2% decline since 2009.

Veterans make up 9.2% of the U.S. adult population and 11.5% of the sheltered homeless adult population.

From 2014–2015... Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in:

- CITIES: +0.8%
- SUBURBAN & RURAL AREAS: +1.1%

**KEY TERM**

Veteran refers to any person who served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States. This also includes Reserves and National Guard members who were called up to active duty.
Understanding the extent and nature of homelessness among veterans is an important focus for both HUD and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). Estimates of homeless veterans began in 2009. HUD and the VA, with support from USICH, have worked collaboratively for many years to produce accurate estimates of veterans experiencing homelessness and identify effective strategies for preventing and ending homelessness among veterans. The overall framework for addressing veteran homelessness, described in Opening Doors: Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness and subsequent updates to the Plan, focuses on several key areas: providing affordable housing and permanent supportive housing, increasing meaningful and sustainable employment opportunities, reducing the financial vulnerability of veterans, and transforming the homeless crisis response system with a focus on prevention and rapid re-housing. This chapter provides the most accurate metrics to gauge the nation’s progress toward ending homelessness among veterans.

On a Single Night in January 2015
- 47,725 veterans were experiencing homelessness in the United States, representing about 8.5 percent of homeless people and 10.9 percent of all homeless adults.
- 66 percent of veterans experienced homelessness in sheltered locations (31,505 veterans), and 34 percent were in unsheltered locations (16,220 veterans).

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- The number of veterans experiencing homelessness declined by 4 percent (1,964 fewer veterans). More than two-thirds of this decline was attributable to the decrease in the unsheltered population (1,350 fewer people).

Between January 2009 and January 2015
- The total number of veterans experiencing homelessness dropped by 35 percent or 25,642 people.
- The number of veterans experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations decreased 45.9 percent (13,738 fewer veterans), and the number in sheltered locations decreased 27.4 percent (11,904 fewer veterans).
- Among veterans experiencing homelessness on a single night, a larger share were in sheltered locations in 2015 (66%) than in 2009 (59.2%).

Data Source: PIT 2009–2015
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD’s Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.
By State

On a Single Night in January 2015

- Two states accounted for nearly one-third of the nation’s homeless veterans: California (23.8% or 11,311 veterans) and Florida (8.3% or 3,926 veterans).
- Homeless veterans accounted for more than 15 percent of the total homeless population in four states: Arkansas (17.8%), South Dakota (17.1%), West Virginia (16.6%), and Montana (16.2%). Across all states, by comparison, 10 percent of all people experiencing homelessness were veterans.

Between January 2014 and January 2015

- The one-night count of veterans experiencing homelessness decreased in 33 states, totaling 3,400 fewer veterans. Nearly one quarter of the decrease was attributable to one state, California, with 785 fewer veterans.
- Increases in veterans experiencing homelessness occurred in 17 states and the District of Columbia, totaling 1,370 more veterans.
- The largest increase in the number of homeless veterans in absolute and relative terms was in Arizona, where 362 more veterans represented a 42.2 percent increase in the homeless veteran population.

Between January 2009 and January 2015

- 14 states had increases in homeless veterans (totaling 1,357 additional veterans).
- The number of homeless veterans declined in 36 states and the District of Columbia (totaling 27,068 fewer veterans). Four states represented 60.8 percent of the total decrease in homeless veterans: California (6,662 fewer veterans), New York (3,480), Florida (3,209), and Texas (3,098).
- Louisiana had a decline of more than 80 percent in veteran homelessness, (1,593 fewer veterans found in the one-night count). Only five other states have experienced decreases in veterans homelessness that exceed 50 percent since 2009: NY, TX, NV, AL, and KS.

Data Source: PIT 2009–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2015 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)
By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2015
- More than half of all veterans experiencing unsheltered homelessness in the United States were in California (43.6%) and Florida (9.7%).
- In just four states, more than half of their veterans experiencing homelessness were in unsheltered locations: Montana (64.6%), California (61.9%), Hawaii (60.3%), and Mississippi (57.8%).
- In 15 states, more than 90 percent of the veterans experiencing homelessness were shelter programs rather than unsheltered.

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- The number of veterans found in unsheltered locations dropped in 22 states, totaling 2,489 fewer veterans, and increased in 27 states and the District of Columbia, totaling 1,081 more unsheltered veterans.
- California, Florida, and New York alone accounted for 61.8 percent of the overall decrease in unsheltered veteran homelessness.

Between January 2009 and January 2015
- Three states accounted for 60.1 percent of the total decrease in the number of veterans experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations: California (4,172 fewer veterans), Florida (2,674) and Texas (1,853).
- The largest decreases in the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were in New York (2,779 fewer veterans), California (2,490), and Texas (1,245).

EXHIBIT 5.5: Sheltered Homeless Veterans by State
Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2009-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT 5.6: Unsheltered Homeless Veterans by State
Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2009-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>145.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: PIT 2009–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
2015 PROFILE

A Veteran in Shelter* by Himself

91.1% MALE / 99.9% 1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

43.3% WERE AGE
51-61

49.8% WERE
White, Non-Hispanic

53.1% HAD
A Disability

73.8% WERE IN A
City

PRIOR TO USING A SHELTER, 46.6% WERE
Already Homeless

23 NIGHTS SPENT IN
EMERGENCY SHELTER

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.
2015 One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Veterans

HMIS

Since 2009, HUD has estimated the annual number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness at some time during the reporting year, from October 1 through September 30. The one-year estimates account for all veterans who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program, including programs that specifically target veterans and those that do not. The estimates are based on a nationally representative sample of communities that submit aggregate Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data to HUD. The estimates statistically adjust for veterans experiencing homelessness in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS—thus providing a complete enumeration of sheltered veterans in each community—and are weighted to represent the entire country. The one-year estimates do not include: (a) sheltered veterans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories; (b) veterans served by victim service providers; and (c) veterans in unsheltered locations who never accessed a shelter program during the 12-month period.¹

Veterans experience homelessness as individuals or as part of a family. Following the definition used throughout this report, veteran individuals are in households without any children, while homeless veterans in families are in households that have at least one child present.

Estimate of Veterans Experiencing Sheltered Homelessness in 2015

- An estimated 132,847 veterans used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at any point between October 1, 2014 and September 30, 2015.²
- One in 170 veterans in the U.S. experienced sheltered homelessness at some point during 2015. While veterans made up 9.2 percent of the U.S. adult population, they made up 11.5 percent of adults using emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting period did not change substantially, rising by less than one percent (1,150 more veterans).
- In spite of the modest short-term increase, the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness declined by 11.2 percent (16,788 fewer veterans) between 2009 and 2015.

1 People served in Safe Havens are included in the PIT estimates but not in these one-year estimates of shelter users.
2 The 95 percent confidence interval for the sheltered homeless veteran population in 2015 is 118,825 to 146,869 (132,847 ± 14,022).

Data Source: PIT 2009–2015; ACS 2014

132,847 veterans experienced sheltered homelessness in the U.S. at some point in 2015.
Gender and Age

Starting this year, HUD collected age information for people between the ages of 18 to 24 who experienced sheltered homelessness during the one-year period. Information is collected separately for people between the ages of 25 to 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2015
- About 9 in 10 veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (91.1%) were men, about the same percentage as for all U.S. veterans.
- Although the majority of all veterans in the U.S. (54.8%) were over the age of 61, only 14.5 percent of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were over 61. Compared with 17.6 percent of all U.S. veterans, more than two in five veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (43.3%) were between the ages of 51 and 61.
- Among veterans age 18 to 30 experiencing sheltered homelessness, 75 percent (9,057 people) were aged 25 to 30.

Changes Over Time
- Between 2009 and 2015, the number of female veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness increased by 6.5 percent (725 more veterans), even as the number of male veterans decreased by 12.6 percent.
- The proportion of veterans below age 51 experiencing sheltered homelessness declined from 52.8 percent in 2009 to 42.2 percent in 2015, while the proportion of sheltered veterans age 51 and older rose from 47.2 percent to 57.8 percent.

Although the majority of all veterans in the U.S. (54.8%) were over the age of 61, only 14.5 percent of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were over 61.

Note: We report data for age 18-30 in the exhibit to facilitate comparisons over time. Data for those in age 18-24 and 25-30 are displayed separately in the supporting HMIS data available online (www.hudexchange.info) and are discussed in the text.


EXHIBIT 5.8: Gender
Sheltered Veterans and U.S. Veterans, 2009-2015

EXHIBIT 5.9: Age
Sheltered Veterans and U.S. Veterans, 2009-2015

5-8 • The 2015 Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress
Ethnicity and Race

In 2015

- Though only 21.2 percent of all veterans in the U.S. identified as belonging to racial groups other than white or as white and Hispanic, about half of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (50.2%) identified as such. This population was even more heavily represented among veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness accompanied by children (61%).

Changes Over Time

- While the total number of Hispanic veterans in the U.S. increased by 22.6 percent between 2009 and 2015, the number of Hispanic veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped by 37.5 percent (6,016 fewer veterans).
- Between 2009 and 2015, the proportion of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness who were African American grew from 34.2 percent to 38.5 percent.

Note: Ethnicity is distinguished among the white race group to facilitate an understanding of minorities and non-minorities. Non-minorities are those who identify their ethnicity as not Hispanic and their race as white.

Household Size and Disability Status

In 2015
- Three percent of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were accompanied by children.
- The majority of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (53.1%) had a disability, compared with less than a third of all veterans in the U.S. (28.1%).

Changes Over Time
- The proportion of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness who were accompanied by children was about the same in 2015 (3%) as in 2009 (3.4%).
- The disability rate among veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness did not change substantially over time.

The majority of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness at some time during 2015 (53.1%) had a disability.

EXHIBIT 5.12: Sheltered Veterans Estimates
By Household Type, 2009-2015

Note: The number of sheltered Veterans served as individuals and in families may not sum to the unduplicated total number of sheltered Veterans because some Veterans were served as both individuals and in families at different points during the reporting period.

EXHIBIT 5.13: Disability Status
Sheltered Veterans and U.S. Veterans, 2009-2015

Geographic Location

In 2015

- Most veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (73.8%) were served in principal cities, while among all U.S. veterans, most (72.4%) were living in suburban and rural areas, as were two-thirds (66.5%) of veterans in the U.S. population living in poverty.

Changes Over Time

- The proportion of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities rose from 69.9 percent in 2009 to 73.8 percent in 2015. Over the same period, the proportion of all veterans in the U.S. living in principal cities remained roughly the same, as did the proportion of veterans in the U.S. population living in poverty.

EXHIBIT 5.14: Geographic Distribution

Note: In 2012, the ACS changed its approach to tabulating data by geographic area. This exhibit updates the estimates for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. population as a whole to account for this change. The revised estimates result in higher proportions of people in principal cities for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the total U.S. populations than shown in past reports. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 5.15: Percent Change by Geography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Cities</td>
<td>Suburban and Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Veterans</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Veterans Living in Poverty</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Veterans</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 2012, the ACS changed its approach to tabulating data by geographic area. This exhibit updates the estimates for both the U.S. population living in poverty and the U.S. population as a whole to account for this change. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from www.hudexchange.info.
Characteristics by Geography

In 2015

- Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities were more likely to be Hispanic (8.4%) or African American (40.7%) than were veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban or rural areas (5.4% and 32.5%).
- Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities were less likely to have a disability (51.3%) than were veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban or rural areas (58.2%).

Changes Over Time

- Between 2014 and 2015, the share of veterans age 62 or older increased (13.5% to 15.2%) in principal cities and declined (13.5% to 12.7%) in suburban and rural areas.
- The proportion of Hispanics among veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas increased from 4 percent in 2009 to 5.4 percent in 2015 and decreased in principal cities from 13.8 percent in 2009 to 8.4 percent in 2015.
- As the proportion of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities who self-identified as white (non-Hispanic) rose 43.1 percent in 2009 to 46.7 percent in 2015, the proportion in suburban and rural areas declined from 63.6 percent in 2009 to 58.5 percent in 2015.

EXHIBIT 5.16: Characteristics by Geography
Sheltered Veterans, 2009-2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Homeless Veterans</td>
<td>104,596</td>
<td>97,255 98,019 45,037 34,442 34,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>92.1 91.4 91.8 90.3 90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.9 8.6 8.2 9.7 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.4 8.4 4.0 5.7 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>92.6 91.6 96.0 94.3 94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>49.0 46.7 63.6 62.1 58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.1 5.6 1.9 3.9 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>39.0 40.7 26.2 28.6 32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other One Race</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8 3.9 3.5 2.3 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1 3.2 4.7 3.2 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 30</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.8 8.6 8.6 9.8 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 50</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>33.2 33.0 44.6 35.8 33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 61</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>44.5 43.3 39.8 40.9 43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 and Older</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.5 15.2 7.1 13.5 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.8 99.9 99.8 99.8 99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 People</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2 0.1 0.2 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 People</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 People</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More People</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>54.6 51.3 57.7 59.9 58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>45.5 48.7 42.3 40.1 41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: HMIS 2009–2015
Living Situation Before Entering Shelter

In 2015
- Nearly half of the veterans who used a shelter program at some point during the reporting year (46.6%) were already homeless prior to entering shelter. Of these veterans, half were on the street or in other unsheltered locations.
- About three in ten veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were in a housed situation before entering shelter (most often staying with family or friends). Another 13.3 percent came from institutional settings such as corrections or medical facilities.
- Among veterans who were not already homeless prior to entering shelter, about three in five (58.9%) were in a housed situation, about a quarter (24.9%) were in institutional settings, and 16.1 percent came from other settings, such as hotel or motel stays not subsidized by vouchers.
- Veterans rarely entered shelter directly after having stayed in permanent supportive housing.

Changes Over Time
- Between 2014 and 2015, the number of veterans who entered shelter from housing (e.g. staying with family) increased 3.6 percent (1,443 more veterans).
- The number of veterans who were already homeless prior to entering shelter fell by 10.6 percent (7,344 fewer veterans) between 2009 and 2015.

### EXHIBIT 5.17: Places Veterans Stayed
Before Entering Shelter and Change Over Time, 2009-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td># Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already Homeless</td>
<td>60,045</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>-1,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered</td>
<td>30,040</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-1,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>30,005</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>40,604</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with family</td>
<td>14,159</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with friends</td>
<td>13,441</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented housing unit</td>
<td>11,372</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned housing unit</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent supportive housing (PSH)</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Settings</td>
<td>17,167</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-1,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment center</td>
<td>4,691</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>-1,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional facility</td>
<td>5,264</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>4,568</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric facility</td>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>-693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Settings</td>
<td>11,121</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or motel</td>
<td>5,696</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other living arrangement</td>
<td>5,425</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>1,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To produce comparable trend information, statistical imputations were applied to missing values in this table. See the 2013 AHAR methodology document for more details.

### EXHIBIT 5.18: Places Veterans Stayed
Who Were Not Already Homeless
Before Entering Shelter, 2009-2015 (in %)

Data Source: HMIS 2009–2015
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

Emergency shelter and transitional housing programs are designed differently. Emergency shelters are high-volume, high-turnover programs; their primary purpose is to provide temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness. In contrast, transitional housing programs offer people experiencing homelessness shelter as well as supportive services for up to 24 months and intend for people to stay longer than they do in emergency shelters.

In 2015

- Though a majority of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were served in emergency shelters, veterans were more likely to be served by transitional housing programs than were all people experiencing sheltered homelessness. A third of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (33.8%) were served in transitional housing—either exclusively or in addition to stays in emergency shelters—compared to only 18.8 percent of all people experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- About a third of veterans in transitional housing (32.6%) stayed for at least half the reporting year.
- The median length of stay was 23 nights for veterans in emergency shelters and 109 nights (or over three and a half months) for veterans in transitional housing.

Changes Over Time

- The proportion of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness who stayed in transitional housing (either exclusively or in addition to stays in emergency shelters) rose from 23.6 percent in 2009 to 33.8 percent in 2015.

EXHIBIT 5.19: Length of Stay
Veterans in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days or less</td>
<td>30,552</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 30 days</td>
<td>25,615</td>
<td>6,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 180 days</td>
<td>33,106</td>
<td>21,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 to 360 days</td>
<td>3,957</td>
<td>9,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361 to 365 days</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>5,068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Length of stay accounts for multiple program entries/exits by summing the total number of (cumulative) days in a homeless residential program during the 12-month reporting period. The maximum length of stay is 365 days, corresponding to the total days observed for this reporting period.

EXHIBIT 5.20: Bed-Use Patterns
Veterans in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2009-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bed-Use Patterns</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter</th>
<th>Transitional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median # nights</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # nights</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The maximum length of stay is 365 days, corresponding to the total days observed for this reporting period.
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Did You Know?
On a single night in January 2015...

83,170 people were chronically homeless as individuals

This is a 30.6% decline since 2007

23.2% of all homeless individuals had chronic patterns of homelessness

Chronically homeless individuals in sheltered & unsheltered locations
65.9% 34.1%

34% of all chronically homeless individuals were found in California

In HI, CA, MT, NV and FL, more than 75% of chronically homeless individuals were unsheltered

**KEY TERMS**

**Individual** refers to a person who is not part of a family with children during an episode of homelessness. Individuals may be homeless as single adults, unaccompanied youth, or in multiple-adult or multiple-child households.

**Chronically Homeless Individual**\(^1\) refers to an individual with a disability who has been continuously homeless for 1 year or more or has experienced at least 4 episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years. By definition, only an adult can be categorized as chronically homeless.

\(^1\)The definition of chronic homelessness changed in 2016, but these changes were not yet in effect for the 2015 data presented in this report.
Since 2007, communities have submitted data on adult individuals experiencing chronic homelessness. Since 2013, the AHAR has also reported on chronic homelessness among families with children, based on patterns of homelessness for the head of a family household. Of all people with chronic patterns of homelessness, 13.6 percent (13,105 people) are in families. This section discusses only chronically homeless individuals.

HUD currently requires communities to report data on people experiencing chronic homelessness only in the Point-in-Time count. However, HUD is making changes to the data collection that supports estimates of people who use shelter programs over the course of a year, and that will help better understand the population with chronic patterns of homelessness. HMIS-based estimates of people experiencing chronic homelessness are expected to be available for the 2017 AHAR.

On a Single Night in January 2015
- 83,170 adult individuals were experiencing chronic homelessness. This was 23.2 percent of all homeless individuals in the U.S.
- Individuals with chronic patterns of homelessness were 1.5 times more likely than the total population of homeless individuals to be found in unsheltered locations. About two-thirds (65.9%) of chronically homeless individuals were unsheltered compared to 42.6 percent of all homeless individuals.

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- The total number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined by 1 percent (819 fewer people).
- The number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness decreased by 9.1 percent (2,848 fewer people), while the number in unsheltered locations increased by 3.8 percent (2,029 more people).

Between January 2007 and January 2015
- The number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined by 30.6 percent (36,643 fewer people).
- The proportion of all individuals who had chronic patterns of homelessness dropped from 29 percent in 2007 to 23.2 percent in 2015.
- The number of unsheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined by 29.8 percent, or 23,230 fewer people.
- The number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness fell by 32.1 percent, or 13,413 fewer people.
### By State

**On a Single Night in January 2015**
- More than a third (35.8%) of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness throughout the country were counted in California. No other state accounted for more than 8 percent of these individuals.
- New York accounted for 10.2 percent of all homeless individuals, but only 5.3 percent of all chronically homeless individuals.
- Individuals experiencing chronic homelessness represented more than one quarter of all homeless people in two states: Oregon (26.6% of all people counted on a single night were chronically homeless individuals), and California (25.2%).
- In the District of Columbia, 41.7 percent of all individuals experiencing homelessness had chronic patterns of homelessness.

**Between January 2014 and January 2015**
- The number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness increased in 18 states (4,972 more people). Oregon had the largest increase in chronically homeless individuals (1,314 more people, a 59.5% rise).
- Increases in the number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness in 18 states were offset by decreases in 31 states and the District of Columbia. Texas experienced the largest decrease (1,174 fewer people, a 23.7% drop).

**Between January 2007 and January 2015**
- The number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined in 40 states and the District of Columbia (37,266 fewer people). California alone accounted for 30 percent of the decrease (11,163 fewer people).
- In 10 states, the number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness increased (2,350 more people). Two states accounted for more than half of the increase: Oregon (692 more people) and Hawaii (594).

---

**EXHIBIT 6.3: Share of Chronically Homeless Individuals**

In the U.S. by State, 2015 (in %)

**EXHIBIT 6.4: Chronically Homeless Individuals by State**

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-1,174</td>
<td>-23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-822</td>
<td>-12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>235.5</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-651</td>
<td>-24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>Connectic</td>
<td>-488</td>
<td>-47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>-412</td>
<td>-21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>-11,163</td>
<td>-27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-4,153</td>
<td>-52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>-2,149</td>
<td>-33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>-1,558</td>
<td>-55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-1,442</td>
<td>-19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2015 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)
By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2015
- In 23 states, more than 50 percent of individuals with chronic patterns of homelessness were found in unsheltered locations. Hawaii had the largest proportion of chronically homeless individuals who were unsheltered (88.8%).
- California alone accounted for 46.9 percent of the total unsheltered chronically homeless population.

Between January 2014 and January 2015
- The number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness increased in 16 states (1,576 more people) and decreased in 34 states and the District of Columbia (4,428 fewer people).
- The number of unsheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness increased in 29 states (4,536 more people), decreased in 20 states and the District of Columbia (2,488 fewer people), and remained constant in Oklahoma. Texas alone accounted for 33.2 percent of the total decrease.

Between January 2007 and January 2015
- The long-term, national decline in individuals experiencing chronic homelessness was driven by reductions in the unsheltered chronically homeless population in 35 states and the District of Columbia (24,219 fewer people) and, to a lesser extent, reductions in the sheltered chronically homeless population in 37 states and the District of Columbia (14,130 fewer people).
- California experienced the largest declines for both individuals experiencing chronic homelessness in unsheltered locations (9,382 fewer people, a 27.3% change) and in sheltered locations (1,781 fewer people, a 29.9% change).
- The largest increase in the number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness was in Maryland (174 more people, a 23.2% change). Oregon had the largest increase in unsheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness (858 more people, a 49.3% change).

EXHIBIT 6.5: Sheltered Chronically Homeless Individuals by State
Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>-521</td>
<td>-44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>356.0</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-507</td>
<td>-29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>-456</td>
<td>-65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>185.4</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-349</td>
<td>-18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-294</td>
<td>-34.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT 6.6: Unsheltered Chronically Homeless Individuals by State
Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>-1,781</td>
<td>-29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-1,747</td>
<td>-53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>167.2</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>-886</td>
<td>-43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>-866</td>
<td>-81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>-830</td>
<td>-52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>State</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>-9,382</td>
<td>-27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>-2,406</td>
<td>-51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>-1,718</td>
<td>-42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>-1,205</td>
<td>-55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>197.6</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>-1,027</td>
<td>-54.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: PIT 2007–2015
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
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Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) is a program designed to provide housing (project- and tenant-based) and supportive services on a long-term basis to formerly homeless people. HUD McKinney-Vento-funded programs require that the client have a disability for program eligibility, so the majority of people in PSH have disabilities.
Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) programs are designed to serve people who were homeless and who have disabilities that reduce their ability to maintain housing without additional support. PSH programs provide permanent housing combined with intensive supportive services to stabilize formerly homeless people in housing. PSH has been an important priority for HUD for many years. The number of beds in PSH projects has increased by 69 percent since 2007, with the growing inventory of HUD-VA Supportive Housing (VASH) program beds an important part of this increase.

In 2010, HUD began collecting from each community estimates of people who had lived in PSH over the course of a year.

The first two exhibits, 7.1 and 7.2, show the estimates of individuals and people in families with children who are living in PSH. As in other sections of this report, individuals are people in households that do not have at least one adult and one child, while people in families with children are in households with at least one adult and one child.

People in PSH are in housing and not considered homeless, unlike people in shelter (emergency shelter or transitional housing programs). PSH is intended to serve people with disabilities and chronic patterns of homelessness. Comparing people living in PSH with people experiencing sheltered homelessness can shed light on the extent to which PSH is targeted to a population with greater needs. Exhibits 7.4 to 7.12 compare people living in PSH with those staying in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs by various demographic characteristics and by location.

The estimates of people in PSH are based on a nationally representative sample of communities that submit aggregate Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) data to HUD. Data are statistically adjusted for people in PSH programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS to provide an enumeration of people in PSH in each community and are weighted to represent the entire country.

2015 Estimate of People in PSH

- An estimated 347,776 people lived in PSH during 2015.
- Just over one-third (35.4%) were people in families with children rather than individuals. This is very similar to the percentage of people experiencing sheltered homelessness who are in families with children (33.8%).

1 This adjustment (and thus the enumeration) accounts for people in all HUD-VASH projects reported on the HIC in 2015. In the past, the enumeration only accounted for people in HUD-VASH projects participating in HMIS, but did not account for those not participating in HMIS, of which the majority were not participating in HMIS.

2 The 95 percent confidence interval for people in PSH in 2015 is 336,247 to 359,305 (347,776 +/- 11,529).

Changes Over Time

- The total number of people living in PSH increased 21.9 percent (62,373 more people) between 2014 and 2015. Among individuals, the number increased 23.4 percent (42,608 more people). This was greater than the 19.1 percent increase among families with children in PSH (19,749 more people).
- Between 2010 and 2015, people in families with children living in PSH declined by 2.1 percent (2,638 fewer people), while individuals living in PSH increased by 32.8 percent (55,624 more people).

EXHIBIT 7.2: Change in the One-Year Estimates
People Living in PSH by Household Type, 2010-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2014–2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total People in PSH</td>
<td>62,373</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in PSH</td>
<td>42,608</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in Families with Children in PSH</td>
<td>19,749</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2010–2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total People in PSH</td>
<td>53,028</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in PSH</td>
<td>55,624</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in Families with Children in PSH</td>
<td>-2,638</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT 7.3: Inventory of PSH Beds in the U.S., 2007-2015

Gender and Age

Starting this year, HUD collected age information for youth between the ages of 18 to 24 who lived in PSH during the one-year period. Information is collected separately for people between the ages of 25 to 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2015

- At 45.2 percent of all adults in PSH, women represented a larger share of PSH residents than of people using emergency shelters and transitional housing programs, 37.9 percent.
- Among adults in PSH in families with children, 77.3 percent were women, which is similar to their share among families experiencing sheltered homelessness (77.7%).
- One-third of PSH residents were aged 30 or below compared to 44.7 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness. About one in five PSH residents was a child under age 18, 6.3 percent were youth aged 18 to 24, and 6.5 percent were aged 25 to 30.
- People living in PSH are older than people experiencing sheltered homelessness, with 34.9 percent aged 51 or older compared to 21.4 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2010 and 2015, the share of people living in PSH aged 62 or older increased from 4 percent to 7.7 percent (14,832 more people), while the share of people aged 51 to 61 grew from 19.9 percent to 27.2 percent (35,681 more people).
- The overall share of adult women in PSH declined from 47.3 percent in 2010 to 45.2 percent in 2015, as the share of people in families dropped. However, the number of adult women living in PSH as individuals increased by 23,058.

The share of PSH residents aged 62 or older was 1.8 times the share of people in emergency shelters and transitional housing programs.
Ethnicity and Race

In 2015
- People identifying themselves as Hispanic made up 11.5 percent of PSH residents, lower than the share of Hispanics experiencing sheltered homelessness, 17.3 percent.
- About three in five people in PSH (62%) identified themselves as belonging to racial groups other than white or as white and Hispanic. This is the same share as people experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- A slightly larger share of people in PSH were African American (46.3%) compared to people using the shelter system (41.4%).

Changes Over Time
- While the number of PSH residents who identified as Hispanic increased by 16.5 percent between 2014 and 2015 (5,664 more people), the share of PSH residents who identified as Hispanic declined from 12.1 percent to 11.5 percent. The Hispanic share among shelter-users increased during the same period, from 15.8 percent to 17.3 percent.
- The share of PSH residents who identified as African American increased slightly between 2014 and 2015, from 44.7 percent to 46.3 percent, mirroring a slight increase in the sheltered population.

EXHIBIT 7.6: Ethnicity
People Living in PSH and People Using Shelter*, 2010–2015

EXHIBIT 7.7: Race
People Living in PSH and People Using Shelter*, 2010–2015

Note: Ethnicity is distinguished among the white race group to facilitate an understanding of minorities and non-minorities. Non-minorities are those who identify their ethnicity as not Hispanic and their race as white.

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
Household Size and Disability Status

Although many people in PSH have a disabbling condition, some PSH programs are restricted to serving participants with a disability, and some are not. A household member must have a long-term disability in order to be eligible for McKinney-Vento-funded PSH programs, for instance. For this reason, HUD requests that CoCs report more detailed disability information in HMIS on adults in PSH than on adults in emergency shelter or transitional housing programs. Adults in PSH can have multiple disabilities, and thus the sum of people with different types of disabilities is greater than 100 percent.

In 2015
- In both PSH and shelters, more people lived alone rather than with others. However, this was less common among PSH residents (59.7%) than among shelter users (64.5%).
- A somewhat larger share of PSH residents were in households with four or more people than people experiencing sheltered homelessness, 18.3 versus 16.9 percent.
- In many PSH programs, only people with disabilities are eligible. As a result, 8 in 10 adults living in PSH had a disability (82.3%). This is twice the rate of adults using shelter who had a disability (40.6%).
- Mental health issues were the most common disability among residents of PSH. Over half (57.8%) of adults in PSH either had a mental health condition or had a dual diagnosis that includes both mental health and substance abuse. Only 8.4 percent reported having only substance abuse issues.

Changes Over Time
- The number of people in PSH living alone increased by 26.8 percent (43,900 more people) between 2010 and 2015.
- Between 2010 and 2015, the number of PSH residents with a disability increased by 39.8 percent (62,701 more people). The increase was especially pronounced among those who have a mental health issue (38,459 more adults), a physical disability (36,505 more adults), or both a mental health and a substance abuse disability (33,250 more adults).
- Between 2010 and 2015, the share of PSH residents with a dual diagnosis increased from 17.3 percent to 25.3 percent.
- While comprising a small share of PSH residents, the share of residents with a developmental disability rose from 3.3 percent in 2010 to 5.6 percent in 2015.
- The number of adult residents of PSH with a substance abuse disability decreased by 6.1 percent (1,441 fewer adults) from 2010 to 2015.

Data Source: HMIS 2010-2015

EXHIBIT 7.8: Household Size
People Living in PSH and People Using Shelter*, 2010–2015

EXHIBIT 7.9: Disability Status
Adults Living in PSH, 2010-2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Type of Disability</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Diagnosis</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disability</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The client self-reports whether or not they have a disability, but McKinney-Vento-funded PSH programs require documentation for disability type. Other programs may or may not rely on self-reported disability type.

Note 2: Dual diagnosis refers to people that have both a mental health and substance abuse issue. People with dual diagnosis are not included in the mental health or substance abuse categories.

Note 3: Percent of adults with disabilities will not sum to 100% because people in PSH may have more than one type of disability.

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
Geographic Location

In 2015
- About one-third of PSH residents (33.7%) were living in suburban and rural areas, while the other two-thirds (66.3%) lived in cities. However, PSH residents were less likely to be located in cities than were people experiencing sheltered homelessness (66.3% versus 71.3%).
- PSH residents were about 2 times more likely to be living in cities than were people in the U.S. population.

Changes Over Time
- The number of PSH residents in suburban and rural areas increased 22.4 percent between 2014 and 2015, while the number of people in suburban and rural shelter programs decreased 3.2 percent. This follows the larger trend between 2010 and 2015, when the number of PSH residents in suburban and rural areas increased by 37.5 percent and the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural decreased by 26.1 percent.
- Between 2010 and 2015, the number of PSH residents living in cities increased by 10 percent (21,009 people). This rise was driven in part by the 21.6 percent increase (40,929 more people) in the number of PSH residents living in cities between 2014 and 2015.

EXHIBIT 7.10: Geographic Distribution
People Living in PSH, People Using Shelter*, and U.S. Population, 2010-2015

Note: In 2012, the ACS changed its approach to tabulating data by geographic area. This exhibit updates the estimates for the U.S. population to account for this change. The revised estimates result in higher proportions of people in principal cities for the total U.S. population than shown in past reports. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 7.11: Percent Change by Geography
People Living in PSH and Homeless People Using Shelter*, 2010-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Cities</td>
<td>Suburban and Rural Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in PSH</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered People</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
Characteristics by Geography

In 2015

- Women made up a larger share of PSH residents in suburban and rural areas than in principal cities, 48.8 percent versus 43.5 percent.
- A larger share of people living in PSH located in suburban and rural areas were children under age 18 (23.9%) or adults ages 18 to 30 (13.9%) than were those in cities (19.3% and 12.2%). Among adults ages 18 to 30, 6.8 percent were between the ages of 18 to 24 in rural and suburban areas compared to 6 percent in cities.
- One-person PSH households were more common in cities than in suburban and rural areas (62.9 percent versus 53.4 percent).
- African Americans in cities made up 1.5 times their share of PSH residents in suburban and rural areas.

Changes Over Time

- Among families with children living in PSH, fewer are large families. Between 2010 and 2015, the share PSH residents in households of 4 or more declined from 21.5 percent to 20.5 percent in suburban and rural areas and from 19.5 percent to 17.1 percent in cities.
- The share of adults in PSH who had with disabilities increased modestly between 2010 and 2015 in both principal cities (from 78.2% to 81.5%) and suburban and rural areas (from 80.1% to 84%).
- Between 2010 and 2015, the share of African Americans in PSH living in cities remained stable at about 52 percent while the share living in suburban and rural areas rose from 29.3 to 34.5 percent.

EXHIBIT 7.12: Characteristics by Geography
People Living in PSH, 2010-2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Principal Cities</th>
<th>Suburban and Rural Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># People in PSH</td>
<td>209,414</td>
<td>189,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other One Race</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Age 18</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-61</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 and Older</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Person</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 People</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 People</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 People</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or More People</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status of Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: HMIS 2010-2015
Places Adults in PSH Stayed before Entering PSH

Information on where people lived before entering PSH was asked only of adults.

In 2015
- Of the adults living in PSH, more than three-quarters (79.2%) had been homeless before they moved into PSH. Among those who were homeless before entering PSH, almost three quarters (72.3%) came from shelters rather than from a place not meant for human habitation.
- Before entering PSH, 13.9 percent of adults had been in a housed situation.
- Of those who came from a housed situation, 14 percent (5,155 adults) had been in another PSH program.
- Only 4.3 percent of adults in PSH were in an institutional setting prior to entering PSH. A little more than half of these 11,503 adults (54%) were in a substance abuse treatment center, 22.3 percent were in a psychiatric facility, 12 percent were in a hospital and 11.6 percent were in a correctional facility.

Changes Over Time
- Between 2010 and 2015, the share of people entering PSH who came from a housed situation dropped from 18.9 percent to 13.9 percent.
- The share of people entering PSH who came from a homeless situation increased from 66.1 to 79.2 percent between 2010 and 2015, a 63.9 percent increase.
- In 2015, 82,041 more people entered PSH from a homeless situation than in 2010.

Almost three-quarters of the 210,353 adults who were homeless before entering PSH in 2015 came from an emergency shelter or transitional housing program rather than the street.
**Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns**

**In 2015**
- As of the end of the reporting year, almost a quarter (23.8%) of people living in PSH at some time during the reporting year had been there for one year or less. Just over half (51%) had lived in PSH between one and five years. Over a quarter (25.2%) had lived in PSH for more than five years.
- Of the 347,776 people in PSH, 38.3 percent moved either into or out of PSH during the reporting year, with 71,500 people entering and 61,710 people exiting.

**Changes Over Time**
- The number of individuals moving out of PSH between 2014 and 2015 increased by 28.2 percent (8,805 more people), leaving more vacancies for new individuals to enter. The number of entries into PSH by individuals increased by 19 percent.
- Similarly, between 2014 and 2015, the number of families with children moving out of PSH increased by 22.9 percent (4,067 more people), leaving more vacancies for new families with children to enter. The number of entries into PSH by families with children increased by 20.1 percent.
- While the number of people in families with children moving into PSH increased between 2014 and 2015, the number declined by 10.7 percent over the longer period, 2010 to 2015.
- The share of long-term stayers living in PSH during the reporting year has steadily increased every year since 2010. The share of PSH residents living in PSH for more than five years increased from 18.3 percent in 2010 to 25.2 percent in 2015.
- Over time, the share of people staying in PSH a year or less declined from 31 percent in 2010 to 23.8 percent in 2015.

In 2015, 1.4 times as many people as in 2010 had lived in PSH for five years or longer.
Destination at Move-Out for PSH Residents

People in PSH exiting the program were asked where they were moving to next.

In 2015
- Of people moving out of PSH, only 5.6 percent left PSH and became homeless. Of those 3,433 people, most (72%) entered shelters rather than going to unsheltered locations.
- About two-thirds (65.8%) of people leaving PSH during the reporting year moved into another housed situation. Nearly two-thirds of those 40,599 people moved into housing they owned.
- Of people moving out of PSH, 6.7 percent (4,125 people) went to an institutional setting. Of those, over half (57.4%) entered a correctional facility, 17.7 percent a substance abuse treatment center, 14 percent a hospital, and 10.8 percent a psychiatric facility.
- Individuals who moved out of PSH were 3.1 times more likely to go to an institutional setting than people in families with children (76.3% versus 60%).
- Of people leaving PSH, 6.7 percent (4,125 people) went to an institutional setting. Of those, over half (57.4%) entered a correctional facility, 17.7 percent a substance abuse treatment center, 14 percent a hospital, and 10.8 percent a psychiatric facility.
- Individuals who moved out of PSH were 3.1 times more likely to go to an institutional setting than people in families with children (76.3% versus 60%).

Changes Over Time
- The share of all people who moved out to an institutional setting declined from 7.1 percent in 2014 to 6.7 percent in 2015.
- Among people in families with children exiting from PSH, the share exiting to another housing situation declined from 79 percent in 2014 to 76.3 percent in 2015.

People in families with children who moved out of PSH were more likely to move into another housed situation than individuals who exited PSH.

EXHIBIT 7.17: Destination upon Moving Out
People Living in PSH by Household Type, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>All People</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>People in Families with Children</th>
<th>All People</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>People in Families with Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>40,599</td>
<td>24,006</td>
<td>16,631</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with family</td>
<td>8,617</td>
<td>4,777</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying with friends</td>
<td>3,533</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented housing</td>
<td>24,869</td>
<td>14,643</td>
<td>10,250</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned housing unit</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other PSH</td>
<td>2,911</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>1,111</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Setting</td>
<td>4,125</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment center</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional facility</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric facility</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Setting or Unknown</td>
<td>13,554</td>
<td>9,901</td>
<td>3,669</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or motel</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster care home</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other living arrangement</td>
<td>3,163</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing destination</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>4,342</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: HMIS 2010-2015

EXHIBIT 7.18: Percent Change in Destination upon Moving Out
People Living in PSH by Household Type, 2010-2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All People</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Setting</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Setting</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-Year Estimates of Veterans Living in PSH

This section provides information on a specific population residing in PSH – veterans. The HMIS estimates distinguish between veterans served as individuals and veterans who are living with at least one child (the same definition of family as elsewhere in this report), but only the veterans are included in the counts, not other adults or children in the household.

The 2015 estimates of veterans in PSH reflect a broader population than in past reports. In the past, the estimates did not include information on all veterans using the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program, a form of PSH. As a result, past estimates underestimated the number of veterans in PSH. In 2015, the methodology used to produce these estimates was changed to account more fully for each community’s HUD-VASH bed inventory reported to HUD, producing a more accurate estimate of veterans in PSH. The estimate increased substantially.3

In collaboration with the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs, this report provides additional supplemental information on veterans using HUD-VASH based on data from the VA’s Homeless Operations Management Evaluation System (HOMES). These data provide a detailed picture of the veterans who use this program separate from the other PSH programs. Information on veterans in HUD-VASH follows the description of veterans in PSH.

In 2015, an estimated 75,331 veterans lived in PSH. The estimate is much larger than in past years due to the inclusion of many more HUD-VASH vouchers in the estimation methodology. Even so, the estimate does not account for all HUD-VASH vouchers in use. The HOMES data from the VA suggest that between 12,000 and 14,000 veterans in PSH may be missed by this 2015 estimate. The 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology report provides more detail about the estimate of veterans in PSH.

In 2015, 75,331 veterans lived in PSH.

In 2015
- 75,331 veterans lived in PSH in 2015.4 The majority were in PSH as individuals (87.4%) rather than as members of a family with at least one child (12.7%).

Changes from Previous Reports
- Past estimations showed the share of veterans living in PSH as members of a family with children to be 3.5 percent in 2010 and 6.5 percent in 2014. Based on the new estimates for 2015, 12.7 percent of veterans living in PSH are doing so as members of a family with children.

Note 1: The share of veterans living in PSH as individuals and as family members may not sum to 100% because some veterans were in PSH as both individuals and in families with children at different points during the reporting period.

Note 2: The large increase in the count from 2014 to 2015 is due largely to methodological changes that resulted in a substantial increase in the representation of veterans permanently housed through the HUD-VASH program. For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Note 3: Because the changes in the basis for estimates are too substantial to permit conclusions about trends in the number of veterans in PSH, we do not present an exhibit showing changes in the number of veterans living in PSH by household types from 2010 to 2015.

Data Source: HMIS 2010-2015

For more information, please see the 2015 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

The 95 percent confidence interval for veterans in PSH in 2015 is 70,565 to 80,097 (75,331 +/- 4,766).
Characteristics of Veterans Living in PSH

In 2015
- The typical veteran in PSH was a man (86.3%) who identified himself either as white and not Hispanic (46.1%) or as African American (43.5%).
- About half of all veterans living in PSH with children were women (45.9%).
- About half of veterans living in PSH (both as individuals and as adults in families) were between 51 and 61 years old (48.7%). Among veterans living in PSH as individuals, more than one in five (21.1%) was 62 or older, compared to about one in ten (11.6%) among all individuals in PSH.
- More than 8 in 10 veterans living in PSH as individuals had a disability (83.6%).
- Compared to veterans in PSH as individuals, those in families with children were younger, with 61.1 percent ages 31 to 50, compared to 23.5 percent for individual veterans. Veterans in families with children in PSH were also less likely to have a disability than those in PSH as individuals (71.2% versus 85.1%).
- More than a third (40.2%) of all veterans in PSH had a physical disability. About a third (33.1%) had a dual diagnosis of both mental health and substance abuse problems, another third (33.6%) had just mental health challenges, and 12 percent had just substance abuse issues.

Changes from Previous Reports
- Past estimates showed the share of elderly veterans (ages 62 and older) living in PSH to be 12.1 percent in 2010 and 17.6 percent in 2014. Based on the new 2015 estimates, 19.2 percent of veterans living in PSH are elderly.
- The share of veterans living in PSH with a dual diagnosis was estimated at 23.7 percent in 2010 and 28.6 percent in 2014. Based on the new estimates for 2015, the share of veterans living in PSH with dual diagnosis is 33.1 percent.
- Past estimates showed the share of veterans living in PSH with a physical disability to be 22.1 percent in 2010 and 37.9 percent in 2014. The new estimates for 2015 show the share of veterans in PSH with a physical disability to be 40.2 percent.

EXHIBIT 7.20: Characteristics by Household Type
Veterans Living in PSH, 2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>All Veterans</th>
<th>Individual Veterans</th>
<th>Veterans in Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Veterans in PSH</td>
<td>73,094</td>
<td>65,391</td>
<td>7,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Hispanic</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other One Race</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-61</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 and older</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status of Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Disabled</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT 7.21: Disability Type
Veterans Living in PSH, 2010-2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Type</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Type of Disability</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Diagnosis</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disability</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disability</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Dual diagnosis refers to people that have both a mental health and substance abuse issue. People with dual diagnosis are not included in the mental health or substance abuse categories.
Note 2: Percent of Veterans with disabilities do not sum to 100% because people in PSH may have more than one type of disability.
Places Veterans Stayed Before Moving Into PSH

In 2015
- More than eight in ten veterans living in PSH were homeless immediately before program entry (81.1%). Of these 57,278 veterans, 29 percent were living in a place not meant for human habitation.
- Of the 8,325 veterans in PSH who moved in from another housed situation, 39.6 percent had been in housing they rented, 25.9 percent had been living with family, and 19.4 percent had been living with friends.
- Nearly half (45.8%) of the 3,371 veterans who came to PSH from an institutional setting, came from a substance abuse treatment center.

Changes from Previous Reports
- Past estimates showed the share of veterans who were experiencing homelessness just prior to entering PSH to be 75.5 percent in 2010 and 76.9 percent in 2014. Based on the new 2015 estimates, the share of veterans who were experiencing homelessness prior to entering PSH is 81.1 percent.

EXHIBIT 7.22: Places Veterans Stayed Before Moving Into PSH, 2010-2015 (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOMELESS</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Because changes in the basis for estimates are too substantial to support conclusions about trends we do not present an exhibit showing change in the places veterans stayed before moving into PSH from 2010 to 2015.

*Homeless refers to people experiencing sheltered or unsheltered homelessness.
Veterans in HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) Programs using Housing Subsidies

The HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program for formerly homeless veterans (HUD-VASH) combines Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) rental assistance provided by HUD with case management and clinical services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) through VA medical centers (VAMCs) and community-based outpatient clinics. Every year since 2008, HUD and the VA have awarded HUD-VASH vouchers based on geographic need as well as public housing agency (PHA) and VAMAC administrative performance. The HUD-VASH program is a form of permanent supportive housing that is designed to bring veterans who are experiencing homelessness into a permanent home and paired with supportive services to improve the stability of their housing situation.

The HUD-VASH program operates using the principles of Housing First, an evidence-based practice that seeks to rapidly house individuals in a low-barrier, accessible program that wraps supportive services around the individual to help ensure that he/she stays housed. Housing First does not require prior treatment completion or sobriety prior to housing the individual. Services that are provided should be focused on supporting the Veteran’s recovery and individual goals.

This year’s AHAR is the first to provide information from the VA’s Homeless Operations Management Evaluation System (HOMES) about veterans who use HUD-VASH. The VAMCs and outpatient clinics that administer the HUD-VASH program are required to report data into HOMES, but most do not provide information to the HMIS. Although data from HOMES share some similarities with HMIS data, and efforts were made to align these data to the extent possible, the data are sufficiently different that the information reported here on veterans in HUD-VASH cannot be directly compared to HMIS-based information.

As of September 2015, more than 98,000 veterans had received housing subsidies through HUD-VASH since the program began in 2008.

EXHIBIT 7.23: Characteristics of Veterans using HUD-VASH Housing Subsidies, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>% Veterans in HUD-VASH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other one race</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 30</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 50</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 61</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 and older</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination at Exit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing*</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Settings*</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Settings*</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Homeless Operations Management Evaluation System (HOMES) data

\* Housing includes a number of situations, including owned and rented housing that may be subsidized or not subsidized.
\* Institutional Settings include psychiatric facilities, non-psychiatric hospitals, correctional facilities, and non-VA residential treatment programs.
\* Destination is only calculated for veterans who left the program, which is a small proportion of the total veterans described in earlier characteristics.
\* For destination at exit, unknown destination is included in other settings.


Examples of clinical services are health care, mental health treatment, and substance use counseling.

HOMES vs. HMIS data

- HOMES provides data from the VA’s system of care for veterans experiencing homelessness, and submission of data is mandatory for VAMCs and VA community-based outpatient clinics. HMIS provides data from the Continuums of Care that serve a broad population of homeless people, including veterans. Participation in HMIS is mandatory for grantees of HUD homeless assistance programs but not for all providers of PSH. PHAs that provide HUD-VASH or other housing assistance to homeless people are not required to participate in HMIS, although some do.
- Data elements, definitions, and guidelines differ between HOMES and HMIS.
- Both HOMES and HMIS data cover veterans using programs at any time during a year.

As of the end of the 2015 fiscal year, 98,264 veterans had received a housing subsidy through the HUD-VASH program at some point since the program underwent significant expansion in 2008. In September 2015, 63,039 HUD-VASH vouchers were currently leased up and providing rental assistance to veterans. These data exclude those veterans who are receiving case management only and have not yet moved into housing and focus on veterans using housing subsidies in order to better align with people who use other permanent supportive housing programs.

Exhibit 7.23 shows the characteristics of veterans using HUD-VASH housing subsidies at some point during the 2015 fiscal year. Most veterans using HUD-VASH housing subsidies were men, 87.7 percent. Just over half (51%) of veterans using HUD-VASH housing subsidies identified themselves as white, 46.3 percent as black or African American, and 3.7 percent as some other race. When asked about their ethnic identity, 8.1 percent of veterans using HUD-VASH housing subsidies identified themselves as Hispanic (any race). Veterans using HUD-VASH housing subsidies typically were between 51 and 61 years of age (47%), with about a quarter (25.3%) age 62 or older, and very few (3.7%) between 18 and 30.

Among those who left the HUD-VASH program, about two-thirds (65.2 percent) went to another housing situation, 7.7 percent became homeless, and 6.3 percent went to an institutional setting. About one in five (20.8 percent) were reported as going to “other” settings, which includes cases where the program administrators did not know where the veteran went.

---

8The information is based on the veteran in the household, excluding other household members who may be in the HUD-VASH unit.