

September 2009



THE HOMELESSNESS PULSE PROJECT

Second Quarterly Report

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



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following principal staff of the nine participating Continuums of Care played an invaluable role in this report by providing and interpreting the data they so carefully collect and maintain:

Phoenix/Mesa Maricopa County CoC: Sarah Graham and Brande Mead
Bridgeport/Stratford/Fairfield: Russ Cormier and Judy Sklarz
District of Columbia: Tom Fredericksen and Darlene Matthews
Lakeland/Winterhaven, Polk County: Mark Spiker and Michael Watkins
Kentucky Balance of State: Carol Anne Sell, Davey King, and Lynn Chrisman
Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest: Lane Richardson
New York City: Eileen Lynch
Cleveland/Cuyahoga County: Carolyn Nabakowski and Ruth Gillett
Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover Counties: Margot Ackermann and Kelly King Horne

The report was prepared by Abt Associates Inc. Contributing staff members include Lauren Dunton, Judith Feins, John Griffith, and Christopher Blaine. Jeff Smith was responsible for design and Missy Robinson for production.

The project also has benefited from the support of HUD staff in the Office of Community Planning and Development, notably Mark Johnston, Ann Oliva, and Julie Hovden. In addition, Alvaro Cortes and Mary Joel Holin of Abt Associates and Dennis Culhane of the University of Pennsylvania provided valuable guidance and assistance in coordination with the preparation of the 2008 *Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR)*.

WHAT THE HOMELESSNESS PULSE PROJECT DOES

The Homelessness Pulse project is intended to help the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) gain a better understanding of the impact of the current economic crisis on homelessness. This understanding relies heavily on collecting up-to-date information on how counts of homeless persons may be changing as the crisis unfolds.

HUD reports to Congress each year in the *Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR)* on the status of homeless populations and services in the United States, drawing on a nationally representative sample of communities and presenting a comprehensive analysis. But at present, the data on homelessness reported to HUD—whether through the AHAR or through the homeless services funding process—are only collected annually, which limits HUD's ability to track real-time changes in homelessness.

To address this limitation, HUD has partnered with nine Continuums of Care nationwide to collect more timely data on sheltered homelessness. A Continuum of Care (CoC) is a community's or region's plan to organize and deliver housing and services that meet the needs of homeless individuals and families to obtain stable housing and maximize self-sufficiency. The data—which are collected on a quarterly basis—will help gauge whether rising unemployment, increased foreclosures, and a slumping economy are leading to marked increases in homelessness.

The up-to-date information will enhance HUD's ability to respond to the economic crisis and inform public policy. But the report draws on a very small number of volunteer communities, so it cannot give as reliable or complete a national picture as the AHAR. Its contents should be taken as suggestive—not definitive—of how homelessness may be changing during these uncertain economic times. In the coming months, HUD intends to expand the number of communities reporting to the Pulse project to track real-time changes in homelessness more reliably.

WHAT'S IN THIS REPORT?

This is the second quarterly report from the Homelessness Pulse project. In the first report (July 2009), we:

- Introduced the participating sites, with a brief summary on how they were selected;
- Presented the annual point-in-time (PIT) counts of sheltered and unsheltered homeless individuals and families, gathered in the last week of January 2009;
- Compared these 2009 PIT counts to the 2008 PIT counts for the same CoCs; and
- Examined the quarterly PIT counts collected by the CoCs at the end of March 2009.

In this report, we:

- Provide updates to the March 2009 PIT counts reported previously;
- Examine the quarterly PIT counts collected by the CoCs at the end of June 2009 and compare them to the March 2009 counts;
- Present the first data collected on new clients in the participating CoCs, between March and June 2009; and
- Convey some qualitative observations from the CoCs.

WHO'S REPORTING PULSE DATA?

Nine CoCs volunteered to participate in the project (see Exhibit 1). These CoCs are located throughout the United States and represent different types of jurisdictions (urban, suburban, rural, and mixed). The selected CoCs are not a representative sample of communities, but rather they provide an early indication—a “pulse”—of how the extent and nature of homelessness may be changing over time in these communities.

Exhibit 1 summarizes the characteristics of the nine participating CoCs, which together cover almost 20 million people, or 6.5 percent of the U.S. population. The individual sites are briefly profiled in Attachment A. For simplicity, these sites are referred to by their state or city names throughout the report.

The nine participating CoCs contained 64,585 beds in emergency shelters and transitional housing in 2008, or about 16 percent of the nation’s total inventory of emergency shelter and transitional housing beds.¹ Of these beds, 71 percent (over 46,000) were located in New York City. Over 60 percent of the beds in the Pulse CoCs were for families, while the remaining beds (nearly 40 percent) were for individuals.

Exhibit 1: Sites Participating in the Homelessness Pulse Project

Continuum of Care	CoC Full Name	Type of CoC	U.S. Location	# of Counties	Principal Cities	2008 Population ^a
AZ-502	Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County	Regional	Southwest	1	Phoenix, Mesa	3,954,598
CT-503	Bridgeport/Stratford/Fairfield	Regional	Northeast	1 (part) ^b	Bridgeport	244,607
DC-500	District of Columbia	City	Mid-Atlantic	0	Washington, DC	591,833
FL-503	Lakeland/Winterhaven, Polk County	Regional	South	1	Lakeland	580,594
KY-500	Kentucky Balance of State	Balance of State	South	118	Frankfort, Elizabethtown	3,273,254
LA-502	Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest	Regional	South	9	Shreveport	533,539
NY-600	New York City	City	Mid-Atlantic	5	New York City	8,363,710
OH-502	Cleveland/Cuyahoga County	Regional	Midwest	1	Cleveland	1,283,925
VA-500	Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover Counties	Regional	Mid-Atlantic	7	Richmond	962,696
TOTAL, 9 Continuums of Care						19,788,756

a. Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, <http://www.census.gov/popest/estimates.html>. County figures are estimates for 2008; city figures are estimates for 2006.

b. CT-503 contains only portions of Fairfield County, CT.

¹ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Community Planning and Development, *The 2008 Annual Homeless Assessment Report to Congress*, July 2009, p. 61. Nationwide, there were 211,222 emergency shelter beds and 205,062 transitional housing beds in 2008. Updated Housing Inventory Chart (HIC) bed counts for 2009 are used in the remainder of this report.

ABOUT THE QUARTERLY POINT-IN-TIME DATA

Turning to the quarterly point-in-time data, Exhibit 2 shows the dates covered for this report and the previous one from the Homelessness Pulse project.

Exhibit 2: Quarterly Reporting Periods

Report Date	Quarter	Reporting Period Covered	Point-in-Time Count Date
July 2009	#1	January-March 2009	March 31, 2009
Sept. 2009	#2	April-June 2009	June 30, 2009

Several of the participating CoCs have made revisions to their first-quarter data since the initial report was released in July.² The effect of the revisions is small and does not change the patterns observed previously. The complete revised data for the first quarter can be found in Exhibit B-1 (in Attachment B). Here are the key results:

- For the first quarter of 2009, the nine CoCs reported a revised combined total of 59,819 sheltered persons on March 31, 2009.³
- Of the revised sheltered total, 35,932 were persons in families (60 percent) and 23,887 were individuals (40 percent).⁴
- Four of the nine CoCs (CT, DC, FL, and NYC) experienced an increase in their sheltered counts during the first quarter of 2009, and the remaining communities experienced a decline.

Turning to the point-in-time data for the second quarter, from April to June 2009, there are some caveats to keep in mind. The CoCs collect the quarterly PIT count of *sheltered* homeless persons only, using their HMIS, on a designated night (in this instance June 30, 2009). These systems do not cover all residential programs in each CoC, making it necessary to adjust statistically the raw numbers of homeless persons to account for programs that do not participate in HMIS. The statistical adjustment assumes that bed usage is the same in HMIS-participating and non-participating programs.

In addition, for the purpose of these quarterly reports, a *family is comprised of at least one adult over the age of 18 and at least one child under the age of 18.*⁵ An unaccompanied person under

² For three of the nine sites (CT, DC and KY), the bed inventory estimates have been modified to reflect prorated seasonal beds and omit domestic violence beds more accurately. (Seasonal beds are prorated as a portion of year-round beds, in proportion to the number of months they are available for use.) This changed the overall adjustment factor used to account for non-participation in a community's HMIS, thus altering the Q1 point-in-time numbers. One other site (VA) submitted new 2009 housing inventory figures, which also altered the adjustment factor for Q1. Two sites (NY and VA) submitted revised Q1 point-in-time estimates for the second quarterly report, citing improved data accuracy.

³ The previously reported combined total of sheltered persons was 61,280.

⁴ The previously reported total of sheltered persons in families was 37,248; the figure for individuals was 24,031.

⁵ This definition is consistent with the AHAR.

the age of 18 is considered an individual. Parenting youth and their children are counted as individuals, not as a family (because an adult is not present).

This report focuses on the HMIS-generated quarterly point-in-time counts of sheltered persons on June 30, 2009 for the nine participating CoCs and compares these estimates to those of the previous quarter.⁶


WHAT DO THE QUARTERLY POINT-IN-TIME DATA SHOW?

For the second quarter of calendar 2009, the nine CoCs reported a combined total of 59,775 sheltered persons on June 30. Of this total, 36,614 were persons in families (61 percent) and 23,161 were individuals (39 percent). See the first panel of Exhibit 3. This pattern, rather different from the national one, is due to the preponderance of family beds in the specific Pulse sites.

The pie chart in the second panel of Exhibit 3 shows the family versus individual proportions for the emergency shelter population on June 30, 2009. Some 64 percent of those in emergency shelters across the nine Pulse sites were persons in families, while 36 percent were individuals. By contrast, of those sheltered in transitional housing (shown in the third panel of Exhibit 3), 50 percent were persons in families and 50 percent were individuals. These proportions reflect the mix of transitional housing beds in the nine participating CoCs. Details of the June counts are found in Exhibit B-2.

Across the Pulse sites, in the second quarter the total number of persons in families increased by 681 (2 percent), while the total number of individuals decreased by 725 (3 percent). The end-of-June data mark a slight decrease (by

Exhibit 3: Point-in-Time Count of Sheltered Persons by Household Type and Program Type, June 2009



⁶ For a complete analysis of the 2009 point-in-time counts for the nine CoCs, including unsheltered persons (the street count), see the *Homelessness Pulse Project First Quarterly Report*, July 2009.

a tenth of one percent) in the total sheltered homeless population from March 31, 2009, when these CoCs reported 59,819 total persons (in their revised counts). Exhibit 4 shows the March and June counts for each site, including the overall increase in total number of sheltered persons in families and the decrease in total sheltered individuals.

Comparing the estimates from March and June, there were some notable differences among the sites in the percent of persons in families. For the second quarter, the participating Florida, Ohio, and Virginia CoCs reported about a fourth of their sheltered persons were in families. Sites reporting that 40 to 50 percent of their sheltered population consisted of persons in families included the Arizona, Connecticut, DC, and Louisiana CoCs. The highest proportions of persons in families—over two-thirds—were reported by the Kentucky and New York City continuums. (More detailed data for Q1 and Q2 are shown in Exhibit B-3.)

Exhibit 4: Comparison of Point-in-Time Counts between Q1 and Q2, 2009

	AZ-502		CT-503		DC-500		FL-503		KY-500 ^a	
	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09
All Individuals	1,582	1,622	271	246	3,689	3,191	377	388	800	634
All Persons in Families	1,427	1,381	131	168	2,297	2,205	161	131	814	1,409
Total	3,009	3,002	401	413	5,986	5,395	538	519	1,614	2,043
Pct Individuals	52.6%	54.0%	67.4%	59.5%	61.6%	59.1%	70.0%	74.8%	49.6%	31.0%
Pct Persons in Families	47.4%	46.0%	32.6%	40.5%	38.4%	40.9%	30.0%	25.2%	50.4%	69.0%

	LA-502		NY-600 ^b		OH-502		VA-500 ^c		TOTAL	
	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09
All Individuals	369	357	14,696	14,792	1,552	1,288	551	643	23,886	23,160
All Persons in Families	193	236	30,463	30,452	277	427	169	206	35,932	36,614
Total	561	593	45,159	45,244	1,830	1,715	720	849	59,818	59,774
Pct Individuals	65.7%	60.2%	32.5%	32.7%	84.8%	75.1%	76.6%	75.7%	39.9%	38.7%
Pct Persons in Families	34.3%	39.8%	67.5%	67.3%	15.2%	24.9%	23.4%	24.3%	60.1%	61.3%

NOTES:

- The March 2009 point-in-time count of sheltered individuals for Kentucky Balance of State CoC was revised due to improved data collection and adjustments to the Housing Inventory totals. The Kentucky Balance of State CoC expressed concern over the overall validity of the Q1 data; however, the CoC was unable to submit a new point-in-time count with improved data quality.
- The first quarter point-in-time count of sheltered individuals for New York City was adjusted after data reconciliation from multiple sources.
- The first quarter point-in-time count of sheltered individuals for Virginia was revised due to improved data collection and adjustments to the Housing Inventory totals.

As already noted, the **total sheltered count** in June for these nine CoCs (59,775) was slightly lower than the March sheltered count (59,819). But five of the nine CoCs (CT, KY, LA, NYC, and VA) experienced an increase in their total sheltered counts during the second quarter of 2009. Notable increases in sheltered homeless population occurred in the Kentucky CoC (where the total number of sheltered persons grew from 1,614 to 2,043 or 27 percent) and the Virginia CoC (which experienced an increase of 130 persons or 18 percent). In both cases, a portion of the increase is due to data improvements.

Of the nine CoCs in the Pulse project, the remaining four communities (AZ, DC, FL, and OH) experienced declines in their sheltered counts during the second quarter. The Washington, DC CoC reported a substantial decline (591 persons, nearly 10 percent) in total sheltered persons, largely attributable to the closure of seasonal beds on April 1.

The total count of **sheltered persons in families** increased by 2 percent across all sites between March and June (from 35,932 to 36,614), and five of the nine participating CoCs reported increases in this population. Two CoCs observed particularly large increases in sheltered persons in families: Kentucky, where the count increased from 814 to 1,409 (73 percent), and Ohio, where the count increased from 277 to 427 (54 percent). Other reported increases in sheltered family population were smaller but still substantial for the communities: CT sheltered 37 more persons in families (28 percent), VA sheltered an additional 37 persons in families (22 percent), and LA sheltered 43 more persons in families (22 percent).

The total count of **sheltered homeless individuals** in the participating CoCs dropped 3 percent, from 23,887 in March to 23,161 in June 2009. This drop was driven primarily by the decreases in the DC CoC (498 persons or 14 percent), the OH CoC (264 persons or 17 percent), and the KY CoC (166 persons or 21 percent).

But five of the nine CoCs (AZ, FL, KY, NYC, and VA) experienced increases in their counts of sheltered individuals. And Virginia reported a fairly substantial percentage increase (92 persons or 17 percent).

INTRODUCING THE QUARTERLY NEW CLIENT DATA

The CoCs also reported data on “new” clients that accessed residential homeless services during the reporting period April-June 2009. For purposes of this report, new clients are persons that a) have not received any residential homeless services from an HMIS-covered emergency shelter or transitional housing provider since December 31, 2007 (i.e., no services in calendar 2008 or the first quarter of 2009); and b) began receiving homeless residential services from one of these providers between April 1, 2009 and June 30, 2009. If any member of a family is considered “new” under this definition, then that family is considered “new” for reporting purposes.⁷ The new client data allow HUD to gauge how many individuals and families in these communities experienced homelessness for the first time during the second quarter.

The CoCs reported longitudinal, unduplicated counts of newly homeless families, persons in those families, and individuals. The counts were for emergency shelters and transitional housing programs. The CoCs also provided data on the household composition of the new client population.⁸

⁷ Due to HMIS software configuration limitations, in CoCs that track persons in families in emergency shelters through a combination of a shelter stay variable (instead of entry/exits) and a “Head of Household” variable, a family is only counted as “new” if the head of that household meets the definition stated above. This means families with other new members only are not counted as “new.” For this reason, the total number of “new” families reported in Exhibit B-4 is believed to be an underestimate. The participating sites with potential undercounts are CT, FL, LA, and VA.

⁸ Significant quality issues were encountered with respect to the data elements on type and duration of living arrangements prior to program entry. We hope to resolve these issues for the next report.

As with the quarterly point-in-time counts discussed earlier, there are some important caveats to note about the new client data. First, “new” is defined in relation to a specific time period. For this report, that period starts at the beginning of 2008 and covers the 15 months through March 2009. The new client counts in each future report will also be based on a 15-month interval. As a result of this definition, it is possible for a client to have been homeless near the end of 2007, be experiencing another spell of homelessness, and be counted as “new” for this project.

Second, since all quarterly data are tracked through each CoC’s HMIS, the definition of new clients is limited to those who have not been served *in HMIS-participating programs* within the same CoC during the specific time period. It is possible—because of HMIS coverage limitations—for a client to be considered “new” even though that person in fact received residential services within the jurisdiction of the CoC within the past 15 months, if the person used a provider of homeless residential services that does not participate in HMIS. As a result, when the reported counts are adjusted for the CoC’s HMIS coverage, these counts may be slight overestimates of the newly homeless population in these CoCs.⁹

A final caveat is that the new client data are cumulative across the quarter, and thus they are not directly comparable to point-in-time data. As a result, we have no basis for comparison for this first report. But over the next four quarters, we will accumulate information on the flow of new clients that will permit assessment of trends for the CoCs participating in the Pulse project.

New Clients Defined


For the Homelessness Pulse project, new clients of the participating CoCs are persons who: a) have not received any residential homeless services from an HMIS-participating Emergency Shelter or Transitional Housing provider in the past 15 months (no services in calendar 2008 or the first quarter of 2009); and b) began receiving homeless residential services from one of these providers between April 1 and June 30, 2009.

WHAT DO THE QUARTERLY NEW CLIENT DATA SHOW?

During the three months ending June 30, 2009, the nine participating CoCs reported 27,632 new clients in their emergency shelters and transitional housing. Exhibit 5 shows the basic numbers by site, with separate bars for individuals and persons in families. Exhibit B-4 (in Attachment B) shows the underlying detailed data.

⁹ It is also possible for a new client to have recently been served by a different CoC.

Exhibit 5: New Homeless Clients by Site, April 2009 – June 2009






The majority of new homeless persons that accessed residential services during the second quarter were individuals. Across the nine participating sites, 51 percent of new clients were individuals and 49 percent were persons in families. A large majority of the overall new clients entered emergency shelters. Across the nine sites, 88 percent (a total of 24,232 new clients) entered an emergency shelter, compared to only 12 percent (3,400 new clients) directly entering transitional housing. This is expected, because there is more bed turnover in the emergency shelter system than in the transitional housing system and also because many transitional programs depend on assessment in shelters before client intake.

In Exhibit 6, the new client totals across the nine participating continuums are shown separately for individuals and persons in families, to demonstrate the mix of new clients overall, the mix entering emergency shelters, and the mix entering transitional housing. The first panel shows that 49 percent of all the new clients were persons in families, while 51 percent were individuals. In emergency shelters, the proportion was the same, with persons in families comprising 49 percent of the new clients and individuals making up the other 51 percent (second panel of Exhibit 6). For transitional housing (third panel), 48 percent of new clients were persons in families, compared to 52 percent who were individuals.


There were notable differences in the sites' new client data. Two sites reported substantially more new individual clients than new clients in families: in Washington DC, 89 percent of the 2,238 new clients were individuals, while in Virginia 79 percent of the 549 new clients were individuals. By contrast, in Connecticut and New York City, the majority of new clients were persons in families (56 percent and 59 percent respectively).

Exhibit 6: New Homeless Clients in Residential Programs for All Pulse Sites



Information on the household composition of new clients is shown in Exhibit 7. Overall, 69 percent of new clients were adults and 31 percent were children. Just under half of the total adults were single males (32 percent of the total), compared to 15 percent single females and 22 percent adults in families. Children in families accounted for 30 percent of the total new client population, while unaccompanied youth represented less than 1 percent of all new clients.

Exhibit 7: Quarterly Mix of New Sheltered Clients, by Household Type, April - June 2009



Washington, DC and Virginia reported the highest percentages of adults among new clients, with 93 percent and 84 percent, respectively. The highest percentage of new children was in New York City, where persons under 18 comprised 35 percent of the new client population. Kentucky reported the highest percentage of new unaccompanied youth clients, with 5 percent. (Further detail by site is provided in Exhibit B-5 in Attachment B.)

WHAT DO THE LOCAL PROVIDERS SEE?

The data provided by the participating CoCs offer a snapshot of one-night counts and trends for a small proportion of CoCs nationwide, as well as a longitudinal glance at clients accessing homeless residential services for the first time. This quarter, only one of the participating continuums provided informal observations about what is happening on the ground.

From Virginia:

In early May 2009, the Richmond CoC conducted a small qualitative survey with homeless service providers, to determine what they were seeing at the local level. While not necessarily a representative sample, the survey provides firsthand accounts of what local providers are experiencing. Providers responding to the survey noted increasing numbers of individuals coping with substance abuse and mental health issues, most notably depression. In addition, the providers noted a decrease in the age of homeless individuals. In particular, there was an upward “trend of younger adult females that are homeless for the first time,” including a number of young mothers.

On a separate note, one service provider wrote that “[w]e are feeling the ripples of the country’s high unemployment rate,” leading to a “greater number of higher functioning people—individuals who have held professional, skilled-craft positions in housing crisis” (as another provider pointed out).

WHAT’S COMING IN FUTURE HOMELESSNESS PULSE REPORTS?

This second quarterly report has presented the first snapshot of the real-time changes in sheltered homeless populations in the nine participating CoCs and provided a baseline for studying persons that experience homelessness for the first time as the economic crisis persists. In future quarterly reports, we will continue to monitor the overall count of individuals and families accessing residential services for the homeless, while tracking trends in the number and background of newly homeless persons throughout the year. We also hope to report on the type and duration of living arrangements prior to program entry for new clients.

Each quarter’s data collection process will also include an opportunity for the leadership of these Continuums of Care to share the stories they are hearing from their local providers. The combination of data and observations—along with the possible expansion of the Pulse project to more sites if OMB approval is obtained—should help HUD gain a better understanding of the impact of the current economic crisis on homelessness.

ATTACHMENT A

Homelessness Pulse Site Selection and Site Profiles

Homelessness Pulse Site Selection

Nine Continuums of Care were recruited to participate in this project. The CoCs are located throughout the United States and represent different types of jurisdictions (urban, suburban, rural, and combinations). Several criteria were used to select them:

- (1) The type of CoC (city, regional, or balance of state);
- (2) The population in the jurisdictions covered by the CoC;
- (3) The part of the country where the CoC is located;
- (4) How well the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) covers beds among emergency shelters and transitional housing programs, especially among family programs; and
- (5) The quality of the CoC's HMIS data.

City CoCs cover only the providers and programs within the boundaries of a major U.S. city. *Regional CoCs*—as we are using the term—cover a combination of types of jurisdictions. This could be a principal city with surrounding suburbs and unincorporated county (for example, Phoenix, Mesa, and the rest of Maricopa County, AZ) or a combination of urban and suburban communities (such as Bridgeport, Stratford, and Fairfield, CT), or several counties with any municipalities within them (such as the nine parishes in northwest Louisiana that make up the Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest LA CoC). A “**balance of state**” continuum encompasses areas not organized into more local provider networks; among the Pulse sites, Kentucky is an example of this type.

The selected CoCs are not a representative sample of communities. HUD may expand the voluntary group in the future, but the focus will still be on early indications—rather than actual measurement—of how the nature and extent of homelessness may be changing in this period.

Profiles of the Participating Sites

1. Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County (AZ)

This Continuum of Care covers all of Maricopa County. Maricopa is Arizona's largest county in population, with nearly 4 million of the state's 6.5 million residents.¹⁰ About half the Maricopa population lives in the cities of Mesa and Phoenix.

2. Bridgeport, Stratford, and Fairfield (CT)

The three southwestern Connecticut jurisdictions in this Continuum of Care—one urban, two suburban—have a combined population of about 250,000 people.

3. The District of Columbia (DC)

This network of service providers focuses on homeless persons in the Nation's capital. The city's 2008 population was just under 600,000.

¹⁰ All population figures are official population estimates from the Bureau of the Census. County figures are estimates for 2008; city figures are estimates for 2006.

4. Lakeland/Winterhaven/Polk County (FL)

This Continuum of Care covers all of Polk County in central Florida. Its principal cities are Lakeland and Winterhaven, and the total county population in 2008 was estimated at nearly 600,000.

5. Kentucky Balance of State

This large Continuum of Care covers 118 of Kentucky's 120 counties, with a total population of almost 3.3 million people. The only parts of the state in separate CoCs are the two largest cities—Lexington and Louisville—and their surrounding counties (Fayette and Jefferson). This Continuum represents 77 percent of the state's population.

6. Shreveport/Bossier/Northwest (LA)

Nine parishes in Northwest Louisiana have joined together to coordinate services for homeless persons. These parishes (Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, Claiborne, De Soto, Natchitoches, Red River, Sabine, and Webster) have a combined population of just over half a million people. Shreveport is the principal city, with about 200,000 residents.

7. New York City (NY)

This network of service providers focuses on homeless persons in the Nation's largest city. The 2008 population was estimated at 8.36 million across the five boroughs.

8. Cleveland/Cuyahoga County (OH)

This Continuum of Care represents 1.28 million people (Ohio's most populous county). Cleveland is the principal city in the continuum, which also includes a few smaller cities (Cleveland Heights, East Cleveland, Euclid, and Parma). Together, these cities account for half the county's population.

9. Richmond/Henrico, Chesterfield, and Hanover Counties (VA)

Seven counties in central Virginia—plus the independent City of Richmond, the state capital—make up this CoC. The combined total population is almost one million people, with a fifth of them in the City of Richmond.

ATTACHMENT B

**Exhibit B-1 Revised Quarterly Point-In-Time Count of All Sheltered Clients
(Adjusted for HMIS Coverage), March 2009**

Type	Homeless Population	AZ-502	CT-503	DC-500	FL-503	KY-500 ^a	LA-502	NY-506 ^b	OH-502	VA-500 ^c	Total
Emergency Shelters	ES- Individuals	1,290	135	2,739	186	639	186	11,821	1,111	105	18,212
	ES - Persons in Families	386	51	720	46	418	25	29,059	54	53	30,813
	ES - Families	106	18	227	22	129	7	8,948	17	22	9,496
Transitional Housing	TH- Individuals	292	135	950	191	161	183	2,874	442	447	5,675
	TH - Persons in Families	1,041	80	1,577	115	396	168	1,404	223	116	5,119
	TH - Families	328	24	500	39	127	60	546	80	44	1,748
Total Sheltered Persons	Total Sheltered Persons	3,009	401	5,986	538	1,614	561	45,159	1,830	721	59,819
	Total Beds in 2009 HIC	4,184	425	6,773	573	2,030	810	46,921	2,062	1,020	64,798
	Bed Utilization Rate	71.9%	94.5%	88.4%	93.8%	79.5%	69.3%	96.2%	88.7%	70.6%	92.3%

NOTES:

^a For KY-500, all bed counts are based on the CoC's 2008 Housing Inventory Data. The Kentucky Balance of State CoC expressed concern about the overall validity of the Q1 data but was unable to provide an improved point-in-time count for Q1.

^b For NY-600, the first quarter point-in-time count of sheltered individuals was adjusted after data reconciliation from multiple sources.

^c The first quarter point-in-time count of sheltered individuals for VA-500 was revised after improved data collection and adjustments to the Housing Inventory totals.

Exhibit B-2 Quarterly Point-In-Time Count of All Sheltered Clients (Adjusted for HMIS Coverage), June 2009

Type	Homeless Population	AZ-502	CT-503	DC-500	FL-503	KY-500 ^a	LA-502	NY-506	OH-502	VA-500	Total
Emergency Shelters	ES- Individuals	1,303	101	2,284	232	355	190	11,907	800	149	17,323
	ES - Persons in Families	327	79	540	63	517	37	28,998	195	59	30,815
	ES - Families	96	24	163	20	194	12	8,984	61	21	9,574
Transitional Housing	TH- Individuals	318	144	907	156	279	167	2,885	488	495	5,839
	TH - Persons in Families	1,054	89	1,665	68	892	199	1,454	232	147	5,799
	TH - Families	317	25	488	22	275	66	565	81	53	1,893
	Total Sheltered Persons	3,002	413	5,395	519	2,043	593	45,244	1,715	850	59,775
	Total Beds in 2009 HIC	4,184	425	6,773	573	2,030	810	46,921	2,062	1,020	64,798
	Bed Utilization Rate	71.8%	97.3%	79.7%	90.7%	100.6%	73.2%	96.4%	83.2%	83.3%	92.2%

^a For KY-500, all bed counts are based on the CoC's 2008 Housing Inventory Data.

**Exhibit B-3 Change in Quarterly Point-In-Time Count of All Sheltered Clients
(Adjusted for HMIS Coverage), March-June 2009**

Type	Homeless Population	AZ-502		CT-503		DC-500		FL-503		KY-500 ^a	
		Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09
Emergency Shelters	ES- Individuals	1,290	1,303	135	101	2,739	2,284	186	232	639	355
	ES - Persons in Families	386	327	51	79	720	540	46	63	418	517
	ES – Families	106	96	18	24	227	163	22	20	129	194
Transitional Housing	TH- Individuals	292	318	135	144	950	907	191	156	161	279
	TH - Persons in Families	1,041	1,054	80	89	1,577	1,665	115	68	396	892
	TH - Families	328	317	24	25	500	488	39	22	127	275
	Total Sheltered Persons	3,009	3,002	401	413	5,986	5,395	538	519	1,614	2,043
	Total Beds in 2009 HIC	4,184	4,184	425	425	6,773	6,773	573	573	2,030	2,030
	Bed Utilization Rate	71.9%	71.8%	94.5%	97.3%	88.4%	79.7%	93.8%	90.7%	79.5%	100.6%

^a For KY-500, all bed counts are based on the CoC's 2008 Housing Inventory Data.

Type	Homeless Population	LA-502		NY-600		OH-502		VA-500		TOTAL	
		Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09	Mar '09	Jun '09
Emergency Shelters	ES- Individuals	186	190	11,821	11,907	1,111	800	105	149	18,212	17,323
	ES - Persons in Families	25	37	29,059	28,998	54	195	53	59	30,813	30,815
	ES - Families	7	12	8,948	8,984	17	61	22	21	9,496	9,574
Transitional Housing	TH- Individuals	183	167	2,874	2,885	442	488	447	495	5,675	5,839
	TH - Persons in Families	168	199	1,404	1,454	223	232	116	147	5,119	5,799
	TH - Families	60	66	546	565	80	81	44	53	1,748	1,893
	Total Sheltered Persons	561	593	45,159	45,244	1,830	1,715	721	850	59,819	59,775
	Total Beds in 2009 HIC	810	810	46,921	46,921	2,062	2,062	1,020	1,020	64,798	64,798
	Bed Utilization Rate	69.3%	73.2%	96.2%	96.4%	88.7%	83.2%	70.6%	83.3%	92.3%	92.2%

**Exhibit B-4 Quarterly Count of New Clients^a (Adjusted for HMIS Coverage),
April-June 2009**

Type	Homeless Population	AZ-502	CT-503	DC-500	FL-503	KY-500 ^b	LA-502	NY-506	OH-502	VA-500	Total
Emergency Shelters	ES- Individuals	1,813	73	1,539	229	575	245	6,967	471	326	12,238
	ES - Persons in Families	563	126	114	86	294	54	10,375	276	107	11,994
	ES - Families	162	40	34	27	87	21	3,365	81	35	3,851
Transitional Housing	TH- Individuals	92	25	444	106	107	24	693	152	112	1,755
	TH - Persons in Families	305	0	141	37	373	165	532	84	8	1,644
	TH - Families	80	0	41	11	51	52	181	27	3	446
	Total New Sheltered Persons	2,773	225	2,238	458	1,349	488	18,567	982	552	27,632

NOTES:

a. New clients of the participating CoCs are persons who: a) have not received any residential homeless services from an HMIS-participating Emergency Shelter or Transitional Housing provider in the past 15 months (no services in calendar 2008 or the first quarter of 2009); and b) began receiving homeless residential services from one of these providers between April 1 and June 30, 2009.

b. Although The Kentucky Balance of State CoC certified all new client counts in the second quarter, its staff expressed concern that the HMIS-generated total number of new families in transitional housing reported above is an underestimate.

Exhibit B-5 Quarterly Count of New Clients by Household Type (Adjusted for HMIS Coverage), April-June 2009

Type	Homeless Population	AZ-502	CT-503	DC-500	FL-503	KY-500	LA-502	NY-506	OH-502	VA-500	Total
Emergency Shelters	Individual adult males	1,029	43	1,405	160	263	176	4,132	293	289	7,791
	Individual adult females	444	17	274	61	127	69	2,494	183	65	3,733
	Unaccompanied Youth	8	0	1	11	71	1	0	14	0	107
	Adults in families	312	82	48	30	160	19	4,551	80	44	5,325
	Children in families	461	67	73	57	162	34	6,143	167	83	7,248
	Missing this information	5	0	0	0	14	3	0	0	1	23
Transitional Housing	Individual adult males	73	17	206	60	49	3	519	106	49	1,081
	Individual adult females	25	0	86	32	53	18	135	34	13	396
	Unaccompanied Youth	4	0	2	8	0	0	53	1	0	69
	Adults in families	161	0	51	13	286	57	221	32	4	824
	Children in families	247	0	92	24	164	97	319	72	5	1,020
	Missing this information	4	0	0	1	0	10	0	1	0	16
Total New Sheltered Persons	Total New Sheltered Adults	2,042	157	2,070	357	938	342	12,052	727	463	19,149
	Total New Sheltered Children	721	67	168	100	397	133	6,514	254	88	8,443
	Total New Sheltered Persons	2,773	225	2,238	458	1,349	488	18,567	982	552	27,632