



The U.S. Department of
Housing and Urban Development
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

DECEMBER 2017

The 2016 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress

PART 2: Estimates of Homelessness in the United States



Summary of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Foreword	iii
Key Terms	iv

About this Report

Types of AHAR Estimates and Key Data Sources: PIT Count and HMIS	ix
Supplemental Data Sources	x
Data Notes	xi
Broader Perspectives on Housing Instability and Homelessness	xiv
Domestic Violence Survivors in the U.S. Homeless Residential Services System	xiv
How to Use This Report	xvi
Key Findings	xvii
Interpretation of the Findings	xxii

Additional Forms of Homelessness and Housing Instability

American Housing Survey 2013 Doubling Up Supplement	3
Residents Who Have Moved Out in the Past 12 Months	3
Residents Who Have Moved In in the Past 12 Months	4
Data from Local Education Agencies on Children who are Homeless	5
American Housing Survey: Renters with Worst Case Housing Needs and Other Indicators of Housing Instability	6

Section 1: Homelessness in the United States

One-Night Estimates of Homelessness	1-3
By State	1-4
By State and Sheltered Status	1-5
One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Homelessness	1-7
Characteristics	1-8
Geography	1-12
Patterns of Homeless Service Use	1-14
Homelessness by Comparison	1-16

Section 2: Homeless Individuals

One-Night Estimates of Homeless Individuals	2-3
By State	2-4
By State and Sheltered Status	2-5
One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Homeless Individuals	2-7
Characteristics	2-8
Geography	2-12
Patterns of Homeless Service Use	2-14

Section 3: Homeless Families with Children

One-Night Estimates of People in Families with Children	3-3
By State	3-5
By State and Sheltered Status	3-6

One-Year Estimates of Sheltered People in Families with Children	3-9
Characteristics	3-10
Geography	3-14
Patterns of Homeless Service Use	3-16

Section 4: Unaccompanied Homeless Youth

One-Night Estimates of Unaccompanied Youth Homelessness	4-3
By State	4-5
By State and Sheltered Status	4-7

Section 5: Homeless Veterans

One-Night Estimates of Homeless Veterans	5-3
By State	5-4
By State and Sheltered Status	5-5
One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Homeless Veterans	5-7
Characteristics	5-8
Geography	5-11
Patterns of Homeless Service Use	5-13
Homeless Veterans Using Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF)	5-15

Section 6: Chronically Homeless Individuals

One-Night Estimates of Chronic Homelessness	6-3
By State	6-4
By State and Sheltered Status	6-5

Section 7: People in Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

One-Year Estimates of People in PSH	7-3
Characteristics	7-4
Geography	7-8
Residential Patterns People Living in PSH	7-10
One-Year Estimates of Veterans in PSH	7-13
Characteristics	7-14
Residential Patterns Veterans Living in PSH	7-15
Veterans in HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) Programs using Housing Subsidies	7-16

Acknowledgements

AUTHORED BY:

Dr. Claudia D. Solari, Azim Shivji, Tanya de Souza, Rian Watt, and Mark Silverbush, *Abt Associates*.

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS:

Dr. Jill Khadduri, *Abt Associates*.

Dr. Dennis Culhane, *University of Pennsylvania*.

DATA MANAGERS:

Korrin Bishop, Stephanie Mills, and Azim Shivji, *Abt Associates*.

DATA COLLECTORS:

Korrin Bishop, Julia Bradshaw, Molly Brune, Meg Carroll, Kristen Cummings, RJ de la Cruz, Tanya De Souza, Michele DeMars, Alanah Hall, Nomoya Hall, Marissa Hashizume, Thuan Huynh, Tresa Kappil, Kelly Lack, Haleigh Miller, Stephanie Mills, Tyler Morrill, Audra Nakas, Marissa Personette, David Robinson, Benjamin Sadkowski, Maureen Sarna, Galen Savidge-Wilkins, Azim Shivji, Aubrey Sitler, Djaniele Taylor, Bill Villalba, and Rian Watt, *Abt Associates*. Jennifer Roesler and Rachel Sarnacki, *University of Pennsylvania*.

DATA ANALYSTS:

Tom McCall, Azim Shivji, Stephanie Mills, and Tanya de Souza, *Abt Associates*.

REVIEWERS:


Karen Deblasio, William Snow, and Norman Suchar, *The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development*.

Dr. Larry Buron and Dr. Alvaro Cortes, *Abt Associates*.

DESIGN AND PRODUCTION:

Nazhin Beiramee and David Dupree, *Abt Associates*.

Foreword



I am pleased to submit to Congress the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) 2016 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) Part 2, which provides national estimates of homelessness in the United States. This is the second part in a two-part series. Part 1 was published in

November 2016 and is based on one-night national, state, and local estimates of sheltered and unsheltered homelessness. This report furthers our understanding of homelessness in our country by including one-year national estimates of people in shelter along with in-depth information about their characteristics and use of the homeless services system.

HUD has released the AHAR each year since 2007 to give both national- and local-level information needed to track progress toward ending homelessness in the United States. Reflecting a continued national commitment to end homelessness among veterans, this year's report includes new information on the Supportive Services for Veteran Families' (SSVF) rapid re-housing program.

Overall, the report shows a nationwide 10.5 percent decline in people experiencing sheltered homelessness over the course of a year since HUD began tracking this information in 2007. The number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness declined by 16.7 percent since 2009, when HUD began collecting information on this population, corresponding to nearly 25,000 fewer veterans. Based on the 2016 point in time count, the number of veterans experiencing homelessness has decreased by 47 percent since 2010. This is good news but the job is not finished, and HUD and the Department of Veterans Affairs will continue their partnership for preventing and ending homelessness among people who have served their country.

HUD and its Federal partners also will continue to support the efforts of local communities across the nation to end the homelessness experienced by families with children, by transition-aged youth, and by people who have chronic patterns of homelessness. This report provides insights into patterns of homelessness for each of these groups and helps us track the progress made nationally and by different types of communities. By understanding the nature of the problem, we will be in a better position to solve it.

By working together and tackling problems head-on, we can improve the lives of all families and communities across the country, wherever they live. This report shows substantial progress toward ending homelessness. With continued insight and effective partnerships, we can reach out effectively to individuals and families and give them the right type and level of support to move from homelessness and into a life of greater opportunity.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. Carson', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Ben Carson, 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 Individual¹ is 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 with a combined length of time homeless of at least 12 months.

Chronically Homeless People in Families refers to people in families with children in which the head of household has a disability and has been continuously homeless for 1 year or more or has experienced at least four episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years with a combined length of time homeless of at least 12 months.

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 survivors of domestic violence.

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

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.

¹ The definition of chronic homelessness changed in 2016. The previous definition was an individual with a disability who had either been continuously homeless for 1 year or more or had experienced at last 4 episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years.

Homeless Management Information System Data, or HMIS Data, provide an unduplicated count of people who are experiencing sheltered homelessness within a CoC 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 Operations Management Evaluations System Data, or HOMES Data, are data on veterans who use the HUD-VASH program, or HUD- Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing. HUD-VASH programs are required to report data in HOMES, but most do not also provide information to an HMIS.

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 within a community 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 dedicated to serve people experiencing homelessness 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.

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 1st through September 30th of the following year. The 1-year count is derived from communities' Homeless Management Information Systems.

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 age 25 or older 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 PSH are not considered homeless because they are in a permanent housing situation, unlike people in emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.

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 in 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 survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. This term includes rape crisis centers, domestic violence programs and battered women's programs (shelters and non-residential), domestic violence transitional housing programs, and other related advocacy and supportive services programs.



About This Report

Types of AHAR Estimates and Key Data Sources: PIT Count and HMIS.....	ix
Supplemental Data Sources.....	x
Data Notes.....	xi
Broader Perspectives on Housing Instability and Homelessness.....	xiv
Domestic Violence Victims in the U.S. Homeless Residential Services System.....	xiv
How to Use This Report.....	xvi
Key Findings.....	xvii
Interpretation of the Findings.....	xxii

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.

In 2001, the U.S. Congress required that HUD fund communities to implement information systems to track the use of homelessness services, with the understanding that ending homelessness requires knowledge about the size of the problem and the way in which it affects different population groups. Two main HUD efforts supported the development of these systems. The first was the provision of technical assistance on conducting the Point-in-Time (PIT) count by communities, which continues today. The second established a set of standardized data that communities collect about people who use emergency shelters and other components of their homeless services systems, as well as system parameters for how this information is stored locally in Homelessness Management Information Systems (HMIS), secured, and disclosed.

In February 2007, HUD released estimates of homelessness in the U.S. based on PIT counts and one-year HMIS data in the first Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR), which has been submitted to the U.S. Congress every year since then. The AHAR 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 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 2016 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) to Congress, Part 1: Point-in-Time Estimates of Homelessness*, and was published in November 2016. The Part 1 report provides estimates of homelessness based on 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 2016 AHAR builds on the Part 1 report by adding 1-year estimates of sheltered homelessness based on data from 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



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 2016, PIT estimates were reported by 403 CoCs for the sheltered count and by 345 CoCs for the 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 adjusted methods and previous years counts.

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

¹ Some CoCs are given permission to conduct counts outside of the last 10 days of January for good cause.

parenting youth as well as unaccompanied youth. However, producing accurate estimates of homeless youth is challenging and local counting methodologies are still improving. In order to provide communities more time to improve their youth counts and services, HUD and federal partners will use the January 2017 PIT counts as the baseline through which HUD and its federal partners will measure future trends in the number of youth experiencing homelessness at a point in time in the U.S. For the purposes of this year's AHAR, the 2016 youth data are included and are the only year of data reported.

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 into the HMIS of 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 people with chronic patterns of homelessness and only limited data on homeless youth, HUD plans to update the AHAR data collection requirements so that, starting with the 2018 AHAR, the 1-year estimates will provide information on these populations.

For the 2016 AHAR, the estimates were derived from aggregate HMIS data reported by 396 CoCs nationwide, 98 percent of all CoCs nationwide. The data are unduplicated, offering information on 1,022,445 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 (1,421,196 people in 2016).² 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 identified 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 homelessness³ 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 U.S. households living in poverty. 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 for each of the population groups described experiencing sheltered homelessness. 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

² Not included in this estimate, by definition, are people in PSH. The unduplicated raw count of people in PSH is 246,190, to generate a weighted estimate of 370,415 people in PSH in 2016.

³ People served in permanent supportive housing programs are no longer considered homeless.

provides a picture of how people who are homeless differ from, or are similar to, the broader population. This report on homelessness also compares the 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.

In collaboration with the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs (VA), this 2016 report includes for the first time data on veterans using the Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program's rapid re-housing services. This year's report also includes an additional year of data on the veterans who use the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing program (HUD-VASH).⁴ The 2016 AHAR supplements the HMIS data on veterans in permanent supportive housing again this year 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 2016 figures in the report can be downloaded from HUD's Resource Exchange at <http://www.hudexchange.info/>. Those tables are:

1. 2016 AHAR HMIS Estimates of Homelessness.xlsx
2. 2016 AHAR HMIS Estimates of Homeless Veterans.xlsx
3. 2016 AHAR_HMIS Estimates of People in PSH.xlsx
4. 2016 AHAR_HMIS Estimates of Veterans in PSH.xlsx

The AHAR estimation methodology and underlying assumptions for the information presented in this report are consistent with past reports, thus making data comparable over time and across AHAR reports. For more details, the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology can be downloaded from: <http://www.hudexchange.info/>.

⁴ For more information on the HUD-VASH program see: http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/hcv/vash and <http://www.va.gov/homeless/hud-vash.asp>.

EXHIBIT B: Historical Context Surrounding Trends in Homelessness

PIT & HMIS 2007-2016

One Year Estimate of Sheltered Homelessness
HMIS Data



FEBRUARY 2007

HUD publishes the first AHAR to Congress, setting the baseline for tracking homelessness trends.

MAY 2008

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

FEBRUARY 2009

Congress enacted the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, including \$1.5 billion for the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program.

MAY 2009

Congress enacted 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.

JULY 2011

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

SEPTEMBER 2009

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

One Day Estimate of Total Homelessness
PIT Data




2007

2008

2009

2010

2011



AUGUST 2012
Release of the Continuum of Care Program Interim Rule.

1,488,371

1,422,360

1,488,465

1,484,576

1,421,196

JANUARY 2014
HUD and the VA announce Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) "surge" funds to be awarded to 71 communities, redoubling efforts to end Veteran homelessness.

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

MARCH 2015
HUD, VA, HHS RHY, and HHS Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) signed a Memorandum of Understanding that outlined their respective roles and responsibilities regarding the use of HMIS.

JUNE 2016
HUD and the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) release criteria and benchmarks for ending chronic homelessness.

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

DECEMBER 2015
HUD publishes the final rule to establish the definition of "chronically homeless."

621,553

590,364

576,450

564,708

549,928

2012

2013

2014

2015


2016

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 fuller 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 temporarily 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 goal to prevent and end homelessness. Ending homelessness cannot rely solely on programs that are targeted to people 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

National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) data published in 2017 show that about 10 million men and women in the U.S. experienced physical violence by an intimate partner in 2012.⁵ Many people escaping domestic violence seek assistance outside of the homeless services system, but emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing programs in the homeless services system can serve as resources for people in crisis and seeking a safe refuge.

Estimating the number of people escaping domestic violence and accessing the homelessness system can be challenging. The housing and services accessed in the homeless services system by survivors escaping domestic violence may be in projects operated by victim service providers specifically for survivors of domestic violence or in projects available to a broader population experiencing homelessness. Providers targeting a broader homeless population report information on their clients to HMIS, some of whom may be survivors of domestic violence. But programs operated by victim service providers are prohibited by law from reporting personally identifying client information into HMIS.⁶ Thus, the HMIS data used as the basis for the AHAR Part 2 report do not include people staying in domestic violence shelters or in housing programs designated for survivors of domestic violence.

Furthermore, the Point-in-Time (PIT) count, another data source for the AHAR Part 2, makes the reporting of people in emergency shelter, safe havens, transitional housing and permanent housing programs operated by victim service providers optional. Where the information is collected in these locations during the PIT count, it is not collected systematically.⁷

⁵ <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/NISVS-StateReportBook.pdf>

⁶ Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-113s47enr/pdf/BILLS-113s47enr.pdf>

⁷ Based on the 2016 optional PIT count of the homeless population “victims of domestic violence,” 68,464 people were reported as homeless and a victim of domestic violence, with 61 percent located in sheltered

EXHIBIT C: Domestic Violence Beds

by Household Type and CoC Type, HIC 2016

Type	DV Beds	Total Beds	% DV Beds	# of CoCs
Total	56,476	867,102	6.5	403
Beds By Household Type				
Individuals	9,778	453,876	2.2	403
Families	46,698	413,226	11.3	403
Beds By CoC Type				
Major City CoCs	15,650	411,664	3.8	48
Smaller City, County, & Regional CoCs	21,851	332,973	6.6	311
Balance of State and Statewide CoCs	18,338	117,777	15.6	40

Note 1: Total beds include year-round beds from emergency shelter (ES), transitional housing (TH), safe havens (SH), rapid re-housing (RRH), permanent supportive housing (PSH), and other permanent housing (OPH) projects. Beds funded under HUD's Rapid Re-housing Demonstration (DEM) program 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, excluding four CoCs. For Puerto Rico PR-502, the DV Beds, Total Beds and % DV Beds are: 285; 2,716; and 10.5%. For Puerto Rico PR-503, the DV Beds, Total Beds and % DV Beds are: 263; 1,448; and 18.2%. For Guam, these figures are: 41; 306; and 13.4%. For the U.S. Virgin Islands, these figures are: 48; 218; and 22.0%.

Note 3: Of the 403 CoCs, 392 CoCs had any DV beds; 11 CoCs did not have bed inventories targeted to survivors of domestic violence.

A data source that provides reliable information about the number of beds that are targeted to serving survivors escaping domestic violence is the Housing Inventory Count (HIC). The HIC contains information on all the projects and beds in the homeless services system, regardless of funding source, including beds in domestic violence shelters. Thus, the HIC can offer an understanding of what beds and units are available to serve survivors of domestic violence experiencing homelessness at a point in time. The HIC gives a count of the beds, but it cannot identify the number of unique people who were served in those beds over the course of year, as the occupancy of beds and turnover of people in those beds may vary. In addition, survivors of domestic violence may use general beds, so the HIC offers only a limited sense of the housing support system this population may use.

Exhibit C displays the bed counts reported in the 2016 HIC for all projects in the homeless services system that have identified domestic violence survivors as the target population. Exhibit D displays beds targeted to serving survivors of domestic

locations (emergency shelters, transitional housing, and safe havens) and the remaining 39 percent in unsheltered locations.

EXHIBIT D: Domestic Violence Beds

by Program Type, Household Type and CoC Type, HIC 2016

Type	DV Beds	Total Beds	% DV Beds	# of CoCs
Total	56,476	867,102	6.5	403
Total – ES, TH, SH	50,056	411,285	12.2	403
Beds By Family Type				
Individuals	8,773	202,163	4.3	403
Families	41,283	209,122	19.7	403
Beds By CoC Type				
Major City CoCs	13,397	196,604	13.2	48
Smaller City, County, & Regional CoCs	19,493	147,699	12.5	311
Balance of State and Statewide CoCs	16,642	64,693	25.7	40
Total – RRH, PSH, OPH	6,420	455,817	1.4	392
Beds By Family Type				
Individuals	1,005	251,713	0.4	392
Families	5,415	204,104	2.7	392
Beds By CoC Type				
Major City CoCs	2,253	215,060	1.0	48
Smaller City, County, & Regional CoCs	2,358	185,274	1.3	300
Balance of State and Statewide CoCs	1,696	53,084	3.2	40

Note 1: Total beds include year-round beds from emergency shelter (ES), transitional housing (TH), and safe havens (SH), separately from rapid re-housing (RRH), permanent supportive housing (PSH), and other permanent housing (OPH) projects. Beds funded under HUD's Rapid Re-housing Demonstration (DEM) program 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, excluding 4 CoCs (PR (2 CoCs), VI, GU).

Note 3: Of the 403 CoCs with any ES, TH, or SH beds, 391 CoCs had any DV bed; 12 CoCs did not have bed inventories targeted to survivors of domestic violence. Of the 392 CoCs with any RRH, PSH, or OPH beds, 119 CoCs had any DV beds; 273 CoCs did not have bed inventories targeted to survivors of domestic violence.

violence by the type of project, distinguishing beds for people currently experiencing homelessness (including transitional housing, safe haven, and emergency shelter beds) from beds in permanent housing projects.

Based on the bed counts in the 2016 HIC, 56,476 (6.5%) of all the beds in the homeless services system (i.e., emergency shelter, transitional housing, safe haven,

and permanent housing) were targeted to survivors of domestic violence (DV) (Exhibit C and D). Of the beds in emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven projects, 12.2 percent were targeted to survivors of domestic violence, as were 1.4 percent of all rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing, and other permanent housing beds. Less than 12 percent of all DV beds were in rapid re-housing, permanent supportive housing and other permanent housing projects.

Exhibits C and D also show how the share of beds in each Continuum of Care (CoC) targeted to survivors of domestic violence varies by geography. CoCs are divided into three geographic categories: major city CoCs (N=48); smaller city, county, and regional CoCs (N=311); and Balance of State (BoS) or statewide CoCs (N=40).⁸ The share of emergency shelter, transitional housing, and safe haven beds targeted to survivors of domestic violence in smaller city, county, and regional CoCs was 13.2 percent in 2016. The share in major city CoCs was 6.8 percent, and the share in BoS or statewide CoCs was 25.7 percent.

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 2016, shares of the state-level bed inventory for people currently experiencing homelessness that were targeted to survivors of domestic violence ranged from 4.5 percent in Hawaii to 33.9 percent in North Dakota. In addition to North Dakota, seven other states had more than 25 percent of their bed inventory for people experiencing homelessness targeted to domestic violence survivors: New Mexico (33%), Utah (32.1%), South Dakota (28.2%), Missouri (27.8%), Wyoming (27.1%), Mississippi (26.6%), and Arkansas (26.6%).

⁸ 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. Note that the 50 largest cities are contained within 48 CoCs, two of which contain two major cities each (TX-601: Fort Worth/Arlington/Tarrant County CoC; AZ-502: Phoenix/Mesa/Maricopa County Regional CoC). Puerto Rico and U.S. territories are excluded from this classification.

How to Use this Report

The 2016 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 6 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 2016. HMIS data on people who were experiencing sheltered homelessness at some time during the reporting year are also reported in Sections 1 to 3 and 5. 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. Section 5 on homeless veterans includes new information on veterans using the SSVF program's rapid re-housing services.

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 efforts to prevent and end homelessness. Key stakeholders can also identify which household types and homeless populations require more attention in this effort and which groups are improving at a slower rate than others.

Key Findings

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 2016, 549,928 people were experiencing homelessness. This is a 15 percent decline since 2007.
- About a third of people experiencing homelessness (32.1%) were in unsheltered locations, while about two-thirds (67.9%) were in sheltered locations.
- California and Florida had the largest numbers of people experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations (78,390 and 15,361 people). In four states—California, Oregon, Hawaii, and Nevada—more than half of the homeless population was unsheltered.

One-Year Estimates

- In 2016, 1.42 million people used an emergency shelter or a transitional housing program at some point during the year. This is a 10.5 percent decline since 2007.
- Between 2007 and 2016, the proportion of people between the ages of 31 and 50 experiencing sheltered homelessness declined, from 41.2 percent to 33.3 percent, while the proportion of people in shelter ages 51 to 61 increased (from 13.6% to 17.7%) and those age 62 and older increased (from 3.2% to 5%).
- In 2016, adults with disabilities were about four times more likely to be experiencing sheltered homelessness than were adults without disabilities.
- Between 2015 and 2016, sheltered homelessness declined 1.2 percent (12,389 fewer people) in principal cities and declined 12 percent (50,991 fewer people) in suburban and rural areas. This interrupted a longer-term trend in which sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural grew from 23 percent in 2007 to 29 percent in 2015.
- Between 2007 and 2016, the number of adults entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program from unsheltered locations increased 64.3 percent (95,271 more people).

Homeless Individuals⁹

One-Night Estimates

- On a single night in January 2016, 355,212 people were experiencing homelessness as individuals, a 13.9 percent decline since 2007. Almost two-thirds of all people in the one-night count (64.6%) were individuals.
- More than half (55.7%) of all individuals in the one-night count were staying in emergency shelters, transitional housing programs, or safe havens.
- Individuals experiencing homelessness were 4.5 times more likely to be

⁹ 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.



unsheltered than people in families with children. Of people in unsheltered locations, 89.1 percent were individuals.

- Individuals made up more than three-quarters of all people experiencing homelessness in the one-night count in five states: Nevada (92.6%), California (82.7%), Louisiana (79.5%), Alaska (78.7%), and Tennessee (75.8%).
- In seven states, more than half of individuals were in unsheltered locations: California, Hawaii, Oregon, Mississippi, Nevada, Washington, and Florida.

One-Year Estimates

- In 2016, 950,837 individuals experienced sheltered homelessness at some point during the year. This is a 14.7 percent decline since 2007.
- The number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness decreased by 3.7 percent (36,403 fewer people) between 2015 and 2016. This is in contrast to increases seen over the prior two years.
- The number of sheltered elderly individuals (age 62 or older) increased 48.2 percent (21,549 more people) between 2007 and 2016. The share of elderly individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness increased each year for the last 6 years (from 4.1% in 2010 to 7% in 2016).
- In 2016, individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were twice as likely to identify as African American as were individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty (38% versus 18.5%).
- In 2016, almost half of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness were white, non-Hispanic – 45.5 percent. This is double the share of sheltered people in families with children experiencing homelessness who identify as white, non-Hispanic – 21.7 percent.
- Between 2007 and 2016, the proportion of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness with disabilities increased from 40.4 percent to 47.3 percent. This is in contrast to a decline (from 38.9% to 30.5%) in the share with disabilities among individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty.
- The share of the sheltered individuals in cities rather than in suburban or rural areas dropped from 78.7 percent in 2007 to 75.8 percent in 2016. This remains higher than the share of all individuals living in poverty found in cities in 2016, 40.7 percent.

Homeless Families with Children¹⁰

One-Night Estimates

- On a night in 2016, 194,716 people experienced homelessness as part of a family with children. This is a 17 percent decline since 2007. The number of family households in the one-night estimates was 61,265.

- About 35.4 percent of all people experiencing homelessness on a single night were in families with children.
- Of all people counted in family households on a single night, 90.2 percent (175,563 people) were experiencing sheltered homelessness, and 9.8 percent (19,153 people) were in unsheltered locations.
- Since 2007, the number of people in families with children experiencing unsheltered homelessness on a single night in January dropped 65.9 percent representing 37,077 fewer people.
- Oregon was the only state where more than half of people experiencing homelessness in families with children were in unsheltered locations in 2016.
- Of all people with chronic patterns of homelessness in January 2016, 10 percent (8,646 people) were in families. More than a third of people in chronically homeless families (36%) were in unsheltered locations.
- In 2016, 23,210 people (parents and their children) were experiencing homelessness in families with a parent under the age of 25. Only five percent of people experiencing homelessness in families with parenting youth were in unsheltered locations.
- While nationally 35.4 percent of people experiencing homelessness were in families with children, in three states and DC, a majority of the homeless population was in families with children: Massachusetts (13,174 people; 67.2%), New York (51,037; 59.1%), District of Columbia (4,667; 55.9%), and Minnesota (3,672; 50%).¹¹

One-Year Estimates

- An estimated 481,410 people used an emergency shelter or a transitional housing program as part of a family with children between October 1, 2015, and September 30, 2016, a 1.7 percent increase since 2007. These adults and children were in 147,355 family households.
- About one-third of all people experiencing sheltered homelessness during the one-year period (33.9%) were in families with children.
- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of people in families with children using a shelter at some point during the year declined 4.2 percent (22,111 fewer people).
- Families with younger parents are at higher risk of experiencing sheltered homelessness than families with relatively older parents. Adults between the ages of 18 and 30 in families with children were three times more likely to use shelter programs than were adults over 30 who live with children.
- The number of children experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of a family increased only 1 percent between 2007 and 2016, while the number of children

¹⁰ Families with children are households composed of at least one adult and one child under age 18.

¹¹ The share of people in families with children out of all people experiencing homelessness on the one-night count is 50.02 percent, which is more than half.

in families living in poverty increased 13 percent over the same period.

- The share of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness who identified as Hispanic was 25.3 percent in 2016, similar to the share of Hispanics in the U.S. population in families with children (23.9%). The share of African Americans in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness was 51.7 percent in 2016, but this share remains nearly four times larger than in the U.S. population in families overall (13.6%) and two times larger than the U.S. population of families living in poverty (23.4%).
- The disability rate among adults in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (21.9%) is 2.6 times higher than among all adults in families with children in the U.S. (8.4%) and 1.5 times higher than among adults in families with children in the U.S. living in poverty (15%).
- About a quarter of the people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2016 were in large households of five or more people.
- Of adults in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness, 57.6 percent had been in a housed situation prior to entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program. Of those 106,495 adults who were in housing, 72.8 percent had been staying with family (48.1%) or friends (24.7%).

Unaccompanied Homeless Youth

One-Night Estimates

- 35,686 youth (people under 25 years of age) were experiencing homelessness unaccompanied (as individuals) on a single night in January 2016. This is 6.5 percent of the total homeless population and 10 percent of all people experiencing homelessness as individuals. Of all youth experiencing homelessness, 20.9 percent were unaccompanied youth.
- Among unaccompanied homeless youth, 89.3 percent (31,862 people) were ages 18 to 24, and 10.7 percent (3,824 people) were under 18.
- The share of unaccompanied youth ages 18 to 24 in unsheltered locations (46.7%) was slightly higher than the share of all people experiencing homelessness as individuals in unsheltered locations (44.3%).
- Of the 50,001 people ages 18 to 24 experiencing homelessness on a single night in 2016, 19.6 percent are parenting youth ages 18 to 24.
- The 9,800 parenting youth (ages 18 to 24) found on a single night in 2016 make up 12.6 percent of all adults experiencing homelessness in families with children (78,010 people).

Homeless Veterans

One-Night Estimates

- On a single night in January 2016, 39,471 veterans were experiencing homelessness in the United States. This is about 7.2 percent of all people experiencing homelessness and 9.2 percent of all homeless adults. The number of veterans experiencing homelessness declined 46.2 percent since 2009.
- Between January 2015 and January 2016, the number of veterans in unsheltered locations dropped in 33 states and the District of Columbia, totaling 3,486 fewer veterans, and increased in 14 states, totaling 340 more veterans.
- The number of veterans experiencing homelessness declined 17.3 percent (8,254 fewer veterans) between 2015 and 2016.
- Among veterans experiencing homelessness on a single night, a larger share were in sheltered locations in 2016 (66.9%) than in 2009 (59.2%).
- Between 2009 and 2016, 43 states and the District of Columbia had declines in veteran homelessness.

One-Year Estimates

- In 2016, 124,709 veterans used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at some point during the year. This is a 16.7 percent decline since 2009 (24,926 fewer veterans).
- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting period declined 6.1 percent (8,138 fewer veterans). This is the largest one-year percentage decline since reporting began in 2009.
- In 2016, veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were 2.4 times more likely to be between the ages of 51 and 61 than were veterans in the U.S. population (42.9% versus 17.8%).
- Since 2009, more than three quarters of the decline in the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness was among veterans ages 31 to 50 (27,181 fewer veterans). The overall decline in veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness was slightly offset by an increase in the number of elderly veterans (ages 62 or older) experiencing sheltered homelessness, which increased 54.3 percent (7,089 more veterans).
- Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were 3.3 times more likely to identify as African American or black than were all U.S. veterans (38.2% versus 11.4%).
- The disability rate among veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness increased from 53.1 percent in 2015 to 55.4 percent in 2016.

- Three-quarters of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (74.5%) were served in principal cities. In contrast, almost three-quarters (72.3%) of all U.S. veterans were living in suburban and rural areas, as were two-thirds (66.9%) of veterans in the U.S. population living in poverty.
- Though a majority (63.4%) 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 (36.6%) of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were served in transitional housing—either exclusively or in addition to stays in emergency shelters—compared to only 17.4 percent of all people experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- In 2016, 67,581 veterans were served by the rapid re-housing component of the Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program. SSVF is an emergency response program that connects veterans to permanent housing. Most of the veterans served by the program (87.4%) were in households without children.

Chronically Homeless Individuals¹²

One-Night Estimates

- On a single night in January 2016, 77,486 individuals had chronic patterns of homelessness. Overall, 21.8 percent of all homeless individuals were chronically homeless.
- Individuals with chronic patterns of homelessness were 1.5 times more likely than the total population of homeless individuals to be in unsheltered locations. More than two-thirds (68.3%) of chronically homeless individuals were unsheltered compared to 44.3 percent of all homeless individuals.
- Nearly two-fifths (39.3%) of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness in the U.S. were located in California. No other state accounted for more than 8 percent.
- Between January 2007 and January 2016, the number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined 35.3 percent (42,327 fewer people).
- The proportion of individuals who had chronic patterns of homelessness dropped from 29 percent in 2007 to 21.8 percent in 2016.
- Patterns of chronic homelessness dropped between 2007 and 2016 among both individuals found in shelter and those found in unsheltered locations, but more of the decline in chronic homelessness was in unsheltered homelessness.

¹² 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.

People in Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)

One-Year Estimates

- An estimated 370,415 people lived in PSH during 2016. Just over one-third (33.9%) were people in families with children rather than individuals.
- The total number of people living in PSH increased 6.5 percent (22,639 more people) between 2015 and 2016.
- The overall share of women in PSH declined from 47.3 percent in 2010 to 43.7 percent in 2016, but the share in 2016 was still larger than the share of adults using emergency shelter or transitional housing programs who were women (37.1%).
- The share of people living in PSH over age 50 grew from 23.9% to 37.1% (66,408 more people) between 2010 and 2016.
- More than seven in ten adults in PSH (75.3%) had a mental health condition, substance abuse issue, or a dual diagnosis that includes both mental health and substance abuse.¹³
- About one-third of PSH residents (33.6%) were living in suburban and rural areas, while the other two-thirds (66.4%) lived in cities. However, PSH residents were less likely to be located in cities than were people experiencing sheltered homelessness (66.4% versus 73.6%).
- The share of people entering PSH who came from a homeless situation increased from 66.1 to 80 percent between 2010 and 2016. Of the 93,529 more people who entered PSH from a homeless situation between 2010 and 2016, 43.9 percent came from unsheltered locations.
- 90,004 veterans lived in PSH in 2016. Most (91%) were in PSH as individuals rather than as members of a family with at least one child (9.4%). The number of veterans in PSH increased 19.5 percent between 2015 and 2016 (14,673 more veterans).

¹³ The first AHAR was published in 2007 and followed the development of HMIS data standards during the early 2000s. HUD published the original HMIS data standards in 2004, and has made modest changes to the standards since. The first two AHARs covered partial years. The first complete year of data was for 2007 and was published in July 2008.

Interpretation of the Findings

For more than a decade, HUD has submitted annual reports to Congress on people who experience homelessness in the United States. The AHAR is based on a broad consensus that preventing and ending homelessness requires a full and accurate understanding of the size and nature of the problem, both at a point-in-time and on an annual basis. These reports use one-night point-in-time (PIT) count data and Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data.¹³

- To generate the PIT count data, communities count how many people are experiencing unsheltered and sheltered homelessness on one night in late January. These data provide estimates of the number of people experiencing homelessness within a community or jurisdiction, the scale of the need for homelessness services and housing on a given day, and how that need is changing from year to year.
- The HMIS data reported by communities are statistically adjusted to generate estimates of the number and demographics of people who use the nation's emergency shelters and transitional housing projects during a 12-month period. These one-year data document the total number and characteristics of people who experience sheltered homelessness over the course of a year, many of whom experience homelessness for short periods of time and may be missed by data collected one night a year.

Overall, homelessness has declined modestly over the past decade, based on both one-night point-in-time (PIT) counts (a 15% decline) and annualized HMIS estimates (a 10.5% decline). These data have also been critically important in measuring progress toward federal, state, and local goals to end homelessness for families with children, unaccompanied youth, veterans, people experiencing chronic homelessness, and everyone else experiencing homelessness.

Reducing family homelessness is particularly important because of the potentially harmful effects on children from trauma and other adverse experiences for young children at a critical stage of their development, disruption of schooling for older children, and disruptions of parenting. Families experiencing sheltered homelessness are young, with about half of adults ages 18 to 30 (51.3%), and about half of children younger than age 6 (49.6%).

While the HMIS-based one-year estimates show that sheltered homelessness among families with children increased somewhat over the past 10 years (by 1.7%), the last two years have seen declines (by 2.9% between 2014 and 2015 and 4.2% between 2015 and 2016). The patterns over time for these year-long estimates suggest that

family homelessness is somewhat sensitive to economic cycles. Modest increases in numbers of people experiencing homelessness during the Great Recession (2007-2010) were almost entirely made up of people experiencing homelessness as members of families with children rather than as individuals.

In contrast to the small increase shown from the estimates of people in shelter over the course of a year, the PIT count shows a large, 17 percent decline in family homelessness between 2007 and 2016. This decline is almost entirely among families found in unsheltered locations. The number of people in families with children dropped from more than 56,000 in 2007 to about 19,000 in 2016.

In the early 2000s, HUD identified a group with patterns of chronic homelessness—individuals with disabilities and long, often repeated time spent on the street or in shelters. HUD and the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness asked communities to focus on ending chronic homelessness through prioritizing the development of permanent supportive housing (PSH)—a program model with a substantial body of evidence of success for preventing returns to homelessness for vulnerable populations. Communities have increasingly been targeting PSH to individuals with patterns of chronic homelessness. This report shows that the growth of the PSH inventory is continuing, and that between 2007 and 2016, chronic homelessness on a single night dropped by 35 percent. The AHAR has recently included estimates of the number of families who also have patterns of chronic homelessness. Those estimates confirm that most people experiencing chronic homelessness (90%) do so as individual adults who are not accompanied by children.

Substantial resources have been allocated in recent years towards preventing and ending veteran homelessness, including PSH, rapid rehousing, and prevention resources. Those investments helped drive significant progress, with major declines in the number of veterans experiencing homelessness on a single night—a 46.2 percent drop from 2009, the first time data were reported separately for veterans. In fact, HUD, USICH, and the Department of Veterans Affairs have confirmed that 51 communities and 3 states have achieved the goal of effectively ending veteran homelessness, as of September 30, 2017. More than half of all U.S. veterans (54.8%) are 62 or older, and most live with someone else (80.2%), often a spouse. In contrast, few homeless veterans are elderly (16.2%), and virtually all experience homelessness as individuals (98%).

Youth homelessness is a particularly complex phenomenon, as it includes children 18 and under not accompanied by an adult (3,824 people), people ages 18 through

24 who are not accompanied by anyone over age 24 (31,862 people), and parenting youth under the age of 25 (9,892 people). The AHAR now identifies these groups separately because they have service needs that differ from those of relatively older people, as well as differing among the three groups. However, the AHAR estimates may not reflect well the nature of risk and insecurity for “runaway” or “throwaway” youth. For example, youth who have left home may not want to use shelters occupied mainly by people older than they. The point in time counts may miss youth who are in unsafe situations not observed by point in time counts—for example, staying with people who are abusing them or exploiting them.

Nearly two in three people experiencing homelessness did so as individuals in 2016. The AHAR considers an individual to be anyone not in a household with at least one adult and at least one child. Most are homeless alone (98.7%), and individuals make up about two thirds of all people experiencing homelessness. Homelessness among individuals has declined by about 15 percent, based on both the one-year (HMIS) and one-night (PIT) estimates. This overall drop in the number of individuals experiencing homelessness mainly reflects the decline among those individuals with patterns of chronic homelessness. Individuals without chronic patterns of homelessness make up a large percentage of all people staying in emergency shelters over the course of a year. Because of the large number of individuals experiencing homelessness who do not meet the definition of experiencing chronic homelessness, any attempt to reduce overall numbers of people who experience homelessness in the U.S. will need to include prevention and diversion efforts for this group.

Unsheltered homelessness has declined in many communities since 2007, but the decline has been uneven across the United States. Some places have seen increases in the unsheltered population, contributing to a change in the national trend from a gradual 32.3 percent decline between 2007 and 2015 to an increase of almost 2 percent between 2015 and 2016. Not all communities have seen increases in unsheltered homelessness. Among Continuums of Care serving major cities, 27 had increases in the unsheltered homeless population between 2015 and 2016, while 22 had decreases or no change. The increases were heavily concentrated in particular California cities, Los Angeles, San Diego and Fresno. HUD is responding to the recent increase in unsheltered homelessness by encouraging and supporting communities to implement effective strategies for outreach and engagement and to work with institutions and systems of care on “in-reach” strategies, such as discharge planning within foster care, hospitals, detox centers, and juvenile and criminal justice systems. Communities are being encouraged to reduce barriers to

entering shelters and also to move formerly unsheltered people through shelters to permanent housing as quickly as possible.

The AHAR permits us to understand the demographics of homelessness. For example, African Americans are at higher risk of experiencing sheltered homelessness than people identifying as white and not Hispanic, and the difference remains apparent when looking just at people with incomes below the federal poverty level. African Americans make up more than half of the people in families with children using shelters over the course of a year, 51.7 percent in 2016 compared with only 23.4 percent of people in families living in poverty. People identifying as Hispanic make up a share of people in shelters that is similar to their share of the U.S. population as a whole, 16.9 percent vs. 17.6 percent.

There has been some shift over the past decade in the demographics of homelessness. For example, as the baby boom generation has aged, so have individuals experiencing homelessness, with the share of individuals aged 51-61 increasing over time. While still a small share of people experiencing homelessness as individuals, the share who are 62 or older also is increasing and is reflected in the age distributions of individuals living in PSH.

While communities of all sizes face homelessness, populous states and large metropolitan areas drive the national data and trend lines. However, among the 10 most populous states, rates of homelessness—that is, the share of the population experiencing homelessness—differ widely. While homelessness is a complex phenomenon, the state-to-state patterns suggest that housing costs and tight housing markets are important factors in explaining levels of homelessness. For example, California and New York both have high rates of homelessness compared to the national average, Florida is about at the national average of 0.17 percent, while Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina, and Texas have below-average rates. The detail on patterns of homelessness provided by the AHAR can serve as a starting point for communities to examine and understand their local patterns, based on their PIT counts and their HMIS data.

The HMIS provides data on where people were immediately before they entered an emergency shelter or transitional housing program. These estimates can throw light on the nature of homelessness and help shape strategies for preventing homelessness at the national and community levels. For example, most families with children do not go from living in their own housing to entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program. Instead, they are doubled-up—that is, staying with family (44.2% in 2016) or friends (31.7%) Only about one in five (21.3% in 2016)

comes from housing they rented. Similar percentages of Individuals who were housed before experiencing sheltered homelessness were doubled up. Over time, increasing percentages of those people entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs who were already homeless have come from unsheltered locations, an additional 95,271 people entering shelters from unsheltered locations since 2007. This increase in the number of people who have been brought into shelter and out of “street” homelessness is reflected in the overall reductions in people found in unsheltered locations by the one-night estimates, down from 255,857 people in 2007 to 176,357 people in 2016.

This AHAR is the most recent in a series that, over the years, has helped national and local policymakers understand the nature of homelessness, and track progress to prevent and end it. The AHAR shows that efforts to end homelessness at the national and local levels have had some success, but that much more progress needs to be made to achieve goals of preventing and ending homelessness.

Additional Forms of Homelessness and Housing Instability

Introduction.....	3
American Housing Survey 2013 Doubling Up Supplement: Residents Who Have Moved Out in the Past 12 months.....	3
American Housing Survey 2013 Doubling Up Supplement: Residents Who Have Moved In in the Past 12 Months	4
Data from Local Education Agencies on Children who are Homeless.....	5
American Housing Survey: Renters with Worst Case Housing Needs and Other Indicators of Housing Instability	6



Introduction

Individuals and families experiencing homelessness often experience multiple types of housing instability. In addition to the data collected through PIT counts and HMIS are several other important 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.

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.

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>.

American Housing Survey 2013 Doubling Up 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.

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 or 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>

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.

EXHIBIT 1: Reasons Household Members Moved Out of the Respondent's Housing Unit and Where They Moved

	# Housing Units	%
Total	4,421,000	
Reason for Stay		
Lack of money	1,191,000	27.1
Other reasons (not lack of money)	3,200,000	72.9
Asked to Leave		
Yes	320,000	7.3
No	4,089,000	92.7
Reason for Leaving		
Financial	543,000	12.4
Crowding, conflict or violence	250,000	5.7
Other reasons ^a	3,585,000	81.9
Destination		
Moved to the home of relatives/friends	1,084,000	25.3
Moved to homeless situation ^b	13,000	0.3
Moved to treatment program, hospital, or nursing home	67,000	1.6
Moved to jail or prison	17,000	0.4
Moved to foster care	11,000	0.3
Moved to another situation ^c	3,090,000	72.2

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 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 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.⁶

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,⁷ but a quarter went to stay with family or friends rather than to a place of their own. Some household members went to settings that are known to be closely interrelated with experiences of 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 Doubling Up 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.⁸ 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 respondents⁹ 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.

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

⁶ Financial reasons could include the inability to contribute to the housing costs in their host's unit, but it could also include a mover's ability to pay for their own housing.

⁷ This is a small number compared to the number of people staying in shelters at some time during 2014 who were reported by the HMIS to have come from staying with friends or relatives. These numbers are based on different methods of identifying people who become homeless.

⁸ These data and those in Exhibit 2 are based on HUD-PD&R tabulations of 2013 American Housing Survey data. They differ from figures presented in the AHS national summary Table S-07_AO. Table S-07_AO includes both in-movers in the past 12 months who formed entirely new households and those who moved into existing households. Exhibit 2 includes only those who moved into a pre-existing household.

⁹ These questions were asked about the person (or group of people) who moved into an occupied housing unit containing a pre-existing household and who moved in within 12 months prior to the interview. The respondent who answered these questions was a knowledgeable household member age 16 or over, not necessarily someone who recently moved into the existing household.

EXHIBIT 2: Reasons Household Members Moved Into an Existing Household's Housing Unit and the Situation from Which They Moved

	# Housing Units	%
Total	3,269,000	
Reason for Stay in Current Home		
Lack of money	787,000	24.6
Other reasons (not lack of money)	2,416,000	75.4
Asked to Leave Prior Situation		
Yes	170,000	5.3
No	3,025,000	94.7
Main Reason for Leaving Prior Situation		
Financial	599,000	18.7
Crowding, conflict or violence	227,000	7.1
Other reasons ^a	2,371,000	74.1
Place Stayed Prior to Current Home		
Moved from home of relatives/friends	1,056,000	33.1
Moved from a homeless situation ^b	18,000	0.6
Moved from treatment program, hospital, or nursing home	11,000	0.4
Moved from jail or prison	7,000	0.2
Moved from foster care	18,000	0.6
Moved from another situation ^c	2,081,000	65.2

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 such as a park, street, sidewalk, car, or abandoned building.

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

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

Data from Local Education Agencies on Children who are Homeless

Children experiencing homelessness have high rates of acute and chronic health problems, as well as exposure to violence. Their schooling is also at risk. The U.S. Department of Education (DoED) works to improve enrollment, retention in, and successful completion of early childhood, elementary, and secondary education for children who are experiencing homelessness, as well as to assist youth in their transition to postsecondary education.

As part of that effort, DoED collects data from local education agencies (LEAs) about children¹¹ ages 3 through grade 12 who are enrolled in public schools, 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 DoED uses these primary nighttime residence categories to identify a group of students eligible for the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, authorized under Subtitle VII-B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. The purpose of this program is to ensure students have access to the education and other services they need to meet state academic standards. The agency uses these data to determine whether states are providing these children with access to a free, appropriate public education.

During the 2014-2015 school year, 1,261,461 students were living in one of the circumstances that triggers services mandated under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, a 2.8 percent decline from the prior school year (36,775 fewer students).¹² During this school year, 76 percent were living with other people because of housing loss or other economic hardship; 14.4 percent were in shelters, transitional housing, or awaiting foster care placement; 6.5 percent were living in a hotel or motel because of the lack of alternate, adequate accommodations; and 3.1 percent were in unsheltered locations.

¹¹ Some students in higher grades are youth over the age of 18.

¹² The Federal Data Summary: School Years 2012-13 to 2014-15 report on education for homeless children and youth is available at: <http://nche.ed.gov/downloads/data-comp-1213-1415.pdf>. Refer to this report for data quality issues that affect school year-to-school year comparisons and trend information.

¹⁰ Respondents could have interpreted this as either positive or negative financial reasons.

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 ways, noted below. 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.

- 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.
- LEA data include children and youth awaiting foster care placement. HMIS data do not include children who are wards of the state such as those awaiting foster care placements.
- LEA data include children and youth whose primary nighttime residence is in housing of other people due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason. HMIS data on people experiencing homelessness do not include people who are housed outside of the homeless services emergency response system—that is, in shelter other than emergency shelters or transitional housing.
- 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 youth (age 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.

EXHIBIT 3: Number of Enrolled Public School Students in Homeless Situations by Primary Nighttime Residence, the U.S. Department of Education, School Years 2012-2013, 2013-2014, and 2014-2015

	2014-2015	2013-2014	2012-2013
Total	1,261,461	1,298,236	1,202,507
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	181,386	186,265	174,715
Living with other people because of housing loss or economic hardship ^a	958,495	989,844	919,370
Unsheltered locations ^b	39,421	42,003	39,243
Staying in hotels or motels because of the lack of alternative accommodations	82,159	80,124	69,179

Source: http://center.serve.org/nche/pr/data_comp.php. For U.S. Department of Education data about homeless children in your state, please visit: <http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html>

^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.

Between the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years, the number of students in shelters, transitional housing, or awaiting foster care placement declined 2.6 percent (4,879 fewer students). The number sharing housing with other people due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason declined 3.2 percent from the prior year (31,349 fewer students). During the 2014-2015 school year, the number of students whose primary nighttime residence was in unsheltered locations declined from the prior year by 6.1 percent (2,582 fewer students). The number of students staying in hotels or motels because of the lack of alternative accommodations increased 2.5 percent (2,035 more children) between the last two school years, the only category to show an increase.

American Housing Survey: 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.

EXHIBIT 4: Housing Instability for Unassisted Renters with Severe Housing Problems



Source: American Housing Survey data, 2013. The exhibit is reproduced from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Worst Case Housing Needs: 2015 Report to Congress*. Office of Policy Development and Research, April 2015.


In 2017, HUD’s Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) released the sixteenth in a series of Worst Case Needs reports to Congress, showing that 8.3 million renter households fell into the worst-case needs category in 2015.¹³ 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 of 2013 AHS data¹⁴ show that, among renter households with severe housing problems and incomes below 30

¹³ <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/Worst-Case-Housing-Needs.pdf>

¹⁴ https://www.huduser.gov/portal/Publications/pdf/WorstCaseNeeds_2015.pdf

EXHIBIT 5: Perceived Housing Destination of Unassisted Renters if Evicted



Source: American Housing Survey data, 2013. The exhibit is reproduced from U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Worst Case Housing Needs: 2015 Report to Congress*. Office of Policy Development and Research, April 2015.

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.



2016 Homelessness IN THE UNITED STATES

POINT-IN-TIME (PIT)

One-Night Estimates of Homelessness	1-3
By State	1-4
By State and Sheltered Status	1-5

HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (HMIS)

One-Year Estimates of Homelessness	1-7
--	-----

Characteristics of Sheltered Homelessness

Gender and Age	1-8
Ethnicity and Race	1-9
Household Size and Disability Status	1-11

Geography of Sheltered Homelessness

Geographic Location	1-12
Characteristics by Geography	1-13

Patterns of Homeless Service Use Among Sheltered Homelessness

Living Situation Before Entering Shelter	1-14
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns	1-15

Sheltered Homeless Populations Compared to Other Populations	1-16
--	------


2016 Homelessness

IN THE UNITED STATES


Did You Know?

PIT

On a single night in January 2016 **549,928** people were experiencing homelessness



This is a **15% decline** since 2007



More than 1 in 3 people experiencing homelessness are in CA or NY

People experiencing unsheltered & sheltered homelessness

32.1%



67.9%

HMIS

In 2016, **1.42 million** people used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at some point during the year

This is a **10.5% decline** since 2007

1 in 226 people

in the U.S. experienced sheltered homelessness at some point in 2016.



African Americans comprised 42.6% of the sheltered homeless population.

From 2015–2016...

People experiencing sheltered homelessness



▼ **1.2%**

CITIES



▼ **12%**

SUBURBAN & RURAL AREAS

KEY TERM

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

2016 One-Night Estimates OF HOMELESSNESS

On a single night in January 2016, 549,928 people in the United States were experiencing homelessness.

PIT

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 PIT count in shelters (emergency shelter and transitional housing programs) and a street (or “unsheltered”) count at least every other year. The unsheltered PIT count was not required in 2016. Nevertheless, 345 CoCs (86% of all CoCs nationwide) conducted both a sheltered and unsheltered count.¹

On a Single Night in January 2016

- 549,928 people were experiencing homelessness in the United States.
- About a third of people experiencing homelessness (32.1%) were in unsheltered locations, while about two-thirds (67.9%) were in sheltered locations.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The one-night estimate of homelessness declined 2.6 percent, or 14,780 fewer people.
- The number of people experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations increased 1.8 percent (3,089 more people), while the number of people experiencing homelessness in shelter declined 4.6 percent (17,869 fewer people). This is the first time since 2007 that the unsheltered population increased while the sheltered population decreased.

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- The one-night estimate of homelessness declined 15 percent, or 97,330 fewer people.
- This long-term decline was driven mostly by reductions in the number of people in unsheltered locations (79,500 fewer people; a 31.1% drop).
- The 373,571 people experiencing sheltered homelessness on a single night in 2016 is the lowest number in any year since data collection began.

¹ The numbers in this report include the counts for the 58 CoCs that did not report an unsheltered count in 2016 but instead rolled over their prior year's unsheltered count.

Data Source: PIT 2007–2016
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD's Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 1.1: One-Night Counts of Homelessness

PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007–2016




EXHIBIT 1.2: Changes in Homelessness

PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007–2016

Years	Total Homeless People		Sheltered People		Unsheltered People	
	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016	-14,780	-2.6	-17,869	-4.6	3,089	1.8
2014 to 2015	-11,742	-2.0	-9,611	-2.4	-2,131	-1.2
2013 to 2014	-13,914	-2.4	6,353	1.6	-20,267	-10.4
2012 to 2013	-31,189	-5.0	4,543	1.2	-35,732	-15.4
2011 to 2012	-2,235	-0.4	-2,161	-0.6	-74	0.0
2010 to 2011	-13,289	-2.1	-11,227	-2.8	-2,062	-0.9
2009 to 2010	6,850	1.1	235	0.1	6,615	2.9
2008 to 2009	-9,557	-1.5	16,947	4.4	-26,504	-10.5
2007 to 2008	-7,474	-1.2	-5,040	-1.3	-2,434	-1.0
2007 to 2016	-97,330	-15.0	-17,830	-4.6	-79,500	-31.1

By State

On a Single Night in January 2016

- Together, California (21.7%) and New York (15.9%) 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 6.2 percent of the one-night estimate of total homelessness.
- Twenty-five states each accounted for less than one percent of the national homeless population.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- 37 states reported declines in the number of people experiencing homelessness, totaling a reduction of 21,286 people. 13 states and the District of Columbia reported increases in the number of people experiencing homelessness, totaling 6,797 people.
- The number of homeless people increased most in California, where 2,404 more people were experiencing homelessness in 2016 than in 2015, a 2.1 percent increase.
- Florida experienced the largest decrease in homelessness: 2,341 fewer people in 2016 than in 2015, followed by New York, with a decline of 1,898 people.

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- Homelessness decreased in 34 states, totaling 133,839 fewer people. This outnumbered an increase of 36,258 people in 16 states and the District of Columbia.
- California had the largest overall decline in people experiencing sheltered homelessness, with 20,844 fewer people (a 15% drop). New York had the largest increase, with 23,751 more homeless people counted in 2016 than in 2007, an increase of 37.9 percent.

EXHIBIT 1.3: Homeless People in the U.S.

Percentage of National Total in Each State, 2016




EXHIBIT 1.4: Total Homelessness by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
California	2,404	2.1	Florida	-2,341	-6.5
Washington	1,408	7.3	New York	-1,898	-2.2
District of Columbia	1,052	14.4	Illinois	-1,587	-12.0
Colorado	597	6.0	Massachusetts	-1,527	-7.2
Oklahoma	330	8.7	Nevada	-1,345	-15.4
2007 to 2016					
New York	23,751	37.9	California	-20,844	-15.0
Massachusetts	4,481	29.6	Texas	-16,666	-41.9
District of Columbia	3,030	57.0	Florida	-14,510	-30.2
Hawaii	1,851	30.5	New Jersey	-8,419	-48.6
Idaho	498	28.5	Georgia	-6,730	-34.3

Data Source: PIT 2007-2016

Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories

See Part 1 of the 2016 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)

By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2016

- California and Florida had the largest numbers of people experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations (78,390 and 15,361 people). In four states—California, Oregon, Hawaii, and Nevada—more than half of the homeless population was unsheltered.
- In 10 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 RI, NE, DC, MA, NY, IA, and DE, where less than five percent of people experiencing homelessness were in unsheltered locations.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- Unsheltered homelessness increased in 27 states (9,837 more people) and decreased in 22 states and the District of Columbia (6,528 fewer people).
- Florida experienced the largest decline in unsheltered homelessness, with 1,656 fewer people (9.7%), followed by Illinois, with 860 fewer people (31.7%).
- Forty-one states experienced decreases in sheltered homelessness.
- California experienced the largest decline in sheltered homelessness, with 2,287 fewer people in 2016 than in 2015, a drop of 5.4 percent.

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- Florida had the largest drop in unsheltered homelessness (a 44.2% decline; 12,179 fewer people). California had the largest drop in sheltered homelessness over this period, 8,759 fewer people (an 18.1% decline).
- Although California experienced the second largest drop in unsheltered homelessness in the whole period from 2007 through 2016 (12,179 fewer people), its unsheltered homeless population has increased for the last two years in a row.
- The decline in national homelessness between January 2007 and January 2016 was driven primarily by reductions in the unsheltered population experienced in 36 states and the District of Columbia.
- Sheltered homelessness increased in 18 states and the District of Columbia over this period. New York had the largest increase, with 25,480 more people experiencing sheltered homelessness on a single night in January 2016 than in 2007 (a 44.5% increase).

EXHIBIT 1.5: Sheltered Homelessness by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2016 to 2016					
District of Columbia	1,278	18.9	California	-2,287	-5.4
Colorado	477	6.7	Massachusetts	-1,694	-8.2
Delaware	103	11.2	New Jersey	-1,663	-18.2
Oklahoma	88	2.9	New York	-1,467	-1.7
Washington	63	0.5	Michigan	-1,088	-11.5
2007 to 2016					
New York	25,480	44.5	California	-8,759	-18.1
Massachusetts	5,135	37.4	New Jersey	-7,375	-49.7
District of Columbia	3,052	61.3	Texas	-6,668	-29.1
Hawaii	901	33.2	Washington	-4,496	-26.7
Minnesota	574	9.8	Oregon	-3,093	-37.1

EXHIBIT 1.6: Unsheltered Homelessness by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2016 to 2016					
California	4,691	6.4	Florida	-1,656	-9.7
Washington	1,345	18.9	Illinois	-860	-31.7
Oregon	607	8.2	Texas	-578	-7.7
Hawaii	465	12.1	Georgia	-437	-7.5
New Jersey	460	47.2	New York	-431	-10.7
2007 to 2016					
Washington	1,944	29.8	Florida	-12,179	-44.2
Hawaii	950	28.3	California	-12,085	-13.4
Montana	335	113.6	Texas	-9,998	-59.1
Mississippi	323	61.4	Georgia	-5,932	-52.5
Pennsylvania	196	13.3	Arizona	-2,784	-46.2

2016 PROFILE

A TYPICAL PERSON EXPERIENCING SHELTERED HOMELESSNESS WAS:

A Man by Himself

62.9% MEN / 64.8% 1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD



Aged 31-50

33.3%

Black or African American

42.6%

Not Disabled

57.1%

Living in a City

73.6%




Already Homeless

PRIOR TO USING A SHELTER* (42.3%)

Spending 27 Nights in Emergency Shelter



*Shelter refers to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.



2016 One-Year Estimates OF SHELTERED HOMELESSNESS

HMIS

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 adjust statistically for people experiencing sheltered homelessness in programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS—thus providing a complete estimated 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.²

The 2016 AHAR uses data from 396 CoCs (98 percent of all CoCs) and is weighted to represent the entire United States.

Estimate of People Experiencing Sheltered Homelessness in 2016

- The estimated number of people who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at any point from October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016, was 1,421,196.³
- One in 226 people in the U.S. experienced sheltered homelessness at some point during that period.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year declined by 4.3 percent (63,380 fewer people).
- Between 2007 (the year HUD began tracking this information) and 2016, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped by 10.5 percent (167,399 fewer people).

² People served in Safe Havens are included in the PIT estimates but not in these one-year estimates of shelter users.

³ The 95 percent confidence interval for the total sheltered homeless population in 2016 is 1,304,276 to 1,538,116 (1,421,196 ± 116,920).

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2016

1,421,196 people in the U.S. experienced sheltered homelessness at some time during 2016, a 10.5% decrease since 2007.

EXHIBIT 1.7a: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Homelessness, 2007–2016




EXHIBIT 1.7b: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Homelessness and Annual Change from the Prior Year, 2007-2016

Year	Estimate	# Change from Previous Year	% Change from Previous Year
2016	1,421,196	-63,380	-4.3
2015	1,484,576	-3,889	-0.3
2014	1,488,465	66,106	4.6
2013	1,422,360	-66,011	-4.4
2012	1,488,371	-13,825	-0.9
2011	1,502,196	-90,954	-5.7
2010	1,593,150	34,233	2.2
2009	1,558,917	-34,877	-2.2
2008	1,593,794	5,199	0.3
2007	1,588,595	—	—

Gender and Age

Starting in 2015, 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 and 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2016

- Unlike in the U.S. adult population where the proportion of men to women is roughly equal (48.6% of adults versus 51.4%), men greatly outnumbered women among all adults experiencing sheltered homelessness (62.9% of adults versus 37.1%).
- More than one-fifth of people experiencing sheltered homelessness (22.3%) were children (that is, under age 18). Just over 10 percent were youth between the ages of 18 and 24, and 11.7 percent were between the ages of 25 and 30.
- One-third of people experiencing sheltered homelessness (33.3%) were between the ages of 31 to 50, the largest and most numerous age group among all people experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- While 18.3 percent of all people in the U.S. were age 62 or older, this population made up only 4.7 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness.

Changes Over Time

- The gender and age distributions of people experiencing sheltered homelessness remained essentially the same between 2015 and 2016.
- Over a longer period of time, the proportion of people in shelter under age 18 remained relatively stable, at 21.8 percent in 2007 and 22.3 percent in 2016. The proportion of elderly people (ages 62 and over) in shelter increased from 2.9 percent in 2007 to 4.7 percent in 2016.
- Between 2007 and 2016, the proportion of people between the ages of 31 and 50 experiencing sheltered homelessness declined, from 41.2 percent to 33.3 percent, while the proportion of people in shelter ages 51 to 61 increased, from 13.6 percent to 17.7 percent.
- The share of men was larger in 2007 (65.2% men and 34.8% women) than it was in 2016 (62.9% men and 37.1% women). Overall, between 2007 and 2016, the number of men experiencing sheltered homelessness declined by a larger degree (14.2%; 115,008 fewer people) than the number of women experiencing sheltered homelessness (a 5.2% decline; 22,275 fewer people).

EXHIBIT 1.8: Gender

Sheltered Homeless Adults and U.S. Adults, 2007-2016




EXHIBIT 1.9: Age

Sheltered Homeless People and U.S. Population, 2007-2016 (in %)

Age	Sheltered People			U.S. Population		
	2007	2016	2016	2007	2016	2016
Under Age 18	21.8	22.3	22.3	24.6	23.0	22.9
18 - 30	20.5	22.4	22.0	18.1	18.2	18.1
18 - 24	—	11.0	10.3	—	9.9	9.8
25 - 30	—	11.4	11.7	—	8.3	8.4
31 - 50	41.2	33.8	33.3	29.0	26.2	26.0
51 - 61	13.6	17.2	17.7	13.2	14.7	14.8
62 and Older	2.9	4.2	4.7	15.1	17.9	18.3

Note: Prior to 2015, data were collected on people age 18-30. Since then, information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Ethnicity and Race

In 2016

- People who identify as Hispanic were slightly underrepresented in the sheltered homeless population (16.9%) compared to the total U.S. population (17.6%).
- More than three in five people experiencing sheltered homelessness (62.5%) identified as either non-white or white and Hispanic. African Americans alone comprised 42.6 percent of the sheltered homeless population but only 12.7 percent of the total U.S. population.
- White, non-Hispanic people comprised 37.5 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness, compared to 61.5 percent of the total U.S. population.

Changes Over Time

- The share of Hispanics experiencing sheltered homelessness decreased from 17.3 percent in 2015 to 16.9 percent in 2016, while the share in the U.S. population increased from 17.3 percent in 2015 to 17.6 percent in 2016.
- The share of people in the sheltered homeless population who identified as Hispanic declined from 21.6 percent in 2007 to 16.9 percent in 2016 while the share of Hispanics in the total U.S. population increased from 14.8 percent to 17.6 percent over the same period.
- 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 38.5 percent in 2016, their proportion in the sheltered homeless population remained about the same, 63.6 percent in 2007 and 62.5 percent in 2016.

African Americans alone comprised 42.6% of the sheltered homeless population but only 12.7% of the total U.S. population.

EXHIBIT 1.10: Ethnicity

Sheltered Homeless People and U.S. Population, 2007-2016





EXHIBIT 1.11: Race

Sheltered Homeless People and U.S. Population, 2007-2016





Household Size and Disability Status

In 2016

- People experiencing sheltered homelessness were 5.1 times more likely than people in the total U.S. population to be by themselves (64.8% versus 12.8% have a household size of one person).
- Adults with disabilities were about four times more likely to be experiencing sheltered homelessness than were adults without disabilities (one in 85 adults with disabilities was experiencing sheltered homelessness, compared to one in 344 adults without disabilities).

Changes Over Time

- Between 2007 and 2016, the percentage of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of a multi-person household increased from 29.7 percent to 35.2 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 33.9 percent over the same period.
- The disability rate among adults experiencing sheltered homelessness increased from 40.6 percent in 2015 to 42.9 percent in 2016.

Adults with disabilities were about 4 times more likely to experience sheltered homelessness than were adults without disabilities in 2016.

EXHIBIT 1.12: Household Size

Sheltered Homeless People and U.S. Population, 2007-2016





EXHIBIT 1.13: Disability Status

Sheltered Homeless Adults and U.S. Adults, 2007-2016



Geographic Location

In 2016


- People experienced sheltered homelessness more often in principal cities than suburban or rural areas (73.6% versus 26.4%). Neither the total U.S. population (32.5% of whom live in principal cities) nor the U.S. population living in poverty (39.7%) have this high degree of urban concentration.
- Although less common outside of principal cities, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas was still sizeable: 374,718 people.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, sheltered homelessness declined 1.2 percent (12,389 fewer people) in principal cities and declined 12 percent (50,991 fewer people) in suburban and rural areas.
- Between 2007 and 2016, people increasingly experienced homelessness in suburban and rural areas (a 1.9% rise; 7,167 more people) and less frequently experienced homelessness in principal cities (a 14.3% decline; 174,566 fewer people).

EXHIBIT 1.14: Geographic Distribution

Sheltered Homelessness, U.S. Population Living in Poverty, and U.S. Population, 2007-2016



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, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 1.15: Percent Change by Geography

Sheltered Homeless People, U.S. Population Living in Poverty, and U.S. Population, 2007-2016

Population	2015-2016		2007-2016	
	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas
All Sheltered People	-1.2	-12.0	-14.3	1.9
U.S. Population Living in Poverty	-4.0	-4.1	15.8	21.9
U.S. Population	0.9	0.8	8.0	7.0

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, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Characteristics by Geography

In 2016

- The profile of homelessness differed by geography. About a quarter of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas (25.6%) were children, compared to 21.1 percent in principal cities.
- Sheltered homeless people in suburban and rural areas were less likely to identify as African American (33.9%) or to be by themselves (59.3%) than were sheltered homeless people in principal cities (45.8% and 66.7%).
- Sheltered homeless adults in suburban and rural areas were more likely to be women (42%) or identify as non-Hispanic (85.8%) than were sheltered homeless adults in principal cities (35.4% and 82.2%).

Changes Over Time

- While the disability rate among adults experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas remained level in 2015 and 2016 (45.3%), the rate rose in principal cities from 38.8 percent in 2015 to 42.1 percent in 2016.
- The proportion of people experiencing sheltered homelessness who are African American grew in principal cities from 39.7 percent in 2007 to 45.8 percent in 2016.
- The share of elderly people (ages 62 or older) experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities increased from 3.2 percent in 2007 to 5 percent in 2016 and from 2 percent to 4 percent in suburban and rural areas.

EXHIBIT 1.16: Characteristics by Geography

Sheltered Homeless People, 2007-2016 (in %)

Characteristic	Principal Cities			Suburban and Rural Areas		
	2007	2015	2016	2007	2015	2016
# Homeless People	1,221,044	1,058,868	1,046,478	367,551	425,709	374,718
Gender of Adults						
Male	66.0	63.8	64.6	62.4	57.7	58.0
Female	34.0	36.2	35.4	37.6	42.3	42.0
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	23.9	18.3	17.8	13.9	14.8	14.2
Non-Hispanic	76.1	81.7	82.2	86.1	85.2	85.8
Race						
White, Non-Hispanic	33.9	34.1	34.3	44.3	47.6	46.4
White, Hispanic	14.9	11.5	11.4	6.5	11.2	10.3
Black or African American	39.7	45.3	45.8	39.3	31.9	33.9
Other One Race	4.1	4.9	4.4	3.2	4.0	4.0
Multiple Races	7.5	4.3	4.2	6.7	5.3	5.6
Age						
Under Age 18	21.1	20.7	21.1	24.0	26.4	25.6
18 - 30	20.0	22.2	22.0	22.1	23.1	22.0
18 - 24	—	11.0	10.3	—	11.1	10.2
25 - 30	—	11.2	11.7	—	12.0	11.8
31 - 50	41.4	34.5	33.8	40.4	32.2	32.1
51 - 61	14.2	18.1	18.2	11.5	15.0	16.4
62 and Older	3.2	4.6	5.0	2.0	3.3	4.0
Household Size						
1 Person	71.9	67.3	66.7	65.1	57.6	59.3
2 People	8.0	8.2	8.3	8.0	10.4	9.8
3 People	7.7	8.7	9.1	9.9	12.2	11.3
4 People	6.0	7.2	7.3	8.0	9.9	9.4
5 or More People	6.3	8.6	8.6	9.0	10.0	10.2
Disability Status of Adults						
Disabled	31.5	38.8	42.1	52.9	45.3	45.3
Not Disabled	68.5	61.2	57.9	47.1	54.7	54.7

Note: Data were collected on people age 18-30 until 2015, when this information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Living Situation Before Entering Shelter*

Information on where people experiencing sheltered homelessness lived before entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs was asked only of adults.

In 2016

- Prior to entering shelter, about two in five adults were already homeless, about another two in five were living in a housed situation, 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 (44.2%) or friends (31.7%), while about a quarter were staying in housing they either rented (21.3%) or owned (2%). Less than one percent left permanent supportive housing to enter a shelter program.
- Over half of the adults who were already homeless before entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program during the reporting year (51.6%) had been staying in unsheltered locations.
- About a quarter (23.2%) of the adults who entered an emergency shelter or transitional housing program from institutional settings came from substance abuse treatment centers, and 40.9 percent came from correctional facilities.
- Of those *not already homeless* at entry into emergency shelter or transitional housing programs, about two-thirds were housed (68.3%), while one in five (20.2%) were in institutions, and 11.4 percent were in other settings.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of adults who were experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations prior to their entry into a shelter increased 4.8 percent (11,109 more people).
- In 2016, just 61 more adults came to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from institutional settings than had done so in 2015. Reductions in the number of adult individuals coming from substance abuse treatment centers, correctional facilities, and psychiatric facilities were offset by a 15 percent increase (3,576 more people) in the number of adults entering shelters from hospitals.
- Between 2007 and 2016, the number of adults entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program from unsheltered locations increased 64.3 percent (95,271 more people).
- The number of adults who were in a hospital before entering a shelter program increased by 86.5 percent (12,716 more people) between 2007 and 2016.

* Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2016

EXHIBIT 1.17: Places Adults Stayed

Before Entering Shelter* and Change Over Time, 2007–2016

Place Stayed	2016		2015–2016		2007–2016	
	#	%	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
Already Homeless	456,946	42.3	-1,231	-0.3	-37,809	-7.4
Sheltered	221,258	48.4	-12,340	-20.8	-133,080	-18.4
Unsheltered	235,688	51.6	11,109	4.8	95,271	64.3
Housing	425,426	39.4	-30,180	-6.4	-26,183	-5.6
Staying with family	188,150	44.2	-4,103	-2.1	-1,129	-0.6
Staying with friends	134,723	31.7	-13,645	-8.9	20,800	17.6
Rented housing unit	90,806	21.3	-11,690	-11.0	-28,536	-23.2
Owned housing unit	8,531	2.0	-659	-6.9	-17,370	-66.2
Permanent supportive housing (PSH)	3,216	0.8	-83	-2.4	52	1.6
Institutional Settings	125,972	11.7	61	0.0	9,085	7.5
Substance abuse treatment center	29,211	23.2	-1,452	-4.6	-8,548	-22.1
Correctional facility	51,489	40.9	-1,046	-1.9	750	1.4
Hospital	26,484	21.0	3,576	15.0	12,716	86.5
Psychiatric facility	18,788	14.9	-1,017	-5.0	4,167	27.3
Other Settings	71,215	6.6	-25,100	-25.4	-46,525	-38.7
Hotel or motel	43,309	60.8	-3,104	-6.5	-678	0.0
Foster care home	3,200	4.5	275	0.1	-2,451	-0.4
Other living arrangement	24,706	34.7	-22,271	-0.5	-43,396	-0.6

Note: To produce comparable trend information, statistical imputations were applied to missing values in this table. See the 2016 AHAR methodology document for more details.

EXHIBIT 1.18: Places Adults Stayed

Who Were Not Already Homeless

Before Entering Shelter*, 2007–2016 (in %)

	2007	2015	2016
HOUSING	66.5	67.9	68.3
INSTITUTIONS	17.6	18.8	20.2
OTHER	15.9	13.3	11.4



Data Source: HMIS 2007–2016

Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

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

In 2016

- The homeless services system nationwide had 264,629 year-round beds in emergency shelters and 144,749 beds in transitional housing programs. Of the 1,421,196 people experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year, 82.6 percent stayed only in emergency shelters, 13.1 percent stayed only in transitional housing programs, and 4.4 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 (117 nights) for transitional housing clients.
- Only 9.8 percent of emergency shelter clients stayed longer than six months, while about a third (34.6%) of transitional housing clients did so.
- On average, 87.7 percent of emergency shelter beds were occupied per night, while 83.1 percent of transitional housing beds were occupied per night.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of year-round, emergency shelter beds remained stable (189 more beds), while the number of people using emergency shelters (either exclusively or in addition to transitional housing programs) decreased by 46,712 people (3.6%).
- There were 15,035 fewer transitional housing beds available in 2016 than in 2015 (a 9.4% decrease), and the number of people using transitional housing (either exclusively or in addition to emergency shelters) declined by 30,764 people (11%) over the same period.
- Emergency shelter beds served fewer people per available bed in 2016 (5.1 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 2016.
- The average occupancy rates changed modestly between 2015 and 2016, from 89.6 percent to 87.7 percent for emergency shelter beds and from 82 percent to 83.1 percent for transitional housing beds.

EXHIBIT 1.19: Length of Stay

People in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2016

Length of Stay	Emergency Shelter		Transitional Housing	
	#	%	#	%
7 days or less	345,771	28.1	12,329	5.0
8 to 30 days	312,267	25.4	30,776	12.5
31 to 180 days	452,811	36.8	118,221	47.9
181 to 360 days	83,789	6.8	55,105	22.3
361 to 366 days	36,686	3.0	30,270	12.3

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 366 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, 2007-2016

Bed-Use Patterns	Emergency Shelter			Transitional Housing		
	2007	2015	2016	2007	2015	2016
Median # nights	18	27	27	113	115	117
Average # nights	46	68	63	149	149	150
Average occupancy rate (in %)	88.5	89.6	87.7	76.9	82.0	83.1
Bed count	211,451	264,440	264,629	211,205	159,784	144,749
Turnover rate	7.3	5.4	5.1	1.8	2.0	2.0

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 number of sheltered homeless persons by the number of year-round equivalent beds available that year.

EXHIBIT 1.21: Sheltered Homeless Population Compared to Other Populations



All People

The number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in the U.S. in 2016 was larger than the total population of San Antonio, TX.

Number in sheltered population (2016)

1,421,196

Number in comparison population (2015)

1,413,881^a

Comparison Population:
Total population of San Antonio, TX



Children

The number of children experiencing sheltered homelessness in the U.S. was about 96% of the number of children enrolled in the Miami-Dade County public school system.

Number in sheltered population (2016)

340,748

Number in comparison population (2016)

356,480^b

Comparison Population:
Total number of children in the Miami-Dade County public school



^a 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates: https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/ACS/15_5YR/DP05/1600000US4865000

^b <http://drs.dadeschools.net/StatisticalHighlights/SH1516.pdf>



African Americans

The number of people in the U.S. experiencing sheltered homelessness identifying themselves as black or African American in 2016 was larger than the total number of African Americans in Detroit, MI. At 80.1% of the total population, Detroit has the highest share of African Americans of any major city in the country.

Number in sheltered population (2016)

557,937

Number in comparison population (2015)


552,875^c

Comparison Population:

Total African American population of Detroit, MI



^c 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/ACS/15_5YR/DP05/1600000US2622000



Veterans

The number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in the U.S. was more than the combined seating capacity of the football stadiums for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—which together seat 123,192 people.

Number in sheltered population (2016)

124,702

Number in comparison population (2016)

123,192^d

Comparison Population:

The combined seating capacity of the football stadiums for the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard



^d Michie Stadium (Army; 38,000): http://www.goarmywestpoint.com/sports/2015/3/6/GEN_2014010113.aspx?path=football; Navy-Marine Corps Memorial Stadium (Navy/Marine Corps; 34,000): http://www.espn.com/college-football/team/stadium/_id/2426; Falcon Stadium (Air Force; 46,692): <http://www.goairforcefalcons.com/facilities/falcon-stadium.html>; Cadet Memorial Field (Coast Guard; 4,500): <http://www.stadiumsusa.com/stadium/cadet-memorial-field-06320/CGA+Bears>



2016 Homeless Individuals IN THE UNITED STATES

POINT-IN-TIME (PIT)

One-Night Estimates of Homeless Individuals.....	2-3
By State	2-4
By State and Sheltered Status	2-5

HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (HMIS)

One-Year Estimates of Homeless Individuals	2-7
--	-----

Characteristics of Sheltered Individuals

Gender and Age	2-8
Ethnicity and Race	2-9
Household Size and Disability Status	2-11

Geography of Sheltered Individuals

Geographic Location	2-12
Characteristics by Geography	2-13

Patterns of Homeless Service Use

Living Situation Before Entering Shelter	2-14
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns	2-15




2016 Homeless Individuals

IN THE UNITED STATES

Did You Know?

PIT

On a single night in January 2016
355,212 individuals were
experiencing homelessness



This is a **13.9% decline**
since 2007

Individuals experiencing
homelessness were
4.5 times more likely
to be unsheltered
than people in families with children

Individuals experiencing
unsheltered & sheltered
homelessness

44.3% **55.7%**



HMIS

In 2016, **950,837** individuals
experienced sheltered homelessness at
some point during the year



This is a **14.7% decline**
since 2007

47.3% of individuals experiencing
sheltered homelessness had a disability,
2.4 times the national rate
for individuals

Among individuals experiencing sheltered
homelessness **in 2016...**



75.8%
CITIES



24.2%
SUBURBAN & RURAL AREAS

KEY TERM

An **Individual** is a person in a household that does not have both an adult (age 18 or older) and a child. These households include people who experience homelessness alone, as adult roommates, as married or cohabiting couples without children, or in households comprised of multiple children. Unaccompanied youth, including parenting teens, are counted as individuals in this section. A separate section of the report focuses just on youth. In contrast to an "individual," a person in a "family with children" is in a household with at least one adult and one child.

2016 One-Night Estimates OF HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

PIT

This section presents the Point-in-Time (PIT) estimates of individuals who experienced homelessness in the U.S. For the purpose of this report, “individuals” refers to people in households without children under age 18 and people in households with only children under age 18. Although the AHAR refers to this population as “individuals,” people who are experiencing homelessness as individuals may include households with more than one person. Taken together, people experiencing homelessness as individuals and as families with children comprise the entire homeless population.

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. The unsheltered PIT count was not required in 2016. Nevertheless, 345 CoCs (86% of all CoCs nationwide) conducted both a sheltered and unsheltered count.¹

On a Single Night in January 2016

- 355,212 individuals were experiencing homelessness in the United States, 64.6 percent of all people in the one-night counts.
- More than half (55.7%) of all individuals in the one-night counts were staying in emergency shelters, transitional housing programs, or safe havens. Individuals experiencing homelessness were 4.5 times more likely to be unsheltered than people in families with children. Of people in unsheltered locations, 89.1 percent were individuals.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The total number of individuals experiencing homelessness declined by nearly one percent (0.9%; 3,210 fewer people).
- The number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness decreased 3.7 percent (7,608 fewer people) after also decreasing between 2014 and 2015. The number of unsheltered individuals experiencing homelessness increased 2.9 percent (4,398 additional people) after also increasing in the prior year.

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- The number of individuals who were experiencing homelessness on a single night in January dropped by 13.9 percent (57,488 fewer people).
- The unsheltered population decreased 21.3 percent (42,423 fewer individuals), and the sheltered population decreased 7.1 percent (15,065 fewer individuals).

¹ The numbers in this report include the counts for the 58 CoCs that did not report an unsheltered count in 2016 but instead rolled over their prior year's unsheltered count.

Data Source: PIT 2007–2016
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories

See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD's Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.

In 2016, 355,212 individuals were experiencing homelessness on a single night in the U.S., a 13.9% decline since 2007.

EXHIBIT 2.1: One-Night Counts of Homeless Individuals
PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007-2016




EXHIBIT 2.2: Change in Homeless Individuals
PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007-2016

Years	Total Homeless Individuals		Sheltered Individuals		Unsheltered Individuals	
	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016	-3,210	-0.9	-7,608	-3.7	4,398	2.9
2014 to 2015	-1,767	-0.5	-3,532	-1.7	1,765	1.2
2013 to 2014	-7,985	-2.2	6,021	3.0	-14,006	-8.5
2012 to 2013	-13,982	-3.7	3,968	2.0	-17,950	-9.8
2011 to 2012	-5,457	-1.4	-6,675	-3.2	1,218	0.7
2010 to 2011	-7,527	-1.9	-6,384	-3.0	-1,143	-0.6
2009 to 2010	3,009	0.8	-3,777	-1.7	6,786	3.9
2008 to 2009	-12,394	-3.1	11,140	5.4	-23,534	-11.8
2007 to 2008	-8,175	-2.0	-8,218	-3.9	43	0.0
2007 to 2016	-57,488	-13.9	-15,065	-7.1	-42,423	-21.3

By State

On a Single Night in January 2016

- More than a quarter (27.8%) of 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 (10.1%) and Florida (6.9%).
- Individuals made up more than three-quarters of all people experiencing homelessness in the one-night count in five states: Nevada (92.6%), California (82.7%), Louisiana (79.5%), Alaska (78.7%), and Tennessee (75.8%). Individuals were more than half of all people experiencing homelessness in all but three states.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- While nationally the number of individuals experiencing homelessness remained largely unchanged, this population declined in 28 states and the District of Columbia.
- Florida had the largest decrease in the number of individuals experiencing homelessness, with 2,124 fewer people (an 8.1% change), while California experienced the largest increase, with 4,504 more people (a 4.8% change).

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- The number of individuals experiencing homelessness dropped in 26 states and the District of Columbia. California had the largest decline, with 13,292 fewer people (a 12% decline). Texas (10,347 fewer people; 39.3% decline) and Florida (8,839 fewer people; 26.8% decline) also experienced large decreases over the period.
- Twenty-four states had an increase in the number of individuals experiencing homelessness. New York alone accounted for over half (52.4%) of this increase, with 7,259 additional people.

EXHIBIT 2.3: Homeless Individuals in the U.S.

Percentage of National Total in Each State, 2016




EXHIBIT 2.4: Total Homeless Individuals by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
California	4,504	4.8	Florida	-2,124	-8.1
Washington	1,374	11.0	Illinois	-1,166	-14.3
Colorado	721	12.6	Nevada	-1,005	-12.8
Missouri	376	10.9	New York	-820	-2.3
Hawaii	283	6.6	North Carolina	-760	-10.6
2007 to 2016					
New York	7,259	25.9	California	-13,292	-12.0
Hawaii	1,255	37.6	Texas	-10,347	-39.3
Washington	611	4.6	Florida	-8,839	-26.8
Wisconsin	483	20.1	New Jersey	-3,432	-38.3
Missouri	474	14.2	Arizona	-3,361	-33.5

Note: Figures from 2007 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

Data Source: PIT 2007-2016
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2016 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)

By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2016

- Nearly half (48.1%) of all unsheltered individuals in the U.S. were in California. Three in four individuals experiencing homelessness in California (75.7%) were in unsheltered locations.
- In six other states, more than half of all individuals experiencing homelessness were in unsheltered locations: HI, OR, MS, NV, WA, and FL.
- In contrast, more than 90 percent of individuals experiencing homelessness were in sheltered rather than unsheltered locations in the District of Columbia and six states: RI, NE, DE, ME, IA, and NY.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The largest increases in the number of individuals counted in emergency shelters, transitional housing programs, and safe havens were in Colorado (613 people; a 16.4% increase) and Missouri (190 people; a 7.2% increase). California had the largest drop, with 1,123 fewer individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness (a 4.5% decrease).
- Florida experienced the largest decline in unsheltered individuals (1,732 fewer people). California and Washington both had substantial increases in unsheltered individuals, but Washington had a larger percent increase (18.7%) than did California (8.2%).

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- New York had the largest increase in individuals counted in sheltered locations (8,886 more people), followed by Minnesota (721 more people) and Wisconsin (424 more people).
- California had the largest decline in sheltered individuals (6,777 fewer people) since 2007, while Florida had the largest decline in unsheltered individuals (7,708 fewer people) over the same period.

EXHIBIT 2.5: Sheltered Homeless Individuals by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
Colorado	613	16.4	California	-1,123	-4.5
Missouri	190	7.2	New Jersey	-1,106	-20.9
Washington	189	3.0	Nevada	-709	-19.4
Nebraska	182	11.4	Ohio	-700	-10.6
Rhode Island	149	22.1	North Carolina	-690	-12.8
2007 to 2016					
New York	8,886	38.8	California	-6,777	-22.2
Minnesota	721	33.1	Texas	-3,804	-29.0
Wisconsin	424	20.5	New Jersey	-2,847	-40.5
South Carolina	310	15.3	Washington	-1,724	-21.2
Ohio	298	5.3	Massachusetts	-1,489	-20.7

Note: Figures from 2007 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

Exhibit 2.6: Unsheltered Homeless Individuals by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
California	5,627	8.2	Florida	-1,732	-12.1
Washington	1,185	18.7	Illinois	-793	-31.1
New Jersey	457	51.0	New York	-441	-11.1
Arizona	371	13.6	Georgia	-439	-8.9
Oregon	308	5.7	Texas	-387	-5.5
2007 to 2016					
Washington	2,335	45.1	Florida	-7,708	-38.0
Nevada	1,078	38.0	Texas	-6,543	-49.6
Hawaii	1,073	48.0	California	-6,515	-8.1
Louisiana	289	35.3	Arizona	-2,502	-44.7
Alaska	267	156.1	Georgia	-2,298	-33.9

Note: Figures from 2007 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

2016 PROFILE

A TYPICAL INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCING SHELTERED HOMELESSNESS WAS:

A Man by Himself

71.2% MALE / 97.8% 1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD



Aged 31-50

41.4%

White, Non-Hispanic

45.5%

Not Disabled

52.7%

Living in a City

75.8%




Already Homeless

PRIOR TO USING A SHELTER* (44.2%)

Spending 21 Nights in Emergency Shelter



*Shelter refers to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.



2016 One-Year Estimates OF SHELTERED HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

950,837 individuals experienced sheltered homelessness at some time during the 2016 reporting year.

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 adjust statistically for people experiencing sheltered homelessness in shelter programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS—thus providing a complete estimated 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.²

Estimate of Individuals Experiencing Sheltered Homelessness in 2016

- An estimated 950,837 individuals used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at some time between October 1, 2015, and September 30, 2016.³

Changes Over Time

- The number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness decreased by 3.7 percent (36,403 fewer people) between 2015 and 2016. This is in contrast to increases seen over the prior two years.
- Between 2007 and 2016, the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped by 164,217 people, or 14.7 percent.

EXHIBIT 2.7a: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Individuals, 2007–2016




Exhibit 2.7b: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Individuals and Annual Change from the Prior Year, 2007–2016

Year	Estimate	# Change from Previous Year	% Change from Previous Year
2016	950,837	-36,403	-3.7
2015	987,239	3,112	0.3
2014	984,127	41,111	4.4
2013	943,017	-26,642	-2.7
2012	969,659	-14,810	-1.5
2011	984,469	-58,773	-5.6
2010	1,043,242	8,583	0.8
2009	1,034,659	-57,953	-5.3
2008	1,092,612	-22,442	-2.0
2007	1,115,054	—	—

² People served in Safe Havens are included in the PIT estimates but not in these one-year estimates of sheltered homelessness.

³ The 95 percent confidence interval for the estimate is 852,127 to 1,049,547 (950,837 +/- 98,710).

Gender and Age

Starting in 2015, 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 and 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2016

- More than two-thirds of adult individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were men (71.2%). In contrast, less than half (46.5%) of individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty were men.
- Of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness, 10.8 percent (101,887 people) were between ages 18 and 24, and 12.2 percent (115,175 people) were ages 25 to 30.
- Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were twice as likely to be between the ages of 31 and 50 than were individuals in the U.S. population.
- Elderly individuals (ages 62 or older) made up just 7 percent of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness, a far lower share than for individuals in the U.S. population of individuals living in poverty (25.9%) and the overall U.S. population of individuals (33.4%).

The share of elderly individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness increased each year for the last 6 years, from 4.1% in 2010 to 7% in 2016.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of children (under age 18) experiencing sheltered homelessness who were not part of a family (that is, they were without adults) increased by 11 percent (2,407 more children).
- Although the number of adult men experiencing sheltered homelessness as individuals declined by 15.3 percent (118,790 fewer people) between 2007 and 2016, men continued to make up the vast majority (71.2%) of adult individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- Among individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness, that largest share continues to be age group 31-50. However, the share in that age group dropped by 31.1 percent since 2007, from 51.9 percent in 2007 to 41.4 percent in 2016.
- The number of sheltered elderly individuals age 62 or older increased by 48.2 percent (21,549 more people) between 2007 and 2016. The share of elderly individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness increased each year for the last 6 years (from 4.1% in 2010 to 7% in 2016).

EXHIBIT 2.8: Gender

Sheltered Adults Individuals and U.S. Adult Individuals, 2007-2016




EXHIBIT 2.9: Age

Sheltered Individuals and U.S. Individuals, 2007-2016 (in %)

Age	Sheltered Individuals			U.S. Individuals		
	2007	2015	2016	2007	2015	2016
Under Age 18	4.8	2.2	2.6	0.2	0.1	0.1
18 - 30	20.3	23.6	22.9	22.0	22.2	22.2
18 - 24	—	11.7	10.8	—	12.6	12.4
25 - 30	—	11.8	12.2	—	9.7	9.9
31 - 50	51.9	42.5	41.4	25.4	21.3	21.0
51 - 61	18.9	25.4	26.1	22.7	23.4	23.2
62 and Older	4.1	6.3	7.0	29.7	32.9	33.4

Note: Prior to 2015, data were collected on people age 18-30. Since then, information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Ethnicity and Race

In 2016

- Of sheltered homeless individuals, 12.5 percent identified their ethnicity as Hispanic, a smaller share than among U.S. individuals living in poverty (14.6%).
- Almost half of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness identified themselves as white and not Hispanic (45.5%), with 8.5 percent identifying as white and Hispanic. Nearly 4 in 10 (38%) were African American or black. Other races include American Indian or Alaska Native (2.7%), Asian (0.9%), and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (0.7%).
- Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were twice as likely to identify as African American as were individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty (38% versus 18.5%).

Almost half of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness were white, non-Hispanic – 45.5%.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness identifying as Hispanic decreased by 5.6 percent (6,908 fewer people), even though this group increased by 4.9 percent in the total U.S. population.
- The share of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness identifying as African American or black increased slightly, from 37.2 percent in 2015 to 38 percent in 2016. Among individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty, the share identifying as African American or black declined from 18.9 percent in 2015 to 18.5 percent in 2016.
- The number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness who identified themselves as not white or as white and Hispanic declined 12.1 percent (69,409 fewer people) between 2007 and 2016.

EXHIBIT 2.10: Ethnicity

Sheltered Individuals and U.S. Individuals, 2007-2016





EXHIBIT 2.11: Race

Sheltered Individuals and U.S. Individuals, 2007-2016





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 2016

- Almost all (97.8%) individuals were experiencing sheltered homelessness by themselves. In the U.S. population of individuals, in contrast, most (74.8%) are in households with two or more people.
- Nearly half (47.3%) of adult individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness had a disability. This is about two and a half times the rate among individuals in the U.S. population (19.6%) and 1.6 times the rate for individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty (30.5%).


Changes Over Time

- The share of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness with other people increased from 0.4 percent in 2007 to 2.3 percent in 2016.
- Between 2007 and 2016, the proportion of sheltered individuals experiencing homelessness with disabilities increased from 40.4 percent to 47.3 percent. This is in contrast to a decline (from 38.9% to 30.5%) in the share with disabilities among individuals in the U.S. population living in poverty.

47.3% of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness had a disability, about 2.4 times the national rate for individuals.

EXHIBIT 2.12: Household Size


Sheltered Individuals and U.S. Individuals, 2007-2016



Note: a) 0.0% for 5 or more people; b) 0.0% for 4 people, 5 or more people; c) 0.0% for 3 people, 4 people

EXHIBIT 2.13: Disability Status

Sheltered Adult Individuals and U.S. Adult Individuals, 2007-2016



Geographic Location

In 2016


- Three-quarters (75.8%) of individuals who experienced sheltered homelessness (720,315 people) were located in principal cities. The remaining one-quarter (24.2%; 230,522 people) were in suburban and rural areas.
- Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness were 1.9 times more likely to be in cities than were individuals living in poverty (75.8% versus 40.7%) and 2.3 times more likely than individuals in the U.S. population (75.8% versus 33.2%).

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness declined less in cities (a 1.9% drop; 13,879 fewer people) than in suburban and rural areas (an 8.9% drop; 22,523 fewer people).
- Between 2007 and 2016, the number of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped 18 percent (157,659 fewer people) in cities and just 2.7 percent (6,468 fewer 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 75.8 percent in 2016.

EXHIBIT 2.14: Geographic Distribution

Sheltered Individuals, U.S. Individuals Living in Poverty, and U.S. Individuals, 2007-2016



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, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 2.15: Percent Change by Geography

Sheltered Individuals, U.S. Individuals Living in Poverty, and U.S. Individuals, 2007-2016

Population	2015-2016		2007-2016	
	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas
Sheltered Individuals	-1.9	-8.9	-18.0	-2.7
U.S. Individuals Living in Poverty	-2.7	-2.6	27.0	26.3
U.S. Individuals	1.6	1.4	16.2	14.3

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, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Characteristics by Geography

In 2016

- Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas were more likely to be women than those in cities (32.9% versus 27.5%).
- Elderly individuals (age 62 or older) used shelters in cities and suburban and rural areas at about the same rate (7.2% versus 6.4%).
- 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 45.8%).
- 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 (46.4% versus 50.1%).

Changes Over Time

- Between 2007 and 2016, the share of elderly individuals (age 62 or over) experiencing sheltered homelessness increased from 4.4 percent to 7.2 percent (13,824 more people) in cities, and from 3 percent to 6.4 percent (7,726 more people) in suburban and rural areas.
- While the share of sheltered adult individuals with a disability in suburban and rural areas declined 9.2 percentage points from 2007 (59.3%) to 2016 (50.1%), their share increased 12.3 percentage points in cities (from 34.1% to 46.4%). This geographic trend continued between 2015 and 2016.

Individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas were more likely to be women than those in cities (32.9% vs. 27.5%).

EXHIBIT 2.16: Characteristics by Geography

Sheltered Homeless Individuals, 2007-2016 (in %)

Characteristic	Principal Cities			Suburban and Rural Areas		
	2007	2015	2016	2007	2015	2016
# Homeless Individuals	877,974	734,194	720,315	236,990	253,045	230,522
Gender of Adults						
Male	73.8	71.3	72.5	71.1	67.7	67.1
Female	26.2	28.7	27.5	29.0	32.3	32.9
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	23.4	13.8	13.1	14.5	10.1	10.7
Non-Hispanic	76.6	86.3	86.9	85.5	89.9	89.3
Race						
White, Non-Hispanic	39.7	42.6	42.6	52.8	56.9	54.2
White, Hispanic	16.0	9.1	8.8	7.5	7.4	7.7
Black or African American	33.6	40.1	40.5	31.6	28.9	30.4
Other One Race	2.8	4.9	4.5	3.0	3.3	3.5
Multiple Races	7.9	3.4	3.6	5.1	3.5	4.2
Age						
Under Age 18	5.3	2.3	2.5	3.3	2.2	2.9
18 - 30	19.4	23.0	22.7	23.8	25.3	23.6
18 - 24	—	11.5	10.6	—	12.4	11.2
25 - 30	—	11.5	12.1	—	12.9	12.4
31 - 50	51.6	42.6	41.6	53.0	42.2	40.9
51 - 61	19.4	25.6	26.0	17.0	24.7	26.3
62 and Older	4.4	6.6	7.2	3.0	5.6	6.4
Household Size						
1 Person	99.8	98.2	97.8	98.9	98.0	97.8
2 People	0.2	1.7	2.0	0.8	1.9	2.1
3 People	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.1
4 People	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 or More People	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Disability Status of Adults						
Disabled	34.1	42.5	46.4	59.3	51.3	50.1
Not Disabled	66.0	57.5	53.6	40.7	48.7	49.9

Note: Data were collected on people age 18-30 until 2015, when this information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Living Situation Before Entering Shelter*

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

In 2016

- Prior to entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs in 2016, 44.2 percent of adult individuals were already homeless, while 35.7 percent came from some kind of housing arrangement. The remaining individuals came from institutional settings (13.7%) or other settings (6.4%).
- Of the 322,558 adult individuals who came into emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from a housed situation, 42.9 percent had been staying with family, 34 percent with friends, and 20 percent in housing they rented. Only 2.2 percent had been in housing they owned, and 0.9 percent had been staying in permanent supportive housing.
- Of the 123,977 adults who came into emergency shelter or transitional housing programs as individuals from an institutional setting, 41.3 percent came from a correctional facility.
- Of the adult individuals who were not already homeless before entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs, almost two-thirds (64%) came from housing, about a quarter (24.6%) from institutional settings, and the rest (11.4%) from other settings such as motels.

Changes Over Time

- Out of all adult individuals entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs, the share that came from rental housing units declined from 10.1 percent in 2007 to 7.1 percent in 2016. In contrast, the share that came from staying with friends increased from 9.1 percent in 2007 to 12.1 percent in 2016.
- In 2016, just 166 fewer adult individuals came to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from institutional settings than had done so in 2015. Reductions in the number of adult individuals coming from other institutional settings were offset by a 15.4 percent increase (3,618 more people) in the number of adult individuals entering shelters from hospitals.
- The number of adult individuals who entered emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from unsheltered locations increased by 59.1 percent, or 83,656 individuals, between 2007 and 2016, while those coming from other shelter programs declined by 20.6 percent (133,091 fewer individuals).
- In 2016 compared to 2007, 12,852 more people (an 89.9% increase) were staying in a hospital and 4,147 more people (a 26.9% increase) were staying in a psychiatric facility before entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.
- While the number of adult individuals coming into emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from other settings declined by 34.9 percent between 2007 and 2016, the number coming from a hotel or motel increased by 36.7 percent (8,801 more people) over the same period.

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2016

EXHIBIT 2.17: Places Adult Individuals Stayed Before Entering Shelter* and Change Over Time, 2007-2016

Place Stayed	2016		2015-2016		2007-2016	
	#	%	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
Already Homeless	399,985	44.2	1,890	0.5	-49,435	-10.7
Sheltered	182,116	45.5	-7,061	-22.2	-133,091	-20.6
Unsheltered	217,869	54.5	8,951	4.1	83,656	59.1
Housing	322,558	35.7	-27,662	-7.6	-23,049	-6.4
Staying with family	138,495	42.9	-7,417	-4.9	-6,111	-4.1
Staying with friends	109,644	34.0	-11,947	-9.5	26,624	30.6
Rented housing unit	64,403	20.0	-7,842	-10.4	-31,593	-31.9
Owned housing unit	7,023	2.2	-346	-4.5	-12,598	-63.2
Permanent supportive housing (PSH)	2,993	0.9	-110	-3.4	629	25.0
Institutional Settings	123,977	13.7	-166	-0.1	9,599	8.1
Substance abuse treatment center	27,637	22.3	-1,671	-5.5	-8,090	-22.1
Correctional facility	51,230	41.3	-1,128	-2.1	690	1.3
Hospital	26,216	21.1	3,618	15.4	12,852	89.9
Psychiatric facility	18,894	15.2	-985	-4.8	4,147	26.9
Other Settings	57,737	6.4	-22,757	-27.5	-32,132	-34.9
Hotel or motel	31,738	55.0	-2,292	-6.5	8,801	36.7
Foster care home	3,082	5.3	282	9.7	-2,604	-45.0
Other living arrangement	22,917	39.7	-20,747	-46.3	-38,329	-61.5

Note: To produce comparable trend information, statistical imputations were applied to missing values in this table. See the 2016 AHAR methodology document for more details.

EXHIBIT 2.18: Places Adult Individuals Stayed

Who Were Not Already Homeless
Before Entering Shelter*, 2007-2016 (in %)

	2007	2015	2016
HOUSING	64.3	63.9	64.0
INSTITUTIONS	20.4	22.7	24.6
OTHER	15.3	13.4	11.4

Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

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

In 2016

- The homeless services system nationwide had 131,106 year-round beds for individuals in emergency shelters and 69,150 year-round beds for individuals in transitional housing programs. Of the 950,837 individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year, 84.7 percent stayed in emergency shelters only, 11.2 percent stayed in transitional housing programs only, and 4.1 percent used both emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
- During the 12-month reporting period, one-third (34.1%) of individuals using emergency shelters stayed one week or less, 60.4 percent stayed one month or less, and 6.5 percent stayed more than six months.
- In contrast, within the reporting year, half (49.5%) of individuals using transitional housing programs stayed between one and six months, 20 percent stayed one month or less, and 30.5 percent stayed more than six months.
- The median length of stay for individuals in emergency shelter was 21 nights, with 6.3 individuals served per bed throughout the year. On average, 85.5 percent of emergency shelter beds were occupied per night.
- The median length of stay for individuals in transitional housing programs was 103 nights, or over three months, with 2.2 individuals served per bed throughout the year. On average, 84.9 percent of transitional housing beds were occupied per night.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the average occupancy rate for emergency shelter beds decreased from 87 percent to 85.5 percent, while the turnover rate decreased from about 7 individuals served per bed throughout the year to about 6 individuals served per bed throughout the year.
- The average number of nights an individual stayed in emergency shelter decreased from 56 nights in 2015 to 50 nights in 2016.
- Between 2007 and 2016, the median number of nights in emergency shelter increased from 14 to 21, and the average number increased from 38 to 50.
- Between 2015 and 2016, the median number of nights in transitional housing slightly increased from 101 to 103, while the average number of nights remained steady at 138.

EXHIBIT 2.19: Length of Stay

Individuals in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2016

Length of Stay	Emergency Shelter		Transitional Housing	
	#	%	#	%
7 days or less	286,519	34.1	8,260	5.7
8 to 30 days	221,114	26.3	20,723	14.3
31 to 180 days	279,086	33.2	71,660	49.5
181 to 360 days	40,789	4.9	28,375	19.6
361 to 366 days	13,298	1.6	15,777	10.9

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 366 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, 2007-2016

Bed-Use Patterns	Emergency Shelter			Transitional Housing		
	2007	2015	2016	2007	2015	2016
Median # nights	14	22	21	91	101	103
Average # nights	38	56	50	130	138	138
Average occupancy rate (in %)	90.2	87.0	85.5	80.7	82.5	84.9
Bed count	113,164	131,433	131,106	99,837	76,091	69,150
Turnover rate	8.9	6.7	6.3	2.1	2.2	2.2

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.



2016 Homeless Families with Children IN THE UNITED STATES

POINT-IN-TIME (PIT)

One-Night Estimates of Homeless Families with Children	3-3
By State	3-5
By State and Sheltered Status	3-6

HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (HMIS)

One-Year Estimates of Homeless Families with Children	3-9
---	-----

Characteristics of Sheltered Families with Children


Gender and Age	3-10
Ethnicity and Race	3-11
Household Size and Disability Status	3-13

Geography of Sheltered Families with Children

Geographic Location	3-14
Characteristics by Geography	3-15

Patterns of Homeless Service Use Among Sheltered Families with Children

Living Situation Before Entering Shelter	3-16
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns	3-17



2016 Homeless Families with Children

IN THE UNITED STATES

Did You Know?

PIT

On a single night in January 2016, **194,716** people were experiencing homelessness as part of families with children 

This is a **17% decline** since 2007 

Of people in families with children experiencing homelessness at least **90%** were in sheltered locations in more than **half** of all states & D.C.

People in families with children in unsheltered & sheltered locations

9.8%  **90.2%**

HMIS

In 2016, **481,410** people in families with children experienced sheltered homelessness at some point during the year 

This is a **1.7% increase** since 2007 

About **3 in 5 people** experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of a family were children 

Between 2015–2016, the number of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness

 **▲ 2.2%** CITIES

 **▼ 16%** SUBURBAN & RURAL AREAS

KEY TERM

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.

Chronically Homeless People in Families are people in families with children 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 where the combined length of time homeless in those occasions is at least 12 months.

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

2016 One-Night Estimates OF HOMELESS FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

PIT

This section presents the Point-in-Time (PIT) estimates of people who experienced homelessness as part of a family 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. The unsheltered PIT count was not required in 2016. Nevertheless, 345 CoCs (86% of all CoCs nationwide) conducted both a sheltered and unsheltered count.¹

“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 number of people in family households rather than the number of households.

On a Single Night in January 2016

- 194,716 people experienced homelessness as part of a family with children. About 35.4 percent of all people experiencing homelessness on a single night were in family households, and the number of such households was 61,265.
- Of all people counted in family households on a single night, 90.2 percent (175,563 people) were experiencing sheltered homelessness, and only 9.8 percent (19,153 people) were in unsheltered locations.

Chronically Homeless People in Families with Children²

- Of all people with chronic patterns of homelessness in January 2016, 10 percent (8,646 people) were in families. More than a third of people in chronically homeless families (36%) were in unsheltered locations.

Homeless People in Parenting Youth Families with Children²

- 23,210 people were experiencing homelessness in families with a parent under the age of 25. Only five percent of people experiencing homelessness in families with parenting youth were in unsheltered locations.

¹ The numbers in this report include the counts for the 58 CoCs that did not report an unsheltered count in 2016 but instead rolled over their prior year’s unsheltered count.

² Both chronically homeless families and homeless families with parenting youth draw from multiple populations: families with at least one adult and one child (like the other families described in this section) and child-only families, where the head of household is under age 18. This latter population of families with only children and no adults, though described here as “families,” is considered part of the population of “individuals” experiencing homelessness. The 194,716 people in families with children do not include these individuals.

Data Source: PIT 2007–2016


Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories

See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD’s Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.

Since 2007, the number of people in families with children experiencing unsheltered homelessness on a single night in January dropped by 65.9%.

EXHIBIT 3.1: One-Night Counts of Homeless People in Families with Children

PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007–2016



Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The number of people experiencing homelessness in families with children dropped by 5.6 percent (11,570 fewer people). The number of homeless family households dropped by 4.6 percent (2,932 fewer households).
- The share of people in families experiencing sheltered homelessness remained stable between 2015 and 2016 (90.1% versus 90.2%).
- Both sheltered and unsheltered family homelessness declined, with 10,261 fewer sheltered homeless people in families in 2016 than in 2015 (a 5.5% drop) and 1,309 fewer unsheltered homeless people in families (a 6.4% drop).

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- The number of people experiencing homelessness in families with children on a single night dropped by 17 percent (39,842 fewer people), driven primarily by a 65.9 percent decrease in the number in unsheltered locations (37,077 fewer people). People in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness declined more modestly, by 1.6 percent (2,765 fewer people).
- Over the nine-year period, the number of family households experiencing homelessness dropped by 22 percent (17,270 fewer family households).

EXHIBIT 3.2: Change in Homeless People in Families with Children

PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007-2016

Years	Total Homeless People in Families with Children		Sheltered People in Families with Children		Unsheltered People in Families with Children	
	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016	-11,570	-5.6	-10,261	-5.5	-1,309	-6.4
2014 to 2015	-9,975	-4.6	-6,079	-3.2	-3,896	-16.0
2013 to 2014	-5,929	-2.7	332	0.2	-6,261	-20.4
2012 to 2013	-17,207	-7.2	575	0.3	-17,782	-36.7
2011 to 2012	3,222	1.4	4,514	2.4	-1,292	-2.6
2010 to 2011	-5,762	-2.4	-4,843	-2.5	-919	-1.8
2009 to 2010	3,841	1.6	4,012	2.1	-171	-0.3
2008 to 2009	2,837	1.2	5,807	3.2	-2,970	-5.5
2007 to 2008	701	0.3	3,178	1.8	-2,477	-4.4
2007 to 2016	-39,842	-17.0	-2,765	-1.6	-37,077	-65.9

Data Source: PIT 2007–2016

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 2016

- While nationally only 35.4 percent of people experiencing homelessness were in families with children, a majority of the homeless population was in families with children in: MA (13,174 people), NY (51,037), DC (4,667), and MN (3,672).
- More than a quarter of all people experiencing homelessness in families with children (26.4%) were in New York. Only two other states accounted for more than five percent of the nation's family homeless population: California (10.6%), and Massachusetts (6.8%).

Chronically Homeless People in Families with Children

- Just under half of the 8,646 people experiencing chronic homelessness in families with children (48%) were located in California, New York, and Massachusetts.

Homeless People in Parenting Youth Families with Children

- New York accounted for 26.1 percent of all people experiencing homelessness in families with parenting youth, the largest proportion of any state.
- Alabama accounted for less than one percent of all people experiencing homelessness in families with parenting youth. However, 5.4 percent of all homeless families headed by parents under the age of 18 were in Alabama.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The one-night count of people experiencing homelessness in families with children increased in 9 states and the District of Columbia, totaling 1,808 more people. The District of Columbia comprised 65.8 percent of this increase (1,190 additional people).
- Homelessness among people in families with children decreased in 41 states, totaling 13,296 fewer people. Three states accounted for more than a third of this decrease: California (2,100 fewer people), Massachusetts (1,583 fewer people), and New York (1,078 fewer people).

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- New York and Massachusetts experienced the most substantial increases in the number of people experiencing homelessness in families with children counted on a single night. The number increased by 16,492 in New York and by 6,339 in Massachusetts. The District of Columbia also experienced a sizable increase in the number of families with children experiencing homelessness since 2007 (3,064 more people, a 191.1% increase).
- Some states had large decreases in the number of people in families experiencing homelessness over the nine-year period: California (7,552 fewer people), Texas (6,319 fewer people) and Florida (5,671 fewer people). Three states had the percent of families experiencing homelessness decline by over 60 percent: Nevada (74.8%), Kentucky (69.1%), and Louisiana (67.6%).

Data Source: PIT 2007–2016

Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories

See Part 1 of the 2016 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)

EXHIBIT 3.3: Homeless Families with Children in the U.S.

Percentage of National Total in Each State, 2016




EXHIBIT 3.4: Homeless People in Families with Children by State

Largest Changes in PIT Estimates, 2007–2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
District of Columbia	1,190	34.2	California	-2,100	-9.3
Idaho	169	21.3	Massachusetts	-1,583	-10.7
South Dakota	118	29.1	New York	-1,078	-2.1
Oklahoma	114	11.4	Missouri	-664	-21.8
Oregon	94	2.5	New Jersey	-554	-14.2
2007 to 2016					
New York	16,492	47.7	California	-7,552	-26.9
Massachusetts	6,339	92.7	Texas	-6,319	-46.9
District of Columbia	3,064	191.1	Florida	-5,671	-37.7
Hawaii	596	21.8	New Jersey	-4,987	-59.8
Idaho	316	48.8	Oregon	-3,860	-50.0

Note: Michigan was excluded from the list of largest decreases from 2007 to 2016 due to methodological changes.

By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2016

- In 29 states and the District of Columbia, at least 90 percent of people experiencing homelessness in families with children were in emergency shelters, safe havens, or transitional housing programs. Oregon was the only state where more than half of people experiencing homelessness in families with children were in unsheltered locations (59.1%).
- Three states accounted for over half (52.4%) of the nation's population of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness as part of a family with children: California (24.5%; or 4,450 people), Florida (15.4%; or 2,801 people), and Oregon (12.5%; or 2,281 people).

Chronically Homeless People in Families with Children

- Nearly two-fifths (39.9%) of the 2,953 people experiencing chronic homelessness in families with children in unsheltered locations in the U.S. (excluding territories) were in California.
- Just over half (51.9%) of all sheltered people experiencing chronic homelessness in families with children were in New York (22.5%; or 1,236 people), Massachusetts (19.1%; or 1,051 people), and California (10.3%; or 568 people).

Homeless People in Parenting Youth Families with Children

- In most states (34 and D.C.), the majority of people experiencing homelessness in parenting youth families with children were in sheltered rather than unsheltered locations. Mississippi is the only state where most of these families with children were in unsheltered locations (67.6%).

In 2016, Oregon was the only state where more than half of people experiencing homelessness in families with children were in unsheltered locations (59.1%).

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

Largest Changes in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
District of Columbia	1,190	34.2	Massachusetts	-1,570	-10.7
Oklahoma	79	8.9	California	-1,164	-6.8
South Dakota	47	11.9	New York	-1,088	-2.1
Connecticut	29	2.2	Missouri	-623	-22.5
South Carolina	28	2.8	New Jersey	-557	-14.5
2007 to 2016					
New York	16,594	48.3	New Jersey	-4,528	-58.0
Massachusetts	6,624	101.4	Texas	-2,864	-29.3
District of Columbia	3,064	191.1	Washington	-2,772	-31.7
Hawaii	719	44.6	Oregon	-2,631	-62.5
Iowa	334	28.1	California	-1,982	-11.0

Note: Figures from 2007 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

By State and Sheltered Status

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The number of people experiencing homelessness as part of families with children in sheltered locations increased in 6 states and the District of Columbia (1,404 additional people). The District of Columbia alone accounted for 84.8 percent of the increase.
- The number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of families with children dropped in 44 states (11,729 fewer people). The largest decreases were in Massachusetts and California.
- California had the largest decreases in the one-night counts of people in families with children in unsheltered locations: 936 fewer people in 2016 than in 2015.

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- The largest increases in the number of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness were in New York (16,594 additional people) and Massachusetts (6,624 additional people). The largest decreases were in New Jersey and Texas.
- California, Florida, Georgia, and Texas all had substantial decreases in people in families with children experiencing unsheltered homelessness over this nine-year period. Since the AHAR began in 2007, the District of Columbia had no unsheltered families with children on the night of its count.

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

Largest Changes in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
Oregon	299	15.1	California	-936	-17.4
Hawaii	221	28.4	Tennessee	-247	-30.8
Idaho	211	163.6	Texas	-191	-42.0
Washington	160	20.1	South Carolina	-155	-36.3
Florida	76	2.8	North Dakota	-150	-70.4
2007 to 2016					
Idaho	205	151.9	California	-5,570	-55.6
Montana	169	281.7	Florida	-4,471	-61.5
Mississippi	102	2,550.0	Georgia	-3,634	-80.4
Utah	20	N/A	Texas	-3,455	-92.9
—	—	—	Maryland	-1,395	-82.5

Note: Figures from 2007 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes. Only four states experienced increases in unsheltered homelessness among people in families with children. Because Utah counted zero people in unsheltered families experiencing homelessness in 2007, a percent change between 2007 and 2016 could not be computed.

2016 PROFILE

A TYPICAL PERSON EXPERIENCING SHELTERED HOMELESSNESS IN A FAMILY WITH CHILDREN WAS:

In a Household with a Young Mother and a Child

77.6% FEMALE /
50.2% 2- OR 3-PERSON HOUSEHOLD



Under Age 18

60.8%

Black or African American

51.7%

Not Disabled

78.1%

Living in a City

69.4%



Staying in Housing

PRIOR TO USING A SHELTER* (57.6%)

Spending 49 Nights in Emergency Shelter



*Shelter refers to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.



2016 One-Year Estimates OF SHELTERED HOMELESS FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN

HMIS

These one-year estimates account for all people who used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program as part of a family with children 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 adjust statistically for people experiencing sheltered homelessness in shelter programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS—thus providing a complete estimated enumeration of sheltered people in families with children in each community—and are weighted to represent the entire country. The one-year estimates do not include: (a) sheltered people in families with children in Puerto Rico and the U.S. territories; (b) people in families with children served by victim service providers; and (c) people in families with children in unsheltered locations who never accessed a shelter program during the 12-month period.

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

Estimate of Families with Children Experiencing Sheltered Homelessness in 2016

- An estimated 481,410 people used an emergency shelter or a transitional housing program as part of a family with children between October 1, 2015, and September 30, 2016.¹ These adults and children were in 147,355 family households.
- About one-third of all people experiencing sheltered homelessness (33.9%) during the one-year period were in families with children.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of people in families with children using a shelter at some point during the year declined 4.2 percent (22,111 fewer people). The number of family households declined 4.6 percent or 7,025 households.
- Over a longer period, the number of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness increased by 1.7 percent (7,869 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 by 12.5 percent (16,387 more households) between 2007 and 2016.

¹ The 95 percent confidence interval for the number of sheltered people in families with children in 2016 is 447,885 to 514,935 (481,410 ± 33,525).

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2016

Between 2015 and 2016, the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of families with children declined 4.2%.

EXHIBIT 3.7a: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered People in Families with Children, 2007–2016




Exhibit 3.7b: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Families with Children and Annual Change from the Prior Year, and One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Family Households, 2007–2016

Year	Sheltered People in Families with Children Estimate	# Change from Previous Year	% Change from Previous Year	Family Households Estimate
2016	481,410	-21,111	-4.2	147,355
2015	502,521	-14,896	-2.9	154,380
2014	517,416	21,702	4.4	160,301
2013	495,714	-39,706	-7.4	156,540
2012	535,420	-1,994	-0.4	167,854
2011	537,414	-29,920	-5.3	172,767
2010	567,334	31,887	6.0	168,227
2009	535,447	18,723	3.6	170,129
2008	516,724	43,183	9.1	159,142
2007	473,541	—	—	130,968

Gender and Age

Starting in 2015, 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 and 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2016

- More than three-quarters of adults experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of families with children (77.6%) were women. Sheltered adults in families with children were more likely to be women than adults in U.S. families (54.4%), and also more likely than adults in families living in poverty (65.3%).
- About three in five people in families experiencing sheltered homelessness (60.8%) were children under 18. About half of these children (49.6%) were under six years old, and 10.7 percent were infants less than one year old.
- Among people in families with children experiencing homelessness, only 1.5 percent were adults over 50 years old. This is a much lower proportion than in all families with children in the U.S. (8.9%) and among families living in poverty (6%).
- Adults between the ages of 18 and 30 in families with children were at greater risk of falling into sheltered homelessness than were older adults living with children. One in 228 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 more likely to use shelter programs as older adults accompanied by children.

Changes Over Time

- The number of children in families experiencing sheltered homelessness increased only 1 percent between 2007 and 2016, while the number of children in families living in poverty increased 13 percent over the same period.
- 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 31 percent (9,993 more people) between 2007 and 2016.

Data Source: HMIS 2007–2016; ACS 2006, 2014, 2015

EXHIBIT 3.8: Gender

Sheltered Adults in Families with Children and U.S. Adults in Families with Children, 2007-2016




EXHIBIT 3.9: Age

Sheltered People in Families with Children and U.S. People in Families with Children, 2007-2016 (in %)

Age	Sheltered People in Families with Children			U.S. People in Families with Children		
	2007	2015	2016	2007	2015	2016
Under Age 18	61.6	60.9	60.8	46.6	46.2	46.2
18 - 30	20.9	20.3	20.1	14.5	14.1	13.9
18 - 24	—	9.6	9.3	—	7.2	7.1
25 - 30	—	10.7	10.8	—	6.8	6.8
31 - 50	16.0	17.2	17.6	32.2	31.1	31.1
51 - 61	1.2	1.4	1.3	4.7	5.9	6.1
62 and Older	0.3	0.2	0.2	2.0	2.7	2.8

Note: Prior to 2015, data were collected on people age 18-30. Since then, information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Ethnicity and Race

In 2016

- About one in four people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (25.3%) identified as Hispanic. While this proportion is similar to the share of Hispanics among all families with children in the U.S. (23.9%), it is lower than the share of Hispanics in families with children in the U.S. living in poverty (35.3%).
- About half of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (51.7%) identified as African American or black. This proportion is 3.8 times higher than the share of African Americans among all families with children in the U.S. (13.6%) and 2.2 times higher than the share of African Americans in families with children in the U.S. living in poverty (23.4%).
- About three-quarters of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (78.3%) identified as non-white or white and Hispanic, a proportion much larger than that among people experiencing sheltered homelessness as individuals (54.5%).

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 23.9 percent in 2016, so too did the proportion of Hispanics in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness, from 21.8 percent in 2007 to 25.3 percent in 2016.
- The proportion of African Americans in all families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness dropped from 55.2 percent in 2007 to 50.1 percent in 2015 and then rose slightly, to 51.7 percent in 2016. In contrast, the proportion of African Americans in all U.S. families with children remained relatively unchanged between 2007 and 2016.

EXHIBIT 3.10: Ethnicity

Sheltered People in Families with Children and U.S. People in Families with Children, 2007-2016





EXHIBIT 3.11: Race

Sheltered People in Families with Children and U.S. People in Families with Children, 2007-2016





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 2016

- 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 (50.2%) 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 (26.7%) were in households with five or more people.
- The disability rate among adults in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (21.9%) is 2.6 times higher than among all adults in families with children in the U.S. (8.4%) and 1.5 times higher than among adults in families with children in the U.S. living in poverty (15%).

About a quarter of the people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2016 were in large households of five or more people.



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 21.9 percent in 2016. Meanwhile, the proportion of households of 5 or more people grew from 23.4 percent in 2007 to 26.7 percent in 2016.
- The disability rate among adults in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness rose from 20.7 percent in 2015 to 21.9 percent in 2016. Over that same period, the disability rate remained level among all families with children in the U.S. and families with children living in poverty.

EXHIBIT 3.12: Household Size

Sheltered People in Families with Children and U.S. People in Families with Children, 2007-2016





EXHIBIT 3.13: Disability Status

Sheltered Adults in Families with Children and U.S. Adults in Families with Children, 2007-2016



Geographic Location

In 2016


- Almost seven in ten sheltered people in families with children (69.4%) experienced homelessness in principal cities. By comparison, four in ten people in families with children in the U.S. living in poverty (39.1%) lived in principal cities.
- The share of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas (30.6%) was larger than the share of individuals experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas (24.2%).

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness increased by 2.2 percent (7,029 more people) in principal cities and declined 16 percent (28,140 fewer people) in suburban and rural areas. In contrast, sheltered homelessness among individuals declined in both principal cities (by 1.9 percent) and suburban and rural areas (by 8.9 percent).
- Between 2007 and 2016, sheltered homelessness among people in families with children declined by 3.5 percent (12,108 fewer people) in principal cities but increased by 15.9 percent (20,203 more people) in suburban and rural areas.
- The proportion of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities increased from 65.1 percent in 2015 to 69.4 percent in 2016.

EXHIBIT 3.14: Geographic Distribution

Sheltered Families with Children, U.S. Families with Children Living in Poverty, and U.S. Families with Children, 2007-2016



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, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology.²

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, 2007-2016

Population	2015-2016		2007-2016	
	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas
Sheltered Families with Children	2.2	-16.0	-3.5	15.9
U.S. Families with Children Living in Poverty	-4.9	-5.0	9.3	19.2
U.S. Families with Children	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.6

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, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology.³

Chartacteristics by Geography

In 2016

- The proportion of Hispanics in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness was higher in principal cities (27.9%) than in suburban and rural areas (19.6%).
- African Americans represented a majority of the sheltered family population in principal cities (57.5%). They were also the most commonly identified racial group in suburban and rural areas, but represented only 39.1 percent of that population.
- White, non-Hispanic people experiencing sheltered homelessness were more heavily represented among families with children in suburban and rural areas (34.3%) than in principal cities (15.9%).
- The disability rate among adults in families experiencing sheltered homelessness was higher in suburban and rural areas (26.7%) than in principal cities (19.8%).
- 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 2015 and 2016, the number of sheltered African Americans in families with children increased 1.9 percent (3,372 more people) in principal cities, and declined 9.5 percent (5,947 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 19.6 percent in 2016, while it increased only slightly in principal cities, from 24.6 percent in 2007 to 27.9 percent in 2016.
- The disability rate of adults in families experiencing sheltered homelessness increased between 2015 and 2016: from 18.9 percent to 19.8 percent in principal cities and from 24 percent to 26.7 percent in suburban and rural areas.

EXHIBIT 3.16: Characteristics by Geography

Sheltered Homeless People in Families with Children, 2007-2016 (in %)

Characteristic	Principal Cities			Suburban and Rural Areas		
	2007	2015	2016	2007	2015	2016
# Homeless People in Families with Children	346,032	326,895	333,924	127,283	175,625	147,486
Gender of Adults						
Male	17.8	22.5	22.0	18.3	22.1	23.4
Female	82.2	77.5	78.0	81.7	77.9	76.6
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	24.6	26.8	27.9	13.4	21.4	19.6
Non-Hispanic	75.4	73.2	72.1	86.6	78.6	80.4
Race						
White, Non-Hispanic	18.6	15.6	15.9	28.1	34.4	34.3
White, Hispanic	11.8	15.4	17.1	5.0	16.7	14.2
Black or African American	56.0	57.9	57.5	53.3	36.2	39.1
Other One Race	7.3	5.0	4.2	3.7	5.0	4.7
Multiple Races	6.4	6.2	5.3	9.8	7.7	7.7
Age						
Under Age 18	60.9	60.8	61.0	63.4	60.9	60.4
18 - 30	21.5	20.5	20.4	19.2	19.9	19.5
18 - 24	—	9.9	9.6	—	9.1	8.6
25 - 30	—	10.6	10.8	—	10.8	10.8
31 - 50	15.9	16.9	17.1	16.3	17.8	18.6
51 - 61	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.0	1.2	1.3
62 and Older	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2
Household Size						
1 Person	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2 People	28.3	22.6	21.9	22.0	22.5	21.8
3 People	27.6	27.7	28.2	28.9	29.4	28.6
4 People	21.6	22.7	22.9	23.4	23.9	23.8
5 or More People	22.5	26.9	27.0	25.7	24.2	25.8
Disability Status of Adults						
Disabled	15.4	18.9	19.8	18.7	24.0	26.7
Not Disabled	84.7	81.1	80.2	81.3	76.1	73.3

Note: Data were collected on people age 18-30 until 2015, when this information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Living Situation Before Entering Shelter*

In 2016

- Of adults in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness, 57.6 percent had been in a housed situation prior to entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program. Of those 106,495 adults who were in housing, only 1.5 percent had been living in a housing unit they owned. Nearly half had been staying with family (48.1%), a quarter staying in housing they rented (25.5%), and another quarter with friends (24.7%).
- A third of sheltered adults in families with children were already homeless before entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program in 2016, and 32.9 percent of these 60,895 adults were living in unsheltered locations.
- Of those sheltered adults in families with children who were not already homeless, 86 percent were living in a housed situation prior to entering shelter, 2.6 percent were in institutional settings, and 11.4 percent were in other settings (predominantly hotels or motels not subsidized by vouchers).

Changes Over Time

- The number of adults in families with children entering an emergency shelter or transitional housing program from the street or other unsheltered locations increased by 10.5 percent (1,941 more people) between 2015 and 2016. Between 2007 and 2016, the number of adults in families with children experiencing homelessness in an emergency shelter or transitional housing program entering from unsheltered locations increased by 306.1 percent (15,346 more people).
- The number of adults in families with children entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from a housed situation declined by 2.5 percent (2,779 fewer people) between 2015 and 2016.

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.


Data Source: HMIS 2007–2016

EXHIBIT 3.17: Places Adults in Families with Children Stayed Before Entering Shelter* and Change Over Time, 2007-2016

Place Stayed	2016		2015–2016		2007–2016	
	#	%	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
Already Homeless	60,895	33.0	-2,321	-3.6	18,250	41.5
Sheltered	40,842	67.1	-4,262	-8.8	2,904	3.7
Unsheltered	20,053	32.9	1,941	10.5	15,346	306.1
Housing	106,495	57.6	-2,779	-2.5	28,351	35.4
Staying with family	51,209	48.1	3,346	6.9	16,463	46.2
Staying with friends	26,293	24.7	-1,938	-6.8	7,170	36.6
Rented housing unit	27,160	25.5	-3,891	-12.3	9,620	53.2
Owned housing unit	1,578	1.5	-320	16.5	-4,757	-74.7
Permanent supportive housing (PSH)	255	0.2	24	10.2	-145	-35.9
Institutional Settings	3,235	1.7	-54	-1.6	182	5.8
Substance abuse treatment center	1,856	57.4	190	11.2	-16	-0.8
Correctional facility	741	22.9	-177	-18.8	193	33.9
Hospital	563	17.4	-7	-1.2	22	3.9
Psychiatric facility	75	2.3	-60	-44.1	-17	-18.3
Other Settings	14,167	7.7	-2,102	-12.7	-4,573	-24.0
Hotel or motel	11,964	84.4	-822	-6.3	-860	-6.6
Foster care home	148	1.0	-4	-2.6	105	233.3
Other living arrangement	2,055	14.5	-1,276	-37.2	-3,818	-63.9

Note: To produce comparable trend information, statistical imputations were applied to missing values in this table. See the 2016 AHAR methodology document for more details.

EXHIBIT 3.18: Places Adults in Families with Children Stayed Who Were Not Already Homeless Before Entering Shelter*, 2007-2016 (in %)

2007	2015	2016		
78.1	84.9	86.0		
3.3	2.5	2.6		INSTITUTIONS
18.6	12.6	11.4		OTHER

Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

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

In 2016

- The homeless services system nationwide had 133,523 beds in emergency shelters for families with children and 75,599 beds in transitional housing programs for families with children. Of the 481,410 people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting year, 78.5 percent stayed only in emergency shelters, 16.9 percent stayed only in transitional housing programs, and 4.7 percent used both emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.
- People in families with children used emergency shelters for a median of 49 nights, more than twice as long as individuals (21 nights). The median stay in transitional housing was 140 nights (about four and a half months) during the one-year reporting period.

Changes Over Time

- The emergency shelter inventory for families with children increased by 35.9 percent (35,236 more beds) from 2007 to 2016, while the transitional housing inventory for families with children decreased by an almost equal quantity (32.1%, or 35,769 fewer beds).
- The proportion of people in families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness that used emergency shelters at some point during the reporting year (either exclusively or in addition to transitional housing programs) increased from 75.4 percent in 2007 to 83.1 percent in 2016, while the proportion using transitional housing programs (either exclusively or in addition to emergency shelters) decreased from 30.5 percent in 2007 to 21.5 percent in 2016.
- Though emergency shelters served more people in families with children in 2016 (400,278 people) than in 2007 (356,899), these projects served fewer people per available bed (3.7 people per bed in 2016 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 with children using emergency shelters was a month in 2007 and about a month and a half in 2016.
- Average occupancy rates have increased in emergency shelters from 85.9 percent in 2007 to 90.4 percent in 2016 and in transitional housing programs from 72.9 percent in 2007 to 81.1 percent in 2016.

EXHIBIT 3.19: Length of Stay

People in Families with Children in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2016

Length of Stay	Emergency Shelter		Transitional Housing	
	#	%	#	%
7 days or less	61,788	15.5	4,125	4.0
8 to 30 days	93,359	23.4	10,196	9.9
31 to 180 days	176,911	44.3	47,119	45.7
181 to 360 days	43,567	10.9	26,976	26.2
361 to 366 days	23,623	5.9	14,627	14.2

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 366 days, corresponding to the total days observed for this reporting period.

EXHIBIT 3.20: Bed-Use Patterns

People in Families with Children in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2007-2016

Bed-Use Patterns	Emergency Shelter			Transitional Housing		
	2007	2015	2016	2007	2015	2016
Median # nights	30	47	49	151	137	140
Average # nights	67	94	91	174	165	166
Average occupancy rate (in %)	85.9	92.6	90.4	72.9	81.4	81.1
Bed Count	98,287	133,007	133,523	111,368	83,693	75,599
Turnover rate	4.9	3.8	3.7	1.6	1.8	1.8

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 number of sheltered homeless persons by the number of year-round equivalent beds available that year.



2016 Unaccompanied Homeless Youth IN THE UNITED STATES

POINT-IN-TIME (PIT)

One-Night Estimates of Unaccompanied Homeless

Youth.....	4-3
By State	4-5
By State and Sheltered Status	4-7



2016 Unaccompanied Homeless Youth

IN THE UNITED STATES

Did You Know?

PIT

On a single night in January 2016 **35,686 unaccompanied youth** were experiencing homelessness



89.3% were 18-24
10.7% were under 18

Unaccompanied youth under age 25 experiencing unsheltered and sheltered homelessness

46.2% **53.8%**




9,892 people were experiencing homelessness as **parenting youth**

9,800 were 18-24
92 were under 18

Parenting youth ages 18-24 made up **60.7%** of all people experiencing homelessness age 18-24 in households of families with children.

Parenting youth under age 25 experiencing unsheltered and sheltered homelessness

5.3% **94.7%**



KEY TERMS

Unaccompanied 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 age of 18 and 24.

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 age 25 or older 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.

2016 One-Night Estimates OF UNACCOMPANIED HOMELESS YOUTH

PIT

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.¹ This section presents the 2016 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 PIT counts of the sheltered homeless population each year and to conduct PIT counts of the unsheltered homeless population every other year. The unsheltered PIT count was not required in 2016. Nevertheless, 345 CoCs (86% of CoCs submitting a sheltered count) reported unsheltered counts in 2016.²

Over the past several years, many communities have made targeted efforts to improve their point-in-time count data collection processes to more accurately reflect the numbers of unaccompanied young people experiencing homelessness. However, methodologies are still improving. In an effort to provide communities additional time to improve their youth collaborations for the purpose of both enumeration and the provision of housing and supportive services, HUD and its federal partners have decided that point-in-time counts conducted in January 2017 will serve as the baseline year for measuring future trends in the number youth experiencing homelessness at a point in time in the United States. This means that, as HUD measures national and local progress on ending youth homelessness with the PIT count, it will generally use 2017 as the initial comparison year. For the purpose of this Part 2 of the AHAR, the 2016 youth data are included. 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 and its federal partners have been collaborating for many years to integrate their data collection efforts, including aligning project types with HUD emergency shelter and transitional housing project classifications. A key element of this integration was the Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY) program funded by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). By October 2015, 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.

This report discusses youth age 24 and under experiencing homelessness, with more detailed data available online.³


¹ Pregnant youth without other children present are treated as individuals rather than in families with children.

² This report accounts for the 58 CoCs that did not report an unsheltered count in 2016 but instead rolled over their prior year's unsheltered count.

³ The 2016 PIT data used to produce the 2016 figures in the report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Of the estimated 35,686 youth who were homeless and unaccompanied on a night in January 2016, 10.7% were under age 18.

Exhibit 4.1: One-Night Counts and Percent of Homeless Youth PIT Estimates, 2016




Data Source: PIT 2016
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories

On a Single Night in January 2016

- 35,686 youth were unaccompanied and experiencing homelessness in the United States. This is 6.5 percent of the total homeless population and 10 percent of all homeless individuals. Of all people under the age of 25 experiencing homelessness, 20.9 percent were unaccompanied youth.
- Among unaccompanied homeless youth, 89.3 percent (31,862 people) were ages 18 to 24, and 10.7 percent (3,824 people) were under 18.
- Of all people experiencing homelessness, 1.8 percent (9,892 people) were parents in parenting youth households. Of those parents, 92 were under age 18 and 9,800 were age 18 to 24.
- Among the 16,150 people age 18 to 24 experiencing homelessness in families with children, 60.7 percent were parenting youth. Of those age 18 to 24, 9,800 are parents.
- The share of unaccompanied youth ages 18 to 24 in unsheltered locations (46.7%) was slightly higher than the share of all people experiencing homelessness as individuals in unsheltered locations (44.3%).
- Only 5.3 percent of the parents in parenting youth households experiencing homelessness were in unsheltered locations. The sheltered status among parents in parenting youth households is similar to all people in families with children experiencing homelessness (9.8% unsheltered).

Of the estimated 35,686 youth who were homeless and unaccompanied on a night in January 2016, 10.7% were under age 18.

Exhibit 4.2: PIT Estimates of Unaccompanied Homeless Youth, Homeless Individuals, Homeless Parenting Youth, and Homeless People in Families with Children by Sheltered Status, 2016




Data Source: PIT 2016
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories

By State

On a Single Night in January 2016

- Four states accounted for nearly half (49.6%) of the nation's population of unaccompanied homeless youth under 18 years of age: California (847), Florida (514), Nevada (292), and Oregon (236).
- In five states, more than a fifth of unaccompanied youth experiencing homelessness was under the age of 18: New Mexico (36.7%), Missouri (31.5%), Florida (24.6%), Arkansas (24.4%), and Oregon (20.1%).
- Four states accounted for about half (50.6%) of all unaccompanied youth ages 18 to 24 experiencing homelessness in the nation: California (10,375), New York (2,701), Florida (1,580) and Nevada (1,380).
- The state-by-state distribution of parenting youth experiencing homelessness is very similar to the distribution of all people experiencing homelessness in families with children.
- New York accounts for over a quarter (27.7%) of all parenting youth experiencing homelessness, the largest proportion of any state. New York also has the largest share of people in families with children experiencing homelessness (26.4%) of any state in the nation.
- New York (27.7%), Massachusetts (5.6%), and the District of Columbia (5.3%) account for 38.6 percent of all parenting youth experiencing homelessness in the U.S.

EXHIBIT 4.3: Homeless Unaccompanied Youth Under 18 in the U.S.
Percentage of National Total in Each State, 2016



Data Source: PIT 2016
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2016 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)

EXHIBIT 4.4: Homeless Unaccompanied Youth 18-24 in the U.S.
Percentage of National Total in Each State, 2016





EXHIBIT 4.5: Homeless Parenting Youth Under 25 in the U.S.
Percentage of National Total in Each State, 2016





By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2016

- Four states had more than half of their unaccompanied youth experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations: Nevada (1,368 people; 81.5%), California (8,691; 77.4%), Hawaii (227; 73.5%), and Oregon (757; 64.4%).
- Of New York's 2,889 unaccompanied homeless youth, 91.4 percent were in emergency shelter or transitional housing programs. Few (8.6%) experienced homelessness in unsheltered locations.
- Four states accounted for 82 percent of all unsheltered unaccompanied youth under the age of 18: California (634 people; 39.5%), Nevada (264; 16.5%), Florida (235; 14.7%), and Oregon (178; 11.1%). Fifteen states and the District of Columbia reported no unsheltered unaccompanied youth under 18.
- While 53.2 percent of unaccompanied homeless youth between the ages of 18 and 24 were in emergency shelter and transitional housing programs overall, more than 90 percent were sheltered rather than unsheltered in eight states: NE (198; 100%), RI (63; 98.4%), IA (132; 93%), NY (2,476; 91.7%), NH (72; 91.1%), ME (132; 90.4%), DE (46; 90.2%), and IL (623; 90.2%).
- More than 90 percent of parenting youth (under age 25) were experiencing sheltered rather than unsheltered homelessness in 34 states and the District of Columbia. Among these locations, the District of Columbia (100%), Massachusetts (100%), and New York (100%) have a "right to shelter" policy.⁴ Mississippi had the largest share of its homeless parenting youth in unsheltered locations of any state (9 people; 35.7%).

EXHIBIT 4.6: States with Highest and Lowest Rates of Unsheltered Unaccompanied Homeless Youth

with Counts of Unsheltered and Sheltered Youth, 2016

State	% Unsheltered	Unsheltered Unaccompanied Youth (#)	Total Unaccompanied Youth (#)
Highest Rates			
Nevada	81.5%	1,363	1,672
California	77.4%	8,691	11,222
Hawaii	73.5%	227	309
Oregon	64.4%	757	1,175
Montana	48.0%	48	100
Lowest Rates			
Nebraska	0.0%	0	238
Rhode Island	1.6%	1	64
Iowa	6.3%	10	160
New York	8.6%	248	2,889
Maine	9.0%	16	177

⁴ For more information on local right-to-shelter policies, see: <https://www1.nyc.gov/site/dhs/shelter/shelter.page>, or <https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/PartI/TitleII/Chapter23B/Section30>.



HOMELESS
BUSINESS

2016 Homeless Veterans IN THE UNITED STATES

POINT-IN-TIME (PIT)

One-Night Estimates of Homeless Veterans.....	5-3
By State	5-4
By State and Sheltered Status	5-5

HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (HMIS)

One-Year Estimates of Homeless Veterans	5-7
---	-----

Characteristics of Sheltered Veterans

Gender and Age	5-8
Ethnicity and Race	5-9
Household Size and Disability Status	5-10

Geography of Sheltered Veterans


Geographic Location	5-11
Characteristics by Geography	5-12

Patterns of Homeless Service Use

Living Situation Before Entering Shelter	5-13
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns	5-14

Homeless Veterans Using Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF).....

5-15



2016 Homeless Veterans


Did You Know?

PIT

On a single night in January 2016, **39,471** veterans were experiencing homelessness



This is a **46.2% decline** since 2009



Almost **1 in 3 veterans** experiencing homelessness are in CA and FL

Veterans in unsheltered & sheltered locations

33.1% **66.9%**



HMIS

In 2016, **124,709** veterans used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at some point during the year




This is a **16.7% decline** since 2009

Veterans make up

8.9% of the U.S. adult population and

11.3% of the adult population experiencing sheltered homelessness

Among veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in 2016, **2.9%** were in families with children



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.

2016 One-Night Estimates OF HOMELESS VETERANS

PIT

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 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 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 section provides the most accurate metrics to gauge the nation's progress toward ending homelessness among veterans.

On a Single Night in January 2016

- 39,471 veterans were experiencing homelessness in the United States, representing 9.2 percent of all adults experiencing homelessness.
- 66.9 percent of veterans experienced homelessness in sheltered locations (26,404 veterans), and 33.1 percent were in unsheltered locations (13,067 veterans).

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The number of veterans experiencing homelessness declined 17.3 percent (8,254 fewer veterans). More than three-fifths (61.8%) of this decline was attributable to the decrease in the sheltered population (5,101 fewer veterans), and two-fifths to the decrease in the unsheltered population (3,153 fewer veterans).

Between January 2009 and January 2016

- The total number of veterans experiencing homelessness dropped 46.2 percent or 33,896 people.
- The number of veterans experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations decreased 56.4 percent (16,891 fewer veterans), and the number in sheltered locations decreased 39.2 percent (17,005 fewer veterans).
- Among veterans experiencing homelessness on a single night, a larger share were in sheltered locations in 2016 (66.9%) than in 2009 (59.2%).

Data Source: PIT 2009–2016
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD's Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.

39,471 veterans experienced homelessness in the U.S. in January 2016, a 17.3% decline from 2015.

EXHIBIT 5.1: One-Night Counts of Homeless Veterans
PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2009–2016




EXHIBIT 5.2: Change in Homeless Veterans
PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2009–2016

Years	Total Homeless Veterans		Sheltered Veterans		Unsheltered Veterans	
	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016	-8,254	-17.3	-5,101	-16.2	-3,153	-19.4
2014 to 2015	-1,964	-4.0	-614	-1.9	-1,350	-7.7
2013 to 2014	-5,930	-10.7	-2,790	-8.0	-3,140	-15.2
2012 to 2013	-4,960	-8.2	-234	-0.7	-4,726	-18.6
2011 to 2012	-4,876	-7.4	-4,890	-12.2	14	0.1
2010 to 2011	-8,632	-11.7	-3,404	-7.8	-5,228	-17.1
2009 to 2010	720	1.0	28	0.1	692	2.3
2009 to 2016	-33,896	-46.2	-17,005	-39.2	-16,891	-56.4

By State

On a Single Night in January 2016

- Two states accounted for nearly one-third of the nation's homeless veterans: California (24.5%; 9,612 veterans) and Florida (7.4%; 2,902 veterans).
- Homeless veterans accounted for more than 12 percent of the total homeless population in three states: South Carolina (14.6%), North Dakota (12.6%), and Kentucky (12.1%). Across all states, by comparison, 7.2 percent of all people experiencing homelessness were veterans on a single night.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The one-night count of veterans experiencing homelessness decreased in 42 states and the District of Columbia, totaling 8,807 fewer veterans. Nearly one fifth of the decrease was attributable to one state, California, with 1,699 fewer veterans.
- Increases in veterans experiencing homelessness occurred in eight states, totaling 575 more veterans.
- The largest increase in the number of homeless veterans in absolute terms was in Colorado, where 231 more veterans represented a 24.3 percent increase in the homeless veteran population.

Between January 2009 and January 2016

- Seven states had increases in homeless veterans (totaling 592 additional veterans).
- The number of homeless veterans declined in 43 states and the District of Columbia (totaling 34,536 fewer veterans). Four states represented 60.7 percent of the total decrease in homeless veterans: California (8,361 fewer veterans), New York (4,631), Florida (4,233), and Texas (3,723).
- Louisiana had a decline of nearly 80 percent in veteran homelessness, (1,585 fewer veterans). Three other states have experienced decreases in veterans' homelessness that exceed 65 percent since 2009: New York (78.8%), Kansas (73.5%), and Texas (67.8%).

EXHIBIT 5.3: Homeless Veterans in the U.S.

Percentage of National Total in Each State, 2016




EXHIBIT 5.4: Homeless Veterans by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2009-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
Colorado	231	24.3	California	-1,699	-15.0
Washington	191	14.8	New York	-1,151	-48.0
South Carolina	57	8.4	Florida	-1,024	-26.1
Missouri	35	6.5	Texas	-625	-26.1
Delaware	28	35.4	Georgia	-493	-31.8
2009 to 2016					
Hawaii	171	34.4	California	-8,361	-46.5
Utah	169	101.8	New York	-4,631	-78.8
South Carolina	109	17.3	Florida	-4,233	-59.3
Oregon	64	5.0	Texas	-3,723	-67.8
Vermont	49	79.7	Georgia	-1,705	-61.8

Note: Figures from 2009 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

Data Source: PIT 2009-2016

Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories

See Part 1 of the 2016 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)

By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2016

- More than half of all veterans experiencing unsheltered homelessness in the United States were in California (43.4%) or Florida (8.3%).
- In four states, more than half of their veterans experiencing homelessness were in unsheltered locations: Hawaii (60.6%), Mississippi (59.7%), California (58.3%), and Oregon (55%).
- In six states, more than 95 percent of veterans experiencing homelessness were in sheltered rather than unsheltered locations: RI (100%), NH (96.7%), MA (96.4%), NE (96.3%), DE (96.3%), and PA (95.8%).

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The number of veterans in unsheltered locations dropped in 33 states and the District of Columbia, totaling 3,486 fewer veterans, and increased in 14 states, totaling 340 more veterans.
- California, Florida, and Texas accounted for 65.9 percent of the overall decrease in unsheltered veteran homelessness.

Between January 2009 and January 2016

- Three states accounted for 63.1 percent of the total decrease in the number of veterans experiencing homelessness in unsheltered locations: California (5,574 fewer veterans), Florida (3,151) and Texas (2,273).
- The largest decreases in the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were in New York (3,891 fewer veterans), California (2,787), and Texas (1,450).

EXHIBIT 5.5: Sheltered Homeless Veterans by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2009-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
Colorado	262	40.7	New York	-1,112	-49.0
Washington	113	12.8	Florida	-547	-23.1
Missouri	64	14.9	California	-297	-6.9
Delaware	29	39.2	Georgia	-285	-32.9
Idaho	28	16.1	Michigan	-233	-23.5
2009 to 2016					
Utah	201	182.7	New York	-3,891	-77.1
Vermont	45	86.5	California	-2,787	-41.0
Hawaii	30	12.8	Texas	-1,450	-53.0
Indiana	28	4.8	Florida	-1,082	-37.2
South Carolina	13	3.0	Nevada	-892	-67.1

Note: Figures from 2009 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

EXHIBIT 5.6: Unsheltered Homeless Veterans by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2009-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
Washington	78	19.2	California	-1,402	-20.0
South Carolina	75	35.5	Florida	-477	-30.7
Nevada	70	20.3	Texas	-420	-46.5
Oregon	43	6.2	Illinois	-221	-48.4
Alaska	25	80.6	Georgia	-208	-30.5
2009 to 2016					
Hawaii	141	53.4	California	-5,574	-49.9
Oregon	133	22.0	Florida	-3,151	-74.5
South Carolina	96	50.5	Texas	-2,273	-82.5
Oklahoma	39	65.6	Louisiana	-1,507	-97.6
Alaska	19	51.4	Georgia	-913	-65.8

Note: Figures from 2009 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

2016 PROFILE

A TYPICAL VETERAN EXPERIENCING SHELTERED HOMELESSNESS WAS:

A Man by Himself

91% MALE / 99.9% 1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD



Aged 51-61

42.9%

White, Non-Hispanic

49.5%

Disabled

55.4%

Living in a City

74.5%




Already Homeless

PRIOR TO USING A SHELTER* (50.1%)

Spending 21 Nights in Emergency Shelter



*Shelter refers to emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.



2016 One-Year Estimates OF SHELTERED HOMELESS VETERANS

124,709 veterans used a shelter program in the U.S. at some point in 2016.

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.¹ The estimates are based on a nationally representative sample of communities that submit aggregate Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) data to HUD. The estimates adjust statistically for veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in shelter programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS—thus providing a complete estimated 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.²

Veterans experience homelessness as individuals or as part of a family. Following the definitions 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 2016

- An estimated 124,709 veterans used an emergency shelter or transitional housing program at some point between October 1, 2015 and September 30, 2016.³
- One in 177 veterans in the U.S. experienced sheltered homelessness at some point during 2016. While veterans made up 8.9 percent of the U.S. adult population, they made up 11.3 percent of adults using emergency shelter or transitional housing programs.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness at some point during the reporting period declined 6.1 percent (8,138 fewer veterans). This is the largest percentage decline since reporting began in 2009.
- The number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness declined 16.7 percent (24,926 fewer veterans) between 2009 and 2016.

¹ VA-funded projects with beds in emergency shelter or transitional housing that participate in HMIS include: HCHV CERS (ES), GPD (TH), CWT/TR (TH). In some cases, SSVF may support an emergency shelter stay while a client awaits a permanent housing placement.

² People served in Safe Havens are included in the PIT estimates but not in these one-year estimates of shelter users.

³ The 95 percent confidence interval for the sheltered homeless veteran population in 2016 is 112,187 to 137,231 (124,709 +/- 12,522).

EXHIBIT 5.7a: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Veterans, 2009-2016




EXHIBIT 5.7b: One-Year Estimates of Sheltered Veterans and Annual Change from the Prior Year, 2009-2016

Year	Estimate	# Change from Previous Year	% Change from Previous Year
2016	124,709	-8,138	-6.1
2015	132,847	1,150	0.9
2014	131,697	-8,160	-5.8
2013	139,857	1,861	1.3
2012	137,995	-3,454	-2.4
2011	141,449	-3,393	-2.3
2010	144,842	-4,793	-3.2
2009	149,635	—	—

Gender and Age

Since 2015, HUD has 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 and 30. For more detailed information on age categories, see the supporting HMIS data available for download (www.hudexchange.info).

In 2016

- About 9 in 10 veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (91%) were men, about the same share as for all U.S. veterans (91.1%).
- Although the majority of all veterans in the U.S. (54.8%) were age 62 or older, only 16.2 percent of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were age 62 or older. Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were 2.4 times more likely to be between the ages of 51 and 61 than were veterans in the U.S. population (42.9% versus 17.8%).
- 2,424 veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were age 18 to 24.
- Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness are 1.7 times more likely to be age 25 to 30 compared to veterans in the U.S. population (7.3% versus 4.3%).

The share of elderly veterans (age 62 or older) nearly doubled between 2009 (8.7%) and 2016 (16.2%).

Changes Over Time

- Between 2009 and 2016, the number of female veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness remained about the same, increasing just 0.3 percent (37 more veterans), while the number of male veterans decreased 18 percent (24,837 fewer veterans).
- The share of elderly veterans (age 62 or older) nearly doubled between 2009 (8.7%) and 2016 (16.2%).
- Since 2009, most of the decline in the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness was among veterans ages 31 to 50 (27,181 fewer veterans). The overall decline in veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness was slightly offset by an increase in the number of elderly veterans (ages 62 or older) experiencing sheltered homelessness, which increased 54.3 percent (7,089 more veterans).

EXHIBIT 5.8: Gender

Sheltered Veterans and U.S. Veterans, 2009-2016




EXHIBIT 5.9: Age

Sheltered Veterans and U.S. Veterans, 2009-2016 (in %)

Age	Sheltered Veterans			U.S. Veterans		
	2009	2015	2016	2009	2015	2016
18 - 30	8.1	9.1	9.2	5.0	6.6	6.6
18 - 24	—	2.3	2.0	—	2.4	2.3
25 - 30	—	6.8	7.3	—	4.2	4.3
31 - 50	44.7	33.1	31.7	23.0	21.0	20.7
51 - 61	38.4	43.3	42.9	24.3	17.6	17.8
62 and Older	8.7	14.5	16.2	47.7	54.8	54.8

Note: Prior to 2015, data were collected on people age 18-30. Since then, information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Ethnicity and Race

In 2016

- The share of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness who identified as Hispanic was slightly higher than the share of all U.S. veterans (7.4% versus 6.6%).
- Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were 3.3 times more likely to identify as African American or black than were all U.S. veterans (38.2% versus 11.4%).
- Although only 21.8 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 (50.5%) identified as such. This population was even more heavily represented among veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in families with children (65.4%).

Changes Over Time

- While the total number of Hispanic veterans in the U.S. increased slightly since 2015, by 0.3 percentage points, the number of Hispanic veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness declined slightly, by .02 percentage points.
- Between 2009 and 2016, the proportion of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness who were African American grew from 34.2 percent to 38.2 percent.
- The share of white, non-Hispanic veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness remained fairly stable between 2009 and 2016 (49.3% versus 49.5%), while the proportion of all U.S. veterans who identified as white, non-Hispanic declined from 81.4 percent to 78.2 percent.

Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were 3.3 times more likely to identify as African American or black than were all U.S. veterans (38.2% vs. 11.4%).

EXHIBIT 5.10: Ethnicity

Sheltered Veterans and U.S. Veterans, 2009-2016





EXHIBIT 5.11: Race

Sheltered Veterans and U.S. Veterans, 2009-2016



Household Size and Disability Status

Veterans in “families with children” are households composed of at least one veteran *and* one child under age 18. Veteran “individuals” refers to veterans in households without children under age 18.

In 2016

- Less than three percent of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (2.9%) were in families with children.
- The share of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness that had a disability (55.4%) was 1.9 times as high as the share of all veterans in the U.S. (28.4%) and 1.3 times as high as the share of all adults experiencing sheltered homelessness (42.9%).


The majority of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness at some time during 2016 (55.4%) had a disability.

Changes Over Time

- The disability rate among veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness increased from 53.1 percent in 2015 to 55.4 percent in 2016.
- The share of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in families with children declined between 2009 and 2016 (3.4% versus 2.9%).

EXHIBIT 5.12: Sheltered Veterans Estimates


By Household Type, 2009-2016



Note: The number of sheltered veterans served as individuals and in families with children 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, 2009-2016



Geographic Location

In 2016


- Three-quarters of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (74.5%) were served in principal cities. In contrast, almost three-quarters (72.3%) of all U.S. veterans were living in suburban and rural areas, as were two-thirds (66.9%) of veterans in the U.S. population living in poverty.

Changes Over Time

- The share of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities rose from 69.9 percent in 2009 to 74.5 percent in 2016. 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.
- Between 2009 and 2016, the number of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness who were living in principal cities declined 11.2 percent (11,755 fewer veterans) while the number living in suburban and rural areas declined 29.3 percent (13,176 fewer veterans).

EXHIBIT 5.14: Geographic Distribution

Sheltered Veterans, U.S. Veterans Living in Poverty, and U.S. Veterans, 2009-2016



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, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 5.15: Percent Change by Geography

Sheltered Homeless Veterans, U.S. Veterans Living in Poverty, and U.S. Veterans Population, 2009-2016

Population	2015-2016		2009-2016	
	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas
Sheltered Veterans	-5.3	-8.5	-11.2	-29.3
U.S. Veterans Living in Poverty	-6.2	-4.6	11.3	15.9
U.S. Veterans	-1.8	-2.3	-2.7	-0.7

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, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Characteristics by Geography

In 2016

- Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities were more likely to be Hispanic (8%) and more likely to be black or African American (39.6%) than were veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban or rural areas (5.7% and 34.1%).
- Veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities were slightly less likely to be female (8.2%) than were veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban or rural areas (11.1%).

Changes Over Time

- The share of veterans with a disability who experienced sheltered homelessness in principal cities increased between 2015 and 2016 (51.3% to 55%) and declined in suburban and rural areas (58.2% to 56.5%).
- Between 2009 and 2016, the share of veterans age 62 or older increased in principal cities (9.5% to 16.9%) and in suburban and rural areas (7.1% to 14%). The share of veterans aged 31 to 50 declined in both principal cities (44.7% to 31.5%) and suburban and rural areas (44.6% to 32.3%).
- The proportion of female veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas increased from 8.2 percent in 2009 to 11.1 percent in 2016 and increased in principal cities from 7.1 percent in 2009 to 8.2 percent in 2016.
- As the proportion of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness in principal cities who self-identified as non-Hispanic white rose from 43.1 percent in 2009 to 47.4 percent in 2016, the proportion in suburban and rural areas declined from 63.6 percent in 2009 to 55.6 percent in 2016.

EXHIBIT 5.16: Characteristics by Geography

Sheltered Veterans, 2009-2016 (in %)

Characteristic	Principal Cities			Suburban and Rural Areas		
	2009	2015	2016	2009	2015	2016
# Homeless Veterans	104,596	98,019	92,841	45,037	34,828	31,861
Gender						
Male	92.9	91.4	91.8	91.8	90.1	88.9
Female	7.1	8.6	8.2	8.2	9.9	11.1
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	13.8	8.4	8.0	4.0	5.4	5.7
Non-Hispanic	86.2	91.6	92.0	96.0	94.6	94.3
Race						
White, Non-Hispanic	43.1	46.7	47.4	63.6	58.5	55.6
White, Hispanic	10.6	5.6	5.7	1.9	3.7	3.8
Black or African American	37.7	40.7	39.6	26.2	32.5	34.1
Other One Race	4.4	3.9	3.8	3.5	2.2	2.8
Multiple Races	4.2	3.2	3.5	4.7	3.2	3.7
Age						
18 - 30	8.0	8.6	9.2	8.6	10.6	9.5
18 - 24	—	2.1	1.9	—	2.7	2.0
25 - 30	—	6.5	7.2	—	7.9	7.5
31 - 50	44.7	33.0	31.5	44.6	33.6	32.3
51 - 61	37.9	43.3	42.4	39.8	43.2	44.3
62 and Older	9.5	15.2	16.9	7.1	12.7	14.0
Household Size						
1 Person	99.7	99.9	99.9	99.8	99.9	99.8
2 People	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2
3 People	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4 People	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5 or More People	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disability Status						
Disabled	50.5	51.3	55.0	57.7	58.2	56.5
Not Disabled	49.5	48.7	45.0	42.3	41.8	43.5

Note: Data were collected on people age 18-30 until 2015, when this information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Living Situation Before Entering Shelter*

In 2016

- Half (50.1%) of the veterans who entered emergency shelter or transitional housing programs at some point during the reporting year were already homeless prior to entry. Of these veterans, just over half (52.1%) were on the street or in other unsheltered locations.
- Nearly three in ten veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness (28.7%) were in a housed situation before entering shelter, most often staying with family or friends. Another 14.6 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 (57.4%) were in a housed situation, 29.3 percent were in institutional settings, and 13.3 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. Only 400 veterans were living in permanent supportive housing prior to entering shelter.
- Among veterans entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from institutional settings, 58.5 percent came from either a hospital or a substance abuse treatment center.

Changes Over Time

- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of veterans who entered emergency shelter or transitional housing programs from institutional settings increased 2.2 percent, while the number of veterans who entered from homelessness, housing, or other settings decreased.
- The number of veterans who were already homeless prior to entering shelter fell 25.1 percent (11,868 fewer veterans) between 2009 and 2016.
- Of the veterans who were already homeless before entering emergency shelter or transitional housing programs, the number from unsheltered locations increased 1.8 percent between 2009 and 2016.

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.

Data Source: HMIS 2009–2016

EXHIBIT 5.17: Places Veterans Stayed

Before Entering Shelter* and Change Over Time, 2009–2016

Place Stayed	2016		2015–2016		2009–2016	
	#	%	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
Already Homeless	59,883	50.1	-6,255	-15.0	-11,868	-25.1
Sheltered	28,706	47.9	-7,592	-20.2	-12,432	-33.2
Unsheltered	31,177	52.1	1,337	4.4	564	1.8
Housing	34,270	28.7	-6,255	-15.0	-11,868	-25.1
Staying with family	12,526	36.6	-1,602	-11.0	-2,643	-17.0
Staying with friends	10,675	31.1	-2,729	-19.8	-1,333	-10.8
Rented housing unit	9,590	28.0	-1,787	-15.2	-5,794	-36.8
Owned housing unit	1,079	3.1	-110	-8.9	-2,273	-67.0
Permanent supportive housing (PSH)	400	1.2	-27	-6.0	175	70.0
Institutional Settings	17,462	14.6	385	2.2	-3,260	-15.4
Substance abuse treatment center	4,837	27.7	194	4.1	-3,491	-41.3
Correctional facility	4,559	26.1	-708	-13.1	-1,718	-26.7
Hospital	5,376	30.8	835	17.8	1,488	36.9
Psychiatric facility	2,690	15.4	64	2.4	461	20.0
Other Settings	7,921	6.6	-3,845	-32.1	-4,055	-33.2
Hotel or motel	5,258	66.4	-474	-8.1	239	4.6
Other living arrangement	2,663	33.6	-3,371	-55.1	-3,910	-58.7

Note: To produce comparable trend information, statistical imputations were applied to missing values in this table. See the 2016 AHAR methodology document for more details.

EXHIBIT 5.18: Places Veterans Stayed

Who Were Not Already Homeless

Before Entering Shelter*, 2009–2016 (in %)

2009	2015	2016
58.6	58.9	57.4
26.3	24.9	29.3
15.1	16.1	13.3



Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

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

In 2016

- Though a majority (63.4%) 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 (36.6%) of veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness were served in transitional housing—either exclusively or in addition to stays in emergency shelters—compared to only 17.4 percent of all people experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- More than a quarter (27.7%) of veterans in transitional housing stayed for at least half the reporting year.
- About a third (32.5%) of veterans in emergency shelter stayed for one week or less.
- The median length of stay was 21 nights for veterans in emergency shelters and 96 nights (or about three months) for veterans in transitional housing.

Changes Over Time

- The share 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 36.6 percent in 2016.
- The median length of stay for veterans in emergency shelter remained stable between 2009 and 2016, while the median length of stay in transitional housing declined from 120 nights in 2009 to 96 nights in 2016.

EXHIBIT 5.19: Length of Stay

Veterans in Emergency Shelter and Transitional Housing Programs, 2016

Length of Stay	Emergency Shelter		Transitional Housing	
	#	%	#	%
7 days or less	27,562	32.5	2,422	5.3
8 to 30 days	24,487	28.9	6,571	14.5
31 to 180 days	29,112	34.4	23,864	52.5
181 to 360 days	2,693	3.2	8,701	19.1
361 to 366 days	864	1.0	3,930	8.6

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 366 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, 2009-2016

Bed-Use Patterns	Emergency Shelter			Transitional Housing		
	2009	2015	2016	2009	2015	2016
Median # nights	21	23	21	120	109	96
Average # nights	47	53	44	149	144	131

Note: The maximum length of stay is 366 days, corresponding to the total days observed for this reporting period.

Homeless Veterans Using Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF)⁴

The AHAR does not include information on the Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program. SSVF has been a critical component of the nation's crisis response system for homeless veterans in addressing their housing and service needs. For the first time, the AHAR is including HMIS data gathered from the SSVF program in order to shed more light on veterans who came from homeless situations before entering SSVF and their housing destinations.

In 2010, the U.S. government announced its goal to end veteran homelessness. In pursuit of that goal, Congress enacted and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) implemented the SSVF program. SSVF fills gaps in the housing and services coordination system by offering rapid re-housing (RRH) or homelessness prevention (HP) assistance to veteran households experiencing housing crises. These services are focused directly on needs that are related to ending a veteran household's homelessness or preventing it when a veteran household is at imminent risk of homelessness.

Starting in October 2011, VA-funded community based organizations (CBOs) have administered SSVF assistance to veterans and their households. Eligible SSVF program participants may be single veterans or households in which its head, or spouse or partner of its head, is a veteran. Services are offered to all members of the veteran's household.⁵

The RRH component of SSVF was designed as a short-term, targeted intervention focused on helping veteran households exit homelessness by obtaining and retaining permanent housing. To that end, SSVF RRH offers a wide range of services, including outreach, case management, linkage to VA benefits, and assistance obtaining community-based services.⁶ One component of RRH services is Temporary Financial Assistance (TFA), which can be used for rental assistance, security or utility deposits, transportation, emergency housing assistance, childcare, and costs associated with moving, employment (maintenance or attainment), housing applications, furniture, and other expenses approved by VA to facilitate the transition from homelessness to housing.⁷ Rental assistance (48.9%) and security deposits (26.8%) have consistently been the top two expenditures among all TFA assistance categories.

⁴ While SSVF programs report data to the HMIS, they are not currently included in AHAR reporting. More detailed information on SSVF is available in the 2015 SSVF annual report: https://www.va.gov/HOMELESS/ssvf/docs/SSVF_Annual_Report_for_FY_2015.pdf

⁵ Serving veterans as well as non-veteran household members is a departure from most VA services that are restricted to veterans only. SSVF serves veterans who might otherwise have been unable to find or sustain housing placements because of unaddressed housing barriers faced by family members. Through SSVF, a veteran can get help with a range of direct assistance for dependent children or other adults in the household. SSVF supports families to remain intact while receiving services.

⁶ Community-based services may include health care, daily living services, financial planning, transportation, income support, childcare, housing counseling, fiduciary and representative payee services, and legal services to assist the veteran household with issues that interfere with their ability to obtain or retain housing or supportive services.

⁷ Emergency housing assistance costs are for expenses that are necessary for a participant's life or safety on a temporary basis, for items such as food, diapers, winter clothing, etc.

EXHIBIT 5.21: Demographic Characteristics of Veterans Served in SSVF RRH, FY 2016

Characteristics	#	%
Total Veterans served	67,581	100.0%
Household Type*		
HHs without children	58,950	87.4%
HHs with children	8,493	12.6%
Military Service		
OEF/OIF/OND	10,213	15.1%
Other	57,368	84.9%
Gender		
Male	59,390	87.9%
Female	7,679	11.4%
Other	512	0.8%
Disability Status		
Disabled	39,847	59.0%
Not Disabled	27,734	41.0%
Chronic Homelessness Status		
Chronically homeless	7,664	11.3%
Not Chronically homeless	59,917	88.7%
Household Income		
Households < 30% AMI	51,105	75.6%
Households >=30% AMI	16,476	24.4%

Source: SSVF-HMIS Repository Data

Note: OEF/OIF/OND refers to service in Iraq or Afghanistan.

* Households of unknown type are excluded from the household type totals and from the denominator of the percentages, but are included in the unduplicated total of veterans.

SSVF RRH has served an increasing number of veterans each year since the program began in FY2012. In FY 2012, SSVF RRH served 12,144 veterans through 85 grantees in 40 states and the District of Columbia. Preliminary data show that in FY 2016 SSVF RRH served 67,581 veterans, five times as many veterans as in FY 2012. In FY 2016, SSVF RRH services were administered through 383 grantees across all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and several U.S. territories.⁸

In total, SSVF RRH served 95,797 people in veteran households in FY 2016, 70.5 percent of whom were veterans.⁹ The program primarily serves veterans in households without children, who may be living alone (the most common situation), with a spouse or partner, or with a parent or sibling. Of the 67,581 veterans in SSVF RRH, 87.4 percent were in households without children and 12.6 percent in households with children. The average household size for a veteran in a household with children using RRH was 3.6 people, compared to 1.1 people in households without children.

Of the SSVF RRH veterans served in FY 2016, 15.1 percent were veterans who served in Iraq or Afghanistan, 11.4 percent were female veterans, 59 percent were veterans with disabilities, 11.3 percent were experiencing chronic homelessness, and 75.6 percent were in households with income under 30 percent of the area median income (AMI) (See Exhibit 5.21).

SSVF RRH served 95,797 people in veteran households in FY 2016, 70.5 percent of whom were veterans.

Among the 67,581 veterans served by SSVF RRH in FY 2016, 49,986 exited the program by the end of the year. Of those veterans who exited, nearly four of five (77.9%) moved into permanent housing (38,928 veterans). Among the veterans moving into permanent housing, exits to rental housing were most common (53.5%; or 20,834 veterans), while moving into permanent supportive housing (including leasing a unit with a HUD-VASH housing subsidy) was the second most common permanent housing destination (40%; or 15,588 veterans).

Of those veterans who exited SSVF RRH, 15.1 percent exited to temporary destinations. Of the 7,538 veterans who exited to temporary destinations, most returned to homelessness (74.4%), with 3,315 veterans who went to emergency shelter, safe havens, or transitional housing programs, and 2,293 veterans who went to unsheltered locations. Among veterans exiting SSVF RRH to other temporary destinations, some stayed temporarily with friends or family (1,643 veterans), and few paid to stay in a hotel or motel (287 veterans). A small share of veterans (2%; or 1,014 veterans) who exited SSVF RRH went to institutions.¹⁰

⁸ FY 2016 SSVF data are preliminary as of the publication of this report, but are unlikely to change substantially. Final data can be accessed through the SSVF University website: <https://www.va.gov/homeless/ssvf/>

⁹ SSVF serves veteran households, including non-veteran household members such as spouses, partners, and children. Of all SSVF program participants in FY 2016, 21.5 percent were children.

¹⁰ Institutional destinations include general hospitals, psychiatric hospitals, substance abuse treatment facilities, jail, or prison.

EXHIBIT 5.22a: Destination upon Exit among Veterans in SSVF RRH, FY 2016




EXHIBIT 5.22b: Destination upon Exit among Veterans in SSVF RRH, FY 2016

Destination	#	%
Total Exiting	49,986	100.0
Permanent Destination	38,928	77.9
Owned housing unit	270	0.7
Rented housing unit	20,834	53.5
Stay with family or friends	2,135	5.5
Permanent housing program for formerly homeless people	15,588	40.0
Long-term care facility or nursing home"	101	0.3
Temporary Destination	7,538	15.1
Homeless	5,608	74.4
Other	1,930	25.6
Institutional Destination	1,014	2.0
Other Destination	2,506	5.0
Deceased	207	8.3
Other	741	29.6
Missing	1,558	62.2


Source: SSVF-HMIS Repository Data

Note: The dataset for FY 2016 includes 6,238 veterans, or 21 percent of total records, with erroneous or missing data, including Veterans with prior living situations marked as a permanent housing location, "other" (e.g., missing or blank), "don't know," or "refused." In part a, these veterans are included within the "Other" category. In part b, these veterans are included within the main "Other Destination" category.

By comparing the prior living and exit destinations, we can gain deeper insights into how veterans use SSVF RRH. As shown in Exhibit 5.23, 87.7% of veterans served by SSVF RRH entered the program from unsheltered (43.1%) or sheltered homeless situations (i.e. transitional housing (17.3%), emergency shelter (26.7%), and safe havens (0.6%)), while 77.9% of exiters left to move into permanent housing.

Four in 10 (43.1%) of SSVF RRH veterans entered the program directly from unsheltered situations, while less than one in 20 (4.6%) of exiters left to unsheltered locations. Similarly, less than one in 20 (4%) of these exiters left to transitional housing, compared to one in 5 (17.3%) veterans at entry. Just one in 40 (2.5%) of these exiters left to emergency shelters, compared to one in 4 (26.7%) veterans at entry. Entries from institutional and safe haven situations were low at 3.1 percent and 0.6 percent. Still, exiter rates to those situations were just 2 percent and 0.1 percent.

EXHIBIT 5.23: Veteran Prior Living Situations and Veteran Exiters' Destinations in SSVF RRH, FY 2016¹¹



Source: SSVF-HMIS Repository Data

Note 1: This exhibit compares all 67,443 veterans served by SSVF RRH to its veteran exiters (49,986) during FY 2016. The veterans exiters subset consists of 74.1% of all SSVF veterans served. An additional 17,457 veterans (25.9%) remained in SSVF RRH by the end of FY 2016.

Note 2: The dataset for FY 2016 includes 6,238 veterans, or 21 percent of total records, with erroneous or missing data, including Veterans with prior living situations marked as a permanent housing location, "other" (e.g., missing or blank), "don't know," or "refused." These veterans are included within the "Other" category.

¹¹ Based on prior years' SSVF RRH exiters data, which included stayers from previous fiscal years, it is likely that the final distribution of the FY 2016 stayers' exit destinations will be similar to that of FY 2016 exiters. For example, SSVF RRH permanent housing destinations have ranged from 71.4% to 77.8% for veterans since the program's inception. Similarly, unsheltered destinations have consistently remained below 5%.



2016 Chronically Homeless Individuals IN THE UNITED STATES

POINT-IN-TIME (PIT)

One-Night Estimates of Chronically Homeless Individuals	6-3
By State	6-4
By State and Sheltered Status	6-5



2016 Chronically Homeless Individuals

IN THE UNITED STATES

Did You Know?


On a single night in January 2016...

PIT

77,486 individuals had chronic patterns of homelessness



This is a **35.3% decline** since 2007



21.8% of all homeless individuals were chronically homeless

Chronically homeless individuals in unsheltered & sheltered locations

68.3% **31.7%**



39.3% of all chronically homeless individuals were in California

In HI, CA and NV, more than **85%** of chronically homeless individuals were unsheltered



KEY TERMS

An Individual is 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" is in a household with at least one adult and one child.

A Chronically Homeless Individual¹ is 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 with a combined length of time homeless of least 12 months.

¹ The definition of chronic homelessness changed in 2016. The previous definition was an individual with a disability who had either been continuously homeless for 1 year or more or had experienced at least 4 episodes of homelessness in the last 3 years.

2016 One-Night Estimates OF CHRONICALLY HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS

PIT

Since 2007, communities have submitted data on adult individuals with chronic patterns of 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, 10 percent (8,646 people) are in families with children. This section discusses only chronically homeless individuals—that is, people in households that do not contain an adult and a child.

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 emergency shelter and transitional housing 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 2018 AHAR.

On a Single Night in January 2016

- 77,486 individuals were experiencing chronic homelessness. This was 21.8 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 in unsheltered locations. More than two-thirds (68.3%) of chronically homeless individuals were unsheltered compared to 44.3 percent of all homeless individuals.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The total number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined 6.8 percent (5,684 fewer people).
- The number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined 13.3 percent (3,759 fewer people), and the number in unsheltered locations fell 3.5 percent (1,925 fewer people).

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- The number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined 35.3 percent (42,327 fewer people).
- The proportion of all individuals who had chronic patterns of homelessness dropped from 29 percent in 2007 to 21.8 percent in 2016.
- The number of unsheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined 32.2 percent, or 25,155 fewer people.
- The number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness fell 41.1 percent, or 17,172 fewer people.

Data Source: PIT 2007–2016
Includes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See the supporting PIT data tabulations posted on HUD's Resource Exchange at www.hudexchange.info.

On a single night in January 2016, 77,486 individuals were experiencing chronic homelessness.

EXHIBIT 6.1: One-Night Counts of Chronically Homeless Individuals

PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007-2016




EXHIBIT 6.2: Change in Chronically Homeless Individuals

PIT Estimates by Sheltered Status, 2007-2016

Years	Total Chronically Homeless		Sheltered Chronically Homeless		Unsheltered Chronically Homeless	
	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016	-5,684	-6.8	-3,759	-13.3	-1,925	-3.5
2014 to 2015	-819	-1.0	-2,848	-9.1	2,029	3.8
2013 to 2014	-2,300	-2.7	1,785	6.1	-4,085	-7.2
2012 to 2013	-9,979	-10.4	-3,229	-9.9	-6,750	-10.6
2011 to 2012	-7,254	-7.0	-6,324	-16.2	-930	-1.4
2010 to 2011	-2,540	-2.4	-4,358	-10.1	1,818	2.9
2009 to 2010	-1,150	-1.1	-2,263	-5.0	1,113	1.8
2008 to 2009	-12,903	-10.7	174	0.4	-13,077	-17.5
2007 to 2008	302	0.3	3,650	8.7	-3,348	-4.3
2007 to 2016	-42,327	-35.3	-17,172	-41.1	-25,155	-32.2

By State

On a Single Night in January 2016

- Nearly two-fifths (39.3%) of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness in the U.S. were located in California. No other state accounted for more than 8 percent.
- New York accounted for 10.1 percent of all homeless individuals but only 5.4 percent of all chronically homeless individuals.
- Individuals experiencing chronic homelessness represented more than one quarter of all homeless people in two states: New Mexico (26.7%) and California (25.2%).

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness increased in 13 states (1,489 more people). California had the largest increase in chronically homeless individuals (624 more people; a 2.1% rise).
- Increases in the number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness in 13 states were offset by decreases in 37 states and the District of Columbia. Illinois experienced the largest decrease (862 fewer people; a 47.9% drop).

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- The number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness declined in 39 states and the District of Columbia (42,472 fewer people). California alone accounted for 24.8 percent of the decrease (10,539 fewer people).
- In 11 states, the number of individuals experiencing chronic homelessness increased (1,872 more people). Two states accounted for more than 65 percent of the increase: Hawaii (881 more people) and South Carolina (340).

EXHIBIT 6.3: Chronically Homeless Individuals in the U.S.

Percentage of National Total in Each State, 2016




EXHIBIT 6.4: Chronically Homeless Individuals by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
California	624	2.1	Illinois	-862	-47.9
Hawaii	287	20.9	Florida	-606	-10.1
Tennessee	148	9.9	New Jersey	-478	-40.4
Oklahoma	102	20.1	Oregon	-444	-12.6
Arizona	81	6.5	Ohio	-427	-36.8
2007 to 2016					
Hawaii	881	113.2	California	-10,539	-26.1
South Carolina	340	59.3	Texas	-4,397	-55.4
Oregon	248	8.8	New York	-2,364	-36.5
Idaho	132	138.9	Florida	-2,048	-27.4
Maine	102	105.2	New Jersey	-1,821	-72.1

Note: Figures from 2007 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

Data Source: PIT 2007-2016
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories
See Part 1 of the 2016 AHAR for more details on PIT estimates by state (www.hudexchange.info)

By State and Sheltered Status

On a Single Night in January 2016

- In 20 states, more than 50 percent of individuals with chronic patterns of homelessness were in unsheltered locations. Hawaii had the largest proportion of chronically homeless individuals who were unsheltered (92.8%).
- California alone accounted for 39.3 percent of the total population of unsheltered chronically homeless individuals.

Between January 2015 and January 2016

- The number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness increased in 13 states (506 more people) and decreased in 37 states and the District of Columbia (4,277 fewer people).
- The number of unsheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness increased in 14 states (1,918 more people), decreased in 34 states and the District of Columbia (3,831 fewer people), and remained constant in two states. Florida alone accounted for 16.1 percent of the total decrease.

Between January 2007 and January 2016

- The long-term, national decline in individuals experiencing chronic homelessness was driven by reductions in the unsheltered chronically homeless population in 38 states and the District of Columbia (26,382 fewer people) and, to a lesser extent, reductions in the sheltered chronically homeless population in 40 states and the District of Columbia (17,684 fewer people).
- California experienced the largest declines for both individuals experiencing chronic homelessness in unsheltered locations (8,499 fewer people; a 24.7% change) and in sheltered locations (2,040 fewer people; a 34.3% change).
- The largest increase in the number of sheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness was in New Mexico (97 more people; a 39.6% change). Hawaii had the largest increase in unsheltered individuals experiencing chronic homelessness (893 more people; a 138.2% change).

EXHIBIT 6.5: Sheltered Chronically Homeless Individuals by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
Colorado	129	17.1	New Jersey	-461	-61.3
Arizona	126	42.4	Oregon	-415	-45.1
New York	81	4.1	Ohio	-379	-48.5
Oklahoma	40	13.8	Illinois	-330	-37.0
Rhode Island	33	33.0	Minnesota	-263	-31.6
2007 to 2016					
New Mexico	97	39.6	California	-2,040	-34.3
Maine	89	132.8	Texas	-1,790	-54.4
Idaho	62	167.6	New Jersey	-1,291	-81.6
Rhode Island	43	47.8	Ohio	-1,198	-74.8
Maryland	33	4.4	Massachusetts	-1,033	-50.2

Note: Figures from 2007 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

EXHIBIT 6.6: Unsheltered Chronically Homeless Individuals by State

Largest Change in PIT Estimates, 2007-2016

Largest Increases			Largest Decreases		
State	# Change	% Change	State	# Change	% Change
2015 to 2016					
California	883	3.5	Florida	-615	-12.8
Hawaii	320	26.3	Illinois	-532	-58.7
Tennessee	183	21.7	New York	-296	-12.6
Washington	129	9.5	Maryland	-216	-30.4
Kentucky	97	255.3	Texas	-201	-9.0
2007 to 2016					
Hawaii	893	138.2	California	-8,499	-24.7
Oregon	829	47.6	Texas	-2,607	-56.2
South Carolina	312	151.5	New York	-2,014	-49.6
Washington	212	16.7	Florida	-1,425	-25.4
Idaho	70	120.7	Arizona	-1,250	-58.0

Note: Figures from 2007 to 2016 exclude North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wyoming, and Michigan from consideration due to methodological changes.

Data Source: PIT 2007–2016
Excludes Puerto Rico and U.S. Territories



2016 People in Permanent Supportive Housing IN THE UNITED STATES

HOMELESS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM (HMIS)

One-Year Estimates of People in Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)7-3

Characteristics of People in PSH

Gender and Age	7-5
Ethnicity and Race	7-6
Household Size and Disability Status	7-7

Geography of People Living in PSH

Geographic Location	7-8
Characteristics by Geography	7-9

Residential Patterns of People Living in PSH

Places Adults Stayed before Entering PSH	7-10
Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns	7-11
Destination at Move-Out for PSH Residents	7-12

One-Year Estimates of Veterans Living in PSH..... 7-13

Characteristics of Veterans Living in PSH..... 7-14

Residential Patterns of Veterans Living in PSH

Places Veterans Stayed Before Moving into PSH	7-15
---	------

HOMELESS OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT EVALUATION SYSTEM (HOMES)

Veterans in HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing
(HUD-VASH) Programs using Housing Subsidies.....7-16

2016 People in Permanent Supportive Housing

IN THE UNITED STATES

Did You Know?

HMIS

Throughout the year in 2016...

370,415

people were living in PSH

Only 6.5%

of people who exited PSH went to a homeless situation



The share of people living in PSH over age 50 grew from 23.9% to 37.1% between 2010 and 2016

▲ **66,408 more people**

2016 PROFILE

A TYPICAL PERSON LIVING IN PSH WAS:



A Man by Himself

56.3% MALE / 61.2% 1-PERSON HOUSEHOLD

Aged 31–50
30.7%

Black or African American
46.7%

Disabled
86.6%

Living in a City
66.4%



Experiencing Homelessness

PRIOR TO ENTERING PSH (80%)

Spending 2-5 Years in Permanent Supportive Housing



KEY TERM

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.

2016 One-Year Estimates OF PEOPLE IN PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

HMIS

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 80.7 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 adjusted statistically for people in PSH programs that do not yet participate in their local HMIS to provide an enumeration of people in PSH in each community¹ and are weighted to represent the entire country.²

¹ This adjustment (and thus the enumeration) accounts for people in all HUD-VASH projects reported on the HIC in 2016. Prior to 2015, 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 2016 is 362,927 to 377,903 (370,415 +/- 7,488).


Data Source: HMIS 2010–2016, HIC 2007–2016

370,415 people lived in Permanent Supportive Housing in 2016, a 6.5% increase from 2015.

2016 Estimate of People in PSH

- An estimated 370,415 people lived in PSH during 2016.
- Just over one-third (33.9%) were people in families with children rather than individuals. This is very similar to the percentage of people experiencing sheltered homelessness as part of families with children (33.9%).

EXHIBIT 7.1: One-Year Estimates of People Living in PSH
By Household Type, 2010-2016



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

Changes Over Time


- The total number of people living in PSH increased 6.5 percent (22,639 more people) between 2015 and 2016. Among individuals, the number increased 9.5 percent (21,440 more people), while the number of families with children in PSH increased by just 2 percent (2,402 more people).
- Between 2010 and 2016, the number of people in families with children living in PSH remained stable, declining by just 0.2 percent (236 fewer people), while individuals living in PSH increased by 45.5 percent (77,064 more people).
- The number of PSH beds available for people in families has grown more slowly since 2007 (up 69.7%) than the number of PSH beds available for individuals over the same period (up 87.6%). This is related to the HUD-VASH inventory growth, which mostly serves veterans as individuals.

EXHIBIT 7.2: Change in the One-Year Estimates

People Living in PSH by Household Type, 2010-2016

Population	2015–2016		2010–2016	
	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
Total People in PSH	22,639	6.5	75,667	25.7
Individuals in PSH	21,440	9.5	77,064	45.5
People in Families with Children in PSH	2,402	2.0	-236	-0.2

EXHIBIT 7.3: Inventory of PSH Beds in the U.S., 2007-2016



Note: The number of PSH beds in 2015 shown here is lower than that originally reported in the 2015 AHAR. The PSH inventory was reduced by 539 beds in the Riverside City and County CoC.

Gender and Age

Starting in 2015, 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 2016

- At 43.7 percent of all adults in PSH, women represented a larger share of PSH residents than of people using emergency shelters and transitional housing programs (37.1%).
- Among adults in PSH in families with children, 77 percent were women, which is similar to their share among families with children experiencing sheltered homelessness (77.6%).
- Nearly one-third of PSH residents (32.2%) were aged 30 or below compared to 44.3 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness. One in five PSH residents was a child under age 18, 6 percent were youth aged 18 to 24, and 6.2 percent were aged 25 to 30.
- People living in PSH are older, on average, than are people experiencing sheltered homelessness, with 37.1 percent aged 51 or older compared to 22.4 percent of people experiencing sheltered homelessness.
- By comparison, people age 18 to 30 represent 22 percent of the people experiencing sheltered homelessness but just 12.2 percent of people living in PSH.

The share of people over age 50 in PSH increased from 23.9% to 37.1% between 2010 and 2016.

Changes Over Time

- The overall share of women in PSH declined from 47.3 percent in 2010 to 43.7 percent in 2016.
- Between 2010 and 2016, the share of elderly people living in PSH aged 62 or older increased from 4 percent to 8.5 percent (19,748 more people), while the share of people aged 51 to 61 grew from 19.9 percent to 28.6 percent (46,660 more people).
- In contrast, the share of people living in PSH under age 18 declined from 26.1 percent in 2010 to 20 percent in 2016, while the share experiencing sheltered homelessness increased from 21.8 percent to 22.3 percent.

EXHIBIT 7.4: Gender

Adults Living in PSH and Adults Using Shelter*, 2010–2016




EXHIBIT 7.5: Age

People Living in PSH and People Using Shelter*, 2010–2016 (in %)

Age	People in PSH			Sheltered People		
	2010	2015	2016	2010	2015	2016
Under Age 18	26.1	20.9	20.0	21.8	22.3	22.3
18 - 30	14.1	12.8	12.2	23.5	22.4	22.0
18 - 24	—	6.3	6.0	—	11.0	10.3
25 - 30	—	6.5	6.2	—	11.4	11.7
31 - 50	35.8	31.5	30.7	37.0	33.8	33.3
51 - 61	19.9	27.2	28.6	14.9	17.2	17.7
62 and Older	4.0	7.7	8.5	2.8	4.2	4.7

Note: Prior to 2015, data were collected on people age 18-30. Since then, information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.

Ethnicity and Race

In 2016

- People identifying themselves as Hispanic made up 12 percent of PSH residents, which is lower than among those experiencing sheltered homelessness (16.9%).
- About three in five people in PSH (62.9%) identified themselves as belonging to racial groups other than white or as white and Hispanic. This is about the same share as among people experiencing sheltered homelessness (62.5%).
- A slightly larger share of people in PSH were African American (46.7%) compared to people using emergency shelter or transitional housing programs (42.6%).

12% of people in PSH identify as Hispanic, compared to 16.9% of people experiencing sheltered homelessness.

Changes Over Time

- The number of PSH residents who identified as Hispanic increased by 10.2 percent between 2015 and 2016 (4,070 more people), driving a small increase in the share of PSH residents who identified as Hispanic, from 11.5 percent to 12 percent. The Hispanic share among shelter-users decreased during the same period, from 17.3 percent to 16.9 percent.
- Over the longer time period, the share PSH residents who identified as Hispanic increased from 9.4 percent in 2010 to 12 percent in 2016, while the share among shelter-users increased just slightly, from 16.4 percent to 16.9 percent.
- The share of PSH residents who identified as African American increased slightly between 2015 and 2016, from 46.3 percent to 46.7 percent, mirroring a slight increase in the sheltered population.

EXHIBIT 7.6: Ethnicity

People Living in PSH and People Using Shelter*, 2010–2016





EXHIBIT 7.7: Race

People Living in PSH and People Using Shelter*, 2010–2016



*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.

Household Size and Disability Status

Although many people in PSH have a disabling 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 2016

- In both PSH and shelters, more people lived alone rather than with others. However, this was less common among PSH residents (61.2%) than among shelter users (64.8%).
- A somewhat larger share of PSH residents were in households with four or more people than people experiencing sheltered homelessness, 17.7 versus 16.8 percent.
- In many PSH programs, only people with disabilities are eligible. As a result, more than four in five adults living in PSH had a disability (86.6%). This is twice the rate of adults using shelter, where four in ten had a disability (42.9%).
- More than seven in ten adults in PSH (75.3%) had a mental health condition, substance abuse issue, or a dual diagnosis that includes both mental health and substance abuse.

Changes Over Time

- The share of people in PSH living alone increased from 55.6 percent in 2010 to 61.2 percent in 2016.
- Between 2015 and 2016, the share of people in PSH who reported any kind of disability increased 4.3 percentage points, from 82.3 percent to 86.6 percent.
- Between 2010 and 2016, the share of PSH residents with a physical disability doubled, increasing from 13.2 percent to 26.6 percent.
- The share of PSH residents with a dual diagnosis increased from 17.3 percent in 2010 to 28.8 percent in 2016.
- While comprising a small share of PSH residents, the share of residents with a developmental disability rose from 3.3 percent in 2010 to 6.2 percent in 2016 (10,646 more adults). Similarly, the share of PSH residents with HIV/AIDS is small but rose from 6.4 percent in 2010 to 7.7 percent in 2016 (8,552 more adults) over the same time period.

EXHIBIT 7.8: Household Size

People Living in PSH and People Using Shelter*, 2010–2016




EXHIBIT 7.9: Disability Status

Adults Living in PSH, 2010-2016 (in %)

Disability Type	2010	2015	2016
Any Type of Disability	78.8	82.3	86.6
Dual Diagnosis	17.3	25.3	28.8
Mental Health	24.2	32.5	36.7
Substance Abuse	11.9	8.4	9.8
Physical Disability	13.2	23.5	26.6
HIV/AIDS	6.4	6.7	7.7
Developmental Disability	3.3	5.6	6.2

Note 1: Programs funded by the HUD Continuum of Care program require documentation for disability type. Other programs may rely on self-reports.

Note 2: Percentages of veterans in PSH with different types of disabilities do not sum to 100% because people may have more than one type of disability. However, people with dual diagnosis—both a mental health and a substance abuse issue—are not included in the mental health and substance abuse categories.

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.

Geographic Location

In 2016


- About one-third of PSH residents (33.6%) were living in suburban and rural areas, while the other two-thirds (66.4%) lived in cities. However, PSH residents were less likely to be located in cities than were people experiencing sheltered homelessness (66.4% versus 73.6%).
- PSH residents were more than twice as likely to be living in cities as were people in the U.S. population.

Changes Over Time

- The number of PSH residents in suburban and rural areas increased 6.2 percent between 2015 and 2016, while the number of people in suburban and rural shelter programs decreased 12 percent. This continues the longer trend between 2010 and 2015, when the number of PSH residents in suburban and rural areas increased by 46.1 percent and the number of people experiencing sheltered homelessness in suburban and rural areas decreased by 35 percent.
- Between 2010 and 2016, the number of PSH residents living in cities increased by 17.4 percent (36,367 people). This rise was driven in part by a 6.7 percent increase (15,359 more people) in the number of PSH residents living in cities between 2015 and 2016.
- This general trend of increasing numbers of people living in PSH across both geographic categories was paired with an across-the-board decline in the number of sheltered people in principal cities (down 1.2% since 2015) and suburban and rural areas (down 12%).

EXHIBIT 7.10: Geographic Distribution

People Living in PSH, People Using Shelter*, and U.S. Population, 2010-2016



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, see the 2016 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*, 2010-2016

Population	2015-2016		2010-2016	
	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas	Principal Cities	Suburban and Rural Areas
People in PSH	6.7	6.2	17.4	46.1
Sheltered People	-1.2	-12.0	2.9	-35.0

*Shelter refers to emergency shelter and transitional housing programs.

Characteristics by Geography

In 2016

- Women made up a larger share of PSH residents in suburban and rural areas than in principal cities, 47.4 percent versus 42 percent.
- A larger share of people living in PSH located in suburban and rural areas were children under age 18 (23.7%) or adults ages 18 to 30 (13.2%) than were those in principal cities (18.2% and 11.7%). Among adults ages 18 to 30, 6.3 percent were between the ages of 18 to 24 in rural and suburban areas compared to 5.8 percent in principal cities.
- Conversely, adults over the age of 51 made up 39.4 percent of PSH residents in principal cities compared to 32.5 percent in suburban and rural areas.
- One-person PSH households were more common in principal cities than in suburban and rural areas (65.1 percent versus 53.6 percent).
- Adults with a disability made up the same share of PSH residents in principal cities and suburban and rural areas (86.6%).
- The share of PSH residents in principal cities who were African American or black (52.6%) was nearly 1.5 times the share in suburban and rural areas (35.1%).

Changes Over Time

- Among families with children living in PSH, fewer are large families. Between 2010 and 2016, the share of PSH residents in households of 4 or more declined from 21.4 percent to 20.9 percent in suburban and rural areas and from 19.5 percent to 16.1 percent in principal cities.
- The share of adults in PSH who had disabilities increased modestly between 2010 and 2016 in both principal cities (from 78.2% to 86.6%) and suburban and rural areas (from 80.1% to 86.6%).
- Between 2010 and 2016, the share of African Americans in PSH living in principal cities remained stable at about 52 percent, while the share living in suburban and rural areas rose from 29.3 to 35.1 percent.
- Within principal cities, the share of PSH residents identifying as Hispanic increased from 9.1 percent in 2010 to 12.1 percent in 2016. This increase was mirrored in suburban and rural areas, where the share increased from 9.9 percent to 11.7 percent.

EXHIBIT 7.12: Characteristics by Geography

People Living in PSH, 2010-2016 (in %)

Characteristic	Principal Cities			Suburban and Rural Areas		
	2010	2015	2016	2010	2015	2016
# People in PSH	209,414	230,423	245,781	85,334	117,353	124,634
Gender of Adults						
Male	53.4	56.5	58.0	51.0	51.2	52.6
Female	46.7	43.5	42.0	49.1	48.8	47.4
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	9.1	12.0	12.1	9.9	10.7	11.7
Non-Hispanic	90.9	88.0	87.9	90.1	89.3	88.3
Race						
White, Non-Hispanic	32.0	31.8	31.4	53.7	49.8	48.1
White, Hispanic	6.2	8.8	8.7	6.2	8.2	8.8
Black or African American	52.9	52.4	52.6	29.3	34.5	35.1
Other One Race	3.1	3.3	3.3	4.5	3.2	3.5
Multiple Races	5.9	3.8	4.0	6.3	4.3	4.5
Age						
Under Age 18	25.5	19.3	18.2	27.5	23.9	23.7
18 - 30	13.5	12.2	11.7	15.8	13.9	13.2
18 - 24	—	6.0	5.8	—	6.8	6.3
25 - 30	—	6.2	5.9	—	7.1	6.9
31 - 50	36.3	31.4	30.8	34.8	31.8	30.6
51 - 61	20.6	28.9	30.4	18.4	23.9	25.0
62 and Older	4.1	8.2	9.0	3.6	6.5	7.5
Household Size						
1 Person	56.0	62.9	65.1	54.5	53.4	53.6
2 People	13.0	10.3	9.7	11.5	13.6	13.4
3 People	11.5	9.7	9.1	12.6	12.5	12.2
4 People	9.1	8.0	7.3	9.8	10.0	9.8
5 or More People	10.4	9.1	8.8	11.7	10.5	11.0
Disability Status of Adults						
Disabled	78.2	81.5	86.6	80.1	84.0	86.6
Not Disabled	21.8	18.5	13.4	19.9	16.0	13.4

Note: Data were collected on people age 18-30 until 2015, when this information was collected separately for people age 18-24 and 25-30.

Places Adults in PSH Stayed before Entering PSH

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

In 2016

- Of the adults living in PSH, 4 in 5 (80%) had been homeless before they moved into PSH. Among those who were homeless before entering PSH, about 7 in 10 (69.3%) came from shelters rather than from a place not meant for human habitation.
- Before entering PSH, 13.5 percent of adults had been in a housed situation.
- Of those who came from a housed situation, the majority (51.2%) had been staying with family or friends, and 14.9 percent (5,577 adults) had been in another PSH program.
- Only 4.2 percent of adults in PSH were in an institutional setting prior to entering PSH. Over half (54.4%) of these 11,493 adults were in a substance abuse treatment center, 20.4 percent were in a psychiatric facility, 14.2 percent were in a hospital and 11.1 percent were in a correctional facility.

Changes Over Time


- The number of people entering PSH who came from a homeless situation increased 5.5 percent (11,488 more adults) between 2015 and 2016. In contrast, the share of people entering from a housed situation stayed relatively level, increasing by just 1.5 percent (564 more adults).
- The share of people entering PSH who came from a homeless situation increased from 66.1 to 80 percent between 2010 and 2016.
- Of the 93,529 more people who entered PSH from a homeless situation between 2010 and 2016, 43.9 percent came from unsheltered locations.
- Between 2010 and 2016, the share of people entering PSH who came from a housed situation dropped from 18.9 percent to 13.5 percent.

The share of people entering PSH who came from a homeless situation increased from 66.1% to 80% between 2010 and 2016.

EXHIBIT 7.13: Places Adults Stayed Before Entering PSH and Change Over Time, 2010-2016

Places Stayed	2016		2015-2016		2010-2016	
	#	%	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
Homeless*	221,841	80.0	11,488	5.5	93,529	72.9
Sheltered	153,654	69.3	1,637	33.1	52,484	51.9
Unsheltered	68,187	30.7	9,851	16.9	41,045	151.2
Housing	37,474	13.5	564	1.5	778	2.1
Staying with family	11,972	31.9	-248	-2.0	-250	-2.0
Staying with friends	7,222	19.3	-309	0.0	193	0.0
Rented housing unit	12,133	32.4	727	6.4	238	2.0
Owned housing unit	570	1.5	-28	-4.7	-1,031	-64.4
Permanent supportive housing (PSH)	5,577	14.9	422	8.2	1,628	41.2
Institutional Settings	11,493	4.2	-10	-0.1	507	4.6
Substance abuse treatment center	6,248	54.4	33	0.5	754	13.7
Correctional facility	1,274	11.1	-66	-4.9	51	4.2
Hospital	1,628	14.2	245	17.7	430	35.9
Psychiatric facility	2,343	20.4	-222	-8.7	-728	-23.7
Other Settings	6,467	2.3	-431	-6.2	-11,579	-64.2
Hotel or motel	2,671	41.3	68	2.6	339	14.5
Foster care home	566	8.8	87	18.2	-42	-6.9
Other living arrangement	3,230	49.9	-586	-15.4	-11,876	-78.6

EXHIBIT 7.14: Places Adults Stayed Before Entering PSH, 2010-2016 (in %)



*Homeless refers to people being served in emergency shelter, safe havens, or transitional housing programs, as well as people living in places not meant for human habitation.

Length of Stay and Other Bed-Use Patterns

In 2016

- More than one in five people living in PSH at some time during the reporting year (22.6%) had been there for one year or less. About half (49.9%) had lived in PSH between one and five years. Over a quarter (27.5%) had lived in PSH for more than five years.
- Of the 370,415 people in PSH, 40.3 percent moved either into or out of PSH during the reporting year, with 85,645 people entering and 63,722 people exiting.

Changes Over Time

- The number of individuals moving out of PSH between 2015 and 2016 increased 6.8 percent (2,708 more people), leaving more vacancies for new individuals to enter. The number of entries into PSH by individuals increased 32.1 percent.
- Between 2015 and 2016, the number of people in families with children moving out of PSH decreased by 2.4 percent (527 fewer people), leaving fewer vacancies for new families with children to enter. The number of entries into PSH by families with children decreased by 0.1 percent.
- While the number of people in families with children moving into PSH decreased slightly between 2015 and 2016, the number declined by 10.9 percent over the longer period, 2010 to 2016.
- 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 27.5 percent in 2016. This is due in part to the accumulation of reporting years and our improved ability to capture longer stays over time.
- The share of people staying in PSH a year or less declined from 31 percent in 2010 to 22.6 percent in 2016.

In 2016, over a quarter of PSH residents had lived in PSH for 5 years or longer.

EXHIBIT 7.15: Length of Stay

People Living in PSH, 2010-2016




EXHIBIT 7.16: Change in the Flow of Entry and Exit by Household Type

People Entering into and Exiting from PSH, 2010-2016

Length of Stay	2015-2016		2010-2016	
	# Change	% Change	# Change	% Change
Entering PSH				
All People	14,145	19.8	5,279	6.6
Individuals	14,450	32.1	8,781	17.3
People in Families with Children	-38	-0.1	-3,229	-10.9
Exiting PSH				
All People	2,012	3.3	9,884	18.4
Individuals	2,708	6.8	11,494	36.8
People in Families with Children	-527	-2.4	-1,409	-6.2

Note: The estimated change in individuals and change in people in families with children will not sum to the overall change because: 1) an overlap adjustment factor (see discussion in the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology section A.5 for more details) and 2) some people were in PSH as both individuals and in families with children at different points during the reporting year. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Destination at Move-Out for PSH Residents

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

In 2016

- Of people moving out of PSH, only 6.5 percent left PSH and became homeless. Of those 3,789 people, most (70.5%) entered shelters rather than going to unsheltered locations.
- Nearly three-quarters (73.4%) of people leaving PSH during the reporting year moved into another housed situation. Nearly three in five of those 42,545 people moved into housing they rented (58.3%). About one in five (21.5%) moved in with family, 9.5 percent went into other permanent supportive housing, and 8.5 percent stayed with friends. Just 2.2 percent moved into housing they owned.
- People in families with children who moved out of PSH were more likely to move into another housed situation than individuals who exited PSH (84.6% versus 67.8%).
- Of people moving out of PSH, 6.8 percent (3,960 people) went to an institutional setting. Of those, more than three in five (61.6%) entered a correctional facility, 15.3 percent a substance abuse treatment center, 13.7 percent a hospital, and 9.5 percent a psychiatric facility.
- Individuals who moved out of PSH were 3.3 times more likely to go to an institutional setting than people in families with children, 8.9 versus 2.7 percent. Individuals were more likely to exit to a hospital (15.1%) or a psychiatric facility (9.9%) than were families with children (4.2% and 6.7% respectively). However, people in families with children were more likely to exit to a correctional facility (71%) or a substance abuse treatment center (18.1%) than were individuals (60.2% and 14.9% respectively).

Among those who moved out of PSH in 2016, people in families with children were more likely to move into another housed situation (84.6%) than were individuals (67.8%).

Changes Over Time

- The share of all people who moved out of PSH to homelessness increased 10.4 percent from 2015 to 2016. This increase was driven by a 20.6 percent increase in the number of individuals who exited PSH into homelessness.
- Among people in families with children exiting from PSH, the share exiting to an institutional setting declined 14 percent between 2015 and 2016.

Data Source: HMIS 2010–2016

EXHIBIT 7.17: Destination upon Moving Out
People Living in PSH by Household Type, 2016

Destination	All People		Individuals		People in Families with Children	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Homeless*	3,789	6.5	3,080	8.0	724	3.7
Sheltered	2,672	70.5	2,080	67.5	603	83.3
Unsheltered	1,117	29.5	1,000	32.5	121	16.7
Housing	42,545	73.4	26,250	67.8	16,441	84.6
Staying with family	9,155	21.5	5,263	20.0	3,923	23.9
Staying with friends	3,614	8.5	2,568	9.8	1,054	6.4
Rented housing	24,795	58.3	15,200	57.9	9,684	58.9
Owned housing unit	935	2.2	597	2.3	341	2.1
Other PSH	4,046	9.5	2,622	10.0	1,439	8.8
Institutional Setting	3,960	6.8	3,453	8.9	520	2.7
Substance abuse treatment center	605	15.3	513	14.9	94	18.1
Correctional facility	2,438	61.6	2,077	60.2	369	71.0
Hospital	541	13.7	521	15.1	22	4.2
Psychiatric facility	376	9.5	342	9.9	35	6.7
Other Settings	13,428	13.3	9,906	15.4	3,577	9.1
Hotel or motel	380	2.8	221	2.2	160	4.5
Foster care home	289	2.2	54	0.5	236	6.6
Other living arrangement	3,177	23.7	2,038	20.6	1,146	32.0
Deceased	3,851	28.7	3,647	36.8	221	6.2
Missing destination	5,731	42.7	3,946	39.8	1,814	50.7

EXHIBIT 7.18: Percent Change in Destination upon Moving Out
People Living in PSH by Household Type, 2010–2016 (in %)

Destination	2015–2016			2010–2016		
	All People	Individuals	People in Families with Children	All People	Individuals	People in Families with Children
Homeless*	10.4	20.6	-18.1	80.0	84.9	64.9
Housing	4.8	9.3	-1.1	56.0	77.9	31.3
Institutional Setting	-4.0	-2.0	-14.0	30.2	28.5	46.1
Other Setting	-0.9	0.1	-2.5	-37.3	-18.0	-61.7

* Homeless refers to people being served in emergency shelter, safe havens, or transitional housing programs, as well as people living in places not meant for human habitation.

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 2016 estimates of veterans in PSH reflect a broader population than in reports published prior to 2015. 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

This report provides some supplemental information on veterans using HUD-VASH based on data from the U.S Department of Veteran Affairs 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 2016, 90,004 veterans lived in PSH.

2016 Estimate of Veterans in PSH

- 90,004 veterans lived in PSH in 2016.⁴ Most (91%) were in PSH as individuals rather than as members of a family with at least one child (9.4%).

Changes Over Time


- The number of veterans in PSH increased 19.5 percent between 2015 and 2016 (14,673 more veterans).
- The number of veterans in households as individuals in PSH increased 24.4 percent between 2015 and 2016 (16,081 more veterans), while the number of veterans in families with children in PSH declined 11.5 percent (1,100 fewer veterans).

³ For more information, please see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

⁴ The 95 percent confidence interval for veterans in PSH in 2016 is 87,537 to 92,471 (90,004 +/- 2,467).

Data Source: HMIS 2010–2016

EXHIBIT 7.19: One-Year Estimates of Veterans Living in PSH
By Household Type, 2010-2016



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 both as individuals and in families with children at different points during the reporting period.

Note 2: The large increase in the count from 2010 to 2015 reflects in part the more complete account of veterans permanently housed through the HUD-VASH program that starting in 2015. For more information, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

EXHIBIT 7.20: Change in Number of Veterans Living in PSH
By Household Type, 2010-2016

Population	2015-2016	
	# Change	% Change
Total Veteran Population	14,673	19.5
Individual Veterans	16,081	24.4
Veterans in Families with Children	-1,100	-11.5

Note: Because of the change in estimating veterans in HUD-VASH that started in 2015, this exhibit does not show changes from 2010 to 2016. For more information, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

Characteristics of Veterans Living in PSH

In 2016

- The typical veteran in PSH was a man (88%) who identified himself either as white and not Hispanic (46.2%) or as black or African American (42.9%).
- Among the 9.4 percent of veterans who were in PSH in families with children, the share of men and women were more evenly divided compared to those as individuals, but were still predominantly male.
- About half of veterans living in PSH were between 51 and 61 years old (50.7%).
- Among veterans living in PSH as individuals (i.e. without children), more than one in five (21.3%) was 62 or older. This is larger than the share age 62 or older among veterans experiencing sheltered homelessness as individuals (16.6%).
- More than 9 in 10 veterans living in PSH had a disability (90.6%). Veterans in PSH as individuals were more likely to have a disability than were veterans in PSH as part of a family with children (91.3% versus 83.7%).
- Nearly half (46.2%) of all veterans in PSH had a physical disability. About a third (34%) had a dual diagnosis of both mental health and substance abuse problems, 36.2 percent had mental health challenges absent substance abuse problems, and 13 percent had substance abuse issues absent mental health challenges.

Changes Over Time

- The share of veterans living in PSH with any kind of disability increased from 80.5 percent in 2010 to 83.6 percent in 2015, and further increased to 90.6 percent in 2016.
- The share of veterans living in PSH with a dual diagnosis increased from 23.7 percent in 2010 to 34 percent in 2016.
- Between 2015 and 2016, the share of veterans living in PSH with a physical disability increased six percentage points, from 40.2 percent to 46.2 percent.

Data Source: HMIS 2010–2016

EXHIBIT 7.21: Characteristics by Household Type

Veterans Living in PSH, 2016 (in %)

Characteristic	All Veterans	Individual Veterans	Veterans in Families with Children
# Veterans in PSH	90,004	81,896	8,504
Gender			
Male	88.0	90.6	58.3
Female	11.9	9.3	41.7
Ethnicity			
Hispanic	6.5	5.9	13.2
Non-Hispanic	93.5	94.1	86.8
Race			
White, Non-Hispanic	46.2	47.2	34.4
White, Hispanic	5.0	4.6	9.7
Black or African American	42.9	42.3	50.0
Other One Race	2.5	2.5	2.5
Multiple Races	3.5	3.5	3.4
Age			
18 - 30	4.1	2.9	17.5
18 - 24	0.6	0.5	1.5
25 - 30	3.5	2.4	16.0
31 - 50	25.3	22.2	61.3
51 - 61	50.7	53.7	16.9
62 and older	19.9	21.3	4.3
Disability Status			
Disabled	90.6	91.3	83.7
Not Disabled	9.4	8.7	16.3

EXHIBIT 7.22: Disability Type

Veterans Living in PSH, 2010-2016 (in %)

Disability Type	2010	2015	2016
Any Type of Disability	80.5	83.6	90.6
Dual Diagnosis	23.7	33.1	34.0
Mental Health	23.3	33.6	36.2
Substance Abuse	16.7	12.0	13.0
Physical Disability	22.1	40.2	46.2
HIV/AIDS	5.8	5.0	4.9
Developmental Disability	1.8	3.7	3.8

Note 1: Programs funded by the HUD Continuum of Care program require documentation for disability type. Other programs may rely on self-reports.

Note 2: Percentages of veterans in PSH with different types of disabilities do not sum to 100% because people may have more than one type of disability. However, people with dual diagnosis—both a mental health and a substance abuse issue—are not included in the mental health and substance abuse categories.

Places Veterans Stayed Before Moving Into PSH

In 2016

- More than eight in ten veterans living in PSH were homeless immediately before program entry (81.8%). Of these 68,113 veterans, 32 percent were living in a place not meant for human habitation.
- Of the 9,536 veterans in PSH who moved in from another housed situation, 38.5 percent had been in housing they rented, 26.7 percent had been living with family, and 19.2 percent had been living with friends.
- Over half (52.7%) of the 3,844 veterans who came to PSH from an institutional setting, came from a substance abuse treatment center.

Changes Over Time

- The share of veterans experiencing homelessness before entering PSH increased from 75.5 percent in 2010 to 81.8 percent in 2016.

EXHIBIT 7.23: Places Veterans Stayed Before Moving Into PSH, 2010-2016 (in %)




EXHIBIT 7.24: Change in Places Veterans Stayed Before Moving Into PSH, 2015-2016

Prior Living Arrangement	2015-2016	
	# Change	% Change
Homeless*	10,835	18.9
Housing	1,211	14.5
Institutional Settings	473	14.0
Other Settings	205	12.6

Note: Because of the change in estimating veterans in HUD-VASH that started in 2015, this exhibit does not show changes from 2010 to 2016. For more information, see the 2016 AHAR Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. This report can be downloaded from: www.hudexchange.info.

* Homeless refers to people being served in emergency shelter, safe havens, or transitional housing programs, as well as people living in places not meant for human habitation.

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)⁵ combines rental assistance with case management and clinical services. HUD provides the rental assistance through the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program. The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) provides case management and clinical services through VA medical centers (VAMCs) and community-based outpatient clinics (CBOCs).⁶ 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 VAMC or CBOC 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, 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 or she stays housed. Basing HUD-VASH on Housing First means that the veteran does not have to complete treatment or be currently sober before moving into permanent housing. Services that are provided focus on supporting the veteran's individual goals, and participation in services are not a condition⁷ of continued occupancy of the housing with support from the voucher subsidy.

This year's AHAR is the second to provide information from the VA's Homeless Operations Management Evaluation System (HOMES) about veterans who use HUD-VASH.⁸ The VAMCs and CBOCs that administer the HUD-VASH program are required to report data into HOMES, but most do not provide information to an HMIS. Although data from HOMES are similar to HMIS data in some respects, the data elements are sufficiently different that the information reported here on veterans in HUD-VASH cannot be compared directly to the HMIS-based information on veterans in other PSH units. In order to improve the comparability between HUD-VASH numbers and other permanent supportive housing programs reported in AHAR, the HUD-VASH numbers reported here do not include veterans who were receiving case management and had not yet moved into a housing unit supported by a voucher rental subsidy.

⁵ For more information on the HUD-VASH program see: http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/hcv/vash and <http://www.va.gov/homeless/hud-vash.asp>.

⁶ Examples of clinical services are health care, mental health treatment, and substance use counseling.

⁷ Participation involves case management, which the program defines individually for each veteran.

⁸ http://www.endveteranhomelessness.org/sites/default/files/HOMES_User_Manual_2011.pdf

Source: Homeless Operations Management Evaluation System (HOMES) data 2015-2016

EXHIBIT 7.25: Characteristics of Veterans using HUD-VASH Housing Subsidies, 2015-2016

Characteristic	% Veterans in HUD-VASH (2015)	% Veterans in HUD-VASH (2016)
Gender		
Male	87.7	86.8
Female	12.3	13.2
Ethnicity		
Hispanic	8.1	7.2
Non-Hispanic	91.9	92.8
Race		
White	51.0	50.0
Black or African American	45.3	46.4
Other One Race	3.7	3.5
Age		
18-30	3.7	4.8
31-50	23.7	25.0
51-61	47.0	46.7
62 and older	25.3	23.5
Destination at Exit^a		
Homeless	7.7	5.7
Housing ^b	65.2	73.2
Institutional Settings ^c	6.3	6.5
Other Settings ^d	20.8	14.6

Source: Homeless Operations Management Evaluation System (HOMES) data

^a Destination is only calculated for veterans who left the program, which is a small proportion of the total veterans described in the other characteristics.

^b Housing includes a number of situations, including owned and rented housing that may be subsidized or not subsidized and permanent or temporary (such as staying with family or friends).

^c Institutional Settings include psychiatric facilities, non-psychiatric hospitals, correctional facilities, and non-VA residential treatment programs.

^d For destination at exit, unknown destination is included in other settings.

HOMES data and HMIS data

- HOMES provides data from the VA's system of care for veterans experiencing homelessness. Submission of data is mandatory for VAMCs and CBOCs. 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 2016 fiscal year, 114,281 veterans had been housed with a housing subsidy through the HUD-VASH program at some point since the program underwent significant expansion in 2008. Between FY 2015 and FY 2016, the program housed an additional 16,000. As of September 2016, 72,481 HUD-VASH vouchers were currently under lease.

As of September 2016, more than 114,000 veterans had been housed through HUD-VASH vouchers since the program began in 2008.

Exhibit 7.25 shows the characteristics of veterans using HUD-VASH vouchers at some point during the 2016 fiscal year and shows how those characteristics changed between FY 2015 and FY 2016. Most veterans using HUD-VASH vouchers were men, 86.6 percent.¹² However, the share of veterans who were women increased by nearly one percentage point between 2015 (12.3%) and 2016 (13.2%). In 2016, half (50%) of veterans using HUD-VASH vouchers identified themselves as white, 46.4 percent as black or African American, and 3.5 percent as some other race. When asked about their ethnic identify, 7.2 percent identified themselves as Hispanic (any race). Veterans using HUD-VASH housing vouchers typically were between 51 and 61 years of age (46.7%), with a quarter ages 31 to 50, under a quarter (23.5%) age 62 or older, and very few (4.8%) between 18 and 30. Veterans using HUD-VASH housing subsidies in 2016 are slightly younger than were those in 2015.

Among those who left the HUD-VASH program, nearly three quarters (73.2%) went to another housing situation (which could be either permanent or temporary), 6.5 percent went to an institutional setting, and 5.7 percent became homeless. About one in seven (14.6%) were reported as going to "other" settings, which includes cases where the program administrators did not know where the veteran went. The share of veterans who exited the HUD-VASH program to another housing situation increased by 8 percentage points from 2015 (65.2%) to 2016 (73.6%), and the share who became homeless declined by 2 percentage points.

¹² The information is based on the veteran in the household, excluding other household members who may be in the HUD-VASH unit.





The U.S. Department of
Housing and Urban Development
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT