
CITY OF SEATTLE



2016
HOMELESS
NEEDS ASSESSMENT

REPORT PRODUCED BY ASR

Acknowledgements

The 2016 City of Seattle Homeless Assessment planning team would like to thank the many individuals and agencies who contributed their considerable talents and efforts to this project. The participation of partner agencies and individuals with lived experience is critical to the success of the project, from the initial planning meetings, to data collection, and through the final stages of the project. Dozens of city and county staff and local community-based organizations assisted with different aspects of the project. We thank these individuals for their valued guidance and input.

The City of Seattle and ASR would like to mention the following individuals in particular for their many hours in planning and oversight.

- Lindsey Garrity – City of Seattle
- Carolyn Hammen – City of Seattle
- Joy Hunt – City of Seattle
- Nissa Limbach – City of Seattle
- Jon Morrison Winters – City of Seattle
- Emily Nolan – City of Seattle
- Adam Petkun – City of Seattle
- Karyn Poblocki – All Home
- Andrew Constantino - Nickelsville
- Leslie Brinson Price – City of Seattle
- Sola Plumacher – City of Seattle
- Mark Putnam – All Home
- Noel Rees – Healthcare for the Homeless
- John Gilvar – Healthcare for the Homeless
- Rodrigo Sanchez – City of Seattle
- Kate Speltz – King County
- Tina Walha – City of Seattle

We would also like to thank the following organizations for hosting focus groups and ensuring diverse participation and insight.

- New Horizons
- St. Luke's Episcopal Church
- Mary's Place
- Peter's Place

Table of Contents

Table of Figures	4	Health Needs, Access and Drug Use.....	26
Executive Summary	1	Drug Use	27
General Findings.....	8	Domestic Violence and Abuse	28
Survey Demographics	8	Appendix I: Methodology.....	29
Living Accommodations before		Survey Planning and Implementation	29
Homelessness.....	15	Survey Administration Details	29
Duration and Recurrence of		Focus Group Methodology	31
Homelessness.....	18	Focus Group Recruitment.....	31
Cause of Homelessness, Prevention and		Focus Group Challenges and Limitations .	31
Housing Assistance.....	19	Appendix II: Survey Results	32
Access to Services	22	Table of Figures	32
Justice System Involvement.....	25		

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Age Breakdown.....	8	Location, Respondents Answering Yes	17
Figure 2. Age at which Resident First Experienced Homelessness	9	Figure 19. Length of Homelessness This Current Time	18
Figure 3. Gender	10	Figure 20. Number of Times Experiencing Homelessness in the Last Year and in the Past Three Years, Including This Time	19
Figure 4. Sexual Orientation	10	Figure 21. Primary Event or Condition That Led to Respondents' Current Episode of Homelessness	20
Figure 5. Race/Ethnicity.....	11	Figure 22. What Would Help You Obtain Permanent Housing.....	21
Figure 6. Educational Attainment.....	11	Figure 23. Would Move Inside if Safe, Affordable Housing Were Available	21
Figure 7. Employment Status.....	12	Figure 24. Government Assistance	24
Figure 8. Primary Language is English.....	12	Figure 25. Local Services	24
Figure 9. Veterans Status.....	13	Figure 26. Shelter Use	25
Figure 10. Relationship of People Currently Living in Household.....	14	Figure 27. Reasons for Not Currently Using any Type of Shelter Services.....	25
Figure 11. Number of Individuals Currently Living with vs Number of Individuals Preferred to Seek Housing with	15	Figure 28. On Probation or Parole at the Time They Most Recently Became Homeless	26
Figure 12. Where Respondents Were Living at the Time They Most Recently Became Homeless.....	16	Figure 29. Health Conditions.....	26
Figure 13. Originally From Seattle	16	Figure 30. Usual Place of Medical Care	27
Figure 14. Length of Time living in Seattle ..	16	Figure 32. Experienced Domestic Violence or Abuse.....	28
Figure 15. Reason For Moving to Seattle.....	16		
Figure 16. Living Arrangements Immediately Prior to Experiencing Homelessness This Time	16		
Figure 17. Where Residents Have Stayed At Some Point In the Last Month	17		
Figure 18. Was Approached By an Outreach Worker While Unsheltered By			

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 2, 2015 Seattle Mayor Ed Murray declared a “State of Emergency on Homelessness” and directed his staff to lead a coordinated response to this growing phenomenon. Many efforts have been underway since his declaration and there is progress on many fronts. Early on, the plan emphasized the need to gather more information about people living unsheltered in Seattle to help inform the response effort, and to educate the public, program planners, and policy makers.

The project goals were to develop an increased understanding of individuals and families residing on the streets, in encampments, and in emergency shelters of the city. The city was interested in developing a profile and description of the population as well as defining current service needs in order to better serve and mitigate the experience of homelessness. The study was not intended to be a prevalence study nor a gap analysis. Instead it was designed to elicit a personal perspective of existing needs and satisfaction with the current system of care as well as an exploration of what those who were experiencing homelessness felt would assist them. The project combined both quantitative and qualitative data collection in order to gain understanding on the breadth and depth of homelessness in the City of Seattle.


In November 2016, the coordinated response continued, and more than 1,050 unique surveys were completed with individuals experiencing homelessness in the city of Seattle. The survey was then supplemented by six targeted focus groups, held with roughly 80 individuals representing different subpopulations within the city. Focus group discussions were facilitated to further reflect on the preliminary survey data and provide additional insight into experiences that could not be obtained from a brief survey. Focus group recruitment was designed to reach targeted subpopulations identified by the city including youth, families with children, those who stay in authorized encampments, those who stay in unsanctioned encampments, persons in emergency shelters, and those who sleep in vehicles.

Survey Results

Majority of respondents living in Seattle/King County when they became homeless

A common question that arises in planning a community response to homelessness has to do with residence and whether the services are attracting persons experiencing homelessness to the city. This is a complex question but the data shows that Seattle’s population experiencing homelessness are generally “homegrown” with around 70% having said they lived in Seattle or King County when they were last stably housed. This is consistent with other communities who solicit this information.


WHERE RESPONDENTS WERE LIVING AT THE TIME THEY MOST RECENTLY BECAME HOMELESS




Majority of respondents came to Seattle to join personal network or job opportunity

Another common perception is that this population are recent arrivals to the city and county who have been attracted to the homeless service network and local resources. The survey suggests that the length of time of local residence is probably not too different from the general population and people come to the area to access their personal safety nets, job opportunities, and for other common reasons.

HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN IN SEATTLE?



WHY DID YOU COME TO SEATTLE?



More than half of respondents have been homeless for more than a year


Respondents were also asked about their length of homelessness in the survey. Roughly 50% had been homeless for a year or more which is consistent with many communities.

Similar demographic profiles were found across people accessing shelter compared to people living outdoors


There are frequently many questions about the different characteristics of those persons experiencing homeless who have found shelter and those that haven't. The survey responses suggest there is little difference in the demographic characteristics of sheltered and unsheltered individuals. We asked about immigrant and refugee experience and found almost 11% described themselves as such and a similar percentage said English was not their primary language.

The following charts profile some of the basic demographic characteristics found through the survey:


AGE



WHICH RACIAL GROUP DO YOU IDENTIFY WITH MOST?



CURRENT LENGTH OF HOMELESSNESS



Homeless services can be challenging to navigate, but people want to be housed

Focus group participants spoke extensively about their challenges in navigating the “system” including physical, mental, and behavioral health, the housing support network as well as challenges in obtaining basic needs. Long waiting lists, communication, paperwork and follow-up challenges, inexperienced case management, and insufficient outreach services were all common themes in focus groups.

Another question posed to respondents addressed a common perception that many experiencing homelessness do not want help; they are travelers or sojourners, and they prefer to be left alone. Well over 90% of respondents said they would move into safe and affordable housing if it were offered. Housing affordability is a clearly stated issue as 41% of respondents worked full time, part time, temporarily or seasonally. Only 20% claimed they were unable to work. Less than 20% did not finish high school and 35% had some college or a college degree (12%). When unsheltered respondents were asked to respond to why they didn’t use local shelter services the responses were varied but there are clearly barriers to effective housing placement.

WHY DON'T YOU USE SHELTER SERVICES?

	Unsheltered
They are too crowded	37%
Bugs	30%
There are too many rules	28%
They are full	27%
I can't stay with my partner/family	23%
Germs	22%
They don't accept my pet	22%
There is nowhere to store my stuff	19%
They are too far away	18%
I can't stay with my friends	13%


Significant experience with domestic violence and/or foster care during lifetime

The survey also asked about domestic violence (DV) and abuse. Almost 42% reported they had a DV experience in their lifetime with especially high rates for transgender respondents (almost 70%) and youth under 25 years of age (51%). Over 23% of our respondents reported a history of foster care which is much greater than the general population.

Reported drug use and mental health issues

Drug use is frequently mentioned as a primary cause and characteristic of persons experiencing homelessness. While drug and alcohol use is documented, the survey indicates that 45% do not engage in drug use (marijuana was not specifically profiled, though the high response rate under "other" could include reports of marijuana use which was not asked in the survey.)


DRUG USE



"People think that most the people out here are on dope. Most people out here have mental issues."

Focus group respondents noted a perceived prejudice from local law enforcement that there was a majority of drug users in the population and explained that this is not correct. Focus group attendees explained this perception by noting that while there is some drug use, there are significant health conditions that also could contribute to the perception of drug addiction. The chart below indicates many mental health conditions that support this.

HEALTH CONDITIONS



GENERAL FINDINGS - HEALTH CONDITIONS

	Experience	Prevent Work or Housing
Depression	42%	21%
Post-traumatic Stress Disorder	31%	1%
Bipolar Disorder	24%	13%
A physical disability	20%	11%
Any other psychiatric or emotional condition	19%	10%
Diabetes	14%	4%
Schizophrenia	9%	5%
Cancer	7%	3%
Traumatic Brain injury	6%	3%

N = 997-1,013


"The problem is we don't heal ourselves. We start doing more, more, and more. We lose our self-values, our self-respect. We don't care about anybody because they don't care about us. Like with Seattle, I grew up here. We're a number. I don't have an identity. I don't have a name."

Housing affordability a key component in the complex causes of homelessness

There is a lot of interest in what elements are some of the primary causes of homelessness. We know from experience that this is complicated and there are a constellation of factors which contribute to an individual becoming homeless. In the competitive and skyrocketing Seattle real estate market there are concerns about the role of housing affordability as causes of homelessness. Approximately 20% of respondents listed housing affordability issues as the primary event/condition that led to their homelessness; these include rent increases (11%), friends and family not being able to affording having the person stay (3%), eviction (3%), and foreclosure (3%). In families, the prevalence of evictions were higher at 9%. Focus group respondents noted that property managers and landlords were raising rents radically to take advantage of surging demand and that deposit requirements and other eligibility stipulations were unattainable for many homeless. They also mentioned a significant level of discrimination that was perceived during their application and clear attempts to discourage their interest in available property.

One of the consistent findings in our surveys and focus group efforts was a strong desire to obtain permanent housing and become self-sufficient. When asked to list what specific interventions would help, respondents were clear in what they needed.

WHAT WOULD HELP YOU OBTAIN PERMANENT HOUSING?

**Seattle is not alone in these findings**

The City of Seattle staff were generally interested in any significant difference we observed in our study effort compared to other locations where ASR has worked where a similar research methodology was used. Some differences were observed but the general findings were similar to other West Coastal communities. Direct comparisons are challenging due to many factors but several findings are consistent with our other research efforts. Some similarities we noted generally include:

- Seattle's homeless are generally 'local' to the area and come to the city for opportunity
- Significant number of encampments all over the city
- 30% of respondents are chronically homeless
- High percentage of foster youth
- Large number of homeless veterans
- Significant demand for mental and behavioral health and rehab services
- Large number of employed homeless
- High rates of domestic violence and trauma
- Need for more qualified and peer-sourced outreach workers
- Strong client perception that coordinated entry, case management and referral system is not working
- Large numbers of vehicularly housed

The complete report that follows includes a more detailed profile of the characteristics of homelessness in the City of Seattle. Survey results are presented for the overall population, for unaccompanied youth under 25, and for a comparison of sheltered and unsheltered respondents. While the body of the report contains the key findings and areas of interest, all responses are profiled in the appendix and may be accessed through a directory. Additionally, survey crosstabs were developed for youth respondents under 25 in a separate appendix and there is an additional

display of responses that compares the responses of sheltered and unsheltered persons. Finally, due to the complex nature of many survey questions follow-up focus groups were convened to review basic findings and enable more detailed discussion of key research themes. These responses have been integrated into the report text where appropriate.

GENERAL FINDINGS


Survey Demographics

To gain a more comprehensive understanding of those experiencing homelessness in the city of Seattle, respondents were asked basic demographic questions, including age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity and race.

Age

Eight percent (8%) of survey respondents were under the age of 25 at the time of the survey. Forty-seven percent (47%) were between the ages of 25 and 40, 41% were between the ages of 41 and 60, and 5% were 61 years of age or older at the time of the survey. Due to constraints on data collection and human subjects' protection during this project, surveys were not conducted with children under the age of 18.

Figure 1. AGE BREAKDOWN



N = 1,050, note: no one surveyed was under the age of 18.

We found that the unsheltered population tended to be younger than the sheltered population; 28% of the unsheltered population respondents were 30 or younger, while only 18% of the sheltered respondents were in that same age range.

In an effort to better understand the experiences of those without housing, respondents were asked how old they were the first time they experienced homelessness. In response, 18% reported that they were under the age of 18, 25% reported they were between the ages of 18-24, 47% reported they were between the ages of 25 and 49, and 9% reported they were over 50 the first time they experienced homelessness.

These data are of particular interest given the relatively small percentage of survey respondents who reported their current age was under 25 years old and points to the large number of individuals who experience homelessness early on, either on their own or as a child of a homeless family.


First Episode

Data suggests multiple episodes of homelessness over a lifetime are the origins of chronic homelessness. About 18% of respondents between the ages of 25 and 55 reported that they were

under 18 years of age when they first experienced homelessness. There has also been increased interest in the number of seniors experiencing homelessness for the first time. While 22% of respondents were over age 51, 9% reported their first experience with homelessness between the ages of 50 and 65, while less than 1% indicated that they first experienced homelessness over the age of 66.

However, these data have implications for service delivery, stressing the need for increased outreach to homeless families and unaccompanied children and youth. In 2016, 16% of the homeless population of King County were under the age of 18 (both unaccompanied and in families), 9% were between the ages of 18-24 years old, and 75% were over age 25. National point-in-time count data were similar and showed the 22% of persons experiencing homelessness were under age 18, 9% were between the ages of 18-24, and 69% were 25 or older.


Figure 2. AGE AT WHICH RESIDENT FIRST EXPERIENCED HOMELESSNESS



Gender and Sexual Orientation

Fifty-nine percent (59%) of survey respondents identified as male, 37% female, 3% transgender, and 1% reported an alternative gender identification. While there are limited data on the number of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) individuals experiencing homelessness, available data suggests that LGBTQ individuals experience homelessness at higher rates, especially in the youth and young adult population. A 2008 study on health outcomes for LGBTQ residents in King County also showed poorer health outcomes compared to non-LGBTQ residents.¹ In total, 28% of survey respondents identified as LGBTQ. Five percent (5%) identified as gay, 4% as lesbian, 3% as queer, 12% as bisexual, and 4% as an alternative sexual orientation.

Figure 3. GENDER



N = 1,050

Figure 4. SEXUAL ORIENTATION

	Percentage	Respondents
Straight	73.8%	765
Bisexual	12.2%	126
Gay	5.4%	56
Other	3.8%	39
Lesbian	3.5%	36
Queer	3.0%	31

N=1,037 respondents offering 1,053 responses.


¹ 2016 from <https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/SeattleLGBTCommission/documents/LGBTReportFinal12-17-07.pdf>

Race/Ethnicity

Questions regarding race/ethnicity matched those asked by the US Census Bureau allowing for comparison of the survey population and the general population of Seattle. About 14% of homeless survey respondents identified as Hispanic or Latino, while only 6% of the general population of Seattle identified as Hispanic or Latino².

In order to provide additional clarity on the population, race and ethnicity were combined to provide a picture of the overall survey population. Based upon these more than half of survey respondents identified as White/Caucasian (Non-Hispanic/Latino), 23% as Black/African American (Non-Hispanic/Latino), and 16% as Hispanic/Latino.

Figure 5. RACE/ETHNICITY




N = 990; Source: United States Census Bureau. (2016). 2015 American Community Survey 1-year estimates.

Education and Employment

Survey respondents were asked their highest level of education. Forty-six percent (46%) of respondents reported they had completed High School or obtained a GED, 23% had completed some college or obtained an Associate’s Degree. An additional 12% had a College degree or higher. Nineteen percent (19%) of respondents reported they had not completed High School.

Figure 6. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT




N = 1,037

² https://factfinder.census.gov/bkms/table/1.0/en/ACS/15_5YR/DP05/1600000US5363000

Thirty-nine percent (39%) of survey respondents reported they were unemployed, an additional 20% reported they were unable to work. Thirteen percent (13%) reported they were employed full time. An additional 28% reported they were employed part-time or in temporary/seasonal employment.

Figure 7. EMPLOYMENT STATUS




N = 1,034

English as Primary Language

Eleven percent (11%) of survey respondents reported that English was **not** their primary language. Thirty-five percent (35%) of respondents who reported English was not their primary language reported staying in Transitional Housing or Emergency Shelter. Forty-two percent (42%) of Hispanic/Latino respondents, 40% of Asian respondents, and 21% of American Indian or Alaskan Native respondents reported English was not their primary language.

Figure 8. PRIMARY LANGUAGE IS ENGLISH



N = 1,029

Refugees and US Immigrants

When asked about refugee or immigration status, 11% of respondents considered themselves a United States immigrant or refugee. Fifty-five percent (55%) of respondents who identified as refugees reported their primary language was English. Thirty-five percent (35%) reported they were staying in Emergency Shelter or Transitional Housing and an additional 15% reported staying in Motels/Hotels. Of refugee respondents, more than half (54%) were between the ages of 30-50 years old, less than 6% were under the age of 25. Forty percent (40%) of United States immigrant or

refugee respondents were Hispanic/Latino, while 19% were White and 16% were Black, African, or African American.

Veterans Status

Despite efforts to address veteran homelessness at the local and federal level, 14% of the population were identified as veterans. More than half (55%) were unsheltered. Of those who were unsheltered, 19% were living in sanctioned encampments. Seventy-two percent (72%) identified as male, 24% as female and 3% as transgender. Three percent (3%) of veterans were under age 25, 25% of veterans were ages 51-60, and 11% were over the age of 60. Thirty-one percent (31%) of veterans reported they had not received health care or benefits from the VA.

Figure 9. VETERANS STATUS

	Yes	No
Have you ever served in the US Armed Forces?	13.6%	86.4%
Have you ever received health care or benefits from the VA? (Veterans)	68.5%	31.5%

N = 1,011 (US Armed Forces); n = 143(Health Care or Benefits from VA)

“As a veteran, I hate those encampments (authorized). All the neighborhood hates your guts. It is so not secure. Your security at these encampments is other people. Do you know how many times everyone’s been thieved from there? There’s not security.”

History of Foster Care

It has been estimated that one in four former foster youth experience homelessness within four years of exiting the foster care system. Transitional housing programs and supportive services are available for youth 18-24. It is hoped that the programs and services assist foster youth with their transition to independence and prevent them from becoming homeless.

“When I was younger, for a couple of months I lived at a bus stop. This life is what I know. When they put me in foster care for a couple of years, I didn't do very well. I'm not use to having a room and a place like that so I was always running away.”

Focus group participants, especially those in the youth and family groups, identified the lack of support for youth transitioning out of foster care, combined with previous experiences of instability and abuse in foster care homes, as causes of homelessness for this vulnerable population. Others also identified family instability and drug use as contributing factors for young people experiencing homelessness for the first time. In addition, involvement in the criminal justice system and previous criminal records contribute to the lack of housing available to people in Seattle. As a participant noted, *“Don't be a felon in the city and try to get an apartment. No amount of money can get you past a felony.”* Finally, some people noted that lacking job experience, child care, and legal immigration status are other issues people face that contribute to homelessness.

“There definitely needs to be more supervision, because pretty much every female that I’ve talked to that has been in the foster care system, one point of the time. I mean, one point time or other they have been molested, raped and a lot of them, because of that situation they start having... you know what happens when they’re raped, they start blaming themselves and then they start turning into prostituting.”


Twenty-three percent (23%) of all survey respondents reported a history of foster care. Of these respondents, 12.9% were under the age of 25, 77.6% were between the ages of 25 and 55 and 9.5% were over the age of 55. By age group, 40% of respondents under the age of 25, 22% of respondents between the ages of 25 and 55 and 18% of respondents over the age of 55 reported a history of foster care. Four percent (4%) of respondents with an experience of foster care reported aging out of foster care as the primary cause of their homelessness, and 6% reported living in foster care immediately before they became homeless.

Sixty-nine percent (69%) of respondents with an experience of foster care reported living in Seattle or King County immediately before they became homeless, while 17% reported living elsewhere in the State of Washington.

Household Composition

For those experiencing homelessness, household makeup can affect housing opportunities and access to other supportive services. Forty-four percent (44%) of survey respondents reported living in multi-person households.

Figure 10. RELATIONSHIP OF PEOPLE CURRENTLY LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD




N = 601 respondents offering 745 responses

While 41% of respondents reported having children of their own, less than 8% of survey respondents reported they were currently living with their own child under the age of 18. In fact, a higher than expected number of respondents reported living with their adult children. Of respondents who had children living with them, 32% of children were under the age of five, and 26% were between the ages of six and seventeen, and 42% were 18 and over. It should be noted that data on homeless families with children can be misleading and our data does not represent the full extent of homeless children and families. The Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) uses a broader definition of homelessness that includes double-up and hotel/motel living situations and their 2014/2015 school year identified 7,260 homeless students in K12 schools.

Shared Housing Interest

Survey respondents were asked about the number of individuals they would include in their housing request. Most (70%) reported that they would prefer to seek housing alone or with one other person.

Figure 11. NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS CURRENTLY LIVING WITH VS NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS PREFERRED TO SEEK HOUSING WITH



N = 989 (Currently Living With); N = 995 (Prefer Seeking Housing With)

Pregnancy

Eleven percent (11%) of female survey respondents (N=364) reported they were pregnant at the time of the survey. More than half of these women were not already living with a child. Twenty eight percent (28%) of pregnant females were under age 25. Thirty-one percent (31%) of pregnant females were staying in shelter or transitional housing.

“Childcare has always been a big problem. You fight so hard to do the things they say about your child, you want to work, but you can’t afford childcare along with the other bills you have.”


Living Accommodations before Homelessness

The way in which an individual seeks services as well as their ability to access support from friends or family is affected by where they lived prior to experiencing homelessness. Previous circumstances can point to gaps in the system of care and opportunities for systemic improvement and homelessness prevention. Focus group participants reported that they were hesitant to look for housing outside of Seattle unless there was convenient transportation. They felt that work, their social support network and services were all in the city and moving away would require a lot of movement that was not always possible.

Housing History

Respondents were asked where they lived when they last had stable housing. The majority (49%) of respondents reported they were living in the City of Seattle at the time they most recently became homeless. Thirty-one percent (31%) of respondents report being originally from Seattle. Of the 69% of respondents not originally from Seattle, (15%) report living in Seattle for 10 or more years.

Figure 12. WHERE RESPONDENTS WERE LIVING AT THE TIME THEY MOST RECENTLY BECAME HOMELESS




N = 1,042

Thirteen percent (13%) of respondents reported that they were living outside of the state when they became homeless, while 21% reported they were in King County, and 9% reported they were in another county in Washington. The most common reason respondents cited moving to Seattle was because family/friends live in Seattle (35%) and for a local job (34%). Fifteen percent (15%) of respondents cited moving to Seattle to access homeless services. Of respondents who moved for work, 36% had full or part-time employment.


Due to the City’s interest in residency history and homeless migration patterns, we compared the survey responses of local and King County respondents to those from out of state and out of County. We found no significant differences in responses that were outside a normal margin of error nor any patterns which would suggest a special reason to come to Seattle.

Figure 13. ORIGINALLY FROM SEATTLE




N = 1,050

Figure 14. LENGTH OF TIME LIVING IN SEATTLE



N = 1,006

Figure 15. REASON FOR MOVING TO SEATTLE




N = 706 respondents offering 967 responses

Prior Living Arrangements

Forty-one percent (41%) of survey respondents reported living in a home owned or rented by themselves or their partner immediately prior to becoming homeless, closely followed by 27% who reported staying with friends or family. Twelve percent (12%) were connected to an institution or system immediately prior to experiencing homelessness: 8% were in a jail or prison facility, 2% were on a military base/active duty, 1% were in foster care, and 1% were in a juvenile justice facility.

Figure 16. LIVING ARRANGEMENTS IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS THIS TIME




N = 1,008

Current Living Arrangements

Close to half of survey respondents reported spending the prior night living outdoors (45%). Of those who stayed in an outdoor location, 30% reported staying in an authorized encampment³, 22% in a park, 9% in an automobile, 8% in a camper/RV/van, and 34% in another outdoor location like a sidewalk or public right of way.

Figure 17. WHERE RESIDENTS HAVE STAYED AT SOME POINT IN THE LAST MONTH




N = 1,002 respondents offering 2,051 responses

Outreach Access

Respondents were also asked if they were ever approached by an outreach worker at any unsheltered locations. Seventy-six percent (76%) of respondents reported being approached by an outreach worker while at an authorized or sanctioned encampment. Forty-one percent (41%) of survey respondents had been asked, at least once, to move sleeping locations as the result of an encampment clean-up.

“They would tell me that I would have to meet with the social worker and I didn’t even know what a social worker was. I was so confused, I did not know what to do. My brain was spinning, I felt really dumb when I was talking to her, and I was like ‘how do I not know this stuff? I don’t understand.’ ”

Figure 18. WAS APPROACHED BY AN OUTREACH WORKER WHILE UNSHELTERED BY LOCATION, RESPONDENTS ANSWERING YES



³ There are approximately 200-250 people living in authorized encampments in the City of Seattle at any one time. In an attempt to best represent this population, this survey includes responses from 119 of them.

Duration and Recurrence of Homelessness

Challenges in ending an individual's homelessness often increase with extended duration of time spent without housing. Extended periods of time also result in increased health risks and early morbidity. Ending homelessness requires shorter durations and the prevention of recurrence.


First Time Homelessness

Unstable living conditions often lead to individuals falling in and out of homelessness and challenges in receiving supportive services. A little less than half of survey respondents reported they were experiencing homelessness for the first time (44%).

Duration of Homelessness

For many, the experience of homelessness is part of a long and recurring history of housing instability. Survey respondents were asked about duration of their current experience or episode of homelessness. Half of respondents reported they had been homeless for a year or more (50%). Eight percent (8%) had been homeless for less than one month.

Figure 19. LENGTH OF HOMELESSNESS THIS CURRENT TIME



N = 1,007


Recurrence of Homelessness

Nineteen percent (19%) of respondents reported they had experienced homelessness four or more times in the past year. When asked how many times they had been homeless in the past three years, 21% reported they had been homeless four or more times.

Chronic Homelessness

Under the Department of Housing and Urban Development's new definition, a chronically homeless individual is someone who has experienced homelessness for a year or longer, or who has experienced at least four episodes of homelessness in the last three years (must be a cumulative of 12 months), and has a disability. A family with an adult member who meets this description would also be considered chronically homeless. Our survey queried this phenomenon and found that just under 30% of our respondents met this definition. As a point of reference, the 2015 Annual Homelessness Assessment Report to Congress stated that nationally the chronic rate is 15%. Our research has shown that other West Coast counties have chronic homelessness rates closer to Seattle's than the national average.

Figure 20. NUMBER OF TIMES EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS IN THE LAST YEAR AND IN THE PAST THREE YEARS, INCLUDING THIS TIME



N = 999 (12 months) N = 1,029 (3 years)


Despite common challenges there was some optimism expressed by respondents. This correlates to a belief that many homeless are in need of a “light touch” from the system. Fifty-four percent (54%) of respondents reported they expected to have housing in the next 12 months. Among those who expected to have housing a greater percentage were employed full or part-time (32%) compared to those who did not expect to find housing (20%). Respondents who were unable and unemployed were just as likely to expect housing as not to. Those who reported they worked seasonally or sporadically were less likely to expect housing.

Cause of Homelessness, Prevention and Housing Assistance

The primary cause of an individual’s homelessness is not always clear and often the result of multiple and compounding causes. One quarter (25%) of respondents self-reported job loss as the primary cause of their homelessness. Thirteen percent (13%) reported alcohol or drug use, 11% reported an inability to afford rent increase, and 9% reported a divorce, separation, or breakup as the primary cause of their homelessness.

In the discussion of the cause of homelessness, there were two large differences between the respondents that lived in Seattle or King County and elsewhere immediately prior to their recent episode of homelessness. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of those from Seattle or King County reported job loss as the primary cause of their homelessness, while only 16% of those from elsewhere in the State of Washington and 19% of those from out of the state or country reported job loss as the primary cause. Fifteen percent (15%) of those from Seattle or King County reported alcohol or drug use as the primary cause of their homelessness, while only 8% of those from elsewhere in the State of Washington and 9% of those from out of the state or country reported alcohol or drug use as the primary cause. Other indicators varied only by a few percent when geographically analyzed. Rent increase was cited as the primary cause for homelessness by 11% of respondents from Seattle/King County, 11% for those from the State of Washington, and 10% for those from out of the state/US.

Figure 21. PRIMARY EVENT OR CONDITION THAT LED TO RESPONDENTS' CURRENT EPISODE OF HOMELESSNESS



N = 1,031 respondents offering 1,297 responses

Housing Assistance

Focus group participants reported that looking ahead, the City of Seattle could better serve the people currently or at-risk of experiencing homeless by providing subsidized housing according to current income, offering cash assistance beyond the initial deposit and rent payments, and supporting housing options within a reasonable distance from the city and/or close to public transportation.

"If housing was available, it should be built along transportation corridors so that folks can find ways to get to the City even if they're not staying in the City."


Participants called for the City of Seattle to offer more affordable housing, including subsidized housing at or below 30% of people's current income. In terms of cash assistance, many worried about how to make ends meet past the initial deposit and first/last month's rent and whether that meant they might end up without a home again after a few months.

When asked about housing options outside the City, responses were mixed. While some participants shared that they just wanted "to get off the streets," others worried about commuting to jobs if they were too far outside the City if they lacked access to public transportation, as well as furthering the effects of gentrification. The consensus was that housing options within an hour of the City might be reasonable as long as they were located along transportation corridors, provided enough space as in the case of families, allowed for people to stay together with their partners and friends if they so choose, and provided basic necessities.

"My credit is actually not horrible. Even when I could find an apartment that I could afford, I'm looking at like 2 to 3 months security deposit for a lot of places in Seattle."

Survey respondents were also asked what would help them obtain permanent housing. The majority (68%) reported rental assistance, followed by 65% who reported that an increase in affordable housing would help them in obtaining permanent housing.

Figure 22. WHAT WOULD HELP YOU OBTAIN PERMANENT HOUSING




N = 1,028 respondents offering 4,184 responses

Housing Interest

Ninety-three percent (93%) of survey respondents reported that they would move inside if safe, affordable housing were available. This is commonly referred to as the “homeless by choice” question and suggests that the “traveler” or “nomadic” sojourner does not represent a significant group. The highest percent (71%) of respondents reported that they could afford a monthly rent of less than five hundred dollars, followed by 24% who reported they could afford between \$500 and \$1,000 monthly.

Figure 23. WOULD MOVE INSIDE IF SAFE, AFFORDABLE HOUSING WERE AVAILABLE



N = 892

“I didn’t know not having credit was just as bad as having bad credit.”

Access to Services

Focus group participants had a lot to say about the current system of care in Seattle in terms of providers, programs and service needs. Participants noted that they had difficulty accessing available services due to lack of support navigating the resource and referral system. Participants noted that they often had to call repeatedly to get someone on the phone or felt they could not follow up with services because they were only offered during certain times, such as regular business hours. A participant explained the difficulty in attaining service resources and referrals, *“They don't know enough. They don't know where to go. Nobody directs you to the right resources.”* Others reported additional difficulties accessing services due to lack of transportation and appropriate counseling services. A participant shared that services are *“so widespread and broken under these tiny little programs all over the place”* that getting there by public transportation was very challenging.

“I didn't even know what a social worker was. I was so confused, I did not know what to do. My brain was spinning, I feel really dumb when I was talking to her, I was like how do I not know this stuff? I don't understand.”

Effective Services

Some participants felt there were too many steps to accessing services, duplication of services across providers and some felt service placement was unfair. A participant explained, *“You have to go to this lady who has to then evaluate you and then go to that lady who has to then recommend you. It's like they eat up more of your time just keeping themselves employed duplicating the same process.”* Across focus groups, some participants expressed mistrust of both governmental and nonprofit organizations and lack of connection with program staff who may be unavailable or do not connect with the homeless clients they serve.

“You call them and they have no resources, or they don't have funding. There's always an excuse to why they can't help you. Then you get frustrated and you're like, 'Well now where do I go?' There's not enough people standing on corners saying, if you're homeless go this way. It's just like they're throwing you out there and telling you to fend for yourself.”

Participants felt good programs should include clinical assessments, long-term support, and staff who care and invest in individuals. Participants reported that programming felt paternalistic and that services did not recognize them as people. Participants had recommendations for improving the system. For example, they felt outreach should be peer-based, and through search and rescue teams. They noted that as most people currently find out about services and programs through word of mouth rather than through outreach workers or program staff.

“You need counseling, you need love, you need 'I'm here for you'. I'm going to talk down to you or whatever but if you can show the love, we get passed that all of a sudden I start respecting myself and start respecting you.”

Participants felt that after outreach, effective support should include comprehensive clinical assessments on an individual's medical history, mental health and capacity to engage in the workforce and other programs. Long-term support was also identified as a key element of a well-designed program, especially in relation to housing assistance programs, particularly in relation to rapid re-housing programs and the challenges of keeping up with rent. One participant elaborated on this recurring theme, *“I don't understand why they leave you after 2 months, why can't they just [help] 6 months to a year if you need it. Then people find themselves right back in the same position that they were in, homeless because they something out of their control happens.”*

*“I think if people aren't using the services, it's because they don't know about them or because they're so widespread and broken under these tiny little programs all over the place.
In order to get to the places to get your bus ticket, you have to use your bus ticket.
You're basically using your bus ticket getting from one place to go to another place. Transportation is huge.”*

Coordinated Intake and Assessment

Coordinated Entry for All (CEA) is a project run by All Home, King County's coordinating body for homeless services. The goal of coordinated entry is to ensure that all people experiencing homelessness are fairly identified, assessed, and connected to assistance based on their existing needs. Intimately coordinated intake and assessment is designed to ensure there is no wrong door and that individuals can access the services they need no matter how they enter the system.

One third (33%) of all survey respondents reported they had completed a coordinated entry assessment. Of the respondents staying outdoors, 27% of people have completed a coordinated assessment, and of the respondents staying in shelter, 37% have completed the assessment, while the percentage of respondents living in authorized encampments who completed a coordinated entry was 26%.


*“The only people that should really be doing outreach are homeless because they're the ones that actually know what homeless people are going through. You got a lot of people their hearts are in the right place or they're really good people and they really do want to help but they're clueless.
They don't know what we need because everybody's different.”*

Government Assistance and Benefits

Over three-quarters (78%) of respondents reported they were receiving some form of government assistance. The largest percentage of respondents (68%) reported receiving Food Stamps or SNAP, followed by 13% who reported receiving Medicare. Ten percent (10%) reported receiving non-veteran disability, SSI, or SSSDI, 7% were receiving General Assistance, 4% were receiving Social Security, 4% were receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), 3% were receiving VA disability compensation, and 3% were receiving other Veteran's benefits.

Individuals who reported they were not receiving any form of government assistance were not clearly different from those who were receiving services. Twenty-nine percent (29%) of youth 18-24 were not receiving services, slightly higher than other age groups. Thirty-nine percent (39%) of individuals who reported they were on parole reported they were not receiving benefits however this was compared to 16% of individuals who reported they were on probation. There was little variability in where respondents reported staying the night prior to the survey. There was a small difference between sheltered and unsheltered populations receiving government assistance, 20% and 24% respectively. There was some additional variability between specific sleeping locations. Only 8% of individuals who reported staying in a place in a house not meant for sleeping reported they were not receiving services, however these individuals represented a very small number of overall respondents and therefore may not be representative.

Figure 24. GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE




N = 1,005 respondents offering 1,340 responses

Twenty nine percent (29%) of the population reported they were receiving some form of disability benefits or Social Security income.

Non-Housing Services

Almost three quarters (73%) of respondents reported using meal services, and almost half (48%) reported using bus passes. Fourteen percent (14%) of respondents reported not using any services.

Figure 25. LOCAL SERVICES



N = 1,038


Eighty-eight percent (88%) of respondents reported using shelters. Of those not using shelters, 36% did not use because they were too crowded, 30% because of bugs, and 29% because the shelters were full. Twenty percent (20%) reported not using shelters because they don't accept pets, and 21% because individuals can't stay with their partners.

"I think they should have ones [authorized encampments] geared towards families only, instead of just a bunch of people and then you'd come with your children. I wouldn't want my children around a bunch of men, especially in that kind of environment. It's just not safe."

"[We] want more sanctioned encampments, plus there's talk, maybe, of low barrier encampments, which means six more. Just think of how many more people we could help. I firmly believe in sanctioned encampments because in sanctioned encampments, there's safety and there's security."

Shelter Access

Figure 26. SHELTER USE



N = 1,042

Figure 27. REASONS FOR NOT CURRENTLY USING ANY TYPE OF SHELTER SERVICES

Response	Percentage
They are too crowded	36.4%
Bugs	30.1%
There are too many rules	29.1%
They are full	28.9%
Germs	22.2%
I can't stay with my partner	21.4%
They don't accept my pet	20.4%
There is nowhere to store my stuff	17.9%
They are far away	16.6%
I can't stay with my friends	13.3%

N = 481 respondents offering 1,137 responses


"You've got to actively self-advocate. In that regard I see why the system is the way it is. It almost has to be. Only the serious people will be the one to get the housing and keep it. Squeaky wheel gets the grease man."

Justice System Involvement

Focus group participants had a mixed response. Some reported involvement with the justice system prevents people from accessing needed services and presented barriers to obtaining housing, particularly when individuals had a history of a felony offense. However, others knew that there were services targeted to those with criminal records and almost felt that this prioritization presented a challenge for those without a criminal record. Most striking to us was the overall lack of discussion regarding police involvement and the criminalization of homelessness in focus group discussions compared to our experiences working in other cities across the nation.

Among survey respondents, 9% reported they were on probation at the time of the survey, 4% reported they were on parole. Roughly one percent reported they were on both probation and parole at the time of the survey. Fourteen percent reported they were on probation or parole at the time they most recently became homeless and 28% reported they were involved in the justice system prior to experiencing homelessness. A small percentage (18%) of respondents on probation or parole reported staying in transitional housing or emergency shelters, of those who were unsheltered 12% were in sanctioned encampments, 18% in unsanctioned encampments and 18% in a vehicle.

Figure 28. ON PROBATION OR PAROLE AT THE TIME THEY MOST RECENTLY BECAME HOMELESS



N = 863

Health Needs, Access and Drug Use

Without regular access to health care, individuals suffer preventable illness, longer hospitalizations, and a higher rate of premature death. Focus group participants identified key challenges related to accessing medical care, including lacking legal immigration status, having criminal records, experiencing difficulty applying to health insurance online or completing paperwork, and lacking awareness about available services. A participant called for mobile clinics with on-site doctors to provide care, especially for those who only access medical care in case of emergency.

One of the greatest challenges participants identified was drug addiction as a contributing factor to homelessness. Respondents agreed that not all persons experiencing homelessness are addicted to drugs and alcohol, and that this misconception about homeless communities has adverse consequences. However, they also agreed that drug use is linked to dealing with the stresses of being homeless, and self-medicating to manage pain. In addition, those seeking drug addiction support indicated that they would like counselors who have the life experience with previous addiction in order to make service offerings more effective and relevant.

Healthcare Needs

Thirty percent (30%) of respondents reported they went without needed health care since experiencing homelessness. Access to dental care is often harder for individuals to access due to limited dental coverage and a small number of providers accepting Medicare and other low cost coverage. Nearly half of respondents reported going without needed dental care.

Figure 29. HEALTH CONDITIONS


	Experience	Prevent Work or Housing
Depression	42.2%	21.9%
Post-traumatic Stress Disorder	30.9%	18.4%
Bipolar Disorder	23.6%	13.6%
A physical disability	19.9%	12.0%
Any other psychiatric or emotional condition	18.5%	10.6%
Diabetes	14.1%	4.4%
Schizophrenia	8.5%	5.2%
Cancer	6.5%	2.8%
Traumatic Brain injury	6.1%	3.3%

N = 997-1,013

Healthcare Access

More than half of respondents (51%) reported they had been to the ER in the year prior to the survey and 28% reported a hospitalization. Previous research suggests that on average, individuals experiencing homelessness stay in the hospital four days longer than persons with stable housing.⁴

Figure 30. USUAL PLACE OF MEDICAL CARE




N = 1,031 respondents offering 1,328 responses

Drug Use

Forty-five percent (45%) of survey respondents reported they did not use drugs. Twenty-nine percent reported using alcohol. Thirteen percent (13%) of respondents reported drug or alcohol abuse was the primary cause of their homelessness, while 13% of respondents reported they were accessing drug or alcohol counseling services. When comparing respondents who were living unsheltered with those in shelter, we found a higher prevalence of drug use in each category with people living unsheltered.

Figure 31. DRUG USE



Sheltered, N=358 respondents offering 403 responses; Unsheltered, N=641 respondents offering 899 responses

“Before I was homeless I was two or three years clean, but within my first week of being homeless, I was using again. I was using meth and all that. I never would have thought I would have been back doing that, but then the only reason why I was doing that, so I could stay warm and literally forget the fact that I was homeless.”

⁴ Salit S.A., Kuhn E.M., Hartz A.J., Vu J.M., Mosso A.L. Hospitalization costs associated with homelessness in New York City. New England Journal of Medicine 1998; 338: 1734-1740.


Domestic Violence and Abuse

Forty-two percent (42%) of survey respondents reported they had an experience of domestic violence or abuse. However, 5% reported it was the primary cause of their homelessness.

A higher percentage of female respondents reported experiencing domestic violence than male, 58% to 30%. Transgender respondents and those who identified as a gender other than male, female or transgender reported even higher percentages, 63% and 78% respectively. More than half (51%) of youth under 25 reported experiences of domestic violence or abuse. Abuse was also higher among those living outdoors compared to those in county shelters, 44% and 38%.

“When it comes down to it, there’s a lot of people who have come from upbringings where the parents were either mentally abusive, verbally abusive or physically abusive; more like a domestic violence, like she was saying. Once they get to a certain age, multiple things happen to you. The parent kicks them out, because the kid finally stands up for themselves or the kid gets tired of getting beat on.”

Figure 32. EXPERIENCED DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OR ABUSE



N = 881

APPENDIX I: METHODOLOGY

Survey Planning and Implementation

The survey of 1,050 homeless persons was conducted in order to yield qualitative data about the community experiencing homelessness and their housing needs in the City of Seattle. These data will be used by the city to better respond to the needs of the homeless community in Seattle. The survey elicited information such as gender, family status, military service, length and recurrence of homelessness, usual nighttime accommodations, causes of homelessness, and access to services through open-ended, closed-ended, and multiple response questions. The survey data also brought greater perspective to current issues of homelessness and to the provision and delivery of services. Surveys were conducted by peers and shelter staff who were trained by Applied Survey Research. Training sessions led potential interviewers through a comprehensive orientation that included project background information along with detailed instruction on respondent eligibility, interviewing protocol, and confidentiality. Peers were compensated at a rate of \$7 per completed survey.

It was determined that survey response rates would improve if an incentive gift was offered to respondents in appreciation for their time and participation. Gift cards valued at \$5 to McDonald's were given as an incentive for participating in the 2016 homeless survey. The gift cards were easy to obtain and distribute, were thought to have wide appeal, and could be provided within the project budget. This approach enabled surveys to be conducted at any time during the day. The gift proved to be a great incentive and was widely accepted among survey respondents.

Survey Administration Details

The 2016 City of Seattle Housing Needs Assessment was administered by the trained survey team between October 4 and November 17, 2016. In all, the survey team collected 1,050 unique surveys. The survey team was comprised of 37 individuals, recruited for their general knowledge and familiarity of homelessness in the City of Seattle, as well as additional knowledge and familiarity of various subpopulations, including youth, those living sanctioned and unsanctioned encampments, and those who stayed in transitional housing shelters.

Survey Sampling

While there have been a number of local assessments, evaluations and strategic planning projects conducted within the City of Seattle, King County and the State of Washington, data on the unsheltered populations is limited. Information on where individuals reside within the city and demographic details were limited and therefore prevent a more accurate survey sampling strategy. Due to these challenges, ASR worked with local surveyors and providers to identify locations and individuals to conduct interviews in all neighborhoods. Outreach efforts were adjusted throughout the process to ensure adequate representation, and additional surveys were completed to ensure non-encampment residents were adequately sampled.

The planning team initially recommended a target of approximately 800 surveys. After roughly 650 surveys were completed, an additional 250 surveys were added to the total to address concerns about oversampling individuals who were staying in sanctioned encampments. All reasonable attempts at randomizing respondent selection were made. Individuals residing in emergency shelters were reached through street surveys. Strategic attempts were made to reach individuals in

various geographic locations and of various subset groups such as homeless youth, those residing in transitional housing, and families. Surveyors were encouraged to gather surveys from neighborhoods throughout the city, based, in part, on the locations of individuals experiencing homelessness in neighborhoods that had been reported by service provider and city staff. The survey coordinator then compared the locations of completed surveys to make sure that all neighborhoods were represented and that no one neighborhood was overrepresented.

One way to increase representation and the participation of various subpopulation groups was to recruit peer survey workers from these groups. In order to increase randomization of sample respondents, survey workers were trained to employ an “every third encounter” survey approach. Survey workers were instructed to approach every third person they encountered whom they considered to be an eligible survey respondent. If the person declined to take the survey, the survey worker could approach the next eligible person they encountered. After completing a survey, the randomized approach was resumed. It is important to recognize that while efforts are made to randomize the respondents, it is not a random sample methodology.

Care was taken by interviewers to ensure that respondents felt comfortable regardless of the street or shelter location where the survey occurred. During the interviews, respondents were encouraged to be candid in their responses and were informed that these responses would be framed as general findings, would be kept confidential, and would not be traceable to any one individual.

Data Analysis

To avoid potential duplication of respondents, the survey requested respondents’ initials and date of birth, so that duplication could be avoided without compromising the respondents’ anonymity. Upon completion of the survey effort, an extensive verification process was conducted to eliminate duplicates. This process examined respondents’ date of birth, initials, gender, ethnicity, and length of homelessness, and consistencies in patterns of responses to other questions on the survey.

Survey Challenges and Limitations

There may be some variance in the data that the homeless individuals self-reported. However, using a peer interviewing methodology is believed to allow the respondents to be more candid with their answers and may help reduce the uneasiness of revealing personal information. Further, service providers recommended individuals who would be the best to conduct interviews and they received comprehensive training about how to conduct interviews. The service providers also reviewed the surveys to ensure quality responses. Surveys that were considered incomplete or containing false responses were not accepted. Neighborhood information was also a challenge, as some neighborhoods names were unfamiliar to either surveyors or the survey coordinator.

FOCUS GROUP METHODOLOGY

Focus groups were designed to follow up on the survey results, building upon data to better inform the focus group process. After an initial analysis of 650 surveys, questions focused on data points flagged as relevant or interesting by ASR staff, working with help from an advisory group from the City of Seattle. The advisory group also identified areas of interest that they would like to see questions focused on. Additionally questions were included to serve as warm-ups and to provide general knowledge of topics common to the issue of homelessness.

Focus groups were centered around 6 different subpopulations from the Seattle area, based in part on findings from initial survey results. There was a focus group for youth, families, those who stay in sanctioned encampments, those who stay in unsanctioned encampments, those who stay in shelters, and those who sleep in vehicles. The youth focus group and family focus group were comprised exclusively of members of those demographics, while the remaining focus groups mixed in individuals from the general population experiencing homelessness.

Focus groups lasted for approximately 1.5 hours. Focus group participants were made aware that a voice recorder would be operating during the focus group, though it was not started until after introductions, to protect their anonymity. Participants were asked to speak one at a time, were encouraged to stay on topic, and were asked to share their experiences as well as those of the population experiencing homelessness they have encountered during their time on the street. Participants were asked to be respectful of other participants and allow them the opportunity to share their stories without fear of judgement. Focus group facilitators followed up, when appropriate, to gather greater and more in-depth information on relevant topics.

Focus Group Recruitment

There were over 80 participants in 6 different focus groups. Focus groups took place across Seattle, allowing for responses to reflect any geographic concerns. They were also held in shelters across the city, to ensure that participants felt safe and comfortable. Participants received \$30 for the 2 hours of the focus group and received a meal. All participants were informed that their answers were confidential and would be kept anonymous.

Individual participants were recruited in a variety of manners. Individuals experiencing homelessness were identified from the list of surveyors who helped conduct surveys during the survey portion of the project. To supplement those numbers, recruitment efforts were put in place to identify individuals who were members of the relevant subpopulation and who had knowledge, familiarity, and experience with homelessness in Seattle. Additional focus group participants were identified by shelter and program staff looking for the same criteria. Participants were recruited from various neighborhoods in Seattle.

Focus Group Challenges and Limitations

Due to the limits of time and flow of conversation, not all focus group participants were asked the same questions. Additionally, some focus groups were asked questions relevant exclusively to their subpopulation. While measures were taken to prevent this, some participants may have felt that they could not share entirely and completely. While recruitment efforts were designed to represent individuals from multiple subpopulations and geographies, not all subpopulations and geographies of the homeless community were present.

APPENDIX II: SURVEY RESULTS

Table of Figures

Figure 31. Drug Use	27	Figure 24. Currently the First Experience of Homelessness.....	41
Figure 1. Age Breakdown.....	34	Figure 25. Length of Homelessness this current time	41
Figure 2. Age at which Resident First Experienced Homelessness	34	Figure 26. Number of Times Experiencing Homeless in the Last Year and in the Past Three Years, Including This Time.....	41
Figure 3. Gender	34	Figure 27. Expect Stable Housing in the Next 12 months	42
Figure 4. Sexual Orientation	35	Figure 28. Primary Event or Condition That Led to Respondents' Current Episode of Homelessness	42
Figure 5. Race/Ethnicity.....	35	Figure 29. What Would Help You to Obtain Permanent Housing.....	43
Figure 6. Educational Attainment.....	35	Figure 30. Would Move Inside if Safe, Affordable Housing Were Available	43
Figure 7. Employment Status.....	35	Figure 31. Monthly amount one could afford in rent/utilities.....	43
Figure 8. Primary Language	36	Figure 32. Has Completed A Coordinated Assessment.....	44
Figure 9. Veterans Status.....	36	Figure 33. Government Assistance	44
Figure 10. Foster Care Experience	36	Figure 34. Disability Benefits.....	44
Figure 11. Single vs Multi-person Households	36	Figure 35. Local Services	45
Figure 12. Relationship of People Currently Living in Household.....	37	Figure 36. Shelter Use	45
Figure 13. Number of Individuals currently Living with vs Number of Individuals preferred to seek housing with	37	Figure 37. Reasons for Not Currently Using any type of shelter services.....	45
Figure 14. Pregnancy (Females Only)	37	Figure 38. Are you currently on probation or Parole	46
Figure 15. Where Respondents Were Living at the Time They Most Recently Became Homeless.....	38	Figure 39. On Probation or Parole at the time they most recently became Homeless	46
Figure 16. Originally From Seattle	38	Figure 40. Were involved with the justice system prior to experiencing homelessness	46
Figure 17. Length of Time living in Seattle ..	38	Figure 41. Number of Times Respondents Reported Being in Jail or Prison in the Past Year	47
Figure 18. Reason For moving to Seattle.....	39	Figure 42. Type of Crime Committed	47
Figure 19. Living Arrangements Immediately Prior to experiencing homelessness This Time	39		
Figure 20. Where Residents Stayed Last Night.....	39		
Figure 21. Where Residents Stayed Outdoors Last Night (subset of respondents).....	40		
Figure 22. Where Residents Have Stayed At Some Point In the Last Month	40		
Figure 23. Was Approached By an Outreach Worker While Unsheltered.....	40		

Figure 43. Went without needed medical or dental care since becoming homeless 47

Figure 44. Health Conditions 48

Figure 45. Number of Times Used the Hospital or ER in the Past 12 Months 48

Figure 46. Usual Place of Medical Care 48

Figure 47. Drug Use 49

Figure 48. Experienced Domestic Violence or Abuse 49

Figure 49. Age Breakdown..... 49

Figure 50. Which racial group do you identify with most? 50

Figure 51. U.S. Armed Forces Involvement . 50

Figure 52. How many people would you like to find housing with? 50

Figure 53. Ages of Children..... 51

Figure 54. Are your children in this age range currently living with you (those who responded 'yes')? 51

Figure 55. Where were you living at the time you most recently became homeless? 51

Figure 56. Reasons for Moving to Seattle.... 52

Figure 57. Age at First Experience with Homelessness 52

Figure 58. Current Length of Homelessness 52

Figure 59. Respondents Who Expect To Have Housing in the Next 12 Months.. 53

Figure 60. Government Assistance 53

Figure 61. Using Services and Assistance 54

Figure 62. Were you involved with the criminal justice system prior to experiencing homelessness?..... 54

Figure 63. Respondents Who Have Needed Care Since Becoming Homeless and been unable to receive it? (% who responded "Yes")..... 54

Figure 64. Health Conditions..... 55

Figure 65. Drug Use..... 55

Figure 66. Race Among Respondents by Respondents Age..... 55

Figure 67. Sexual Orientation Among Youth Respondents by Respondents Age..... 56

Figure 68. Employment Status Among Respondents by Respondents Age..... 56

Figure 69. Where Did You Stay Last Night by Respondents Age..... 57


Figure 70. Length of Homelessness This Current Time by Respondents Age..... 57

Figure 71. Primary Cause of Homelessness Among Respondents by Respondents Age..... 58

Figure 72. Health Conditions Among Respondents by Respondents Age..... 59


Figure 73. Percent Who Regularly Use Drugs by Respondents Age..... 59

Figure 1. AGE BREAKDOWN




N = 1,050, note: no one surveyed was under the age of 18.

Figure 2. AGE AT WHICH RESIDENT FIRST EXPERIENCED HOMELESSNESS



N = 1,025

Figure 3. GENDER




N = 1,050

Figure 4. SEXUAL ORIENTATION


	Percentage	Respondents
Straight	73.8%	765
Gay	5.4%	56
Lesbian	3.5%	36
Queer	3.0%	31
Bisexual	12.2%	126
Other	3.8%	39

Figure 5. RACE/ETHNICITY




N = 990

Figure 6. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT




N = 1,037

Figure 7. EMPLOYMENT STATUS



N = 1,034

Figure 8. PRIMARY LANGUAGE




N = 1,029

Figure 9. VETERANS STATUS

	Yes	No
Have you ever served in the US Armed Forces?	13.6%	86.4%
Have you ever received health care or benefits from the VA?	68.5%	31.5%


N = 1,011 (US Armed Forces); n = 143(Health Care or Benefits from VA)

Figure 10. FOSTER CARE EXPERIENCE




N = 1,010

Figure 11. SINGLE VS MULTI-PERSON HOUSEHOLDS




N = 1,050

Figure 12. RELATIONSHIP OF PEOPLE CURRENTLY LIVING IN HOUSEHOLD




N = 601 respondents offering 745 responses

Figure 13. NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS CURRENTLY LIVING WITH VS NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS PREFERRED TO SEEK HOUSING WITH




N = 989 (Currently Living With); N = 995 (Prefer Seeking Housing With)

Figure 14. PREGNANCY (FEMALES ONLY)




N = 364

Figure 15. WHERE RESPONDENTS WERE LIVING AT THE TIME THEY MOST RECENTLY BECAME HOMELESS




N = 1,042

Figure 16. ORIGINALLY FROM SEATTLE




N = 1,050

Figure 17. LENGTH OF TIME LIVING IN SEATTLE




N = 1,006

Figure 18. REASON FOR MOVING TO SEATTLE




N = 706 respondents offering 967 responses

Figure 19. LIVING ARRANGEMENTS IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS THIS TIME




N = 1,008

Figure 20. WHERE RESIDENTS STAYED LAST NIGHT




N = 1,045

Figure 21. WHERE RESIDENTS STAYED OUTDOORS LAST NIGHT (SUBSET OF RESPONDENTS)




N = 453

Figure 22. WHERE RESIDENTS HAVE STAYED AT SOME POINT IN THE LAST MONTH




N = 1,002 respondents offering 2,051 responses

Figure 23. WAS APPROACHED BY AN OUTREACH WORKER WHILE UNSHELTERED




N = 598

Figure 24. CURRENTLY THE FIRST EXPERIENCE OF HOMELESSNESS




N = 1,012

Figure 25. LENGTH OF HOMELESSNESS THIS CURRENT TIME




N = 1,007

Figure 26. NUMBER OF TIMES EXPERIENCING HOMELESS IN THE LAST YEAR AND IN THE PAST THREE YEARS, INCLUDING THIS TIME




N = 999 (12 months) N = 1,029 (3 years)

Figure 27. EXPECT STABLE HOUSING IN THE NEXT 12 MONTHS




N = 997

Figure 28. PRIMARY EVENT OR CONDITION THAT LED TO RESPONDENTS' CURRENT EPISODE OF HOMELESSNESS




N = 1,031 respondents offering 1,297 responses

Figure 29. WHAT WOULD HELP YOU TO OBTAIN PERMANENT HOUSING




N = 1,028 respondents offering 4,184 responses

Figure 30. WOULD MOVE INSIDE IF SAFE, AFFORDABLE HOUSING WERE AVAILABLE




N = 1,006

Figure 31. MONTHLY AMOUNT ONE COULD AFFORD IN RENT/UTILITIES




N = 892

Figure 32. HAS COMPLETED A COORDINATED ASSESSMENT




N = 963

Figure 33. GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE




N = 1,005 respondents offering 1340 responses

Figure 34. DISABILITY BENEFITS




N = 985 respondents offering 1,020 responses

Figure 35. LOCAL SERVICES



N = 1,038

Figure 36. SHELTER USE




N = 1,042

Figure 37. REASONS FOR NOT CURRENTLY USING ANY TYPE OF SHELTER SERVICES

Response	Percentage
They are too crowded	36.4%
Bugs	30.1%
They are full	28.9%
There are too many rules	29.1%
Germs	22.2%
I can't stay with my partner	21.4%
They don't accept my pet	20.4%
There is nowhere to store my stuff	17.9%
They are far away	16.6%
I can't stay with my friends	13.3%


N = 481 respondents offering 1,137 responses

Figure 38. ARE YOU CURRENTLY ON PROBATION OR PAROLE




N = 1,005 (Probation); N = 624 (Parole)

Figure 39. ON PROBATION OR PAROLE AT THE TIME THEY MOST RECENTLY BECAME HOMELESS




N = 863

Figure 40. WERE INVOLVED WITH THE JUSTICE SYSTEM PRIOR TO EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS




N = 844

Figure 41. NUMBER OF TIMES RESPONDENTS REPORTED BEING IN JAIL OR PRISON IN THE PAST YEAR




N = 970 (Jail); N = 971 (Prison)

Figure 42. TYPE OF CRIME COMMITTED



N = 453

Figure 43. WENT WITHOUT NEEDED MEDICAL OR DENTAL CARE SINCE BECOMING HOMELESS




N = 954 (Medical); N = 670 (Dental)

Figure 44. HEALTH CONDITIONS

	Experience	Prevent Work or Housing
Diabetes	14.1%	4.4%
Cancer	6.5%	2.8%
Post-traumatic Stress Disorder	30.9%	18.4%
Bipolar Disorder	23.6%	13.6%
Depression	42.2%	21.9%
Schizophrenia	8.5%	5.2%
Any other psychiatric or emotional condition	18.5%	10.6%
A physical disability	19.9%	12.0%
Traumatic Brain injury	6.1%	3.3%


N = 997-1,013

Figure 45. NUMBER OF TIMES USED THE HOSPITAL OR ER IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS




N = 833 (ER); N = 752 (Hospitalization)

Figure 46. USUAL PLACE OF MEDICAL CARE




N = 1,031 respondents offering 1,328 responses

Figure 47. DRUG USE




N = 999 respondents offering 1,302 responses

Figure 48. EXPERIENCED DOMESTIC VIOLENCE OR ABUSE




N = 881

Figure 49. AGE BREAKDOWN




Sheltered, N=376; Unsheltered, N=674

Figure 50. WHICH RACIAL GROUP DO YOU IDENTIFY WITH MOST?




Sheltered, N=360; Unsheltered, N=630

Figure 51. U.S. ARMED FORCES INVOLVEMENT




Served in U.S. Armed Forces: Sheltered, N=367; Unsheltered, N=644; Receives health care from VA: Sheltered, N=350; Unsheltered, N=635

Figure 52. HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD YOU LIKE TO FIND HOUSING WITH?




Sheltered, N=350; Unsheltered, N=645

Figure 53. AGES OF CHILDREN




Sheltered, N=136 respondents offering 165 responses; Unsheltered, N=250 respondents offering 308 responses

Figure 54. ARE YOUR CHILDREN IN THIS AGE RANGE CURRENTLY LIVING WITH YOU (THOSE WHO RESPONDED 'YES')?




Note: 0-5: Sheltered, N=54; Unsheltered, N=106; 16-17: Sheltered, N=55; Unsheltered, N=97; 18+: Sheltered, N=59, Unsheltered, N=111

Figure 55. WHERE WERE YOU LIVING AT THE TIME YOU MOST RECENTLY BECAME HOMELESS?




Note: Sheltered, N=374; Unsheltered, N=668

Figure 56. REASONS FOR MOVING TO SEATTLE




Sheltered, N=252 respondents offering 352 responses; Unsheltered, N=454 respondents offering 615 responses

Figure 57. AGE AT FIRST EXPERIENCE WITH HOMELESSNESS




Note: Sheltered, N=357; Unsheltered, N=668

Figure 58. CURRENT LENGTH OF HOMELESSNESS




Sheltered, N=345; Unsheltered, N=662

Figure 59. RESPONDENTS WHO EXPECT TO HAVE HOUSING IN THE NEXT 12 MONTHS




Sheltered, N=358; Unsheltered, N=663

Figure 60. GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE




Sheltered, N=368 respondents offering 512 responses; Unsheltered, N=637 respondents offering 828 responses

Figure 61. USING SERVICES AND ASSISTANCE




Sheltered, N=374 respondents offering 1,185 responses; Unsheltered, N=664 respondents offering 1,553 responses

Figure 62. WERE YOU INVOLVED WITH THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PRIOR TO EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS?




Sheltered, N=311; Unsheltered, N=533

Figure 63. RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE NEEDED CARE SINCE BECOMING HOMELESS AND BEEN UNABLE TO RECEIVE IT? (% WHO RESPONDED "YES")




Medical care: Sheltered, N=342; Unsheltered, N=612; Dental care: Sheltered, N=359, Unsheltered, N=629

Figure 64. HEALTH CONDITIONS




Note: Sheltered, N=354-362; Unsheltered, N=640-652

Figure 65. DRUG USE




Sheltered, N=358 respondents offering 403 responses; Unsheltered, N=641 respondents offering 899 responses

Figure 66. RACE AMONG RESPONDENTS BY RESPONDENTS AGE




Under 25 N = 66; 25-60 N = 876, Over 60 N=48

Figure 67. SEXUAL ORIENTATION AMONG YOUTH RESPONDENTS BY RESPONDENTS AGE




Under 25 N = 81; 25-60 N = 908, Over 60 N=48

Figure 68. EMPLOYMENT STATUS AMONG RESPONDENTS BY RESPONDENTS AGE




Under 25 N = 81; 25-60 N = 902, Over 60 N = 51

Figure 69. WHERE DID YOU STAY LAST NIGHT BY RESPONDENTS AGE




Under 25 N = 81; 25-60 N = 914, Over 60 N = 50

Figure 70. LENGTH OF HOMELESSNESS THIS CURRENT TIME BY RESPONDENTS AGE




Under 25 N = 80; 25-60 N = 876, Over 60 N = 51

Figure 71. PRIMARY CAUSE OF HOMELESSNESS AMONG RESPONDENTS BY RESPONDENTS AGE




Under 25, N = 80 respondents offering 103 responses; 25-60 901 respondents offering 1,141 responses; Over 60 50 respondents offering 53 responses

Figure 72. HEALTH CONDITIONS AMONG RESPONDENTS BY RESPONDENTS AGE



Under 25, N=72-76; 25-60, N= 873-888; Over 60, N=49-51

Figure 73. PERCENT WHO REGULARLY USE DRUGS BY RESPONDENTS AGE



Under 25, N=80 respondents offering 104 responses; 25-60, N=869 respondents offering 1,139 responses, Over 60, N= 50 respondents offering 59 responses