U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research

# **Evaluation of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program**

Volume III: Technical Appendices

PXR



## Evaluation of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program

Volume III: Technical Appendices

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research

Prepared by:

Abt Associates Judith D. Feins Linda B. Fosburg Gretchen Locke

Contract: H-5882

September 1994

The contents of this report are the views of the contractor and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development or the U.S. Government.

### FOREWORD

The Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG) program is one of the oldest and most widely used of the McKinney Act programs. *Evaluation of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program* provides valuable information on the activities and resources of grantees and providers, their needs for and uses of Federal assistance, and the effectiveness of ESG in meeting those needs.

The evaluation shows that, although ESG provides only 10 percent of the average ESG provider's operating budget, it has been an important resource for shelter providers. By meeting the most basic needs for operating funds and appropriate facilities, ESG has enabled providers to use other funding sources to offer additional programs and services. As a formula grant, ESG also targets funding to areas of need. With expansions in the range of eligible ESG activities, providers have shifted a growing share of their grants away from capital expenditures and toward essential services and homeless prevention initiatives.

ESG is one of HUD's oldest programs to assist the homeless. However, as we have gained experience, our approaches to serving homeless people have evolved to focus more on permanent solutions. We now recognize that emergency care alone will not solve homelessness and is only the first step toward the long-term goal of enabling homeless people to make the transition into permanent housing.

The lessons that emerge from this evaluation have immediate relevance to ongoing efforts to reform assistance to the homeless. HUD is working with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, shelter and social service providers, and homeless persons to reshape and coordinate Federal assistance. This approach will foster the development of comprehensive local systems capable of providing the "continuum of care" needed to reduce homelessness. Homeless persons will be brought into a system which assesses their problems, provides them with the services and housing they need to lead independent lives, and helps them make a successful transition from temporary shelter to permanent housing. HUD has proposed to reorganize the existing array of HUD McKinney homeless assistance grants for the purpose of enabling communities to establish comprehensive systems to meet the multidimensional needs of homeless persons. Many of the issues discussed in this evaluation—formula funding, the role of grantees, local strategic planning, and others—will be central to this dialogue. *Evaluation of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program* offers useful information to anyone interested in the future of Federal homeless assistance efforts.

Stegman

Michael A.<sup>1</sup> Stegman Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research

.

## EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM EVALUATION TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDIX A	Supplementary Tables
	Introductory Note
APPENDIX B	Summary of Sampling, Survey Response, and

Data Co	llection
B1.0	Sampling
B2.0	Survey Response
B3.0	Data Collection Summary



## APPENDIX A

### SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

.



## APPENDIX A SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

#### Introductory Note to Appendix A

This appendix contains supplementary tables corresponding to all the research questions posed by HUD for this evaluation. The questions are organized according to the list in the Contract Scope of Work and numbered for correspondence with the crosswalk in the evaluation's Research Design.<sup>1</sup> The subject areas are in the following ranges:

Analytic Theme	<b>Research Questions</b>	Item Numbers
Description	A.1 to A.8.e	1 to 110
Implementation	B.1 to B.16	111 to 165
Impact	C.1 to C.10.a	166 to 198

The tables are uniform in format, with the same elements in each. There is one version for reporting data about grantees, a second for reporting data about providers. Empty shells of each are shown in Exhibits A.1 and A.2, so that the common elements can easily be located. These elements are listed here.

Item(s) -- Indicates the item numbers in the Research Design crosswalk.

Research Question(s) -- Gives the number(s) and text of the research question(s) posed by HUD

#### Shaded bar

Responses -- Shows the answer categories or identifying labels of rows in the table.

Respondent groups ---

<u>Grantees</u> are always grouped by grantee type (state/territory, metropolitan city, urban county).

<u>Recipients</u> (the middle level of the program) are reported all together, sometimes in the same table as grantees.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Abt Associates, Inc., Evaluation of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program: Research Design, Data Collection and Analysis Plan (March 24, 1992), pp. 59-75.

Exhibit A.1

Sample Table for Grantees

Responses	State/Territory Number Percent	Metropolitan City Number Percent	Urban County Number Percent	All Respondents Number Percent
Question 1				
TOTAL RESPONSES				
Question 2				
OTAL RESPONSES				
source:				
lissing Cases:				
lotes: (1)				

All Respondents Number Percent Operations Number Percent Homelessness Prevention Essential Services Conversion/Rehabilitation Number Percent Number Percent Number Percent Sample Table for Providers Research Question(s): TOTAL RESPONSES TOTAL RESPONSES Missing Cases: Responses Question 2 Question 1 Notes: (1) Source ltem(s)

Exhibit A.2

<u>Providers</u> are always grouped by stratum (homelessness prevention, essential services, conversion/rehabilitation, operations). Assignment of providers to strata indicates one but not all of the ESG-eligible activities for which funding was received in FY 91; many providers were conducting more than one eligible activity. The hierarchical assignment of providers to strata is explained in Chapter 2 and described in detail in Appendix B.

Measure -- Shows the statistical measure being reported (mean, percent, median).

Left column

Questions -- Shows wording of survey question when it differs from research question.

*Total responses* -- Shown when response categories are mutually exclusive (no multiple responses). Notes indicate when multiple responses are possible.

Source -- Indicates data collection instrument and whether data are weighted.

Missing cases -- Shows the unweighted number of missing responses.

Notes – Gives information about multiple responses, definitions of data items, and other details. General notes are numbered (1); notes for specific items in table are lettered (a). General notes are listed before specific notes.

Items 1, 5

0.
g
ы
2
ť
Č.
Ē
B
ō
5
8
£
2
9
ž
2
2
8
ġ.
6
5
4
8
3
5
8
÷
Ē
4
- 6
8
뗮
2
g a
the grau
A the grau
s of the grau
tics of the grau
istics of the grau
teristics of the grau
acteristics of the grau
aracteristics of the grau
characteristics of the grau
e characteristics of the grau
the characteristics of the grau
re the characteristics of the grau
t are the characteristics of the grau
hat are the characteristics of the grau
What are the characteristics of the grau
: What are the characteristics of the grau
Le: What are the characteristics of the grau
V.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
V.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
s A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
ons A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
tions A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
estions A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
Questions A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
h Questions A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
vch Questions A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
earch Questions A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau
research Questions A.1, A.2.e: What are the characteristics of the grau

and the second sec	Number	Percent	MULTINE			AL AND AL	T THE PARTY OF	and
'nimery mission of grantee agency:								
Community development	18	32.4%	139	63.3%	72	67.0%	229	60.1%
Economic development	10	8.2%	4	2.0%	8	1.9%	Ħ	2.9%
Health care	•	0.0%	N	0.8%	•	0.0%	2	0.4%
Housing	F	19.1%	4	18.8%	13	12.2%	65	17.0%
Social services	10	18.4%	12	5.9%	8	7.4%	30	7.9%
Welfare/public assistance	9	11.3%	8	1.1%	-	1.0%	10	2.0%
Other	8	10.5%	19	8.5%	11	9,6%	35	9.2%
DTAL RESPONSES	55	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.0%
oes grantee have primary sponsibility for homeless programs, r is the responsibility shared?								
rimary	28	51.2%	104	47.5%	29	27.4%	162	42.4%
shared	27	48.8%	116	52.5%	78	72.7%	220	57.0%
DTAL RESPONSES	55	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.0%
what division are homeless ograms located?								
conomic development	-	1.8%	12	5.4%	-	1.3%	14	3.7%
nergency assistance	•	960.0	2	2.1%	0	0.0%	N)	1.2%
ousing division	10	18.0%	31	14.5%	24	23.0%	66	17.9%
ommunity development	13	23.5%	5	25.1%	29	27.4%	98	25.2%
uman or social services	22	39.8%	36	16.7%	29	27.4%	87	23.1%
ter and the second s	a	16.3%	78	36.2%	22	20.8%	110	29.2%
DIAL RESPONSES	55	100.0%	215	100.0%	106	100.0%	376	100.0%

A-1

Items 1-5 (cont.)

	State/Territory Number	Metropolitan City Number	Urban County Number	All Grantees Number	Hecipients
Mean number of staff assigned primarily to issues regarding homeless	2.87	2.49	4.35	3.07	2.75
Mean number of volunteers assigned primarily to issues regarding homeless	0.00	0.52	3.57	1.30	0.00
How many staff have primary duties for					
Program administration	2	2	2	8	0
Direct program management	-	-	N	-	0
Housing search	0	0	0	0	0
Health care	0	0	0	0	0
Vhat was grantee's/recipient's total udget for homeless activities/services?	_	_			
Mean budget	\$3,832,656	\$931,182	\$589,474	\$1,236,171	\$321,637
Median budget	\$1,030,000	\$163,000	\$150,000	\$210,000	\$27,500
Nat was the grantee's/recipient's SGP Budget?	-	_			
Mean budget	\$698,532	\$164,417	\$84,115	\$235,766	\$59,899
Median budget	\$557,000	\$77,000	\$68,500	\$86,000	\$19.400

and the second states of the	0.00	A. S.	Man-	CI BILL		Lunds Allock	LION				
Grantee Agency		Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
WISSING		Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Community Development	(229)	55.7%	60.4%	19.1%	%0.0	15.6%	14.7%	8.3%	%0.0	1.3%	%0.0
Economic Development	(11)	41.1%	38.9%	40.1%	36.8%	7.8%	2.7%	9.2%	10.4%	1.7%	%0.0
Housing	(92)	55.8%	57.0%	25.7%	13.8%	11.5%	13.7%	5.3%	%0.0	1.7%	%0.0
Health Care	(2)	66.4%	66.4%	5.5%	5.5%	%0.0	%0'0	28.1%	28.1%	%0.0	%0.0
Social Services	(00)	53.4%	51.7%	13.9%	13.0%	20.3%	18.5%	9.2%	7.5%	3.2%	4.7%
Welfare	(10)	47.6%	44.3%	42.4%	28.8%	8.9%	7.5%	5.0%	1.7%	3.1%	1.7%
Other	(35)	49.4%	<b>29.6%</b>	27.6%	50.9%	14.0%	13.0%	7.0%	%0.0	2.0%	0.3%
Source: Grantee Survey, Sources	Question =382, 5	n 2 (weighted ( Survey Sample	data); Grantee =234.	Census for fund	is alliocations.						
Missing Cases: None.											

Notes: (a) Numbers in parentheses are weighted numbers of grantees.

A-3

Item 2

Responses Recipient's primary mission: Local government Human Services Neighborhood and Community Services Department of Public Works TOTAL RESPONSES	Number of Recipients 9	Devent
Recipient's primary mission: Local government Human Services Neighborhood and Community Services Department of Public Works TOTAL RESPONSES	. 0	Recipients
Local government Human Services Neighborhood and Community Services Department of Public Works TOTAL RESPONSES	8	
Human Services Neighborhood and Community Services Department of Public Works TOTAL RESPONSES		75.0%
Neighborhood and Community Services Department of Public Works TOTAL RESPONSES	-	8.3%
Department of Public Works FOTAL RESPONSES	-	8.3%
FOTAL RESPONSES	-	8.3%
	12	100.0%
Does recipient have primary esponsibility for homeless programs or is responsibility shared?		
rimary	0	75.0%
Shared	6	25.0%
TOTAL RESPONSES	12	100.0%
n what division are homeless brograms located?		
fousing	8	16.7%
leighborhood and Community Services	-	8.3%
.ocal Government (general unit)	4	33,3%
luman Services	-	8.3%
lanning	N	16.7%
ublic Works	-	8.3%
community Development	-	8.3%
OTAL RESPONSES	12	100.0%
iource: Recipient Survey, Questions 2-4.		
dissina Cases: None.		

A-4

	-	•	J
2	-	2	1
į	5	H	6
l	7	-	1
l	r	•	ś
,	<	ŕ	i
		'n	i
	č		
	ş	2	
	2	5	

Research Questions A.2.a, A.2.d, A.3.g, A.3.h : What are the characteristics of the ESG participants?

	Number	ss Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Percent	Conversion/F Number	Rehabilitation	Opera Number	tions Percent	All Resp Number	Percent
What percentage are operated by										1
Local governments	48	11.0%	59	6.1%	14	3.5%	40	3.5%	162	5.4%
Non-profits with no eligious affiliation	322	73.7%	111	79.7%	304	74.7%	823	71.0%	2227	74.8%
Non-profits with eligious affiliation	67	15.2%	138	14.2%	89	21.8%	296	25.6%	590	19.8%
TOTAL RESPONSES	437	100.0%	974	100.0%	408	100.0%	1160	100.0%	2978	100.0%
How long have these organizations been in operation?										
Vean number of years n operation	20.3		15.1		19.7	1	15.6	I	17.0	ł
Median number of years n operation	16.0	1	10.0		10.5	1	10.0		11.0	1
Percent in operation under i years		12.0%		10.0%		13.0%		22.0%	1	16.0%
What are the sizes of the shelters?										
lumber of beds										
Aean	1	1	53.6	!	46.4		49.4		50.2	1
Aedian	-	-	31		20	1	28		26	1

A-5

Notes: (1) Shelter size not asked of HP stratum.

Items 10 & 17

Research Questions A.3., A.3.f.: What are the characteristics of shelters receiving ESG funds? How are the facilities configured?

Responses	Homelessnes Number	s Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/ Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Oper Number	tions Percent	All Resp Number	Percent
What is the physical setup of this shelter? <sup>(a)</sup>										
Group home or large house	146	52.6%	424	52.0%	201	51.0%	463	42.1%	1234	47.7%
Dormitory	60	21.7%	274	33.6%	107	27.1%	386	35.1%	826	31.9%
Entire apartment building	30	10.6%	16	2.0%	22	5.7%	118	10.7%	186	7.2%
Group of apartments	25	9.1%	38	4.6%	18	4.7%	35	3.2%	116	4.5%
Rooms in single room	9	2.0%	0	0.0%	18	4.6%	35	3.2%	59	2.3%
occupancy punging Single apartment	4	1.6%	18	2.3%	ø	0.9%	0	0.0%	26	1.0%
Hotel or motel	0	%0.0	2	0.9%	0	0.0%	4	0.4%	11	0.4%
Other	7	2.4%	38	4.7%	24	6.1%	59	5.4%	128	4.9%
<b>FOTAL RESPONSES</b>	278	100.0%	815	100.0%	393	100.0%	1099	100.0%	2587	100.0%
source: Provider Mailed Survey, ( Provider Universe = 300	Question 21 (wei 0-3500 (estimat	ghted data). ed), Survey Sa	mple = 301.							
Aissing cases: 13 providers.										

A-6

Notes: (a) Question asked only of shelters.

Items 10, 12-13

Responses	Homelessness	S Prevention	Essential	Services	Conversion/	Rehabilitation	Opera	Percent	All Respon	Percent
Providers that are shelters:	156		751		411		1159		2477	
Shelters reporting they operate:										
Day shelter or drop –in center only	6	5.5%	48	6.5%	2	1.7%	62	6.2%	124	5.6%
Night shelter only	80	5.0%	47	6.4%	35	11.3%	119	11.8%	209	9.5%
24-hour shelter with day program	140	89.5%	639.	87.1%	270	87.0%	825	82.0%	1874	84.9%
TOTAL RESPONSES	156	100.0%	734	100.0%	310	100.0%	1006	100.0%	2205	100.0%
Characteristics of shelters: (*)										
Temporary, overnight	-		392	53.4%	216	69.8%	521	51.8%	1129	51.2%
Short-term, 90 days or less		-	573	78.1%	275	88.7%	872	86.7%	1720	78.0%
Longer – term, transitional			368	50.1%	254	82.0%	465	46.2%	1087	49.3%
No time limits, clients with special needs, e.g. substance	1		244	33.2%	117	37.7%	290	28.8%	650	29.5%

Source: Provider Phone Survey, Questions raino or the survey Sample=651. Provider Universe=3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample=651.

Missing Cases: None.

Notes: (a) Second question not asked of providers in HP stratum.

Number Percent 65.7% 23.3% 10.1% %6.0 100.0% All Respondents How many days out of the year are shelters operational? Notes: (1) Includes, for example, an organization that runs a day program 5 days per week and an 3500 2299 815 354 32 Percent 32.4% 62.1% 5.6% %0.0 100.0% Non-shelters What hours are the shelters open? Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 301. Number 788 255 489 4 0 Source: Provider Mailed Survey, Question 10 (weighted data). Percent 1.2% 75.4% 12.0% 11.4% 100.0% Shelters overnight shelter 2 nights per week. Number 2712 2044 326 310 32 Research Questions A.3.d., A.3.e.: Open 24 hours/7 days per week Missing cases: 6 providers. Open during daytime hours TOTAL RESPONSES Open overnight Items 14-15 Responses Other<sup>(1)</sup>

Responses	Ho mele ssnes	s Prevention	Essential	Services	Conversion/Rel	habilitation	Opera	tions	All Resp	ondents
	Number	Percent	Number	rercent	Number	rercent	Number	rercent	Number	rercent
Where are the shelters located?										
No rthe ast	11	7.3%	157	21.0%	130	31.7%	314	27.1%	613	24.7%
South	59	37.7%	214	28.6%	94	22.8%	389	33.6%	757	30.5%
Midwest	99	41.3%	225	30.0%	128	31.2%	252	21.8%	670	27.1%
West	22	13.7%	154	20.5%	59	14.2%	204	17.6%	438	17.7%
TOTAL RESPONSES	158	100%	750	100%	411	100%	1159	%001	2478	100%
Source: Provider Phone Survey, loc Provider Universe = 3000⊶3	ation Information 3500 (estimated), 3	(weightæd data). Survey Sample =	:651							
Missing Cases: None.										
Notes: (1) Data are on shelters on	iv non-shelter ni	oviders are exclu	hed							

Item 16

•

A-9

elters     14.1       II – Time Equivalent Staff     13.5       Mean     4.6       Wean     4.6       Mean     4.6       Median     4.6       Median     1.8       Median     1.6       Median     1.6       Median     1.6       Median     1.6       Median     1.6       Median     0.6       Median     0.6       Median     2.6       Median     2.6       Median     2.6       Median     2.6       Median     2.6       Median     2.6       Median     0.3       Median     0.3       Median     0.0       Median     0.0		Government Shelters	Private Shelters	Ail Sheiters
II – Time Equivalent Staff       13.5       14.1       14.0         Wean       4.6       6.3       6.0       6.0         Weal       4.6       6.3       6.0       6.0         Wean       1.6       3.2       3.2       3.2         Wean       0.6       1.4       1.3       1.3         Median       0.6       1.4       1.4       1.3         II – Time Equivalent Staff       4.5       11.8       10.5         Mean       2.6       3.6       3.6       3.6         Afencies       0.0       1.0       0.6       0.6	helters			
Mean Wedian         13.5         14.1         14.0           Wedian Wean         4.6         6.3         6.0           II – Time Equivalent Volunteers         1.6         3.2         3.2           Wean         0.6         1.4         1.3           Wean         0.6         3.2         3.2           Wean         0.6         1.4         1.3           Wean         0.6         1.4         1.3           Wean         0.6         1.4         1.3           Median         0.6         1.4         1.3           Median         0.6         1.4         1.3           Median         2.6         3.8         3.6           Median         2.6         3.8         3.6           Median         0.3         2.4         2.1           Mean         0.0         1.0         0.6	ull – Time Equivalent Staff			
Vectian     4.6     6.3     6.0       II – Time Equivalent Volunteers     1.6     3.2     3.2       Wean     1.6     3.2     3.2     3.2       Wean     0.6     1.4     1.3       Wedian     0.6     1.4     1.3       Median     0.6     1.4     1.3       Median     0.6     1.4     1.3       On-Shelters     0.6     1.4     1.3       Median     4.5     11.8     10.5       Median     2.6     3.8     3.6       Median     0.3     2.4     2.1       Median     0.0     1.0     0.6	Mean	13.5	14.1	14.0
II – Time Equivalent Volunteers Vedian Vedia	Median	4,6	6.3	6.0
Vean     1.6     3.2     3.2       Vedian     0.6     1.4     1.3       Vectian     0.6     1.4     1.3       Non-Shelters     1.4     1.3       Dn-Shelters     Agencies     Agencies     Non-Shelters       Nn-Shelters     11.8     10.5       Nn-Shelters     11.8     10.5       Nedian     2.6     3.8     3.6       I-Time Equivalent Staff     2.6     3.8     3.6       Mean     2.6     3.8     3.6       Median     0.0     1.0     0.6	ull – Time Equivalent Volunteers			
Vectian     0.6     1.4     1.3       n-Shelters     n-Shelters     Non-Shelters     All       n-Shelters     Agencies     Agencies     Non-Shelters       n-Shelters     11.8     10.5       dean     4.5     11.8     10.5       dedian     2.6     3.8     3.6       II-Time Equivalent Staff     0.3     2.4     2.1       Mean     0.0     1.0     0.6	Mean	1.6	3.2	3.2
In-Shelters     Local Government     Private     All       on-Shelters     Non-Shelters     Non-Shelters       II-Time Equivalent Staff     4.5     11.8     10.5       Mean     4.5     11.8     10.5       Median     2.6     3.8     3.6       II-Time Equivalent Volunteers     0.3     2.4     2.1       Median     0.3     2.4     2.1       Median     0.0     1.0     0.6	Median	0.6	1.4	1.3
II – Time Equivalent Staff     4.5     11.8     10.5       Mean     4.5     3.8     3.6       Median     2.6     3.8     3.6       Median     2.6     3.8     3.6       Median     2.6     3.8     3.6       Median     0.3     2.4     2.1       Median     0.0     1.0     0.6	Local	Government gencies	Private Agencies	All Non-Shelters
II – Time Equivalent Staff     4.5     11.8     10.5       Mean     4.5     11.8     10.5       Median     2.6     3.8     3.6       Median     2.6     3.8     3.6       Median     2.6     3.8     3.6       Median     0.3     2.4     2.1       Median     0.0     1.0     0.6	on-Sneiters	-	-	
Mean         4.5         11.8         10.5           Median         2.6         3.8         3.6           Median         0.3         2.4         2.1           Median         0.0         1.0         0.6	uli – Time Equivalent Staff			
Median         2.6         3.8         3.6           IITime Equivalent Volunteers         0.3         2.4         2.1           Aean         0.3         2.4         2.1           Aedian         0.0         1.0         0.6	Mean	4.5	11.8	10.5
II-Time Equivalent Volunteers Aean Aedian 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	Median	2.6	3.8	3.6
Aean 0.3 2.4 2.1 2.1 Aedian 0.0 0.6	ul-Time Equivalent Volunteers			
Aedian 0.0 1.0 0.6	Mean	0.3	2.4	2.1
	Median	0.0	1.0	0.6

A-10

Item 20

ltem 22

<b>c</b> .	
-	
0	
- 5	
-	
ŝ	
~	
~	
-	
7	
-	
0	
-	
.0	
-	
10	
-	
5	
2	
_	
e	
-	
0	
ž	
-	
- 60	
-	
2	
÷	
***	
•	
5	
ā	
tar	
at ar	
hat ar	
(hat ar	
What ar	
What ar	
: What ar	
:: What ar	
.j.: What ar	
3.j.: What ar	
.3.j.: What ar	
A.3.j.: What are	
A.3.j.: What are	
n A.3.j.: What are	
on A.3.j.: What are	
ion A.3.j.: What are	
tion A.3.j.: What are	
stion A.3.j.: What are	
estion A.3.j.: What are	
uestion A.3.j.: What are	
Duestion A.3.j.: What are	
Question A.3.j.: What are	
Question A.3.j.: What are	
h Question A.3.j.: What are	
ch Question A.3.j.: What ar	
rch Question A.3.j.: What ar	
arch Question A.3.j.: What are	
earch Question A.3.j.: What ar	
search Question A.3.j.: What are	
search Question A.3.j.: What ar	
lesearch Question A.3.j.: What are	
Research Question A.3.j.: What are	

Responses	Homelessnes Number	s Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/F Number	<b>Rehabilitation</b> Percent	Oper Number	ations Percent	All Resp Number	Percen
o drinking/drug use in facility	255	91.7%	815	100.0%	363	97.7%	1084	98.6%	2518	98.29
o possession of weapons	220	100.0%	815	100.0%	368	%0'66	1046	95.1%	2449	97.79
annot steal from/assault persons	220	83.2%	808	39.3%	369	99.1%	1075	97.7%	2473	96.99
rrfew	214	78.8%	798	97.9%	300	92.9%	1047	95.3%	2359	94.0%
ittain standards of personal hygiene	227	81.5%	730	89.5%	287	79.9%	996	87.9%	2210	86.6%
o engaging in prostitution	200	71.7%	687	84.3%	289	78.8%	66	90.7%	2174	84.9%
ust meet with caseworker	206	84.8%	641	78.9%	263	82.1%	943	86.2%	2053	83.1%
ent must actively seek housing	261	93.6%	583	72.2%	257	80.6%	942	85.7%	2043	81.6%
quired chores	232	83.3%	622	76.5%	292	80.6%	853	78.9%	2000	80.1%
sexual activity in facility	182	67.7%	632	80.3%	280	75.4%	869	79.0%	1963	¥1.77
ildren must enroll in/attend school	175	91.3%	660	84.2%	254	84.7%	699	66.0%	1758	76.8%
herence to case management plan	156	56.2%	611	75.2%	270	83.7%	848	77.5%	1885	75.2%
foul language in facility	182	65.3%	715	87.7%	214	68.3%	766	69.7%	1876	74.9%
drinking/drug use anywhere	228	81.8%	530	65.3%	286	79.8%	829	75.5%	1874	73.5%
ited visitors allowed	238	86.1%	209	87.0%	228	71.4%	638	60.5%	1813	73.5%
actively sulcidal clients	177	63.6%	474	60.7%	228	65.1%	720	67.0%	1600	64.4%
ss of bed if long absence occurs	130	47.0%	613	76.7%	162	51.1%	649	60.8%	1554	63.2%
smoking in facility	116	44.0%	483	59.6%	161	51.2%	606	57.5%	1365	55.9%

tem 22 (cont.)

Research Question A.3.j.: What are the shelter rules for client behavior?

Must look for job unless handlexapped         155         64.0%         334         41.8%         150         48.6%         635         58.4%         1275         52.3%           No sexual offenders allowed         179         64.4%         306         39.0%         112         36.6%         425         40.1%         1023         42.1%           Must attend training sessions         120         49.4%         30.6%         112         36.6%         435         40.1%         1023         42.1%           Must attend training sessions         120         49.4%         206         39.0%         114         36.6%         43.5%         1004         41.1%           Must attend training sessions         120         49.4%         16.6%         141         38.0%         171         30.8%           No outside visitors allowed         28         10.7%         132         16.6%         141         38.0%         51.6%         51.6%         51.4%         771         30.8%           Servings (escrow) program required         28         10.7%         132         15.6%         90         29.1%         672         26.8%         610         24.4%           Servings (escrow) program required         28         87         1	Responses	lomelessnet Number	s Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/F Number	Sehabilitation Percent	Oper Number	ations Percent	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
No sexual offanders allowed         179         64.4%         306         39.0%         112         36.6%         425         40.1%         1023         42.1%           Must attend training sessions         120         49.4%         30.6         39.0%         116         37.0%         494         45.9%         1004         41.1%           Health screen required upon admission         116         41.7%         140         17.3%         139         43.2%         376         34.4%         771         30.8%           No outside visitors allowed         29         10.7%         132         16.6%         141         38.0%         370         34.7%         672         25.3%           No outside visitors allowed         28         10.3%         150         18.5%         90         29.1%         171         30.8%           Location of facility kept confidential         119         42.6%         299         37.1%         90         29.3%         51.3%         51.4%         52.2%         56.4%         56.2%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.3%         56.1%         56.3%         56.3%	Must look for job unless handicapped	155	64.0%	334	41.8%	150	48.6%	636	58.4%	1275	52.3%
Must attend training sessions         120         49.4%         274         33.8%         116         37.0%         49.4         45.9%         1004         41.1%           Health screen required upon admission         116         41.7%         140         17.3%         139         43.2%         376         34.4%         771         30.8%           No outside visitors allowed         29         10.7%         132         16.6%         141         38.0%         370         34.7%         672         26.8%           Savings (escrow) program required         29         10.7%         150         18.5%         90         29.1%         353         32.9%         671         26.8%           Location of facility kept confidential         119         42.6%         21.1%         70         21.9%         353         32.9%         671         25.2%           No violence in criminal records         87         31.3%         172         21.1%         70         21.9%         52.9%         53.1%         17.8%         52.8         23.4%         71.4%         73.4%         73.4%         73.4%         73.4%         74.4%         74.4%         74.4%         74.4%         74.4%         74.4%         74.4%         74.4%         74.4%	No sexual offenders allowed	179	64.4%	306	39.0%	112	36.6%	425	40.1%	1023	42.1%
Health screen required upon admission         116         41.7%         140         17.3%         139         43.2%         376         34.4%         771         30.8%           No outside visitors allowed         29         10.7%         132         16.6%         141         38.0%         370         34.7%         672         26.8%           Savings (secrow) program required         29         10.7%         132         16.6%         90         29.1%         35.3         32.9%         672         26.8%           Location of facility kept confidential         119         42.6%         299         37.1%         94         29.2%         610         24.4%           Participation in vocationel counselling         98         35.1%         172         21.1%         70         21.8%         23.3%         610         24.4%           No violence in criminal records         87         31.3%         177         21.1%         70         21.8%         28.3%         582         23.3%         610         24.4%           No violence in criminal records         87         31.3%         177         28.4%         70         21.8%         28.4%         70         21.4%           Non -school youth do volunteer work         42	Must attend training sessions	120	49.4%	274	33.8%	116	37.0%	494	45.9%	1004	41.1%
No outside visitors allowed         29         10.7%         132         16.6%         141         38.0%         370         34.7%         672         26.8%           Savings (secrow) program required         28         10.3%         150         18.5%         90         29.1%         353         32.9%         671         25.2%           Savings (secrow) program required         28         10.3%         150         18.5%         90         29.1%         353         32.9%         671         25.2%           Participation of facility kept confidential         119         42.6%         299         37.1%         94         29.2%         98         9.0%         610         24.4%           No violence in criminal records         87         31.3%         157         19.8%         51         70         21.8%         528         21.4%           Non-school youth do volunteer work         42         21.3%         157         29.5%         183         17.8%         528         21.4%           No police referrals         0         0.0%         51.6%         17         5.4%         96         8.8%         150         6.0%           Source: Provider Malled Survey, Question 2         52         35.3%         17	Health screen required upon admission	16 16	41.7%	140	17.3%	139	43.2%	376	34.4%	771	30.8%
Savings (escrow) program required         28         10.3%         150         18.5%         90         29.1%         353         32.9%         621         25.2%           Location of facility kept confidential         119         42.6%         299         37.1%         94         29.2%         98         9.0%         610         24.4%           Participation in vocational counselling         98         35.1%         172         21.1%         70         21.8%         243         22.3%         582         23.3%           No violence in criminal records         87         31.3%         157         19.8%         91         29.5%         193         17.8%         528         21.4%           Non-school youth do volunteer work         42         21.7%         170         21.9%         28         9.9%         47         5.1%         286         13.2%           Non-school youth do volunteer work         42         21.7%         170         21.9%         28         21.4%         28         28.5%         183         28.6%         16.0         24.4%           Source for violence in criminal records         87         37         45.6%         28         21.4%         28         28         21.4%         28 <t< td=""><td>No outside visitors allowed</td><td>29</td><td>10.7%</td><td>132</td><td>16.6%</td><td>141</td><td>38.0%</td><td>370</td><td>34.7%</td><td>672</td><td>26.8%</td></t<>	No outside visitors allowed	29	10.7%	132	16.6%	141	38.0%	370	34.7%	672	26.8%
Location of facility kept confidential         119         42.6%         299         37.1%         94         29.2%         98         9.0%         610         24.4%           Participation in vocational counseling         98         35.1%         172         21.1%         70         21.8%         243         22.3%         582         23.3%           No violence in criminal records         87         31.3%         157         19.8%         91         29.5%         193         17.8%         528         21.4%           Non-school youth do volunteer work         42         21.7%         170         21.9%         28         9.9%         47         5.1%         18.2%         18.2%         286         13.2%           No police referrals         0         0.0.0%         37         4.5%         17         5.4%         96         8.8%         150         6.0%           Source referrals         0         0.0.0%         37         4.5%         17         5.1%         286         13.2%           Source referrals         0         0.0.0%         37         4.5%         17         5.1%         286         53.5%         56.7%           Source referrals         52         35.3%         103<	Savings (escrow) program required	28	10.3%	150	18.5%	6	29.1%	353	32.9%	621	25.2%
Participation in vocational counseling       98       35.1%       172       21.1%       70       21.8%       243       22.3%       582       23.3%         No violence in criminal records       87       31.3%       157       19.8%       91       29.5%       193       17.8%       528       21.4%         Non-school youth do volunteer work       42       21.7%       170       21.9%       28       9.9%       47       5.1%       286       13.2%         No police referrals       0       0.0%       37       4.5%       17       5.4%       96       8.8%       150       6.0%         Source: Provider Mailed Survey, Question 22 (weighted data).       56.0%       131       72.3%       525       56.7%	Location of facility kept confidential	19	42.6%	299	37.1%	94	29.2%	98	%0'6	610	24.4%
No violence in criminal records         87         31.3%         157         19.8%         91         29.5%         193         17.8%         528         21.4%           Non -school youth do volunteer work         42         21.7%         170         21.9%         28         9.9%         47         5.1%         286         13.2%           No police referrals         0         0.0%         37         4.5%         17         5.4%         96         8.8%         150         6.0%           Opolice referrals         52         35.3%         103         56.0%         131         72.3%         239         57.9%         56.7%           Source:         Provider Mailed Survey, Question 22 (weighted data).         200.0         50.0%         131         72.3%         239         57.9%         55.5         56.7%	Participation in vocational counseling	96	35.1%	172	21.1%	22	21.8%	243	22.3%	582	23.3%
Non-school youth do volunteer work         42         21.7%         170         21.9%         28         9.9%         47         5.1%         286         13.2%           No police referrals         0         0.0%         37         4.5%         17         5.4%         96         8.8%         150         6.0%           Other         52         35.3%         103         56.0%         131         72.3%         239         57.9%         55.5         56.7%           Source:         Provider Mailed Survey, Question 22 (weighted data).         103         56.0%         131         72.3%         239         57.9%         525         56.7%	No violence in criminal records	87	31.3%	157	19.8%	91	29.5%	193	17.8%	528	21.4%
No police referrals         0         0.0%         37         4.5%         17         5.4%         96         8.8%         150         6.0%           Other         52         35.3%         103         56.0%         131         72.3%         239         57.9%         56.7%           Source:         Provider Mailed Survey, Question 22 (weighted data).         200         50.0%         131         72.3%         239         57.9%         56.7%	Non-school youth do volunteer wark	42	21.7%	170	21.9%	28	6.6	47	5.1%	286	13.2%
Other     52     35.3%     103     56.0%     131     72.3%     239     57.9%     56.7%       Source:     Provider Mailed Survey, Question 22 (weighted data).     Boold of the structure of the	No police referrals	o	0.0%	37	4.5%	17	5.4%	96	8.8%	150	6.0%
source: Provider Mailed Survey, Question 22 (weighted data). Broukder Heiseren – 3000–3500 (zeitmeted) Survey Servels – 303	Other	52	35.3%	103	56.0%	131	72.3%	239	57.9%	525	56.7%
	Source: Provider Mailed Survey, Question Drovider Iniverse = 3000–3500	22 (weighted /estimated) S	data). untev Semula -	- 301							

A-12

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.

Missing cases: 15-48 providers.

24-Hour Shelters 38.4% 78.4% 31.7% 86.8% 82.6% 43.0% Night-Only 83.0% Shelters 81.9% 18.7% 57.7% 53.3% 57.3% Day-only Shelters Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 17 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651. 65.6% 80.9% 56.4% 91.1% 62.2% 88.0% Research Question A.3.k: How do shelters vary by client type? 44.9% 75.7% 30.7% 82.7% 44.9% 78.6% Shelters All Non-Shelters 78.5% 88.3% 33.8% 95.4% 93.6% 80.1% All Families with no children Women and children Percent serving: Single women Responses Single youth Single men Families Item 23

Missing cases: 0-3 providers.

ltems 24, 25, 96, 101, 102, 103

Research Questions: A.3.I., A.7., A.7.e., A.7.f.: Which shelters provide supportive services, and what type of services are offered/required? On what services are ESGP tunds being spent? Who provides services and where? How are residents linked to services?

desponses	Percent Offering	Percent Funding	Percent Providing	
	Service	Service with ESGP	Service On -Site	Participation by All
ed space	89.2%	66.5%	85.8%	35.2%
reakfast	79.3%	52.2%	88.7%	10.4%
Inch	69.3%	55.8%	85,4%	10.9%
nner		49.5%	87.9%	11.9%
dditional services beyond referrals	93.1%			
Assistance in obtaining benefits	94.2%	38.4%	91.0%	11.0%
Assistance obtaining permanent housing	92.2%	52.1%	91.8%	16.4%
Assistance with daily living skills	86.2%	40.1%	87.9%	30.3%
Transportation	79.1%	41.4%	95.9%	17.1%
Support groups	78.6%	17.9%	82.7%	32.0%
Nutritional counseling	50.1%	22.9%	90.1%	26.9%
Job referrals	69.8%	36.6%	87.6%	14.0%
Child care	42.2%	25.6%	67.3%	3.8%
Clothing	81.7%	17.8%	%9'11	2.9%
untinued)				

A-14

Items 24. 25. 96. 101. 102. 103 (cont.)

Research Questions: A.3.I., A.7., A.7.e., A.7.E., Which shelters provide supportive services, and what type of services are offered/required? On what services are ESGP funds being spent? Who provides services and where? How are residents linked to services?

Responses	Percent Offering Service	Percent Funding Service with ESGP	Percent Providing Service On-Site	Percent Requiring Participation by All
dditional services beyond referrals (cont.)				
Assistance in GED preparation	47.9%	30.5%	69.9%	14.1%
Other basic skills (e.g. budgeting)	32.0%	17.2%	60.9%	5.8%
Vocational counseling	50.6%	30.1%	65.8%	21.1%
Job training	28.1%	40.8%	56.2%	25.1%
English as a second language classes	20.3%	2.8%	38.9%	14.9%
Substance abuse counseling	53.4%	22.7%	65.6%	15.5%
Psychological counseling	45.5%	19.6%	60.6%	16.3%
Medical care	44.2%	24.1%	56.3%	12.1%
Detoxification/other drug treatment	22.5%	24.1%	13.2%	12.4%
Legal assistance	39.6%	15.5%	47.9%	13.3%

Source: Provider Mailed Survey, Question 19 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 301.

Missing cases: 3-16 providers.

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.

Item 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 110

sectoreau	Homelessnes	s Prevention Percent	Essential	Services	Conversion/ Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Oper	Percent	All Resp Number	Percent
Mean number of clients served annually:										
Shelter days/nights	7286		12816	1	12804	1	13167		12644	
Individuals	3368		948	1	877	:	761		1247	!
Families	1613		992		730	-	551	-	936	1
Which of the following groups does provider serve?										
Unaccompanied men over 18	320	73.0%	526	53.3%	208	50,9%	490	41.6%	1545	51.2%
Unaccompanied women over 18	387	88.3%	822	83.3%	264	64.6%	888	75.2%	2361	33.0%
Unaccompanied youth under 18	104	23.7%	353	35.7%	129	31.6%	360	30.5%	946	31.4%
Families with children, headed by:										
Single men over 18	342	78.5%	571	58.1%	145	35.6%	531	45.0%	1590	52.9%
Single women over 18	415	94,8%	857	86,8%	263	64.2%	927	78.8%	2462	81.8%
Youth 18 and under	231	52,8%	398	40.9%	151	36.9%	521	44.4%	1301	44.0%
Two parents 18 and over	350	81.0%	604	61.2%	158	38.6%	560	47.5%	1673	55.6%
Two parents 18 and under	187	42.9%	331	34.1%	96	23.6%	264	22.4%	879	35.09
Families with no children	348	79.3%	551	55.8%	188	45.9%	452	39.0%	1538	51.4%

Missing Cases: 44 providers for first question, 3-8 providers for second question.

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.

Item 28, 37, 39, 110

Research Questions A.4, A.8.e: Wha the sut	at are the characte ESG? Characteri bstance abuse, ph	ristics of the h istics include s ysical disabiliti	omeless ass pecial proble ies.	isted by oms, e.g. me	ntal illness,					
Responses	Homelessness Number	Prevention	Essential	Services Percent	Conversion/F Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Opera Number	Percent	All Respo Number	Percent
Provider offers services to:										
Battered women	278	63.5%	608	61.1%	199	48.5%	604	51.0%	1689	55.8%
Children/youth/child victims <sup>(1)</sup>	26	22.1%	329	33.0%	68	16.6%	229	19.3%	722	23.8%
Chronically mentally ill	176	40.2%	407	40.9%	132	32.0%	409	34.6%	1124	37.1%
Mentally retarded individuals	212	48.3%	342	34.4%	87	21.1%	277	23.4%	918	30.3%
HIV Positive	218	49.8%	422	42.4%	100	24.4%	446	37.6%	1186	39.2%
Alcohol dependent	260	59.4%	575	57.8%	168	41.0%	579	48.9%	1582	52.3%
Drug dependent	273	62.2%	539	54.2%	163	39.8%	583	49.3%	1559	51.5%
Elderly	286	65.2%	481	48.4%	180	43.8%	432	36.5%	1380	45.6%
Veterans	257	58.6%	447	44.9%	169	41.2%	411	34.7%	1284	42.4%
Physically disabled	240	54.7%	486	48.9%	165	40.2%	415	35.0%	1306	43.1%

Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 18 (weighted data). Provider Universe=3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample=651.

Missing Cases: 3-8 providers.

 Separate from battered women.
 Multiple responses possible. Notes:

achoneae	Homolossnoss	Essential	Conversion/	Oneratione	VII
	Prevention	Services	Rehabilitation	chaignois	Respondents
edian percent of clients ith no income	10.0%	35.0%	30.0%	34.0%	25.0%
f clients with income, edian percent receiving:					
Vages	30.0%	11.0%	15.0%	15.0%	20.0%
FDC	35.0%	25.5%	29.5%	27.0%	30.0%
ieneral Assistance	2.5%	5.0%	5.0%	%0'0	2.0%
hild Support	5.0%	%0.0	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
ocial Security Income	2.0%	5.0%	3.5%	3.0%	5.0%
ocial Security Disability Income	5.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	3.0%
ther Disability income	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	%0.0	0.0%

A-18

Responses	Homelessness	Prevention	Essential	Services	Conversion/F	<b>Rehabilitation</b>	Opere	itions	All Resp	ondents
	Mean Percent	Median Percent	Mean	Median	Mean Percent	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Percent of clients from										
Streets	15.6%	5.0%	25.5%	20.0%	19.6%	5.0%	29.7%	10.0%	24.0%	10.0%
Living with friends/relatives	16.6%	9.5%	11.8%	7.5%	17.0%	10.0%	18.5%	10.0%	15.7%	10.0%
Private rental housing	25.5%	20.0%	8.9%	2.5%	14.5%	4.5%	8.4%	0.0%	13.0%	5.0%
Emergency shelters	5.4%	3.0%	11.3%	5.0%	8.9%	5.0%	11.8%	5.0%	3.9%	5.0%
Public housing	8.9%	5.0%	5.4%	%0.0	5.0%	0.5%	3.6%	%0.0	5.5%	1.0%
Jail/prison	4.3%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	4.9%	1.0%	4.4%	1.0%
Owner-occupied home	6.4%	2.0%	9.1%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%
Detox/substance abuse shelter/program	4.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	6.1%	1.0%	6.4%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%
Psychiatric facility	2.2%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.9%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	%0.0
Residential treatment programs	2.1%	0.0%	9%6'0	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.5%	%0.0
Fransitional shelters	2.1%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	1.6%	%0'0

Research Question A.4.: What are the prior places of residency of providers' clients?

Item 36

Missing cases: 5-31 providers.

A-19

	Oper Number	ations Percent
/hich of the following perating costs are supported ith ESG funds?		
Maintenance	708	70.5%
Dperations (excluding staff), rent, epairs, security, fuels, equipment	931	92.8%
nsurance	564	56.2%
Jtilities	941	93.8%
urnishings	392	39.1%
upplies	126	12.6%

Items 42-79 92-95

ts?
g cos
peratin
ding c
inclue
costs,
ESG (
e the
Vhat ar
.6.a.: V
A.5. A
Questions /
Research

All project costs (a)         40         \$31,580         \$1,74,470         \$316,432         \$255,589         \$50,595         \$51,376         \$51,376         \$51,376         \$51,376         \$51,376         \$51,376         \$51,695         \$51,695         \$51,695         \$51,695         \$55,695         \$51,695 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>						
Par bed (b)         25         5722         560.355         560.355         560.067         55.500           Par equare foot (b)         24         \$3.050         \$1.650.558         \$50.067         \$51.978         \$41           Par equare foot (b)         24         \$3.050         \$1.650.558         \$50.067         \$51.978         \$41           Par equare foot (b)         5         \$2.1250         \$1.650.558         \$50.078         \$51.978         \$41           Par equare foot (b)         5         \$2.260         \$1.650.558         \$50.078         \$51.978         \$41.333           Par equare foot (b)         25         \$1.0090         \$757.059         \$1.832.029         \$51.978         \$41.333           Ann-eath         35         \$10.090         \$757.059         \$1.320.059         \$1.82.078         \$41.333           Cotal per square foot (b)         25         \$10.090         \$757.059         \$1.50.55         \$1.50.668         \$41.833           Cotal per square foot (b)         25         \$1.680.730         \$1.680.730         \$1.680.730         \$1.600         \$51.608           Statistion         35         \$1.668.730         \$1.680.730         \$1.680.730         \$1.690.710         \$1.693.710         \$1.600	otal project costs (a)	40	\$31,680	\$1.741.470	\$316.432	\$269.884
Par equare foot (b)         24         54         5366         5302,493         551,376         541           Total         ab bed (b)         51,250         \$1,895,556         \$302,493         \$51,376         \$41,33           Par equare foot (b)         6         \$1,250         \$1,895,556         \$302,493         \$51,376         \$43,327           Par equare foot (b)         6         \$1,250         \$1,895,556         \$302,493         \$51,976         \$12,376           Par equare foot (b)         35         \$10,090         \$767,059         \$132,029         \$76,059         \$16,416           Oreal par equare foot (b)         35         \$10,090         \$76,7059         \$18,446         \$51,620         \$16,163           Cital par equare foot (b)         23         \$10,090         \$76,326         \$16,820         \$16,83         \$16,163           Cital par equare foot (b)         23         \$51,000         \$22,839         \$16,83         \$16,163           Cital par equare foot (b)         23         \$51,000         \$25,833         \$13,20,29         \$76,057           Sameral administration         23         \$51,112         \$13,52,013         \$13,63         \$14,6           Sameral administration         23         \$51,112 </td <td>Par had (h)</td> <td>25</td> <td>\$722</td> <td>560 595</td> <td><b>CB 087</b></td> <td>\$5 560</td>	Par had (h)	25	\$722	560 595	<b>CB 087</b>	\$5 560
monsion/rehabilitation costs         14         \$3,050         \$1,859,558         \$302,493         \$51,976         \$30,335         \$51,976         \$30,335         \$51,976         \$30,335         \$51,976         \$30,335         \$51,976         \$30,335         \$51,976         \$30,335         \$51,976         \$30,335         \$51,976         \$30,335         \$51,655         \$502,493         \$51,655         \$51,976         \$43,325         \$51,655         \$51,655         \$51,655         \$51,655         \$51,616         \$41,833         \$51,616         \$51	Per square foot (b)	24	\$4	\$386	\$62	\$41
Total         14         \$3.050         \$1.859.558         \$302.493         \$51.976           Par square foot (b)         9         \$1.250         \$1.859.558         \$302.493         \$51.976           Par square foot (b)         9         \$1.250         \$1.250         \$1.250         \$52.978         \$130.068         \$4.332           Par square foot (b)         35         \$10.090         \$76.7059         \$7132.029         \$75.165           Par square foot (b)         35         \$10.090         \$77.055         \$132.029         \$75.165           Orlal         355         \$10.090         \$7.035         \$198.46         \$52.206         \$1.618           Afr costs         35         \$10.090         \$7.035         \$1.9446         \$52.206         \$7.183           Afr costs         35         \$1.5625         \$1.984.730         \$1.813.711         \$112.266         \$1.63.706         \$1.618           Afr costs         356.622         \$51.652         \$1.503         \$1.820.203         \$1.618         \$1.618         \$1.618           Afr costs         \$51.652         \$1.989.730         \$1.83.711         \$1.12.266         \$1.630.700         \$1.618.700         \$1.618.700         \$1.618.700         \$1.618.718.100         \$1.61	onversion/rehabilitation costs					
Part bod (b)         6         \$1,250         \$92,976         \$19,068         \$4,332           Par equare foot (b)         9         \$2         \$21,4         \$39         \$12           Par equare foot (b)         35         \$10,090         \$77,059         \$132,029         \$76,165           Von -staff costs (c)         35         \$10,090         \$77,059         \$132,029         \$76,097           Cletal per bed (b)         25         \$10,090         \$77,059         \$16,926         \$16,926         \$70,091           Cletal per square foot (b)         25         \$10,090         \$77,059         \$16,926         \$16,693         \$16,619           Aff costs         38         \$7,035         \$16,926         \$16,637         \$16,193         \$16,193           Aff costs         38         \$7,035         \$16,926         \$16,937         \$16,193         \$16,193           Second services         32         \$30,112         \$16,967,300         \$16,927         \$16,193         \$16,193           Second services         32         \$16,927         \$16,967,300         \$16,967,300         \$16,926         \$16,193           Second services         32         \$16,962         \$16,968         \$16,966         \$16,92	Total	14	\$3.050	\$1,859,558	\$302,493	\$51,978
Par square foot (b)         9         \$2         \$2:14         \$33         \$1:2         \$33         \$1:5         \$1:6	Per bed (b)	9	\$1,250	\$92,978	\$19,068	\$4,332
arrating costs         35         \$10,090         \$767,059         \$76,165         \$76,165           Cotal         35         \$10,090         \$76,105         \$132,029         \$76,067           Cotal per bad (b)         35         \$10,090         \$76,057         \$53,886         \$53,209         \$76,067           Cotal per square (cot (b)         25         \$3335         \$10,090         \$76,056         \$51,816         \$16,916         \$16	Per square foot (b)	თ	\$2	\$214	\$38	\$12
Otal         570,050         577,059         513,029         576,057         576,056         577,128         571,058         576,056         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         571,058         5	perating costs	-				
Von-staff costs (c)         35         \$10,090         \$268,988         \$68,280         \$76,037           Total per bad (b)         25         \$335         \$10,090         \$268,988         \$68,280         \$76,037           Total per square foot (b)         23         \$335         \$16,925         \$16,925         \$18,771         \$16,935           aff costs         38         \$7,035         \$18,770         \$18,771         \$112,696         \$112,696           aff costs         38         \$7,035         \$1,656,730         \$18,771         \$112,696         \$122,696           clad staff costs         32         \$9,112         \$1,656,730         \$18,771         \$112,696         \$15,696           clad staff costs         32         \$9,112         \$1,656,730         \$18,771         \$112,696         \$15,90           sential services         32         \$9,112         \$1,656,730         \$16,80,730         \$112,696         \$17,906           cital services         32         \$15,625         \$1,5231         \$16,50,730         \$18,771         \$112,696         \$19,92           cital services         33         \$15,625         \$1,656,730         \$16,86,730         \$112,696         \$16,96,730         \$16,96,730         \$138,771	Total	35	\$10,090	\$767,059	\$132,029	\$76,165
Clatel per bad (b)         25         \$336         \$16,926         \$2,879         \$1,618	Non-staff costs (c)	35	\$10,090	\$268,988	\$88,280	\$76,087
Cotal per square foot (b)         23         \$3         \$50         \$18         \$18         \$18         \$112,096         \$41,833         \$41,8	Total per bed (b)	25	\$336	\$16,926	\$2,879	\$1,618
aff costs         \$198,446         \$52,206         \$41,833           issential administration         38         \$7,035         \$198,446         \$52,206         \$41,833           issential social services         32         \$9,112         \$1,658,730         \$183,771         \$112,696           domelessness prevention         32         \$9,112         \$1,658,730         \$183,771         \$112,696           otal staff costs         32         \$9,112         \$1,658,730         \$183,771         \$112,696           interstat costs         32         \$9,112         \$15,625         \$1,658,730         \$153,913         \$25,066           sential services         32         \$9,112         \$15,827         \$15,837         \$153,930         \$153,916           sential services         32         \$51,625         \$1,658,730         \$163,900         \$163,917         \$112,696           it         32         \$15,625         \$15,625         \$1,658,730         \$163,917         \$112,696           it         32         \$1,690         \$17,006         \$17,006         \$17,006         \$163,617         \$112,696           it         \$168         \$17,006         \$158,221         \$163,617         \$136,617         \$11,902	Total per square foot (b)	23	\$3	\$60	\$18	\$15
Sentral administration         38         \$7,035         \$159,446         \$52,206         \$41,833           Sentral administration         32         \$9,112         \$1,55,730         \$153,730         \$153,730         \$112,696           domelessness prevention         32         \$9,112         \$1,556,730         \$183,771         \$112,696         \$41,833           domelessness prevention         32         \$9,112         \$1,556,730         \$183,771         \$112,696         \$539,918           sential services         32         \$9,112         \$1,558,730         \$183,771         \$112,696         \$25,066           sential services costs         32         \$9,112         \$1,558,730         \$183,771         \$112,696         \$25,066           sential services costs         32         \$9,112         \$1,558,730         \$183,771         \$112,696         \$136,90           cital         services costs         32         \$1,568,730         \$18,679         \$166,90         \$112,696         \$100,90         \$100,90         \$100,90         \$169,90         \$166,90         \$166,90         \$166,90         \$166,90         \$166,90         \$166,90         \$166,90         \$166,90         \$169,90         \$169,90         \$100,90         \$100,90         \$100,90	aff costs					
Sesential social services         32         \$9,112         \$1,658,730         \$183,771         \$112,656         \$133,721         \$112,656         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$25,065         \$38,522         \$38,522         \$38,522         \$35,505         \$35,505         \$35,505         \$35,505         \$35,505         \$35,505         \$35,505         \$315,231         \$315,231         \$315,231         \$315,231         \$315,231         \$315,303         \$315,303         \$315,305         \$316,305         \$316,30	General administration	38	\$7.035	\$198.446	\$52,206	\$41,833
domelessness prevention         12         \$6,682         \$12,988         \$38,522         \$25,066         \$15,625         \$1,658,730         \$38,522         \$25,056         \$15,625         \$1,658,730         \$219,126         \$15,031         \$112,696         \$15,031         \$112,696         \$15,031         \$112,696         \$15,031         \$112,696         \$10,02         \$112,696         \$10,02         \$112,696         \$10,02         \$112,696         \$10,02         \$112,696         \$10,02         \$112,696         \$10,02         \$10	essential social services	32	\$9,112	\$1.658.730	\$183,771	\$112,696
ortal staff costs         38         \$15,625         \$1,658,730         \$219,126         \$163,316           sential services costs         32         \$9,112         \$1,658,730         \$219,126         \$163,696           sential services costs         32         \$9,112         \$1,658,730         \$1,658,730         \$112,696         \$112,696           otal         36         \$17,006         \$1,658,730         \$1,658,730         \$112,696         \$112,696           otal         36         \$17,006         \$315,231         \$1,002         \$36,500         \$1,002           otal per bed (b)         25         \$169         \$169         \$35,233         \$38,522         \$21,902           Melessness prevention costs         12         \$6,682         \$179,888         \$38,522         \$21,002           Mon-staff         \$753         \$55,250         \$56,682         \$58,621         \$18,679           Octal         14         \$7753         \$52,550         \$28,017         \$18,679           Sold         \$538,525         \$52,666         \$18,679         \$28,017         \$18,679           Otal per bed (b)         25         \$52,606         \$28,617         \$18,679         \$18,679           Otal per bed (b)	domelessness prevention	12	\$6.682	\$129,888	\$38,522	\$25,066
servical services costs         32         \$9,112         \$1,658,730         \$183,771         \$112,696           itaff         0 tal         36         \$17,006         \$1,658,730         \$183,771         \$112,696           0 tal         36         \$17,006         \$315,231         \$103,803         \$135,231         \$135,231         \$1,902           0 tal         36         \$153         \$153         \$153         \$35,323         \$1,902         \$1,902           melessness prevention costs         12         \$6,682         \$153         \$35,323         \$38,621         \$1,902           cital         14         \$753         \$56,682         \$129,888         \$38,621         \$13,600           cital         36         \$7753         \$58,250         \$28,017         \$18,679         \$18,679           cital         5753         \$55,250         \$58,600         \$25,006         \$19,000         \$19,679         \$19,000         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,679         \$19,689	fotal staff costs	38	\$15,625	\$1,658,730	\$219,126	\$163,918
italf         32         \$9,112         \$1,658,730         \$183,771         \$112,696           otal         0tal         517,006         \$17,006         \$17,006         \$1315,231         \$103,803         \$65,600           otal         0tal         517,006         \$17,006         \$17,006         \$17,006         \$103,803         \$65,600           melessness prevention costs         12         \$163         \$129,888         \$13,633         \$1,902           melessness prevention costs         12         \$6,682         \$129,888         \$38,522         \$25,066           ital         25         \$753         \$129,888         \$38,621         \$18,679           ital         25         \$753         \$356,250         \$14,499         \$38,621         \$18,679           ital         36         \$753         \$328,250         \$38,621         \$18,679         \$18,679           ital         5753         \$328,250         \$328,220         \$18,679         \$18,679         \$18,679           ital         \$753         \$526,250         \$538,220         \$18,679         \$18,679         \$18,679           ital         \$60,000         \$56,580         \$528,250         \$28,017         \$18,679         \$18,679	sential services costs					
otal         36         \$17,005         \$315,231         \$103,803         \$85,600           otal per bed (b)         25         \$163         \$17,006         \$315,231         \$103,803         \$85,600           melessness prevention costs         12         \$163         \$163         \$35,323         \$35,330         \$1,902           melessness prevention costs         12         \$5,682         \$169         \$36,323         \$38,522         \$1,902           staff         14         \$753         \$129,888         \$38,621         \$1,800         \$1,902           otal         536,520         \$129,888         \$38,621         \$16,00         \$1,800         \$16,00         \$18,679         \$18,	staff	32	\$9,112	\$1,658,730	\$183,771	\$112,696
otal per bed (b)         25         \$163         \$163         \$36,323         \$3,630         \$1,902           melessness prevention costs         12         \$6,682         \$129,888         \$38,522         \$25,066         \$1,902           staff         12         \$5,682         \$129,888         \$38,621         \$1,902         \$1,902           otal         14         \$753         \$47,499         \$129,488         \$38,621         \$18,679         \$18,679           otal         36         \$753         \$355,250         \$136,000         \$18,679         \$18,679         \$18,679         \$18,679           otal per bed (b)         25         \$47         \$22,277         \$176         \$18,000         \$17,6         \$17,6         \$17,6         \$13,000         \$13,000         \$13,000         \$13,0	otal	36	\$17,006	\$315,231	\$103,803	\$85,600
melessness prevention costs12\$6,682\$129,888\$38,522\$25,066italf14\$753\$424,499\$38,621\$18,679ion - staff36\$753\$385,250\$28,017\$18,679iotal per bed (b)25\$47\$2,277\$176\$333urce: Cost data from a purposive sample of providers in the 15 intensive-study sites. These providers were not selected rendomily; their costs may not be to cost and ESG-funded providers.the 15 intensive-study sites. These providers were not selected rendomily; their costs may not be to cost and to cost and providers.	fotal per bed (b)	25	\$169	\$36,323	\$3,630	\$1,902
itaff 12 \$129,888 \$38,522 \$53,522 \$23,665 for - staff 5753 \$124,499 \$38,621 \$18,679 otal 5753 \$424,499 \$38,621 \$18,679 otal per bed (b) 25 \$753 \$47 \$385,250 \$28,017 \$18,000 urce: Cost data from a purposive sample of providers in the 15 Intensive - study sites. These providers were not selected randomly: their costs may not be trolical of all ESG-funded providers.	melessness prevention costs					
Ion-staff     14     \$753     \$424,499     \$88,621     \$18,679       otal     36     \$753     \$385,250     \$28,017     \$18,679       otal     5     \$753     \$385,250     \$28,017     \$18,000       otal     5     \$385,250     \$28,017     \$18,000       otal per bed (b)     25     \$47     \$2,277     \$176     \$333       urce:     Cost data from a purposive sample of providers in the 15 intensive-study sites. These providers were not selected randomity; their costs may not be to be the selected randomity; their costs may not be to be the selected providers.     \$10     \$10	Staff	12	\$6,682	\$129,888	\$38,522	\$25,066
otal cost data from a purposive sample of providers in the 15 intensive-study sites. These providers were not selected randomly; their costs may not be to all ESG-funded providers.	von – staff	44	\$753	\$424,499	\$88,621	\$18,679
otel per bed (b) (b) 25 (5333) urce: Cost data from a purposive sample of providers in the 15 intensive—study sites. These providers were not selected randomly; their costs may not be topical of all ESG-funded providers.	otal	36	\$753	\$385,250	\$28,017	\$18,000
urce: Cost data from a purposive sample of providers in the 15 intensive-study sites. These providers were not selected randomly; their costs may not be topical of all ESG-funded providers.	Fotal per bed (b)	25	\$47	\$2,277	\$176	\$333
	urce: Cost data from a purposive sample of typical of all ESG-funded providers.	f providers in the 15 ir	ntensive−stuchy sites. Tr	nese providers were not s	elected randomly; their co	sts may not be

- (a) Total project costs reflect entire agency budget.
   (b) Total project cost per bed and per square foot reflects costs for homeless programs and services divided by number of beds or number of square feet.
   (c) Operating costs include payment for shelter maintenance, operation (including administration but excluding staffing costs), rent, repairs, security, fuel, equipment, insurance, utilities. food, and furnishings.

Responses	Homelessnes	Prevention	Essential	Services	Conversion/R	ehabilitation	Opera	suop	All Respo	ndents
	Number	Leven				L SUCOLA	Number	recent	Number	Percent
roviders receiving funding from:										
epartment of Housing & Urban Development	311	70.9%	759	78.3%	302	73.0%	972	82.1%	2344	77.4%
CDBG	58	13.2%	328	33.0%	128	31.2%	306	25.8%	820	27.1%
ESG from another grantee (*)	73	16.0%	163	16.4%	54	13.2%	251	21.2%	541	17.9%
Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation	2	0.5%	19	1.9%	æ	2.1%		0.5%	35	1.2%
SHDP	7	1.0%	23	2.3%	21	5.0%	57	4.8%	107	3.9%
SAFAH	9	1.4%	16	1.0%	15	3.0%	19	1.0%	56	1.8%
deral Emergency Management Agency Emergency Food and Shelter Program	244	55.7%	642	64.9%	223	54.2%	796	67.2%	1905	62.0%
epartment of Health & Human Services	88	20.2%	191	19.2%	99	16.0%	268	22.0%	613	20.3%
Community Mental Health Services for the Homeless	N	0.5%	F	1.1%	0	%0.0	33	2.8%	46	1.9%
Emergency Community Services Homeless Grant Program	15	3.5%	12	1.2%	12	2.9%	19	1.0%	58	1.6
Health Care for the Homeless	8	0.0%	25	2.5%	6	2.1%	22	4.9%	94	3.19
partment of Veterans Affairs	5	1.2%	9	0.3%	2	0.8%	2	0.0%	18	0.0
Homeless Chronically Mentally III Veterans Program	ß	1.2%	•	0.0%	N	0.5%	7	0.0%	15	0.5
Domiciliary Care for Homeless Veterans	ŝ	1.2%	6	0.3%	2	0.5%	2	0.0%	18	0.6
partment of Education	14	3.1%	46	4.0%	13	3.1%	38	3.2%	111	3.7
Adult Education for the Homeless	-	0.3%	Ħ	1.1%	0	0.0%	21	1.7%	32	1.1
Education for Homeless Children and Youth	2	0.5%	22	2.2%	0	0.0%	17	1.4%	14	1.3
partment of Labor	10	2.3%	22	2.3%	14	3.4%	8	0.7%	55	1.8
Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program	0	960.0	•	0.0%	2	0.5%	•	0.0%	8	0.1
Job Training for the Homeless	-	0.3%	÷	1.1%	0	0.0%	•	0.0%	12	0.4
urce: Provider Phone Survey, Questions 9–12 Provider Universe=3000–3500 (estimate	(weighted data ed), Survey Sam	). 1016=651.								
sing Cases: 55-71 providers.										
as. (1) Multinla resources proceible										

A-22
Item 80 (cont.)

sources?
y other
baid b
ion ar
roport
what p
SG and
the E
oaid by
ts are
of cos
oportion
What pi
A.5.a:
Question
Research

		recent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percen
ber and percent of grantees rting that they receive funds from								
rtment of Housing & Urban Development <sup>(e)</sup>	47	85.5%	145	66.1%	68	64.0%	261	68.3%
080	21	38.4%	128	58.4%	54	50.2%	203	53.2%
ction 8 moderate rehabilitation	2	4.2%	22	%6'8	4	3.5%	28	7.3%
pportive housing demonstration program	14	24.7%	17	7,9%	7	6.6%	38	6.9%
pplemental assistance for facilities assist the homeless	12	21.2%	13	5.8%	8	5.2%	30	7.8%
tment of Health & Human Services	30	54.7%	14	6.5%	4	3.6%	48	12.6%
mm unity mental health services for the meless block grant	•	7.1%	e	1.6%	-	1.4%	6	2.3%
rergency community services homeless ant program	25	44.8%	æ	4.0%	-	1.3%	35	9.2%
alth care for the homeless	-	2.3%	60	3.7%	0	%0.0	0	2.5%
tment of Veteran's Affairs	0	%0'0	0	%0.0	0	%0.0	0	%0.0
meless chronically mentally ill teran's programs	0	0.0%	•	0.0%	•	%0'0	0	%0.0
miciliary care for homeless veterans	0	%0.0	0	%0.0	0	%0.0	0	%0.0
tment of Education	0	%0.0	-	0.4%	0	%0.0	-	0.2%
ult education for the homeless	0	%0.0	-	0.4%	0	%0'0	-	0.2%
ucation for homeless children and youth	0	%0.0	-	0.4%	•	%0.0	-	0.2%
tment of Labor	0	%0.0	7	3.2%	-	1.0%	89	2.1%
meless veteran's reintegration projects	0	%0.0	2	0.8%	0	%0.0	8	0.4%
training for the homeless	0	%0.0	4	1.6%	-	1.0%	50	1.2%
al Emergency Management Agency	0	%0.0	16	7.4%	4	13.2%	30	2.9%
ergency food and shetter program	0	0.0%	a	4.0%	12	10.9%	20	5.3%
e: Grantee Survey, Question 9.b (weighted data). Grantee Universe =382, Survey Sample =234.								
d Catas: None.								

A-23

Notes: (a) In addition to ESG.

ltems 80-86

Funding Source Emergency Shelter Grant Program Other Federal Programs: Community Development Block Grant Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless Department of Health and Human Services		
Emergency Shelter Grant Program Other Federal Programs: Community Development Block Grant Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless Department of Health and Human Services		
Other Federal Programs: Community Development Block Grant Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless Department of Heatth and Human Services	\$1,240,430	10.9%
Community Development block Grant Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist the Homeless Department of Health and Human Services		
Supplemental Assistance for Facilities to Assist une notification Department of Health and Human Services	501,42/ F0 000	2.9%
	209.186	0.4%
Federal Emergency Management Adency	293,135	1.0% 2.6%
Supportive Housing Demonstration Program	72,624	0.6%
Department of Labor	65,000	0.6%
Other rederal Programs	004/2/2/	11.2%
State	875,677	7.7%
Local government	1,363,248	12.0%
Foundation contribution	632,358	5.6%
Corporate contribution	503,001	4.4%
ndividual contribution	1,431,487	12.6%
n-kind contributions	1,350,050	11.9%
Client fees	269,665	2.4%
tentel Income Paid by tenants	90,499 8,945	0.8% 0.1%
ease income	5,900	0.1%
Jusiness income	156,873	1.4%
rovider agency or organization	133,594	1.2%
ther	1,012,509	8.9%
IRAND TOTAL	\$11,368,014	100.0%

IT81-86

Perc	ate/Territory cent of funds	Metropolitan City Percent of funds	Urban County Percent of funds	All Respondents Percent of funds
What percent of these funds come from the:				
Federal government	74.9%	84.2%	80.0%	81.7%
State government	26.8%	9.4%	16.7%	14.5%
-ocal government	1.3%	12.9%	12.5%	10.7%
Private foundations	1.0%	1.5%	0.6%	1.2%
3usinesses	%0.0	0.0%	0.8%	0.2%
ndividuals	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	%0.0
Percent of grantee agency's budget from ESGP:				
Aean	46.1%	58.5%	55.6%	56.0%
Aedian	46.7%	61.7%	50.4%	53.1%

Ð	
Son	
9	l
φ	I
Ξ	I
ŝ	Í
ē	I

Research Question A.5.a: What proportion of costs are paid by the ESG Program and

				1							
Respons	68	Homelessness Mean	Prevention	Essentia Mean	Median	Conversion/ Mean	Rehabilitation Median	Opera	Median	All Resp Mean	ondents Median
otal ope	rating budget in FY91 <sup>(1)(2)</sup>	\$1,303,481	\$304,519	\$689,160	\$275,000	\$613,549	\$323,500	\$508,678	\$300,799	\$691,691	\$300,000
Y91 ES	3P funding excluding C/R/R <sup>(3)</sup>	\$22,343	\$14,000	\$24,758	\$28,600	\$11,850	\$8,739	\$17,276	\$13,025	\$20,592	\$13,565
Aean per	cent ESGP <sup>(3)</sup>	16.0%	4.7%	11.6%	12.5%	8.0%	4.6%	7.5%	4.5%	10.3%	10.6%
unding I	by eligible category										
onversio	n/Rehabilitation	660'2\$	\$3,950	\$14,073	\$10,000	\$28,488	\$15,000	\$3,164	\$1,089	\$20,325	\$4,275
ssential S	bervices	\$4,089	\$2,400	\$12,604	\$8,348	\$2,235	\$0	\$3,183	\$0	\$9,267	\$4,850
perations		\$10,321	\$15,962	\$14,949	\$8,169	\$7,925	\$6,300	\$16,409	\$11,625	\$14,827	\$9,400
omeless	ness Prevention	\$15,051	\$18,333	\$1,161	\$0	\$228	\$0	\$335	\$0	\$8,744	\$4,275
ource: Pr	ovider Phone Survey, Questions 9- ovider Universe=3000-3500 (estin	– 11 (weighted dat nated), Survey Sar	a). nple=651.								
issing Ce	tses: 46 providers.										
otes:	<ol> <li>For the provider's fiscal year in</li> <li>Budget figures capped at \$10</li> <li>ESGP funding excluding the p</li> </ol>	n which FY 91 ESC million; providersr ortion for capital p	3P funding wa eporting agen rojects (conve	s received. cy budgets o srsion, rehabil	ver \$10 millior itation, renove	i excluded. ttion) if any. Vali	les greater than	zero anly.			

Responses	Homelessne Number	ss Prevention Percent	Essentia	I Services Percent	Conversion/ Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Op. Number	ercent Percent	All Re. Number	spondents Percent
Does provider receive funds from more than one source?										
Yes	378	86.7%	963	97.2%	381	92.7%	1154	97.5%	2876	95.2%
No	58	13.3%	28	2.8%	30	7.3%	30	2.5%	146	4.8%
TOTAL RESPONSES	436	100.0%	991	100.0%	ŧ	100.0%	1184	100.0%	3022	100.0%
Responses	Homelessne Number	ss Prevention Mean Percent of funds	Essentia Number	I Services Mean Percen of funds	Conversion/	Rehabilitation Mean Percent of funds	Ope Number	rations Mean Percent of funds	All Res Number	spondents Mean Percent of funds
For providers with multiple funding sources, mean percent of funds from:										
Federal government		25.0%	1	26.4%	1	31.4%		29.8%		30.5%
State government	1	15.4%	1	19.4%	-	24.6%	1	19.7%		19.7%
County or local government	1	8.4%		13.2%	1	10.9%	-	8.8%	;	10.5%
Private foundations	1	11.1%		10.7%	;	11.7%	1	14.4%	-	12.4%
Businesses		3.1%		5.0%		4.1%	1	4.3%	1	4.4%
ndividuals	1	9.2%	I	13.3%	1	7.3%		16.5%	1	13.3%

	Number	Percent	Number	Sheiters Percent	Number	Percent	All Sh Number	Percent
l the shelter receive abilitation/conversion ding from ESGP?								
 Sa	19	18.8%	15	10.2%	294	22.4%	328	21.0%
0	82	81.2%	135	89.8%	1016	77.6%	1233	79.0%
TAL RESPONSES	101	100.0%	150	100.0%	1311	100.0%	1562	100.0%

Lip Control Internet         Fring         Sec: 201         SE2: 201         SE3: 201 <th>Program dollars         S4,523,766         S3,4           FY87         S4,523,766         S3,4           FY87 S(7)         S4,523,766         S14,2           FY87 S(7)         S22,663,759         S14,2           FY89         S3,716,126         S3,0           FY89         S14,065,575         S16,3           FY90         S16,316,409         S31,3           FY90         S16,316,409         S31,3           FY97(3)         S11,037,065         S28,2           FY97(3)         S14,185,143         S34,4</th> <th>80,321 48,643 31,198</th> <th>SERVICES</th> <th>PREVENTION</th> <th>NUMINAL INIMUM</th> <th>- THIN</th>	Program dollars         S4,523,766         S3,4           FY87         S4,523,766         S3,4           FY87 S(7)         S4,523,766         S14,2           FY87 S(7)         S22,663,759         S14,2           FY89         S3,716,126         S3,0           FY89         S14,065,575         S16,3           FY90         S16,316,409         S31,3           FY90         S16,316,409         S31,3           FY97(3)         S11,037,065         S28,2           FY97(3)         S14,185,143         S34,4	80,321 48,643 31,198	SERVICES	PREVENTION	NUMINAL INIMUM	- THIN
From         84,660,761         85,1,601         85,1,601         85,1,601         85,1,601         85,1,601         85,1,600         84,660,201         85,1,601         85,1,601         85,1,600         85,1,57,340         85,1,57,340         85,1,57,340         85,1,601,160         85,1,611,160         85,1,611,160         85,1,611,160         85,1,611,160         85,1,611,160         85,1,611,125         84,606,176         85,1,601,160         85,1,611,125         84,606,160         85,1,611,125         84,606,176         85,1,601,160         85,1,611,125         84,606,176         85,1,601,160         85,1,611,125         84,600,1760         85,1,601,160         85,1,601,161         85,1,661,162         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,1,661,162         85,060,1763         85,1,661,162         85,061,161         85,066,1162         85,061,161         85,066,1162         85,061,161         85,062,104         85,1,661,162         85,061,161         85,066,1162         85,060,1763         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,060,1763         85,061,161         85,061,161	FY87         \$4,523,766         \$3,4           FY87 S(7)         \$22,663,759         \$14,2           FY86         \$22,663,759         \$14,2           FY89         \$14,065,575         \$16,4           FY90         \$16,316,126         \$31,7           FY90         \$16,318,409         \$31,7           FY97(7)         \$11,6316,409         \$31,7           FY97(7)         \$11,6316,403         \$31,7           FY97(4)         \$11,631,403         \$34,4	60,321 48,643 31,198				
FYBS <sup>10</sup> 82.060,750         81.42,406,453         83.157,340         84.73,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,807,800         84.60,800,700         85.7,421,000         87.60,807,800         87.60,807,800         87.60,807,800         87.60,807,800         87.60,807,800         87.60,807,800         87.60,807,800         87.60,807,800         87.60,807,	FY87 S(7)         \$22,093,759         \$11,2           FY88         \$3,716,126         \$3,6,4           FY89         \$16,316,126         \$3,6,4           FY80         \$16,319,400         \$31,7           FY97 <sup>(3)</sup> \$11,037,005         \$28,2           FY97 <sup>(4)</sup> \$14,165,143         \$34,4	48,643	\$521,207	_		\$8,525,294
F166         53,716,126         53,031,136         5330,026         54,73,80         54,73,80         57,030,136           F160         51,031,8400         51,04,6705         51,04,6705         54,06,135         54,06,136         54,00,136           F170         51,10,07065         51,031,8400         51,12,412         51,065,165         51,065,165         55,761,035           F1970         51,10,10505         52,02,24000         51,2,304,335         55,665,455         51,065,165         55,7421,035           F1970         51,4,165,143         53,4,405,166         51,2,334,335         55,665,455         51,066,162         55,7421,035           F1971         51,4,165,143         53,4,405,166         51,2,334,335         55,665,455         51,066,162         55,7421,035           F1971         54,4,65,143         53,4,405,166         51,1,1,2,35         96,660,352         52,465,455         55,7421,035           F1971         54,4         17,35         51,35         50,00,352         57,423,000           F1971         54,6         17,35         12,35         12,35         52,35         57,435,000           F1971         74,65         54,65         17,25         12,35         16,35         4,58         57,43	FY86 \$3,716,126 \$3,00 FY89 \$14,065,575 \$16,4 FY97 <sup>(3)</sup> \$11,637,065 \$28,2 FY97 <sup>(9)</sup> \$11,637,065 \$28,2 FY97 <sup>(9)</sup> \$14,165,143 \$34,4	31.198	\$3,157,349			\$40,099,751
F100         514,064,575         514,467,065         544,646,455         541,736         541,7460         544,064,55         544,064,55         544,064,55         544,064,55         544,064,55         544,064,55         544,064,55         544,064,55         544,064,55         547,620,756         557,620,756	FY80 \$14,065,575 \$16,4 FY90 \$16,316,409 \$31,7 FY97 <sup>(3)</sup> \$11,637,065 \$28,2 FY97 <sup>(4)</sup> \$14,185,143 \$34,4		\$336,932			\$7,094,256
F100         510,310,400         51,704,12         57,631,735         51,035,165         55,7305,155         51,035,165         55,7305,155         57,930,155         55,7305,155         55,7305,155         55,7305,155         55,7305,155         55,7305,155         55,7305,155         55,7305,155         55,7457,105         55,742,100 </td <td>FY90 \$16,318,409 \$31,70 FY97<sup>(3)</sup> \$11,637,065 \$28,2 FY97<sup>(9)</sup> \$14,185,143 \$34,4</td> <td>87,905</td> <td>\$4,436,435</td> <td>\$417,950</td> <td></td> <td>\$36,007,865</td>	FY90 \$16,318,409 \$31,70 FY97 <sup>(3)</sup> \$11,637,065 \$28,2 FY97 <sup>(9)</sup> \$14,185,143 \$34,4	87,905	\$4,436,435	\$417,950		\$36,007,865
Front         S11,607,055         282,254,060         515,131,255         56,465         51,405,162         557,421,005           Front         514,165,143         584,405,166         515,131,255         56,065,162         572,463,003	FY91 <sup>(3)</sup> \$11,037,065 \$28,2 FY91 <sup>(4)</sup> \$14,185,143 \$34,4	64,412	\$7,831,735	\$1,935,195		\$57,850,751
Front/G         S14,165,143         S54,405,166         S15,113,125         S6,066,752         82,023,794         S72,423,000           any any any any any any any any any any	FY91 <sup>(4)</sup> 514,185,143 534,44 1 percent of total	24,980	\$12,398,353	\$5,495,455	\$1,665,182	\$57,421,035
In percent of ited           Proof         65.6%         54.4%         11.3%           Proof         65.6%         54.4%         11.3%           Proof         7.42%         7.4.5%         13.5%           Proof         7.42%         7.4.5%         13.5%           Proof         7.42%         7.4.5%         12.4%           Proof         43.0%         60.0%         17.2%         12.4%           Proof         43.0%         60.0%         17.2%         12.4%           Proof         43.0%         60.0%         17.2%         12.4%           Proof         61.9%         2.22%         16.3%         4.5%           Proof         67.14%         50.87%         10.00%         12.4%           Proof         67.14%         50.87%         10.00%         14.3%           Proof         67.14%         50.87%         15.0%         14.3%           Proof         67.4%         10.00%         14.3%         4.5%           Proof         2.2.2%         10.00%         14.3%         4.5%           Proof         2.2.3%         10.00%         14.3%         4.5%           Proof         2.2.0%         10.00%	n percent of total	05,186	\$15,113,125	\$6,698,752	\$2,029,794	\$72,432,000
Fig/r         65.6%         54.4%         11.3%         11.3%           Fig/r         63.5%         53.2%         13.5%         13.5%           Figer         74.2%         76.4%         17.5%         12.4%           Figer         53.0%         64.1%         17.5%         12.4%           Figer         43.0%         66.0%         17.2%         12.4%           Figer         41.0%         61.9%         22.2%         16.3%         4.5%           Figer         41.0%         61.9%         22.2%         16.3%         4.5%           Figer         41.0%         61.9%         22.2%         16.3%         4.5%           Figer         63.0%         10.00%         22.2%         16.3%         4.5%           Figer         63.1%         10.00%         11.23%         4.5%           Figer         85.0%         15.00%         14.6%         5.0%           Figer         20.3%         15.00%         14.6%         5.0%           Figer         20.6%         111.0%         11.23%         5.0%           Figer         50.0%         67.4%         2076.0%         14.6%         5.0%	rantees funding					
F707S         00.3%         50.2%         13.5%         13.5%         13.5%           F706         7.4.2%         7.8.4%         17.6%         12.4%         12.4%           F700         43.0%         06.0%         17.2%         12.4%         12.7%           F700         43.0%         06.0%         17.2%         12.7%         4.5%           F701         41.0%         01.9%         22.2%         10.3%         4.5%           F701         67.14%         50.97%         10.00%         10.3%         4.5%           F702         64.16%         62.2%         13.3%         4.5%         4.5%           F701         67.14%         50.97%         10.00%         11.23%         4.5%           F702         64.16%         62.2%         13.3%         11.25%         4.5%           F702         50.0%         72.36%         171.10%         11.12%         5.0%           F702         50.0%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.67%         5.0%           Garties UniversandSa.         67.43%         2078.0%         14.65%         5.0%	FY87 65.6%	54.4%	11.3%			
F706         74.2%         76.4%         17.0%           F706         83.0%         04.1%         15.6%         12.4%           F706         43.0%         06.0%         17.2%         12.4%           F706         43.0%         06.0%         17.2%         12.4%           F707         61.9%         2.22%         16.3%         4.5%           F707         67.14%         50.07%         10.00%         1.2.4%           F707         67.14%         50.07%         10.00%         1.6.3%         4.5%           F707         67.14%         50.07%         10.00%         1.6.3%         4.5%           F708         67.14%         50.07%         10.00%         1.1.23%         4.5%           F708         67.14%         50.07%         1.0.00%         1.4.67%         4.5%           F708         67.14%         50.05%         1.1.23%         4.5%         4.5%           F708         50.06%         72.73%         10.00%         1.1.23%         5.0%           F709         34.36%         67.43%         207.0.0%         1.4.63%         5.0%           Cost Grantiae Universa-206.         67.43%         207.0.0%         1.4.63%         5.0% </td <td>FY87S 63.3%</td> <td>59.2%</td> <td>13.5%</td> <td>·</td> <td></td> <td></td>	FY87S 63.3%	59.2%	13.5%	·		
Free         53.0%         64.1%         15.8%         12.4%           Free         43.0%         66.0%         17.2%         12.4%           Free         43.0%         66.0%         17.2%         12.3%           Free         41.0%         01.9%         22.2%         16.3%         4.5%           Free         67.14%         50.97%         10.00%         4.5%         4.5%           Free         67.14%         50.97%         10.00%         11.3%         4.5%           Free         63.0%         73.0%         10.00%         11.4.6%         4.5%           Free         82.07%         10.00%         11.4.6%         4.5%         4.5%           Free         82.07%         10.00%         11.4.6%         4.5%           Free         82.07%         10.00%         11.2.3%         4.5%           Free         34.36%         73.06%         111.1.0%         11.2.3%         5.0%           Free         34.36%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.6%         5.0%           Carries Universa-362.         67.43%         2078.0%         14.6%         5.0%	FY88 74.2%	76.4%	17.6%			
FY80         43.0%         66.0%         17.2%         12.7%         12.7%           FY91         41.0%         61.9%         22.2%         16.3%         4.5%           Ian percent of Lby activity         FY87         61.9%         22.2%         16.3%         4.5%           FY87         67.14%         50.97%         10.00%         10.3%         4.5%           FY87         67.14%         50.97%         10.00%         11.43%         4.5%           FY87         69.10%         62.22%         13.6%         14.43%         5.0%           FY89         85.00%         72.73%         1665.0%         14.43%         5.0%           FY80         82.00%         77.10.6%         11.23%         5.0%         10.50%           FY80         85.00%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%         5.0%	FY89 53.0%	64.1%	15.8%	12.4%		
FIG1         41.0%         01.0%         22.2%         10.3%         4.5%           Its percent of Its activity         Free         07.14%         50.97%         10.00%         4.5%           Free         07.14%         50.97%         10.00%         10.00%         14.5%           Free         02.36%         05.07%         13.8%         14.67%         0.5%           Free         02.00%         72.73%         1685.0%         14.47%         0.6%           Free         03.00%         72.73%         1085.0%         14.47%         0.6%           Free         03.00%         72.73%         1085.0%         14.47%         0.6%           Free         03.00%         72.73%         1085.0%         14.47%         0.6%           Cold         34.36%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%         5.0%           Constrate-constance         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%         5.0%	FY90 43.0%	66.0%	17.2%	12.7%		
Impercent of ty workingy         F/87         67.14%         50.07%         10.00%           FY87         67.14%         50.07%         10.00%         13.6%           FY86         82.22%         13.6%         14.6%           FY86         82.05%         15.00%         14.6%           FY86         82.00%         72.73%         15.00%         14.6%           FY80         34.36%         73.66%         1711.0%         11.23%           FY81         26.60%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.6%         5.0%           ceil Grantes Census.         28.60%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%         5.0%	FY91 41.0%	61.9%	22.2%	16.3%	4.5%	
FY87         07.14%         50.07%         10.00%           FY875         06.16%         62.22%         13.8%           FY86         82.38%         85.07%         15.00%           FY80         82.00%         72.73%         166.06%         14.67%           FY80         34.36%         72.73%         1086.0%         14.67%           FY90         34.36%         72.66%         1711.0%         11.23%           Coarties Cansus.         28.60%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%           Coarties Cansus.         28.60%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%         5.0%	an percent of by activity					
FY87 S         08.16%         62.22%         13.6%         13.6%         13.6%         50.05%         15.00%         15.00%         14.87%         14.87%         14.87%         50.00%         72.73%         1665.0%         11.10%         11.123%         50.0%         50.00%         72.73%         2078.0%         14.87%         5.0%         50.0%         72.73%         1665.0%         11.123%         14.87%         5.0%         14.63%         5.0%         5.0%         10.0%         10.00%         11.23%         5.0%	FY87 67.14% 5	\$26.0	10.00%			
FY86         92.36%         65.07%         15.00%         14.67%           FY89         50.00%         72.73%         16.65.0%         14.67%           FY80         34.36%         72.73%         16.65.0%         11.63%           FY80         34.36%         73.66%         1711.0%         11.23%           Cold Grantee Censue.         28.66%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%         5.0%           Cold Grantee Universe=302.         Ing Ceases 07 grantees.         5.0%         5.0%         5.0%	FY87S 08.16% 0	2.22%	13.8%			
FYB0         50.00%         72.73%         1085.0%         14.67%           FYB0         34.36%         72.73%         1085.0%         14.67%           FYB0         34.36%         73.66%         1711.0%         11.23%           Coil Grantee Censue.         28.86%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%         5.0%           Coil Grantee Universama32.         Intersama32.         Intersama32.         5.0%         14.63%         5.0%	FY88 \$2.38% 8	5.07%	15.00%			
FYBO         34.36%         73.66%         1711.0%         11.23%           FYP1         28.69%         67.43%         2078.0%         14.63%         5.0%           Casi Grantee Census.         Grantee Universe=392.         Ing Cases: 67 grantees.         5.0%         5.0%	FY89 50.00% 7.	2.73%	1685.0%	14.87%		
FYP1 28.80% 67.43% 2078.0% 14.43% 5.0% Cei Grantee Census. Grantee Universa=382. Ing Cases: 67 grantees.	FY20 34.36% 7.	3.68%	1711.0%	11.23%		
ca: Grantee Census. Grantee Universa=382. Ing Cases: 67 grantees.	FY01 28.89% 8	7.43%	2078.0%	14.63%	5.0%	
ing Cases: 67 grantees.	a; Grantee Census. Grantee Universe=382.					
	ng Cases: 67 grantees.					

rch Question A.5.c: What proportion of emergency shelters use ESGP funds

	H	omelessness	Prevention	Facantial	Sanicae	Conversion	Debabilitation	×			
Hesponses	z	umber	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	All Resp.	Percent
Did provider receive ESG FY91 funding for operating costs?											
Yes		223	52.3%	759	76.3%	132	32.1%	1169	98.9%	2292	75.8%
No		204	47.7%	236	23.7%	279	67.9%	13	1.1%	732	24.2%
TOTAL RESPONSES		427	100.0%	565	100.0%	111	100.0%	1182	100.0%	3024	100.0%
Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question Provider Universe=3000–3500 (	n 3 (weigh (estimated	hted data). I), Survey Sami	ole=851.								
Missing Cases: 1 provider.											
Notes: (1) Data reflect funding of provide	ters for mu	ultiple activities,	not just for ass	igned stratum	÷						

Items 96 & 97

Responses	Percent Offering Service	Percent Funding Service with ESGP	Percent Providing Service On-Site	Percent Requiring Participation by Al
Providers offering:				
Concrete services				
Bed space	89.2%	66.5%	85.8%	35.2%
Breakfast	79.3%	52.2%	88.7%	10.4%
Lunch	69.3%	55.8%	85.4%	10.9%
Dinner	79.6%	49.5%	87.9%	11.9%
Essential services (beyond referrals)	93.1%	1	t 1	
Assistance in obtaining benefits	94.2%	38.4%	91.0%	11.0%
Assistance obtaining permanent housing	92.2%	52.1%	91.8%	16.4%
Assistance with daily living skills	86.2%	40.1%	87.9%	30.3%
Transportation	79.1%	41.4%	95.9%	17.1%
Support groups	78.6%	17.9%	82.7%	32.0%
Nutritional counseling	50.1%	22.9%	90.1%	26.9%
Job referrals	69.8%	36.6%	87.6%	14.0%
Child care	42.2%	25.6%	67.3%	3.8%
Clothing	81.7%	17.8%	77.6%	2.9%

Item 91 (continued)

ires of ESG -

			1	010		V BD						
Number of Funded Activities Per Provider	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers	Number of Providera	Percent of Providens	Number of Providens	Percent of Providers
			-						-		-	
One category	219	62.9%	740	61.8%	472	78.8%	922	62.3%	1135	60.2%	1375	62.2%
Two categories	01	27.0%	332	27.7%	109	18.2%	414	28.0%	589	31.3%	573	25.9%
Three categories	32	9.2%	125	10.4%	18	3.0%	141	9.5%	147	7.8%	231	10.5%
Four categories	-	!			1	!	8	0.1%	13	0.7%	31	1.4%
TOTAL RESPONSES	348	100.0%	1197	100.0%	500	100.0%	1479	100.0%	1884	100.0%	2210	100.0%
	2	8	FY	875	L	VRA		80	EV	8	1	V 01
Mix of Funded Activities	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers	Number of Providers	Providers	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers	Number of Providers	Percent of Providers
Conversion/Rehabilitation only	101	29.0%	316	26.4%	187	31.2%	256	17.3%	244	13.0%	242	11.0%
Any Conversion/Rehabilitation	183	52.6%	618	51.6%	249	41.6%	582	39.4%	581	30.8%	502	22.7%
Any Essential Services	88	25.3%	358	29.9%	121	20.2%	457	30.9%	645	34.2%	814	36.8%
Operations plus Essential Services or Homelessness Prevention	79	22.7%	280	23.4%	83	13.9%	305	24.7%	531	28.2%	652	29.5%
Operations Only	113	32.5%	367	30.7%	255	42.6%	525	35.5%	698	37.0%	823	37.2%
TOTAL FUNDED PROMDERS	348		1197		565	-	1479	-	1884	l	2210	
Source: Grantee Census, (Provi Grantee Universe=382.	ider-level Data	9.										
Missing Cases: 67 Grantees.												
Votes: (1) As reported by grant (2) Categories in second	tees. d panel are not	mutually exclusiv	ė									

Items 96 & 97 (con't)

Responses	Percent Offering Service	Percent Funding Service with ESGP	Percent Providing Service On–Site	Percent Requiring Participation by All
Essential services (beyond referrals) (cont.				
Assistance in GED preparation	47.9%	30.5%	69.9%	14.1%
Other basic skills (e.g. budgeting)	32.0%	17.2%	60.9%	5.8%
Vocational counseling	50.6%	30.1%	65.8%	21.1%
Job training	28.1%	40.8%	56.2%	25.1%
English as a second language classes	20.3%	2.8%	38.9%	14.9%
Substance abuse counseling	53.4%	22.7%	65.6%	15.5%
Psychological counseling	45.5%	19.6%	60.6%	16.3%
Medical care	44.2%	24.1%	56.3%	12.1%
Detoxification/other drug treatment	22.5%	24.1%	13.2%	12.4%
Legal assistance	39.6%	15.5%	47.9%	13.3%
Source: Provider Mailed Survey, Question 19 (wei Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (estimat	ghted data). ed), Survey Sample = 3	301.		
Missing cases: 3-16 providers.				
Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.				

Items 99~100

Research Questions A.7.c., A.7.d.: Who identifies service needs? How are needs identified?

ntake interview         767         99.6%         1127         99.8%         404         100.0%         1137         100.0%         and an	caelindeau	Homelessne Number	ss Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services	Conversion/ Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Opera	Mions	All Resp.	ondents
ntake interview         767         99.6%         1127         99.8%         404         100.0%         1137         100.0%         1           teferral from agency/provider         758         100.0%         1117         100.0%         340         100.0%         1137         100.0%         92.1%         9           teferral from agency/provider         758         100.0%         1117         100.0%         340         100.0%         1023         92.1%         9           telf-referral         701         91.5%         1080         96.7%         312         94.3%         1115         99.2%         9           ase worker assessment         591         83.2%         832         77.8%         254         81.4%         946         86.7%           iedical examination/diagnosis         160         23.3%         277         26.2%         116         37.4%         305         31.0%           tandardized tests         27         3.9%         56         5.7%         19         6.5%         83         8.5%										lagilion	rercen
ielerral from agency/provider         758         100.0%         1117         100.0%         340         100.0%         1023         92.1%         0           elf-referral         701         91.5%         1080         96.7%         312         94.3%         1115         99.2%         0           ase worker assessment         591         83.2%         832         77.8%         254         81.4%         946         86.7%         0           edical examination/diagnosis         160         23.3%         277         26.2%         116         37.4%         305         31.0%           andardized tests         27         3.9%         56         5.7%         19         6.5%         83         8.5%	ntake interview	767	99.6%	1127	99.8%	404	100.0%	1137	100.0%	3435	66.66
elf-referral         701         91.5%         1080         96.7%         312         94.3%         1115         99.2%         0           ase worker assessment         591         83.2%         832         77.8%         254         81.4%         946         86.7%         9           edical examination/diagnosis         160         23.3%         277         26.2%         116         37.4%         305         31.0%           andardized tests         27         3.9%         56         5.7%         19         6.5%         83         8.5%	ieferral from agency/provider	758	100.0%	1117	100.0%	340	100.0%	1023	92.1%	3238	97.39
ase worker assessment         591         83.2%         832         77.8%         254         81.4%         946         86.7%         3           edical examination/diagnosis         160         23.3%         277         26.2%         116         37.4%         305         31.0%           andardized tests         27         3.9%         56         5.7%         19         6.5%         83         8.5%	elf – referral	701	91.5%	1080	96.7%	312	94.3%	1115	99.2%	3209	96.19
edical examination/diagnosis 160 23.3% 277 26.2% 116 37.4% 305 31.0% and ardized tests 27 3.9% 56 5.7% 19 6.5% 83 8.5%	ase worker assessment	591	83.2%	832	77.8%	254	81.4%	946	86.7%	2623	82.49
andardized tests 27 3.9% 56 5.7% 19 6.5% 83 8.5%	edical examination/diagnosis	160	23.3%	277	26.2%	116	37.4%	305	31.0%	857	28.29
	andardized tests	27	3.9%	56	5.7%	19	6.5%	83	8.5%	185	6.3
her 131 39.9% 37 8.2% 21 27.4% 34 13.2%	her	131	39,9%	37	8.2%	21	27.4%	34	13.2%	223	20.29

A-34

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.

Items 104, 106			
Research Questions A.8, A.8.b; <i>On</i> n are	vhat specific homele ESG funds being sp	ssness prevention activities ent?	Ś
Responses	Homelessness P Number F		
Back rent/utility payments for families that received eviotion/termination notices.	358	82.4%	
Security deposits or first month's rent to obtain new housing for person(s) about to			
lose permanent nousing	330	%(C.1)	
Mediation for landlord/tenant disputes	179	41.3%	
Legal services for indigent tenants	87	20.2%	100
Payments/loans to prevent foreclosure	172	39.9%	
Referrals/Counseling	111	25.3%	
Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question: Provider I Iniverse=3000-3500 /e	⊧ s 25–26 (weighted dat estimated). Survev Sam	a). Die=651.	
Missing Cases: 2 providers.			
Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.			

		Percent		Percent	Number	County Percent	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
cal Year								
(89	14	6.4%	13	23.2%	2	6.7%	34	9.0%
06,	44	20.2%	19	33.9%	21	20.2%	84	22.2%
'91	73	34.4%	30	53.6%	39	37.1%	142	38.1%

	Hamelane	. Dravantion	Essential	Services	Conversion/	<b>Rehabilitation</b>	Oner	tione	All Dane	and and a
Hesponses	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Does the provider employ v vorkers to seek potential c	outreach lients?									
Yes	153	20.2%	258	22.4%	67	16.5%	291	25.2%	769	22.1%
No	605	79.8%	897	77.6%	338	83.5%	864	74.8%	2705	77.9%
OTAL RESPONSES	758	100.0%	1156	100.0%	404	100.0%	1156	100.0%	3474	100.0%
ocial service providers	144	94.0%	193	74.5%	60	90.3%	231	79.2%	627	81.59
ocial service providers	144	94.0%	193	74.5%	09	90.3%	231	79.2%	627	81.59
olice	120	78.2%	162	62.9%	58	86.4%	172	59.0%	512	66.59
ublic housing agencies	138	90.4%	125	48.2%	46	69.0%	106	36.5%	415	54.09
etox or substance abuse	75	48.9%	43	16.5%	58	86.4%	190	65.2%	365	47.4
treatment racilities sychiatric facilities	87	57.1%	22	8.6%	54	81.3%	173	59.4%	337	43.8
rivate landlords	95	62.1%	78	30.1%	38	56.8%	71	24.2%	281	36.5
tility companies	87	56.8%	0	3.7%	22	32.7%	78	26.8%	196	25.5
ther	33	21.6%	91	35.2%	42	62.8%	171	58.8%	337	43.8

•

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible in second question.

Missing cases: 8 providers.

Research Question B.1: How have grantees assessed the need for the assistance to be provided by the ESG?

Responses	State/	erritory	Metropo	litan City	Urban	County	All G	antees	Recip	ents
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Made surveys of needs of homeless	37	67.4%	144	65.4%	86	80.8%	267	70.0%	-	8.3%
Used state or local CHAP/CHAS	45	82,5%	200	90.9%	102	95.4%	347	91.0%	0	%0'0
Gathered information from service providers	55	100.0%	211	95.8%	107	100.0%	373	67,6%	7	58.3%
Relied on experience of agency staff	49	89,8%	203	92.4%	86	91.7%	351	91.9%	Ø	25.0%
Aelied on testimony of homeless advocates	47	85.9%	167	76.0%	88	83.8%	304	79.5%	4	33.0%

Source: Grantee Survey, Question 23 (weighted data); Recipient Survey, Question 18. Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.

Missing Cases: 1 grantee.

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.

Research Question B.2: How have grantees selected their specific strategies for utilizing the ESG Program to must the marke of their homaless populations?

Responses	State/T Number	Percent	Metropo	Percent	Urban ( Number	Sounty Percent	All Gra Number	Percent	Rec	percent
Does agency rely on ESG funding to fill particular needs in it's strategy to address the problems of the homeless?										
Yes	23	95.5%	200	80.9%	35	89.0%	348	91.0%	9	54.6%
No	8	4.5%	20	9.1%	12	11.0%	34	%0'6	Q	45.5%
Total	55	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.0%	1	100.0%
How does agency select specific strategies for using ESG funds $P^{(2)}$										
Recommendations from staff	48	30,9%	166	83.1%	73	77.0%	287	82.6%	e	25.0%
Recommendations from interagency council	30	57.2%	81	40.6%	60	63.5%	172	49.4%	-	8.39
Preparation of CHAP/CHAS	41	78.6%	173	86.2%	81	85.3%	295	84.8%	0	0.09
Recommendations of homeless advocates	42	80.5%	163	81.7%	74	%6.17	280	80.5%	4	33.39
State criteria			-				1	1	+	8,3%

Missing Cases:1 recipient first question, 3-4 grantees second question.

Notes: (1) Only respondents answering "yes" to the first question were asked the second question. (2) Multiple responses possible to second question.

Item 112 (con't)

Research Question B.2: How have grantees selected their specific strategies for utilizing the ESG to meet the needs of their homeless populations?

Responses	State/Te	orritory	Metropo	litan/City	Urban	County	All Gra	antees	Recip	ients
	% Ranking #1-3	% Ranking	% Ranking #1-3	% Ranking	% Ranking #1-3	% Ranking	% Ranking #1-3	% Ranking	% Ranking #1-3	% Ranking
How would you rank the agency's top priorities for use of ESG funds?		i d		ť		1			2	
Rehabilitation	45.9%	21.3%	37.8%	21.0%	39.0%	14.7%	39.3%	19.3%	16.7%	16.7%
Increase number of beds	2.2%	2.2%	2.2%	0.7%	4.5%	3.3%	2.8%	1.7%	8.3%	8.3%
Increase number of shelters	13.1%	8.4%	6.1%	4.3%	3.3%	2.2%	6.3%	4.3%	%0.0	0.0%
Provide essential services	54.0%	6.7%	47.0%	6.9%	55.7%	9.6%	49.6%	7.7%	33.3%	16.7%
Improve access to services	8.8%	4.5%	1.8%	0.7%	2.2%	1.0%	2.9%	1.4%	8.3%	0.0%
Prevent homelessness	53.8%	4.2%	31.3%	6.7%	40.8%	9.1%	37.2%	7.0%	16.7%	0.0%
Support existing shelters	74.4%	48.5%	67.5%	40.8%	65.3%	43.2%	67.9%	42.6%		1

Missing Cases: None in first question, 2 grantees in second question.

Item 112 (cont.)

Research Question B.2: How have grantees selected their specific strategies for utilizing the ESG to meet the needs of their homeless populations?

	State/Te % Ranking #1-3	% Ranking	% Ranking #1-3	Kanking	% Ranking % #1-3	Ranking	All Grants % Ranking % #1-3	Ranking	Number of Re Respond	ling
What are the most pressing needs of bomeless population served by ESGP?				1						
vicohol abuse treatment	%0.0	%0.0	0.6%	0.0%	1.1%	%0.0	%2.0	%0.0	100.0%	į
laily living skills	%0'0	0.0%	3.0%	0.8%	%0.0	%0.0	1.7%	0.4%	%0'0	i
rug abuse treatment	1.8%	%0.0	0.6%	%0.0	1.0%	1.0%	%6'0	0.3%	100.0%	1
mergency shelter	72.3%	50.6%	73.7%	59.5%	70.2%	54.7%	72.5%	50.9%	0.0%	ł
mployment opportunities	2.3%	%0.0	8.7%	0.5%	11.3%	%0'0	8.5%	0.3%	300.0%	1
poo	39.2%	2.2%	21.9%	0.8%	21.7%	1.1%	24.3%	1.1%	200.0%	1
omelessness prevention	25.2%	8.7%	15.7%	6.9%	27.7%	9.1%	20.5%	7.8%	%0.0	ł
ob training	20.8%	4.8%	22.5%	2.4%	14.0%	2.2%	19.9%	2.7%	200.0%	1
te skills training	2.4%	%0.0	11.3%	0.8%	9.2%	%0.0	9.4%	0.4%	0.0%	1
ledical care	7.5%	2.4%	19.6%	0.8%	17.6%	1.0%	17.3%	1.1%	500.0%	1
ermanent low cost housing	19.1%	14.5%	19.3%	11.3%	12.3%	5.6%	17.3%	10.2%	100.0%	1
sychological counseling	11.7%	%0'0	3.7%	0.0%	13.5%	3.8%	7.6%	1.1%	100.0%	1
ransitional or sheltered housing	21.0%	4.8%	20.6%	3.7%	24.6%	6.8%	21.8%	4.7%	300.0%	-

Missing Cases: 3 grantees.

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possiible.

Item 112 (cont.)

Research Question B.2: How have grantees selected their specific strategies for utilizing the second the FSG to meet the needs of their homeless population?

lesponses	State/Te Number	rritory Percent	Metropolita Number	n City Percent	Urban C Number	ounty Percent	All Respo Number	ondents Percent
low does [agency] set priorities among ie four categories of activities?								
und what is requested	20	36.9%	100	45.5%	42	39,0%	162	42.4%
dministrative decision	21	38.0%	49	22.4%	34	32.1%	105	27.4%
input of providers and others	12	21.1%	53	23.9%	19	17.5%	83	21.7%
Based on CHAS/CHAP	ø	5.8%	26	11.6%	17	16.0%	46	12.0%
Through community needs assessment	n	6.0%	15	6.8%	Q	5.5%	24	6.3%
Federal guidelines/HUD restrictions	0	2.7%	ŝ	2.4%	N	2.0%	0	2.4%
Other <sup>(2)</sup>	4	46.4%	53	24.3%	21	19.2%	88	23.0%
Source: Grantee Survey, Question 26 (weighter Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sampl	od data). №=234.							
Missing Cases: 3 grantees.								
Notes (1): Multiple responses possible (2) Evamples of "Other" responses are h	Mavor's office re	commendation. C	Sitv Task Force o	In Homelessne	ass. Human Serv	ice Advisary Cou	uncil, governme	int personnel

Total a very considerable extent         12         22.9%         40         20.4%         18         18.8%         70         70           To a very considerable extent         19         37.1%         93         47.1%         40         42.3%         153           To a considerable extent         19         37.1%         93         47.1%         40         42.3%         153           To a considerable extent         10         19.5%         52         26.2%         26         27.7%         88           Vot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         24           Number tand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10           OrAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         1	Number         Percent         Number	Number         Fercent         Number	Responses	State/T	erritory	Metropo	litan City	Urban	County	All Resp	ondents
O a very considerable extent         12         22.9%         40         20.4%         18         18.8%         70         70           O a considerable extent         19         37.1%         93         47.1%         40         42.3%         153           O a considerable extent         19         37.1%         93         47.1%         40         42.3%         153           O a small extent         10         19.5%         52         26.2%         26         27.7%         88           I ot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         24           I on 't understand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10           OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         1	o a very considerable extent         12         22.9%         40         20.4%         18         18.8%         70         20.3%           o a considerable extent         19         37.1%         93         47.1%         40         42.3%         153         44.3%           o a considerable extent         10         19.5%         52         26.2%         26         27.7%         88         25.6%           o a small extent         7         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7         7           fot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7         26         27.7%         88         25.6%           fot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7         7           for at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7         7           for at all         7         15         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10         28           for at all         7         7.8%         1         1         7         7         7           for at all         7         1.5%         3 <t< th=""><th>o a very considerable extent       12       22.9%       40       20.4%       18       18.8%       70       2         o a considerable extent       19       37.1%       93       47.1%       40       42.3%       153       4         o a considerable extent       10       19.5%       52       26.2%       26       27.7%       88       2         o a small extent       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       24         lot at all       7       10       19.5%       10       48%       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       24       10       10       11       4       6.7%       3       3       3.4%       10</th><th></th><th>Indition</th><th>Leicelli</th><th>Ianiinu</th><th>Illania</th><th>Inumber</th><th>Percent</th><th>Number</th><th>Percent</th></t<>	o a very considerable extent       12       22.9%       40       20.4%       18       18.8%       70       2         o a considerable extent       19       37.1%       93       47.1%       40       42.3%       153       4         o a considerable extent       10       19.5%       52       26.2%       26       27.7%       88       2         o a small extent       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       24         lot at all       7       10       19.5%       10       48%       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       7       24       10       10       11       4       6.7%       3       3       3.4%       10		Indition	Leicelli	Ianiinu	Illania	Inumber	Percent	Number	Percent
O a considerable extent     19     37.1%     93     47.1%     40     42.3%     153       O a small extent     10     19.5%     52     26.2%     26     27.7%     88       I ot at all     7     13.8%     10     4.8%     7     7.7%     24       I on 't understand the question     4     6.7%     3     1.5%     3     3.4%     10       OTAL RESPONSES     53     100.0%     198     100.0%     95     100.0%     346     1	o a considerable extent         19         37.1%         93         47.1%         40         42.3%         153         44.3%           o a small extent         10         19.5%         52         26.2%         26         27.7%         88         25.6%           tot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         28         25.6%           tot at all         7         7         7.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.0%         28         25.6%           tot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         28         26.6%           tor understand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10         2.8%           OrTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%           ource: Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data).         138         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%           forsing Cases: 2 grantees.         2 grantees.         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%	0 a considerable extent       19       37.1%       93       47.1%       40       42.3%       153       4         0 a small extent       10       19.5%       52       26.2%       26       26       27.7%       88       2         tot at all       7       13.8%       10       4.8%       7       7.7%       24         tot at all       7       13.8%       10       4.8%       7       7.7%       24         tor tunderstand the question       4       6.7%       3       1.5%       3       3.4%       10         on't understand the question       4       6.7%       198       100.0%       3       346       10         OTAL RESPONSES       53       100.0%       198       100.0%       95       100.0%       346       10         ource: Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.       53       100.0%       95       100.0%       346       10         fissing Cases: 2 grantees.       (1) Question asked only of grantees that said they relied on ESGP to fill particular needs.       1       10       10	o a very considerable extent	12	22.9%	40	20.4%	18	18.8%	02	20.3%
o a small extent         10         19.5%         52         26.2%         26         27.7%         88           lot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         24           lot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         24           lot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         24           lon't understand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10           OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         1	o a small extent     10     19.5%     52     26.2%     26     27     88     25.69       lot at all     7     7     13.8%     10     4.8%     7     7     7.9       lon't understand the question     4     6.7%     3     1.5%     3     3.4%     10       OTAL RESPONSES     53     100.0%     198     100.0%     95     100.0%     346     100.0%       ource: Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data).     Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.     198     100.0%     95     100.0%     346     100.0%	o a small extent         10         19.5%         52         26.2%         26         27.7%         88         2           lot at all         7         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         88         2           lor tunderstand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10           OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         10           ource:         Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data).         53         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         10           ource:         Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.         138         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         10           fissing Cases:         2 grantees.         10         108         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         10	o a considerable extent	19	37.1%	63	47.1%	40	42.3%	153	44.3%
Iot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         24           on't understand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10           OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         1	Iot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         24         7.09           on't understand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10         2.89           OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%           ource: Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%           sising Cases: 2 grantees.         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%	Iot at all         7         13.8%         10         4.8%         7         7.7%         24           on't understand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10           OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         10           ource:         Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data).         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         10           ource:         Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data).         Grantee Survey Sample=234.         95         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         10           otes:         (1) Question asked only of grantees that said they relied on ESGP to fill particular needs.         1         1         1	o a small extent	10	19.5%	52	26.2%	26	27.7%	88	25.6%
on't understand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10           OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         1	on't understand the question         4         6.7%         3         1.5%         3         3.4%         10         2.8%           OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%           Ource:         Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data).         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%           Sising Cases:         2 grantees.         32.0         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%	on't understand the question     4     6.7%     3     1.5%     3     3.4%     10       OTAL RESPONSES     53     100.0%     198     100.0%     95     100.0%     346     10       ource: Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234. Issing Cases: 2 grantees.     95     100.0%     95     100.0%     346     10	lot at all	7	13.8%	10	4.8%	7	7.7%	24	7.0%
OTAL RESPONSES 53 100.0% 198 100.0% 95 100.0% 346 1	OTAL RESPONSES         53         100.0%         198         100.0%         95         100.0%         346         100.0%           ource:         Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data).         Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.         346         100.0%         35         100.0%         346         100.0%           sising Cases:         2 grantees.         2	OTAL RESPONSES     53     100.0%     198     100.0%     95     100.0%     346     10       ource:     Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data).     Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.     346     10       issing Cases:     2 grantees.     10     100.0%     108     100.0%     345     10	on't understand the question	4	6.7%	8	1.5%	Ø	3.4%	10	2.8%
	ource: Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234. issing Cases: 2 grantees.	ource: Grantee Survey, Question 8 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234. issing Cases: 2 grantees. otes: (1) Question asked only of grantees that said they relied on ESGP to fill particular needs.	OTAL RESPONSES	53	100.0%	198	100.0%	95	100.0%	346	100.09
		votes: (1) Question asked only of grantees that said they relied on ESGP to fill particular needs.	Aissing Cases: 2 grantees.								

Items 114-116

2
ä
1 gr
Scia
3p
20
paa
0
niqt
0 11
4 P
nize
Bo
ž
265
essi
mel
2
sing
res.
ada
p
lies
ateg
St.
Tant
6 8
2
tert
tex
븉
10
ë
n B
stio
Que
5
Sear
34

lave strategy for meeting needs of tomeless families fictims of domestic violence							
tomeless families 55 factims of domestic violence 55							
fictims of domestic violence 55	100.0%	215	97.5%	107	100.0%	377	98.6%
	100.0%	194	88.0%	100	93'0%	349	91.4%
Algrants 31	55.9%	52	23.8%	30	28.4%	114	29.7%
identy 34	61.3%	106	48.1%	20	55.1%	199	52.0%
Geterans	65.9%	127	57.8%	51	47.7%	215	56.2%
thronically mentally ill	80.7%	162	73.8%	69	64.6%	276	72.2%
iomeless youth 26	46.8%	65	29.6%	23	21.5%	114	29.8%
4	8.2%	28	12.9%	1	6.4%	9	10.4%
ubstance abusers 8	14.9%	58	26.4%	15	13.8%	81	21.2%
ictims of domestic violence	1	4.0	!	4.0		4.1	ł
omeless youth 3.8		4.0		3.9		3.9	ł
omeless families 3.8	1	3.8	1	3.8	1	3.8	ł
derly 3.3		3.7		3.1		3.5	ł
3.1 3.1	1	3.2		3.0	1	3.2	ł
ubstance abusers		3.2	1	3.5		3.1	1
aronically mentally ill 3.0	!	3,1		3.1	!	3.1	ł
grants 2.8	-	3.2	1	2.7	!	3.0	ł
3.5 3.5	1	2.8	1	2.6		2.9	!

Items 117-118

Research Questions B.4, B.4,a: To what extent do grantees coordinate internally ESGP

Responses	State/T	erritory	Metapol	tuan City	Urban	County	Alle	antees	Hacipi	ents
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
How would you rate your agency's internal coordination of various sources of homeless funding?										
Very effective	21	45.5%	80	55.0%	45	64.5%	147	55.8%	9	50.0%
Somewhat effective	23	49.6%	64	43.8%	24	34.1%	111	42.5%	0	0.0%
Somewhat ineffective	-	2.1%	2	1.2%	-	1.4%	4	1.4%	0	0.0%
Very ineffective	-	2.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-	0.5%	-	8.3%
TOTAL RESPONSES	47	100.0%	145	100.0%	20	100.0%	263	100.3%	2	58.3%

Notes: (1) Question asked only of grantees and recipients with multiple funding sources.

117-118	
117-118	
117-118	
117-118	
117-11	æ
117-	Ξ
117	Ξ.
11	Ň
-	-
	-
	E
- 6	വ

Research Questions B.4, B.4.a: To what extent do grantees coordinate internally ESGP with other homeless activities?

l	1	1	ŀ	
i	ŝ	ñ	L	
å	5	1	٢	
1	c	3	1	
q	5	ï	:	
2	5	ŝ	ï	
â	2		1	
ł	E	1	l	
ī	ï	ī	ī.	
1	2	2	ł	
ł		1	t	
			1	
1	Ŀ		Ŀ.	
2	t		2	
1	ų	0	1	
4	h	ń	i.	
ŝ	1	ź	ſ	
1	i	ŝ	t	
1	ų	l	l	
1	Ē	5	٠	
1	c	2	•	
2	÷	-		
ļ	ç	1	,	
4	ř	ş	÷	
	•	•		
1	Ŀ.			
3		b	٢	
ļ	Ę	ł	L	
4	f	ş	÷	
	c	5	ŧ.	
1	f	5	1	
ļ	C	1	ł	
	1			
1	f	•	٠	
ł	ć		1	
ŝ	5		2	
1	ś	ŝ	í	
2			:	
1				

responses	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
How would provider/recipient rate internal coordination?										
Very Effective	307	82.1%	755	80.6%	309	82.3%	116	85.9%	2375	83.2%
Somewhat effective	64	17.3%	174	19.1%	63	16.9%	158	13.9%	464	16.5%
Very ineffective	2	0.6%	2	0.2%	8	0.9%	ø	0.3%	11	0.4%
TOTAL RESPONSES	373	100.0%	931	100.0%	376	100.0%	1138	100.0%	2850	100.0%
							•			
Source: Provider Survey, Questi Provider Universe=300	ion 13 (weighted 0-3500 (estimate	data). ad), Survey Sami	ple=651.							
Missing Cases: 6 providers.										
Notes: (1) Question asked o	inly of those with	multiple funding	sources.							

Research Question B.5: How do grantees select recipients?

esponses	State/ Number	Percent	Metropo	Percent	Urban Number	County Percent	All Gr Number	Percent	Number	Derront
the application process for ESG fund: parate, or combined with other fundin	g sources ('')									
eparate	43	79.9%	192	87.9%	88	84.8%	325	85.9%		
ombined	÷	20.1%	26	12.1%	16	15.2%	\$	14.1%	:	
TAL RESPONSES	55	100.0%	218	100.0%	105	100.0%	379	100.0%		
эw does agency publicize availability ESG funds?										
dvertise in newspapers	23	41.0%	128	58.3%	50	46.8%	201	52.6%	8	25.0%
dvertise in bid apportunity sublications	Ħ	20.4%	24	10.9%	15	13.9%	20	13.1%	0	0.0
end announcement to prior ecipients	53	95.5%	197	89.6%	66	93.0%	349	91.4%	-	8.39
and RFP to prior recipients	49	88.8%	154	70.2%	83	77.2%	286	74.9%	6	25.09
eet with prospective recipients	47	85.4%	195	88.7%	98	91.3%	340	88.9%	0	0.0
and announcement to prospective ecipients	51	93.3%	178	80.8%	96	90.1%	326	85.2%	0	0.0
and RFP to prospective activitients	42	75.6%	134	61.1%	72	67.7%	248	65.0%	-	8.3

Source: Grantee Survey, Questions 13-14 (weighted data); Recipient Survey, Question 11. Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.

Missing Cases: 2 grantees from first question, 0-1 grantees from second question.

Notes: (1) This question was not asked of the 12 recipients. (2) Multiple responses possible to second question.

Item 120 (continued)

Research Question B.5: How do grantees select recipients?

for do you determine prospective           SG recipients?           Mailing lists         50         90.5%         129         58.4%         69         64.1%         247         64.1%           Homeless Task Force         50         91.1%         143         64.8%         82         76.2%         214         71.8           Homeless Task Force         50         91.1%         143         64.8%         82         76.2%         214         71.8           Homeless advocates'         44         80.7%         141         63.9%         72         61.1%         233         71.8           Homeless provider networks         51         92.0%         161         73.4%         91         85.2%         280         73.3           Mont of mouth         44         73.4%         91         85.2%         28.4%         167         43.7%           Mont of mouth         44         73.4%         91         85.2%         28.4%         167         43.7%           Mont of mouth         44         73.4%         91         73.4%         91         86.2%         28.4%         167         43.7%           Mont of mouth         38.4%         38.4%         36.	Responses	State/T Number	erritory Percent	Metropo	litan City Percent	Urban	County Percent	All Resp Number	Percent
Mailing lists         50         90.5%         129         56.4%         69         64.1%         247         64.1%           Homeless Task Force         50         91.1%         143         64.8%         82         76.2%         274         71.8           Homeless Task Force         50         91.1%         141         63.9%         82         76.2%         274         71.8           Homeless advocates' recommendations         44         80.7%         141         63.9%         75         69.9%         260         68.0           CHAP/CHAS         37         67.7%         141         63.9%         75         69.9%         260         68.0           Association memberships         27         49.7%         65         29.5%         44         41.4%         137         35.8           Morid of mouth         44         73.4%         91         85.2%         303         704.           Word of mouth         38         60.4%         92         42.0%         41.4%         137         358.           Providers in areas with overflow problems         38         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         43.7%         236         77.6           Providers in	fow do you determine prospective 55G recipients?								
Homeless Task Force         50         91.1%         143         64.8%         82         76.2%         274         71.8           Homeless advocates' recommendations         44         80.7%         141         63.9%         75         69.9%         260         68.0           CHAP/CHAS         37         67.7%         164         74.4%         75         69.9%         260         68.0           CHAP/CHAS         37         67.7%         164         74.4%         75         69.9%         260         68.0           Association memberships         27         49.7%         65         29.5%         44         41.4%         137         35.8           Homeless provider networks         51         92.0%         161         73.4%         91         85.2%         303         79.4           Word of mouth         44         79.5%         171         77.6%         82         76.7%         286         77.6           Providers in areas with         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         43.7%           Providers in areas with         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         43.7%           Ource: Grantee Universe=332, Survey Sample	Mailing lists	50	90.5%	129	58.4%	69	64.1%	247	64.7
Homeless advocates' recommendations         Homeless advocates' (ecommendations         44         80.7%         141         63.9%         75         69.9%         260         68.0           CHAP/CHAS         37         67.7%         164         74.4%         72         67.7%         273         71.5           CHAP/CHAS         27         49.7%         65         29.5%         44         41.4%         137         35.8           Association memberships         21         92.0%         161         73.4%         91         85.2%         303         79.4           Mond of mouth         44         79.5%         171         77.6%         82         76.7%         296         77.6           Providers in areas with         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         48.7           Aurote Of mouth         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         48.7           Aurote Of mouth         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         48.7           Aurote Of mouth         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%	Homeless Task Force	50	91.1%	143	64.8%	82	76.2%	274	71.8
CHAP/CHAS         37         67.7%         164         74.4%         72         67.7%         273         71.5           Association memberships         27         49.7%         65         29.5%         44         41.4%         137         35.8           Homeless provider networks         51         92.0%         161         73.4%         91         85.2%         303         79.4           Nord of mouth         44         79.5%         171         77.6%         91         85.2%         303         79.4           Providers in areas with         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         43.7           Orce: Grantee Survey, Questions 13-14 (weighted data).         32         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         43.7           Ource: Grantee Survey, Questions 13-14 (weighted data).         32         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         43.7           Sing Cases: 1 grantee.         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         43.4%         167         43.7           Sing Cases: 1 grantee.         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         <	Homeless advocates' recommendations	44	80.7%	141	63.9%	75	69.9%	260	68.0
Association memberships         27         49.7%         65         29.5%         44         41.4%         137         35.8           Homeless provider networks         51         92.0%         161         73.4%         91         85.2%         303         79.4           Nord of mouth         44         79.5%         171         77.6%         82         76.7%         296         77.6           Providers in areas with         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         43.7           Ource: Grantee Survey, Questions 13-14 (weighted data).         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         43.7           Sising Cases: 1 grantee.         .         .         92         42.0%         167         43.7	CHAP/CHAS	37	67.7%	164	74.4%	. 72	67.7%	273	71.5
Homeless provider networks         51         92.0%         161         73.4%         91         85.2%         303         79.4           Nord of mouth         44         79.5%         171         77.6%         82         76.7%         296         77.6           Providers in areas with         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         43.7           Providers in areas with         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         43.7           Overflow problems         33         60.4%         92         42.0%         41         38.4%         167         43.7           Ource: Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.         167         43.7         43.7           Sising Cases: 1 grantee.         1         161         165         167         43.7	Association memberships	27	49.7%	65	29.5%	44	41.4%	137	35.8
Nord of mouth     44     79.5%     171     77.6%     82     76.7%     296     77.6       Providers in areas with overflow problems     33     60.4%     92     42.0%     41     38.4%     167     43.7       Jurce: Grantee Survey, Questions 1314 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.     92     42.0%     41     38.4%     167     43.7       Sing Cases: 1 grantee.     (1) Question asked only of respondents mentioning prospective recipients.     131     157     43.7	Homeless provider networks	51	92.0%	161	73.4%	91	85.2%	303	79.4
Providers in areas with vertiow problems     33     60.4%     92     42.0%     41     38.4%     167     43.7       Ource: Grantee Survey, Questions 1314 (weighted data).     33     60.4%     92     42.0%     41     38.4%     167     43.7       Survey Sample=234.     61     61     61     61     61     63.7       Sing Cases: 1 grantee.     61     01     of respondents mentioning prospective recipients.     61     02     42.0%     43	Nord of mouth	44	79.5%	171	77.6%	82	76.7%	296	77.6
ource: Grantee Survey, Questions 13–14 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234. issing Cases: 1 grantee. otes: (1) Question asked only of respondents mentioning prospective recipients.	Providers in areas with overflow problems	33	60.4%	92	42.0%	41	38.4%	167	43.7
issing Cases: 1 grantee. otes: (1) Question asked only of respondents mentioning prospective recipients.	ource: Grantee Survey, Questions 13-1 Grantee Universe=382, Survey S	14 (weighted da ample=234.	ita).						
otes: (1) Question asked only of respondents mentioning prospective recipients.	issing Cases: 1 grantee.								
	otes: (1) Question asked only of respo	ondents mentior	ning prospectiv	/e recipients.					

Responses         Build Frequent         Mandber         Pecent         Numbler         Pecent											
Detar agency requires written         Detar agency requires written         2         2/36         194         80.05         90         62.356         90         66.55         90.056         9         56.55         90.056         9         66.55         90.056         9         6.56         90.056         9         6.56         90.056         9         6.56         90.056         9         9.466         9         7.566         90         9.56         9.5         2.500         90.056         9         9.466         9         7.566         90         9.56         9.5         9.5         9.500         90.056         90         9.56         9.5         9.500         90.056         9.5         9.500         90.056         9.5         90.056         9.5         90.056         9.5         90.056         90         9.55         90.056	Responses	State/T Number	eritory	Metropoli Number	tan City Percent	Urban Number	Sounty Percent	All Gr Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yea         Total Resonance <sup>(1)</sup> Ed.         CF.3K         Total Resonance <sup>(1)</sup> C         C.3/K         C         C         C/3/K         C <thc< th="">         C         <thc< th="">         C</thc<></thc<>	Does agency require written application for ESG funds?										
No         2         2.7%         20         1.00%         107         100.0%         107         100.0%         12         200.0%           Total Response10         55         100.0%         220         100.0%         107         100.0%         107         100.0%         12         100.0%           Mont are the required contents         2         100.0%         102         87.4%         90         89.5%         342         80.4%         7         80.0%           Budget for how funds will be spent         24         7.3%         112         87.4%         90         89.5%         342         90.0%         7         7         80.3%           Namelies of excitents         24         7.3%         112         87.4%         90         82.5%         91         92.5%         92.5%         92.5%           Namelies of excitents         24         7.3%         119         87.5%         91         91.5%         92.5%         92.5%           Namelies of excitents         24         7.3%         111         80.3%         91         92.5%         92.5%         92.5%           Namelies of excitents         24         24.5%         91         92.5%         92.5%         92.5%	Yes	54	97.3%	194	88.0%	66	92.6%	346	%9`08	ø	75.0%
Total Response(1)         55         100.05K         220         100.05K         107         100.05K         102         100.05K         12         100.05K           Mhat are the respired contents         81 May are the respired contents         84 May         94 May	No	8	2.7%	26	12.0%	8	7.4%	36	9.4%	6	25.0%
Mark are fire ESC application?         Budget for incluing funds         54         73%         122         87.4%         60         89.5%         342         89.4%         7         53.5%           Budget for incliny/program operation         41         74.2%         149         67.3%         67         22.6%         343         89.4%         7         53.5%           Namelion of activities to be funded         54         97.3%         100         81.9%         97         90.5%         343         80.3%         7         53.5%           Namelion of activities to be funded         54         97.3%         100         81.9%         93         97.5%         7         53.5%           Description of matching funds         54         97.3%         107         84.9%         94.9%         94.9%         93.5%         100         47.5%         7         53.5%           Conservality providers         34         82.5%         111         50.3%         91         47.5%         91         97.5%	Total Responses <sup>(1)</sup>	55	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.0%	12	100.0%
Budget for how funds will be spent         54         97.3%         182         87.4%         98         98.5%         342         96.4%         7         75.0%           Budget for facility/program operation         41         7.42%         149         67.3%         67         62.6%         343         80.3%         7         75.0%           Narative or matching funds         54         97.3%         160         85.5%         99         92.6%         33         80.3%         7         56.3%           Narative on matching funds         54         97.3%         160         85.5%         99         92.6%         33         80.3%         7         56.3%           Description of client population         54         97.3%         160         85.3%         91.3%         335         87.7%         8         67.7%           Anong underseved populations         54         97.3%         180         87.3%         190         47.2%         190         47.3%         17         56.3%           Anong underseved populations         26         46.7%         111         80.3%         190         47.2%         100         47.2%         100           Anong underseved populations         26         47.3%	What are the required contents of the ESG application?										
Budget for facility/program operation         41         74.2%         149         67.9%         257         67.4%         7         68.3%           Narative of expirities to be trinided         54         97.3%         190         85.5%         90         22.6%         343         60.3%         9         75.0%           Narative or matching funds         54         97.3%         197         84.9%         91         95.5%         329         69.3%         9         75.0%           Description of client population         54         97.3%         187         84.9%         91         91.3%         335         67.7%         9         75.0%           Description of client population         54         97.3%         187         84.3%         91         91.3%         97         95.5%         9         75.0%           Anong undereaved areas         34         82.0%         111         80.3%         91         77.3%         9         97.3% <td>Budget for how funds will be spent</td> <td>54</td> <td>87.3%</td> <td>192</td> <td>87.4%</td> <td>96</td> <td>89.5%</td> <td>342</td> <td>89.4%</td> <td>6</td> <td>75.0%</td>	Budget for how funds will be spent	54	87.3%	192	87.4%	96	89.5%	342	89.4%	6	75.0%
Narative of activities to be funded         54         97.3%         190         86.5%         99         92.6%         343         89.3%         8         75.0%           Narative or mutching funds         52         94.9%         180         81.3%         91         35         82.6%         8         75.0%           Description of client population         52         94.9%         187         84.3%         91         35         87.7%         8         75.0%           Description of client population         54         97.3%         187         84.3%         91         35         87.7%         8         75.0%           In underserved areas         34         82.0%         111         50.3%         51         47.5%         190         47.2%              Area entitlement communities within your juriadiction, or their providers         28         43.3%         59         53.5%         190         51.3%	Budget for facility/program operation	41	74.2%	149	67.9%	67	62.8%	257	67.4%	7	58.3%
Narrative on matching funds         52         94.9%         180         81.9%         329         86.2%         9         75.0%           Description of client population         54         97.3%         187         84.9%         98         91.3%         335         87.7%         8         66.7%           Is any special effort made to recurit provides         34         62.0%         187         84.9%         98         91.3%         335         87.7%         8         66.7%           In underserved areas         34         62.0%         111         50.3%         51         47.5%         18         66.7%           Among underserved population         26         46.7%         111         50.3%         59         55.5%         196         51.3%             Among underserved population         26         46.7%         111         50.3%         196         51.3% <td>Narrative of activities to be funded</td> <td>54</td> <td>97.3%</td> <td>190</td> <td>86.5%</td> <td>66</td> <td>92.6%</td> <td>343</td> <td>89.8%</td> <td>8</td> <td>75.0%</td>	Narrative of activities to be funded	54	97.3%	190	86.5%	66	92.6%	343	89.8%	8	75.0%
Description of client population         54         97.3%         187         84.9%         98         91.3%         335         87.7%         8         00.7% <i>ts any spectial effort made to recurit providers</i> 1n underserved areas         34         82.0%         95         43.3%         51         47.5%         180         47.2% <i>in underserved areas</i> 34         82.0%         95         43.3%         51         47.5%         180         47.2%             Among underserved areas         34         82.0%         111         50.3%         59         55.5%         196         51.3% <td< td=""><td>Narrative on matching funds</td><td>52</td><td>94.9%</td><td>180</td><td>81.9%</td><td>87</td><td>90.5%</td><td>329</td><td>86.2%</td><td>6</td><td>75.0%</td></td<>	Narrative on matching funds	52	94.9%	180	81.9%	87	90.5%	329	86.2%	6	75.0%
Is any special effort made to reveal areas In underserved areas In underserved areas In underserved areas Among underserved areas Among underserved areas Among underserved populations 20 40.5.5% 10 51.3% 50 55.5% 190 51.3% 50 51	Description of client population	54	87.3%	187	84.9%	88	91.3%	335	87.7%	8	66.7%
In underserved areas         34         62.0%         95         43.3%         51         47.5%         180         47.2% <td>Is any special effort made to recruit providers</td> <td></td>	Is any special effort made to recruit providers										
Among underserved populations     26     46.7%     111     50.3%     59     55.5%     196     51.3%         Are entitlement communities within your jurisdiction, or their providers     26     46.7%     111     50.3%     59     55.5%     196     51.3%         Your jurisdiction, or their providers     46.7%     11     50.3%     97     59.8%     1     8.3%       Yes, entitlement communities eligible     44     80.4%       53     49.2%     97     59.8%     1     8.3%       Yes, service providers eligible     43     77.7%       68     64.0%     111     88.6%     3     25.0%       Source: Grantee Survey, Questions 15-17 (weighted data); Recipient Survey, Questions 12-13.       68     64.0%     111     88.6%     3     25.0%       Missing Cases: None.     Missing Cases: None.     Null Infla.     1     1     1     25.0%	In underserved areas	34	62.0%	95	43.3%	51	47.5%	180	47.2%	1	!
Are entitlement communities within your jurisdiction, or their providers eligible to compete for your ESG funds? (states & urban counties only)       44       80.4%        53       49.2%       97       59.8%       1       8.3%         Yes, entitlement communities eligible       43       77.7%        68       64.0%       111       68.6%       3       25.0%         Source: Grantee Survey, Questions 15–17 (weighted data); Recipient Survey, Questions 12–13.         68       64.0%       111       68.6%       3       25.0%         Missing Cases: None.       Missing Cases: None.       (1) Column may not total due to rounding.       0.1 Multiha reconces concluted and fourth questions.       12–13.	Among underserved populations	26	46.7%	111	50.3%	59	55.5%	196	51.3%	!	
Yes, entitlement communities eligible       44       80.4%        53       49.2%       97       59.8%       1       8.3%         Yes, service providers eligible       43       77.7%        68       64.0%       111       68.6%       3       25.0%         Source: Grantee Survey, Questions 15–17 (weighted data); Recipient Survey, Questions 12–13.        68       64.0%       111       68.6%       3       25.0%         Missing Cases: None.       Missing Cases: None.       68       64.0%       111       68.6%       3       25.0%         Notes: (1) Column may not total due to rounding.       68       64.0%       111       68.6%       3       25.0%	Are entitlement communities within your jurisdiction, or their providers eligible to compete for your ESG tunds (states & urban counties only)	6									
Yes, service providers eligible 43 77.7% 68 64.0% 111 68.6% 3 25.0% Source: Grantee Universe = 382, Survey Sample = 234. Missing Cases: None. Notes: (1) Column may not total due to rounding.	Yes, entitlement communities eligible	44	80.4%	1		53	49.2%	67	£9.8%	-	8.3%
Source: Grantee Survey, Questions 15–17 (weighted data); Recipient Survey, Questions 12–13. Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234. Missing Casses: None. Notes: (1) Column may not total due to rounding.	Yes, service providers eligible	43	%1.7%		ł	68	64.0%	111	68.6%	3	25.0%
Missing Cases: None. Notes: (1) Column may not total due to rounding. (2) Multikula reservesses cossible for second third and fourth questions.	Source: Grantee Survey, Questions 15–17 (N Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sam;	veighted data); Ri ple=234.	ecipient Surve	y, Questions 12	2-13.						
Notes: (1) Column may not total due to rounding. (2) Multikula reservesse possible for second third and fourth guestions.	Missing Cases: None.										
	Notes: (1) Column may not total due to round (2) Muthinla resonces possible for se-	ding.	with duetion								

Г

Research Question B.5.b: How are specific shelters selected for funding?

Responses	State/T Number	erritory Percent	Metropo Number	Percent	Urban	County Percent	All Gre Number	Percent	Number	pients Percent
Who is involved in the decision?										
Form an interagency committee to decide	33	59.2%	87	39.5%	65	60.4%	184	48.2%	1	8.3%
Refer decision to some local coalition	Q	8.7%	48	21.8%	40	37.5%	63	24.3%	-	8.3%
Make decisions among own agency staff	54	98.2%	169	76.6%	75	70.0%	297	%6'11	2	58.3%
Elected officials decide	თ	16.0%	105	47.5%	25	23.6%	139	36.3%	6	75.0%
Who makes the final decision?									-	
Interagency committee	0	16.7%	24	11.7%	18	17.2%	22	14.0%	0	0.0%
Local coalition	-	1.8%	14	6.7%	11	10.3%	21	7.0%	0	0.0%
Agency staff	36	65.5%	73	35.4%	49	48.0%	75	43.4%	-	8.3%
Elected officials	6	16.0%	96	46.2%	20	19.6%	125	34.2%	10	83.3%
State coordinator	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-	8.3%
Community development department	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	-	8.3%
Other	0	0.0%	0	%0.0	ŝ	4.9%	ŝ	1.4%	0	0.0%
TOTAL RESPONSES	22	100.0%	207	100.0%	86	100.0%	243	100.0%	13	108.3% (2

Source: Grantee Survey, Questions 18–19 (weighted data); Recipient Survey, Questions 14 & 15. Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample-234.

Missing Cases: 17 grantees.

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible. (2) One recipient has agency staff and the local community development department jointly make the final decision, therefore total sums to more than 100%.

Research Question B.5.c: What methods are used to monitor shelter activities?

			NUTTOBE	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
har role does granteer express by in monitoring the ESGP delivery boess after allocation of funds?	*					-		
Ive role, Including site visits 51 92.2%	200	\$0.7%	67	91.0%	348	91.0%	7	58.3%
derate role, by phone reports. Inces and program	15	7.0%	6	3.3%	21	5.4%	2	16.7%
derate role, phone and reports, orts, finances only 3 4.5%	4	1.8%	2	1.8%	Ø	2.1%	-	8.3%
tant monitoring (reports only) 0 0.0%	N	0.7%	9	2.8%	4	1.2%	8	16.7%
monitoring role 0.0%	0	0.0%	-	1.0%	-	0.3%	0	%0.0
TAL RESPONSES 55 100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.0%	12	100.0%

Notes: (1) Columns may not total due to rounding.

Research Question B.5.c: What methods are used to monitor program activities? 90.9% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% Percent 10 Number (1) Multiple responses possible. Source: Recipient Survey, Question 17. recipient handling of ESG funds? How does grantee monitor Missing Cases: 1 recipient. Reports on achievement Reports on spending Budget approval Item 123 (con't) Phone contact Responses Notes:

lesearch Questions B.6, B.6.a: 7 9	o what exten ant awards i	t do non-sta o recipients?	te grentees	raallocate				
Responses	State/T Number	arritory Percent	Metropol Number	itan City Percent	Urban Number	County Percent	All Respo Number	Percent
to you distribute ESG funds to ther agencies that make further SGP funding decisions?								
88	11	30.2%	თ	4.0%	4	3.9%	30	7.77%
0	38	69.8%	211	96,0%	103	96.1%	352	92.93%
OTAL RESPONSES	55	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.7%
ource: Grantee Survey, Question 20   Grantee Universe – 382, Surve	weighted date y Sample ≂23							
issing Cases: None.								
otes: (1) See text in Chapter 3 for c	lscussion.							

Responses     Percent of Providers using Source As: Match for ESG       Source of Matching Funds     As: Match for ESG       Source of Matching Funds     24.4%       Federal Sources:     24.4%       Community Development Block Grant     24.4%       Federal Sources     24.4%       Community Development Agency     24.4%       Department of Human Services     4.1%       Aid for Families with Dependent Children     20.4%       United Way     20.4%       Contributions/donations     20.4%       Foundations     20.4%       Foundations     20.4%       State     20.4%       State     20.4%	primary source of matc	
Source of Matching FundsFederal Sources:Community Development Block GrantFederal Sources:Community Development Block GrantFederal Emergency Management AgencyDepartment of Heath and Human ServicesAid for Families with Dependent ChildrenDepartment of AgricultureUnited WayContributions/donationsContributions/donationsFoundationsDepartmentContributions/donationsContributions/donationsStateStateCoal (city or county)	Responses	Percent of Providers using Source As Match for ESG
Federal Sources:Community Development Block Grant Federal Emergency Management Agency Department of Health and Human Services Aid for Families with Dependent Children 	Source of Matching Funds	
Federal Emergement Agency Department of Health and Human Services24.4% 4.1%Department of Health and Human Services Aid for Families with Dependent Children Department of Agriculture4.1% 6.1%United Way20.4%United Way20.4%Contributions/donations46.9%Foundations20.4%Foundations20.4%State20.4%Coal (city or county)28.6%	Federal Sources: Community Develonment Block Grant	74 4%
Department of Health and Human Services4.1%Aid for Families with Dependent Children6.1%Department of Agriculture6.1%United Way20.4%United Way20.4%Contributions/donations46.9%Foundations22.5%In-kind, including volunteer time20.4%State20.4%Local (city or county)24.5%	Federal Emergency Management Agency	24.4%
Department of Agriculture       4.1%         United Way       20.4%         United Way       20.4%         Contributions/donations       46.9%         Foundations       22.5%         In-kind, including volunteer time       20.4%         State       20.4%         Local (city or county)       24.5%	Department of Health and Human Services Aid for Families with Dependent Children	<b>4.1%</b> 6.1%
United Way       20.4%         Contributions/donations       46.9%         Foundations       22.5%         In-kind, including volunteer time       20.4%         State       28.6%         Local (city or county)       24.5%	Department of Agriculture	4.1%
Contributions/donations46.9%Foundations22.5%In-kind, including volunteer time20.4%State28.6%Local (city or county)24.5%	United Way	20.4%
Foundations In-kind, including volunteer time State Local (city or county) 24.5%	Contributions/donations	46.9%
In-kind, including volunteer time 20.4% 28.6% Local (city or county) 24.5%	Foundations	22.5%
State 28.6% Local (city or county) 24.5%	In-kind, including volunteer time	20.4%
Local (city or county)	State	28.6%
	Local (city or county)	24.5%
	Notes: (1) Most providers cited multiple sources of matching fu	

Research Question B.8: What are the major features of local ESG?

Responses	Homelessne	ss Prevention	Essential	Services	Conversion/F	<b>Sehabilitation</b>	Opera	tions	All Resp	ondents
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Provider received 1991 ESG funds for:										
Payment of operations costs	233	53.2%	759	76.3%	132	32.1%	1169	98.7%	2292	75.7%
Provision of essential services	202	46.0%	981	98.7%	88	21,5%	264	22,3%	1534	50.7%
Homelessness prevention activities	428	97.3%	172	17.3%	75	18.2%	96	8.1%	769	25.4%
Conversion/renovation/rehabilitation	58	13.1%	157	15.8%	401	97.6%	85	7.2%	701	23.1%
Provider is operated by:										
Local or county government	48	11.0%	28	6.1%	41	3.5%	40	3.5%	162	5.4%
Non-profit with no religious affiliation	322	73.8%	111	79.7%	304	74.7%	823	71.0%	2227	74.8%
Non-profit with religious affiliation	67	15.2%	138	14.2%	88	21.8%	296	25.6%	590	19.8%
TOTAL RESPONSES	437	100.0%	974	100.0%	408	100.0%	1160	100.0%	2979	100.0%
Mean number of years in operation	20.3		15.1	ł	19.7		15.6		17.0	1
ls provider currently providing services?										
Yes	438	100.0%	066	89.6%	409	%9.66	1180	%9.66	3018	%1'66
No	0	%0.0	4	0.4%	2	0.4%	4	0.4%	10	0.3%
TOTAL RESPONSES	438	100.0%	565	100.0%	411	100.0%	1184	100.0%	3028	100.0%
Source: Provider Phone Survey, Questions Provider Universe=3000–3500 (est	3–7 (weighted di imated), Survey S	ata). Sample=651.								
Missing Cases: 1-3 providers.										
Notes: (1) Multiple responses poss (2) Columns may not total c	ble to first questi ue to rounding.	on.								

0110 Research Question B.8.a: Is local program success or failure related to any particular type of administrative or

Vespoilses	Local/Coun Number	ty Agency Percent	Non-Pro Religious Number	Affiliation Percent	Religious A Number	rt, wrn ffiliation Percent	All Respo Number	Percent
How would you rate you overall effectiveness in I the needs of the homele	ır program's meeting sss?							
Very effective	117	75.4%	1511	68.1%	417	71.9%	2045	69.2%
Somewhat effective	37	23.5%	680	30.7%	153	26.3%	869	29.4%
Somewhat ineffective	5	1.2%	24	1.1%	-	0.2%	27	0.9%
/ery ineffective	0	0.0%	4	0.2%	10	1.7%	14	0.5%
<b>FOTAL RESPONSES</b>	156	100%	2219	100%	581	100%	2955	100%
Source: Provider Phone Su Provider Unive	urvey, Questions srse=3000-350	s 4, 36 (weigh 00 (estimated)	ted data). ); Survey Samp	ole=651.				
Missing Cases: 8 providers								

Items 140-142

Responses	Homelessness Number	s Prevention Percent	Essential	Services	Conversion/F Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Oper Number	ations Percent	All Resp Number	ondents
Has the provider received assistance from outside ( or individuals in applying implementing ESGP-fun.	l any technical organizations for or ded programs?			•						
Yes	383	50.2%	370	31.2%	156	40.8%	397	33.6%	1306	37.2%
No	380	49.8%	815	68.8%	227	59.2%	785	66.4%	2207	62.8%
TOTAL RESPONSES	764	100.0%	1185	100.0%	383	100.0%	1182	100.0%	3514	100.0%
Who has provided this as	sistance?									
State government agencies	163	42.5%	122	33.0%	25	15.7%	0	0.0%	309	23.79
Local government agencies	20	5.2%	62	16.7%	83	52.9%	105	26.5%	270	20.79
Local development office	6	2.3%	72	19.4%	N	1.3%	26	24.5%	180	13.8
State development office	147	38.3%	14	3.8%	0	0.0%	ø	0.9%	164	12.6
United Way	80	2.0%	0	%0.0	14	8.7%	ŝ	1.4%	27	2.0
HUD local office	80	2.0%	0	0.0%	4	2.5%	ŝ	1.4%	17	1.3
Other	21	5.4%	18	4.9%	22	36.3%	121	30.3%	216	16.5
Source: Provider Mailed Sur Provider Universe =	vey, Question 22. = 3000–3500 (est	.a (weighted d timated), Surve	ata). ey Sample =	301.						
Missing cases: 4 providers.										
Notes: (1) Multiple records	ae nneeihla to sar	und direction								
Item 140-142 (cont.)

Research Question B.11.: What types of technical assistance have recipients needed as they implement the program?

	Number	Percent	Essentia	I Services Percent	Conversion/F Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Opera	Percent	All Respo	Percen
Prior to and during the application pridit you receive technical assistance w	ocess, vith:									
Proposal preparation	213	57.2%	342	100.0%	107	76.5%	267	77.2%	929	77.4%
Identification of matching funds sources	203	56.8%	118	34.5%	50	49.5%	168	42.6%	539	45.1%
Budget development	149	42.4%	143	41.2%	94	64.0%	116	33.6%	502	42.2%
Other	121	65.5%	63	48.5%	12	22.0%	20	40.0%	246	51.2%
During start-up, did you receive technical assistance with:										
Service program provision	157	41.5%	138	44.0%	16	61.0%	173	50.4%	558	47.2%
Identification of matching funds sources	204	57.8%	75	22.6%	45	48.7%	133	35.1%	458	39.5%
Building rehabilitation	49	13.3%	145	41.8%	57	61.7%	163	48.7%	414	36.2%
Other	15	16.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	•	0.0%	15	4.7%
During project operations, have you received technical assistance with:										
Client record keeping	235	62.5%	108	38.3%	14	9.2%	184	55.4%	541	47.5%
Service program provision	259	74.0%	28	23.8%	34	21.8%	145	44.7%	496	46.1%
Developing an accounting system	88	25.4%	110	39.1%	24	17.1%	164	49.4%	387	35.0%
Identification of matching funds sources	183	51.4%	78	30.0%	26	18.5%	107	28.0%	393	34.6%
Other	13	16.7%	22	42.3%	•	0.0%	0	0.0%	36	13.3%

A-59

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.

the sources of technical assis 11/6-4 .4 + F G 10110 **Research Que** 

Number of grantees indicating their providers receive technical assistance?       52       95.2%         assistance?       52       95.2%         Sources of technical assistance:       52       95.2%         Sources of technical assistance:       52       95.2%         Sources of technical assistance:       52       95.2%         Grantee agency       49       88.7%         County human services department       3       6.1%         United Way       1       1.8%         Coalition for the homeless       12       21.7%	169 163	76.6% 74.2% 5.8%	<b>3</b> 3 22 03	70.0%	-	
Sources of technical assistance:4988.7%Grantee agency36.1%County human services department36.1%Jnited Way11.8%calition for the homeless1221.7%	163 13	74.2% 5.8%	89		297	77.9%
Grantee agency 49 88.7% County human services department 3 6.1% Inited Way 1 1.8% calition for the homeless 12 21.7%	163 13	74.2% 5.8%	63			
County human services department 3 6.1% Inited Way 1.8% calition for the homeless 12 21.7%	13	5.8%	1	59.3%	275	72.1%
Inited Way 1.8% calition for the homeless 1.2%			15	13.8%	31	8.1%
calition for the homeless 12 21.7%	14	6.4%	8	2.0%	17	4.5%
	10	4.5%	4	4.0%	26	6.8%
ource: Grantee Survey, Question 12 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.						
ssing Cases: 5 grantees for second question.						
<ul> <li>Multiple responses possible.</li> <li>Second question asked only of respondents indicating their pro</li> </ul>	providers rec	eive technic	al assistance.			

Mean Med w fong did the ESGP-funded provements take, from the tification of the grant award till the project was completed? umber of months to complete dumber of months to complete tumber of months to complete dumber of months to complete toorversion projects	16 16 data). Survey Samp	65.6 6 	Mean 8.0 11.4	9 7	Mean 6.2 7.0	Median 7	Mean 6.2 8.8	Median 6
w fong did the ESGP-funded provements take, from the tification of the grant award util the project was completed? 5.3 all projects able to 5.3 bumber of months to complete tumber of months to complete conversion projects	4 16 data). Survey Samp	5.6 6 6 6 	8.0	N 00	6.2	~ ~	6 8 8 2	ø
all projects 5.3 sull projects 6.0 lumber of months to complete 8.0 conversion projects	4 16 data). Survey Samp	5.6 6 6 6	8.0	N 0	6.2	~ ~	8 6.2	Ø
lumber of months to complete 8.0 conversion projects	16 data). Survey Samp		11.4	o	7.0	~	8.8	
	data). Survey Samp	ile = 301.						~
Notes: (1) No conversion projects reported by provider	rs in essentia	services stratum.						
	0	- -			8			
				1				

	4	ļ	2
	•	đ	٢
	2	E	
	2	ï	ï
	-		2
1	2		

Research Question B.12.a.: What were the critical factors in the implementation schedule (type/experience of sponsor,

secondeau	Homelessness Number	Prevention	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/I Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Opere Number	Percent	All Respo	Percen
Were changes implemented on schedule?										
Yes	247	87.6%	386	86.8%	203	64.8%	248	65.8%	1084	76.5%
No	35	12.4%	59	13.2%	110	35.3%	129	34.2%	333	23.5%
TOTAL RESPONSES	282	100.0%	445	100.0%	313	100.0%	377	100.0%	1417	100.0%
Providers indicating they encountered problems with:										
Contractor delays	35	100.0%	44	84.7%	73	82.6%	21	17.0%	173	57.59
Procurement delays	4	11.8%	17	45.3%	74	71.7%	21	17.0%	117	38.6
Competitive bidding process delays	4	11.8%	14	27.0%	12	81.8%	21	17.0%	111	36.95
Environmental review delays	27	78.1%	13	24.7%	15	19.0%	8	2.4%	58	23.5
Health or building codes/permits	4	11.8%	11	33.1%	12	38.1%	9	4.9%	40	15.9
Objections from neighbors, community groups, local businesses	0	0.0%	0	%0'0	12	36.3%	0	%0'0	12	4.8
Planning commission delays	0	%0.0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	e	2.4%	e	1.3
Other	0	0.0%	7	11.7%	-	1.3%	8	2.4%	11	3.4

Missing cases: 3-7 providers.

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible in second question.

		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	All Hesp Number	Percent
hat has been the most significant oblem in trying to implement 'GP-funded physical changes?									
sessive documentation was required	16.4%	92	20.7%	26	8.4%	122	32.4%	286	20.3%
ee bids requirement	0.7%	30	0.7%	12	3.9%	18	4.7%	62	4.4%
ministrative oversight was extensive	0.0%	17	3.9%	18	5.7%	N	0.6%	37	2.6%
ook so long, the estimates were	12.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	36	2.5%
rvaid when work began vironmental review 0	%0.0	16	3.7%	ŝ	1.6%	13	3.4%	34	2.4%
ler 4	1.5%	28	6.2%	71	23.0%	0	0.0%	102	7.3%
significant problem	68.8%	262	58.8%	177	57.6%	222	59.0%	855	60.6%

esponses	Recipion	ents Percen
ow does the recipient agency publicize ailability of ESGP funds?		
dvertise in newspapers	ი	37.5%
dvertise in bid opportunity publications	0	%0`0
end announcement to prior recipients	-	12.5%
end RFP to prior recipients	ო	37.5%
eet with prospective recipients	0	%0``0
end announcement to prospective ecipients	0	%0"0
end RFP to prospective recipients	-	12.5%
TAL RESPONSES	æ	100.0%
urce: Recipient Survey, Question 11.		
ssing Cases: 4 recipients.		

Research Question B.14: To wha	at extent has	the ESG enl	hanced client	access to so	cial services	6.		
Responses	State/T Number	erritory Percent	Metropol Number	itan City Percent	Urban Number	County Percent	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
Respondents indicating that ESG has								
Increased social services offered	53	96.8%	197	89.4%	100	93.4%	350	91.6%
Reduced number of under-served homeless	36	66.0%	138	62.8%	99	61.9%	241	63.0%
Source: Grantee Survey, Question 31 Grantee Universe=382, Sur	1 (weighted d rvey Sample=	ata). 234.						
Missing Cases: None.								
Notes: (1) Multiple responses	possible.							

Responses	Homelessne Number	as Prevention Percent	Essential Number	l Services Percent	Conversion/F Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Oper Number	ations Percent	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
lave providers added ew services as result f ESG funding?										
Yes, direct result	177	40.7%	321	32.9%	103	25.7%	211	18.2%	813	27.3%
Yes, indirect result	48	11.1%	228	23.3%	40	9.9%	321	27.7%	637	21.4%
No	210	48.2%	428	43.8%	259	64.4%	627	54.1%	1525	51.2%
DTAL RESPONSES	436	100.0%	978	100.0%	402	100.0%	1160	100.0%	2975	100.0%
hat services have been t	added? (s)									
lucation and training	18	7.8%	72	13.2%	25	17.5%	180	33.9%	295	20.4%
iild-related services	23	10.3%	88	16.2%	31	21.5%	95	17.8%	238	16.4%
using-related services	68	30.1%	54	9.8%	22	15.6%	56	10.6%	200	13.8%
ansportation services	<b>თ</b>	4.1%	Ø	1.5%	15	10.5%	138	25,9%	170	11.79
alth/medical assessments	19	8.5%	59	10.7%	۲.	5.2%	52	3,9%	138	9.59
mity services	10	4.3%	38	7.0%	14	10.1%	49	9,3%	112	7.79
creased service capacity	98	43.2%	233	42.4%	54	37.7%	483	90.8%	868	59.89
iilding improvement	Ø	3.7%	95	17.2%	47	33.1%	106	19.9%	256	17.79
her (b)	102	44.9%	194	35.3%	32	22.7%	68	12.8%	396	27.39
	Perception of	Vetal botheriouv								
ource: Provider Prione Surv Provider Universe =	ey, Question 33 3000–3500 (es	(weignted data). timated), Survey	Sample = 6	51.						
Aissing cases: 11 providers.				5						

Notes: (a) Multiple responses possible. (b) Includes homelessness prevention services, case management, rent/mortgage assistance, utilities assistance, outreach, and new counseling programs.

Item 154 (cont.)

Are ESGP funds used to pay all or part of the salaries of those       Are ESGP funds used to pay all or part of the salaries of those       Are ESGP funds       Are Salaries of those       Are Salaries </th <th>Responses</th> <th>Homelessnes Number</th> <th>s Prevention Percent</th> <th>Essential Number</th> <th>Services Percent</th> <th>Conversion/ Number</th> <th>Rehabilitation Percent</th> <th>Oper. Number</th> <th>ations Percent</th> <th>All Resp Number</th> <th>ondents Percent</th>	Responses	Homelessnes Number	s Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/ Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Oper. Number	ations Percent	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
Yes       205       27.3%       666       61.3%       58       15.6%       323       29.0%       1252       37.7%         No       545       72.7%       421       38.7%       315       84.4%       790       71.0%       2071       62.3%         TOTAL RESPONSES       749       100.0%       1087       100.0%       373       100.0%       1113       100.0%       3322       100.0%         Source: Provider Mailed Survey Question 20 (weighted data).       Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 301.       373       100.0%       1113       100.0%       3322       100.0%	Are ESGP funds used or part of the salaries who provide services?	to pay all of those						1 . 12	1	8	
No         545         72.7%         421         38.7%         315         84.4%         790         71.0%         2071         62.3%           TOTAL RESPONSES         749         100.0%         1087         100.0%         373         100.0%         1113         100.0%         3322         100.0%           Source:         Provider Mailed Survey, Question 20 (weighted data).         1087         100.0%         373         100.0%         1113         100.0%         3322         100.0%           Source:         Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 301.         Missing cases: 20 providers.	Yes	205	27.3%	666	61.3%	28	15.6%	323	29.0%	1252	37.7%
TOTAL RESPONSES         749         100.0%         1087         100.0%         373         101.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3322         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3323         100.0%         3323         100.0%         313         100.0%         313         100.0%         313         100.0%         313         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%	No	545	72.7%	421	38.7%	315	84.4%	290	71.0%	2071	62.3%
Source: Provider Mailed Survey, Question 20 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 301. Missing cases: 20 providers.	TOTAL RESPONSES	749	100.0%	1087	100.0%	373	100.0%	1113	100.0%	3322	100.0%
Missing cases: 20 providers.	Source: Provider Mailed Provider Univers	Survey, Questic se = 3000350	on 20 (weighted 0 (estimated), S	data). urvey Sample	e = 301.						
	Missing cases: 20 provid	lers.									
				ŝ	3			-			

Items 155-156

Research Questions B.14.a., B.14.b.: How do clients learn about the services available under ESGP?

assindent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Providers indicating they receive referra	ls from:									
Social service agencies	765	100.0%	1144	100.0%	. 388	97.1%	1107	98.5%	3404	99.2%
Clergy/churches	744	97.6%	1065	95,8%	343	88.2%	1122	98.8%	3274	96.3%
Friends	751	<b>39.6%</b>	1086	96.5%	287	84,4%	1074	94.9%	3197	95.4%
Other shelters	661	88.7%	1115	98.9%	330	85.7%	1091	95.1%	3197	93.9%
Citizens	755	%9.66	1059	93.4%	264	80.1%	1056	93.5%	3134	93.5%
Doctors/hospitals	681	89.5%	1035	92.0%	268	81.6%	1010	90.8%	2994	60.09
Police	657	89.4%	090].	93.6%	290	74.9%	1028	91.8%	3035	60'06
Walk - ins	717	94.2%	266	87.6%	258	76.2%	866	92.6%	2970	89.69
Detox/substance abuse treatment programs	567	77.3%	868	80.7%	234	76.3%	883	80.4%	2552	79.49
Psychiatric programs and treatment centers	576	77.0%	815	75.7%	276	81.1%	828	74.2%	2496	76.19
Courts	603	60.3%	781	72.2%	246	71.6%	795	72.8%	2424	74.2
Public housing agencies	668	88.5%	826	74.8%	222	67.2%	691	64.9%	2407	74.0
Parents	551	76.2%	648	58.5%	282	85.5%	6//	73.3%	2261	70.1
Hotline	378	52.0%	738	68.6%	282	72.7%	881	80.5%	2278	69.4
Therapists	362	52.4%	290	72.8%	281	77.8%	608	62.4%	2021	65.5
School personnel	544	74.6%	588	55.0%	213	64.6%	594	56.1%	1938	60.9
Landlords	563	77.7%	529	49.4%	219	67.0%	459	44.9%	1769	56.3
Outreach workers from this shelter/program	420	59.0%	541	49.7%	202	61.8%	555	54.1%	1717	54.5
Referral center	302	43.0%	414	40.3%	181	52.9%	648	65.2%	1545	50.4
Alliance for the Mentally III	164	24.0%	274	26.2%	8	. 26.1%	315	31.3%	838	27.4
Utility companies	361	49.9%	184	17.6%	11	23.0%	173	18.2%	789	26.1
Other	33	9.9%	120	34.1%	28	21.6%	115	33.0%	295	25.4

Missing cases: 13-45 providurs.

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.

Dees your organization have a       Vritten policy for access to the       ervices you offer?       Yes     531       Yes     502	Responses Ho	umber umber	ss Prevention Percent	Essentia Number	l Services Percent	Conversion/f Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Oper. Number	ations Percent	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
Yes   531 78.0%   860 78.4%   302 76.9%   958 87.9%	oes your organization h ritten policy for access ervices you offer?	ave a to the								λ.	
	Yes	531	78.0%	860	78.4%	302	76.9%	958	87.9%	2652	81.3%
No 150 22.0% 237 21.6% 91 23.1% 131 12.1%	No	150	22.0%	237	21.6%	6	23.1%	131	12.1%	609	18.7%
OTAL RESPONSES 682 100.0% 1097 100.0% 393 100.0% 1089 100.0%	OTAL RESPONSES	682	100.0%	1097	100.0%	393	100.0%	1089	100.0%	3261	100.0%

His provide rever         His pro pro provide rever         His provide rever <th>Res provider ower timed anny eligible clients?         Res provider ower timed annow clients?         Res provider ower time timed annow clients?         Res provider ower time timed annow clients?         Res provider ower time time timed annow clients?         Res provider ower time time time time time time time time</th> <th>Res provider ever tunned war wighle clansh         Res provider ever tunned (0.000, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10,</th> <th>Responses</th> <th>Homelessne</th> <th>ss Prevention Percent</th> <th>Essential Number</th> <th>Services</th> <th>Corversion/R Number</th> <th>Percent</th> <th>Open Number</th> <th>Percent</th> <th>All Resp. Number</th> <th>Percent</th>	Res provider ower timed anny eligible clients?         Res provider ower timed annow clients?         Res provider ower time timed annow clients?         Res provider ower time timed annow clients?         Res provider ower time time timed annow clients?         Res provider ower time time time time time time time time	Res provider ever tunned war wighle clansh         Res provider ever tunned (0.000, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10,	Responses	Homelessne	ss Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services	Corversion/R Number	Percent	Open Number	Percent	All Resp. Number	Percent
Yes         329         77.3%         736         80.0%         335         82.0%         801         921         801         903           No         20         27.3%         192         10.0%         74         8.0%         225         122%         500         1905%           IOTAL RESPONES         430         100.0%         927         10.0,0%         400         100,0%         217         100,0%         201         100,0%           IOTAL RESPONES         430         100,0%         927         100,0%         400         100,0%         217         901         100,0%           Mean number lumed energy         82.1         22.1         30.3%         40         22.9%         20.1         100,0%         201         100,0%           Mean number lumed energy         82.1          30.3          30.3         40.4%         201         100,0%         201         100,0%           Mean number lumed energy         82.1         64.6%         40.6%         40.6%         101         40.6%         201         40.6%           No         22.6         82.8%         64.6%         40.6%         101         20.4%         201         201	Ver         330         77.3%         726         80.0%         336         82.0%         241         60.5%         241         60.5%           No         201         20.0%         100.0%         1177         100.0%         225         122.3%         500         105.0%           IOP parts 20 days, how many eligible clients how been turned away         201         202.0%         203         203         201         200.0%           Mean number lumed away         82.1          30.3          37.3         201         200.0%         301         200.0%           Mean number lumed away         82.1          30.3          37.3         40.4         25.3         50.0%         301         200.0%           Mean number lumed away         82.1         24.3         24.3         24.3         24.3         24.3         24.4         24.4           Mean number lumed away         82.1         24.4         24.5         24.4         24.5         24.4         24.4         24.5         24.4         24.4         24.4         24.5         24.4         24.4         24.5         24.4         24.4         24.4         24.4         24.4         24.4         24.4	View         328         7.3.%         7.3%         7.3%         7.3%         7.3%         7.3%         7.3%         7.3%         7.3%         7.3%         7.3%         2.6%         6.0%         2.6%         6.0%         2.6% <th2.6%< th="">         2.6%         2.6%         <th2< td=""><td>Has provider ever turned away eligible clients?</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th2<></th2.6%<>	Has provider ever turned away eligible clients?										
No         Do         2.7.%         122         16.4.%         74         18.0%         22.3         12.0%         500         10.0%           IOTAL RESPONESS         438         100.0%         867         100.0%         807         100.0%         801         100.0%         3010         100.0%         3011         100.0%         3001         100.0%	No         Dia         22.7%         128         14.4%         74         16.0%         127         120.0%         1177         100.0%         201         100.0%           TOTAL, RESPONES         490         100.0%         1177         100.0%         1177         100.0%         201         100.0%           Alman number lumed anny         201         201         201         201         201         201         201           Alman number lumed anny         201	No         Dot         22.7%         128         10.4%         74         10.5%         255         13.2%         500         10.0%           TOTAL, RESPONEGS         400         100.0%         101.7         100.0%         111.7         100.0%         3011         100.0%           Total part 20 days, how many eligible         400         100.1%         2013          444           444           444 </td <td>Yes</td> <td>339</td> <td>77.3%</td> <td>795</td> <td>80.6%</td> <td>335</td> <td>82.0%</td> <td>951</td> <td>80.8%</td> <td>2421</td> <td>80.4%</td>	Yes	339	77.3%	795	80.6%	335	82.0%	951	80.8%	2421	80.4%
TOTAL RESPONSES         458         100.054         867         100.054         400         107.7         100.054         3011         100.054           In the past 30 days, how many alighte         directs have been traned anary?         82.1          37.8          48.5          48.4          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.5          48.4          48.4          48.4          48.4          48.4          48.6         46.05         19.1         26.05         46.05         19.1         26.5         46.05         19.1         26.5         46.05         19.1         26.5         46.5         46.05         19.1         26.5         46.5         46.5         46.5         46.5         46.5         46.5         46.5         46.5         46.5         46.5 <t< td=""><td>TOTAL RESPONEES         430         100.05         400         100.05         1177         100.055         301         100.05           In the part 30 days, how many alights         diants have been furned away         82.1          30.8          43.4</td><td>TOTAL RESPONES         480         100.0%         1177         100.0%         9011         100.0%           In the part 30 days, for many eligible         distar have been intraned analy?         48.1          48.5          4</td><td>No</td><td>8</td><td>22.7%</td><td>192</td><td>19.4%</td><td>74</td><td>18.0%</td><td>225</td><td>19.2%</td><td>590</td><td>19.6%</td></t<>	TOTAL RESPONEES         430         100.05         400         100.05         1177         100.055         301         100.05           In the part 30 days, how many alights         diants have been furned away         82.1          30.8          43.4	TOTAL RESPONES         480         100.0%         1177         100.0%         9011         100.0%           In the part 30 days, for many eligible         distar have been intraned analy?         48.1          48.5          4	No	8	22.7%	192	19.4%	74	18.0%	225	19.2%	590	19.6%
In the part 30 days, how many slighted dama?           diama 30 days, how many slighted dama?           diama humber turned away         S2:1          36.8          45.5          43.5          43.4            Mean number turned away         S2:1          36.8          37.6          45.5         45.4         57.4%         100         45.5%         1012         55.0%           Mean number turned away         205         83.2%         40.4         20.0%         40.4         20.0%         40.4         100.0%         1100         100.0%         2000         100.0%           Mon         205.4         54.4         57.4%         100         40.5%         40.4         100.0%         1100         100.0%         2000         100.0%           Mon         205.4         54.4         57.4%         100         100.0%         1100         100.0%         2000         100.0%           Mon         205.4         21.4         21.4         21.4         21.4         21.4         21.4         21.4           Mon         205.6         21.4         21.6         21.4         21.4 <th< td=""><td>In the part S0 days, from many eligible clients have been turned anony         82.1          30.8          46.5          43.4            Mean number turned anony         82.1          30.8          46.5          43.4            Mean number turned anony         154         30.8%         40.4         2.0.6%         2.0%         110         200.0%         1318         45.0%           Mean number turned anony         154         30.8%         544         2.0%         2.0%         100.0%         100.0%         1318         45.0%           Mo         255         154         51.4%         100         400.0%         1100         100.0%         230.6%         40.4           Mo         255         41.9         100.0%         2.06         100.0%         1010         100.0%         2.06         100.0%           Southy problems         116         41.3%         100         100.0%         1010         100.0%         1010           Southy problems         11         4.2%         251         7.4 0%         1702         251.7%         1001           Southy problems         16         4.2%         2</td><td>In the part S0 days, how many alighte directs have been turned away?         B2.1          30.8          46.5          40.4           Mean number lurned away?         B2.1          30.8          46.5          40.4           Mean number lurned away?         1         24.0         24.05         21.7         83.8%         84.9         46.0%         131.0         45.0%           Mean number lurned away         1         14.9         30.0%         4.40         42.0%         100         45.3%         101         45.0%           Yea         28.8         1         1         24.4%         94.0         100.0%         110         100.0%         28.00         100.0%           No         25.5         24.0%         53.3         24.0%         100         11.0         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         14.4%         100         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         14.4%         100         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         100         100.0%         100.0%         100</td><td>TOTAL RESPONSES</td><td>438</td><td>100.0%</td><td>987</td><td>100.0%</td><td>400</td><td>100.0%</td><td>1117</td><td>100.0%</td><td>3011</td><td>100.0%</td></th<>	In the part S0 days, from many eligible clients have been turned anony         82.1          30.8          46.5          43.4            Mean number turned anony         82.1          30.8          46.5          43.4            Mean number turned anony         154         30.8%         40.4         2.0.6%         2.0%         110         200.0%         1318         45.0%           Mean number turned anony         154         30.8%         544         2.0%         2.0%         100.0%         100.0%         1318         45.0%           Mo         255         154         51.4%         100         400.0%         1100         100.0%         230.6%         40.4           Mo         255         41.9         100.0%         2.06         100.0%         1010         100.0%         2.06         100.0%           Southy problems         116         41.3%         100         100.0%         1010         100.0%         1010           Southy problems         11         4.2%         251         7.4 0%         1702         251.7%         1001           Southy problems         16         4.2%         2	In the part S0 days, how many alighte directs have been turned away?         B2.1          30.8          46.5          40.4           Mean number lurned away?         B2.1          30.8          46.5          40.4           Mean number lurned away?         1         24.0         24.05         21.7         83.8%         84.9         46.0%         131.0         45.0%           Mean number lurned away         1         14.9         30.0%         4.40         42.0%         100         45.3%         101         45.0%           Yea         28.8         1         1         24.4%         94.0         100.0%         110         100.0%         28.00         100.0%           No         25.5         24.0%         53.3         24.0%         100         11.0         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         14.4%         100         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         28.00         14.4%         100         100.0%         28.00         100.0%         100         100.0%         100.0%         100	TOTAL RESPONSES	438	100.0%	987	100.0%	400	100.0%	1117	100.0%	3011	100.0%
Mean number turned avery         22.1          36.8          37.6          48.5          43.4	Mean number turned every         52.1          30.8          30.8          43.5          43.5          43.4        <	Mean number lumed event         B2.1          30.3          40.5	In the past 30 days, how many eli clients have been turned away?	gible									
Has provider ever admitted invigible clients?           Ves         154         30.8%         404         42.0%         217         53.8%         543         46.6%         1316         45.0%           Yes         265         63.2%         544         57.4%         196         46.2%         1912         55.0%           No         265         63.2%         544         57.4%         196         46.2%         1912         55.0%           TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         544         57.4%         196         46.2%         1912         55.0%           For what reasory/under what conditions         419         100.0%         54.3%         74.0%         74.0%         702         73.7%         1061         68.0%           Security problems         16         4.7%         92         74.0%         702         73.7%         1061         68.0%           Security problems         16         6.3.5%         58         56.3%         56.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6% <td>Hase provider over admitted invigible clients?         Ist         36.8%         404         42.6%         217         53.8%         543         46.6%         1318         45.0%           Yes         207.IL         265         63.2%         544         77.4%         196         46.2%         1912         55.0%           Yos         265         63.2%         544         77.4%         196         46.2%         017         53.2%         1912         55.0%           YOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         260         100.0%           For vitat rescont/under what conditions         410         105.0%         543         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         100.0%</td> <td>Heap provider ower admitted inveligible clients?         Heap provider ower admitted inveligible clients?           Yea         154         30.8%         4.04         42.6%         217         53.9%         543         46.6%         1318         45.0%           Yea         205         80.2%         544         57.4%         169         40.0%         1318         45.0%           No         265         80.2%         544         57.4%         169         40.0%         169         46.0%         161         68.0%           No         205         80.2%         544         57.4%         169         100.0%         280         100.0%         100.0%         280         100.0%</td> <td>Mean number turned away</td> <td>52.1</td> <td> </td> <td>36.8</td> <td>1</td> <td>37.6</td> <td>ł</td> <td>48.5</td> <td> </td> <td>43.4</td> <td></td>	Hase provider over admitted invigible clients?         Ist         36.8%         404         42.6%         217         53.8%         543         46.6%         1318         45.0%           Yes         207.IL         265         63.2%         544         77.4%         196         46.2%         1912         55.0%           Yos         265         63.2%         544         77.4%         196         46.2%         017         53.2%         1912         55.0%           YOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         260         100.0%           For vitat rescont/under what conditions         410         105.0%         543         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         280.0         100.0%         100.0%	Heap provider ower admitted inveligible clients?         Heap provider ower admitted inveligible clients?           Yea         154         30.8%         4.04         42.6%         217         53.9%         543         46.6%         1318         45.0%           Yea         205         80.2%         544         57.4%         169         40.0%         1318         45.0%           No         265         80.2%         544         57.4%         169         40.0%         169         46.0%         161         68.0%           No         205         80.2%         544         57.4%         169         100.0%         280         100.0%         100.0%         280         100.0%	Mean number turned away	52.1		36.8	1	37.6	ł	48.5		43.4	
Yea         154         30.8%         404         42.0%         217         53.8%         543         46.0%         1318         45.0%           No         205         63.2%         544         57.4%         186         46.2%         617         53.2%         1912         55.0%           TOTAL RESPONSES         130         100.0%         543         54.0         1100         100.0%         203.0         50.0%           Total RESPONSES         115         20.0%         948         100.0%         40.4         100.0%         200.0% <t< td=""><td>Yea         154         30.9%         404         42.6%         217         53.9%         543         45.0%         1318         45.0%           No         205         03.2%         544         77.4%         196         46.2%         617         53.2%         1912         55.0%           TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         2260         100.0%           For what reason/tunder what conditions         419         100.0%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.0%           Sheller at capacity         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.0%           Sheller at capacity         115         4.4%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         117         167         169.0%         14.4%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         17.5%         26         29.3         24.4%           Nong type of client         37         1106         13.3%         86         26&lt;</td><td>Yes         154         3.0.8%         4.04         4.2.6%         2.17         5.3.8%         543         46.9%         1316         45.0%           No         265         63.2%         544         57.4%         186         40.2%         1100         100.0%         235.0%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         100.0%         1100         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         100.0%         235.0%         101.4%         100.0%         100.0%         235.0%         101.4%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%</td></t<> <td>Has provider ever admitted ineligible clients?</td> <td></td>	Yea         154         30.9%         404         42.6%         217         53.9%         543         45.0%         1318         45.0%           No         205         03.2%         544         77.4%         196         46.2%         617         53.2%         1912         55.0%           TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         2260         100.0%           For what reason/tunder what conditions         419         100.0%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.0%           Sheller at capacity         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.0%           Sheller at capacity         115         4.4%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         117         167         169.0%         14.4%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         17.5%         26         29.3         24.4%           Nong type of client         37         1106         13.3%         86         26<	Yes         154         3.0.8%         4.04         4.2.6%         2.17         5.3.8%         543         46.9%         1316         45.0%           No         265         63.2%         544         57.4%         186         40.2%         1100         100.0%         235.0%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         53.6%         100.0%         1100         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         235.0%         100.0%         100.0%         235.0%         101.4%         100.0%         100.0%         235.0%         101.4%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%         100.0%	Has provider ever admitted ineligible clients?										
No         265         63.2%         5.4         57.4%         180         46.2%         617         53.2%         1612         55.0%           TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         2930         100.0%           For what resort/under what conditions         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.6%           Security problems         116         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         346         14.4%           Security problems         116         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         35.3%         364         14.6%           Nong type of client         15         4.4%         98         12.3%         60         17.8%         176         15.5%         364         14.4%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         702         702         703         15.5%         364         14.4%           Nong type of client         37         4.4%         98         12.8%         160         16.5%         28         2.	No         265         63.2%         54         57.4%         180         46.2%         017         53.2%         1012         56.0%           TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         2830         100.0%           For what reasoryUnder what conditions have clients been transed away?         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.0%           Shelter at capacity         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.0%           Recimits been transed away?         11         15         34.4%         106         13.3%         85         55.3%         14.7%         364         14.6%           Nong type of client         15         4.4%         106         13.3%         85         56.3%         14.7%         364         14.4%           Nong type of client         15         4.4%         106         13.3%         85         26.3%         14.7%         56.9%         14.4%           Nong type of client         15         4.4%         26	No         265         69.2%         5.4%         190         46.2%         61.7         53.3%         1012         56.0%           TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         2030         100.0%           For what reason/under what conditions         For what reason/under what conditions         115         33.9%         583         7.4.6%         251         7.4.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.0%           Shelter at capacity         115         33.9%         583         7.4.6%         683         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.4.6%         7.02         7.3.7%         1061         68.0%           Nong type of client         116         4.7%         106         13.3%         69         1.4.6%         200         12.6%         201         12.6%         201         12.6%         201         12.6%         201         12.6%         201         12.6%         201         12.6%         201         12.6%         201	Yes	154	36.8%	404	42.6%	217	53.8%	543	46.8%	1318	45.0%
TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         100.0%         2930         100.0%           For what reasony/under what conditions have clients been turned away <sup>7</sup> 115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.6%           Shelter at capacity         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.6%           Shelter at capacity         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.6%           Security problems         116         4.7%         106         13.3%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.6%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         06         128         13.5%         306         12.9%           Insufficient tunds         120         35.6%         17         9.7%         06         17.8%         22         9.2%           Insufficient services         15         4.3%         06         7.4.9%         7	TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         948         100.0%         404         100.0%         1160         100.0%         2830         100.0%           For what reasory/under what conditions         For what reasory/under what conditions         115         33.9%         533         74.6%         702         73.7%         1661         68.6%           Shelter at copacity         115         33.9%         533         74.6%         702         73.7%         1661         68.6%           Shelter at copacity         115         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         346         14.6%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.6%           Security problems         16         4.4%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         346         14.6%           Recurity problems         16         4.4%         106         13.5%         26         25.3%         14.6%         26         26.3%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%         26.6%	TOTAL RESPONSES         419         100.0%         548         100.0%         404         100.0%         1100         100.0%         2030         100.0%           For what reasonyLunder what conditions Interest capacity         115         33.0%         533         74.0%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.6%           None clearis been turned anary7         15         4.4%         533         74.0%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.6%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.6%           Security problems         16         4.7%         26         13.3%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1061         68.6%           Nong type of clent         37         11.0%         777         9.7%         00         17.6%         26         23.3%         14.4%           Nong type of clent         37         11.0%         7.0%         7.0%         7.0%         2.3%         14.4%           Nong type of clent         37         11.0%         7.2%         2.3%         2.4%	No	265	63.2%	544	57.4%	186	46.2%	617	53.2%	1612	55.0%
For what conditions           have clients been turned away?         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.6%           Shelter at capacity         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.6%           Shelter at capacity         15         4.4%         96         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.6%           Security problems         15         4.4%         96         13.3%         60         17.8%         176         18.5%         349         14.6%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         126         28.5%         349         14.4%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         126         28.2%         349         14.4%           Nong type of client         37         110         9.7%         66         19.8%         128         223         8.2%           Nonflicient services         15         4.3%         50	For what reason/under what conditions have clients been turned away?         115         33.9%         503         74.0%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.0%           Shelter at capacity         115         33.9%         503         74.0%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.0%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         349         14.6%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         17.8%         14.6%         366           Nong type of client thrnds         12         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         17.8%         340         12.6%           Nond type of client thrnds         12         3.5%         55         6.0%         21         6.2%         326         14.4%           Nondificient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         22         22         22         22         22         22         22         22         22         22         22         23         27         26         10         4.0%	For what reason/under what conditions         To what reason/under what conditions         115         33.9%         533         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1601         68.6%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.0%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.0%           Security problems         15         4.4%         98         12.3%         85         25.3%         147         155%         354         14.0%           Mong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         126         12.9%         309         12.9%           Monolof/drug abuse         12         3.7.5%         26         2.4         4.2%         30         12.6%         306         12.6%         306         12.6%         306         12.6%         306         12.6%         306         12.6%         306         12.6%         306         12.6%         306         12.6%         306         12.6%         306	TOTAL RESPONSES	419	100.0%	948	100.0%	404	100.0%	1160	100.0%	2930	100.0%
Shelter at capacity         115         33.0%         593         74.0%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         08.0%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.0%           Security problems         15         4.4%         98         12.3%         60         17.8%         176         18.5%         364         14.0%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         19.8%         128         13.5%         369         14.4%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         19.8%         128         13.5%         309         12.6%           Nong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         19.8%         128         13.5%         309         12.6%           nsufficient tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.0%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           nulticient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         2	Shelter at capacity         115         33.9%         593         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         08.0%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.6%           Recurity problems         15         4.4%         96         13.3%         60         17.6%         176         18.5%         364         14.6%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         126         13.5%         309         12.9%           Wrong type of client tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         128         13.5%         309         12.9%           Insufficient tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         128         325         9.2%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         26         5.7%         166         6.5%         128         6.5%         128         6.5%         12.4%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7 <t< td=""><td>Shelter at capacity         115         33.9%         583         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.6%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.6%           Security problems         15         4.4%         98         12.3%         60         17.8%         177         15.5%         354         14.6%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         12.8%         12.8         14.6%           Insufficient tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         12.8         13.5%         306         12.9%           Insufficient tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         12.8         13.5%         306         12.9%           Insufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         128         13.5%         308         12.8           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7         2</td><td>For what reason/under what conc have clients been turned away?</td><td>litions</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Shelter at capacity         115         33.9%         583         74.6%         251         74.9%         702         73.7%         1661         68.6%           Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.6%           Security problems         15         4.4%         98         12.3%         60         17.8%         177         15.5%         354         14.6%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         12.8%         12.8         14.6%           Insufficient tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         12.8         13.5%         306         12.9%           Insufficient tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         12.8         13.5%         306         12.9%           Insufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         128         13.5%         308         12.8           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7         2	For what reason/under what conc have clients been turned away?	litions									
Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.0%           Inebriated/high         15         4.4%         96         12.3%         60         17.8%         176         18.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         128         13.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         128         13.5%         349         14.4%           Nrong type of client         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.3%         12.8%         349         14.4%           Insufficient tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.3%         222         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         223         224         253         <	Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.0%           Inebriated/high         15         4.4%         98         12.3%         60         17.8%         176         18.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         17.8%         128         13.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         17.8%         128         13.5%         349         14.4%           Insufficient tunds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         349         14.4%           Alcohol/drug abuse         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         26         2.8%         265         6.5%         16.6%         16.6%         17.6%         309         12.6%         309         12.6%         309         12.6%         305         136         5.6%         16.6%         2.6%         2.6%         2.6%         2.6%         2.6%         2.6%         2.6%         2.6%	Security problems         16         4.7%         106         13.3%         85         25.3%         147         15.5%         354         14.0%           Inebriated/high         15         4.4%         98         12.3%         85         25.3%         176         18.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         17.8%         128         13.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         60         17.8%         128         13.5%         349         14.4%           Insufficient services         120         35.5%         55         6.0%         21         6.2%         21         2.8%         12.9%         349         14.4%           Insufficient services         120         35.5%         55         6.0%         21         6.2%         22         9.2%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         110         4.0%           Other         16         4.9%         34         10.2%         54         5.6% <t< td=""><td>Shelter at capacity</td><td>115</td><td>33.9%</td><td>593</td><td>74.6%</td><td>251</td><td>74.9%</td><td>702</td><td>73.7%</td><td>1661</td><td>68.6%</td></t<>	Shelter at capacity	115	33.9%	593	74.6%	251	74.9%	702	73.7%	1661	68.6%
Inebriated/high         15         4.4%         96         12.8%         60         17.8%         176         18.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         128         13.5%         309         12.8%           nsufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         309         12.8%           nsufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           nsufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         65         6.3%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         158         6.5%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         16         5.7%	Inebriated/high         15         4.4%         98         12.3%         60         17.8%         176         18.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         128         13.5%         309         12.8%           Mrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         128         13.5%         309         12.8%           Insufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         202         9.2%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         5.7         6.0%         158         6.5%         6.5%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         5.7%         57         6.0%         110         4.6%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (estimated), Survey Sample = 551.         34 <t< td=""><td>Inebriated/high         15         4.4%         26         17.8%         176         18.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         126         13.5%         309         12.6%           Insufficient thirds         15         4.3%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         309         12.6%           Insufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         66         3.8%         309         12.6%         309         12.6%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         5.7%         509         12.6%         5.7%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         5.7%<td>Security problems</td><td>16</td><td>4.7%</td><td>106</td><td>13.3%</td><td>85</td><td>25.3%</td><td>147</td><td>15.5%</td><td>354</td><td>14.6%</td></td></t<>	Inebriated/high         15         4.4%         26         17.8%         176         18.5%         349         14.4%           Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         126         13.5%         309         12.6%           Insufficient thirds         15         4.3%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         309         12.6%           Insufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         66         3.8%         309         12.6%         309         12.6%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         5.7%         509         12.6%         5.7%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         5.7% <td>Security problems</td> <td>16</td> <td>4.7%</td> <td>106</td> <td>13.3%</td> <td>85</td> <td>25.3%</td> <td>147</td> <td>15.5%</td> <td>354</td> <td>14.6%</td>	Security problems	16	4.7%	106	13.3%	85	25.3%	147	15.5%	354	14.6%
Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         128         13.5%         309         12.8%           nsufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           nsufficient funds         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.0%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         5.7%	Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         12.8%         128         13.5%         309         12.8%           insufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         209         12.8%           insufficient funds         15         4.3%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.6%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data).         Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%	Wrong type of client         37         11.0%         77         9.7%         66         19.8%         128         13.5%         309         12.8%           insufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           insufficient funds         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.6%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.6%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Source: Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.         7         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%	Inebriated/high	15	4.4%	96	12.3%	99	17.8%	176	18.5%	349	14.4%
Insufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.9%         222         9.2%           Insufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         62         6.6%         158         6.5%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.6%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%	Insufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           Insufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         62         6.6%         158         6.5%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.6%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data).         7         2.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%	Insufficient funds         120         35.5%         55         6.9%         21         6.2%         26         2.8%         222         9.2%           Insufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         62         6.6%         158         6.5%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.0%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         110         4.0%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Source: Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%	Wrong type of client	37	11.0%	11	9.7%	66	19.8%	128	13.5%	309	12.8%
nsufficient services 15 4.3% 80 7.5% 20 6.1% 62 6.6% 158 6.5% Alcohol/drug abuse 27 7.9% 19 2.4% 7 2.2% 57 6.0% 110 4.6% Other 16 4.9% 34 4.2% 34 10.2% 54 5.6% 138 5.7%	Insufficient services     15     4.3%     60     7.5%     20     6.1%     62     6.6%     158     6.5%       Alcohol/drug abuse     27     7.9%     19     2.4%     7     2.2%     57     6.0%     110     4.0%       Alcohol/drug abuse     27     7.9%     19     2.4%     7     2.2%     57     6.0%     110     4.0%       Other     16     4.9%     34     4.2%     34     10.2%     54     5.6%     138     5.7%       Source:     Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data).     8     5.7%     34     10.2%     54     5.6%     138     5.7%	Insufficient services         15         4.3%         60         7.5%         20         6.1%         62         6.6%         158         6.3%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.4%         10         4.0%           Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.0%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Source: Provider Phone Survey Question 20 (restimated), Survey Sample = 651.         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%	Insufficient funds	120	35.5%	55	6.9%	21	6.2%	26	2.8%	222	9.2%
Alcohol/drug abuse 27 7.9% 19 2.4% 7 2.2% 57 6.0% 110 4.6% Other 16 4.9% 34 4.2% 34 10.2% 54 5.6% 138 5.7%	Alcohol/drug abuse 27 7.9% 19 2.4% 7 2.2% 57 6.0% 110 4.6% Other 16 4.9% 34 4.2% 34 10.2% 54 5.6% 138 5.7% Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.	Alcohol/drug abuse         27         7.9%         19         2.4%         7         2.2%         57         6.0%         110         4.6%           Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Source:         Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data).         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Missing cases: 3 providers from first question, 21 providers from second question.         651.         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%	insufficient services	15	4.3%	60	7.5%	20	6.1%	62	6.6%	158	6.5%
Other 16 4.9% 34 4.2% 34 10.2% 54 5.6% 138 5.7%	Other         16         4.9%         34         4.2%         34         10.2%         54         5.6%         138         5.7%           Source:         Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data).         Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.         5.7%	Other 10.2% 54 5.6% 138 5.7% Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651. Missing cases: 3 providers from first question, 21 providers from second question.	Alcohol/drug abuse	27	7.9%	19	2.4%	7	2.2%	57	6.0%	110	4.69
	Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.	Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 20 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651. Missing cases: 3 providers from first question, 21 providers from second question.	Other	16	4.9%	34	4.2%	34	10.2%	2	5.6%	138	5.79

Research Question B.16: To what extent have recipient efforts continued following completion

٨.
~
6
-
en
-
1
5
ίū.
5
0
/m
G
ŝ
ESG.
ESG
e ESG
he ESG
the ESG
f the ESG
of the ESG
of the ESG
of the ESG

Responses	State/Territory Mean Percentage	Metropolitan City Mean Percentage	Urban County Mean Percentage	All Respondents Mean Percentage
When no further ESG funding was forthcoming, what percentage of providers have				
Continued services at same or higher service level	62,9%	67.3%	60.0%	64.6%
Continued, but at reduced service level	16.7%	8.8%	16.1%	12.0%
Discontinued services (e.g., closed the shelter)	0.8%	2.0%	4.3%	2.5%
Does not apply – all agencies still receiving ESG funding	19.6%	21.9%	19.6%	20.9%

A-71

Source: Grantee Survey, Question 22 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.

Missing Cases: 1-5 grantees.

Responses	State/To Number	Percent	Metropo	litan City Percent	Urban Number	County Percent	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
Since the beginning of the ESGP in FY 87 have the following changes occurred?								
Increased number of beds	53	96.8%	193	87.8%	103	96.1%	349	91.4%
Increased number of shelters	53	96.8%	155	70.3%	78	72.6%	285	74.7%
Reduced number of underserved homeless	36	%0.99	138	62.8%	99	61.9%	241	63.0%
	State/T Mean Ranking	erritory Percent Ranking 5	Metropo Mean Ranking	olitan City Percent Ranking 5	Urban Mean Ranking	County Percent Ranking 5	All Res Mean Ranking	pondents Percent Ranking
How important was the ESGP to this change? (5=highest, 1=lowest)								
Increased number of beds	4.1	40.8%	3.9	42.8%	3.9	47.6%	3.9	43.9%
Increased number of shelters	3.6	29.8%	3.4	33.9%	3.4	30.8%	3.4	32.3%
Reduced number of underserved homeless	3.8	25.1%	3.6	29.5%	3.6	24.1%	3.6	27.4%
Source: Grantee Survey, Question 31 (weighte Grantee universe = 382, Survey Samį	ed data). ple = 234.							
Missing Cases: 0-1 grantee.								
Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible to first	question.							

Risponses	Homelessnes Number	s Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/F Number	lehabilitation Percent	Oper Number	ations Percent	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
Have you seen the following changes since the beginning of the ENGP in FY8.										
Increased number of beds	241	55.1%	657	66.1%	283	68,8%	794	67.0%	1975	65,2%
increased number of shelters	167	38.1%	529	53.2%	184	44.8%	582	49.2%	1463	48.3%
Reduced number of underserved homeless	210	47.8%	567	57.0%	186	45.2%	640	54.0%	1602	52,9%
	Homelessnes Mean Ranking	s Prevention Percent Renking 5	Essential Mean Renking	Services Percent Ranking 5	Conversion/R Mean Ranking	ehabilitation Percent Ranking S	Oper Mean Ranking	ations Percent Ranking 5	All Resp Mean Ranking	Parcent Parcent Ranking 5
How important was the ESGP to this change? (5=highest, 1=lowest)										20.01
Increased number of beds	3.9	36.9%	3,9	42.0%	4.2	44.2%	4,4	65.2%	4.1	50.9%
Increased number of shelters	3.9	44.1%	3.6	44.1%	4.2	48.0%	4.0	54.9%	3.9	48.6%
Reduced number of underserved homeless	4.0	32.5%	3.7	28.7%	3.8	39.4%	3.9	43.4%	9.8	36.2%
Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 39 Provider Universe = 3000–3500 (est	(weighted data). timated), Survey S	ample = 651.								
Missing Cases: 40-47 providers.										
Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.										

Responses	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	Homelessness Number	Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/R Number	ehabilitation Percent	Opera Number	tions Percent	All Resp. Number	Percen
tave ESGP fun sed to increas f available bec	ds been e the numbu is?	ar				Ţ					
Yes		1		246	33.5%	141	35.7%	145	13.0%	532	23.79
No		-		489	66.5%	254	64.3%	996	87.0%	1710	76.3
OTAL RESPO	NSES	1		735	100.0%	395	100.0%	1111	100.0%	2241	100.0
lean number of	beds added			11.6		20.2		20.3		16.9	1
ource: Provider Provider	Phone Surve Universe = 3	y, Question 34 (w. 3000–3500 (estima	eighted data). ated), Survey \$	Sample = 65							
issing Cases: 1	2 providers o	n number of beds	added.								
otes: (1) Quest	ions not aske	d of homelessnes	s prevention p	roviders.							

Responses	State/T Number	erritory Percent	Metropol	itan City Percent	Urban	County	All Resp Number	ondents Percent
Since the beginning of the ES( have the following changes oc	GP in FY87, curred?							
Improved habitability of shelters	55	100.0%	203	92.4%	101	94.4%	359	94.1%
Improved amenities in shelters	53	95.6%	195	88.5%	96	88.4%	342	89.5%
increased security of shelters	42	75.9%	170	77.4%	73	68.4%	285	74.6%
Enhanced drug-free environment	45	81.4%	143	65.2%	82	76.4%	270	70.7%
Reduced number of homeless	16	28.7%	72	32,9%	28	26.2%	116	30.4%
ncreased public awareness	Ħ	20.4%	48	21.7%	16	15.1%	11	20.2%
More cooperation	~	13.1%	25	11.3%	18	17.1%	50	13.2%
	State/T Mean Ranking	erritory Parcant Ranking 5	Metropol Mean Ranking	itan City Percent Ranking 5	Urban Mean Ranking	County Percent Ranking 5	All Resp. Mean Ranking	ondents Percent Ranking 5
fow important was the ESGP o this change? (5=highest, 1=	()sewest)					1		
nproved habitability of shelters	4.2	20.0%	4.1	23.4%	3.8	23.5%	4.0	22.9%
nproved amenities in shelters	3.8	16.3%	3.7	25.8%	3.9	22.4%	3.8	23.2%
hcreased security of shelters	3.7	24.0%	3.4	30.3%	3.2	33.1%	3.4	30.1%
nhanced drug-free environment	3.5	22.1%	3.5	31.5%	3,3	21.7%	3.4	27.8%
educed number of homeless	3.5	40.2%	3.5	40.0%	3.3	42.5%	3.5	40.8%
creased public awareness	4.3	37.5%	4.2	58.6%	4.5	62.5%	4.3	37.5%
ore cooperation	4.3	40.0%	3.7	69.2%	4.1	33.3%	4.3	40.0%
ource: Grantee Survey, Question 31 Grantee Universe = 382, Su	i (weighted d rvey Sample	lata). = 234.						
Issing Cases: None.								
otes: (1) Multiple responses possil	ble to first qu	estion.						

Item 167

Item 167, cont.

sabouses	Homelassnee Number	is Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/R	ehabilitation Percent	Opera	tions	All Respo Number	Percent
ve you seen the following ct. ce the beginning of the ESG	anges P in FY87?			29	er î					
iroved habitability of shelters	251	57,3%	781	78.6%	352	85.7%	1020	86.1%	2404	79.4%
roved amenities in shelters	279	63.7%	756	76.0%	331	80.7%	952	80.4%	2318	76.6%
eased security of shelters	123	28.0%	501	50.4%	205	50.0%	451	38.1%	1281	42.3%
anced drug – free environment	185	42.3%	551	55.4%	193	46.9%	572	48.3%	1501	49.6%
luced number of homeless	119	27.1%	233	23.4%	74	18.1%	335	28.3%	761	25.1%
eased public awareness	371	84.6%	825	83.0%	354	86.3%	1020	86.2%	2571	84.9%
	Homelessnes Mean Ranking	ss Prevention Percent Ranking 5	Essentia Mean Ranking	I Services Percent Ranking 5	Conversion/R Mean Ranking	ehebilitation Percent Ranking 5	Op er Mean Hanking	rations Percent Ranking S	All Resp Mean Ranking	Percent
w important was the ESGP this change? (5=highest, $1^z$	=lowest)									
roved habitability of shelters	4.2	52.6%	4.0	41,5%	4.4	59.6%	4.2	47.7%	4,2	48.29
roved amenities in shelters	4.2	50.2%	3.8	31.3%	4,3	50.7%	4.1	46.5%	4.0	42.49
eased security of shelters	3.5	29,6%	3.0	20.5%	4.0	50.6%	3.7	35.9%	3.4	31.49
anced drug – free environment	3.7	30.9%	3.3	23.2%	3.4	32.9%	3.7	42.6%	3.5	33.3
uced number of homeless	3.6	29.7%	3.8	29.2%	3.6	32.6%	3.9	53.5%	3.8	40.49
ased public awareness	3.4	25.1%	3.0	21.9%	3.1	18.8%	3.4	35.9%	3,2	27.5
ce: Provider Phone Survey, Q. Provider Universe = 3000-	lestion 39 (weiț -3500 (estimate	jhted data). d), Survey Sam	ole = 651,							
ing Cases: 21–64 providers.			7							

Item 167. cont

s the nation?
S ACTOS
of shelter
quality .
increased the
ESGP
as the
extent l
To what
#
estion C.
h Qu
Research

o date, what has been th apital investment at the a					CONCEPTION	rendolitation	opera	suons	All Resp.	ondents
	gency?									
ean		\$342,379		\$1,702,658		\$821,149		\$656,602		\$1,046,672
edian	2	\$43,302		\$129,000	-	\$90,491		\$80,104		\$89,174
o date, how much has th pency received from the SGP for these improvem	e Indis 7									
ean		\$189,216		\$375,905		\$183,824		\$61,064		\$229,206
edian		\$10,942		\$40,100		\$40,700		\$31,872		\$35,100
	Homelessnes	s Prevention Percent	Essential S Number	Percent	Corwersion/R Number	ehabilitation Percent	Opera	bons Percent	All Respo Number	Percent
or providers using the El habilitation/conversion, I hich types of improvemen en undertaken using ES	SGP for o date tts have SP funds?									
erior remodeling	29	71.5%	218	60.6%	331	80.9%	150	65.9%	611	70.3%
guique	99	50.5%	265	73.7%	325	80.5%	108	48.8%	764	69.7%
uctural	76	68,4%	248	68.8%	279	68.7%	146	65.9%	748	68.1%
octrical	50	57.8%	252	71.1%	263	64.9%	115	50.5%	694	63.2%
ilding/fire code work	46	41.8%	235	67.1%	267	65.2%	102	44.8%	650	59.2%
Inting	41	37.2%	219	60.8%	256	62.5%	120	53.2%	635	57.5%
ating, cooling, ventilation	63	57.1%	138	30.2%	266	65.0%	8	43.2%	566	51.5%
proved safety for children	34	31.0%	212	63.3%	181	44.5%	96	41.9%	523	48.4%
đ	45	40.3%	143	41.3%	229	57.0%	52	22.5%	469	43.0%

Source: Provider Phone Survey, Questions 14-16 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.

Missing Cases: 20 providers for capital investment, 4-5 providers for types of improvements.

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible to third question.

Research Question C.1.a.: Is there a continuing unmet need for emergency shelters for the homeless?

Hesponses Hesponses	lessness Prevention Mean Ranking	Essential Services Mean Ranking	Conversion/Hehablilitation Mean Ranking	Mean Ranking	Mean Ranking
Wean ranking of unmet needs, where 1 is low and 5 is high:				1	
More night shelter beds	4.5	4.2	4.4	4.5	4.4
More night shelter facilities	4.3	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1
More day shelter facilities	4.2	4,0	9.6	4.1	4.0
More essentital services support	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7
More homelessness prevention support	4,9	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.8
More affordable housing	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.8
More public awareness	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3

Item 168 (cont.)

Research Question C.1.a.: Is there a continuing unmet need for emergency shelters for the homeless?

	Mean Ranking	Mean Ranking	Mean Ranking	Mean Ranking
Mean ranking of unmet needs, on a scale where 1 is low and 5 is high:				
More night shelter beds	4.38	4.08	4.25	4.17
More night shelter facilities	4.23	3.77	4.05	3.92
More day shelter facilities	4.00	3.71	3.84	3.79
Increased security of shelters	3.50	3.34	3.27	3.34
Enhanced drug-free environment	3.50	3.32	3.33	3.35
Improving habitability	4.12	3.77	3.85	3.84
Improving amenities	3.94	3.60	3.81	3.71
Reducing the number of homeless	4.65	4.18	4.14	4.24
More essential services support	4.41	4.36	4.34	4.36
More homelessness prevention	4,48	4.31	4.37	4.35
More transitional/permanent housing	4.70	5.00	4.72	4.85

Missing Cases: 1–3 grantees.

	IN THE REAL PROPERTY IN	Percent	Number	Parcent	Number	Percent	Number Number	Percent
Has the cap affected service quality?								
(65	22	39.8%	83	37.8%	83	49.4%	158	41,4%
9	32	58.1%	137	62.2%	54	50.0%	223	58.4%
Jon't Know	-	2.0%	•	%0'0	0	0.0%	-	0.3%
OTAL RESPONSES	55	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	362	100.0%
tow has the ES limitation affected the the quality of services ?								
Qualty diminished with cap	13	68.9%	10	73.5%	33	62.0%	107	\$0.69
limis opportunity for on-going ervices/rot enough ES money	7	38.9%	30	36.3%	26	48.6%	63	40.8%
Other	e	13.4%	0	9.1%	0	17.6%	19	12.5%
Youd you assign a different priority o the 4 activities if caps on essential revices and homelessness prevention vere removed?								
50	28	50.9%	100	45.2%	52	48.5%	179	47.0%
0	27	49.1%	121	54.8%	55	51.5%	203	53.1%
OTAL RESPONSES	55	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.0%
the spending limitations on ES & HP vere removed, what would you do liferently?	-		_		-		-	
evole more money to HP	a	33.9%	41	41.0%	8	44.4%	73	19.29
evote more money to ES	13	47.6%	48	48.6%	0	0.0%	62	16.29
edirect funding into different categories	4	13.5%	N	1.6%	13	25.5%	6	4.9%
und transitional housing	0	0.0%	0	6.2%	0	17.3%	15	4.09
ave HP available for 1 year	-	3.6%	e	2.8%	a	17.5%	13	3.49
xpand current projects	0	9.2%	0	0.0%	2	12.6%	0	2.49
ther	4	12.5%	8	8.2%	-	2.7%	13	3.49

Items 170-171

Responses	Metropo Number	litan City Percent	Urban Number	County Percent	All Resp Number	Percent
Has your agency ever (counts of "Yes" responses)						
Considered applying for a waiver, but didn't	10	4.7%	2	4.7%	15	4.7%
Applied for a waiver and received it	13	5.9%	2	6.5%	20	6.19
Applied for a waiver and been turned down	41	18.5%	14	12.7%	54	16.6%
None of the above	156	70.9%	81	76.1%	237	72.6%
TOTAL RESPONSES	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	327	100.09
Did the waiver enable you to						
increase the effectiveness of ESGP funding?						
Substantially	ო	19.4%	4	63.4%	7	34.8%
Somewhat	10	80.6%	υ	36.6%	13	65.2%
Not at all	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
TOTAL RESPONSES	13	100,0%	7	100.0%	20	100.0%
Source: Grantee Survey, Question 34 (weighted Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample:	l data). ⊨=234.					
Martin - Canada Marta						

Notes: (1) State grantees excluded. (2) Second question asked only of grantees receiving waivers.

	Homelessness Media	Prevention
For HP Providers:] How many ave been able to retain their current ousing or find other permanent housing?		
ndividuals in past year	55	Q
amilies in past year	62	8
lients in previous years	42	9.
amilies in previous years	54	4
sponses	Homelessnes Number	s Prevention Percent
these clients have other unmet ds?	-	
	391	92.7%
	31	7.4%
AL RESPONSES	422	100.0%

Items 172-173

Responses	State/ Number	Ferritory Percent	Metropo	litan City Percent	Urban Number	County Percent	All Resp. Number	Percent
Does your agency allocate ESG funds for HP activities?								
Yes	45	82.6%	119	54.2%	66	61.6%	231	60.4%
No	10	17.4%	101	45.8%	41	38.4%	151	39.6%
TOTAL RESPONSES	55	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.0%
Individuals who retained housing as a result of homelessness prevention measur	es:							
Total.	8723	!	7008		1060	1	16790	1
Mean per grantee	432	1	210		20	1	235	-
Families who reatained housing as a result of homelessness prevention measure	es:							
Total	6374		7940		3016		17330	1
Mean per grantee	297	l	128		62	!	142	1
Source: Grantee Survey, Question 36 (weighte Grantee Universe=382, Survey Samp	ed data). ole-234.							
Missing Cases: None.								
Notes: (1) Means calculated for grantees report	orting some nu	mber assiste	ті ті					

51.5% 7.4% 1.1% 40.1% 100.0% Percent All Respondents 382 153 197 28 Number 1.3% Percent 40.4% 52.5% 5.9% 100.0% Urban County Research Question C.4: How successful have been the grantees' strategies to match the needs of their 107 43 56 ø Number homeless populations with available ESG Program services and Percent 39.9% 51.4% 8.1% 0.6% 100.0% Metropolitan City 113 220 88 18 Number Percent 40.3% 7.4% 2.7% 49.5% 100.0% State/Territory Source: Grantee Survey, Question 28 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234. 22 55 27 4 2 Number facilities? overall effectiveness in meeting How would grantee rank it's needs of the homeless? TOTAL RESPONSES Somewhat ineffective Somewhat effective Very ineffective Very effective Responses Item 174

A-84

Missing Cases: None.

		,	
	ì	5	
	٦		
	1	F	
	i	Q	Ľ
	4	h	ì

Percent 38.1% 38.3% 16.9% 2.5% 4.1% 1.1% All Respondents Number 111 111 49 2 2 e 35.0% 41.5% 20.5% 6.0% 5.0% Percent 2.7% Urban County 16 27 32 S Number 4 N Research Question C.4.a: What role has the ESG played in the development of these strategies? 37.2% 40.4% 16.4% 1.0% 3.9% %0.0 Percent Metropolitan City 65 20 29 2 ~ 0 Number Percent 48.4% 22.7% 12.4% 2.6% 3.1% 3.3% State/Territory 19 σ ŝ Number Can't run program without these funds ESG funds influenced your How has the availability of Allows better organization in Allows money for prevention Enhances program/services Allows us to deal with Low level of funding special populations restricts strategies funding sources Responses strategies?

Source: Grantee Survey, Question 29a (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.

%0.6

26

3.6%

3

10.0%

17

14.9%

9

Other

Missing Cases: 63 grantees.

 Base is grantees indicating some strategies have been more successful than others.
 Multiple responses possible. Notes:

Number         Percent           Affordable housing initiatives         2         7.3%         18         15.7%         15         33.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         18.6%         35         35.6%         35         18.6%         35         35.6%         35         35.6%         35         35.6%         35         35.6%         35         35.6%         35         36%<	Responses	State/Terr	itory	Metropoli	tan City	Urban	County	All Respo	ndents
Targeting of special populations         5         16.9%         30         25.8%         6         17.8%         43         22.5%           Affordable housing initiatives         2         7.3%         18         15.7%         15         33.6%         35         18.6%           Homelessness prevention services         2         8.0%         11         9.9%         4         9.6%         18         7.3%           Rent abatement programs/ efforts to keep people in apartments         2         5.0%         4         3.4%         8         191%         14         7.3%           Rehabilitation         0         0.0%         9         7.5%         2         4.5%         11         5.6%           Adding new beds         1         4.3%         2         2.1%         4         9.6%         11         5.6%           Mating new beds         1         4.3%         2         4.7%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Muteragency coordination         4         14         7.3%         5         2.9%         11         5.6%           Interagency coordination         1         4.3%         5         4.7%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Affordable housing initiatives         2         7.3%         18         15.7%         15         33.6%         35         18.6%           Homelessness prevention services         2         8.0%         11         9.9%         4         9.6%         18         9.5%           Rent abatement programs/ efforts to keep people in apartments         2         5.0%         4         3.4%         8         19.1%         14         7.3%           Rehabilitation         0         0.00%         9         7.5%         2         4.5%         11         5.6%           Adding new beds         1         4.3%         2         2.1%         4         9.1%         8         4.0%           Substance abuse counseling         0         0.00%         5         4.7%         0         0.00%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.00%         5         2.9%         7.5%         5         2.9%           Essential services/provision         1         3.3%         3         3.4%         0         0.00%         5         2.9%         2.9%         2.9%         2.9%         2.9%         2.9%         2.9%         2.9%         2.9%	Targeting of special populations	ß	16.9%	30	25.8%	æ	17.8%	43	22.5%
Homelessness prevention services         2         8.0%         11         9.9%         4         9.6%         18         9.5%           Rent abatement programs/ efforts to keep people in apartments         2         5.0%         4         3.4%         8         191%         14         7.3%           Rehabilitation         0         0.0%         9         7.5%         2         4.5%         11         5.6%           Adding new beds         1         4.3%         2         2.1%         4         9.1%         8         4.0%           Substance abuse counseling         0         0.0%         5         2.1%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         3.4%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagencies         1         3.3%         4         3.4%         0	Affordable housing initiatives	N	7.3%	18	15.7%	15	33.6%	35	18.6%
Rent abatement programs/ efforts to keep people in apartments         2         5.0%         4         3.4%         8         19.1%         14         7.3%           Rehabilitation         0         0.0%         9         7.5%         2         4.5%         11         5.6%           Adding new beds         1         4.3%         2         2.1%         4         9.1%         8         4.0%           Substance abuse counseling         0         0.0%         5         2.1%         4         9.1%         8         4.0%           Interagency coordination among public and private agencies         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%         5         2.9%         5         2.9%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         4.0%         5         2.9%         5         2.9%         5         2.9%         5         2.9%         5         5 <td>Homelessness prevention services</td> <td>~</td> <td>8.0%</td> <td>11</td> <td>6.6</td> <td>4</td> <td>9.6%</td> <td>18</td> <td>9.5%</td>	Homelessness prevention services	~	8.0%	11	6.6	4	9.6%	18	9.5%
Rehabilitation         0         0.0%         9         7.5%         2         4.5%         11         5.6%           Adding new beds         1         4.3%         2         2.1%         4         9.1%         8         4.0%           Substance abuse counseling         0         0.0%         5         4.7%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         2         4.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         2         4.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         3.3%         4         3.4%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         1         3.3%         4         3.4%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         1         3.3%         4         3.4%         0         0.0%         5         2.6%           Sestified services         1         <	Rent abatement programs/ efforts to keep people in apartments	Q	5.0%	4	3,4%	¢O	19.1%	14	7.3%
Adding new beds       1       4.3%       2       2.1%       4       9.1%       8       4.0%         Substance abuse counseling       0       0.0%       5       4.7%       0       0.0%       5       2.9%         Interagency coordination among public and private agencies       4       12.1%       0       0.0%       2       2.8%         Essential services/provision       1       3.3%       4       3.4%       0       0.0%       5       2.6%         Other <sup>(1)</sup> 14       46.8%       38       32.6%       10       23.1%       62       32.6*	Rehabilitation	0	0.0%	თ	7.5%	N	4.5%	11	5,6%
Substance abuse counseling         0         0.0%         5         4.7%         0         0.0%         5         2.9%           Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         2         4.0%         5         2.8%           among public and private agencies         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         2         2.8%           Essential services/provision         1         3.3%         4         3.4%         0         0.0%         5         2.6%           Other <sup>(1)</sup> 14         46.8%         38         32.6%         10         23.1%         62         32.6*	Adding new beds	٣	4.3%	N	2.1%	4	9.1%	Ð	4.0%
Interagency coordination         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         2         4.0%         5         2.8%           among public and private agencies         among public and private agencies         4         12.1%         0         0.0%         2         4.0%         5         2.8%           Essential services/provision         1         3.3%         4         3.4%         0         0.0%         5         2.6%           Other <sup>(1)</sup> 14         46.8%         38         32.6%         10         23.1%         62         32.6*	Substance abuse counseling	0	0.0%	<u>س</u>	4.7%	0	0.0%	Q	2.9%
Essential services/provision         1         3.3%         4         3.4%         0         0.0%         5         2.6%           of supportive services         14         46.8%         38         32.6%         10         23.1%         62         32.6%	Interagency coordination among public and private agencies	4	12.1%	0	0.0%	~	4.0%	വ	2.8%
Other <sup>(1)</sup> 14 46.8% 38 32.6% 10 23.1% 62 32.6%	Essential services/provision of supportive services	٣	3.3%	4	3.4%	0	0.0%	ດ	2.6%
	Other <sup>(1)</sup>	14	46.8%	38	32.6%	10	23.1%	62	32.6%

Missing Cases, None,

Notes (1) Includes a variety of specialized programs and services, such as job training, educational programs, assistance with rent and utilities, life skills training, health services. (2) Multiple responses possible

Aesponses     Homelessness Prevention     Essential Services     Conversion/Rehabilitation     Operations     All Re       Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number       Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number       Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number       Nerall effectiveness in meeting     248     57.4%     601     61.3%     298     73.5%     935     79.1%     2083       ery effective     163     37.8%     38.5%     105     26.0%     232     19.7%     878       omewhat effective     21     4.8%     2     0.2%     2     0.6%     2     0.5%     27	desponses     Homelessness Prevention     Essential Services     Conversion/Rehabilitation     Operations     All Respondents       for would you rate your program's     Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Number     Percent     Percent     Number     Percent     Percent     Percent     Percent     Percent     Number     Percent     Per	ionses Homelessness Prevention Es Number Percent Ni would you rate your program's all effectiveness in meeting eeds of the homeless?	sential Services mber Percer 601 61.3%	Conversion/H Number 298	Percent 73.5%	Opera	Percent	All Resp. Number	ondents
Cow would you rate your program's           verall effectiveness in meeting           be needs of the homeless?           Bet of the homeless?           ery effective         248         57.4%         601         61.3%         298         73.5%         935         79.1%         2083           ery effective         248         57.4%         601         61.3%         298         73.5%         935         79.1%         2083           ery effective         163         37.7         38.5%         105         26.0%         232         19.7%         878           comewhat effective         21         4.8%         2         0.2%         2         0.6%         2         0.6%         27         27	cow would you rate your program's verall effectiveness in meeting the needs of the homeless?           er needs of the homeless?         57.4%         601         61.3%         298         73.5%         935         79.1%         2083         69.4           er needs of the homeless?         248         57.4%         601         61.3%         298         73.5%         935         79.1%         2083         69.4           er needs of the homeless?         21         4.8%         51.4%         601         61.3%         298         73.5%         935         79.1%         2083         69.4           omewhat ineffective         21         4.8%         37.7         38.5%         105         26.0%         232         19.7%         878         29.3           omewhat ineffective         21         4.8%         37.7         38.5%         105         26.0%         232         19.7%         878         29.3           omewhat ineffective         21         4.8%         20         0.2%         2         0.5%         2         0.5%         2         2         0.5%         0.5%           orther lineffective         0         0.0%         10         0.0%         2         0.2%         2         0.5%	would you rate your program's Ill effectiveness in meeting eeds of the homeless?	601 61.3%	298	73.5%				Percent
ery effective         248         57.4%         601         61.3%         298         73.5%         935         79.1%         2083           omewhet effective         163         37.8%         377         38.5%         105         26.0%         232         19.7%         878           omewhet ineffective         21         4.8%         2         0.2%         2         0.6%         2         0.5%         27	ery effective         248         57,4%         601         61.3%         298         73.5%         935         79.1%         2083         69.4           omewhat effective         163         37.8%         37.7         38.5%         105         26.0%         232         19.7%         878         29.5%           omewhat ineffective         21         4.8%         2         0.2%         2         0.6%         232         19.7%         878         29.5%           ery ineffective         21         4.8%         2         0.2%         2         0.6%         232         19.7%         878         29.5%           ery ineffective         21         4.8%         2         0.2%         2         0.6%         232         19.7%         878         29.5%           ery ineffective         21         4.8%         2         0.2%         2         0.2%         27         0.9%           ery ineffective         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         1         1.1%         1.1%         1.4         0.5%           ortar         2         0.0%         100         0.0%         1         1         0.5%         27         0.9%		601 61.3%	298	73.5%				
ormewhat effective 163 37.8% 377 38.5% 105 26.0% 232 19.7% 878 comewhat ineffective 21 4.8% 2 0.2% 2 0.6% 2 0.5% 27	ormewhat effective         163         37.0%         37.7         38.5%         105         26.0%         232         19.7%         878         29.3%           omewhat ineffective         21         4.6%         2         0.2%         2         0.5%         232         19.7%         878         29.3%           sry ineffective         21         4.6%         2         0.2%         2         0.5%         27         0.5%           or vineffective         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         14         1.1%         14         0.5%           OTAL RESPONSES         432         100%         980         100%         405         100%         14         0.5%           Ducce: Provider Phone Survey, Question 36 (weighted data).         7         00%         100%         100%         100%         100%         3002         100%	affective 248 57.4%				935	79.1%	2083	69.4%
omewhat ineffective 21 4.8% 2 0.2% 2 0.6% 2 0.2% 27	omewhat ineffective         21         4.8%         2         0.2%         2         0.6%         2         0.2%         27         0.9           ary ineffective         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         14         1.1%         14         0.59           OTAL RESPONSES         4.32         100%         980         100%         405         100%         148         0.69           Durce: Provider Phone Survey, Question 36 (weighted data).         980         100%         405         100%         1183         100%         3002         1009	what effective 163 37.8%	377 38,5%	105	26.0%	232	19.7%	878	29.3%
	ary ineffective         0         0.0%         0         0.0%         14         1.1%         14         0.59           OTAL RESPONSES         432         100%         980         100%         405         100%         1183         100%         3002         1009           Purvider Phone Survey, Question 36 (weighted data).         Provider Universe=3000-3500 (estimated; Survey Sample=551.         2005         1005         105         1005         1005         1005         1009 <td>what ineffective 21 4.8%</td> <td>2 0.2%</td> <td>5</td> <td>0.6%</td> <td>8</td> <td>0.2%</td> <td>27</td> <td>0.9%</td>	what ineffective 21 4.8%	2 0.2%	5	0.6%	8	0.2%	27	0.9%
ary ineffective 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 0 0.0% 14 1.1% 14	DTAL RESPONSES         4.32         1.00%         980         1.00%         4.05         1.00%         1.183         1.00%         3002         1.00%           Durce:         Provider Phone Survey, Question 36 (weighted data).         Provider Universe = 3000 – 3500 (estimated; Survey Sample = 651.         1.00% <td>neffective 0 0.0%</td> <td>0 0.0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.0%</td> <td>14</td> <td>1.1%</td> <td>14</td> <td>0.5%</td>	neffective 0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0.0%	14	1.1%	14	0.5%
OTAL RESPONSES 432 100% 980 100% 405 100% 1183 100% 3002	ource: Provider Phone Survey, Question 36 (weighted data). Provider Universe=3000–3500 (estimated; Survey Sample=651.	L RESPONSES 432 100%	980 100%	405	100%	1183	100%	3002	100%

Pire to receiving ESG funding, were you offering any of the ESG-supported programs or services to the homeless?         731         78-1%         76-9         78-9%         28-5%         717         75-8%         218-2         77-3%           Yea         87         20-9%         76-97         76-9%         28-67         76-9%         28-75%         218-2         77-3%         21-3%         21-3%         21-3%         24-75%         24-8         24-2%         63-0         2-3.7%           No         87         20-0%         96-2         100.0%         392         100.0%         102-0         100.0%         27-8%         630         2-3.7%           How would provider rate effectiveness         418         100.0%         392         100.0%         392         100.0%         27-9%         630         2-3.7%           Yea effectiveness         280         78-3%         183         73-9%         1102-0         100.0%         27-9%         21-6%         24-5%         28-6%         28-6%         28-6%         28-6%         28-6%         28-6%         28-6%         28-5%         100.0%         21-5%         28-6%         28-5%         28-6%         28-5%         28-6%         28-5%         28-6%         28-5%         28-5%	Prior for secerving ESG funding, were proundering any of the ESG-supported programs or services to the homeleas?         731         70.1%         736         736         717         736         716         736         716         736         716         736         716         736         716         736         716         736         716         736         716         736         2162         7736         2162	Responses	Homelessnes	as Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/R Number	ehabilitation Percent	Opert	ations Percent	All Resp Number	Percent
Vas         331         70.1%         750         78.0%         205         75.3%         777         75.8%         2162         77.3%           No         87         20.0%         203         21.1%         97         24.7%         248         242%         636         22.7%           TOTAL RESPONSES         416         100.0%         203         21.1%         97         24.7%         248         242%         636         22.7%           TOTAL RESPONSES         416         100.0%         962         100.0%         362         100.0%         21.7%         24.7%         248         24.2%         636         22.7%           How would provider rate effectiveness         100.0%         362         100.0%         362         100.0%         27.9%         100.0%         27.9%         100.0%         27.9%         24.5%         64.5% </th <th>Vea         331         79.1%         759         75.3%         771         75.3%         771         75.3%         773         713         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         73.3%         73.3%         73.3%         700.0%         930         22.7%           How would provider rate effectiveness         In using ESG tradding to expand         280         79.3%         487         64.2%         183         73.3%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Way instituctive         1         0.0.0%         73.3%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%         53.3%           Somewhat ineffective         52         16.1%         23.3%         11         14%         55.2%         1345         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%</th> <th>Prior to receiving ESG funding, were you offering any of the ESG-supported programs or services to the homeless?</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>3</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Vea         331         79.1%         759         75.3%         771         75.3%         771         75.3%         773         713         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         773         73.3%         73.3%         73.3%         73.3%         700.0%         930         22.7%           How would provider rate effectiveness         In using ESG tradding to expand         280         79.3%         487         64.2%         183         73.3%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Way instituctive         1         0.0.0%         73.3%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%         53.3%           Somewhat ineffective         52         16.1%         23.3%         11         14%         55.2%         1345         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%         64.5%         53.3%	Prior to receiving ESG funding, were you offering any of the ESG-supported programs or services to the homeless?				3						
No         87         20.9%         203         21.1%         87         24.2%         630         22.7%           TOTAL RESPONSES         418         100.0%         962         100.0%         392         100.0%         1026         100.0%         23.7%           How would provider rate effectiveness         418         100.0%         487         64.2%         382         100.0%         1326         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         100.0%         27.3%         04.5%         05.5%         04.5%         04.5%         <	No         87         20.9%         203         21.1%         87         24.7%         24.8%         24.3%         639         22.7%           TOTAL RESPONSES         418         100.0%         962         100.0%         392         100.0%         24.3%         639         22.7%           How would provider rate effectiveness in using ESG funding to expand services to the homeless?         418         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         04.5%           New would provider rate effectiveness         22         103.0%         323         103.0%         325         100.0%         279.8         100.0%           Somewhat ineffective         22         133         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         04.5%           Somewhat ineffective         12         3.1%         23         34.1%         62         24.9%         236         04.5%           Somewhat ineffective         12         3.1%         133         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         04.5%           Somewhat ineffective         12         3.1%         23         33.3%         641         31.7%           Somewhat ineffective         1         1.4%         2         0.0%         4.4	Yes	331	79.1%	759	78.9%	295	75.3%	777	75.8%	2162	77.3%
TOTAL RESPONSES         418         100.0%         962         100.0%         392         100.0%         1026         100.0%         2798         100.0%           How would provider rate effectiveness in using ESG funding to expand services to the homeless?         280         78.9%         487         64.2%         183         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         04.5%           Very effective         52         16.1%         280         78.9%         681         31.7%           Somewhat effective         52         16.1%         259         34.1%         62         24.9%         288         38.3%         661         31.7%           Somewhat effective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         7.3.9%         47         2.3%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         62         24.9%         55.2%         1345         04.5%           Very ineffective         12         3.71%         62         24.9%         28         36.1%         7.3%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         7.4%         2.4%         2.4%         2.4%         2.4%         2.4%	TOTAL RESPONSES         418         100.0%         382         100.0%         1026         100.0%         2798         100.0%           How would provider rate effectiveness in using ESG funding to expand services to the homeless?         487         64.2%         183         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Vary effective         220         79.9%         487         64.2%         183         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Vary effective         220         79.9%         487         64.2%         183         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Somewhat effective         22         16.1%         259         34.1%         62         24.9%         283         38.3%         061         31.7%           Somewhat ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.5%         0.6%         30         1.5%           Vary ineffective         12         3.7%         100.0%         288         100.0%         273         30         1.5%           Vary ineffective         12         0.4%         28         0.0%         24         47         2.3%	No	87	20.9%	203	21.1%	87	24.7%	248	24.2%	636	22.7%
How would provider rate effectiveness in using ESG funding to expand services to the homeless?         280         79.9%         487         64.2%         183         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Very effective         52         16.1%         259         34.1%         62         24.9%         288         38.3%         661         31.7%           Somewhat effective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         62         24.9%         288         38.3%         661         31.7%           Very ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         47         2.3%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         75         100.0%         74         5.9%         73.9%         73.9%         73.9%         73.9%         73.9%         73.9%         73.4%         <	How would provider rate effectiveness           in using ESG funding to expand           in using ESG funding to expand         280         79.9%         487         64.2%         183         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Very effective         52         16.1%         259         34.1%         62         24.9%         33.3%         661         31.7%           Very effective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         82         24.9%         288         38.3%         661         31.7%           Somewhat ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         61         31.7%         2.3%         61         31.7%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         61         31.7%         2.3%         61         31.7%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         61         31.7%         2.3%         61         31.7%           Very ineffective         1         0	TOTAL RESPONSES	418	100.0%	962	100.0%	392	100.0%	1026	100.0%	2798	100.0%
Very effective         260         79.9%         487         64.2%         183         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Somewhat effective         52         16.1%         259         34.1%         62         24.9%         288         33.3%         661         31.7%           Somewhat effective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         23         100.0%         24         44         5.9%         7.3%         7.3%           TOTAL RESPONSES         326         100.0%         750         100.0%         248         100.0%         2064         100.0%         2.3%	Very effective         260         79.9%         487         64.2%         183         73.9%         415         55.2%         1345         64.5%           Somewhat effective         52         16.1%         259         34.1%         62         24.9%         288         38.3%         661         31.7%           Somewhat ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         0         0.0%         44         5.9%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         0         0.0%         44         5.9%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         74         5.9%         47         2.3%           Very ineffective         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         752         100.0%         47         2.3%           Source: Frovider Phone Survey, Question 41 (weighted data).         750         100.0%         248         100.0%         2064         100.0%           Prov	How would provider rate effectiveness in using ESG funding to expand services to the homeless?										
Somewhat effective         52         16.1%         259         34.1%         62         24.9%         288         38.3%         661         31.7%           Somewhat ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         0         0.5%         30         1.5%           Very Ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         0         0.0%         44         5.9%         47         2.3%           TOTAL RESPONSES         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         752         100.0%         100.0%	Somewhat effective         52         16.1%         259         34.1%         62         24.9%         288         38.3%         661         31.7%           Somewhat ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         7         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         7         4         5.9%         47         2.3%           Voral. RESPONSES         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         752         100.0%         2.3%           Source: Provider Phone Survey. Question 41 (weighted data).         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         752         100.0%         2084         100.0%	Very effective	260	79.9%	487	64.2%	183	73.9%	415	55.2%	1345	64.5%
Somewhat ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very Ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         0         0.0%         44         5.9%         47         2.3%           TOTAL RESPONSES         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         752         100.0%         100.0%	Somewhat ineffective         12         3.7%         11         1.4%         3         1.2%         5         0.6%         30         1.5%           Very Ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         0         0.0%         44         5.9%         47         2.3%           Very Ineffective         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         752         100.0%         2064         100.0%           Source:         Provider Phone Survey, Question 41 (weighted data).         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         752         100.0%         2084         100.0%	Somewhat effective	52	16.1%	259	34.1%	62	24.9%	288	38.3%	661	31.7%
Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         0         0.0%         44         5.9%         47         2.3%           TOTAL RESPONSES         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         2084         100.0%	Very ineffective         1         0.4%         2         0.3%         0         0.0%         44         5.9%         47         2.3%           TOTAL RESPONSES         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         275         100.0%         2084         100.0%           Source: Provider Phone Survey. Question 41 (weighted data).         Provider Phone Survey. Question 16 providers from first question. 16 providers from second question.         248         100.0%         752         100.0%         2084         100.0%	Somewhat ineffective	12	3.7%	11	1.4%	0	1.2%	ŝ	0.6%	30	1.5%
TOTAL RESPONSES 326 100.0% 759 100.0% 248 100.0% 752 100.0% 2084 100.0%	TOTAL RESPONSES         326         100.0%         759         100.0%         248         100.0%         752         100.0%         2084         100.0%           Source:         Provider Phone Survey, Question 41 (weighted data).         Provider Universe=3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample-651.         American Cases: 40 providers from first question. 16 providers from second question.         Image: Cases: 40 providers from first question. 16 providers from second question.         Image: Cases: 40 providers from first question.         Image:	Very ineffective	-	0.4%	8	0.3%	0	%0.0	44	5.9%	47	2.3%
	Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 41 (weighted data). Provider Universe=3000–3500 (estimated), Survey Sample –651. Missing Cases: 49 providers from first question. 16 providers from second question.	TOTAL RESPONSES	326	100.0%	759	100.0%	248	100.0%	752	100.0%	2084	100.0%
Motec: (1) Only resonantiant areas to the first question were asked the second.		(2) Columns may not total due to	rounding.									

tem 175

	to address hor	nelessness?		liad sacinos	ß			
Responses	State/ Number	erritory Percent	Metropol Number	itan/City Percent	Urban Number	County Percent	All Resp Number	Percent
Has there been any change in the level of private donations or voluntary support as a result of the ESG?								
Yes, increase	29	54.4%	92	41.6%	43	40.5%	165	43.1%
Yes, decrease	0	0.0%	8	0.7%	-	1.3%	ø	0.8%
No	21	38.3%	110	49.9%	49	46.0%	180	47.1%
Don't know	4	7.3%	17	7.8%	13	12.2%	34	9.0%
<b>TOTAL RESPONSES</b>	54	100.0%	220	100.0%	107	100.0%	382	100.0%
Source: Grantee Survey, Question 35 (wei Grantee Universe=382, Survey S	ghted data). ample=234.							
Missing Cases: None.								
Votes: (1) columns may not total due to ro	ounding.							

Items 182-183

; -¢ Recentry Oligetic

Mean          54.5          82.8          70.5            Mean          28          28.8          70.5          30         55         55         44.6%         137         35.5%         55         55         55         55         55         55         55         5	Responses	Homelessnes	s Prevention Percent	Essential Number	Services Percent	Conversion/ Number	Rehabilitation	Opera	ations Percent	All Resp. Number	ondents
Mean           54.5          92.6          72.6          70.5            Median           28          92.6          70.5          30         30         30         30         30         30         30         30         30         30         30         30         30         30	Length of stay (in nights):										
Median          28          28          30	Mean			54.5	1	92.6	-	72.6	-	70.5	
Extent of client problems         186         4.2.3%         467         46.9%         121         29.5%         531         44.9%         1304         43.1%           Availability of permanent housing         135         30.8%         46.9%         151         36.8%         566         47.8%         1393         42.7%           Availability of permanent housing         135         30.8%         46.9%         151         36.8%         566         47.8%         1197         39.5%           Cooperation of client         100         22.9%         36.5%         203         49.4%         528         44.6%         1197         39.5%           Shelter time limit expires         71         16.3%         205         20.6%         92         22.5%         286         21.9%         647         21.4%           Financial stability         114         26.1%         205         20.9%         86         27.9%         286         21.4%         647         21.4%           Length of time to get entitlements         14         3.3%         20         2.9%         286         2.1%         647         21.4%           Safety of client         14         3.5%         286         8.6%         127         10.	Median	1	1	28	!	40	1	30	1	30	
Availability of permanent housing         135         30.6%         440         41.2%         151         36.8%         566         47.8%         1293         42.7%           Cooperation of client         100         22.9%         365         36.7%         203         49.4%         556         47.8%         1197         39.5%           Cooperation of client         100         22.9%         365         36.7%         203         49.4%         528         44.6%         1197         39.5%           Shelter time limit explres         71         16.3%         206         20.6%         92         22.5%         238         24.1%         655         21.6%           Financial stability         114         26.1%         209         21.0%         86         20.9%         238         20.1%         647         21.4%           Length of time to get entitlements         114         26.1%         74         7.4%         35         8.6%         127         10.7%         280         3.9%           Kine to get entitlements         14         3.3%         78         7.4%         74         7.4%         286         2.4.1%         6.7%         286         2.4%           Satety of client         1	Extent of client problems	186	42.3%	467	46.9%	121	29.5%	531	44.8%	1304	43.1%
Cooperation of client         100         22.9%         365         36.7%         203         49.4%         528         44.6%         1197         39.5%           Shelter time limit expires         71         16.3%         205         20.6%         92         22.5%         286         24.1%         655         21.6%           Financial stability         114         26.1%         205         20.6%         92         22.5%         238         20.1%         647         21.4%           Financial stability         114         26.1%         209         21.0%         86         20.9%         238         20.1%         647         21.4%           Length of time to get entitlements         45         10.2%         74         7.4%         35         8.6%         127         10.7%         280         9.3%           Safety of client         14         3.3%         122         1.2%         38         9.2%         184         15.5%         280         283           Avaitability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         27.8%         28         2.0%         192         6.4%           Avaitability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         2.8	Availability of permanent housing	135	30.8%	440	44.2%	151	36.8%	566	47.8%	1293	42.7%
Shelter time limit expires         71         16.3%         205         20.6%         92         22.5%         286         24.1%         655         21.6%           Financial stability         114         26.1%         209         21.0%         86         20.9%         238         20.1%         647         21.4%           Length of time to get entitlements         45         10.2%         74         7.4%         35         8.6%         127         10.7%         280         9.3%           Safety of client         14         3.3%         7.1         7.4%         38         9.2%         184         15.5%         248         8.2%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         20         4.8%         50%         192         6.4%         5.1%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         20         4.8%         155         5.1%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         20         4.8%         155         5.1%           None/no time limit         13         3.0%         16         3.9%         56         4.7%         155         5.1% <td>Cooperation of client</td> <td>100</td> <td>22.9%</td> <td>365</td> <td>36.7%</td> <td>203</td> <td>49.4%</td> <td>528</td> <td>44.6%</td> <td>1197</td> <td>39.5%</td>	Cooperation of client	100	22.9%	365	36.7%	203	49.4%	528	44.6%	1197	39.5%
Financial stability         114         26.1%         209         21.0%         86         20.9%         238         20.1%         647         21.4%           Length of time to get entitlements         45         10.2%         74         7.4%         35         8.6%         127         10.7%         280         9.3%           Safety of client         14         3.3%         12         1.2%         38         8.2%         184         15.5%         280         9.3%           Avaiability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         78         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         6.4%           Avaiability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         6.4%           Avaiability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         5.1%           Avaiability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         59         4.5%         5.4         4.5%         5.1%           None/no time to get Section 8         13         3.0%         19         4.5%         56 <td>Shelter time limit expires</td> <td>7</td> <td>16.3%</td> <td>205</td> <td>20.6%</td> <td>92</td> <td>22.5%</td> <td>286</td> <td>24.1%</td> <td>655</td> <td>21.6%</td>	Shelter time limit expires	7	16.3%	205	20.6%	92	22.5%	286	24.1%	655	21.6%
Length of time to get entitlements         45         10.2%         74         7.4%         35         8.6%         127         10.7%         280         9.3%           Safety of client         14         3.3%         12         1.2%         38         9.2%         184         15.5%         248         8.2%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         78         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         6.4%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         78         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         6.4%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         6.4%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         7.8%         20         4.5%         51         6.4%           None/no time to get Section 8         44         10.1%         41         4.1%         16         4.5%         155         5.1%           None/no time limit         13         3.0%         39         9.0%         14         127         4.2%	Financial stability	114	26.1%	209	21.0%	86	20.9%	238	20.1%	647	21.4%
Safety of client         14         3.3%         12         1.2%         38         9.2%         184         15.5%         248         8.2%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         78         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         6.4%           Availability of staff/services/funding         36         8.2%         78         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         6.4%           Length of time to get Section 8         44         10.1%         41         4.1%         16         3.9%         54         4.5%         155         5.1%           None/no time limit         13         3.0%         38         3.9%         19         4.5%         127         4.2%           Other         64         14.6%         185         18.6%         37         9.0%         143         127         4.2%	Length of time to get entitlements	45	10.2%	74	7.4%	35	8.6%	127	10.7%	280	9.3%
Availability of statifiservices/funding         36         8.2%         78         7.8%         20         4.8%         59         5.0%         192         6.4%           Length of time to get Section 8         44         10.1%         41         4.1%         16         3.9%         54         4.5%         155         5.1%           None/no time limit         13         3.0%         39         3.9%         19         4.5%         56         4.7%         127         4.2%           Other         64         14.6%         185         18.6%         37         9.0%         143         12.1%         429         14.2%	Safety of client	14	3.3%	12	1.2%	38	9.2%	184	15.5%	248	8.2%
Length of time to get Section 8         44         10.1%         41         4.1%         16         3.9%         54         4.5%         155         5.1%           None/no time limit         13         3.0%         39         3.9%         19         4.5%         56         4.7%         127         4.2%           Other         64         14.6%         185         18.6%         37         9.0%         143         12.1%         429         14.2%	Availability of staff/services/funding	36	8.2%	78	7.8%	20	4.8%	59	5.0%	192	6.4%
None/no time limit         13         3.0%         39         3.9%         19         4.5%         56         4.7%         127         4.2%           Other         64         14.6%         185         18.6%         37         9.0%         143         12.1%         429         14.2%	Length of time to get Section 8	44	10.1%	41	4.1%	16	3.9%	54	4.5%	155	5.1%
Other 64 14.6% 185 18.6% 37 9.0% 143 12.1% 429 14.2%	None/no time limit	13	3.0%	39	3.9%	19	4.5%	56	4.7%	127	4.2%
	Other	64	14.6%	185	18.6%	37	%0.6	143	12.1%	429	14.2%
	Provider Universe = 3000	)-3500 (estimate	d), Survey San	nple = 651.							
Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.	Missing cases: 15 providers.										

A-90

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible. (2) Length of stay not asked of homelessness prevention stratum.

Ľ	
α	
T	
2	Ì
α	
Ű	ſ,
Ŷ	
ā	Ī
-	2

Research Questions C.7.b., C.7.c.: What methods have been employed for tracking clients after they leave ESGP shelters?

Responses	Homelessne Number	ess Prevention Percent	Essentia Number	l Services Percent	Conversion/I Number	Rehabilitation Percent	Opera Number	tions Percent	All Respo Number	ondents Percent
Does your program follow- on clients who leave?	dn-					,				
Yes	328	75.1%	734	75. <b>6</b> %	236	57.7%	764	64.9%	2062	68.9%
No	109	24.9%	237	24.4%	173	42.3%	413	35.1%	932	31.1%
TOTAL RESPONSES	437	100.0%	970	100.0%	409	100.0%	1177	100.0%	2994	100.0%
номз										
Periodic telephone calls	181	55.0%	435	59.3%	152	64.3%	425	55.6%	1193	57.8%
In – person visits	140	42.7%	359	48.9%	95	40.3%	390	51.0%	984	47.7%
During clients' return visits	108	32.9%	329	44.8%	122	51.7%	378	49.5%	937	45.4%
Postcards/mailings	141	42.8%	232	31.6%	52	22.1%	202	26.5%	627	30.4%
Other contacts	42	12.9%	81	11.1%	98	15.1%	101	13.2%	260	12.6%
Word of mouth	28	8.5%	88	12.0%	48	20.2%	56	7.4%	220	10.7%
Group meetings	24	7.3%	53	7.3%	. 27	11.5%	74	.9.7%	179	8.7%
Other	0	0.0%	41	5.6%	ω	2.7%	19	2.5%	99	3.2%

Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 23 (weighted data). Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651.

Missing cases: 7 providers.

Notes: (1) Second question asked only of providers conducting follow-up. (2) Multiple response possible for methods of follow-up.

Responses	State/Te	erritory	Metropo	litan Citv	Urban	County	All Reen	ondante
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
How have the program changes affected your administration of the ESG?								
Changes have had no effect	ø	6.1%	82	37.2%	31	28.5%	116	30.3%
Environmental review is restricting	38	68.3%	40	18.0%	34	31.8%	111	29.1%
Raising cap on services has been positive	22	40.3%	59	26.8%	27	25.2%	108	28.3%
Adding HP has been positive	16	28.2%	34	15.6%	21	19.7%	7	18.6%
Changes have given us more flexibility	7	13.3%	17	7.8%	10	8.9%	34	8.9%
Increased paperwork is a problem	4	7.6%	13	5.8%	e	2.4%	19	5.1%
Dislike 180-day restriction on HP	ß	9.4%	0	%0.0	e	2.4%	80	2.0%
Other	Ŋ	2.7%	17	7.6%	9	5.6%	24	6.3%
Source: Grantee Survey, Question 38 (weighted da Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=2	ata). 234.		_		_		_	
Missing Casse: 2 grantage								
Missing Cases: 2 graniees.								

A-92

Notes (1) Multiple responses possible.

Items \$7- 90

Department of Health and Human Services,	
M	
tionship between the ESG Program and programs of the Department of Labor, F	her Faderal homeless programs?
s the rela	ell as oth
What is	AS W
Research Question C.9:	

Responses	Homelessness Prevention Number Percent	n Essential Se Number F	Percent	Conversion/Rehabilitatio Number Percent	Nu	Operations mber Perce	N N	ul Respon Imber	Percent
Providers ruceiving funding from:									
Jepartment of Housing & Urban Development	311 70.9%	759	76.3%	302 73.6%		972 82.1	%	2344	77.4%
CDBG	58 13.2%	328	33.0%	128 31.29		306 25.8	%	820	27.1%
ESG from another grantee <sup>(e)</sup>	73 16.6%	163	16.4%	54 13.29	.0	251 21.2	%	541	17.9%
Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation	2 0.5%	19	1.9%	9 2.19		6 0.5	%	35	1.2%
SHDP	7 1.6%	23	2.3%	21 5.0%	-0	57 4.8	%	107	3.5%
SAFAH	6 1.4%	16	1.6%	15 3.6%		19 1.6	%	56	1.8%
ederal Emergency Management Agency Emergency Food and Shelter Program	244 55.7%	642	64.5%	223 54.2%		796 67,2	%	1905	62.9%
Department of Health & Human Services	89 20.2%	181	19.2%	66 16.0%		268 22.6	*	613	20.3%
Community Mental Heatth Services for the Homeless	2 0.5%	F	1.1%	0 0.0%	_	33 2.8	*	46	1.5%
Emergency Community Services Homeless Grant Program	15 3.5%	12	1.2%	12 2.9%		19 1.6	8	58	1.9%
Health Care for the Homeless	3 0.6%	25	2.5%	9 2.1%		57 4.9	*	94	3.1%
Jepartment of Veterans Affairs	5 1.2%	9	0.3%	2 0.5%		7 0.6	*	18	0.6%
Homeless Chronically Mentally III Veterans Program	5 1.2%	0	0.0%	2 0.5%		7 0.65	*	15	0.5%
Domiciliary Care for Homeless Veterans	5 1.2%	6	0.3%	2 0.5%		7 0.69	*	18	0.6%
Department of Education	14 3.1%	46	4.6%	13 3.1%		38 3.29	*	Ħ	3.7%
Adult Education for the Homeless	1 0.3%	11	1.1%	0.0%		21 1.79	8	32	1.1%
Education for Homeless Children and Youth	2 0.5%	53	2.2%	0.0%		17 1.49		41	1.3%
tepartment of Labor	10 2.3%	8	2.3%	14 3.4%		8 0.7%	9	22	1.8%
Homeless Veterans Reintegration Program	0.0%	0	0.0%	2 0.5%		60.0	9	~	0.1%
int Trainington the Homeless	1 0.3%	F	1.1%	0 0.0%		0 0.0%		12	0.4%

Source: Provider Phone Survey, Questions 9−12 (weighted data). Provider Universe≕ 3000−3500 (estimated), Survey Sample=651.

Missing Cases: 55-71 providers.

Notes: (1) Muttiple responses possible. (a) ESG funding from a grantee other than the one through which the provider was sampled for the study.

ltems 187-190 (cont.)

Responses	State/1	erritory	Metropoli	tan/City	Urban	County	All Resp	ondents	
	Number	recent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Number and percent of grantees reporting that they receive funds from									
Department of Housing & Urban Development (*)	47	85.5%	145	66.1%	68	64.0%	201	68.3%	
CDBG	21	38.4%	128	58.4%	54	50.2%	203	53.2%	
Section 8 moderate rehabilitation	8	4.2%	22	%6'6	4	3.5%	28	7.3%	
Supportive housing demonstration program	14	24.7%	11	%6'.2	7	6.6%	38	8.8%	
Supplemental assistance for facilities to assist the homeless	12	21.2%	13	5.8%	ø	5.2%	30	7.8%	
Department of Health & Human Services	30	54.7%	14	6.5%	4	3.6%	48	12.6%	
Community mental health services for the homeless block grant	4	7.1%	e	1.6%	-	1.4%	0	2.3%	
Emergency community services homeless grant program	25	44.8%	0	4.0%	-	1.3%	35	9.2%	
Health care for the homeless	-	2.3%	8	3.7%	0	%0.0	8	2.5%	
Department of Veteran's Affairs	0	%0.0	•	%0.0	0	%0'0	0	%0'0	
Homeless chronically mentally ill veteran's programs	0	%0.0	0	%0'0	0	%0'0	•	%0.0	
Domiciliary care for homeless veterans	0	%0.0	0	%0'0	0	%0.0	0	%0.0	
Department of Education	0	%0.0	•	0.4%	0	%0.0	-	0.2%	
Adult education for the homeless	0	%0.0	-	0.4%	0	%0.0	-	0.2%	
Education for homeless children and youth	0	%0.0	-	0.4%	0	%0.0	-	0.2%	
Department of Labor	0	%0.0	7	3.2%	-	1.0%	80	2.1%	
Homeless veteran's reintegration projects	0	0.0%	N	0.8%	0	%0.0	8	0.4%	
Job training for the homeless	0	%0.0	4	1.6%	-	1.0%	5	1.2%	
Federal Emergency Management Agency	0	%0.0	16	7.4%	14	13.2%	30	7.9%	
Emergency food and shelter program	0	%0.0	6	4.0%	12	10.9%	20	5.3%	

Source: Grantee Survey, Question 9.b (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.

Emergency food and shelter program

Missing Cases: None.

Notes: (a) In addition to ESG.
Item 191

Research Question C.9.a: To what extent do other federal programs overlap or duplicate the ESG?

Responses	State/T Number	erritory Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
considerable overlap	3	5.7%	8	5.4%	3	3.9%	13	5.1%
tome overlap	19	40.9%	74	51.1%	21	29.3%	114	43.4%
lo Overlap	24	51.3%	63	43.5%	46	65.2%	133	50.7%
ion't Know	-	2.1%	0	0.0%	-	1.6%	0	0.8%
OTAL RESPONSES	47	100.0%	145	100.0%	20	100.0%	263	100.0%

Missing Cases: None.

Notes: (1) Grantees reporting only one funding source were not asked this question. (2) Columns may not total due to rounding.

em 191 (cont.)

......

Responses	Homelessner	Percent	Rumber	Percent	Corversion/F Number	Percent	Number	Percent	All Pro Number	Percent	Number	Percent
How would provider/recipient rate internal coordination of funding sources?												
Very effective	307	82.1%	755	80.6%	309	82.3%	216	85.9%	2375	83.2%	9	85.7%
Somewhat effective	64	17.3%	174	19.1%	63	16.9%	158	13.9%	464	16.5%	0	0.0%
Very ineffective	2	0.0%	53	0.2%	9	0.9%	6	0.3%		0.4%	-	14.3%
TOTAL RESPONSES	373	100.0%	931	100.0%	376	100.0%	1138	100.0%	2850	100.0%	2	100.0%
Source: Provider Phone Survey, Qi Provider Universe=3000-	uestion 13 (weight ·3500 (estimated),	ted data); Recipii Survey Sample⊧	ent Survey, Qu =651.	estion 10,								
Missing Cases: 6 providers, 5 recipi	ients.											
Notes: (1) Ouestion asked on	the of respondents	with multiple fun	ding sources.									

A-96

Item 192

Research Question C.9.b. In what ways could the ESG be better coordinated with other homeless funding or services?

Make into big homeless block grant   13   22.8%   40   18.2%   14   12.8%   66     Coordinate/centralize different deadlines &   6   11.5%   31   14.2%   14   13.4%   52     Coordinate/centralize different deadlines &   6   11.5%   31   14.2%   14   18.4%   52     Requirements/simplify application process   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     Okay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0%   2   0.7%   2   2.0%   4     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0%   2   1.0%   0   0.0%   2     Other   11   19.3%   32   19.3%   31   28.9%   84   2	Make into big homeless block grant1322.8%4018.2%14Coordinate/centralize different deadlines & requirements/simplify application process611.5%3114.2%14Coordinate/centralize different deadlines & requirements/simplify application process611.5%3114.2%14Coordinate/centralize different deadlines & centiments/simplify application process1425.4%208.9%10Okay as is/satisfied1425.4%208.9%10220202020Climinate match requirements00.0%21.0%222222Combine all HUD sources of funding00.0%21.0%222222Increase dissemination of information00.0%21.0%33122Other712.7%3817.3%2111	onses	State/Ter Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	n County Percent	All Resp Number	Percen
Wake into big homeless block grant   13   22.8%   40   18.2%   14   12.8%   66     Coordinate/centralize different deadlines & countements/simplify application process   6   11.5%   31   14.2%   14   13.4%   52     Coordinate/centralize different deadlines & countements/simplify application process   14   28.9%   10   9.2%   43     Chay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     Chay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     Chay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0,0%   2   0.7%   2   2.0%   4     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0,0%   2   1.0%   0   0.0,0%   2     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0,0%   2   1.0%   2   2.0%   4     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0,0%   2   1.0%   2   2.0%   4	Make into big homeless block grant   13   22.8%   40   18.2%   14     Coordinate/Centralize different deadlines & equirements/simplify application process   6   11.5%   31   14.2%   14     Coordinate/Centralize different deadlines & equirements/simplify application process   6   11.5%   31   14.2%   14     Coordinate/Centralize different deadlines & equirements/simplify application process   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10     Okay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8   3.8%   5   5     Orabine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0%   2   0.7%   2   2   10%     Oncrease dissemination of information   0   0.0%   2   1.0%   0   0     Other   11   19.3%   38   17.3%   21   1   2   1   2   1   2   1   2   1   2   1   1   2   1   2   1   2   1   2   1   1   2   1   1   2   1   2   1   2   1   1   2 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>									
Coordinate/centralize different deadlines & 6   11.5%   31   14.2%   14   18.4%   52     equirements/simplify application process   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     Okay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     Okay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     Climinate match requirements   0   0.0%   8   3.8%   5   4.5%   13     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0%   2   0.7%   2   2.0%   4     Anordocomment   0   0.0%   2   1.0%   0   0.0%   2     Other   11   19.3%   42   19.3%   31   28.9%   65   1	Coordinate/centralize different deadlines &   6   11.5%   31   14.2%   14     equirements/simplify application process   7   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10     Okay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10     Okay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10     Okay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   5     Eliminate match requirements   0   0.0%   8   3.8%   5     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0%   2   1.0%   2   2     Increase dissemination of information   11   19.3%   42   19.3%   31   2     One/no comment   7   12.7%   38   17.3%   21   1   1	into big homeless block grant	13	22.8%	40	18.2%	41	12.8%	99	17.4%
kay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10   9.2%   43     iliminate match requirements   0   0.0%   8   3.8%   5   4.5%   13     combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0%   2   0.7%   2   2.0%   4     combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0%   2   1.0%   2   2.0%   4     crease dissemination of information   0   0.0%   2   1.0%   0   0.0%   2     ther   11   19.3%   31   28.9%   84   2   5	Nay as is/satisfied   14   25.4%   20   8.9%   10     Ilminate match requirements   0   0.0%   8   3.8%   5     Combine all HUD sources of funding   0   0.0%   2   0.7%   2     Acrease dissemination of information   0   0.0%   2   1.0%   0   0     Acrease dissemination of information   11   19.3%   42   19.3%   31   2     One/no comment   7   12.7%   38   17.3%   21   1	inate/centralize different deadlines & aments/simplify application process	Q	11.5%	31	14.2%	4	13.4%	22	13.6%
Iminate match requirements     0     0.0%     8     3.8%     5     4.5%     13       combine all HUD sources of funding     0     0.0%     2     0.7%     2     2.0%     4       combine all HUD sources of funding     0     0.0%     2     0.7%     2     2.0%     4       orease dissemination of information     0     0.0%     2     1.0%     0     0.0%     2       ther     11     19.3%     31     28.9%     84     2       constant     7     12.7%     38     17.3%     21     19.6%     65     1	Iminate match requirements     0     0.0%     8     3.8%     5       combine all HUD sources of funding     0     0.0%     2     0.7%     2     2       increase dissemination of information     0     0.0%     2     1.0%     0     0     0       ther     11     19.3%     42     19.3%     31     2       one/no comment     7     12.7%     38     17.3%     21     1	as is/satisfied	4	25.4%	50	8.9%	0	9.2%	43	11.3%
Combine all HUD sources of funding 0 0.0% 2 0.7% 2 2.0% 4   Increase dissemination of information 0 0.0% 2 1.0% 0 0.0% 2   Inter 11 19.3% 42 19.3% 31 28.9% 84 2	Combine all HUD sources of funding 0 0.0% 2 0.7% 2   ncrease dissemination of information 0 0.0% 2 1.0% 0   nther 11 19.3% 42 19.3% 31 2   none/no comment 7 12.7% 38 17.3% 21 1	ate match requirements	0	0.0%	89	3.8%	IJ	4.5%	13	3.4%
Increase dissemination of information 0 0.0% 2 1.0% 0 0.0% 2   Inter 11 19.3% 42 19.3% 31 28.9% 84 2   Inter 7 12.7% 38 17.3% 21 19.6% 65 1	holicease dissemination of information 0 0.0% 2 1.0% 0   ther 11 19.3% 42 19.3% 31 2   cone/no comment 7 12.7% 38 17.3% 21 1	ine all HUD sources of funding	0	0.0%	N	0.7%	8	2.0%	4	1.0%
Other     11     19.3%     42     19.3%     31     28.9%     84     2       One/or comment     7     12.7%     38     17.3%     21     19.6%     65     1	ther 11 19.3% 42 19.3% 31 2 one/no comment 7 12.7% 38 17.3% 21 1	se dissemination of information	0	%0.0	2	1.0%	0	0.0%	N	0.6%
Charloo comment 7 12.7% 38 17.3% 01 19.6% 65 1	lone/no comment 7 12.7% 38 17.3% 21 1		ŧ	19.3%	42	19.3%	31	28.9%	84	22.0%
		no comment	7	12.7%	38	17.3%	2.	19.6%	65	17.0%

Notes (1) Multiple responses possible.

Item 193

Research Question C.10: Are there any ESG requirements that contribute to inefficien

Responses	State/Teri Number	Percent	Number	litan City Percent	Urba	n County	All Resp	pondents
		7					Number	Percent
invironmental review	14	24.7%	9	2.6%	15	13.7%	34	8.9%
mount of paperwork/reporting	ß	9 5%	£	5.0%	14	12.8%	30	7.8%
aps on spending	2	4.2%	10	4.4%	9	5.7%	18	4.7%
iming between notice and due date or application	-	1.8%	Ω	2.3%	10	9.0%	16	4.1%
80-day HP requirement	4	7.0%	۲	0.4%	10	9.2%	15	3.8%
ther	7	12.5%	14	6.3%	2	1.7%	23	5.9%
o/none	25	45.4%	171	77.7%	62	57.9%	258	67.5%
ource: Grantee Survey, Question 41 (weig Grantee Universe≕382, Survey San	ihted data). nple=234.							
issing Cases: 1 grantee.								
stes (1) Muttiple responses possible.								

•

A-98

Items 194-198

Research Question C.10.a: What changes in sponsor eligibility, application requirements, monitoring procedures, etc. would improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the ESGP?

What other changes would you like to see HUD consider for the ESGP?   26   47.9%   96   43.5%   72   66.9%   194     Increased funding   26   47.9%   96   43.5%   72   66.9%   194     Eliminate caps   10   17.5%   52   23.6%   7   6.5%   87     Eliminate paperworkload   2   3.6%   16   7.4%   7   6.5%   16     Change environmental review restrictions   6   11.0%   3   1.4%   7   6.5%   16     Okay as is/satisfied   1   1   2.0%   11   4.8%   7   6.5%   16     Make ESGP funding coincide with catendar year   0   0.00%   3   1.4%   7   5.2%   5     Make into block grant   2   2.7%   3   1.4%   2   2.3%   5     Other   7   14   4.8%   7   6.3%   14   11.1%   13     Okay as is/satisfied   2   8.9%   3   1.4%   7   6.3%   16     Make into block grant   2	Responses	State/Ter Number	ritory Percent	Metropol Number	litan City Percent	Urban Number	County Percent	All Respo Number	ndents Percent
Increased funding     26     47.3%     36     43.5%     72     66.9%     194       Eliminate caps     10     17.5%     52     23.8%     7     6.5%     87       Eliminate caps     10     17.5%     52     23.8%     7     6.5%     87       Eliminate paperwork load     2     3.6%     16     7.4%     7     6.5%     87       Change environmental review restrictions     6     11.0%     3     1.4%     7     6.5%     16       Okay as is/satisfied     1     1     2.0%     11     4.9%     7     6.2%     16       Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year     0     0.0%     3     1.4%     2     2.3%     5       Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year     0     0.0%     3     1.4%     2     2.3%     5       Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year     2     3     1.4%     2     2.3%     5       Make Into block grant     2     2.1.4%     2     2.3.3%     5<	What other changes would you like to see HUD consider for the ESGP?			:					
Eliminate caps   10   17.5%   52   23.6%   25   23.5%   87     Eliminate caps   2   3.6%   16   7.4%   7   6.5%   25     Change environmental review restrictions   6   11.0%   3   1.4%   7   6.5%   16     Okay as is/satisfied   1   2   3%   11   4.8%   1   1.1%   13     Okay as is/satisfied   1   2   3%   1.4%   7   6.2%   16     Kapand HP 180-day restriction to 1 year   5   8.9%   3   1.4%   1   1.1%   13     Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year   0   0.0%   3   1.4%   2   2.3%   5     Make into block grant   2   2   2.7%   4   1.7%   0   0.0%   5     Other   7   15.4%   24   10.8%   14   13.2%   45     Missing Cases: None.   3   1.4%   2   2.3%   6   5   5     Make Into block grant   2   2   2.4%   2	Increased funding	26	47.9%	96	43.5%	72	66.9%	194	50.7%
Eliminate paperwork load   2   3.6%   16   7.4%   7   6.5%   25     Change environmental review restrictions   6   11.0%   3   1.4%   7   6.2%   16     Okay as is/satisfied   1   2   3.0%   11   4.8%   7   6.2%   16     Okay as is/satisfied   1   1   2.0%   11   4.8%   7   6.2%   16     Expand HP 180-day restriction to 1 year   5   8.9%   3   1.5%   0   0.0%   8     Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year   0   0.0%   3   1.4%   2   2.3%   5     Make into block grant   2   2.7%   4   1.7%   0   0.0%   5     Other   7   18.4%   24   10.8%   14   19.2%   45     Source: Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.   7   18.4%   24   10.8%   14   19.2%   45	Eliminate caps	10	17.5%	25	23.8%	25	23.5%	87	22.8%
Change environmental review restrictions     6     11.0%     3     1.4%     7     6.2%     16       Okay as is/satisfied     1     2.0%     11     4.8%     1     1.1%     13       Expand HP 180-day restriction to 1 year     5     8.9%     3     1.5%     0     0.0%     8       Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year     0     0.0%     3     1.4%     2     2.3%     5       Make into block grant     2     2.7%     4     1.7%     0     0.0%     5       Other     7     13.4%     24     10.8%     14     13.2%     5       Missind Cases: None.     3     1.4%     2     2.3%     5	Eliminate paperwork load	2	3.6%	16	7.4%	2	6.5%	25	6.6%
Okay as is/satisfied     1     2.0%     11     4.8%     1     1.1%     13       Expand HP 180-day restriction to 1 year     5     8.9%     3     1.5%     0     0.0%     8       Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year     0     0.0%     3     1.4%     2     2.3%     5       Make into block grant     2     2.7%     4     1.7%     0     0.0.0%     5       Other     7     13.4%     24     10.8%     14     13.2%     45       Source: Grantee Survey, Question 39 (weighted data).     7     13.4%     24     10.8%     14     13.2%     45	Change environmental review restrictions	Q	11.0%	e	1.4%	7	6.2%	16	4,1%
Expand HP 180-day restriction to 1 year     5     8.9%     3     1.5%     0     0.0%     8       Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year     0     0.0%     3     1.4%     2     2.3%     5       Make into block grant     2     2.7%     4     1.7%     0     0.0%     5       Other     2     2.7%     2     1.7%     0     0.0%     5       Other     7     13.4%     24     10.8%     14     13.2%     45       Missing Cases: None.     Missing Cases: None.     3     1.4%     24     10.8%     14     13.2%     45	Okay as is/satisfied	۲	2.0%	11	4.8%	٢	1.1%	13	3.4%
Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year     0     0.0%     3     1.4%     2     2.3%     5       Make into block grant     2     2.7%     4     1.7%     0     0.0%     5       Make into block grant     2     2.7%     4     1.7%     0     0.0%     5       Other     7     13.4%     24     10.8%     14     13.2%     45       Source: Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.     Missing Cases: None.     14     13.2%     45	Expand HP 180-day restriction to 1 year	Q	8.9%	g	1.5%	0	0.0%	Ø	2.2%
Make into block grant     2     2.7%     4     1.7%     0     0.0%     5       Other     7     13.4%     24     10.8%     14     13.2%     45       Source: Grantee Survey, Question 39 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234.     24     10.8%     14     13.2%     45	Make ESGP funding coincide with calendar year	o	0.0%	0	1.4%	01	2.3%	ß	1.4%
Other 7 13.4% 24 10.8% 14 13.2% 45 Source: Grantee Survey, Question 39 (weighted data). Grantee Universe=382, Survey Sample=234. Missind Cases: None.	Make into block grant	63	2.7%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	ß	1.4%
Source: Grantee Survey, Question 39 (weighted data). Grantee Universe≖382, Survey Sample=234. Missing Cases: None.	Other	2	13.4%	24	10.8%	14	13.2%	45	11.8%
Missing Cases: None.	Source: Grantee Survey, Question 39 (weighted o Grantee Universe≍382, Survey Sample≕;	lata). 234.							
	Missing Cases: None.								

A-99

Notes (1) Multiple responses possible.

ltems 194 - 198, cont.

2.3% 9.1% 3.3% 25.3% 21.0% 10.6% Research Question C.10.a.: What changes in sponsor eligibility, application requests, permitted uses of grant assistance, monetary procedures, or other Percent 44.4% 30.7% **All Respondents** 275 635 59 Number 1344 768 321 5 930 2.1% 7.3% 4.1% Percent 30.9% 9.5% 19.4% 55.7% 30.3% Operations program criteria would improve the effectiveness of the operation and administration of ESGP7 112 48 24 87 Number 660 229 366 359 Conversion/Rehabilitation Percent 11.1% 0.4% 3.1% 16.1% 32.3% 39,9% 15.9% 15.3% 46 9 99 133 8 N 164 8 Number Essential Services Percent 7.7% 7.4% 1.1% 2.4% 40.3% 24.6% 31.5% 14.0% Provider Universe = 3000-3500 (estimated), Survey Sample = 651. Number <u>6</u> 245 140 23 33 27 314 Ξ Homelessness Prevention Number Percent Source: Provider Phone Survey, Question 43 (weighted data). 10.2% 34.5% 37.1% 36.3% 15.1% 20.4% 9.2% 1.9% 159 8 \$ œ 4 163 99 151 More local/personal involvement of ESGP and HUD staff Increase in allowable activities Less paperwork and red tape Ease application process Longer time perlod to receive funding Raise funding caps Increased funding Responses Other

A-100

Notes: (1) Multiple responses possible.

Missing cases: 80 providers.

# APPENDIX B

# SUMMARY OF SAMPLING, SURVEY RESPONSE, AND DATA COLLECTION



## **APPENDIX B**

# SUMMARY OF SAMPLING, SURVEY RESPONSE, AND DATA COLLECTION

This Appendix provides a summary of the evaluation's sample design in Section B1.0, a summary of survey response in Section B2.0, and a synopsis of the data collection in Section B3.0.

# B1.0 Sampling for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program Evaluation

For this study, several separate samples were required. The sample design was based upon both the hierarchical structure of the ESG Program and the different data collection requirements to answer the research questions posed by HUD. The following samples were drawn and used:

- A sample of grantees, for purposes of a telephone survey and selection of intensive-study sites ("the grantee sample");
- A sample of shelters and other homeless services providers receiving ESG funds in FY 91 from the sampled grantees, for purposes of a telephone survey, a mailed survey, and selection of intensive-study sites ("the provider sample"); and
- A set of intensive-study sites, each consisting of a grantee and selected providers.

Grantees are at the head of the program hierarchy, and shelters and other homeless services providers are at the bottom of the hierarchy. From reconnaissance work in the field, and through discussions with our consultants, it was realized that use of an intermediate category of *recipient* was quite infrequent. For the study, *the definition of recipient was restricted to a second-level decision-making entity*, such as a county, with authority to reallocate ESG funds. Recipients identified by grantees during the course of the data collection were interviewed.

Grantees may be states, metropolitan cities, urban counties, territories, and (beginning in fiscal year 1991) Indian tribes. Indian tribes were excluded from the study since they had not yet received their first ESG allocations (from FY 91) when the research began. Data reported in the tables below also exclude Indian tribes. All states are grantees only and must fully distribute ESG funds (except administrative monies) to recipients or directly to service providers. Shelters may be day shelters, night shelters, or 24-hour operations. It is clear that shelters are not the only kinds of service providers funded by ESG; other types include health and counseling service agencies, residential treatment facilities, local government agencies, and a variety of other entities serving the homeless and at-risk populations.

The population structure suggested the selection of a cluster sample nested across levels. Therefore, a national probability sample of grantees was drawn. A sample of providers was then drawn from the sample grantees. This resulted in a two-stage cluster sample of providers. However, it was also necessary to identify the recipients directly funded by grantees who in turn funded sampled providers.

This approach offered three key advantages. First, it was only necessary to create a complete sampling frame (list) of recipients and providers for the sample grantees and not for all grantees in the population. Keeping in mind the lack of any complete and up-to-date national list of recipients or providers, this approach made the sampling frame construction task much easier to implement.

Second, the selection of a nested cluster sample limited the number of grantees that must be contacted and asked to provide information. It thus limited respondent burden and allowed use of our knowledge of the grantee when dealing with the recipients, shelters, and other service providers.

Third, nesting the provider and recipient samples within the grantee sample offered the ability to link grantee characteristics to the other organizations in the program. This linking of characteristics strengthened the analysis. It was particularly useful for answering research questions that cut across the levels. Examples included linking differences in grantee strategies with variations in local ESG services and facilities, or comparing shelter services and facilities by type of grantee.

#### **B1.1** Sampling of Grantees

# The Grantee Population

Sample design began with a census of all 382 grantees ever funded in the Emergency Shelter Grants Program. A data base provided by HUD on the ESG Program was used to analyze the size and nature of the organizations in the program over the years. The size of the population of grantees is shown in Exhibit B.1 for the years 1987 through 1991. The initial

Appendix B

FY 87 allocation is referred to as FY 87, the supplemental from the same year is referred to as FY 87S.<sup>1</sup>

The total number of grantees in the ESG Program did not change very much after FY 87S; there was relatively steady participation of grantees in the ESG Program over the years. Fully 367 grantees had annual participation from FY 87S through FY 91, and the mean grantee population for that period was 376. While many new grantees entered the program with the supplemental appropriation in 1987, none who received the initial allocation left the program in 1987. There were only nine grantees that were participants in the ESG Program in at least one previous year that were not still participants in FY 91. Of these, six were steady participants from FY 87S through FY 90. There were only two grantees that did not participate in FY 90 but did in FY 91; of these, one was a steady participant in the previous years.

# Exhibit B.1

**Grantee Population and Funding** 

YEAR	FY 87	FY 87S	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
Number of grantees Total funding	87 \$10,000	378 \$50.000	374 \$8.000	379 \$46 500	378 \$73.164	373
(\$'000 appropriated)		400,000	40,000	Ψτυ,συυ	Ψ/J,104	φ12,432

#### **Stratification of Grantees**

The sample of grantees was drawn from the 367 grantees with steady participation from FY 87S to FY 91. An advantage of this approach was that historic data on grantees could be collected without any missing years. However, the grantee census still included all 382 grantees ever receiving ESG funds.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The \$10 million FY 87 appropriation and the \$50 million FY 87 supplemental appropriation are referenced in the HUD 1989 Annual Report to Congress on Community Development Programs as the 1986 Program and the 1987 Program respectively. This study refers to the FY 87 initial appropriation as FY 87, and the FY 87 supplemental appropriation as FY 87S. The FY 91 total here excludes \$732,000 reserved for Indian tribes, as explained above.

# Grantee and Funds Distribution by Census Region

YEAR Region	FY 87	FY 87S	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
Northeast	19	115	115	116	103	98
(\$'000)	\$2,955	\$14,788	\$2,367	\$13,719	\$19,028	\$18,767
Midwest	21	76	73	75	75	76
(\$'000)	\$2,468	\$12,320	\$1,972	\$11,395	\$17,928	\$17,758
South	27	106	106	108	120	120
(\$'000)	\$2,901	\$14,478	\$2,317	\$13,565	\$23,904	\$123,706
West	20	81	80	80	80	79
(\$'000)	\$1,676	\$8,414	\$1,344	\$7,821	\$12,304	\$12,201

Region	Average Percent of National Funds (Excluding Territories)	Homeless Population Percent 1991 <sup>2</sup>
Northeast	27.0%	32.7%
Midwest	25.5%	13.4%
South	30.2%	22.1%
West	17.3%	31.8%
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  U. S. Bureau of the Census, Shelter and Street Night counts (March 20, 1991). The Census Bureau states that the results of its *Shelter and Street Night* (S-night) operation are estimates of the number of persons housed in emergency shelters and situated on the streets during the time of the S-night survey (evening of March 20, 1991, and early morning of March 21, 1991). The Census Bureau cautions that the data are not and were never intended to be a count of the total population of homeless persons at the national, state or local level. However, there are no such counts available.

The grantee sample was stratified by region and type. The HUD data base provided information to examine how these stratifiers were distributed. Exhibit B.2 shows the numbers of grantees and the dollar allocations by the four Census Regions. The West and Midwest regions had fewer grantees compared to the Northeast and South (around 80 versus around 100). An examination of the ESG Program allotments over time showed that in FY 87, the Northeast received the highest average award per grantee (\$155,526 vs. \$114,943 on average), presumably because of New York City's grant. When the FY 87S grants were allocated, a ratio of average allocation by region was established and has remained relatively stable through FY 91. Each region's allocation as a percentage of the national, excluding territories, averaged over time, is shown in the lower panel of Exhibit B.2 along with the regional distribution of homeless persons in 1991 counted by the Census Bureau. One region-the Midwest-received roughly twice the proportion of funding relative to its homeless count in 1991; by contrast, the West has the reverse situation, with about half the proportion of funding compared to the homeless population. As HUD wished to ensure a geographically representative sample, the variations in funding relative to homeless population were not taken into account in sampling but formed part of the background for the research.

The second stratifier for the grantee sample was grantee type. Based on the HUD database information, the grantee population was classified into the following three categories: state or territory, urban county, and metro city. (A grantee that is a metro city may be either a central city or a suburban area.) Exhibit B.3 summarizes the types of grantees from 1987 through 1991. It shows that, from FY 87S to FY 91, roughly 14 percent of the grantees have been states, 28 percent have been urban counties, and 57 percent have been metropolitan cities. Grantees were stratified by type because there are significant differences in program authority and administrative structure among the types.

B-5

YEAR Type	FY 87	FY 87S	FY 88	FY 89	FY 90	FY 91
STATE	51	51	51	51	51	51 (13.7%)
TERRITORY	0	5	5	5	5	5 (1.3%)
URBAN COUNTY	5	103	101	105	104	105 (28.2%)
METRO CITY -Central city -Suburb	31 0	191 28	190 27	190 28	190 28	187 (50.1%) 25 (6.7%)
TOTAL	- 87	378	374	379	378	373 (100%)

## **Types of ESG Program Grantees**

# The Grantee Census

An intensive effort to collect documentation on all the grantees from HUD (including the applications, interim, annual performance, and final reports) produced a complete enumeration of the jurisdictions receiving funding over the study period. The documentation available at HUD provided considerable information on the ESG Program grantees from FY 87 to FY 89, but the records were notably incomplete for FY 90 and FY 91. In many cases, the only information available for these two years was the total program funding allocated to the grantee. The census was conducted by mail using data abstracted from the applications and reports. After relevant fields had been abstracted and a data base created, a printout was sent to each grantee for checking, with telephone contacts to fill in the information gaps.

Data items verified during the grantee census included:

- grantee contacting information (agency name, address, phone, and contact person);
- ESG funding amounts obligated and spent, for each eligible activity category, from FY 87 to FY 91;
- identification of all recipients and providers receiving ESG funds from the grantee;

- for each recipient and provider, the ESG funding amount and the eligible activity categories funded, from FY 87 to FY 91;
- for each recipient and provider, the type of organization (public or nonprofit, shelter or non-shelter) and the organization's role (recipient or provider).

#### The Grantee Sample

The grantee census was used to create the sampling frame for grantees. This census was used to draw a probability proportional to size (PPS) sample of grantees, from the population of 367 steady grantees still active in FY 91. The measure of size was the cumulative annual dollar grant amount. Annual figures were converted into constant dollars to adjust for inflation over time.

PPS sampling was used for two key reasons. First, it gave the larger grantees a greater probability of selection. This is important when the population consists of units that vary greatly in terms of size.<sup>3</sup> Second, selecting grantees with PPS sampling follows classical cluster sampling theory<sup>4</sup> regarding the later selection of recipients within grantees and of shelters and other service providers within grantees and recipients.

After some concern was expressed that the allocation of ESG dollars (which is based on the CDBG formula) might not match up well with the distribution of the homeless population, further investigation was made of the relationship between ESG funding and homeless population counts at the state level. The correlations between ESG funding (in the years 1987 through 1991) for all grantees within the state and the Bureau of the Census counts of homeless population across states in 1991 were very high.<sup>5</sup> The product-moment correlation of approximately +0.88 showed a very strong relationship between the distribution of homeless population across states and ESG funding amounts. These high correlations suggested that, even

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Kish, L., 1987. Statistical Design for Research, John Wiley & Sons, New York, Section 7.5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Kish, L., 1965. Survey Sampling, John Wiley & Sons, New York, Chapter 6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The Census Bureau states that the results of its *Shelter and Street Night* (S-night) operation are estimates of the number of persons housed in emergency shelters and situated on the streets during the time of the Snight survey (evening of March 20, 1991, and early morning of March 21, 1991). The Census Bureau cautions that the data are not and were never intended to be a count of the total population of homeless persons at the national, state or local level. However, there are no such counts available.

though unevenly distributed by region, dollars funded was an acceptable measure of size for this sample design.

A grantee sample of 310 was drawn from the grantee population of 367 steady ESG Program participants. (Nine grantees were excluded from the sample since they had already been interviewed by Abt or Aspen staff during the reconnaissance visits for the evaluation, and the extensive information gathered from them had already informed the understanding of the ESG Program.) Grantees were sampled with probability proportional to size (PPS); the size measure was the constant dollar<sup>6</sup> cumulative funding of ESG from FY 1987 to FY 1991. The sample was stratified based on Census region (Northeast, South, Midwest, and West) and grantee type (state or territory, urban county, and metropolitan city). Exhibit B.4 shows a cross-tabulation of type by census region in the grantee sample. Of the sample of 310 grantees, 101 are in the South, 81 in the Northeast, 64 in the West, and 64 in the Midwest. There are 176 metropolitan cities in the sample (56.8 percent of the total). The number of urban counties is 86 (27.7 percent), and the number of State or Territories is 48 (15.5 percent).

HUD requested that Abt Associates examine the grantee sample distribution relative to two other characteristics (beyond the stratifiers): HUD region and activity mix. As Exhibit B.5 indicates, the grantee sample contained a minimum of 10 grantees in each HUD region. There were 10 and 12 sampled grantees in Regions 8 and 10, respectively.

The interest in grantee activity mix concerns the allocation of ESG funds among the four eligible activity categories: operations; rehabilitation; essential services; and homelessness prevention. Until the grantee census, there were no complete or recent data available on patterns of funding allocation among the categories. Exhibit B.6 shows the number of eligible activity categories grantees funded in FY 91. (The categories exclude administration, to focus on the uses of funds for helping the homeless.) About half the sample grantees funded 3 or 4 types of eligible activities. Only 37 sample grantees funded a single category. Exhibit B.7 shows that substantial proportions of the sample grantees are funding each type of activity. Even homelessness prevention, the newest stand-alone category, is being supported with ESG funds

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> ESG funding amounts from FY 1987 to FY 1991 were converted into 1991 dollars using the implicit price deflator for gross domestic product compiled by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce.

# Census Region by Grantee Type Grantee Sample

Census <u>Region</u>		Grantee Type		Total
Count Row Pct. Col. Pct.	State/Territory	Urban County	Metro City	
Northeast	8	27	46	81
	9.88	33.33	56.79	100.00
	16.67	31.40	26.14	26.31
South	15	23	63	101
	14.85	22.77	62.38	100.00
	31.25	26.74	35.80	32.58
Midwest	12	14	38	64
	18.75	21.87	59.38	100.00
	25.00	16.28	21.59	20.65
West	13	22	29	64
	20.31	34.38	45.31	100.00
	27.08	25.58	16.48	20.65
Total	48	86	176	310
	15.48	27.74	56.77	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00%

# HUD Region by Grantee Type Grantee Sample

HUD <u>Region</u>		Grantee Type		Total
Count Row Pct. Col. Pct.	State/Territory	Urban County	Metro City	
Boston (1)	4	0	17	21
	19.05	0.00	80.95	100.00
	8.33	0.00	9.66	6.77
New York (2)	2	16	19	37
	5.41	43.24	51.35	100.00
	4.17	18.60	10.80	11.94
Philadelphia (3)	4 10.53 8.33	17 44.74 19.77	17 44.74 9.66	38 100.00 12.26
Atlanta (4)	9	14	37	60
	15.00	23.33	61.67	100.00
	18.75	16.28	21.02	19.35
Chicago (5)	6	12	31	49
	12.24	24.49	63.27	100.00
	12.50	13.95	17.61	15.81
Dallas (6)	5	3	20	28
	17.86	10.71	71.43	100.00
	10.42	3.49	11.36	9.03
Kansas City (7)	4 30.77 8.33	2 15.38 2.33	7 53.85 3.98	13 100.00 4.19
Denver (8)	5	2	3	10
	50.00	20.00	30.00	100.00
	10.42	2.33	1.70	3.23
San Francisco (9)	5 11.90 10.42	16 38.10 18.60	21 50.00 11.93	42 100.00 13.55
Seattle (10)	4	4	4	12
	33.33	33.33	33.33	100.00
	8.33	4.65	4.65	3.87
Total	48	86	176	310
	15.48	27.74	56.77	100.00
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Number of Categories*	All Gra	ntees	Grantee S	Sample
1	53	16.8%	37	14.1%
2	106	33.7	90	34.2
3	90	28.6	75	28.5
4	66	21.0	61	23.2
Total	315	100.0	263	100.0

# Number of Eligible Activity Categories Funded by Grantees in 1991

\*Excludes administration (capped at 5%).

Missing cases: 67 grantees from the universe (non-respondents to the grantee census), 47 grantees from the sample.

#### Exhibit B.7

# Proportion of Sample Grantees Funding ESG-Eligible Activity Categories in FY91

	All Grantees	Grantee Sample
Operations	72.5%	74.8%
Rehabilitation	44.8	47.7
Essential Services	54.7	59.7
Homelessness Prevention	37.2	39.0

by almost 40 percent of the sample grantees; operations funding is provided to shelters by about three-fourths the sample grantees.

#### **Completion of the Grantee Census**

After all relevant data were abstracted from the documents (and after drawing of the grantee sample), a printout of the existing data was sent to each grantee for review. There were two purposes to this step: obtaining full data on the use of program funds in FY 90 and FY 91, and obtaining a full list of recipients and providers to build those sampling frames. If necessary, grantees were contacted by telephone to obtain a response or to deal with incomplete or missing items. Grantees were asked to:

- Confirm their allocation of funds among the eligible activity categories;
- Check for completeness and accuracy in the list of funded organizations;
- Check for completeness and accuracy in the annual funding amounts and activity categories for each funded organization;
- Indicate whether the organization is a governmental agency or a private nonprofit; and
- Indicate which organizations have further funds allocation authority (i.e., are recipients) and which organizations provide services to the homeless population.

Exhibit B.8 shows the results of the grantee census as they related to the previously drawn grantee sample. Overall, 84.8 percent of the grantees provided usable responses. For purposes of recipient and provider sampling, usable responses were those that had sufficient data on the entities funded in FY 91 to identify their funded activities. Both the distribution of usable responses by grantee type (Exhibit B.8) and the distribution by Census region (Exhibit B.9) indicate that the usable responses were representative of the universe and of the sample as a whole.

# **Constructing the Recipient and Provider Sampling Frames**

After drawing the PPS sample of grantees and completing the grantee census, a list was generated from the grantee census data base of all the recipients and service providers associated with each sampled grantee. This list reflected all the funded entities the sample grantees had

	All Grante	ees, FY 91	Grantee	e Sample	Useable	Grantees
Grantee Type	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Metropolitan City	220	57.6%	176	56.8%	1 <b>48</b>	56.3%
State or Territory	55	14.4%	48	15.5%	37	14.1%
Urban County	107	28.0%	86	27.7%	78	29.7%
TOTALS	382	100.0%	310	100.0%	263	100.0%

Exhibit B.8 Usable Grantee Responses by Grantee Type

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

#### Exhibit B.9 Usable Grantee Responses by Census Region

	All Grant	ees, FY 91	Grantee	Sample	Useable	Grantees
Census Region	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Northeast	103	27.0%	81	26.1%	66	25.1%
South	121	31.7%	101	32.6%	87	33.1%
Midwest	77	20.2%	64	24.5%	57	21.7%
West	81	21.2%	64	24.5%	53	20.2%
TOTALS	382	100.0%	310	100.0%	263	100.0%

previously reported to HUD, as confirmed and updated during the processing of the grantee census. The data indicated whether the funded entity was a direct service provider or an agency with further authority to allocate ESG funds (a recipient). In a few instances, second-level decision makers were also reported to provide services. These entities were classified as providers for sampling purposes, since service provision was of greater interest to the study.

#### **B1.2** Sampling of Recipients

One purpose of the grantee census was to identify grantees that used a middle layer of funding decision-makers to further allocate ESG funds. The evaluation's research design calls for sampling of these middle-layer funders -- termed recipients -- as the second stage cluster, with sampling of providers funded by the selected recipients representing the third-stage cluster.

At the time the research design was completed, it was already known from reconnaissance efforts that few recipients were likely to be found; the sample size for recipients was estimated at 100. During the grantee census data collection, considerable attention was paid to clarifying whether grantees used "pass-through" agencies as conduits for funding shelters and other homeless-services providers, or whether the agencies actually made further ESG allocation decisions.

Results of the grantee census indicated that state grantees used counties and localities to pass through ESG monies to providers in the earlier years of the program; indeed, this was required in FY 87 and FY 87S. States providing data on pass-through agencies over the program period (FY 87 to FY 91) included New York, Delaware, West Virginia, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, and Washington. However, it appears that in FY 91 only two states in the grantee sample -- Missouri and Alabama -- used county or local governments to make further funding choices. California was a third state that still actively used recipients; however, its recipients are on a two-year cycle, and none received FY 91 funding. Therefore, these are the only sample grantees for which a middle layer exists.

As a result of this minute number of recipients, the sampling strategy was altered to draw a uniform 2-stage (grantee-provider) cluster sample. For the two states where recipients were present, recipients were traced back from the sampled providers, and these recipients were interviewed. In the course of the provider survey, only two other recipients were identified and interviewed.

#### **B1.3** Sampling of Providers

#### **The Provider Population**

2

The HUD database contained some information on ESG-funded shelters and other service providers for FY 87, FY 87S, and FY 88. Unfortunately, there were no data after FY 88. Until the completion of the grantee census, therefore, there was no estimate of the total number of providers funded by ESG monies in FY 91. Based on the data abstracted from HUD records and completed and verified by the grantees, Exhibit B.10 shows selected characteristics of the providers reported to receive ESG funding in FY 91, including number of activities funded and geographical distribution (by HUD region and Census region). Exhibit B.11 shows what proportion of the providers received funding for each of the eligible activities. Over 70 percent received some monies in FY 91 for operations. Over a third received some essential services funding. About a fifth were funded for capital work (conversion, renovation, or rehabilitation), and roughly the same proportion for homelessness prevention.

#### Stratification of Shelters and Other Service Providers

Using the grantee census data for the grantees in the sample, a sampling frame was constructed of providers eligible for inclusion in the sample. Criteria for eligibility include receipt of funding from FY 91 to provide services to the homeless and availability of data on the mix of ESG-funded FY 91 activities. These criteria excluded agencies that received only administrative funding and agencies for which no activity data were available from the grantee.

The evaluation's research design called for the providers to be sampled by type of funded activity. There were to be four strata: rehab, operations, essential services, and homelessness prevention. It is easy to assign a provider to a stratum if only one activity is being supported by FY 91 ESG funding. However, as shown in Exhibit B.10, many of the providers in this sampling frame conducted more than one activity.

Providers carrying out multiple activities with ESG funds were to be randomly assigned to sampling strata. However, based upon examination of actual activity distributions, as well as estimation of the effect of random selection on numbers of completed interviews by activity category, it was decided that a hierarchical assignment would be used instead, in order to

B-15

# Providers' Number of Eligible Activity Categories Funded in FY 91

Number of Categories* Funded in FY 91	All Gi Pro	rantees' viders	Sampled Pro	Grantees' viders
1	1375	62.2%	1205	60.9%
2	573	25.9	517	26.1
3	231	10.5	226	11.4
4	31	1.4	31	1.6
Total**	2210	100.0%	1979	100.0%
HUD Region				
1	236	9.7%	175	8.0%
2	234	9.6	208	9.5
3	167	6.9	136	6.2
4	487	20.0	474	21.7
5	447	18.4	413	18.9
6	212	8.7	205	9.4
7	196	8.1	193	8.9
8	46	1.9	46	2.1
9	267	11.0	195	8.9
10	140	5.8	135	6.2
Total	2432	100.0	2180	100.0%
Census Region				
Northeast	553	22.7%	467	21.4%
South	771	31.7	719	33.0
Midwest	667	27.4	630	28.9
West	441	18.1	364	16.7
Total	2432	100.0	2180	100.0%

\*Excludes administration (usually retained by grantees).

\*\*All grantees: 222 providers had admin only or no FY 91 activity mix data. Sample grantees: 201 providers had admin only or no FY 91 activity mix data.

# Number and Percentage of Providers Receiving Funding for Eligible Activity Categories in FY 91

	All Gr Prov	rantees' /iders	Sample C Prov	Grantees' iders
Operations	1578	71.4%	1431	72.3%
Rehabilitation	502	22.7	452	22.8
Essential Services	814	36.8	753	38.0
Homelessness Prevention	429	19.4	405	20.5

Percentages add to more than 100%, due to multiple activity funding (see Exhibit B.10).

achieve a more even distribution of sample across the strata, and to assure that providers of lower-incidence services would be represented in the sample.

A hierarchical assignment of providers to the four strata was made according to the following rules, based on FY 91 activities:

- All providers who deliver *homelessness prevention* services are assigned to that stratum (H), regardless of what other activities they conduct.
- Providers not funded for homelessness prevention services but delivering *essential services* are assigned to that stratum (E), regardless of what other activities they conduct.
- Providers funded for neither homelessness prevention nor essential services but that are conducting *conversion*, *renovation or rehabilitation* are assigned to that stratum (C), regardless of whether they also are funded for operations.
- The remaining providers are assigned to the *operations* stratum (O). They consist of agencies only funded for operations (not in combination with other activities), as reported by the grantees.

B-17

Note that these assignments were made according to activity, not according to budget allocations. They were also made on the basis of grantee reports, unverified by the provider.<sup>7</sup>

Using this approach, about a fifth of all the providers eligible to be sampled fell in the homelessness prevention stratum, 28 percent into the essential services stratum, 16 percent into conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, and the remaining 36 percent into shelter operations. There was considerable variation in this distribution for particular grantees.

#### Sampling Shelters and Other Service Providers

The sampling of service providers assumed that only currently funded (FY 91) shelters and non-shelter service providers were to be sampled. Grantees indicated the service providers that no longer received funding, but the service provider sample did not include former service providers, because there was likely to be substantially greater non-response and overall higher survey costs to reach this segment. (However, some former providers were included in the site visits.)

A random sample of current FY 91 shelters and other service providers was drawn within the strata defined above for each of the 263 usable grantees. (Usable grantees were those who responded to the grantee census and provided updated information on funded providers, including activity mix and dollar amount of FY 91 grant.). At the bottom level of the ESG Program, it was not desirable that only the largest providers fall into the sample; therefore, size variations were allowed to occur naturally in the sample. This avoided the problems that could have resulted from PPS sampling based on ESG grant size. (The reconnaissance had already shown that grant size was not a good indicator of overall provider size.)

Once the providers were assigned to the four strata within a usable grantee, sample selection was accomplished. The provider sample selection method had the following main . characteristics:

- A target sample size of 1075 allowed for 40 percent provider nonresponse.
- The selection method used in each of the 263 usable grantees was simple random sampling by activity stratum.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> In a small number of cases, it appears that the data provided by grantees in the census were in error or out of date.

- An equal allocation of sample to the four strata would select 269 providers for each. This was modified because equal allocation was balanced against taking roughly equal numbers of providers per grantee.<sup>8</sup>
- Sampling of roughly equal numbers of providers per grantee, by taking all providers for any grantee with 5 or fewer providers, then sampling at random from the providers of the grantees with more than 5.

Thus, the provider sample is a cluster sample within the sampled grantees. Providers were sampled within grantees according to the number and stratum mix of providers funded by the grantee. For grantees with more than five providers in FY 91, not all providers fell in 'the sample.

#### **Characteristics of the Provider Sample**

A provider sample of 1131 members was drawn from the sample grantees. The actual sample size differed from the target sample size (1075) due to the stochastic rounding procedure used to convert the individual grantee stratum sample sizes to integer stratum sample sizes. Note, too, that, because only 263 of the 310 sample grantees had usable responses, the mean number of sampled providers per grantee was slightly over 4.

Exhibit B.12 provides information on the characteristics of the providers selected for the sample. Like the sampling frame, the sample is not very evenly spread across strata. Some 22 percent falls into the H (homelessness prevention) stratum and 18 percent into the C (conversion/renovation/ rehabilitation) stratum. There are at least 90 providers in each HUD region, except Region 7 (70 providers), Region 8 (29), and Region 10 (62).

Finally, Exhibit B.13 shows the numbers and actual combinations of ESG-funded activities being carried out by sampled providers with FY 91 monies. It shows that they represent a good range of agencies in terms of number and mix of activities. A full set of activity combinations is present.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> An initial sample draw used strict equal allocation and produced an extremely "lumpy" sample -- i.e. there were large numbers of providers included for some grantees and few or none for others. This reflected the fact that a few grantees make very large numbers of small grants, while others make fewer and larger grants and, thus, have fewer providers. It also reflected some differences in the activities funded by the grantees.

# **Characteristics of Sampled Providers**

		Sampled P All Samp	roviders for led Grantees
		Number	Percent
	Н	253	22.4%
	Е	300	26.5
STRATUM	с	201	17.8
	0	377	33.3
	Total	1131	100.0%
	1	90	8.0%
	2	131	11.6
	3	111	9.8
	4	188	16.6
	5	198	17.5
HUD REGION	6	118	10.4
	7	70	6.2
	8	29	2.6
	9	134	11.8
	10	62	5.5
	Total	1131	100.0%
	Northeast	278	24.6%
	South	348	30.8
CENSUS REGION	Midwest	281	24.8
	West	224	19.8
	Total	1131	100.0%

Note: Percent columns may not add to 100, due to rounding.

<u>Key</u>: H = Homelessness Prevention E = Essential Services

C = Conversion/Renovation/Rehabilitation O = Operations

	Sampled Prov All Sampled	iders for Grantees
	Number	Percent
Activity Mix		
С	127	11.2%
CE	10	.9
CEH	2	.2
СН	6	.5
со	74	6.5
COE	40	3.5
COEH	14	1.2
СОН	11	1.0
E	81	7.2
EH	33	2.9
н	110	9.7
0	377	33.3
OE	169	14.9
OEH	52	4.6
ОН	25	2.2
	1131	100.0%
Number of Activities		
One	695	61.5%
Two	317	28.0
Three	105	9.3
Four	14	1.2
	1131	100.0%

Exhibit B.13 Activities of Sampled Providers

Note: Percent columns may not add to 100, due to rounding.

<u>Key</u>: C = Conversion/Renovation/Rehabilitation E = Essential Services H = Homelessness PreventionO = Operations

## **B1.4** Recommended Sample Sizes of Completed Interviews

Recommended sample sizes play a major role in determining the level of precision that will result for the sample estimates. The total sample sizes also needed to be allocated to the domains of interest so that reliable subgroup estimates could be provided. Target sample sizes of completed interviews were:

- Grantees—216;
- Recipients—~100 (as population allows)
- Providers—648.

For the grantee sample, the sample size had be large enough to yield reliable estimates for the 3 grantee type categories or the 4 Census regions. A sample size of 54 completed interviews per Census region would yield 95 percent confidence limits for survey estimates of about plus or minus 7 percentage points, comparing proportions between groups for P = 50percent. (The calculation incorporated a finite population correction and a design effect due to weighting.) This yielded 216 completed grantee interviews in total. The grantee type stratifier has 3 categories, so that an average of 72 completed interviews could be allocated to each type. This would yield estimates with the same or better precision as the grantee type estimates. The target response rate for the grantee telephone survey was 70 percent. This meant that 310 grantees should be sampled in order to achieve about 216 completed interviews.

As noted above, little was initially known about the recipient level. However, it became evident that many grantees do not use recipients. Had the number of completed recipient interviews been about 100, with no stratifiers, then the 95 percent confidence limits would have been around plus or minus 10 percentage points, taking into account the effects of using a cluster sample. (The calculation also takes into account the finite population correction and a design effect due to weighting.) However, the actual confidence interval was open to the final number of recipients identified.

The total recommended service provider sample size was 648 interviews. With stratified sampling to achieve an even division among the 4 activity categories, the yield would be 162 interviews for each activity type. Service provider activity type estimates would then have 95 confidence limits of roughly plus or minus 7.5 percentage points.

B-22

Non-response of 30 to 40 percent was anticipated from the service provider sample. Experience during reconnaissance and instrument pre-testing had already shown that it was more difficult to obtain the cooperation of the providers compared to the grantees; both the nature of their business and their greater distance from HUD were factors reducing their ability and incentive to respond. Therefore, an initial sample of 1075 providers was planned to allow for a 60 percent response rate. (As noted, the actual draw was 1131 providers.)

## **B1.5** Sample Weighting and Variance Calculations

It was necessary to weight the grantee and provider samples so that inferences could be drawn about each of the target populations. The weights adjusted for the oversampling and were also constructed to incorporate adjustments for nonresponse. Final weights are described in Section B2.0 below. No weights were calculated for the recipient sample, due to its very small size.

The grantee sample had a stratified unequal selection probability design. The variance calculations for key grantee estimates took the design structure into account. The recipient sample was of such a small size as to be descriptive only; no statistics were calculated from it. The provider sample was a stratified cluster sample involving provider stratification within grantee, but equal selection probabilities within the provider strata. For this type of design, variance approximation methods (such as Taylor Series linearization) as implemented by the SUDAAN standard error computer software, were used.

#### **B1.6** Selection of Intensive-Study Sites

In contrast to the formal sampling for the grantee and provider phone surveys, the selection of sites for visits by senior project staff was purposive. In consultation with the HUD GTR and GTM, sites were selected for visits based on their specific characteristics, using information gathered in the grantee census and in the process of constructing the recipient and provider sampling frames.

Fifteen sites were visited, a number which provided ample additional data to support and supplement the phone survey results. Each visit included contact with the grantee, one recipient (if present), and 2 to 4 shelters or other service providers. The visitors often spoke to one or more other organizations involved in the local provision of homeless services (whether or not

B-23

they received ESG funds), such as homeless coalitions or inter-agency councils. The purpose of the site visits was to enhance the analysis by:

- improving the understanding of the environment in which the ESG-funded organizations operate, including linkages to other local programs;
- gathering further data on the characteristics of the client population, on strategies for meeting homeless needs, and on planning and implementation of service elements; and
- gathering further data on program costs, matching funds, outputs, and impacts.

A number of criteria were used in selecting the 15 intensive-study sites. They included *grantee type* (state or territory, metro city, urban county), *region*, *grantee size* (1 or 2 of the largest grantees and 1 very small one), *grantee use of recipients* (1 site out of the 15), and *grantee receipt of a waiver* on the essential services cap (1 site of the 15). In addition, these criteria were considered in making the selections:

- mix of activities funded by the grantee; and
- clustering sites (1 or 2 instances where providers receive ESG funds from multiple grantees).

Exhibit B.14 shows the final sample of intensive-study sites. Among the 15 sites were five states, seven metropolitan cities, and three urban counties. They were well-distributed across the HUD regions. Included were one grantee with a waiver of the cap on essential services spending, one grantee that uses recipients, and two sets of grantees that are clustered. Four grantees received over \$1 million in FY 91 ESG Program funds; seven received under \$250,000.

For selection of providers to include in the site visits, the criteria of interest included type of activity, length of time in the ESG Program, type of provider (shelter or other), and quality of record-keeping (client demographics, cost data, service outputs, client impacts). For type of provider, we have used four mutually exclusive categories: shelters; government agencies (such as welfare departments); food service stations; and other non-shelter providers (e.g., substance abuse treatment centers, housing counseling and advocacy organizations, community action agencies). In the case of record keeping, it was necessary to select sites with sufficient data to support the analysis. For the other criteria, care was taken to balance the choices to avoid Exhibit B.14 Final Sample of Intensive-Study Sites

Grantee	- -	Type				l	H	UD Re	gion								
	، د ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲ ۲	X ()	Энран Ловен;				4	va	•	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	œ	و ا	•	Dve Kecieraio	∐a>e ≩a∵>er	ESG Grant Amount FY 91	
	2	~ `	<b>h</b>	• •	-	,		+ 		+-	$\left  \right $					442,000	
Boston, MA			Ϊ.	、 	1.		+	+	+-	+	-					44,000	_
Morris County, NJ				╋		+,		+	+-	+	+		-			336,000	_
Allegheny Co., PA					$\uparrow$			+	+		+	+	╂		$\vdash$	239,000	_
State of Maryland				+	╞		+,	+	+	+	+	+	╂			164,000	-
Birmingham, AL			-   -		T	$\uparrow$	1	$\dagger$	+-	╎	┼─	+	-			66,000	
Jefferson County, AL				╋		$\uparrow$		+	+	+	╉╼		<u> </u>			757,000	_
State of Alabarria	>			-+	+	+		+,	+	+-	╀		+	$\left  \right $	-	2,029,000	_
Chicago, IL		~			+	-+-	+	+	+	╀	╉	╀	╞	╋	┢	000 976 1	_
State of Ohio	>					-+	-+				+	+	+	┼		000 010	
New Orleans, LA		>						-		$\dashv$	┥	$\neg$	$\neg$	-	┥	348,000	

Exhibit B.14, continued

Grantee		Type					H	UD R	gion							
						<b>-</b>								n		
			;;											s		
														e		
		N	- 4											1	H	
		INI	9											R	æ	I
		e	œ											9	٨	
	0	t	u											J	e	
		L														
		•	υ											0	M	
	s		•													
	t	c	n											e		
	8	i	u											u	A	ESG Grant
	t	t	t											t	e	Amount
	e	y	y	1	7	3	4	S	9	2	8	6	10	s	r	FY 91
State of Texas	1								>							1,910,000
Corpus Christi, TX		1							>							89,000
State of California	1											>		Y		1,027,144
San Francisco, CA		>	,									>				422,000
Portland, OR		>											>			174,000

selecting sites with a greater likelihood of positive program impacts, because the evaluation's purpose was to give a picture of the full range of ESG Program experience.

For each intensive-study site, a subsample was selected of the providers receiving ESG monies from the grantee in FY 91. Selection was made using the grantee census data, responses to inquiries about record keeping, and discussions with the grantees. Exhibit B.15 summarizes the characteristics of the providers across the 15 sites, against the selection criteria enumerated above.

#### **B1.7** Summary of Sampling Strategy

Exhibit B.16 provides a summary of the sampling and related data collection for the evaluation. (The data collection will be described in Section B3.0 below.)

#### **B2.0** Survey Response for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program Evaluation

The evaluation involved four survey efforts: a telephone survey of grantees, a telephone survey of recipients, a telephone survey of providers, and a mailed survey of providers. The sample design for these surveys was detailed in Section B1.0 above; there, the provider sample for the entire grantee sample was described. In practice, these surveys were nested as follows:

- providers became eligible for the telephone survey only when the grantee providing their ESG funding completed the grantee telephone survey;
- recipients were surveyed only when a recipient was identified between a respondent grantee and a respondent provider; and
- providers became eligible for the mailed survey only when they completed the telephone survey. In fact, these instruments were labelled as Part I (telephone) and Part II (mailed).

Exhibit B.17 shows the anticipated and actual response rates for the four surveys, as well as for the collection of cost assessment forms from the providers in the 15 intensive-study sites. Target response rates were achieved for all efforts except the mailed provider survey, which suffered from timing that coincided with the December holidays.

**B-27** 

Characteristics of Selected Providers in Intensive Study Sites **Exhibit B.15** 

Grantee/Providers		Grante	e Type				Selecti	on Criteria for Prov	viders
	0 th 10 th 1	X D	Drbas Cossay	用UDA Kemies	FYD0 04 404-9-49 ()	Hyde of Freeder (5)	Years Grosseg	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
Boston, MA		`		-	1.2		8.1.5 1.5 1.6	567,700	\$442,000
Roxbury Multiservice Center Dorchester, MA					υ	s	9		\$40,700
Urban Revival, Inc. <sup>-</sup> Jamaica Plain, MA					Н	0	2		\$26,500
Wornen's Lunch Place Boston, MA	_				0	Ч	1		\$20,000

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

m 4 2
Graatee/Providers		Grante	Type				Selecti	on Criteria for Pro	riders
	<b>س ب ب ب</b>	Zetro Outy	Droad Donday	度 り の 、 ス ゅ & の は	Fyda of 404mpm4y (j		Уеаго – д Сгоюга <u>н</u>	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
forris County, NJ			`	2	23	Service Service		428,600	\$44,000
oard of Social Services Iorristown, NJ					H	U	S I		\$13,200
rrsey Battered Women's Service, Inc. Iorris Plains, NJ			†		ш	s	s		\$13,500
lorris Shelter Iorristown, NJ				_	щ	s	7		\$15,100
lfre, Inc. lorristown, NJ					U	s	-		\$23,200 FY'89

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: ahelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient juriadiction CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

- CI (C) - -

.

Grantee/Providers		Grant	ee Type				Selecti	on Criteria for Provi	iders
	<b>3 4 5 4 4 4</b> 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Xarro Omry	Droad Dosery	田口口 Ression	F 2 6 6 4 6 5	Fyde of Freeder (5)	≫ears …a ⊽roœra≣	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
State of Maryland	`		A. Car	3			ŝ.	A new Star of	\$239,000
Allegany Co. Human Resources Development Cumberland, MD					0 H	Ð	1	75,400	\$20,050
Family Crisis Resource Center Cumberland, MD					υo	s	4	23,300	\$6,467
Hughesville Regional Shelter Hughesville, MD					0	S	5	1,208	\$29,640
Washington Co. Community Action Council Hagerstown, MD					0 E H	0	9	115,800	\$32,000

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birnningham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

- 2 6 4

Grantee/Providers	Gran	tee Type	 		Selectio	n Criteria for Provi	ders
			TNDO OF COURTE	нуда од бгоридаг (j) (j)	уюаго – П БгомгаЕ	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
Alligheny Co., PA	1000			No pres		1,360,500	\$336,000
Action-Housing, Inc. Pittsburgh, PA			H	0	en		\$59,000
Salvation Army Northside Corps Pittsburgh, PA			ш	s	10		\$59,000
Debra House Braddock, PA			00	s	-		\$21,000
Rosalia Center Pittaburgh, PA			0	S	5		\$30,630

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birrningham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

3

=

Grantee/Providers	9	rantee T	ype			Selection	on Criteria for Provi	ders	
	<b>公十日十日</b>	Zerro Ower	用DD K 0 80 0 H	下 ちゅう ゆう ゆうしょう (二)	Нува от вгох-даг (2)	Years - E Fromrag	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91	
State of Alabama	`		4			1.1		\$757,000	
City of Montgomery Montgomery, AL		R					186,700	\$155,095	
Alf Cox Fellowship Montgomery, AL				U	s	1	186,700	\$15,000	
City of Tuscaloosa Tuscaloosa, AL		R					76,700	\$10,360	
Tuscaloosa Spouse Abuse Shelter Tuscaloosa, AL				HOC	s	6	76,700	089'6\$	

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operationa, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

- 7 6 4

D.
ă
Ξ.
Ŧ
5
10
-
Å
÷:
9
Xh
E

Grantee/Providers		Grantee	Type				Selecti	on Criteria for Prov	viders
	۵ <b></b>	Xanro Ouny	Droge Dosers	HDQ Xemies	Fyde of Konmymay (1)	ра от <b>Чго</b> ми (5)	Уваго – д СгожгаД	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
Birmingham, AL		`		4				282,900	\$164,000 CB <sup>4</sup> \$80,954 AL
Birmingham PATH Program Birmingham, AL				<u> </u>	0	s	s		\$18,000 CB \$5,660 AL
Interfaith Hospitality House Birmingham, AL					0	s	s		\$17,500 CB \$9,910 AL
Urban Ministries Birmingham, AL					EH	0	1		\$21,000 CB

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

- 2 6 4

...

Grantee/Providers		Grante	e Type				Selecti	on Criteria for Prov	iders
	<b>2 4 1 4 4 4 9</b>	Xetro Cuty	<b>Сгоан Лонну</b>	<b>第7日 及 8 8 - 9 日</b>	F 2 5 5 4 5 5 5 5 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5 7 5	Tyde of Grovider (2)	уеаго д Сгоюга <u>д</u>	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
Jefferson County, AL (as Grantee and Recipient of State ESGP funds)			\$	4				683,000	\$66,000 \$58,336*
Bread & Roses Hospitality, Inc. Birmingham, AL (City of B'ham also)					00	s	2 5		\$10,000 JCo. \$20,000 CB
Cooperative Downtown Ministries Birmingham, AL (State of Alabama also)					о о щ но o	s	1 2 1		\$6,000 JCo. \$29,300 CB \$5,660 AL
Jefferson Co. Housing Authority Fultondale, AL (State of Alabama also)					0/ H	s	2		\$10,000 JCo. \$6,200 AL

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operationa, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: ahelter, O: not a ahelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmingham, AL: State of Alabama, JCO: Jefferson County

- 2 2 4

Grantee/Providers	Ŭ	rantee	Type			Selecti	on Criteria for Prov	iders
	۵ - a - a - a	Xatro Oity	Bows DCH	<ul> <li>B 2 4</li> <li>B 2 4</li> <li>C 4 4</li> <li></li></ul>	Hyda of Frobudar (5)	Хөчгү үд бгожгад	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
State of Ohio	`		S	1			10,847,115	\$1,346,000
Community Action Council of Pike County Piketon, OH				н	0	3	25,100	\$20,000
Friends of the Homeless Columbus, OH				ОШ	s	s	580,800	\$55,611
The Open Shelter Columbus, OH				οщ	s	. s	580,800	\$44,700

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H. homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

2 ŝ 4

3

Grantee/Providers		Grantee	type				Selectio	on Criteria for Provic	ders
	<b>公书站台台</b>	20010 U-07	Drdag Cosgey	田びひ R もあよっ日	下 みち のよ ふしょうマミップ ①	Нуба од Флоршдал (5)	てきゅうち うは ひょうきてゅい	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
Chicago, IL	1. 1. C.	>		S				3,029,300	\$2,029,000
Bethel New Life Chicago, IL		4			υщ	s	5		<b>\$</b> 132,453
Christian Industrial League Chicago, IL					ощ	ц	1		\$195,000
House of Mary and Joseph (Franciscan Outreach) Chicago, ${\rm I\!L}$					U	s	5		\$95,000
Southwest Women Working Together Chicago, IL					0	s	1		\$25,000

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

- 1 6 4

Grantee/Providers	9	rantee	Type				Selecti	on Criteria for Prov	iders
	<b>ふちゅう</b>	Xatro Oitty	<b>Эгдан Оозд</b> жу	HDD Kemion	FYDD OF COTHYNHY E	Hyde of Frosuder (5)	Years wa Prossrad	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
New Orleans, LA		<u>``</u>		9				496,938	\$348,000
Associated Catholic Charities Care Center, New Orleans, LA					0	0	s		\$31,680
Recovery Works New Orleans, LA					υo	s	1		\$30,800
Salvation Army New Orleans, LA					οщ	s	S		\$50,500

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birrringham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

- CI CO 4

.

Grantee/Providers	Ŭ	Grantee	Type				Selectic	on Criteria for Prov	iders
	٥ + ۵ + ۵	X 0	Droge Dosewy	用りね 我 * * * * * *	TYPE OF COTHENTY ()	TYPE OF Frommer (3)	Yeara H FromraH	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
State of Texas	•			9				16,986,510	\$1,910,000
Brighter Tomorrows Duncanville, TX					НЕО	s	1	36,000	\$51,636
City of Copperas Cove					ОН	s	s	19,469	\$32,970
Collin Intervention to Youth Plano, TX					οщ	s	1	117,200	\$50,000

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: ahelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmungham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

- 2 8 4

Grantee/Providers		Grante	e Type				Selecti	on Criteria for Pro	viders
	6 4 B 4 2	がっちゃつ ひょうど	<b>Эгран Ооздчу</b>	単UD Kewing	F>B0 04 404	тура от риотеран (2)	УФаго – д РгосгаН	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
Corpus Christi, TX		•	2. Sec. 2	6			Sec. No.	270,100	\$89,000
Dos Mundos Day School Corpus Christi, TX					υou	0	S		\$30,000
Metro Ministries Homebase Rainbow House Corpus Christi, TX			-		ОШ	s	s		\$55,000
Battered Women's Shelter Corpus Christi, TX		1		4	vo	s	4		\$28,800 FY90

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: ahelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient juriadicition CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama: JCO: Jefferson County

- 2 6 4

B-39

Grantee/Providers		Grantee	Type				Selectio	on Criteria for Provi	ders
	<b>ふちまま</b> の	がもちょう ひょもど	Имае Оовени	単ひつ K e ⊗… o g	F 240 04 404424 (j	Туда от Бгоу-даг (2)	уоано – д <u>Р</u> гожна <u>н</u>	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
State of California	>			•					\$1,027,144
The Depot Marysville, CA					ОШ	s	S	11,400	\$175,300
Santa Clara Family Living Center San Jose, CA					ОШ	s	1	740,900	\$200,000
San Bernadino County Community Action Agency, Hollister, CA					ОШ	s	1	11,488	\$90,250
Tri-City Homeless Coalition Shelter Program Freemont, CA					οщ	s	1	162,800	\$196,455
Kings Community Action Agency Hanford, CA					υощ	s	7		\$147,671

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama, JCO: Jefferson County

- 2 2 4

Grantee/Providers	-9	rantee Ty	be			Selectio	n Criteria for Provi	ders
	٥ - a - o	V + BEOC BBDTC	EDA Kessies	下 ア 4 9 4 4 9 4 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Нуда од бгоршдаг (2)	Уоаго – в бгожгаВ	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
San Francisco, CA	A difference and a second a se		6				748,600	\$422,000
American Red Cross, G.G. Chapter San Francisco, CA				H	0	-		\$29,162
Larkin Street Youth Services San Francisco, CA				0	s	ю		000'16\$
Richmond Hills San Francisco, CA				οщ	s	5		000'57\$

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operations, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: shelter, O: not a shelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient jurisdiction CB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

- 11 - 4

.

Grantee/Providers		Grantee	Type				Selectio	a Criteria for Provi	iders
	٥ + a + o	X 0	Dross Coss-P	EDD Kession	F 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	F > G = 6	Уеаго – д бгожгаН	Population of Community	ESG Grant Amount FY 91
Portland, OR	in the second	`		10				437,319	\$174,000
Transition Projects Inc. Portland, OR					0	s	s		\$14,200
Portland IMPACT Family Resource Center Portland, OR					0	s	3		\$10,800
Raphael House Portland, OR					0	s	s		\$14,000
Red Cross Clearinghouse Portland, OR					Н	0	5		\$35,000

Funded in FY 91: C: conversion/renovation/rehabilitation, O: operationa, E: essential services, H: homelessness prevention S: ahelter, O: not a ahelter, G: government entity, F: food service station R: indicates recipient juriadiction ÇB: City of Birmingham; AL: State of Alabama; JCO: Jefferson County

() (n 4

### Emergency Shelter Grants Program Evaluation Sampling and Data Collection Summary

r			
	Grantees	Recipients	Providers
Population	All 367 ESG grantees with steady participation from FY 1987S to FY 1991 Universe is 382 grantees ever funded	All organizations receiving ESG funding from grantees and with further allocation authority, FY 1991	All shelters and other service providers receiving ESG funds in FY 1991 to assist the homeless.
Sample Size and Nesting	Grantee data base: no selection (universe: N=382) Grantee sample for phone surveys: N = 234 Site visits: N = 15	N < 216, with sampling of 1 recipient only where grantee uses recipients N = 12 Site visits: N = 2	N = 648, with sampling of about 4 providers per grantee For mailed survey, N = 389 (60% response) Site visits: N > 15
Sample Stratifiers	Grantee type: state or territory/urban country/metro city <u>Census region</u> : Northeast/Midwest/ South/West <u>HUD region</u> and <u>activity mix</u> to be examined	None	<u>Type of activity:</u> rehab/operations/ essential services/ homeless prevention. Providers with mixed activies randomly assigned to one category
Method of Selection	PPS (Size is cumulative ESG \$)	All recipients between sampled grantee and sampled provider	Equal probability within provider strata 2-stage cluster
Approximate Confidence Intervals (Phone Surveys)	± 7%	for N = 100, $\pm$ 10%	± 4%
Primary Data Sources	Grantee Phone Survey Site Visits	Recipient Phone Survey Site Visits	Provider Phone Survey Provider Mailed Survey Site Visits Cost Assessment Forms
Secondary Data Sources	Annual Reports Application Forms Funding Data	Funding Data	Funding Data
Data Collection Steps	Secondary data abstracting Mail and phone fill-in to assemble recipient and provider lists Reconnaissance visits Phone survey Site visits	Mail and phone fill-in to complete provider lists Reconnaissance visits Phone survey Site visits	Reconnaissance visits Phone survey Mail survey Site visits

Population Group	Approximate Universe Size	Initial Sample Size	Expected Completion Rate	Expected Number of Completed Interviews	Actual Completion Rate	Actual Number of Completed Interviews
Grantees	382	310	70%	216	75.4%*	234
Recipients	Unknown	12	80 %	10	100 %	12
Providers/ Telephone Survey	3000- 3500	1131	60 %	648	57.6%**	651
Providers/ Mailed Survey	3000- 3500	651	60%	389	46.2%	301
Providers/ Cost Assessment	3000- 3500	45	100 %	45	88.9%	40

### Potential Respondent Universe and Expected and Actual Numbers of Completed Interviews

\*Among the 263 usable grantees, the response rate was 89 percent.

\*\*Not all of the 1131 cases were released for interviewing. Due to higher response than anticipated, the sample was reduced in a random fashion across all the strata except B. The final sample released and worked was 975, with a response rate of 66.8 percent.

### **B2.1** Comparison of Grantee Respondents with Grantee Universe

The 234 respondents to the grantee survey were well representative of the universe of entitlement jurisdictions. Exhibit B.18 shows how the distribution of cases on grantee type and Census region compares to the program as a whole. They are quite similar.

Grantee Type	Grantee #	Universe %	Grantee I #	Respondents %
State/Territory	55	14.4%	37	15.8%
Metropolitan City	220	57.6	129	55.1
Urban County	107	28.0	68	29.1
Total	382	100.0%	234	100.0%
Census Region				
Northeast	103	27.0%	63	26.9%
South	121	31.7	77	32.9
Midwest	77	20.2	54	23.1
West	81	21.2	40	17.1
Total	382	100.0%	234	100.0%

### **Comparison of Grantee Respondents With Universe**

### **B2.2** Comparison of Provider Respondents with Provider Universe

The 651 providers that responded to the telephone survey were sampled from a universe of 2210 providers funded for FY 91, using information from the grantee census. However, providers only became eligible for the survey when their grantees completed the grantee telephone survey. Therefore, the distribution of provider characteristics could be affected both by grantee non-response and provider non-response. Exhibit B.19 compares the distribution of phone survey respondents to that of the universe, the full sample of providers, and the providers of respondent grantees. It shows that the homelessness prevention and rehab strata were slightly over-represented in the phone respondent group, while the essential services and operations strata were slightly under-represented. In the mailed survey response, the homelessness prevention and essential services strata were slightly over-represented, with rehab and operations underrepresented. Sample weights by stratum adjusted for these differences, as described in Section B2.3 below.

### **Provider Response by Stratum**

Stratum	Unive Prov #	erse of riders %	Sampled P All San Grant #	roviders, npled ees %	Sampled of Gr Respo #	Providers antee ndents %	Pro Resp (Phoi #	ovider ondents ne/Mail) %
Н	444	20.1	253	22.4	240	23.1	126/ 67	19.4/ 22.3
Е	598	27.1	300	26.5	274	26.3	162/ 89	24.9/ 29.6
С	345	15.6	201	17.8	187	18.0	143/ 56	22.0/ 18.6
0	823	37.2	377	33.3	340	32.7	220/ 89	33.8/ 29.6
Total	2210	100	1131	100	1041	100	651/ 301	100/ 100

H = Homelessness PreventionKey: E = Essential Services

C = Conversion/Renovation/RehabilitationO = Shelter Operations

### B2.3 **Construction of Final Grantee and Provider Weights**

### **Grantee Sample Weights**

Section B1.1 above described the sampling of grantees. The size of the sample, combined with selection probabilities proportional to size, meant that a significant number of grantees were selected with certainty (probability of selection equals 1). Smaller grantees were selected with probabilities less than one -- i.e. they were selected from among grantees of the same type and region, with the likelihood of inclusion in the sample proportional to their cumulative ESG funding.

The weighting methodology for the grantees involved assigning to each sample grantee a basic sampling weight equal to the reciprocal of its probability of selection. The basic sampling weight was then adjusted for nonresponse, on a Census region by grantee-type stratum basis. This adjustment brought the weighted count of grantees in each stratum into exact agreement with the number in the program universe (382). Exhibit **B**.20 shows the distribution of unweighted and weighted grantees on the two stratifying variables. Weighting has brought the distributions into closer alignment with the grantee universe (cf. Exhibit B.18).

Grantee Type	Unw #	eighted %	Weigl #	nted %
State/Territory	37	15.8%	55	14.4%
Metropolitan City	129	55.1	220	57.6
Urban County	68	29.1	107	28.0
Total	234	100.0%	382	100.0%
<b>Census Region</b>				
Northeast	63	26.9%	101.3	26.5%
South	77	32.9	122.5	32.1
Midwest	54	23.1	79.0	20.7
West	40	17.1	79.1	20.7
Total	234	100.0%	382	100.0%

### Comparison of Unweighted and Weighted Distributions of Grantee Survey Responses

### **Provider Sample Weights**

Telephone survey respondents. As described in Section B1.3 above, the provider sample is a cluster sample within the grantees. Providers were assigned to a stratum based on the activities for which they received ESG funding in FY 91; the assignment was hierarchical, in this order: H (Homelessness Prevention); E (Essential Services); C (Conversion, Renovation, or Rehabilitation); and O (Shelter Operations). Providers were sampled within grantees, according to the number and stratum mix of providers funded by the grantee. A selection ratio for each stratum for each grantee governed the number of providers chosen; for grantees with 5 or fewer providers, the selection ratios for all strata were 1:1 (all providers included).

Derivation of provider weights began with the grantee weights. These were multiplied by the selection ratio for the particular stratum and grantee. Weights were then summed by

**B-47** 

stratum across the sample and adjusted for non-response based on a comparison to the distributions in the grantee census for the 234 respondent grantees.

Final adjustment of the weights involved comparison of the weighted dollar totals across the whole program for the four eligible activity categories. Adjustment by stratum brought the totals into line with best estimates (from the grantee census) of program-wide funding allocation for FY 91. Specifically, the comparison of funds allocations between the grantee census and the provider phone survey data is as follows:

	<b>Grantee Census</b>	<b>Provider Pho</b>	ne Survey
Conversion/renovation/rehabilitation	\$14,185,143	\$14,628,351	(+3.12%)
Operations	\$34,405,186	\$34,297,887	(-0.31%)
Essential Services	\$15,113,125	\$14,427,017	(-4.54%)
Homelessness Prevention	\$ 6,698,752	\$ 6,789,756	(+1.36%)
Administration	\$2,029,794		
PROGRAM TOTAL	\$72,432,000		
EXCLUDING ADMINISTRATION	\$70,402,206	\$70,143,012	(36%)

Exhibit B.21 shows the distribution of unweighted and weighted provider telephone survey respondents on the provider stratifying variable. The weighted total N is 3,028 providers.

Mailed survey respondents. The response was much lower to the mailed portion of the provider survey. Weights for the analysis of items from the mailed survey therefore required further adjustment for non-response, followed by adjustment against the best estimates of program-wide funding from the grantee census. Exhibit B.21 showed the unweighted and weighted mailed survey response against the provider stratifying variable. Respondents in the

Provider	Unw	veighted	Weig	hted
Stratum	#	%	#	%
Telephone Survey:				
Н	143	22.0%	438.36	14.5%
E	162	24.9	994.51	32.8
С	126	19.4	410.79	13.6
0	220	33.8	1184.28	39.1
Total	651	100.0%	3027.95	100.0%
Mailed Survey:	-00			
Н	67	22.3%	773.50	21.7%
E	89	29.6	1195.90	33.6
С	56	- 18.6	404.31	11.3
0	89	29.6	1187.04	33.3
Total	301	100.0%	3560.75	100.0%

### Comparison of Unweighted and Weighted Distributions of Provider Survey Responses

homelessness prevention and essential services strata were over-represented, in the rehab stratum slightly over-represented, and in the operations stratum quite under-represented. In addition, there appears to have been some non-response bias relative to the size of the providers, with small agencies more likely to respond. The results of the final weighting, also shown in Exhibit B.21, show larger weighted Ns overall and for the H (Homelessness Prevention) and E (Essential Services) strata, compared to the provider phone survey sample. Relative to program funding, the results are as follows:

	Grantee Census	Provider Ma	iled Survey
Conversion/renovation/rehabilitation	\$14,185,143	\$15,784,027	(+11.27%)
Operations	\$34,405,186	\$38,508.214	(+11.93%)
Essential Services	\$15,113,125	\$14,424,559	(-4.56%)
Homelessness Prevention	\$ 6,698,752	\$ 6,703,017	(+0.06%)
Administration	\$2,029,794		
PROGRAM TOTAL	\$72,432,000		
EXCLUDING ADMINISTRATION	\$70,402,206	\$75,419,817	(+6.36%)

### **B2.4** Level of Accuracy

Statistical tests on the data collected from the grantee and provider samples must take into account the sample designs (grantee stratified sampling and provider cluster sampling within grantees), as well as the sizes of each of the samples relative to the respective universes. Specialized statistical software<sup>9</sup> was used to make these adjustments: to calculate standard errors incorporating the finite population correction; and to measure design effects resulting from the sample designs. These computations were carried out for selected key variables, as there were far too many variables in the entire study data base to do them for each one.

Exhibit B.22 is a matrix of confidence intervals on observed proportions ranging from 5/95 percent to 50/50 percent in each of the three samples (grantee, provider phone, and provider mail samples). The matrix was developed by calculating average design effects over a number of different variables for a range of observed proportions, then applying them to the standard error of the proportion (computed in the usual manner) and multiplying by 1.96 (for the 95 percent level of confidence). The sample sizes shown are for the full number of responses in each sample and stratum. The confidence intervals are largest, of course, at 50 percent. For grantees, a proportion close to 50 percent in the full sample of 234 has a 95 percent confidence interval of  $\pm 4$  percent. For Western grantees, a proportion close to 50

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Babubhai V. Shah, Beth G. Barnwell, Nileen P. Hunt, and Lisa M. LaVange, SUDAAN User's Manual, Release 5.50 (Research Triangle Institute, 1991).

**EXHIBIT B.22** 

# EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM EVALUATION 95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVALS FOR PROPORTIONS\*

			0	BSERVED P	ROPORTIO	Z	
	SAMPLE SIZE	5% OR 95%	10% OR 90%	20% OR 80%	30% OR 70%	40% OR 60%	50%
GRANTEES TOTAL	234	1.8	2.4	3.2	3.7	4.0	4.0
STATES/TERRITORIES	37	4.0	5.5	7.4	8.5	9.0	9.2
METRO CITIES	129	2.5	3.5	4.6	5.3	5.7	5.8
URBAN COUNTIES	68	3.1	4.3	5.7	6.5	7.0	7.1
NORTHEAST	63	3.4	4.7	6.3	7.2	7.7	7.9
SOI ITH	2	50	3.5	4.6	5.3	5.7	5.8
MID/A/EGT		0 1 0 1 0	3.8	5.0	5.8	6.2	6.3
WEST	t 04	5.3	7.3	9.8	11.2	12.0	12.2
PROVIDERS-PHONE SURVEY					ļ	c L	Ţ
TOTAL	651	2.2	3.1	4.1	4.7	0.6	- 0
	201	0 8	54	7.2	8.2	8.8	8.9
	071	) a	. 99 99	8.9	10.1	10.8	11.1
	201	) <del>-</del>	4.0	5.7	6.5	7.0	7.1
	220	3.7	5.1	6.7	7.7	8.3	8.4
PROVIDERS-MAILED SURVEY						7	7 6
TOTAL	301	3.3	4.5	6.0	0.9	<b>t</b> , _	2
	Į	6 U	74	9.8	11.2	12.0	12.3
STRATUM=H	/9	י ה מ	. 0	12.0	13.7	14.6	14.9
STRATUM=E	50 L		9 9 9 9	1.0	10.5	11.2	11.4
STRATUM=C STRATUM=0	6 8 8	0.0 0.0	8.0	10.6	12.1	13.0	13.3

\* Standard errors incorporating finite population correction, adjusted for average design effects and then multiplied by 1.96. Stratum key: H=homelessness prevention; E=essential services; C=conversion/renovation/rehab; O=operations

# B-51

percent in the sample of 40 has a 95 percent confidence interval of  $\pm$  12.2 percent. However, an observed proportion of 10 percent in this group has a confidence interval of  $\pm$  7.3 percent.

The confidence intervals for the provider phone survey sample range for  $\pm 2.2$  percent to  $\pm 5.1$  percent for the full sample of 651. They are larger for the essential services stratum than for the other groups, all else equal; for observed proportions around 50 percent in this stratum, the true proportion would have a 95 percent probability of falling between 38.9 and 61.1 percent. However, most intervals are in the  $\pm 5$  to 7 percent range for the other strata and for proportions farther from 50 percent. The 95 percent confidence intervals for the mailed survey data are larger, due to much lower response; however, they fall below  $\pm 12$  percent in most instances.

Exhibit B.23 shows equivalent information for selected continuous variables collected from the grantee and provider phone surveys. For some of these variables, the means are of interest (e.g. average grantee agency budget, average share of grantee budget coming from ESG, average provider agency budget). For others, such as counts of individuals served or beds added to shelters, we are interested in estimating totals across the program (or parts thereof). The exhibit shows standard errors (with finite population correction), design effects, and resulting 95 percent confidence intervals for three grantee-level variables and three provider-level variables, with actual sample sizes and data points. The same specialized SUDAAN software was used for these computations. In the text of the report, statistical tests were applied in selected, key places using output and computations like those shown for Exhibits B.22 and B.23.

### **B3.0** Data Collection Summary

This portion of Appendix B provides a synopsis of the data collection and data processing undertaken for the evaluation of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program. Section B3.1 provides an overview of the various data collection steps undertaken. Section B3.2 describes each of the data collection steps. Section B3.3 supplies the details of the data processing undertaken to produce this evaluation report.

### EXHIBIT B.23

### EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM EVALUATION STANDARD ERRORS FOR MEANS AND TOTALS OF SELECTED CONTINUOUS VARIABLES

GRANTEES	Total Grantee Agency Budget						
	Sample <u>Size</u>	Mean	Standard Error of Mean	DEFF* Mean	95% Confidence Interval		
TOTAL	225	\$1,202,827	\$150,750	0.35 +/-	\$295,470		
STATES/TERRITORIES METRO CITIES	34 125	\$3,943,386 \$849,073	\$715,894 \$1,883,877	0.33 +/- 0.44 +/-	\$1,403,152 \$3,692,399		
URBAN COUNTIES	66	\$599,144	\$136,491	0.33 +/-	\$267,522		
NORTHEAST SOUTH MIDWEST	57 77 54	\$1,050,629 \$937,948 \$821,544	\$362,166 \$168,931 \$116,647	0.4 +/- 0.15 +/ 0.15 +/	\$709,845 \$331,105 \$228,628		
WEST	37	\$2,215,096	\$508,387	0.6 +/-	\$996,439		
GRANTEES		ESGP as % of Grantee Budget					
	Sample <u>Size</u>	Mean	Standard Error DEFF* of Mean Mean		95% Confidence Interval		
TOTAL	225	55.98	1.50	0.40 +/-	2.94		
STATES/TERRITORIES METRO CITIES URBAN COUNTIES	34 125 66	46.13 58.52 55.65	2.86 2.05 2.93	0.28 +/- 0.42 +/- 0.41 +/-	5.61 4.02 5.74		
NORTHEAST SOUTH	58 77	66.92 57.06	3.20 2.41	0.42 +/- 0.40 +/-	6.27 4.72		
MIDWEST WEST	53 37	62.54 33.87	2.42 3.83	0.28 +/- 0.69 +/-	4.74 7.51		
GRANTEES	Sample	umber of Indivi	duals Retaining Hou	sing as a Res	ult of HP		

	5 5					
	Sample <u>Size</u>	Total	Standard Error <u>of Total</u>	DEFF* Total	95% Confidence Interval	
TOTAL	43	16,790	2,229	0.27 +/	4,369	
STATES/TERRITORIES	12	8,722	1,444	0.27 +/-	2,830	
METRO CITIES	20	7,008	1,683	0.34 +/-	3,299	
URBAN COUNTIES	11	1,060	222	0.71 +/-	435	
NORTHEART	0	004	- 080	0 00 1 /	540	
NORTHEAST	9	931	280	0.00 +/-	549	
SOUTH	13	5,639	1,226	0.27 +/-	2,403	
MIDWEST	12	7,640	1,688	0.29 +/-	3,308	
WEST	9	2,580	732	0.98 +/-	1,435	

\* Design effects, although shown separately for purposes of information, are already incorporated in the standard errors.

### **EXHIBIT B.23 continued**

PROVIDERS	Number of Individuals Served					
	Sample <u>Size</u>	Total	Standard Error of Total	DEFF* Total	95% Confidence Interval	
TOTAL	486	2,799,673	516,646	0.94 +/-	1,012,626	
STRATUM≕H STRATUM=E STRATUM=C STRATUM=O	114 91 102 179	1,218,133 551,694 302,552 727,294	438,873 171,828 129,324 114,693	0.92 +/- 3.42 +/- 2.91 +/- 1.37 +/-	860,191 336,783 253,475 224,798	

PROVIDERS	Number of Beds Added to Shelter as a Result of ESGP					
	Sample <u>Size</u>	Total	Standard Error of Total	DEFF* Total	95% Confidence Interval	
TOTAL	98	7,714	1,117	0.82 +/-	2,189	
STRATUM=H**					·	
STRATUM=E	25	2,585	694	2.99 +/-	1,360	
STRATUM=C	40	2,672	648	1.30 +/-	1,270	
STRATUM=0	33	2,457	626	0.40 +/-	1,227	

PROVIDERS	Provider Total Operating Budget for 1991					
	Sample <u>Size</u>	Mean	Standard Error of Mean	DEFF* <u>Mean</u>	95% Confidence Interval	
TOTAL	605	\$691,691	\$72,295	1.64 +/-	141,698	
STRATUM=H STRATUM=E STRATUM=C	128 157 120	\$1,303,481 \$689,160 \$613,549	\$273,704 \$141,324 \$88,656	1.34 +/- 1.97 +/- 0.77 +/-	536,460 276,995 173,766	
STRATUM=0	200	\$508,678	\$80,882	1.40 +/-	158,529	

- \* Design effects, although shown separately for purposes of information, are already incorporated in the standard errors.
- \*\* Question not asked of providers in this stratum.

Stratum key: H=homelessness prevention; E=essential services; C=conversion/renovation/rehab; O=operations

### B3.1 Overview of the Data Collection for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program Evaluation

The data collection for the ESG evaluation was conducted in three increasingly intensive levels requiring seven steps, as shown in Exhibit B.24. The data sources and methods for collecting the data at each level of the evaluation are summarized in Exhibit B.25.

The first level of the data collection focused on acquiring the background information on the ESG necessary to develop a final data collection plan. It included discussions with HUD personnel to determine the content and location of information and reports from the ESG, assessment of grantee reports in HUD Central Office files, and visits to selected reconnaissance sites. Reconnaissance visits were made to eight communities that administer ESG and interviews were conducted with grantees, shelters, and other service providers, to improve program understanding and assess the feasibility of data collection plans.

The discussions with HUD provided the location of the ESG files that had been forwarded by the HUD field offices to Headquarters. After abstracting all of the available information, it was computerized and used to generate reports for mailing to each grantee. Then each of the 382 ESG grantees was requested to review, correct, and complete the information needed. This information, compiled as the grantee census, was next used as a sampling frame for the telephone interview samples of grantees, recipients, and homeless-services providers.

The second level of the evaluation data collection consisted of telephone surveys of samples of grantees and recipients, and a combination of telephone and mail surveys of service providers. Altogether, four surveys were conducted.

The final and most intensive level of data collection consisted of in-depth site visits to a sample of 15 grantees, their recipients (if present), shelters and other service providers, and selected collateral respondents (e.g., the local Homeless Taskforce). These visits supported our collection of additional information, such as Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategies (CHASs) and cost data from the providers at each site.

### **B3.2** Data Collection Steps

The evaluation consisted of seven data collection steps, implemented sequentially. Each step is described below.

# Schematic Diagram of ESG Program Evaluation Data Collection



### Data Sources for the Evaluation of the Emergency Shelter Grants Program

Data Sources	Primary/Secondary	Methods
HUD Central Office (CC	)) P	• Discussion of program with CO staff
ESG Applications	S	• Abstract applications
Performance Reports	S	• Abstract performance reports
CHAPs/CHASs	S	• Collect CHAPs or CHASs for intensive- study sites
Grantees	Ρ	<ul> <li>Mailing with telephone follow-up to fill in data missing from application abstracts; completion of lists of recipients, shelters, and other service providers</li> <li>Reconnaissance visits</li> <li>(Sample) Phone survey</li> <li>(Sub-sample) Site visits with in-person inter-</li> </ul>
Recipients	Р	<ul> <li>Reconnaissance visits</li> <li>(Sample) Request for list of shelters and other service providers</li> <li>(Sample) Phone survey</li> <li>(Sub-sample) Site visits with in-person interviews</li> </ul>
Shelters & Homeless Services Providers	Р	<ul> <li>Reconnaissance visits</li> <li>(Sample) Phone survey</li> <li>(Sample) Mail survey</li> <li>(Sub-sample) Site visits with in-person interviews</li> <li>(Sub-sample) Cost assessment forms</li> </ul>

### Discussions with the HUD Central Office Personnel

The first data collection effort drew upon information from HUD Central Office staff concerning available documentation on the ESG grantees. The objective of these discussions was to develop a strategy for conducting the census of grantees. During the initial discussions with the HUD Central Office staff, we were informed of several HUD automated data files, as well as the location of the existing collection of ESG documents. Further examination of the ESG files at the HUD Central Office revealed that most of the information available pertained to FY 89 or earlier. FY 90 and FY 91 materials were very incomplete. As a consequence, the next step, the census of grantees, was begun with full knowledge that there would be many "holes" to fill before the data could be considered complete.

### The Census of Grantees

The census of grantees was conducted using three types of data sources: the HUD automated data on the ESG Program; documents submitted to HUD by the grantees; and mail and telephone follow-ups with grantees to fill in missing data. Using an abstracting form designed for this project, data items were drawn from the following secondary sources:

HUD Data Base: Provided the full list of grantees and their ESG funding totals from FY 87 to FY 91.

Application Forms: Usually only contained the required representations and certifications. Some information was abstracted from these forms for FY 87 to FY 89; forms for FY 90 and FY 91 were seldom available.

**Performance Reports:** Annual performance reports (FY 87 to FY 89; FY 90 and FY 91 were rarely present) were reviewed to determine the amount of funds obligated and spent for each of the four categories of eligible activities, and to assemble initial lists of recipients and providers. Matching funds data were particularly incomplete.

After all relevant data were abstracted from these three sources and entered into a data base, each grantee organization was contacted by letter to introduce the evaluation and solicit cooperation. Enclosed with the letter were printouts of existing data for the specific grantee. The grantees were asked to check the information carefully, correcting grantee allocations by activity category for each fiscal year, completing names of recipients and homeless-services providers together with total dollar allocations by fiscal year, adding contacting information for recipients and service providers, and identifying funded activities for recipients and service providers. Telephone follow-up was used to increase response. Additional telephone contacts filled in information gaps so the grantee census information could be used as the sampling frame for drawing samples of grantees, recipients, and homeless-services providers.

### **Reconnaissance Visits**

For this evaluation, the reconnaissance visits had three purposes. The first was to test the evaluation team's ability to identify appropriate respondents at the grantee, recipient, and shelter/service provider levels—that is, to ascertain whether the current understanding of ESG structure was correct. The second was to determine the availability of needed data and the opportunities for collecting (cost-effectively) proxies for those data.

The third purpose of the reconnaissance site selection was to duplicate the sampling design proposed for the full study, that is, selection of sets of grantees and their associated recipients and shelters/service providers. Within the geographic areas of the evaluation team's offices were seven states that offered variation on several variables of interest: size (measured by the amount of ESG funding), grantee type (state/territory, urban county, metropolitan city), and relationship to recipients (whether funds went to recipients for further allocation of ESG funds or went directly to service providers). Variation in HUD region was also sought. The selected states included two in New England (Massachusetts and New Hampshire), three mid-Atlantic states (Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia), and two western states (Colorado and California). The seven states were located in four HUD regions and provided a mix of grantee types:

- Four state grantees (Massachusetts, New Hampshire, the District of Columbia, and Colorado)
- Two urban county grantees (Anne Arundel County, Maryland; Los Angeles County, California)
- Four city grantees (Manchester, New Hampshire; Cambridge, Massachusetts; Richmond, Virginia; Los Angeles, California).

As part of the planning process for the reconnaissance visits, each grantee was asked to supply the following information for all organizations awarded ESG funds:

• Type of organization: unit of local government or nonprofit agency;

- Second-level decision-maker? (yes/no);
- Shelter operator? (yes/no);
- Number of shelters operated; and
- ESG-funded activities (shelter operations, shelter renovation/rehabilitation, homelessness prevention, essential services).

From this information, the selections of recipients and homeless services providers were made, as shown in Exhibit B.26.

Eight visits were made, with contacts at the grantee, recipient, and shelter and other service provider levels. The reconnaissance visits occurred in the early months of the evaluation.<sup>10</sup> From these visits, the evaluation design was refined and the options that could be applied across a wide range of entities receiving ESG funds were clarified, with resulting improvement in the face validity of the research design and the data collection instruments.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> For a detailed discussion on the findings from the reconnaissance, see the Research Design, Data Collection and Analysis Plan for the Emergency Shelter Grant Program Evaluation, March 24, 1992, pp. 80-96.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> It was during the course of setting up and making reconnaissance visits that information on the lack of a widespread recipient level in the ESG emerged. Although a few recipients were later found, this level in the ESG system was rare.

# **Reconnaissance Visit Sites**

Agency Name	G r a n t e e	R e c i p i e n t	S h e l t r	P Sr eo rv vi id ce er
Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Human Services, Department of Public Welfare, Shelter Resources Unit	1			
Catholic Charities Bureau			1	
Boston Trustees of Health and Hospitals or Greater Boston Adult Shelter Alliance			1	
City of Cambridge	1			
Casper-Albany Street Shelter			1	
Hildebrand Self-Help Center			1	
State of New Hampshire, Division of Mental Health and Development Services	1			
New Horizons			1	
City of Manchester	1			
Manchester Welfare Department			1	
Town of Dover				/
District of Columbia Department of Human Services	1			
Emory House			1	
City of Richmond	1			
Daily Planet			1	
Richmond Department of the Mental Health				1
Anne Arundel County	1			
Associated Catholic Charities		1		
Sarah's House			1	

### **Reconnaissance Visit Sites**

Agency Name	G r a n t e e	R e c i p i e n t	S h e l t e r	P Sr eo rv vi id ce er
State of Colorado, Division of Housing	1			
Weld County Department of Social Services		1		
Catholic Community Services, Greeley			1	
Gateway Battered Women's Shelter. Aurora			1	
City of Los Angeles, Department of Human Services	~			
County of Los Angeles, Community Development Commission	1			
St. Vincent DePaul Society			1	
El Centro				1

### **Telephone and Mail Surveys**

This level of the data collection was composed of three telephone surveys of the nested samples of grantees, recipients, and homeless-services providers, plus a follow-up mail survey of the providers. At each stage in the telephone survey, the data collection was used to build hierarchically on prior information gleaned (for example, from the census of grantees). The following three stages of surveys were conducted:

Survey of Grantees: This phone survey of 234 grantees contained questions designed to address relevant research topics. This survey was the first source of data on grantee strategies, decision-making, and implementation; such topics could not be covered in the grantee census.

Survey of Recipients: This phone survey was conducted with each recipient that met the definition of intermediate decision-maker, as these entities were identified between

sampled grantees and sampled providers. It gathered the necessary data on organizational characteristics, strategies, and decision-making about further allocation of ESG funds.

Surveys of Shelters: A phone survey of 651 shelters and other service providers gathered data to answer many of the research questions about shelter operations, clients, service providers, and the like. A follow-up mail survey to phone respondents gathered further information on funding, shelter characteristics and rules, and population served.

The complete instrument package for this portion of the data collection was included in the Research Design, Data Collection and Analysis Plan for the Emergency Shelter Grant Program Evaluation.<sup>12</sup>

### **Intensive-Study Site Visits**

Fifteen site visits were made to a sub-set of the grantees, recipients, shelters, and other service providers interviewed in the phone surveys. The purpose of these visits was to provide the five senior members of the evaluation team with the opportunity to gather in-depth information on how the ESG operates, its contexts, its successes and limitations, and its potential for further impact. Through site visits to clustered grantees, recipients (where present), and shelters/service providers, the evaluation team explored the dynamics of program planning, linkages across levels of organization, strategic choices and decisions, plans and hopes for the future.

One or two staff members visited each site for approximately three to three and one-half days. Interview guides for grantees, recipients, shelters, other service providers, and collateral/ related respondents were used to ensure that the site visits addressed all the relevant research questions in a consistent way. Separate cost assessment forms were used to collect cost and funding data from the shelters/service providers at each site. The volume of material collected in each of these visits to ESG sites was substantial. One product of the visits was the site profiles contained in Volume 2. Materials from the site visits are also used throughout the report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Abt Associates, March 24, 1992.

### **B.3.3 Data Processing Plan**

The database for the ESG evaluation consists of each of the data sets from the various data collection instruments. Specifically, these are:

- The grantee census data set created from the abstracting forms used to collect comparable information on the universe of ESG grantees from documentation available at the HUD Central or Field offices (including the grantee applications, and interim and annual reports). The HUD data base also contributed to this data set, as did the corrections and additions made by the grantees;
- The grantee phone survey data set containing the responses of the grantee sample to questions about program administration, costs, activities, and populations served;
- The recipient phone survey data set containing recipient responses about program administration and role;
- The shelter/services provider phone survey data set containing shelter/service administrator responses to questions about agency characteristics, budgets, services offered, facilities, and populations served;
- The shelter/services provider mail survey data set containing administrator responses to additional detailed questions about funding and clients; and
- The intensive site profiles containing data on costs, staffing, funding, program, and site characteristics for the 15 sites visited by senior staff.

### **Data Entry and Validation**

Data collection for this evaluation was conducted by Abt Associates and Aspen Systems. Abt's Survey Research Group (SRG) was responsible for two of the three telephone surveys, and Aspen Systems did the abstracting and follow-up of the data for the grantee census. All data entry was performed in-house at Abt or Aspen using experienced data entry personnel and was 100 percent key verified. Items from one of the three telephone surveys (grantee sample) and the mail survey was entered into ASCII files by the SRG data entry personnel. The provider phone survey was administered using a Computer Aided Telephone Interviewing System (CATI); data entry was direct. The recipient telephone survey (N=12) was performed by an evaluation team member and entered into a small data set.
# Data Base Design

A unique Case ID was assigned for each case, with a separate ID for the grantees, recipients, shelters, and service providers. However, due to the hierarchical nature of our sample, the grantee Case ID was embedded in the appropriate recipient and shelter records; likewise the recipient Case ID was embedded in the appropriate shelter or service provider record. This allowed linkage of the data from each of the sources, to enrich the analyses possibilities.

The grantee ID is comprised of:

- A 2-digit HUD region in the range 1 through 10.
- A 6-digit unique identifier that is found in the DIRWITH file from the HUD ESG database. This ID consists of a 2-digit state code and a 4-digit sequence number unique to that grantee. Embedding this unique identifier from the DIRWITH file makes it possible for the DIRWITH data and grantee census to be used in conjunction with the survey data.

The *recipient ID* is comprised of:

- The first 8 digits from the grantee ID (the 2-digit Federal region and the 6-digit DIRWITH identifier);
- 3-digit sequence numbers.

The shelter/services provider ID is comprised of:

- The first 8 digits from the grantee ID;
- A 3-digit sequence number.

## **Data Base Structure**

Exhibit B.27 provides a picture of the overall evaluation data base. It shows the primary and secondary data sources that feed into the grantee, recipient, and shelter/service provider files. It also indicates the hierarchical linkages among these files.

# ESG Program Data Base Design



B-66

## **B.3.4 Data Processing**

All data processing and analysis were performed on IBM AT-compatible microcomputers running under MS-DOS version 3.0 or higher. Once the data were entered and cleaned, SAS system files were created for the grantee census and each of the surveys. All final analysis files were converted to SPSS before they are transmitted to HUD, in keeping with PD&R specifications. The secondary data were also transformed from PARADOX files into SAS files for analysis and then to DBase and Lotus files for transmittal to HUD.

While the database was being built, file descriptions of each data file identifying the contents of the file in terms of the name, position, source, and characteristics of each data item in the file were created. All variables, including the constructed analysis variables, were labelled and all categorical values formatted (defining the range of values and the associated definition for each valid code for the categorical data item) as part of the building of the database. This created a data dictionary which was available to all analysis staff members and ultimately to HUD. Hardcopy versions (and machine-readable versions) of the file descriptions and the data dictionary was also produced.

Typically, during the course of analysis, several analysts worked on different research questions simultaneously and defined and computed their own variables for use in particular analyses. However, all variable construction was centralized under the control of the project programmer, thus ensuring only one version of the complete database, consistency in the definitions of all derived variables, and complete and thorough documentation.

### **Database Submission to HUD**

At the conclusion of the ESG Program evaluation, the database was submitted to HUD following PD&R specifications as requested in the Scope of Work. All files and related documentation were provided on 5.25-inch double-sided, high-density write-protected floppy diskettes for IBM-compatible micro-computers. Documentation was provided in hard-copy.

**B-67**