



## Adult Services Division - Homeless Program Unit

# 2017 Point-In-Time Homeless Count Data Report Summary

## Overview

The 2017 Point-In-Time Homeless Count unsheltered methodology consisted of a street-based count, and a service-based count. The sheltered count methodology consisted of data extracted from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) to count sheltered homeless individuals on the night of January 23, 2017. A total of 1,638 unsheltered homeless individuals and a preliminary sheltered count of 775 (**total homeless = 2,413**) were identified in Riverside County during the 2017 Point-In-Time Homeless Count on January 24, 2017. In contrast, during the 2016 PIT Count, 1,351 unsheltered and 814 sheltered homeless individuals (total homeless = 2,165) were identified. Therefore, there was a **11.45%** increase in the overall total number of homeless people counted from 2016 to 2017 (**21.2%** increase in unsheltered homeless; **4.8%** decrease in sheltered homeless). Among the 1,638 unsheltered individuals counted in 2017, 1,128 were interviewed and 510 were observed.

## Rationale for Countywide Increase

The increase in the overall unsheltered 2017 Point-in-Time Count (PIT) reflects a countywide commitment to conducting a more collaborative and rigorous count. The County of Riverside Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) submits that that this increase may be attributed to the following:

- ⇒ In 2017, following HUD's new requirements to have a separate youth count, we increased our efforts to obtain a more accurate count of youth ages 24 and under that are experiencing homelessness. We expanded our efforts by inviting youth friendly partners to assist in implementing the youth count. These partners included youth opportunity centers, transitional age youth programs, youth emergency shelters, city leaders, and other public, private, and non-profit agencies focused on the goal to end homelessness for youth. The knowledge and experience that each collaborative partner brought to the table helped us to better identify homeless youth during both the traditional and the youth counts. By having youth friendly volunteers, we were more successful in engaging youth to be willing to participate in the PIT Survey. Our 2017 count for youth ages 24 and under is 122; a 28% increase from last year's count. We believe this increase is due to our increased collaboration and focus on youth experiencing homelessness.
- ⇒ For the 2017 Point in Time Count, there was a targeted countywide effort to significantly increase city engagement activities and the participation of law enforcement agencies working on the frontlines to end homelessness. This enhanced partnership included the Riverside County Sheriff's Department, various City Police Departments, Riverside County and City Code Enforcement agencies, Riverside County Probation Department, DPSS Homeless Programs Unit, Housing Authority of the County of Riverside, The Riverside University Health System – Behavioral Health (formerly Department of Mental Health), the U.S. Department of Veterans' Affairs (VA), Loma Linda Medical Center, and other key nonprofit housing providers. These coordination efforts helped to improve planning activities through the pre-canvassing of communities to identify more accurate homeless locations. There was also an increased commitment from community partners to conduct a more accurate count by conducting follow up counts during the seven day window following the PIT Count date.



## 2017 Point-In-Time Homeless Count Data Report Summary

### Rationale for Countywide Increase (Continued)

⇒ Riverside County was under a severe thunderstorm warning by the National Weather Service in the weeks and days leading up to the PIT Count. As the majority of Riverside County's unsheltered homeless population resides in unsheltered settings, we partnered with first responders to raise awareness for the PIT Count and to promote the outreach services for homeless veterans, youth and families taking place on the day of the count. This message was layered onto an existing safety advisory initiated by first responders to warn homeless individuals of the dangers of residing in riverbeds, flood control channels and areas prone to mudslides during thunderstorms. This countywide effort between partnering county agencies helped to:

- ◆ Raise awareness and educate the homeless population of the benefits of participating in the count.
- ◆ Educate the most service resistant individuals residing in hard to reach areas.
- ◆ Reinforce common purpose to bring homeless individuals out of the shadows and promote a common message not to fear law enforcement personnel escorting PIT Count volunteers into encampments.

Homeless individuals that heeded the law enforcement/emergency management warning either sought shelter in drier areas or felt safe to participate in the survey, thus increasing the number of individuals surveyed during the entire PIT Count.

⇒ During the 2017 PIT Count, there was a 65% (201) increase in the number of observational surveys utilized compared to 2016. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) makes provisions for using an observational survey instead of an interview survey in the following situations:

- ◆ A PIT Count volunteer is unable to enter the location to conduct a survey.
- ◆ A PIT Count volunteer cannot conduct a survey (person refused to answer questions, language or other issues).
- ◆ A PIT Count volunteer does not wish to disturb people sleeping.

However, due to the limited amount of information collected on the observational survey and the fact that it includes the volunteer's perspective as opposed to the homeless individual's response, it makes the deduplication process challenging. Even though every effort is made to remove duplicates, there is no guarantee that some of the individuals observed may or may not have been interviewed at another time during the PIT Count.

**Note:** The following tables represent *unsheltered* PIT data only.

2017 Unsheltered Homeless Count by City

City or Unincorporated Area	2017 PIT Count		Total Unsheltered				Count Change	Percent Change
	Interview	Observational	2016		2017			
			Count	Percent	Count	Percent		
<b>City</b>								
Banning	26	6	25	1.9%	32	2.0%	7	28.0%
Beaumont	14	4	10	0.7%	18	1.1%	8	80.0%
Blythe	31	28	63	4.7%	59	3.6%	-4	-6.3%
Calimesa	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	-
Canyon Lake	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	-
Cathedral City	37	7	27	2.0%	44	2.7%	17	63.0%
Coachella	61	20	59	4.4%	81	4.9%	22	37.3%
Corona	39	17	83	6.1%	56	3.4%	-27	-32.5%
Desert Hot Springs	33	10	28	2.1%	43	2.6%	15	53.6%
Eastvale	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	-
Hemet	65	54	107	7.9%	119	7.3%	12	11.2%
Indian Wells	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	-
Indio	57	32	70	5.2%	89	5.4%	19	27.1%
Jurupa Valley	95	18	113	8.4%	113	6.9%	0	0.0%
La Quinta	1	1	8	0.6%	2	0.1%	-6	-75.0%
Lake Elsinore	53	9	53	3.9%	62	3.8%	9	17.0%
Menifee	10	4	20	1.5%	14	0.9%	-6	-30.0%
Moreno Valley	54	19	61	4.5%	73	4.5%	12	19.7%
Murrieta	5	2	0	0.0%	7	0.4%	7	-
Norco	3	1	12	0.9%	4	0.2%	-8	-66.7%
Palm Desert	21	7	19	1.4%	28	1.7%	9	47.4%
Palm Springs	90	48	83	6.1%	138	8.4%	55	66.3%
Perris	27	2	65	4.8%	29	1.8%	-36	-55.4%
Rancho Mirage	0	0	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	-3	-100.0%
Riverside	237	168	258	19.1%	405	24.7%	147	57.0%
San Jacinto	23	8	18	1.3%	31	1.9%	13	72.2%
Temecula	67	18	37	2.7%	85	5.2%	48	129.7%
Wildomar	4	2	13	1.0%	6	0.4%	-7	-53.8%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1053</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>1235</b>	<b>91.4%</b>	<b>1538</b>	<b>93.9%</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>24.5%</b>
<b>Unincorporated Area</b>								
Anza	0	0	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	-2	-100.0%
Bermuda Dunes	10	0	2	0.1%	10	0.6%	8	400.0%
Cabazon	1	0	6	0.4%	1	0.1%	-5	-83.3%
Cactus City	1	0	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	-
Cherry Valley	1	0	3	0.2%	1	0.1%	-2	-66.7%
Coronita	0	5	0	0.0%	5	0.3%	5	-
Highgrove	1	4	25	1.9%	5	0.3%	-20	-80.0%
Home Gardens	0	1	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	-
Homeland	0	0	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	-2	-100.0%
Idyllwild	8	2	12	0.9%	10	0.6%	-2	-16.7%
Lakeland Village	9	0	14	1.0%	9	0.5%	-5	-35.7%
Mead Valley	12	2	0	0.0%	14	0.9%	14	-
Meadowbrook	0	0	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	-3	-100.0%
Mecca	13	2	21	1.6%	15	0.9%	-6	-28.6%
Mesa Verde	0	0	2	0.1%	0	0.0%	-2	-100.0%
Romoland	4	1	3	0.2%	5	0.3%	2	66.7%
Temescal Valley	0	1	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	-
Thermal	1	0	8	0.6%	1	0.1%	-7	-87.5%
Thousand Palms	12	5	6	0.4%	17	1.0%	11	183.3%
Valle Vista	2	2	0	0.0%	4	0.2%	4	-
White Water	0	0	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	-1	-100.0%
Woodcrest	0	0	6	0.4%	0	0.0%	-6	-100.0%
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>8.6%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>-16</b>	<b>-13.8%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1128</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>1351</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1638</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>21.2%</b>

\*Note: 2017 PIT comprehensive data. Only unincorporated communities with a 2016/2017 unsheltered count greater than zero are included.



City or Unincorporated Area	Total Unsheltered Homeless Individuals		Chronically Homeless		Families with Children		Veterans		Youth (24 or younger)		Alcohol Use		Drug Use		PTSD		Mental Health Conditions		Physical Disability		Developmental Disability		Brain Injury		Victims of Domestic Violence		AIDS or HIV		Jail (within 12 months)	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Lake Riverside	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lake Tamarisk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lakeland Village	9	0.5%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lakeview	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Lost Lake	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
March ARB	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Mead Valley	14	0.9%	7	0.6%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	1	0.1%	7	0.6%	6	0.6%	4	0.4%	4	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	5	0.4%	0	0.0%	3	0.3%
Meadowbrook	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Mecca	15	0.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.1%	6	0.5%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%
Mesa Verde	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Mountain Center	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
North Shore	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nuevo	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Oasis	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pine Cove	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Pinyon Pines	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Rancho Capistrano	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Ripley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Romoland	5	0.3%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	4	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sage	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Sky Valley	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Temescal Valley	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Thermal	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Thousand Palms	17	1.0%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	1	0.1%	3	0.3%	3	0.3%	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	4	0.4%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%
Valle Vista	4	0.2%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Vista Santa Rosa	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Warm Springs	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Whitewater	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Winchester	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Woodcrest	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.2%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1.0%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1638</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>30.2%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>7.4%</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>25.8%</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>40.9%</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>27.4%</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>32.1%</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>20.2%</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>19.2%</b>

\*Note: 2017 PIT comprehensive data. Unsheltered count and Youth(24 or younger) includes total interview and observational collected data; percent of total unsheltered field and Youth(24 or younger) field calculated on total collected (1638). Families with Children, PTSD and Brain Injury field are unique to the general PIT questionnaire; percent of total calculated based on persons interviewed (1050). All remaining fields percentage calculated on total persons interviewed (1128).