Report to Congress:

Progress on HUD's Strategy for Improving Homeless Data Collection, Reporting and Analysis

May 2003

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Community Planning and Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, D.C 20410

HUD's Progress in Homeless Data Collection, Reporting and Analysis
May 2003

I. Introduction

This is a progress report on HUD's Strategy for Homeless Data Collection, Reporting and Analysis submitted to Congress in August 2001. HUD's Strategy can be found at: http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/hmis/index.cfm. This is the second progress report requested by Congress and those requests reflect continuing Congressional interest in HUD's efforts to improve homeless data collection and analysis locally and nationally.

HUD identified four major activities to address Congressional direction on the need for better data at the local and national levels on homelessness: (1) flexibly implementing the new Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) eligible activity under the Supportive Housing Program in the McKinney-Vento competition; (2) initiating a comprehensive technical assistance program to help local jurisdictions collect unduplicated client-level data by 2004; (3) developing an approach to obtain meaningful data for an Annual Homeless Assessment Report from a nationally representative sample of jurisdictions, and; (4) analyzing the most viable approaches to obtain homeless client-level reporting in the Annual Progress Report (APR) submitted by HUD's Continuum of Care (CoC) grantees. This report will assess HUD's progress in addressing each of these major activities.

II. Implementing the New Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) Eligible Activity and Initiative

HMIS Implementation in Continuum of Care communities after the 2001 and 2002 Competitions

The 2001 homeless assistance Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) officially notified Continuum of Care planning bodies, state and local government, homeless service providers and advocates of the Congressional direction on improved local and national homeless data collection and analysis when they were released on February 23, 2001. Most CoCs had less than three months to assess the HMIS concept and their communities' interest in implementing a system and submit proposed projects for funding. Nonetheless, the response to

the initiative was greater than expected. The number of communities in the middle to late stages of the HMIS planning process was greater than expected, as was the number of dedicated HMIS project applications submitted in the 2001 competition.

The 2002 homeless assistance competition gave greater definition to the homeless management information initiative. More communities became aware of the Congressional direction and began to seriously assess the HMIS concept and began a planning process.

1. Status of HMIS Implementation in CoCs from 2001 to 2002

In 2001 all CoCs were asked to complete a new, non-scored section of the comprehensive homeless plan assessing their status in implementing an HMIS. There were 437 CoCs that reported on the status of their HMIS implementation in Exhibit 1 of the 2001 CoC application.

In 2002 all CoCs were required to present information on their strategies for implementing an HMIS and asked to assess their progress. Each community's strategy and progress in implementing an HMIS was rated in the overall competitive process.

- 26 percent of CoCs indicated having implemented an HMIS or were updating or expanding an existing HMIS in 2002, compared with 16 percent of CoCs in 2001.

- In 2002, 51 percent of CoCs indicated that they had decided to implement an HMIS and were selecting a software and hardware, while 23 percent were selecting software and hardware in 2001.

- In 2002, 22 percent of CoCs indicated that they had been meeting and considering implementing an HMIS, while 35 percent were meeting and considering an HMIS in 2001.

- 1 percent indicated they had not yet considered implementing an HMIS, compared with 26 percent in 2001.

Status of HMIS Implementation	2001	2002
	Percent	Percent
The CoC has not yet considered implementing an HMIS.	26	1
The CoC has been meeting and is considering implementing an HMIS.	35	22
The CoC has decided to implement an HMIS and is selecting needed software and hardware	23	51
The CoC has implemented a continuum-wide HMIS or are updating or expanding an existing HMIS	16	26
TOTAL	100	100

2. Applications for HMIS Funding

CoCs can utilize two approaches for funding an HMIS through the Supportive Housing Programs (SHP): 1) a single **dedicated HMIS project;** or 2) a **cost-sharing or levy approach** across some or all new or renewal projects.

a. Dedicated HMIS Project

2001 Applications One method to fund an HMIS was for the CoC to submit a Supportive Services Only (SSO) project for the sole purpose of funding the implementation and operating costs of a new system or the upgrading or expansion of an existing system. While HUD estimated that 30 dedicated projects would be submitted, HUD received over 80 applications. In addition, nearly every dedicated HMIS project that a CoC proposed within its pro rata need amount was funded. Applicants submitted 84 HMIS dedicated projects totaling $24 million**.** 51 HMIS dedicated projects were funded totaling $13.3 million.

2002 Applications

In the 2002 competition, 135 HMIS dedicated projects totaling $35 million were submitted**.** HUD funded 83 of these HMIS dedicated projects for a total of $25 million.

	Requested Funds		Awarded Funds	
	Projects	Amount $	Projects	Amount $
2001	82	$24 million	49	$13 million
2002	135	$35 million	83	$25 million

b. Shared HMIS Funding

CoCs were also permitted to spread the cost of an HMIS across multiple SHP projects. In this approach, all or some of the new and renewal SHP projects that a community would be including on its priority list would add to each individual project's request as its share of the HMIS cost. If the project was a SHP renewal, it could only request the supportive services funding for HMIS activities if its current grant already included supportive services in its budget. Relatively few CoCs appear to have used the shared approach to funding an HMIS in the 2001 and 2002 competitions.

III. Implementing a Comprehensive Technical Assistance (TA) Program to Assist Communities

Aspen Associates/University of Massachusetts-Boston TA Contract
HUD signed a two-year, $4.1 million TA contract with Aspen Systems, Inc. in September 2001. The Center for Social Policy at the John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Massachusetts-Boston (UMASS) is the principal resource for developing a variety of TA products, trainings and technical assistance. In addition to the UMASS experts, HUD selected 15 experienced contractors and consultants to provide on-site technical assistance on the implementation of an HMIS to CoCs.

Technical Assistance Reports and Analysis

The following is a description and schedule for new or updated HMIS guidance being prepared by UMASS under the Aspen contract.

Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS): Cost Framework and Submission Guidance These guidelines assist applicants in developing projects for HMIS implementation through the Supportive Housing Program. These guidelines also help HUD staff review conditionally awarded grants. The Cost Framework and Submission Guidance complements the 2002 Technical Submission guidance for HMIS dedicated projects. This guide is located at: http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/hmis/index.cfm.

Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) Consumer Guide: A Review of Available Solutions The guide contains an in-depth review of 11 HMIS software solutions. It discusses the range of technical, functional, and other considerations involved in software selection and examines each solution in light of these considerations. Communities' operational needs, system requirements, technical capabilities, and financial resources vary. The document provides useful information to assist readers during the HMIS selection process; however, each community's own needs will serve as the lens through which to read the document. The guide helps readers to understand the range of products that are available and to narrow their search to those systems that have features

and performance consistent with local requirements. The guide should not be used exclusively to select a system. It does not contain an exhaustive review of all HMIS software applications. HUD does not endorse or recommend specific solutions and communities do not have to select one of the software solutions presented in the review. The guide was made available to CoCs on HUD's website in January of 2003. This guide is located at: http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/hmis/guide/index.cfm.

Homeless Management Information Systems: Implementation Guide A greatly expanded HMIS planning and implementation guide was put up on the website in September 2003. The Guide describes eight steps in the HMIS implementation process:

- "**Step One: Planning**" explains the whys, whos, and hows of planning and developing consensus on the HMIS vision.
- "**Step Two: Designing the System-Programmatic Decisions**" outlines critical decisions about how the HMIS will function within the community and discusses possible outcomes of these decisions.
- "**Step Three: Designing the System-Technical Decisions**" explains design options and how a community can assess their existing technical infrastructure to determine their future technical needs.
- "**Step Four: Selecting Software**" proposes a methodology for a community to select an appropriate HMIS software package using the information complied in the system-design requirements document.
- "**Step Five: Funding an HMIS**" discusses the major cost items to be considered in an HMIS budget, including planning, implementing, and operating costs. This step also considers the implication of design decisions on costs and potential revenue options.
- "**Step Six: Implementing the System- Management and Implementation Strategies"** describes system management models for HMIS implementation and operation, implementation strategies, and the key phases of the implementation process.
- "**Step Seven: Implementing the System- Operating Procedures and Protocols"** builds on the system management discussion in Step Six and indicates the standard operating procedures and data accuracy protocols that need to be developed prior to system operation.
- "**Step Eight: Using the HMIS Data**" provides insight into data analysis opportunities of an HMIS and reviews data coverage, cleaning, and release issues.

This guide is located at:
http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/hmis/implementation/index.cfm.

Data Integration Paper The goal of the paper is to describe HMIS integration practices that have been or may be used by communities to combine data from multiple client-level and service-level database systems. The first topic will focus

on the integration of existing client-centered database systems with the larger HMIS. The second topic will focus on the integration of services-level data from Information and Referral databases (including 211) with HMIS. The paper will document practices from several communities, identify common themes and methodologies, and include recommendations for integration strategies based on the findings. The paper is expected to be completed and put on the website in September 2003.

HMIS Technical Assistance

HUD provides three broad types of TA assistance to communities:

- **Basic Education (Training)** – Currently HUD's training consists of three courses: HMIS 101, HMIS 201, and a Consumer Involvement course. HMIS 101 is a four-module workshop designed for CoCs who are in the very early stages of planning for an HMIS. It provides introductory information on HMIS and how to plan for HMIS implementation. HMIS 201 is a seven-module workshop designed for CoCs that understand HMIS basics and are in the implementation or intermediate stage. The modules are designed so that they can be "mixed and matched" depending on the needs of the CoCs in attendance. The Consumer Involvement course is a four-module workshop designed to educate consumers and provider agencies about how to increase consumer involvement, and the benefits of consumer involvement in HMIS planning and decision-making.

  There are 64 training events scheduled each year for two years.

- **Targeted Implementation Help (Technical Assistance)** – This is "advanced" technical assistance designed to move CoCs beyond basic training to HMIS implementation. This assistance is appropriate for communities facing logjams in decision-making or implementation, or that present significant opportunities for multi-jurisdiction collaborations. First priority will go to statewide HMIS implementations, balance of state or multi-CoC collaborative efforts, large city or county CoCs, or places seen as vital to the construction of a nationally representative sample of jurisdictions for the annual homeless assessment report.

  There are 26-targeted technical assistance sessions planned each year for two years. Technical assistance could include up to two days on-site time, and phone and other (off-site) support to the community.

  General Information Sharing (Conferences and Satellite Broadcasts) – This involves information presentations in 16 national, regional and state conferences (sponsored by other organizations) each year for two years.

Technical Assistance Accomplishments as of May 2003

- **180 Training events:** Since the initiation of the TA contract in September 2001, 180 training events have been completed, scheduled or pending. These events have occurred in virtually every state and Puerto Rico (See Appendix A).

- **3, 540 persons received TA:** An estimated 3,540 have attended these HMIS training events.

- **TA Viewed Very Positively:** Of the 3,540 persons who have received TA, 70 percent of the participants turned in evaluation forms. These evaluation forms indicate that the level of skills and knowledge of participants increased significantly and training objectives were realized. The quality of the materials and their delivery were also rated very highly. Participant evaluations also showed high satisfaction levels in the three major training areas: meeting session objectives, quality of materials presented, and delivery of materials.

- **Participants:** Over half of the participants, 54 percent, were from nonprofit service providers. State and local governments and advocacy groups were also represented at these trainings. Directors, administrators, program managers and case managers made up 74 percent of the participants.

Special Technical Assistance for Los Angeles/Orange County Regional HMIS:

The Los Angeles /Orange County Collaborative (LA/OC) is comprised of the Cities of Glendale, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Pasadena, Pomona and Santa Monica and the Los Angeles and Orange counties. The LA/OC represents 5 Continuum of Care jurisdictions that include a population base of approximately 12.5 million and a geographic area that encompasses 4,900 square miles. Hundreds of agencies involved in the five CoCs operate close to 18,500 shelter beds for people who are homeless in LA/OC jurisdictions. The participating communities in LA/OC have agreed in principle to implement a regional HMIS. The majority of these agencies are expected to jointly implement a regional HMIS to support local data collection, service and planning functions and fulfill the HMIS directive from Congress.

With the encouragement and support of the Los Angeles Field Office, LA/OC asked HUD for significant assistance under the College of Experts initiative to help facilitate this regional HMIS planning process. The communities needed expert facilitators to conduct 20-25 meetings over several months. The scale of the effort was beyond the resources available under regular Aspen national HMIS TA contract. HUD utilized its Community Connections contract to develop a special package of TA assistance to help further the LA/Orange County Regional

HMIS process. On May 5, 2003, over 300 people from LA/OC met for an all day HMIS planning session. The regional HMIS planning process is continuing and is likely to provide valuable lessons for other large complex metropolitan areas with multiple CoCs looking to pursue a regional HMIS strategy and implementation. To assist the LA/OC regional HMIS effort, research was conducted on other jurisdictions around the country that have successfully implemented an HMIS. The document, "What Works" in Partnership Building for HMISs: A Guide for the Los Angeles/Orange County Collaborative, highlights examples of decisions and practices that could help uniform the LA/OC HMIS decision-making process. This will be put on the website in June 2003.

IV. The Annual Homeless Assessment Report

Congress first directed HUD to collect data from a representative sample of existing local HMIS in the FY 1999 HUD Appropriations Act, to be included in an Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR). Two years later, Senate Report 106-410 (prepared in conjunction with the 2001 HUD Appropriations Act) directed HUD:

> ...to continue on an annual basis to provide a report on a nationally representative sample of jurisdictions whose local MIS data can be aggregated yearly to document the change in demographics of homelessness, demand for homeless assistance, to identify patterns in utilization of assistance, and to demonstrate the effectiveness of assistance.

Abt Associates /University of Pennsylvania Research Contract

In July 2002, HUD signed a three-year contract with Abt Associates Inc. to collect and analyze local Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS) data. Abt Associates Inc. subcontracted with the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Mental Health Policy and Research (forming the Abt/U Penn team) in order to develop the first Congressionally-mandated Annual Homeless Assessment report (AHAR) for Congress in 2005. The Abt/U Penn team is now undertaking the first of several tasks required to produce that Congressional report.

National HMIS Data Standards

The Abt/U Penn team assisted the Department in developing a draft HMIS Data and Technical Standards Notice that will be released for public comment shortly. The Notice will specify the data elements and standards that will guide HMIS data collection across the country. The Notice will standardize data collection nationally and allow local CoCs to generate consistent reports on the characteristics of homeless persons. The Notice also describes how data are to be collected and safeguarded. This proposed Notice reflects an effort to consult with

Federal agencies implementing homeless programs, State and local governments and Continuum of Care agencies experienced in implementing an HMIS, major advocate groups and leading academic and national experts on homelessness. HUD convened over 50 representatives from these organizations for a two-day session on the standards in late August 2002.

The expert panel discussed the results of a review of existing Federal program reporting data elements and definitions along with a variety of issues concerning the nature of the Federal database and a number of sensitive issues dealing with client consent, data confidentiality and security. In late September 2002, the Abt/UPenn team provided HUD with a draft set of standards reflecting the conference deliberations. This draft was circulated to several Federal agencies, key HMIS experts and homeless research experts. The Abt/UPenn team provided HUD with a second draft at the end of October 2002. A third draft of the standards was developed reflecting HUD comments. HUD and Abt/UPenn then convened another review session with leading HMIS experts for a two-day intensive review session in early February. The fourth draft of the standards, reflecting extensive comments from the HMIS expert panel, was provided to HUD in late March.

The proposed standards are currently in expedited internal HUD clearance. It is expected that the final standards will be published in late May. A 60-day public comment period will run from the day the Notice is published in the Federal Register. HUD and the Abt/UPenn team hope to review and analyze what may be a significant number of comments by 60 days after the closing day of comments. Assuming the Notice is published by June 1, comments would be due at the end of July and the final Notice might be published October 1.

Selection of a Nationally Representative Sample of 80 Jurisdictions for the First Annual Homeless Assessment Report

While every HMIS will be expected to provide data to HUD for the national report, a special nationally representative sample of jurisdictions has been developed to ensure that nationally reliable information can be generated for the report. The Abt/U Penn team has selected a representative sample of 80 jurisdictions (representing 71 Continuums of Care) from which the lion's share of the AHAR data will be collected. The selected sites represent a national distribution of CDBG jurisdictions within Continuums of Care and include: large central cities, medium-sized (>50,000) cities, urban counties, and non-entitlement areas. These jurisdictions were selected to be representative of the entire nation but purposively include the largest cities with significant populations of homeless persons. ***Notably, these jurisdictions were not selected based on their progress in implementing an HMIS.*** (See Appendix B for the proposed stratified sampling frame.)

National Meeting of Sample Participants

The Abt/U Penn team is contacting the CoCs that represent the 80 jurisdictions in the sample to discuss the research, assess each CoC's progress in HMIS implementation, and determine whether they would be able to contribute reliable and fairly complete data from their local HMIS by 2004 or 2005. If a jurisdiction is unable or unwilling to provide data, another jurisdiction may be substituted. The selection process and invitation process will be completed in May. Participation in the HMIS sample offers a number of benefits. CoCs will be eligible for targeted technical assistance from a cadre of HMIS experts who can help with HMIS implementation, including selecting software packages, obtaining the buy-in of local service providers, and identifying funding sources. In addition, the sample sites will receive technical assistance from the Abt/U Penn team on how to use HMIS data effectively to produce reports that will be helpful for local planning and grant applications. Finally, two representatives from each sample site will be able to attend (at HUD's expense) a two-day conference on HMIS implementation, which will be held in the Washington DC area on July 14-15, 2003.

A select number of additional CoCs that are not included in the sample will also be invited to the conference because they represent significant experience with HMIS implementation.

Additional future tasks under the contract are:

- Convene a panel of national experts on HMIS research issues
- Prepare Technical Assistance Guide on Local Uses of HMIS Data
- Produce a Report Setting Forth the Proposed Format and Content for the Annual Homeless Assessment Report
- Produce an Annual Homeless Assessment Report Using HMIS Sample Data

V. Implementing a Homeless Client-Level HUD McKinney-Vento Program Reporting System

As a part of its overall strategy, HUD proposed assessing the technical feasibility of receiving client-level reporting on homeless client characteristics and outcomes through the Annual Progress Report for each of its several thousand CoC projects. HUD sought to assess the technical issues and program implications of client-level reporting from its grantees, including but not limited to, the following: proposed alternatives, their costs for HUD and grantees, implementation advantages and disadvantages, issues of confidentiality, and the use of HMISs to provide client-level APR reporting.

Client Level Reporting Assessment

The Center for Social Policy of the John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Massachusetts-Boston conducted the analysis of a client-level report. An initial issues report raised and assessed a variety issues with HUD's receiving identified or de-identified client-level HMIS/APR data.

Drawing from the report and the results of the 2-day August 2002 meeting on HUD standards, HUD has concluded that the HMIS initiative will include no federal effort to track homeless people and their identifying information beyond the local level. HUD has no plans to develop a national client-level database with personal identifiers of homeless service users, having concluded that such plans would create serious impediments to provider participation in local HMISs and client recourse to local services. This consideration was weighed against the advantages of a national database with personal identifiers that could be used to more accurately identify mainstream service use by homeless persons and analyze data on the characteristics of homeless persons nationwide. It was decided that these objectives could be accomplished through analysis of de-identified HMIS data compiled from CoCs across the country.

HUD will continue to explore the use of electronic reporting of aggregate APR data in the future as local HMIS systems mature.

Appendix A:

HMIS Trainings (T), Technical Assistance (TA) and Conference Events (C) October 2002-May 2003

State	Location/Event Type	Date	Status/(CoCs served)
Connecticut	Meridan (T)	2/26/02	Completed (11)
	North Haven (C)	11/13/02	Completed (11)
Maine	Augusta (T)	12/4–5/02	Completed (3)
	Portland (CI/TA)	1/14/03	Completed (3)
Massachusetts	Lowell (T)	1/16/03	Completed (12)
New Hampshire	Manchester (CI/TA)	3/25/2003	Completed (3)
Rhode Island	Providence (T)	6/25/02	Completed (1)
	Providence (CI)	3/14/03	Completed (1)
Vermont	Waterbury (T)	7/16/02	Completed (4)
New York	Rochester (T)	4/12/02	Completed (5)
	Saratoga Springs (T)	5/9/02	Completed (6)
	Long Island (TA)	5/21/02	Completed (2)
	Orange County (T)	5/22/02	Completed (1)
	New York City (T)	7/23/02	Completed (1)
	NYC Center for Urban Community Services	9/2002	Completed (1)
	Orange County (TA)	10/8/02	Completed (1)
	Rockland County (TA)	10/8/02	Completed (1)
	Nassau/Suffolk County (TA)	10/9/02	Completed (1)
	Syracuse (TA)	11/20/02	Completed (12)
	Albany (TA)	12/3/02	Completed (1)
	New York City (TA)	1/13/03	Completed (1)
	New York City (TA)	4/1–2/03	Completed (1)
	Ulster County (TA)	5/19/03	In process
	Syracuse (TA)	TBD	In process
New Jersey	Newark (T)	4/22/02	Completed (9)
	Newark (TA)	1/9–10/03	Completed (1)
	Trenton (TA)	3/10–11/03	Completed (5)
Delaware	Wilmington (TA)	9/17-18/02	Completed (1)
	Wilmington (T-201)	4/3–4/2003	Completed (1)
Washington, DC/National	COSCDA (C)	11/13-15/02	Completed (16)
	Washington, DC (TA)	TBD	In process
Maryland	Ann Arundel (T)	5/2/02	Completed (14)
	Baltimore (C)	6/20-21/02	Completed (4)
	Baltimore (TA)	12/18/02	Completed (1)
	Baltimore (TA)	1/17/2003	Completed (1)
	Baltimore (TA for State)	4/8/2003	Completed (1)
Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh (T)	5/2/02	Completed (7)
	Philadelphia (T)	5/23/02	Completed (7)
	Philadelphia (TA)	TBD	In process
	Pittsburgh (T-201)	3/12–13/2003	Completed (11)
	Erie County (TA)	4/11/03	Completed (1)
	Harrisburg (T)	6/3–4/03	In process
Virginia	Richmond (T)	5/2/02	Completed (6)
	Arlington (T)	6/25/02	Completed (5)
	Roanoke (C)	9/11-13/02	Completed (16)
	Charlottesville (Phone TA)	11/2002	Completed (1)
West Virginia	Charleston (T)	5/16/02	Completed (5)
	Charleston (T-201)	2/19–20/2003	Completed (4)
	Wheeling (TA)	June 2003	In process
Alabama	Birmingham (T)	1/29/02	Completed (6)
	Birmingham (T for all AL)	1/15/03	Completed (6)
	Birmingham (TA for S. AL)	1/16/03	Completed (4)

State	Location/Event Type	Date	Status/(CoCs served)
	Birmingham (TA B'ham only)	1/16/03	Completed (1)
	Huntsville (TA for N. AL)	2/4/2003	Completed (1)
	Mobile (TA)	3/10/03	Completed (1)
	Montgomery (TA)	3/11/03	Completed (1)
Caribbean (Puerto Rico/USVI)	San Juan, PR (C)	4/4-5/02	Completed (1)
	San Juan, PR (T)	5/2/02	Completed (1)
	Caguas, PR (T)	6/6/02	Completed (1)
	Ponce, PR (TA)	6/12/02	Completed (1)
	St. Croix, USVI (T)	8/29/02	Completed (1)
	St Thomas, USVI (T)	8/30/02	Completed (1)
	Aguadilla, PR (T)	12/11/2002	Completed (1)
	Ponce, PR (T-101)	3/26/03	Completed (1)
	Mayaguez, PR (T-101)	TBD	In process
	Aguadilla, PR (TA)	3/19/03	Completed (1)
	USVI (T-201)	TBD	In process
	Aguadilla, PR (T-201)	4/9/03	Completed (1)
	BoS, PR (T-101)	4/29/03	Completed (4)
Florida	Naples (T)	7/9/02	Completed (2)
	Key West (T)	7/11/02	Completed (1)
	Pinellas County (T)	7/26/02	Completed (1)
	Tallahassee (T)	8/16/02	Completed (5)
	Orlando (C)	10/7-8/02	Completed (12)
	Miami (C)	11/13-15/02	Completed (12)
	Lee County (TA)	3/3/03	Completed (1)
	Gainesville (T-201/TA)	3/20–21/03	Completed (6)
	Sarasota (T-201/TA)	3/27–28/03	Completed (6)
	Tallahassee (T-201/TA)	4/2/03	Completed (6)
	Ft. Lauderdale (T-201/TA)	4/10–11/003	Completed (6)
Georgia	Atlanta (C)	10/30-31/01	Completed (8)
	Atlanta (NCSHA Conf.)	5/3–6/2003	Completed (TBS)
Kentucky	Louisville (T)	6/6/02	Completed (4)
	Louisville (T-201)	TBD	In process
Tennessee	Murfreesboro (T)	3/14/02	Completed (5)
	Nashville (TA)	3/15/02	Completed (2)
	Knoxville (T)	3/20/02	Completed (5)
	Knoxville (TA)	9/30/02	Completed (1)
	Murfreesboro (TA)	12/4/02	Completed (1)
Mississippi	Jackson (T)	4/9/02	Completed (4)
	Gulfport (T-201)	5/1/03	Completed (TBS)
North Carolina	Greensboro (T)	3/12/02	Completed (12)
	Raleigh (C)	12/2-3/02	Completed (12)
South Carolina	Greenville (C)	9/19–20/02	Completed (6)
	Columbia (TA)	2/6/03	Completed (3)
	Florence (TA)	2/24/03	Completed (3)
Ohio	Cincinnati (TA)	2/11/02	Completed (1)
	Columbus (C)	4/22-24/02	Completed (4)
	Columbus (T)	5/22/02	Completed (4)
	Granville (T-201)	3/13/2003	Completed (8)
Illinois	Springfield (T)	4/23/02	Completed (22)
	Chicago (T)	4/24-25/02	Completed (22)
	Springfield (T/TA)	3/10–11/03	Completed (10)
	Chicago (T/TA)	3/13–14/03	Completed (7)
Indiana	Indianapolis (T)	3/21/02	Completed (19)
	Indianapolis (TA)	1/7/03	Completed (7)
Michigan	Lansing (TA)	2/5/02	Completed (20)
	Lansing (T)	3/21/02	Completed (20)
	Lansing (C)	6/10-12/02	Completed (3)
	Lansing (TA)	10/7-8/02	Completed (1)
	Lansing (TA)	1/13/03	Completed (1)
Minnesota	Minneapolis (T)	3/21/02	Completed (10)
	St. Cloud (TA)	8/26/02	Completed (9)

State	Location/Event Type	Date	Status/(CoCs served)
	Minneapolis (C)	10/2-5/02	Completed (2)
	Minneapolis (C)	10/2-5/02	Completed (2)
Wisconsin	Madison (TA-CI)	4/4/03	Completed (4)
	Madison (CI)	7/21/03	In process
Arkansas	Little Rock (T)	3/20/02	Completed (6)
	Little Rock (C)	9/26-27/02	Completed (8)
	Little Rock (T-201)	3/4/2003	Completed (5)
Texas	Corpus Christi (T)	11/6/01	Completed (10)
	Brownsville (T)	5/14-15/02	Completed (5)
	Beaumont (T)	7/9/02	Completed (3)
	Arlington (T)	8/9/02	Completed (7)
	El Paso (T)	9/18/02	Completed (2)
	Houston (C)	11/5/02	Completed (1)
	Brownsville (T-201)	5/30/03	In process
	Dallas (T-201)	5/9/2003	In process
	Houston (T-201)	4/25/03	Completed (2)
New Mexico	Albuquerque (T)	5/21/02	Completed (2)
	Albuquerque (C)	8/7-9/02	Completed (2)
	Albuquerque (T-201)	4/25/03	Completed (2)
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City (T-201)	3/17/03	Completed (3)
	Tulsa (T-201)	3/19/03	Completed (3)
Louisiana	TBD (T)	TBD	In process
	TBD (TA)	TBD	TBD
Iowa	TBD	TBD	TBD
Kansas/Missouri	Kansas City, KS (T)	6/10/02	Completed (8)
	Columbia, MO (T)	6/18/02	Completed (8)
	Jefferson City, MO (TA)	9/16/02	Completed (8)
	Wichita, KS (C)	11/14/02	Completed (5)
	Columbia, MO (T)	6/3–4/2003	In process
Nebraska	Grand Island (T)	4/25/02	Completed (6)
	Grand Island (T/201)	12/11/02	Completed (6)
Colorado	Denver (T)	5/2-3/02	Completed (9)
	Denver (TA)	7/23-24/02	Completed (3)
	TBD (TA)	TBD	In process
Montana	Helena (TA)	12/11-12/02	Completed (1)
	TBD (TA)	TBD	TBD
North Dakota	Devil's Lake (TA)	10/28/02	Completed (1)
South Dakota	Pierre (TA)	11/21/02	Completed (1)
Utah	Salt Lake City (T)	3/21/02	Completed (3)
	Salt Lake City (TA)	7/31/02	Completed (3)
Wyoming (High)	Cheyenne (TA)	4/21/03	Completed (1)
Arizona	Phoenix (T)	11/15/01	Completed (3)
	Phoenix (T/TA)	2/24–25/2003	Completed (6)
California	Oakland (T)	11/16/01	Completed (21)
	Pasadena (T)	2/11/02	Completed (1)
	Los Angeles (TA)	2/12/02	Completed (1)
	San Francisco (TA)	2/13/02	Completed (10)
	San Francisco (TA)	4/16/02	Completed (10)
	Los Angeles (TA)	9/18-20/02	Completed (2)
	Los Angeles (C)	10/1-6/02	Completed (1)
	San Francisco (TA)	10/17/02	Completed (1)
	Kern County (TA)	11/12-13/02	Completed (4)
	Riverside/San Bernardino (TA)	11/14-15/02	Completed (3)
	Santa Barbara (TA)	12/16/2002	Completed (5)
	San Bernadino (TA)	1/17/2003	Completed (1)
Hawaii/Guam	Honolulu (T)	4/24-25/02	Completed (4)
	Honolulu (T)	2/11–12/2003	Completed (3)
Nevada	TBD (T or TA)	TBD	TBD
Alaska	Anchorage (TA)	10/10-11/02	Completed (2)
Idaho	Boise (T/TA)	TBD	In process

State	Location/Event Type	Date	Status/(CoCs served)
Oregon	Portland (T)	10/23/01	Completed (10)
	Portland (T-201)	2/12–13/2003	Completed (8)
Washington State	Seattle (T)	10/22/01	Completed (9)
	Seattle (TA)	1/29-30/02	Completed (1)
	Wenatchee (T)	5/7/02	Completed (7)
	Wenatchee (C)	5/8/02	Completed (7)
	Seattle (TA)	2/26–27/2003	Completed (3)

Appendix B
Sample Selection and Stratified Sample Table

Number of Sites in Universe and Sample by Region-CDBG Type

Stratum	# of Geographic Areas in Universe	# of Certainty Sites in Sample	# of Non-Certainty Sites in Sample	Total Sample
Northeast Central City	86	3	5	8
South Central City	151	4	8	12
Midwest Central City	124	3	7	10
West Central City	106	5	7	12
Northeast City >50,000	81	1	2	3
South City >50,000	48	0	2	2
Midwest City >50,000	55	0	1	1
West City >50,000	114	0	3	3
Northeast Urban County	33	0	3	3
South Urban County	54	0	4	4
Midwest Urban County	33	1	3	4
West Urban County	34	1	3	4
Northeast Non-Entitlement	148	0	3	3
South Non-Entitlement	812	0	4	4
Midwest Non-Entitlement	890	0	4	4
West Non-Entitlement	373	0	3	3
Total	3142	18	62	80