

Results of the 2021 All-Volunteer Greater Hollywood Homeless Count

Louis Abramson, PhD^{*,†,‡}

^{*}*Hollywood 4WRD Homelessness Coalition*

[†]*Central Hollywood Neighborhood Council*

[‡]*Observatories of the Carnegie Institution for Science*

labramson.chnc@gmail.com

February 17, 2021

Abstract

1 Introduction

The Los Angeles Homelessness Services Authority (LAHSA) has conducted an annual Point In Time (PIT) census of the unhoused population of Los Angeles every year since XXX. These data are critical to essentially all other homelessness-related activities in both the County and City of LA. They inform funding levels, educate residents, undergird local and state legislative efforts, and shape the day-to-day practices of professional and volunteer service providers alike. As the official assessment of the size of one of the most pressing humanitarian issues of our time, the LAHSA Count is simply invaluable.

Disruptions from COVID-19 have only further emphasized the need for good data. As incomes fluctuated, many of Los Angeles' already sizable population of housing-unstable residents may have been pushed off couches or out of apartments and onto the street. As such, while the epidemiological considerations of an all-volunteer, county-wide count are real, the damage from failing to obtain an estimate of the change in homelessness from 2020—before such disruptions occurred—are not to be diminished.

Given the size and non-uniformity in volunteerism and resources across LAHSA's area of operations, the challenges of COVID were ultimately deemed sufficient to cancel the formal 2021 PIT census of unsheltered Angelenos. However, not all communities agreed with this decision, and many had the resources to execute a robust—if unsponsored—survey on their own. Hollywood is one such community.

Greater Hollywood is one of the epicenters of Los Angeles’s homelessness crisis. According to the 2020 Count, the Hollywood and East Hollywood Continuum of Care (CoC) were home to 2203 unhoused residents, 1714 of whom (78%) were living unsheltered on the street. This corresponds to roughly 5% of LA’s total homeless population concentrated in an area with just 2.5% (CITE) of its total population. In some regions within those CoCs, fully 1-in-30 residents are unhoused compared to 1-in-100 citywide.

While the above statistics are tragic, Hollywood is also marked by its substantial community of professional and volunteer service providers, solutions-minded businesses, and attuned political leaders. Increasingly formal coalitions of the above have spread across the district, dedicated to humanely reducing the numbers just quoted. All of the above stakeholders rely on the annual PIT count for educational, financial, and programmatic purposes. When communicating with the public, the starting point for many conversations is simply stating the size of the challenge. When communicating with funders, it is similarly critical to convey how many people require services. When designing legislation—especially given the shock of COVID-19 and in the face of looming court proceedings—knowing how many unhoused Angelenos live where is foundational. For these reasons, various organizations and individuals in Hollywood decided to with a 2021 Homeless count irrespective of other governmental decisions.

This document describes the methodology and findings of that count, conducted on the night of Thursday, February 25. Below, Section 2 describes the volunteer data acquisition, analysis, and training protocols. Section 3 present estimates of the unsheltered population in the Hollywood, East Hollywood, and Greater Hollywood CoCs. Section 4 contextualizes those findings in terms of previous LAHSA results and describes factors that would modulate them upwards or downwards. Section ?? summarizes. Additional information can be found in the Appendix, including a table of tract-level results in each of the survey’s 39 US Census tracts.

2 Methodology

The 2021 Greater Hollywood All-Volunteer Homeless Enumeration adhered as closely as possible to the official LHASA 2020 Point In Time count in both data collection and analysis. Below, I discuss these phases separately.

2.1 Data Acquisition

The count covered the 39 US Census tracts in the LAHSA-defined *Hollywood* and *East Hollywood* Continuum of Care (CoC). Given their proximity to difficult to assess areas primarily near freeways, 7 of these tracts were reserved for professional teams who conducted visual inspections during the day. The remaining 32 tracts were divvied up among the volunteer car-based teams and surveyed at night. Table ?? presents each tract’s classification.

Results were therefore integrable at the tract, CoC, and Greater Hollywood levels.

Volunteers were recruited using the *Eventbrite* website. XXX teams of at least 2 people signed-up, with YYY showing up for the count itself.

Each volunteer team of 2 people comprised a Driver and a Counter. Teams of 3 additionally included a Navigator. In the latter case, the Navigator was responsible for instructing the Driver where to turn to stay on-tract, the Counter visually inspected surroundings to tally unhoused individuals and dwellings, and the Driver drove. In 2-person teams, the Counter doubled as the Navigator.

The count was based at *The Center at Blessed Sacrament* (6636 Selma Ave, Hollywood, CA 90038), a major service provider in Hollywood, where volunteer teams launched from and returned to.

Teams were assigned 2 tracts each. Upon arriving at *The Center*, organizers gave each team a clipboard with:

1. tract maps;
2. tally sheets;
3. a 1-page primer summarizing their training with a contact number for issues when deployed.

Examples of each of the above documents are included in the Appendix.

Teams were then deployed to their respective tracts. Departures ran from **XXX PM** to **YYY PM**. Teams returned to *The Center* after their counts between **ZZZ PM** and **AAA PM**.

In the field, teams were instructed to drive the tract interiors in a serpentine fashion if possible before making a final pass of their border streets. All teams were instructed only to examine the interior sides of tract borders. Teams were instructed to drive slowly, using hazard lights if necessary to give counters adequate time to inspect both sides of the street.

Upon returning, organizers greeted each team with a tablet or laptop computer. Counters verbally read-off their tallies to the organizer, who entered the results into a google form so it could be stored electronically along with the email of the volunteer for any follow-up. The organizer read back the results and resolved any interpretation errors before recovering all materials—including hand-written tallies—from the volunteers.

After all materials had been collected, the organizers convened to cross-check the electronic records with the physical tally sheets. At this point, comments were also examined and any uncounted streets noted. **Teams were then dispatched to count any uncounted areas, with tallies manually added to the appropriate tract. This occurred in only XXX instances.**

Given that the number of volunteer teams exceeded the number of available tracts, a subset of randomly selected tracts were chosen to be counted twice. These duplicate measurements are discussed in Sections 2.3 and 4.

2.1.1 Volunteer Training

Teams underwent mandatory Zoom-based training sessions lasting approximately 30 minutes before arriving at the count. All volunteers were also required to watch the official 2020 LAHSA count training video, and sign participation waivers.

The training covered the motivation for performing a count of unsheltered people experiencing homelessness, an overview of the survey geography (the CoCs), the duties of the various roles, descriptions of the classes of unhoused individuals—“Adult,” “Transition Age Youth,” “Unaccompanied Minors,” “Families”—and dwellings—cars, vans, RVs, tents, and makeshift structures (CVRTM). Photos of examples of the latter were also included. Volunteers were instructed to count dwellings and individuals separately and not to try to guess how many people might live in or be associated with a specific dwelling. This ensured that final results could be analyzed as a function of the CVRTM weights, which may change with future information (see Section 2.2).

A recording of a volunteer training session is available at [WEBSITE](#).

2.2 Data Analysis

The spreadsheet of raw count data was downloaded from the internet before passing it through a number of programs (written in IDL) to:

1. parse and associate tracts with CoCs;
2. identify tracts counted by multiple teams;
3. assess tract-level counting errors;
4. upweight the CVRTM values by the 2020 LAHSA SPA4 CVRTM weights;
5. construct a Monte Carlo estimate of the underlying probability distributions for the number of unhoused people of a given class/in a given dwelling type in each census tract.

All results quoted below derive from the 10,000 Monte Carlo samplings of Item (5).

2.2.1 Monte Carlo Estimations of Unhoused Probability Densities

The point-in-time (PIT) data obtained by the Counters represent a draw from the underlying probability distribution describing how many people are actually experiencing homelessness in a given tract. We have only the PIT counts, but seek the actual number. We can estimate that as long as we have a model for the intrinsic uncertainties in the PIT counts and demographic CVRTM weights. We have—or can model—both of these uncertainties, and can therefore reconstruct the full probability distribution functions (PDFs) using Monte Carlo sampling.

Here, Monte Carlo sampling is simply the process of randomly generating 10,000 alternate versions of the PIT estimates that reflect what might happen if the count was conducted on a different day or by a different counter. If you know how a quantity is expected to change from one measurement to another, independently

In all cases, baseline Poisson counting uncertainties exist in the raw counts. That is, if n adults were Counted by one team in a given tract, the best guess is that the true number of unhoused adults in that tract falls between $n \pm \sqrt{n}$ about 2/3 of the time. We therefore translate each raw

count into 10,000 simulated counts where each entry reflects a Gaussian random number with standard deviation \sqrt{n} 10,000 to all raw counts to simulate what we could expect to

In the case of the CVRTM elements, these samplings incorporated both Poisson counting errors in the raw counts (random errors) and uncertainties in the CVRTM weights (systematic errors). In the case of the individual categories, only the Poisson counting errors were propagated.

Explicitly, the i th estimate for the number of people in the j -th class of unsheltered person in any tract is:

$$N_{i,j} = [n_j + \mathcal{N}(0, \sqrt{n_j})] \times \mathcal{N}(w_j, \sigma_j) \quad (1)$$

where i runs from 1 to 10,000, n is the raw visual inspection result, $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ is a Gaussian random number with mean μ and standard deviation Σ , w is the 2020 LAHSA CVRTM weight for the appropriate class, and σ is related to the standard error on that weight. For the individual classes—including families— $(w, \sigma) \equiv (1, 0)$; i.e., weights were simply set to unity for all 10,000 trials.

Equation 1 entails an assumption that the CVRTM weights, w , are normally distributed about their quoted values. If we had access to their full probability distribution of the CVRTM weights, we would not need to make this assumption. But, given that we did not have access to those distributions, σ was calculated by assuming the quoted CVRTM weight was the maximum likelihood value, with a 95%

The outcome is the equivalent of 10,000 $N_{\text{class}} \times N_{\text{tract}}$ arrays, each containing a different point estimate for the size of the i th classes' population in the j th tract. Summing across trials thus yields probability distributions that N people of any class are dwelling in any tract.

BASELINE BACKGROUND UNCERTAINTIES

2.3 Duplicate Measurements

3 Results

4 Discussion