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Introduction

In the Austin / Travis County Continuum of Care (CoC), people who are unhoused often have different experiences based on their race or ethnicity. In terms of overall representation, the Black community is significantly overrepresented in the homeless population compared to its makeup in the overall Austin / Travis County population. Although service providers strive to serve all people equally regardless of race, there is still inequity in housing outcomes, such as rates of successful program exits, among different racial and ethnic groups. Further, there is reason to suspect that there are racial disparities in access to the system, and based on research ECHO has conducted, discrimination and lack of institutional trust are driving forces of that lack of access. While the Homelessness Response System (HRS) is committed to making homelessness rare, brief, and non-recurring in our community, decades of systemic inequity affect the homeless community today, especially along racial lines. As the HRS is working to correct this inequity, it is important to recognize where it still exists. This report analyzes data reported by HRS partners, as well as federal Census data, to understand where disparities lie and potential next steps to address them.

Note

In writing this report, we define racial categories as they are represented by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). They are:

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Asian American
- Black or African American
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White

Likewise, we follow HUD's lead in classifying ethnicity as simply Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x) or not Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x). The reason for this is twofold: First, it ensures that population-level data analyzed is in line with what is reported by the Census Bureau. Second, data entered by service providers into Homelessness Management Information System (HMIS), a database used by providers to collect information on people engaged in the HRS, likewise follows HUD data standards that are based on the federal government's racial and ethnic categorizations. As such, the language used in this report is in alignment with federal regulations.

We recognize the shortfalls of using these categories. First, terms such as "American Indian" could be considered by many members of the Indigenous American community to be an offensive erasure of their culture and history. Second, there are groups that are not shown as their own distinct racial or ethnic group in the categories used in this report. For example, people from the Middle East or North Africa are considered "White" in the data.
collected. Likewise, people of Roma, Jewish, or individual Indigenous tribal descent are simply grouped into the “Non-Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x)” ethnic group. As such, we recognize the erasure caused by such a narrow definition of racial and ethnic categories when reporting on disparities in the unhoused population.

Data

The data used for this report are pulled from the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) used by the Austin / Travis County CoC. Service providers enter client information into this system, which can then be used to analyze trends in the HRS. For this report, data used in the analysis is limited to data on people enrolled in any program recorded in HMIS in the calendar year 2022. Further, we have deduplicated client information to ensure that people are not counted more than once in analyses of client data.

While this report focuses only on 2022 HMIS data, current information on system performance can be found on ECHO’s dashboard, updated monthly: https://www.austinecho.org/dashboard/.

About ECHO

The Ending Community Homelessness Coalition (ECHO) is a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization that serves as the Austin / Travis County Continuum of Care (CoC) Lead Agency, CoC Collaborative Applicant, Coordinated Entry System manager, and local HMIS database administrator. We are tasked with planning and coordinating community-wide strategies to end homelessness in the Austin and Travis County geographic region. We work in collaboration with people with lived experience of homelessness, community nonprofits, and government agencies to coordinate services and housing resources for the people who are experiencing homelessness in our community. ECHO uses research and evidence-based practices to advocate for the resources to bring the local Homelessness Response System to scale and meet our community’s goal of ending homelessness.

Acknowledgement of Limitations

The Homelessness Response System is a constantly shifting environment. The most current HMIS data may be in flux if corrections are made, missing values are caught (or remain missing), or if information is either initially reported or recorded incorrectly. For these reasons it is possible that identical analyses conducted at different points in time could yield slightly different results, but which do not change the overall trends or big picture of what the data show. Since the following analyses are largely for the previous full calendar year, this allows us to confidently use the most stable and accurate data. This report was crafted with care and effort, and it is accurate to the best of ECHO’s knowledge. In the event
that any mistakes are identified, the report will be corrected, noted here, and republished with an errata section appended to it. This is the first edition of the report.
Racial Disparities in the Population Experiencing Homelessness

Overall System Involvement
Black people comprised approximately 9% of the overall Travis County population as per most recent Census estimates published in 2022 but 32% of the population enrolled in homeless services in 2022, creating a four-time overrepresentation in the homeless population (Figure 1). In contrast, non-Hispanic White people made up 48% of the overall county population and 28% of the homeless population. Other racial and ethnic groups have almost equivalent proportions in both the overall population and homeless population, with the exception of the proportion of Asian people in the homeless population being nine times less than their proportion in the overall population; however, a low sample size may skew this number.

Figure 1

The racial composition of people who were enrolled at any point in 2022 in either a Permanent Supportive Housing program (PSH) or a Rapid Re-Housing program (RRH), regardless of their initial entry date, differs by project type. Figures 2 and 3 below parse out the raw numbers, showing that number of Black, Hispanic, and White people totaled
around 1,200 people in PSH projects in 2022, while for RRH projects it was around 1,800 people.\(^1\) White people made up the highest number of people enrolled in PSH projects, followed closely by Black people. Hispanic people, however, had significantly fewer enrollments in these projects (Figure 2). In contrast, there were significantly fewer White people than both Black and Hispanic people in RRH projects (Figure 3).

Figure 2

![Total Enrollments in Permanent Support Housing Projects in 2022](image)

- **Hispanic/Latinx**: 277
- **Black or African American**: 443
- **White**: 603

*Note: Racial and ethnic categories are mutually exclusive. For example, those who identified as Hispanic/Latinx will be counted under that category and not any others.*

---

\(^1\) Only non-Hispanic White, Black, and Hispanic racial and ethnic categories are included in visualizations of PSH and RRH enrollments because the numbers for other race/ethnicity groups are very low and possibly misleading.
Figure 4 puts these raw numbers into context of each racial group’s overall representation in the HRS. Black people experiencing homelessness had fairly comparable representation in both PSH and RRH projects compared to their overall representation. In comparison, Hispanic people were underrepresented in PSH projects but had comparable representation in RRH projects. White people were disproportionately underrepresented in RRH projects but overrepresented in PSH projects compared to their representation in the homeless population. This may be in part due to the historical use of the VI-SPDAT as the prioritization tool in the Austin/Travis County Coordinated Entry System from 2017 to 2021. Further information on the new prioritization tool currently being used as the local Coordinated Assessment is available in the “Ongoing Efforts” section further in this report.
In comparison to the total number of enrollments in PSH and RRH projects, regardless of when the entry occurred, narrowing down the data to just people who entered for the first time ever in 2022 shows that White people had fewer entries into both PSH and RRH projects, while Black and Hispanic people had about similar numbers compared to each other in both projects (Figures 5 and 6). Although it cannot be stated for sure, this may in part be due to the local shift to a new Coordinated Assessment.
Figure 5

New Enrollments into Permanent Supportive Housing Projects in 2022

Racial / Ethnic Identity

- White: 42
- Black or African American: 53
- Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x): 58

*Note: Racial and ethnic categories are mutually exclusive. For example, those who identified as Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x) will be counted under that category and not any others.

Figure 6

New Enrollments into Rapid Re-Housing Projects in 2022

Racial / Ethnic Identity

- White: 219
- Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x): 356
- Black or African American: 363

*Note: Racial and ethnic categories are mutually exclusive. For example, those who identified as Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x) will be counted under that category and not any others.
Intersections of Race and Ethnicity with Other Demographics Among 2022 HMIS Clients

As shown in Table 1, of the 16,164 people engaged in the HRS in 2022, 32% (5,208) identified as being Hispanic compared to 64% (10,306) who did not. Of the 32% who did, the vast majority (84%, or 27% total of all HRS clients) identified as White and 7% (or 2% total of all HRS clients) as Black. For people who identified as not being Hispanic, 49% (or 31% total of all HRS clients) identified as Black and 43% (or 28% total of all HRS clients) identified as White.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x)</th>
<th>Not Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.6% (97)</td>
<td>0.2% (70)</td>
<td>0.8% (167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.1% (6)</td>
<td>0.7% (117)</td>
<td>0.8% (125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>2.2% (343)</td>
<td>31.5% (5,063)</td>
<td>33.7% (5,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1% (17)</td>
<td>0.2% (32)</td>
<td>0.3% (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>1.3% (211)</td>
<td>3.4% (543)</td>
<td>4.7% (758)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27.1% (4,373)</td>
<td>27.8% (4,457)</td>
<td>54.9% (8,873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.2% (5,208)</td>
<td>63.8% (10,306)</td>
<td>100.0% (16,164)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hispanic and Black people, relative to other racial and ethnic groups, were more likely to be minors age 18 or younger (Table 2). Thirty percent and 24% of Hispanic and Black HRS clients, respectively, were children, compared to just 5% of White clients. Given that the overall percentage of HRS clients 18 or younger was 21%, Black and Hispanic people were disproportionately overrepresented among minors experiencing homelessness.

White people were, on average, older than Black or Hispanic people. Only 12% of Hispanic people were age 55 and above, as opposed to 21% of Black people and 28% of White people.
Males comprised the majority in all racial and ethnic groups. White people were more likely to be male than most other racial and ethnic groups, and Hispanic people were less likely to be male (Table 3). Very few people in any racial or ethnic category were nonbinary, questioning, or other, or identified as transgender.

Table 3: Intersection of Race and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Nonbinary/No Single Gender</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Questioning</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>1.2% (1)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0% (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>0.8% (1)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0% (119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>0.1% (4)</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0% (5,092)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino(a)(x)</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>0.2% (11)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0% (5,203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0% (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>0.5% (3)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0% (546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>0.3% (14)</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>100.0% (4,493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>0.2% (33)</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0% (15,567)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the racial and ethnic breakdown of the several subpopulations for which the HRS has programs specifically dedicated (definitions for these subpopulations can be found in Appendix A). First, significantly more Black and Hispanic people were youth between the ages of 0-24, with just 12% of White clients being youth compared to 34% of Black clients and 42% of Hispanic clients.
Second, only 5% of Hispanic clients were veterans, compared to 16% of White clients and 11% of Black clients.

Third, White people were less likely to be members of family households with children than the other two racial and ethnic groups, with less than 10% of people clients being in one. In contrast, 37% and 42%, of Black and Hispanic people, respectively, were in family households.

Fourth, only 33% of Hispanic people engaged in the HRS were experiencing chronic homelessness, compared to almost half of those who were White and 41% of those who were Black.

Finally, a comparable number of Black, Hispanic, and White people had a history of domestic violence (27%, 30%, and 33%, respectively).

Table 4: Intersection of Race and Subpopulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Veteran</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Experiencing Chronic Homelessness</th>
<th>Domestic Violence Survivor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin(o)(a)(x)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permanent Housing Program Exits

Figure 7 shows the percentage of people who exited either PSH or RRH projects to permanent housing destinations, such as rental apartments or living permanently with family. About 75% of White, Black, and Hispanic people exited RRH projects to permanent housing.

While RRH projects provide time-limited rental assistance and housing stability case management, clients may remain enrolled in Permanent Supportive Housing projects to receive ongoing supportive services and housing stability assistance for as long as they need to remain stably housed. Of those who did exit PSH projects, only 51% of Black people exited to permanent housing compared to 66% and 65% of White and Hispanic clients, respectively. Therefore, although there was a less than 10 percentage point difference between successful exits from RRH and PSH projects for both White and Hispanic clients, there was an over 25 percentage point difference in successful exits for Black clients (78% from RRH compared to 51% from PSH).
Discussion

Roots of Racial Disparities

Although assessing current and historic causes of homelessness, especially along racial lines, is an in-depth topic, there are several key reasons that may explain the disparities found in this report.

First, policies introduced in the early 20th century both restricted where Black people could live in Austin as well as stunted the economic growth of historically Black East Austin compared to areas with a majority White population. In 1928, city planners wrote a document that outlined where the rapidly growing city should have schools, parks, shopping districts, and other amenities located. Although the Supreme Court ruled in the 1917 Buchanan v. Warley case that racialized zoning was illegal, the 1928 plan still managed to slowly concentrate the Black population into East Austin.²

² Marisa Charpentier and Audry McGlinchy, "Two Paragraphs Forced Black Residents to East Austin. Exploding Real Estate Prices Forced Them Out," KUT Radio, Austin's NPR Station, June 28, 2023,
Although this plan didn’t create legalized segregation, it still very quickly put it into practice. After this plan was passed, schools that served Black children that weren’t in East Austin were soon shut down, as were city services to Black Austinites living outside of East Austin. Hispanic Austinites were soon given the same treatment and likewise were all but forced to move to East Austin as well.

This geographic restriction on where Black and Hispanic people could live was further solidified by redlining. The University of Richmond’s Digital Scholarship Lab created an interactive map that shows which neighborhoods were deemed “desirable” and not, with most of East Austin being labeled as “hazardous” under these redlining plans.3 As such, homes in these neighborhoods were devalued compared to homes in other parts of the city, with anyone who wasn’t White frequently being denied mortgages and other types of financial assistance if they were trying to buy homes in majority White neighborhoods. This redlining in turn led to stagnated economic growth that has resulted in concentrated poverty along with reduced access to employment opportunities, public transportation, and neighborhood services, as well as the creation of food deserts and the perpetuation of concentrated poverty in majority non-White neighborhoods.4

Today, while legalized housing discrimination and redlining are no longer allowed, disparities still exist along racial lines. In 2021, the overall poverty rate in Travis County was 11.3%. When looking at the poverty rate along racial and ethnic lines, however, 7.3% of White households lived in poverty, compared to 12.6% and 18.6% of Black and Hispanic households, respectively.

In combination with the higher poverty rates in Black and Hispanic communities, Austin’s increasing cost of living has been making it more difficult for low-income households to obtain and stay in housing. At the end of 2022, the seasonally adjusted average rent in Austin was $1,967.5 Due to the disparate poverty rates among the different racial groups, these increased costs have a greater chance of affecting Black and Hispanic Austinites and pushing them out of the city.6 While the Travis County population has increased dramatically since 2000 across all racial and ethnic groups as per Census estimates, new residents are disproportionately White, and the relative proportional increase in the Black population in the County has not kept up with the overall population increase between 2000 and 2020.

At the same time, with the higher cost of living, gentrification in East Austin neighborhoods has made it particularly difficult for Black and Hispanic people to afford housing in the city. When completing a Coordinated Assessment (CA), a tool that prioritizes households in need of housing services for enrollment in housing program openings, 54% of Hispanic people and 46% of Black people stated that they were born and raised in Austin, compared to just 25% of White people (Figure 8). Of people born and raised in Austin or those who indicated on the CA that they lived in permanent housing in Austin at some point, 69% of those who were Hispanic and 68% of who were Black reported that they were once housed in a gentrified ZIP code\(^7\), compared to 50% of those who were White who indicated this (Figure 9). Gentrification can push low-income people out of their homes and neighborhoods due to housing prices increase to above what they can afford, both in terms of increased rent as well as increased property taxes.\(^8\) This decrease in affordability can lead to housing displacement and overall housing instability, which in turn can lead to difficulty in finding stable housing, increased risk of eviction, and difficulty in accessing services if an individual is forced out to the outskirts of a city.\(^9\)

\(^7\) These ZIP codes are 78701; 78702; 78717; 78721; 78723; 78725; 78728; 78741; 78744; 78748; 78749; 78752; 78753; 78754; 78757; 78613; & 78641. Assessee who answered "East Austin" are also counted as having lived in a gentrified area.


Figure 8: Percent of People Taking a CA Who Answer “Yes” to Being Born or Raised in Austin, by Race/Ethnicity

Figure 9: Percent of People Taking a CA Who Were Once Housed in a Gentrified Zip Code, by Race/Ethnicity
Finally, another factor affecting racial disparities is the difficulty those with criminal backgrounds have in obtaining housing. Over-policing and over-criminalization mean that Black people are incarcerated at a much higher rate than White people. Among the many effects that this has is that it makes obtaining housing for formerly incarcerated people, who are more likely to be Black or Hispanic, much harder. When running background checks, many apartment complexes have a look-back period where certain criminal charges are automatically denied depending on how recent the charge is. These look-back periods are often seven to ten years but can be up to a lifetime denial depending on the charge. All of these factors contribute to the fact that Black people are much more likely to experience homelessness than White people in Austin/Travis County.

**Ongoing Efforts**

Currently, the HRS is working on several initiatives to reduce racial and ethnic disparities in housing outcomes. The *Art of the Heart* report published by ECHO was a qualitative research project that relied on interviews with 34 Black people with lived experience of homelessness in Austin. This report uncovered why people do and do not engage with the HRS. Research participants explained how lived expertise and compassion in service delivery were critical in being able to trust service providers.

This project also found that some people identified past instances of disrespect and dismissive behavior that they saw was a result of racial biases, making them disillusioned with agencies that have long been established in the HRS. Created partly to address this fact are new grants such as the WoodNext Foundations grant. The goal of this grant is to reach agencies that have not formally worked in the HRS but are still seeing people experiencing chronic homelessness, and therefore can help divert them from further bouts of homelessness. With the hope of increasing the number of agencies in the HRS and expanding the system’s overall capacity, people experiencing homelessness now have more options for this type of intervention. Grants such as these provide an opportunity to smaller agencies not funded through traditional grants to be part of the system and to support the diversion needs of people experiencing homelessness. Because these are grassroots agencies, they often have established and built trust with people, especially people of color, who feel that they’ve been turned away from the system. As the agencies enter into the HRS and gain the resources needed to expand their work, there is the potential of decreasing disparities in the system.

---


Further, for agencies already in the System, ECHO also received and distributed funding from the St. David’s Foundation to increase access to services in the Homelessness Response System through a direct services funding grant called the “Austin Street Outreach Collaborative.” The purpose of this initiative was to create new initial “front door” pathways into the System, as well as reinforce and expand existing pathways already in frequent use. The CoC awarded approximately $2 million in funding to three community agencies (Urban Alchemy, Sunrise Navigation Center, and We Can Now) to create 12 new full-time positions dedicated to Street Outreach, Coordinated Assessment, and SOAR benefits access, and grantees were selected on their plan and ability to bring these services to marginalized and underserved populations. More than 2,000 individuals have been engaged by positions directly funded by that project in its first year, with more than a year remaining of additional funded services within the grant.

In addition to these grants, the Equity Committee of the Austin / Travis County Homelessness Response System Leadership Council continues to develop and test new questions for the local housing prioritization survey, the Austin Prioritization Assistance Tool (APAT), which is used when a person completes a CA. The Committee uses local assessment data to find racial and gender disparities in who is connected to housing, then writes and pilots new questions that aim to reduce those disparities by better accounting for a person’s vulnerability. Based on data analysis from these questions, the Committee decides which questions to formally adopt in the survey. Since the summer of 2022, the Committee has tested five new pilot questions and approved adding two former pilot questions to a new version of the CA.

**Conclusion**

Although the Austin / Travis County Homelessness Response System (HRS) has made strides over the course of 2022 to address racial and ethnic disparities—by funding new agencies, increasing outreach efforts, and working to improve the Coordinated Assessment—there is still much work to do in the HRS and the broader community. Black and Hispanic folks are more likely to experience these disparities due to the systemic barriers that these communities have had and continue to face. Notably in Travis County, Black folks are six times as likely to experience homelessness relative to White folks. Other data likewise shows that there is still inequity within the system, such as the comparatively low rates of Black clients exiting PSH projects to permanent housing compared to other clients. In response, the HRS continue to improve policies and processes to ensure that the needs of all people experiencing homelessness in the community are equitably met.
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Appendix A: Glossary

**Domestic Violence Survivor:** Clients who have disclosed a history of experiencing domestic violence.

**Experiencing Chronic Homelessness:** Clients who are living with a disability AND have been experiencing homelessness for at least 12 months or on at least four separate occasions in the past three years with a combined duration of at least 12 months.

**Family:** Clients who are members of households with at least one adult AND at least one child.

**Veteran:** Clients who have served at any point in the United States military.

**Youth:** Clients between 0 – 24.