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Women and Homelessness in Massachusetts

Problem

It’s not my home. Things feel so unstable. I don’t know when I’ll be transferred, how long I might be here... —homeless mother

[Homelessness is] nasty, not nice. Especially for a woman. It makes you hard, mean; it makes you a hard woman. It’s a hard life... I look at people [differently] now. I used to be pretty trustworthy, and now I don’t trust anybody. It’s hard to trust when you are out there... —homeless woman living on the streets

Ninety percent of the 1,100 families who utilize the state’s shelter system annually are headed by women; as are approximately 20% of the 19,000–29,000 individuals who stay in Massachusetts emergency shelters each year. In total, a minimum of 5,000 women and 2,000 children annually stay in Massachusetts homeless shelters.

These figures do not include over 3,000 women in domestic violence shelter (60% of whom enter a shelter with their children), nor the 50% of families seeking emergency shelter who are turned away each year. Over a period of three years, women also make up a quarter of Boston’s 1,400 street dwellers: homeless people who reside on the streets, rather than staying in shelters (approximately 350 women).

DEFINITIONS

THERE ARE THREE TYPES OF HOMELESS SHELTERS IN THE COMMONWEALTH:

• Individual emergency shelters for adult women and men
• Family shelters serving parents and their children
• Domestic violence shelters housing both single women and mothers with children who are fleeing domestic violence

For the most part, individual shelters provide a bed for the night, while family and domestic violence programs offer longer stays, from several months in, in some cases, a year or longer.

FIGURE 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF HOMELESS WOMEN IN SHELTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unaccompanied Women</th>
<th>Women in Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>38 years</td>
<td>32 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Children</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School or Less</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate/GED</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or More</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Widowed/Widowed</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital/Partnered/Never Married</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid/Medicare/MassHealth</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status (more than one response possible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental/Health Problems</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Addiction</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Problems</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Reasons for Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Unemployment</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Conflict/Abuse</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtaking/Health/Disability</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Prior to Current Shelter (primary response categories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shelter</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of Relative/Friends</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown/Central/Bridge</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned Home</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Reasons for Leaving Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left for Permanent Housing</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction/Grounded</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminated</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THIS FACT SHEET DRAWS ON THE FOLLOWING SOURCES:


Figure 1 compares the circumstances of women staying in individual shelters with those who enter family shelter. Women who enter shelter as unaccompanied individuals may also have children living elsewhere. (Most of the data presented are for 2003; however, some of the family information is for 2001.) Notable differences between the two groups include:

- Unaccompanied women are more likely to be white, and less likely to be Latina, than those in families. The single women are also more educat-
ed, less likely to have health insurance, and more likely to have stayed on the streets prior to enter-
ing a shelter. Women in family shelter are more likely to end up there due to overcrowding, health violations, or fire; they are also more likely to enter shelter from rental housing. As compared to men, single women are twice as likely to stay with friends or relatives before becoming homeless, pos-
ibly because women are more likely to have a supportive social network than are men.

- Outcomes for unaccompanied women and those in families also vary. Those in family shelter are more likely to go from shelter to housing, and to be ter-
ninated from their program for rule violations, while single women are more likely to disappear from the system; they do not return to shelter, and staff are unable to track their whereabouts.

- About half of the children growing up in shelter are girls. Just under half are ages five and younger, and about one in five are twelve years of age and older. Just over two in five of the pre-schoolers participate in formal child care or early-childhood education, as compared to two-
thirds of the housed population of young children in the Commonwealth. For these young children, the disruptions associated with homelessness can nega-
actively impact school readiness.

- As compared to their male counterparts, long-
term female street dwellers are more troubled by life on the streets, and therefore more likely to leave the streets when opportunities arise. They are also more willing to accept help than are men. As a female service provider states:

  “I think they [the women] are also much more 
  prone to accept help [as] to even think about it. 
  Men tend to think maybe, I can do this on my own. 
  I have not found that too much in women.”

In 2002, the income eligibility for family shelter was reduced from 130% to 100% of the federal poverty level. Families who need assistance are being denied access to shelter because Emergency Assistance (EA) income-eligibility criteria have not been adjusted to reflect the increased cost of liv-
ing. Many working mothers are unable to afford the high cost of today’s housing, yet they earn too much to be eligible for shelter; as a result, families are forced to live in unsafe, overcrowded condi-
tions. To remain in shelter, a parent with two chil-
dren must earn less than $15,670 annually ($7.53/hr).

In order to afford a two-bedroom Fair Market Rent 
apartment in the Commonwealth, a full-time worker has to earn a minimum of $20.93 per hour, more than three times the Massachusetts minimum wage. The situation is even worse for those with the lowest incomes. In Massachusetts, there are less than four afford-
able and available units for every five extremely low-income renters (0.20% of area median income). The supply of low-income housing is shrinking.

- State priorities have included ending homeles-
seness through an increased emphasis on mobiliz-
ing interagency collaborations and a renewed commit-
ment to implementation of homelessness prevention and rapid rehousing initiatives. The state no longer relies upon hotel/motel plac-
ements for families, and has, instead, developed transitional and other programs designed to house families more quickly.

- Continue to expand funding for the Mass. Rental 
  Voucher Program (MRVP), the state’s rental assistance 
  program. MRVP helps low-income families and 
  the elderly pay their rent in private apartments. In FY06, MRVP was funded at 
  $26.3 million, a $2 million increase over FY05. 
  In addition, the program was adjusted so that 
  voucher holders will pay no more than 40% of 
  their income for rent. Further, mobile vouchers 
  whose use had been discontinued are being reissued, 
  so as households turn in their vouchers, new house-
  holds will receive them. Continued funding will 
  enable more families to find rental housing.

- Expand its investment in homelessness prevention 
  for both families and individuals. These efforts 
  require sustained partnerships among federal, state, and local governments with housing devel-
opers, the nonprofit sector, philanthropists, 
  employers, educational institutions, households’ 
  informal support networks, and faith-based 
  organizations.

For women as well as men, solving homelessness requires increasing affordable housing and raising income levels. Recommended approaches include:

1. A federal commitment to:
   - Offer short-term rental vouchers, like those cur-
   rently being provided to hurricane survivors, to 
   all homeless families and individuals.
   - Expand funding for the Section 8 program.
   One proven solution to keeping people out of 
   homelessness is the Section 8 Voucher Program, the 
   country’s main source of federal housing assistance. 
   Section 8 is the only federal program 
   targeted to extremely low-income individuals, 
   and yet the funding is in constant danger of 
   being cut.

2. A state commitment to:
   - Expand funding for “Housing First” programs. 
   This year, the state has begun housing the most 
   disabled homeless people prior to treatment. The 
   housing is then used as a transforming element 
   to support participation in treatment.

- Focus on housing. Homeless service programs 
  should take a more active role in addressing 
  housing needs. Housing assistance should be 
  included as a critical component in detoxification 
  and mental health programs.

Conclusions

After California, Massachusetts is the second-
least-affordable state in the nation for rental 
housing. Growing poverty and an inadequate 
supply of permanently affordable housing and 
affordable housing and housing assistance feed the continuing crisis of homelessness in the Commonwealth.

• None of the women described above come close to 
having an income high enough to meet their 
base needs at a minimal level of adequacy. 
Three-quarters of parents and one-third of single 
women receive public assistance in the form of 
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food 
Stamps, Social Security, and/or Unemployment 
benefits. These benefits average $130-600 per 
month. About another two in five work, with 
monthly salaries averaging $1,000 or less. Figure 2 
compares the average earnings of homeless 
families in Boston from 1999-2003 with that 
required to afford a two-bedroom apartment at 
Fair Market Rent (FMR). As shown, the gap 
between wages and rent is growing.

- In 2002, the income eligibility for family shelter 
  was reduced from 130% to 100% of the federal 
  poverty level. Families who need assistance 
  are being denied access to shelter because 
  Emergency Assistance (EA) income-eligibility 
  criteria have not been adjusted to reflect the 
  increased cost of living. Many working 
  mothers are unable to afford the high cost of 
  today’s housing, yet they earn too much 
  to be eligible for shelter; as a result, families 
  are forced to live in unsafe, overcrowded 
  conditions. To remain in shelter, a parent 
  with two children must earn less than $15,670 
  annually ($7.53/hr).

- In order to afford a two-bedroom Fair Market 
  Rent apartment in the Commonwealth, a full-time 
  worker has to earn a minimum of $20.93 per 
  hour, more than three times the Massachusetts 
  minimum wage. The situation is even worse 
  for those with the lowest incomes. In 
  Massachusetts, there are less than four 
  affordable and available units for every five 
  extremely low-income renters (0.20% of area 
  median income). The supply of low-income 
  housing is shrinking.

- State priorities have included ending homeless-

ess through an increased emphasis on mobiliz-
ing interagency collaborations and a renewed commit-
ment to implementation of homelessness prevention and rapid rehousing initiatives. The state no longer relies upon hotel/motel place-
ments for families, and has, instead, developed transitional and other programs designed to house families more quickly.

- Continue to expand funding for the Mass. Rental 
  Voucher Program (MRVP), the state’s rental assistance 
  program. MRVP helps low-income families and 
  the elderly pay their rent in private apartments. In FY06, MRVP was funded at 
  $26.3 million, a $2 million increase over FY05. 
  In addition, the program was adjusted so that 
  voucher holders will pay no more than 40% of 
  their income for rent. Further, mobile vouchers 
  whose use had been discontinued are being reissued, 
  so as households turn in their vouchers, new house-
  holds will receive them. Continued funding will 
  enable more families to find rental housing.

- Expand its investment in homelessness prevention 
  for both families and individuals. These efforts 
  require sustained partnerships among federal, state, and local governments with housing devel-
opers, the nonprofit sector, philanthropists, 
  employers, educational institutions, households’ 
  informal support networks, and faith-based 
  organizations.

- Continue funding for RAFT (Residential 
  Assistance for Families in Transition), an exam-
ple of a family homelessness prevention program that offers hope. Initially funded in FY00, RAFT 
  provides families with up to $3,000 to help them 
  maintain their housing or move to safer, more 
  affordable housing.

- Expand public support for the creation of 
  affordable housing.

Solutions
Figure 1 compares the circumstances of women staying in individual shelters with those who enter family shelter. Women who enter shelter as unaccompanied individuals may also have children living elsewhere. (Most of the data presented are for 2003; however, some of the family information is for 2001.) Notable differences between the two groups include:

- Unaccompanied women are more likely to be white, and less likely to be Latina, than those in families. The single women are also more educated, less likely to have health insurance, and more likely to have stayed on the streets prior to entering a shelter. Women in family shelter are more likely to end up there due to overcrowding, health violations, or fire; they are also more likely to enter shelter from rental housing. As compared to men, single women are twice as likely to stay with friends or relatives before becoming homeless, possibly because women are more likely to have a supportive social network than are men.
- Outcomes for unaccompanied women and those in families also vary. Those in family shelter are more likely to leave the streets when opportunities arise. They are also more willing to accept help than are men. As a female service provider states: "I think they [the women] are also much more prone to accept help [or] to even think about it. Men tend to think macho, I can do this on my own. I have not found that too much in women.”

Figure 1 compares the circumstances of women staying in individual shelters with those who enter family shelter. Women who enter shelter as unaccompanied individuals may also have children living elsewhere. (Most of the data presented are for 2003; however, some of the family information is for 2001.) Notable differences between the two groups include:

- Unaccompanied women are more likely to be white, and less likely to be Latina, than those in families. The single women are also more educated, less likely to have health insurance, and more likely to have stayed on the streets prior to entering a shelter. Women in family shelter are more likely to end up there due to overcrowding, health violations, or fire; they are also more likely to enter shelter from rental housing. As compared to men, single women are twice as likely to stay with friends or relatives before becoming homeless, possibly because women are more likely to have a supportive social network than are men.
- Outcomes for unaccompanied women and those in families also vary. Those in family shelter are more likely to leave the streets when opportunities arise. They are also more willing to accept help than are men. As a female service provider states: "I think they [the women] are also much more prone to accept help [or] to even think about it. Men tend to think macho, I can do this on my own. I have not found that too much in women.”

For women as well as men, solving homelessness requires increasing affordable housing and raising income levels. Recommended approaches include:

1. **A federal commitment to:**
   - Offer short-term rental vouchers, like those currently being provided to hurricane survivors, to all homeless families and individuals.
   - Expand funding for the Section 8 program. One proven solution to keeping people out of homelessness is the Section 8 Voucher Program, the country’s main source of federal housing assistance. Section 8 is the only federal program targeted to extremely low-income individuals, and yet the funding is in constant danger of being cut.
   - Provide resources for the preservation and production of affordable housing. Support the establishment of a National Housing Trust Fund that would build, repair, and preserve 1.5 million units of rental housing for the lowest-income families over the next ten years.

2. **A state commitment to:**
   - Expand funding for “Housing First” programs. This year, the state has begun housing the most disabled homeless people prior to treatment. The housing is then used as a transforming element to support participation in treatment.
   - Focus on housing. Homeless service programs should take a more active role in addressing housing needs. Housing assistance should be included as a critical component in detoxification and mental health programs.

- In 2002, the income eligibility for family shelter was reduced from 130% to 100% of the federal poverty level. Families who need assistance are being denied access to shelter because Emergency Assistance (EA) income-eligibility criteria have not been adjusted to reflect the increased cost of living. Many working mothers are unable to afford the high cost of today’s housing, yet they earn too much to be eligible for shelter; as a result, families are forced to live in unsafe, overcrowded conditions. To remain in shelter, a parent with two children must earn less than $15,670 annually ($7.53/hr).

- In order to afford a two-bedroom Fair Market Rent apartment in the Commonwealth, a full-time worker has to earn a minimum of $20.93 per hour, more than three times the Massachusetts minimum wage. The situation is even worse for those with the lowest incomes. In Massachusetts, there are less than four affordable and available units for every five extremely low-income renters (0.07% of area median income). The supply of low-income housing is shrinking.

- State priorities have included ending homelessness through an increased emphasis on mobilizing interagency collaborations and a renewed commitment to implementation of homelessness prevention and rapid rehousing initiatives. The state no longer relies upon hotel/motel placements for families, and has, instead, developed transitional and other programs designed to house families more quickly.

**FIGURE 2**

AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT INCOME OF BOSTON SHELTERED FAMILIES COMPARED WITH INCOME NEEDED TO AFFORD TWO-BEDROOM FAIR MARKET RENT, 1999-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Employment Income</th>
<th>Income Needed to Afford 2-Bedroom Fair Market Rent in Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td>$2,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$1,912</td>
<td>$2,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>$1,155</td>
<td>$2,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$1,019</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>$1,070</td>
<td>$2,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Context* After California, Massachusetts is the second-least-affordable state in the nation for rental housing. Growing poverty and an inadequate supply of permanently affordable housing and housing assistance feed the continuing crisis of homelessness in the Commonwealth.

- None of the women described above come close to having an income high enough to meet their basic needs at a minimal level of adequacy. Three-quarters of parents and one-third of single women receive public assistance in the form of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, Social Security, and/or Unemployment benefits. These benefits average $130-600 per month. About another two in five in work, with monthly salaries averaging $1,000 or less. Figure 2 compares the average earnings of homeless families in Boston from 1999-2003 with that required to afford a two-bedroom apartment at Fair Market Rent (FMR). As shown, the gap between wages and rent is growing.

- In 2002, the income eligibility for family shelter was reduced from 130% to 100% of the federal poverty level. Families who need assistance are being denied access to shelter because Emergency Assistance (EA) income-eligibility criteria have not been adjusted to reflect the increased cost of living. Many working mothers are unable to afford the high cost of today’s housing, yet they earn too much to be eligible for shelter; as a result, families are forced to live in unsafe, overcrowded conditions. To remain in shelter, a parent with two children must earn less than $15,670 annually ($7.53/hr).

- In order to afford a two-bedroom Fair Market Rent apartment in the Commonwealth, a full-time worker has to earn a minimum of $20.93 per hour, more than three times the Massachusetts minimum wage. The situation is even worse for those with the lowest incomes. In Massachusetts, there are less than four affordable and available units for every five extremely low-income renters (0.07% of area median income). The supply of low-income housing is shrinking.

- State priorities have included ending homelessness through an increased emphasis on mobilizing interagency collaborations and a renewed commitment to implementation of homelessness prevention and rapid rehousing initiatives. The state no longer relies upon hotel/motel placements for families, and has, instead, developed transitional and other programs designed to house families more quickly.

- Continue to expand funding for the Mass. Rental Voucher Program (MRVP), the state’s rental assistance program. MRVP helps low-income families and the elderly pay their rent in private apartments. In FY06, MRVP was funded at $26.3 million, a $2 million increase over FY05. In addition, the program was adjusted so that voucher holders will pay no more than 40% of their income for rent. Further, mobile vouchers whose use had discontinued are being reissued, so as households turn in their vouchers, new households will receive them. Continued funding will enable more families to find rental housing.

- Expand its investment in homelessness prevention for both families and individuals. These efforts require sustained partnerships among federal, state, and local governments with housing developers, the nonprofit sector, philanthropists, employers, educational institutions, households’ informal support networks, and faith-based organizations.

- Continue funding for RAFT (Residential Assistance for Families in Transition), an example of a family homelessness prevention program that offers hope. Initially funded in FY05, RAFT provides families with up to $3,000 to help them maintain their housing or move to safer, more affordable housing.

- Expand public support for the creation of affordable housing.
Women and Homelessness in Massachusetts

Problem

It’s not my home. Things feel so unstable. I don’t know when I’ll be transferred, how long I might be here. —homeless mother

[Homelessness is] nasty, not nice. Especially for a woman. It makes you hard, mean, it makes you a hard woman. It’s a hard life... I look at people [differently] now. I used to be pretty trustworthy, and now I don’t trust anybody. It’s hard to trust when you are out there. —homeless woman living on the streets

Ninety percent of the 1,100 families who utilize the state’s shelter system annually are headed by women, as are approximately 20% of the 19,000–29,000 individuals who stay in Massachusetts emergency shelters each year. In total, a minimum of 5,000 women and 2,000 children annually stay in Massachusetts homeless shelters.

These figures do not include over 3,000 women in domestic violence shelter (60% of whom enter a shelter with their children), nor the 50% of families seeking emergency shelter who are turned away each year. Over a period of three years, women also make up a quarter of Boston’s 1,400 street dwellers.

The state’s shelter system annually is headed by women, as are approximately 20% of the 19,000–29,000 individuals who stay in Massachusetts emergency shelters each year. In total, a minimum of 5,000 women and 2,000 children annually stay in Massachusetts homeless shelters.

DEFINITIONS

THERE ARE THREE TYPES OF HOMELESS SHELTERS IN THE COMMONWEALTH:

• Individual emergency shelters for adult women and men
• Family shelters serving parents and their children
• Domestic violence shelters housing both single women and mothers with children who are facing domestic violence

For the most part, individual shelters provide a bed for the night, while family and domestic violence programs offer longer stays, from several months in, in some cases, a year or longer.

Average Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unaccompanied Women</th>
<th>Women in Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latina</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School or Less</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate/GED</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College or More</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/Widowed</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Widowed</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Partnership</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid/MassHealth/Medicare</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Status (more than one response possible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental/Health Problems</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Addiction</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Problems</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Reasons for Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unaccompanied Women</th>
<th>Women in Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Unemployment</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Conflict/ breakup</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eviction</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding/Health/Fire</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residence Prior to Current Shelter (primary response categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unaccompanied Women</th>
<th>Women in Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Shelter</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home of Relative/Friends</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downing/Car/Cabin/Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned Home</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Primary Reasons for Leaving Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unaccompanied Women</th>
<th>Women in Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left for Permanent Housing</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed/Unemployed</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed/Sadness</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>