

Understanding the Personal Networks of People Experiencing Homelessness in King County, WA with Aggregate Relational Data

Zack Almquist^{1a}, Ihsan Kahveci^a, Owen Kajfasz^b, Janelle Rothfolk^b, Amy Hagopian^a

^a*University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA*

^b*King County Regional Homelessness Authority, Seattle, WA, USA*

Abstract

The social networks of people experiencing homelessness are an understudied, yet important feature of the lives of unhoused people in the U.S. Personal networks provide access to information, amenities, and emotional support and safety. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s 2023 annual homeless count reported 653,100 people experiencing homelessness in the U.S. on any night, a 23% increase since 2022, and still likely to be a significant undercount. This paper explores a novel three-year dataset of survey responses from thousands of people experiencing homelessness collected via network-based sampling (peer referral methods), employed to estimate the total number of unsheltered people in King County, WA (including the Seattle metro area), from 2022 to 2024. We have compiled the most extensive data on the networks of the unhoused U.S. population, produced over three consecutive years, including more than 3,000 individuals and providing a large representative sample of aggregate relational data. We analyze the mean degree, degree distribution, and mixing rates of King County’s unsheltered population, along with four core network measures: an acquaintance network, a close friendship network, a kinship network, and a peer referral network. In general, we found a decrease in the number of people that unhoused people know over time. The average number of acquaintances from 2023 to 2024 declined from around 80 to 40. The number of close friends reported in our study was stable at 2.5 between 2023 and 2024; for this to

¹Corresponding Author: zalmquist@uw.edu

be mathematically true, given the growth in the unhoused population during the period, the social network has to be less connected (i.e., the probability of two unhoused people being connected has declined). Finally, we also see growth in the size of family groups within the community, suggesting more kin of unhoused people are also experiencing homelessness. Therefore, unhoused people in the Seattle area can be characterized as more anomic over time as their communities grow. This decline in interconnectedness might be caused by increasing displacement conducted by local authorities and the increase in people newly experiencing homelessness. The implications are that people may feel less aware/connected while losing out on information-passing opportunities. Meanwhile, as non-familial social connections have declined, the extended family unit has become more important. This work suggests that policies should aim to improve social connections and build community, such as reducing displacement or providing more places to congregate.

Keywords: ARD, Egocentric, Homelessness, degree distribution, degree model, aggregate network data

1. Introduction

The social networks of people experiencing homelessness are an understudied and important aspect of the lives of unhoused people in the United States (US). The personal networks of social and economic support (Small, 2013, 2017) play an important role in policy, support, and interventions (e.g., improved sleep locations or housing) for this population (Joly et al., 2014; Kennedy et al., 2022). Personal networks for the unhoused population provide access to information (e.g., shelters, new programs, resources), amenities (e.g., access to phones, food or shelter), emotional support (e.g., someone to talk to), and safety (e.g., physical safety). These networks nudge decisions about where people spend their time, where they work, who they go to for help, and ultimately whether they stay in housing once they obtain it (Simon et al., 2019). Social support is known to help people move out of substance use situations and help them not use in the first place (Rapier et al., 2019). There are, however, only few studies on the networks between people experiencing homelessness (e.g., Anderson et al., 2021, 2024; Almquist, 2020; Green et al., 2013), and qualitative and quantitative studies on the importance of social support networks for the unhoused population (Cummings et al., 2022; Solarz and Bogat, 1990; Green et al., 2013; Groton and Radey, 2019). Here we seek to follow up this literature with a population level sample of people experiencing homelessness in King County, WA² has adopted a network sampling-based approach to counting the number of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness (Almquist et al., 2024b) to understand the social networks between people experiencing homelessness over a large metro area (i.e., Seattle, WA).

People living unhoused are typically considered a hard-to-reach population (Almquist et al., 2024b; Killworth et al., 1998), but it is a growing and socially important community across the US. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (HUD) Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR) – presented to the US Congress in December 2023 – reported 653,100 people experiencing homelessness in the United States on any given night. This number is estimated from two key measurements: (1) the sheltered counts from the Homeless Management Information System

²The twelfth largest county by population in the US with 2.3 Million people and the third largest population of unhoused people, with more than 16,000 people living outdoors or in temporary shelters on any given night.

(HMIS) databases and allied service provider records contained in the HUD-designated administrative/geographic unit known as continuum-of-care (see for details [Almquist et al., 2020](#)), and (2) the unsheltered count ([Richards and Kuhn, 2023](#)), which comes from the Point-in-Time (PIT) count conducted biennially every January within a given federally defined local jurisdiction³. Traditionally, this PIT count is conducted on a single night in January by volunteers and is performed as a visual census of people sleeping in the streets ([Almquist et al., 2020](#)). For example, in King County, WA, 2020, this was conducted from 2:00 AM to 6:00 AM with around 1,000 volunteers, followed in the next few weeks by a demographic survey in day centers and emergency shelters ([All Home, 2020](#)). This process has been scrutinized recently (see, [Tsai and Alarcón, 2022](#)), and new methods have been proposed in recent years. [Almquist et al. \(2024b\)](#) introduced a method to count the unsheltered people experiencing homelessness using network-based methods. This method was implemented using network sampling – specifically respondent-driven sampling (RDS) ([Heckathorn, 1997](#); [Gile and Handcock, 2010](#)) in 2022 and again in 2024 with large-scale unofficial county-wide RDS in 2023.

Over the last three years, in King County, WA, this network-based approach has produced the most extensive set of network data that we know of on the US unhoused population. In this paper, we will analyze the resulting network data to understand the social networks of the unhoused population in King County, WA, with an eye on how this can be used to improve social policy and outcomes of the unhoused community. The data collected in this study included several aggregate personal network measures: (1) the total number of people experiencing homelessness who ego⁴ knows by sleep location; (2) a list of close alters⁵ experiencing homelessness by their sleep location⁷ and (3) ego’s kinship network, and (4) a peer referral network. This data type has become known as Aggregate Relational Data (ARD) ([Breza et al., 2020](#)) and can be employed to learn about population-level characteristics of the social network of interest ([Breza et al., 2023, 2020](#)), in this case, people experiencing homelessness.

Our goal in this paper is to understand the *change* in the social structure of people experiencing homelessness from 2022 to 2024 and to describe the

³These jurisdictions are known as Continuum of Care (COC) by HUD.

⁴The focal node in a network, in this case, the survey respondent [Almquist \(2012\)](#); [Wasserman \(1994\)](#).

⁵A person connected to ego [Almquist \(2012\)](#); [Wasserman \(1994\)](#).

networks of the unhoused community in a large urban, suburban, and rural area. We will be looking specifically at the differences and similarities of these four networks across demographics and other characteristics with an eye to how these networks can inform policy (e.g., improve information flow during a natural hazard). We explore these four networks over the three waves (2022, 2023, and 2024) of data collected in [Almquist et al. \(2024b\)](#) to understand the basic network/relational structure of people experiencing homelessness in King County. We will focus our analysis on 2023 and 2024 with larger samples and all four network measures (2022 only collected aggregate network data due to privacy concerns). Overall, our samples consist of three years of cross-sectional data collected through peer referral methods. Specifically, this process followed network recruitment of respondents (ego in network parlance) through ego’s acquaintanceship of people experiencing homelessness (alters in network language). Starting in 2022, we surveyed 671 people experiencing homelessness; in 2023, 1,106; and in 2024, 1,466, using network methods to estimate the unsheltered population in King County, WA.

The paper is laid out as follows: we first provide basic information on the study design and participants, then we explore the networks of people experiencing homelessness through first careful analysis of their personal network (e.g., degree or count of individuals connected to the focal person (or node); [Wasserman, 1994](#)) over the three core survey measures; we follow this up with statistical models of the personal network size by demographic and social attributes. Next, we analyze the peer referral network and the resulting diffusion process through the network of people experiencing homelessness. Last, we discuss the implications of these results, including simulating complete networks by fitting an exponential-family random graph model to the observed network statistics, and we conclude by discussing the results and implications for future research.

2. Methods

2.1. Study participants

Respondents to the survey were individuals experiencing homelessness recruited through peer referral methods (see Study Design) over two years of HUD mandate point-in-time count of unsheltered people experiencing homelessness (2022 and 2024) and one unofficial point-in-time count run by the University of Washington in 2023. For details, see [Almquist et al.](#)

(2024b). In total, 671 individuals experiencing homelessness were interviewed in 2022, 1,106 individuals experiencing homelessness were interviewed in 2023, and 1,466 individuals experiencing homelessness were interviewed in 2024. All individuals in the sample were experiencing homelessness following the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, which was first enacted in 1987, such that each individual are “people living in places not meant for human habitation (e.g., on the streets, in cars, in abandoned buildings), emergency shelters, or transitional housing designated for homeless individuals” (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2012). The full demographics for 2023 and 2024 can be found in Appendix G, and 2022 can be found in U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2023).⁶ Demographics are representative of the unhoused population of King County, WA.

2.2. Study design

The data was collected by Almquist et al. (2024b), annually from 2022 to 2024 via respondent-driven sampling (RDS; Gile and Handcock, 2010), a peer referral method for sample design combined with a statistical procedure to de-bias the data (e.g., we know that high degree individuals are more likely to be sampled). The RDS sampling process is portrayed in Figure 1, where we can see how the peer referral generates connection chains (or waves) over time. In Figure 1, we see the longest tree (diffusion path) in 2024 has 20 waves (distinct branches); further, the figure also provides a histogram of the wavelengths observed for the complete sample colored by their hub location (see Figure 2). We have included gender to visualize this process further. Following the work of Heckathorn (1997) and follow-up work by Salganik and Heckathorn (2004) and further work by Gile et al. (2015); Gile (2011); Gile and Handcock (2010) and others, we performed convergence diagnostics and followed the RDS estimators in Handcock et al. (2024); Gile and Handcock (2010). Our particular RDS was implemented as follows: each year, a set of geographically disparate physical locations across our large county (“hubs”) was selected; homeless service care workers recruited “seed” individuals near each location to supply an initial round of interviewees. After an individual was surveyed, she was provided three coupons to recruit

⁶Full demographics for 2024 will be released in U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2023), and complete list of 2023 can be found Almquist et al. (2024a).

other people experiencing homelessness and a \$20.00 Visa gift card. For each individual she recruited, she was provided (electronically to her phone) a \$5.00 digital Visa gift card.




Figure 1: Illustration of the longest chain in 2024 with the degree distribution and geospatial location of the interview (labeled as RDS hub location).

The university’s institutional human subjects research review board approved all study parameters for each year. Altogether, 671 individuals were interviewed in 2022, 1,106 in 2023, and 1,466 in 2024, all experiencing homelessness. In 2023, our team developed novel software to improve the data quality and peer referral process – this allowed the survey to go from taking six weeks to just under two weeks by the 2024 implementation. We focus this study on the 2023 and 2024 data, which provided larger network samples with more detailed network data. We acknowledge that in 2022, we did not collect as extensive network data as in 2023 and 2024, attributable to privacy concerns subsequently alleviated with extensive piloting in 2023. We (when appropriate) note details about the 2022 networks.




Figure 2: King County, WA plotted with the 17 RDS Hub locations from the 2024 PIT survey. Urban areas are colored in red, and rural areas are colored in grey. King County, WA, which has around 2.3 Million people, contains Seattle, WA, the largest city at around 750,000 people and is the region’s economic hub.

2.3. Network Instruments

First, we review the network questions employed in these surveys and then proceed to the core set of network statistics generated from our sample, starting with the mean degree and degree distribution of the sample. For 2023 and 2024 data, we collected four network measures: (1) peer referral via coupons (referred to throughout as the *peer referral network*), (2) aggregate counts of the number of people experiencing homelessness (referred to throughout as the *acquaintance network*), (3) a network list generator of people the respondent (also known as ego in the network literature) knows are experiencing homelessness (referred to throughout as the *close friendship network*), and (4) kinship or family networks (referred to throughout as the *kinship network*). In 2022, we gathered only aggregate data and did not collect list-based data on the number of people experiencing homelessness or their families. We have included the network questions in [Appendix F](#).

2.4. Statistical modeling approach

To understand the effect of node-level covariates ([Butts, 2008](#)) (e.g., basic demographics, length of time experienced homelessness, etc.) on network structure (primarily degree distribution and mean degree), we employ count

data models with a generalized linear model (GLM) structure (Nelder and Wedderburn, 1972). We focus on a core class of count data models with a long history of use in the social sciences and social network literature, which is that of the classic Poisson and Negative Binomial models with and without a zero-inflation component (e.g., Zheng et al., 2006). We consider the model classes with a zero-inflation component in the kinship network context (i.e., families of size one are expected to differ systematically from families of two or more people), and like Butts (2003) we know that recall and bias issues can systematically lower the number of personal contacts reported.

2.4.1. Count data models with GLM structure

Zero-Inflated Poisson (ZIP) Model. The ZIP model combines a Poisson model with a logistic model for zero inflation (note that this inherently contains the pure Poisson model by zeroing out the logistic model). Mathematically, we can write it as follows,

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } \pi_i, \\ \text{Poisson}(\lambda_i) & \text{with probability } 1 - \pi_i, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where:

- π_i is the probability of an excess zero, modeled by a logistic function:

$$\pi_i = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma})},$$
- λ_i is the Poisson mean, modeled by a log-link: $\log(\lambda_i) = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$,
- \mathbf{x}_i and \mathbf{z}_i are vectors of covariates for the count and zero-inflation parts, respectively.

Zero-Inflated Negative Binomial (ZINB) Model. The ZINB model generalizes the ZIP by allowing overdispersion through a Negative Binomial distribution for the counts:

$$Y_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{with probability } \pi_i, \\ \text{Negative Binomial}(\mu_i, \alpha) & \text{with probability } 1 - \pi_i, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where:

- $\pi_i = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma})}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma})}$ is the zero-inflation probability,

- μ_i is the Negative Binomial mean, modeled by $\log(\mu_i) = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$,
- α is the dispersion parameter for the Negative Binomial.

2.4.2. Model selection

We employ classic model select (Kuha, 2004, e.g.) to choose the best fitting model. For our analysis, we focus on the AICc metric (Anderson et al., 1994) because it both corrects for finite population size issues and is known to better handle overdispersion if present as a decision criterion (see Table 1 for count and percentage of zeroes (and/or skips) in each network for 2024).

Table 1: Count and percent of zeros (or skips) for all four personal networks in the 2024 RDS survey.

Network	N	% Zero
Kinship	1426	82
Close Friendship	1426	45
Acquaintance	1363	12
Referral	1466	56

To find the best fitting model, we created a set of candidate models based on theoretical relevance (see demographics and characteristics of homelessness we consider below). Then, we assessed model diagnostics and AICc to determine the most suitable model family (class) on a given degree distribution Mazerolle (2023). Then, we employ (backward) stepwise selection algorithm (Olusegun et al., 2015) using AICc as the decision criterion to find the best fitting model, including the final set of node level characteristics. We use the Jackman et al. (2015) in the R statistical programming environment (Hornik, 2012). We consider the following covariates, which are available across surveys and generally available on all respondents in all three-degree distribution models: *age*, *gender*, *race*, *ethnicity*, *shelter use*, *veteran status*, *chronically homeless*⁷, *self identified mental health*, *self identified substance use*, and *self identified disability*.

⁷Using HUD definition of chronically homeless (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2012).

2.4.3. Model fitting and selection for count data models for degree

In the main paper, we attempt to model only the most recent data set’s four core networks for 2024. The appendix includes a count data model for 2023; see [Appendix C](#).

Degree distribution model for the acquaintance network, 2024

We focus on model fit by AICc for the acquaintance network degree distribution; we were not able to find a ZINB model that fit, as it does not have “zero” inflation problem (see [Table 1](#)), but of the models that we were able to fit, the NB model was the best fitting for the acquaintance network ([Table 2](#)). See [Figure Appendix B.1](#) for model diagnostics.

Table 2: Model fit diagnostics for the acquaintance network, 2024.

Model	AICc	AIC	BIC	RMSE
Negative Binomial	10049.53	10048.53	10171.35	155.07
Zero-Inflated Poisson	110952.67	110949.03	111184.42	152.41
Poisson	119362.50	119361.59	119479.29	152.17
Zero-Inflated Negative Binomial	—	—	—	155.06

Degree distribution model for the close friendship network, 2024

Again, for the close friendship model, we use AICc for our decision criterion; here, the ZINB is the best-fitting model as it is clear over dispersion occurring ([Table 3](#)). See [Figure Appendix B.2](#) for model diagnostics.

Table 3: Model fit diagnostics for the close friendship network, 2024.

Model	AICc	AIC	BIC	RMSE
Zero-Inflated Negative Binomial	5277.80	5274.16	5516.72	3.74
Negative Binomial	5369.80	5368.85	5492.71	3.74
Zero-Inflated Poisson	5806.12	5802.63	6040.03	3.74
Poisson	7986.71	7985.83	8104.53	3.74

Degree distribution model for the kinship network, 2024

Next, we fit the count data model for the kinship network; the model is chosen by AICc; here, the ZINB is the best-fitting model as it is clear over dispersion occurring ([Table 4](#)). See [Figure Appendix B.3](#) for model diagnostics.

Table 4: Model fit diagnostics for the kinship network, 2024.

Model	AICc	AIC	BIC	RMSE
Zero-Inflated Negative Binomial	1672.76	1669.12	1911.68	0.85
Zero-Inflated Poisson	1703.61	1700.13	1937.53	0.86
Negative Binomial	1721.07	1720.12	1843.98	0.88
Poisson	1949.93	1949.06	2067.76	0.86

Degree distribution model for the peer referral. Last, we fit the count data model for the peer referral network; the model is chosen by AICc; here, the ZIP model is the best-fitting model as it is clear over dispersion occurring (Table 5). See Figure [Appendix B.4](#) for model diagnostics.

Table 5: Model fit diagnostics for the kinship network, 2024.

Model	AICc	AIC	BIC	RMSE
Zero-Inflated Poisson	3140.72	3137.23	3374.63	1.02
Zero-Inflated Negative Binomial	3142.87	3139.23	3381.79	1.02
Negative Binomial	3190.12	3189.17	3313.03	1.02
Poisson	3251.26	3250.39	3369.09	1.02

3. Results

This section reviews the basic descriptive network statistics we can obtain from the data, focusing on personal networks. We review both the sample and population-level estimates of the network descriptive statistics. Because of its robustness and common usage, we used the RDS-II estimator ([Gile and Handcock, 2010](#)) for all population-level statistics.

The data, as discussed, contains four core network measures: (i) a peer referral network (capped at three referrals), (ii) an aggregate measure of the total number of people experiencing homelessness the respondent knows, *acquaintance network*, (iii) a list-based network elicitation task (interpreted as close network ties of people experiencing homelessness), *close friendship network*, and (iv) kinship network (this includes extended kin such as adopted kids, etc), *kinship network*). Each of these networks is distinct, with very different profiles. Our analysis of the 2023 and 2024 acquaintances, close friends, and kinship networks allows us to calculate the mean degree and degree distribution for these three networks. We then break up these measures by core demographics: gender, age, and race. Next, we use the RDS referral

network to estimate mixing rates across race and gender. Last, we fit a count data model regression model to the three core networks.

3.1. Network degree of acquaintanceship, close friends and kinship

3.1.1. Mean degree and degree distribution

The mean degree (or the average size of one’s personal network) is considered one of the most important graph statistics in network analysis (Wasserman, 1994). The most important reason for this is that if we assume the mean degree is stable Anderson et al. (1999), it fixes the density of the graph (which will necessarily decline). The mean degree is also the core metric that captures information about people’s “personal networks,” important for understanding well-being (Wellman and Wortley, 1990), social capital (Lin, 2017), and discussion of important matters Burt (1984). Here, our multiple measures of personal networks capture various aspects of the extensive literature on personal and egocentric networks (Brea Perry and Small, 2023). We generally associate the acquaintance network as a network of weak tie relations (Granovetter, 1973) and a general sense of how embedded the respondent is in the larger homelessness community. For example, some people respond to this network question with 0 or under ten people, while others report hundreds or thousands of individuals. On the other hand, we interpret the list-based (name generator; Small et al. (2021)) as the respondent’s “close” friends within the community of people experiencing homelessness. Finally, we look at the kinship networks, which Figure 7, indicates extends beyond the concept of simple parents and children and includes any number of extended kin and non-kin relations.

Sample degree distribution and mean degree

We begin by examining the sample degree distribution (or reported degrees of those surveyed over the three-year period). The plot of all four networks in Figure 3 indicates that over the three waves of data, the mean degree of the referral network is 0.273 (2022), 0.784 (2023), and 0.789 (2024). Improved software and techniques piloted in 2023 improved our capacity to map the referral network. The mean degree of the aggregate network is 144 (2022), 77.5 (2023) and 37.1 (2024). The close friend network (available only in 2023 and 2024) is 4.91 (2023) and 2.73 (2024)⁸ Finally, the kinship network

⁸Note that the population estimates of mean degree do not greatly differ, suggesting we interviewed more well-connected people in 2023.

average degree was 1.60 (2022), 1.93 (2023), and 1.33 (2024)⁹.




Figure 3: Degree distribution for kinship, list-based network, and peer referral network for 2022, 2023, and 2024. Note that 0s in close friendship in 2023 and 2024 are artificially inflated by including skips; based on the aggregate data, we would not expect more than 9-10 percent of the sample to be zeros and those only in the “seeded” individuals.

Population estimates of the mean degree and degree distribution

Close Friendship, as tracked on the RDS-II estimator, is stable over both years at around 2.5 (Tables 6a and 6b), suggesting a decline in density of around 13% – i.e., the network of people experiencing homelessness is less connected now than it was a year ago. Next, the acquaintance network’s mean degree is estimated to be around 83 in 2023 and 36 in 2024, a difference

⁹Note that the population estimates of the mean kinship network in 2023 and 2024 are not statistically different and reversed (i.e., the population estimate for 2025 is bigger).

of 46 people (Tables 6a and 6b). This is a large decline and could represent a number of different scenarios, such as interviewer effects or a true decline in how aware people are of other people experiencing homelessness. Given the decline in density, it is very plausible that people are actually less connected within the community of people experiencing homelessness and thus have small acquaintance networks. Last, we find that the kinship mean degree is estimated to be 1.76 in 2023 and 1.98 in 2024 (Tables 6a and 6b), so we are finding a small but modest growth in the size of groups living together in the unhoused community. We can see the full distribution in Figure 4, where we see the most common grouping is two people together (often mother and child) with a steady decline in family size (see Figure 7 for all family combinations in 2024). Last, it is worth pointing out that the close friendship personal network distribution is typically under 5 with a long tail (we see some clumping with the 15-person cut-off, but almost none with the 20-person cut-off); this suggests that a cut-off of 20 people is pretty reasonable for data collection with almost no top coding occurring. In other words, very few people list more than 20, but many people list knowing more than 15.




Figure 4: Degree distribution of the kinship network for 2022 to 2023 with density plot (red).

Table 6: Population level estimate of mean degree over three network measures from 2023 RDS survey of people experiencing homelessness in King County, WA.

Term	Estimate	95% C.I.	S.E.¹	D.E.²	N
<i>All Respondents</i>					
Close Friendship	2.6	[2.37, 2.83]	0.12	3.36	1,108
Acquaintance	82.79	[0, 179.56]	49.37	4.36	1,043
Kinship	1.76	[1.58, 1.94]	0.09	1.92	302
<i>Seeds Removed</i>					
Close Friendship	2.63	[2.37, 2.89]	0.13	3.49	869
Acquaintance	93.8	[0, 219.75]	64.26	4.48	813
Kinship	1.75	[1.56, 1.94]	0.1	1.84	246


¹Standard Errors ²Design Effect ³Seeds are included.

(a) Mean degree as estimated from RDS-II for 2023.

Term	Estimate	95% C.I.	S.E.¹	D.E.²	N
<i>All Respondents</i>					
Close Friendship	2.5	[2.31, 2.69]	0.1	4.47	1,466
Acquaintance	36.07	[29.18, 42.97]	3.52	0.69	1,363
Kinship	1.98	[1.31, 2.64]	0.34	11.89	250
<i>Seeds Removed</i>					
Close Friendship	2.5	[2.29, 2.7]	0.1	4.34	1,156
Acquaintance	40.27	[31.12, 49.42]	4.67	0.79	1,081
Kinship	1.89	[0.89, 2.89]	0.51	19.64	170

¹Standard Errors ²Design Effect ³Seeds are included.

(b) Mean degree as estimated from RDS-II for 2024.



(a) Close friend network degree distribution in 2023. (b) Close friend network degree distribution in 2024.

Figure 5: Degree distribution of the close friendship network for 2023 and 2024. In 2023, we top-coded the instrument at 15 (subjects were not made aware of this fact); in 2024, we top-coded at 20.

Next, we focus our results on mean degree by key demographics: gender (Table 7), age (Tables 8 and 9) and race (Tables 10 and 11). We found no major gender differences between 2023 and 2024. We found younger people tended to report fewer close friends and smaller sets of acquaintances but larger kinship networks; in 2023, we saw a larger set of close friendships in those who identify as white but with lower kinship networks. Asian or Asian Americans reported larger close friendship networks and Hispanic/Latina/o/x had the largest kinship networks.

Table 7: Mean degree for gender in 2023 and 2024 as estimated by RDS-II estimator.

Term	Estimate	95% C.I.	S.E.¹	D.E.²	N³
<i>Male</i>					
Close Friendship	2.64	[2.35, 2.93]	0.15	3.51	717
Acquaintance	69.25	[2.12, 136.39]	34.25	3.89	696
Kinship	1.93	[1.64, 2.21]	0.15	2.16	180
<i>Female</i>					
Close Friendship	2.74	[2.22, 3.25]	0.26	3.52	277
Acquaintance	26.05	[20.12, 31.98]	3.03	0.67	270
Kinship	1.52	[1.26, 1.77]	0.13	2.76	110
<i>Other gender identity</i>					
Close Friendship	2.33	[1, 3.66]	0.68	1.8	18
Acquaintance	183.68	[49.08, 318.29]	68.67	0.87	18
Kinship	4	—	—	—	1

¹Standard Errors ²Design Effect ³Seeds are included.

(a) 2023 gender RDS-II estimates.

Term	Estimate	95% C.I.	S.E.¹	D.E.²	N³
<i>Female</i>					
Close Friendship	2.58	[2.19, 2.97]	0.2	3.85	394
Acquaintance	37.28	[23.68, 50.88]	6.94	1.37	374
Kinship	2.2	[1.15, 3.24]	0.53	12.1	138
<i>Male</i>					
Close Friendship	2.5	[2.28, 2.73]	0.11	4.59	1,009
Acquaintance	35.49	[27.04, 43.93]	4.31	0.63	969
Kinship	1.71	[1.43, 2]	0.14	2.05	109
<i>Other Gender Identity</i>					
Close Friendship	2.13	[1.37, 2.9]	0.39	1.21	12
Acquaintance	6.66	[2.24, 11.09]	2.26	0.51	11
Kinship	1.2	[1.2, 1.2]	0	0	2

¹Standard Errors ²Design Effect ³Seeds are included.

(b) 2024 gender RDS-II estimates.

Table 8: Mean degree for gender in 2023 as estimated by RDS-II estimator.

Term	Estimate	95% C.I.	S.E.¹	D.E.²	N³
<i>18-24</i>					
Close Friendship	2.02	[0.99, 3.04]	0.52	1.82	26
Acquaintance	22.26	[6.7, 37.81]	7.94	1.08	26
Kinship	2.06	[0.64, 3.47]	0.72	2.17	13
<i>25-34</i>					
Close Friendship	2.56	[1.97, 3.14]	0.3	4.13	208
Acquaintance	48.89	[27.09, 70.69]	11.12	1.27	202
Kinship	1.85	[1.51, 2.18]	0.17	1.94	68
<i>35-44</i>					
Close Friendship	2.74	[2.29, 3.19]	0.23	2.85	302
Acquaintance	116.34	[0, 452.69]	171.61	5.33	293
Kinship	1.68	[1.38, 1.98]	0.15	1.85	95
<i>45-54</i>					
Close Friendship	2.73	[2.16, 3.31]	0.29	4.38	240
Acquaintance	72.56	[56.82, 88.3]	8.03	0.15	236
Kinship	1.43	[1.18, 1.69]	0.13	1.73	60
<i>55-64</i>					
Close Friendship	2.76	[2.15, 3.37]	0.31	3.88	180
Acquaintance	125.05	[0, 393.17]	136.8	4.87	177
Kinship	1.94	[1.51, 2.38]	0.22	1.04	43
<i>65 or older</i>					
Close Friendship	2.27	[1.44, 3.1]	0.42	3.52	62
Acquaintance	60.24	[27.14, 93.35]	16.89	0.43	57
Kinship	2.32	[1.38, 3.26]	0.48	1.38	12

¹Standard Errors ²Design Effect ³Seeds are included.

Table 9: Mean degree for gender in 2024 as estimated by RDS-II estimator.

Term	Estimate	95% C.I.	S.E.¹	D.E.²	N³
<i>18-24</i>					
Close Friendship	2.23	[1.49, 2.97]	0.38	3.85	61
Acquaintance	44.06	[13.42, 74.7]	15.63	0.56	60
Kinship	2.26	[0.54, 3.98]	0.88	2.8	16
<i>25-34</i>					
Close Friendship	2.39	[1.97, 2.82]	0.22	4.49	299
Acquaintance	21.41	[14.89, 27.92]	3.32	1.3	288
Kinship	2.46	[0.89, 4.02]	0.8	14.9	79
<i>35-44</i>					
Close Friendship	2.55	[2.21, 2.89]	0.17	3.72	407
Acquaintance	38.39	[26.75, 50.04]	5.94	0.27	384
Kinship	1.81	[1.41, 2.21]	0.21	2.27	71
<i>45-54</i>					
Close Friendship	2.57	[2.18, 2.96]	0.2	3.82	351
Acquaintance	33.54	[23.01, 44.07]	5.37	0.88	343
Kinship	1.54	[0.6, 2.48]	0.48	12.92	57
<i>55-64</i>					
Close Friendship	2.62	[2.2, 3.04]	0.21	3.82	247
Acquaintance	38.28	[17.74, 58.82]	10.48	1.69	236
Kinship	2.03	[1.06, 3.01]	0.5	1.09	19
<i>65 or older</i>					
Close Friendship	2.51	[2.17, 2.85]	0.17	0.6	51
Acquaintance	103.63	[0, 226.13]	62.5	1.9	44
Kinship	1.11	[1.02, 1.2]	0.05	0.16	8

¹Standard Errors ²Design Effect ³Seeds are included.

Table 10: Mean degree for race in 2023 as estimated by RDS-II estimator.

Term	Estimate	95% C.I.	S.E.¹	D.E.²	N³
<i>White</i>					
Close Friendship	2.91	[2.53, 3.3]	0.2	3.84	523
Acquaintance	93.01	[0, 205.58]	57.43	5.41	507
Kinship	1.75	[1.52, 1.99]	0.12	2.21	164
<i>Multiracial</i>					
Close Friendship	2.66	[1.93, 3.39]	0.37	4.2	129
Acquaintance	46.66	[31.57, 61.76]	7.7	0.38	127
Kinship	1.84	[1.27, 2.41]	0.29	2.48	37
<i>Black, African American, or African</i>					
Close Friendship	2.42	[1.84, 3]	0.3	3.51	163
Acquaintance	32.87	[24.05, 41.68]	4.5	0.36	158
Kinship	1.89	[1.32, 2.45]	0.29	1.59	44
<i>Asian or Asian American</i>					
Close Friendship	2.02	[0.91, 3.13]	0.56	3.58	20
Acquaintance	3.96	[0, 8.82]	2.48	1.01	19
Kinship	2	[2, 2]	0	NA	2
<i>American Indian, Alaskan Native or Indigenous</i>					
Close Friendship	2.39	[1.51, 3.27]	0.45	3.22	77
Acquaintance	24.23	[8.76, 39.69]	7.89	1.64	76
Kinship	1.79	[1.16, 2.41]	0.32	1.28	24
<i>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</i>					
Close Friendship	2.91	[1.27, 4.55]	0.84	2.33	24
Acquaintance	11.73	[0, 26.19]	7.38	2.98	24
Kinship	1.59	[0, 3.19]	0.81	0.67	4
<i>Another race</i>					
Close Friendship	1.78	[1.04, 2.51]	0.38	3.33	14
Acquaintance	9.45	[2.08, 16.82]	3.76	2.52	14
Kinship	—	—	—	—	0

¹Standard Errors ²Design Effect ³Seeds are included.


Table 11: Mean degree for race in 2024 as estimated by RDS-II estimator.

Term	Estimate	95% C.I.	S.E.¹	D.E.²	N³
<i>White</i>					
Close Friendship	2.76	[2.4, 3.13]	0.19	4.37	576
Acquaintance	33.4	[25.1, 41.69]	4.23	0.97	557
Kinship	1.59	[1.29, 1.9]	0.15	3.55	106
<i>American Indian, Alaskan Native or Indigenous</i>					
Close Friendship	2.2	[1.38, 3.02]	0.42	5.91	59
Acquaintance	26.08	[13.18, 38.98]	6.58	1.65	54
Kinship	1.77	[0, 4.01]	1.14	10.35	16
<i>Multiracial</i>					
Close Friendship	2.5	[2.03, 2.97]	0.24	3.44	211
Acquaintance	70.37	[43.58, 97.17]	13.67	0.39	205
Kinship	1.83	[1.25, 2.4]	0.29	2.53	39
<i>Hispanic or Latina/o/x</i>					
Close Friendship	2.3	[1.94, 2.67]	0.19	5.71	219
Acquaintance	31.88	[7.57, 56.18]	12.4	1.36	202
Kinship	2.93	[0, 5.9]	1.52	12.09	37
<i>Black or African American</i>					
Close Friendship	2.34	[1.95, 2.74]	0.2	4.26	232
Acquaintance	23.87	[9.99, 37.76]	7.09	1.8	224
Kinship	2.09	[1.82, 2.36]	0.14	0.25	31
<i>Other</i>					
Close Friendship	2.3	[1.45, 3.15]	0.43	3.7	44
Acquaintance	30.3	[0, 60.91]	15.61	2.11	43
Kinship	1.69	[0.71, 2.67]	0.5	1.64	6
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>					
Close Friendship	2.36	[1.45, 3.26]	0.46	1.87	30
Acquaintance	7.94	[3.03, 12.85]	2.51	1.31	28
Kinship	2.81	[1.82, 3.81]	0.51	1.02	9
<i>Other Racial Identity</i>					
Close Friendship	1.31	[0.64, 1.98]	0.34	2.3	4
Acquaintance	18.25	[18.25, 18.25]	0	0	2
Kinship	—	—	—	—	0
<i>Asian or Asian American</i>					
Close Friendship	3.22	[2.43, 4]	0.4	1.28	25
Acquaintance	15.59	[3.58, 27.59]	6.13	2.09	25
Kinship	2.11	[1.85, 2.37]	0.13	0.07	3


¹Standard Errors ²Design Effect ³Seeds are included.

3.2. Peer referral network

One of the defining characteristics of an RDS study is that it is a diffusion process, where we can think of this as a basic measure of how information or goods would flow through the community of people experiencing homelessness. We can categorize the typology of this diffusion process as expressed in the isomorphism (Wasserman, 1994) of the recruitment trees (See Figure 6 for the 2023 and 2024 tree isomorphism observed). Overall, we see many small diffusion chains with a handful of cases that take off (Goel et al., 2012, similar to another diffusion process that has been studied, such as those of diffusion processes over online networks such as Twitter or Facebook). The implication of these diffusion chain results suggests that in the case of getting out emergency information – e.g., the heat warnings like the heat dome in Seattle, WA in 2021, where the temperatures reached 107 degrees Fahrenheit or 42 degrees Celsius, and information on where cooling stations would be available was utmost importance – depends on finding a few well-connected people which can result in large and fast cascades of information flow through the community. This backs up the simulation results in Almquist (2020).



(a) 2023 Isomorphism diffusion trees.



(b) 2024 Isomorphism diffusion trees.

Figure 6: Recruitment trees for the 2023 and 2024 RDS surveys counted by their graph isomorphism (Wasserman, 1994).

Gender and Race Mixing

From the RDS recruitment procedure, we can also estimate empirical rates of mixing by race (Tables 13a and 13b) and gender (Table 12b). In 12a and 12b, we see high levels of homophily, and as one would expect, we see more Female Male recruitment because women represent around 20% of the population compared to males. Similarly, in Tables 13a and 13b, we see high mixing with the largest racial group (White), followed by Black/African American and Multiracial.

Table 12: Gender mixing rates estimated from the peer referral network.

Recruiter	Recruitee		Recruiter	Recruitee	
	Male	Female		Male	Female
Male	0.71	0.29	Male	0.79	0.21
Female	0.66	0.34	Female	0.60	0.40

(a) The 2023 Gender mixing between male and female respondents. We have dropped those who responded with other genders.

(b) 2024 Gender mixing between male and female respondents. We have dropped those who responded with other genders (only 14 in the total data set).

Table 13: Racial mixing rates estimated from the peer referral network.

Recruiter	Recruitee					
	AIANI	AAA	BAA	MR	NHOPIW	W
American Indian, Alaskan Native or Indigenous	0.16	0.00	0.30	0.06	0.02	0.46
Asian or Asian American	0.00	0.38	0.23	0.00	0.08	0.31
Black or African American	0.04	0.01	0.24	0.15	0.06	0.50
Multiracial	0.10	0.00	0.15	0.17	0.00	0.57
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.19	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.52
White	0.06	0.02	0.15	0.15	0.02	0.59

(a) The 2023 empirical mixing rates derived from the RDS procedure.

Recruiter	Recruitee						
	AIANI	AAA	BAA	HL	MR	NHOPIW	W
American Indian, Alaskan Native or Indigenous	0.08	0.03	0.20	0.20	0.18	0.00	0.31
Asian or Asian American	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.17	0.28	0.06	0.44
Black or African American	0.02	0.02	0.40	0.12	0.14	0.04	0.26
Hispanic or Latina/o/x	0.02	0.00	0.09	0.54	0.13	0.01	0.20
Multiracial	0.06	0.03	0.19	0.16	0.22	0.01	0.34
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.07	0.00	0.40	0.13	0.27	0.10	0.29
White	0.04	0.02	0.12	0.07	0.15	0.01	0.61

(b) The 2024 empirical mixing rates derived from the RDS procedure. Note that HUD changed the racial categories in 2024, resulting in different categories (e.g., HUD now treats Hispanic/Latina/o/x as race and an ethnicity).

4. Count data model for degree distribution in the four networks

In this section, we consider just the 2024 networks, where we model them as zero-inflated negative binomial models, as discussed in the Methods section. The results for 2023 can be found in [Appendix C](#). The four models see a clear impact of age, gender, and health on network size. The resulting models for 2024 can be found in [Table 14](#) with the referral network in [Table D.16](#) – the major implication of this model is that women are better at recruiting people than men with large and significant parameter estimates.

Table 14: Zero-inflated negative binomial model for degree distribution, 2024

Term	Conditional Component		
	Acquaintance	Kinship	Friendship
Age (ref. 18-24)			
25-34	0.49 (0.04)***		
35-44	0.97 (0.04)***		
45-54	0.52 (0.04)***		
55-64	0.88 (0.04)***		
65 or older	1.96 (0.04)***		
Gender (ref. Man (Boy if child))			
Woman (Girl if child)	0.00 (0.01)		0.19 (0.07)**
Other	-1.62 (0.12)***		-0.92 (0.48)+
Race (ref. White)			
American Indian, Alaskan Native or Indigenous	0.06 (0.03)*	-0.30 (0.36)	-0.56 (0.18)**
Asian or Asian American	-0.55 (0.05)***	1.52 (0.74)*	0.09 (0.24)
Black or African American	-0.09 (0.02)***	0.88 (0.29)**	-0.32 (0.10)**
Hispanic or Latina/o/x	0.96 (0.03)***	0.73 (0.44)+	-0.72 (0.17)***
Multiracial	0.71 (0.01)***	-0.20 (0.32)	-0.23 (0.11)*
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	-1.04 (0.06)***	1.08 (0.40)**	-0.26 (0.23)
Other identity	0.05 (0.03)+	-0.69 (0.53)	-0.35 (0.18)+

Ethnicity (ref. Hispanic/Latinoax)			
Hispanic/Latina/o/x	-0.69 (0.02)***	0.55 (0.38)	0.28 (0.13)*
Shelter (ref. Housed)			
Sheltered	0.35 (0.02)***		
Unsheltered	0.66 (0.02)***		
Yes/No (ref)			
Veteran	0.53 (0.01)***		0.11 (0.07)
Chronic Homeless	-0.14 (0.02)***	0.74 (0.22)***	0.16 (0.07)*
Mental Health	0.69 (0.01)***	0.41 (0.22)+	
Substance Use	0.39 (0.01)***	-0.69 (0.20)***	0.21 (0.07)**
Disability	-0.10 (0.01)***	-0.65 (0.20)***	0.07 (0.07)
Goodness of Fit			
AICc	119362.5	1655.2	5248.6
AIC	119361.59	1653.07	5247.73
BIC	119479.29	1838.86	5366.46
RMSE	152.17	0.86	3.74

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Zero-Inflation Component

Term	Acquaintance	Kinship	Friendship
Age (ref. 18-24)			
25-34	—	-0.11 (0.70)	
35-44	—	0.86 (0.71)	
45-54	—	0.92 (0.73)	
55-64	—	1.81 (0.77)*	
65 or older	—	1.33 (0.97)	
Gender (ref. Man (Boy if child))			
Woman (Girl if child)	—	-2.82 (0.44)***	
Other identity	—	0.72 (1.44)	
Race (ref. White)			

American Indian, Alaskan Native or Indigenous	—	-0.97 (0.97)	
Asian or Asian American	—	3.47 (1.06)**	
Black or African American	—	2.17 (0.57)***	
Hispanic or Latino	—	1.54 (0.90)+	
Multiracial	—	-0.14 (0.76)	
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	0.82 (0.91)	
Other identity	—	-0.74 (1.57)	
<hr/>			
Ethnicity (ref. Hispanic/Latinoax)			
Hispanic/Latinoax	—	0.42 (0.84)	
<hr/>			
Shelter (ref. Housed)			
Sheltered	—	1.95 (0.52)***	0.45 (0.23)+
Unsheltered	—	1.57 (0.53)**	0.07 (0.25)
<hr/>			
Yes/No (ref)			
Veteran	—		-0.27 (0.15)+
Chronic Homeless	—	1.28 (0.52)*	0.23 (0.21)
Mental Health	—	0.96 (0.46)*	0.32 (0.15)*
Substance Use	—	-0.30 (0.42)	-0.28 (0.15)+
Disability	—	-1.07 (0.43)*	
<hr/>			
Goodness of Fit			
AICc	119362.5	1655.2	5248.6
AIC	119361.59	1653.07	5247.73
BIC	119479.29	1838.86	5366.46
RMSE	152.17	0.86	3.74

+ $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

5. Discussion

In this paper, we review the core network statistics available from the King County PIT RDS survey from 2022 to 2024, possibly representing the largest network study on people experiencing homelessness in the US. We re-

port a decrease in density (stable mean degree) between 2023 and 2024, suggesting that people experiencing homelessness have become less connected (within the community of people experiencing homelessness) over the last year. This is further emphasized by the decrease in reported acquaintances from 2022 to 2024 (halving yearly). Further, the average size of families (kinship networks) has increased (almost to the size of the reported mean degree of close friends), suggesting family units are becoming more insular over time. Further, we find that the mean degree we find from Close Friendship is 2.6 (2023) and 2.5 (2024), which closely matches important matters from the General Social Survey (GSS) and political matters from the American National Election Survey (ANES), which range from 2.14 to 2.94 (Lee and Bearman, 2017) – we interpret this as evidence we are capturing a meaningful and close social relationship to that of who people discuss important matters or politics with.

Close friendship network. The close friendship network has a mean size of around 2.5 people in 2023 and 2024. This result of reporting around 2.5 individuals in their close network is similar to other network questions centered around close ties, such as discussing important matters in the US housed population (Lee and Bearman, 2017), emphasizing we are capturing the local support of unhoused to unhoused networks. These ties are known to be very important for survival Cummings et al. (2022), access to resources (Adams et al., 2023), and well-being (Addo et al., 2022). Further, we see within these networks from the ZINB model of network size that gender plays an important role (women have larger networks). Last, we note that the stability of the mean degree of close friendships means that the density of the social network between people experiencing homelessness must decline as the population grows – suggesting that the population is becoming more anomic over time. This might be because of increased displacement events or due to the increase in people newly experiencing homelessness – both of these mechanisms are likely playing out to weaken the social support networks of the unhoused population.

Acquaintanceship network. We interpret the acquaintanceship network as providing a general sense of how embedded the individual is in the larger homelessness community – we see this most prominently in the increase in size by age, but also the differing composition in size by race/ethnicity in the ZINB model, where we find that Hispanic or Latina/o/x, American Indian,

Alaskan Natives or Indigenous and multiracial groups have larger families on average compared to White, whereas Asian or Asian American and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders have smaller families compared to Whites. This decline in all three years suggests that the unhoused population is not as visible even to the unhoused population. This is striking as the population has grown by 23% between 2022 and 2024 [Almquist et al. \(2024b\)](#). Again, this measure implies the population is becoming less tightly connected over time. This has large implications for social support, access to resources, information, and safety.

Kinship connections and composition. One of the most critical networks for survival while living without shelter is one’s kinship network. [Almquist et al. \(2024b\)](#) estimated 17% of people living unhoused in 2024 lived with their extended kin. In [Figure 7](#), we have mapped the labeled isomorphism by gender and role (e.g., child, spouse, etc.) for all families surveyed in 2024. Most relationships involve single parents with a child, but we see several large households, including families with ten children. We see that family sizes for Black or African Americans, Asian or Asian Americans, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders are statistically larger than those of White families, whereas the other groups are statistically distinguishable. Last, this model further allows us to see that chronically homeless people have larger family groups. Our data also suggest additional family members are falling into homelessness when one member is already on the streets. People are less connected and in less dense networks, implying the family unit is growing in importance for people living unhoused.

Referral network. The referral network shows an empirical diffusion process, where we see some chains take off similar to online networks ([Dow et al., 2013](#)) with certain sets taking way off and many burning out in short order (see [Figure 6](#)). In the regression model ([Table D.16](#)), we see a strong gender effect, where women are more likely to recruit women (to the study) than are men; this is important, as recruiting women is typically harder in this setting where they are a smaller percentage of the population, more vulnerable and less likely to be recruited.




Figure 7: Family Tree (labeled) Isomorphisms in 2024.

Simulated complete networks for power analysis:. Now that we know more about the networks of people experiencing homelessness, we can improve the power analysis introduced in [Almquist et al. \(2024b\)](#) with updated simulations of this unhoused to unhoused network (see [Appendix E](#) for details on the simulation process from Exponential-family Random Graph Models (ERGM) ([Robins et al., 2007](#))). We can see in [Figure 8](#), what this RDS process might look like, where we have simulated an ERGM based on the observed density and gender mixing.




Figure 8: Updated power analysis from [Almquist et al. \(2024b\)](#) based on [Appendix E](#) simulation analysis of the complete network of people experiencing homelessness in King County, WA 2024.

Limitations: These studies have all the standard limitations of an RDS sample, which include concerns of convergence (see [Almquist et al. \(2024b\)](#) for details on the convergence statistics in this sample). We worry about known biases in network reporting; see [Butts \(2003\)](#). However, there is good evidence that this is not a major concern in estimating population-level statistics from RDS procedure ([Fellows, 2022](#)). Last, we have limited clustering data because of minimal information on alter-alter ties.

Summary: Here, we have carefully described the personal networks of people experiencing homelessness in King County, WA. Over the three years, we have surveyed more than 3,000 unhoused people, making this the most extensive network study of people experiencing homelessness in the United States. We have found the population of people experiencing homelessness in King County, WA, appears to be becoming less connected, less visible to their community, and more reliant on their local family structures, which are growing and heterogenous in nature (i.e., include many non-kin relationships). This work suggests that policies to improve social connections and

build community could benefit this community, such as reducing displacements or providing more places to congregate.

Future studies. We hope to add information about people’s alter-alter ties and look towards understanding how people move in and out of homelessness by modifying the instrument to allow for closer in-time sampling. We’re also interested in the relationship between people experiencing homelessness and the housed community to understand whether having family members who are homeless increases the odds of one becoming homeless themselves. Further, we are interested in exploring the mechanisms for why the network is becoming less connected over time, e.g., this could be because the city has been conducting more frequent encampment displacement operations, because of the Supreme Court’s 2024 *Grants Pass* decision changing the legal landscape of the city and county jurisdictions (It has been shown by [Kaufman, 2022](#), and others the displacement events disrupt people’s social networks.) or because of the growth in the population of people experiencing homelessness ([Almquist et al., 2024b](#)).

Acknowledgments

Funding. Partial support for this research came from a Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development research infrastructure grant, P2C HD042828, to the Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology at the University of Washington; NSF CAREER Grant #SES-2142964; University of Washington Population Health Initiative Tier 2 and 3 Grants. The content is solely the authors’ responsibility and does not necessarily represent the official NIH or National NSF views.

Data-availability. HUD Data exchange provides all official PIT totals from KCRHA (see [HUD website](#)). Individual data for 2022 and 2024 is available via request to KCRHA and to the University of Washington through Zack Almquist for the 2023 PIT data.

Conflict of Interest. Zack Almquist, Ihsan Kahveci, and Amy Hagopian have no conflict of interest to declare. Owen Kajfasz, and Janelle Rothfolk, as King County Regional Homelessness Authority employees, acknowledge the importance of transparency and accountability in scientific research and peer

review. The King County Regional Homelessness Authority employed Kajfasz and Rothfolk during the 2022 and 2024 Point-in-Time count. The King County Regional Homelessness Authority, in its role as the Community of Care (CoC) lead, both conducted and provided funding for the King County 2022 RDS survey, which was carried out as a requirement of the HUD-mandated biannual 2022 Point-in-Time count. **Financial Interests:** Kajfasz and Rothfolk declare that they have no financial interests, such as stocks, patents, or research grants, that may be perceived as affecting their objectivity in the peer review process. **Organizational Interests:** The King County Regional Homelessness Authority has a stake in addressing homelessness in King County and may be impacted by the outcomes of this survey project. As the Community of Care (CoC) lead, the King County Regional Homelessness Authority must complete a bi-annual unsheltered Point-in-Time count by both Federal and State statutes as a requirement for continued funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. As such, they have a stake in identifying valid methods of enumeration of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness.

References

- Adams, E.J., Lu, M., Duan, R., Chao, A.K., Kessler, H.C., Miller, C.D., Richter, A.G., Latyshev, D.G., Dastoor, J.D., Eckburg, A.J., et al., 2023. Nutritional needs, resources, and barriers among unhoused adults cared for by a street medicine organization in Chicago, Illinois: a cross-sectional study. *BMC public health* 23, 2430.
- Addo, R., Yuma, P., Barrera, I., Layton, D., 2022. Social networks and subjective wellbeing of adults in a housing first program. *Journal of Community Psychology* 50, 238–249.
- All Home, 2020. Seattle/King County point-in-time count of individuals experiencing homelessness. Published by King County Regional Homelessness Authority.
- Almquist, Z., Yang, J., Appiah Kubi, F.J., Kaye, B., Robinson, J., Schachtman, R., 2024a. Understanding homelessness - data science for social good 2024. https://uwescience.github.io/DSSG2024_understanding_homelessness/. Accessed: 2024-10-24.

- Almquist, Z.W., 2012. Random errors in egocentric networks. *Social networks* 34, 493–505.
- Almquist, Z.W., 2020. Large-scale spatial network models: An application to modeling information diffusion through the homeless population of san francisco. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 47, 523–540.
- Almquist, Z.W., Helwig, N.E., You, Y., 2020. Connecting continuum of care point-in-time homeless counts to united states census areal units. *Mathematical Population Studies* 27, 46–58.
- Almquist, Z.W., Kahveci, I., Hazel, M.A., Kajfasz, O., Rothfolk, J., Guilmette, C., Anderson, M., Ozeryansky, L., Hagopian, A., 2024b. Innovating a community-driven enumeration and needs assessment of people experiencing homelessness: A network sampling approach for the hud-mandated point-in-time count. *American Journal of Epidemiology* .
- Anderson, B.S., Butts, C., Carley, K., 1999. The interaction of size and density with graph-level indices. *Social networks* 21, 239–267.
- Anderson, D., Burnham, K., White, G., 1994. Aic model selection in overdispersed capture-recapture data. *Ecology* 75, 1780–1793.
- Anderson, M.C., Hazel, A., Perkins, J., Almquist, Z., 2024. Norms of fairness and generosity among people experiencing homelessness: A dictator game field experiment. *International Journal on Homelessness* , 1–13.
- Anderson, M.C., Hazel, A., Perkins, J.M., Almquist, Z.W., 2021. The ecology of unsheltered homelessness: Environmental and social-network predictors of well-being among an unsheltered homeless population. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 18, 7328.
- Brea Perry, A.R., Small, M., 2023. Personal networks and egocentric analysis. *The Sage Handbook of Social Network Analysis* , 439.
- Breza, E., Chandrasekhar, A.G., Lubold, S., McCormick, T.H., Pan, M., 2023. Consistently estimating network statistics using aggregated relational data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120, e2207185120.

- Breza, E., Chandrasekhar, A.G., McCormick, T.H., Pan, M., 2020. Using aggregated relational data to feasibly identify network structure without network data. *American Economic Review* 110, 2454–2484.
- Burt, R.S., 1984. Network items and the general social survey. *Social networks* 6, 293–339.
- Butts, C.T., 2003. Network inference, error, and informant (in) accuracy: a bayesian approach. *social networks* 25, 103–140.
- Butts, C.T., 2008. Social network analysis: A methodological introduction. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 11, 13–41.
- Cummings, C., Lei, Q., Hochberg, L., Hones, V., Brown, M., 2022. Social support and networks among people experiencing chronic homelessness: A systematic review. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 92, 349.
- Dow, P.A., Adamic, L., Friggeri, A., 2013. The anatomy of large facebook cascades, in: *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, pp. 145–154.
- Fellows, I.E., 2022. On the robustness of respondent-driven sampling estimators to measurement error. *Journal of Survey Statistics and Methodology* 10, 377–396.
- Gile, K.J., 2011. Improved inference for respondent-driven sampling data with application to hiv prevalence estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106, 135–146.
- Gile, K.J., Handcock, M.S., 2010. Respondent-driven sampling: an assessment of current methodology. *Sociological methodology* 40, 285–327.
- Gile, K.J., Johnston, L.G., Salganik, M.J., 2015. Diagnostics for respondent-driven sampling. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 178, 241–269.
- Goel, S., Watts, D.J., Goldstein, D.G., 2012. The structure of online diffusion networks, in: *Proceedings of the 13th ACM conference on electronic commerce*, pp. 623–638.
- Granovetter, M.S., 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American journal of sociology* 78, 1360–1380.

- Green, H.D., Tucker, J.S., Golinelli, D., Wenzel, S.L., 2013. Social networks, time homeless, and social support: A study of men on skid row. *Network Science* 1, 305–320.
- Groton, D.B., Radey, M., 2019. Social networks of unaccompanied women experiencing homelessness. *Journal of community psychology* 47, 34–48.
- Handcock, M.S., Gile, K.J., Fellows, I.E., Neely, W.W., 2024. Package ‘rds’.
- Heckathorn, D.D., 1997. Respondent-driven sampling: a new approach to the study of hidden populations. *Social problems* 44, 174–199.
- Hornik, K., 2012. The comprehensive r archive network. *Wiley interdisciplinary reviews: Computational statistics* 4, 394–398.
- Jackman, S., Tahk, A., Zeileis, A., Maimone, C., Fearon, J., Meers, Z., Jackman, M.S., Imports, M., 2015. Package ‘pscl’. *Political Science Computational Laboratory* 18.
- Joly, L., Cornes, M., Manthorpe, J., 2014. Supporting the social networks of homeless people. *Housing, Care and Support* 17, 198–207.
- Kaufman, D., 2022. Expulsion: A type of forced mobility experienced by homeless people in canada. *Urban Geography* 43, 321–343.
- Kennedy, D.P., Osilla, K.C., Hunter, S.B., Golinelli, D., Maksabedian Hernandez, E., Tucker, J.S., 2022. Restructuring personal networks with a motivational interviewing social network intervention to assist the transition out of homelessness: A randomized control pilot study. *Plos one* 17, e0262210.
- Killworth, P.D., McCarty, C., Bernard, H.R., Shelley, G.A., Johnsen, E.C., 1998. Estimation of seroprevalence, rape, and homelessness in the united states using a social network approach. *Evaluation review* 22, 289–308.
- Kuha, J., 2004. Aic and bic: Comparisons of assumptions and performance. *Sociological methods & research* 33, 188–229.
- Lee, B., Bearman, P., 2017. Important matters in political context. *Sociological Science* 4, 1–30.

- Lin, N., 2017. Building a network theory of social capital. *Social capital* , 3–28.
- Mazerolle, M.J., 2023. AICcmodavg: Model selection and multimodel inference based on (Q)AIC(c). URL: <https://cran.r-project.org/package=AICcmodavg>. r package version 2.3.3.
- Nelder, J.A., Wedderburn, R.W., 1972. Generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society* 135, 370–384.
- Olusegun, A.M., Dikko, H.G., Gulumbe, S.U., 2015. Identifying the limitation of stepwise selection for variable selection in regression analysis. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics* 4, 414–419.
- Rapier, R., McKernan, S., Stauffer, C.S., 2019. An inverse relationship between perceived social support and substance use frequency in socially stigmatized populations. *Addictive behaviors reports* 10, 100188.
- Richards, J., Kuhn, R., 2023. Unsheltered homelessness and health: a literature review. *AJPM focus* 2, 100043.
- Robins, G., Pattison, P., Kalish, Y., Lusher, D., 2007. An introduction to exponential random graph (p*) models for social networks. *Social networks* 29, 173–191.
- Salganik, M.J., Heckathorn, D.D., 2004. 5. sampling and estimation in hidden populations using respondent-driven sampling. *Sociological methodology* 34, 193–240.
- Šimon, M., Vašát, P., Poláková, M., Gibas, P., Daňková, H., 2019. Activity spaces of homeless men and women measured by gps tracking data: A comparative analysis of prague and pilsen. *Cities* 86, 145–153.
- Small, M.L., 2013. Weak ties and the core discussion network: Why people regularly discuss important matters with unimportant alters. *Social networks* 35, 470–483.
- Small, M.L., 2017. *Someone to talk to*. Oxford University Press.
- Small, M.L., Perry, B.L., Pescosolido, B., Smith, E.B., 2021. *Personal networks: Classic readings and new directions in egocentric analysis*. Cambridge University Press.

- Solarz, A., Bogat, G.A., 1990. When social support fails: The homeless. *Journal of Community Psychology* 18, 79–96.
- Tsai, J., Alarcón, J., 2022. The annual homeless point-in-time count: Limitations and two different solutions. *American Journal of Public Health* 112, 633–637.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2012. Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH): Defining "Homeless" Final Rule. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/1928/hearth-defining-homeless-final-rule/>.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2023. Point-in-time (pit) and housing inventory count (hic) data since 2007. URL: <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3031/pit-and-hic-data-since-2007/>. accessed: 2024-10-24.
- Wasserman, S., 1994. *Social network analysis: methods and applications*. Cambridge University Press google schola 2, 1–22.
- Wellman, B., Wortley, S., 1990. Different strokes from different folks: Community ties and social support. *American journal of Sociology* 96, 558–588.
- Zheng, T., Salganik, M.J., Gelman, A., 2006. How many people do you know in prison? using overdispersion in count data to estimate social structure in networks. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 101, 409–423.

Online Appendix To: Understanding the Personal Networks of People Experiencing Homelessness in King County, WA with Aggregate Relational Data

Appendix A	Introduction to the appendix	39
Appendix B	Model fit for count data models	40
Appendix C	Count data models for 2023	43
Appendix D	ZIP model for peer referral network, 2024	46
Appendix E	Exponential-family random graph models	47
Appendix E.1	Estimation of network models from sampled data	47
Appendix E.2	Simulation of complete networks from ERGMS	48
Appendix F	Network questions from the surveys	48
Appendix G	Sample demographics for 2023 and 2024	52
Appendix G.1	2023 UW Unofficial RDS PIT	52
Appendix G.2	2024 KC Point-in-Time survey	53

Appendix A. Introduction to the appendix

This appendix provides the necessary extra details for the paper, including a discussion of statistical models, extra tables, and basic information on the survey and sample statistics.

Appendix B. Model fit for count data models





Figure Appendix B.1: Four diagnostic tests for model fit for the best fitting model for the acquaintance network degree distribution model.


Posterior Predictive Check

Model-predicted intervals should include observed data points




Misspecified dispersion and zero-inflation

Observed residual variance (green) should follow predicted residual variance (blue)



Homogeneity of Variance

Reference line should be flat and horizontal



Uniformity of Residuals

Dots should fall along the line





Figure Appendix B.2: Four diagnostic tests for model fit for the best fitting model for the close friend network degree distribution model.


Posterior Predictive Check

Model-predicted intervals should include observed data points




Misspecified dispersion and zero-inflation

Observed residual variance (green) should follow predicted residual variance (blue)



Homogeneity of Variance

Reference line should be flat and horizontal



Uniformity of Residuals

Dots should fall along the line




Figure Appendix B.3: Four diagnostic tests for model fit for the best fitting model for the kinship network degree distribution model.




Figure Appendix B.4: Four diagnostic tests for model fit for the best fitting model for the kinship referral degree distribution model.

Appendix C. Count data models for 2023

	Kinship	Friendship	Acquaintance	Referral
25-34	-0.311 (0.464)		0.421 (0.425)	0.160 (0.345)
35-44	-0.456 (0.458)		0.490 (0.417)	0.376 (0.337)
45-54	-0.855+ (0.471)		1.126** (0.420)	0.544 (0.340)
55-64	-0.467 (0.483)		0.902* (0.427)	0.145 (0.354)
65+	-1.945** (0.684)		1.676*** (0.488)	-0.028 (0.416)
Male	-0.160 (0.179)		0.189 (0.145)	-0.158 (0.107)

Other	-18.333 (4283.568)		1.776** (0.545)	-0.225 (0.420)
Hispanic/Latin/a/o/x	0.403+ (0.215)	0.079 (0.118)	0.150 (0.193)	-0.107 (0.192)
Shelter Use	0.590** (0.214)		-0.173 (0.190)	
Veteran	-0.177 (0.276)	0.134 (0.122)	0.141 (0.194)	-0.153 (0.242)
Asian or Asian American		-0.877** (0.308)	-1.508** (0.465)	
Black, African American, or African		-0.188 (0.161)	0.135 (0.256)	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		0.156 (0.275)	-0.880+ (0.465)	
White		0.029 (0.142)	0.739** (0.230)	
Multiracial		-0.170 (0.165)	0.159 (0.265)	
Another Race		-1.369** (0.451)	-1.327* (0.520)	
N	630	723	700	756
AIC	1291.5	3620.5	6373.0	1815.3
BIC	1344.9	3684.6	6454.9	1880.1
RMSE		4.40		0.98

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

	Kinship	Friendship	Acquaintance	Referral
25-34	-0.311 (0.464)		0.421 (0.425)	
35-44	-0.456 (0.458)		0.490 (0.417)	
45-54	-0.855+		1.126**	

	(0.471)		(0.420)	
55-64	-0.467		0.902*	
	(0.483)		(0.427)	
65+	-1.945**		1.676***	
	(0.684)		(0.488)	
Male	-0.160		0.189	
	(0.179)		(0.145)	
Another Gender	-18.333		1.776**	
	(4283.568)		(0.545)	
Hispanic/Latina/o/x	0.403+	0.208	0.150	-0.033
	(0.215)	(0.326)	(0.193)	(0.546)
Shelter Use	0.590**	-0.569	-0.173	0.244
	(0.214)	(0.393)	(0.190)	(0.370)
Veteran	-0.177	0.582+	0.141	0.346
	(0.276)	(0.309)	(0.194)	(0.560)
Asian or Asian American			-1.508**	
			(0.465)	
Black, African American, or African			0.135	
			(0.256)	
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander			-0.880+	
			(0.465)	
White			0.739**	
			(0.230)	
Multiracial			0.159	
			(0.265)	
Another Race			-1.327*	
			(0.520)	
N	630	723	700	756
AIC	1291.55	3620.5	6373	1815.3
BIC	1344.90	3684.6	6454.9	1880.1
RMSE		4.40		0.98

+ p < 0.1, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Appendix D. ZIP model for peer referral network, 2024

Table D.16: Zero-inflated Poisson model for referral network, 2024

Characteristic	Zero-Inflation		Conditional	
	Beta ¹	SE ²	Beta ¹	SE ²
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	—	—		
Female	0.44*	0.179		
Other identity	0.35	0.848		
<i>Shelter</i>				
Housed	—	—		
Sheltered	-0.80**	0.300		
Unsheltered	0.15	0.229		
<i>Veteran</i>				
No	—	—	—	—
Yes	-0.14	0.232	-0.08	0.095
<i>Mental Health</i>				
No	—	—	—	—
Yes	-0.30	0.235	0.04	0.092
<i>Substance Use</i>				
No	—	—	—	—
Yes	-0.46*	0.224	-0.16	0.092
<i>Disability</i>				
No	—	—		
Yes	0.19	0.183		
No. Obs.	1,310		1,310	
Sigma	1.00		1.00	
Log-likelihood	-1,552		-1,552	
AIC	3,131		3,131	
BIC	3,198		3,198	
Deviance	1,849		1,849	
Residual df	1,297		1,297	

¹*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

²SE = Standard Error

Appendix E. Exponential-family random graph models

Exponential-family Random Graph Models (ERGMs) are a class of statistical models used to represent and analyze social relations within networks. They provide a flexible framework for modeling the complex dependencies in network data (Robins et al. (2007)), and have become increasingly common through statistical packages such as STATNET (Handcock et al. (2008)). ERGMs have a long history in social network analysis, from the p^* models (Pattison and Wasserman (1999)) to more recent development (Hunter et al. (2012)). Unlike traditional models that assume independent observations, ERGMs accommodate the interdependence of network ties by specifying the probability distribution over the set of all possible graphs (Robins et al. (2007)). ERG models can be written as the probability distribution over a set of graphs G as follows:

$$P(G = g \mid \theta) = \frac{\exp(\theta^T s(g))}{Z(\theta)}, \quad (\text{E.1})$$

where g is the observed graph, θ is a vector of parameters, $s(g)$ is a vector of sufficient statistics that capture graph features such as edges, triangles, and degree distributions, and $Z(\theta)$ is a normalizing constant (Hunter et al. (2012)). Given this formulation, the key becomes estimating sufficient statistics from the data. The main challenge in estimating ERGMs arises from the normalizing constant $Z(\theta)$, which is computationally expensive to calculate because it involves summing over all possible graphs. Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods are typically employed to approximate the likelihood function and estimate model parameters (Hunter et al. (2012)). Alternative methods, such as Maximum Pseudo-Likelihood Estimation (MPLE), are also used for faster computation. However, they may be less accurate than full MCMC-based inference (Hunter et al. (2012)) and have generally fallen out of favor as MCMC methods have become more readily available.

Appendix E.1. Estimation of network models from sampled data

In the case where we do not have complete network data, one advantage of ERGMs is that they are exponential-family models and, therefore, can be estimated directly from population statistics estimated from sampling design. This can be readily done in Krivitsky and Morris (2017) by specifying the target statistics. Here, we will compute the target statistics from the network descriptive statistics in this paper. See also, Jenness et al. (2017) for a

clear description of how to compute the target statistics to fit ERGMs from population-level statistics.


Appendix E.2. Simulation of complete networks from ERGMS

Using the target statistics estimated from this paper, we simulate complete networks using gender mixing, density, and degree distribution with the R package STATNET ([Handcock et al. \(2008\)](#)), and results can be seen in [Figure 8](#).


Appendix F. Network questions from the surveys

Appendix F.0.1. 2022 Network and Family Questions

In 2022, we asked only the aggregate network question of how many people you know experiencing homelessness, followed by the aggregate question of how many are in tents, RVs, etc. (See [Figure Appendix F.1](#)), due to privacy concerns. As well as basic family information (also in aggregate).



(a) 2022 Aggregate network question.



(b) Family list-based question.

Figure Appendix F.1: The 2022 network questions asked for the official RDS PIT study.

Appendix F.0.2. 2023 Network and Family Questions

In 2023, we expanded our method to include the aggregate level and list-based measures for those they know experiencing homelessness and family members. See Figure [Appendix F.2](#).

Who You Know

Q206

5. Outside of your family living with you, how many people do you **personally know** who are unhomeless or experiencing homelessness?

Instructions: please enter a digit, ex. 1 not "one"

Q22

6. Outside of your family living with you, please list the first name, pseudonyms or initials of the person and their relation (e.g. Friend, Family, Etc) of people you personally know who are unhomeless or experiencing homelessness?

Please answer for as many people as you know.

	Custom options -	Custom options -
	Name	Relation
	[Name / Initials / pseudonym]	[ex. brother, friend]
1	_____	_____
2	_____	_____
3	_____	_____
4	_____	_____
5	_____	_____
6	_____	_____
7	_____	_____
8	_____	_____
9	_____	_____
10	_____	_____
11	_____	_____
12	_____	_____
13	_____	_____
14	_____	_____
15	_____	_____

(a) 2023 Aggregate and list-based network question.

Must Demo info per fam member

Q24

27. Please list the initials of all the people in your household

[Interviewer: if prompted, say this includes family members, partners, children, etc.]

Person 1 _____

Person 2 _____

Person 3 _____

Person 4 _____

Person 5 _____

Person 6 _____

Person 7 _____

Person 8 _____

Person 9 _____

Person 10 _____

(b) Family list-based question.

Figure Appendix F.2: The 2023 network questions asked for the UW non-official RDS PIT study.

Appendix F.0.3. 2024 Network and Family Questions

In 2024, we further improved our family and network questions; see Figure Appendix F.3.

alter_count

Outside of your family living with you, how many people do you who are unhoused or experiencing homelessness?

Instructions: Please enter a digit, ex. 1 not "one"

prompt2

Surveyor Prompt: Respondents can define "personally know" and "family living with you" however they please.

Page Break

alter_names

Outside of your family living with you, please list the first name, pseudonym/nickname/street name or initials of the person and their relation (e.g. friend, family, etc) of people you personally know who are unhoused or experiencing homelessness.

Please answer for as many people as you know.

Person 1

Person 2

Person 3

Person 4

Person 5

Person 6

Person 7

Person 8

Person 9

Person 10

Person 11

Person 12

Person 13

Person 14

Person 15

Person 16

Person 17

Person 18

Person 19

Person 20

prompt_alter_names

Surveyor Prompt: There are no specific rules for names that can be listed, but full names should not be used. This question is here to help get a more accurate picture of the size of someone's network.

(a) 2024 Aggregate and list-based network question.

4. household

intro_household

Transition:
Next, I'll ask about each member of your household. If you live alone, we'll skip this part.

Page Break

family_names

Please list the initials of all the people in your household.

Instructions: This includes family members, partners, children, etc. Does not include the respondent.

Person 1

Person 2

Person 3

Person 4

Person 5

Person 6

Person 7

Person 8

Person 9

Person 10

(b) Family list-based question.

Figure Appendix F.3: The 2024 network questions asked for the official RDS PIT study.

Appendix G. Sample demographics for 2023 and 2024

Appendix G.1. 2023 UW Unofficial RDS PIT

Table G.17: Demographic Characteristics for the 2023 UW Unofficial RDS PIT survey.

Category	Response	N	%
Age	18-24	26	2.3
	25-34	208	18.8
	35-44	302	27.3
	45-54	240	21.7
	55-64	180	16.2
	65+	62	5.6
	Missing	90	8.1
Gender	Man (Boy if child)	717	64.7
	Woman (Girl if child)	277	25.0
	Other Gender Identity	18	1.6
	Missing	96	8.7
Race	American Indian, Alaskan Native or Indigenous	77	6.9
	Asian or Asian American	20	1.8
	Black, African American, or African	163	14.7
	White	523	47.2
	Multiracial	129	11.6
	Other Racial Identity	14	1.3
	Missing	158	14.3
Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic/Non-Latin(a)(o)(x)	820	74.0
	Hispanic/Latin(a)(o)(x)	146	13.2
	Missing	142	12.8
Shelter	No	748	67.5
	Yes	111	10.0
	Missing	249	22.5
Veteran	No	972	87.7
	Yes	111	10.0
	Missing	25	2.3
Chronic Homeless	No	355	32.0
	Yes	505	45.6
	Missing	248	22.4
Disability	No	379	34.2
	Yes	444	40.1
	Missing	285	25.7
Mental Health	No	508	45.8
	Yes	312	28.2
	Missing	288	26.0
Substance Use	No	428	38.6
	Yes	407	36.7
	Missing	273	24.6

Appendix G.2. 2024 KC Point-in-Time survey

Table G.18: Demographic Characteristics for the 2024 KC RDS PIT survey.

Category	Response	N	%
Age	18-24	61	4.2
	25-34	299	20.4
	35-44	407	27.8
	45-54	351	23.9
	55-64	247	16.8
	65+	51	3.5
	Missing	50	3.4
Gender	Man (Boy if child)	1009	68.8
	Woman (Girl if child)	394	26.9
	Other Gender Identity	12	0.8
	Missing	51	3.5
Race	American Indian, Alaskan Native or Indigenous	59	4.0
	Asian or Asian American	25	1.7
	Black or African American	232	15.8
	White	576	39.3
	Multiracial	211	14.4
	Other Racial Identity	48	3.3
	Missing	66	4.5
Ethnicity	Non-Hispanic/Non-Latin(a)(o)(x)	1092	74.5
	Hispanic/Latin(a)(o)(x)	317	21.6
	Missing	57	3.9
Shelter	No	217	14.8
	Yes	301	20.5
	Missing	859	58.6
Veteran	No	964	65.8
	Yes	502	34.2
	Missing	0	0.0
Chronic Homeless	No	835	57.0
	Yes	591	40.3
	Missing	40	2.7
Disability	No	676	46.1
	Yes	726	49.5
	Missing	64	4.4
Mental Health	No	915	62.4
	Yes	469	32.0
	Missing	82	5.6
Substance Use	No	761	51.9
	Yes	628	42.8
	Missing	77	5.3

References

- Handcock, M.S., Hunter, D.R., Butts, C.T., Goodreau, S.M., Morris, M., 2008. statnet: Software tools for the representation, visualization, analysis and simulation of network data. *Journal of statistical software* 24, 1548.
- Hunter, D.R., Krivitsky, P.N., Schweinberger, M., 2012. Computational statistical methods for social network models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 21, 856–882.
- Jenness, S.M., Goodreau, S.M., Morris, M., 2017. Epimodel: an r package for mathematical modeling of infectious disease over networks. *bioRxiv* , 213009.
- Krivitsky, P.N., Morris, M., 2017. Inference for social network models from egocentrically sampled data, with application to understanding persistent racial disparities in hiv prevalence in the us. *The annals of applied statistics* 11, 427.
- Pattison, P., Wasserman, S., 1999. Logit models and logistic regressions for social networks: Ii. multivariate relations. *British journal of mathematical and statistical psychology* 52, 169–193.
- Robins, G., Pattison, P., Kalish, Y., Lusher, D., 2007. An introduction to exponential random graph (p^*) models for social networks. *Social networks* 29, 173–191.