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Executive Summary

Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHY)
Youth and young adults who are living on the streets or who do not have consistent, stable housing are highly vulnerable. Homelessness is not just a problem in large urban centers such as New York City or Buffalo. Young people in suburban and rural communities also face homelessness. RHY are often fleeing neglect, abuse, or conflict in their homes. These youth are generally still developing physically and emotionally, and, when experiencing homelessness, they often do not complete their education, lack general life skills, and have little or no work experience. Homelessness and running away from home also make youth vulnerable to violence, crime, and sexual exploitation at the hands of other youth and adults. Pursuant to Article 19-H of the Executive Law, and Subparts 182-1.2 and 182-2.2 of Title 9 of New York Codes, Rules and Regulations (NYCRR):

- **Runaway youth** means a person under the age of 18 years who is absent from his or her legal residence without the consent of his or her parent, legal guardian, or custodian.
- **Homeless youth** means a person under the age of 18 who is in need of services and is without a place of shelter where supervision and care are available; or a person who is under the age of 21, but is at least 18, and who is in need of services and is without a place of shelter; or a homeless young adult when a municipality’s approved comprehensive plan authorizes RHY services be provided to such individuals.
- **Homeless young adult** means a person who is age 24 or younger, but is at least age 21, and who is in need of services and is without a place of shelter.

In accordance with section 532-e of the Executive Law, the powers and duties of the New York State Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS) include but are not limited to the following:

- Visiting, inspecting and making periodic reports on the operation and adequacy of RHY crisis services programs and transitional independent living support programs (TILPs)
- Certifying residential facilities serving RHY
- Maintaining a register of RHY crisis services programs, TILP programs and RHY service coordinators
- Developing and promulgating regulations concerning the coordination and integration of services for RHY with applicable bureaus and programs and prohibiting the disclosure or transferal of any records containing the identity of individual youth receiving services without the written consent of the youth

---

Developing and annually reviewing, in conjunction with the New York State commissioner of education, a plan for homeless children to have access to education and monitoring the compliance of RHY residential programs with such plan

Submitting an annual report to the governor and the Legislature detailing the numbers, characteristics, and service needs of RHY statewide

In accordance with Article 19-H of the Executive Law, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA), OCFS oversees a system of programs and services to meet the needs of RHY. This includes residential services offered through OCFS-certified RHY crisis services programs and TILPs, as well as non-residential services offered through such programs that address the needs of RHY through hotlines, street outreach programs, and case management.

Part M of Chapter 56 of the Laws of 2017 amended section 420 and Article 19-H of the Executive Law to offer municipalities the option of expanding services for RHY and modifying the requirements for RHY programs. These amendments went into effect on January 1, 2018. In general, the major changes to the Executive Law include the following:

- The renaming of “Approved Runaway Programs” to “RHY crisis services programs”
- The option for municipalities to provide RHY services to homeless young adults if authorized in a municipality’s approved comprehensive plan
- The option for municipalities to extend the length of stay in residential RHY programs if authorized in a municipality’s approved comprehensive plan
- The ability of TILPs to serve homeless youth who are under the age of 16 years if the municipality has properly notified OCFS
- The requirement of RHY crisis services programs to contact the appropriate local department of social services (LDSS) if it is believed that the youth may be a destitute child, as such term is defined in section 1092 of the Family Court Act
- The requirement that RHY crisis services programs provide information to eligible youth about their ability to reenter foster care in accordance with Article 10-B of the Family Court Act, and in appropriate cases, refer any such youth who may be interested in reentering foster care to the applicable LDSS
- The requirement that all residential RHY programs that are serving youth under the age of 18 and that are certified by OCFS on or after January 1st, 2018, be operated by authorized agencies

In 2018, OCFS revised Subparts 165-1, 182-1, and 182-2 of Title 9 NYCRR in accordance with the changes made to the Executive Law by Part M, Chapter 56 of the Laws of 2017. The RHY regulations, Subparts 182-1 and 182-2 of Title 9 of NYCRR, implement the statutory requirements with respect to certification, the option to expand services, and the coordination and integration of services for runaway and homeless youth statewide that are intended to:

- protect RHY;
- establish and coordinate services to help RHY cope with and resolve problems;

---

4 RHY crisis services programs, formally known as Approved Runaway Programs, as defined by New York State Executive Law, Section 532-a (4), consist of RHY shelters and interim family programs.

5 Transitional independent living support programs are either a group residence or a supported residence.
• reunite youth with parents, guardians or legal custodians whenever possible; and
• help homeless youth progress from crisis shelter programs and TILPs to independent living.

Each municipality seeking state aid to provide RHY services must develop an RHY plan, in accordance with section 420 of the Executive Law, that provides for a coordinated range of services for RHY and their families, and addresses the RHY’s needs. To the extent that funding is available, municipalities may be eligible to receive reimbursement from New York State for up to 60 percent of the costs associated with the establishment and operation of RHY programs and services. Reimbursement is subject to the availability of funding as well as the approval of the municipality’s RHY service plan by OCFS.

Overview of Statewide Findings
Below are highlights from the 2017 surveys of certified RHY residential programs conducted by OCFS:

• At the end of 2017, there were 122 RHY residential programs certified by OCFS, with a total bed capacity of 1,237 beds (1,127 youth beds and up to 134 infant/dependent beds).6 Of these 122 residential programs, 37 were crisis services programs (29 crisis shelter programs and 8 interim family programs) and 85 were TILPs. Of the 85 TILPs, 38 were group residences and 47 were supported residences. By comparison, in 2016 there were 113 programs with 1,125 beds. Four crisis services program and 20 TILP beds were closed in ROS during 2017, while New York City saw a net gain of 20 crisis services program and 88 TILP beds.

• In 2017, there were 6,809 admissions to RHY residential programs, representing 5,156 individual youth, which is a decrease from 7,064 admissions of 5,292 individual youth from the previous year. Of the 5,156 youth:
  o 1,243 were classified as runaway youth; and
  o 3,913 were classified as homeless youth.
  o Approximately 252 youth with dependent children were admitted into RHY residential programs with a total of 308 dependent children admitted.
  o Statewide, the majority of youth admitted to RHY crisis services programs and TILPs were female. A total of 521 more females than males were admitted to homeless youth crisis services programs, and 11 more females than males were admitted to TILPs.
  o Youth accessing crisis shelters in New York City were slightly older than youth accessing crisis services programs in the rest of the state (ROS). Eighty-seven percent of youth accessing RHY crisis services programs in New York City were between the ages of 18 and 20 years old, while the highest percentage of youth (51 percent) accessing RHY crisis services programs in ROS were between the

---

6 This figure represents certified bed capacity as opposed to operating capacity. In parent and child programs, the program is certified to serve a certain number of youth, dependents, and a combination of youth and dependents. For example, such a program could serve one youth with nine dependents on one night and seven youth with three dependents on another night.
ages of 15 and 17 years old. This pattern has held steady year over year for ROS/New York City.

- The top three self-reported service needs for youth coming into programs in 2017 were addressing parental conflict, independent living skills, and employment skills. In 2016 the top three self-reported services needs were parental conflict, health (including behavioral health), and education.
- RHY programs continue to inquire of youth’s sexual and gender orientation and expression. While most youth report as heterosexual and cisgender, training is ongoing with programs for improving ability to provide services to LGBTQ+ youth.

**New York State RHY Service Array**
There are certified residential and non-residential services for RHY in New York State.  

**Residential Programs**
Participation by youth in RHY programs is voluntary and may be terminated by the youth at any time. Youth and young adults, therefore, cannot be forced or mandated to stay in RHY programs. However, program recipients may be required to leave programs for a variety of reasons including, but not limited to, when they age out, are a threat to themselves or others in the program, or reach the statutory limits for lengths of stay (see 9 NYCRR 182-1.9 (b) and 9 NYCRR 182-2.9 (b) for further information on situations that may interfere with a youth being admitted to a program or require youth to involuntarily leave a program).

OCFS regulates the following types of certified RHY residential programs:

- **RHY crisis services programs**
  - **Runaway and Homeless Youth Shelter** – a residential program for a maximum of 20 youth, all of whom are either under the age of 18 years old or who are between the ages of 16 and 21 years old
  - **Interim Family Home** – a private dwelling providing temporary shelter to a maximum of two runaway and homeless youth under the age of 21 years as part of an interim family program, which is sponsored, inspected, and supervised by an authorized agency

- **Transitional Independent Living Support Programs (TILPs)**
  - **Group Residence** – a residential program operated for a maximum of 20 youth, between the ages of 16 and 21 years old or homeless young adults, which provides an environment that encourages the development and practice of independent living skills.
  - **Supported Residence** – a residential program for a maximum of five youth of the same gender, between the ages of 16 and 21 years old or homeless young adults, which provides an environment that approximates actual independent living

---

7 Non-residential services are included in the definitions of RHY crisis services programs and TILPs in section 532-a of the Executive Law.
8 In accordance with 9 NYCRR sections 182-1.9 (d) (1) and 182-2.9 (d)(1).
**Non-Residential Programs**
Non-residential programs serve RHY and youth who are at risk of homelessness. The programs also serve the families of these youth where appropriate. Services provided by these programs include, but are not limited to the following:

- Basic needs (provisions for food, clothing, hygiene, emergency housing financial assistance)
- Behavioral/Medical health
- Case management
- Drop-in centers
- Educational/Vocational support
- Hotlines
- Services that are considerate of the needs of the LGBTQ community
- Street outreach

**Findings**

**Data Sources and Methodology**
OCFS requires RHY residential programs to report data annually. The data is then compiled in an annual report. This 2017 annual report includes information from 127\(^9\) OCFS-certified residential programs in 24 counties and New York City. Of the responding 127 residential programs, 38 of them were RHY crisis services programs (31 crisis shelters and 7 interim family programs) and 89 of them were TILPs (40 group residences and 49 supported residences).

There is no method to identify specific youth within the overall system of RHY programs. Some transient youth are served by multiple programs, so the “individual youth” counts will have some duplication of youth numbers across programs. However, any duplicate count has been eliminated within a single program.

Data in the charts and tables in this report have been divided into two sections: New York City (NYC)-specific data, which references the five boroughs of New York City, and ROS, which references all other counties in the state. Data under the New York State (NYS) headings include data from both NYC and ROS.

**Characteristics of Youth Admitted to OCFS Certified RHY Residential Programs**
- **5,156** individual youth were reported to have been admitted to residential programs statewide:
  - **4,114** were served in RHY crisis shelter programs
    - **2,115** were from NYC
    - **1,999** were from ROS

---

\(^9\) This number reflects the number of programs that contributed data to this report, which is different than the number of programs that were in operation at the end of calendar year 2017.
1,042 were served in TILPs
   619 were from NYC
   423 were from ROS
252 of the youth were parents who were accompanied, in sum, by 308 dependent children across the state, an increase of almost 100%, but the number of dependents was slightly lower.10

More youth were served by TILPs in 2017, especially in New York City, while the overall number of youth served in any setting dropped slightly from 5,292 in 2016. Youth served in crisis shelters ROS decreased from 2,045 in 2016, and from 2,308 from New York City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NYC</th>
<th>ROS</th>
<th>NYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duplicated Admissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHY Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>2,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TILPs</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>3,291</td>
<td>2,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unduplicated Admissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHY Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TILPs</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>2,734</td>
<td>2,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHY Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>2,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TILPs</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sex**

The majority of youth in both RHY crisis services programs and TILPs statewide were female at birth. New York City had a larger percentage of male youth in TILPs compared to ROS. The number of youth across the state who identified as either intersex, not aware of their sex, or chose not to answer questions about sexual identity was minimal (less than 1 percent) and is therefore not included in the charts below.

---

10 Note: The dependent children of RHY are not included in the characteristics data contained in the charts. In addition, percentages in charts were rounded to the nearest whole number and as such may not add to 100 percent.
Gender Identity

Over 80 percent of youth in both RHY crisis services programs and TILPs statewide identified with the sex assigned to them at birth, also known as cisgender. New York City had a slightly greater percentage of youth than ROS who identified as transgender in both crisis shelter programs and in TILPs. This may be due to the availability of specialized services within New York City for LGBTQ youth.
Sexual Orientation

A majority of youth in both RHY crisis services programs and TILPs statewide identified as straight/heterosexual, with a much larger percentage of youth identifying as LGBTQ in NYC. This may be due to the availability of specialized services within NYC for LGBTQ youth. Statewide, 10 percent of youth in RHY crisis services programs identified as bisexual, 7 percent identified as gay, and 7 percent as lesbian. A slightly higher percentage of youth in TILPs in ROS identified
as bisexual (16 percent) compared to youth in TILPs in New York City (10 percent). There were no youth that resided in RHY crisis services programs or TILPs in New York State who identified as asexual.

This chart includes elements identified by 4 percent or more of youth admitted to crisis services programs in New York State.

This chart includes elements identified by 4 percent or more of youth admitted to TILPS in New York State.

**Age**
Youth who resided in RHY crisis services programs in New York City were older than youth in crisis services programs in ROS. A significantly higher percentage of 19 and 20-year-old youth resided in TILPs in New York City as compared to 19- and 20-year-old youth in TILPs in ROS.

Note: This chart includes only elements with a response of 5 percent or more in New York State.

**Race/Ethnicity**

Youth who identified as Black, non-Hispanic, were the most frequent users of RHY residential services, accounting for 45 percent of RHY crisis service program recipients and 49 percent of
TILP admissions statewide. In New York City, youth identifying as Hispanic or Latino were the second largest group served in both types of programs, while in ROS White, non-Hispanic youth comprised the second largest admission group. There were no youth who resided in either program type who identified as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.

**Race/Ethnicity of Youth Admitted to RHY Crisis Services Programs**

- **New York City**:
  - Native American/Alaskan Native: 47%
  - Asian: 35%
  - Black, non-Hispanic: 42%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 45%
  - White, non-Hispanic: 1%
  - Multiracial: 1%
  - Unknown/not provided: 1%

- **Rest of State**:
  - Native American/Alaskan Native: 6%
  - Asian: 5%
  - Black, non-Hispanic: 13%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 25%
  - White, non-Hispanic: 1%
  - Multiracial: 4%
  - Unknown/not provided: 3%

- **New York State**:
  - Native American/Alaskan Native: 9%
  - Asian: 1%
  - Black, non-Hispanic: 17%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 13%
  - White, non-Hispanic: 45%
  - Multiracial: 3%
  - Unknown/not provided: 1%

**Race/Ethnicity of Youth Admitted to TILPs**

- **New York City**:
  - Native American/Alaskan Native: 56%
  - Asian: 28%
  - Black, non-Hispanic: 39%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 31%
  - White, non-Hispanic: 1%
  - Multiracial: 24%

- **Rest of State**:
  - Native American/Alaskan Native: 4%
  - Asian: 1%
  - Black, non-Hispanic: 18%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 10%
  - White, non-Hispanic: 1%
  - Multiracial: 7%

- **New York State**:
  - Native American/Alaskan Native: 9%
  - Asian: 1%
  - Black, non-Hispanic: 18%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 18%
  - White, non-Hispanic: 1%

**Housing Status at Intake**

- **New York City**:
  - Homeless: 3%
  - Non-homeless: 97%

- **Rest of State**:
  - Homeless: 3%
  - Non-homeless: 97%

- **New York State**:
  - Homeless: 3%
  - Non-homeless: 97%
Youth’s housing status prior to receiving RHY residential services varied across the state. In New York City, most youth reported coming to RHY crisis services programs from a different crisis shelter (43 percent) and most youth reported coming to a TILP (77 percent) from a crisis shelter. In ROS, 62 percent of youth served in RHY crisis services programs reported previously living in their parent’s/guardian’s home while 39 percent of youth served in TILPs reported previously living in relative’s/friend’s home.
Problems and Service Needs

The charts below show the categories of problems and service needs reported most often by youth at the time of their intake into RHY residential programs.

Youth in RHY crisis services programs in New York City and in ROS identified conflict with parent as the top service need. As Chart 13 indicates, 11 percent of youth in New York City accessed services related to employment needs while 4 percent of youth in ROS accessed services related to employment. Five percent of youth in both New York City and ROS accessed services related to education needs.

Note: This chart represents service needs that were identified by 5 percent or more of youth in RHY TILPs statewide.

In TILPs, the predominant service need statewide was independent living/life skills. Service needs related to parental conflict and employment were the other top service needs for youth in New York State.
In response to the youths’ needs, programs provided a wide array of services. The most common services provided to RHY in residential programs were

- basic needs (e.g., food, clothing, hygiene);
- independent living/life skills;
- counseling/mental health supports;
- recreation services;
- employment/employability skills;
- education services; and
- health care services.

These services were provided either directly by the residential program or through a network of referrals to community services available to the program and the youth in the program.
Length of Stay in Residential Programs and Living Situation at Exit

In New York City, the most common range of length of consecutive stay was 31 to 60 nights for youth staying in RHY crisis services programs. In ROS, the most common range of length of consecutive stay was 2 to 7 nights. The numbers below reflect the consecutive nights that youth spent in the programs.

In TILPs statewide, the most common length of consecutive stay was less than 30 days. At exit, most youth were either living in a private residence or living independently.

Note: One percent of youth statewide stayed in TILPs over 18 months; they are not reflected in this chart.
In 2017, there were **5,480** departures from RHY crisis services programs and **752** departures from TILPs. These are duplicated counts, since youth may cycle in and out of programs, and each departure is counted separately.

The charts below indicate the top five known living situations of youth who left RHY residential programs. In 2017, most youth exiting RHY residential programs in ROS reported that they left to a private residence. However, as there is no aftercare, it is unknown if this represents a return to their parents/guardians, other relatives or friends, or independent apartments. For youth in New York City, voluntary exit without a plan was the most comment exit type.

![Living Situation of Youth Departing from RHY Crisis Services Programs](chart1)

Note: This chart includes only elements with a response of 5 percent or more statewide.

![Living Situation of Youth Departing from TILPs](chart2)

Note: This chart includes only elements with a response of 5 percent or more statewide.
RHY Identified but Not Served

In 2017, there were 1,164 instances\(^\text{11}\) when a youth was turned away from an RHY crisis services program or TILP because no space was available; 744 were from New York City and 420 were in ROS. 478 of the youth not served were reported by RHY crisis services programs and 686 were reported by TILPs. More youth were not served by TILPs in 2017 than in 2016. During 2017 New York City added TILP beds and TILP beds were closed in ROS. While NYC saw a net gain in TILP beds in 2017, a greater proportion of youth appear to have stayed in TILP beds longer than the previous year. This may explain why fewer beds were available. Additionally, beds were opened across the year; the net total of beds was not available as of 1/1/17. The loss of 20 beds in ROS may have contributed towards fewer available beds for youth.

Capacity data was collected at the program level. Without unique identifiers assigned to individual youth through a centralized data system, and without permissions for sharing confidential information across programs, there is no way to discern whether youth who were turned away from one program received services from another program.

RHY Crisis Services Program Capacity
At the end of 2017, five agencies operated 11 RHY crisis services programs within the five boroughs of New York City. There were 347 instances where a youth was turned away from an RHY shelter in New York City because the shelter was at full capacity. There are no interim family programs in New York City.

At the end of 2017 in ROS, 23 agencies operated 26 RHY crisis services programs. There were 131 instances where a youth was turned away from an RHY shelter in ROS because the shelter was at full capacity. There were no nights when interim family programs reported being at full capacity.

TILP Capacity
At the end of 2017 in New York City, 10 agencies operated 34 TILP programs within the five boroughs. There were 397 instances where a youth was turned away from a TILP in New York City because the program was at full capacity.

At the end of 2017 in ROS, 17 agencies operated 51 TILP programs. There were 289 instances in which a youth was turned away from a TILP in ROS because the program was at full capacity.

Non-Residential Program Services
Non-residential services for RHY include street outreach, drop-in services, case management, provisions to help meet basic needs (housing, food, clothing, hygiene products), and medical

\(^{11}\) Due to the inability to identify each youth who attempts to access each program, it is not possible to say how many individual youths were turned away. This number represents individual program’s reports of turning youth away.
and mental health supports, including HIV- and STD-risk education to high-risk or homeless youth, vocational support, educational support, employment services, hotlines, services for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning/queer youth, emergency housing financial assistance, and general support. It should be noted that the data collected from non-residential RHY programs include multiple appearances of individual youths; predominantly the data pertains to street-outreach programs, but also to services received.

In 2017, the six primary reasons that youth sought services from non-residential programs were:
- basic needs (housing, food, clothing, hygiene products);
- family conflict;
- safe space/support needs;
- independent living skills;
- educational needs; and
- employment services.

Other reasons that brought youth to non-residential programs:
- service coordination support (DSS, social security, etc.);
- advocacy;
- LGBTQ services/support;
- computer access;
- participation in workshops/groups;
- referral services (mental health & substance abuse counseling, transitional housing);
- socialization with peers; and
- transportation needs.

**Sex**

In 2017, most of the youth in both New York City and ROS who accessed non-residential RHY services identified as male or female; no youth identified as not knowing their sex. No youth in ROS identified as intersex.
**Gender Identity**

In 2017, the majority of youth in New York City and ROS that received services from non-residential programs identified as cisgender. Eight percent of youth in New York State chose not to disclose their gender identity. Three percent of the youth surveyed in New York City identified as non-conforming. None of the youth in New York City reported as not knowing their gender identity.
Sexual Orientation

In 2017, youth in New York City and ROS that received services from RHY non-residential programs identified most frequently as heterosexual/straight. A higher percentage of youth identified as bisexual and gay in New York City versus ROS. None of the youth in New York
City identified as asexual while 3 percent of youth in ROS did. Most youth surveyed in both New York City and ROS chose to disclose information regarding their sexual orientation.

Age

In 2017, 83 percent of youth receiving services from RHY non-residential programs in New York City were between the ages of 18 and 20 years old. Seventy-three percent of youth receiving non-residential RHY services in ROS were between the ages of 14 and
16 years old. Thus, youth receiving non-residential services in New York City were significantly older than youth receiving the same type of services in ROS.

Race/Ethnicity
In 2017, among the youth receiving services statewide, 33 were White, non-Hispanic youth, 24 percent were Hispanic or Latino, and 23 percent were Black, non-Hispanic. None of the youth surveyed in New York State identified as Native American/Alaskan Native. Two percent of youth
In New York City, nearly one-third of youth accessing non-residential RHY services identified as multiracial (32 percent), 31 percent identified as Black, non-Hispanic, and 31 percent identified as Hispanic/Latino. In ROS, youth accessing non-residential RHY services were most likely to identify as White, non-Hispanic (38 percent), followed by Hispanic or Latino (23 percent) and Black, non-Hispanic (22 percent).
Summary

In 2017, New York State saw an increase in certified bed capacity for RHY and their dependent infant children, a decrease in the number of youth served, and an increase in the number of
dependent infant/children of RHY youth served. The number of youth who were classified as runaway by these programs slightly decreased statewide. Admissions of youth identified as homeless increased. More than any other reason, youth identified the need for independent living or life skills as the reason they needed services in both New York City and ROS for TILPs. Parental conflict was the most common reason RHY services were needed in both New York City and ROS for crisis shelters.
## Appendix 1: Programs by Region at Year End 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties by Region</th>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th># of programs</th>
<th># of beds</th>
<th># of dependent beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albany Region</strong></td>
<td>Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional Independent Living Support Programs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Family Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albany Region Subtotals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffalo Region</strong></td>
<td>Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional Independent Living Support Programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Family Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffalo Region Subtotals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York City Region</strong></td>
<td>Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional Independent Living Support Programs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Family Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York City Subtotals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rochester Region</strong></td>
<td>Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional Independent Living Support Programs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Family Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rochester Region Subtotals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Valley Region</strong></td>
<td>Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional Independent Living Support Programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Family Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Valley Subtotals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syracuse Region</strong></td>
<td>Crisis Shelter Programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitional Independent Living Support Programs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Family Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Agencies With Certified Programs in 2017

Albany Region
- CAPTAIN Youth and Family Services
- Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Albany
- Equinox, Inc.
- SAFE Inc., of Schenectady
- Warren/Washington Counties Homeless Youth Coalition, Inc.

Buffalo Region
- Chautauqua Opportunities, Inc.
- Compass House
- Family and Children’s Service of Niagara, Inc.
- The Franciscan Center
- United Church Home
- Teaching and Restoring Youth, Inc.

New York City Region
- Ali Forney Center
- Children’s Village, Inc.
- CORE Services Group, Inc.
- Covenant House New York Under 21, Inc.
- Diaspora Community Services, Inc.
- Girls Educational & Mentoring Services
- Good Shepherd Services, Inc.
- Imeinu, Inc.
- Inwood House
- Project Hospitality, Inc.
- Safe Horizon, Inc.
- Safe Space NYC, Inc.
- Sheltering Arms Children and Family Services, Inc.

12 These figures represent certified bed capacity as opposed to operating capacity. In parent and child programs, the program is certified to serve a certain number of youth, dependents, and a combination of youth and dependents. For example, such a program could serve one youth with nine dependents on one night and seven youth with three dependents on another night.
• SCO Family of Services

Rochester Region
• Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Rochester
• Salvation Army
• Seneca County Youth Bureau
• The Center for Youth Services, Inc.

Spring Valley Region
• Children’s Village, Inc.
• Family and Children’s Association
• Family of Woodstock, Inc.
• Green Chimneys Children’s Services
• HONORehg, Inc.
• Hope for Youth
• Hudson River Housing, Inc.
• Mercy Center Ministries
• SCO Family of Services
• Town of Huntington Youth Bureau

Syracuse Region
• Catholic Charities of Broome County
• Catholic Charities of Herkimer County
• Catholic Charities of Oneida/Madison Counties
• Family and Children’s Service of Ithaca
• Family Nurturing Center of Central New York, Inc.
• John Bosco House, Inc.
• Kids Oneida, Inc.
• Mohawk Valley Community Action Agency, Inc.
• Oswego County Opportunities, Inc.
• The Learning Web, Inc.
• The Salvation Army, Syracuse Area Services
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