



Center for Statistics  
and Analytical Services

**Every Georgian Counts**

2011 Estimates of Homelessness in Georgia

Prepared by Jennifer Lewis Priestley, Ph.D.

Kennesaw State University

November 2011

## **Acknowledgements**

This report on the status of the Every Georgian Counts project to better meet the needs of Georgia's homeless, represents the hard work and commitment of many individuals across several organizations. I would like to specifically recognize the work of Jason Rodriguez from the Georgia Department of Community Affairs, Paul Vaughn and Christy Storey of the A.L. Burruss Institute of Public Service at Kennesaw State University, and Chris Cusumano and Olivia Gupton, undergraduate students in Applied Statistics at Kennesaw State University.

## Executive Summary

Using demographic and econometric data from the 2011 Georgia County Guide, the current study provides an estimate of the number of homeless persons in the state of Georgia for each of the 159 counties. From the *2009 Report on Homelessness*, the previous estimate of unsheltered homeless in the state of Georgia, was 12,101 persons, based on a state population of 9,685,744 (2008 population estimate from the *Georgia County Guide*). The percent of the state population previously estimated to be unsheltered homeless was .1249% (*2009 Report on Homelessness*). The current estimate of unsheltered homeless is 11,366 persons, based upon the most recent state population estimate of 9,829,211 (2009 population estimate from the *Georgia County Guide*). The percent of the state population currently estimated to be unsheltered homeless is .1156%.

The estimated number of individuals precariously housed in Georgia is 4,712, which is .05% of the population.

Together, the number of unsheltered and precariously housed individuals in Georgia is estimated to be 16,078, which is .1636% of the population.

The primary demographic and economic variables found to explain homelessness in Georgia included Percent of Population Native Born, Property Crime Rate, Arrests, Lottery Sales Rate, Poverty Rate, TANF (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families) and Child Abuse Cases.

## Introduction

In 2003, the U.S. Congress mandated that every state provide a homeless census every two years to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The state of Georgia, through the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) responded to this mandate by using homeless estimates based on local counts and national studies. Even after the mandate had been in place for three years, Georgia's Balance of State 2007 Continuum of Care Plan continued to rely on very simplistic estimations based upon anecdotal information (Georgia Department of Community Affairs, 2008).

Grappling with the count mandate for the balance of the state was daunting – not only was the sheer size of the state geography an obstacle, many of the counties covered by the Balance of State Continuum had few homeless service providers. The absence of service providers meant that in many counties there was not a local organizational infrastructure to conduct counts. At the same, a full state count conducted by state employees or contractors looked to be prohibitively expensive. Consequently, counting the homeless population in Georgia seemed an almost Herculean task — a physical census was financially impossible and would have almost assuredly resulted in an undercount. After investigating count approaches used by large locally-based continuums, DCA staff determined that some type of inferential modeling approach would be necessary.

The current report provides the third estimate of homelessness in Georgia (previous estimates were developed in 2008 and in 2009) using a combination of point-in-time counts, survey-based data and inferential modeling techniques. The methodology used to develop the current estimates will be explained, followed by the results and a discussion of the limitations and challenges of an inferential approach to homeless enumeration. It should be noted that the current version of the modeling methodology represents a refinement of the two previous years estimates, based upon input from individual county organizers. These refinements will be explained in the Methodology section below.

## **Methodology**

The estimates for counts of homeless individuals, and precariously housed individuals by county have been derived from three sources.

In the Atlanta counties of Fulton and Dekalb, organizers assembled teams of volunteers to drive around during a 4-5 hour period in the middle of the night to count people they saw on the street. These teams tallied up people they saw and the counts for all the teams were combined to arrive at the overall number for each county. The values reported below for Fulton and Dekalb were derived from this process.

Muskogee, Chatham, Richmond, and Clarke counties each organized their own respective counts. These counties used a combination of point-in-time counts as well as surveys.

For the Balance of the State, a combination of inferential modeling and survey-based data was utilized.

The inferential modeling process utilized data extracted from the 2011 Georgia County Guide. After reviewing the available demographic and economic variables, a total of 24 variables were selected for use in the modeling exercise. All variables included data reflecting 2009 information. Variable selections were based upon previous experience with the data, assessment of the variables as potential predictors of homelessness, up-to-date information and previous predictive value. The selected predictors came from following areas: economic, courts and crime, education, government, health, housing, labor, public assistance, and vital statistics. Where needed, variables were scaled and/or standardized to facilitate direct comparisons among counties.

An ordinary least squares regression model was developed, using percentage or rate of homeless within the single population by county as the dependent variable. The rate of homeless, instead of actual counts of homeless persons, has always been utilized to remove the effects of population size. In the current methodology, the rate was based upon the single population

rather than on the total population. This change was made based upon input from experts from Pathways and from the Dekalb County organization. The rationale being that homeless people come, primarily, from the population of single people – not people living in family units. Once the rates of homeless are predicted for each county, the result is then multiplied by the current population to determine the estimated count for counties where counts were not provided. All analysis was executed using BASE SAS version 9.2.

## Results

The final inferential model included thirteen variables found to be significant predictors of homelessness. These variables, and their associated weights or effects on rate of homelessness, can be found in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Model Results

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Parameter Estimate</b>	<b>t Value</b>	<b>Pr &gt;  t </b>
<b>Intercept</b>	-0.00173	-0.58	0.5627
<b>Percent US Native Born</b>	0.00472	1.59	0.1142
<b>Property Crime Rate per 100k</b>	.00000019	2.22	0.0277
<b>Commercial Percent of Gross Tax Digest</b>	-0.00013035	-6.37	<.0001
<b>Industrial Percent of Gross Tax Digest</b>	-0.00007927	-5.53	<.0001
<b>Utility Percent of Gross Tax Digest</b>	-0.00002429	-2.08	0.0389
<b>Motor Vehicle Percent of Gross Tax Digest</b>	-0.00031816	-5.56	<.0001
<b>Mobile Home Percent of Gross Tax Digest</b>	0.00060572	3.48	0.0007
<b>Lottery Sales Rate per Capita</b>	0.00000202	5.39	<.0001
<b>Poverty Percent Overall</b>	0.00016803	8.14	<.0001
<b>Percent Female Head of Household</b>	-0.00008409	-3.07	0.0026
<b>Child Abuse per 1000 kids</b>	0.00006961	5.69	<.0001
<b>Change in food stamps 08to09</b>	0.00005123	4.43	<.0001
<b>PCT of Families Receiving Temporary Assistance</b>	0.00138	2.27	0.0248

The model generated an adjusted R<sup>2</sup> value of 78%, meaning that 78% of the change or variation in the rate of homelessness by county has been captured using a linear combination of the variables listed above.

The current overall rate of homelessness for the state of Georgia is estimated to be .1156%. Based on a population of 9,829,211<sup>1</sup>, the current estimated count of homelessness in the state of Georgia is 11,366 persons.

The 10 counties with the highest estimated rate of homelessness and the lowest estimated rate of homelessness can be found in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Highest and Lowest Estimated Rate of Homelessness by County

COUNTY	2009 Population	FINAL COUNT	SOURCE	Effective Percent of County Population
QUITMAN	2659	15	MODEL	0.5578%
TALIAFERRO	1812	8	MODEL	0.4598%
CLAY	3113	13	MODEL	0.4250%
JOHNSON	9300	37	MODEL	0.3931%
HANCOCK	9219	35	MODEL	0.3822%
JENKINS	8450	31	MODEL	0.3718%
TREUTLEN	7058	26	MODEL	0.3647%
LANIER	8423	31	MODEL	0.3638%
MCINTOSH	11,378	41	MODEL	0.3630%
BROOKS	16,354	57	MODEL	0.3494%
HENRY	195,370	86	MODEL	0.0438%
RICHMOND	199,768	83	COUNT	0.0415%
CHEROKEE	215,084	80	MODEL	0.0370%
COLUMBIA	112,958	41	MODEL	0.0360%
BARTOW	96,217	30	MODEL	0.0312%
FAYETTE	106,788	33	MODEL	0.0308%
TOOMBS	27,959	7	COUNT	0.0250%
DEKALB	747,274	132	COUNT	0.0177%
COBB	714,692	31	MODEL	0.0043%
GWINNETT	808,167	11	COUNT	0.0014%

From Table 2, the “Source” column represents the source of the final estimated count. Where the source is identified as “MODEL” the value represents a prediction from the inferential modeling methodology described above. However, where the source is identified as “COUNT”, the value represents a count provided by the DCA (or one of the constituent agencies) based upon surveys or actual counts provided by the representative authority for that county.

<sup>1</sup> 2009 population estimate from the 2011 Georgia County Guide.

A full listing of all the rates and counts for all 159 counties can be found in Appendix 1.

What would cause some counties to have such a high rate while others have such a low rate?

Consider Quitman county, which was estimated to have a homeless rate of .5578%. Quitman county is in the southwest corner of the state, on the border with Alabama. From the 13 significant variables listed in Table 1 above, Quitman county had the highest rate of lottery sales (\$2,935 per person) and the highest rate of TANF (100%). Since both of these variables are positively correlated with the homeless rate (the associated parameter estimates from Table 1 are positive), it is logical that Quitman would have a high rate of homelessness. Quitman county was also near the “top” of the list for other positively correlated variables and at the “bottom” of the list for the negatively correlated variables – specifically those associated with the gross tax digest.

On the other end of the rate spectrum, Cobb county – a suburban county south of Atlanta – had the lowest predicted rate of homelessness (while Gwinnett county had a lower reported rate of homelessness, the value provided above is from a count provided directly from the county rather than from the inferential model). From the list of significant variables in Table 1, Cobb county had one of the lowest overall poverty rates (11.38%) and had one of the lowest rates of child abuse cases per 1000 children under 18 (5.7). Cobb county was also near the “bottom” of the list for other positively correlated variables and near the “top” of the list for other negatively correlated variables.

In addition to homeless individuals, the number of precariously housed individuals was estimated. Precariously housed individuals are defined as people living a house or apartment but who face the loss of their housing within two weeks or who live in substandard/dilapidated housing, or as people living in a hotel or motel who (a) face the loss of their housing within two weeks and (b) are not having their stay paid for by an agency, church, or other service provider. The estimates for precariously housed were based upon a combination of survey data and inferences from the same model described above. Estimates of precariously housed individuals for each county can be found in Appendix 1.

## **Limitations**

As with previous estimates, the present estimates have limitations and should be received in context.

The most important context to have when reviewing any numbers related to the enumeration of homeless persons is that the true numbers are not only unknown, but arguably unknowable. While econometric and demographic data are generally agreed upon indicators of trends and patterns of homelessness, prediction counts devoid of error is unrealistic.

Because unsheltered homeless and precariously housed individuals are difficult to count, confidence in some of the “actual” numbers may be low. As a result, the accuracy of the predictions from the model becomes somewhat of a moving target. For example, if the “actual” count for a county is 100 but the model predicted 150 for the county, there is a possibility that, given the characteristics of the county, the count is an under representation of the actual homeless population.

Further to this point, it may or may not be a coincidence that four of the 10 counties with the lowest rates of homelessness have counts provided by the DCA through survey-based research or volunteer census work. The model generated counts were almost always higher than for DCA-provided counts, where available. This may indicate one of two patterns: 1) although the DCA and its constituent agencies have engaged in very thorough research and data collection, homeless enumeration is destined for undercounting or 2) the modeling process may be biased upwards. Or, the residuals are simply a series of random events.

While the estimates in the present study should be understood using the lens of the limitations above, the results still have greater than simply directional value – they represent an improvement over previous generalized estimation methods and anecdotal information.

## Appendix 1: Unsheltered Homeless and Precariously Housed Counts by County

COUNTY	2009 Population	UNSHeltered HOMELESS		PRECARIOUSLY HOUSED		Percent of Population	TOTAL	Percent of Population
		COUNT	Percent of Population	COUNT	Percent of Population			
APPLING	18,011	34	0.1876%	31	0.1721%	65	0.3597%	
ATKINSON	8,230	23	0.2755%	11	0.1332%	34	0.4087%	
BACON	10,601	14	0.1328%	9	0.0849%	23	0.2177%	
BAKER	3,637	12	0.3264%	7	0.1925%	19	0.5189%	
BALDWIN	46,337	94	0.2027%	14	0.0302%	108	0.2329%	
BANKS	16,799	36	0.2150%	7	0.0401%	43	0.2551%	
BARROW	72,158	80	0.1112%	33	0.0451%	113	0.1563%	
BARTOW	96,217	30	0.0312%	34	0.0357%	64	0.0669%	
BEN HILL	17,567	33	0.1888%	20	0.1161%	54	0.3050%	
BERRIEN	17,044	45	0.2652%	21	0.1259%	67	0.3912%	
BIBB	156,060	138	0.0887%	59	0.0380%	198	0.1267%	
BLECKLEY	12,855	28	0.2202%	14	0.1079%	42	0.3280%	
BRANTLEY	15,643	43	0.2731%	20	0.1269%	63	0.4000%	
BROOKS	16,354	57	0.3494%	19	0.1159%	76	0.4654%	
BRYAN	32,559	34	0.1044%	12	0.0371%	46	0.1416%	
BULLOCH	69,213	129	0.1865%	26	0.0376%	155	0.2240%	
BURKE	22,797	73	0.3217%	17	0.0746%	90	0.3962%	
BUTTS	24,392	48	0.1983%	8	0.0332%	56	0.2315%	
CALHOUN	6,306	19	0.3047%	10	0.1586%	29	0.4633%	
CAMDEN	48,277	81	0.1674%	7	0.0145%	88	0.1819%	
CANDLER	10,680	22	0.2021%	12	0.1089%	33	0.3110%	
CARROLL	114,778	107	0.0933%	20	0.0174%	127	0.1107%	
CATOOSA	64,035	77	0.1206%	23	0.0362%	100	0.1569%	
CHARLTON	10,725	27	0.2483%	17	0.1580%	44	0.4063%	
CHATHAM	256,992	476	0.1852%	26	0.0101%	502	0.1953%	
CHATHAHOOCHEE	14,402	17	0.1162%	4	0.0288%	21	0.1450%	
CHATTOOGA	26,619	60	0.2262%	31	0.1162%	91	0.3424%	
CHEROKEE	215,084	80	0.0370%	92	0.0428%	172	0.0798%	
CLARKE	116,342	226	0.1943%	68	0.0583%	294	0.2525%	
CLAY	3,113	13	0.4250%	5	0.1722%	19	0.5972%	
CLAYTON	275,772	278	0.1008%	76	0.0276%	354	0.1284%	
CLINCH	6,988	19	0.2658%	12	0.1688%	30	0.4347%	
COBB	714,692	31	0.0043%	18	0.0025%	49	0.0069%	
COFFEE	40,868	91	0.2224%	11	0.0269%	102	0.2493%	
COLQUITT	45,596	99	0.2165%	44	0.0965%	143	0.3130%	
COLUMBIA	112,958	41	0.0360%	49	0.0434%	90	0.0794%	
COOK	16,603	32	0.1905%	15	0.0918%	47	0.2824%	
COWETA	127,111	84	0.0659%	35	0.0274%	119	0.0934%	
CRAWFORD	12,240	34	0.2765%	18	0.1444%	52	0.4210%	
CRISP	22,210	53	0.2404%	10	0.0449%	63	0.2853%	
DADE	16,127	42	0.2613%	21	0.1318%	63	0.3931%	
DAWSON	22,555	34	0.1514%	20	0.0887%	54	0.2401%	
DECATUR	28,838	81	0.2801%	17	0.0589%	98	0.3390%	
DEKALB	747,274	132	0.0177%	250	0.0334%	382	0.0511%	
DODGE	19,749	55	0.2791%	19	0.0950%	74	0.3741%	
DOOLY	11,819	25	0.2080%	11	0.0915%	35	0.2996%	
DOUGHERTY	95,859	182	0.1899%	91	0.0949%	273	0.2849%	
DOUGLAS	129,703	92	0.0710%	34	0.0261%	126	0.0971%	

COUNTY	2009 Population	UNSHelterED HOMELESS		PRECARIOUSLY HOUSED		TOTAL	Percent of Population
		COUNT	Percent of Population	COUNT	Percent of Population		
EARLY	11,568	38	0.3265%	31	0.2680%	69	0.5944%
ECHOLS	4,213	13	0.3047%	7	0.1635%	20	0.4682%
EFFINGHAM	53,541	62	0.1154%	14	0.0263%	76	0.1416%
ELBERT	20,372	40	0.1939%	16	0.0810%	56	0.2749%
EMANUEL	23,075	50	0.2153%	52	0.2254%	102	0.4407%
EVANS	11,695	23	0.1940%	11	0.0934%	34	0.2875%
FANNIN	22,945	59	0.2566%	25	0.1099%	84	0.3665%
FA YETTE	106,788	33	0.0308%	13	0.0119%	46	0.0426%
FLOYD	96,250	127	0.1319%	26	0.0271%	153	0.1590%
FORSYTH	174,520	187	0.1073%	93	0.0534%	281	0.1608%
FRANKLIN	21,748	48	0.2209%	17	0.0801%	65	0.3010%
FULTON	1,033,756	2,234	0.2161%	827	0.0800%	3,061	0.2961%
GILMER	29,021	77	0.2658%	24	0.0825%	101	0.3482%
GLASCOCK	2,801	6	0.2147%	2	0.0595%	8	0.2741%
GLYNN	76,820	148	0.1929%	103	0.1341%	251	0.3270%
GORDON	53,292	64	0.1206%	20	0.0372%	84	0.1578%
GRADY	25,187	61	0.2424%	96	0.3811%	157	0.6236%
GREENE	15,743	51	0.3209%	16	0.1016%	67	0.4225%
GWINNETT	808,167	11	0.0014%	88	0.0109%	99	0.0122%
HABERSHAM	43,613	81	0.1867%	26	0.0595%	107	0.2462%
HALL	187,743	149	0.0796%	6	0.0032%	155	0.0828%
HANCOCK	9,219	35	0.3822%	17	0.1801%	52	0.5623%
HARALSON	28,890	59	0.2052%	11	0.0397%	71	0.2449%
HARRIS	30,138	33	0.1080%	10	0.0341%	43	0.1421%
HART	24,067	54	0.2246%	13	0.0531%	67	0.2777%
HEARD	11,528	29	0.2489%	5	0.0465%	34	0.2953%
HENRY	195,370	86	0.0438%	38	0.0196%	124	0.0634%
HOUSTON	135,715	83	0.0614%	10	0.0074%	93	0.0688%
IRWIN	10,086	23	0.2312%	9	0.0904%	32	0.3216%
JACKSON	63,544	71	0.1122%	22	0.0350%	94	0.1472%
JASPER	13,953	30	0.2122%	5	0.0389%	35	0.2511%
JEFF DAVIS	13,659	23	0.1675%	11	0.0830%	34	0.2505%
JEFFERSON	16,478	51	0.3080%	30	0.1821%	81	0.4900%
JENKINS	8,450	31	0.3718%	13	0.1505%	44	0.5222%
JOHNSON	9,300	37	0.3931%	18	0.1883%	54	0.5814%
JONES	27,740	37	0.1317%	6	0.0231%	43	0.1548%
LAMAR	17,550	35	0.1986%	7	0.0377%	41	0.2363%
LANIER	8,423	31	0.3638%	6	0.0701%	37	0.4338%
LAURENS	48,295	64	0.1329%	37	0.0772%	101	0.2101%
LEE	34,410	16	0.0474%	4	0.0124%	21	0.0598%
LIBERTY	62,186	90	0.1453%	35	0.0557%	125	0.2010%
LINCOLN	7,913	19	0.2447%	10	0.1323%	30	0.3770%
LONG	12,234	31	0.2514%	5	0.0409%	36	0.2923%
LOWNDES	106,814	136	0.1275%	53	0.0496%	189	0.1771%
LUMPKIN	27,528	73	0.2657%	11	0.0400%	84	0.3056%
MACON	13,336	35	0.2652%	9	0.0659%	44	0.3311%
MADISON	28,232	58	0.2044%	11	0.0380%	68	0.2424%
MARION	6,995	22	0.3120%	7	0.0930%	28	0.4050%
MCDUFFIE	21,862	45	0.2077%	8	0.0367%	53	0.2444%

COUNTY	2009 Population	UNSHelterED HOMELESS		PRECARIOUSLY HOUSED		TOTAL	Percent of Population
		COUNT	Percent of Population	COUNT	Percent of Population		
MCINTOSH	11,378	41	0.3630%	21	0.1813%	62	0.5443%
MERIWETHER	22,783	61	0.2696%	11	0.0487%	73	0.3183%
MILLER	6,228	15	0.2397%	20	0.3211%	35	0.5609%
MITCHELL	23,800	48	0.2002%	12	0.0504%	60	0.2507%
MONROE	25,425	48	0.1872%	12	0.0491%	60	0.2363%
MONTGOMERY	8,930	24	0.2729%	10	0.1114%	34	0.3844%
MORGAN	18,761	40	0.2129%	11	0.0606%	51	0.2735%
MURRAY	40,621	69	0.1710%	14	0.0351%	84	0.2060%
MUSCOGEE	190,414	255	0.1339%	51	0.0268%	306	0.1607%
NEWTON	99,944	85	0.0846%	11	0.0110%	96	0.0956%
OCONEE	33,320	24	0.0722%	8	0.0234%	32	0.0956%
OGLETHORPE	14,328	25	0.1774%	7	0.0507%	33	0.2281%
PAULDING	136,655	112	0.0818%	44	0.0320%	156	0.1138%
PEACH	27,247	51	0.1871%	11	0.0399%	62	0.2271%
PICKENS	31,264	44	0.1410%	9	0.0293%	53	0.1703%
PIERCE	18,580	31	0.1673%	15	0.0833%	47	0.2506%
PIKE	17,721	21	0.1167%	6	0.0347%	27	0.1514%
POLK	42,298	95	0.2250%	20	0.0472%	115	0.2721%
PULASKI	9,897	28	0.2781%	6	0.0566%	33	0.3347%
PUTNAM	20,495	52	0.2560%	7	0.0342%	59	0.2902%
QUITMAN	2,659	15	0.5578%	7	0.2495%	21	0.8074%
RABUN	16,611	45	0.2681%	8	0.0492%	53	0.3173%
RANDOLPH	7,180	21	0.2922%	11	0.1469%	32	0.4391%
RICHMOND	199,768	83	0.0415%	89	0.0446%	172	0.0861%
ROCKDALE	84,569	54	0.0643%	27	0.0320%	81	0.0963%
SCHLEY	4,325	7	0.1722%	4	0.0861%	11	0.2583%
SCREVEN	15,054	41	0.2716%	19	0.1244%	60	0.3960%
SEMINOLE	9,094	26	0.2847%	10	0.1152%	36	0.3999%
SPALDING	64,708	98	0.1516%	20	0.0309%	118	0.1825%
STEPHENS	25,700	60	0.2337%	13	0.0511%	73	0.2848%
STEWART	4,558	12	0.2532%	6	0.1286%	17	0.3819%
SUMTER	32,084	72	0.2249%	39	0.1212%	111	0.3461%
TALBOT	6,355	15	0.2358%	7	0.1037%	22	0.3395%
TALIAFERRO	1,812	8	0.4598%	4	0.2134%	12	0.6731%
TATTNALL	24,493	66	0.2694%	26	0.1055%	92	0.3749%
TAYLOR	8,587	25	0.2903%	9	0.1059%	34	0.3962%
TELFAIR	12,792	33	0.2570%	18	0.1381%	51	0.3951%
TERRELL	10,320	29	0.2827%	46	0.4457%	75	0.7284%
THOMAS	46,188	95	0.2058%	26	0.0563%	121	0.2621%
TIFT	42,959	66	0.1536%	43	0.1001%	109	0.2537%
TOOMBS	27,959	7	0.0250%	15	0.0536%	22	0.0787%
TOWNS	11,010	31	0.2853%	7	0.0634%	38	0.3488%
TREUTLEN	7,058	26	0.3647%	12	0.1752%	38	0.5400%
TROUP	64,653	87	0.1346%	40	0.0619%	127	0.1964%
TURNER	9,254	17	0.1863%	8	0.0852%	25	0.2716%
TWIGGS	10,111	26	0.2594%	12	0.1169%	38	0.3764%
UNION	21,252	54	0.2521%	11	0.0527%	65	0.3048%
UPSON	27,551	47	0.1717%	10	0.0368%	57	0.2085%
WALKER	64,983	120	0.1844%	25	0.0378%	144	0.2222%
WALTON	87,311	88	0.1008%	34	0.0386%	122	0.1394%
WARE	35,914	63	0.1751%	10	0.0278%	73	0.2030%
WARREN	5,755	9	0.1564%	26	0.4518%	35	0.6082%
WASHINGTON	20,879	35	0.1693%	17	0.0838%	53	0.2531%
WAYNE	29,407	42	0.1434%	29	0.0995%	71	0.2428%
WEBSTER	2,192	4	0.1991%	2	0.1135%	7	0.3125%
WHEELER	7,010	18	0.2630%	11	0.1513%	29	0.4143%
WHITE	25,294	60	0.2386%	12	0.0474%	72	0.2860%
WHITFIELD	93,698	61	0.0651%	278	0.2967%	339	0.3618%
WILCOX	8,895	19	0.2123%	10	0.1153%	29	0.3276%
WILKES	10,268	28	0.2716%	12	0.1186%	40	0.3901%
WILKINSON	10,076	12	0.1166%	7	0.0648%	18	0.1814%
WORTH	21,214	11	0.0519%	24	0.1131%	35	0.1650%
<b>Georgia</b>	<b>9,829,211</b>	<b>11,366</b>	<b>0.1156%</b>	<b>4,712</b>	<b>0.0479%</b>	<b>16,078</b>	<b>0.1636%</b>