Methodology for NY-519 - Columbia, Greene Counties CoC

Sheltered Population Total

1. What data source(s) was used to produce the total number of people included in the sheltered population (staying in an emergency shelter, Safe Haven, or transitional housing) on the night of the count? Please indicate the percentage of the PIT count derived from each of the sources. (If a source was not used, please enter zero).

HMIS Data	**75%**
Provider-level surveys	**25%**
Client-level surveys	**0%**
Observation	**0%**
Other	**0%**
Total	**100%**

2. Was the CoC able to collect information about the number of people being sheltered on the night of the count from all emergency shelters, Safe Havens, and transitional housing projects listed on the HIC or only some? listed on your HIC or only some?

- Complete census count

3. What information or method(s) was used to de-duplicate the count of the total number of people included in the sheltered population?

- Comparison of personally identifying information (PII), such as name, date of birth, and Social Security Number
- Blitz count of persons in shelters (i.e., count occurred at same time to avoid double counting)

Sheltered Subpopulation

4. What data source(s) was used to produce the demographic and subpopulation data included in the sheltered population (staying in an emergency shelter, Safe Haven, or transitional housing) on the night of the count? (select all that were used)

- HMIS Data

- Provider-level surveys

5. Was the CoC able to collect information about the demographic and subpopulation characteristics of all sheltered people or only some?

- All sheltered people

6. Looking at the change in your sheltered count from last year's count, please choose up to three reasons that best explains these changes from the drop down list below.

- Increased or improved PIT count training

- Impact of coordinated entry

Please provide a brief description of these specific factors (500 word limit):

The two reasons best explaining the change (net decrease of 59 persons) in the sheltered count from 2019 to 2020 include the positive impact of Coordinated Entry and increased or improved PIT count training.

Impact of Coordinated Entry: With funding through the CoC, Columbia Greene has developed a robust Coordinated Entry system focusing on rapidly and effectively housing the most vulnerable households. The CE system has strengthened communication and relationships across program types, and has empowered street outreach programs to more rapidly make appropriate referrals and increase the number of vulnerable persons sheltered. The community continues to see the positive impact of CE, including shorter lengths of shelter stay, more appropriate placements within PH and improved housing stability.

Increased or improved PIT count training: This year, in coordination with the Collaborative Applicant and HMIS Lead, the community was trained on PIT requirements and provided training on HMIS data clean up to ensure PIT data quality. The CA also provided additional one-on-one technical assistance to agencies not within HMIS on how to collect data and complete required forms. This improved training led to a more accurate PIT count.

Unsheltered Population

7. What approach(es) was used to count the total number of people included in the unsheltered population during the PIT count. (select all that were used)

- "Night of the count" - known locations

7a. Were certain areas within the CoC geography specifically excluded because the CoC had reason to believe there were no unsheltered people in those areas?

No

7c. In areas that were canvassed, did the CoC count all unsheltered people in those areas or a sample of people?

- All people encountered during the count

8. What information or method(s) was used to de-duplicate the total count of people in the unsheltered population? (Check all that apply)

- Comparison of unique client identifiers (not PII)

- Blitz count of unsheltered people (i.e., canvassing of different areas occurred at same time to avoid double counting)

- Interview/survey question(s) with screening questions (e.g., have you already completed a count survey)

Unsheltered Subpopulations

9. What approach(es) was used to collect demographic and subpopulation data about unsheltered people included in the unsheltered population during the PIT count?

- Surveys/interviews of people identified as unsheltered on the night of the PIT count

10. Were all people who were encountered during canvassing on the night of the count or during post night of the count PIT activities asked to complete a survey/interview?

- All people encountered were surveyed

11. What information or method(s) was used to produce an unduplicated total count of homeless people across your sheltered and unsheltered populations?

- Comparison of personally identifying information (PII), such as name, date of birth, and Social Security Number
- Comparison of unique client identifiers (not PII)

- Blitz count of unsheltered people (i.e., sheltered and unsheltered counts occurred at same time to avoid double counting)
- Interview/survey question(s) with screening questions (e.g., have you already completed a count survey)

12. Looking at the change in your unsheltered count from last year's count, please choose up to three reasons that best explains these changes from the drop down list below

- Change in PIT count methodology

- Change in participation of programs serving general homeless populations (e.g., singles, families)

- Change in participation of programs serving subpopulations (e.g., veterans, youth)

- Increased or improved PIT count training

- Weather

Please provide a brief description of these specific factors (500 word limit):

With a net decrease of 3 person in the unsheltered count from last year, weather was the best reason for this change. On the night of the count, on-street homeless persons were subjected to harsh weather conditions that contributed to their motivation to seeks shelter.

- HMIS data from street outreach and/or other providers