

Methodology for NY-522 - Jefferson, Lewis, St. Lawrence 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 unique client identifiers (not PII)
- Blitz count of persons in shelters (i.e., count occurred at same time to avoid double counting)
- Interview/survey question(s) with screening questions (e.g., have you already completed a count survey)

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
- Change in availability of affordable housing

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

The reasons that best explain the change (a net increase of 38 persons) in the sheltered count from last year's count are: (1) Increased or Improved PIT count training and (2) Change in Availability of Affordable Housing.

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

Change in Availability of Affordable Housing: Due to the eviction moratoriums, the CoC's area has seen an extremely low vacancy rate and a stark decline in available affordable housing. As a result, more households have been staying in shelter – even if voucher assistance is available – it has been challenging to find available units.

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" - complete census

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 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

- Increased or improved PIT count training
- Impact of coordinated entry
- Other: Eviction Moratorium

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

The reasons that best explain the change (a net decrease of 1 person) in the unsheltered count from last year's count are: (1) Increased or Improved PIT count training, (2) Impact of Coordinated Entry, and (3) Other: Eviction Moratoriums.

Increased or improved PIT count training: This year volunteers were trained more effectively to ensure de-duplication. In addition, the Collaborative Applicant facilitated phone meetings which included the unsheltered PIT Lead Agencies hosting homeless events to ensure a more accurate and complete count.

Impact of Coordinated Entry: With funding through the CoC, Points North has developed a robust Coordinated Entry system focusing on rapidly and effectively housing the most vulnerable households – including those who experience unsheltered homelessness. The CE system has strengthened communication and relationships across program types, and has empowered street outreach programs to more rapidly make appropriate referrals directly into permanent housing. The community continues to see the positive impact of CE, including more appropriate placements within PH and improved housing stability.

Other, Eviction Moratoriums: While on the night of the count, the NYS Eviction Moratorium had expired, it had only recently expired (January 15th). As such, on the night of the count, the community was still seeing the impact of the moratorium. Specifically, while eviction proceedings may occur, many evictions have yet to be implemented. This reduced the state of homelessness as residents are remaining in rental properties, even if they have not been able to pay rent.

