

Methodology for FL-511 - Pensacola/Escambia, Santa Rosa 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	22%
Provider-level surveys	0%
Client-level surveys	64%
Observation	0%
Other	14%
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?

- Non-random sample and extrapolation

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

Sheltered Subpopulation

4. Looking at the change in your sheltered count from last year's count, please choose the three reasons you believe best explains these changes from the drop-down list below

- Change in emergency shelter capacity
- Change in PIT count methodology
- Change in number of volunteers for PIT count

Please provide a summary description of the selected factors and how they impacted PIT count implementation (3,000 character limit):

We used known bed counts and occupancy rates, with extrapolation, to add in individuals and households that we know are in shelters but cannot get the shelters to report to us about. Extrapolation was done with the HUD provided PIT Count Data Extrapolation Tool (XLSX) – Updated March 2024. Due to extrapolating data for 162 clients in several sheltering providers that did not provide us with any data on their clients, the extrapolation tool showed 8 warnings for the extrapolation of the demographics of individuals. These warnings indicated that the percent with unknowns for each issue were higher than 20%, and that this would affect the accuracy of the extrapolated data. The warnings were as follows: For households with children in ES: percent with unknown age (44.9%), percent with unknown gender (32.7%), and percent with unknown race/ethnicity (44.9%). For households without children in ES: percent with unknown age (24.1%), percent with unknown gender (21.4%), and percent with unknown race/ethnicity (24.1%). For households without children in TH: percent with unknown age (33%), and percent with unknown race/ethnicity (33.3%). To determine if the extrapolated data could be used, comparisons were made between projects that provided data on their clients, within household types, to determine if demographics distributions were comparable. They were found to be comparable to each other and to the resulting extrapolated data. As there would be no reason for the demographics of the projects that did not report on their clients to be different from the demographics of the projects that did report, and have not differed in the past, the resulting extrapolated data was determined to be reportable.

Unsheltered Population

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

- "Night of the count" - census

5a1. Did you cover the entire geography of your CoC during the night of the count?

5a1a. What were the reasons you were unable to cover the entire geography (select all that apply)?

- volunteer/staff capacity

- "Night of the count" - known locations only

5b. How did the CoC select the areas that were included for canvassing?

- An effort was made to use local knowledge (such as outreach workers and other local expertise) to target known locations (e.g., areas with known concentrations of people experiencing unsheltered homelessness)
- Data from prior PIT count
- Administrative data

5e1. What administrative data did you use for your unsheltered count?

- HMIS

6. Were certain areas within the CoC geography specifically excluded because the CoC had reason to believe there were no unsheltered people in those areas based on prior knowledge/experience?

- Yes

7. Did the CoC adjust the information in some way (e.g., statistical adjustment or extrapolation) to account for areas within the CoC geography that were not canvassed but where unsheltered people might have been on the night of the PIT count?

- No

8. Were certain areas within the CoC geography specifically excluded because of concerns related to public health and safety?

- No

9. 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 personally identifying information (PII, such as name, date of birth, and Social Security Number)
- Interview/survey question(s) with screening questions (e.g., have you already completed a count survey)

Unsheltered Subpopulations

10. Looking at the change in your unsheltered count from last year's count, please choose up to three reasons that best explain these changes from the drop down list below. Please also provide a brief description of these specific factors (500 word limit).

- Change in participation of partners and programs (e.g., increased PIT count participation from programs that serve youth or other populations, change in participation of programs due to COVID-19 restrictions)

Please provide a brief description of these specific factors and how these changes affected PIT count implementation (3,000 character limit):

Greatly reduced number of experienced volunteers for conducting surveys, due to reduced community partner participation.

Please provide a summary description of the selected factors and how they impacted PIT count implementation (3,000 character limit):

Greatly reduced number of experienced volunteers for conducting surveys, due to reduced community partner participation.