Methodology for WI-501 - Milwaukee City & County 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMIS Data</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider-level surveys</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client-level surveys</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
- Comparison of unique client identifiers (not PII)
- 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
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).
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.
   - Other:

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

The Point in Time Planning Committee did not change the methodology in how sheltered individuals are counted because it is pulled directly from our HMIS system which encompasses all funded organizations. Those that are not funded but participate in the overall count are entered into the HMIS system as well so as to capture 100% bed capacity in our community.

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
   - “Night of the count” - known locations
   - HMIS
No change
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?
   Yes

7b. How did the CoC select the areas that were included for canvassing?
   - Areas were not selected randomly, but an effort was made to use local knowledge to target known locations (e.g., areas with known concentrations of unsheltered homeless people)

7b1. 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

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 personally identifying information (PII), such as name, date of birth, and Social Security Number
   - Comparison of unique client identifiers (not PII)
- 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
   - Surveys/interviews of people identified as unsheltered on the night of the count, but completed at a later date
   - Surveys/interviews of people identified within 7 days following the night of the PIT count night who may have been unsheltered on the night of the PIT count (e.g., “service-based” surveys at locations where people who are homeless go for assistance)

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)
   - 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
   - More volunteers for PIT count
   - Change in CoC geographic coverage area
   - Impact of coordinated entry

Please provide a brief description of these specific factors (500 word limit):
Each year, the Point in Time Planning Committee works with funded and unfunded street outreach groups to identify heavily concentrated areas where sheltered individuals might congregate. This year the group was able to work with a local church and set up a warming room. This provided those experiencing homelessness an opportunity to come out of the element and be interviewed for the purposes of collecting demographic data for the Point in Time count. Normally, Milwaukee is able to identify warming room locations throughout the city, but this year the group was able to set-up a new location that we have had difficulty arranging in past years. This location brought in about 30 individuals that may not have been captured in the overall count or Post 7 day count. Adjusting the methodology to include a new location may have increased the overall count however, allowed Milwaukee the ability to cover every district and zone without worry that there weren’t enough locations where interviews could be conducted. The continued collaborations within Milwaukee County allow for a reliable count representative of the entire CoC.

Since the CoC is doing outreach, prioritization and utilizing a BNL on an on-going basis, the PIT was a simple activity. The CoC used a combination of Service Based, Counts, HMIS, street canvases and the BNL to ensure accuracy.

One of the barriers to enumerating and surveying youth is the relatively hidden nature of youth homelessness. Due to the transient nature of their homelessness, youth are often less visible during counts. In this community, some youth actively avoid contact with youth-serving organizations out of fear or mistrust, making them nearly impossible to locate during a count. There are inherent risks to staying on the street leading many youth to stay temporarily with friends and family, often referred to as ‘couch surfing,’ thus making them “uncountable” for the purposes of the PIT count. However, after many years of diligently working with youth providers, youth focus groups, magnet events and service counts, the COC now has an effective youth engagement process to improve the representation of youth in counts.