

MEETING NOTES

HPAC Data Subcommittee Meeting

Wednesday, May 18, 2016 - 9-10 a.m.

Meeting attendees: Isaac Blackstock, Yolo Community Care Continuum; Chris Bulkeley, Yolo County District Attorney's Office; Tracey Dickinson, Yolo County HHSA; Ginger Hashimoto, Yolo County HHSA; Lynnette Irlmeier, Empower Yolo; James McLeod, Yolo Community Care Continuum; Niomi Michel, Empower Yolo; and Dan Sokolow, City of Woodland

Welcome and Meeting Purpose

The purpose of the meeting was to further explore HPAC's data sharing options for its local Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). Attendees discussed that this is an important decision as it will inform how HPAC establishes and implements its coordinated entry system.

Review Data Sharing Options

Through research and conversations with our HMIS vendor five potential options for data sharing were identified.

1. **Fully Closed**—revert to a fully closed system by eliminating the full share of client profiles.
2. **Partially Closed (what we have at present)**—maintain status quo by continuing the full share of client profiles and prohibiting the full share of the following data elements:
 - Program enrollment history
 - Service history
 - Files
 - Locations
 - Referral history
 - Assessments
3. **Partially Open**—fully share program enrollment history, service history, referral history, and assessments, but privatize personal identifying information by entering dummy information for the client profile screen and allow the option to share personal identifying information with relevant agencies on an as-needed basis.
4. **Opt-In Open**—fully share client profiles, program enrollment history, service history, files, locations, referral history, and assessments among only the agencies who opt-in and choose to participate in the region's data sharing agreement.
5. **Fully Open**—fully share client profiles, program enrollment history, service history, files, locations, referral history, and assessments among all agencies.

Discussion of Options

The attendees discussed that the ideal solution would be one that is not listed above. The attendees would prefer that HMIS include an option to assign a unique ID to each client, while hiding their personal information. If an agency were entering a client that was already in the system (based on social security number), they would receive a notification that another agency was also working with that individual. They could contact the other agency to secure a release of confidentiality, at which point personal information could be viewed by both agencies. However, this option is not currently available in our current HMIS system, and would likely require a significant cost for BitFocus to develop it for us. County staff committed to requesting a cost estimate for the development of this system.

MEETING NOTES

HPAC Data Subcommittee Meeting

Wednesday, May 18, 2016 - 9-10 a.m.

In the meantime, attendees discussed that the only viable options in the list above were #3 and #4. The group agreed that #3 would require a significant amount of work on the part of agencies to create and track dummy information, and would not work for coordinated entry due to the duplication of client files.

Recommendations for Future Action

1. All attendees agreed that HPAC should continue to pursue the opt-in open system option. The attendees agreed that the County should work individually with each agency using HMIS to determine whether they want to participate in HPAC's data sharing agreement and collect the necessary paperwork.
2. The attendees requested additional training on how to protect client privacy in the system, particularly as it relates to HIPAA requirements.
3. Concurrently, attendees agreed that the County should work with our HMIS software vendor to obtain a cost estimate on developing and programming a system of assigning clients a unique ID rather than sharing personal information, as described in the section above.