

Yakima County Human Services  
Data Committee  
MEETING MINUTES  
**February 15, 2024**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Welcome/Ice  
Breaker

The **February 15, 2024** Data Committee Meeting came to order at **11:05am**.

Members present: Dave Hanson (SOC)

Zoom: Kyle Curtis (YCC), Linda Dilembo (Valley Mall),

\*If you don't see your name or your organization name here, please email Deann at  
[Deann.Bergquist@co.yakima.wa.us](mailto:Deann.Bergquist@co.yakima.wa.us)

Human Services staff present:

Melissa Holm, Esther Magasis, Deann Bergquist, Ivan Orozco

**OLD BUSINESS**

*Approval of  
minutes*

Approval of Minutes: January 22, 2024, Data Committee Meeting.

Linda Dilembo moved to approve the minutes from the January 22, 2024, Data Committee Meeting. Commissioner Curtis seconded. No one abstained/denied. The motion carried.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Data Dashboards (HENNA,  
YAHA, 2023 HMIS  
Project Enrollments)**

Ivan Orozco provided an overview of the HENA dashboards covering the period from August 15 to January 31. Out of 731 total submissions, there were 620 unduplicated clients identified using their unique HMIS identifier. Ivan then reviewed the race/ethnicity demographics using a pie graph, which indicated minimal movement. White individuals constituted the largest percentage of HENA submissions, followed by Hispanic/Latin(a)(o)(x). Smaller percentages were observed for other populations, with some groups still suppressed due to being under 11%.

Ivan then provided a breakdown of locations tracked for 'where have you slept in the last 24 to 48 hours.' The data revealed that 364 responses indicated sleeping outdoors, in a car, boat, or RV, which was the largest number of responses. The next highest response, with 113 individuals, was sleeping in emergency shelters. Additionally, 90 respondents reported sleeping in rentals, couch surfing, or hotels/motels-self pay. However, data for transitional housing, multiple locations, psych facility, hospital, other, or Department of Corrections (DOC) were suppressed as they were under 11%.

Regarding the question about 'when was the last time you had housing for 6 months or longer,' the overall response still predominantly indicated a period of 2.5 years or more. Specifically, there were 238 respondents aged 25-61 years or older and 36 respondents aged 62 years old or older in this category. Those reporting housing for 6 months to 2.5 years included 151 individuals aged 25-61 years and 18 individuals aged 62 years or older. Respondents indicating housing for less than 6 months included 144 individuals aged 25-61 years and 28 individuals aged 62 years or older.

In the HENA Vulnerability Scoring slide, scores were broken down for the period from August 15 to January 31, ranging from 0 to 11 points. The Score Categories

showed a higher number of clients scoring in the middle category of 4-7, with 114 scoring from 1-3 (the lowest score range) and 53 scoring 8 or more. Dave requested a breakdown of vulnerability scores by age group, which Ivan agreed to provide for the next meeting. Ivan also reviewed the overall average vulnerability scores by race/ethnicity. Notably, the category of two or more races remained under the data suppression level of 11. The White Only category showed that 225 clients scored an average of 6, while 225 Hispanic/LatinX clients scored a 5.

In the YAHA (Youth and Young Adult Homelessness Assessment), the unduplicated YYA (Youth and Young Adult) clients have finally surpassed 100 submissions, although some suppression is still occurring. In the chart depicting the unduplicated YYA demographics, Hispanic/Latino individuals constitute the highest percentage at 50%, while White individuals are lower at 25%, which is contrary to what was observed in the HENA (Homeless Exposure and Needs Analysis). American Indian/Alaska Native individuals occupy the third position, similar to the pattern seen in the HENA. The average scores for these demographics are 3 for overall demographics, with American Indian/Alaska Native individuals scoring the highest at 5.

Commissioner Curtis inquired about the locations where the surveys are being conducted, prompting Ivan to confirm that he can retrieve that data as well. Melissa Holm raised the idea of directly contacting organizations to understand the populations they are reaching and to gauge the size of the HENA population accurately. Ivan confirmed that Rod's House is the primary contributor to these submissions. Melissa pointed out that the majority of submissions originate from Rod's House in the lower valley, suggesting that there may be valuable lessons to glean from this data that could be applied across other areas.

The average vulnerability score was noted to be 3 out of 14, prompting Dave to inquire about a breakdown of this score by race. Ivan subsequently reviewed the scores by race/ethnicity. Melissa observed that with the relatively low overall number of 100 submissions, the one-digit difference between race/ethnicity categories may not be statistically significant.

The discussion shifted towards comparing the lower scoring numbers to those of other communities, with Dave expressing curiosity about the specific training methods employed elsewhere. Melissa offered to share the training materials being developed by her and Ivan for other groups such as ACI Core, a suggestion that Dave found promising. They also planned to request details from other organizations about their initial scoring processes to identify any similarities to their own methods for the YAHA assessments.

It was noted that the 2023 HMIS project enrollments closely mirrored those of the HENA, with no significant differences observed. A notable change occurred in the YAHA, where the top two categories were reversed.

Linda Dilembo raised the question of whether these numbers have been indexed and proposed that Ivan compare them against indexed data for the county or the State of Washington, particularly with 2023 update figures broken down by age group. The discussion continued with a focus on understanding why the YAHA data appears different from what was expected. Dave pointed out that our results are inverted for both general populations and youth populations by age, as well as by

race/ethnicity. Notably, the HENA is weighted towards the white population, whereas the YAHA is dominated by Hispanic/Latino individuals.

Melissa suggested reaching out to providers such as Rod's House and other HENA providers to inquire about when, where, and how the YAHA/HENA forms are being utilized. This information could shed light on why the population demographics differ significantly between the two assessments.

Annette Rodriguez emphasized the importance of equity in the discussion. She noted that their HENA form is still undergoing testing and hasn't been reviewed by the state for official use yet. This might explain the data discrepancies they are observing. On the other hand, the YAHA has received state approval. However, Melissa clarified that there are additional steps required before the YAHA can be fully implemented.

Esther explained how there is variation in accessing data for certain groups due to differences in ease of access. While some clients come on site, others are reached through outreach efforts, leading to differences in data representation.

**PAPA (Program Alignment Prioritization Assessment)**

Dave explained that the tool is still in its early stages, with decisions yet to be made about its utilization. There's a need to determine whether it will be used as a one-time assessment for each provider project, serving as a filtering tool for scoring, or if it will be employed in conjunction with the HENA tool by individuals. Additionally, there's a question of how it will integrate into HMIS as a screening tool. Melissa raised the point of whether various program requirements can be standardized to achieve the desired end result.

The PAPA includes fundamental questions addressing front door barriers for each provider's projects, such as the availability of bed space and the presence of pets. The aim is to incorporate this into each provider's project as a screening tool during vulnerability assessments.

Annette highlighted that some of the questions in the PAPA align with those already included in the PRISM Score, which pertains to State Referred clients from various facilities including hospitals and law enforcement. Melissa encouraged Annette to offer additional training on the PRISM Score, emphasizing its value in assessing vulnerability. She expressed a desire to bring together the HENA, PAPA, and PRISM to enhance their effectiveness in case conferencing and scoring. Melissa suggested that while they explore these tools, they might also discover existing community tools similar to the PAPA that could serve their needs, potentially eliminating the need to create new tools.

Melissa clarified that while vulnerability is the primary focus for HMIS, the tools required to achieve this are not provided externally. She noted that the Balance of State does not involve itself in providing vulnerability assessment tools, leaving this responsibility to each provider and community to develop and utilize as necessary.

**Commerce Dashboard Updates**

Dave brought up the issue of outdated data on the website, noting that the last update was in April 2023. He expressed concern over the poor data quality for

## and Local Data Quality Reports

Yakima County compared to other counties in Washington State. The discussion turned to identifying the difficulties and actions being taken to address them. Ivan has been actively working on resolving these issues, although progress has not been fully realized yet. He emphasized the importance of prioritizing the resolution of these gaps before the next update. Ivan explained that Commerce will be updating the data at the end of the month and then on a quarterly basis thereafter. He outlined the ongoing efforts to clean up the data and stressed the need to address these issues regularly to ensure more accurate data in future updates.

Melissa asked Ivan to share some reports that demonstrate how the Technical Assistance they have been given has helped to balance the administrative burdens, it indicates there have been some improvements, but it is slow and steady improvement. Esther mentioned it has been at least ten years since Yakima County has had this much work done in the HMIS system. There are a lot of little kinks in the system after less than quality data input into the system. It is a vast improvement in the system, even though everything has been in disrepair, but these are improving.

Annette explained that the most important part of the performance in these projects, and YNHS has been landing in Tier 1 in the top 10 for most of their projects. The data is improving quickly due to Ivan's hard work with improving the data quality, and it's moving in the right direction.

## ACTION ITEMS

1. Ivan will provide age ranges within the scoring ranges for the HENA Vulnerability Scoring Data.
2. Melissa will reach out to ACI Policy/Core team to ask about trainings for YAHA surveys and getting them out to other communities. She will also ask them about their scores and if their initial numbers were low like ours are now for the YAHA.
3. Ivan will find out if these numbers have been indexed so they can be compared this against the one for the State of Washington.

## Next Meeting

DATE: **March 11, 2024**

Location: Hybrid Zoom and In Person at General Administration Building Small Conference Room

## Adjourn

With no other business, the meeting was adjourned at **3:12pm**.