



KAREN L. SMITH, MD, MPH
Director & State Health Officer

Vital Statistics Advisory Committee (VSAC)
Vital Records Protection Advisory Committee (VRPAC)
Joint Meeting
Meeting Minutes for Wednesday August 12, 2015
9:00 A.M.



EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Governor

ATTENDEES:

Convener:

Heather Fukushima, HPS I, Health and Research Section

Committee Members:

Phone:

Erlinda Valdez, Board Member, California Funeral Directors Association, Jonathan Teague, Manager, Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, Sun Lee, MPH, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, PhD, University of Southern California

California Department of Public Health (CDPH) Staff:

Present: Cindy Tanaka-Fong, Research Analyst II, Data Management Unit, Colin Chew, Research Analyst I, Health Information and Research Section, Elaine Bilot, MS, MA, Section Chief Health Information and Research Section, Laura Lund, MA, Science Advisor, Public Health Policy and Research Branch, Tori Pena, Branch Secretary, Public Policy and Research Branch, Heather Fukushima, HPS I, Health Information and Research Section

Public Attendees: No Public Attendees

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M.

A/B. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS:

Staff present attending the meeting included: Cindy Tanaka-Fong, Research Analyst II, Data Management Unit, Colin Chew, Research Analyst I, Health Information and Research Section, Laura Lund, MA, Science Advisor, Public Health Policy and Research Branch, Elaine Bilot MS, MA, Chief, Health Information and Research Section, Tori Pena, Branch Secretary, Public Policy and Research Branch, and Heather Fukushima, HPS I, Health Information and Research Section

Committee members on the phone included: Sun Lee, MPH, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Jonathan Teague, Manager, Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, Erlinda Valdez, Board Member, California Funeral Directors Association, and Emily Putnam-Hornstein, PhD, University of Southern California

Heather informed everyone that the meeting was being recorded to assist with note taking purposes. This meeting complies with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

We have reserved a portion of the meeting for public comment. We would like to ask our public attendees to reserve comments until we arrive at that portion of the meeting.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

Erlinda Valdez motioned to approve the July 8, 2015 meeting minutes. Jonathan Teague seconded the motion. Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein and Sun Lee voted aye to unanimously approve the minutes. There were no oppositions. Motion carried. The minutes were approved as distributed.

D. VSAC RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING:

The State Registrar's Responses to VSAC Recommendations are included in your agenda package as Attachment 1.

ATTACHMENT 2 – CONSENT CALENDAR: OSHPD DATA REQUESTS

The following five OSHPD projects were placed in the Consent Calendar:

- Project Title: Neighborhood Effects and Preterm Birth Among Asian American Subgroups
Principal Investigator: Mistry Gage, PhD Candidate, Kristin Rankin, PhD, (Co-PI), University of Illinois
Project Type: New Data Request
Data Requested: 2008-2011 Linked PDD/ED/AS/Birth Cohort File
- Project Title: Exogenous Shocks in Utero and Infant Health: Evidence from California
Principal Investigator: Shin-Yi Chou, PhD, Lehigh University, Department of Economics

Project Type: New Project
Data Requested: 1991-2011 Linked PDD/Birth Cohort File

- Project Title: Impact of Health Insurance on Long-term Health and Mortality
Principal Investigator: Bernard Black, MD, Northwestern University
Project Type: New Project
Data Requested: 1991-2011 Linked PDD/Death Data
- Project Title: Complications of Hematological and Oncologic Diseases in California
Principal Investigator: Ted Wun, MD, Richard White, MD (Co-PI),
University of California, Davis
Project Type: New Project
Data Requested: 1991-2012 Linked PDD/Death Data
- Project Title: Impact of New Medicare Readmission Policy on Hospital Readmissions for All Patients
Principal Investigator: David Zingmond, MD, PhD, University of California, Los Angeles
Project Type: Continuing Project
Data Requested: 2011 Linked PDD/Death Data

VSAC Discussion: No Discussion

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the data release. Emily Putnam-Hornstein seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried.

Ten projects were reviewed.

The first project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "California Occupational Safety and Health Surveillance (U600H008468-10)"

Principal Investigator(s): Jennifer Flattery, CDPH, Occupational Health Branch

Project Type: Continuing Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 13-02-1077

Expiration: April 1, 2016

File(s) Requested: 2014 Non-Public PDD, 2014 Non-Public EDD, 2014 Non-Public AS

Requested Identifiers: OSHPD files with identifiers

Personal Contact: Yes

Identifiers Released: No

History: Previous Data Request

VSAC Discussion: The comments from the Science Advisor (SA) had after her review included that this was public health surveillance, not research. She felt that VSAC should review the project because of the database linkage aspects. Only the fields requested on page 14-15 should be released to the requestor.

It was clarified that there were no other e-mails from Jennifer after she responded to Cindy that they were not linking data. Cindy said she received a response but was asking about it going for VSAC review.

Sun Lee commented that they said they were going to match SSN from various data sources. Throughout their protocol, they stated matching is on-going.

The SA felt that this was public health surveillance, but not research and a linking project. It sounds like they are linking at the personal level where they can do follow-up and linking at multiple data sources. The SA referred to page 4 of the application. They are going to identify the asthma cases through these sources through linking them. They also checked they were using this for scientific research, which raised a red flag to the SA even though the rest of what they described was public health surveillance. They were not going to publish any type of research study or journal.

The SA asked the Committee if they wanted more information specifically about what fields they would be using for linkage and how they would be going about doing that.

Jonathan noticed no contact information on file as the linkage was dependent upon the SSA. He did not know how they will use the data to contact subject. The SA told him they had 5 or 6 data sources they

are planning on linking together. They have the DIR reports of occupational exposures and have other sources that might have personal level contact information.

The SA said it was important that the Committee see the application because the linkages are across a lot of databases that may have very strong personal identifiers, and they do plan to contact people.

The SA reiterated that CDPH has moved to a minimum data necessary data release policy. Even though the requestor has requested an entire file, the requestor will only get the specific fields that are relevant to the research study and will not get fields from the file.

Sun asked for surveillance purposes, do these have to go to VSAC? The State Registrar can decide whether to release the file to a government agency without VSAC review. Because of the data linkage and possible implications of that, the State Registrar can invoke this Committee as an advisory group if the Committee had concerns about the use of the data for linkage purposes. This would be the place to tell the State Registrar that there may be things the State Registrar might want to consider before releasing the file.

It was the understanding of the SA that the Committee does not have any objection to the use of the data, but prior to the release; they would like to see a more complete description of how the data is being linked to other data sets.

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the data release for this project subject to clarification by the applicant as to how they were going to link the data and how the linkage would be executed. Sun Lee seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request subject to clarification by the applicant as to how they were going to link the data and how the linkage would be executed. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as stated above in the motion.

The second project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Longitudinal Study of Hospital Outcomes for California Children"

Principal Investigator(s): Geraldine Oliva, MD, Linda Remy, PhD, Co-PI, UC San Francisco

Project Type: Continuing Project with Changes to the Protocol

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 13-02-1077

Expiration: April 1, 2016

File(s) Requested: 2013 Birth Statistical Master File (select variables), 2013 Death Statistical Master File (select variables)

Requested Identifiers: BSMF (Name, Certificate Number, Address), DSMF (Name, Certificate Number, Address, MMN, and SSN)

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: Previous Data Request

VSAC Discussion: The SA said that the applicant did not revise their application. They responded in an email to the points that the Committee brought up and opted not to revise the application because the attachments sent responded to the Committee's concern about the original application. They would like the Committee to consider the original application as submitted, as well as the supplemental material from Linda Remy. The purpose of this review is to decide whether or not the application be accepted, based on the supplemental materials they've submitted. The Committee could revote and reconsider the original application or the Committee could decide they want the applicant to revise the original application as discussed in June.

Jonathan said that one of the concerns the Committee had was the re-release of the data as they were combining files and producing additional research files. They seem to state they would not be releasing record level to others without VSAC and OSHPD being aware of it.

Other questions they had was once you build this file, what are you doing with it? What are the purposes of it? They did provide concrete examples of it and what they plan on doing with it. It was Jonathan's understanding giving the broad gauge of the nature of the work, they want to keep it open-ended, as there may be research purposes that may emerge in addition to the current and ongoing functions of the file.

Some of their things that were on the SharePoint site were pulled because they do not use any cell suppression. This was a real concern CDPH as we realized that. They are publishing tables with no cell suppression. When it was posted to the website and available to the public on request, they had cell sizes with one individual. The SA asked the Committee if they would want to stipulate that they need to use cell suppression protocols in their data publications.

Emily was surprised that there was no cell suppression as isn't that specific provision of the applications they already submitted, that everything has to be 11 plus? The SA said she is not sure as we do not request that for our data for CDPH.

Jonathan said for publication and open literature, CPHS strongly recommends the cell size of 15. It was not sure if these tables were considered to be published.

The SA said that they have a small cell size committee at CDPH working on a departmental standard, but do not have a final department standard. There are a lot of guidelines out there from 5 to 15 or more. The SA was concerned that one is bad.

Emily said if it is not a CDPH specific guideline, she was pretty sure if they had an Institutional Review Board (IRB) with the State, there is a provision that any data that is published does not specify peer review, and has a minimum cell size of 10 or 11. The SA said they would not need CPHS review for all of the projects they would do. They would have our data and have ongoing multiple projects, some of which would require CPHS review, and some of which may not.

The SA was concerned that the tables they provided does not invoke any cell suppression policy.

Sun commented that they mention doing lots of projects but only see them mentioning Family Health Outcomes Project (FHOP). The SA told her that FHOP is an umbrella project; it involves lots of different components.

Emily noticed that the response the PI provided, she was going to phone in to follow up with questions the Committee had. Linda Remy did join by phone for the July meeting. This meeting must follow the Bagley-Keene requirements, which means any information that is going to be discussed at the meeting has to be posted to the public prior to the meeting. She submitted her materials the day before.

Even though she spoke during the public comment period, we could not reopen the discussion and vote on the application for that meeting, as there was not enough time for the public to be informed about it so we had to pen the application for the next meeting.

The SA said that Jonathan was correct as they addressed the major concerns of the Committee and their supplemental e-mails statements, that they would not be re-releasing the data files. They talk about the purposes of which they would be using the data, which is pretty broad. That is up to the Committee if they would want to approve that level of broadness. The SA said her only concern is the data tables she saw was at individual level and would not be acceptable with CDPH for release purposes.

Jonathan said that OSHPD is in the process with the development of these guidelines as they review a wide variety of data products they produce to see how the guidelines will affect it. This is probably a new regime for a lot of state departments. The guidelines are not formally adopted, but they are simply in the process to test them and apply them in advance. He was not sure if this will be an ongoing issue for the Committee as he suspects we will see other kinds of project requests. He thought this was something we could put on the agenda for next time. Jonathan did not want block the request because of this. He was comfortable that they were not rereleasing information.

The SA said it would be good to do research on the small cell size issue to determine what this Committee might want to recommend. One of the things the Committee could choose to do is recommend to the State Registrar the release of the data be approved, but disallow any tabular release of the information until the Committee has time to research and review what the options are for cell suppression might be. They can have the data and work on their analysis. This would give them time to do the work they need to do, but they would not be able to publish until the Committee feels comfortable with the final output.

It would be up to the Committee to decide. They could use a threshold value of the recommendation by CPHS of 15 and that the Committee will consider whether or not small cell sizes might be appropriate.

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the data release with stipulation that any analytical results of the data not be published unless it complies with CPHS small cell size

recommendation, pending further consideration by the Committee. Emily Putnam-Hornstein seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request with stipulation any analytical results of the data not be published unless it complies with CPHS small cell size recommendation pending further consideration by the Committee. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as stated above in the motion.

In the next couple of months, we will have Scott Fujimoto come to talk about the small cell size committee's work and what they are doing.

The third project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Infant Social and Emotional Development"

Principal Investigator(s): Eric Walle, PhD, University of California, Merced

Project Type: Continuing Project with Changes to the Protocol

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No: 13-08-1316

Expiration: October 2, 2015

File(s) Requested: Birth Records from 8/1/14 - 12/31/14 (select variables), Infant Death Records from 8/1/14 - 12/31/15 (select variables)

Requested Identifiers: Birth Records (Name, Certificate Number and Address), Infant Death Records (Name, Address, Mother's Maiden Name)

Personal Contact: Yes

Identifiers Released: No

History: Previous Data Request

VSAC Discussion: No Discussion

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the data release. Sun Lee seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as described in the protocol.

The fourth project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Probabilistic Inference and Categorization Development in Infants"

Principal Investigator(s): Fei Xu, PhD, University of California, Berkeley

Project Type: Continuing Project with Changes to the Protocol

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 12-04-0161

Expiration: October 2, 2015

File(s) Requested: Preliminary Birth Records from 1/1/15 – 12/31/15 (select variables), Infant Death Records from 1/1/15 – 12/31/15 (select variables)

Requested Identifiers: Birth Records (Name and Address), Infant Death Records (Name, Certificate Number, and Address)

Personal Contact: Yes

Identifiers Released: No

History: Previous Data Request

VSAC Discussion: No Discussion

VSAC Motion: Sun Lee motioned to recommend approval of the data release. Jonathan Teague seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez,, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in favor of recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as described in the protocol.

The fifth project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "The California Maternal Data Center: Establishing a Statewide Data Center for Use in Rapid-Cycle Maternity Care Improvement"

Principal Investigator(s): Jeffrey Gould, MD, Elliott Main, MD, Stanford University

Project Type: Continuing Project with Changes to the Protocol

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 12-04-0157

Expiration: June 3, 2016

File(s) Requested: 2015-2016 Birth Statistical Master Files (monthly data runs)

Requested Identifiers: California Identifiers

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: Previous Data Request

VSAC Discussion: No Discussion

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the data release. Sun Lee seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in favor of recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as described in the protocol.

The sixth project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Study of Expanded Population of Radiation Workers in Shipyards"

Principal Investigator(s): Genevieve Matanoski, MD, John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

Project Type: New Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 15-07-2113

Expiration: August 5, 2016

File(s) Requested: 1970-2011 Death Statistical Master Files (select variables), 1960-1969 Merged Death Files (select variables), 1970-2010 Multiple Cause of Death (Certificate Number)

Requested Identifiers: DSMF (Name, Certificate Number, Address, SSN, MMN), Merged Death Files (Name and Certificate Number), MCOD (Certificate Number)

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: New Data Request

VSAC Discussion: Sun referred to Page 10 item (I), as they said they are going to share this de-identified data with the nationwide radiation database maintained by the Department of Energy. The SA said this would be a violation of statute. Statute for the purposes of vital records data does not differentiate between identified and de-identified data. Statute is very specific that no portion of a file may be rereleased.

The SA said that reading the application that there was an optional part of the work. They can do the work they planned, and they would also make it available in the database for others researchers. It would not prevent them from doing the work it described if they can't add it to the database.

If they join the office with the Navy to their request and someone as a Co-PI, would that be okay. The SA said except that it sounds like this database exists to be rereleased to a number of different people. It is not just the Navy, so it would allow the Navy to see the data, but they could not release it from that. It sounds like they want to have a very large central database available to researchers of all different kinds. It would not do them any good to have the Navy be a co applicant for purposes of adding the data to that database and not be able to re-release it to anyone else.

In terms of the analytical results, their conclusion of their studies, those could be published. The problem is sharing record level data whether it is de-identified or not.

It was pointed out that on Page 10, 8 (I) and 9 (b), it states the Navy requires de-identified data to be shared with the nationwide radiation

database maintained by the Department of Energy to determine dose related health risks from exposures.

Jonathan wanted to know if there is any discretion to the State Registrar to release de-identified information. The SA says the statute is very specific and does not allow any discretion.

The SA said the best we can do for them is release the public use fields but she was not sure it would do any good as it does not have the cause of death. It only has name, date of death, date of birth and father's last name.

Emily asked if we could make a provision that while they cannot release the files to anyone else or de-identified files, they can give the de-identified files back to the State and other researchers who wanted to use it could request the file. The SA said we cannot release other people's data files. We do not have any statutory authority to do that.

If the Navy and Department of Energy were Co-PI, they could put the data in their database. They could not release it to anyone else from that database, but could use it for their own research purposes unless they came back with another research application.

Sun had questions about the database owned by the Department of Energy. Do they have users from other states and rereleasing it, sharing it with others? As no one knew the answer to this question, Sun wanted to know if we could ask the requestor this question. The SA said you don't have to approve an application that you are not comfortable with and you can go back to the requestor for more information.

We can draft a letter to the requestor saying that re-release of the data is a violation of the California statute and the Committee has some questions. Based on the answers to those questions, you might want to come back with a Co-PI. They need information from us about what is possible, and you need information on what exactly they want to do.

On Page 11, 9 (c), it states death data will not be shared in any identifiable form with any third party unless that group obtains direct permission from CPHS. It sounds like they have an option of resharing. If there is an approved CPHS protocol, this would not be okay.

The SA said it sounds to her that the Committee would not recommend approval of the application to the State Registrar and would request further information from the applicant that describes more about the database into which they plan to put these data and who would have future access to it.

We will let the applicant know that the data cannot be re-released at the record level or to the Department of Energy unless someone from one or both of these groups, depending on who they want to share with, is a Co-Principal Investigator on the application.

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend to the State Registrar not release the data as described in the application and request that the applicant submit additional details on the database and how the data will be shared in that database. Sun Lee seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending to the State Registrar not release the data as described in the application and request that the applicant submit additional details on the database and how the data will be shared in that database. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar not release the data as described in the application and request that the applicant submit additional details on the database and how the data will be shared in that database.

The seventh project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Los Angeles Mommy and Baby (LAMB) Project"

Principal Investigator(s): Shin Margaret Chao, PhD, Los Angeles (LA) County Department of Public Health, MCAH

Project Type: Continuing Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 12-12-0949

Expiration: February 5, 2016

File(s) Requested: 2014 Birth Records from LA County Department of Public Health

Requested Identifiers: California Identifiers

Personal Contact: Yes

Identifiers Released: No

History: New Data Request

VSAC Discussion: It was noted that the requestor would not be able to receive marital status.

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the data release. Sun Lee seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as described in the protocol.

The eighth project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Los Angeles Health Overview of a Pregnancy Event (LAHOPE)"

Principal Investigator(s): Shin Margaret Chao, PhD, Los Angeles (LA) County Department of Public Health, MCAH

Project Type: Continuing Project with Changes to the Protocol

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 12-10-0828

Expiration: December 4, 2015

File(s) Requested: 2014 Birth Records and 2014 Death Records from LA County Department of Public Health

Requested Identifiers: California Identifiers

Personal Contact: Yes

Identifiers Released: No

History: Previous Data Request

VSAC Discussion: It was noted that the requestor would not be able to receive marital status.

The SA told the Committee that we had some concerns with the security protocols, so our Legal Department advised us to have the applicant sign our Information Practices and Security Release (IPSR) document prior to receiving the data. We will make sure we get that signed before LA County releases the information. Sun asked if they

should wait for that to be completed. The SA told that they should not release the data until they have signed the IPSR. Jonathan wanted to know if this was for both projects. The SA advisor said no, it was only for this one as the sub-contractor declined to state their security protocols. LA County is going to have to cover them with the IPSR.

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the data release. Erlinda Valdez seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as described in the protocol.

The ninth project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Callbacks and Names"

Principal Investigator(s): Melissa Tartari, University of Chicago

Project Type: New Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 14-10-1751

Expiration: December 4, 2015

File(s) Requested: 1986 Birth Statistical Master File (select variable)

Requested Identifiers: Name

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: New Data Request

VSAC Discussion: The Committee had reservations regarding this project and wanted to pend this for the next meeting for further discussion and review.

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend to move this project to the next meeting. Sun Lee seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: There was no vote.

The tenth project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "California Parkinson's Disease Registry Pilot Project Research: Use of Medicare Data to Assess Registry Data Collection Efficiency"

Principal Investigator(s): Caroline Tanner, PhD, UC San Francisco

Project Type: New Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 12-04-0140

Expiration: May 11, 2015

File(s) Requested: 2009-2013 Death Statistical Master Files (select variables), 2006-2012 Multiple Cause of Death Files (select variable)

Requested Identifiers: DSMF (Name, Certificate Number, Address, and SSN), MCODE (Certificate Number)

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: Data Request

VSAC Discussion: It was clarified that they were not planning on re-releasing data.

VSAC Motion: Sun Lee motioned to recommend approval of the data release. Jonathan Teague seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, Emily Putnam-Hornstein, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in favor of recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as described in the protocol.

F. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION: Heather asked the Committee to refer to Attachment 3, Recap of Data Requests Approved in the Vital Statistics Unit.

G and H. Public Comments and AGENDA ITEMS:

There was no Public Comment.

I. MEETING ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 A.M.

