



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 July 8, 2015
9:00 A.M.



EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
Governor

ATTENDEES:

Convener:

Henry Montes, Chief, Data Management Unit

Committee Members:

Phone: David Grant, PhD, UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, Sun Lee, MPH, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Jonathan Teague, Manager, Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, Shannon Muir, PhD, Science and Technology Fellow, Senate Health Committee, Erlinda Valdez, Board Member, California Funeral Directors Association

California Department of Public Health (CDPH) Staff:

Present: Heather Fukushima, HPS I, Health Information and Research Section, 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, the new Section Chief Health Information and Research Section, Henry Montes, Chief, Data Management Unit Also present were Lucila Martinez and Dr. Lois Lowe from the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects.

Public Attendees: Linda Remy

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

A/B. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS:

Staff present attending the meeting included: Heather Fukushima, HPS I, Health Information and Research Section, 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, and Elaine Bilot MS, MA, Chief, Health Information and Research Section, Henry Montes, Chief, Data Management Unit.

Committee members on the phone included: David Grant, PhD, UCLA Center for Health Policy Research, Sun Lee, MPH, Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, Jonathan Teague, Manager, Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, Shannon Muir, PhD, Science and Technology Fellow, California Senate Health Committee, and Erlinda Valdez, Board Member, California Funeral Directors Association.

Henry 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 June 10, 2015 meeting minutes. Jonathan Teague seconded the motion. Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, David Grant, Shannon Muir, 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.

E. NEW BUSINESS:

Eight projects were reviewed.

The first project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Obstetric Management and Gestational Age-Specific Maternal Morbidity, Neonatal Morbidity, and Perinatal and Infant Mortality by Maternal Pre-pregnancy BMI from 2007-2011"

Principal Investigator(s): Cassandra Gibbins-Pickens, MPH/Carol

Hogue, PhD (Co-PI), Emory University

Project Type: New Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 14-11-1784

Expiration: April 1, 2016

File(s) Requested: 2007-2011 Linked PDD/Birth Cohort Files

Requested Identifiers: California Identifiers

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: New Data Request

VSAC Discussion: After the discussion of Project 3, Shannon brought up that the variable grid was cut off and was wondering if staff would send her the Excel format for the variable grid.

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

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, David Grant, Shannon Muir, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried.

The second project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Disparities in Outcomes for Pediatric Diseases: Context, Access and Quality of Care"

Principal Investigator(s): Nancy Wang MD/Paul Wise MD (Co-PI), Stanford University

Project Type: Continuing Project with Changes to the Protocol

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 12-06-0328

Expiration: August 1, 2015

File(s) Requested: 2010-2012 Linked PDD/ED/Death Data Files,

Requested Identifiers: California identifiers only

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: Yes

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, David Grant, Shannon Muir, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request. Motion carried.

The third project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Strong Start for Mothers and Newborns Evaluation"

"Principal Investigator(s): Ian Hill, Urban Institute (UI)

Project Type: New Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No: 15-02-1859

Expiration: April 1, 2016

File(s) Requested: 2014-2016 Birth Statistical Master File (select variables)

Requested Identifiers: No Personal Identifiers

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: New Data Request

VSAC Discussion: Sun Lee had concerns about what was stated in the protocol on page 11, Number 8 (d). They state that at the end of the project, analytic files containing only the Urban-created ID and PHI would be transmitted to CMS via an encrypted CD by secure delivery or encrypted electronic transfer by a secure FTP process. After the project, all PII and PHI will be destroyed. This is coming from the Urban Institute who is requesting the data; is CMS one of their Co-PI's?

It seems like CMS is a sponsor. If they are part of the project, shouldn't they be listed as a PI?

The Science Advisor (SA) said if they are going to get any of the data, they have to be listed as a Co-PI or contractor.

Sun also had concerns with the Vital Statistics application as they have a lot of people listed, but it was uncertain whether it was UI or CMS staff. The SA asked if they would like a list of affiliation of each of the people who has access and need to clarify what the role is of CMS. If they are not a contractor or co-PI, they shouldn't be receiving any of the data.

Jonathan commented that it was his understanding that CMS was the actual source of the enrollment data, providing that to Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) through linkage, but there is no agreement with DHCS getting the data. This is also something that needs to be clarified as DHCS will be receiving all the information as they will be doing the linkage.

Another comment the SA had was that they were requesting marital status and they cannot have that.

David commented that on the application, there is detail about matching or linkage between birth certificate and Medicaid eligibility and claims. It refers to "you will do this and this", but it is not clear who is doing the matching. They are asking for help from the State partner, but it is not clear if that is DHCS. Jonathan pointed out on page 11, 8(c), it references being reviewed at an April meeting, but April has past.

The SA said the Committee can ask them to provide us with information on data transfer, who the data will go to, what will be the responsibility of the recipient, and where will the data go when it is finally done..

There is reference to an attachment of variables being requested but no one was able to find this except for what was listed in the application. They need to let us know what variables they are requesting.

The SA asked the Committee if they felt comfortable with the application as described that you could motion to make a recommendation to approve, but with stipulation that all of the concerns and language change. Or do you want to see this application again? If they were to rewrite their application based on the

Committee's comments, they would send it in and we would review it at the next meeting.

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the data release contingent upon clarification of issues surrounding the custody of data, data retention and who is granted access to the data. They will also be informed that they cannot receive marital status. Sun Lee seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, David Grant, Shannon Muir, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request contingent upon clarification of issues surrounding the custody of data, data retention and who is granted access to the data. They will also be informed that they cannot receive marital status. 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 fourth project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "Imaging Intensity as a Measure of Cancer Care Efficiency"

Principal Investigator(s): Benjamin Franc, MD, University of California, San Francisco

Project Type: New Project

CPHS Approval: Pending CPHS Approval

Project No.: 15-04-1990

Expiration: Pending CPHS Approval

File(s) Requested: 1989-2013 Death Statistical Master File (select variables)

Requested Identifiers: Name and Social Security Number

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: New Data Request

VSAC Discussion: It was noted that there was no OSHPD application. They are drawing their data directly from EMR through UCSF. They have imaging data in the EMR that OSHPD does not have in their inpatient file.

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

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez , David Grant, Shannon Muir, 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: "Predictors of Recurrent Breast Tumors in Women with DCIS"

Principal Investigator(s): Karla Kerlikowske MD, University of California, San Francisco

Project Type: Continuing Project

CPHS Approval: Pending CPHS Approval

Project No.: 14-08-1691

Expiration: Pending CPHS Approval

File(s) Requested: PI is requesting to use data she previously obtained; 2013 Death Statistical Master File (select variables)

Requested Identifiers: Name, Certificate Number, Address, Social Security Number, and Mother's Maiden Name

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: Previous Data Request

VSAC Discussion: Sun wanted to know if this Principal Investigator has any other projects that she has requested in the past or is she sharing data, or receiving it from someone else. The SA told Sun that she does a lot of research projects; you have reviewed requests from her in the past. She has been approved to use data sets for multiple projects.

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

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, David Grant, Shannon Muir, 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: "Pregnancy Outcomes of Veterans (PROVE)"

Principal Investigator(s): Ciaran S. Phibbs, PhD, VA Palo Alto Health Care System

Project Type: New Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 12-07-0559

Expiration: October 2, 2015

File(s) Requested: 1991-2012 Birth Statistical Master Files (select variables) and 1991-2011 Fetal Death Statistical Master Files (select variables)

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

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: New Data Request

VSAC Discussion: Sun referenced on Page 9 Question 5 (g) it states the duration of the study is uncertain. We talked about this at our meeting last month where PIs say we don't know when the study is going to end. We are uncertain when we will be destroying the data file.

Sun asked if requestors have a one year period to use the data and have it reviewed. The SA said they have to go back to CPHS annually unless this Committee request they come back. They do not have to come back to VSAC.

Another concern Sun had was on page 11, Question 8 (g) regarding who had access to the data. It stated Dr. Beate Danielson without compensation or a WOC VA Palo Alto Health Care System employee had access. Jonathan told Sun that they do not know at this point.

For OSHPD, where there is a contingency, we ask that they inform us. We would often approve their request conditionally, but we would need to know if anyone is added or if additional personnel will be accessing personal information. The SA said that this was something the Committee could request, but is not a standard procedure that we have. They could submit a new page for the application that lists all the people who have access.

Jonathan said that they have been aware of this project proposal for a while. The first request dates back to 2009. According to his understanding and his records, that request was withdrawn and a subsequent proposal was submitted in 2013. In both causes, neither one was actually approved by OSHPD. He approached us as being part of the staff of VA. The VA is not an eligible entity under the Information Practices Act for us to provide the data. We can provide them HIPAA limited data sets under different provision of their law but that law was not extant when they submitted the application. Subsequently, he relied on his affiliation with Stanford as his sponsor. That certainly would work and that's where it has been left at this point. The application process has not been completed and he could not find any final approval documents. It doesn't mean that VSAC cannot approve this request conditionally because we have not established a formal sequence. He is not getting OSHPD data until we complete that process.

The SA said that VSAC can approve for the vital records release of the project, but the OSHPD release would be up to OSHPD. He is asking for the linked file with the birth cohort file. Jonathan said normally you don't see a vital statistics application if the linked file is being sought. It was uncertain if he was approaching this organization to try to address the vital records component to the linked file and hoping to come back to OSHPD and finish out the application there. He has not been in direct communication with Dr. Phibbs so he said he is not sure what is going on.

OSHPD did not see any material flaws; it was a question of what is your status and who is your sponsor as the VA would not work. If it was Stanford, that would work.

SB1812 passed, opening up their data in HIPAA limited form to a variety of Federal agencies. The VA was included in that list. That part of the law contemplates release of HIPAA limited data sets to these agencies and does not talk about the linked files, which includes vital records. We have always treated those as more confidential and

that part of their data act does not say anything about release of vital data. It would be easier if he was coming as a Stanford facility member, professor, or researcher under their sponsorship; that process has been established. It is not clear how we disburse linked files. This is probably a conversation we need to have with vital statistics staff.

The SA agreed that we should have discussion on this as she was not sure it was HIPAA limited but needed more information.

The SA said that one of the things the Committee can do is approve the application pending OSHPD approval of an OSHPD application. Once that happens, the State Registrar can release the data to the requestor. Then he would not have to come back to VSAC.

VSAC Motion: Jonathan Teague motioned to recommend approval of the request with data release contingent upon an OSHPD data request for that project. Sun Lee seconded the motion.

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, David Grant, Shannon Muir, and Sun Lee voted aye unanimously in recommending approval of the data request contingent upon the approval of an OSHPD data application. Motion carried. The Committee has voted to recommend that the State Registrar approve the use of the data as described in the protocol.

The seventh project reviewed by the Committee was:

Project Title: "National Longitudinal Mortality Study (NLMS)"

Principal Investigator(s): Norman Johnson, U.S. Bureau of the Census

Project Type: New Project

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 15-02-1883

Expiration: April 1, 2016

File(s) Requested: 1999-2011 Death Statistical Master File (select variables)

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

Personal Contact: No

Identifiers Released: No

History: New Data Request

VSAC Discussion: Sun wanted to know if he hadn't gotten the data before. The SA told her that he hadn't asked for the electronic data file before. He received the hard copies of the certificates and manual data entry. When he found out how much it was going to cost, he opted to go with the electronic file request.

The State Registrar likes to run linkage past VSAC even if it is not a classic research study because one of the things the Committee does is to advise him on security and confidentiality issues and concerns about that kind of thing. The note was made that it is not a research study but it is linkage verification and validation, and would come under the purview of the Committee to make a recommendation to the State Registrar.

Mother's Maiden Name would be given out but marital status cannot be shared from the Birth Certificate.

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

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, David Grant, Shannon Muir, 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: "Learning to Listen Ahead in English and Spanish"

Principal Investigator(s): Anne Fernald, PhD, Stanford University

Project Type: Continuing Project with Changes to the Protocol

CPHS Approval: Approved

Project No.: 12-10-0873

Expiration: February 5, 2016

File(s) Requested: 2014 Preliminary Birth Records (select variables), 2014 Infant Death Records (select variables)

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

Personal Contact: Yes

Identifiers Released: No

History: Previous Data Request

VSAC Discussion: Sun Lee wanted to know if it's preliminary is the data coming from AVSS. The SA stated that we need to tighten up some of the language and semantics around that. There is no such thing as preliminary or provisional. What they are saying is they would like real time data as opposed to waiting for an annual file at the end of the year. We do it now for several applications, for example, Elliot Main's study.

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

VSAC Vote: Jonathan Teague, Erlinda Valdez, David Grant, Shannon Muir, 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.

F. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION: Henry 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:
Public Comment

Linda Remy was the public attendee. Colin provided information to the Committee he received from Linda.

Linda commented that when she submits application to CPHS, they always ask for approval for some number of years in advance so they can go forward every year with a no change in their request. She has understood from the vital statistics staff, they could not make any request for data in advance at the time they are available. She only requested data for 2013 when it would have been consistent with the other protocol to ask for it through 2018, which they have been

approved to get every year so they can go forward, having already been approved, going back for renewal with no changes to the protocol and they can receive it. She noticed that several people here have been requesting data well in advance of the period of time they are available.

The SA said this is a policy issue. This is something that the State Registrar can take under advice whether or not approving years in advance as they become available. The SA said we would make a note in the minutes and visit it as a policy issue here in the Center for Health Statistics.

Linda said she noticed that several people are asking for data in advance from when it is available. Clarification was given to Linda that they would get a letter saying that they can be only approved through the years the data are available and would have to apply for future years.

Linda asked if the Committee has any questions regarding what she sent. The SA said that those materials weren't available to the public. They ought not to form the basis of discussion today subject to Bagley-Keene. This can be on the agenda for the next meeting. For public comment, we can have open discussion and questions but we cannot reference materials that the public has not had the opportunity to see.

Linda thought she was invited and was it because she did not get the material to them until yesterday? Agenda and materials have to be published 10 days in advance of the meeting per Bagley-Keene requirement.

Linda was told we could put her project on the agenda for next meeting and if she wishes to present those materials to VSAC for review and comment. She asked if she would have to submit a new application after we meet next month or if the Committee would consider their present application in light of the responses she had sent. The SA told her that Bagley-Keene open meeting law requires that any discussion the Committee has and any material they review, pertaining to the discussion be available to the public. Twenty-four hour notice before the Committee meetings does not make those materials available to the public under the law.

Linda asked at the next meeting, would her original proposal be back on the agenda for reconsideration in light of the additional materials.

The Committee cannot consider these materials outside the meeting in terms of discussion. The SA told Linda the answer to your question is you can ask for your application to be put back on the agenda for the next meeting. You can submit these materials as you have already done for the Committee's review. They can discuss these materials in the context of the application you submit, whether you submit an original application or a revised one. The Committee would then have to make a decision from there. Linda said she would like to request to revisit their original application and add the additional information at the next meeting to have the application be reconsidered. The SA told Linda the Committee did have comments, you can choose to revise your application based on those comments and you also wanted the supplemental materials submitted and attach to application for their review. Linda said they did not plan to do a new proposal in light of these additional attachments. The attachments would be incorporated in the application. Linda informed everyone that she would be attending by phone.

Discussion Topics:

CPHS/VSAC Research Protocol Review Process – Workflow and Timing

Laura thanked Lois and Lucila for attending the meeting this morning. She said she was invited last month to give a presentation to the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects about VSAC process, statutory requirements and permissions. She briefed them on how the Committee works, what kind of questions come up, what the concerns of this Committee are and how that might be different from CPHS.

There were two items that came out of that discussion. Members of that Committee expressed concern that sometimes they have an application that comes through that also has a vital records application and would be seen by VSAC. They don't feel confident about their knowledge around the data release laws governing vital records as this Committee might be. They see requests for a lot of confidential medical and personal information. They have questions whether this is appropriate for that particular study for that requestor to get access to those very confidential data fields.

A proposal that the Committee can work in tandem if the reviewers from CPHS come across one of these applications whether they are not sure, they can hold their decision and wait for VSAC to review the application, and see what discussions, concerns, and questions might

come out of VSAC and whether VSAC would approve it. That could inform their final decision making about the particular application.

The SA said she is the information bearer and cannot make any decisions about that, but wanted to bring it to the Committee for discussion to see how you feel about that kind of process. Jonathan thought it was a reasonable process; sounds similar to what OSHPD does. When they receive an application and draft protocol, they will review that on a preliminary basis and to see if it is approvable. They can't formally approve it because it has to go to the officials at OSHPD but CPHS can get a letter back so they would know that the data specifications and data handling and all the logistically and research provisions are in order so there won't be changes as they continue to negotiate the OSHPD request.

Sun wanted to know if it comes to VSAC, would that be a formal approval they would give or what Jonathan was saying similar to what they are doing: preliminary approval, return to CPHS, they make the final approval, and then it comes back to us. Laura said no, we often review applications simultaneously. We never release data files until it has CPHS approval. At the time the Committee makes it formal recommendation to the State Registrar, sometimes that approval hasn't yet been granted. This shouldn't be any different than that in terms of process. What it means would be that there might be a delay for some requestors but do not anticipate it would come up very often. The example they talked about was a very unusual application but it does come up occasionally and has come up more than once. They would be reviewing an application; VSAC may be reviewing it simultaneously. They would wait to hear it at the full Committee or wait for reviewers to finalize the review until this Committee had a chance to review and comment and make a recommendation to the State Registrar. Obviously if the recommendation to the State Registrar is no, we don't recommend releasing it. It would be very helpful for CPHS to know in making their own determination.

It was the understanding of the SA that this process would be operated on an exception basis. At most, it may delay the process by a month; possibly less if the applications were reviewed simultaneously.

Sun asked if they had to make a decision now. The SA said you don't have to make a decision now but told her if there is more information she could provide for her or ask CPHS for, in order for her to feel better informed about a decision.

Shannon commented that it is one way to improve efficiency and if there is a chance to do that in state bureaucracy, we should jump on it.

As the Committee did not have any comments or concerns regarding this, the SA suggested that we would have our VSAC facilitator draft a letter to CPHS saying that VSAC had this discussion and is willing to work with CPHS on having them pen applications that require VSAC review and recommendations before they make their final decisions of the discretion of CPHS reviewers.

Minimum Data Necessary Data Releases

There was an actual question from the Committee whether this Committee would be receptive to a formal recommendation in a form of a letter from CPHS to VSAC regarding minimum data necessary data release. The Committee can consider minimum data necessary as one of the criteria when they are releasing data files and restrict the release of variables to only minimum data necessary for each data request.

Subsequent to her presentation to CPHS, the Center for Health Statistics has been reviewing their release policy. Effective immediately, we are moving forward with only minimum data necessary data releases. We will no longer be releasing what we traditionally released in terms of statistical master files – Birth Statistical Master File, Death Statistical Master File and so forth. We will be creating custom subsets of those data file for requestors based on approval by VSAC for their application and their needs of their study.

CPHS request to this Committee as to whether a recommendation from them would be helpful and still open, but from the Center's perspective, we have already begun to implement that policy. It is the Department's standard; we are uncomfortable now releasing data beyond what is requested.

Lois said that CPHS began this minimum data set requirement effective with the Information Practices Act (California Civil Code Section 1792) change effective January 1, 2006. The variables are the minimum that are necessary to answer the research questions. The data should not be reused. The SA told Lois that our statutes don't allow sharing specifically for vital records. That's why when

Karla's research project came up, it was actually a request she been through before but cannot reuse data for another research project unless she comes back to the Committee.

Jonathan said OSHPD has been trying to do this for a while too, hence their data grids they use which provide element by element justification to address each point in the data file when they release it for research. However, when they request data from VSAC for preparing linked files, they are generally looking for all the data elements with a few specific exceptions. For example, they don't want names, and one or two other elements they would refuse to have in the file for a variety of policy reasons. Typically, they don't know what the research needs would be for any particular element, they would typically want the whole file so they can prepare the linked file. Then when the linked files are released, those are subject to data element grids that would have to be indicated where the elements have to be justified. He asked if that process would be changing. The SA told Jonathan that they would probably need to talk about the data elements because what we are developing now is that we will no longer have statistical master files moving forward. The death one is the first one we are preparing and it is called the California Comprehensive Death File. It has everything from raw data from EDRS, everything that used to be on the Death Statistical Master File, plus other things such as funeral homes that were added in.

Jonathan said that he had sent the data grid to Colin and Cindy in regards to Shannon's comment she made regarding the first project.

The SA told the Committee we are in the process of revising the materials associated with the release of the data files. We will keep you apprised of those changes.

Consent Calendar

One of the things that have come with the Committee over time is when we review OSHPD related applications. The Committee is somewhat at a loss as to anything additional that they might contribute because as we discussed, they are clean, well prepared and pre-approved by OSHPD.

One of the options available to the Committee is place the OSHPD applications in a block on the agenda. You can approve them as a block, and if anyone on the Committee has a concern about any one of those applications, you can ask to have it removed from the block and

it will be discussed individually. But otherwise, you can motion to approve all the items listed in the block at one time.

The agenda needs to be posted 10 days in advance to the scheduled meeting due to the Bagley-Keene requirement. We will send a draft agenda, prior to the meeting you to have the opportunity to say if there is something you want moved out of the block and into discussion. The OSHPD materials will be available 10 days prior to the agenda posting so you would have the opportunity to move something out of the block and onto the agenda as an individual item. We won't put it in the block if you don't have the opportunity to review in advance to move out of the block. If it is a late addition, we will keep We won't put it in the block if you don't have the opportunity to review in advance to move out of the block. If it is late addition, we will keep it as an individual item. We will begin in August structuring the agenda so we would have the OSHPD applications in a block on a consent calendar.

I. MEETING ADJOURNMENT: Jonathan Teague motioned to adjourn the meeting. Sun Lee seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 A.M.