ORIGINAL

Transcript of Proceedings

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

- - -

SECRETARY'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON

AUTOMATED PERSONAL DATA SYSTEMS

- - -

Bethesda, Maryland

Friday, 29 September 1972

ACE - FEDERAL REPORTERS, INC.

Official Reporters

415 Second Street, N.E.
Washington, D. C. 20002

Telephone:
(Code 202) 547-6222

NATION-WIDE COVERAGE

CR 7337
CRAIG:
paw

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

- - -

SECRETARY'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON

AUTOMATED PERSONAL DATA SYSTEMS

- - -

The committee met pursuant to notice Mr. David B. Martin, presiding.

Montgomery Room
Holiday Inn
Bethesda, Maryland

Friday, 29 September 1972

C O N T E N T S

AGENDA:	PAGE
STATE AND MUNICIPAL INFORMATION SYSTEMS	20
Andrews O. Atkinson, Superintendent Regional Computer Center Cincinnati/Hamilton County, Ohio	20
Selma J. Mushkin Professor of Economics, Director, Public Services Laboratory Georgetown University Washington, D. C.	
Charles R. Rowan, Executive Director National Association for State Information Systems Englewood, Colorado	3
William Mitchel, Senior Consultant Claremont Graduate School Claremont, California Claremont University	49
GENERAL DISCUSSION	61

EVENING SESSION

(7:30 p.m.)

MR. MARTIN: Can we come to order, please. We will start the panel discussion of state and municipal information systems now.

The first member of the panel will be Charles R. Rowan, the Executive Director of the National Association for State Information Systems.

His presentation will include some slides, so others of us, sitting up here might want to move to the side, and then the rest of the panel can come up and sit down for the rest of the presentation when the slides are over.

MR. ROWAN: Now, that I have the coffee pot in the right place, out of the view of the slide projector, I would like to begin the discussion of state/municipal systems with an overview of what is happening in State Information Systems, and where they are at the present, and some of the trends for the future.

Some of the needs that state government and demands placed upon the states and some of the characteristics of the state government which affect the development of these information systems.

Then, hopefully, from this information on slides, and the background, a few comments will speak to the subject that you are most closely concerned with, the personal information systems.

er-2

Now, I would like to point out two things to begin with; that representing the NASIS organization, and the admininstrators of information systems in fifty states, I have nothing to sell you.

I am not asking you to buy anything. And I would like to report what we feel is happening in the 50 states, and hopefully, that will be of use to the committee in its deliberations and finally, decisions.

So, if I could have the slides, please.

(Slide.)

The 50 state governments --

(Slide.)

-- and Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa, we consider as members of NASIS, and the information systems in the States, of course, deal with Federal and local information.

Of prime importance, of course, is the fact that over 50 percent of the gunding of information systems at the state level comes from various Federal agencies.

Now, state information systems represent over $300 million a year in expenditures. So that means that 150 million of that is coming from some group of Federal agencies. Interestingly enough, and one of the problems is that it does not flow in a nicely coordinated manner.

It flows in vertical systems between the Department

r-3

of Transportation and the highway agencies, Labor Employment Security, HEW, and the welfare agencies, on, and on, and on. And there is no crosscut or horizontal coordination at the Federal level on the flow of that information or money.

Now, the prime business for state government, of course, is to serve the people in businesses that are resident within that state and provide services to the public, so that is the information that we are talking about.

(Slide.)

About people and about businesses --

(Slide.)

-- and the needs of the users and customers of state government are usually, or can be categorized in four major areas.

(Slide.)

Some of these programs we are talking abour are titling of motor vehicles, standards for businesses, leasing of public lands, licensing of business, and vehicles, assistance of welfare hospitals, service programs, including highways and education.

I think all of you --

(Slide.)

-- are pretty well aware that that is what state government does, but we might look back a little bit and see how this developed, because originally, it is a pretty

simple structure.

Originally, in a state we had a governor and state board, and the state board was the only thing between the governor and the people.

That was in the early days, --

(Slide.)

It has become a lot more complex as society had more demands, there were more services required, more dollars more departments --

(Slide.)

-- until today, we see a very complex structure in every state has something over a hundred and fifty boards, commissions, and agencies.

One state has over 300 boards, commissions, and agencies. And in one state, there are something like 80 people reporting to the governor.

Now, that group of agencies has the job of administering these programs to the people and the businesses and administering the tax dollar.

(Slide.)

The demands that are placed upon that group of agencies are primarily social, because --

(Slide.)

-- in an analysis a few years ago, we found if you take the expenditures in 50 states, nationwide, 60 percent

of the dollars spent at the state level are for what can be categorized as peoples' affairs programs. Now, I trust that that is very close to what you are calling personal programs of personal information.

The biggest function outside of peoples' affairs is that of highways, which accounts for about a quarter of the expenditures in the states.

(Slide.)

Now, if we took a look from a somewhat social standpoint of what these agencies that are spending that 60 percent of your tax money do, we might see that here is an individual who is trying to get into a permanently productive capacity in society.

Now, the reason we have a lot of thse agencies is to help him get into permanent productivity and stay there. If he falls out of productivity, we have several agencies to help return him to that capacity.

Now, health and education are ones that act on him early in his life. The other agencies may have impact on him, from time to time. One of the important things that most of you who have looked in to the state government have probably seen, is that there is very little interaction between these agencies.

They are built to serve a certain responsibility, they have their own hierarchy, their own organization, their

own goals, their own reward systems.

(Slide.)

Now, that problem, that social problem covers this broad range of agencies from 100 to maybe 400 within a state. And, as we already know, the money that comes trickling down, comes down in fragmented fashion in these programs.

This may have some unfortunate results --

(Slide.)

-- I don't know, you can probably better asses that than I can, but let us take an individual that filters through the system and has contact with many of these social programs, or agencies at the state level. He may wind up as a tremendous success, or a total failure.

But regardless of what the outcome is, if we want to go back and examine, and analyze what agency or what program contributed what to the success or failure, it is virtually impossible.

(Slide.)

Now, the same agencies that are in this structure where 60 percent of that money is spent are also competing for the limited tax dollars.

And, somebody every year, and usually it is a function between the executive and the legislative branch, has to sit down and say, this is the way it is going to be

ter-7

divided, and this is the way we are going to spend it.

Now, one of the biggest problems, I think we have, from an information systems standpoint, is providing those people who make those decisions, with some realistic and intelligently sifted information.

(Slide.)

Some of the trends that affect us -- that have affect on the system, are that by 1976, we are looking at a structure in 50 state governments where we will be serving less than 224 million people because of the zero population effect that took place after I drew the chart, and the trend is not quite that high, but something less than 220 million people; and we will be spending $129 million a year in state services, to serve those people.

And this is based on the '56 to '66 timeframe. Just taking it and extending it out, I checked on some of these figures the other day, and as of '69 we are right on target on everything except population.

The spendings go up at the same rate but population is being held down --

(Slide.)

-- major cost of state government is what we pay our employees in salaries and wages. And, in 1966, we had 1.7 million people working in state government and we paid them ten and a half million dollars. Now, the problem with this trend is that while our employment is going on

that sort of ascent, we expect that by '76 we will have 2.6 million employess, the cost of those employees is going like this --

(Slide.)

-- and I checked on these through '69, and they are both exceeding that projection. So what do we do about it? What is the legislature, the executive branch doing?

Normally, we look at it and there are three normal, general solutions in state government -- we increase taxes, we decrease the services, or we reduce costs. Now, we never come up with only one of these, we usually come up with a combination of two, or three of these in any program.

(Slide.)

And from an information systems' standpoint, we always revolve around when we look for solutions to the fact that we have to have a plan to handle this information system that is trying to serve this whole state government structure.

(Slide.)

That plan really needs to draw together the available information we have. Whether it is within a vertical program, or whether it crosses horizontally, some of these vertical programs; we still have to develop that information.

(Slide.)

This is some of the information that an average-size state, I think, most of you probably live in states with a larger population than what this was drawn for.

This is about the 24th in population. These are the finals that you have to deal with, if you are faced with this problem.

In welfare, you have got 120 thousand people in a state of about three million. Taxes -- you have got 120 thousand businesses, a state income tax, we have several hundred thousand individual personal records, professional licensing, a hundred thousand; on, and on.

Motor vehicles, of course, the major volume files, employment security; in a state of three million, has files on 900 thousand people. And 60 thousand businesses.

Now, there has been a lot of discussion, not much, about crossing some of these records, and, in sitting and listening to the conversations today, I am sure that will raise a lot of hackles on a few necks. But, there is talk about it, but there is not much action.

Mind you, I don't propose that we should go full-blast in crossing these. There are members in NASIS that think we should start that, and others who say, we should never touch it, but somewhere there is a balance in that whole strata.

(Slide.)

Another interesting fact that not too many people are aware of in state government, is we always look at the state capitol and say that is state government, that is where the people are.

But even in a state of three million, or so, the majority of state employees probably 60 percent, are not in the state capitol. They are out in the field offices of welfare, of employment, of institutions, and education systems, and field offices in workmen's compensation.

Here is just an example of this signal state, or medium size state, we look at 15 agencies and found 651 field offices, with the majority of the state employees out in those field offices.

And if you think that the systems at some state levels, at state capitols are archaic, you ought to see the field offices, because they have not had the computers and they have not had the microfilm systems, and they have not had management analysts, because they have almost always been at the state capitol.

You do see an awful lot of files and an awful lot of information and an awful tough situation for the people who have to work with that data.

(Slide.)

So, we are talking about information on people, on businesses, and internal administration of state government.

Of course, I know that this committee is most interested in personal data, so I won't dwell on the businesses of the administration side.

(Slide.)

But, from the people's standpoint, we are talking about programs of public assistance, more vehicles, institutions, education, employment, rehabilitation, et cetera.

We are talking about collecting files and records of Unemployment since, assistance benefits --

(Slide.)

-- education, driving records, et ceters --

(Slide.)

-- the question is, and I hope that you will address it so that the people at the state government level can do a better job, is, we raise the question of; "Do we link or do we not link?"

"Do we match, or do we not match?"

"Do we try to integrate systems, or do we leave them totally fragmented?"

Nobody has any answers to those questions, today. That is what puts the state administrator, who has the job of administering these information systems, in such a tough situation.

If I could have the slide projector turned off, and the lights turned up.

Just like to make a few summary comments. The key to this integration, in the minds of the people that I represent, centers on whether we can do it in a controlled environment. Now, any integration of records in an uncontrolled environment is dangerous, it is sheer idiocy, we should never let it happen, and the key is, can we do it in whatever limited fashion we decide, or whatever fashion we decide in a controlled situation?

Now, the people that I represent are looking for answers in this area, and they are the persons in the 50 states that the governors look to and the legislatures look to, to control and monitor and develop the information systems.

Remember, the average state is spending something like $6 million a year on this effort. So, it is a pretty big job. Now that man, and you have one of them on your committee, Mr. Gentile, from Illinois, is in a tug-of-war, and he is in a tug-of-war between the objectives of state government and the programs, and the technologies that say, we can do everything.

And, on the other hand, he has this fragmentation of agency directors who don't want to have anything to do with any other agencies. Who want to continue the fiefdom. Then he has got his pragmatic day to day problems of people and systems, and staying abreast of technology, and he could ignore the privacy issue at the present time, if he wants to,

because there is not that much pressure on him.

But, if he does not handle some of these crucial decisions, then the services to the public is neglected and he is not performing his function of managing those systems in order to serve the public.

e-1/s-2

Now, I am sure there has got to be some question as to what is going on in this linking and this matching area. I have talked to about eight or ten states in the last two weeks, ever since I understood I was going to appear here, and I wanted to find out what they had to say. And there is not much activity in linking information. There is some.

For example I think some of the trends that you see are -- in some states they have combined agencies in the area of human resources. In the State of Washington they combined the Health Department, the Department of Institutions and Public Welfare into one agency called Health and Social Services.

All of a sudden you have an agency director working for the governor who has all those files in his department. And when you get that situation, it makes it a lot easier if you do want to do some matching.

In Michigan there is a Governor's Advisory Committee that is working on two major areas. One is what policies should we have for administrators in the whole area of privacy and what legislation would be good.

In Illinois they have had public hearings on the subject and have some probably unique input from those public hearings that has not been available before.

In Illinois there is also the privacy project

that's jointly, or will be jointly operated between IBM and the State of Illinois which John I am sure will talk about at some point.

In Minnesota they are not linking any files in the people area but they have set up a master business index. In Minnesota there are 20 some agencies that deal with businesses. And at the present time they have a master index that will tell the administrator what information do we have and what businesses are doing business with these agencies. It is only limited to three agencies at the present time but will be expanded to 20.

In Ohio there is an encouragement for human resources agencies to include Social Security number in their records so that eventual matching or linking can be made if it is appropriate and if it can be controlled. That's largely because of pressure from various groups that would like to know when a person leaves the unemployment insurance rolls, how long is it before he goes on welfare? And what does he get on welfare compared to what he got on unemployment.

Now that's the only place that I heard that kind of stimulus, but if it is in one place, it is not far behind in the others.

In Wisconsin a couple years ago they created a data directory to tell you exactly what data elements were in every file in state government and they created it; it is

about a six-inch book and they put it on the shelf because there was so much fracas as to what they were going to use that for and how they were going to use it that they decided they better not proceed on that path any more. That may be good or it may be bad but it is an actual situation that happened.

Some of the most detailed matching that's going on is going on in the State of Iowa where the driver's license file is being used to find addresses for individual tax returns that are sent out and returned with no address, or no known address.

Then the tax agency will go to the driver file, check it and see if there is a better address, only with written approval of both agencies and the agencies actually do the compilation.

They are also matching the death indexes that are available in the Health Department with the driver license file to eliminate old drivers -- or outdated driver records, let's say driver records that will never be current again and the old first-time match was the aid to the blind file against the driver's license file.

In Illinois there is some matching between the nursing home files and the public aid files because of the responsibility to determine eligibility for nursing home patients that are on part of the public aid program.

mea-4

Okay. In summary I would just like to leave you with the fact that the man in the fifty states, has a fantastic concern for the privacy issue because he probably knows better what some of the bad effects could be than anybody in that state level. And he understands some of the dangers of going into an uncontrolled environment where we would match files and link files.

But on the other hand, he sees no real push to get into this linking and on the other hand he hesitates to move fast because he doesn't want to get cut off because somebody raises the invasion of privacy issue.

In essence, in my discussions with these administrators they would like to know the answers to some questions and I think you can help them find the answers in the area of data, what is public information, what is private information, what is good policy in this area, what is good legislation to pass around the states?

And should the Social Security number be used? How much fragmentation is good and how much integration is bad? The the guy in the state would like to have some help in finding these answers and would like to participate in developing but I don't think the leadership can come from anyplace but the federal level.

And in speaking of the federal level, I certainly hope we don't develop a privacy program for HEW, HUD,

Department of Transportation, Department of Interior, ad infinitum, but I see no controlled program to coordinate the privacy effort at the federal level. Maybe this Committee will do that. I hope so. Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Will all the other panelists please come up now? I think there is no more slide presenting, is there?

Someone has counted that after you pass the level of state government there are some 80,000 governments in the United States. And many of them are what we think of as municipal governments. No one person obviously could hope to speak authoritatively or comprehensively about all those local governments' information practices and systems.

But Andrew Atkinson, Superintendent of the Regional Computer Center for Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, can perhaps give us a picture of one of the more sophisticiated and successful efforts to apply information systems.

Andy?

MR. ATKINSON: Thank you, Dave. What I would like to do this evening is sort of strip away all the frills and discuss primarily some of the decision factors in the development of a local government management information system, a local government management information system which serves 43 independent departments, cities, villages,

townships, practically every form of local government below the state level, in trying to provide them services just described by Chuck in an effective and efficient manner.

In 1966 the problem first manifested itself when these 43 agencies and their law enforcement components petitioned the Office of Law Enforcement Administration for a grant to develop a comparative law enforcement system among the agencies. They envisioned that this would cost $2 million annually to operate a computer information system serving these 43 autonomous agencies.

OLEA was very responsive because it was a comparative coordinated effort and would serve many agencies rather than just a single agency.

But there were two problems, first of which was that they only had $7 million to spread across the whole country, so $2 million in one county was going to be hard to arrange. And secondly, the Hamilton County Police Association was not a government entity with which they could contract.

In my position as Superintendent of the Data Processing for the City of Cincinnati with a staff of one, I approached the group to see if we could redraft their application in a form that would be acceptable to OLEA and through an agency, the City of Cincinnati, which would apply for the grant.

mea-7

The grant was reworked and applied for in the sum of $125,000, a design grant to form a police information system for those 43 agencies.

As a mechanical engineer we attacked the problem just from the raw materials we had, the necessity to provide $2 million a year to operate the system and to serve the needs of 43 autonomous agencies.

The county very benevolently said since it represented all those agencies it should obviously run the system. And then we said, "Well, fine, $2 million." And then they said, well, maybe they shouldn't run the system.

So the city had already, through a consultant study, envisioned en expenditure of about three-quarters of a million dollars a year on five commercial applications, retirement system, payroll accounting, a water utility, and the city's income tax.

The county government could also envision an equal expenditure probably in the data processing activities that it needed in delivery system to its agencies.

So even ignoring law enforcement the funds earmarked for data processing in the county were well below those which would serve even a single agency in an on-line information system.

It was therefore proposed that a tax levee be placed on the ballot which would subsidize the law enforcement

component, subsidize law enforcement. It was suggested that the tax levee be scaled to provide half the cost of the center, and that the city and county rather than paying for individual systems, could share a single system which could back up the law enforcement system and satisfy the requirements of a real time on-line system, that being that you had to have a backup computer to make the information available or all records on the computer would have to be maintained manually so that questions could be answered when the computer was unavailable.

The tax levee idea was adopted; it was placed on the ballot in 1967, November 7, 1967, and passed by a whopping 53 percent. The tax levee was a modest one, three-tenths of a million. It did produce approximately $1 million annually and the city and county then signed a contract to jointly operate the center and the unique contract does not infringe in any way on the autonomy of the city or county; there were no legislative changes and all 43 agencies by virtue of the tax levee being equally taxed automatically participated, and were provided with a terminal in the system.

So this seemed the logical approach and we built the regional computer center in order to manage the center and administer the fiscal funds a control board of three city officials and three county officials was designated to monitor

ea-9

the development and operation of the center.

The system went into operation in 1969 with 90-some terminals serving the 43 agencies in law enforcement and at the same time city and county applications were developed and made operational on the backup equipment.

In 1971, the expenditures of the center were $2.2 million, $1.1 million provided by the tax levee, 500,000 from the City of Cincinnati, 500,000 from Hamilton County and about 200,000 in research and development grant funds.

So a study in 1965 which indicated that the city would pay for its commercial applications three-quarters of a million dollars, and probably that sum increased at least 25 percent with inflationary costs and so on, has never been reached yet by sharing of computer facilities.

The normal data processing in a city or county environment would be an eight-hour-a-day operation, so obviously in a 24-hour-a-day operation required for law enforcement, the backup computer system would provide 24 hours of computer services.

7337
End #2

In essence we had the foundation for an integrated regional information system. And the control board began to recognize the awesome responsibility it had for dealing with the issues of security and privacy.

As there are -- as none exist today, in 1969 no guidelines were available for security and confidentiality and it was obvious that there were many different and appropriate points of view which had to be taken into consideration. So the control board, with the assistance of the center staff, developed a data access policy which indicated that any inquiry for access on a one-time basis or on a full-time basis for exchange of information at any level, on line or actual processing would be brought before the control board once the inquiring agency had received an approval from the agency of responsibility, because again the center is just a computer utility. It has no authority to approve or restrict access to data.

So that the data access control plan provides a form and we have several copies here for those of you who might be interested, that is presented to the inquirer, he takes it to the agency of responsibility and if they agree that the inquiry is appropriate and in the best interests of the citizen then the control board as a set of checks and balances, reviews that same inquiry and must approve then the release of the information.

In many cases this has proved invaluable. An early

eak2

inquiry was from a local university who had received a grant to study problems of juvenile delinquency in the base and core area of the city.

It was obviously there for appropriate that some form of information which would -- should be made available to them to be the basis of their study. They were directed to the juvenile court and the judge approved our providing the information on all cases which had gone through the juvenile court. The control board recommended, with the -- on the advice of the staff, that before that information be released, even in magnetic tape form or statistical evaluation, that the individual name be deleted from each of the cases because it was obvious that a statistical study would not require that information.

And even though the inquirer had agreed that no work would be done on an individual basis, there was no reason to give him information on an individual basis.

So in essence, in a lot of cases where the need to know is appropriate and in the best interest, special conditions can be provided, will permit appropriate access.

The -- as the center grew it became obvious that more and more services could be provided. And once law enforcement had initiated an arrest record into the system, had introduced an arrest record into the system this was obviously all that was required to trigger the action of the entire judicial process.

So with the assistance of a research grant from LEAA we have installed and now operate a subject and process criminal justice system which takes all arrests that occur within a 24-hour basis, appropriately notifies all the agencies that if any other arrests should be included for the next day's docket that they enter those before 6 a.m. that morning.

Once they are entered at an average of about 80 arrests a day which generate a docket of about 100 cases for the criminal and common pleas court, criminal court of common pleas and municipal court, a complete docket is prepared, individual -- a complete docket is prepared for each courtroom and judge, for each individual case, an appropriate rap sheet is prepared for each individual docket.

The arrest records are prepared for the agency of record, and when the case is heard that day, the appropriate disposition is entered into the system so that a complete update and all records in the system reflect the status of the case.

In this manner, the court as did the municipalities in the original police concept are preserved in their autonomy and in fact, they don't even have to exchange information with the other branches of government. It is automatic in the process.

So that the autonomy is actually better established. In response to that is a little take off from

Judge Greene's presentation this morning but correctly applied, all the fundamental requirements of the judicial process can be safeguarded and insured and perhaps even ideally protected in a shared system or a dedicated system.

In a shared system we feel that because it brought to our attention several years ago the necessity to evaluate very carefully and not prejudge either an inquirer or -- the ability of someone to have information, but to investigate every inquiry on its merits, and even allow resubmission but not any finding is necessarily final because the whole scope and concept may change as time passes.

Again, as the center continued to grow it became obvious that there were interrelations between the files which could be very appropriately developed that would be of tremendous value to the citizens for whom we were serving.

The county auditor's property file which gave an address index, a property description of every piece of property in Hamilton County would be invaluable to the Safety Department if they received an emergency call for service, if they knew that there was a three-story frame building on there rather than a vacant lot obviously they would respond in a much different manner, what invaluable time saved which can be directly corrolated to valuable life and money. So that the control board was presented from the Hamilton Police Association with a request to make the index, the address index

and property description portion of the auditor's file available on line to police agencies. The county prosecutor was asked for a legal opinion, as agency responsibility as to whether this was appropriate. He agreed that this was a valid inquiry, was reviewed by the control board, and the address index portion of the property record is available to the dispatching agency of our local law enforcement community. They are restricted by software to the billing records and accounts receivable records that are obviously fundamental to the auditor's information but at no duplication to them automatically updated master index to all valuable property in Hamilton County.

It is always available. In fact, it is probably safeguarded much better through the computer system than if copies of the documentation were made available to police agencies because those are much more available to someone coming into the office than access to the portion of the file through the computer terminal.

Obviously these manual records wouldn't be fast enough to respond to an emergency call in an amount of time to really facilitate the use of law enforcement.

As I said when I started out, maybe from an engineering standpoint the -- a solution, or our approach to the solution of some of these projects is naive almost, in the way we went about it. But we assumed that there were valid reasons for

sharing technology and sharing computer services, the level of technology made available to small communities in Hamilton County that may have only two or three thousand population is identical to the level of services that are made available to the City of Cincinnati with over half a million population, and at no sacrifice to the individual autonomy. And once technology was a valuable sharing tool, could not information itself in appropriate environment be a valuable -- valid tool for sharing?

We feel that rather than ignoring or avoiding the issue of security and confidentiality we have built appropriate mechanisms to safeguard it. And by a concerted effort and discipline to insure the safeguards are maintained and enhanced through hardware, software and personal discipline, the entire system provides an invaluable service to the community with an effective nature which justifies its consideration.

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: That is Andy. Our next presenter is Dr. Selma J. Mushkin, an Alumni of HEW, who in recent years directed for several years at George Washington University an interesting effort to explore the possibility of introducing program planned budgeting systems in five states, five counties and five cities, came to be referred to as the Five, Five, Five Project. MOre recently Dr. Mushkin has moved to being a professor of economics at Georgetown University and director

eak 7

there of the public services laboratory which engages in a good deal of program analysis and program evaluation activity whereby Dr. Mushkin continues to be a resource benefit to municipalities and states and at the same time providing a teaching or learning environment for her students.

end 3

Dr. Mushkin?

MS. MUSHKIN: Thank you, Mr. Martin. I guess I am really performing in my role of grandma of what do you do with the data when you get it?

What happens that is different as a consequence of varying?

And I have heard two presentations and I am not sure that either one of them could answer grandma's questions, because I am not sure that varying these data did anything about crime in the City of Cincinnati.

If it did, I didn't hear it. And if it did anything about fire protection, I didn't hear it. And if it did anything about some intermediate purpose like reducing response time, I didn't hear it; and if it made better state government, I haven't heard about it recently either.

The beginning of a more systematic assessment of public programs for budget decisions has had a marked influence on federal, state and local fact gathering.

And the need for caution about automated personal data systems; for one thing it has acted as a tremendous stimulus to management information systems. And it has put a lot of emphasis on defining public service outcomes.

In terms of what happens to people. Do they learn? Do they get better? Do they commit fewer crimes? Do they ride to work more safely?

There was a time when public decisions were made

mm2

essentially on the basis of how many people around are on the payroll, and what is the total amount of expenditure.

Now a third thing that has happened as a consequence of trying to do some analysis of public services is that we have gone into longitudinal studies because we have learned that we have to have more data about the relationship between services and what happens to people.

Still another thing that has happened and that is the experimentation with policy practices.

And then, of course, my own bag, of trying to get governments to look ahead a little bit. The Swiss Statewide INformation Systems were set up in a number of states, and financed, as has been indicated, primarily by federal grants in aid.

And I must say my friends at IBM and other hardware companies encouraged this.

Because the defining of information requirements is difficult enterprise, the national government really turned initially to the states and cities and said, give us the data. If anybody believes that the federal government did not just check the problem to the states, or the cities, all one has to do is look at the requirements of the old Model City Program.

Those Model Cities were required to report on things they could not possibly have known about.

mm3

Now, where are we today with respect to management information systems?

I think we are still in the place of not knowing what it is that we really like to collect data about. We don't have the standard definitions for specific program contents, and everyone is much more concerned about setting up that computer than they are about defining in a hard way, standardized components of public activity on an outcome basis.

Now, let's take a look at the measuring of outcome. Part of the difficulty we have originates with the fact that the concepts of human services are very complex. Let me just quickly run through the education problem.

We started with educational outcomes being defined as earnings and employment and years of schooling.

We moved, of necessity, to achievement test scores.

And then because reading test scores were in widespread use, we used those.

More recently we have discovered that we need new kinds of measures of outcome and we started again to define what is the measure?

How can we test it?

How can we get it out there in a way that will tell us whether something different is happening about children?

mm4

A word about longitudinal studies. We have tried to, at each stage, decide what kind of program inputs create what kinds of outputs. And we have done this largely with massive statistical analysis.

But always there is the doubt that those particular resources didn't really enter into the education, for example, of the child or didn't enter into the medical care system for the individual that got better or got sicker.

As a result, we now have a whole series of longitudinal studies that create new needs for safeguarding data. And any state system that really asks what are we getting for what we experienced, I think ultimately too will turn to longitudinal study.

And the same thing is true of experimental ventures.

For these reasons, I think we really have to ask what is it that we want by way of data?

What is it we know can be achieved by data?

What difference would there be if we had it?

What would you really do with it if you had it?

And, unless grandma gets answers to those, she is not sure that the information systems are worth having.

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Selma.

Our next speaker will be Myron Weiner, who is Associate Extension Professor at the Institute of Public

mm5

Services, University of Connecticut, who has for some years, been actively engaged in the study and application of information systems at the state and local level, and I think Myron plans to give us a view of an ideal future as he sees it.

MR. WEINER: Thank you, Dave.

xxx

I am going to stand up, number one.

Number two, I only have 15 minutes, which means I am going to talk very fast, and I apologize in advance.

I have to add something to this, Dave, if you don't mind. I am with the University, but I don't teach any academic students at all, and I don't even teach on campus. I teach city government professionals out in the field. I work with them designing systems for them, systems that involve computers. And when I am talking about technology today, I am talking about what I call automation and flotation:

The communication of data in either a symbolic form or in a whole image form, a visual form.

Prior to that I worked for state and local government, so I am not really academic, and I have to say that to mark myself.

I don't want to pick on anybody on this panel, but I also want you to know that the axe I have to grind is fundamentally different. The kind of person I am concerned

about is one who is concerned about being out there in local government on a day-to-day basis, so that I don't even like to use the word information systems. I don't even like to use the word management information system.

I am sorry, in my opinion, after 20 years of working in this field, I don't think there is anything as a management information system. I think all of us here are walking management information systems.

Let me start from the beginning. I mailed something out, Dave did for me, and I hope you read it. I made that assumption you did, because in that is a publication I am about to write, which I am finished writing in this field.

In this I call government automation 2,002, not because I am trying to talk about something futuristic, but something available today, but improbable to do before 2,002.

I didn't tell you why I think it is going to take until 2,002 at the earliest to do, part of which is some of the problems you are dealing with.

I am not even going to deal with your problem.

I am dealing with what has to be done out there as far as I am concerned.

First, let me describe my motto. It is fundamentally different than what we have ever done before. What do you do with a computer, what do you do with a communication systems in local government?

mm7

What you put down is generally public safety subsystem, human resources subsystem, public finance subsystem. The mind rejects completely functionalism. As far as I am concerned, it is the greatest impediment the hierarchical principles of organizational management, which we inherited and needed at that time from our friend Taylor, or outmoded in the kind of society we have got to build ourselves as we head for the 21st Century.

So my motto is based completely on a nonfunctional basis. What we are concerned about in government, and I named five things, I am only going to elaborate on one, and what do you do with a computer?

I will start with the later one. I put this here, I hope someone might have had a chance to look at it. There are three uses of computers as far as I am concerned in a government, city government.

The first is a direct use by the citizens themselves, and I gave you a list in here which indicates this ishow the citicen himself has a right to use a computer in his -- right in his own home or in his institution.

I categorize them as: An instructor, as a searcher, as a community resources, service resources, as a personnel scheduler, as a personnel planner, and record keeper, as a dispatcher.

I am not concerned about who needs what for data.

mm8

I am talking about, there is no need for anyone to have to go and register in any more schools, which most of us do. No need to walk into City Hall and pay. We have the capability for people to be able to, right in their own home, do this through technology we have.

Incidentally, the only difference is this came from the Jonathon Project right outside of Minneapolis. And they categorize this a little differently.

They did the same identical thing. We have the prsonnel dispatcher for fires right in the home. When something goes off in your home, the fire department notices it immediately because it has this capability.

The interesting thing here, they feel that the computer should be run by what they call the community information system. I felt that the computer should be run by the local government.

Now we could argue over that. I am not even going to attempt to get into that, because as far as I am concerned -- and also in Dr. Goldmark's article in Scientific American, he did the same thing. They have community information centers, I am not talking about. I am talking primarily about automation for two purposes. And you saw part of it, because Chuck started off immediately.

One is automation for productivity. Okay. Although that is dollar oriented, that is not my major concern.

mm9

My major concern for automation and productivity is the concern for most human beings in government mental institutions, who are automatons.

They are doing things human beings should not be doing, because they are not doing the things human beings should be doing. Okay.

So the two prime concerns, although I am very concerned about that tremendously widening gap in the lack of productivity in government, my basic concern is getting the human potential we have in government mental organizations capturing that for doing human kind of things.

I gave you, when you go beyond the direct use of a computer -- in other words computer is searching titles.

Some of you think I am in a legal field. There is no reason in the world why companies can't search titles, or real estate companies can't get this information directly, or the data directly into their offices. They do not have to send someone over there and spend the physical and psychic energy of going through big volumes of books and so forth.

I am suggesting to you that it not only isn't necessary, it will not be done.

end #4

CR7337
Craig 5
bl

The second major use of a computer in government is to expand the professional accounting capabilities. Here is where I differ with my friends when we use the word "management information system".

I break the word "mangement" down into the normal levels we have been used to doing. The first level is the operational level. People on the operating base are concerned with managing what they set out to do. And I elaborate exactly what that's meant in here.

I give an area, it concerns itself with accidents. Okay. I am concerned what happened when an accident occurred. Generally in most cities when an accident occurs, is you go out, take care of the bodies, take care of the streets, and that's the end of it.

You should go far -- we have the capability of going far beyond that, using what I call "liberal concern", liberal meaning that if Dave does not need any help, then we do not have to provide him any help. He has a family to provide him help.

A crisis occurs in his family when an accident occurs and you go beyond -- you have someone you outreach to his family or to him at that time. And it goes through a whole series of things. This is as simple as notifying a family support worker in the middle of the night to get out, you have a problem. And start working with this problem and

alerting and dispatching ambulances, turning on and off lights, getting medical records to people so doctors don't have to operate in the dark.

All these kinds of things that are cited right in here we have that capability of doing.

We also have the capability of doing what I call management control level.

Management control is someone who is concerned, he has set objectives for a certain amount of money. How can I make the most of that money? It's a scenario that concerns itself with social services. You call it services integration.

When you have a situation as in the Greater Hartford Process Report where they have 500 separate institutions in the Hartford area providing different social services for people, obviously you have to find some way. And this is going on out there.

The problem isn't just in the city manager's office. Yet, when he says "I wish people would come out and find what we are doing," we recognize the comprehensive services have to be delivered and we are delivering them.

The biggest problem we have got is it's slow. We have a tremendous amount of problems with the kind of technology we use today. They today are sharing that kind of data they feel they have to give in order to provide services.

Yet, to do it with the controls they exercise, happens to be a city manager with a very dynamic community

with an awful lot of problems that are the cutting edge in most of America.

The third kind of level of expanding a professional capability is in what I call strategic planning. Here, while the first two are symbiotic relations, meaning they sit down at the table and there is a computer there just like the telephone is there, and they interact with it, they range all over the community, not just the city government, they range all over that community, any institution they want with control set up.

And I have no question in my mind that the proper controls will be, because we have rational minds and there is danger in everything. Danger in sending my daughter down the street on a bicycle, and I concern myself about that. But, you know, if you don't want to face a complex society, there is one thing to do, and that's get out of it.

But we live in a complex society so I am not concerned about ranging, letting the computers do the walking through the community, not just the local government.

The only one that is not symbiotic is strategic planning. Here you can't get away from someone who has to range through the data to be able to see patterns through the community. Here, if you want to call it management information, perhaps that it is.

I think each of us individually have towns in that

area or don't have towns. There is one other third category.

First was director, second was management responsibility, third is organizational responsibility.

I gave a long list here of what kind of organizational support you can provide that the computer should provide. Routing, scheduling networking. By the way, we are doing good things in America in this collectively, in my opinion.

These fellows, both Cluck and Andy, tell you quite a bit. Automatic.

I would like someone to record how much physical energy is being spent in a community making duplicate maps -- fantastic amounts of money. It's ridiculous how we are spending money. We don't have that kind of resources in our community any longer.

Handling warroom, and a warroom, by the way, is used believe it or not in the north in the snow. That is a warroom kind of atmosphere because you are fighting against everything that is against you and they need certain kinds of capability.

Knowing your community resources presses memory of situations. Community resources even reach in Hawaii.

I have got a strike situation here. Who in the community can help me solve that? We have tremendous resources in the community.

One other area in organization support is in the

area of what I call supportive staff. We unfortunately have what we call merit systems. A personnel person should be an employee development officer. I won't get into that particular area.

You have to understand what I am basically saying to you, I am basically saying that fundamentally technology is an extension of man. I would defy any of you in this room, and some of you I know, all of you are sharp as anything, I defy any of you to try to give me a cost justification if tomorrow the President says "I feel there should not be anything such as telephones or wireless radios in America any more. We are going to eliminate them. However, I am a nice guy. I am going to pay you the amount of money you feel you need in order to run your organization without them."

I defy you gentlemen and women that you cannot give any cost justification in that kind of situation because it's an extension of you. Getting rid of a telephone for the way you operate, it not only changes the method of what you do, it changes the whole form and favric of what you are doing.

Any technology is going to do that as much as computer technology. So far as I am concerned we see it already, you know. It's here.

My kid is two weeks into school and he already is on a computer at Penn, working in a classroom. I can't get in the State of Connecticut after ten years -- I can't get --

maybe out of about 1,000 employees I might have two who know how to program. I mean use a scientific computing language. These are the guys running, and they are fairly decent, you know, they are all intelligent guys. I am just telling you that these are coming.

The idea that when we reach for a telephone today we are going to have that old thing called computer. We are so used to it we are -- it's going to be invisible as far as we are concerned. Hey, that leaves us with a lot of problems a what a lot of problems, but this is what -- it's almost what Jack says, we don't even control technology. We have got to catch up with it in order to turn -- it has bad effects, any technology obviously has bad effects.

But you have got to be positively oriented toward what it can do for you. And it has fantastic capabilities in making a municipality of greater resources than it does today.

There is one other thing, let me finish with that. Two things, if I may:

The first is that fundamentally when you follow through technology, it changes the roles of professional people. And in this, my short dissertation to you, I told you or I listed the 20 municipal professions today, listed what their roles were fundamentally. Then I told you what really is happening today in terms of how that is being changed.

All right. By the technology of the communications and computer, what I call automation and photomation processes.

For example, I was pleased when I saw the city manager in Boulder, Colorado, the first in the United States who said that the -- he advertised for a financial director and did not advertise for an accountant. Because we don't need an accountant. Technology can do any accounting. I need what we call a public economist and fiscal advisor.

I am suggesting to you in this list here, if you follow through every profession you will find you change fundamentally the professional roles of these people.

For example, and I elaborate here, what really is the role of a librarian in a community? To keep a bunch of books? Well, that is what most librarians in America think today, but not the ones on the cutting edge.

The ones on the cutting edge recognize in terms of the cultural stimulation of that community, in terms of the continuing education of that community, whether we are talking about drug education, health education, job education, those librarians on the cutting edge, they are out there already.

I am not a great seer as far as I am concerned. I can only record what I see out there. And the cutting edge of certain professions, you find them already changing the roles. Generally what happens in the history of the way things go, this is a lag. And the last point I would like to

make, and I am sorry I talk fast, but I only had 15 minutes, and I am sorry I talked loud, I thought the air conditioner was going to be on, but it was off, so I kept on going.

Anyway, I just want to make one last note.

I am programmed -- I am sorry about that, Bill -- there is one thing at least in my 20 years of monkeying around with this: I've come to certain conclusions. I have come round to a conclusion on one thing. That is while this technology -- let me read it to you --

While this technology can form what is done today better, cheaper and more effectively, the real potential of this technology will be to do what heretofore has been impossible.

Thank you.

lmil

MR. MARTIN: Our last panel presenter will be William Mitchel, who is now a senior consultant at the Claremont Graduate School, although seldom to be found in Claremont, California, since he is virtually full-time occupied in Washington as a consultant to the USAC project, about which members of the committee have heard testimony at earlier meetings. Bill had a great deal to do with conceiving USAC and he will speak a bit about the relationship between information systems and service delivery systems and probably other matters.

MR. MITCHEL: Thank you, Dave. Your letter to me gave me a chart. I will read it, concentrate on the relationship of information systems to service delivery systems as a means of defining problems and identifying solutions thereto. I would like to take an analytic approach as against the descriptive approach of my colleagues.

I might add I find myself in even more difficulty than Myron, in that I am older than Myron and I find it very difficult to do anything any more in 15 minutes, but within those -- it really isn't funny. But I want to take an analytic approach. In a sense what I want to do is to provide you with the intellectual framework in thinking about the problems of security and confidentiality.

And in western lingo, I have "bellied up" to this problem now for about six and a half or seven years. And

2mil

it has plagued me and plagues me today, and I would like to leave with you the concept of being plagued and the feelings of frustration that grow about addressing this problem. I think I want to start then talking a very little bit about the concept of the delivery system itself.

What I would call the delivery system environment characterizes an urban society. We need to think about our society primarily today as a service society. If we thought about it in terms of a productive society, material things, we would not be here, we would not be concerning ourselves with human beings and their problems. We are dealing then in a service society with incredibly complex needs. We do not understand, and I think that my colleague in talking about we don't know what we need in the way of information had in the back of her mind a recognition of the incredible complexity and the problems in attempting to identify the inter-relationships of that complexity of service systems. It requires, for example, it seems to me in some broad general terms, a tying-together of past, present, and future. The processes of government are the processes of linking the past experience with the future decision in terms of some future state of affairs.

And these future states of affairs in our society deal with the condition of human beings. They deal, for example, in the human resource area with the uncycling

of the human being, moving him from a dependent status, unhappy status and into presumably a productive and increasingly happy status.

The government's role I see as three in this emerging society of the service needs.

In the first place I see it in a supportive role for people who have fixed needs. Social Security Administration dedicates almost its entire time to the supportive role. The supporting of the blind in New Mexico is a supportive role.

A second role is where the government assumes that it will change the life style of its citizens presumably for their benefit. We have a series of programs, rehabilitation programs, welfare programs, educational programs, a spectrum of programs which relate themselves and have -- the reason for their existence is the attempt to change the life style of our citizens.

The third grouping that we have and which we must deal with is what I would call the containment or the control functions for the benefit of other citizens and here we are talking about the whole area of criminal justice.

The goal is not to change the individual, as much as it is to change, to contain him so that he doesn't affect the lives of other individuals, and these are fundamentally different orientations.

We also have clearly in the service society a swiftly changing set of values, in terms of which we plan, judge and evaluate. It seems to me that as you contemplate security and privacy, the problem of values and the changing of those values will plague you.

Let me share with you a specific example. Ten years ago information relating to a pregnant female -- it is difficult not to have one being pregnant and not be female, I suppose, but there are those that aspire to that condition -- but in any event 10 years ago, 10 years ago this would have been unacceptable record in Santa Monica. Today it is an acceptable record. One thinks nothing at all about being identified as pregnant and unmarried.

So that values then induce themselves into what is confidential and what is to be an invasion of our notions of privacy.

The second aspect of this societal view is what I would call the processes of the delivery systems themselves in contradistinction to the actual service that is delivered. Processes of the delivery system break into about six parts. The problem is definition. What is it that the government -- that government is about? What kinds of problems do we have? Can we bring them into sharp enough focus that we can arrange our resources and allocate them in some meaningful fashion?

mea-3

The second step in that process of delivery system is the Gold definition.

The third is what I would call the decomposition, from policy to pill. This process must go on.

The fourth step is cybernetic evaluation, the need for feedback, the recomposition in a fundamentally different fashion to see where it is that we have gone and how far we have from whatever it is that we aspire to.

The fifth aspect of the delivery systems process is the multiple service recipient. Let me share here a fundamental issue. It is not true in our society that the service needs of its citizens tend to be unified needs, cycling around a single program. The individual who lives in a publicly financed house does not in the receipt of that service satisfy his requirements. To the contrary, it is almost impossible to find the recipient of a single delivery system.

The individual who needs assistance in his public housing needs assistance with family planning, with preimposed natal care, with education, probably has a child that's afoul of the law and another child in difficulty with his educational system and is an underachiever, probably has a broken family, needs mental health assistance; that's the profile.

Ninety-six percent of the individuals in St. Paul, for example, that are recipients of a single delivery system

have recipients of multiple delivery systems. Each of them operate in isolation, each of them dealing with that particular client as if that particular delivery system were all that was necessary to encycle that individual.

The sixth aspect of our delivery system processes as I see them today is that they are multijurisdictional and just as the programs themselves have impact on the individual in a random fashion, so the jurisdictions themselves are random and I brought with me tonight 15 and a half pages listing for example for the Chattanooga area 700 and some odd agencies delivering systems in one fashion or another, the purpose of which is either to contain the individual, to encycle the individual or to support the individual and there is no relationship between these 700 agencies. Indeed this is the first inventoring of those agencies. That is the problem.

Now, I suggest to you if one thinks about the delivery system in this fashion, one needs to then recognize that the energy that drives, the lifeblood of those systems, is information, is data. Essentially it is a series of symbol systems.

And I would like here then to invite your attention to a second complexity in privacy and confidentiality and that is the distinction between symbols or data and the informational content of that data.

ea-5

And these are the two distinctly different phenomena. They are not the same. Only in the human being is there a simultaneous translation from symbol to meaning.

The computer deals with a finite universe, the data, whatever that data series might be. We can define it in metadata terms; we can describe it and we can scientifically reproduce it. The informational content of that data depends entirely on the values, attitudes, skills, orientation and purposes of the individual who receives it. Therefore what might not be confidential information on one interpretation or one infusion of meaning into the symbol, the same symbols, in the possession of another individual would not be a breach of confidentiality whatever the standard might be. And that meaning universe is the universe that has infinity as its boundaries; it is not defined.

Therefore in a sense you are dealing with the infusion of meaning into symbols and you are dealing then in a sense with almost indefinable boundaries.

If we look then at these symbol systems, these data processes that drive the delivery systems, the energy that's required to process the symbols is a majority of the energy required to deliver the services.

In the case of the average welfare worker, she spends approximately 68 to 70 percent of her time, somewhere in that neighborhood, processing symbols and 30 percent of

her time -- in a study we made of the childrens' hospitals some years ago 87 percent of the registered nurse's time was spent dealing with symbols and 17 percent having hands on relationship with the patients that needed her care and her support.

This characterizes local governments. Most local governments spend the majority of their energies in the processing of data. Even an extremely efficient police department will spend between 25 and 30 percent of its uniformed police time in the processing of symbols.

The environment then of local government is the environment of data and the translation of that data into meaning. It is resource consuming. It has about it the peculiar characteristic called commonality. The same data in data terms can be used by the planner, by the police officer, by the fire chief, by the city manager, and by the assessor. We can use assessment data and come within accuracy of .5/10ths of one percent of a projection of population based on assessment data. We do not need the census.

Yet the data is equally of utility to the assessor. And his assignment of real property values, the utility of data and the ability to infuse that data with meaning is a function of the ability to link at the local government level and one can link in three ways. One can link in terms of a land parcel or geographic area; one can link in terms of an

individual and one can link in terms of an event. These are the raw structures in terms of which the computer becomes a cost benefit,justifiable, meaningful device in providing energy to the delivery systems.

By the very fact that one enhances the utility of data by that linking mechanism also permits the derivation of meaning which you I presume are concerning yourself with and that is how does this then intrude into whatever it is we think of as privacy and what is it that it does to our sense of confidentiality.

And we have a paradox in that the ability to link makes more effective the delivery systems because it makes more effective the processes that drive the delivery systems and permits the delivery of those systems in that decomposition from policy to pill.

But it also permits then and admits of the possibility of its perversion to purposes which we do not wish to have.

And I see then in the minute that I have left, Dave, that the major problem that confronts a society dealing with confidentiality, and it is just as true here as it is in Europe where I spent some time this spring looking at their problems, is on the one hand our society cannot continue to provide the services to our citizens that we believe necessary and available in a post-industrialized

society. We are going to deliver those services.

And Chuck Rowan indicated what happens when we do not automate the information processes. The costs are a astronomical.

On the other hand the only way in which we can improve the delivery systems is through the integration of data and with that integration of data comes the possibility, potential, for substantial disfunctional results.

I do not see then the problem, and I want to share with you that problem; I do not see the problem as one of presuming that computers are bad. I share here the view of Mr. Weiner: they are inevitable; they are appropriate; we cannot do without them.

The problem then becomes how does one restructure the equities. How does one bring into balance the human being with a new technology.

The real issues then as I see it are for example the balancing of those equities. I think here the inherent trade pattern is inevitable. One gives up something to get something; there is no such thing as a free lunch.

I suggest that your attention be directed to the security of pluralism. Pluralism of policy and pluralism of institutions.

Indeed in our society probably the essential recognition and acceptance of pluralism because the

pluralism of our governmental institutions reflects a pluralism of values, and values are at the basis of what we consider security or confidentiality. It seems to me that the only constant I find and one I would invite your attention to is that of due process and explicit recognition of what the constraints are on the computer technology, and that this be in a pluralistic fashion.

Let me suggest if I might in closing the difficulties in establishing what is a policy on security. I read your manifesto. I found three things of interest.

In the first place the charge that was given to you was not that of a jury to decide on guilt but rather guilt was presumed and your charge was to establish the penalty inherent.

Second and of even greater interest to me was in the carrying out of this charge you established a list and in that list you asked for the name of those people who have violated a security provision in an institution. And I wonder if you have the right to know whether I have or have not violated a security provision.

7337
End #6

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: We invited a number of people to be here as observers and resource persons. discussants, persons who might be interested. I don't know if any have arrived, but I would like to briefly state who we invited, so if they are here, they will feel free to participate.

Bob Chartrand (?) of the Congressional Research Service, at the Library of Congress. I do know three gentlemen from Public Technology, Inc., who came to represent our invitee, who was Porter Homer. Their names are Will Wynne, Nelson Hoyt, and George Howe.

Mark Keane, the Executive Director of the International City Managers Association. Edward Lehan, Program Manager, local Government office of Intergovernmental Science Research Utilization of the National Science Foundation.

Clarke Reninger, Acting Assistant Chief of the Automated Data Processing Management Information Systems Policy, in the Office Of Management, Budget; Executive Office of the President, and J. Ward Wright, Project Director of the National Cities.

They may be here.

If any of those gentlemen are here, would you raise your hand.

Well, the gentlemen from Public Technology are here, yes, all right, our invitees did not show.

ter-2

Who would like to break the ice on questions and discussion.

John?

MR. GENTILE: Actually, I would like to answer a question very articulately put, by Dr. Mushkin. Dr. Mushkin asked what does state government do with information systems; and I have to add, that I am in the cornfields of Springfield, Illinois, when I am not here, out where some of the people live, they don't all live in Washington.

And there is something more to information systems than master plans. And when I am not here hob-nobbing with master plannners, and the thinkers, and dealing in value judgments, which I feel are very important, there are certain things that I do, out in the state that other people in state government do, and in Illinois for example, some of the things are:

Number one, we license drivers, we provide drivers' licenses for 7.2 million people. We also issue welfare checks to 200 thousand people a month. We pay 700 thousand medical payments each month in the hope that the service providers will provide these services again to our needy people

We have a system that can printout all of the statutes or selected statutes of the State of Illinois in Braille, so that a blind attorney can still be productive

in our society. We have what is called the Plato System, which helps educate children. My point in giving all these examples is that there is something else to information systems other than master planning and a global view, it helps us do our job and our job is to provide direct services to the citizens of Illinois.

And, as President of NASIS, especially, I felt obligated to answer your question.

MS. MUSHKIN: May I respond so we can break out the difference here?

I think John and I can do this. You do know how many welfare checks you issue, and I daresay, you even know how much you spend.

You don't know, however, what proportion of poor people in the state are on your welfare roles. So that if your governor wanted to look at that poll and put the welfare checks in context, he would not have a baseline to do it with. There is nothing in your information system that provides this baseline for policy.

MR. GENTILE: Well, in response to that comment, I would like to add that our first objective is to feed the hungry people. And that it would be wonderful if we would and if we could and we are working on that.

We have some definite programs, to find out who are the poor people and how are they defined, and this is

ter4

a very mobile group of people; who is poor -- who is poor or classified as poor last month is different than who is classified as poor this month. Buc my primary point is that in state and local governments, different from Federal government, we have an objective to deliver something to a person as opposed to Government.

MR. ROWAN: I would like to follow on that comment, if I may. If you use the definition of poor, that I understand the sociologists use in HEW, that it is X number of dollars a year, for a family, in 1961, there was a system in the State of Washington that in addition to paying a hundred thousand checks a month, you could analyze the entire file as to what was on the line, who was off it, who was below it.

And there were analyses being run because the state wanted to know not because anybody else wanted to know. So, I have to differ with that, if you are going to define poor, there are systems that can tell you that information.

MR. DOBBS: Mr. Rowan, what did they do with that information? What did the state having found, you know, by virtue of the analysis you have just described, you know, certain kinds of answers; what did they then do?

MR. ROWAN: The point is, that is an example, they did not do that specific example, they could have,

ter-5

because the file was there.

I will give you an example of something they did do with the file and that was the work -- work program; taking people off of the roles and putting them to work was originally tried there because they had the information to determine who might be able to work, from the income information, the basic data was provided from the case workers.

When vocational rehabilitation said to the Department of Public Assistance, we can remove five million dollars from the welfare roles, the Public Welfare people took their parameters that they were basing their decision on, ran them against the files, and determined that certainly, if we added some vocational programs, we could reduce the roles by a million dollars, but not five million.

And they did some of that type of analysis. Now, there are not very many states where that goes on, because most are concerned with pumping out checks. But it is possible and it has been done in some states.

MR. DOBBS: I guess just to pursue the point, because I -- I have some conflict or whatever it is, in the sense that I am really in sympathy with John's sort of litany, of the hard bread-and-butter, full, of what he has to do, and I guess, one of the things that has concerned me is that we hear an awful lot about management information

systems. We have not heard anybody really tell us what that is, you know, I am not now attacking state and local government kinds of systems as a particular example.

It is really a much broader, much more general problem, because the kind of rationale that we have heard for collecting a variety of information has in many instances been based on the presumption that, if you collected it that you had something that was called a management information system, which would, in fact, then help you to make better and more rational kinds of decisions.

And, I guess that my problem is in those instances where such capability has been available. I see scant evidence for me that indicates that, in fact, there have been any, quote, "better," or any more rational kinds of decisions being made.

And, you know, so, in a sense, if people like John can spend their money effectively in making sure that people who need the direct service, you know, and see that they get it; I would sort of really prefer that the money go that way, than on some other area.

I am not articulating it very clearly -- I am kind of tired and it is kind of late, and I am confused, but, maybe you get the gist.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. De Weese?

MR. DE WEESE: I just want to add one more thing

to that. I think we are all concerned about something that Mr. Mitchel said here, that a vast percentage of the time of any state or local government official is spent massaging or using data.

And, I am concerned that computerizing is not saving the guy time which is what John's type of program does. But, just generally he is spending more time massaging sort of useless information, which noone uses to make any decision.

MR. MITCHEL: Could I answer that for a moment?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. MITCHEL: I concur, we don't know what management information systems are; number two, the point I tried to make was that while the use of computers is valuable in the delivery system, it is essential to effective delivery systems. That the translation, then, of the information processed to deliver these services, translate that into some meaningful planning process, involves the linking mechanism which we have not yet achieved, and there it seems to me, is the crux of the security problem.

In that one, to establish Dr. Mushkin's view, how well are we doing rather than we issued a hundred thousand welfare checks, how well are we doing in uncycling the individual, requires then that we track that individual linearly as in the case of Chattanooga, through some 200 to

250 agencies, and that it also, in addition to tracking, if we are going to be effective, provides -- must provide us with other kinds of information.

There is the paradox.

MR. DE WEESE: I would venture to say anybody who has worked in the welfare field can tell you already where the individual goes.

MR. MITCHEL: No, this is what we do not know. I am not suggesting even that we ought to do that. I am suggesting if we don't do that, then we can not answer Dr. Mushkin's question, how well are we doing.

All we can say is, we are issuing so many welfare checks. The delivery system, in the delivery system, the issue of confidentiality does not come up nearly as readily as it does in the evaluation of delivery systems or the tying and fusing of multiple delivery systems, which are essential for Type II type of condition, and that is where we are attempting to recycle that individual back into a productive member of his society.

That is where the issue falls. In case of containment, the law says, we will have information on that man.

In the case of sustaining the individual, there is no problem of providing a welfare check to a diabetic, blind in New England. It is not a confidentiality problem.

MR. WEINER: May I react? Mr. Dobbs and Bill Mitchel, the term maintenance information system is a generic term. Please stop thinking in that way. If you take management --

MR. DOBBS: I won't take it if people won't say it.

MR. WEINER: O.K. There is no such thing as management information system unless you break the word management down. It is conditionally traditionally broken down into three types of management. When you talk about I am concerned about putting out certain number of pay checks and that is my responsibility and I have gotten people in charge of it so many checks to put out we have, that is an operational kind of a job. All right. I am in charge. So much money, certain things I have to do. We have management information systems because they know immediately how many checks go out whether I got them out on time, the amount of money. I don't call that management information, that is already built in.

If you go up a level with someone concerned with what they call the whole control over a series of programs we have those already automated. I don't call that management information systems. The only think you can restrict yourself to management information system is that if you take today take and try to manipulate it so it gets patterns, that I must tell you we run into two problems in government today. The first is get this, this gets to Mr. De Weese's problem,

the first problem is that most of the time we have to spend in manipulating the data ourself, we have no automatic way of doing it, and we are bogged down trying to do that. The second is frankly its a bigger problem, most of the generation out there are unidimensional in their thinking in terms of management. A police chief thinks of one thing when crimes go up, I need more policemen. A fire chief thinks of one thing when the fires go up, I need more fireman. When, in fact, if he knows how to manipulate data as college kids could, he begins to see that it's not a crime problem, it's a recreational problem. Indeed, in the City of Hartford, dire department, they have a recreational unit because they discovered that that was taking care of their false alarms and vandalism in fire areas.

The data that Bill talked about Mr. De Weese, in terms of the automania, it's not high fluting data today. Just go into the office, watch the time it takes for a girl to walk down the hall, pick something up, write it five times on five pieces of paper. The five of us getting paid $25 an hour can sit while we say, hey Ginny, will you go down and pull these things together. We are back in the 19th century in the way we call them data manipulations. The actual recording, the movement, the filing, the retrieving of what is pieces of paper and on that paper are symbols that someone has got to put together. That may not be data manipulation as you call it.

I don't use the term data manipulation for that.

MR. DE WEESE: Did you need a computer to tell you that juvenile deliquency is related to lack of recreational facilities?

MR. WEINER: Believe it or not, that may seem common sense to you, but I would like to take you to budget hearings where a police chief pounds the table.

MR. DE WEESE: There is a problem he has but doesn't have anything to do with couputer information.

MR. WEINER: It's not a crime problem I could beat it into the ground because I don't have the data information to support it. There isn't a recreational program, I am sorry, there are less than five recreational programs in city government in the United States that have any use of data processing today. O.K. That is an area I know. So, if I stood up and said, hey, that's a recreational problem, I couldn't back it, he'd say prove it.

MR. DE WEESE: So you come in with all this computer jargon.

MR. WEINER: I just want facts. I don't care about computer jargon. I want data and I ain't got time to implement data in recreation, I am out on the street trying to provide service. That is the way it is. By the way, I don't mean to tear them down, they are tremendous guys. As a matter of fact, the only decent person who ever began to play around with

computers in recreation, Bill Harvey, they laughed her out, all they are doing with human beings, dealing with them as machines, most recreation directors, I have got activities if you don't want to do it I will get somebody else to do it. Hey, I'm sorry to react that way, but they don't have anybody with the tools.

MR. MITCHEL: Incidentally, I don't think you can establish empirically that -- what the correlation is between recreation and crime patterns without data. And to say intuitively that you think there is a relationship is really not particularly a healthful statement, even to the city manager, the city council, the police chief or recreational director. This is not good enough. One doesn't solve problems that way.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: I have been sitting here, you know, blowing my mind trying to understand especially what you two are saying. I am sure it must be something terribly serious. But, I hear you say let me turn to Mr. Weiner, I hear you saying things about the police chief who doesn't know what his situation is with respect to various aspects of his job for example, he doesn't know the relationship between rise in crime and decline in recreational facilities. And largely because he doesn't have the data which in turn is a function of the fact that he doesn't know how to use modern tools. And I hear Weiner say that there are five cities in the United

States which have a certain property and that all police chiefs have certain properties and that no firemen or no fire chiefs know this and that and so on.

MR. WEINER: You are misreading me.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: This is what I thought I heard you say. You have made statements very much like this. I must assume, I must assume on the basis of your own logic if I heard you correctly at all, that you have some giant computer system somewhere that you have done an enormous computer analysis of all cities in the United States and so on, that you derive the evidence for these enormous generalizations that you have made on the basis of these analyses that you urge on us so rigidly.

MR. WEINER: Let me ask, I know recreation, I can answer you categorically in recreation. We know from reports that are made the use or misuse of computers in police. We know also that we have outstanding examples in the United States where people with knowledge are able to use modern tools, but we also know that in most instances that we come across and we visited many places this is not true. So, I am not giving you the aim of a researcher in any great detail. I am telling you based on the experience that I have had over these past years in the cities that I have come across, having devoted my time for the past X number of years, this is a general pattern that we have hit. I don't say it with any

kind of accusation, I just accept it as the condition of what exists.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: You just said you know you say we know. I don't know exactly who we are.

MR. WEINER: Leave it to me, I know.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: You know this and you know it on the basis of many years experience, so on and so forth. Now I believe you. I believe you. I have no reason not to. But then why do you disbelieve the fire chief, you haven't claimed to know anything about fire prevention. Why do you disbelieve the fire chief, who, in order to become chief must have been in the fire prevention business 20 years and who can say, I know about fires not in the whole United States but in my city. I have been in it for 20 years on the basis of my experience. I know this, that the others think. Then, you come along and say he can't possibly know because he doesn't have --

MR. WEINER: I didn't say that. No sir. I said in the case of the Rand report in New York City when asked what was the response to the fact that in 30 minutes they couldn't respond to a fire the response was we need more fire personnel. The fire commissioner, it's my understanding as to the report made by Rand Committee, the fire commissioner said that can't be the categorical answer. We must have another answer and they found other answers.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: O, that's a very, very different response.

MR. WEINER: I am sorry if I gave you the impression --

MR. WEIZENBAUM: Seems to me that is a very, very different response from the response, and I think I am quoting you, and we can get the record, that whenever fire chiefs are confronted with an increase in the incidence of fires, whenever police chiefs with rare exceptions, they always say I need more firemen, I need more policemen.

MR. WEINER: Sorry if I gave you the impression that I gave a categorical answer. O.K.? I don't intend to --

MR. WEIZENBAUM: Then I am puzzled as to what remains of the lesson you were trying to teach us, and I don't -- could you capsulate the lesson in one sentence or two that you were trying to teach us? I am very confused.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: I wish I knew -

MR. MITCHEL: I'd like to. Sentence number one: Certainly delivery systems are driven by data processes. The data processes are sufficiently complex that they now consume an inordinately large portion of the resources available to local government. Computers, when apparently used as a portion of inherent organic part of the delivery system, reduces the demand for manpower and frees that manpower for other functions. In the process of making that computer

technology useful in the delivery systems, one introduces the linking mechanism then permits the tracing of an individual linearly or geographically. And we are inviting your attention, I think there too is in this area, with a particular set of delivery systems, that the issue of privacy and confidentiality arises and tends to constitute a paradox, that is to be able to make effective the delivery systems requires the aggregation of data which then when used in some other fashion permits a transparency of the individual which we may or may not consider good in terms of other types of rights.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: I find it difficult to relate that to the war room that was talked about. I am very confused. I'll give up. I give up.

MR. SIEMILLER: I would like to know what union represents those people that get the $25 an hour.

MR. ARNOFF: May I start by making a disclaimer and that is that until two days ago I did not know Andy Anderson from Hamilton County, Cincinnati. I perhaps should have. Nor did I know that he was invited to testify before this committee. However, his appearance here raises a vital question that I don't know the answer to and I'd like the expertise of the committee here, in that Mr. Anderson has -- Mr. Atkinson, excuse me, has this evening and one time earlier this afternoon expounded upon the virtues of a shared time computer at the regional basis. And he further sais that

jean 9

certain criminal data could well be served by this kind of system and at the same time protect the confidentiality and security of data. And if I am not misrepresenting the case, I think that Mr. Gallati, or Dr. Gallati, on several occasions has expounded the proposition that in the area of criminal data a dedicated system, one that is only dedicated to that purpose, is necessary. Perhaps I overstated the case. In fact, Judge Green also even said, took that proposition and extended it one degree further and said that a dedicated system should be for the courts alone and not for any other purpose. The question that I pose to the committee is in Hamilton County in Cincinnati, if I understand it, you have an unusual if not unique situation in which the local populus has voted a tax levy for an integrated system. And then taking the charge of this committee I pose the question, can an integrated system deal with this kind of very sensitive data and at the same time protect the privacy of the individual? And I don't ask the question facetiously.

end #8

MR. DOBBS: Can I ask a question for clarification?

Is that six-man control board, does it consist of elected officials or appointed officials?

MR. ATKINSON: Two elected and four appointed.

MRS. HARDAWAY: By whom are they appointed?

MR. ATKINSON: All right, the six elected officials are the council and city manager. One by county commissioners, one by city council. Those two bodies are elected officials.

The city finance director is appointed; the county auditor is directly elected, his counterpart in the county.

The sheriff is directly elected and the city safety director, who is a city counterpart, is appointed.

But in all cases they are only one removed from elected officials. Their appointments are predicated on elected officials.

Can I respond to -- in the shared versus dedicated environment, I believe that law enforcement and our own criminal justice agencies have found a value in the use of information available to local government in an appropriate manner.

The index to the county auditor's property file, 280,000 records, is available to the local law

enforcement and safety officials in the exercise of their duties and responsibilities to safeguard and protect that property.

I think in a small way, maybe not even a small way, this answers the same question just preceded this one, how does -- I don't know that I classify it as a management information system, but here is a responsibility which the Regional Computer Center has from the county auditor to provide management level information to another decision body.

In other words, when the dispatcher or the desk sergeant gets a call for service for some place in a vast metropolitan area, and he can immediately recall specific and complete information, will assist him in making a decision as to how to respond to that call for service, we haven't had to manipulate any data or anything else.

Maybe that is where this diference is but in a sense, this is a management information system because information made available to a central computer source can help another agency make a management decision, and it is -- the computer is necessitated by virtue of the fact you cannot predict where in those 280,000 parcels the next fire is going to occur or the next automobile accident, so all of those massive records are the only way to make them available fast enough to assist in the management

decision that has to be made is to put them on line through a computer system.

So in essence, I submit this for a partial answer to both of the questions.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Ware?

MR. WARE: Let me reply to that in the following way.

The answer of your question, I think, is really a point of view. It revolves around the issue of how much certainty do you wish that those records are safe? If you wish the closest you can come to absolute safety, then you go the dedicated route, because the agency that owns the records owns the computers, it can button it up, protect it as it sees fit.

If anything happens to that data, it can only be that agency's fault.

If you are willing to live a little bit more dangerously, then you can go the shared computer route, and the exchange between those two situations is basically one of economics although as was just pointed out, there is some functional convenience sometimes to having multiple data bases in a comon system.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: I want to expand a little on that. I certainly agree with that. However, I think there is another dimension that also has to be considered. This

dgr 4

Judge Greene mentioned, the autonomy consists not only of the appearance of impartiality of the judiciary and so on and so forth, it also gives the judiciary in this particular example the freedom to change his mind without affecting everything else.

Okay.

MR. ATKINSON: I don't believe it necessarily causes impedements in any degree which might impede future progress because you can always split out the system if this comes to a point of --

MR. WEIZENBAUM: I deny that. I claim you reach a point after a while where you get hooked. While it may be theoretically possible to always split out the system, but after a while it just can't be done practically.

MR. ATKINSON: That could be, an opinion.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Gentile, then Dr. Gallati.

MR. GENTILE: I would like to make a few points without getting emotionally involved.

When we talk about this dedicated computer issue, I am afraid that we have a false sense of comfort in thinking that a dedicated computer is inherently safer than a shared computer.

For example, no offense intended to Dr. Gallati, he has taken enough abuse for one day, but let us take the NCIC system, that is run essentially by the FBI.

People object to having the NCIC system at state level on a shared computer.

People in the FBI object to that, and I wonder if any of the members of this committee are fully cognizant of the fact that the user or the participant in the NCI system which connects as you know all of the law enforcement systems of state governments together and feeds into the FBI, that those administrators of those systems are subject only to the regulations of the FBI, not the state administrator and not the state legislature but to a direct line of police officers.

Now, the FBI might argue that this is not so, we have so-called state committee. But I wish that you would look into those committees and find out that, and I think you will find out, that these are primarily police officers, if not currently police officers, they are police officers of 30 years experience and I propose that they don't change their ideas by just being appointed to some committee.

So I think we should get off the kick of this false security by having autonomy.

I propose it might be more dangerous to have all these separate systems.

That is point one.

Point two, when I went to Illinois, we had many,

many computer systems, a whole proliveration of computers.

People weren't too worried about privacy at the time.

We are more concerned with it now.

I took a step that consolidated the computer processing of 30 state agencies onto one dual system in a computer center and I feel that these agencies are currently operating in a more secure environment than they were before.

So this could be argued both ways.

MR. WARE: That is a non sequitur.

MR. GENTILE: Why is that?

MR. WARE: Because you did a better job than they did individually.

MR. GENTILE: Well, it certainly --

MR. DOBBS: It may follow that the important principle is one of management.

MR. GENTILE: That is the point. This is not a spurious relationship.

In addition -- no, we couldn't because we don't have the funding and positions to hire the caliber people that I have on my staff in 30 state agencies and I know we like to get off the economics of these things, but in the real world out in the cornfields of Springfield, Illinois, we have problems of budget.

dor 7

MR. MARTIN: Dr. Gallati?

MR. WEIZENBAUM: I think I was misunderstood, I wasn't arguing at all that a dedicated computer system for any purpose, criminal justice or whatever, is necessarily safer than a system imbedded in some super system. Not at all.

I was addressing myself merely to a possible consequence of being imbedded in a shared system of maybe the consequences that I mentioned, that that consequence, and I would argue that that consequence may very well be unavoidable in the very long run, that it would lead to compromises.

Those compromises may very well be acceptable to everyone.

I am merely pointing out that there is a kind of commitment to a future which may not be entirely predictable by all the agencies that make the commitment we are talking about.

I wasn't talking about the security of the system.

I fully agree with your analysis with respect to everything else.

end 9

mea-1
7337
10

MR. MARTIN: Dr. Gallati?

DR. GALLATI: I think we have to be somewhat more precise in our definition of dedicated systems. Ideally you would have a separate computer system under the control, management control and indeed perhaps the entire system encased within a criminal justice agency, but in any event this would be a very ideal situation.

From the standpoint of control and the handling of this derogatory personal data which these systems entail, it is not the position of myself, or, nor is it the position as I understand it of the NCIC that you necessarily have to have this ideal situation. You can have a shared environment, but the requirement of the NCIC at the present time is that there be sufficient management control by the criminal justice agency over the system and the data. So that the responsibility for it rests with the criminal justice agency.

Now, why is this good? Well, obviously the discipline that exists within the profession is one which is vertical as well as was pointed out, responsibilities to the jurisdiction in which it finds itself. But we have in the law enforcement profession a discipline which is at the federal, state and local level, because of the professional bonds that exist. And it might be found I suppose in many other professions as well.

But there is a particular discipline here which we feel is very precious. We are very concerned not only about the concerns of other people within the jurisdiction in which we operate but we are concerned with our professional reputation and discipline that occurs throughout the entire professional ladder.

There is a greater discipline, I would submit, among police officers and criminal justice agencies generally than there is among noncriminal justice agencies dealing with their own problems.

Particularly is this true in terms of police officers. They are held to the highest standards possible. Your laws and so on are geared so that they are subject to all kinds of disciplinary action if they breach their faith. In fact, they are sworn as opposed to most employees, they are sworn and by violation of their oath in any fashion they are subject to greater sanctions than the average employee.

This is one aspect of it. I feel that personally, that, I will finish in a moment, that there is a greater guarantee of security and better protection for privacy within the context where the criminal justice agency which is concerned about its own type of data, its own professional data has the control.

But this is one very important part of this whole

mea-3

picture of the concept of management control, the dedicated systems, if you will. But there is another aspect too and I think Joe touched on it and that is once you get into a shared environment in the sense that it is shared with many other applications, there is always the problem that this emergency type of data which is around the clock as we know, which is necessary to be responded to quickly in many cases and most accurately in all cases because we are dealing with very sensitive problems and sensitive data and we are dealing with people; we are dealing with derogatory data about people; this gets mixed up with other functions.

I think the history that you mentioned here today or this evening, of the system that you control is indicative of just what can happen. You started out, did you not, as a law enforcement system? And all of a sudden because there happened to be a little extra time on the computer, moved in these other applications.

And I submit that the danger here is exactly I think as Joe indicated, that at some point in time the priorities will stop being law enforcement or may stop being law enforcement or may stop being criminal justice or may squeeze out some aspect of criminal justice because criminal justice is a type of operation of government which is nonrevenue producing number one; it is subject sometimes to less pressure than other areas. For example, suppose you

had to get out a payroll and suppose you only had on this computer that handles payrolls as well as your criminal justice applications and you had to get that damn payroll out. Now what is going to take precedent, getting that payroll out. You are going to have hundreds of thousands of people screaming over the state if you don't get the payroll out or are you going to continue handling this criminal justice application. That is the type I probably think has to be recognized as well as the privacy and security problem.

MR. ATKINSON: The regulations prepared for the control board, the first segment or the first, prime emphasis, the law enforcement and criminal justice applications have the prime priority and there are no other considerations so from that the total responsibility and necessity for providing that service is emblazoned in the whole philosophy of the center.

By the same token, I was hired in 1966 as Superintendent of Data Processing for the City of Cincinnati to develop five commercial applications and the priority immediately shifted to law enforcement, and it was identified as a priority project so that the systems were developed concurrently in the philosophy of law enforcement and criminal justice need requiring a very complicated and complex computer system which wuold require the backup of a very complicated sophisticated computer system.

There was no reason to hang the cost of operating both those systems on the one application and kill the other systems off in a vacuum someplace where you were not able to take advantage of taxpayer supported computer equipment.

MR. WARE: David, are you willing to go another round?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. How many hands are there up? Three hands. May I suggest that these be the last three comments for formal and official meeting. We are welcome I am sure to stay in this room as long as we want to, but I feel we should allow our stenographer to leave and adjourn after these three comments, the formal part.

Anybody who wishes to stay and continue to rap should feel free to.

Mr. De Weese?

MR. DE WEESE: I think maybe Mr. Ware should go first.

MR. MARTIN: All right.

MR. WARE: There is another aspect that maybe Bob, if the Chair will recognize you, you may want to comment on, and it has to do with fixing the responsibility in case the system leaks.

In the dedicated system, no problem. In the shared system, if your system leaks confidential information, I haven't the slightest idea how one would go

about fixing responsibility for that malfeasance or negligence or whatever the responsibility is.

MR. DOBBS: It is his responsibility. Right there. If it isn't his, then he ought to get out of the business.

MR. WEINER: Right there. Be fired tomorrow. Right there.

MR. MARTIN: That settles that.

Mr. De Weese?

MR. DE WEESE: I wanted to ask you --

MR. ATKINSON: Just as in the criminal justice system if a leak occurred in the criminal justice, dedicated computer, the manager of the center.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. De Weese?

MR. DE WEESE: I am sorry. I was just very concerned about the makeup of the panel, the board that oversees the operation of the Cincinnati computer system and when you consider the diversified amount of -- diversified types of personal information in this system, and as you admit, the really hard decisions are going to have to be made not only this year but in the future years. Do you believe that your board is representative of a fair cross section of the City of Cincinnati, the interests that are in the city to be protected and so forth?

MR. ATKINSON: I believe it is but I also believe there would certainly be room for other aspects such as

mea-7

advisory boards or steering committees with direct citizen involvement because if you get it too big it is going to be harder to really execute fiscal responsibility.

MR. DE WEESE: It seems like you have the sheriff and and city finance director, auditor of the county.

MR. ATKINSON: City manager and county administrat administrator.

MR. DE WEESE: That's an accurate cross section of the points of view in the City of Cincinnati?

MR. ATKINSON: Yes, I believe especially with the, your management element of the city manager and county administrator. The only thing that might be omitted, as I said, is direct citizen participation.

In our evolution I think we are taking this into consideration and attempting to build onto that.

MR. MARTIN: Dr. Mitchel.

MR. MITCHEL. Several points: One, 75 percent of the police force in the United States is an employee of cities.

Two, we interviewed 79 cities in the United States that had computers or alleged to or aspired to computers. One of the questions not in this book but which we have records on was a question as to breaches of security. We found two breaches.

One was by the police force itself, that had

access under right to that particular bit of information and was used for blackmail purposes.

The second was in the welfare system where a welfare worker was using data to blackmail pregnant mothers.

Three, in our study of patterns of police response requirements for data we found that 95 percent of the data required by a police officer to respond intelligently to a request for service was data not traditionally related to the police force at all but related primarily to land location and use of that land such as artifact structures and previous existence.

Four, the notion that privacy -- that security can be achieved only in a dedicated system flies in the face of all that we know about technology.

The inherent characteristic of the computer is such that one can use the same power which generates or produces data to secure that data against improper intrusion or improper access. We have examples of that well documented, for example the Lane count system in which there are two programmers; one spends full time attempting to analyze it and one who attempts to block him. At this point he is unable to.

Five, the balance of the computer use, indeed the allocation of that resource as among the contending functions is in the control of local government of elected officials

and I submit that in a democracy the ultimate responsibility is in the elected officials and not an isolated police force.

Six, in the integrated systems where we are linking in the USAK Program, we require as a mandatory adjunct a data access control board. In each of the data access control boards a majority of the members represent the public. In all cases there are elected officials; in all except one case a member of the American Civil Liberties Union is involved. In all cases a representative of at least two church groups are involved. In all cases there are due process requirements imposed and the regulations for access and control of that computer are explicitly expressed in

Thank you.

MR. MARTIN: Senator Aronoff, I move to end on a poetic note. In view of the variety of responses to your question, I am put in mind of a couple of Alexander Pope's sayings on man which as I recall it runs for forms of government. "Let fools contest; what airs best administered is best."

The Committee will resume tomorrow at 9 a.m.

MRS. HARDAWAY: Would you please ask the Committee about these two gentlemen coming in the morning if they desire?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. The Committee will resume

a-10

in formal session at 9 o'clock, in conference room 10, wing C, building 31. That is the same building on the National Institute of Health campus in which you met on Saturday the last time we were here. It is a different room in the building.

Staff will be there to guide you. Jane Hardaway has asked me to put to members of the Committee the question whether in view of the fact that there will be an executive session there is objection, and I take it one objection would suffice --

MRS. HARDAWAY: It certainly would. Please feel free to vote your conscience; we won't get mad.

MR. MARTIN:--if two of her colleagues from the State Government of Tennessee who are here and have been with us today may sit in on tomorrow's meeting; if not they will take an earlier plane home to Tennessee.

If they may, they will escort Jane back on her plane at 2.

MRS. HARDAWAY: It really has nothing to do with it.

MR. GENTILE: I think they should be there to witness the pain that we go through.

MR. MARTIN: She guarantees their confidentiality under pain of discharge.

MR. DOBBS: There is only, you know, it seems

to be a minor procedural point on that issue. That is that by so extending the invitation whether in fact that is to be an open session.

MRS. HARDAWAY: That's right.

MR. DOBBS: I think we ought to be clear one way or the other on that issue.

MR. MARTIN: I have not read the secretarial determination by means of which we are able to conduct an executive session. I cannot answer your question.

Perhaps in view of the fact that there is doubt. we should say that they shouldn't attend.

MR. WEIZENBAUM: I think we may rest on a principal that we may agree on very informally I would suppose, namely that members of the Committee are permitted under special circumstances and there being no objection to bringing counsellors and advisors to the executive sessions, which is very different from inviting friends and relatives as witnesses.

And I suggest that what we are now proposing falls into that first category. I don't see any technical or legal objection to that.

MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Counsellor Weizenbaum.

MRS. HARDAWAY: Of course in return for that I have to buy him a drink I think.

MR. MARTIN: We will declare this session

mea-12

adjourned but as I say I think we are welcome to stay. Anybody that would like to continue to rap informally should feel free to do so.

(Whereupon, at 10:20 p.m., the meeting was adjourned, to reconvene at 9 a.m. on Saturday, September 30, 1972.)

7337
End #11