

Approved Minutes

***VITAL RECORDS IMPROVEMENT FUND  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE***

***-MINUTES-***

***Thursday  
January 10, 2002***

# Approved Minutes

## **-MINUTES-**

### **Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting**

January 10, 2002

Department of Safety Building  
1st Floor Conference Room  
2 Hazen Drive  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

#### ***COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:***

Patricia Little, City Clerk Appointment  
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar  
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Office of the State Medical Examiner Appointment  
Patricia Seskes, Hospital Association Appointment  
Jane Ireland, Town Clerk Appointment  
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment  
Tom Janosz, Funeral Director Appointment  
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment

#### ***COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:***

Debra Eastman, Town Clerk Appointment  
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment  
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment

#### ***GUESTS:***

Dr. Jesse Greenblatt, Director, Division of Epidemiology and Vital Statistics, OCPH  
Melanie A. Orman, Program Specialist, DEVS  
John O'Neal, Office of Information Systems  
Mark Parris, Office of Information Systems

# Approved Minutes

## Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

### **1. Approval of Minutes:**

Meeting called to order at 10:06 a.m. by Ms. Little. The first order of business was to approve the minutes of the November 15, 2001 meeting. The committee agreed to table the approval of those minutes until the next meeting.

### **2. New Committee Member:**

Ms. Linda Hartson has graciously agreed to become the committee's newest member. She will replace Deborah Eastman who recently resigned her position.

### **3. Election of Chairperson:**

Ms. Little advised the committee that her term had ended in December and asked for nominations for Chairperson. Ms. Ireland nominated Ms. Little to another term and Mr. Bergeron seconded the nomination. Ms. Little asked if there were any other nominations and there were not. She thanked the committee for their support and added that she would be happy to continue as Chair. With no further nominations Ms. Little called for a vote and was unanimously re-elected Chairperson.

### **4. OIS Update:**

#### **A. Rollout to Hospital Towns/Frame Relay Sites:**

Mr. Parris reported that the RFP is ongoing and is on track. His staff, and Mr. Bolton and his staff planned to meet at the end of the week. One of the things that remain to be discussed is security, and Mr. Parris hoped that they would be able to cover that topic in the aforementioned meeting. Mr. Parris added that he had invited Ms. Linda Socha, of OIS to the meeting for that purpose. He wants to ensure that everything we need in order to maintain proper security gets into the RFP.

Mr. Parris also reported that the RFP team is working closely with Ms. Eileen Grimmer in putting together the document. She has a great deal of experience in the creation and requirements of RFP documents. Once the team feels the document is complete, they will sit down and review it one last time, make any changes and then forward it to DITM. Mr. Parris anticipated that the RFP would be forwarded to DITM in mid February. Once they have released it to vendors it will be approximately an eight-week process before work actually begins. Ms. Little asked if the eight-week process was for review of proposals. Mr. Parris replied that the RFP would be sent to a list of vendors. They have a certain amount of time in which to respond. There will be a vendor conference where the RFP team will answer questions vendors might have and to explain the RFP. Vendors send in proposals and the evaluation team reads those proposals. The evaluation team then selects a proposal to recommend. Negotiations are then held and a contract is awarded.

Ms. Little reminded Mr. Parris that at an earlier meeting this committee had expressed an interest in one of its members being a part of the evaluation team. Mr. Parris and Mr. O'Neal agreed that there should be a committee member on the team. Mr. O'Neal asked

## Approved Minutes

Ms. Little if the committee would also like to see the RFP either before or after the DITM review. Ms. Little felt that it would be good for the committee to familiarize themselves with the RFP. Mr. Armstrong asked if she did not want to see it first. Ms. Little replied that she would certainly trust DITM to review the document.

Mr. Armstrong felt that the law regarding collaboration should come into play. Ms. Little asked how that law fit into this situation. Mr. Armstrong replied that he believed that Ms. Tinsley had spoken with Mr. Bolton about it. He explained that this committee has the representation of all the interested parties i.e. Town Clerks, hospitals and funeral homes. He went on to say that if the committee defers, OIS would oversee it for them. He also reminded Ms. Little that the initial requirements development for the original VRV2000 was done with a great deal of clerk involvement and he would think the committee would want to see the finished product.

Ms. Little asked the members of the committee their feelings. Ms. Ireland felt it would be beneficial to see it. Mr. Bergeron offered that if it would not interfere with the release date, he would like to see it as well. Mr. Armstrong replied that he believed that a more realistic timeframe for the project would be it hitting the streets in March and a contract in place in June. He added that it could happen more quickly, but since DITM hadn't seen the document yet, that may not be the case. This is a big project and Mr. Armstrong felt that for smaller projects Mr. Parris would be correct on the eight-week period, but it is not a small project. He felt that it would take longer to review the proposals, interview and do reference checks on a project of this size. Three months is a more realistic goal for this type of project. ITS7 simplifies the process somewhat, but if the vendor selected is not ITS7 then it could take up to six months because you are obligating yourself to a lot.

Ms. Little asked if the committee should be holding a meeting to review the document or if members should just be allowed to review it individually. Mr. O'Neal replied that it was up to the committee. He explained that the typical process is once there is a "smooth" draft, OIS reviews it with DITM and actually they (DITM) have sort of been involved in this process from the beginning of the development of this RFP. Once they feel they have the final version they would certainly attend a special meeting of the committee to present it or they could e-mail it to committee members. Mr. O'Neal stated that he would leave it up to the committee as to how to proceed. Ms. Seskes mentioned that if it would be convenient, she would prefer the committee meet and OIS present and explain the RFP to them. She felt it would help committee members to better understand the document. Ms. Ireland added that she would like to have it prior to the meeting, to read.

Ms. Little agreed and asked Mr. Bolton to schedule a meeting for mid February. Mr. Armstrong mentioned that there are two other things that fit into this. He mentioned that there was a statewide RFP out for document management. He stated that it was a real "sleeper" because document management not only encompasses imaging, computer output reports, but it also has workflow and analysis components. Parts of those reports come from a workflow product that is normally associated with this type of things. He went on to say that the statewide IT plan, is pretty much predicated on the fact that the state will be doing much more E-government over time. One of the big challenges facing them is, as they deal with electronic media it is much harder to trace it. To know whom it went to, what happened to it and how long it has been sitting around.

## Approved Minutes

The workflow product is an integral part of the project because you can track things. This RFP has workflow components built into it. DHHS is part of the team of agencies reviewing the statewide RFP and it will set a state standard on what software the state will use. That very much has the potential to fit into the web enablement project. That is just something to be aware of. Another thing is the architecture. It will have things such as security, credit card processing, payment and receipt engines, etc. So security is a major concern for the entire state and they want to be consistent. Mr. Armstrong admitted that it is an area that has not been well developed to date.

He told the committee that DITM would stay in close contact on this project with the security end of it just to ensure that it is made more mature for the state. To also ensure that the web enablement project does not diverge from the direction the state wants to go. Where the state wants to go is where the agencies need to go. He added that it should not be a major issue but that DITM needs to remain in close contact. Ms. Little replied that she had happened to look at the document management RFP that morning and was curious about the timeline for the release of that RFP. Mr. Armstrong informed her that it had been released the 27th of December. He anticipates that work will begin the first part of May, so the timing is good in comparison to this project.

Dr. Greenblatt asked if there had been any discussion on the facets of security for the web enablement project with OIS. Mr. Bolton replied that there had not been. Dr. Greenblatt suggested that the team not go through the entire process only to have the RFP rejected by DITM over security concern. He asked if there was a way that it could be discussed ahead of time. Mr. Armstrong replied that they could. Mr. O'Neal reported that he feels that those types of issues have delayed the development of this RFP. DHHS has established its architecture for static display of content on the web, but when you go to a transaction base then you have a whole different ball of wax and that has not been addressed yet. It has impacted the development of this RFP. He went on to say that they have finally come to the realization that this project is so far out ahead of where we may be with our transaction base that this project may indeed set the standard for DHHS and maybe others.

Ms. Little reiterated that a meeting would be scheduled for February and members would receive advance copies of the RFP for their review as stakeholders. Mr. O'Neal asked if e-mail was an acceptable way to get the document to committee members. Ms. Ireland replied that she did not have access to e-mail at her location. Ms. Little asked if there were any other potential stakeholders not represented in this committee. Mr. Bolton mentioned the certifying physicians but deferred to Dr. Andrew as their representative. Dr. Andrew reported that a meeting had been scheduled at the Medical Society with Mr. Palmer Jones to discuss the best way to approach the issue, but he had missed it, so it would be rescheduled.

### **B. Hospital Town Rollout:**

Mr. Parris reported that the nine hospital towns were all on-line and had completed training December 13 and 14. He advised the committee that the training had gone really well and commended Mr. Milligan and Mr. Wurtz for their work on it. The reason Mr. Parris was so aware of the quality of the training is the volume of calls from the towns in question has been minimal. In fact, they had only received three calls and those were to do with the dial in procedures. Ms. Little remarked how nice it was to hear that.

## Approved Minutes

### **C. Safety/Frame Relay Agreement:**

Mr. Parris reported to the committee that both sides had approved the agreement between the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Safety. He was unsure if it had been signed yet, but at that point signing was just a formality. Mr. O'Neal added that it had not been signed and he had actually hoped to have it signed at this meeting but, Mr. Bailey, nor Mr. Croteau could attend. Mr. O'Neal reported that the agreement would be signed shortly.

Ms. Little asked for a clarification of what exactly was being agreed to. Mr. Parris replied that what the agreement says is that for these fifteen towns, we agree with the Department of Safety as to how it will be connected, for what uses the machines are being provided by both Safety and DHHS. Telecommunications costs and who and how to pay for them are also covered. Mr. Parris added that in the near future his team would be getting together with the Department of Safety to set up a schedule of training and implementation for those towns. Mr. Parris stated that the towns are: Bradford; Brentwood; Bristol; Charlestown; Dublin, Henniker; Kingston; Mont Vernon; New Hampton; Northfield; Madbury; Ossipee; Sutton; Walpole and Windham.

He reminded the committee that the list he had given was the original list and that there was a possibility that one or more of the towns had since lost interest or dropped out. Ms. Little asked Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Parris if the committee could receive a copy of the agreement after it is signed. They replied that it could. Dr. Greenblatt asked Mr. Parris if the towns he mentioned were scheduled for training. Mr. Parris replied that they were and that Mr. Milligan and possibly someone from Safety would be going out to the sites and hooking them up to the existing hardware in the town and city offices, test the hardware and install the software. He is anticipating the same success with these new users that they have had with the hospital towns.

### **D. VRV2000 Software Release:**

Mr. Parris also reported to the committee that there is a new release of VRV2000 being released in February. There are a few items that have been corrected and some that have been created. They hope to get the release into the mail to the users by February 15, 2002. They hope to have it installed and running by February 25, 2002. Some of the changes in that release include: Time of Injury and Time of Death on death certificates has been a problem in the past if military time was used. That has been corrected for this version; NCHS birth and death reports; SSA birth and death reports have been corrected and are ready to go; 707 geocoding problem has been corrected. There had been problems with the first letter of an amendment dropping off. That has also been corrected. Some corrections have been made to fee collections. The New Hampshire/Vermont Interstate Data Exchange will also be in place in the new release. Mr. O'Neal asked about testing of the new version. Mr. Bolton replied that they have been looking at scheduling testing. He reported that Mr. Wurtz was going to line up some people to do testing. Mr. Parris reported that they would begin doing their own internal testing on January 14, 2002 and it would run throughout that week. Bureau staff and possibly end-users would be invited to do testing the following week, January 22, through January 25. They are hoping to have fairly heavy end-user testing the week of January 28 through February 1. They have reserved the training room at Nash and there are seven machines to be used for the testing. Mr. Milligan is currently setting up the machines and loading the software for testing.

## Approved Minutes

Mr. O'Neal distributed a hand out to the committee regarding the cost of adding an additional 23 lines to the modem bank. He pointed out the first section of the report as outlining the actual cost of adding them. Three of the charges were for Verizon so there would be no flexibility in them. The one time hardware charge of \$9,000. is a DHHS expense. He went on to explain that when the Juvenile Justice program moved to DHHS in July, one of the things they brought with them was something called an AS5 5300 which is a dial in device that has the capability for four PRI interfaces and that was paid for with \$36,000 in federal funds.

Mr. O'Neal proposed that we would use twenty-five percent of its capability and since it was purchased with federal funds, the department should reimburse the program for twenty-five percent of its cost. The \$9,000. figure represents that twenty-five percent of the \$36,000. There would be a one time installation charge of \$381., a monthly recurring charge of \$855. and then a per minute charge that works out to 5.2 cents per minute. When Mr. O'Neal last addressed the committee on this subject there had been confusion in the department over whether or not we paid a per minute charge on in-state calls. What they discovered is that in the billing the state receives for its 800 lines, there are minutes associated with them but no charges. They found that that is the case because all the toll free lines are associated with the 271 exchange so they had to dig even deeper to find the actual cost.

The 5.2 cents per minute didn't really mean anything to Mr. O'Neal and he wanted to present the committee with a clear picture of communication costs so he produced a report with current usage outlined and applied the estimated costs associated with adding the additional lines. The report showed the actual usage for October, November and December 2001. In October there were one hundred nineteen callers and one hundred twenty in November. Dr. Greenblatt asked Mr. O'Neal if that was the number of callers or the number of calls. Mr. O'Neal replied that it was referring to callers. He went on to say it was an unduplicated list but the duplication was so small he didn't break it out. Mr. Bolton explained that a city like Manchester has three sign ons.

Mr. O'Neal reported that the "blip" in the December figure was the addition of the nine hospital towns. He added the monthly charge of \$855. and then figured the total minutes for the three months. The 167,000 minutes are the actual numbers for October. Multiplying that number by 5.2 cents per minute you get \$8,700 dollars in per minute charges. He then projected usage and expense for a year. He added the hardware and installation charges and averaged the number of minutes, based on the three months he had collected data on. To give the committee a better idea of annual costs Mr. O'Neal had used the three month average he had collected and forecast ahead two years. During the first year the one time hardware and installation costs were added and in the second year they were not. He calculated that there would be one million eight hundred thousand minutes. That would translate into a \$100,000 annual expense.

Dr. Greenblatt asked if the usage might be lower the first year because towns would need to be trained and would therefore come on slowly with demand increasing slowly. Mr. O'Neal replied that the assumption was that we were getting closer to maximum capacity on the existing lines. With the addition of the nine hospital towns the OIS staff feel that we are getting close to getting into a situation where users will begin hearing "busy" signals when they dial in. Mr. O'Neal at the request of the committee researched the cost associated with adding additional modems.

## Approved Minutes

Dr. Greenblatt wanted to clarify what he thought he was hearing from Mr. O'Neal. He understood what Mr. O'Neal was saying to mean that he was suggesting the additional capacity be purchased to handle the current users. Mr. O'Neal replied that current users were fine, but if more users were to be brought on, additional capacity would be needed. Dr. Greenblatt asked if it were not possible that costs would be lower the first year because of training. Mr. O'Neal replied that another thing for the committee to take into consideration, is the fact that Mr. Bailey has been up to this point, absorbing the per-minute charges. He went on to say that as budgets tighten, Mr. Bailey may no longer be able to do that and that cost would be passed on to the committee.

Mr. O'Neal reported that even if the committee decides against adding the extra lines they are still going to be seeing a \$7,000. to \$8,000. a month charge in the coming months. Dr. Greenblatt replied that from what he understood, the committee had planned and budgeted that expense all along so it would not be a surprise. Mr. Bolton explained that the figures Mr. O'Neal presented were representative of no new users, just the expense of adding the lines and projected cost of future use, based on current use. Mr. O'Neal stated that he had no way of forecasting the expense of additional users.

Mr. Armstrong wanted to comment on the statewide telecom RFP, which he noticed was mentioned in the minutes from the previous meeting minutes. The Governor would like all cities and towns to be connected to Concord over high speed connections. That would allow the public to have access to Concord. He referenced Ms. Little mentioning that she had spoken with Tom Towle at a Municipal Association meeting about it. He went on to say that the assumption might be that those all go to DITM which is not a good assumption. They would go to NHSun, which is the Intranet here in Concord. He added that there were questions raised about who would pay for what. If the towns were going to try to connect to the state, would cost sharing be done.

He also stated that part of that RFP is to provide better statewide ISP services, no matter the location. Ms. Little asked about the timeline on the statewide telecommunications contract. Mr. Armstrong replied that he did not think it was to be awarded until March, but he would get the date for the committee. He reported that it was out on the street. Ms. Little asked if it allowed for communication between municipalities as well as between the state and municipalities. Mr. Armstrong replied that, that was the Governor's initiative. He added that there will probably be a new Governor next year, so that could change. Mr. Armstrong felt there was a broader issue that he hoped the NH LOGIN was still dealing with.

If the city or town is already "online" it would be much easier for the state to connect to them. If the city or town is not already "wired," would cost sharing be an alternative? Mr. Armstrong explained that he is not aware of what the municipalities would be willing to do. He added that the possibility of other agencies going out to municipalities and sharing the expenses might lessen the burden for many cities and towns. Ms. Little mentioned that at the last NH LOGIN meeting there had been a presentation from Global Crossing and Equal Access and what they now call the New England Connect. It used to be the The Monadnock Connect. They (municipalities) were asked to start defining just what they would want from this sort of communication. Would they want the ability to communicate between municipalities and if so, what would they be using it for.

Ms. Little explained that Ms. Tinsley suggested that the group speak with Mark Vernon, in Mr. Armstrong's office to get a better understanding. Mr. Armstrong stated that to

## Approved Minutes

know if they need to communicate with one another, the municipalities need to determine what kind of interaction they currently have. Ms. Little agreed but felt “thinking outside the box” was necessary. Not to be led by what they currently do, but by what they could do if given the capability. Dr. Greenblatt asked Mr. Armstrong if he was requesting that the committee delay making a decision on the additional lines until that was implemented. Mr. Armstrong replied that he was not, but he did not want anyone to forget the other issue. That there is an RFP out there.

Mr. O’Neal then went on to explain the user information on the second page of his handout. Displayed were the heaviest and lightest users. Mr. O’Neal explained that twenty percent of the users were accounting for eighty percent of the minutes used. He reported that twenty-eight percent of users are logged on for ten hours or more and that really wasn’t too bad. That the largest percentage of users were logged on under ten hours per week. Mr. Janosz asked if these numbers represented people that logged on and just stayed on. He remarked that the committee had previously discussed the issue. Mr. O’Neal replied that he had no way to know if they were actual transactions or just idle time. Mr. Janosz remarked that the names he was seeing did belong to larger funeral homes but had to wonder if the time involved was necessary. He went on to say that on an average death, any funeral director should be able to go through it in fifteen to twenty minutes. He felt the users were just leaving it logged on and that the committee needed to explore the logging them off automatically option further.

Ms. Little asked what was happening with the plan to automatically log off users that were inactive. Mr. O’Neal replied that it would be able to be installed when the new equipment is in place. He also added that he was not trying to draw any conclusions by including these numbers in the handout, just to give a snapshot of current use. Ms. Little remarked that she had been operating under the assumption that the timeout feature had already been installed as she had been hearing staff mention that they were in the middle of a record and been logged off. She asked if that was not the auto disconnect what could it be. Ms. Little also felt it important that users not be logged off in the middle of completing a record. Mr. O’Neal replied that the terminal would have to be inactive for thirty minutes in order to be logged off.

Ms. Little returned to the automatic log off issue, stating that she had been under the impression that the committee had authorized/requested previously. Mr. O’Neal agreed but added, with current capabilities, dropping a user from Oracle does nothing to lower costs as they are still dialed in. Mr. Bolton stated that logging users off of their Oracle account just serves to confuse them as they are still connected via their phone line.

Ms. Little was under the impression that inactivity was identified as nothing transmitted for thirty minutes. Mr. O’Neal explained that just moving the mouse would be considered inactivity. If a record was being input, the system would not interrupt it. Only if a terminal was logged in for thirty minutes without a single thing happening. Mr. Bolton explained to Ms. Little that her staff should not be losing any data. That they may be able to export it as Funeral Directors do with their partially completed death records. Mr. Armstrong asked the committee how they planned to approach users that were abusing the login. Would they send a letter telling them how many records they submitted and how long they were on. He wanted to know how the committee planned to close that gap. Ms. Little asked if the new equipment was not going to solve that problem by automatically logging off a user if they were inactive for thirty minutes. Mr.

## Approved Minutes

O'Neal replied that the new equipment could do that if that is what the committee elects to do.

Mr. Bolton explained that if a VRV site wanted to get around the automatic log off all they would have to do is to tab through fields repeatedly or play with it somehow so that it would "appear active." Mr. Armstrong felt that the issue was one the committee might want to address with users. Ms. Little asked if the committee hadn't previously sent a letter to users about this issue. Mr. Armstrong added that the message might be more effective if the users were shown what their cost should have been versus what it really was. Dr. Greenblatt mentioned that it was his understanding that the committee did not intend to put on those controls at that point.

Mr. Armstrong replied that judging by the previous exchange, it is a concern. He also added that the committee did not have to take any action, just notify the users of the issue. Dr. Greenblatt explained that he did not hear a concern raised about cost in the previous discussion. Ms. Little responded that she did hear concern from Mr. Janosz about his peers (funeral directors) abusing the system. Mr. Armstrong commented that Mr. Janosz would be in a position to judge as he is in the same field. Mr. Armstrong added that it would be an opportunity to improve the process.

Mr. Bolton asked the committee if they planned to act on the new modem bank or address it at a future meeting. He explained that he would prefer to not wait a year until a state communication RFP could be released and that delaying the addition would prohibit the addition of new sites. Ms. Little asked if Mr. Bolton was looking for a vote. He replied that he did not know, asking when a vote would be appropriate. Ms. Little responded that she had been under the impression that it was the committee's intent to go forward with the additional modem bank all along. Mr. Bolton agreed, adding that the committee had expressed its desire to go forward before knowing the final cost associated with it. Ms. Little stated that she did not think a vote was necessary as the committee had already agreed it was a good idea.

Ms. Little suggested that the issue be discussed with Mr. Janosz and that possibly a letter from Funeral Directors Association and Mr. Bolton might be more effective. It would demonstrate what logging on and then walking away is costing the fund. Mr. Janosz agreed and reported that he would be attending the association's annual meeting within weeks and would bring the issue before them. Ms. Little asked who the President of the association was. Mr. Janosz replied that the current President was Mr. Ed Pelzar of Newmarket, and the incoming President will be Mr. Tim Kenny of Goffstown. He added that the person the committee should contact is the full-time Executive Officer, Dave Pollard of Pittsfield. Mr. Janosz did not have Mr. Pollard's address, but Mr. Bolton did.

Mr. Bergeron asked for a further explanation of the circumstances under which a user would be logged off. He reported that in his office they are logged in all day and they have the need to do that. He would not want his system to close down on them. Mr. Bolton stated that it would and suggested it would be helpful if there were some kind of notice to inform the user that they had been logged off.

He asked Mr. O'Neal if that were something that the PRI could do. Mr. O'Neal replied that it would not. Mr. Bergeron explained that it is not unusual for that terminal to be busy six to seven hours a day. He stated that it would be ok if it worked like a screensaver and only happened when it was not in use. Mr. O'Neal explained to Mr.

## Approved Minutes

Bergeron that a user would only be logged off if they were inactive for thirty minutes. Ms. Eastman suggested a warning message that the terminal was going to be logged off, to alert the user. Mr. Bolton added that at least when the user came back they would see that message and understand that they needed to dial in again to re-establish their connection.

### **5. Records Preservation Project:**

Mr. Bergeron reported that what was originally HB1151, which established a study committee to make recommendations on creating a Local Government Records Management Improvement Fund did make its recommendations. It is asking for a \$250,000 appropriation from the General Fund to finance a program that would provide one to one and one half people at state archives to provide field support and technical training to clerks and city and town officials. With the balance of the funds helping to manage the expenses of that very small office, going out as re-grants to local communities to help with small projects, such as shelving or the hiring of consultants to help take inventories, etc.

The committee had looked at a number of vehicles to put a surcharge on existing documents to fund the program. The one they settled on, which appeared to be most practical, was the preparation of documents fee. This fee has been on the books at Motor Vehicle for years and has not been touched for years. Clerks receive one dollar for each auto registration document they prepare. The committee wanted to raise the fee to two dollars, with fifty cents staying local to help with records preservation and the other fifty cents going into the state fund. The clerks were fairly divided on the issue. Roughly sixty percent supported the change and forty percent opposed it. Of the sixty percent that supported it, all but one wanted the money that stayed local to be designated for local record preservation.

Representative Norm Majors, who is on the House Finance Committee commented that this revenue vehicle would raise about a half a million dollars and since only \$250,000 was needed, the committee should ask for financing from the General Fund first. Mr. Bergeron reported that the committee had decided to do just that. That is not to say that during the legislative process the issue will not be revisited, but they are going to look for the money. Mr. Bergeron drafted the legislation and it was being reviewed by Legislative Services. He expected that bill to come out in the next week.

Mr. Bergeron also reported about the Dartmouth Local Records Program. They have now held four sessions, attended by approximately seventy-six people. The fund has enough money to fund forty local consultation visits. A professional will go in and tour a city or town's facilities and help with planning. There have been eight requests received so far. There were three or four more workshops planned for Phase I of the project. They are currently developing the curriculum for Phase II, which will begin in the spring. The Dartmouth folks will go back into the communities they were in originally and provide additional training. Mr. Bergeron was pleased with the number of attendees. He thought Dartmouth was disappointed in the number though.

For Phase II of the program, their goal is to have two tracks, one for museums, historical societies and libraries and the other for government officials as the committee feels the two groups' priorities are different. He added that for small communities, the two tracks could be blended. Often the people involved in the government records are the same

## Approved Minutes

people involved with the historical societies. Mr. Bergeron stated that Mr. Daily intended to have the program outline within the next thirty to forty-five days. Mr. Bolton reported that Dr. Mevers is proof reading a pamphlet that was altered to reflect New Hampshire information. He added that the Vital Records Improvement Fund is funding the printing of the brochure as well as offering some tuition reimbursement.

Ms. Little asked if the program is on a website. Mr. Bergeron replied that the state has a small archive and the state advisory board has a presence on the web. Ms. Little asked if it was through Webster. Mr. Bergeron replied that it was and then through the Secretary of State's office. He admitted it was kind of buried, but that he thought it a good idea to post the information there. Ms. Little asked if the Dartmouth Project information was there. Mr. Bergeron explained that it was not. Dartmouth would like a strong web presence, but is hesitant, as they do not want to have to maintain it after their funding has been exhausted. Mr. Bergeron added that he was under the impression they were hoping an institution would post the information for them. He felt the state archives would be the appropriate office to post the information. If not the state archives, Mr. Bergeron added, possibly the New England Clerks Association would.

### **6. Potential New Use of the VRIF:**

Dr. Greenblatt asked to add this item to the agenda. He explained that the Vital Records Improvement fund that is working toward web enablement does two things; it is very effective in providing a way to enter data from cities and towns, funeral homes and hospitals; and then provide the data back, through the ability to print records. One of the things he felt the committee may not be aware of is the tremendous other use for this project. That is in terms of providing population health data and statistical information. This data is used for a variety of purposes. Most recently the department has been able to use the data that is coming in through VRV2000 to do real time death certificate monitoring to look for instances of bio-terrorism in the state.

Dr. Greenblatt then explained that in some states, death records are sometimes not filed for more than a week. He referenced the case in Connecticut in which an elderly woman died from exposure to Anthrax. Because of VRV2000, New Hampshire death records are filed very quickly. Our system is in front of many computer projects within the state as well as nationally. We are in front, because of our ability to use the data for statistical and population health purposes. Within communities there are health planning projects and community health assessments that are done.

Dr. Greenblatt asked the committee to place him on the March meeting agenda to present the idea in a little greater detail. He will ask the Chief of Health Statistics to provide cost projections at that time. The specific project is to not only web enable VRV2000 to accept data, but to enable it to provide data out via the web. Dr. Greenblatt envisions communities downloading their own communities data, based on information provided by Vital Records as well as other data sets. Theoretically, it could also be done for Medicaid data as well. While it may not be as useful for this committee, it would be for individuals or organizations within their towns.

Ms. Little replied that the idea sounded very interesting and the committee would be very interested in hearing about it further. Mr. Bergeron added that as part of the presentation he would be interested in hearing how much the communities use this kind of data currently. He would like to be convinced that there is a need for this information to be

## Approved Minutes

placed online. Dr. Greenblatt replied that he would make sure that was addressed for the March meeting.

Mr. Armstrong asked if Dr. Greenblatt had addressed the shortcomings of the department's capabilities. He was under the impression that they had a Webmaster and web capabilities already. Mr. Armstrong asked Dr. Greenblatt what other funding he was pursuing. The mention of bio-terrorism prompted Mr. Armstrong to think there might be funding from the federal government. Dr. Greenblatt agreed that there may be and they will discuss that further with the committee in March. He went on to say the department currently has the ability to put a static presentation on the web now and that is done. The problem is that many towns are requesting that data in more creative ways and requesting it in groupings of geographic towns which are not published in the report. He envisions two-way communication rather than one way.

Mr. Armstrong stated that Dr. Greenblatt had brought up a good point, the Office of State Planning heads up GIS for the state and UNH is the central repository for state data and he felt there was definitely geospatial implications here. He advised the committee that UNH is upgrading its software to be web enabled and that may be an alternative. Get the data to UNH to have it published and save on the cost and also maximize the usefulness. Dr. Greenblatt replied that this was an area that has not been investigated fully. That there are areas where there could be cooperation between agencies. Mr. Armstrong suggested that we definitely do not want to duplicate efforts and he did not know what is and what is not appropriate information to be posted on the web.

He added that they do have a strategic plan for GIS for the state that is near completion. He was also under the impression that the Department of Health and Human Services already contributes some funding to the program. Mr. Armstrong stated that because the plan had not been published many people were probably not aware of its existence. Dr. Greenblatt suggested that Mr. Armstrong invite a representative of that project to the March meeting as well. Mr. Armstrong replied that he would. Dr. Greenblatt added that what he was thinking of was slightly different than geospatial portion of it, but that doesn't mean that there aren't potential links.

### **7. Expenditure Report:**

Mr. Andrew distributed a handout to the committee before beginning his presentation. He wanted to walk the committee through anything important that happened during the first six months of the state fiscal year (July-December). The handout contained detailed pages on what was spent and where. He pointed out on page one that the revenue that came in during the first six months from the clerks was \$439,000. On an annualized basis the committee might expect to collect \$878,000, which is a little higher than the \$800,000 the committee had anticipated. He pointed out the current balance of the fund, \$1,037,147.

He then moved to the expenditures. To date, the fund has paid out \$90,000 this year for expenses. Some of those expenses are personnel, overtime and current expenses. The \$21,000 listed, represent payments to ManTech for work they did last year. Because of the contract we had with them, the payments fell in this fiscal year. There were some small equipment purchases and some small miscellaneous purchases made. Mr. Andrew asked the committee if they had any questions regarding the information he had just provided.

## Approved Minutes

Mr. Andrew also wanted to address the issue of the \$200,000 appropriated from the fund by the legislature. He had been working with the Public Health Financial Manager and none of the VRIF funds had been used. They are hoping that they won't have to use any, but if any of the funds are used, they will not be anywhere near the \$200,000. Vital Records has various revenue streams, general and federal funds and the legislature stuck in the VRIF. The message to the committee is that the department had no intention of using the funds, except as a last resort. Ms. Little expressed her pleasure with that and Mr. Andrew once again asked for questions. Dr. Greenblatt asked Mr. Andrew to clarify his statement about using the VRIF funds. Dr. Greenblatt wanted the committee to understand that there is a chance that some of the funds would be used, but as little as possible. Mr. Andrew agreed.

### **8. Electronic Death Registration User Group:**

Mr. Bolton told the committee that he wanted to establish a group of key stakeholders in the Electronic Death Registration process. He had already initiated that with setting up a meeting with Dr. Andrew, the New Hampshire Medical Society and New Hampshire Funeral Directors. He had planned to invite a member of the committee to join, but there will already be three members of the committee represented. The Social Security Administration had set a timeline for stakeholder involvement and Mr. Bolton planned to keep in step with it.

Mr. Armstrong asked if these requirements were going into the Web Enablement RFP. Mr. Bolton replied that they were not. They were SSA requirements that key stakeholder be brought in on the decision making process and that had already been established with the creation of the original version of VRV2000. What Mr. Bolton wanted to do with this committee is just demonstrate that stakeholders are still involved in the decision making process.

### **9. DITM:**

Mr. Armstrong reported that they have been asked to sign off on an RFP that deals with early hearing detection that could expand to a cumulative vision of this. There are different components to it. He stated that Dr. Greenblatt might have been able to explain it better than he. Mr. Armstrong wanted to ask a process question. DITM tries to minimize the number of systems people have to dump information into and they do not quite understand the relationship between that and VRV2000. He was meeting with that group in the next week, but felt since there was discussion regarding the fund paying for the file format to be set up to send data.

He explained that DITM had no issue other than they do not understand the relationship. He asked if we were generating more systems than necessary? Is it really something that people want? Dr. Greenblatt replied that he did not know enough about what was requested to respond to Mr. Armstrong's question. He did know that there was a grant awarded to the department to improve newborn hearing detection. To do that they would need to know where the newborns were. Mr. Armstrong agreed. Dr. Greenblatt went on to say there was interest in having the birth certificate information spun off to that unit. He was not aware that they had proposed a new data collection software system or something out to the hospitals, so he could speak about that.

## Approved Minutes

Dr. Greenblatt suggested the hospital association as a good group to speak with to determine if adding another piece would be too much duplication. He also assured Mr. Armstrong that if he needed additional information or help in determining the outcome of the subject that he would certainly be willing to help out any way that he could. Dr. Greenblatt added that this is another example of Vital Records data being collected in real time is actually being used for real purposes.

Ms. Little asked what the fund would receive in return for its generosity. Mr. Bolton replied that the committee had already discussed this once before. The committee would be gaining a developer for our projects on the cheap. The grants would pay for half the salary and the fund the other half.

### **10. Other Business:**

Mr. Andrew pointed out that on the second page of his handout there were guidelines on what comes out of the fund and what does not. The position that Mr. Bolton was mentioning was included on the form in italics. The crossed out position on the form, was previously paid for by the fund. Mr. Andrew had been able to move it to the general funded Vital Records Operational budget this year.

Mr. Janosz asked Mr. Bolton about submitting paper copies to Town/City Clerks. At a training session with Mr. Wurtz, they were told that they would begin submitting the paper copies directly to the business office by January first and they had heard nothing more about it. Mr. Bolton replied that they would be sending them to the business office and that Mr. Janosz should have received a fax.

### **11. Next Meeting:**

There will be a special RFP meeting in mid February. Mr. Bolton will forward invitations with date, time and location. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the committee is scheduled for Thursday, March 21, 2002.

Ms. Little adjourned the meeting.