

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

To The New Hampshire Department of Health & Human Services

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
January 16, 2003***

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

January 16, 2003

Health and Welfare Building
Conference Room 110/111
6 Hazen Drive
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patty Little, City Clerk Appointment
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
Linda Hartson, Exeter Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Tom Janosz, Funeral Director Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
Jane Ireland, Rye Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Vacant, Health Information Specialist Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment

GUESTS:

Dr. Jesse Greenblatt, Director, Division of Epidemiology and Vital Statistics, OCPH
Mark Andrew, Administrator, Division of Epidemiology and Vital Statistics, OCPH
John O'Neal, Office of Information Systems, DHHS
Mark Parris, Office of Information Systems, DHHS
Steve Wurtz, Supervisor of Registration/Certification, BVR, DEVS
Lynda Mower, Clerks Executive Committee Liaison

Draft Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Bolton asked if there was any discussion on the minutes. Mr. Kruger moved that the minutes be accepted as printed. Ms. Ireland seconded and Mr. Bolton hearing no one wishing to discuss the minutes, called for a vote. The minutes were unanimously accepted as written. Mr. Bolton announced to the committee that the VRIFAC meeting minutes were once again available on the web. Meeting minutes for the past two years are available on the Vital Records website. He then advised members of the address to the site, www.dhhs.state.nh.us/dhhs/bvr/library/default.htm.

2. OIS Update:

Mr. Parris distributed a handout to the committee. He reported that during the last meeting the selection committee had still been in the process of evaluating all the vendors that bid on the web enablement project. Some vendors had been eliminated and others asked for further explanation or demonstrations. After the responses were received and the demonstration complete, the selection committee met again. They crafted a recommendation for the contractor they most felt met the needs and criteria of the RFP. Mr. Parris added that the negotiations with that contractor have begun. There were a couple of issues, one possibly legal that the state contract manager was working through. It all appeared to be on track.

Mr. Parris stated that even though it was an ITS07 RFP, in order to finalize the contract it must go before Governor & Council. He had spoken with Mr. Perry that morning and was still unsure as to the exact date that it would be reviewed by Governor & Council. He explained that adjustments would need to be made to the timeline to accommodate the additional steps needed for approval. Mr. Parris stated that there were two very hard deadlines to be met. One being the EDR module that is required by the agreement with the federal government and the birth module needs to be done by January 1, 2004 in order to make it effective. There would have to be adjustments made to the schedule.

Recorder Malfunction No audio

Mr. Andrew explained that instead of utilizing the entire \$1 million allocated by the legislature, the department would only use \$500,000 and let the committee allocate more of the fund to the web enablement project. Ms. Little asked why they could not use the whole amount allocated. She wanted Dr. Greenblatt and Mr. Andrew to go to the Commissioner and explain that the committee recommended using the entire amount. Dr. Greenblatt responded that they would be happy to share the committee's concerns with the Commissioner. Ms. Little asked Dr. Greenblatt and Mr. Andrew if they would committee return to the committee with the Commissioners response. They agreed that they would.

Ms. Little explained that she feels it is clear that the committee is not willing to give up the \$1 million yet. She asked if anyone would like to make a motion regarding that and hearing none, Ms. Little brought forth a motion for the committee to try to hold on to the whole \$1 million originally budgeted by the Legislature. She added that she wanted the letter being forwarded to Governor and Council to include the \$1 million capital budget

Draft Minutes

expenditure included. Ms. Ireland seconded Ms. Little's motion. Ms. Little asked for discussion on the matter. Mr. Bergeron stated that he didn't think he had ever disagreed with Ms. Little before, but that he would have to vote against her in this matter out of respect for the Department of Health & Human Services having a better understanding of their overall budget. He felt that they needed to be given some flexibility on this issue. Ms. Little thanked Mr. Bergeron for his comments and polled committee members and the motion carried with six yes votes, one no and two members abstaining. Ms. Little asked Dr. Greenblatt and Mr. Andrew to carry that message forward to the department and to advise the committee if they were unwilling to acknowledge it so the committee might take it to the next step.

3. Vital Records Business Plan:

Dr. Mevers informed the committee that the never-ending saga of the contract proposal was still ongoing. A potential contractor was selected in late September and they signed off on the contract cover page and contract letter. Those documents were forwarded to the Department of Personnel in early November. They were approved, signed and returned to Dr. Mevers around Thanksgiving. The documents were sent to the Attorney Generals office on December 3, 2002. On December 20, 2002 Dr. Mevers received a call from the Attorney Generals office. They had reviewed the document and that Dr. Mevers needed to provide an exhibit A showing what the deliverables would be. They also requested an exhibit B showing the payment schedule. An exhibit C showing the insurance coverage and they demanded a \$1 million dollar policy.

The chosen vendor needed to provide a certificate of vote or authority from their board of trustees. Dr. Mevers stated that since there were only two people associated with the contract he was not sure there was anyone else associated with them. They also needed a certificate of good standing for the company. He then added that after giving him the list of items needed the representative of the Attorney Generals office informed him that she was not the correct person to be reviewing the contract. She explained that she would pass it on to the correct party and they would be in touch.

Christmas came and went and Dr. Mevers tried to contact the "correct" person and finally on January 3, 2003 they made contact. She explained that he did need all the items the previous representative had listed. He then explained to her that the "company" consisted of two people. She replied that they would both then have to sign the contract. Dr. Mevers explained that they had and after looking the attorney agreed and added that they would still need a certificate of good standing and exhibits A, B, & C. She advised Dr. Mevers to check with the vendor regarding their insurance coverage.

He contacted the vendor and they provided the necessary documents and assurances. By January 13, 2003 he had all the documents prescribed by the Attorney Generals office. Dr. Mevers reported to the committee that it appeared that the insurance policy would be able to be waived as it had been for the previous project. If the Attorney General accepts what has been done, a letter would be sent to the Governor and Council along with the package. It was Dr. Mevers understanding that both he and the Commissioner of Health & Human Services would need to sign the letter. He hoped that the package would be submitted to the Governor & Council some time in early February. Because the timeline is somewhat flexible, Dr. Mevers felt that the chance to get it completed by summer are slim but possible.

Draft Minutes

4. **Filenet Solution:**

Mr. Armstrong reported that his office led a procurement effort to get a enterprise or statewide solution for document management, imaging, scanning, web publishing, electronic content management, etc. It is a fairly new concept that he felt that probably everyone was dealing with. We are dealing with mixed mediums, paper, electronic documents, emails, and faxes. There are systems out there that can deal with all these sources, including video clips. It is utilized usually for cases. If the police department wants to know everything about a case, all that is available. Knowing about all the documents in the state could, someday be done through a central system. The product they came up with was Filenet.

Filenet is a software publisher. Mr. Armstrong reported to the committee that they (Filenet) have been around awhile and have a good cash flow. They have a number of systems integrators that work with them to (“customize”) take the software and meld it into the application their customer is using. They have done a system dealing with Workers Compensation that manages documents, hearing, posting etc. It extremely streamlines things for agencies handling the filings. It is very powerful, but is not inexpensive. It is not a lot more expensive than a stand-alone product for something like imaging that may not work with other systems. The applications that are being done in the state system right now are the Financial and Human Resources system produces a ton of paper every day. It will save costs on printing and paper supplies.

They are also going to image in the hazardous materials manifest in Environmental Services so that it will be available to the public and others. It allows more accessibility to information that was not available in the past. Another application is in the consumer protection/charitable trust in the Department of Justice. They are going to image a lot of the back-filed documents and will eventually move to web filings. Those are the applications currently underway. The Department of Health & Human Services is looking at several uses for this project.

Mr. Armstrong stated that he believed that Employment Security was also considering using it. He reported that this technology could take the older technology, scanning and imaging and will marry it with emails, electronic documents, faxes, etc. It also has a web-publishing component that will make it very useful for those authorized to post on the websites. He noted that again, it was not cheap, but the goal is to eventually centralize everything. Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton how this solution would fit into the committees strategic planning. Mr. Bolton replied that he was unsure as to whether the strategic plan had been taken into consideration yet, but there is and has been a business need to archive the information.

Since 1996 the bureau has not kept pace with microfilming records. He and Mr. Armstrong met with Filenet representatives and technical staff to see if they could provide a technology that could spin off a reproduction of the Oracle database into an image file. The bureau could then maintain and even issue from it in the event of a catastrophic event. Mr. Wurtz added that one of the benefits to that would be, that for births the bureau is paperless. Currently births are electronic only, no backup. This would provide a backup to that electronic record. If the bureau had to recreate an electronic birth record right now, it would be unable to. Ms. Little asked if it was then a disaster recovery issue. Mr. Wurtz replied that it was.

Draft Minutes

Mr. Kruger asked if that would only entail records from 1995 on. Mr. Bolton replied that it would be the whole Oracle database, which would encompass anything from 1988-1989 and some other records that have been downloaded into the system. It would satisfy a rather acute business need. Mr. Bolton explained that all the older records had been previously microfilmed. Mr. Wurtz added that it also provided a timely backup of the database, including updates and corrections. Ms. Little asked if the issue of web publishing was something that would be of value to the bureau or committee. Mr. Bolton replied that he was unaware of any value to the bureau in the web publishing. Ms. Little asked if the electronic content management feature met any business need of the committees. Mr. Bolton replied that they would probably have to speak further with the FileNet sales people to see if it had value.

Ms. Little stated that the scanning ability seemed to be the key. Mr. Bolton explained that the estimate supplied to committee members included the imaging and catastrophic recovery components as well as a pictorial of the architecture that would be placed into effect. Mr. Armstrong stated that he had a question about the long term vision about getting this information on the web and would it be a state initiative or Latter Day Saints? He felt there would be a distinction. Mr. Bolton replied that the Latter Day Saints has offered to do all the “grunt” work for us, but the resulting files would belong to us and we could post it if we wanted to. Mr. Kruger added that they are only interested in making this information more readily accessible to the public. He stated that if the state wanted to run its own web site and maintain it, they would support that. If the state did not want to, they would make it available on their own.

Mr. Bolton stated that he had not seen their content manager component. Mr. Kruger replied that he had seen pieces of it as a user and it is user friendly. Mr. Armstrong asked if they would index things the bureau requested. Mr. Kruger replied that what he and Mr. Bolton had spoken with them about was taking the microfilm they have already done and having volunteers or paid (at LDS expense) data entry operators double key the information contained on it into the system and digitized. Mr. Armstrong asked if they would index specific fields. Mr. Bolton made a suggestion of ten fields. Mr. Kruger replied that they would probable index more than ten fields anyway. Mr. Bolton added that they were going to share the software with the bureau so he would be able to see what they were indexing. Mr. Kruger stated that he would be surprised if Mr. Bolton and the bureau’s requirements were more stringent than the Latter Day Saints.

Ms. Little asked if this could be brought into the FileNet solution at a later time. Mr. Kruger replied that he did not know if we would need to, but since it is an electronic solution it would probably be feasible. Mr. Armstrong replied that it would entail additional expense so it would probably make more sense to just use them from the start. He added that depending on who is doing it, the screens could be customized. Mr. Armstrong added that many in the department were just getting their feet wet in this issue and it might be wise to further investigate the alternatives and their financial impacts. He felt that there were many operational documents that should also be scanned in. In discussions, he heard that there were three chunks of records to be captured.

Mr. Kruger asked to explain the three chunks of records. The first was the records from 1988 to present. They are already in digital form and there is no indexing required. The second is death, marriage and divorce records from 1947 back. Birth records would be from 1900 back. Those records are on microfilm and none are in electronic form. He

Draft Minutes

knew of no technology available that would allow them to be imaged and indexed. It would require manual intervention with human eyes. That is where the expense is if you have to pay for it. He explained that Ancestry.com did about 125 million people in the 1930 census and it was well up into the tens of millions and he believed the keying was done somewhere like India. The third group is records from 1948 to 1987, which from an imaging standpoint are very much like the large group of old records.

Many are typewritten, but many are not. It would more than likely be problematic. Those records are closed to the public and for the immediate future will remain closed. He stated that they could be scanned and copies made, with rudimentary indexes made, but they would be nothing like an electronic record. Mr. Wurtz added that there was an index for the 1948-1987 records. It was an old Ebase program.

Ms. Little asked what the LDS was offering. Mr. Kruger and Mr. Bolton replied that they had offered to do the largest group. Mr. Bergeron added that when the LDS had been filming his older records in Nashua they had offered to film the records that were not yet in the public domain to preserve them. He did not take them up on their offer even though they offered to preserve the confidentiality until such time that the records were open to the public. Mr. Bolton reported that they had offered to do the bureau's closed records and leave the film onsite until they were made available to the public. Dr. Greenblatt asked if giving them the records to film was legal. He felt that there was a need for a legal opinion on the legality of allowing the LDS access to closed records.

Ms. Little asked if the relationship with the LDS was before the committee. Mr. Bolton replied that he did not feel it was necessary to bring it before the committee. Mr. Kruger added that cost was zero. Mr. Armstrong stated that the timing would be the issue. Mr. Bolton agreed and explained that because they are offering to do this for free, we would not be able to demand a set timeline. Mr. Kruger added that after meeting with church hierarchy that it would be four years before we would see useful information. Their volunteers can do 25 million records a year and were investigating ways to ramp that up with paid workers.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the committee would like he and Mr. Bolton to do further investigation into FileNet and other products. Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. Bolton and Mr. Armstrong were looking for a vote on FileNet. Mr. Bolton replied that they would like one only to say yes, this is a bonafide use of funds and do go forward and find more details and report back to the committee. Mr. Bergeron felt that if the state is committed to FileNet and it would solve the immediate need for backups for recent records it should be approved right away. The department could come back with recommendations on other ways we might expand the use of the software. Mr. Kruger asked if that would require an RFP. Mr. Armstrong replied that it would not require an RFP. It was ready to go.

Mr. Kruger suggested Mr. Bergeron put that in the form of a motion. Mr. Bergeron put forward a motion that the committee approve the bureau's purchase and use of FileNet to back up the electronic records in the Oracle database that currently have no paper backup. Mr. Kruger seconded his motion. Ms. Little asked for discussion. Ms. Ireland asked that Mr. Bergeron explain exactly what they were approving. Mr. Bergeron replied that the motion would be to adopt FileNet as the software vehicle for access and preservation of some of our records and to commit the funds to begin the project. It would also direct

Draft Minutes

Mr. Bolton to return to the committee at a later date, with suggestions as to other ways in which the project can be expanded.

Ms. Little asked what the bottom line was. Mr. Bolton replied that there was a \$75,000 charge for services and the software required would \$93,500. Mr. Kruger and Mr. Bolton agreed that it would come to \$168,000-170,000. Mr. Kruger suggested that we focus on the records that have already been digitized rather than spending a lot of time and money worrying about the older records. Mr. Bergeron agreed. Mr. Bolton wanted to clarify that the records in question were all those on the Oracle database. Mr. Kruger stated that this project is exactly what the committee should be expending funds on. Mr. Armstrong added that the department is helping to keep costs down by using an existing server. Ms. Little asked for a vote on Mr. Bergeron's motion. The committee unanimously voted to move forward with the Filenet project.

5. Research Center Staffing:

Mr. Bolton reported that the position has been offered and accepted. They are just waiting for Fiscal and the Governor & Council to encumber the money. He stated that it would be at least February before the position began.

6. Other Business:

Dr. Greenblatt asked Ms. Little for clarification on the first motion brought forward. He stated that one of the things Mr. O'Neal mentioned earlier in terms of the allocation funding that had just been decided upon was that the items going before the Governor & Council needed to have details spelled out. He stated that the motion that had just been voted on would stop the process of that going forward at this time. He wanted to make sure that everyone was aware of that. Until there is agreement on the actual distribution of funds, that Governor & Council note would have to be held back. Ms. Little replied that she understood and hoped that there would be time to get it in for the February meeting. She stated that she wanted it to be right.

Mr. Armstrong asked for clarification. He asked Mr. Andrew if the million could be put into 2003 or if they expired. He added that Mr. Andrew mentioned 2003 and 2004, but had not mentioned the \$500,000 for 2002, was that money gone. Mr. Andrew replied that it was not. Mr. Armstrong stated that since there was \$1 million in 2003, rather than asking for capital money to be extended. Mr. Andrew explained that he arrived at his decisions/suggestion based on looking at the deliverable schedule. Mr. Armstrong asked if the commissioner agreed and said no, lets spend the money, would that be the 2003 money and the 2004 money be the Social Security Administration (SSA) funds. Mr. Andrew replied that off the top of his head, no. The SSA funds terminate sometime this year so they would probably go ahead and ask for the capital funds.

Mr. Armstrong asked if that would require Fiscal committee review and approval and cause delays. Mr. Bergeron asked to comment on the issue and further complicate it. He asked if to protect the preservation funds would it be possible to accept the SSA funds in July or August, which is still their fiscal year 2003, but is our fiscal year 2004 and move the \$400,000 contribution from the Vital Records Improvement Fund (VRIF) from fiscal 04 to 03. It would be the same money, but on paper it would be locking up our funds and

Draft Minutes

limiting our exposure. Mr. Andrew replied that he would have to see how much flexibility we have with the SSA funds. He added that they are currently appropriated and are not in the 04 budget. He was unsure whether they would be able to make that change at this stage of the budgeting process.

Mr. Armstrong replied that the conflict is just a three month lag. We would not be changing their fiscal year that it was just in the interest of protecting the fund. Mr. Andrew replied that they could potentially have the opportunity to do that in biennium budgeting. But, that would not be part of what the legislature is looking at right now. That part has already been submitted and the VRIF funds would not be protected by that action.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the funds were encumbered, how would they not be protected. Mr. Andrew replied that that is part of what the legislature would be looking at. Mr. Armstrong asked why the legislature would not be looking at the funds if they were just sitting there. Mr. Andrew stated that those funds had already been identified. Mr. Andrew explained that there is just a line item for Vital Records. Ms. Little asked if Mr. Andrew had shown the \$200,000 VRIF money in the line item for Vital Records expenses. Mr. Andrew replied that he had not.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the committee had a business plan. Mr. Bolton explained that there was a Strategic Information Technology (SIT) plan that included VRV2000. Mr. Armstrong suggested that it be updated. Mr. O'Neal explained that they were currently in the SITP process. Mr. Armstrong felt that it should be updated annually. Ms. Little suggested that the committee have a plan for the off years so they could keep track of things. Mr. Bolton, Mr. O'Neal and Ms. Little agreed that they could put that on the July 2003 agenda.