

***VITAL RECORDS IMPROVEMENT FUND  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE***  
*To The New Hampshire Department of State*

***-MINUTES-***

***Thursday  
January 29, 2004***

# Draft Minutes

## **-MINUTES-**

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

January 29, 2004

New Hampshire Department of Safety  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room  
33 Hazen Drive  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

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

Patty Little, City Clerk Appointment  
Linda Hartson, Exeter Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar  
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment  
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment  
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment  
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment  
Annette Barnaby, Health Information Specialist Appointment  
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment  
Fred Rusczek, Manchester Health Officer, DHHS Appointment

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

Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment  
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment  
Rick Bailey, OIT, DHHS Appointment

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

Bob Lambert, Peterborough Town Clerk, VRIFAC/NHC&TCA Liaison  
Steve Sullivan, IT Manager, SOS  
David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS  
Anthony Stevens, Assistant Secretary of State, SOS  
Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS  
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS  
Mark Parris, Office of Information Systems, DHHS  
Eric Allen, OIT, Vital Records, SOS  
Steve Wurtz, Supervisor of Registration/Certification, DVRA, SOS  
John O'Neal, OIT, DHHS  
Cynthia Swank, Consultant, InLook Group  
Peter Parker, Consultant, InLook Group

# Draft Minutes

## Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

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

Ms. Little began the meeting and asked everyone to introduce him or herself. After the introductions were complete she thanked everyone for their participation and attendance. Ms. Little remarked that Mr. Bolton should explain to the committee about the statute that added several new members in attendance. Mr. Bolton explained that Mr. Lambert, clerk for the town of Peterborough was the new liaison between the committee and the clerk's association. He went on to explain that Mr. Pollard, Executive Director of the New Hampshire Funeral Director's Association was a new member replacing Mr. Janosz who resigned. Mr. Hall is a data user that the Department of Health & Human Services appointed as one of their three appointees.

Mr. Bolton explained that Mr. Bailey, who was not in attendance, was also a new DHHS appointee. Mr. Rusczek, Health Officer from Manchester is also a vital records user and is the municipal person appointed by DHHS. Ms. Kimberly Johnson, Town Clerk of Henniker was not in attendance, but is also a new member of the committee replacing Jane Ireland, who fulfilled two full terms on the committee. Ms. Little mentioned that she did not see Mr. Armstrong in attendance and wanted to confirm with Mr. Bolton that he was still a member. Mr. Bolton replied that he had heard nothing about Mr. Armstrong being removed as a member so he assumed he was still with the committee. Mr. Bolton added that the Medical Examiner's office was also not in attendance.

Ms. Little asked if the committee had taken the opportunity to read the minutes from the November meeting. She then asked if there was a motion to accept them and Ms. Hartson made a motion. Mr. Kruger seconded Ms. Hartson's motion and Ms. Little asked if there was any discussion. Hearing none she asked for those in favor of accepting the minutes to say aye and those opposing nay. Hearing no nays, the minutes were accepted as written unanimously.

### 2. **InLook Group Presentation:**

Ms. Swank reported that she and Mr. Parker had provided Mr. Bolton and Dr. Mevers with a number of deliverables. They included suggestions for a plan, white paper on preservation of books and records which also included resources and disaster planning document, standards and guidelines for permanent paper, microfilming digital imaging and record storage. An introduction to vendors listed according to specialty, whether it is book and paper conservators, book binders, micrographics vendors and digital imaging vendors. They had done the benchmarking using other states that was discussed at the previous meeting. They had written up in a narrative, a comparison of those various programs.

Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank had spoken with Dr. Mevers about their draft deliverables and she expected that they would meet with him and Mr. Bolton to go over them within the next couple of weeks. Ms. Swank explained that what remained to be done was the overall plan and grant application packet and what would be included. She felt that they would have that to Mr. Bolton and Dr. Mevers by the end of February. It would then hopefully be available to the committee in advance of the next meeting. She distributed a handout to the committee. She and Mr. Parker call their three-prong program Educate, Facilitate and Perpetuate.

## Draft Minutes

The education part has already begun via the New Hampshire Local Records Education Project, which was a grant-funded program that this fund contributed to. It was a program run out of Dartmouth. A number of clerks took advantage of the workshops that were offered. After attending the workshop they had an opportunity to have a site assessment with a report by preservation consultants. They felt that the program should continue as there are always new people coming in and it would be a reminding process.

They also felt that the brochures that VRIF funded should continue to be funded as well as information such as, standards and guidelines that InLook provides and workshop curricula. Those items should be available online. In addition there could be links to the New Hampshire Historical Records Advisory Board, Vital Records, New Hampshire Municipal Association, and NHLOGIN. There are a lot of parties where people might seek information about records preservation. Ms. Swank and Mr. Parker felt that the workshops needed to continue. Ms. Swank added that it would probably be most easily achieved by having Northeast Document Conservation center conduct them.

To facilitate is obviously about securing funding/grants for municipality projects. To begin actually addressing their preservation needs. They felt that for those municipalities that had never had a site assessment done or it had been more than ten years since one was done, needed a planning document. That document would help them identify exactly where their problems are and how to address them. Ms. Swank felt that those municipalities that had already had an assessment done should be immediately eligible for grants to improve their storage facilities, to purchase equipment and archival supplies.

To perpetuate is to continue with the educational efforts and adding to the grant program. Once the storage areas are improved then conservation, filming, scanning, project help, and other aspects of improving their records programs can be addressed. Ms. Swank explained that the question was, does local government record improvement funds fit into this? She added that ideally if it were funded there would be a local government records staffer to assist in administering this program and to provide hands-on advice. Because that additional staff person is on hold at the state level, Ms. Swank suggested that maybe the VRIF could fund the position or contract someone to keep the project running.

The committee and State Historical Records Advisory Board might want to consider going for a National Historical Publications and Records Commission grant that would provide more funding. It might even cover a person, but there is the problem that you end up with a larger grant program that is not exactly what you had aimed for. The NHPRC has its own agenda and your application would have to reflect that in some way so it would force the committee to expand the program.

Mr. Parker directed the members to the second page of the handout. He explained that the document attempts to describe some of their concerns over the grant program. He asked the committee to please speak up if they see something that should not be supported or something that is missing. Basically, what they had seen in grant programs nationwide run the gamut. Preservation type activities that should be supported: site visits to help people plan for what they want to do, refurbish storage areas. Mr. Parker spoke of some of the facilities he has seen used as storage facilities. He explained that he had visited around forty sites in New Hampshire. Many are located in the basement, have running water going through them.

## Draft Minutes

Refurbishing storage areas, providing environmental equipment, archival supplies. Mr. Parker added that they had noticed that the state has arrangements with certain vendors to provide supplies and they felt that access might be given to municipalities to make their few dollars go further. He then stated that he would be curious to know how many cities and towns have disaster plans in place. It is a real need and most do not have one. Mr. Parker then asked the committee if they noticed anything missing from the document that they felt needed to be there.

Ms. Little asked Mr. Parker to explain what he meant by temporary project help. He replied that he could not clearly explain, but if someone were a genius grant writer, you might spin a tale so that you have 10,000 records to re-house and there is only one of you. In order to accomplish task in one fiscal year you will need to have help. You will need a body or two or three. Some might be volunteers, but you will need someone to supervise the volunteers. That sort of thing is what he and Ms. Swank have in mind as a possibility. He added that you would need to justify it very clearly.

Mr. Parker then explained that most grant programs that he and Ms. Swank had looked at had pre-conditions for applicants. In Maine, Mr. Henderson requires that before a grantee receives money, the town municipality or historical society must attend at least one meeting sponsored by Maine State Archives. Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank felt that the attendance at such a workshop could serve as a wakeup call to them as to what needs to be done and how it needs to be done. They felt that it should be an essential precondition. He then asked the committee if they felt that there should be others.

Ms. Little replied that in looking back at the minutes from last month's meeting there was talk about adherence to standards, and did that play into their plan. Mr. Parker responded that in a way they did. He and Ms. Swank had been looking at statutes and discovered that administrative rules cannot impose unfunded mandates. He explained that it could be a requirement rather than a pre-condition. They will understand that they can only spend the grant money on approved items or uses.

Ms. Hartson expressed concern that there will be a terrific need for a lot of public relations work, in that this plan is all well and good. She added that in most municipalities the clerk is responsible for records. It will be easy for a clerk to say that they want to participate in the program, but convincing municipalities are another story. Many clerks are elected as Ms. Hartson is and remembers having this discussion with her municipality before about preserving records. The discussion invariably turns to whether or not this is just for vital records or is it for all of the municipalities' records?

The municipalities feel that the VRIF is already responsible for maintaining and preserving vital records. She went on to explain that when this survey was originally done, that was one of the biggest issues raised. Mr. Parker replied that Massachusetts requires that there be a resolution from the governing body, be it the council, selectmen, etc. The resolution authorizes you to sign the contract and to expend the grant funds. In other words, the governing body is at least warned that you are going forward with the project that they approved or you want them to approve.

In deciding what to do first and whether the monies should be spent only on vitals. Mr. Parker stated that InLook is strongly suggesting that we follow the lead of a former colleague of his, now a senior conservator at the Library of Congress. He says the first thing to worry about is the environment and the second is storage conditions and only

## Draft Minutes

then do you spend money on actual conservation or preservation of the objects. Mr. Parker explained that the committee would get more bang for its buck doing things that way. Rather than sending out books to be re-bound and then just putting them back in the damp, drafty place they started out.

Ms. Hartson explained that she understood that, but the issue remained that even if the municipality agreed and signed a contract. In three years she might be replaced and the subsequent clerk may have no interest in the preservation project. The selectmen would probably also have changed by that point. It would probably be expected that a municipality contribute to the project. That would require the selectmen to put an article before the townspeople to sell it to them. Ms. Hartson reiterated that her only point would be that there needs to be a clear list of steps that must be taken before a grant can be accepted by a municipality. Mr. Parker agreed. Mr. Bergeron asked if it was possible under town government to do a generic resolution that allows the municipality to accept gifts of services and supplies without transferring money into the community?

Ms. Hartson replied that they could accept gifts. Mr. Bergeron stated that maybe there was a way to do it where the bills would just be paid by the fund rather than giving out money. Mr. Parker replied that Georgia does their grants that way. Mr. Bergeron felt that that method could alleviate some of the difficulty. Ms. Hartson replied that there was an article that appears on the warrants to accept gifts, not necessarily services. Mr. Bergeron felt that it could be a gift of services. He wanted to go on the record as stating strongly, that he felt that the money should be used only for vital records issues only. In doing so he felt that maybe the committee would be giving clerks a wakeup call about their other record needs. In a round about way the improvement of facilities would benefit all records anyway.

Mr. Parker stated that the five grants originally given amounted to about \$25,000. The total amount expended on the purposes of the grants was close to \$100,000. Mr. Parker mentioned Rollinsford as an example, purchased a wonderful safe. It is located right in the clerk's office, climate controlled and above grade. He added that there was some work done on vitals in each case, but the projects were conceived as a larger project covering the environment, storage conditions as well as the physical condition of the particular vitals. He explained that there were some that were more concerned about the survival of the information than the survival of the artifact. The debate was whether money should be spent filming the records to ensure the information is captured on another medium.

Mr. Kruger stated that there might be sources outside, beyond this fund and taxpayers. Some for profit some not that have a great deal of interest in the use of vital records and associated information. They may well be another source of funding for the preservation/maintenance records. Mr. Kruger was aware of two major projects, both approaching one-half a million dollars. They involve filming and scanning of documentation and the preservation of the original documents appear to be equally important. He went on to add that the funding was 60% outside the taxpayer's purview in Quincy, Massachusetts and almost 100% outside in Groton. That money could selectively come into play here. Ms. Swank asked Mr. Kruger who provided that funding. He replied that in both cases it had been the New England Historic Genealogical Society and it funded the projects by using its resources to go out and find private donors.

## Draft Minutes

Between the two projects there was close to three quarters of a million dollars brought to bear. He added that the money is out there. Ms. Swank asked Mr. Kruger what Groton and Quincy had that made it worth doing. Mr. Kruger replied that in neither case was it Vital Records, but if the funds from VRIF are pointed at vital records and then point the donated funds at tax records, dog licenses, etc. There is a use value to that information. Receiving additional funding allows for the discussion of new safes, etc. Mr. Parker stated that what he was hearing was that public relations were paramount. Whether it be advising clerks and others about standards, providing them with information and ammunition to take to their boards of selectmen or councils. They could advise that this is one of the first things to be done to show the organizations that the city or town is serious in their endeavor to protect and preserve their history.

Mr. Lambert explained that he comes from a hospital town (Peterborough), and he has a vault in his office. Because they keep all records in that vault it is wide open every day and before they could begin their improvement process they had to put an article on the town warrant. The Historical Society is located right next door to his office and they split the cost of a new vault, which was a tremendous help. He was expecting new shelving in the next week. Records in the vault are currently on tables. Of the records he has had done, some are on microfilm, CD, and on TIP. So if you have a "Dockstar" system you can put it on the computer. He explained that he was having all the records backed up. He felt the best way to get the town to support your effort is to bring your worst looking books for them to see.

When Mr. Lambert's town saw the condition of his records his request was granted, and he now can expect at least \$20,000 each budget year. He explained that his leather bound books were disintegrating and they were very persuasive. Mr. Lambert admitted that going locally for grant money was easy. To apply for the library grant he explained that you needed to submit eleven copies. To apply for many of the grants available out there you need someone that is familiar with writing grant applications. Most people are not familiar with writing grants and when they hear the requirements they throw up their hands. Mr. Parker stated that he was down to his last two points. Who would be administering the grant program?

In Virginia, the administrator told he and Ms. Swank that he had written or re-written two-thirds of the grant applications that had come his way. A number of other grant administrators admitted to doing a lot of hand holding throughout the process. Mr. Parker told the committee that he and Ms. Swank were concerned who would be doing this for the committee. They were also concerned about the review process. He then asked how the review process was handled in 1998. Mr. Bolton replied that there had been a subcommittee formed to evaluate the requests. Mr. Parker asked Mr. Wurtz (was on review subcommittee) who received the documents when they came in. Mr. Wurtz replied that they were received in Vital Records office. Mr. Parker then asked how many were received.

Ms. Hartson replied that she thought there had been twelve submissions. She went on to add that at the annual clerk convention, held about a month prior to the deadline, many were interested in participating. Once it became clear the amount of work and knowledge required the enthusiasm faded. When they realized they would be responsible for finding contractors, getting estimates and doing all of the legwork. Ms. Hartson explained to Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank that those items were a lot of work and did not usually fall under a city/town clerk's expertise.

## Draft Minutes

Ms. Hartson felt that it was not the clerk's place to tell the elected officials what they should be doing. She said that they probably wouldn't get very far anyway and would start off the project on the wrong foot. She restated that she felt that there needed to be a major public relations push for this to be successful. She also felt that making help available to those clerks that need it throughout the process from grant request to the end.

Mr. Parker asked if it would help if the first step in the process were a site visit by someone that came to look at the town's storage area and invited/persuaded the chair of the selectmen to sit in on the visit. He asked if Ms. Hartson felt that might help get something approved? Ms. Hartson replied that she was sure that it would. Ms. Little stated that she thought that what was in front of the committee at this point was how the committee would fund this initiative especially since SB74 was lost. She explained that the bill would have been the ideal funding mechanism for it. Ms. Little was unsure exactly what had happened on the floor. She stated that she knew there had been a majority and a minority report. She asked if anyone had heard what had happened.

Mr. Bergeron replied that it was his understanding that opponents of the bill painted it as another attempt by the Division of Motor Vehicles to increase the revenue source. It never even made it to discussion where it would have been plain that it was a clerk's fee and bill. Mr. Bergeron added that they had essentially gone against Senate and House leadership and the House majority committee report. Essentially killing the bill until 2005. Mr. Parker told Ms. Little that she had hit the nail on the head. He then explained that he and Ms. Swank had been told that there was approximately \$100,000 available from the VRIF. He asked if this was still the case. Mr. Bolton replied that they had allocated \$50,000 per year to preservation, so that would be \$100,000 for the biennium. He then added that the committee had never discussed those funds carrying forward from year to year.

Ms. Hartson asked if that was in danger of being tapped. Mr. Bolton replied that they just need a mechanism to tunnel the funds through. Ms. Little verified that Ms. Hartson was referring to the fund being used as it was intended. Ms. Hartson answered in the affirmative. Ms. Little explained that the best way to protect the fund is to have a program in place to spend it. Being a new member Mr. Lambert asked that because he is from a hospital town and has so many birth records to handle and are not on safety paper, would this type of project deal with that? Mr. Bolton replied in the affirmative. Mr. Parker asked what was happening to HEP 7000. Mr. Bolton replied that it had been carried forward and was still a valid set of rules.

Ms. Little suggested that the committee talk about a stopgap measure to hold them over until the legislation is re-submitted to create the funding conduit. She stated that it would be needed for the next year or two if they ever wanted to do anything with this initiative. Her first question was whether the fund could actually pay personnel, at least for some sort of pilot program to keep the idea going for a few years. She asked if anyone had interest in doing that. Ms. Little then verified with Dr. Mevers that the amount was \$50,000. Dr. Mevers added that they would be able to hire and provide benefits for someone qualified to help cities and towns with their project as well as act as a liaison between them and the program with that sum.

Mr. Parker asked if that position would be full-time. Dr. Mevers replied that it would be. Mr. Bolton replied that those figures were at least a year old so some adjustment could be

## Draft Minutes

necessary. Mr. Parker asked if Mr. Bolton and Dr. Mevers would consider doing like Maine does with Janet Roberts coming in eight hours per week. He was unsure as to whether or not she was under contract with them or as a part-time employee. To clarify, he asked if they would consider a contract employee, working sixteen hours per week.

Mr. Bergeron replied that he thought it would be better to have someone full-time that would be capable of conducting the seminars rather than bringing in outside companies to do them. He explained that bringing in a vendor to do the seminars is about \$1000 per seminar and there would be approximately fifteen per year. Between paying for the seminars and someone to come in for eight hours per month it would take no time to go through the \$50,000. Mr. Parker agreed. Mr. Bergeron felt that hiring a professional would probably ensure that the person would be knowledgeable and stay. Dr. Mevers added that it is difficult to hire a person part-time. He added that the committee would need to get the position covered through the fund.

Ms. Little asked what the current budget looked like and if the committee would not then have to beef up the fund to cover the grants if the personnel took the \$50,000. Mr. Parker replied that they would in the second and third year. Mr. Bolton replied that Ms. Penney had been working on a spreadsheet for the committee, but was not finished with it. He distributed a handout that detailed some of the budget picture. They were working on creating a report styled after the budget report the committee had grown accustomed to with Mr. Andrew. She was trying to automate the process by firing state data through their data system and then incorporating the same form, but it was still not finished. To illustrate his point, Mr. Bolton directed the committee's attention to the front page of the budget report under current support it has partial information on SFY 04 total expended, but has no balance or revenue forward.

Mr. Bolton then explained that because of the missing information on the report he could not be 100% certain of the bottom line. Mr. Bolton added that there had been \$1.1 million SFY 03 and had the \$400,000 obligated by the legislature to offset DHHS operating expenses. He added that there was \$400,000 per year budgeted. Mr. Bolton informed the committee that he was under the impression that the fund was quite fluid. Adding that he would get the bottom line from Ms. Penney, Mr. Bolton stated that he felt there was room to fund the position in addition to \$50,000 to use for grants.

Mr. Bolton then explained that they had budgeted that money repeatedly and had not obligated any of the funds over the years. Ms. Hartson asked what the person hired would be responsible for. Dr. Mevers replied that they would be responsible for the training, site visits and acting as liaison between the fund and city and town clerks. He hoped to find someone capable of doing all that and be knowledgeable of archival principles and preservation/restoration principles.

Ms. Hartson asked if the committee elected to not go forward with it, the initiative would be left at a standstill. Ms. Little replied that they would be unable to do anything. Dr. Mevers added that the reason they would be unable to do anything was because he and Mr. Bolton were the only two people that would be left to do it. Ms. Hartson replied that she was only verifying what she understood. Mr. Parker asked if the committee would lose the money if they did not use it. Ms. Little and Mr. Bolton replied that the money would not be lost. Mr. Kruger and Ms. Hartson agreed that the legislature had appropriated some of the fund before, so they did not want to say it could not happen again. Ms. Swank added that they would probably lose momentum that the New

## Draft Minutes

Hampshire Local Records Education Project has provided. Now is the time to keep the momentum going, plus she felt that they would be building constituencies eventually.

Ms. Little asked if the hiring freeze was still on. Dr. Mevers replied that as far as he knew it was, but deferred to the Deputy Secretary of State. Ms. Little asked Mr. Scanlan if the committee would be able to hire someone for the proposed position. Mr. Scanlan replied that there was a hiring freeze on General fund funded positions, but something like this would probably pass. Mr. Kruger stated that he was very leery about building additional administration. He informed the committee that the \$50,000 represented 6% of the fund annually and did the fund want to commit itself to that amount? He also asked if that was all the money that would be allocated to preservation is it all going to go for the personnel. That would only cover the educational portion and is the committee planning on budgeting an additional 6% of the fund for preservation? That would leave 12% of the expected \$800,000 generated each year spoken for.

Mr. Kruger wanted to be sure the committee was aware of the implications of taking this step. Mr. Kruger was also concerned that if an additional \$50,000 were allocated it would still cost 50% of the budgeted amount to administer it and that seemed high to him. He then added that those amounts could be offset by educational monies collected from offering the courses ourselves. Mr. Bergeron reminded the committee, that months earlier he had broached the subject of budgeting/allocating a percentage of the fund rather than a set amount of \$50,000 each year. At the time the percentages he suggested were eight to ten percent. That way as the fund grew, the amount of dollars being used for local records preservation would also increase. He felt that might be one way to address Mr. Kruger's concerns.

A gentleman suggested that possibly the two areas could be separated. The educational and outreach portions being administered by the new hire and possibly the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation would be interested in seeking, obtaining and reviewing the grant applications. They specialize in receiving and reviewing grants. That is their business. They have also made grants to municipalities; small ones but they do have the experience. He wondered if they would handle the administration of the grant process, forwarding qualified applications to the committee for review. The other advantage to that would be if they would do it for free. Someone would need to ask them, but he had heard of them doing it before. It would also provide another avenue of outreach. Having a charitable organization aware of the preservation needs and opportunities.

Mr. Lambert spoke up and said that the education part is great, but when the seminar is over and the clerk returns to his/her town they need guidance. Where do they start? "You walk into a vault and there are records in there from 1760 in there and nothing has ever been done?" They need help making a plan and he felt having the new hire that can go out and visit cities and towns to help. The information you get at the seminars is wonderful, but because you go right back to your usual routine, much of the information is lost because you do not use it right away.

Mr. Kruger referring to Mr. Bergeron's suggestion to link the amount budgeted to the amount brought in by the fund, stated that Mr. Bergeron's idea addressed another of his concerns. If they are going to devote that kind of money including benefits, do they think they can find someone with all the talents they are hoping for with that kind of money? He felt that possibly Mr. Bolton and Dr. Mevers were building quite a job description, but

## Draft Minutes

can they fill that position for that salary? Ms. Hartson replied that they would not know until they try. Mr. Kruger agreed, but added that there might be a way to take the grant-writing piece of it and accomplish that another way taking some of the stress off that position and would make the salary more agreeable.

Ms. Barnaby stated that if new personnel would be administering the program, then who would do the actual archiving of the records? She did not think clerks would have the time to take on such projects. She felt that was a position in itself. At the hospital where she works they pay outside companies to come in to archive their records. She added that it is very expensive. Mr. Kruger explained that is what the grants are for. Ms. Little told the committee that this was not an issue they could hope to settle in one discussion.

Ms. Little then asked that someone contact the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation to see if they would be interested in taking a role in this initiative. She also asked that a job description be presented to the committee to look at for the prospective new hire. Mr. Parker asked if he might have a copy of the job description as well as the names of the people to contact at the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation because he wanted to be involved.

Ms. Little also asked that Mr. Bolton take a look at the budget situation and think about Mr. Bergeron's suggestion of a percentage. Maybe do some projections of the impact that might have on the fund. Mr. Bergeron volunteered to be the one to contact the New Hampshire Charitable Fund. Mr. Parker asked if there were going to be changes to the Vital Records website with links, how does the state bill the department for the changes. Mr. Bolton explained that he works with Mr. Sullivan, whom he pointed out to Mr. Parker. Mr. Sullivan is in charge of keeping up the website and Mr. Bolton has found it quite easy to make changes. Ms. Little thanked the committee for a very good discussion on this issue. She again expressed her disappointment in the failure of SB 74, but said the committee needed to just keep moving forward.

Mr. Kruger asked Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank if they were on time and on budget with the contract. Mr. Parker replied that the original called for the work to be done by the end of March. He and Ms. Swank hope to have it finished by the end of February so the committee can review it and they can revise it in time. Mr. Parker added that in terms of "how much is left in the pot for us, somewhere around fifty percent." Ms. Little asked for the OIT update.

### **3. OIS Update:**

Mr. O'Neal proclaimed that December was a particularly bad day for the web enablement project. The room erupted in laughter. He explained that the difficulty he faced was that he was unable to bring the right people to the table to move the project forward. He told the committee that they had done several things. Including an architecture and infrastructure overview for the other team. Mr. Sullivan and Ms. Way from OIT did an independent assessment of the project so there are some action items that came from that. Mr. O'Neal stated that he felt they had all lost focus and communication had suffered. He felt that they had gotten it back together and he was feeling better about it. The contractor was on site yesterday for another presentation for another system.

Mr. O'Neal reported that he had had an opportunity to speak with them and they had scheduled regular weekly meetings and can pull in whatever resources they need. They

## Draft Minutes

had fallen behind and Mr. O'Neal reported that Mr. Bolton had been unhappy with him. He did feel that they were getting back on track. "It was a train wreck and sometimes you need a train wreck to get peoples attention." Ms. Little asked if the train wreck has cost anyone any money? Mr. O'Neal replied that it was costing the contractor money. He added that he would do what he could do help the contractor get caught up. They had discussed integrating Secretary of State staff and Mr. O'Neal's staff into the CNSI project team in hopes that they could help speed things along. He felt that the weekly meetings would go a long way toward speeding things up.

Mr. O'Neal continued that he thought the centralization of the Office of Information Technology was in spirit the right thing to do. Except it sent everyone off in different directions worrying about other things and they lost focus. Ms. Little asked how many weeks behind schedule the project was. Mr. O'Neal was unsure. Mr. Bolton replied that they were still talking about revising the dates as they had received a tentative WBS. He stated that they were looking at possibly an April rollout of birth and death software and a July rollout of Marriage and Divorce. They have discussed combining all the modules and having a grand rollout in July. Mr. Bolton added that there was still an issue as to how they are going to handle the SSA grant. They may insist that the death registration module be up and running by a certain date that we cannot meet and they have provided nearly \$500,000 toward the project. He had spoken with the SSA and they were going to get back to him. They had a lot of staff turnover and the new project manager was unsure. Looking back at the last meeting's minutes Ms. Little brought up the Memorandum of Understanding between several state agencies that had been discussed. She asked if that agreement had been accomplished. Mr. O'Neal replied that there had been talk about it but no action yet. Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton to make sure that the MOU remain on future agendas. She felt it was a very important that everyone agreed on duties and responsibilities and that this committee has the chance to review and weigh in on it. Mr. O'Neal replied that there was a template that shows what an MOU should look like but he was unsure as to whether or not anyone from his Finance group had shared it with any of the other agencies.

#### **4. Other Business:**

Ms. Little asked Mr. O'Neal to report to the committee on the impact of Mr. Anderson's sudden departure from OIT. Mr. O'Neal replied that there was a great deal of speculation regarding Mr. Anderson leaving so suddenly. He added that OIT was on the hook for the \$11 million dollar savings that was supposed to come about from the reorganization of the all the state IT staff. He stated that he had not personally spoken to Mr. Anderson, but did feel that he had been a breath of fresh air to the organization. He was a fast mover that had built up a lot of support.

Mr. O'Neal said that because of that there has been a tremendous impact and he believed that Mr. Yao was acting in Mr. Anderson's place as CIO. Directors have been asked to provide budget updates so there is a lot of turmoil. Mr. O'Neal was sitting pretty comfortable several weeks earlier watching the Department of Health & Human Services reorganize itself. He felt quite smug until Mr. Anderson resigned. From a model standpoint where you have a web development group, centralized, operations and desktop support and the embedded agency applications, the model works. It just needs to be stabilized. He did not believe anyone coming in would be making any major changes.

## Draft Minutes

Ms. Little asked if the legislature was really looking for those \$11 million in savings. Mr. O'Neal replied in the affirmative. She then asked who suggested that figure in the first place. Mr. O'Neal said it was his understanding that the savings was first portrayed as \$32 million and someone on the finance committee bumped it down to \$11 million. So Mr. Anderson was on the hook for it and Mr. O'Neal was not sure whether Mr. Anderson was on good terms with the finance committee or not. A gentleman in the room stated that the \$11 million was mentioned in the Governor's budget originally. Ms. Little urged the committee members to hope for the best. From the perspective of local government, those at NHLOGIN were certainly impressed with Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson was really an ally for local government when it came to state IT allocation. They were very discouraged and quite anxious over his departure. With the loss of DITM and now Mr. Anderson there is no longer a bridge. They are waiting to see if anyone else sends them a signal that their relationships with local governments, is still a priority. Mr. O'Neal replied that Mr. Bailey who had been acting as deputy to Mr. Anderson is still acting in that capacity and may have even picked up some of Mr. Anderson's responsibilities. He added that Mr. Bailey is a known entity to this committee.

### **5. VITAL RECORDSIF Quarterly Budget Update:**

Mr. Bolton pointed out that some of the blanks in the budget paperwork Ms. Penney had produced needed to be filled in and she had just recently re-allocated some time for working on this document. He advised that she would have it corrected by the next meeting. He had invited her to attend the next meeting and present the budget information to the committee.

### **6. New Equipment:**

Ms. Little mentioned the "New Equipment" on the budget and asked Mr. Bolton if that was his or Mr. Wurtz' issue. Mr. Bolton replied that he thought that most of that was covered in the document he distributed. Mr. Allen had been invited to the meeting because he was being asked to configure the new equipment that Mr. Wurtz had been purchasing. He then gave a little background about earlier discussions surrounding the ability of some towns and cities to support the new Explorer 5 and above on their current systems. During a Help America Vote Act meeting there was some discussion about the configuration of the new machines and whether we all want desktops, or some want laptops. The people that attended that meeting were a mix of clerks and supervisors of the checklist. Supervisors wanted to know why they didn't get equipment if clerks did. Some clerks inquired as to whether or not they could re-allocate the equipment to the supervisors if they did not need it.

Mr. Bolton explained to the committee that he was asked at that meeting to bring the issue to the VRIF committee to ask their position on providing equipment for supervisors as well. Ms. Little asked what would happen to the equipment if we did not turn it over to the supervisors. Mr. Bolton replied that old equipment is antiquated and will go to surplus. The question was regarding new equipment. He added that this was assuming that every clerk was allocated one machine whether they needed it and whether if they did not, they could then re-allocate it to the supervisor of the checklist. Mr. Allen answered Ms. Little's question regarding what we would do with the equipment if the

## Draft Minutes

clerk did not need it. He stated that he presumed that we would only order equipment for those clerks that need it.

Mr. Wurtz told the committee that failures in the older computers have been reported and Mr. Allen has gone to investigate, only to find upon arrival that the clerk already has superior or equal equipment to what we would provide in their office. Finding that, all Mr. Allen had to do was load software on the existing computer. Mr. Allen assesses the needs of the clerks on an office-by-office basis. Mr. Wurtz informed the committee that it is becoming more common for him to hear from the clerks, "The last thing I need is another PC in my little office." Mr. Lambert agreed, stating that he has two new state computers on one desk and the supervisor has one old computer on another.

Mr. Allen agreed with Mr. Wurtz, adding that Nashua is one city that has its own machines. Mr. Bergeron stated that they could use more printers. Mr. Allen explained that the classic example was when he went to Pittsburg to bring a new machine and the office was tiny and the configuration would mean that she would have three computers on her desktop. Instead, Mr. Allen explained how he could just load the software on her current machine if that is what she wanted in order to save space. Given the choice she chose to forgo the new equipment. Ms. Hartson then discussed the diversity personalities and styles in the meeting Mr. Bolton spoke of. She then added that New Hampshire is known for that.

Some clerks and the supervisors work very well together and others don't. Some do not want the other involved in any thing under their purview. It varies from town to town and city to city. Also, cities do things a little differently than do towns. Ms. Hartson stated that the committee provides this equipment for the town not for supervisor of the checklist that might want to use it at her home, which was one of the issues raised. She felt that if the supervisor of the checklist wanted to access that information at home or at the polling place it would be the town's responsibility to provide them with the hardware or connectivity to do so.

Mr. Bergeron replied that he thought Ms. Hartson was being kind in her description of the dynamics between the offices of the city/town clerk and supervisors of the checklist. He saw the VRIF as responsible for providing the equipment to cities and towns to collect vital records data. He felt that if HAVA can piggyback on that hardware by providing a software solution through that hardware, then wonderful. Mr. Bergeron suggested that the Secretary of State's office was only responsible to provide the HAVA applications. Mr. Bergeron was concerned about building two layers of hardware.

Mr. Scanlan agreed with Mr. Bergeron stating that he felt that the Secretary of State's office was on the same page. Ms. Little thanked Mr. Scanlan and to ensure that she understood what Mr. Scanlan had said, reiterated that he was not asking the committee to provide the equipment the supervisors wanted. Mr. Scanlan replied that with the Help America Vote project they wanted to piggyback on the vital records system. HAVA requires a live hook up out to each town and as long as there is at least one, they would be satisfying their responsibility. Whether that is through the vital records computer or another provided by the town was not particularly important.

Multiple individuals in a town may be able to hook up to the system, but they are required to provide at least one per town. He reiterated that he felt that the SOS, the committee and Vital Records were on the same page. Mr. Kruger replied that it was clear

## Draft Minutes

even to laypersons that one size clearly does not fit all in New Hampshire. Mr. Hall added that he would be concerned about the legal implications of VRIF monies being used to provide equipment for supervisors when the fund is intended to support the collection, maintenance and preservation of vital event data. He felt that if that hit the paper it could be disastrous to the fund and he did not want to see that happen. Ms. Little thanked Mr. Hall for his point.

Mr. Lambert then remarked that he remembered that before Vital Records was under the umbrella of the SOS they had a computer in their office that they were not allowed to load any software not approved by Vital Records. Ms. Hartson asked if the Help Desk was still the same one used previously. Mr. Bolton replied that it was. She then asked if the supervisors of the checklist would be using the same helpdesk with the HAVA software. Mr. Scanlan replied that they would. Ms. Hartson was concerned that the committee was footing the bill for their calls as well. Mr. Bolton explained that Vital Records has contracted with Seneca to pay on a per call basis so we would not be covering those calls. Mr. Scanlan agreed that the HAVA fund would pay for its own calls to the helpdesk.

Ms. Little asked that the committee return to the topic of purchasing new computers for clerks. She asked how many were being purchased. Mr. Allen replied that the directive he was following was to provide for the hospital towns first and replace old computers that will not support the newer software and then rolling out to all towns that have VRV because their older systems will not support XP. Ms. Little asked if when he visited towns and noticed that they were already running new equipment he suggested they use their current machines rather than accept a new one from the state. Mr. Allen replied that he left that up to the individual towns. Mr. Scanlan added that from a HAVA standpoint, they like to see these machines and NHVRIN rolled out to all the towns by January 2006.

Mr. Bergeron asked to go back to his question. He has five or six people set up with VRV in his office. Does this mean that he will need to make sure that all of his people have XP compatible machines when the new software is rolled out? Mr. Allen replied that it was not necessary from a VRV or NHVRIN point of view. He stated that all Mr. Bergeron needed to ensure was that his machines met the browser requirements for NHVRIN. He said he could not speak for HAVA. Mr. Kruger asked what happened to the old equipment that still works. Mr. Bolton replied that it was sent to surplus. Mr. O'Neal explained that the state sells it at its surplus auction or it is made available to municipalities.

Mr. Kruger acknowledged it would not be much, but asked if any of that money flows back to the fund. Mr. Bolton replied that the funds from those auctions probably goes back into the general fund. Mr. Kruger asked if a municipality wanted more computers that did not have to be XPs could they get some of the old computers? Mr. Bergeron replied that he had been to the surplus barn that week and he was not interested in having anything that he saw there. Mr. Allen added that the machines that he was replacing were really outdated and he did not think anyone would want them.

### **7. Heirloom Certificate Marketing Plan:**

Mr. Bolton advised the committee that it was not necessary to have a full discussion of the issue at that particular meeting. He was anxious to display the winning design for the committee and brought along the framed original. He explained that the selection

## Draft Minutes

committee had picked this design on Halloween. Mr. Bolton told the committee that Ms. Karen Holman was the winning artist and that she was an accomplished artist, having illustrated several books including one written by New Hampshire's Poet Laureate, "G is for Granite." Mr. Bolton explained that they would need to hit the ground running on the certificates, as they should be available to the public soon.

Mr. Bolton felt the release would probably entail some promotion or marketing campaign and the committee will probably be players in this. Ms. Little asked if Mr. Bolton had established a plan for marketing the certificate. Ms. Hartson suggested that Vital Records follow the lead of motor vehicle and have enlarged representations of the certificate mounted to cardboard signs that could be displayed in clerk's offices. Mr. Wurtz agreed with Ms. Hartson and added that he had thought of creating a handout for birth clerks to provide to new parents while they are still in the hospital or place in their packet that they take home from the hospital.

Mr. Kruger asked how the certificate was being priced. Mr. Bolton replied that it had been priced by statute. The price is \$25 for an heirloom certificate. Ms. Hartson asked if that was in addition to the current \$12. Mr. Bolton replied that it was not. Ms. Hartson asked how much the town receives and how much the state receives from the sale of the new heirloom certificates. Mr. Bolton replied that the statute states that, "the Registrar shall forward \$15 of each fee collected to the state treasurer for deposit in the Vital Records Improved Fund." Ms. Little asked if the heirloom certificated could be purchased at the local level. Mr. Bolton replied that it could not as they would be personally applying signatures to the heirloom certificate rather than stamping them.

Ms. Hartson clarified that persons seeking an heirloom certificate would need to apply for directly through Vital Records. Mr. Bolton replied that it would. Mr. Bergeron suggested that in addition to signs it would be a good idea for the division to provide pamphlets they could display on their counter. Ms. Hartson was concerned about how corrections would be processed. If parents send in a form from their hospital parent packet and then found an error upon receiving the certificate, would they all have to come to Concord? Mr. Wurtz explained that the heirloom certificate did not contain all the information that is displayed on the current abstract, so there would not be the opportunity for a lot of errors.

Ms. Swank asked if the paper being used was archival quality paper. Mr. Bolton assured her it would be. The paper has not been selected yet. Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton if he had brought the issue before the committee to seek some funding for marketing. Mr. Bolton replied that he now planned to talk with the people at motor vehicle and was not asking for funding at that point. Mr. Kruger suggested that because of the amount of money that it would contribute to the fund he felt Mr. Bolton could be confident in the committee supporting any request for marketing funds.

### **8. Mileage Reimbursement for Committee Members**

Ms. Little asked where this issue had come from. Mr. Bolton stated that he felt that it had probably come about due to a former funeral director member of the committee who was concerned that some of the appointees were not made aware that they would get nothing out of being part of this committee. Mr. Bolton felt that it was a worthwhile issue for the committee to consider as many committees reimburse members for travel expenses. He felt it would be most important for those that travel to meetings in their personal vehicles.

## Draft Minutes

Mr. Hall replied that in his experience committees that are set up statutorily there is wording in the legislation that allows for the reimbursement of members for mileage. He admitted he could be wrong, but he was not aware of any statutory committee that has established it as policy as opposed to statute. He asked if anyone was aware of any. Mr. Bolton replied that he was thinking of the Certificate of Need board. Mr. Hall asked if that was not written into the statute. Mr. Bolton replied that he did not think so. Mr. Hall remarked that as long as there is a precedent for it he would not object. Mr. Bergeron stated that there was nothing in the statute that he was aware of.

Mr. Pollard added that he was shocked that the previous funeral director member wanted to be reimbursed for travel to and from these meetings. Mr. Bolton replied it was only because he found he was not being compensated in the manner he expected. Mr. Pollard replied to Mr. Bolton that the former member was not a paid member of the association, but that he was and as such, the association compensated him for his attendance. Mr. Lambert stated that in his town only the Executive committee was reimbursed automatically. Anyone else seeking reimbursement had to submit a bill and get it approved.

Ms. Little said that she would think the clerks association would agree to reimburse clerk representatives for their travel expenses. Mr. Bergeron added that he would not accept any reimbursement. Ms. Little and Ms. Hartson both added that their respective municipalities covered them both. Ms. Little remarked that the issue might be of interest to the public employees or members that attend the meetings at their own expense. Mr. Kruger asked how many were reimbursed already. He thought that quite a few were. He then asked how many were not reimbursed. It was determined that most were reimbursed. Mr. Lambert stated that he uses his private vehicle to attend meetings but did not think that the amount of gas used for a round trip to Concord was significant enough to require reimbursement.

Ms. Little told the committee that she would certainly support reimbursing a member that was not already being compensated and found it a hardship to attend meetings without it. She felt it was an issue that they should be concerned with. Mr. Bolton agreed. Ms. Hartson asked if Mr. Bolton was seeking a vote on the issue. Mr. Bolton replied that he was under the impression that the committee wanted him to check to make sure it was not written into the statute and if that was required. Ms. Little and Ms. Hartson asked Mr. Bolton to please do that. Mr. Kruger stated for the record that he did not want this practice established for his benefit. Mr. Bergeron added that every public member should be reimbursed without having to show hardship. The members in attendance agreed.

### **9. Other Items:**

Mr. Bolton reminded the committee of the prior discussion and approval of using FileNet to archive our records. We finally decided on a product and wanted to go forward with the purchase. The FileNet salesman then presented them with new pricing for the options they wanted. Mr. Bolton directed the committee's attention to the last page of his handout. He informed the committee that there was another item on the table to consider. He planned to talk with Mr. Scanlan and Mr. Sullivan about the issue the following week to ensure that this solution works for everyone involved.

## Draft Minutes

Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton if he was now deciding against Filenet. Mr. Bolton replied that he was not sure yet. He pointed out that the Filenet contract included an almost \$27,000 maintenance fee. Mr. Sullivan told the committee that it was not that they were turning down the Filenet solution or against it. They just wanted to ensure that it was the best solution available and would be compatible for all involved.

Meeting adjourned.