

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

***-MINUTES-***

***Thursday  
March 18, 2004***

# Draft Minutes

## **-MINUTES-**

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

March 18, 2004

Health & Welfare Building  
Conference Rooms 110-111  
29 Hazen Drive  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

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

Patty Little, City Clerk Appointment  
Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar  
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM 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

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

Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment  
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment  
Linda Hartson, Exeter Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment  
Fred Rusczek, Manchester Health Officer, DHHS Appointment  
Rick Bailey, OIT, DHHS Appointment

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

David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS  
Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS  
Vijay Mishra, NHVRIN Project Manager, CNSI  
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS  
Mark Parris, Office of Information Systems, DHHS  
Eric Allen, OIT, Vital Records, SOS  
Steve Wurtz, Supervisor of Registration/Certification, Vital Records, SOS  
John O'Neal, OIT, DHHS  
Cynthia Swank, Consultant, InLook Group  
Peter Parker, Consultant, InLook Group  
Cathy Eccleston, OIT, Vital Records, SOS

# Draft Minutes

## Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

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

Ms. Little began the meeting at 10:02 a.m. and asked everyone to introduce him or herself. After the introductions were complete, she thanked everyone for their participation and attendance.

Ms. Little asked if the committee had taken the opportunity to read the minutes from the January meeting. Ms. Orman stated that she had rushed in producing the minutes and had found numerous typographical errors after they had been submitted. Ms. Little replied that the committee would leave it up to Ms. Orman to correct those errors. Dr. Mevers asked if in the future the time the meeting adjourned could be included in the record. Ms. Orman agreed that she would include the time in future minutes. Ms. Little then informed the committee that there was a motion to accept the minutes with corrections. Members were asked to vote by raising their hand if they wished to approve the minutes. The committee voted unanimously to accept the minutes with corrections.

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

Ms. Swank stated that she hoped that all the members had taken time to look over the documents Mr. Bolton had forwarded to them prior to the meeting. She felt that if there were going to be a discussion it would surround those documents. One of which was a business plan for the Vital Records Improvement Fund to support the preservation of vital records. Another was a grant application packet that she and Mr. Parker had put together. A beyond the VRIF Grant Program document rounded out the three documents.

As far as the business plan Ms. Swank directed attendees to look at the summary on page one of the document. It also included a job description for the Vital Records Preservation Program Administrator (VRPPA). As she and Mr. Parker have worked on this project and been a part of this committee's discussions they had determined that the committee could support a full-time person for several years. It would be a great benefit to getting the project up and running. Not only the grant program but also the educational aspects of the preservation workshop and possibly even a grant writing workshop.

The person selected would also be responsible for promoting standards and guidelines, providing vendor information, and assisting city and town clerks in getting their municipalities records in order. Ms. Swank asked if there were any questions. Ms. Little asked what funding the position would mean with the hiring freeze that is currently in effect in New Hampshire state government. Mr. Bolton agreed that there was an ongoing freeze but felt because this request was to use "other funds" it wouldn't be difficult to get it approved.

Ms. Little asked if there would be any additional review by the Division of Personnel of the position before approval. Mr. Bolton replied that there would. He explained that Personnel evaluates job descriptions for requested positions and assigns the labor grade they feel is most appropriate to the skill level required to perform the duties. Ms. Little added that if the committee creates the position and funds it, it might be awkward to just eliminate it several years down the road. She felt that once the committee started down that road there would be no turning back. Mr. Bolton explained that the committee had funded positions in the past that the bureau eventually took over and funded. He

## Draft Minutes

mentioned Ms. Lane and Ms. Orman's positions. They had both begun as committee funded positions before being rolled back into the OCPH budget. He did not think it would be necessary to put in wording to that effect into the decision. Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton to clarify that he meant that he thought there would be some kind of migration. Mr. Bolton agreed that he was saying that. Mr. Armstrong asked if the position was necessarily a full-time position or could they work three days a week on the committee's project and the other two days with Archives.

Ms. Swank replied that at least for the first couple of years the position would need to be full-time. There is enough involved in just setting up the project and working with all the clerks will take all their time and more. She felt that the person chosen for that position would become the public face of the project and the committee. Down the road the person could quite possibly focus elsewhere part-time. Once the program is up and running smoothly and clerks are more aware of their responsibilities and the assistance available to them. She and Mr. Parker had tried to be flexible in what they considered the position duties as well as the credentials required. It could be someone that has training as an archivist manager or someone coming up from a government position that has some preservation training/experience.

Mr. Parker added that the person in that position would be keeping a number of plates in the air. In particular, the education portion and their role as liaison with clerks. He felt that those two items were of great importance if the program was to work. Secondly, Mr. Bergeron had found that the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation was not interested in administering the VRIF for free and that would be the third plate. The fourth plate would be attempting to get important information onto the Internet through the Vital Records and Archives web sites. They could provide information on standards and to act as a liaison state procurement offices.

Ms. Little asked where the position would be physically located? Dr. Mevers stated that they had planned for the person to be at the Records & Archives building. He went on to say that what the report does is suggests further criteria and requirements for the person filling the position. The Inlook group even went so far as to ferret out the labor grade and step information. Dr. Mevers added that there were still areas where the position could be altered. As for Mr. Bolton's discussion of the future of the position, that would be up to the Secretary of State's office. They would need to determine if the position would have enough of an effect on other local records and then they might determine that another funding source could fund the position. Dr. Mevers felt that the position should definitely be a full-time professional position.

### **3. New Hampshire Charitable Fund:**

Ms. Little asked Mr. Bergeron if he wanted to summarize the handout he had distributed about his discussions with the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation's representative. Mr. Bergeron reminded the committee that he was tasked with approaching the NHCF about their possibly administering the grant program. Mr. Bergeron spoke by telephone with Ms. Rachel Stewart, Vice President of Programs. The sense that he got from that meeting was that they deal mainly with non-profit organizations. This fund is one of over two hundred designated revenue funds within the state. There was a question "if they opened the door for us what are they really getting themselves into?"

## Draft Minutes

Mr. Bergeron added that our fund did not really fit with their mission. However they are now exploring the possibility of contracting out certain services like we were asking about. They had not yet costed-out those programs when he met with Ms. Stewart. Mr. Bergeron added that on the scale of things, \$80,000 might be a lot to this committee. To the NHCF it was actually a very small sum. He reminded the committee that in Maine and Vermont we learned that there needed to be a lot of hand holding and selling of the program by the state. NHCF would not do that. They would provide the application, award the grants and follow up. Where we are planning fifteen hours a week on this project, NHCF would more likely plan fifteen hours a year. He felt that we could build a relationship if we wanted to but he did not think we would be buying the service that we need.

Dr. Mevers stated that Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank had subtitled their report “Educate, Facilitate and Perpetuate”, which tells us a lot. One of the things this person will be doing is working on and following through with the education part of this project. That in itself will be very time consuming. Anyone that has run workshops or programs, especially a series of them knows the amount of time that is devoted to setting up, materials preparation, interacting with city and town clerks and ultimately running the workshops. That would be in addition to going to the towns and holding hands, helping them through the grant application process, reviewing applications, etc. Then there is the Perpetuate part, which is interacting with other boards and committees and organizations. There is a lot of work involved for one person so he did not want to shortchange the position.

Mr. Armstrong told the committee that in the ERP RFP that was back on the street once again had a small requirement regarding grants management capabilities. He said it was not the highest priority requirement, but it was included. He felt that once it gets to that stage it would be helpful to the person that accepts this position. Ms. Little stated that the report before the committee was just one of many deliverables they had worked on throughout the contract. She asked if they would go through their list and describe where they were on each deliverable adding that it seemed like the contract was winding down.

Both Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank happily agreed with Ms. Little. Ms. Swank displayed a binder she had put together with the deliverables she and Mr. Parker had provided for Dr. Mevers and Mr. Bolton. She explained that the committee had gotten the “essence” of everything with the three documents Mr. Bolton distributed. They had provided a great deal of information to Mr. Bolton and Dr. Mevers and then went back and revised it so they could provide the third document that better outlines things at the state level. The other documents were almost ready to be put on a website or to be delivered as part of the grant application packages to clerks.

So there would be a document on preservation of paper records with the basics. It would include a list of resources with links and a disaster preparedness outline. Ms. Swank added that they had established guidelines and standards for microfilming. It would include basic microfilming standards, online resources and a sample contract. This would at least let clerks know what they should be asking of any filming vendors. They also had a list of microfilming vendors along with a list of questions they used to determine that the vendor belonged on the list. That way, Mr. Bolton and Dr. Mevers or the VRPPA would be able to keep the list current.

## Draft Minutes

Ms. Swank continued that they had also included information for clerks regarding the information they should know about their own records before even speaking with a vendor. There are guidelines and standards for record storage. Services for records preservation to include; book conservators, binders, etc. There was also a questionnaire and listing of vendors including the usual suspects and many individuals in the New England area. Some of them also can do the preservation surveys. They are a very good resource to have.

Ms. Swank moved on to digital imaging vendors that based on how they responded to InLook's questions could possibly handle bound volumes and older records. They have benchmarking and review of the original five towns that received grants. The only other item Ms. Swank could think of was guidelines for digital imaging. Mr. Kruger asked if Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank had tied digital imaging to microfilming as a single step as opposed to separate steps as digital imaging was becoming very important and would only become more important. Because if they are separate sections it allows people to go either way and that is not economically sound.

Mr. Parker replied that they hoped that the same contractor could perform both processes. The vendors that he and Ms. Swank spoke with and ultimately listed could do both. Mr. Kruger responded that his question was if InLook would be encouraging the two together in their final report. Mr. Parker replied that they were. Mr. Kruger felt it was important that we endorse the two together. Ms. Swank explained that they could microfilm and scan at the same time or vice versa.

Mr. Armstrong asked if anyone was aware of the number of documents they were talking about statewide. Mr. Kruger stated that he did not think that was in the scope of the InLook contract. Mr. Armstrong asked if they knew if it was five or ten million. Mr. Kruger felt that the number was considerable larger. Mr. Armstrong replied that the only reason he brought it up was that the state has a contract with one of the larger imaging vendors and one scenario that could occur would be municipalities scanning their records into a central library that could be hosted by the state, but still have the security of the municipality. That would minimize their licensing obligation. They could even sub-contract someone to scan the materials in. The state could probably offer better disaster recovery support for a central location.

Mr. Parker stated that they really wanted to see the records microfilmed as well as scanned. Mr. Armstrong agreed and stated that his idea would be more for the access. Ms. Little asked Mr. Armstrong who the vendor was. He replied that it was a Filenet software product. It is built to handle a lot of documents. Ms. Little recognized Dr. Mevers. He reported that he had written a report he wanted to share with the committee regarding the InLook contract and felt that it might lead to a conclusion. Ms. Little agreed that he should share it.

### **Business Plan for the VRIF to Support the Preservation of Records: Educate, Facilitate and perpetuate.**

Inlook Group, Cynthia Swank and Peter Parker, have now presented our committee with reports of their findings. These reports, with some recommendations, and along with some far-sighted considerations, do in fact provide the committee with the "deliverables" that we discussed and asked for when we considered the contract with them last year.

## Draft Minutes

We asked for information in the form of guidelines and standards that would be immediately useful to keepers of Vital Records. We asked also for a business plan as to how to gather and review applications for grants, and how to award and administer grants for records preservation.

They went further they have taken us “beyond the programs, advising that we consider coordinating with the State’s Historical Records Advisory Board and the organizations such as the New Hampshire Archives group. They informed us even of internal state groups that are concerned with electronic records, groups such as OIT’s State and Local Government OIT Alliance Council. We should look into that at the VRIFAC. They conducted all extensive poll of mechanics and policies conducted by other States as part of their bench marketing process.

Their “Business Plan,” the heart of their production, focuses in on the position of Vital Records Preservation Program Administrator (VRPPA), on the continuing education needed statewide by records keepers, on the standards/guidelines/vendors/and other resources necessary to implement paper preservation, microfilming, imaging, and disaster planning. They go even further and present us with a timeline work plan from this moment (actually they begin March 1) through the year 2007. They realize that their timeline is idealistic and that they are presenting it to a government but their hopes that it will help remain high nevertheless. And it will prove helpful in trying to keep ourselves on track as we implement this.

Inlook Group has spelled out in detail the duties of the proposed program administrator. These are professional by definition and arduous and will require someone professional as well as being passionate about what they are doing. Inlook Group has gone so far as to ferret out and suggests prospective labor grades and titles for the position and we all know (as do they) that this committee will work with the Secretary of State to finally determine the hiring criteria.

They are absolutely on track with suggesting that our educational efforts around the state must continue based on the foundation established by the recent Local Records Education Project carried out through Dartmouth College and in which this Committee participated and lent support.

Their guidelines for microfilming, imaging, and preserving actual paper records include references to, and actual reproduction of, certain accepted “best practices” standards as promulgated by the National Institute of Standards & Technology, the Library of Congress, the National Archives, and others. Also here for all to see, use and refer to are lists of many helpful websites, books, pamphlets, and articles along with lists of vendors available to carry out some of these functions.

All in all, these guides should be meaningful (a term not lightly used here) to government records keepers because the information (a vast amount) is provided succinctly, conveniently, easily, and completely.

In the area of making grants Inlook Group has suggested several different types of grants with several different levels of funding, along with criteria for successful application to each. These include (1) Assessment and Planning grants; (2) Storage Improvements and Equipment grants; (3) and reformatting and Rehousing grants.

## Draft Minutes

Inlook Group has suggested application forms for both narrative and budget parts of the application. They have provided general timelines for applying, reviewing, and awarding.

Inlook Group has, in summary, given us most of the mechanics that we will need to implement this rather large, significant, and ongoing program for the preservation of vital records at the local level.

We have seen that records keepers in New Hampshire have a genuine interest and concern for the preservation of the documentary heritage in their care. What we need to do at this juncture is follow through vigorously to assist with their preservation needs.

I would make a motion now to the effect that we accept the project contracted to Inlook Group as having been completed, that is, that we accept the plan they present as a principal tool on which to build our preservation program.

Dr. Mevers made a motion that the committee vote to accept the project contracted out to InLook Group as having been completed. That is, we accept the plan they have presented as a principle tool on which to build our preservation program. Ms. Little asked for a second to Dr. Mevers motion. Mr. Bergeron seconded. Ms. Little thanked Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank for an “amazing effort.” She said to hear it all played back convinced her that they had indeed established a foundation to take it forward. After the committee completes the vote Ms. Little would like to see the action items identified that still need to happen internally with this group to take it to the next step.

Ms. Little asked for any discussion on Dr. Mevers motion. Mr. Bergeron asked to make a comment. He told the committee that he had crossed paths with Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank many times since this project went out to bid. He felt that they had done a very thorough job in looking in corners and under carpets and places he would have never even considered. He saw them at conferences and clerk meetings doing research and he wanted to thank them for their thorough job.

Mr. Kruger asked to also compliment Dr. Mevers on his statement regarding the InLook contract. Mr. Bolton added his agreement. Hearing no further discussion Ms. Little asked for a vote. The committee voted unanimously to declare the InLook contract complete. Ms. Little thanked them once again for their work. Ms. Little then brought up the action items again. Mr. Bolton replied that he felt a subcommittee should be formed to work on the action items. There are budget items that need to go forward and some direction may be needed.

Ms. Little agreed that a subcommittee would be a good idea. She asked Mr. Bolton what would be expected of committee members. Mr. Bolton replied they would be looking at the position, assessing the budget to see how much we do have and how we are spending it. The subcommittee would be looking at the business plan and how that would impact the budgeting effort. They would need to identify costs. Ms. Little asked if anyone wanted to volunteer. She asked Mr. Bolton how many volunteers he wanted. He suggested three to five.

Ms. Little asked for volunteers. Mr. Bolton, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Bergeron, Dr. Mevers and Ms. Little all volunteered to be members of that committee. Ms. Little added that she was very excited about it. That it would be such a gift to future generations if we can

## Draft Minutes

make this happen as InLook laid out in the plan. Mr. Armstrong asked Dr. Mevers if he thought this was newsworthy enough for one of the organizations or groups he belonged to would be interested in possibly publicizing that New Hampshire had completed this and was embarking on to the next step. Dr. Mevers replied that he was sure he could get it published in one newsletter. Mr. Kruger asked who would be chairing the subcommittee. Ms. Little responded that she would ask Mr. Bolton to chair if he did not mind. Mr. Bolton agreed that he would be happy to.

#### 4. **OIT Update:**

Mr. Bolton was having difficulty with the internet connection and Ms. Little suggested moving on to the next item on the agenda, the Accountability Committee update. Mr. Wurtz stated that he felt that despite the technical glitches that something needed to be said about NHVRIN as a large number of people have invested a great deal of time in it and its rollout was rapidly approaching. Recently, several funeral directors had come in to put the software through its paces “real world” issues to ensure that the software was to their liking.

Mr. Wurtz reported that all of the feedback received to date had been very positive. He admitted that there was still work to be done to please everyone, but a great deal had already been accomplished. He stressed that it was the division’s goal to strive to please everyone that they could. He asked Mr. Bolton if he wanted to reveal the timeline of the rollout to the committee. Mr. Bolton replied that he did and explained that the death application of NHVRIN would go online April 19, 2004. Mr. Wurtz added that it was a Monday and that they would turn on NHVRIN for funeral directors only. The City and Town clerks would have a rollout specifically geared to them scheduled at a later date.

What the rollout means is that funeral directors as of April 19 will no longer use the VRV2000 software/system. They will be able to access the NHVRIN software via the internet, file their documents as they do now. This will occur with little or no disruption to the funeral directors. For the families the funeral directors serve and the clerks there will be no disruption whatsoever. All certified copies will still be available to clerks as the vendor has created a crossover between VRV2000 and NHVRIN. Anything the funeral directors enter into the NHVRIN system will be accessible to the 105 clerks that are using VRV2000.

The disadvantage, if one has to be mentioned is that the out-of-state funeral director will temporarily not be able to go to a clerk to get a record keyed into the system. He stressed that it was only a *temporary* issue. Until it is resolved, if out-of-state funeral directors go to a NHVRIN funeral director they will be able to get the record entered, but if they go to a clerk the information will have to be forwarded to the vital records office by fax. Vital Records staff will then key the information, create a burial permit and fax it back to the clerk. That should minimize any inconvenience to the funeral director. Mr. Wurtz added that it was a band-aid fix until the rest of the system is rolled out and the clerks are introduced to the new system.

The April 19 date is firm and there will be three days of training held at the end of March for funeral directors. They will be invited in for training and will have the ability to get some “hands on” time with NHVRIN. The look and feel of the NHVRIN system is very similar to that of VRV2000. There are some issues that are not and that is because it is a web-system and some things cannot be the same. Mr. Wurtz added that after inviting

## Draft Minutes

users in and watching them walk themselves through the program he had more confidence that the training necessary would be minimal. Some points that he planned to bring up, the users found on their own. From a user's standpoint the new system is very user friendly and with common sense they can continue with the same functionality in their office as before. Ms. Little replied that it sounded very encouraging. She asked if Mr. Bolton and Wurtz wanted to share the rest of the timeline. When the rollout for clerks and hospitals would occur.

Mr. Bolton replied that the target dates for the rest of the rollout were not set in stone. The next module to be released would be the birth module and it was set to be online in late April. There would be user acceptance testing before it would be released. Mr. Wurtz added that hospitals would then have access and would be adding the information and it would be populating databases on VRV2000 as well. City and town clerks would get their first glimpse of NHVRIN upon the release of the marriage module.

When marriage is rolled out and the clerks are able to access it, that is when VRV2000 will cease to function. Mr. Wurtz asked Mr. Bolton when he expected to have the marriage out. Mr. Bolton replied that it would rollout sometime near the end of July. Ms. Little stated that she was impressed with the bridge between the two software packages. Mr. Wurtz agreed and added that the vendor worked very hard to put that together for the state. Vital Records staff had also put a lot of time into the bridge. Not only were they involved in testing NHVRIN but they were also testing VRV2000 to make sure that the information was transferring correctly.

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

Ms. Little called for Ms. Penney to make the report. Mr. Bolton replied that Ms. Penney was not in attendance, that staff shortages and the legislature being in session prevented her from attending. He added that Thursday meetings were going to be problematic for her. He then distributed a handout that contained the latest incarnation of the budget report. He explained that the first page indicated the most recent budgeted expenditures through February. It details what the fund has paid out during the last eight months.

The 'bottom line' is on line SFY04. It represents the balance of the fund. The amount is \$2,000,411. Mr. Bolton added that some of the expenditures did not show up on this report. Looking at the detail on the second page, the equipment expenditures on the first line represents the sixty computers purchased. The hardware (servers) and software required for the web enablement project was an expenditure of \$47,619. There are two lines carried forward through the budgeting process, the upgrade to Microsoft Office 2000 and the Oracle licensing for which they have yet to see a bill. They have budgeted \$50,000 a year for it. Actually, all the new replacement machines, which cost \$1100 each, will have MS Office 97 installed on them.

Mr. Armstrong asked if when purchasing the new machines Mr. Bolton was buying in blocks so he could get the best price. Mr. Bolton replied that they were purchasing through the state contract with Dell. He believed they were getting all the available discounts, as the first purchase was sixty pieces.

Mr. Bolton then informed the committee that he believed there had been some miscommunication with the way the web-enablement contractor was being paid. When Vital Records was transferred to the Secretary of State's office the contract that was in

## Draft Minutes

place with CNSI contained a mixture of funds; capital, federal, and VRIF. The only funds that had been targeted were \$51,000 from the VRIF. He explained that we might have exceeded that threshold through an unfortunate situation where Vital Records was moving to the SOS, OIS was moving to OIT and some areas within DHHS were being shuffled around. There was a breakdown as to how exactly we will spend this contract. Mr. Bolton felt that closer scrutiny was needed and was very important. Mr. Bolton explained that the amount that had been expended appeared to be \$125,628. He also added that the InLook contract did not appear on the document nor did the scholarships the fund provided for clerks attending the Dartmouth records education seminars. Ms. Little asked where the data Mr. Bolton was discussing was coming from.

She asked if the SOS software was not picking up all of their expenditures. Mr. Bolton replied that the information came from the state's financial reporting software, IFS, which is just a big database of all state expenditures. You must query it to get the information you seek and Ms. Penney may not be that familiar with our activities yet. He added that he would be sitting down with Ms. Penney to better plan out the document and explain to her what the committee needed from the report. Mr. Andrew, who used to provide this information to the committee was involved with it daily and knew it like the back of his hand. Ms. Penney has not been working with it long and has more to learn. She is also quite busy, but he would speak with her. Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton if he felt the IFS system could work for the committee and he replied that he did. He suggested that in the future they could possibly get a tabular report from the system.

Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Bolton to discuss the dial up charges of \$96,000. Mr. Bolton replied that there had been a bill against that account. For a long time OIS took care of that expense and the VRIF had been billed for September, October, November, December and that is not reflected there, but there are monthly expenses for all the users that dial up. Mr. Armstrong asked how much that came to monthly. Mr. O'Neal replied that he thought it was down to about \$2,000 a month. Mr. Bolton agreed and added that \$60,000 had been budgeted and he did not expect to come close to that for the year. On the report there was no monetary figure, but Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton if his narrative did not indicate a figure of \$8,000.

Mr. Bolton replied that he would predict it would end up being \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year for communication costs. Ms. Little asked if when the NHVRIN system was fully operational, would the dial up costs stop completely or would it be used for backup? Mr. O'Neal replied that he presumed that those without high-speed internet access would still dial in as necessary and it would still be used as a backup. Mr. Bergeron added that it is a great backup. He explained that a switch went in his office and his IT people were so slow getting around to fixing it they used dial up to provide timely customer service. Mr. Armstrong asked for clarification that the dial up and VPN costs were all tied up together.

Mr. Bolton reported that many of the cities and towns are already online either with DSL or Broadband so he did not feel the committee would have a lot to worry about regarding communication costs. Mr. Kruger asked about after all was said and done the numbers he was discussing impact the revenue forward in aggregate how much money was Mr. Bolton talking about. Mr. Bolton replied that they were not talking big numbers \$100,000 to \$200,000, were the numbers being kicked around. Ms. Little explained to Mr. Bolton that the committee would be patient but they needed to see the full picture of the account and being presented with incomplete reports was not acceptable. Ms. Little

## Draft Minutes

asked Mr. Bolton to ensure that the committee received a full accounting of the fund at the next meeting. He agreed that he would work with Ms. Penney to provide it.

Mr. Kruger suggested that if and when the complete report is completed and presented to the committee and the spending continues at its current level in comparison with the fund balance, one of two things could happen. The committee could find other things to spend the money on that go along with its goals or a certain body across the river could get designs on it. Mr. Bolton replied that the subcommittee would be looking at ways to draw down the fund. Mr. Kruger stated that he felt it was getting to be a concern and once there is an accurate picture of the state of the fund it would be a good idea to do some planning. He felt there was good news to be found there, but he just couldn't tell it.

### **NHVRIN Presentation:**

Mr. Bolton and Mr. Mishra were then ready to demonstrate NHVRIN for the committee. Ms. Little asked if this would require a password that would need to be changed periodically. Mr. Bolton replied that it would need to be changed every 90 days. She asked if there would be one password for the city that had multiple machines or would each user have one. Mr. Bolton replied that individuals would have passwords. Everyone would be assigned a username and would be initially assigned a password that they would change the first time they logged onto the system. Mr. Bergeron asked about timing out on the new program. Mr. Bolton replied that the user would time-out after twenty minutes of no activity.

Mr. Bergeron explained that his concern was that his office is so busy that once they log on in the morning they are off and running and the same person's logon would be used by all of his six staff members. Mr. Bolton suggested that he might want to encourage them to log on and off, as it would not be cumbersome. It also would promote security if they were to log on and off. If someone in his office was to log on and walk away and another staff member accessed information they were not supposed to the username that was logged in would be accountable for it.

Mr. Bolton then displayed the sign in page and opening page of NHVRIN to the committee. He explained that on the front page there was space where vital records staff could display information for users, such as outages, training, etc. That will eliminate the need for faxes. As he moved through the NHVRIN screens Mr. Bolton pointed out how the look and feel of it was very similar to VRV2000. The required fields are noted in several different ways. They are highlighted in red and the fields themselves were yellow and all required fields needed to be completed before you could move forward. Ms. Little asked if was reliant on the mouse versus tabbing through. It was established that both were required to navigate the pages.

Mr. Wurtz pointed out a change in the way the new system processes data. In VRV2000 if you made a mistake or input something questionable VRV would stop you and prompt you to confirm or correct the error. With NHVRIN it fires all of its edits at the end of the page as you go to save it. You get the messages at that point, but at the same time you are saving that tab. In the past you could get all the way through a record and just before saving get kicked out for some reason and lose all the information you input. With NHVRIN each tab saves when it is completed. Mr. Bolton added that it was performing the online verification with the Social Security Administration (SSA) as information was being input by the funeral director.

## Draft Minutes

Funeral directors would have five chances to verify the information for a record. Mr. Wurtz asked Mr. Bolton if that verification was the functionality the SSA paid us for. Mr. Bolton responded in the affirmative. Mr. Wurtz asked how much and Mr. Bolton replied \$497,000. Mr. Bergeron asked if there was a limit to the number of characters that can be entered for names. Mr. Bolton replied that there was. Mr. Parris told Mr. Bergeron not to worry the limit is 130 characters for the first and last name. Mr. Wurtz reported that the only problem that they had foreseen was the fact that extraordinarily long names would not print on birth cards. Mr. Bolton explained that while they were talking the SSA database was checking the information that Mr. Mishra entered. Ms. Little asked where that database was located and he replied that it was in Maryland. Mr. Wurtz then pointed out the message that the user receives that tells them that the information on the previous tab has been saved.

Mr. Allen and Ms. Eccleston advised that the speed of the program could be slowed for those using dial up instead of broadband. Ms. Little asked if someone were using dial up for VRV and used it for NHVRIN would it be comparable? Mr. Bolton replied that because they would not have the synchronization that they experienced every time they logged onto VRV it would not be bad. There would be a 12-14 second delay between pages. Ms. Little stated that the thing to do would be to get a high-speed connection. She asked if anyone knew how many clerks were using dial ups. Mr. Wurtz replied that CNSI had done a survey. He asked Mr. Bolton if he had those results. Mr. Allen replied that there were only about twenty-two clerks using dial up. He could not tell her about those using AMC. Mr. O'Neal stated that he had no experience using VRV, but he had dialed in and used NHVRIN and did not think it was that bad. Obviously there was a big difference between it and high-speed, but it was acceptable to him. Mr. Allen reported that those that do not have broadband are low volume users and he did not feel it would be a big impact.

Mr. Bolton then explained that funeral directors will be notifying certifying physicians to go onto the system to complete their portion of the certificate. That is also a new addition. They will either be alerted by email or fax. Giving them this ability will satisfy national requirements and will help the funeral director not have to chase the doctor down. Mr. Wurtz explained to the committee that the demo they had just seen was the state view and some of the things on it would not be available to users. Ms. Little thanked Mr. Bolton for the presentation and stated she couldn't wait to get it. Mr. Wurtz replied that vital records was anxious to give it.

### **Accountability Update:**

Mr. Wurtz explained that his subcommittee had been tasked with finding a way to better account for funds and materials. The subcommittee met and discussed several ways. They decided that electronic monitoring was the best, most economical way. They planned to meet soon with a representative from the Office Automation Solution Company, which is proposing a vital records invoicing project. It is a software package known as the Secretary of State Knowledge Base (SOSKB), which is the total accountability of our monies. It will establish an account for each city/town where they can query their account to see what monies they owe, be able to print a report, invoice or send an email to pay the state. They would be able to perform electronic transfers of money and create the form the state requires.

## Draft Minutes

Mr. Wurtz added that Mr. Bolton had assured him that representation from the clerks association would also attend. Mr. Wurtz was very much looking forward to having everyone on the same page. Ms. Little asked if there would be an opportunity for a clerk to correct failed transactions, misprints, etc. Mr. Wurtz replied that one of the bigger stumbling blocks with the VRV system has been its accounting package. He believes that the flexibility that will be brought to the clerk through NHVRIN will be friendlier than in the past, but it will still require work on the clerk's part. He added that some clerks use the system on VRV it just takes a lot of work. He felt the best part about the NHVRIN system is that we can change the program we can do that without having to burn 300 CDs each time. Ms. Little stated that she expected to hear more about the system at the next meeting. She then asked if there was any further discussion regarding accountability. Hearing none she moved to the next item on the agenda.

### **6. Possible Equipment Purchase:**

Mr. Wurtz explained that the two microfilm readers we have had in our genealogical research vault for many years have now both been retired. At first one machine was cannibalized to fix the other and now there is no cannibalization that can help the second machine. He explained that vital records hoped to purchase two new readers. Ms. Little asked how much and he replied that they have estimates ranging from \$5000-\$9000. Although the money is great one of the functions they hope to get in a new reader is the ability for visitors to be able to use the machine. A lot of the users are not electronics savvy and can sometimes be a burden to vital records staff.

Mr. Wurtz continued saying also have not had the capability to reduce it to paper form and one of the readers available will print a copy of a document. That will not only assist researchers but also division staff. Mr. Kruger added that there was another functionality that Mr. Wurtz had failed to mention. The brides index is on film and that is the only way you can look up a woman. All marriage records are filed by the husband's name. With the reader down no one can access that index. He felt it was a very important piece to the puzzle. Mr. Kruger expressed his support of allowing vital records to purchase the microfilm readers.

Mr. Bergeron asked if there were ever requests for digital images. Mr. Kruger stated that he had been a volunteer for eight years and could only remember two instances where someone had asked for a digital file. Mr. Wurtz added though that as the researcher population become younger that is the first thing they ask for. Mr. Bolton added that the higher end machine had that capability. Mr. Wurtz stated that the machine they were looking at was a digital microfilm scanner system. It takes the microfilm digitizes and scans it. Mr. Bergeron asked if the machine could be networked. Mr. Wurtz replied that one of them could. Ms. Little stated that she felt that there was certainly enough money in the fund.

Mr. Wurtz replied that Mr. Bolton had discussed with Dr. Mevers the type of machines they use at archives. Mr. Bergeron asked if one machine would be enough. Mr. Kruger replied that when the division had both of their machines working he never saw both machines in use at the same time. Mr. Kruger added that sometimes town clerks call in looking for older records that are in the public domain. Staff take down the particulars and then hand off the request to the volunteer staff who look up the information and the office staff then reads off the information to the clerk. In a case like that the ability to send an image would come in quite handy. Ms. Little stated that although she did not

## Draft Minutes

have the statute in front of her she believed there was a line that spoke to improving vital records and wouldn't that cover this purchase. Mr. Bolton answered in the affirmative. Ms. Little then asked for a motion to approve the expenditure of \$9100 for the purchase of the new microfilm reader. Dr. Mevers felt that the amount should be increased to allow for the division to purchase two machines. Explaining that there would be times when two machines would be needed and thinking of the future he added that there would come a time when there would be a need to cannibalize one machine to keep the other going. At the archives they have two and they are both in use. Once researchers find out how nicely they work they will be using them more. There is also a move in the future and once Archives and Vital Records are together there will be more traffic and more demand. Ms. Little replied that there was a motion already on the floor. Mr. Kruger amended his motion to \$19,000 so vital records could purchase two microfilm readers.

Mr. Wurtz was asked how many copies are requested currently. He responded that because the division did not currently have that capability the number was zero, but based on the ease of use of this machine he felt it would be a large number. Mr. Armstrong stated that he felt that if they were really looking toward the future they would look to digital imaging rather than these machines for research. Mr. Armstrong stated that he was not sure that they needed to purchase two machines at this time. He felt the future was definitely PCs using a database and using the microfilm as a backup. Mr. Wurtz and Mr. Kruger explained to Mr. Armstrong that none of the records on microfilm were digitized and these machines would help them to create more of an electronic file. Right now a PC would serve no purpose at this point. Ms. Little asked for a second to Mr. Kruger's motion and Dr. Mevers provided it. She then asked if there was any further discussion about the motion. Hearing none she asked for those in favor to say aye and the motion passed unanimously.

### OLD BUSINESS:

Mr. Bolton reported to the committee that he had been in touch with Motor Vehicle regarding the promotional materials he was considering for the Heirloom Birth Certificate. The person he spoke with indicated that Motor Vehicle had not done the promotion that it was Fish & Game. She gave him a name of someone that has apparently left Fish & Game. Mr. Bolton added that Mr. Mishra had told him that the Division would probably have the capability to print the certificate in May.

Mr. Bolton stated that he was also considering using the selection committee in the marketing plan of the new birth certificate. He was unsure of what it would cost but hoped to keep it low. Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton to bring a plan and an estimate of cost to the next VRIFAC meeting. Mr. Bolton agreed that he would.

### MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT:

Mr. Bolton replied that he did not get very far with that issue either. It was his recollection that they had a statute, but when he queried staff that was there at that time they said there was no statute. He stated that it was in the statute as far as building in reimbursement. He felt that there was really no need for it to be in the statute or rules. He stated that he would just recommend the committee do that. Ms. Little agreed that it was the cost of doing business. Mr. Bolton made a motion for the committee to begin reimbursing members for travel and his office staff would maintain records of the

## Draft Minutes

members travel. Ms. Little asked if there was a second for that motion. Mr. Bergeron seconded. Ms. Little then asked for any further discussion adding that she certainly supported the motion. She felt that if members were putting out money from their own pocket to attend these meetings and if any had ever debated attending because of that cost it was well worth the small expense to the fund. Ms. Little asked if there were any further discussion. Hearing none, she asked those in favor to say aye and once again the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Little asked if there were any other business, hearing none she adjourned the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:46 a.m.