

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

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
March 15, 2007***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

March 15, 2007

Archives
Conference Room
71 South Fruit Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS Appointment
Nelson Allan, Public Member Appointment
Jill Hadaway, Bow Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Debbie Augustine, NH Hospital Association
Dr. David Laflamme, DHHS Appointment
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment
Joseph Gray, Rochester Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Peter Croteau, OIT, OIT Appointment
Judy Gaouette, Dover City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment

GUESTS:

Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS
Jackie Goonan, OIT
Steve Wurtz, Vital Records, SOS
Bill Bryer, OIT
Chris Bentzler, OIT

Approved Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Meeting Called to Order:

Mr. Gray called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Gray explained to the committee that the first order of business was to approve the minutes from the last meeting. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Gaouette made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Another committee member seconded the motion. Mr. Gray called for a vote and the committee voted unanimously to accept the minutes as written.

3. Introduction of Newest Committee Member:

Mr. Gray introduced the committee's newest member, Mr. Nelson Allen. Mr. Allan expressed to the committee that he was very happy to be there. Mr. Scanlan asked for a few moments to introduce Mr. Nelson. He explained that Mr. Nelson was a two or three term legislator. Although he was not currently in the House he had been instrumental in the move of vital records to the Secretary of State's office. He had helped with the re-codification of the administrative rules into statute. Mr. Allan is very aware of vital records issues and did a really fantastic job in the Legislature. Mr. Scanlan felt that Mr. Allan would be a real asset to the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee.

Mr. Allan thanked Mr. Scanlan. He explained to the committee that throughout his life, he had been involved with software systems issues. His experienced had mainly been with the military but he felt that software was software. He understood that the new vital records system was quite a system. Mr. Allan explained that he understood some of the issues that are involved when you have many different users of differing levels of understanding or training. He explained that he was impressed with the level of training that had been undertaken in the last several years.

Mr. Gray explained that the training is continuous and is always ongoing. As new clerks are elected they have to be trained in how to use the NHVRIN system. Mr. Allan explained that he had spent 28 years with the General Electric Corp. and then an additional ten years at Kollsman, and he was pleased to have this opportunity to work on this committee. He felt that state employees have a difficult job to do and run into many roadblocks that we do not necessarily run into in the private sector. He felt that this was a very successful program and he looked forward to working with the committee.

Mr. Gray replied that he was happy to have Mr. Allan on the committee. He explained to the committee that Mr. Allan represented a Secretary of State private citizen appointment. Mr. Gray then asked Ms. Augustine if the Department of Health and Human Service had selected a new member to replace the Manchester Health Department representative. Dr. Laflamme replied that there was no actual private citizen member to represent DHHS, but there is a public health member from the city or town level and they were looking for someone to fill that slot. Mr. Bolton asked Ms. Orman if she had any additional information regarding the public health member. Ms. Orman replied that she'd been in contact with Commissioner Stephen's office several times. Each time they told her that

Approved Minutes

they would pass the information onto someone else and would be back in touch with us.

4. NHVRIN Update:

Ms. Goonan distributed a handout to the committee. She explained that the first page of the report showed the metrics for change requests for the NHVRIN system. She reported that the last time the committee met there were 104 change requests and this month there were 102. She explained that this did not mean her staff had done no work, just that new requests came in on a regular basis. They had completed a new release in January. They also did a small maintenance release to fix a few bugs in the code of the new release. The most obvious bugs to town clerks would have been resident report errors. Ms. Goonan stated that she hoped that this new release had improved response time. She added that she had not heard any complaints.

Ms. Goonan pointed out that the work that she had planned for the future was quite substantial. At the end of March or the first week of April they planned to introduce into NHVRIN the out-of-state death record capability. They planned to do that using the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) data format. The screens involved will be available to state staff only. Her staff had created two new roles for the new module. One is a state researcher role that is for a state level administration person to look at out-of-state records. There will also an out-of-state death record data entry clerk role that will be a person that can enter records and view incomplete ones. These restrictions were done on purpose so data can remain confidential as required. Ms. Goonan explained that change request numbers 35 and 274 were related to that.

They also plan to release something called purge pending searches. This is in support of the SOSKB project. There is also another new role, a Town Clerk Administrator. This user can go into view pending searches and view all the pending searches for their office, not just their own personal searches. They will also have the capability of printing reports. The idea is to better manage and reconcile there pending searches and purges each day or at the end of the month. The state admin role cannot only view all the records for the entire state they can also see them by town, city, etc. They also have the ability to delete a pending search if they decide it's invalid. Ms. Goonan explained that these items would be included in the next release.

A new release would mean that the application would be unavailable for a short time while the new release was loaded. The release would be done in the evening or on the weekend when as few users as possible would be impacted. At about the same time, or within a week, they would be releasing for the state staff, the data entry screens for the out-of-state birth records. This release will not be available through NHVRIN. They have created this module to be a completely stand-alone application. Ms. Goonan explained that she would have Mr. Bryer describe the application to the committee further. She then introduced Technical Team Leader Mr. Bill Bryer to the committee.

Mr. Bryer explained to the committee that he and his staff have learned a lot of lessons while maintaining NHVRIN and trying to extend it to out-of-state death records. He reported that he had suggested to Mr. Bolton that they create the out-of-state birth application as a stand-alone application that would be hosted with NHVRIN. So to the end-user it would be the same login, same authentication and authorization required to

Approved Minutes

get into it, but they would have a whole new set of screens. It would use common design patterns and best practice approaches in its design. He told the committee that they had just started about two weeks ago and were 50 percent complete.

Using more modern tools and not reinventing the wheel they were able to incorporate and end layer architecture that allows small download sizes, easy to maintain, all the data access components are separate to include business rules. Mr. Bryer and his team felt that they have saved a great deal of time in its development and feel it should be relatively easy to maintain. He hoped to provide to Mr. Bolton a best practices approach to building anything new in the future. His team planned to demonstrate the prototype today and they were very excited about it.

Ms. Goonan reported that Mr. Bryer had worked on the out-of-state death in NHVRIN and had to modify what was there. Due to the complexities of NHVRIN and the way it was constructed it was actually much more effort to modify NHVRIN than to build a whole new module. She felt it was very significant to understand the difference. Because most of the efforts up until this project have been to modify NHVRIN and there has been a lot of talk about the time and expense to do that. For the same amount of effort they now have something that is much better performing and is easier to use. It has increased security, and is something that can be reused if we decide we want to do something else. It is very, very easy to maintain and very flexible. Ms. Goonan stated that they hoped that this would be a proof of concept of where they could go with the application.

Ms. Gaouette asked if this was for all out-of-state records only. Ms. Goonan replied that it was for state staff to enter out-of-state events. Mr. Bolton stated that committee members might want to ask more questions about it as Mr. Bryer had suggested re-architecting the application or at least discussing the benefit of doing that. The committee member asked if all the data from the out-of-state events would be going into NHVRIN. Ms. Goonan replied that it would be, that state users would be able to see the data through NHVRIN, but in every other way it is completely disconnected from NHVRIN, which is a good thing. Ms. Hadaway asked if this was something that clerks would not be able to get into.

Mr. Bolton replied that they would not be able to access the data from out-of-state records, but that ultimately if they decide to move to new architecture this would possibly be the way to go. Replacing the code that we currently use to get into NHVRIN. Mr. Hall stated he had a number of questions about the out-of-state modules. He asked if the out-of-state birth information in the past was not just a data dump. Mr. Bolton replied that it had not been. He explained that there was a national effort to move to an electronic exchange of data between states. Mr. Hall again asked if it is not been a data dump in the past from other states. Mr. Bolton stated that it had not been. Mr. Hall then asked how many out-of-state birth records have to be entered on an annual basis. Dr. Laflamme replied that it was 11 to 12 percent annually.

Mr. Hall asked if there is a staff person whose duty it was to enter those records. Mr. Bolton replied that that has been a problem in the past, as they had lost a data entry position several years earlier and just recently were able to hire two new data entry personnel. That was a result of this committee approving those new positions. He added that now that we have the two people in the positions we are working on getting the module ready to get the data entered. Mr. Hall explained that if it was only 1100 entries

Approved Minutes

per year, there should not be a need for full-time person. Mr. Bolton replied that the out-of-state data was only a portion of their duties.

They would also be responsible for helping to enter older paper records into the system. He explained that those records needed to be entered in order for city and town clerks to be able to use the software to its full potential. Mr. Hall replied he was only talking about out-of-state data. Mr. Bolton stated that the out of state birth and death record data entry would be part of those positions duties. Mr. Hall replied that he must have heard something wrong about a data entry person that was going to do this. Mr. Bolton replied that it was not a person in total. That task would be accomplished by a piece of a person or persons. Mr. Bolton stated that it is fairly esoteric to be able to deal with multiple state forms. We may not want to farm it out to three or four different people. We may want to target one person in particular to own this task.

Dr. Laflamme asked if they were at such a point where they might be able to estimate when out-of-state data would be in for birth and death. Death data is in up until 2003 and birth is in until 2004. Mr. Bolton replied that death data is current through the year 2004. Dr. Laflamme asked when 2005 and 2006 data would be ready. Ms. Goonan replied that they planned to release the software at the end of March or first week of April. At that point she would expect it would be fully used for entering the data. Dr. Laflamme asked how long that would take. Mr. Bolton replied that it was not that many records that they were looking at. He felt it would be a fairly quick process, a matter of the couple of months. He added that the out-of-state outstanding death would then be coded.

NCHS allows us to bump up against their database with our state file number and the out-of-state file number and they would return coding causes of death, which we would add to our database. He added that NCHS had just released their death file, so it shouldn't be too long before we could get 2006 data. He felt that we would be able to add codes within a few months of that. Dr. Laflamme replied that this was good news. Mr. Bolton reported that there are a lot of solutions on the horizon. It could eventually be an electronic thing where we bump our death data up against NCHS and it returns a code, or we could get coding staff. Right now we rely heavily on NCHS to do all of our death coding that we cannot do with automated software. If we were to have a person that could code a record at like \$3 a record we could knock out all of our death codes as we collect them. Dr. Laflamme replied that it sounded wonderful.

Ms. Goonan pointed out the next page in her handout. She explained that this page detailed the IT needs and priorities that were identified by the subcommittee. She explained that there been no changes since the last report as they had been working on the application. She suggested that after they completed the out-of-state work and it had been in use for a while, the committee might want to revisit this list to see if they would like to revise it. Mr. Gray agreed that that would be a good idea. Ms. Goonan added that if they did not, her staff would continue to work on the list that they currently have.

Ms. Goonan reported that they did meet with some representatives of Mortware and ran into some hurdles. She asked Mr. Pollard if the funeral directors had had a chance to discuss how they might modify their requirements due to our limitations. Mr. Pollard replied that the requirements had seemed different than what he and Ms. Goonan had anticipated. Instead of data going from NHVRIN to Mortware, they wanted Mortware to push the data to NHVRIN. Ms. Goonan stated that given the two different technologies and the various software packages out there it just presented a lot of hurdles and a lot of

Approved Minutes

effort. Mr. Pollard added that he thought they were going to contact Mortware and other software companies to see if they could do something to make it easier for the two applications to interact. Ms. Goonan agreed.

Mr. Gray asked if all funeral directors were on Mortware. Mr. Pollard replied that they were not. He explained that there were several different software packages in use out there. Mr. Gray asked how difficult it would be for all the funeral directors to all go in on one software package that might interface better with NHVRIN or the next generation of it. He added that maybe we should think about the next version interfacing with the funeral director software programs. Mr. Pollard replied that obviously you would never be able to get all the funeral directors to buy from the same company. We cannot force them to do that, but we could force the companies to make their product more compatible with NHVRIN. If they felt they could better market their products if they interfaced with NHVRIN, they would probably do so.

Mr. Wurtz stated that the company that comes up with a product that interfaces with NHVRIN would find itself more marketable to New Hampshire funeral directors. Instead of us gearing our software towards one of them, they need to make their software a better fit with ours. Ms. Goonan concluded that they would be revisiting the subject after the completion of the out-of-state birth and death modules. Mr. Gray asked if anyone was contacting the software companies about this type of arrangement. Ms. Goonan replied that she had been contacted by several vendors and those would be the ones she would extend an invitation to discuss the issue with. She added that she would be happy to invite other vendors, but was not aware of any others.

Looking at the budget information, Mr. Gray noted that we were over budget on three lines. He stated that one of the lines was rent, which we have discussed in the past. He still questioned whether we should be paying for rent out of this fund. Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Gray where he was saying that we were over budget on the document that Ms. Goonan had distributed. Ms. Goonan replied that the first line for salary and benefits was one area where we appear to have gone over budget. She explained that we should be around 51 percent and we appear to be running higher than that. She added that some of the other lines appear to be running high percentage-wise, but the dollars are low. The rent was not something that Ms. Goonan could speak to.

Mr. Gray agreed that Ms. Goonan was correct that the dollars were low on some of the lines that appeared to be over budget. Ms. Goonan explained for those that had not seen this budget information before, that the bottom row extracts the salaries and benefits from the first line. These were the salaries and benefits for the development team. This was done due to a request to see just how much it costs to develop or modify the NHVRIN software. The difference between the two amounts is the shared costs, which is when the developers to work for other programs.

Those programs are then responsible for paying a portion of their salary and benefits. Mr. Gray acknowledged that there are six months to go in the year, but felt that OIT would come in about the same as they had the previous year. He asked Ms. Goonan if she anticipated anything changing that. Ms. Goonan replied that she did not anticipate any major changes in the coming year. There were no plans to add or replace any staff or hardware.

Mr. Gray stated that unless Ms. Goonan had anything else he would let that segue into the

Approved Minutes

next item on the agenda. Mr. Bolton stated that actually he would like Mr. Bentzler to speak about WildBlue and a connectivity problem recently encountered by some NHVRIN users. Mr. Bentzler reported that they had an update from the Hampton co-op that WildBlue installers were going to begin again at the end of that month. At that point we had three towns that had their paperwork completely filled out and sent to WildBlue. Mr. Bentzler has spoken to one other town directly that is actually going to wait until after their town meeting in May, where they will discuss coming onto NHVRIN. That town is the town of Stoddard and they're looking at having a new building put up. They do, however, want to move forward with the install. Mr. Bentzler explained that he told them that he was unaware of what the cost would be to move the satellite dish when that became necessary.

Mr. Bentzler reported that we have two towns that are now on but are just awaiting training. There are also two other towns that are in the process of getting their paperwork in order and would be moving forward. It is just a matter of getting everything set up. That leaves us with just four other towns and Mr. Bentzler hoped to have them online by the end of the summer. At that point everyone would be online with NHVRIN. Mr. Pollard asked if that would be everyone. Mr. Bentzler replied that it would mean that every town in New Hampshire would have some means of accessing NHVRIN.

The other issue that Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Bentzler to speak to was an issue we encountered recently where five towns were unable to access NHVRIN. They were able to get online and go to any other website but could not access our application or any state website. Mr. Bentzler worked with state OIT people and they determined that it had nothing to do with our system. They still have not determined what the exact cause of the problem, but all those affected appear able to access the state's websites again. This was an ongoing problem for two weeks. During that time Mr. Bentzler worked to determine what the problem was, whose problem that was, and who would be responsible to fix it.

It was a continuous battle. Mr. Bentzler enlisted the assistance of networking, operations, and the Web services division. He reported that it appears to be fixed at this point and thankfully did not escalate to more towns. This problem affected mainly smaller towns. Litchfield was probably the biggest town involved and they were very patient during the ordeal. Mr. Bentzler reported that he, Mr. Bolton, and Mr. Wurtz tried to remain in constant contact with the towns to keep them apprised of what was happening.

Mr. Pollard asked how long the issue persisted. Mr. Bentzler replied it occurred over a period of two weeks. Ms. Gaouette asked if all the towns were back online. Mr. Bentzler replied that they were. Mr. Wurtz thanked Mr. Bentzler for all his efforts in determining and fixing the problem. When the calls came in, the clerks on the other end of the phone were frustrated and the business office could not understand how they could access all other websites but not ours. The word that NHVRIN was down started to spread and that was incorrect.

Mr. Bentzler's persistence helped to quickly obtain assistance in trying to determine the cause of the problem. It took the expertise of OIT staff to explain to Comcast that this was not our issue. This was a totally new problem for us and Mr. Wurtz had to be convinced that it was not operator error, so he contacted some of the users encountering the difficulty. To his chagrin they were doing everything they were supposed to be doing and were still unable to log on.

Approved Minutes

5. VRIFAC Subcommittee/Budget Update:

For members that had not been in attendance at the last few meetings Mr. Gray offered to recap what had been happening with the subcommittee. He explained that one of the reasons he had formed the subcommittee was because a flaw he had noticed with the fund over the years. They just spent money as they needed it. What they should have done was hold meetings and prepare budgets to appropriate the money. Mr. Gray felt that had been a mistake and it was important to correct it. He felt that all committee members needed to participate in both the committee and the subcommittee to remain in touch with the issues.

Mr. Gray felt that having a budget was a policy statement. He explained that he may be on the clerks committee and all of that, but he tried to be objective in the way that he runs the committee. Mr. Gray felt that everyone had been a little more involved this past year and he hoped to see that continue. It was his goal to use this fund in an objective way. When he began the subcommittee they were looking at fiscal year 08 and they wanted to see where the fund was going. The fund usually generates around \$1 million per year. Mr. Gray stated that he considers there to be three parts to the fund. There is an OIT component, a vital record component, and a grants program component. Those three components will require that we spend around \$1 million in grant funds this year.

Mr. Gray explained that he did not expect to spend \$1 million per year in grant funds, but in order to get the program rolling this year we expended a greater amount. Mr. Scanlan had reported to the subcommittee on the grant program for Mr. Teschner the previous week and explained that the grant program would not be spending the whole \$1 million this year. The amount expended for this year would be nearer to \$850,000. Mr. Gray said that people are asking what the vision is for the future of the fund. To support the fund and create the next generation of NHVRIN, Mr. Gray felt that would be around \$300,000. When he looks at the budget for OIT he sees that they're asking for somewhere near \$770,000 and vital records is asking for around \$240,000.

If you add all those numbers up that puts us up near \$1.5 million, which is a half-million dollars more than we generate through the sale of vital records. Mr. Gray reported that the subcommittee would be meeting again the following week. Members of the subcommittee include Kathy Bizarro from the New Hampshire Hospital Association; Barbara Reed from the Local Government Center; Kathy Seaver, Town Clerk from Farmington; Carol Johnson, the Deputy Clerk from Manchester; and Mr. Gray. Everyone on the committee except for Barbara Reed has had experience with this fund. The projected OIT cost for this year is \$700,000. After reviewing that amount the committee determined that they could only cut about \$60,000 from that cost.

There's really not a lot that can be cut from the budget because OIT charges what it calls a shared cost. That \$700,000 figure includes a \$300,000 "shared cost" charge that we have to pay before we even pay any of our staff salaries. Mr. Gray explained that he found that figure hard to deal with. He reported that he asked Mr. Bolton to draw up a Request for Proposal (RFP) so we can go out to the private sector to see if we can maybe lower our costs that way. He added that that did not mean that we would just take the lowest bid. Mr. Gray added that the Secretary of State's office had also shown interest in maintaining the NHVRIN application. He felt that the committee needed to look at all options and then decide as a committee, not a subcommittee, or the chair, but the whole

Approved Minutes

committee.

If we want this fund to continue to benefit the public far into the future we have to look at this objectively. What is going to be good for the fund going forward? Mr. Gray stated that he had no problem with this fund helping different bodies and that brought him to another point. This fund supports the NHVRIN application and many agencies benefit from it, but none provide any funding. It may be a partnership, but they are non-paying partners. Mr. Gray reported that he asked Mr. Bolton to suggest other ways that we could generate more revenue. The only problem with that is that by law we can only generate revenue one way, through the sale of vital records. In order to generate more revenue, it will require that legislation be passed.

We are faced with two problems. The first is growing expenses and the second is revenue. There are two ways that we can fix this. We can either raise revenue or we can cut our costs. The only way that we can generate additional revenue is by raising the cost of a vital record. The other way is maybe asking our partners to play a role in funding the application. The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) uses our bandwidth to service their customers and they do not contribute to this fund or the upkeep of the application. Mr. Gray told Ms. Goonan that he hoped that OIT would bid when we release the RFP. Maybe through their bid we could track other government bodies that use our services.

Mr. Pollard asked what the balance of the fund was at that time. Mr. Gray replied that it was approximately \$3 million. He added that we were not at the point where the fund has lost money, but if we do not do something the cushion will slowly be eaten away. We are supposed to be drawing down the fund, but if you look at future budget information, it will not be sustainable at its current rate. In two years there will not be a fund if something is not done. Mr. Gray felt that we needed to put the brakes on now because in 18 months it would be too late. The subcommittee met with Mr. Bolton the previous week about vital record requirements for the next year. Mr. Scanlan also met with them for Mr. Teschner regarding the grant program needs for the following year.

Mr. Gray stated that the only thing he found questionable about the vital records request for the next year was a computer-based training module. He added that Mr. Wurtz could speak to that later and yielded the floor to Mr. Bolton. Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Wurtz if he would like to discuss the computer-based training module. Mr. Gray reported that the largest portion of our records request for the following year was approximately \$50,000 for a computer-based training module. He explained that this was the first the subcommittee had heard of this idea and the cost seemed relatively high. Mr. Bolton replied that Mr. Wurtz would not be defending the cost of the software. That was a budget item placeholder that Mr. Bolton had placed. He added that it could actually be higher than that because it had not been put out to bid yet.

Mr. Bolton felt that Mr. Wurtz could better described the need for this product. Mr. Hall stated that he did not have a budget document in front of him that had these budget items/requests on it. Mr. Gray replied that the subcommittee would be meeting the following week and he would generate a document for the whole committee outlining the requests for the out years. This was just a question that he had raised with Mr. Bolton previously and Mr. Bolton asked for the opportunity to explain this request to the whole committee. Mr. Gray added that he would send out an e-mail detailing this information the following week to committee members. When the committee met again he planned for them to be voting on the budget.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Wurtz explained that he and Mr. Bolton had sat down earlier in the year to try and determine where they wanted to go with NHVRIN and what their needs would be in the coming year. One of the major priorities that we have not touched on yet was physicians certifying deaths electronically. NHVRIN was designed with this module in mind and we haven't implemented that portion of it yet. The reason being, the training issues involved. In 2006 they estimated that there would be 1100 to 1200 physicians that would need to be trained in electronic death certification. There are physicians that certify every day and there are those that certify once or twice a year. That would be their target audience and Mr. Wurtz's concern was that with the conventional training procedure that we have in place today there would be no way to train 1100 to 1200 physicians adequately.

Mr. Wurtz did not feel we could entice physicians enough to come into our new facility 18 at a time. They have tried to figure out a way that we can do this whether it is regional training, training sessions within the hospitals, or a combination of all of the above. One of the ideas that Mr. Wurtz suggested was the ability for us to produce or have produced, some type of electronic training module that physicians themselves could log into, take the training class, and pass the test at the end. We could possibly work with the medical society and make continuing education credits available to the physicians that complete training. That in itself is a major task. We also have a degree of difficulty added to this, in that funeral directors have sponsored a bill that deals with the certification of death.

That bill talks about making the certification of death in New Hampshire a requirement of the physician to do online. Mr. Wurtz fears this legislation will pass, take effect in 60 days, and we will not be prepared. Mr. Pollard stated that it is flying through the approval process right now. Mr. Wurtz reported that we are in no way prepared at this time to take on that kind of a training burden. He added that he had previously told Mr. Bolton that he could not support any kind of legislation that would require us to roll out this module with some kind of training not in place previously. If this bill passes and it takes effect in 60 days we're in deep trouble. We need an alternate way to do this kind of training.

Mr. Gray asked Ms. Augustine if the hospital association was aware of this bill. She replied that they were. Mr. Gray stated that it would have been nice for this committee to have been made aware of this bill previously. Someone should have told the committee that there was a bill being sponsored that would change the way that we do business. Mr. Pollard replied that it would not change the way that we do business. Only funeral directors and physicians would be impacted. Mr. Gray replied that that may be, but if a bill will have this kind of impact on vital records it should have been made known to the committee. Mr. Pollard replied that they sponsored this bill with the full support and cooperation of the Division of Vital Records.

Mr. Gray stated that he was not blaming anyone, but it would have been nice to know that this might be on the horizon. Mr. Pollard added that they were planning to change the effective date of the Bill. Mr. Scanlan asked for the bill number. Mr. Pollard replied that it was HB645. Mr. Bolton stated that in reality it was not changing the functionality of how the NHVRIN software works or the audience that we hit. It is just a matter of the volume of people we will need to reach. Mr. Gray asked if this would not remove the need for NHVRIN to interface with Mortware. Mr. Bolton and Mr. Pollard replied that would not remove the need. It is a completely different situation.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Pollard added that if this legislation passes and the training takes place over the next year, it will be much more important to the funeral directors than Mortware. Mr. Wurtz agreed and felt that this bolstered the request for the computer-based training module. He felt that time was of the essence. Mr. Pollard reported that the bill was on the consent calendar and they expected it to pass the house that week. It came out of committee with a vote of 15 to 1, so they expect it to pass easily. It has proven to be a very popular bill. Mr. Bolton reported that this bill would bring New Hampshire more into line with federal guidelines. Mr. Pollard stated that they added certified nurse practitioners to the bill and expected that might cause some problems, but it did not.

Mr. Wurtz asked Ms. Augustine if the hospital association had any experience with computer-based training for physicians. He felt that this was something that that we really needed to start looking at. He did not feel that Vital Records could accommodate such a large group of people for training. Mr. Pollard stated that this was especially true when you're talking about training doctors. He likened it to herding cats. You cannot get 18 of them in the same room at the same time. Mr. Wurtz said even with computer-based training module it would be a battle. Ms. Augustine stated that she hoped some mechanism could be put in place to make it easier. Mr. Wurtz replied that we had not yet explored this avenue completely, but if the legislation passed the need would be imminent.

Mr. Gray asked why, if the legislation is passed, is it our responsibility to train all the physicians. If it is a requirement for them to certify death why are we responsible to train them? Mr. Bolton replied that we actually require their participation. It is a part of our statute, the certification of death, and the collection of that data. It is written that certifying physicians have to participate, but currently states that participation can be in paper or electronic form. Mr. Hall asked how many currently do it electronically. Mr. Wurtz replied that none did. Mr. Bolton replied that the Medical Examiner had dabbled in the application. He explained that he had done some promotion with the N.H. Medical Society to some oncology groups and there was not a great deal of excitement generated.

Mr. Hall stated that by passing this legislation, despite the effective date, they have essentially upped the motivation to be trained so that is not a question of going out and searching them out for training. In addition to the medical society is the Board of Medicine, which licenses physicians to practice every two years. There is no reason why this could not be a requirement for licensing. Mr. Bolton replied that they found out over the last few years that the New Hampshire Medical Society does not represent all New Hampshire physicians. Mr. Hall stated that the Board of Medicine is the legal avenue that we could use to make this happen.

The legislation could make this a requirement of renewing their license. Mr. Pollard replied that he would not be taking that to the Legislature. Mr. Allan added that these costs should be on the fiscal note for this bill. That would make the budget office and those that are considering this bill aware of this training need and expense. Mr. Gray stated that once again it comes back to who is paying. We have to get out of the mindset that the fund will pay for everything. Mr. Pollard stated that every time Vital Records offers training, it costs money. If this computer-based training module were purchased it would be a onetime cost.

Mr. Wurtz agreed and stated that although the focus is on physicians at this point. In the future, once the application is in place we can produce a version for hospital clerks, town

Approved Minutes

clerks, and funeral directors. There is still a tremendous need for training for all the other users as staff changes, clerks change, and the application evolves. We still have the ability for hands-on training and he would never suggest that we stop that completely. Mr. Gray stated that he was just suffering from sticker shock. Mr. Wurtz explained that division staff used to make themselves available for grand rounds of the hospitals and he has made his trips to the hospital at 7:00 in the morning to discuss the certification of death. History has shown very little participation on the part of physicians.

Mr. Gray asked when they hope to have this software completed. Mr. Wurtz replied that he was unsure because they did not have any kind of date for the legislation to go into effect. It would take time to explore available software vendors, do an RFP, and pick a vendor. Mr. Gray asked Ms. Augustine if it might be possible for the hospital association to put together some kind of training seminar to see how much interest is generated. Mr. Bolton stated that there were approximately 660 current users of NHVRIN and 1 staff member at vital records to run training sessions. It is not really feasible to consider going on that way. He felt that even without the impending legislation he might like to go in this direction anyway.

Mr. Hall stated that other basic question would be, how complicated could it possibly be to have a physician certify online? They probably have to enter a name, password, and then go to a particular record and click an X. if the process itself is not that complicated, then the training can't be too complicated. Mr. Wurtz replied that he believed because of that, the cost of this training module would be kept to a minimum. There are several steps they have to follow to login, identify the record, do the certification, and understand the edits they see on the screen, and to be able to complete the process.

Mr. Hall suggested another way would be to provide a written sheet for physicians to follow when doing the certification. He felt they should have a training module to back it up but some sort of a cheat sheet they could hang on the wall would also be helpful. Mr. Wurtz replied that he felt that all of these recommendations would be what we would put into effect, but none of them singly would be a magic bullet. Mr. Gray stated that now that he had heard the background of the request, he was more in favor of it.

Mr. Gray stated that if we were going to do this, then he would like to see computer-based training for all levels. He felt that in the long run we might save money by offering computer-based training rather than sending Mr. Wurtz out to offer training. Mr. Wurtz agreed. Mr. Gray suggested that Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz research pricing and reach out to the hospital association for assistance. Ms. Augustine said she would look into it for them.

6. Preservation Update:

Mr. Scanlan distributed a handout to the committee and explained that Mr. Teschner was unable to make the meeting. He directed the committee's attention to the first page of the document where the status of the vital records improvement fund was outlined. The current balance was \$3,260,576. It showed revenue for this fiscal year as \$650,058. The expenses through February 28th of 2007 were \$487,000. He explained that this is a sheet that the committee has seen in the past. Mr. Teschner just updated it with the activity that has taken place so far this year.

Approved Minutes

The second part of a handout was a more detailed description of where the expenses have gone out of the fund. Mr. Scanlan stated that there was nothing on the page that really jumped out at him. He did want to point out the one section on object class 30, which is equipment, and new and replacement. When the construction of the new building was being taken up, the committee approved an expenditure of \$76,000 to help with things that were specific to vital records, such as HVAC.

It was rather difficult to separate those items out and pay them directly, so what they did was purchased furniture for the research room and the building out of that. They can allocate that on paper to climate control at a later date. The \$14,000 represents purchases of furniture to date. Mr. Scanlan felt that everything else in the document appeared to be straightforward. If committee members required additional information or had questions, Mr. Scanlan offered to attempt to answer them but Mr. Teschner would be the best one to contact. He explained that the rest of the handout dealt with greater detail on what had been purchased and for whom from the grant program.

Mr. Gray noted that Mr. Teschner indicated on this document that he planned to spend only \$872,000 and not the \$1 million allocated. He directed committee members to look at the next page where Mr. Teschner was anticipating spending \$720,000 next year. Mr. Scanlan reported that the grant program was very much a success and very much in demand. A majority of communities in the state took advantage of it and they are either in the process of having their assessments done or waiting for them to be done. It is taking some time due to the number of requests. Once the assessments are done the towns have been following up with Mr. Teschner and requesting assistance.

Mr. Gray stated that initially the committee had expected possibly 50 towns to take advantage of this program. Approximately 150 towns were participating in the program. Mr. Scanlan explained that the other handout that was distributed was a description of the towns participating and where they were in the process. It listed what the towns have requested and for what purpose. Ms. Gaouette asked why there were two lines having to do with grants. Mr. Scanlan replied that he believed that the class 95 would have to do with the grant program and was unsure as to what class 20 was, but would check.

Mr. Gray asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the grant program. Mr. Hall replied that he had a question that related back to the overall budget. Looking at the document that Mr. Scanlan handed out it appeared that the grants program would be expending approximately \$800,000 per year for two years. That amount represents a onetime thing. Mr. Hall suggested that the committee not count that amount against the overall budget. We have that asset base that has been accumulating over the years and instead of expending it during those years, it built up. The fact that we are now expending those funds should not count against current and future budgets.

He felt that unless some decisions were made to continue these kinds of expenditures, the budget outlook was not as bad as it seemed. If you look at some of Mr. Teschner's ideas for going forward some of them involved going beyond the vital records scope and would require legislative change among other things. He stated that he was feeling a lot more comfortable about the fact that in the next year the amount of revenue might be less than the expenditure of these listed amounts. Mr. Gray replied that one of the reasons he was pushing for better planning is that he wanted the committee to get into the habit of setting up an annual budget. Mr. Hall stated that he thought that was a good idea.

Approved Minutes

There was so much interest in its first offering that it is going to take us two years to complete all of the requests. He explained to Mr. Hall that it is the committee's intent to keep the grant program going in future years. He envisions a grant program that everyone enjoys and that will continue for years to come. Many of the grants from this first year were very small ones, from \$2000 to \$3000 per town and not all towns applied. Mr. Gray reported that his town did not apply for a grant because his entire office is in such bad condition that it would've had little effect. He said that he would like to see the program fund more capital projects, possibly do some HVAC for some towns and other larger projects in future years. That is something that the committee needs to decide a year from now, but needs to think about now.

7. Annual Meetings:

Mr. Gray asked Mr. Bolton where he was going now. Mr. Bolton replied that there was a joint vital statistics cooperative program with the National Association of Public Health Statistics and Information Systems (NAPHSIS) and they are holding a meeting in Utah. He explained he would like to bring Mr. Wurtz and Ms. Patsy Elderkin. Mr. Bolton said that he would like to attend because he is the VS CP contractor for the state of New Hampshire, Mr. Wurtz because he is the field operations person, and Ms. Elderkin because she is the statistician that works directly with the NCHS statisticians.

Ms. Hadaway asked where the meeting was being held. Mr. Bolton replied in Utah. She asked where in Utah. Mr. Bolton was not sure. Dr. Laflamme replied that the meeting was being held in Salt Lake City, UT. Mr. Wurtz added that in addition to the valuable information that they get from these meetings, they are also able to demonstrate our software and few other states software packages. They can then bring things back that they've seen to try and enhance vital records software. There is still a great deal of interest in New Hampshire's electronic birth and death registration system. We've recently been contacted by the state of California in regards to their electronic death registration project.

Mr. Gray asked how many states have a program similar to ours? He asked if all states have electronic systems. Mr. Bolton replied that they do not. Mr. Gray suggested we sell our system to those states to do not have been electronic death and birth registration system. Mr. Wurtz and replied that every state has some sort of electronic birth module, but all are working towards an electronic death registration system. He estimated that less than a dozen states had electronic death registration. Mr. Bolton felt it was more like one-third of the state's have electronic distribution system.

Mr. Allan asked if it was standard for the committee to requests some sort of a report when staff returns from the meeting in Utah. Mr. Gray replied the Mr. Bolton generally reports to the committee of his experiences at these national meetings. He then asked Mr. Bolton how much he was looking for the committee to expend on this trip. Mr. Bolton responded that he estimated to cost to be around \$5000. Mr. Gray reminded Mr. Bolton that to keep in mind that he and only requested \$5000 for the entire year in the next budget. He explained that Mr. Bolton would not be able to come to the committee once the budget was in place and ask for additional money. He suggested that Mr. Bolton better plan his travel needs for the next budget.

Mr. Bolton replied that you may need to revise his budget request for the following year

Approved Minutes

and would take a look at it. He explained that the funding asked for the next year was for ICD 10 training for a staff member. Mr. Scanlan asked if this funding was in addition to what was in the general fund. Mr. Bolton replied that the general fund held \$1500 for travel. Mr. Bolton stated that he would rework the budget and try to better plan with the needs would be for travel for vital records the following year. Mr. Gray stated that we needed to get out of the mindset that we can come to the committee anytime and ask for additional funds. Let's make a budget and once the money is gone it's gone. Mr. Bolton agreed.

Mr. Gray made a motion to appropriate \$5000 to sentence Mr. Bolton, Mr. Wurtz, and Ms. Elderkin to the meeting in Utah. Mr. Allan seconded the motion providing the committee receives a report for Mr. Bolton at the completion of this trip. Mr. Hall asked what the agenda of the meeting was. Mr. Bolton replied that there was agenda posted but that he would generally be regarding electronic death registration and state systems. New Hampshire would be presenting at one or two of the sessions at this meeting. Mr. Hall stated that everyone knew his interest in this and that was the outputs of the system, which is the use of the statistics. He asked if they would be any of that discussed at this meeting.

Mr. bull replied that there probably would be. Mr. Hall asked if you be able to bring stuff back on that. Mr. Bolton replied that he could. Mr. Pollard asked if there was a trade show there as well and Mr. Bolton replied in the affirmative. Dr. Laflamme suggested that the committee also fund someone from public health to attend this meeting for the public health statistics side of this. Normally each state has four memberships to NAPHSIS and encourages member states to have one person from OIT, public health, and vital records. That has not happened in New Hampshire. It used to be done that way, but doesn't any longer. He felt that would really benefit in general, to have someone with public health statistics knowledge at this meeting.

Mr. Gray asked what the cost was per person. Mr. Bolton estimated \$1500 per person. Ms. Hadaway asked what the registration fee was for the meeting. Dr. Laflamme replied that was \$425 for members, \$350 if you register early. Mr. Wurtz replied that he'd done some research on flights and hotel and the figure he came up with per person was approximately \$1500 to \$1600. Mr. Gray stated that he would amend his motion to \$6500 to include someone from public health. Mr. Gray suggested that Mr. Bolton consider bringing along public health representatives to some of these meetings when he is planning his budget for the next year.

Mr. Bolton replied that he would do that, but this is also another example of the committee providing for one of our silent partner's and getting nothing in return. He felt this might be a good opportunity for them to participate in funding some of the work surrounding public health statistics. Mr. Gray agreed that Mr. Bolton had a point and suggested that we need to start holding some of the people the benefit from our work responsible for some of that expense. Mr. Gray reminded Mr. Bolton that this one trip would eat up the entire amount he budgeted for the next year the one travel.

He asked Mr. Bolton if he did not take more than one trip per year? Mr. Bolton agreed to take another look at his budget. Mr. Gray advised that once the budgeted money was gone we would not be accepting supplemental requests for funding. He then told Dr. Laflamme that he should take a look at the meetings and Mr. Bolton plans to attend in the coming year and determined if someone from public health might also like to go. He also

Approved Minutes

suggested that DHHS should plan to chip and some funding for travel for the representatives.

Mr. Gray again made a motion to appropriate \$6500 to send Mr. Bolton, Mr. Wurtz, Ms. Elderkin, and a DHHS representative to the meeting in Utah. Mr. Allan seconded. Ms. Gaouette asked if this was for fiscal year 2008 or 2007. Mr. Bolton replied that was for 2007. Mr. Gray explained that he was not questioning the value of the trips Mr. Bolton and his staff and go on each year, but they need to better plan for them. The committee unanimously voted to appropriate to funds to send them to Utah.

8. RFP OIT Services:

Mr. Bolton reported that he had been asked to prepare an RFP to look at how we can save money or reduce costs. He had not yet done that and explained that because he then asked to he would go through the exercise, but wanted the committee to know that he was not in support of it. He felt that we have our IT services right about where we want them. We have a team that is actually familiar with the code, is doing some pretty good development, and has a good idea of where we want to go in the future. He felt it was risky to contemplate moving to another provider who may be far cheaper, both require extensive training on our software and our business rules.

He thought that the RFP might be a valuable exercise that he was uncomfortable with the idea of just taking the lowest bid. Mr. Bolton stated that he had approach the committee in the past to examine the value they were receiving for their dollars and that would've costs money to hire a consultant to investigate how much bang they were getting for their buck. He felt that maybe something we want to contemplate again, but he was uncomfortable in moving to a new provider at this time. Mr. Gray replied that just because he puts out an RFP does not mean that we have to move to a new vendor. He hoped that the RFP could be completed before the next meeting.

That way any proposals could be discussed and examined at the next meeting. At that time the committee would welcome Mr. Bolton and ask input on any proposals. The committee could then weighing whether the financial benefit of going to another company would outweigh the drawbacks. He hoped this would be a wake-up call to OIT. Mr. Gray stated that he found their billing practices to be unacceptable. He thought to charging us \$300,000 for shared services was unacceptable. The scary part is that for fiscal year is only \$770,000, but next year it goes up to \$900,000. If these costs keep going up where are we going to draw the line?

He recalled the meetings of the subcommittee had with OIT and was discouraged when during their presentation they expressed that they do not look at us as a customer. He added the Ms. Goonan had not said that, but that Mr. Croteau had. For the most part, Mr. Gray found the services that he received from Ms. goonan and her team to be very good, but we're getting to the point where they are pricing us out of the plan. He felt that we were the good point where we could stop and take a look at what else is out there. He hoped that OIT would also submit the proposal. He suggested to Ms. goonan and that maybe OIT should look at how they bill or they might find themselves with a shortfall.

Mr. Gray added he was not saying this as a scare tactic, he actually hoped it would open

Approved Minutes

some eyes at OIT. He stated that he felt the direct costs were fine, it was the shared costs that he did not agree with. Ms. Hadaway asked if all the agencies get those shared costs. Ms. goonan replied that they do. Mr. Hall asked how they allocated those costs. Ms. goonan replied that there are several different methods and depending on the costs they use a certain method. She stated that some might be computed by PC count, staff count, number of servers, or number of CPUs. Mr. Hall then asked who decides which method is used. Ms. goonan replied that when a job number is created you submit a request. She believed it was the OIT finance office that applies the correct method.

There are descriptions online on the state intranet that describe what these allocation methods are and why they are used. Mr. Hall asked if the shared costs were not still somehow connected to the direct costs. Ms. goonan agreed. Mr. Hall asked if that would mean the shared costs would go to 0 if an independent contractor were used. Ms. goonan replied she was not an expert in the financial aspects of our billing. She added she would like to have someone from OIT finance answer that question because the answer is somewhat technical. For example, if the CIO of OIT does something that has benefit for OIT, part of the costs of the CIO would be shared by all the agencies that use OIT services.

Mr. Hall replied that the only question would be the percentage charged each agency and how they would arrive at that. That is the question, how is that allocated. Ms. goonan again stated that was very complicated, she was not well versed in the billing practices of OIT, and would like to have a representative make a presentation for the committee. It would be far better to have someone that understands the practice to explain it to the committee. Mr. Hall told Mr. Gray that he thought that his idea for RFP might be of benefit because we could then see how OIT allocates our billing.

This situation reminded him and when he was in the legislature years earlier and they abolished a centralized data processing for the same type of problem. He felt that OIT needed to take this question seriously and not just something coming from our records, but a real issue. Mr. Gray stated that he was not doing this to scare OIT or even necessarily to leave OIT. He just wanted to see what kinds of services were available out there and what they would cost. He told Mr. Bolton that he wanted the RFP be very specific regarding our expectations.

Maybe suggest a three-year contract, but it was Mr. Bolton's to write. He suggested that Mr. Bolton also look for potential vendors to describe where they see the next generation of NHVRIN going. Someone mentioned that that would be very big RFP. Mr. Gray agreed, but added that he felt that if we selected another vendor to maintain our software they should be thinking ahead to the next version of it. Mr. Gray asked Mr. Bolton how soon he thought he could complete an RFP. Ms. Norman replied that the last RFP that we had done for a new application took months to complete.

Mr. Bolton said that there were many things to consider including architecture for the new application. Mr. Gray asked if he thought he could have a completed if they move the budget discussion to the July meeting. Mr. Bolton asked if he met as far as a written RFP. Mr. Gray replied that he wanted to know if we get an RFP how soon could we have an answer. Mr. Bolton explained that we would not be able to complete the process by July. Mr. Gray asked how long we were talking. Mr. Bolton replied December. Otherwise we would have some half-baked RFP that would not nail down what we currently get as well as what we hope for the future.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Gray stated that the one advantage we have over other funds another committee's is we are self-contained and if we have to we can complete the budget in May and wait on that portion. He asked how other committee members felt about that. Mr. Allan replied that he felt the state would like to maintain control of the architecture of the application and the fundamental design constraints of the application. We would have to have people to manage the subcontractors and check their work. It would still incur additional cost to go outside OIT from this group of people that already has the knowledge.

Mr. Gray stated that we know how much the fund generates. It generates about \$1 million a year. At what point do we decide that we cannot afford to continue with OIT? He felt that we were approaching that point right now. Mr. Hall asked if the system were complete now and there were no changes being requested. What would be the budget for OIT to simply maintain the application and database? Then what would be the development budget? He felt would be helpful to know what the breakout would be. It seemed to him that the bulk of the staffing and expense is on development.

Maybe suggest a three-year contract, but it was Mr. Bolton's to write. He suggested that Mr. Bolton also look for potential vendors to describe where they see the next generation of NHVRIN going. Someone mentioned that that would be very big RFP. Mr. Gray agreed, but added that he felt that if we selected another vendor to maintain our software they should be thinking ahead to the next version of it. Mr. Gray asked Mr. Bolton how soon he thought he could complete an RFP. Ms. Norman replied that the last RFP that we had done for a new application took months to complete.

Mr. Bolton said that there were many things to consider including architecture for the new application. Mr. Gray asked if he thought he could have it completed if they were to move the budget discussion to the July meeting. Mr. Bolton asked if he meant as far as a written RFP. Mr. Gray replied that he wanted to know if we prepare an RFP how soon could we have an answer. Mr. Bolton explained that we would not be able to complete the process by July. Mr. Gray asked how long we were talking. Mr. Bolton replied December. Otherwise we would have some half-baked RFP that would not nail down what we currently get as well as what we hope or for the future.

Mr. Gray stated that the one advantage we have over other funds another committee's is we are self-contained and if we have to we can complete the budget in May and wait on that portion. He asked how other committee members felt about that. Mr. Allan replied that he felt the state would like to maintain control of the architecture of the application and the fundamental design constraints of the application. We would have to have people to manage the subcontractors and check their work. It would still incur additional cost to go outside OIT from this group of people that already has the knowledge.

Mr. Gray stated that we own homage to fund generates. It generates about \$1 million a year. At what point do we decide that we cannot afford to continue with OIT? He felt that we were approaching that point right now. Mr. Hall asked if the system were complete now and there were no changes being requested. What would be the budget for OIT to simply maintain the application and database? Then what would be the development budget? He felt would be helpful to know what the breakout would be. It seemed to him that the bulk of the staffing and expense is on development.

He wanted to suggest getting an unbiased opinion on the costs that we currently incur.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Bolton was interested in having an outside vendor evaluate our model to see if we are being unfairly charged by OIT. Mr. Gray suggested that we go ahead and let OIT make a presentation of the next meeting and then let the committee take a vote to determine whether we should seek outside proposals. He felt the problem was going with an outside vendor to evaluate our current model would be they would want to charges \$100,000 to do so.

He encouraged Mr. Bolton to come up the some other options to evaluate the services we receive before the next meeting. Mr. Hall asked if that the next meeting OIT could be asked to breakout the difference between just maintaining the completed software vs. continuous development. Ms. Orman explains Mr. Hall that it had been discussed in previous meetings over the last six or eight months that because of the size of this application it would probably never be complete and just require maintenance development would always be necessary. Mr. Crow had stated this previously to the committee in a meeting. She was unsure whether OIT would be able to provide that type of an estimate.

Mr. Gray stated that this was another reason why we needed to have this presentation from OIT. He asked Ms. goonan if we employed for staff members. She replied three full-time employees plus 25 percent of herself. Mr. Gray reported that just the costs of staff before anything else is \$400,000. Mr. Wurtz explained that he felt that this next meeting was going to be quite significant and maybe waiting two months was not the way to go. He felt that for this issue, a special meeting might be in order. Mr. Gray asked committee members if they wanted a special meeting scheduled for the OIT budget.

Mr. Pollard stated that as a group the committee would still not have the knowledge to make a decision or vote at the May meeting. He said that he would not be comfortable voting on OIT, one way or the other. Mr. Gray replied that the committee should go with the special meeting with the presentation. The committee would vote on whether to stay with OIT or explore their options with an RFP. He suggested that the committee get together the third week of April. Ms. Hadaway and Mr. Hall both replied that they would be unable to attend a meeting that week.

Mr. Hall asked if the material could be circulated by email because he would be away for three weeks. Ms. Hadaway suggested that the committee not schedule a special meeting. She suggested that they have the OIT presentation at the regular May meeting and discuss the issue again at that time. If we are satisfied with the answers they give us then everything will be fine. If not, then we can discuss the RFP. She agreed with Mr. Bolton that we might want to have a consultant look at what OIT does for us versus what they charge. Mr. Gray polled the committee about whether they wanted to schedule a special meeting. Members elected not to hold a special meeting. Mr. Hall suggested that if this discussion was going to be held at the next meeting in addition to a presentation, that the meeting, begin earlier than 10:00 a.m. Mr. Gray agreed and offered to begin the meeting at 9:00 a.m. Mr. Bolton replied that he would check the availability of the room.

9. Increasing Revenue:

Mr. Bolton distributed a handout while explaining that it was in reference to increasing revenue. It was a recent survey from a company that sells vital records. They surveyed states as to the cost of a record. The handout listed the cost of the first copy and second

Approved Minutes

copy. New Hampshire currently charges \$12.00 for the first copy and \$8.00 for additional copies. At the bottom of the document they listed the average cost of the first copy. It came out to \$16.46. The funds for the records we generate go directly into the general fund. For town clerks, \$8.00 goes to the VRIF.

Clerks generate approximately 100,000 records a year. For every dollar in revenue we collect, there is an additional \$100,000 that might go into the fund. He explained that if we were to pursue an increase in the fee from \$12.00 to \$15.00 that would be an additional \$300,000 in revenue to the fund. He felt that it was something to consider. Mr. Hall asked if the cost was set legislatively. Mr. Pollard replied that it was by statute. Ms. Hadaway stated that the law would need to be changed to do this. Mr. Bolton agreed.

Mr. Pollard reported that funeral directors had been through a money grab the previous year when there was an attempt to raise the cost of death records to help fund the State Medical Examiner's Office. The funeral directors defeated that attempt. He was not sure they would be in favor of raising the cost of death certificates. Mr. Gray asked Mr. Bolton if there were any other sources of revenue. Mr. Bolton replied that the only additional funds would probably come from the sale of data and that money would have to go into the general fund.

Mr. Gray asked the committee if they thought it would be worthwhile to ask someone to write legislation to help us recoup some of our expenditures. He reminded the committee that we have many partners that benefit from our relationship, but contribute nothing. He admitted that there may be some non-material returns, but costs are rising. Mr. Gray asked Ms. Goonan how difficult it would be to track how much of our bandwidth DMV uses. She replied that she would have to check with someone, as she was not familiar with the DMV system.

Mr. Allan asked if there were any federal funds available to the committee. Mr. Bolton replied that Vital Records contracts with the Social Security Administration (SSA), National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), & the Centers for Disease Control for data. There are numerous federal agencies that are interested in using our data in the future. That money also goes directly to the general fund. Mr. Allan asked if there was no way to appropriate fixed costs for the maintenance of the database. Mr. Bolton was unsure how successful legislation would be to set aside a restricted account for a specific purpose. Mr. Allan replied that he was not on finance and could not say.

Mr. Gray asked if Vital Records was profitable. Mr. Bolton replied that revenue did not cover costs. It did have the potential to do so, but was yet to do that. Mr. Gray asked if they did not generate enough revenue to cover personnel on staff. Mr. Bolton replied that he would have to check the bottom line, but he was under the impression that they were in the red. Mr. Gray suggested that the committee consider having someone write legislation where we can draw some more revenue. Possibly even consider allowing Vital Records to draw more as well so they can try to break even. He added that his goal in his office is always to break even. He admitted that he comes up with every half-baked idea he can to bring in revenue, even selling pens and hats at the counter.

Mr. Hall made a motion to adjourn and the committee unanimously agreed to adjourn at 12:03 p.m.