

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

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
May 20, 2004***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

May 20, 2004

Health & Welfare Building
Conference Room 312
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
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Annette Barnaby, Health Information Specialist Appointment
Linda Hartson, Exeter Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

William Armstrong, IT Manager, OIT Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment
Fred Rusczek, Manchester City Health Officer, DHHS Appointment
Rick Bailey, Acting CIO, OIT, DHHS Appointment

GUESTS:

David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS
Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS
Linda Burke, Keene City Clerk's office
Tricia Piecuch, Manchester City Clerk's office
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS
Mark Parris, OIT
Eric Allen, SOS IT
Steve Wurtz, Supervisor of Registration/Certification, Vital Records, SOS
John O'Neal, OIT, DHHS
Steve Sullivan, CIO, SOS
Cathy Eccleston, SOS IT

Approved Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. **Approval of Minutes:**

Ms. Little asked if there was a motion to accept the minutes. A committee member made the motion to accept them. Mr. Bergeron stated that he had one small correction. In the minutes when it referenced his discussion with the representative of the New Hampshire Charitable Foundation it stated that he met with her. He did not meet with her. They spoke on the telephone. Ms. Little asked if there were any other corrections. Hearing none she took a vote. The minutes were accepted with corrections. Ms. Little asked if the minutes were being posted to the website. Mr. Bolton replied that the most current ones had not been posted yet.

2. **Accounting Software:**

Ms. Little asked if someone could provide an intro to the subject. Mr. Bolton agreed and stated that he had forwarded the proposed development project to the state accountability subcommittee of the VRIF fund as well as to the city and town clerks that are assigned to this committee. The project is titled the Secretary of State Knowledge Base (SOSKB). It would integrate the financial information collected through VRV2000/NHVRIN and then returns it as an invoice or an automatic debit system to the city and town clerks. He explained that they were looking for guidance from the committee on how they should proceed in the development.

Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton if there had been any concerns expressed about the functionality of the software or concerns other than those of Manchester. Mr. Bergeron stated that he had made some notes and had conversations with his staff, but he had not submitted anything formally. Mr. Bolton added that he had not forwarded it, but he had received an email from Ms. Patrick, the clerk in Berlin. She suggested that we need to look more carefully at the way we collect fees and backing out of the fee collection. Her concern was that we might be going forward with a way to amend an invoice and she felt that if the software worked correctly there would be no need.

Ms. Little wanted to clarify what she thought she was hearing. She asked Mr. Bolton if what Ms. Patrick was saying was that she was looking for was a little more specificity about how to collect the fee and when it is appropriate to collect what amount of fee, versus correcting the invoice. Mr. Bolton agreed. Ms. Hartson asked if Mr. Bolton and Ms. Little preferred to have the concerns in writing. Ms. Little replied that it was not necessary. She was under the impression that they needed to make a decision at this meeting and hoped the committee could work through the concerns presented. Ms. Little suggested that the committee begin with Manchester's concerns and asked Ms. Picuch to lead the committee through the concerns. She then asked if all members had received the documentation of Manchester's concerns/comments. Ms. Picuch and Mr. Bolton both had brought copies.

Ms. Picuch stated that she was a member of the accountability committee and had attended a meeting in March about the SOSKB and that agreed that it needs to be done. She told the committee that during one of the meetings Mr. Wurtz had told them that it would be a big training issue and that NHVRIN would be a more forgiving system than the VRV2000 accounting system. She stated that Manchester was hoping it would be because with the way the current system worked they would be charged for records they

Approved Minutes

were not issuing. Ms. Piecuch went on to say the Manchester hopes the first three items under the heading clerks optional interface on the SOSKB agreement will not be optional per say but will give the clerks the option. Manchester felt the main issue is to ensure that cities and town have the ability to dispute a specific charge and re-generate an invoice. She explained that it would all depend on what the system can do. None of the clerks have seen the system so they do not know how it works.

Ms. Piecuch added that any city or town with a large volume like Manchester would probably be concerned with this issue. The pricing of the proposal is before the committee but Manchester questioned whether it was something to maintain and preserve vital records or if it was an enhancement. They wondered if there would be any reimbursement to the fund. Referring to section 3.4 Ms. Piecuch stated that they were also curious as to why in the March proposal the price went up \$2200 for the training of the SOS staff. The folks in Manchester felt that was a large increase from the original proposal. They had also noticed that there were additions to some sections regarding configuring the ACA Debit for more than one town and she had not seen that in the original proposal. She acknowledged that they were aware that it would increase the final cost.

Ms. Piecuch told the committee that the search charge issue would be the area where there would need to be training. If someone comes to the counter in a hospital town or even a funeral director and a record is not found the system would then require them to charge the customer \$12. Currently there is no way in the system to get out of that because when you go into that last screen for search it says search slash copy where you can give a free copy. Right now that section is blacked out and they can't go in to select free copy and have to charge the customer, but her office is not collecting the fee. Another thing is with the protected records. She distributed screen prints to members.

Mr. Wurtz spoke up stating that the reason Ms. Piecuch was getting the "eyes" was because he felt that these were flaws with the old system that was about to be replaced. Ms. Piecuch agreed and stated that they were questioning because they had no idea whether the new system would have those abilities or not. Mr. Wurtz replied that he was not there to defend VRV2000 and that he felt many of the issues raised were just training issues, but they were at this meeting to look to the future. He added that there were clerks signed up for NHVRIN testing/training the following week. In that session they would be testing the new accounting package and that is important. Ms. Piecuch replied that Manchester had been asked for concerns and she was only sharing those. She said that if the new system allows for those things it would be great.

Mr. Wurtz told Ms. Piecuch that he did not think the system was going to be totally magic and make all the issues go away. Partly because many of the issues are operator training related and he fights that battle weekly. To be fair to VRV2000 there was no training in the accounting side as it was optional. He has had success with the system in training in that Meg in Londonderry and Cathy from Farmington uses the software successfully and he was sure there were probably others that did to. He stressed that it takes training and a lot of effort to do so. He believed the NHVRIN system is a little more forgiving.

Mr. Wurtz explained that when he hears the thing about searching on a protected record and having to charge the customer when no record can be found or it is protected. He stated that the issue is you have asked the system to do something and it searches and

Approved Minutes

returns a protected record. In Mr. Wurtz' opinion the customer should be charged because they were probably looking for a record that they were not entitled to. He explained that they had to separate out what the people are entitled to and what the law says we charge for the search of.

Many times in the business office staff have searched for a record and presented the requester with a "No Record" statement. That is what they get for their \$12. Is the customer happy? No, but upon further investigation the customer is just guessing at the information or is trying to access records they have no right to. In the business office the money is collected up front and based upon the information given to us by the requester, the system searches for any records that may be on file. Mr. Wurtz had just dealt with a case where the woman that requested the record failed to inform the clerk that the death took place in Massachusetts.

Mr. Wurtz explained that there is no guilt when we charge customers for the search when the error is on their part. The clerk in the case of the Massachusetts death did not want to charge the customer for the search. Mr. Wurtz informed the committee that he had told the clerk to charge the \$12 because she had performed the search the law told her to. The clerk explains that the search revealed the death was not in NH and presents the requester with a no record statement. That is what they receive for their \$12. Ms. Piecuch agreed with Mr. Wurtz on the need to separate the two areas. She added that she felt that because of the proximity of Manchester and Goffstown (Grassmere), that it would be unfair to charge customers looking for a birth certificate in the wrong location.

Ms. Piecuch explained that Manchester does its best to provide excellent customer service and disagrees with charging an individual \$12 only to send them to Goffstown is not the way to do that. She added that other clerks probably feel that way too. Mr. Wurtz explained that the decision on that would have to be left to the committee because he disagreed with Manchester on that issue. The wording of the law is that the fee is collected for the search not the result. Whether the clerk did due diligence and could not find the record, called Concord only to find the record elsewhere does that mean that the search fee should be forgotten because the customer came to the wrong counter, Mr. Wurtz stated that he could not answer that. He added that he did not know whether or not there would be a decision to allow the clerk a place to "back out" if a customer was in the wrong location.

Mr. Wurtz told Ms. Piecuch that if clerks were just handing out no record statements and telling the customer "I don't know what to tell you" then he would have a problem, but they are not they are searching their records and then calling Concord and finding out the location of the record. In Mr. Wurtz' opinion that fulfills the obligation placed on the clerk by the law and they are entitled to the \$12. Ms. Piecuch stated that Manchester disagreed and added that it also happens when hospitals or wedding officiants have not gotten their information in before a parent/couple comes looking for a birth/marriage or death record. They do not feel right collecting \$12 from them when they have nothing to provide in return.

Mr. Wurtz explained that he was not trying to argue with Ms. Piecuch, but stated that they had still performed the service outlined by law. He added that if the person is sure that there is a problem the business office will exchange the no record statement for the actual record once it is filed correctly. Ms. Piecuch replied that there was another training issue. Mr. Wurtz agreed. Ms. Piecuch told Mr. Wurtz that the word needed to

Approved Minutes

get out to clerks. Ms. Orman told Ms. Piecuch that in handling daily inquiries she always informs customers from the start that the “search” fee will be collected regardless of whether a record is found. Ms. Johnson added that her staff always informs customers that if they are not completely positive that the record they are looking for is a Henniker event they should travel to the Vital Records office to avoid a search fee in vain. Mr. Wurtz agreed telling Ms. Piecuch that if the customer is warned in advance that the fee is a search fee we have provided all the information they need to determine whether or not to request a record.

Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Wurtz if NHVRIN would provide the clerk with the opportunity to fix a typographical error after the filing of a death certificate. Mr. Wurtz jokingly told her that when she came into training the following week she would see. He added that they system is very similar to VRV2000 and names like MaryEllen and Billy Joe can cause a problem. The training for NHVRIN will play a large role in calming some of the fears of the clerks and will allow them to see things that they may not have been aware of that they were already capable of doing. He informed the committee that he had spoken with Kathy (sic?) from Farmington that morning and she asked him to let the committee know that she had had three months in a row where they were 100% and she worked herself through the problems as they arose.

He added that there would never be an “oh whoops” key that would eliminate everything because of the accounting part of the process. There is a piece of paper that has been assigned to the transaction as an issuance document. The transaction that the clerks do in the front end represents three or four more transactions for the staff in Concord on the back end. He stated that during training they could probably spend a whole day on the collection of fees and probably will if it gets to the point where it counts. Ms. Piecuch replied that she felt it was important for it to get to a point where it counts. Mr. Wurtz agreed adding that he was unsure just yet as to how the SOSKB would plug in, but was excited to find out how it would integrate with the new system to make everyone’s life easier.

Ms. Little asked if Ms. Piecuch had any additional comments about the new system she wished to have addressed. Ms. Piecuch replied that there was an issue she had brought up previously and training issues that needed to be addressed. One item was there needed to be a way for the cities and towns to dispute bad checks. She explained that in Manchester they get 2-5 checks a month that bounce. Mr. Wurtz agreed that Ms. Piecuch had a legitimate question. Ms. Little asked if the ability to do that had been built into the new accounting package. Mr. Bolton replied that if the committee opted to go ahead with the invoice correction part that would be included.

Ms. Piecuch stated again that there are many training issues and printer problems. She added that Mr. Allen could probably back her up on the many printer issues that they have experienced in Manchester. She asked what kind of information the state would be looking for on the reporting of voids or exchanges. Will they require the number exchanged or the actual document numbers? Mr. Wurtz replied that there would be a few basic changes to NHVRIN from VRV2000 to make the accountability part better. Ms. Piecuch offered the funeral director as an example. After they have already printed death certificates for the funeral director they then receive faxed corrections. She asked if the numbers from the original copies have to be entered somewhere to report the exchange?

Approved Minutes

Mr. Wurtz explained that Ms. Piecuch would see how the new system worked; but that when the clerk next went into the system they would be going under exchange rather than trying to collect the fee. It is a pretty regular issue in the Vital Records office. A clerk calls after getting five certificates returned. Rather than doing the transaction under exchange they go through the normal request process and then call when the system tells them to collect \$12 for the first copy and \$8 for each additional. That issue will be covered in training. Ms. Piecuch agreed that the collection module would be a very important part of training and added that Vital Records staff would probably encounter many errors in the beginning and would have to be cognizant of incorrect invoices.

Overall Ms. Piecuch felt that NHVRIN was going to be a wonderful program after all the training issues were worked out. Mr. Wurtz agreed with her and expressed his delight in the fact that everyone was working together to make the program successful. He stated that the VRV2000 system was a very powerful tool and that NHVRIN would only enhance it further. With the accountability portion beefed up he felt that it would only make everyone's job that much easier. Ms. Piecuch suggested that one change they would like to see to the drop down menu is a law enforcement option. They would like to see a U.S. Marshall option, DEA and Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) option to name a few. Mr. Wurtz replied that there was currently an INS option in the VRV2000 system.

Ms. Piecuch also suggested a local hardship/welfare case. Mr. Bolton replied that there was already a state welfare option. Mr. Wurtz stated that the business office maintains the free reason table and if there comes a time when a new reason becomes frequently used staff can update the table to include it. Ms. Piecuch thanked Mr. Wurtz for his explanations about NHVRIN and stated that she was looking forward to the testing and opportunity to sit down and look it over. Mr. Wurtz replied that he felt she would be pleased with it.

Ms. Little then asked Ms. Burke if she had any questions or comments for Mr. Bolton or Mr. Wurtz about the new program. Ms. Burke replied that she had looked at the RFP and there were a couple of things that she wanted to ask about. In the Keene City Clerk's office they get a request monthly from the Assessing office and the Water department for a report on deaths in the city. They normally just call and ask if a specific person has died. She explained that she normally just goes under non-customer initiated search and looks for a record. If she is unable to find it there she does a state search as the person may have died in another city or town. She asked if Keene would be charged for those searches on the new system.

Ms. Burke explained that they were looking into electronic payment to the state and wondered if there would be a grace period between the invoice date and the removal of funds from the city's account? Will there be an opportunity for them to dispute an invoice or will the money be taken immediately? Mr. Bolton replied that he was unsure as to how much time between the invoice and the withdrawal of funds but he did not think it would be immediate. Mr. Sullivan agreed with Mr. Bolton adding that it would depend on the time delay. He believed that it was 72 hours. Ms. Burke asked if that meant that Keene would need to validate and make any changes to their invoices within that 72-hour period.

Mr. Sullivan replied that he was not positive about the 72 hour time period. He was under the impression that programs in the Secretary of State's office used it, but was not positive. Mr. Scanllan added that he did not think that the 72 hours was definite. He felt

Approved Minutes

that it was something that would have to be examined further and that there would probably be some flexibility to the time period. He added that possibly clerks could be given the opportunity to share their opinions as to what would be an appropriate grace period. Ms. Burke added that when VRV2000 was originally rolled out that Keene had been a pilot site. The pilot sites had made a lot of changes to it during the warranty period and she didn't see anything about that period in the RFP. There was no mention about the cost of changes following the warranty period. Mr. Bolton replied that there was an annual maintenance fee. Ms. Burke asked if enhancements/changes were included in that fee. Mr. Bolton replied that changes would not be covered under maintenance. Mr. Sullivan explained that changes would be an additional cost.

Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton or Wurtz to address Ms. Burke's question regarding the information the Assessing and Water department request on a monthly basis. Mr. Wurtz replied that customer-initiated search was probably not where she should be pulling that information. If a resident of Keene dies that information is available in a report or on the voter list. The VRV has a voter report that details resident deaths and if Ms. Burke does not locate the person there she should not look elsewhere. If the person is not on that list they were not reported as a resident of Keene when the death was entered.

Mr. Bergeron stated that the report Mr. Wurtz was speaking of was not always correct. If there are people from a city or town, but spend a considerable amount of time in a health facility or hospice their residence may be listed in the city or town where the facility is located. That does not take into account that the person may own property in another town due to a veteran's exemption and that is what the assessors are looking for. Mr. Bolton asked Ms. Burke how many she is looking for each month. She replied that recently between the Assessing and water departments and ambulance billing she had been looking up two to three a week. Ms. Burke explained that she prints the regular report on the first of the month, but when someone dies after the printing and a family member brings in a bill for the ambulance she needs to verify for the finance department that the person had passed away. Ms. Little asked if that option could be added to the free table. Mr. Wurtz agreed that it could.

Mr. Bergeron reported that he had sat down with representatives from his IT and finance department. His IT people were not impressed and called NHVRIN "vapor ware" because there was nothing that they could look at yet. Finance questioned the need to have parallel accounting systems. He informed them that this was the way the state was moving and their suggestion was to make sure the reconciliation process is parallel as well. Nashua does not want to have a situation where they have 72 hours at the end of the month to reconcile a whole months worth of transactions. They would prefer to have the option of going in daily or weekly to take care of voids or enter pertinent information.

Mr. Bergeron had brought some examples of his offices daily procedures. The first item was a daily log. He realized that smaller towns might not have the volume to make the log necessary. The second item is that they use Word documents to track their voids. The third item is an example of the report that they send to the state each month with their check. The document was 21 pages long and he stated that he had brought it to show the volume his office deals with and demonstrates the need for them to be able to manage their invoice throughout the month.

Mr. Bergeron was also concerned with how voids and credits would be handled. He stated that Mr. Wurtz had alluded to that with the exchanges and expressed the need for

Approved Minutes

some sort of accounting procedure to handle those credits. Mr. Bergeron also felt there needed to be a procedure in order to enter manual certificates. Genealogists sometime require a photocopy of the original document and that is not processed through the system. Mr. Wurtz replied that when the search is done everything goes through the front end of VRV2000 and a fee should be collected. Mr. Bergeron replied that sometimes they don't have to go that far. If someone comes in or someone calls from overseas and says that they want their "original" record there is no reason for him to even go to the system. Mr. Wurtz replied that if he wanted the accounting system to work he would have to go through the system.

Mr. Wurtz explained that the business office gets the same kinds of requests and they do it through the system. They just select photocopy and then what happens is we do photocopying but the system records the transaction. Ms. Burke asked if that were the same case with true copy attests because she does them all the time and just photocopies the record rather than putting it on safety paper because if there is anything mentioned about an abstract the court kicks it back to them. Mr. Wurtz replied that this was simply a training issue for the courts.

The business office gets many of these requests and when the requester tells us the court will not accept an abstract that is an automatic telephone call to the courts asking why. The law states that an abstract is the real thing and 90% of the time the court backs down. If they do not, Vital records staff just photocopies the original onto safety paper and issues it that way. It is then no longer an abstract, but a certified photocopy of the original record like was done before VRV2000. Mr. Bergeron reiterated Nashua's desire for the ability to reconcile their information on a daily basis. Ms. Little asked if that was "do-able?" Mr. Wurtz replied that the business office reconciles their account every afternoon using the system. If there has been an error made and it hasn't been caught during the day a note is placed on the report and Mr. Wurtz initials it that it is a legitimate change.

Mr. Wurtz reported that both NHVRIN and VRV2000 have that capability even before the addition of the SOSKB. Mr. Bolton explained to Mr. Bergeron that they hoped to not create redundancy by creating a way where a file could be downloaded to the city or town's system each day. Mr. Bergeron wondered if that would be cost prohibitive. Ms. Hartson added that every check she processes goes through the town so it would mean double entry. Mr. Bolton asked what software packages Exeter had. Ms. Hartson replied that Exeter was not networked with the state. Mr. Bolton expressed that he did not think it would be a major issue to provide an electronic file to Exeter. Mr. Bergeron added that he did not want to give the impression that Nashua was not supportive of the project; they just wanted certain issues discussed prior to the release.

Ms. Little agreed that it was a shame that they had to make the decision prior to getting a look at NHVRIN. She went on to state that she was under the impression that there was a specific timeline that could not be altered to allow them time to look over the system before it was released. Mr. Bolton replied that he did not know how long they could prolong it, as SOSKB wanted a decision as their offer was made several months ago. Mr. Scanlan stated that he felt the timing a little flexible. He did not think that this meeting was the "drop dead" date but also did not think there was a great deal of time to spare. Ms. Little asked if it couldn't wait a month or two. Mr. Scanlan replied that it could not be put off that long.

Approved Minutes

Ms. Hartson asked if the Accountability Committee had submitted any kind of report to Mr. Bolton with their opinion. Mr. Bolton replied that they had not; that there had not been a follow up meeting of the committee. During the first meeting the committee had agreed that the way to take care of the problem of under-reporting or non-reporting was to use the software. Ms. Burke asked if there was any reason why they could not do pilot sites again before it is widely released. Possibly for thirty days so the clerks could bring back their comments and the software could be tweaked for full release. Mr. Bolton replied that they would not be able to only make it available to specific towns.

They would have to release it and not tell everyone that on a specific date they would have to switch over. Ms. Hartson asked for clarification that the two packages NHVRIN and SOSKB were linked together so there would be no way to pilot the accounting part. Mr. Bolton replied that they were linked, but he felt the testing the following week would be very telling. Mr. Wurtz wanted to clarify further stating that Mr. Bolton was talking about the NHVRIN accounting package and he felt Ms. Hartson was talking about the SOSKB. Ms. Hartson replied that she was. Mr. Bolton added that when NHVRIN was rolled out SOSKB would not be there yet. The requirements have been written and it has been agreed that it is necessary.

Ms. Burke reminisced about the months that were required to get VRV2000 into shape and asked if there were not a way to do that with SOSKB. Mr. Bolton replied that that issue had been discussed and they were considering using some hospital towns as pilots. Ms. Little asked if Ms. Burke had any further observations or questions. Ms. Burke replied that she did not. Ms. Little stated that what she found important was that clerks took the time to look things over and offered their opinions and feedback. She felt that was critical to the process and only benefited the initiative. Ms. Hartson stated that her biggest concern was that there are many towns out there that do not even know how to use VRV2000 correctly. She wondered how they would handle the new software and accounting package.

Everyone agreed that there would definitely be hurdles. Ms. Hartson stated that there are towns that do not take advantage of the training opportunities. Instead they just direct customers to other towns. Ms. Burke agreed that she also receives calls from other towns seeking help with the system and suggested that at some point clerks need to think about becoming their own support system to some of the smaller towns. Some of the smaller towns are one-person operations that cannot shut down for several days to attend training. Mr. Wurtz replied that training is key and a major headache for him. With the recent rollout of the death module they held training and many funeral directors did not attend. After the rollout office staff spent the entire week on the phone with those people doing individual training and that is not acceptable.

The new system will go to all 105 current VRV2000 users, the 40 that are on the original system and also to clerks that have not been automated in any way so the training issues will be tough, but not insurmountable. The biggest problem with the really small towns is after training they will not be doing every day and it is hard to retain and become proficient if the training is not used regularly. Ms. Hartson reiterated Ms. Burke's statement about one-person offices would not be able to close for training. Mr. Wurtz replied that the training before the release of VRV2000 had been made mandatory. Clerks were not allowed on without it. Ms. Hartson offered that clerks could just decide to not go on. Mr. Wurtz agreed that there was not a lot of interest in training and stated that he hoped they would not turn on NHVRIN to cities or towns that had no training.

Approved Minutes

Ms. Hartson asked about whether or not there was a detailed written procedure and suggested that it be mailed out.

Mr. Wurtz replied that there had been so many changes to VRV2000 that had not been kept up with since the initial printing of it that it was no longer useful. The NHVRIN vendor is in the process of supplying us with a pretty detailed user's manual. The manual is available both in paper or electronic form so that if a clerk encounters difficulty they only have to click on the manual to help find their way. The Vital Records office has tried to learn from past mistakes and make it better this time around. Ms. Piecuch stated that she was glad to hear that because with turnover it is important to have a resource for the new employee. She added that it would be helpful to those smaller towns that do not use the system daily.

Mr. Bolton asked if there was going to be any training done at the clerk's annual meeting. If historically, any agencies offer training. Ms. Piecuch replied that she believed that at last years meeting Motor Vehicle set up their computers to show their system, but it was not training. Mr. Bolton asked if anyone showed up for it. Ms. Hartson added that any training that is done is usually held after the official meetings concluded. Ms. Piecuch told Mr. Bolton that if it was something he was considering they could bring up the idea. Mr. Wurtz stated that they used to haul VRV2000 up to the meetings. Ms. Hartson and Mr. Bergeron replied that it had been more of a demonstration than training. Mr. Bergeron suggested that it could be could possibly be worked into the schedule. He said that the first day of the meeting they did not get started until later in the day. If this option were offered maybe clerks would come the night before to take advantage of it.

Ms. Little asked that the committee consider whether or not the Vital Records Improvement Fund pay for the SOSKB addition. She stated that she was aware that Manchester did not believe it met the intent of the statute as an appropriate use of the fund. Ms. Little had gone online to refresh her familiarity with the statute. She read...

"There is hereby established a special fund for the improvement and automation of Vital Records at the state and local level. The sole purpose of the fund shall be to provide revenues for the improvement of the registration, certification, preservation, and management of the state's vital records and said money shall not be used for any other purpose. Monies in the fund shall be allocated for software applications and development, preservation efforts, hardware/communications, and technical support associated with these purposes. Said monies shall not be used for rent or electricity, expenses or for the general clerical or administrative personnel of the division."

Ms. Little stated that there were words like certification, preservation, management of vital records and she stated that this initiative could fall under that. It also mentions software applications and development and she admitted that it was kind of side issue to vital records, but the case could probably be made. She asked if on the flip side was the initiative more administrative. Would it be serving more of an administrative function? She opened the issue up for discussion. Mr. Bergeron offered that he felt it was definitely a part of the management of vital records not only from the state's point of view but also some of the cities and towns. One of the reason this was all brought about was because a few unfortunate incidents that took place in the last year or so. This might never have come about if they had been managing their own business locally. This will not only help towns, but it will help the state. Ms. Hartson agreed with Mr. Bergeron. Ms. Little asked if there were any other comments. Ms. Piecuch stated that it was Gail that had

Approved Minutes

raised this issue and she herself was not at all familiar with the statute so she could not speak to that. Ms. Little stated that Carol Johnson was a main contributor to a document the committee used to “drill down” to what would be considered appropriate. She read...

“This list includes categories of expenditures that fall into the above general statement which is again, appropriate expenditures. It is meant to be illustrative of the types of allowable expenditures” so it pays for personnel related costs, overtime related costs, hardware, software and equipment, travel costs associated with the automation projects and pays for all contracts, supplies, safety paper, telecommunications and telephone charges. It pays for all the shipping and costs associated with these meetings, so it really doesn’t get into what it should not be used for.

With that she suggested that the committee would have to go back to the statute. It is not for rent, electrical, administrative personnel. She did not think that this proposal fell under any of those categories. Ms. Little then asked for a motion to approve the funding of the SOSKB software in the amount of \$41,110. Mr. Bergeron made the motion and Dr. Mever’s seconded. Ms. Little asked for further discussion. A vote was taken and the committee unanimously voted to approve the request.

3. Fund Accounting Update:

Mr. Bolton distributed a budget handout. Ms. Little asked why we always have the date November 21, 2002 on the top of the handout. Mr. Bolton replied that Ms. Penney could not attend because she was having a cast removed. She had provided a reporting of the fund to Mr. Bolton. He spoke with her last week and asked her to prepare a financial accounting of the fund for the committee. Ms. Little asked as of what date the report was current. Mr. Scanlan replied that the November date that kept coming up had been on the initial template Ms. Penney received and she had not deleted nor changed it. He was of the understanding that the report was current as of April 20, 2004. Ms. Little directed committee members’ attention to the revenue line and stated that it looked like the fund was doing pretty good (\$750,000).

Ms. Little asked for someone to explain the highlights. Mr. Bolton stated that looking at the budget it appeared that unless there was a large influx of revenue at the last minute the fund would not hit the expected \$815,000 mark. Ms. Hartson asked if the fiscal year ended June 30, 2004. Mr. Bolton agreed that it did. Ms. Little noted that revenue might be low. Mr. Bolton noted that under current positions the budgeted amount had been exceeded as of April. He added that the budgeted amount showing on the report had not been updated to include the recently created Genealogical Clerk position and that was the reason the amount appeared to exceed budget. He then went on to discuss the overtime showing on the report and attributed it to IT time spent on NHVRIN.

Mr. Bolton explained that he could foresee charges for safety paper coming down the line. He felt that the \$18,000 figure needed to be amended. For equipment the fund appeared to be on track. A lot of the purchases had also been associated with NHVRIN, i.e. servers, etc. They had purchased printers and thirty machines. Ms. Little asked if the committee could get a report similar to what Mr. Andrew supplied to the committee previously, detailing the expenditures. Mr. Scanlan and Mr. Bolton felt that they could provide that detail. Mr. Bolton explained that there had been a part-time position budgeted but that it was no longer in the budget. He added that his registration fee for the NAPHSIS conference in June would increase the amount listed. A portion of the amount

Approved Minutes

under contracts was \$51,000 for CNSI that had been allocated. Ms. Little asked what the Vital Records Operations line was for. Ms. Orman offered that she thought that line was the line created when the legislature budgeted the \$200,000 from the fund and that it was just another holdover. Ms. Little then asked what the total fund balance was. Mr. Bolton replied that the total amount had not been included in this report.

Ms. Little asked if there was a way to find out how much money the fund held. Mr. Scanlan replied that there should be a way. Ms. Little speculated that with the rollover from the previous year there was at least \$2 million dollars. Mr. Bolton replied that from the previous report had stated \$2,000,401 as the fund balance. Ms. Little asked if there were any additional questions about the financial report. She stated that the committee was still interested in more detail in the reports.

4. Equipment Purchase:

Mr. Wurtz reminded the committee that the last time it met they had discussed purchasing microfilm readers. The committee had voted at that time to fund the purchase. Mr. Bolton had contacted the manufacturers and purchased two Canon MS400 digital microfilm scanner systems. At the time it was presented at the previous meeting the cost for each machine was estimated at \$7300. That did not include the electronic software for the computers nor did it include the printer. The contracted amount including the aforementioned item came out to \$15,000. The machines were delivered and set up in the vault and is being used. The genealogical community very well received them.

Mr. Wurtz explained that the good news is those types of machines are universally used in many research locations and that many people that come in are already aware of how to use them. The system is powerful and allows us to display the microfilm that we have on file and will print out a digital image of the record. It also gives us the ability to store it through the computer interface. That will also allow us to share the image with others if the need arises. He stated that he would be happy to show committee members the machines if they wanted to go down after the meeting.

5. Heirloom Certificate Marketing Plan:

Mr. Bolton explained that at the last meeting he had been asked to bring forward a marketing plan along with cost estimate to the committee. Mr. Bolton reported that he had met with Acorn Creative Group LLC, a Concord public relations group regarding the new certificate the day before. They had brought in some examples of their previous work and some estimates regarding the cost of a campaign. They explained how to target the hospitals and clerks offices to promote the certificate. Their cost estimate was between \$20,000 and \$30,000 the first year. Ms. Little asked if Mr. Bolton felt it would require an annual campaign. Mr. Bolton replied that Mr. Tomajczyk, who had helped them with the initial contest, had suggested that it might be a good idea to hold an annual contest or refresh it every couple of years.

Ms. Little asked if he was looking for the committee to fund the marketing effort. Mr. Bolton stated that he was. Ms. Little asked if it fell under the terms of the committee's statutory expenditures. Mr. Bolton replied that he felt it did and in fact \$15 out of each \$25 certificate would go to the VRIF. The other \$10 would go toward the administrative support of an Institutional Review Board (IRB). It is an attached board for DHHS that would consider all requests for confidential information. Mr. Bergeron asked how many

Approved Minutes

birth certificates are printed each year and what kind of revenue was Mr. Bolton talking about. He added that unless there was revenue in excess of \$30,000 it would be kind of silly to spend the money to promote the certificate. Mr. Bergeron asked what kind of revenue states that do not promote their heirloom certificates bring in. Mr. Bolton replied that those that do not do any kind of promotion do not bring in a lot.

In fact NAPHSIS had done a survey of those states and it varied from very little to Alaska, which does pretty well. Ms. Little asked what we would get for our money. Mr. Bolton explained that they had put together a press kit, but they also deal with the press and create printed materials. Ms. Little asked the feeling of the committee. Mr. Bergeron asked if they are seriously considering doing this should it not go out to bid.

Mr. Bolton agreed that it should be done through a bid process and stated that the local company had been very nice to come in and do a presentation but he felt they would need to work with a firm that there was already a relationship with. He added that it was important that it be done quickly. Ms. Little said that she could not imagine getting through the RFP process that quickly. Mr. Bolton replied that the Secretary of State's (SOS) office could do it quickly. Mr. Scanlan agreed with Mr. Bergeron that there needed to be more of a plan and that a cost benefit analysis needed to be done. Mr. Bergeron stated that if they could spend \$15,000 and make \$25,000 that would be great, but if they spent \$30,000 and only brought in \$35,000 he did not think it would be worth it. He added that he liked the idea but wanted to see better numbers.

Ms. Little agreed that an RFP would give them a better idea of costs associated with the project. She felt that the committee should definitely support the idea and asked Mr. Bolton about the IRB and the fund's association with it. Mr. Bolton replied that in the move from DHHS to the SOS the board was included in the legislation. He recalled that it had been addressed, but had not heard much about it since. Mr. Scanlan stated that it was a budget item and the amount that he recalled was \$20,000.

Ms. Little asked if the heirloom certificate project did not go through would the fund then be responsible for the \$20,000. Mr. Bolton replied that the VRIF would not. That he felt that they were relying on the revenue from the sale of the new certificates to fund it. Ms. Little asked if that amount were not met would the fund be responsible. Mr. Bolton replied that the fund was not liable for the funding of the committee. He added that there had been no committee formed yet. Ms. Little suggested that Mr. Bolton put together an RFP for the project so the committee could get a better idea of the scope of the project.

6. OIT Update:

Mr. Scanlan reported that the previous week the Secretary of State's office had made a reluctant decision to move the management of the NHVRIN project from OIT to the SOS. To address one primary concern that had been plaguing the project team for months. The issue was something that came out of the OIT database Administration group that had the team frustrated, angry and tense on more than a couple occasions. Different individuals within the team had expressed those frustrations to Mr. Scanlan on a number of occasions. Despite several contacts with OIT about the problem there was never any resolution or easing of the situation. Mr. Scanlan discussed the issue with members of the team and the consensus was that they should assume control of the project. He added that the decision was in no way a reflection of anyone sitting in the

Approved Minutes

room. Ms. Little stated that she felt that at some point the discussion would need to be closed to anyone but the committee members in attendance.

Mr. Bergeron asked what Mr. Scanlan meant by “moved.” He wanted to know what that mean staff and equipment wise. Mr. Sullivan replied that the hardware would remain in the data center under OIT. Networking as far as clerks were concerned would not change. They would be moving the database to the SOS database where no other applications would be hitting it. Ms. Little asked where the SOS database was housed. Mr. Sullivan replied that it was also in the data center on Hazen drive. Desktop support staff would be Mr. Allen, Ms. Eccleston, the developer and Mr. Sullivan. They were also in the process of looking for another developer. He added that they plan to maintain their relationship with OIT in terms of hosting.

Mr. Sullivan reported that from an outside view there would be no noticeable change. They just felt it was in the best interest of the application at this time. Ms. Little asked if there were any other comments. She added that she did have comments, but wished to make them in a non-public session. Hearing no further comments or questions Ms. Little asked for a motion to take the meeting into a closed session for the discussion of the NHVRIN project move. Mr. Bergeron asked if there was any special wording needed for the record. Mr. Bolton replied that he did not think that was necessary as this was not really a public meeting. Mr. Bergeron then made the motion and Ms. Hartson seconded the motion. The committee voted to go into a non-public session to discuss the move of the NHVRIN project from OIT to the Secretary of State’s office.

The remainder of the meeting continued without the recording device.

Meeting adjourned around noon.