

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

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
August 12, 2004***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

August 12, 2004

Department of Resources & Economic Development
Conference Room
Pembroke Road
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Debbe Augustine, Health Information Appointment
Linda Hartson, Exeter Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Patty Little, City Clerk Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment
Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Fred Rusczek, Manchester Health Officer, DHHS Appointment
Rick Bailey, OIT, DHHS Appointment

GUESTS:

David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS
Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS
Karen Way, OIT
Annette Barnaby, Health Information Manager, SNHMC
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS
John O'Neal, OIT, DHHS
Peter Croteau, OIT
Cathy Eccleston, Vital Records, SOS

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

Approved Minutes

1. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Bergeron informed the committee that he had been asked to stand in as Chair of the committee as Ms. Little was unable to attend the meeting. He asked if everyone had taken an opportunity to review the minutes from the May VRIFAC meeting. He then asked if there was a motion to accept the minutes as submitted. Mr. Kruger asked that Ms. Orman make note that he had not been in attendance at the last meeting yet he was mentioned as making a motion. Ms. Orman apologized explaining that she had been working on the minutes at home without benefit of the sign in sheet following surgery and had mistaken a voice on the tape for his. Dr. Mevers asked if all grammatical and spelling errors were corrected prior to the minutes being published on the website. Ms. Orman and Mr. Bolton agreed that they were.

Ms. Hartson made the motion to accept the minutes with corrections. Dr. Mevers seconded the motion and Mr. Bergeron called for a vote. The committee unanimously agreed to accept the minutes with corrections.

2. IT Update:

Mr. Bergeron stated that a lot had been happening over the previous couple of months relative to the move of the NHVRIN project away from OIT to the Secretary of State's office. Ms. Little had provided a letter that she asked Mr. Bergeron to share with the committee. The letter summarized some of the discussions that had been held between the clerks, SOS and OIT. In Ms. Little's opinion, and that of all the clerks that joined her in the discussions, it was important that the technical support for the NHVRIN initiative goes back to and remains in the Office of Information Technology. In the letter she summarizes the reasoning behind the recommendation.

Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. Scanlan or Mr. O'Neal had anything they would like to add. Mr. O'Neal replied that they had met the week prior at the State House and that both sides presented costing and support models for the application. It was a good discussion and they agreed on a lot of things. There were still some things that they did not agree on and they recognized that. Mr. O'Neal reported that this was their first presentation to Ms. Little and the clerks on the plans. He felt that it was a good presentation and it had played a great part in Ms. Little's decision.

Mr. Scanlan added that the initial decision to move away from OIT was a management decision and when they did that they were willing to accept the responsibility for the success or problems encountered. He stated that he still felt it was the correct thing to do but explained that the Secretary of State's office was sympathetic to the clerks concerns and would therefore support the clerk's decision to return oversight to OIT and would cooperate in every way. Mr. Kruger stated that as a relatively disinterested public member of the committee he felt that the support that has gone into this project since its inception was very good and while there may be other ways of doing it he did not think that "changing horses at this time" made sense.

Mr. Kruger then offered a motion that the committee take a vote to accept Ms. Little's recommendation that the NHVRIN project continue to be supported by OIT and that there be an explicit agreement between the two parties outlining responsibilities so that politics is left out. Mr. Bergeron asked for additional discussion or questions. Hearing

Approved Minutes

none he asked the committee for a vote. The committee voted unanimously to keep the technical support for NHVRIN with the Office of Information Technology. Mr. Pollard added for the record that he would second Mr. Kruger's motion. Mr. Bergeron apologized for not seeking a second to Mr. Kruger's motion. Other committees that he chairs do not require them and as he was just standing in for Ms. Little he had forgotten.

Mr. O'Neal introduced Ms. Karen Way to the committee. She would be assuming management responsibility of the NHVRIN project for OIT. Mr. Parris had been reassigned between the decision to remove oversight of the project in May and the decision for reversal and he was no longer available to continue on in that role. Ms. Way would be the IT Manager and Mr. O'Neal added that he had identified the Business Analyst and technical team based on a sort of a preliminary notification he received From Mr. Bailey last week of what was going to happen. They had also notified the operations group and Ms. Way was working on a transition plan.

Mr. O'Neal explained that he had enlisted the support of a new group Mr. Bailey had put together called the Project Integration Bureau. Its purpose is to help OIT manage projects across agencies and divisions. He had asked them for assistance to help with the transition plan, in particular the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Mr. O'Neal explained that they had also notified the vendor of their need for training or knowledge transfer. He added that that education would need to occur regardless of who supported NHVRIN. The preliminary transition plan is in the works, but Mr. O'Neal stated that nothing would be undertaken before the MOU or service level agreement is in place.

Mr. O'Neal did feel it was important to begin training as he was under the impression that the warranty period had already begun. He wanted permission to train five OIT staff members. Only two would be assigned to the NHVRIN project and the others would be available to work with the two main staffers. Because the technology and application are both new the more people he is able to train the better. Ms. Eccleston would be acting as the team leader for the project. Mr. O'Neal explained that the plans he had put together were only preliminary and they were based on what he was told about the expected outcome of this meeting.

Mr. Bergeron thanked Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Bolton welcomed Ms. Way to the team. Mr. Bergeron reiterated what Mr. Kruger had mentioned in his motion that the committee is very appreciative of the effort Mr. O'Neal's staff had put in on this and other projects in the past and they have a good comfort level with his people and look forward to continuing the relationship. Mr. O'Neal thanked Mr. Bergeron. Mr. Bergeron asked if there were any other comments and there were none.

3. Budget Update:

Mr. Bolton distributed handouts to those in attendance. He explained that he had met with OIT representatives after the meeting Mr. O'Neal described to look at the big-ticket budget items. One of the handouts was a spreadsheet of the VRIF budget based on a number of items. He also provided a current budget for 5153, which is the Vital Record Improvement Fund account. Mr. Bergeron pointed out that the figures contained in the report were arrived at by a VRIFA subcommittee in response partly to the business plan that was presented some months ago by the InLook group relative to support for the preservation of our vital records. In addition they looked at the needs of this group to

Approved Minutes

continue and speed up the deployment of PCs and hardware to the city and town clerks so they could expand involvement beyond what they currently have.

Mr. Bolton pointed out several highlights, the total expended, total revenue forward, the amount of monies budgeted to be spent over the next several years. He pointed out that the budget was a deficit budget. They planned to draw down the balance of the fund substantially. The revenue for this year was \$888,971 and that exceeds the forecasted amount of \$800,000. Mr. Bolton stated that they are unsure as to why the revenue is so high. It probably is reaching an area that is consistent with new expectations and requirements of Vital Records for birth certificates and other things. It may be a realistic plan to raise the bar a little.

The total expended by the fund last year was \$504,000 so we are bringing forward more revenue than in the past. The current balance for the account is \$2,547, 483. Mr. Bolton explained that we have more than was initially indicated at the start of the budget year. Mr. Pollard told Mr. Bolton that he was having a hard time following on the handout. He saw under *Actual SFY04* revenue of \$589,000. Mr. Bolton told committee members to disregard the actual column as it was probably just a carryover of another spreadsheet and would only serve to confuse. Mr. Pollard asked if he should just scratch the whole column out. Mr. Bolton replied that he would advise that. He added that those figures were accurate 2/3 of the way through the year.

Mr. Pollard asked where Mr. Bolton was getting the figure he gave the committee. Mr. Bolton told him he could find that figure under *Budget SFY04*. Total expended, which they would find near the bottom of the page was \$504,437.70. Mr. Pollard thanked Mr. Bolton for explaining. Mr. Bolton continued that the total revenue brought forward for *SFY05* should be \$2,547,483. Mr. Kruger stated that he could not find the figures on the handout that Mr. Bolton was referring to. Ms. Hartson pointed out the number at the bottom of the page for Mr. Kruger. Mr. Bolton apologized for jumping from sheet to sheet.

Mr. Bolton then explained that with such a large balance in the account the subcommittee met to discuss some rather big-ticket items that they should be spending money on in the next five years. As far as equipment was concerned they decided that in order to accommodate the rollout of NHVRIN to all the city and town clerks there would be an additional \$110,000 that would be used to purchase 100 PCs and monitors. For outlying years they would look forward to replacing 25% of the computers annually. He pointed out the \$110,000 in *SFY05* and \$66,000 for the other years. For the printers it would be about the same.

Mr. Bolton explained that the figure for *SFY05* was incorrect it would not be \$27,000. It would be \$45,000 for the first year and \$27,000 for the following years. The next item that was new to the spreadsheet was the Microsoft XP licenses. They anticipate purchasing licenses in *SFY05* and then renewing or purchasing new licenses in *SFY08* for another \$75,000. To replace servers they had just put a placeholder of \$40,000 in *SFY08* assuming the servers need to be replaced as well.

Regarding additional software, they put in a placeholder for virus protection software and had prior approval for the development and support of the Secretary of State's Knowledge Base software, which is a financial package that invoices and/or sends out invoices to cities and towns. There is also a placeholder for Filenet software for

Approved Minutes

document management. For those older records that need to be imaged and then maintained in a database. Contractual expenses were taken from a projected budget from OIT that included hardware support, software support and staffing. Those numbers are included in this spreadsheet. That included OIT software maintenance, which included the Oracle licenses and support. The amount provided was for one year so Mr. Bolton figured outlying years from that. That first year figure was \$16,775. OIT hardware maintenance was \$20,762.

Other costs were listed as \$37, 736. Mr. Pollard stated that whenever he hears costs that are above and beyond the items listed he wonders what those costs are. Mr. Bolton replied it was an error. That the figure was the sum of the two figures for the software and hardware support and they had already been addressed. Next was the CNSI maintenance contract and there were several question marks next to it. Mr. Bolton was not certain if we would need to go forward with a modification to the current contract but we have the ability to maintain further modifications to NHVRIN and they had inserted a \$20,000 placeholder for that purpose.

High-speed ISP accounts were also discussed. They estimated it would cost considered \$100 per month multiplied by 40 cities and towns for 12 months (\$48,000 per year). The Helpdesk is a number that has been brought forward and although it is somewhat high it is reasonable. There is also a perpetual placeholder for contracted technical support staff to be used in rollouts, etc. We have become less dependent on that because the software is now web based, but decided to leave it there anyway. Records preservation contracts and training grants will be expending funds in the future and they budgeted \$100,000 for the first year and it will expand with need. That assessment is relatively costly as well and is estimated at \$120,000 per year for four years. The need to begin administering grants and to provide preservation training to New Hampshire cities and towns was outlined in the report from the InLook group.

There is also a one time investment budgeted to support renovations at the Records & Archives building renovations for controlled environments for the vaults. Mr. Bolton explained that he understood that the committee, or at least those that had been in attendance at the meeting had agreed to go forward with support for the renovations that they are planning for Records & Archives. He went on to explain the funds would go to support HVAC systems for the Micrographics and Vital Records vaults. The expected cost is \$76,000.

Mr. Bolton asked if there were any questions. Ms. Hartson suggested that Mr. Bolton subtract the \$37,000 dollars discussed earlier from the total so that the amount would be accurate. She just wanted to ensure that it was done. Mr. Bolton agreed. As far as current expenses, the committee agreed to carry forward expenses for the staff that is currently being paid through the VRIF like for telephones and such. They also decided to put in a placeholder for the Local Records Administrator. The funds would pay for desks and supplies. The rest of the costs have remained relatively stable. The permanent personnel (Class 10) are those staff that are currently being paid by the fund. Mr. Allen, The Technical Support Specialist, Ms. Eccleston, Systems Development Specialist, Ms. Moore, Genealogical Support Clerk and he had also included the vacant Administrator for the Local Records Preservation Program. The personnel costs associated with the NHVRIN software support provided by OIT. Staff members falling into that category, were previously identified by Mr. O'Neal. Mr. Bolton completed his presentation. Mr. Bergeron asked for questions.

Approved Minutes

4. Other Business:

Ms. Hartson asked if the money expended for the Secretary of State's office was going to be absorbed by HAVA (Help America Vote Act). Mr. Scanlan replied that it was his understanding that they were going to see whether the equipment that was purchased in the move is going to be utilized by OIT and if so, it would then be a legitimate VRIF expenditure. If it was not the equipment could be absorbed by HAVA because they would be using it for that application as well.

An attendee brought up the fact that the fund has a really high balance and he was concerned that it would become a target for the legislature when they begin crafting the next budget. He had heard that a list of the balances of all dedicated funds had already been requested. Mr. Bergeron explained that the committee was aware and therefore had been working on expanding its benefit and reach to cities and towns through planning for the expenses in the very near future. Mr. Bergeron added that in the last session a bill had been introduced that would have taken 25% off the top of all dedicated funds. Mr. Bergeron asked if there were any more comments.

Mr. Kruger asked that at the next meeting it would be nice if Mr. Bolton provide a cleaner copy of the budget. This one was good, but he would like to see the figures cleaned up so the committee could have a working document going forward. Ms. Hartson wanted to comment that revenue is on the rise. She is unsure why, but her office has seen a large increase in birth certificate requests and out of state marriages. She felt that it was a result of 9/11.

Mr. Scanlan added that not only is the committee drawing down the account but is also in a deficit spending situation after SFY08. To the extent that money is being spent on programs that we want to sustain in the future you have to consider the fact that at some point there is a wall that will be hit. Mr. Bergeron agreed. Mr. Kruger wondered how realistic it is to simply forecast the revenue five years into the future, especially in light of what Ms. Hartson just reported. He felt that the numbers are very soft when estimated out that far.

Mr. Bergeron asked if there was any further discussion. Mr. Bolton replied that they were hoping for a vote from the committee approving the budget figures presented so that they might begin to finalize the budget and implement the business plan. It was not clear who made the motion for a vote. Ms. Hartson seconded and the committee voted. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Kruger asked Mr. Bolton about the September meeting. Mr. Bolton replied that it would be held on September 16. Mr. Kruger just wanted to verify since this meeting was rescheduled to August. Mr. Bolton polled those in attendance if they wanted to stick to the schedule and everyone was agreeable. If they did not the committee would not meet again until November. Mr. Pollard asked Mr. Bolton if he would email members to remind them of the date.

Mr. Bergeron asked if there were any other items of business to be discussed. Hearing none the meeting was adjourned at 10:35 a.m.