

Approved Minutes

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

***-MINUTES-***

***Thursday  
November 15, 2001***

# Approved Minutes

## **-MINUTES-**

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

November 15, 2001

Department of Safety Building  
2nd Floor Conference Room  
2 Hazen Drive  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

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

Patricia Little, City Clerk Member  
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar  
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment  
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment  
Jane Ireland, Town Clerk Member  
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment

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

Patricia Seskes, Health Information Specialist Appointment  
Tom Janosz, Funeral Director Appointment  
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment  
Debra Eastman, Town Clerk Appointment  
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment

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

Melanie A. Orman, Program Specialist, DEVS  
John O'Neal, Office of Information Systems  
Mark Parris, Office of Information Systems

# Approved Minutes

## Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

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

Meeting called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Mr. Bolton. The first order of business was to approve the minutes of the September 20, 2001 meeting. Dr. Mevers provided the correct spelling of Mr. Daniel Daily's surname and noted that the "s" had been left off his own name in a few instances. Ms. Ireland noted a place in the minutes where a word had been cut off and a blank space left behind. Mr. Kruger reported that the substance was correct and made a motion that the minutes be accepted with corrections. The committee accepted the minutes of September 20, 2001 with corrections.

### **2. OIS Update:**

#### **A. Rollout to Hospital Towns/Frame Relay Sites:**

Mr. Parris reported that his team is currently working on getting the nine remaining hospital towns up and running. Mr. Milligan is working on getting the software installed. He has completed Center Conway, Colebrook, Lancaster, Plymouth and Wolfeboro. He is doing Claremont and North Haverhill this afternoon or tomorrow morning. That will leave New London and Franklin to be done and he has tentatively scheduled those for the beginning of next week. They will all be complete prior to the training scheduled for December 10, 13 and 14 at the Nash building in the training room. Mr. Parris stated that everything should be up and running in those towns by the end of December.

He also reported that the Department of Safety/Frame Relay towns in addition to Pembroke are: Bradford, Brentwood, Bristol, Charlestown, Dublin, Henniker, Kingston, Mont Vernon, New Hampton, Northfield, Madbury, Ossipee, Sutton, Walpole and Windham. Mr. Parris reported that he believes the agreement between the Department of Safety and OIS/Health and Human Services is complete. He forwarded the agreement to Mr. Bailey who forwarded it to Mr. Croteau, who then forwarded it to their legal department.

After the legal department has given it the once over we should be in business. Mr. Bolton has not heard anything negative from them. He added that he spoke with Mr. Croteau earlier in the week and that he (Mr. Croteau) would be out next week and hoped to have the agreement out the door by the end of this week. When Mr. Bolton informed him that this committee would be meeting in the Department of Safety building this morning, he led Mr. Bolton to believe that he hoped to have the agreement back to Mr. Bailey by this morning. He mentioned that they would be requesting some minor changes but nothing major that could sidetrack the project.

Mr. Parris replied that he would make the necessary changes as soon as Mr. Bailey returned the agreement to him. Once the changes were in place the document would be presented for signatures. As soon as the document is signed, Mr. Parris and his team can begin scheduling the aforementioned towns. Mr. O'Neal added that it should go quickly once the agreement is signed. Mr. Parris replied that yes, the hardware is already in place so it is just a matter of running cables from the back of the PC to an existing hub or switch, already in the offices. The Department of Safety would have to do a quick

## Approved Minutes

software update to enable us to run traffic through their servers, but that could be accomplished in a matter of minutes. He added that as his people went out to hook up offices they would be able to verify that the office was online right then and there. Mr. Bolton inquired about training. Mr. O'Neal asked how Mr. Parris and Mr. Bolton were planning on handling the training. Would it be one office at a time or all the users at once at the Nash building? Mr. Parris replied that either way is fine with him, but felt having users in all at once would be good as they could all benefit from the questions that may come up. He suggested that Mr. Milligan and Mr. Wurtz get together and figure out how they want to handle it. Mr. Bolton's only concern was that a time be established that would not interfere with any of the town's office hours. Mr. Parris reiterated that whatever Mr. Wurtz, Mr. Bolton and Mr. Milligan decided was fine with him.

### **B. Additional Modem Bank:**

Mr. O'Neal explained that he had encountered a great deal of difficulty in trying to get a concrete price from Verizon. They just will not commit to a price. He apologized to the committee because he had hoped to have the information for them at this meeting. He stated that he plans to keep working on it and that not having it will not prevent them from going forward with the additional towns.

Mr. Bolton asked if the holdup was because the price was being bargained down. Mr. O'Neal replied that it was. He reported that Verizon was currently trying to figure out whether we are paying the per-minute connect charge for in state calls. He added that they have still not gotten a straight answer on that. It was unclear to him what was preventing Verizon from providing answers or a firm price for the additional modem bank. Mr. O'Neal stated that they are just not willing to sit down and discuss the issue with us. Mr. Kruger mentioned that maybe they did not want to answer that question because they did not like the answer.

### **C. New Position:**

Mr. O'Neal told the committee that he also wanted to discuss a new position. He asked Mr. Bolton if he had taken a poll. Mr. Bolton replied that yes a poll was conducted and the support was unanimous. Mr. O'Neal reported to the committee that there is going to be a new OIS position assigned to Vital Records. The Office of Community and Public Health (OCPH), which is the group that Vital Records belongs to, is very good at getting grants from places like the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and a variety of places. Two groups have come up with grant money that has a connection to Vital Records. They want data from Vital Records. They will fund half a person and Mr. O'Neal was requesting that the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee fund the other half. That would give us one full time person to work both on VR support and on support for these two grants OCPH has been awarded. He believes it would be a win win solution for everyone.

The title of the new position is Systems Development Specialist V. Mr. O'Neal added that since there would be no state funding needed for the position it should be approved quickly. It has been submitted to the Department of Personnel and will have to go to Governor and Council. He thinks it will be January before the position will be available. Mr. Parris reported that the only other thing he had to report on the new position was that he and Mr. Bolton had been collaborating on the job description and it was now complete.

## Approved Minutes

### **D. ManTech Maintenance Agreement:**

Mr. Bolton reported that the ManTech maintenance agreement is a go. Several representatives from ManTech had wanted a teleconference on the new agreement, but that did not happen. They were agreeable with the terms of the contract submitted to them by Ms. Grimmer, so they are signing and returning it. Mr. O'Neal asked if they were going to pay us the \$17,000 from the sale of the software. Mr. Bolton replied that they were not. That money is still up in the air. Mr. Andrew had explained to them that we wanted them to pay us the \$17,000 and we would pay on the contract as we go, in order to keep the maintenance agreement and the sale of the software separate.

What they have proposed is that we wait while they litigate with the state of Connecticut over that sale and collect our money when they get theirs. Ms. Little and Mr. O'Neal asked what was happening with the state of Connecticut. Mr. Bolton explained that it was a little messy. The state of Connecticut had hired a primary contractor and they awarded a contract to ManTech through a RFP process for the code. The state paid the primary contractor and apparently that contractor did not pay ManTech. The state of Connecticut doesn't feel it owes ManTech anything as their contract was not with them.

Mr. Bolton stated that he is under the impression that there is also a disagreement on deliverables. It was Mr. Bolton's opinion that ManTech may be stuck and that we may be as well. He believes they will still be wrangling with this long after our maintenance contract is over. Ms. Little inquired as to exactly what the maintenance contract is for. Mr. O'Neal replied that it is sort of a safety net. If we run into problems we can call them. Mr. Kruger stated that it should not matter if ManTech has a disagreement with someone else. The code was sold and we are supposed to be compensated when it is. He suggested that if that was not in the current contract it should be written into the next one.

Mr. Bolton replied that he did not think we would be going into that kind of contract with ManTech again. He also expressed doubt that the state would pursue ManTech legally for the royalties. He felt that a huge corporation such as ManTech should have written the state a check and then pursued the disagreement with Connecticut. Mr. O'Neal asked if the state of Connecticut had the software up and running. Mr. Bolton replied that he believed they were. He was unsure of what module but suspected birth as it was the easiest. He went on to say that ManTech is maintaining Connecticut's software as they do have a maintenance contract with them. So they are maintaining them and pursuing this disagreement with the primary contractor.

Ms. Little asked what this maintenance contract was going to cost us. Mr. Bolton explained that it was a trade off. ManTech agreed to an hourly rate that we would be charged whenever we used them. Mr. O'Neal added that if we don't use them it will cost us nothing and the total had been capped at \$17,000. Mr. Bolton stated that the original intent was to use the \$17,000 in royalties to cover the contract so it would have been a wash. Then it was decided to separate the reimbursement from the contract. He did not think it would be much if anything.

Mr. Parris reported that he, Mr. Bolton and members of their staff have teamed up to create the RFP for web enabling the VRV2000 software. Ms. Eileen Grimmer had also been brought into the process. The group has met on three occasions and is working on the Statement of Work portion of the RFP. He stated that there has been significant progress made on that portion. Some of the web personnel were also invited to the last

## Approved Minutes

meeting. Everything is on target and a lot of the background work is getting done. He was very pleased with the progress.

Ms. Little asked about where we were in the cost sharing negotiations with the Department of Safety. Mr. Bolton reiterated what he and Mr. Parris had reported earlier. She asked if it was a 50/50 split and they confirmed that it was. Ms. Little then asked about the next fifteen towns. Would that be a 50/50 split as well? Mr. Parris explained that they have not gotten that far yet. That agreement may have to be a little different. There may be some hardware expenses that we will be expected to pick up. In the interest of getting the first fifteen towns up Mr. Parris focused only on them for this agreement. He went on to say that he will begin working on the next agreement after this first group is up and running.

Ms. Little asked if the equipment Mr. Parris was referring to was communication equipment or the PC's for the offices. Mr. Parris explained that it would be communications hardware. Hubs, routers, etc. would cost approximately \$5000 per site. Mr. Bolton added that after all the costs associated with sharing the DSL line are known, it may not be cost effective to go to really small sites. He stated that especially if we are adding the additional modems, it might be better to bring in the very small sites through dial up.

Ms. Little asked if what Mr. Bolton was hinting at was, that the next fifteen sites would not be 50/50. He replied that they might be. They might pick up ten sites for \$5,000 a pop and then we would pick up ten sites for \$5,000 in addition to paying the monthly share of the DSL line as well. If we are adding additional lines to the modem bank, they would accommodate a great deal more traffic at the cost of \$3,000-\$4,000 per month – possibly without a per-minute dial up cost. That would be much more cost effective than going out and buying equipment for all those sites.

Ms. Little asked if we were to get an additional modem bank would the Department of Safety join us. Mr. Bolton replied that they would not. Mr. O'Neal explained that the Department of Safety is going to these additional fifteen towns whether we go with them or not. He thought that what Mr. Bolton was saying was that if it is cost prohibitive for some of the towns maybe we wouldn't go to all fifteen with them. That we could install the additional modem bank and let the very small sites dial in.

Ms. Little asked who would be paying the cost. She was concerned that the town not be paying for it. Mr. Bolton explained that that issue would be put before the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee because it would be a cost that either the fund would have to pick up or Department of Safety. The town would not pick up the cost. Mr. O'Neal added that whether we go with frame relay or dial up, the cost still comes back to this committee. Ms. Little stated that she had not been aware it would cost so much per site. Mr. O'Neal replied that the \$5,000 figure was an average. Not every site would require \$5,000 worth of hardware, but the purchase of a server for our office that is \$20,000 to \$25,000 (not an unusual amount) would be spread among the sites. Mr. Kruger, hoping to clarify, stated that if they spent \$75,000 that would average out to \$5,000 each for 15 sites.

Ms. Little reported that she heard Tom Towle at the NHMA conference discussing access issues and he talked about an "extranet." Sort of a state municipal network as being something the state needs to consider. When we see costs like these and realize that is

## Approved Minutes

just for our little project. What must the state be paying to connect to towns and cities? Mr. Bolton asked if Mr. Towle had discussed funding. That kind of undertaking would probably mean manning or populating DITM with all this equipment and they would be the state hub. Ms. Little replied that he had not, but she did want to speak with him about it. Mr. Bolton asked whether he wanted to connect it to every department or if it would be a statewide initiative that would require funding from the legislature.

Ms. Little explained that after the conference she asked Mr. Towle if anyone knew what the actual communication costs are for the state now and he did not. She felt it would be important for someone to know that. It could be more cost effective for the state to do an extranet and pool our resources. Mr. O'Neal stated that he has heard a lot of talk about it but did not believe that anyone was working on it. He felt that Mr. Towle and his group should own it, but he doesn't believe that they have the resources. He explained that half the battle would just be getting someone to take ownership of the project. He went on to say that maybe Administrative Services should, as they own our telephone and Internet connections.

According to Mr. O'Neal, half the battle is just getting someone to step up and say "yes, I own it and will drive it forward." Dr. Mevers replied that the state intranet system is not even up yet. There is no clear-cut communication between departments yet. Ms. Little stated that she was under the impression that NH Sun was connected to all state agencies. Dr. Mevers replied that they aren't yet. Mr. Bolton asked Dr. Mevers if his office and the Secretary of State's offices might be the exception. Dr. Mevers replied that his office goes through the Secretary of State's office and Webster, but they are still trying to communicate with each department. He added that it is coming, but is just not there yet.

Ms. Ireland asked about what was happening or had happened with the Department of Safety security issue. Mr. Bolton replied that it was more of an FBI issue than a Department of Safety issue, because they share the equipment as well. Mr. O'Neal also replied that it would have been more of an issue had we planned to combine PC's. For the fifteen new sites the computers will remain separate so there will be no problem. He went on to say that our ultimate goal would be to share equipment. Ms. Little reported that it was the CJIS (Criminal Justice Information System) that really established these standards. From what she has heard it does set out the parameters for connection.

It is just that Major Fred Booth thinks it is easier to just say "no connection." That he feels it is really safe to just say no connection. She added that there are some opportunities for connection. In fact, at the NHMA conference Mr. Croteau predicted that in the next year we would see the state back away from the "you cannot connect to a local network." Ms. Little feels the policy ties the state's hands as well as the clerk's. Mr. Bolton reported that we are working with Tom Edwards, Information Technology Manager for the Administrative Office of the Courts. As they are going forward with the CJIS RFP we may be tying into their database. This will enable us to look at both divorce and adoption records.

Mr. O'Neal agreed with Ms. Little that it is just easier for them to say no connection. He also felt it was time for people to figure out just how to connect and to do it securely. Ms. Ireland reported that her town had just had a run in with the Nimda virus and it had virtually crippled the police department and they are supposed to have firewalls and protection in place. Mr. Bolton stated that in speaking with Eric Herr, there could be a

## Approved Minutes

centralized networking and email through DITM. They will be in charge of the state networking resources and will take care of it.

### **3. Local Records Education Project:**

Mr. Bolton explained that he had accompanied Dr. Mevers to the first New Hampshire Local Records Education Project class in Keene on November 8. This class will be offered throughout the state. Dr. Mevers reported that the class was well received. There were twenty-eight responses which given the time frame for responses was excellent. The people were very attentive and asked a lot of questions. The class consisted of four sections. Records Management, Records Preservation, Microfilming and Disaster Planning. The second workshop has been scheduled for November 16 in Conway. Dr. Mevers then handed out a pamphlet on the classes.

Dr. Mevers pointed out that the pamphlets he handed out were not the pamphlets that the committee had voted to subsidize. He remarked that he had planned to call Mr. Andrew the week prior to inform him that no funds had been expended yet. Mr. Andrew had been concerned about the printing. The committee now has one brochure ready for printing. They have had to reformat the brochures to reflect New Hampshire information. When he had reported to the committee previously he was under the impression that the Dartmouth committee was in a rush to get the brochures printed. That was not the case.

They do hope to have tuition reimbursement available soon for municipal officials that want to take the class. One of the areas in which they planned to utilize some of the funds from the Vital Records Improvement Fund was to reimburse municipal officials the cost of the class. Ms. Little asked if they were only providing that benefit to municipal officials. Dr. Mevers replied that that was his understanding. Mr. Kruger stated that the committee did not feel it appropriate to use the funds to reimburse historical society members. The committee was allowing this benefit for town clerks and their representatives only. Mr. Kruger pointed out that the town selectmen or city councilors could also take advantage of this benefit.

Dr. Mevers reported that there has also been a great deal of interest from librarians and historians. Mr. Kruger asked if there was any breakdown from the first class as to how many were from towns and how many from historical societies. Dr. Mevers replied that six or eight of those in attendance were not from cities or towns. Ms. Little reported that her deputy was there and he is a records manager. He found it very worthwhile and came away with some interesting points to follow up on. Dr. Mevers stated that Mr. Daily is a good teacher and had some help from the Education Director from Northeast Conservation Center. She will not be there for all the classes but Mr. Daily will always have someone accompanying him. He reminded the committee that all those that attend can consult after completing the class. There is a consultation award available.

Mr. Bolton mentioned that there was a conflict with reimbursing consultants travel expenses. Dr. Mevers explained that the consultation fee is paid with grant money, but there is nothing set aside to pay travel expenses. Mr. Bolton felt it sounded nitpicky to announce that the consultation cost would be covered but the travel expense would not. Ms. Little agreed with Mr. Bolton that the expenses should be reimbursed along with the consultation fee. She felt it would be a hardship for any town that did not have a training or travel budget to come up with money for travel expenses for a consultant. Dr. Mevers

## Approved Minutes

reported to the committee that there were some consultants that would be traveling from northern Maine, but no one would be flying.

Mr. Kruger asked if there would be a set per-mile rate and per diem for lunch if the committee were to agree to pick up these expenses. Dr. Mevers agreed that there would be. Ms. Ireland suggested the state's standard be used. Mr. Bolton explained that the state uses the IRS standards for mileage and meals. Mr. Kruger suggested that the committee agree to cover these expenses at the state/federal rate. Ms. Little asked if people had to apply and be chosen for the on site consulting or can anyone/any town that attends the class can apply. The application is in the folder and was discussed at the end of the workshop. Mr. Kruger asked if everyone that applies would be selected. Dr. Mevers replied that the committee would do their level best to make sure everyone gets one.

Mr. Kruger asked if the committee wanted the travel expense reimbursement to come from the \$20,000 or should it be over and above that amount. Mr. Bolton replied that it was something that was not anticipated. Ms. Little stated that she felt it should be over and above that amount. Mr. Kruger agreed and asked if there should be a ceiling placed on the amount. Dr. Mevers suggested a \$5,000 ceiling and the rest of the committee agreed. Ms. Little was unsure of whether a quorum had been reached. Mr. Kruger suggested that Mr. Bolton do another telephone poll of absent committee members. Mr. Bolton agreed to do one. Mr. Kruger added that the committee should be careful with the phone polls as some members might think they do not have to attend meeting, as they will be able to vote by telephone.

Dr. Mevers asked if the committee would rather wait and take a vote at the next meeting. He did not feel the issue was pressing enough to warrant a phone poll, but then thought better of it. He advised the committee that consultations would begin in January and the committee would not be meeting until mid January if the current schedule were followed. It was agreed that the phone poll was the way to go. Dr. Mevers asked if, when conducting a phone poll the bureau calls all committee members or if the bureau stops calling when a quorum/majority had been reached. Mr. Bolton replied that the last time, all members were called. Ms. Little stated that she preferred that all members be called. All members present (5) voted in favor and Mr. Bolton agreed to poll the rest by telephone.

#### **4. Social Security Administration RFP Response Update:**

Mr. Bolton reported to the committee that the RFP process for web-enabling the Electronic Death Registration process is ongoing. All the vendors on the vendor list will be included. All the known vendors of vital records software have been contacted and are being put on the ITS07 Approved Vendor List. There were some deliverables due to the Social Security Administration by the end of November. One of which was the project plan. Mr. Bolton stated that he would be working with OIS to get that out.

#### **5. NH Municipal Association Annual Meeting/NH LOGIN:**

Mr. Bolton informed the committee that representatives of the bureau had attended the NH LOGIN portion of the New Hampshire Municipal Associations annual meeting.

## Approved Minutes

They did a presentation on VRV2000 and were joined by the New Hampshire State Library and Secretary of State. Ms. Little added that Motor Vehicle attended a separate session. Mr. Kruger asked if any issues were raised. Mr. Bolton replied that the floor was very receptive as usual. Mr. O'Neal added that the number of participants was impressive. Ms. Little agreed, adding that the conference is generally well attended.

Mr. Bolton reported that vital records were mentioned quite a few times during the class on the 8th. Because maintaining and preserving vital records are a major concern for most municipalities. We were also recognized at the NH Login meeting as one of the statewide initiatives. He added that we did not have any money thrown our way, but we are currently well funded anyway. Ms. Little agreed that we have good funding and are indeed very lucky.

### **6. Other Business:**

Mr. O'Neal asked if there was a reason that the last few meetings had been so spottily attended. He stated that he is not a member, but wondered if we might be doing something wrong. Mr. Bolton replied that part of the problem might be that minutes and agenda go out later than he would like. There are several internal meetings that he participates in to help prepare for these meetings. In the future he plans to hold the VRV2000 Project Team meeting one-week prior in order to give members a little more advance notice. Mr. O'Neal suggested sending out a letter with a schedule of the 2002 meetings. Ms. Little liked that idea. Because of the lack of a constant meeting room the locations would be announced later. Ms. Little stated that it would be easier for clerks to attend if they could schedule it well in advance.

Ms. Little announced that she had received the resignation of Debra Eastman, Town Clerk of Gilford. She also received an email from Paul Bergeron of Nashua. He feels he may be spreading himself too thin. It seems every time the committee is scheduled to meet he has a conflict. Ms. Little told the committee members that she feels there is a problem with attendance. She did think that getting the schedule out early would be a real help. Mr. O'Neal replied that Mr. Bailey first received notice of the meeting the day before and he was already booked for that time period so he could not attend. Ms. Ireland reminded Mr. Bolton that she did not have email.

Ms. Little asked the committee who routinely misses these meetings. It was mentioned that hospital representatives attend the meetings infrequently. Mr. Bolton replied that Kathy Bizarro and Pat Seskes were unable to attend the meeting as Ms. Seskes is on vacation and Ms. Bizarro had a prior engagement. Ms. Little expressed relief that they had contacted Mr. Bolton. She explained that at least they bothered to call. She would be much more concerned had they not. Mr. Kruger suggested the committee revisit whether the third Thursday of the month is the best time for all involved. Mr. O'Neal asked if meeting quarterly would be better. Ms. Little replied that the committee used to meet quarterly a long time ago. Mr. Kruger, Ms. Little and Ms. Ireland all felt that because of all the projects in the works, continuing to meet bi-monthly was the way to go. Ms. Ireland told the committee that if a meeting is scheduled on a day that her deputy has a prior engagement there is nothing she can do. Ms. Little asked about the medical examiner. Mr. Bolton replied that if Mr. Andrew had been given more than a days notice he would have contacted him. He also noted that Wednesdays or Thursdays are autopsy days. Mr. Bolton stated that he believes Mr. Andrew tries to get to the meetings as often

## Approved Minutes

as he can. Ms. Little suggested that in the letter that goes out with the schedule, Mr. Bolton explain the reasoning behind sending the schedule out. Explain the need for a quorum. Ms. Ireland asked if Mr. Bergeron was intending to resign. Ms. Little replied that she was not sure but had emailed him back asking if that was the case.

Ms. Little explained that Mr. Bergeron is a very busy man, but that he is very interested in the issues before this committee. Because of that, Mr. Kruger suggested that he would support anything the committee could do to make it easier for Mr. Bergeron to attend. Ms. Little stated that she would follow up with him. In terms of the Town Clerk vacancy, Ms. Little reported that she would have to check with the new President. Ms. Ireland asked if that was the new President's appointment and Ms. Little replied that it was. Mr. O'Neal asked if Concord was the most convenient place for everyone to meet. All agreed that it was a central location and easy for all, including state staff.

Ms. Little asked Mr. Bolton what the status was on the Administrative rules. He reported that the rules were the reason he had been a little late to the meeting. The committee met this morning to meet with the legal staff and find out if all were in agreement on the objection response to JLCAR. Mr. Bolton informed the committee that the JLCAR meeting was scheduled for the next afternoon. Ms. Little asked if they had raised opposition in regard to Social Security numbers.

Mr. Bolton replied that the Social Security number issue was one of about one hundred fifty points they were questioning. The rules are one hundred and ten page in length and there was a question or comment on nearly every page. A lot were just edits, others just questioning if the bureau had the authority to require statistical information collection. Most recently the issue was sub-registrars. The bureau did away with sub-registrars in 1997 through the legislative process. He felt that they did that in anticipation of the VRV2000 software being rolled out to everyone and there would be no issue. He noted however, that there is an issue with local clerks that are not automated needing to provide emergency burial permits.

He explained that he had a call into Carol Derocher to see if she would like to have someone present at the meeting to speak to that issue. Ms. Little asked if the bureau's position is that it does not want to go back to sub-registrars. Mr. Bolton replied that the bureau is trying to work around the issue with semantics. They could pursue it legislatively. In fact that was JLCAR's original recommendation. Mr. Bolton felt that it could still be an issue with the legislature. The way that the bureau gets around the issue is through the fact that the burial permits are issued through our software. The funeral director or clerk may print a permit, but the bureau technically issues it. Even in smaller towns that are not yet automated AVRIS is used. It is the bureau software so it is the bureau issuing the permits. Ms. Little asked how many clerks are not yet automated. Mr. Bolton replied that there are ninety-four.

Mr. Bolton explained that the main issue is when someone dies at 10:30 p.m. and the family wants the body on a plane or train first thing in the morning. A permit needs to be issued. In the past there was a sub-registrar identified. A police or fire chief or someone in the town that can be called in the middle of the night to issue a permit. Then when the new legislation was passed, Funeral Directors were identified as statewide sub-registrars. At least that is what the bureau believed. That language never appeared in any legislation. The concern is that there will be a body somewhere that cannot be moved because a permit cannot be issued.

## Approved Minutes

Mr. Armstrong asked if Town Clerks were not able to issue the permits. Mr. Bolton replied that they want to make sure that Town Clerks are available. Ms. Ireland told the committee that that sort of thing comes with the territory. Ms. Little agreed and added that it doesn't happen often but when it does the clerk should get out of bed and issue the record. Mr. Armstrong added that it wouldn't be that expensive to get equipment for ninety-four towns. Mr. Bolton agreed but added we would then have to handle communication costs as well. He added that he did not want to spend the \$2.5 million required to bring everyone on when it would be more cost effective to do it gradually with Verizon.

Mr. Armstrong replied that the Governor wants Internet access to all towns. Ms. Little summed up the Administrative Rules process as still having a long way to go. Mr. Bolton replied that the meeting the next day could actually be the final one. Mr. Armstrong mentioned that there are one hundred forty dispatchers around the state and they are on a network. Mr. Bolton asked if he was referring to EMS or 911. Mr. Armstrong replied that he was. Mr. Bolton stated that he and Mr. Parris had looked at that angle, but the location of the dispatchers was not consistent in all cities/towns. Mr. Armstrong stated that he meant if the department wanted to designate someone to issue in the event of an emergency. Mr. Bolton replied that he is not concerned with the issuance of a permit. He is concerned with the erosion of the duties of a city or town clerk that might wish to be part of the process.

Ms. Little mentioned that another item that seems to be hanging over from meetings past is the \$200,000 that was appropriated from the fund to offset operating expenses of the bureau. The question is whether this committee would ask the Governor and Council for some sort of solution to this error. She added that if the funds were returned it would leave the bureau with a \$200,000 hole in its budget. Ms. Little suggested the committee let it go. The fund has enough money and in her opinion it would be very difficult politically and from a bureaucratic standpoint to try and get this money back. Mr. Kruger agreed that what is done is done and trying to go back would not be beneficial. On the other hand, he felt, the committee needs to be vigilant during the next budget negotiations. It will be important to let the legislature know we will not accept this again. He suggested that the issue be discussed fully when there are more members present.

Making sure this doesn't happen again should be the main focus of discussions. Mr. Bolton reminded the committee that the \$200,000 would be taken in each of the two years. Ms. Little recommended the committee send a letter to Commissioner Shumway and the appropriate political individuals simply alerting them to the fact and expressing the committee's concern. The letter might also remind them that the committee went to battle years ago over this very issue. That the committee recognizes this was a mistake and do not expect the bureau to build in that \$200,000 as a funding source in future budgets.

Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Kruger both replied that they did not feel it was an accident on the part of the legislature. Mr. Kruger added that they were looking for every nickel they could find. Mr. Armstrong replied that they were in essence "testing the waters." Mr. Kruger reiterated that it was important that the committee make enough noise so that they will think twice before doing it again. He also reminded the committee that the fund is fat right now and it stands out when they are looking for extra funds. If it continues to grow it will just become a larger target.

## Approved Minutes

Ms. Little asked Mr. Kruger if he still felt the committee should wait for a meeting with better attendance even though a quorum had been reached. Mr. Kruger replied that he did think the committee should wait. He also added that because the budget was a biennium, time was not crucial. He and Ms. Ireland felt it should be added to an agenda of a future meeting with a request that all members attend. It was agreed that it would be added to a future agenda. Dr. Mevers told the committee that a year from this meeting the new budget would be in the works.

Ms. Little asked when agencies prepare their budgets. Dr. Mevers replied that those budgets would be assembled next August. It was agreed that the issue would be placed on the March meeting agenda. Mr. Armstrong asked the committee what its intended recourse would be if it indeed did happen again. Ms. Little replied that we would alert all the city and town clerks to it and do battle as we have in the past. She agreed that the committee should spend some money as the coffers are too full and we would not appear sympathetic. Mr. Kruger asked how much was in the fund. Mr. Bolton replied that there was \$1 million currently in the fund.

Ms. Little referred to the discussion outlined in the previous meeting's minutes, with Vicky Tinsley regarding the stakeholder collaboration document coming from DITM. She asked if Mr. Bolton or Parris had received it. They both replied that they had not. She reiterated that it was in connection to the web enablement. That legislation required a collaborative stakeholder study and sort of an identification of how you are going to bring in stakeholders. Mr. Bolton and Mr. Parris recalled the discussion but had received nothing from Ms. Tinsley. Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Bolton if he had the white paper format for the project that talked about what it is. Mr. Bolton replied that yes, it had been kicked around a year ago.

Mr. Armstrong explained that it should probably be updated and part of it is assumptions of those external impacts can be described in there. He added that this project is kind of a model that they wanted other projects to follow. It is a good communications document for anyone that wants to learn about the project and has been in process since Karen Grady was here. It probably just needs an annual brushing up. Mr. O'Neal explained that the stakeholder analysis is part of their SITP response. He asked if there was a separate form. Ms. Little replied that she took Ms. Tinsley's statements to mean there were separate forms. Mr. Armstrong stated that there is a recommended flow in involving stakeholders. Ms. Little asked Mr. O'Neal if that process was in the SITP.

Mr. O'Neal replied that it required them to identify who the external stakeholders were and how they would interact with them. He went on to say it wasn't in great detail that there would have been a separate form. They just had to identify and explain how they would involve stakeholders for each project. Mr. Armstrong explained that it usually ties in with the lifecycle development. If there is user acceptance check off then you just describe them and in this case, they are city/town clerks, hospitals and funeral directors. That identifies who and as long as they are hooked into any other process that is described then it is pretty well nailed down. Mr. Parris asked if the Project Definition Form was a three or four page document. Mr. Armstrong replied that it was. Mr. Parris stated that he knew which document they were referring to. Mr. Bolton offered that he and Mr. Gerow had worked on the last revision of that document.

## Approved Minutes

Mr. Bolton asked the committee if it should make a commitment to fund the web enablement RFP process. Ms. Little replied that the committee has always acknowledged that it would, because the \$200,000 had went to the bureau, the fund would have to offset that and maybe even more. She asked if Mr. Bolton was asking if the committee had a motion. He replied that yes he was asking that or if a motion was necessary. Ms. Little responded that web enablement was the committee's core objective so she didn't think it was necessary. Mr. Armstrong asked what the bureau had received from the Social Security Administration. Mr. Bolton replied that it had been awarded \$497,000 and the Bureau has received \$1 million in moneys that the legislature assigned to DHHS IT Initiatives. Mr. Armstrong asked if that was capital. Mr. Bolton replied that it was. Mr. Armstrong asked if that was an outright grant. Mr. Bolton explained that it was a contract with deliverables to provide them with electronic death registration and online verification. They will pay based on deliverables so there will be payments throughout the life of the contract. Mr. Armstrong felt it would be important to update the project plan so the stakeholders will know how it is going to fit and make sure everyone understands.

Ms. Little explained the earlier discussion of communication costs to Mr. Armstrong and asked if he had any idea what the state pays in total for communication costs. He did not know the exact figure but noted that they are in the process of developing the statewide technology plan and it would include those numbers. Ms. Little asked if he thought the figure would be high enough to drive the state municipal network that had been discussed. So it could be more of a centralized initiative. Mr. Armstrong replied that at that time it would only work if the town was already hooked up to a LAN. Ms. Little asked if it wouldn't be a state initiative in order to centralize and possibly cut some of the communication costs.

Mr. Armstrong replied that he did not believe they know enough yet to make a firm commitment on that. It is a project they are looking at. The state does spend enough resources that it is probably worth looking at. He also felt that cities and towns could share some of the cost if they get and ISP out of it. That should be worth something to the town. Ms. Little asked if there wasn't a telecommunications RFP going out soon and is it just state agency to state agency. Mr. Armstrong replied that it was a state agency oriented but he thought that like all state contracts, municipalities could buy off it. The unfortunate part is that there are multiple circuits going to Nashua but the buildings are not co-located so they would get somewhat nominal benefit from that.

If the city was wired and the state could connect in that might change the game, but no one has really looked at that in detail. Both ends would really need to coordinate to see what could be achieved. As far as Mr. Armstrong knew nothing had been done to that end. Ms. Little told him of Mr. Towle throwing out the concept of the "extranet" at the NHMA conference and how it was very enticing to those in attendance. They are interested and want to do what they can to perpetuate that discussion. Mr. Armstrong replied that some states have taken advantage of their university systems in their major cities and built from that. He told Ms. Little that if that is what they want they need to start rattling some cages. It is all out of tax money so why pay so much to the telephone company if we don't have to.

He did think it would take quite awhile to build it. He added that there would need to be someone in charge of it to make it happen. It is a project that will show up in the state IT plan in some flavor. Mr. Armstrong suggested that Ms. Little talk with Tom to make sure

## Approved Minutes

he knows of their support. The other thing he wanted to mention is they are doing a comprehensive statewide DITM Information Technology Plan. They are also doing a Citizens Report similar to what the Accounting division does on the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR). In the Citizen's Report they will describe IT initiatives and the web enablement project is one they would like to highlight. Because this project would directly benefit the citizens and the state it will be outlined. He was not sure who would be doing the write up. Mr. Bolton asked if they just needed an overview. Mr. Armstrong offered to give Mr. Bolton the main bullets to address and link him to the website so he can see how the other report is presented.

Mr. Bolton asked that since Mr. Armstrong had arrived there was now a quorum and if a vote could be taken there would be no need for a telephone poll. He explained the consultant travel expense issue and Mr. Armstrong made the vote unanimous.

### **Next Meeting:**

Because of the Martin Luther King holiday the January meeting was scheduled for January 10, 2002. Dr. Mevers asked if the committee wanted to keep meeting the third Thursday. All in attendance agreed that the current schedule worked for them.

With no additional business noted, Ms. Little adjourned the meeting at 11:21 a.m.