

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

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
January 18, 2007***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

January 18, 2007

N.H. Department of Resource and Economic Development
Conference Room
Pembroke Road
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS Appointment
Jill Hadaway, Bow Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Debbie Augustine, NH Hospital Association
Dr. David Laflamme, DHHS Appointment
Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Joseph Gray, Rochester Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Peter Croteau, OIT, OIT Appointment
Judy Gaouette, Dover City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment

GUESTS:

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

Approved Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Meeting Called to Order:

Mr. Gray called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Gray stated that the first order of business was to vote on the minutes from the previous meeting. Dr. Teschner replied that he had one correction to the minutes. On page 10, fourth paragraph down, the minutes state that the meeting with consultants was held on October 12. The correct date was October 24, 2006. Mr. Gray asked for additional corrections. Hearing no further discussion of corrections or additions, Mr. Gray asked for a motion to accept the minutes as corrected. Ms. Gaouette offered a motion to accept and Ms. Hadaway seconded the motion. Mr. Gray asked for a vote and the minutes were unanimously accepted as written by the committee.

3. Election of Chair:

Mr. Gray reported that he had been reading the committee statutes and they state that the Chair can serve one year and then must be elected again to serve a second term. The second term can continue throughout their appointment to the committee. He then asked for nominations from committee members for chair of the committee. Ms. Gaouette asked if Mr. Gray was running. He replied that he would be happy to if the committee wanted him. Mr. Scanlan nominated Mr. Gray as Chair and Ms. Hadaway seconded the motion. Hearing no other nominations Mr. Gray asked for a vote. He was unanimously re-elected to a second term as chair of the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee.

4. NHVRIN Update:

Ms. Goonan distributed three handouts to committee members. She explained that the first page was their (OIT) final metrics for the year 2006. There were 126 change requests (CRs) submitted between 2004-2006. Ms. Goonan's staff completed 126 CRs during that same time period. The net effect of that was at the end of December 2006 there were 114 remaining CRs. It remained pretty flat. As change requests were completed more would come in. So far in 2007 they had completed 16 CRs and 6 have been submitted. That leaves 104 open.

Ms. Goonan reported that she had included the information about Release 4.1, which was launched January 7, 2007 for those that did not use NHVRIN regularly. Those items included some data fixes, but the largest part of it was the fetal death module and the fact that clerks can now issue divorce abstracts. Under "Other Work Completed" are non-release fixes. They are just modifications to the database. The rest of the information was their planned work, which should take them through the rest of the year. They were planning a maintenance release within the next few weeks. They need to correct several things that were discovered during this most recent release.

One of those items they hope will help correct the resident report issues that have arisen. They did find some code that creates the report that could be improved and they plan to

Approved Minutes

implement that. Going beyond that, the general performance problems that are being experienced intermittently, to her knowledge had not yet been analyzed. There have been some small changes made to try and improve it but the real root cause analysis has yet to be done.

Ms. Goonan asked if any of the users had noticed any improvements or decline in performance. Ms. Gaouette replied that sometimes the system is good, but other times you wait forever. She admitted she had not brought the log she had been keeping, but stated that it did appear to happen at certain times of day as previously suggested. Ms. Goonan asked if it ever ran good for an entire day or did it always eventually bog down. Ms. Gaouette replied that it always slows throughout the day. She added that after 6 p.m. it did seem to pick up speed.

Mr. Gray reported that he tried to run the reports Ms. Goonan mentioned every day for a week. He stated that he knew that if he just waited until after 5:00 p.m. he would have better luck. On the evening he worked late they printed out fine. During normal business hours the system is too slow to print the reports. Ms. Goonan replied that she would report that to the Ops staff and Database Administrator. She added that the code they planned to load would help the performance but would have no impact on network factors or the load on the database.

Ms. Goonan informed the committee that coming at the end of March they would have the out-of-state death screens corrected. They would be part of a new release. Her staff would also be modifying how searches in death will be handled. That is necessary because not everyone will have access to the out-of-state data. They will also be doing something with purging pending searches. The SOSKB project is underway and we need a way to manage what is in the pending search bin. It is essentially a report for the clerk to see what searches are still there. Ms. Goonan asked Mr. Wurtz to correct her if she was incorrect, but she believed that the state users would be able to purge everyone.

Mr. Wurtz replied that there were the several things. When it gets to the points where we are ready to pilot the SOSKB program there are several towns that have been identified as likely pilot towns. We will purge those towns so they can start fresh and see how successful they are using the new program. When we go live with SOSKB we will purge everybody's files. Then, through a process, which has yet to be released to clerks, but will be. At the end of the month during validation of the charges, towns will have a period of time in which to reconcile with the state all the charges attributed to them. Any and all adjustments made will then be made by a state employee. When the state and city/town agree, the program will create a new statement. At that point the state will have the functionality to purge all outstanding pending searches. The city or town will then start fresh the next month.

Ms. Goonan reiterated that these changes would require a new build. The other thing that would be happening at the end of March would be out-of-state birth records. A decision was made to help keep the process simple. They plan to have the out-of-state birth coding function outside the NHVRIN application. That will simplify the process and allows them to make the changes that much quicker. It will still be a .Net Web based application that the vital records staff can easily access. They will not access it through NHVRIN. They will get a different URL and see a different set of screens. Records will be entered there and they will be able to retrieve incomplete records.

Approved Minutes

It will not be an application that looks like NHVRIN at all. They are hoping to incorporate some best practices in order to start a foundation in the event there is a need in the future, to create a new version of NHVRIN. There are basic functions that happen in NHVRIN that will happen in this application as well. Ms. Goonan asked Mr. Bryer to speak a little more on that subject. Mr. Bryer explained that they hoped to make the download time faster by reducing the amount of traffic on the line. That should allow users to see a much quicker response time. Initially, it will only be vital records staff, that see the improved response time, but they (OIT) will be developing a framework that they will be able to build upon if they elect to incorporate other modules.

Mr. Bryer stopped short of calling it a prototype, but said new features and new technologies are available and they will be incorporating those. With the tools they currently have it cuts development time in half. Mr. Wurtz wanted to be sure that everyone understood that this module was being created for the business office only. Mr. Bryer and Ms. Goonan replied that he was correct. Mr. Bolton added that the out-of-state birth is only relevant to the business office. Ms. Goonan reported that there were a lot of people clamoring for the out-of-state data so they were hoping to get the data entered as quickly as possible. Mr. Bolton stated that this could be the beginning of the new architecture for the next generation of NHVRIN. He felt it was very worthwhile to do this development in this manner.

Ms. Gaouette asked if this was for New Hampshire residents that have out-of-state births. Mr. Bolton replied that it was. Mr. Gray asked if this were strictly for state agencies, they would not be printing out-of-state births would they? Mr. Bolton replied that they would not. In fact, there are very tight controls on how out-of-state records can be used. Mr. Gray asked if this was more for DMV. Mr. Bolton replied that according to the Inter-jurisdictional Exchange Agreement (IJE) motor vehicle is not allowed access to out-of-state data. There are specific, agreed upon uses for these records. Mr. Gray asked who it was for then.

Mr. Bolton replied that there are a multitude of uses for the data. It could be for programs within the state, such as the Help America Vote Act (HAVA). To allow data sharing, for getting people on and off the voting lists. It is also for public health purposes, child fatality review, low birth weight, etc. A lot of agencies are allowed to use out-of-state data. Ms. Goonan stated that a lot of agencies have come to her about verification of events only. If a New Hampshire resident dies out of state, these agencies would like verification of the event. That did not really fall under the data exchange or sharing model so she did not know if it applied. Family Assistance, Medicaid, and Child Support have all asked for verification of death, birth, etc. Mr. Bolton replied that he would need to review the need of another agency for this purpose.

Dr. Laflamme asked if Mr. Bolton knew how the difference in out-of-state records from in-state records were being handled, because in some cases they are different from our records and they collect something in a different way and that does not immediately translate into our version. He used education as an example. The old way that education was collected does not crosswalk into the new way. There are different certificates in different states and he wondered how vital records, manages to map those differences. Mr. Bolton replied that it is either explicit on the document received from another state or it would not be recorded. He did not think we could guess at it. If it was not clear and there was no apparent crosswalk it would go in as "unknown." Mr. Bolton added that we have gotten into this situation because the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS)

Approved Minutes

went with multiple standards and allowed states to proceed in their own manner. In one to two years when everyone has gone to the new standard and there is a data sharing router, which would allow states to share/access data, this will all be moot. Dr. Laflamme asked if this would then make this application unnecessary. Ms. Goonan replied that she and her staff follow current NCHS standards for out-of-state events like Vital Records do now. Dr. Laflamme asked if this was not just a patch to get through the next two years until the hub is created. Mr. Bolton replied that once we are able to get electronic data from another state we would not be doing the data entry step, as we would no longer be dealing with paper records. He added that other agencies would also be able to access data from other states based on their own access rights.

Ms. Goonan reported that she was going to try and get staff from Operations to assist her team in formulating and executing a plan to assess the traffic starting at the client web browser and going all the way through to the web server, network, database and back again to pinpoint the spots where the bottlenecks are. She felt that there was probably more than one. They are aware of one area where the application tries to push too much data. That is a primary bottleneck, but there could be others and they need to be identified. With the assistance of the Operations staff it should be easier as they know the network, web servers, database and database servers. Her team knows the application and the two groups working as a team should be able to pinpoint the problems.

If she is unable to get support from Operations, Ms. Goonan stated that she was unsure as to how she was going to address the issue. It is her goal to not allow any problems other than production problems to interfere with her staff's current work plan. There are not enough resources to do both projects simultaneously if they do not get help from another group. Mr. Bolton replied that he would be happy to speak to someone and he suggested that Mr. Croteau could also put in a good word to make this collaboration possible. Mr. Croteau agreed. Ms. Gaouette asked if clerks would be able to query whether one of their residents had died out-of-state. They are currently unable to remove anyone from the voter checklist without verification of their death.

Mr. Bolton replied that he was under the impression that the ability Ms. Gaouette referred to had already been automated. For those states that are willing to share their data, Ms. Goonan's team built an application that allows the sharing of that data through Election Net or at least the state automated system. The data is complete through the year 2005. He explained that we need this interface in order to enter the 2006 data. Mr. Wurtz added that the timeliness of New Hampshire receiving out of state events is not good. Until they have some type of electronic way of doing it we are at the mercy of the other states. In some cases we are months or up to a year behind schedule.

Mr. Bolton reported that several months earlier we had received twelve records from Massachusetts for 2004 events. Mr. Wurtz stated that there is no one pushing the states to get the information to us in a timely manner. New Hampshire vital records sends the information out regularly because we are automated, but states that still do everything manually take more time. Mr. Bolton added that even though we are automated we do print the records out and mail them to the states and they then have to manually enter them so everyone is looking at improving this process. He assured members that there is a solution in the works.

Ms. Goonan reported that the third page of her handout was the planned work for the third and fourth quarters of 2007. She pointed out the original list created by the

Approved Minutes

subcommittee on IT needs and priorities. Her team had completed about half the requests made. Several are in process and several have already had analysis done so she can determine a cost estimate. The ones that are open have had no work done on them yet so she could not provide any kind of estimate. She wanted to highlight several of the items on the list. It was her plan that the requirements be collected for the data extracts for Mortware and ObNet during that time period. Not necessarily any code written or deployed, but at least requirements obtained.

It could be a difficult project or something relatively straightforward and simple, but they would not know until they have the requirements. Ms. Goonan planned to set up a requirements meeting that week. So far she had Ms. Augustine, Mr. Pollard, a gentleman from Mortware and Dr. Lauria representing OBNet to contact regarding this issue. The reason they are combining the two groups into one is Ms. Goonan was hoping to come up with a common set of requirements for sharing data so we can optimize our development effort. If the two groups can agree on how they get the data that will cut down on the time and effort required for development. Otherwise, it will be two separate projects, which will require a great deal more effort from Ms. Goonan's staff.

Ms. Goonan reported that she attended the budget subcommittee meeting the day before and she needed to get more detail on the class 10 salaries shared cost column in the budget that went from \$97,000 to \$147,000 and also class 93 that is \$8,500 that may be a duplicate of something else but she was unsure. The recommendation to reduce the number of PCs for developers that we purchase, spread the cost of new servers over the biennium, and to develop a strategic IT plan (which Ms. Goonan greatly emphasized) will help us plan operationally what work will need to be completed and therefore allow for more accurate budgeting. The other two documents she distributed were the October invoice and a summary invoice.

Ms. Goonan told Mr. Gray she hoped to bring this to his attention in particular. The document she distributed had been available online, but they had removed it to modify it. She pointed out that what made this document interesting was that it explained how the costs are shared. They determine the cost by the number of PCs and the number of OIT staff dedicated to a project or agency. VRIFAC's share is 1.15%, and that figure can be carried through the whole report and get a better understanding of how they arrive at the figures they do. She explained that this topic was discussed a great deal at the subcommittee meeting the day before. Everyone wanted to know how and why these costs are allocated. The direct expense portion of the budget is relatively simple. It is for three developers, their PCs, and some training. Ms. Goonan did not believe there was a lot there to think about.

Mr. Gray asked if this invoice was from July to now. Ms. Goonan replied that it was not, for November only. Mr. Gray said his first question was who was making all the job requests for DHHS on the report. Mr. Bolton replied that we are under the DHHS ASD. Ms. Goonan asked Mr. Gray for a specific. Mr. Gray pointed out that the three largest expenditures on page 186 appear to be for DHHS. In fact, all the largest expenditures looked to be for DHHS projects. Ms. Goonan replied that the titles may be misleading and maybe the system should probably be updated. The descriptions have not been updated since Vital Records was moved from DHHS to SOS. The line item Mr. Gray referred to was the cost of our developers for the month of October.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Gray asked if these were supposed to be shared costs. Ms. Goonan replied that the document did not show it that way, but if you see 100% it is a direct cost. Anything you see with less than 100% is a shared cost. In the budget for fiscal year 07, VRIFAC only has staff at 100% direct cost. Very little else is billed directly.

Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Bryer to discuss NHVRINWeb. Mr. Bryer reported that they had received the code from Constella for NHVRINWeb. The documentation they provided will make the build relatively straightforward. Setting up the database will be a little more difficult. The code is already on the web server. They just have to set up the database. That is a shared resource and it is in the queue and they hope to get something resolved within the next week or two. Ms. Goonan added that the plan was that OIT would give an assessment of what they had been given and need the Database Administrator to complete his part of the work. They will then present their findings/recommendations to Mr. Bolton. She stated that what Mr. Bryer meant by deployed was in a test environment.

Ms. Goonan offered that once the assessment is complete they could better tell the committee when NHVRINWeb could actually go into production. During development there was concern about security and other things and they want to make sure that the vendor complied with their requests before going forward. Mr. Bolton added that the committee might remember that the rollout of NHVRIN to the outstanding towns had stopped several months earlier. They were being held up because WildBlue's satellites were at maximum capacity. He announced that new satellites have been launched and are scheduled to go online March 15. After that the remaining eleven towns would be brought online.

5. VRIFAC Budget Update:

Mr. Gray reported that the subcommittee had held two meetings. Committee members included: Mr. Gray; Kathy Seaver, Clerk from Farmington; Carol Johnson, Deputy Clerk Manchester; Kathy Bizarro, NH Hospital Association; Barbara Reed, Local Government Center. For their first meeting they just looked at the budgets/expenditures for the fund from the last three years. The subcommittee came to the conclusion that what they are doing is formulating a multi year plan. Their goal is to come up with a long-term plan that will not totally exhaust the fund. He reminded the committee that there are many needs at play. Maintaining NHVRIN, providing statistics for DHHS, and maintaining the grants program, to name a few. The trouble is, costs continue to rise and the revenue into the fund is relatively static.

The committee had met the day before with Mr. Bolton, Mr. Croteau, and Ms. Goonan from OIT. They had looked over the FY07 OIT budget. Mr. Gray then asked Ms. Goonan to better explain how costs are billed. Ms. Goonan explained that OIT staff support all state agencies and in some cases perform work that benefits everyone. Their costs are allocated out to all those that benefit from them. She then referred to the state positions and PC count she had spoken of earlier as one of the ways they allocate the expenses. Ms. Goonan added that a more understandable example would be that network, database, and server people support the servers we use. Their costs are shared with VRIF because they also support other agencies doing the same thing. We end up sharing the cost of a person with other agencies.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Wurtz asked if the cost of the physical plant incorporated into the shared expense charge as well. Ms. Goonan replied that the rent for the Nash building is a shared cost. It is based on the number of cubicles located in the building and Vital Records has four. Mr. Wurtz wanted to be sure that the VRIFAC portion of the shared costs was not the PC count of the PCs we use for technical support. Ms. Goonan replied that it was not. She then pointed out the rent information was listed on page 188. VRIFAC's share was 4.4%. Mr. Gray replied that his issue with shared costs was that by law the fund was not supposed to be charged those types (rent) of expenses. He was also alarmed by the fact that for the current year the shared costs exceeded the direct costs by over \$100,000.

Mr. Gray explained to committee members that this discussion was just informational. He did not have a solution to the problem. The subcommittee had discussed putting the work out to bid, but no decisions had been made. The next meeting of the subcommittee was scheduled for February 3 and Mr. Croteau would be in attendance. Mr. Gray asked Mr. Scanlan and Mr. Bolton to also attend. He envisioned them discussing revenue and wanted to hear what Mr. Scanlan and Mr. Bolton would like for non-OIT expenditures from the fund for the next year. The subcommittee had also discussed a strategic IT plan.

NHVRIN is nearing the end of its lifecycle and we should probably be planning for NHVRIN2. That is one of the items they discussed at the meeting the day before. Mr. Gray added that Ms. Goonan had suggested it would cost approximately \$2.9 million to develop. Ms. Goonan replied that the estimate had been hypothetical. Without requirements there was no real way to estimate the development cost of a new application. Mr. Gray felt that if we are going to develop a new application we should change the user group mission. Instead of a change NHVRIN group, make it into a wish list group. He suggested that with all future changes to NHVRIN, we ensure that it will be easily incorporated into a future NHVRIN product.

Ms. Goonan replied that she was unsure as to what Mr. Gray meant. He stated that they already are working on projects, but that for future projects we should maybe look at what architecture we want to use for a future NHVRIN and plan for that when making major changes to the current application. Ms. Goonan replied that many of the CRs are to fix NHVRIN, but that there are some requests that fall outside NHVRIN and are more inline with how they envision a future NHVRIN.

Dr. Teschner asked Ms. Goonan how one distinguishes the direct cost versus the shared cost on the invoice. Ms. Goonan replied that this is just one version of the invoice and on this one you could not. She explained that she did not bring all the different versions of the invoice. Mr. Gray then explained to Dr. Teschner using his documentation. Mr. Gray then asked Ms. Goonan if the document she distributed was the complete invoice for November. Ms. Goonan replied that it was. Mr. Gray stated that his problem was that OIT budgeted VRIFAC for \$300,000 in shared costs for FY2007. In looking at the November invoice, Mr. Gray explained that he did not see 1/12th of that amount.

Ms. Goonan replied that he was looking at the invoice for FY07 and the budget information he had looked at was for FY08. Mr. Gray replied that even for FY07 he did not see 1/12th of the shared costs that he saw in the budget line the day before. Ms. Goonan was confused as to what Mr. Gray was referring to. Mr. Gray replied that if you divide \$300,000 by 12 and figure that the monthly number should be somewhere near that number. He did not see that. Dr. Teschner asked what the shared cost of the \$41,000 was versus the direct cost. Ms. Goonan replied that the month they were looking at

Approved Minutes

happened to be a simple month. Both she and Mr. Gray explained to Dr. Teschner that you subtract the \$17,000 from the \$41,000. What resulted was the shared cost and the \$17,000 was the fixed cost.

Dr. Teschner asked where the \$17,000 came from. Ms. Goonan directed his attention to page 186. The \$17,000 was a direct cost and the \$41,000 minus the \$17,000 was a shared cost. Ms. Goonan stated that you could tell by looking at it that the largest share of the expense was salaries and benefits. Mr. Bolton reiterated that this invoice was for a low month. The \$41,000 was running about \$8,000 to \$10,000 lower than usual. He thought the normal amount would be more like \$50,000 per month. Ms. Goonan stated that the biggest change apparent to her was in staffing.

Mr. Gray explained that one of the biggest complaint he has heard since joining the board is in the detail the committee receives on the budget and expenses. He felt this was a great example. Here was a bill for \$41,000 and yet you look at the invoice and he could not tell what they did for us by looking at it. Ms. Hadaway asked if she could mention that on page 188 when it talks about the Nash building there are two separate items. One that shows a summary and then one that just showed rent for the building. Ms. Goonan replied that all the information in greater detail is located on the state intranet and that she was not really qualified to explain OIT billing practices. One of the things she felt that the committee needed to know was what the job numbers mean. She explained that every invoiced item is available to be looked at on the state intranet as well. There was much greater detail available there.

Mr. Croteau explained that when they built this accounting system they did so without input from human resource or administrative using programmers they pulled together to accomplish the task. This committee is not the only customer to complain about the system. OIT is aware that they have to do to make the bills more user-friendly and understandable. They have added staff to that area in the last few months and hope to make improvements to the billing process. He explained that he was aware of the rules regarding OIT charging the fund for rent, etc., but they could not transfer that cost over to the other agencies they do work for as they would not appreciate picking up the bill for another agency. He felt it would be most logical for the SOS, out of some budget, to find a way to cover that portion of the bill. There is no OIT budget to pay for anything and he had no idea where else that money could come from.

Mr. Gray replied that he knew OIT would not be changing its billing model he just felt there were a few things that the committee was looking for and that was an explanation as to why the shared costs were so much higher than the fixed costs. He felt that if a programmer is doing twenty jobs at a specific rate. It might be simpler to put him/her into the fixed costs so we are not paying the shared costs. Mr. Croteau replied that though he understood where Mr. Gray was going. If someone on the shared side is putting in forty hours per week, maybe they should not be on the shared side.

Mr. Gray added that instead of doing the shared costs, and he did not think this would break the rules. He thought they should have a billing rate. John Smith works on Vital Records work and he is billed at \$150. per hour and the cost are then rolled up. That would also allow the committee to decide if the work was a high enough priority to pay to have it done. Mr. Croteau reiterated that he was hearing that if Vital Records consumed a whole position they wanted that person to be billed as a fixed cost rather than the percentage they would be charged for their share of a router. The reason they usually

Approved Minutes

do this in shared expenses is because in most cases because they need backups for vacations, sick time, training, etc. Smaller agencies usually do not consume a whole resource and even if they do, OIT prefers that they have access to two resources 50% of the time so there is a backup. That complicates the model some.

Mr. Gray explained that in future meetings he wanted to discuss who uses our data and if they are contributing anything to the upkeep and maintenance of it. We are distributing data to many different groups, yet right now the only revenue we are bringing in is through the sale of vital records and is there a way where we could get some of our revenue back.

6. Preservation Update:

Dr. Teschner distributed his handouts to the committee. He explained that he hoped to summarize some of the key information contained in the report. The three records preservation workshops had been held the previous week and were very successful. There were 49 attendees at the Concord workshop, 8 in Lancaster, and 18 in Lebanon. Most of the feedback Dr. Teschner had received had been very positive. He had not yet seen the written evaluations at that point. He reported that he was asked by one of the members of the clerk's executive committee if the speaker could come and make a presentation at the clerk's annual conference next fall.

Dr. Teschner then recognized Chris Wittenberg, a Vital Records staff member for assisting him with the registration and logistics for the Concord workshop, which had been a very large group. Ms. Wittenberg did a great job and her help was greatly appreciated by Dr. Teschner. He also thanked Mr. Bolton for making Ms. Wittenberg available to him. There were more workshops scheduled for the following week and Dr. Teschner encouraged committee members to attend.

Dr. Teschner reported that he had received 154 grant requests to that point. He reminded the committee that they had agreed early on that the deadline for the program would be January 15, 2007. He explained that he had told Mr. Gray that we might want to let it go until the end of the workshops because a few of the people showing up did not apply, but after attending the workshop, wanted to. The majority of those attending have already applied, but a few have not. Dr. Teschner proposed that the committee extend the deadline to at least the end of the last workshop. He suggested the committee might want to think of how they plan to handle subsequent requests that arrive after that date.

148 of the 154 requests are for assessments. Dr. Teschner had already assigned 56 of them to the consultants. Forty-three site visits have been completed and he had already received 25 reports from those visits. He stressed that all the clerks realize that there is a backlog and this will probably take until next summer or fall to get everyone worked through the program. Dr. Teschner directed committee members' attention to the detail list that showed each town individually. He reminded the committee that some of the towns are grand fathered, such as Bow. The program has purchased some cabinets for Bow some time ago, but most towns are going through their assessments.

Dr. Teschner referenced his own town of Haverhill. They had an assessment done on November 27 and the report was filed on December 11. The consultant cost was \$1000. The consultant's costs are running between \$1000 and \$2700. After he receives the report Dr. Teschner goes back to the town and verifies their priorities. From the

Approved Minutes

discussions he has already held they have ordered cabinets, a safe, University products, installed wiring and an alarm, asked for estimates from Browns River for microfilming, and are considering buying a microfilm reader. Each town has a plan based on what the report says. He is spending a great deal of time talking with the clerks and dealing with the vendors.

There are five vendors who they are primarily working with. He reported that the process was rather labor intensive. In terms of the money and spending there is definitely a big lag with this program. So far, \$43,000 had been spent on assessments and that was for 25 reports. Dr. Teschner explained that until he has an invoice in hand he does not put the number in this report. The total amount spent so far was \$98,000. There would be no way they would spend the \$1 million by June 30, 2007. He explained that he could probably provide a ballpark estimated based on the way it is progressing, but it will be well under \$1 million. They have budgeted \$10,000 per town and that could eventually mean they would end up spending \$1.3 million. He felt that it would take 18 months to complete this program and to spend all of the money allocated for it. To spend the money and to spend it right takes time.

Dr. Teschner explained to the committee that he had spoken with Ms. Penney the financial manager for the SOS about reflecting the grant program in the budget numbers. Ms. Penney explained to Dr. Teschner that she is restrained by the state accounting system and that there is no way to separate consultants that Dr. Teschner might use from consultants Mr. Bolton might use. Mr. Bolton asked if they could not use job codes to delineate between the two. Dr. Teschner replied that Mr. Bolton might want to have that discussion with Ms. Penney. She had not appeared optimistic about any major changes to the way that the reporting is done. Dr. Teschner explained that even though the grant information cannot be broken out on the SOS budget report he has tried his best to do so with the spreadsheet he provided to members.

Mr. Gray asked if that kind of detail would be possible with the new accounting package being developed. Mr. Croteau replied that he was not sure but certainly hoped so. Mr. Gray asked if it was still on schedule for June or July. Mr. Croteau replied that to the best of his knowledge it was. Dr. Teschner stated that he had spoken with Ms. Penney about that and that she had said they were only going to be doing payroll and other things and that accounting would be the last step, possibly a year or two away. Mr. Croteau replied that he understood that the budget information and payroll were the first step and HR came later, but that he could be mistaken.

Mr. Gray informed Dr. Teschner that his meeting with the budget subcommittee was scheduled for March. He explained that the committee would be interested in Dr. Teschner's take on the future of the program. The \$1 million allocated for the current grant program had been a one-time thing and they would like to hear where he thinks they should go in the future. What kind of dollar figure they should plan for, how they should go forward, what will be the normal grant cycle, and grant writing to raise additional funds. Dr. Teschner replied that the current program funding should carry the program through the next fiscal year. He felt that the question should be, once we have completed all the requests for the program what is next? In his opinion there were a several different directions the program could go. The program and workshops were stimulating interest in records preservation and that was a good thing.

Approved Minutes

Dr. Teschner believed there would be more interest and commitment on the local level. As a committee we might want to decide if we want to go back and do bigger grants. Do we want to build some vaults or do more long-term preservation grants? The reports he has received from the consultants include long-term recommendations as well. There is no reason the committee couldn't go back to these consultant reports in two to three years and survey the towns to see where they are in their efforts and begin another competitive grant program that would build on the progress made in the current program. Another idea might be to encourage the 80 towns that have not expressed interest in the program to do so.

Another avenue the committee might take according to Dr. Teschner would be to expand the program to other municipal records. Vital records are really only 10% of the records that clerks maintain. There is a lot of need for retention of other records. In order to expand in this manner they would need to find additional funding sources. Mr. Gray replied that he wanted this to be a clerk's grant program and he suggested that Dr. Teschner might want to contact Mr. Bergeron in Nashua and Ms. Little in Keene and ask them what they thought clerks would be interested in doing/seeing next. Mr. Gray envisioned the committee beginning to do some capital grants. He suggested that a discussion with them might help Dr. Teschner to plan for the meeting with the budget committee in March.

Mr. Gray asked the committee for a motion to extend the deadline for grant applications to the last workshop date. Ms. Gaouette made the motion and Ms. Hadaway seconded. Mr. Gray suggested that Dr. Teschner mention the change in deadline at the workshops so those in attendance might have the opportunity to apply as it only takes a few minutes to fill out the application. Dr. Teschner felt that he might receive another six to eight applications. The committee voted unanimously to extend the application deadline for the records preservation grant program to the end of the last workshop.

7. Vital Records Move Update:

Mr. Scanlan reported that the building is basically done. They are just waiting for a Certificate of Occupancy. He has been trying to ascertain who the responsible party is so he can try to move it along and everyone keeps on passing the buck. Mr. Scanlan met with the Fire Marshall's office the day before and felt that he had finally gotten to the bottom of where things were. Key players, including the Attorney General's office would be meeting the following day to hopefully resolve the issues that are holding the project up. A major issue is that the fire alarm system still needs to be hooked up and that could take a several weeks to accomplish. He hoped that they would be able to move into the building in two to three weeks. Mr. Gray asked if the next meeting of the VRIFAC would be at the new building. Mr. Scanlan replied that he sure hoped so. He added that we might meet there no matter what. He stated that the SOS is very proud of the new building and advised those committee members that had not seen it yet that they would be really impressed.

Mr. Bolton reported that all the genealogists that volunteer in the Vital Records genealogy vault were back at the office packing up all the records for the move. They are packing them into new boxes, which will then be transferred to the new building and be housed in the new cabinets made by Correctional Industries in the research room. As of that morning they had completed 291 drawers of birth records, completed divorces, and

Approved Minutes

are just beginning marriages. When he left the office to come to the meeting there were five volunteers there rewriting cards to separate records and packing boxes.

Mr. Gray stated that genealogists are passionate about their work. Mr. Bolton agreed. Mr. Scanlan asked if they get recognized for their contribution. Mr. Bolton replied that we needed to think of something to do for them as they were doing a great job. In fact, Mr. John Martin has basically stepped up and is coordinating the efforts of the volunteers. Mr. Gray suggested a brass plate recognizing their effort in moving the records. Mr. Scanlan suggested a commendation from the Governor. Mr. Gray and Mr. Bolton agreed.

8. Other Business:

Mr. Gray stated that he had two quick other business items. He advised Mr. Scanlan that Secretary Gardner needed to appoint a private citizen to the committee and DHHS also needed to appoint a private citizen. They almost did not have a quorum at this meeting and need to get these vacancies filled.

Mr. Bolton made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Gaouette seconded and the meeting adjourned.

Mr. Kruger made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Hall seconded his motion and the committee unanimously agreed to adjourn at 11:53 a.m.