

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

*To The New Hampshire Department of State*

***-MINUTES-***

***Wednesday  
December 06, 2006***

# Approved Minutes

## **-MINUTES-**

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

December 06, 2006

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

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

Joseph Gray, Rochester City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment  
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar  
Judy Gaouette, Dover City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment  
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment  
Debbie Augustine, NH Hospital Association  
Peter Croteau, OIT, OIT Appointment  
Jill Hadaway, Bow Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment

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

David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS Appointment  
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment  
Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
Bob Lambert, Peterborough Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
Dr. David Laflamme, Maternal & Child Health, DHHS Appointment  
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment

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

Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS  
Jackie Goonan, OIT  
Bill Bryer, OIT  
Chris Bentzler, OIT  
Douglas Teschner, Grant Program Coordinator, SOS

# Approved Minutes

## Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

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

Mr. Gray called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and asked members if there was a motion to accept the minutes from the September 21, 2006 meeting as written. Dr. Mevers replied that there were two items he wanted to point out. On the fifth page of the document the word forecasted should have been forecast to make it grammatically correct. On the fourteenth page there was discussion between Mr. Gray and Ms. Goonan about the OIT budget document Ms. Goonan had distributed.

In the minutes Mr. Gray asked why 1/3 of the amount for the year was being billed in one month and Ms. Goonan replied that it was billed quarterly. Dr. Mevers wanted to ensure that Mr. Gray understood and was satisfied with that response and its characterization in the minutes. Mr. Gray replied that he was. Ms. Orman reminded Dr. Mevers that she is required to put down what is said by members during the meeting, not to interpret. Dr. Mevers wholeheartedly agreed. The committee then voted unanimously to accept the minutes as corrected.

### 2. **Personnel Update:**

Mr. Bolton reported that on March 16, 2006 the committee approved the creation of three data entry positions. In actuality Vital Records went forward with two positions. One of the positions was filled in October and the other is currently listed on the Personnel website. Mr. Bolton was confident that they would be able to begin interviewing potential candidates within the next month. Ms. Hadaway asked if the one position that had been filled was filled internally. Mr. Bolton replied that it had.

Ms. Hadaway stated that this just created another “hole” in the Vital Records office. Mr. Bolton agreed that a current part-time person had accepted the full-time data entry position, so there was now an opening for a part-time counter person. The current employee could not move into the new position until a replacement counter person was found. Fortunately, a replacement has been hired and is scheduled to begin work on December 8, 2006. Ms. Hadaway asked if the committee was going to forget about the third position. Mr. Bolton replied that to the best of his knowledge that was correct. Mr. Gray asked Mr. Bolton to confirm that he was still one full-time person short. Mr. Bolton replied that Mr. Gray was correct, but now that the position was posted he expected to fill it relatively quickly.

### 3. **NHVRIN Update:**

Ms. Goonan distributed a handout to the committee. She explained that the report being distributed showed the metrics for essentially 2006. They started with 126 open change requests, 112 were submitted, 5 were withdrawn, and 93 were completed. That leaves a total of 116 outstanding change requests. They have done six releases in 2006. There are 84 change requests considered open, meaning they have been submitted but there has been no activity on them. Thirteen of them are on hold, meaning they have started them and done some preliminary analysis, but there has been no decision to move forward with

## Approved Minutes

them. There are thirteen in development right now. They call that “construction.” They will be incorporated into the January or March 2007 release.

Ms. Goonan explained that the last release was in October and she provided the committee with a list of changes and enhancements that were included in that release. The work in process was also listed. Ms. Goonan was unsure if committee members were interested in greater detail about these items. She added that most would be included in the March release. These items were not dependent upon a new release and could be released at any time without any impact to users. Mr. Gray asked what was slowing the system down right now. Ms. Goonan replied that it was item three on the list. The short answer was that the root cause was under investigation.

Ms. Goonan explained that OIT had a fix in place that appears to be working and if time allows the committee could discuss how to find out the root cause and a permanent solution. Ms. Goonan introduced Mr. Bryar, Technical Team Lead for the NHVRIN developers. She asked if the committee wanted to take a few moments to discuss the fixes. She pointed out in the hand out some of the quick fixes they had attempted to address the slowdown of the NHVRIN application.

The database servers were initially thought to be at the heart of the problem, but it is now believed that it is something with the application itself. The database servers will be replaced by the end of the first quarter (end of March). They will be twice as fast as the ones we currently use and if there is still a performance issue, it will further prove that it is the application at fault. Mr. Gray asked when those servers were going online. Ms. Goonan replied that the Ops people were telling her the end of the first quarter of 2007.

There was some work that Ms. Goonan wanted to suggest that might help find the resolution and she wanted to explain to the committee how that would fit into the current schedule of work. She wanted the committees input on how they felt she should best use her already limited resources. Ms. Gaouette stated that in Dover they work until 6 p.m. and they have noticed that after 4:00 p.m. the system speed seems to rebound. Before that they are repeatedly kicked out and forced to wait for long periods of time to process records. Ms. Goonan asked if this was everyday or intermittent.

Ms. Gaouette replied that it was every day and had been, since the election. Mr. Gray suggested it had been slowing since the September primary. Mr. Teschner stated that he was unaware of any software or hardware relation to ElectionNet. He asked if it was fair to say that any issues relating to ElectionNet would have had nothing to do with any of the NHVRIN difficulties. Ms. Goonan agreed that he was correct. Mr. Bolton asked Ms. Gaouette if she had spoken to her own network people about the slowdown. Ms. Goonan stated that her staff had heard that although it was not as fast as it had been in the past, it was acceptable. Ms. Gaouette replied that on some days it was extremely slow.

Ms. Goonan asked if it had happened during the past week. Ms. Gaouette said that it had. It was suggested that there could be a network bandwidth issue if things improve when some of the office staff leaves for the day. Ms. Goonan added that they could try just adding a person at a time to see if performance suffers as more users log on to the system. Mr. Bentzler asked if each user had their own computer, password, and login. Mr. Bentzler asked if each user had his/her own PC and login. Ms. Gaouette replied that they do. Mr. Bentzler felt that an experiment like that might help to pinpoint the problem.

## Approved Minutes

Ms. Goonan asked if any other committee members had heard anything about performance issues with NHVRIN.

Mr. Pollard replied that he had spoken with his town clerk that morning and she had said it had seemed slow lately, but he felt it was “acceptable.” Mr. Croteau asked Mr. Bolton if there had been calls into the helpdesk this week about performance. Mr. Bolton replied that he was not aware of any. Mr. Croteau explained that they had put in a temporary fix that Ms. Goonan talked about and they wondered if things had not improved. Mr. Gray stated that it has been going on so long that the clerks are no longer calling to report it.

Mr. Croteau said that they needed to initiate, with Mr. Bolton’s permission, the clerks. OIT was under the impression that the temporary fix had solved the performance issues. He suggested that the clerks be asked to keep track of when and how performance suffers and report that information. Mr. Bolton replied that a notice could be posted on the global page. Mr. Gray asked that some sort of notice also be added that tells the clerk what the normal response time should be. Give the base standard of what the user should expect. He explained that he had seen response time dropping since September.

It has been going on so long that the users don’t know what would constitute normal response. Mr. Croteau asked Ms. Goonan if that was something that they could do. Ms. Goonan replied that they could provide an estimate. She explained that what she had been hearing was that performance was fine first thing in the morning and would degrade throughout the day. Then two weeks ago they applied the temporary fix and were told that there was improvement. It was not fast, but was no longer becoming nearly unuseable by afternoon.

Ms. Goonan asked if that was no longer the case as she had not heard anything more about it and was under the impression the fix they put in place was working. If that is not the case, Ms. Goonan explained, she needs to be made aware of it. Mr. Gray replied that there are certain times throughout the day that everyone expects the net to slow down, like at lunchtime, but it should not happen at 9:00 a.m. or 10:00 a.m. Mr. Bolton asked Ms. Goonan to clarify whether the fix put in two weeks prior was different than the one utilized a month or two earlier. Ms. Goonan replied that the most recent change was the scheduled reboot of the servers each Monday morning following the restart of the database server.

They have found that if they reboot the web servers following the restart, performance stays at an acceptable level. That is why they have automated that process. Mr. Bolton stated that two weeks prior to this meeting the reboot was not done. Ms. Goonan replied that at that time the process was not automated and it was purely human error. She explained that she was very surprised to hear that the system was still slowing down. Ms. Gaouette added that her staff often calls Concord, gets put on hold and no one ever comes back so they just hang up. She explained that it can take up to three quarters of an hour to enter an older marriage that would ordinarily take three minutes to key.

Mr. Croteau suggested to Mr. Bolton that they select five to seven users to call the helpdesk to keep them up to date on performance. Preferably users that are open five days a week, and maintain longer office hours. Mr. Bolton suggested that rather than involving the helpdesk, someone could call specific users periodically to see how the application is running. Mr. Croteau replied that in order for that to work they would need to ensure that clerks were keeping a log of the times that they ran into difficulties. They

## Approved Minutes

would like to know times of day that it acts up. Mr. Bolton stated that he would have Mr. Wurtz get right on that.

Ms. Hadaway stated that in her town she is not constantly in NHVRIN so when they go in it is usually just one person so there is no bandwidth issue. Sometimes it seems slower, but never a crawl and they have not been kicked out to her knowledge. Ms. Gaouette replied that there are often three people at a time in her office using the application. Mr. Bolton stated that it could be local resources rather than the application that is causing the problem.

Mr. Croteau explained that was why the logging of slowdowns by the clerks would be helpful. If other clerks experience a slowdown at the same time then it would indicate something other than local resources. Ms. Goonan reiterated that she had been under the impression that the temporary solution was working. Under the circumstances she explained that the next item she planned to address was more important than ever. She advised committee members to look at the next page (page 3) in her handout as it showed the work in process and the January release.

That page gave an idea as to what they (OIT) were currently focusing their energy on. All the work listed should be complete by late March. Ms. Goonan then directed their attention to page six. That page contained a small list of change requests (CRs) that the IT Needs and Priorities subcommittee had compiled. She explained that those that could be estimated had information in the duration column as to how many working days it would take to complete the request. Ms. Goonan explained that this collection of change requests would be the work covered over the rest of 2007 based on everything else remaining status quo.

The question is, there are three other significant items that need to be looked at and they cannot be added to the list. They would need to replace items already on the list. They are analyzing/fixing the performance issues and re-architecting the applications so it would work better and they could add new features, such as Mortware, ObNet, etc. There is also NHVRINWeb that will need maintenance and enhancements and the ever-growing list of change requests. Ms. Goonan stated that it is important that these items be prioritized because there are not enough resources to do everything.

Mr. Gray asked Ms. Goonan if she felt the subcommittee was working well. He saw a lot of good ideas and wondered if it was turning out to be a positive experience. Ms. Goonan replied that it was a very positive experience as OIT was receiving clear direction as to how and what the committee wanted to see. The fact that the input and feedback comes from users, Ms. Goonan felt that all users were being represented in the subcommittee. She added that they have completed their work for now with the list she presented the committee, so they have no future meetings scheduled.

Mr. Gray asked if they did not still need to prioritize which CRs would be done in and in what order. Ms. Goonan replied that the technical staff would decide which order would be most efficient, but that they were comfortable that they could complete the work in 2007 for everything on the list. Mr. Croteau reiterated that this list would be completed in 2007 comfortably, only if they did not have to devote time to the previously mentioned items, i.e. the fix for the NHVRIN application, etc. Mr. Gray stated that he looked at the list as a list of extras. He added that Mr. Bolton has a list of things he wants to see happen, but the availability and use of NHVRIN is most important.

## Approved Minutes

Mr. Gray felt the committee was nice as users had an opportunity to discuss why some issues were more important than others. He did think the committee needed to get together again to discuss the priorities. Mr. Gray suggested that the NH Funeral Directors and hospital administrators would like to see some movement on their enhancements to NHVRIN as part of the process. Mr. Gray offered that there is always 2008 if all the items are not addressed.

Ms. Hadaway asked if she understood correctly that if OIT takes the time to do the fix on NHVRIN to speed it up consistently then they would not have the time to do the items listed on the handout. Ms. Goonan replied that the answer to that is unknown. Once Mr. Bryer had taken the time to analyze the problem and they had established what tools it would be required to do the job. Only after that had all been determined would they know the scope of the job and how much of the resources would need to be expended on it. Based on what they currently know about the application they believe it is big, bad and ugly. What they do not know is where to go first. What will have the biggest impact if they change it?

Mr. Croteau added that they believe it is linked to the initial architecture of the system, which is one of the problems. They recently updated the database and sometimes when you upgrade one piece of software that either OIT or a vendor had made and it works faster, it will often highlight weaknesses in other applications. They believe that is where the problem lies and that is why they feel it will be a large task. Ms. Hadaway asked if there was any consideration to redoing NHVRIN. Would that be cheaper in the long run? Mr. Bolton suggested that we needed to see what Mr. Bryer finds when he analyzes the system.

Ms. Hadaway stated that she was aware that this product had been developed with an easy transition for clerks in mind. In the process of that maybe it is not the best system. Mr. Bolton replied that the current system does satisfy a lot of old issues and that is why it is still being deployed around the state. He admitted that it was now three years old and maybe it is time to rethink it. Ms. Hadaway suggested it would be really difficult to prioritize the change requests until they have a better idea of what really is wrong with the system.

Mr. Gray agreed that operation should be a priority and if we only get to one or two other things on the list, at least there will be priorities for the following year. He added that if we have to "re-draw" NHVRIN to follow federal guidelines we could end up with only eighty users rather than the current number. That would also allow really intensive training instead of scattering training out to meet the needs of over two hundred users. Ms. Goonan agreed that the analysis needed to be done and that after it is completed, the easiest route may be to redo the software.

Mr. Bryer stated that VRV2000 was an application that was originally deployed on a desktop. It was then manipulated to work on the web and that is not an easy task. Heavy downloads and browsers pushing a lot of data to and from the server are a couple of the issues that were created. The bandwidth issue, which is suspected to be part of the problem, is not one that can be easily remedied. Mr. Gray asked for a vote as to whether committee members supported OIT focusing mainly on the NHVRIN performance issues. The committee members voted unanimously to support that effort.

## Approved Minutes

Ms. Goonan reported to the committee that she, Mr. Bolton and Mr. Bryer would be meeting the following day to discuss the issue. They are currently working on two releases and she felt they could begin the analysis work in late February or early March. She offered that if they wanted to suspend the other work and begin the analysis right away, they could discuss that as well.

Ms. Goonan reported that the last section of her handout focused on the financial aspect of OIT. She asked Mr. Gray to let her know if this information better satisfied his desire for additional information. Ms. Goonan pointed out that one of the things he had requested was a cost estimate, so she wanted to put that number out there. Mr. Gray responded that this was great and was what he had been looking for. This shows the actual cost to change something. Ms. Goonan asked if there were any questions and hearing none she ended her presentation.

Mr. Bolton stated that there were a couple more things he wanted to address. He reported to the committee that he had spoken with WildBlue that morning. They had previously been given the go ahead to bring on the outstanding towns with a satellite solution. The New Hampshire Electric Cooperative has brought on fourteen towns. There were two towns (Dummer & Orford) that actually got caught in the satellite max capacity thing and are still waiting their turn. There are still eight sites waiting. Mr. Bentzler explained that what had happened was the satellite that provides high speed internet for the region reached a 90% capacity.

When a satellite reaches that capacity they stop bringing on new users until they can send a new satellite up into orbit. That is not scheduled to happen until sometime in the spring. There are five towns that were ready to go forward, but are now on hold. In the meantime there are some other towns that are capable, but because of training that they had to do for the DMV and ElectionNet they did not have time for NHVRIN. Within a few months there should be a couple more towns ready to go online if we provide the training. They have the capability of getting NHVRIN and just need training. There are currently 222 towns on NHVRIN right now. That leaves just twelve more towns without. Mr. Bentzler felt that there were a couple of towns we would really need to push the issue with.

#### **4. Budget Presentation:**

Mr. Bolton distributed a handout with budget detail to the committee members. He explained that it more graphically describes what we are paying out and have paid out in the last twelve months. Mr. Gray reminded the committee that they have been seeking better budget information for some time. He stated that it is bad government to just spend money out of the fund whenever you need it. There needs to be some kind of annual budget you can operate from. Mr. Gray had asked Mr. Bolton to put together a document that would show greater detail. He also wanted a budget created for the fund that planned for all the different expenses to the fund for the year and planned to form a subcommittee to work on that budget.

The subcommittee will look at how we operated in the past and how we want to operate in the future. Hopefully, the SOS will sign off on the budget we pass because we are the ones that generate funds for it. He explained that he would like to have this process complete in about five months. The people he would like to be on the subcommittee are: Mr. Hall, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Gray and one other clerk. When the committee first meets

## Approved Minutes

Mr. Gray will explain how he wants the subcommittee to work. They will request expenditures for the last five to six years. After that they will hold four additional meetings. One of the meetings will be with OIT to map out what they think they will need for one or more years, because some of the items will be capital items. He suggested that Ms. Goonan meet with Mr. Bolton before this meeting so he can support OIT planned activities. The second meeting will be with Mr. Teschner and he can come before the committee and they can map out how they want the grant program to go during the next year and how to maintain and sustain that program.

Mr. Bolton will also go before the committee to discuss items/positions that are funded through the VRIF. OIT will be brought back in the end for a final discussion. If redoing the system is the way to go, they can discuss it at the fourth and final meeting. Hopefully the budget can be complete by April or May 2007. Mr. Gray stated that if the subcommittee has to meet twice a month to accomplish the task, then that is what they will do.

Mr. Bolton reported to the committee that the last time the budget document he had presented had been updated was sometime in 1999 and there were several clerks involved in that committee. It describes what allowable expenditures would be and has been kind of used as a blueprint ever since. He then handed out a sample budget that had been put together several years prior by another subcommittee of the VRIF. It included Ms. Little, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Bergeron, Dr. Mevers, and Mr. Bolton. They crafted a budget with some big-ticket items. Some of the budgeted items were never purchased, but places were held for those future purchases. There were places for equipment upgrades, training, contract expenditures, records preservation, and things like a Sequel conversion that was never done. Members looked through the document and Mr. Gray asked if anyone from the funeral directors or hospitals would like to participate in the budget process. He explained that he was omitting OIT because he wants the budget created independently. Both Mr. Pollard and Ms. Augustine declined Mr. Gray's offer. Mr. Bolton suggested a placeholder for the New Hampshire Hospital Association in the budget. He reminded the committee that they had approved replacing old equipment in the hospitals. Mr. Gray added that it did not have to be Ms. Augustine, but possibly someone else from the association with a strong financial background.

### **5. Grant Program:**

Mr. Teschner distributed handouts to the committee. He expressed that it was exciting that only four short months earlier they had approved this program. In the initial phase of the program the majority of the effort went into the marketing of it. At the time people told him that he might only get fifty clerks to participate, but he ended up getting 135 clerks to apply for grants. Of the 135 applicants 125 asked for assessments. Ten towns including Bow were grandfathered because of prior assessments.

Bow had an assessment done in 1996, so when Ms. Hadaway submitted an application it was quickly approved. Mr. Teschner explained that they had also gone through a vendor process where they vetted potential vendors. A fireproof safe was ordered and was on its way to Bow. The more typical situation is the towns having assessments. There are four vendor consultant teams and they have been assigned fifty-four towns so far. There had been nineteen site visits completed and eleven reports filed by the consultants.

## Approved Minutes

Mr. Teschner pointed out that he included a sample of one of the reports in the handout so committee members could see the layout of the report. He explained that he had spent a lot of time designing the reports so they would be easy to read. On the first page there is an executive summary, no/low cost recommendations, long-term recommendations, and then what are some of the things that could be funded by the grant program. Further in the report there is a great deal more detail and photographs of the site to back up some of the points in the report.

At the end of the report is the appendix and this is something Mr. Teschner reported he worked with the clerks on to come back with precise recommendations for the kinds of things the city/town needs. He also included an email he received from a clerk and pointed out how excited the clerk was about their participation in the grant program. Mr. Teschner reported that he asked the clerk, now that they had this report what did they want to do. He directed the members to look at Chichester on the chart, explaining that he had given more detail on the report for members. The first step for a town is to have the assessment completed.

The clerk and Mr. Teschner then study the report from the consultant and discuss it with Mr. Teschner. He stressed that he prefers to give the clerks some flexibility and they seem to like that. They are happy that it has not been an overly bureaucratic process. The feedback has all been very positive. In Chichester, they ordered a Fireking fireproof cabinet, have arranged to have some microfilming done, purchased some archival supplies, and the clerk is looking into a Hepa vacuum cleaner.

There have been two meetings with the consultants and one of the things they have recommended based on their initial experiences was that we go forward with the preservation workshops. They felt this would strengthen the assessment process and was part of the original business plan developed by InLook. After an October 24, 2006 meeting with consultants Mr. Teschner circulated information about training recommendations to some members of the committee and there was a great deal of enthusiasm for it. He explained that he had discussed the training with the consultants and had negotiated a good price for the training with one of them. He sent out an announcement and registration information to the clerks. In the first twenty-four hours he received forty-seven registrations back. Clearly, this signaled a great deal of interest in the training. In one day enough registrations were received to fill the site they had procured for the training.

Mr. Teschner reported they would have to schedule another training session or find a larger site if the demand remained this strong. There was obviously a great deal of interest among the clerks and he thought that was very exciting. There was one issue that he wanted to discuss with the committee and that was capacity options. When we hired the consultants to do the assessments we did not guarantee them any amount of work because we were not sure how much work there would be. Nor did we require them to do a minimal amount of work. We came up with flexible contracts and are now in a situation where we have a lot of requests for assessments. He stated that he did not want to say the consultants were overwhelmed, but there were 125 assessments to be done.

After doing some analysis, Mr. Teschner estimated that the consultants could probably complete 10-16 assessments per month. That would mean it would be August or September before all the assessments would be complete. There had been some

## Approved Minutes

internal discussion as to whether or not they should add more consultants or not. Mr. Teschner felt that in order to maintain the quality, they should not. He explained that he had advised the clerks when they signed up that he would be back in touch in months rather than weeks. Mr. Gray stated that the committee had put aside \$1 Million for the program. He asked Mr. Teschner how much he anticipated the fund spending on the grants. Mr. Teschner replied that there was a little financial information on the chart he had distributed, but it was very limited. He explained that he was only adding the information as the invoices came in. He advised that the assessment costs are running around \$1500-\$2000 each and he told the clerks that we would spend about \$7000 on them after the assessment.

When the committee approved the \$1 million for the program it was thinking in terms of the program being more spread out. Even though it looks like we are spending more with 135 requests (\$1.3 million), but he felt the reality was that because it is spreading out, it would probably not go over \$1 million in a year. Mr. Teschner stated that this does raise questions for the future of the program. Mr. Gray agreed and explained that Mr. Teschner would have to come to the committee with recommendations about future budgeting for the program.

Mr. Teschner stated that financially there was not a lot of new information. A lot of the costs associated with the program were not tracking into the report yet. When you get to the expense section of the report there is no line for the grant program. He spoke with Ms. Penney at the SOS and she explained that there is no place for it. The state system is very limited. Mr. Teschner explained that he is creating his spreadsheet the way he (and probably the committee) wants to see the information. Where he assigns the numbers to each town as it happens. On the state system it only shows equipment purchased on one line. That could possibly change in the next fiscal year. He had always found the state system cumbersome and unsatisfactory, but he was sure there was a way that they could redo the budget to be more user friendly.

Mr. Gray replied that the governor had come out and said that this accounting system is not working. He wanted to know what is being done. Mr. Bolton replied that they were working on a new one. Mr. Teschner replied that process would be a long one. Mr. Croteau replied that it was a three-phase project and the first phase would be going in July 1, 2007 and he thought that was the financial portion of it, not the human resources portion. Mr. Gray asked if we would be able to use that portion when it is rolled out. Mr. Croteau replied that it was his understanding that we would. Mr. Gray stated that he felt that the fund deserved its own account detail. The current information is hard to read and there is little detail.

Mr. Teschner replied that the entire system was very poor and had been in place for a long time. He was happy to hear that they are replacing it. Hopefully it will be something the average person can pick up and read, which has never been the case with the state budgeting system. Mr. Croteau stated that he did not think it went down to the line item detail. He was under the impression that it was up to the agency to do that. Mr. Bolton added that you can request actual detail and that will get you to classes and subclasses but then you have to track what that \$150 for books was. The individual agency would keep track of the actual vendor, but there will be a lot more detail available. Ms. Hadaway asked as it relates to the fund, who keeps track of the detail. Mr. Bolton replied that we used to do that in Vital Records. Ms. Gaouette asked if they

## Approved Minutes

would continue to. Mr. Bolton replied that he did not know. They would have to discuss it with Ms. Penney.

Ms. Hadaway stated that it would be nice if they could have that under Vital Records. Mr. Gray asked Mr. Teschner what the cost of the preservation training classes were. Mr. Teschner asked if he meant cost to the user or cost to the fund. Mr. Gray replied fund. Mr. Teschner reported that the cost of the class to the fund is \$1000, there is some travel expenses for the instructor and lunch for the attendees that the fund is also picking up. He had not specifically budgeted for the luncheon, but he estimated about \$7000. It would another \$1000 per class if they add more to the schedule. We are paying them \$760 a day for assessing and that is what he proposed to them. They countered that they have prep work for the training and they have to produce materials, so he agreed to \$1000.

Mr. Gray asked that Mr. Teschner not schedule any additional classes without first coming to the committee. He then asked members for a motion to approve the \$7000 for the classes. Dr. Mevers offered the motion and Ms. Hadaway seconded. The committee voted unanimously to approve the expenditure for the preservation training classes. Mr. Teschner stated that he would keep the committee informed and extended an invitation for any member that wished to attend the training. Mr. Gray asked members if they would be opposed to meeting monthly rather than bi-monthly because they are currently dealing with a lot of change.

Members were not interested in meeting more frequently. Mr. Gray stated that he understood, but felt he should offer as the committee is now talking about millions of dollars and overhauling things. Mr. Pollard replied that he did not think the committee was holding anything up by meeting bi-monthly. He stated that if he felt that the committee could not make decisions fast enough he would go along with the monthly idea. He added that Mr. Gray or Mr. Bolton could always call if there is an important issue.

### **6. Hub Discussion:**

Mr. Bolton reminded the committee that it had funded his trip to Oregon to work on requirements and to look at how states are going to share data with other jurisdictions. At the meeting they thrashed out some requirements of the hub that will take state data and parse it out to whoever needs it. The gist of it is the state will be spinning a database of vital record data and based on the rules we assign it, would provide the information to the state that is eligible to receive it. Mr. Bolton felt that this would put an end to the wholesale giving out the database so that you can bump up whatever data you need to our dataset. It will just provide a nationwide rules based data access hub for any program, agency, or individual.

They are targeting late summer or early fall to have a prototype ready. Then based on federal funds, they will roll it out to the entire nation. They are using bird flu money to build the prototype. Ultimately there will probably be Homeland Security and Intelligence Reform funds in the mix. New Hampshire is kind of on the cutting edge in this as we will be providing through the data web query system, a data set that matches the data requirements for this hub. They will require that all states field an

## Approved Minutes

Interjurisdictional Exchange (IJE) data set . Mr. Bolton added that he would be attending a Use Case development meeting in February that is being paid for by another source.

### **7. Electronic Subcommittee:**

Mr. Bolton reported this was something that he tried to get going on at the last meeting. We have essentially a paperless product. We are keeping records of birth and death in an electronic manner that is essentially an Oracle database. We rely on OIT to maintain it. They make sure the database is backed up and the data set is kept off site for data recovery. They have not gone through requirements documentation or at least to describe how we should do this to ensure we have instant recovery or that we never lose records. Mr. Bolton suggested that a subcommittee be formed to look at how we are going to maintain our electronic data sets.

Mr. Gray asked if anyone was being sent to the conference in Arizona this month. He did not recall the name of the organization, but the conference was on electronic storage. There is also a company in Massachusetts, Northeast Document that holds a digital seminar every May. Mr. Gray felt that everyone needed to be a little more educated on that. Mr. Bolton replied that a lot of people are more interested in getting a digital image of the document. Bringing that forward and making sure it never loses the ability to bring it forward.

Mr. Teschner replied that Mr. Burford from Records and Archives attended a major conference on this issue several months earlier. The whole electronic imaging and preservation of data is the hottest topic in the archives field. He stated that although he did not attend, it seemed that one out of three seminars at the national conference was on electronic data preservation. The consultants are very concerned about not having some type of paper backups even if it is at the archives. If nothing else, print out the database every couple of months just so it would be available in case of a disaster. Mr. Teschner stated that he thought Mr. Bolton's suggestion was a good one.

Mr. Gray replied that even though Mr. Bolton was concerned about data, he thought maybe we should be concerned that there is no capture of the image whether microfilm or not. He then asked for volunteers for the subcommittee. Mr. Bolton suggested himself, Dr. Mevers, and Mr. Burford. Mr. Gray asked if someone from OIT would be interested in being a member. Mr. Croteau replied that they would provide a representative, but asked if it had to be one of the three in attendance at this meeting. Mr. Gray did not think so. Mr. Gray suggested a clerk also be involved. Because he had been handing out subcommittee assignments he offered to join this committee himself.

### **8. NHVRIN Support Discussion:**

Mr. Bolton reported that this agenda item was another one that was brought forward from the last meeting. He reported that he was about at the point of releasing an RFP to have someone evaluate the support model that we have with OIT. An evaluation to see if we are currently getting the best bang for our buck. See if there might be a more efficient way to maintain our system or if we can chunk out pieces of it to a consultant. There are companies out there that evaluate IT provisioning and system wide reviews. Mr. Gray replied that he was concerned with OIT billing. He added that because of statute they are not supposed to be charging the fund for rent and telephone and he understood that those are rolled up in the rate we are being charged. That was a concern to him and he agreed

## Approved Minutes

that we need to look around to see if there are other cost effective alternatives. At the same time he explained that is why he asked Ms. Goonan to start putting a price tag on the change requests because that way we can know the cost before approving work. He added that this can be discussed further at the subcommittee meeting in January.

Mr. Teschner asked if Mr. Bolton was thinking of the RFP for the total package or for segments. Mr. Bolton replied the total package for review. Ms. Hadaway asked what the cost would be for this. Mr. Bolton replied that they had received a quote from First Data of about \$80,000. Ms. Gaouette asked if it would be put out to bid. Mr. Bolton replied that he would, so he thought it would end up being lower.

Mr. Gray suggested that this be discussed further in the budget committee meeting in January. He suggested that Mr. Bolton go ahead and circulate the RFP and get some quotes. The committee can then decide if that is a path they want to go down at the next meeting. Mr. Teschner said that designing the RFP would take time. Mr. Bolton replied that he had a statement of work from the First Data company and that would help a lot.

### **9. Additional Business:**

Ms. Gaouette asked if the data web tool was up and running. Mr. Bolton replied that it was running in a test environment. The one developer that was assigned to the project was recovering from surgery so progress has slowed considerably. He felt we should be getting the software shortly. We would host it, load data, and test it.

Mr. Bolton made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Pollard seconded.

Meeting adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 11:36 a.m.