VITAL RECORDS IMPROVEMENT FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To The New Hampshire Department of State

- MINUTES -

Friday
April 8, 2011

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

April 8, 2011

Archives Building 2nd Floor Conference Room 71 South Fruit Street Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS Appointment
Stephen M. Wurtz, Acting State Registrar
Patricia Little, Keene City Clerk, NHC&TC Association Appointment
Brooke Dupee, Data User, DHHS Appointment
Tricia Piecuch, Nashua City Clerk, NHC&TC Association Appointment
Joanne Linxweiler, Auburn Town Clerk, NHC&TC Association Appointment
Theresa Pare-Curtis, OIT CIO Appointment
Debra Clark, Town Clerk, NHC&TC Association Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Medical Examiner Appointment Anna Thomas, Municipal Data User, DHHS Appointment Stephen Norton, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment Robert Carrier, Funeral Director Association Appointment Nelson Allan, Public Member, SOS Appointment Brian Burford, State Archivist

GUESTS:

Vicki Tinsley, DOIT Chris Bentzler, DOIT Bart Bronson, DOIT

1. Meeting Called to Order:

- Ms. Little called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. and asked those in attendance to introduce themselves to the committee's newest member, Brooke Dupee. Mr. Dupee explained that he had worked closely with Vital Records over the years. He had currently been tasked with overseeing the Health Statistics group and with the cooperation of Mr. Wurtz over the last year they had become better versed in the concern of maintaining the confidentiality of vital records.
- Ms. Little explained that Mr. Dupee had another obligation and would be unable to stay for the entire meeting, but wanted to ensure a quorum was reached. Ms. Little and Mr. Wurtz agreed that a quorum could be attained without Mr. Dupee. Ms. Little welcomed Mr. Dupee and advised him that he was welcome to stay for the meeting or he could leave to attend to the other obligation. Mr. Dupee replied that he wanted to stay for at least a half hour.

2. Approval of Minutes:

• Ms. Little asked for motion to accept the December 10, 2010 minutes. Ms. Piecuch stated that she wanted to make a correction to the minutes. On the seventh page under "New Business", 3rd sentence, it should read when the current machines break down instead of when the current "contract" runs out. Ms. Little asked for a motion to accept the minutes with that correction. Ms. Piecuch made the motion and Ms. Linxweiler seconded. The committee then voted unanimously to accept the December 10, 2011 minutes with corrections.

3. Proposed Governor & House Budget Update:

- Mr. Scanlan explained that as most members knew from reading the newspaper, the house had made dramatic cuts to the budget and most every area had been affected including the Department of State. The area they focused on was the Vital Records Improvement fund mostly. The Governor's office had initially requested that the Secretary of State voluntarily return \$500,000 of the fund. The Secretary of State agreed that this was doable if that was the only cut they would be asked to absorb. The current balance of the fund was just above \$3.5 million.
- The House then decided to take an additional \$400,000 in revenue from the fund in each of the next two years. The Secretary of State then had to come up with corresponding cuts to make up the \$400,000. They way they intend to do that is to eliminate any balance left in the grants program, cutting the equipment budget \$100,000 per year, leaving \$20,000. They also cut \$162,000 in expenses earmarked for DOIT costs. Initially the Secretary of State informed the house that they could withstand a \$200,000

- cut but that any more than that and it would really affect the operation of Vital Records. They went ahead with \$400,000 in cuts anyway.
- The Secretary of State plans to meet with the Senate Finance committee in the next two weeks to attempt to get some of the cuts restored so our DOIT positions can be maintained and the ongoing NHVRIN projects not be compromised. He advised that the fund appears to have an annual growth of \$200,000 per year so even if they stick with the \$400,000 cut he felt we could still continue moving forward, but would end up with a zero balance in the fund at the end of the biennium.
- Ms. Little asked for more information about the anticipated discussions with the Senate finance committee. Mr. Scanlan replied that they would explain that a \$400,000 cut would be harmful to the operation of Vital Records and ask for a couple hundred thousand be restored. At minimum we need \$70,000 restored so the positions that we need to move the NHVRIN project forward can be maintained. Ms. Little asked about our relationship with the Senate following the change in leadership. He replied that we have a good relationship and felt that they view us as credible and listen to what we have to say.
- Mr. Scanlan was reasonably confident that if we provide an accurate picture of what is going on they will be responsive. Ms. Piecuch asked why the cuts had to affect positions, why we could not just give them the \$400,000 like we are giving the Governor the \$500,000. He replied that the house told them of the cuts and asked for corresponding cuts in that amount. Ms. Pare-Curtis then explained that DOIT had to also show corresponding reductions in revenue for their budget. The only area they have to cut is personnel and they do not have the authority to spend money that is not budgeted.
- Mr. Scanlan suggested that if revenue comes in stronger than anticipated those funds could be transferred to some of the lines where the cuts took place, like equipment. Ms. Little stated that she would remain confident that the Secretary of State could get some of the funding returned. Mr. Scanlan reported that there was legislation moving through the process that eliminates the additional fee for vital records that went right to the general fund. It is moving through the process at a pretty fast pace so they are anticipating it will pass and the additional \$3 per record would no longer be available to the general fund.
- Ms. Little advised Mr. Scanlan that if the Secretary of State needed any assistance from
 the committee or the City & Town Clerk Association for their discussions with the senate
 finance committee to let them know. Mr. Scanlan replied that he would let them know
 when the meetings were scheduled and they could make themselves available should the
 finance committee have an questions.

4. Fund Income and Expense Report:

 Mr. Cloutier advised that he could report the numbers but could not elaborate on what they represented. He suggested that Mr. Wurtz would be able to provide additional detail.

Personnel \$38,000Current Expenses \$54,000

Mr. Wurtz explained that things such as safety paper (\$17,000) come out of current expenses. Most of the equipment purchases had been printers. Luckily the printers we use are just a little over \$100 apiece. The personnel expenses were for the two data entry personnel and a genealogical clerk. He felt the rest of the numbers were pretty self explanatory. The division was running pretty lean at this point. Mr. Cloutier asked if there were any outstanding invoices from DOIT. Ms. Pare-Curtis replied that there were no past-due invoices. Mr. Scanlan stated that he believed we were paid up through February.

Ms. Little stated that she was surprised to see that revenue was \$200,000 as she was seeing her vital records money shrinking each year. Mr. Scanlan replied that he had been looking at the bottom line. That amount could be due to expenditure control, but over the last few years it has remained pretty steadily around the \$200,000 mark. Mr. Cloutier added that if you look at the revenue line you can see that it is going down.

3. DOIT Update:

- Ms. Pare-Curtis deferred to Mr. Bronson who reported that the RFP had been released February 14, 2011. A vendor conference was held February 25, 2011 at the Brown building, attended by four vendors. There were then several weeks where vendors could submit questions and receive answers. Four addendums to the RFP were released since that time. They included answers to the submitted questions, updates to the RFP, an extension of the schedule for vendors to submit proposals.
- Proposals were due April 4, 2011 and six were submitted. The evaluation team would be meeting following this meeting to discuss the proposals. The scoring team included Mr. Bronson, Mr. Wurtz, Ms. Piecuch, Mr. Cloutier and Dr. Laflamme. To evaluate the proposals they would be pulling in subject matter experts. Mr. Wurtz added that an invitation to attend the vendor presentations would go out to everyone and their input would be accepted prior to the selection of a vendor.
- Mr. Dupee stated that he wanted to acknowledge the fine job being done by Vital Records in the RFP process. They have maintained a very open and professional

- atmosphere throughout. Mr. Scanlan added that he was pleased that they had kept to their aggressive schedule. Mr. Barton reported that the low bid was roughly \$2 million and the high was right around \$4.7 million. Out of a total of 100 points, 25% was allotted for cost, 25% for project management team, overall solution.
- Mr. Wurtz felt it very important that everyone remember that the quoted cost was for a five year maintenance plan. Mr. Barton agreed stating that there was a one year license and maintenance and a five year license and maintenance agreement. Mr. Wurtz could not recollect the exact cost of the project in 2003, but he felt the cost was comparable. He felt that all the vendors did a good job of providing a nice package for the expense. Considering how much we spend now to maintain and enhance NHVRIN this application will be a tremendous savings. Ms. Little agreed and suggested that in the very near future the fund would begin to grow again and the committee would need to determine how best to use the funds and she hears constantly from clerks that they would like to see it used for the cities and towns.
- Mr. Bentzler asked when the vendor maintenance period begins. Mr. Bronson replied that in some of the proposals he had noted that it begins when they begin work. Mr. Wurtz stated that the "go live" dates vary widely. Some are as soon as the first quarter of 2012 and others are July 1, 2013 for completion. There is a lot of information that the selection committee has to consider.

4. Same Gender Marriage Update:

- Ms. Tinsley reported that DOIT staff were just finishing up with the same gender marriage projects. The last piece is changing some labels and the database to have a truly neutral appearance. That will include adding generational identifiers to both, person A and person B fields as well as maiden name fields for both parties. They have been working on the same gender issues for two years now.
- Prompted by a question at the last meeting Ms. Tinsley reported that in total the Business Analyst and programmer put in approximately 1800 hours on this project and that number is probably a little low. That does not count the database and operations personnel time but they do not spend a great deal of time on this type of project. She calculated the cost of the work performed at \$99,700.
- Mr. Scanlan asked Mr. Wurtz how much the fiscal note had been for this project.
 Mr. Wurtz replied that the first estimate had been \$50,000 and the second \$60,000. He complimented the DOIT team for all their work and remarked that the average person did not realize just how much work went into making all the forms and applications gender neutral. These changes also helped eliminate other

older issues. Before these changes a man that elected to take his bride's surname was unable to have that reflected on the marriage record because the application only allowed the bride to make that type of change.

- Mr. Wurtz stated that he was very proud of this accomplishment. The average person would not understand how crucial it was to go through every aspect of the application to ensure that every item changed reacted properly somewhere else in the application. The size of the project is evident in the fact that the legislation went into effect in 2010 and we are just now completing all the changes in April of 2011.
- Ms. Pare-Curtis wanted to acknowledge Ms. Barton, the NHVRIN Business
 Analyst that had remained on the project part-time after retiring to help see it
 through to the end. Members agreed that her knowledge and experience were
 essential to completing this project.

5. Clerk PC Count & Inventory:

- Mr. Mr. Bentzler reported that there were a total of 153 state pcs in use. 92% of those are six years old or older. He explained that although they are still functioning, things like the batteries are starting to go. Until recently Mr. Bentzler had not been aware of the budget issues surrounding equipment purchases.
- Instead of planning to just replace each pc they are now looking at purchasing peripherals such as batteries and hard drives to keep those older machines viable for a little longer. He has 10 pcs on hand right now that we can swap out if need be but they are older like the machines out in the field. He only has one brand new machine.
- Mr. Wurtz added that as clerks return old machines we are not sending them to surplus. Those machines are being updated and used. Mr. Scanlan asked what the usual life cycle of the pc was normally. Mr. Bentzler replied that the plan originally was to replace one-third of the machines every three years. The life cycle is longer than three years but that was the original plan. Ms. Pare-Curtis suggested that Mr. Wurtz and Mr. Bentzler work on using any class 30 money to purchase what they can while they can. Mr. Scanlan felt that would be a prudent move.
- Ms. Piecuch reminded the committee of the discussion at the last meeting regarding the DMV no longer providing pcs to users and the possibility of those clerks coming to the VRIF for a computer. She asked if the committee should plan to grandfather all the existing computers or how they should handle new

requests for hardware. Mr. Wurtz replied that he felt the committee was obligated to maintain the pcs we have. We have not seen any new requests and with the current budget situation he did not see how we could entertain new requests. It was his opinion that we just hunker down for the next two years and work with what we have.

• Ms. Piecuch asked if the committee should entertain a motion that we will support those cities and towns that currently have existing hardware and future requests will be put on hold until such time as the committee has the funding and if a city or town returns their equipment they cannot turn around and request new equipment later. Mr. Wurtz replied that a motion like that would be helpful to vital records as they could then blame the committee. Ms. Piecuch offered that motion with Ms. Linxweiler seconding. Ms. Little called for a vote and the committee voted unanimously in favor.

6. Proposed Legislation:

- Mr. Wurtz reported that there were a few pieces of legislation the committee should discuss. The first deals with the rollback of the fee increase of the previous year. It did not really affect us as the additional \$3 (\$5 for marriage licenses) went directly to the general fund. He did not foresee any expense to us if the legislation is successful. It would just be an administrative table change for us as well as some form changes.
- Mr. Wurtz reported that the three bills to rollback the same gender marriage were found to be inexpedient to legislate this year, but would probably be back next year. The bill sponsored by the division and Secretary of State to bring the marriage statutes into line is on the house side right now.

7. New Business:

 Mr. Wurtz reported that the conversion of civil unions to marriage on January 1, 2011 was carried out by the DOIT staff pretty seamlessly and he wanted to acknowledge their effort. Had it not been so efficient, each of the civil unions would have had to have been keyed by vital records staff and that would have taken quite a bit of time.

8. New Business:

Mr. Wurtz reported that the conversion of civil unions to marriage on January 1,
 2011 was carried out by the DOIT staff pretty seamlessly and he wanted to
 acknowledge their effort. Had it not been so efficient, each of the civil unions

would have had to have been keyed by vital records staff and that would have taken quite a bit of time.

9. Next Meeting:

The next meeting was scheduled for June 17, 2011.

Ms. Little adjourned the meeting at 10:33 a.m.