VITAL RECORDS IMPROVEMENT FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

Thursday
May 17, 2007

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

**Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee
Meeting**

May 17, 2007

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
Nelson Allan, Public Member Appointment
Jill Hadaway, Bow Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Dr. David Laflamme, DHHS Appointment
Carol Johnson, Manchester Deputy Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Peter Croteau, OIT, OIT Appointment
Judy Gaouette, Dover City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment
Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS Appointment
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment
Debbie Augustine, NH Hospital Association

GUESTS:

Rick Bailey, OIT
Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS
Jackie Goonan, OIT
Bill Bryer, OIT
Steve Wurtz, Vital Records, SOS
Kathy Bizarro, Budget Subcommittee
Chris Bentzler, OIT
Kathy Seaver, Budget Subcommittee
Thomas Towle, Municipal Resources, Inc.
Anthony Stevens, SOS
Dr. Douglas Teschner, SOS

Approved Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1.   **Meeting Called to Order:**

Mr. Bolton called the meeting to order. He explained that there were several items he wished to attend to before beginning the planned agenda. He reported to the committee that Mr. Gray had been deployed to Iraq and Ms. Carol Johnson, Deputy City Clerk of Manchester had agreed to temporarily join the committee in his place. He welcomed Ms. C. Johnson of behalf of the committee and thanked her for taking on the commitment. The second item that Mr. Bolton wanted to address was Ms. Gaouette's leaving the committee. He presented her with a gift of appreciation from the committee for all the time and effort she had put into the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee and to the division.

Mr. Bolton added that Ms. Gaouette was also retiring as City Clerk of Dover and wished her a great retirement. Members joked that the gift bag contained an older version of vital records software. Ms. Gaouette thanked the committee for the gift and said that it had been a pleasure serving.

2.   **Election of Chair:**

Mr. Bolton advised the committee that when Mr. Gray left he was the Chairperson and that they needed to elect a member to take his place. He asked the committee for nominations. Ms. Gaouette nominated Ms. Hadaway for chair. Her nomination was seconded and Mr. Bolton asked for any additional nominations. There were no other nominations and the committee voted unanimously in favor of Ms. Hadaway becoming the new Chairperson of the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee.

Mr. Bolton presented Ms. Hadaway the gavel and she called the meeting to order.

3.   **Approval of Minutes:**

Ms. Hadaway noted that the first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes for the March 15, 2007 meeting. She asked for a motion to accept the minutes as written. Ms. Gaouette made that motion and Mr. Allan seconded. Ms. Hadaway called for a vote and the committee voted to accept the minutes as written with Ms. C. Johnson abstaining as she had not attended that meeting.

Ms. Hadaway explained that there were a lot of guests in attendance at the meeting. The committee had requested that representatives of OIT attend the meeting to answer some questions they had. Because Mr. Bailey had not yet arrived, Ms. Hadaway asked Ms. C. Johnson to report to the committee on the budget subcommittee findings. Before taking

over on the full committee for Mr. Gray she had also been asked to participate on that subcommittee.

Ms. Hadaway explained that other members of that subcommittee were Ms. Bizarro of the New Hampshire Hospital Association, Ms. Reed from the Local Government Center, and Ms. Seaver, Town Clerk/Tax Collector for the Town of Farmington. Ms. Hadaway reminded the committee that Mr. Gray had been the only committee member on the subcommittee and she asked them to remember that, as the subcommittee had worked really hard and put together an evaluation for the committee. They were initially charged with reviewing the expenditures, determine goals and possible changes, and to recommend a budget. Ms. Hadaway added that she had asked Ms. C. Johnson to give the committee a quick overview of the subcommittee's findings and recommendations.

4.   **Budget Subcommittee:**

Ms. C. Johnson distributed a handout to committee members and thanked Ms. Hadaway. She reported that Mr. Gray initiated the subcommittee because he had concerns with budgeting and approached her and several others to sit on this subcommittee with him. The budget subcommittee had met several times and Ms. C. Johnson explained that there was a description of their evaluation process in the handout. During the evaluation the subcommittee had met with vital records staff and OIT representatives. They made phone calls and went through the numbers and remained in contact with each other throughout the process by email.

In the midst of this process Mr. Gray was deployed and he called Ms. C. Johnson and asked her to finish up the work on the subcommittee for him and also take his place on the VRIFAC. Because of that the subcommittee had asked her to represent them at this meeting. Ms. C. Johnson stated that there were several concerns that came out of their subcommittee.

Those concerns were listed in no particular order as findings and there were also recommendations to go with those findings. The subcommittee did not feel it would be fair to submit findings to the committee without offering some sort of solution to them. Ms. C. Johnson began her presentation on the financial report. This was because that financial report was really kind of what drove a lot of what the findings represent. The first page showed that they divided the cost of the fund itself into three separate categories based on how the fund was initially established.

The focus of the fund has really been on automation and preservation issues. The budget is really automation support, which was staff, equipment and supplies. Secondly, it's a system support, which OIT was currently providing. Thirdly, was preservation. Trying to work through the records in all the various towns had become Dr. Teschner's project. She directed the committee's attention to the first page of the handout where those three areas were broken out.

The document then discussed the fund balance projections. Ms. C. Johnson pointed out that in the last column it showed that in two years the fund will have been depleted and by the third year it would be defunct. Ms. C. Johnson stated that was not a good thing to be looking at going forward and it was based on very real projections that subcommittee did. They went through the budget item by item, including going through it with OIT.

The subcommittee had concluded that with the current rate of spending, even with some curtailments the fund is going to be depleted within three fiscal cycles.

The subcommittee felt that if something did not change somewhere along the line that outcome would become reality. Another issue was user groups. The subcommittee tried to look at user groups and there were no user groups out there to tell them if they are getting what they want. Ms. C. Johnson reported that the perception is that the system isn't doing what anybody wanted and DHHS and the clerks and everyone seemed to have issues with the current system.

There was no user group that was readily identified to deal with the perceptions whether they were real or not. Ms. C. Johnson stated that she knew that some of it was reality, but did not know how much. She continued that there was a perception from everybody that no one was getting completely what they needed from the system as it exists today. That is not to say it isn't an improvement over what was there before, it is just a general comment.

Ms. C. Johnson explained that the financials on the second page start talking about the automation support. The budget is utilized by the Vital Records staff in day-to-day operation strictly for automation support. She explained that if you look across the columns it says that the amount requested for Fiscal Year 08 is funding that was requested by Vital Records. She explained that there was a definite difference between the amount requested and what the subcommittee recommended.

The subcommittee had removed the funding for the equipment replacement for forty printers and twenty-five PCs and monitors. Ms. C. Johnson reported that the reason she was pointing that out was because there had been no real replacement or capital plan for replacements. When a clerk needs something they just call up and say, "my computer broke" and the next day a new computer is issued to them. She felt there had been some attempt at a replacement schedule but no real visible replacement schedule was in place.

Ms. C. Johnson added that everyone was aware that the computers were being utilized for things other than vital records. They are being used for motor vehicle records, email, and general office things. In the larger hospital communities they are not even using state computers. It is the towns that are primarily using them and Ms. C. Johnson stated that the subcommittee was aware that they needed them. The equipment that would need to be replaced more frequently was the printers so they had limited the budget for computer replacement.

The budget subcommittee also considered changes or replacement of the NHVRIN application and how that might affect equipment needs. In the end they felt that it should be expected that more printers would need to be replaced because they are not designed for the abuse they undergo on a regular basis. She felt that the printers that were now being used seemed to be better than the ones they had originally issued to cities and towns.

Ms. C. Johnson reported that the subcommittee had eliminated the out-of-state travel budgeted because they felt that was more of an operational expense. They had also eliminated the $50,000 computer based training module that had been requested. The subcommittee did not see the need for automated training at this time, especially if there was talk of changing or replacing the application. They felt that there was a solid base of

knowledge between funeral directors, hospital users, and city and town clerk users to make that expenditure unnecessary.

Many hospitals are doing their own internal training when they hire new staff and the number of new users is small enough to handle without the big expense of an automated training module. The subcommittee was not aware of a great need for this expense from a fund that was going defunct. Ms. Hadaway explained to Ms. C. Johnson that at the last meeting of the committee the training module had been discussed and especially with physician certification of death coming, it was decided that this was indeed a necessary expenditure.

There had been a great deal of discussion about how to train this large new pool of users. She felt that the subcommittee had not been aware of this when they were evaluating the budget. Ms. C. Johnson directed committee members to the next two pages of the handout that related to costs as they relate to the system and OIT. Ms. Bizarro said that she wanted to make a point before Ms. C. Johnson continued. One of the things they had deliberated quite a bit was the difference between operational expenses and vital records approved expenses and they really tried to take a hard line as to what should be a vital records/Secretary of State expense versus a VRIF expense.

Ms. Bizarro felt that committee would see this woven throughout the report. Ms. C. Johnson reported that the amounts the subcommittee removed were amounts that appeared to be duplicate costs, particularly in the equipment, new, replacement (line item 30). That is why the reduction went from $89,000 to $29,000. They saw the equipment replacement there when they looked at what OIT stated they needed for funding and there was no justification for those amounts so their assumption at the time was that they were tying in the replacement costs that Vital Records had also requested because the numbers were very close.

The only thing substantiated by OIT at the time was the $29,000. The four web servers at $5,000 each for FY08, there was some talk in OIT about what was really needed, what was not needed, what could be put off, and what could not. The ultimate consideration of the subcommittee was that they would replace four of the web servers in FY08 and two in FY09. Line item 30 also included the OIT shared costs of $9,234 that are assigned to the VRIF. There are some shared costs and direct costs assigned to the fund.

The subcommittee went through how OIT determined the formulas for that and she presumed that they were going to discuss that with the committee at this meeting. The $9,234 was for equipment replacement that they had put in the budget request. There was a $5,000 cost for network hardware (router switch). They moved it to a projection for FY09 because OIT told them that would be a reasonable move. They moved the three developer PCs ($1,100) to FY09 only. Ms. C. Johnson stated that it was her understanding that the others requested had just been purchased and she presumed that they had been billed to the fund. She was not aware if they had shown up as a cost yet.

Lastly was the preservation. The subcommittee's understanding of the preservation portion was that the committee had already voted on and committed certain funding to the communities for assessments and preservation efforts, so they did not change much of anything with regards to anything they felt was already required based on actions of the committee. They had met with Dr. Teschner and he had supplied them with some

numbers relating to that. It showed a request of $720, 400 and it showed that the recommended is $701,000.

Ms. C. Johnson pointed out that the subcommittee had tried to break it down into categories for the committee as well. The categories were grants, subsidies and workshops. It was felt by the subcommittee after they spoke with Dr. Teschner that if the clerk's association was requested, that perhaps the workshops could be tied in with the clerk's conventions and that would be a substantial savings to the fund. It might also reach more clerks. Ms. C. Johnson reported that she felt there was some controversy with that number, but it was something that they were recommending. The committee could discuss that further at a later date.

It was the subcommittee's feeling that between the clerk's association, the municipal association and other resources, they might be able to cut down on some of the costs. She explained that built into all of FY09 was a 3% increase to allow for cost of living increases. Ms. C. Johnson directed the committee's attention to the findings. She explained that they had already talked about item 1. Item 2 was the user groups she had also mentioned earlier.

The change in the budget process for OIT created billing items that are not allowed under statute. Those items (rent, electricity) are being billed to the fund and are part of the shared costs discussed earlier. They are showing up as a direct amount against the fund and it is nothing that OIT is necessarily doing wrong because that is the way the state system set them up to be, but they are contrary to law. The subcommittee does consider them to be inappropriate charges for that reason. She stated that as Ms. Bizarro mentioned previously, the committee really needs to separate out what is operational and what is part of the automation, which is the basis for the fund and that goes back to the initial legislation and the change of the legislation several years earlier.

Item 5 was probably the longest discussion the committee members would see and it showed there were items being charged to the fund that are not consistent with the purpose of the fund. She stated that it comes down to the coding and coding is a big item. The subcommittee agreed as a group that the coding is essential and that the Vital Records committee needs to support the Secretary of State and DHHS in that endeavor.

There was a lot of back and forth in the subcommittee about this because about five years ago coding was contained in the DHHS budget and it is something that needs to be done. Ms. C. Johnson stated that if there was no automated system the deaths would still need to be coded and Vital Records would still need to put those statistics together. The bottom line was that there was a cost there to try and get the Vital Records staff trained to take over that function. It appears that when Vital Records was taken over by the Secretary of State there was no funding mechanism brought forward because DHHS was using the national as she understood it.

For both SOS and DHHS the coding was important, but it was not really an automation issue. Because it is so important the subcommittee said ok on the financial side as some kind of a bridge to help Vital Records to get where it needs to go. They allowed the $8,000 for the two years to hire a consultant to get Vital Records caught up. In the meantime if the SOS and DHHS work together, perhaps they can find a way to pay for that travel, which is why it was taken out of the budget on the Vital Records side. It is a

truly operational expense and the subcommittee did not feel the fund should be paying for it at all.

Ms. Bizarro mentioned that another issue is timing. Right now the state is in the middle of its budget process and the SOS cannot just go and request an additional $8,000 item be added to their budget request. Their budget would have already been submitted so this was a compromise. The bridge concept will allow them time to come up with a way to include it in the SOS/Vital Records budget. All of the coding costs would be a Vital Records operational item rather than relying on the fund for that support. Ms. C. Johnson stated that there was no doubt that the public agencies need that information and that was a concern.

The subcommittee wanted to find a way to meet both needs in the process, but it is definitely not something that should be coming from the fund. The last item they commented on was that additional revenue needed to be maintained in the fund. The committee needs to be looking at what needs to be spent and making recommendations to the SOS. At the same time the other thing that needs to be considered is that the fund is going to be defunct. The committee needs to look at the expense side to see what they can get a handle on and obviously the biggest expense is OIT.

At the same time the committee also needs to look at the revenue sources very carefully. When they were doing the financials, just trying to get the expenses was a nearly impossible task for the subcommittee. It depended on who you were talking to and what document you were looking at as to what matched what. That was clearly spelled out as well in the financials on the first page of their report. There is a notation there that the total column for the FY05-06 doesn't balance to the fund balance reported.

Ms. C. Johnson stated that it was her understanding that there was some sort of an audit underway of some sort and perhaps the audit will clarify some of that. She stated that if you call Paula Penney and ask what the budget is and if you look at the budget being presented here and talk to what is requested and the OIT budget, nothing is matching. It is a big jumble. That is why it took the subcommittee so long to get through it all. What was initially seen as not a big deal, certainly became a big deal.

The subcommittee started by asking Mr. Bolton for budget information and some of it he could not provide. The committee was told that there was no budget. She believed that the numbers they presented the committee were pretty straight-forward and were presented in a way that everyone could review and understand them. Getting to that point was not an easy thing. She explained that when members get to the recommendations the subcommittee also addressed some of those issues as well.

The OIT costs are the biggest cost and to get a handle on that and to deal with the issue of paying for rent and other things they should not be, one of the things the subcommittee felt was that there should be an immediate RFP done to get an apples to apples cost comparison. The second would be to say that there would not be any additional changes to the system unless they are emergency in nature. One of the things that came out of their looking through all of the expenditures that have been coming out of OIT is that when the last rendering of the system came up, there were change orders done later at additional cost.

Those change orders are something that should have been part of the initial system. DHHS was promised up front that they would not lose anything in terms of statistical information that they were getting when Vital Records went from DHHS to the SOS. When the new system came up some of the stuff that was part of the old system that DHHS was getting their information from was not added to the new system. The NHVRIN system had several changes done to it that were required because somebody didn't plan something somewhere.

Ms. C. Johnson added that this was an assumption on the subcommittee's part and it could just be that there was no user group to sit down and talk about it. The end result was that DHHS did not get what it needed and there were changes that had to be made to the system. When the subcommittee was looking over the materials they could not understand why there were so many changes, because the clerks were saying that they did not get anything that they wanted and were not getting the changes they wanted in the system.

The subcommittee felt that the full committee needed to look at what the physical costs of maintenance are and do an apples to apples comparison to see if there is a cheaper way to do it while at the same time looking at the bigger picture. Part of doing that is not making changes to the system when we know it is not something we plan to continue with long term. Setting up a users group, doing a business process, and doing those things that you need to do is something the subcommittee feels is very important. Go through that process and then have an analysis of what it is you really need and then go out to bid.

Finding a system you want and start to initiate that and by that time you are three to four years down the road and in the meantime you are paying large costs to OIT. Ms. Hadaway asked Ms. C. Johnson if she could interrupt one more time. She explained to Ms. C. Johnson that the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee (VRIFAC) was set up to be sort of the user group. Everyone around the table represents a user. She added that one of the things the subcommittee did not do was come back to the committee and seek its input as to how things were going.

Ms. C. Johnson replied that she believed the subcommittee was talking about a more extensive, smaller user group committee that reached out to other members. Ms. Hadaway explained that that was the purpose of the VRIFAC committee. Ms. C. Johnson replied that she understood that but did not believe that this was truly the mission of this committee to look at it in terms of day-to-day users things. Ms. Bizarro suggested functionality concerns. Ms. Hadaway explained that day-to-day things like functionality was exactly what committee members brought to the table when they came to meetings.

Ms. Bizarro replied that that fact had not been conveyed to the subcommittee. Ms. Hadaway said that she understood, but that the subcommittee needed to remember that they were given a task to do, but not sitting on the committee there was much information, etc. that they just did not have access to. Ms. C. Johnson replied that this issue was something that was brought up when Mr. Gray was still part of the subcommittee so there was VRIFAC representation at the subcommittee meetings.

Mr. Hall stated that he thought that the subcommittees attempt to get the full committee to focus on the difference between the maintenance of the system and the operational

aspects was very helpful. One question that he would have would be whether the OIT piece could be broken down so we could look at the operational expense of just maintaining the current application for which OIT needs a certain amount of money versus how much is needed for improvement of the system. When we went through this at the last meeting, some of the talk about the OIT piece was that approximately $300,000 shared costs out of the $700,000 and the information the subcommittee had provided doesn't actually break out the shared costs it has everything listed as a direct cost.

Ms. C. Johnson replied that they have those as well and that she could provide those for him. He stated that his concern was how could we divide this because it would seem to him that the Improvement fund should be paying for improvements, but once that improvement is made, maintenance for it would be an operational expense and should not be paid for by the fund. Ms. Bizarro replied that Mr. Hall was actually bringing up a really interesting fundamental question. That when the subcommittee looked at OIT expenses they had looked at the expense as an improvement fund expense regardless of whether is was an improvement or ongoing support.

If this group decides that once the system is in place those maintenance costs should be an SOS expense because it is an ongoing support of a system versus an improvement. That is a decision the committee will have to make. The subcommittee really did not talk about it in that great detail. Ms. C. Johnson stated that she was involved in the initial VRIFAC legislation and subsequent legislation and when the fund was established it was envisioned that the VRIF was there to cover the maintenance of that system. That is what the fund was for. To allow for the automation of Vital Records and to make sure that there was a fund there to improve and maintain it over the course of many years.

It also considered that anything that was operational in relation to Vital Records should not be charged to this fund. There have been a couple of occasions over the years where operational charges have begun showing up. Each time that happens someone calls her and asks her to come in and look it over. The reason for that is because there is some cloudiness there. Determining what is automation and what is not and trying to separate that out is not an easy task.

Maybe it is time to look at that in its entirety and determine if it is realistic goal based on the revenue stream we have now. Do we need to change that legislation or the purpose of the fund? Of course, any time you bring the purpose of the fund before the legislature you are raising all kinds of red flags. The Senate Finance Committee did call this fund "The Holy Grail" one time when Ms. C. Johnson was standing before them testifying because they were trying to take some funding out. She was among thirty clerks that showed up to speak against their doing so. She explained that you have to be very careful how you do that, but it is a good point to be brought forward and at least considered.

Ms. C. Johnson also felt that once the audit was complete the committee might find there are other revenue streams that may be not getting there, but that would be a discussion for another day. One of the things they state under the comments section is that the VRIFAC consider resolutions in support of operational needs during the next budget session if it is deemed appropriate. The coding is a direct operational expense that needs to be put into the budget somewhere.

Approved Minutes

To the extent that DHHS or the SOS is going to provide funding for that, the committee may need to be some support, possibly with a resolution somewhere along the line to reinforce the thought process. The last two items are also recommendations from the budget subcommittee that say the committee should seriously consider the budgetary figures presented and adopt a budget for FY08. Determine a preliminary budget for FY09 and initiate planning changes for 2010 through an official request to the SOS.

Ms. C. Johnson stated that it is very clear to the subcommittee that things are not necessarily being done in a orderly kind of fashion where there is a planning phase that coincides with the state capital plans or the state budget itself. You are dealing with a state agency so there is some overlap and in order to have things run in a smooth fashion you have got to have some mirroring going on. You have to know how much is in the fund, how much you are going to spend, and know how much operationally you need to support or not support the automation from the fund.

Ms. C. Johnson felt that having changes throughout the year every time something comes up is not a good idea. It needs to be more planned. Right now it appears that if Mr. Bolton needs something, he comes in, the committee discusses and approves it and sends their recommendation to the SOS and it is processed. That leaves sort of a haywire effect on the budgeting and planning. She felt the committee had some heavy cleaning to do over the next several years.

The subcommittee felt that there also needs to be some communication between the SOS and DMV about who might be able to pay for some of the operational support because you have voter registration, DMV, and general everyday stuff on the same system and there should be some shared costs on both sides of the fence. The last recommendation was that the VRIFAC should establish other subcommittees. The subcommittee's feeling was that they had provided a great deal of information that took a lot of time and effort to put together.

They felt that it should be an ongoing process. That there should be some kind of subcommittee first on the budget process and second to look at maintenance and system issues over the long term. Ms. C. Johnson stated that she felt it was important that the new chair of the committee and the committee itself, talk about what subcommittees might be useful. She was not aware if this was the first time the committee had utilized a subcommittee, but she felt that they had provided good information and felt it would be helpful in the future to continue.

Ms. Hadaway thanked Ms. C. Johnson and the subcommittee for all their hard work and for the report and asked if anyone had any questions. Mr. Bolton explained that he had some comments. As Ms. C. Johnson was discussing coding and a couple of other points, he was aware that their interpretation was that maybe the committee had not been clear or provided adequate information, but there were some inaccuracies in the report that he wanted to address.

Whether the coding should be considered maintenance was one item. He had concerns that possibly he did not communicate clearly to the subcommittee to indicate where we were going with regard to our need to satisfy NCHS needs. He also had a small concern about the travel and whether or not that could be wrapped up in the operational budget. There was also a document that was floating around some years ago that Ms. C. Johnson

was instrumental in creating that outlined what would be considered appropriate expenditures from the fund.

Mr. Bolton was not aware if that document had been shared with the subcommittee. Ms. Bizarro replied that they did have it. Mr. Bolton stated that most of the expenditures delineated in that document was pretty much what the committee has been adhering to. It now seemed like the rules are changing and it might be beneficial to kind of nail down those rules again. If they are correct or incorrect it should be spelled out clearly for the committee.

Ms. Bizarro replied that they were not necessarily rules, but recommendations to the committee and they could elect to just throw it up in the air and decide to start over. The subcommittee made these recommendations based on all the detail they reviewed and there were lots of bits and pieces that Ms. C. Johnson had to try and string together. She continued that the subcommittee had done its best and Ms. C. Johnson had done a yeoman's job in trying to figure out a lot of gray information.

Ms. C. Johnson reported that the subcommittee did have a conversation with Mr. Scanlan about the coding issue. He was well aware of what they were recommending and initially their recommendation was zero dollars because they saw that as operational. After discussing it extensively with Mr. Scanlan they decided to put in bridge money to at least get them through the next couple of years. Mr. Scanlan was also going to talk with DHHS to see if there was a way to get the employees through the training during that two-year cycle. She added that was what he told them he could do, but she could not guarantee he would physically do anything with the SOS budget.

Mr. Scanlan was well aware of it and understood where the subcommittee was coming from on that issue. Ms. Gaouette stated that the revenue seemed extremely flat. She asked if there was a reason for that. Ms. C. Johnson explained that on the revenue stream, if you look at the fund balance it goes from $2 million down to $472,000 on the balance line. Some of the revenue is based on interest. If there is no money in the fund there will be no interest accumulated. They figured flat revenues only because they do not know that Vital Records will see an increase in revenue.

Ms. C. Johnson said that now that civil unions were coming down the line that may be a whole different ballgame. They were not given anything by anybody involved that would give any indication of an increase in revenue. So the subcommittee could only presume a flat line of what was taken in and in the latter year they rounded the number only because they would not have the interest and had to allow for that. Ms. Bizarro added that from a budget perspective, you need to be conservative on your revenue projections and not be overly optimistic.

Ms. C. Johnson stated that the subcommittee felt that if there was increased revenue obviously that was going to reduce the fund balance projections in a good way. Mr. Bolton asked if they were certain that we were collecting interest. Ms. C. Johnson replied that there was interest going into the fund. Mr. Bolton stated that by statute there was, but was it going into the fund? Ms. Bizzaro and Ms. C. Johnson both replied that it showed on past reports that it was.

Mr. Hall asked Ms. Hadaway how she wanted the committee to proceed. They had a report with recommendations from the subcommittee. Did she want to handle one

recommendation at a time or how did she want to proceed? Ms. Hadaway asked what the committee's thoughts were. The subcommittee had given them a lot to think about and her concern was jumping into everything all at once and accepting all of the recommendations at one time did not really give the committee the opportunity to individually really look at the findings and recommendations.

Ms. Hadaway felt that looking at them one at a time was probably the way to go. She did not feel the committee had the time remaining in this meeting to go over all of the recommendations. If there was something in the report that the committee felt was a really important issue, that they felt needed to be acted upon today, maybe they ought to look at that first and then go from there. Ms. C. Johnson stated that she thought that because they have an OIT presentation coming up, they might want to have that tied in with the subcommittees recommendations. She said that she assumed they were there to answer committee questions about the budget figures and billing questions.

Ms. Hadaway agreed that they should open up the discussion with OIT at that time. She added that there was also a presentation scheduled by a consultant firm for later in the meeting. She suggested that the committee listen to everything that was presented at this meeting before they actually break down and look at the individual recommendations. Ms. C. Johnson asked that the report just not be put on a shelf and nothing done with it. Mr. Hall agreed and said in particular recommendation #7, the budget recommendation. He added that the committee would not be meeting for another two months and that would be after the fiscal year has started.

If we are going to adopt the budget this was the meeting when they would have to do it or schedule another meeting in between. Ms. Hadaway suggested that the committee listen to all the other presentations and they would then go back to the recommendations later and look at the budget information at least.

5.   **OIT Update:**

Ms. Hadaway introduced Mr. Bailey, Mr. Croteau and regular OIT VRIFAC attendees. She opened the floor for questions of OIT. Mr. Bailey suggested that he start and that he could maybe answer some questions before they were asked. He explained that he was aware that their budget and billing processes had raised a number of questions with the committee and subcommittee. The fundamental situation is that as you look at the direct and shared numbers, they (OIT) do not have room for discussion about the shared charges.

Those are calculated based on metrics. The numbers of PCs supported, quantity of disk space used to run your application, type of servers and things like that. Whether it is the Vital Records application or one in Health & Human Services, or DOT, those calculations are done and the costs come out where they come out. They are an agency like many state agencies where almost half their budget is driven by personnel costs. So in the last year as personnel benefit costs went up and raises occurred, their costs went up and they do not have a way to defray those increases.

In the Vital Records environment you have ultimate control over the direct charges. There are a number of staff directly charged to this project to work on change orders and things like that. He mentioned that Ms. C. Johnson mentioned during her presentation

that they thought that OIT was doubling up on PC replacement with money that was inside the class 27 line. Those are direct charges and the committee can elect not to do those things. Mr. Bailey stated that he wished they had more flexibility and options in their funding approach for shared costs, but they are set up primarily to make sure that the federal programs pay as much of their share as can reasonably be requested from them.

OIT has very detailed cost capture metrics that they use. Many will say they are overly complex, but when it comes to making sure that the Medicaid program at the federal level pays every penny they can to support the operations of the state. He stated that he would be happy to answer questions, but felt that the recommendation of taking a look at the IT support costs for the system is a fundamentally good one. The Vital Records system is a fairly mature system and he explained that he could not predict what the right direction would be in ten years.

It is probably worth the committees' time and the cost associated to take a look. Vital Records is no longer part of DHHS and is now supported by the SOS. That changes the dynamics from when all this started. We now know what the OIT cost structure is that we didn't a few years ago and we know which pieces are flexible and which are not. He was unsure of what it would cost or how long it would take, but stated that they were effectively eighteen months away from the next budget cycle and this is the perfect time to start looking at some of those questions.

Not only from an IT support perspective, but if you want to split out what some people refer to as operating, capital costs, improvements, etc. Mr. Bailey felt that was a great idea, but felt it also need to go hand in hand with a strategic view and you need to have your partners from DHHS and the SOS involved in it because with Ms. Goonan and her staff as direct costs, you are buying a certain number of hours per week to work on Vital Records. No matter how you do it someone will have to pay for the care and feeding of the system and the hiccups that come along the way.

A lot of their time is spent on the change requests and improvements that this group or a subcommittee of this group has set as priority. Just looking at the costs without also looking at the strategic plan over the next few years such as what kind of federal legislation is coming in the next few years, Homeland Security requirements, and he had heard mention of motor vehicle in the earlier discussion.

Without looking at where the application is going in the future or what kind of influences it/you will encounter, you would not have a clearer picture. Mr. Bailey felt it was a great idea to bring in an outside entity in to look at the application and assist the committee in strategizing on not only was OIT the right support mechanism, but in what direction you are planning to go in the next few years. From the earlier discussion it was clear that there were other issues besides the OIT billing and budget issues.

Mr. Bailey explained that it would be great if they could nail down what a reasonable IT cost would be for a reasonable vision for the system. Then that would be kind of a foundation point for the rest of your discussions about your funding. Ms. Hadaway asked Mr. Bailey if he saw any way that the fund using OIT could cut back on expenses. Mr. Bailey replied that it is driven by the direct charges. Running that database with that number of users out in the field making network connections drives up the costs. They

would probably remain constant unless you decrease the number of users, and he did not believe that was the goal of the committee.

Vital Records might even be increasing the quantity at some of the hospitals with new functionality. Mr. Bailey explained that this change would drive up the operational costs and there really is no way to change that in the OIT model. The only real flexibility is in some of those direct charges. The subcommittee recommended that you cut back on some of the PC replacement funding because you hadn't really done a plan in the past. Those types of things you can absolutely do.

If you get to a point where you decide you want fewer developers fully available to support what is going on, OIT could look at that sort of thing. You could not take it down to zero as there is a system and it has to be maintained but you may not require the full complement that you have now. You could find out depending on how your strategy goes that the full complement isn't enough and you could then augment with more people or contractors. He felt that is what planning ahead a few years would help tell the committee.

Is it one level line of support or do you need to bump it up as you have in the past for certain projects to get them done. Mr. Hall asked Mr. Bailey to go back to the allocation of the shared costs because one of the things Mr. Bailey had discussed was the metrics used to formulate the costs and one of those was the number of users that are being supported. What Mr. Hall had hoped to get from this meeting was a sense of what that looked like because how many users being supported were being included in that?

He asked if every town clerk's office that is connected to the system was being counted as a user? He explained that he logs on to the Departments of Education and Revenue's website and gathers a lot of data, but doubted that he was being counted as a user when their allocated costs are figured. Mr. Hall asked exactly how that figure was arrived at. If each town's clerk was being counted as a user, then no wonder the shared costs were so high. Mr. Bailey replied that every PC connected to the system full-time is counted as a user.

Ms. Hadaway suggested that those numbers would include every funeral director and hospital user as well. Mr. Hall said that it was as if they were all state employees in a state agency and we getting allocated on those costs. If we do not have the formula that is used we cannot know. Mr. Bailey stated that one of the reports Mr. Bolton has, gives an exact number of PCs in the PC count for that metric. Ms. Goonan replied that it was 125 this year and goes to 155 in FY08. Mr. Bolton stated that he thought it was 160, but 155 was close enough.

Mr. Bolton added that the PC count was a number generated by RSS, the support group that supports us. He asked Mr. Bentzler to speak to that. Mr. Bailey replied that it is the PCs that the fund purchased for users, which are primarily the towns. The hospitals and funeral directors generally provide their own PCs. They get the software to operate, but if they had PC problems they were on their own. The PC count covers the 150 locations they send Mr. Bentzler to.

Mr. Bolton replied that he does verify that with Mr.Bentzler in terms of how many machines they have out there. In reality we were supporting a lot more users, but the PC count is rather minimal compared to the number of users, which is around 650 that are

currently able to use the software. Mr. Croteau added that those 650 people also have access to the help desk. Mr. Bolton agreed. Mr. Bailey pointed out that the help desk is paid for as a separate item and is a direct cost. Ms. C. Johnson stated that in the breakdown that the subcommittee had there was a shared cost attributed to the help desk.

Ms. C. Johnson reported that there was a total of $302,000 in shared costs for FY08. That was primarily personnel and benefits. In addition there were some other minor things. One was the discrepancy on equipment, which was on the other side of the direct service. She explained that the subcommittee budgeted exactly what they were told by OIT was needed. Mr. Bailey stated that should have been somewhere between a 15-20% replacement.

Ms. C. Johnson replied that there was a $40,000 gap that there was no explanation as to what that was for and the subcommittees only assumption was that it was part of the $38,000 Vital Records was asking for. That is why that amount was removed, but the rest of the shared costs themselves. It was personnel and benefits that was really driving the major portion of the support costs.   There were some minor things for PC replacement, help desk services, those kinds of things. Mr. Bailey replied that the shared cost in PC replacement is replacing PCs for the people that are in shared costs.

Mr. Bailey explained that on a periodic basis, Mr. Bentzler and his coworkers get equipment. That is why that expense shows up in the shared costs. Ms. C. Johnson said that she had a question as a follow-up to what Mr. Bailey had just stated. On the shared side OIT talks about the PCs as being 125 and going up to 155. She explained that those machines are not being used strictly for the vital records application. In many cases it is not used for vital records for even 10% of the time.

If the same PC is being used 30% of the time for the DMV, should or could those shared costs be divided by purpose of use? If the committee elects to stay with OIT and did not change anything else, could they look at the shared costs to be billed differently because it's a different function? Mr. Bailey replied that it certainly could be looked at, but we would have to get some buy in from whoever the host program is, whether it be DMV or another program. He was not aware of any other program using it. Mr. Bolton and Ms. C. Johnson both mentioned that Election Net was also using the PCs.

Mr. Bailey reported that this program was set up at a time when this program was buying PCs for people and they wanted the ability to send someone out to help those locations. Ms. C. Johnson replied that she understood that, but felt that the cities on networks didn't really require a lot of Mr. Bentzler's attention unless they discover a state issue rather than an internal city issue. Mr. Bentzler replied that they do contact the help desk and troubleshooting is done with them.

Mr. Bentzler explained that it is either resolved or gets reverted back to the town IT staff. Ms. C. Johnson replied that they do contact the help desk because that is what they were instructed to do. There was a time when they were experiencing issues and the state wanted to be made aware when they encountered difficulties. Ms. C. Johnson asked Mr. Bailey if OIT would be able to provide data on the percentages of use of NHVRIN on state owned computers to the committee.

Mr. Bailey replied that OIT could help, but they are not aware of what each individual town is doing. He stated that Mr. Bentzler could have some input because he has been

out to the locations, but OIT does not keep a record of who all is using a particular PC. Ms. Hadaway stated that the one thing we would know is the number of licenses they are generating. Mr. Bolton clarified that Ms. Hadaway was talking about number of transactions they are doing on the NHVRIN application. She continued, that every time they go into NHVRIN and do a search or print a record it is recorded.

So if they are doing three transactions a month in NHVRIN and using the PC daily for motor vehicles and HAVA then obviously, there must be a way to look at it and say that the amount of time that they are really using it for NHVRIN is miniscule compared to its use for other purposes. Ms. Hadaway stated that she had always felt that the fund was being unjustly charged for the things that the smaller towns were using our PCs to do.

Mr. Hall stated that this brought him back again to when he asked for the formula by which this is done. Because if it is divided up on a count of PCs, that might be 25% of how it is divided up. If it is divided up on another basis then it might be 50%. CPU time would be one way to look at the same question. If a user is only using a minute and a half of CPU time a month, then that is a lot less than counting them as one end user. Mr. Bailey replied that they do not track CPU time on the servers, that is a mainframe number.

Mr. Hall asked if the committee could possibly get the formula. Mr. Bailey replied that Ms. Goonan would get the formulas and the inputs for the committee. He explained that the most substantial one would be the PC count. It would show you which shared cost that applied to and then in the operations environment there are a couple of formulas for server disk space. Mr. Bailey offered to get the most recent quarterly numbers for that.

Ms. C. Johnson asked if the committee could also find out where all the PCs are. Mr. Bolton replied that he could get that information for the committee. Ms. Hadaway stated that it would be good to get that and also some idea as to what their usage is. Ms. C. Johnson replied that she felt the committee needed to know where they are first and could then figure out how they could get that information. Mr. Bailey stated that in the larger municipalities the program only provided one or two machines, but a number of them have multiple people using those computers so he felt that what they would really get would be a municipality count of transactions versus a PC count.

Mr. Bolton replied that he did not think Manchester or Nashua had any state PCs. Ms. C. Johnson agreed that Manchester did not and that is why she wanted to see this information. Mr. Bentzler informed the committee that Nashua did have two state PCs. Ms. Hadaway stated that most of the smaller towns that had been given PCs would be easier to track because they have no other system on their own and do not have a motor vehicle program so they are on MAAP. They are using the PCs for a lot of different things. Ms. C. Johnson added that this was used as part of the sale factor in the beginning, but if you are looking at it in terms of being charged shared costs then it is time to look at that stuff.

Mr. Hall replied that just the fact of the envelope calculations, if half of the $300,000 is PC count, that is $150,000 of shared costs for 150 PCs. That is $1,000 per year per PC. That is a lot of money. Mr. Bailey cautioned that Mr. Hall was not capturing the other couple hundred users that are in the hospitals and funeral homes. Dr. Teschner asked what we were actually getting from OIT for the $300,000. He stated that the minutes said there was a $700,000 figure that included $300,000 in shared costs. So we are paying the

OIT people $400,000 but what are we getting for the $300,000? Mr. Bailey replied that we get access to the servers and ability to respond to those 150 locations when they need assistance.

Dr. Teschner asked if the committee was billed when someone responds to one of the 150 locations. Mr. Bailey replied that they do not. Ms. Goonan added that the shared costs also include network operation and DBA support, which we use quite a bit of and is not cheap. She felt it was important to not just think of two web servers sitting in the data center. OIT supports an infrastructure that keeps the database and system secure and monitored. Mr. Bailey added that those were things that would have to be quantified because if the committee is going to go out and seek alternative providers they will have to be very careful to include all of those aspects, whether the SOS looks at their internal staff or whether you look to a contractor.

Mr. Wurtz asked if the licensing fees for Oracle and Microsoft Office come out of those shared costs. Mr. Bailey replied that the Microsoft Office that the fund is providing to users would tend to be a direct charge. He was unsure as to whether Oracle was a direct charge or not. Ms. Goonan replied that she would speculate that Oracle expenses were shared because we share the Oracle database server, BDG PROD and BDG DEV. Mr. Bailey agreed.

Ms. Hadaway asked if the fund changed to a different database would that save money. Ms. Goonan replied that there would be licensing fees and hardware required to run a database, but then you would have to look at the cost to transport or change NHVRIN's Oracle database into Sequel server for example. It would not be a simple copy and paste. There would be an upfront cost associated with changing databases, but after that the costs could be quite a bit lower.

Mr. Bailey said that this would again be a question for study because while you may find some reduced costs you would find increased risks for a number of reasons. He stated that people do it all the time. There are applications at the state house and all over in Sequel or other databases. He added that he would not recommend a database of this size or importance be put in Sequel. He felt that Oracle had a lot more to offer, but at the end of the day it is probably a bit more expensive. For a lot of their applications it is well worth it because of the added security and robustness.

The committee would have to look at that as part of any plan to move, but as Ms. Goonan stated there would be a migration issue. He did not know how many years it would take to pay back the cost of converting NHVRIN in the reduced maintenance costs per year. That cost also depends on where you end up. The SOS has a fairly substantial investment in Sequel server so it might be a lower incremental cost if that is part of the strategy going forward.

Ms. Bizarro stated that she had been around long enough to have been on this committee back when NHVRIN was being converted from the old system and for the decision of this committee to go ahead and buy PCs and deploy them and to pay for broadband and all that stuff. That was a substantial decision made years ago that we are now living with. We are living with the consequences because there are shared costs related to that PC investment and it was going to continue. Especially if this committee decides it will continue to support that investment of PCs at the local level.

The other thing to consider was that this group was sort of on the leading edge of deploying a statewide system and supporting the cost of PCs at the local level. You were before DMV, HAVA, and all these other systems. Now that they are there, they have all piggybacked on you. There really has to be a definitive discussion with these other organizations/departments about how you are going to share those costs going forward.

Ms. Bizarro asked someone to correct her if she was wrong, but she did not believe those discussions had truly happened on a vigorous level to deal with the shared cost issue in a real way. Mr. Bailey replied that this committee had been looking for ways to entice cities and towns to participate back when they made these decisions, but many things have changed since then. That was why he felt the idea of the study was a good one at this time.

Mr. Allan asked if there was a way to trace where all the change requests have come from. If they come from the PC users or other users in the communities that we do not have direct access to. Mr. Bailey replied that the change request database should have that information. Mr. Bolton stated that the change database includes the requests and the reasoning behind them. Mr. Allan asked if some were bug fixes or simply enhancements. Mr. Bolton replied that it was a mixture of both.

Mr. Bolton asked Ms. Goonan if she had a better idea of the breakdown of the change requests. Ms. Goonan agreed with Mr. Bolton that it was a mixture. She stated that for the first six months after a release it is heavier on bug fixes, but after that it is more enhancements. She used civil unions as an example of an upcoming enhancement. Vital Records would have to support that change in the law. Mr. Allan asked if the budget numbers included those enhancements. Ms. Goonan replied that what it covers is three full-time developers, a part-time Project Manager, and DBA, and network support.

Ms. Goonan explained that what is done with those resources is decided by the IT subcommittee that has prioritized the change requests. She estimated that there were about 100 change requests. That number tends to stay pretty static. As her staff completes requests, new ones come in. Ms. Hadaway asked if the budget subcommittee looked at that sort of thing when they were developing the budget. Ms. C. Johnson replied that when they developed the budget they said there should be no more enhancements made to the application unless it is of an emergency nature.

The new laws would be considered an emergency and the committee does have staff to develop those enhancements as part of the direct costs. Ms. Hadaway asked if they budgeted for any additional costs for those changes. Ms. C. Johnson replied that they had not because they were saying that the committee would not be making more improvements to the system if you planned to follow their recommendations. Ms. Hadaway stated that if the law changes there would be no choice but to make the changes to NHVRIN.

Ms. C. Johnson replied that there may not be a choice, but the system, nor the fund was designed to carry that. She added that there should be a fiscal note on that bill because it should be addressed somewhere. That is not what the system was designed to carry and goes back to the revenue stream. If you are going to carry that, you need to tell someone how much it is going to cost to carry it. In terms of adding that to the system there has to be some discussion as to how to do it. If you are not doing anything else to the system and have the three developers on staff you should be able to address some of that.

Ms. Bizarro added that they (subcommittee) were not given two different costs, enhancements vs. bug fixes. It was not presented to them in that fashion. What OIT gave the group was basically "here is what it is going to take to maintain where you are at right now." Ms. Goonan stated that some detail was given to Mr. Gray and the committee, but that she had brought the same presentation to this meeting for the full committee to see. Ms. Bizarro replied that it was not specific as to bug fix numbers versus enhancement numbers.

Ms. C. Johnson added that they did not get the detail that went into that but when they followed up with questions about the changes, the understanding of the committee was that there had been changes brought in to the committee by Mr. Bolton and those were a lot of the changes she notated earlier in the discussion about having come because of things that DHHS needed that had not been brought into the new system. She did not know if debugging was a correct characterization for those fixes or if something was just missed in the planning phase.

The subcommittee was told that those changes had been made and the rest of the change requests were enhancements that would benefit users. The subcommittee was just suggesting that before more enhancements were made the committee should look at the bigger problem first. Mr. Hall wanted to go to the subcommittee's recommendation for OIT on pages three and four. As he looked at the difference between what had been requested and what the subcommittee recommended there were only two major differences.

One was the new and replacement equipment reduction of $55,000 and the other was the PC replacement reduction of $11,000. Otherwise it looked like it was essentially the same. So that means the staffing pattern that had been requested by OIT remains the same. Ms. C. Johnson stated that they did not make any changes to the staffing levels. Mr. Hall stated that he did not know how Ms. Hadaway wanted to proceed, but given all that had been discussed so far he would be willing to make a motion to approve the subcommittees recommended budget for OIT.

Ms. Gaouette seconded Mr. Hall's motion. Ms. Gaouette clarified that this was just the OIT portion for FY08. Everyone agreed that was what the motion would cover. Ms. Hadaway asked for discussion. Dr. Laflamme stated that providing the PCs and equipment was a great motivator when the automation began. He mentioned that he saw it a lot like a cell phone. Before you have one you don't need it, but once you do, most people cannot live without one. He felt that if the committee were to stop providing these to the towns who now see the value and have a need for them, they would pick up the slack. That would cut out almost $38,000 in equipment.

Ms. C. Johnson replied that it would not cut any out of the OIT budget. Dr. Laflamme felt that eliminating the trips out to the towns to support the PCs could also be eliminated. Ms. C. Johnson replied that eliminating the trips to support the state owned PCs would save some money. Dr. Laflamme suggested that the fund could continue to provide the PCs, but without service contracts. Mr. Bentzler informed the committee that with all the new technology it is really not necessary to visit every town that has a problem with their PC. He is able to respond to problems remotely most of the time. They also no longer bring the equipment to the users. Instead, they ship most everything via UPS.

Unless there is a severe problem or a new rollout Mr. Bentzler tries to avoid traveling to the towns as much as possible. Mr. Wurtz added that Mr. Bentzler does a really good job of managing his time. Over the last year or so they have begun to rely more heavily on software packages and UPS to provide some services to the users. To reduce the cost to an individual town and say we are not going to replace your computer does not eliminate Mr. Bentzler's position in any way. Mr. Wurtz felt it increases his issues. Most of the computers that we use are configured in such a way that they lock down so users cannot add other software packages to our system causing a reaction to the way that NHVRIN responds.

The first question that we generally ask when we get a call to the help desk is "are you using a state PC?" If the answer is yes, then we listen to them one way. If it is no, then we assume that someone has installed a pop-up blocker on the PC they are using and doing that will interfere with NHVRIN. Mr. Bentzler's time is now spent, even more so supporting those locations. Mr. Bentzler agreed with Mr. Wurtz's assertions. Mr. Wurtz added that Mr. Bentzler is now installing our PCs into small towns that have no IT staff and minimal understanding of how a PC works.

OIT has a help desk with a toll-free number and it is staffed full-time. Vital Records does not have a help desk. Instead, all of our staff are the help desk. The clerks call and they are having a problem with NHVRIN. We do not automatically give them the help desk telephone number. We function as a help desk, but do not get any recognition as a help desk provider. This is quite a problem for us because an official help desk person is represented with a certain level of understanding and is rewarded with a certain level of compensation through their labor grade.

Mr. Wurtz explained that he had staff downstairs that are nowhere near that level in education or compensation. They represent for example the marriage module and the clerks rely heavily on them doing so. Dr. Laflamme replied that he understood that just because we might consider getting rid of the hardware we would not eliminate the support. Mr. Wurtz stated that in a sense, getting rid of the hardware component would increase the need for support because we would have users using incompatible software on the machines that they also used for NHVRIN.

Users then become frustrated because they think that NHVRIN is not working when it is not the application that is causing the problem. Ms. Hadaway asked Mr. Hall if he would mind waiting to hold a vote on his motion. She felt that before that decision should be made the committee needed to decide if they wanted to do anything more about looking at a consultant to do an analysis to help the committee decide if they wanted to stay with OIT or look elsewhere for support.

Mr. Hall replied that he would be willing to withdraw his motion, but it seemed to him that by the end of the meeting they needed to have an amount of money budgeted. Even if the committee elects to go forward with an RFP the hope would be that it would cost less than the amount that would be brought forward in the budget. Ms. C. Johnson suggested that instead of saying OIT, make the motion for system support. Mr. Hall replied that he would be happy to change his motion to system support.

Ms. Hadaway stated that she would be comfortable with that motion. She explained to members that the motion would cover the bottom line that they had requested for OIT support for FY08 of $700,117. Ms. C. Johnson suggested that since things are still in

flux the committee might want to make that "an amount not to exceed" as the general recommendation. She understood that this recommendation would go to the SOS. Ms. Hadaway asked Mr. Bolton if this was correct. Mr. Bolton replied that it was. Ms. Hadaway asked Ms. Gaouette if she was comfortable with that.

Ms. Gaouette answered in the affirmative. Ms. Hadaway called for a vote and the committee voted unanimously to support the motion to not exceed $700,117 in OIT support in FY08. Mr. Hall pointed out that it was the second line on page 1 of the subcommittee document. Ms. Hadaway thanked subcommittee members for attending the meeting and sharing their findings.

6.   **Vendor Presentation:**

Mr. Bolton reported to the committee that he contacted Mr. Tom Towle of Municipal Resources, Inc. (MRI) about doing a review of our OIT budget and the value that we are receiving for the dollars the VRIF fund expends. MRI does a lot of work for municipalities. They plug in staff when they are needed and perform reviews for IT and other town functions. Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Towle for a proposal from his company to review our IT services.

He reminded the committee that in a previous meeting he had suggested getting an outside opinion on the value of the services we were receiving. He had initially approached First Data Government Solutions, but the quote they provided was rather high. Unbeknownst to Mr. Bolton, MRI had previously done this sort of review and was familiar with the municipal layout of New Hampshire. Mr. Bolton then introduced Mr. Tom Towle of Municipal Resources Inc. to the committee.

Mr. Towle greeted the committee and explained that many of the people attending the meeting might recognize him from his many years of state service. Among other things, he had been director of IT for a number of years. His state service totaled about 34 years in all. Mr. Bolton had called him in to chat about some of the issues the committee had been discussing in regard to their IT services. Knowing his background Mr. Bolton was anxious to discuss what he would suggest to help the committee get a better grasp of where their funds were going. Mr. Towle first asked if Mr. Bolton was aware of Municipal Resources Inc.?

They had been around for 18 to 20 years and Mr. Towle had recently become associated with them. He thought of the Company as a portfolio organization. They have a number of consultants and associates that are available to do certain work for governmental functions. They have a number of people that have backgrounds in IT, school districts, town government, and managers that have worked in many different areas of government. The company exists to help entities solve governmental type problems. They assemble a team based on what the particular issue or need is.

He suggested to Mr. Bolton, that one approach they could take would be for him to take the issues back to his team and discuss how they could put together a proposal that would deal with all the questions the committee is facing. Considering that this was a basically an unsolicited proposal they tried to put into the context of what they knew at the time. The proposal really outlines how they tried to approach the situation. They would be

coming in trying to help the committee look at cost containment, reduction of costs, ongoing support issues, alternative providers, and options and strategies for future upgrades or replacement.

He and his staff looked at it in that larger context. They thought about how they would recommend that we approach this for a long time. One option would be to commit to one big full-blown study. Feeling instead, that would be better if they broke this situation down into phases, they scoped it out as phase one being an initial study, kind of a high-level study. An independent body coming in and looking at the cost structure, how we are being billed, comparing some of the invoices with the services received and making an independent analysis of that. The second component was really looking at the technology side. Looking at hardware, the network, and analyzing where we are from a sustainability standpoint.

Is the system stable? Are we in good shape or are there obvious measures that we might want to consider from a technology standpoint? These two key components are really just to get a context of where we are today and whether we are getting the service level we are paying for. It is certainly not a judgmental type of analysis. It is more of an outside entity coming in to look at the system with a fresh pair of eyes. Then making suggestions utilizing their experience and backgrounds.

Mr. Towle felt it was very important before writing an RFP, changing vendors, changing the whole system, to get a fresh perspective on what we're working with. At that point, informed decisions could be made. If the committee elected to go forward, phase 2 which contains items such as more in-depth analysis of the methodology, supporting and breaking out the costs of development and maintenance of the system. Evaluating staffing and anything associated with support. Again doing a more thorough, almost design phased analysis of the computer technology, networking issues, whatever might have been found in the initial study.

Reviewing end-user functionality, finding out if there are real issues with the functionality. Are they perceived or are they real? If they are real, then determining how to deal with them. Regardless of whether you stay with your existing system or support structure, those are things that are really going to drive the future direction. Making an assessment of your internal control structures and the security issues associated with that. At this stage, those are types of things that could be done later on if in fact, you elect to go with the proposal.

MRI felt that the initial study would take about seven weeks to complete. The cost they are proposing for this study is $16,500. They would provide a written report, as well as come into discuss their findings at the conclusion of the study. Mr. Towle directed committee members attention to his hand out where he had listed his team and their credentials. Mr. Towle explained that the meeting had already run long and he did not wish to take up anymore of their time, but would be happy to take any questions the committee members might have.

Mr. Hall stated that would one of the things that makes him nervous about this type of proposal is competition. He asked Mr. Towle if MRI would be vying for any contract that may come out of this study. Mr. Towle replied that they would not be, they were not a software vendor. They help to determine the problem and then get out of the way. Ms. Hadaway asked if municipal resources Inc. would suggest companies that might be able

to help with any solution that they might recommend. Mr. Towle replied that that would be in the second phase if that was what the committee elected to do. Ms. C. Johnson asked if any of this would look at the billing issues that have been discussed in this meeting.

Ms. Hadaway replied that she felt they would look at anything that the committee directed them to. Ms. C. Johnson added the she didn't see anything in the proposal that stated that they would be looking at billing. Mr. Towle replied that it could be something they looked at now that he was aware that it was a major issue. He explained that this proposal had been written without knowing all the particulars of the issues this committee was considering. The committee could give them marching orders as to what they wanted exactly for them to look at and give recommendations on. He added that they would be happy to modify the proposal to get to where the committee wanted them to be.

Mr. Allan asked if this proposal or contract would need to go before Governor and council. Dr. Teschner replied that the Secretary of State's office was exempt from Governor and council. Mr. Stevens agreed that Dr. Teschner was correct. He was not sure about the competitive requirements, but it did not have to go before Governor and council. Dr. Teschner stated that there had been a lot of talk today about an RFP and that Ms. C. Johnson had even referenced one in her presentation. He felt it might be useful to put together a subcommittee to come back to this meeting at the next meeting and make a very specific recommendation whether they want to hire someone or come up with options.

Do we want to bid it out or go forward with an RFP ourselves? He felt that somehow the committee had to move the agenda forward. This subject had been kicked around for sometime. Ms. C. Johnson's committee had brought forward some very concrete things, and Mr. Bolton offered the concept of hiring an outside entity to examine the service that we are receiving from OIT. Before hiring an outside entity Dr. Teschner suggested that the committee might want to define what the specifications were. Are we going to hire from the outside or we going to try to do it ourselves. He did not feel that the committee would be able to resolve the issues at this meeting.

A subcommittee might be able to make some concrete recommendations for the next meeting. Exactly how we are going to move this whole agenda forward. He felt the specifications were important whether they were for a consultant or perhaps to go right into the specifications of what we want from OIT. He suggested that would be helpful for OIT to give us some specifications of what they do. That was one of the things he felt was really missing during the year that he has been attending these meetings. He felt that it had taken a lot of digging to get to the $300,000 to find out about the direct and indirect costs. It took a lot of probing questions from Mr. Gray in order to get to this point.

Dr. Teschner said it would be nice for OIT to provide some information in English describing what it is they were giving us for our money. Maybe the subcommittee could then kick it around and comeback with some recommendations. Ms. C. Johnson asked Mr. Towle if municipal resources Inc. had any sort of timetable for this project. Mr. Towle replied the phase one would take approximately seven weeks. Phase 2 would depend on the direction the committee wanted to go in. whether they just want to tweak what they have or put out an RFP. He could not place an estimate on phase two without knowing what the requirements would be.

Mr. Hall asked Mr. Bolton what we had in the current budget that has not been spent. He asked if there was money in the current budget that could jumpstart this project. Mr. Bolton replied that that would be contained in the budget report. Dr. Teschner added that that document would show what funds have been expended, but may not answer the question of what is available. This is the information that he gathers every month from Ms. Penney. He distributed the hand out to the committee and explained it is really an accounting of what we have spent and the revenue that has come in, but does not explain that. Ms. Hadaway exclaimed that this is because we've never really had a budget. Ms. C. Johnson replied that the committee does have a budget and it is on the report she provided the committee. She explained that they had to work in order to get the budget.

Mr. Hall stated that according to the document there was an expenditure budget for 2007 of $2,020,975. Given that, there are about six weeks left of the current fiscal year. Where do we stand with that? Ms. C. Johnson replied that the problem is the she is not sure if the transfers to OIT were reflected in this figure or not. She felt that they would probably have to go back as she and the subcommittee did, and break out what goes in each category. That would bring them closer to what might really be available. She added that they might be able to better figure out by looking at the contracts, but there was no budget for them.

Ms. Goonan reported that she had brought the standard report that she normally provides the committee and it did have budget figures on it. She explained that the invoices are posted through March and that information can be found on agency intranet. Ms. Hadaway replied that Ms. Goonan could distribute her hand out to the committee at that time. Ms. C. Johnson stated that she did not want to committee thinking that it was May and the transfers had all gone through and that the fund balance was larger than it really was. Ms. Hadaway stated that her feeling was that the committee had an opportunity to have an independent agency look at where we are and that was one of the recommendations of the subcommittee.

She felt the committee needed to decide if they were willing monetarily, to do that. In her opinion MRI appears to have experience and expertise with municipalities and state governments. She added that this independent look at the software and IT support probably would be beneficial and would answer many of the committee's questions. Ms. Bizarro asked that she might speak as a nonmember of the committee. Ms. Hadaway agreed. Ms. Bizarro suggested that the committee had not answered the main question, which was, was the current system where they wanted to be? If it is not, where do they want it to be?

Once that is answered then a consultant could be hired. If they're brought in before the system is where you want it to be, she did not feel that any helpful information would be forthcoming. Ms. Hadaway replied that the thing the she felt the committee had most been concerned about is the fact that the OIT costs have been so high. Ms. Bizarro stated that that may be the case, but she felt there was a bigger fundamental question. There were a lot of issues regarding functionality and speed that the subcommittee batted around and she believed the committee needed to determine whether they planned to replace it, upgrade it, or leave it as it was before moving forward with a consultant.

It seemed to her that there were a lot of unmet needs and the committee might be considering scrapping the whole thing and starting over. If no one can say with certainty that this is the way we want the system to be when it is grown-up, then how can a

consultant bounce that off the current system. She asked Ms. C. Johnson if she had described it correctly. Ms. C. Johnson replied in the affirmative. Ms. Hadaway replied the she could understand what Ms. Bizarro was saying and realized that the system did have some shortcomings that would probably have to be dealt with in the future. They recognize that NHVRIN is outliving its functionality. The committee has expected that. They realize that they are not going to just be able to go on forever using the same application.

Mr. Bolton stated that if you look at the genesis of the system. It was the Clipper based program when it began in 1988 and then redeployed in 1992. In 1998 they went to a client/server, PowerBuilder front-end and Oracle back and 2004 the current Web enabled incarnation was launched. In reality they expect a five or six year lifecycle for the application. He explained that that meant in the next year or two we would be going to a new or "new-ish" system. A lot of innovations occur every year and updating or changing the system will only reduce costs and make the software more efficient.

Mr. Bolton added that he took exception to the inference that the system was not meeting the needs of its users. He felt that we were very successful in meeting the needs of our users, both internal and external. He receives many comments on the timeliness and quality of our data. He felt that we were doing a pretty good job and want to do a better job and save some money in the process. Ms. C. Johnson stated the she did not want to anyone to feel that the subcommittee was bashing vital records or OIT because that was not their intent. One of the reasons they talked about a new system was not just the user, but also OIT. OIT also told the subcommittee that NHVRIN was not making sense when they sat down with them.

From a clerk's perspective Ms. C. Johnson stated that if she processed a marriage by hand many years ago, it was a 10-minute process. It is a 45-minute process to do the same thing today. Ms. K. Johnson, Ms. Hadaway, and Ms. Gaouette all expressed audible surprise and explained it did not take them 45 minutes to do a marriage in their respective offices. Ms. C. Johnson replied that it does in her office and they tell people to plan for 45 minutes. She stated that the reason for this is sometimes you get disconnected and the system is going back and forth to the system in comparison to some of the other things they do in their office.

She felt that they brought a lot of inefficiencies along when they upgraded to the NHVRIN system. She added the she thinks things have gotten a lot better, but that is because Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz have worked very hard. Maybe now it does not take quite as long to enter a marriage, but it can take up to that amount of time. Aside from that, she felt that what the subcommittee has said is that there are a lot of problems and that there are a lot of problems that are perhaps not real, but OIT was recognizing that there were issues with NHVRIN. There are a lot of things that can be done more easily or the way the code is written will make it more difficult in the future to make upgrades. Ms. C. Johnson concluded that we have to keep up with technology.

Ms. Hadaway replied that the committee was aware of that fact. Ms. C. Johnson continued that those were the issues the subcommittee wanted to point out. It is not to say that Vital Records has not done a good job with what they have. She remembered what was put out in 1988 and explained the she knows that the software is much better than what we had. There were many clerks that had never used a computer in their life and vital records helped them learn and grow into regular users. The subcommittee was

not saying that Vital Records had not done a good job because they have worked very hard.

She agreed with Dr. Teschner that the subcommittee needed to determine where the committee wanted to go. Doing nothing was not really an option. Ms. C. Johnson also felt that the committee had not gotten an answer on whether there was money in the budget to hire MRI should they elect to. She added that she was not sure if OIT would allow the outside company to come in and look over just what it is they would be working with. That was why she felt a subcommittee would be in order, to determine the parameters in which a consultant would work. Ms. Hadaway asked Mr. Bailey if OIT would allow a consultant such as municipal resources Inc. to come in and look at the system.

Mr. Bailey replied that they would turn everything over to Mr. Bolton and he could grant access to an outside consultant at his discretion. They would not be allowed onto the system in any sort of administrator capacity, but if they want database layouts in readable format OIT would be happy to comply. His only concern was that this contract would begin around the end of the fiscal year. One of the constraints in the proposal is that they requested a three day turnaround in any questions that they submitted to OIT. He was concerned that during that very busy time it would be nearly impossible to guarantee that turnaround time.

Especially when it came to financial information, as their finance office is very small and would be working at maximum capacity at that time of year. He did not feel that access to the systems analysis portion of the proposal would be an issue. Dr. Teschner stated that from his experience working with consultants in the past, the committee needed to write the specifications, not the consultant. He felt that the proposal that Mr. Towle had presented looked very good, but felt the committee needed to take a little time to digest it and go over it. That was why he was suggesting a subcommittee.

Mr. Bailey stated that he fell the subcommittee was a good idea. He suggested that the committee's goal would be to still be talking to Mr. Towle at the end of the contract, not be angry with him. They needed to come up with a list of questions that the committee expected to be answered by the study. If that was not done, some committee members might feel shortchanged. They needed to decide what questions they feel need to be answered in order to allow them to make the best decision. Ms. Hadaway asked if she had anyone willing to serve on the subcommittee. Mr. Bolton volunteered, Dr. Teschner stated that he would also be willing as did Mr. Hall, and Mr. Allan also expressed interest in being a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. Hadaway thanked them stating that their participation would be very helpful. She asked the subcommittee to meets before the next meeting and come up with recommendations/specifications. They could report to the whole committee at the next meeting. Ms. C. Johnson stated that someone raised the point of getting OIT to provide some sort of narrative on the services they provide. She asked if that was something that the committee was going to request from OIT. She felt that it would be helpful to the committee. Ms. Hadaway replied that that would be something that the subcommittee would want to have.

Mr. Hall suggested that the committee ask OIT to provide that document to the subcommittee as soon as possible. Mr. Croteau asked for more specificity as to what the

committee was looking for. Were they looking for the specific services that are provided by OIT to vital records? Dr. Teschner suggested they document all the tasks they perform. Mr. Bolton asked if the committee meant all the services they provide vital records or just in general. Mr. Hall replied services that are billed to the fund and Ms. Hadaway agreed. Mr. Bolton agreed that would be a good idea, but added that there is great detail of information on allocations, etc. on the state Intranet. There is very specific information located there.

Mr. Hall explained that the budget detail the committee is given does not break down or explain any of the costs. How much is development, fixes, etc. Those are the kinds of things you would put on an RFP. Dr. Teschner stated that to have some sort of estimate as to how much it costs to do some of those tasks would be good starting point. He stated that he had been attending these meetings for a year and still felt that the NHVRIN system and the budget information was a big mystery. He sees the report at each meeting and was sure some people understood it, but he does not. He felt that it could be a lot clearer.

Ms. Hadaway stated the she hoped that the committee would come up with a detailed description of what it is that we want from a review. Ms. C. Johnson stated that one of the things that her subcommittee had said was that in the end you may determine that you are getting the best deal from OIT, but until you look at an apples to apples situation you do now. Ms. Hadaway explained that the committee was running really late and she wanted to thank the subcommittee for the report and Mr. Towle for coming in to meet with them.

7. Preservation Update:

Dr. Teschner distributed a handout to the committee and explained that it showed where the grant program stood. He added that there had been a lot of positive feedback for the program and had included in his report, a letter from the City of Manchester that was very supportive. He stated that he wanted to make one observation about the budget process as it applied to the grant program. There was a definite lag effect with the program.

Dr. Teschner pointed out that the program had spent $411,000 and they had budgeted $700,000 to $800,000 for the year. It is just taking time from the time the reports come in until they purchase something. He felt that they would catch up by the end of FY08 to that $1.5 million type figure. It would not be as much this year and would be more next year.

When the grant program hosted the workshops the vendor suggested that the program purchase a book they used for city and town clerks. Dr. Teschner explained that he felt that all the information contained in the book was online, but offered to share it with the committee on the vendor's behalf. The books were $20 each and he wondered if the clerks would think that they were useful enough for that expense.

The book is titled "Preservation of Library & Archival Materials" and goes into great detail about certain aspects of the work. Dr. Teschner explained that what he tries to do with his communications is summarize and this book goes into great detail. He added that he would be interested in any feedback from committee members.

Approved Minutes

Dr. Teschner explained that the program had hosted the workshops in January and they had been very successful with 111 people in attendance. He stated that he was aware that the committee wanted to approve additional workshops before he scheduled them. At some point he felt that they needed to have a discussion about how many workshops the committee wanted to have a year and the impact of the workshops. This was probably not the best opportunity because the meeting was nearing its end.

With the suggestion of the subcommittee and with the support of the Clerk Executive Committee, Ms. Lori Foley had been asked to give a presentation on disaster planning at the September clerk conference. The cost for her presentation would be $500 plus expenses, so it would probably end up around $1000. Dr. Teschner asked for the committees support going forward with that workshop. The five workshops in January had cost $7,000.

Dr. Teschner suggested that the committee discuss doing more workshops and whether they wanted to look into having them at clerk's conferences. At this point he had not scheduled any further training and the only thing on the horizon was the September event. Ms. Hadaway replied that as a clerk she felt that the conferences hit most of the clerks that would come and be interested. If people do not come to conference they are not going to attend other scheduled workshops even in their own area.

Ms. Hadaway felt that holding the training at the conference would allow Dr. Teschner to reach all the people that would have an interest and would participate. She believed that would also save a great deal of money because we would then only have to offer the program once per year. Updates at the workshops in the spring might also be very helpful. Dr. Teschner replied that he would take that as a directive from the committee.

Dr. Teschner informed the committee that the consultant contracts he had would be expiring in June and he needed to extend them. These were the people doing the assessments. He anticipated that the assessments would be complete by December. There were 76 assessments completed of the 145 requested which works out to 52%. He explained that there was detail in the back of his report about what exactly was done for each applicant. The vendor contracts were not fixed price contracts. They do the work and we pay them the amount they provided through the bid process.

Dr. Teschner stated that he did not think he asked the committee for approval the last time when they were doing assessments, but stated that it was his intention to extend the contracts. He explained that the vendors only get paid when they do assessments or when they attend meetings. Ms. Gaouette asked if Dr. Teschner was extending this to any more towns. He replied that he wanted to discuss that.

We initially made a deadline of January for people to apply. There were 158 communities that applied. Now that he was making the rounds to the clerk conferences people were approaching him and saying "our clerk had cancer and that is why we did not apply" or "we were waiting for town meeting." He asked if the committee wanted to let people in to the back of the queue for an assessment, just tell them no, or tell them to wait and see. Did the committee want to take a hard line and tell them no, maybe, or put them in the back of the line?

Ms. Hadaway asked if any committee members wanted to respond. Mr. Hall asked if Dr. Teschner would need additional money to add more towns. Dr. Teschner replied that he

probably would. He explained that his financial information is based on invoiced amounts plus he allocated the administration for the current year. The information the committee gets from Ms. Penney is an audit report that is based on what has been paid out in cash. The two reports unfortunately, do not communicate and there is not a grant line in the state budget because there was no grant line. He had spoken to Ms. Penney about the budget information and how if he was on this committee he would like to see how the numbers he is punching in show up on the other report.

Dr. Teschner explained that if he buys a cabinet for a town it shows up on the equipment line and unless you go back through all the invoices you have no way of tracking those.

Ms. Hadaway asked Dr. Teschner what he was asking for. Dr. Teschner replied that he was asking if the committee would be willing to entertain applicants from towns that are late. The committee could say no or we can offer an assessment, but not guarantee anything more. The assessments were running around $2000 and that might be a good compromise. Or we could say wait and see until we get to the end.
Ms. Gaouette stated that they have had several opportunities to take advantage of the program. They had all been addressed individually by letter and they did not choose to participate at that time, so she felt that they could wait until we see where this whole budget thing was going. Another year possibly, and if they are still interested they should come to the clerk's conference.

Mr. Allan stated that there appeared to be very tragic mitigating circumstances in some of the cases and he would not want the committee to appear too cold hearted. Ms. Hadaway replied that this process had started the previous year and everyone had the opportunity to participate. Ms. Gaouette added that it is not like they would not have the opportunity again later to do it. Mr. Allan asked how long would they have to wait. Dr. Teschner replied that at that point assessments were so backed up that they would not be able to do something for them until January.

Even if he told them they were in there would be a long wait. Ms. Hadaway suggested that we take a wait and see attitude. Put those towns that are now expressing interest on a waiting list and see how the rest of the current assessments go and then decide whether to offer services to them. Dr. Teschner felt that was the best way to handle it because it was not giving them a definite no. Ms. Gaouette suggested that those towns could be at the front of the line for the next round. Dr. Teschner stated that the next round would probably not occur until FY09 or late in FY08.

Dr. Teschner explained that he is going over all the assessments, dealing with all the vendors and processing all the invoices. He was purchasing the equipment and services for the towns, not handing out money. That had been Mr. Gray's idea, but is time consuming. The program is moving along well and the clerks are happy. Because of the lag time involved Dr. Teschner wanted to carry over any funds not spent in 2007 to 2008.

Mr. Hall suggested a motion to make any money not spent in FY07 be made available in FY08 to the grant program. Mr. Allan seconded Mr. Hall's motion. Ms. Hadaway explained that the committee would be voting to approve the preservation portion of the budget, encumbering the $872,000 for FY 07 and $701,000 for FY08. The committee voted unanimously to approve Mr. Hall's motion.

8.   **Additional Budget Discussion:**

Mr. Hall pointed out that they still had the first line item in the budget. The automation support staff, equipment, and supplies and that was where the additional equipment was taken out. Ms. C. Johnson agreed. Mr. Hall pointed out that it was located on page two of the subcommittee report. Ms. Hadaway asked if Mr. Bolton or Mr. Wurtz had any issues with the recommendation of the subcommittee on the equipment changes. Mr. Wurtz stated that it was fine with him. Ms. C. Johnson pointed out that this is where they had also removed the out-of-state travel money for the coding training.

The subcommittee did, however put the $4000 in for the coding consultant in FY08 and FY09. Mr. Scanlan had agreed that this was an operational expense and was working on finding a solution. She asked if Mr. Stevens or Dr. Teschner had spoken with Mr. Scanlan about operational expenses. Mr. Stevens replied that he had not. The other thing the subcommittee had removed was the $50,000 for the computer-based training. Ms. Gaouette asked Mr. Bolton if he was comfortable with those changes.

Mr. Bolton replied that he had not spoken with Mr. Scanlan about the issues outlined by Ms. C. Johnson. Ms. Hadaway suggested that since two voting members had now left the meeting if there was a quorum. Mr. Bolton counted the remaining members and they no longer had a quorum. Ms. Hadaway stated that this item would have to wait until the next meeting to vote on the last piece of the budget. She wanted to be sure we had a quorum when a vote was taken.

Mr. Stevens asked if the committee had acted on the subcommittee's recommendations. Ms. Hadaway replied that the committee had not gone over all of them yet. They were just looking over the budget portion at this point. She felt that the rest would be looked at in July, at the next meeting. Obviously, voting on some of the budget items, the committee had acted on some of the recommendations. Ms. C. Johnson pointed out that they had also created a subcommittee to look at the recommendations. Mr. Stevens asked about the suggestion that this report be put on the agenda for the next meeting so each recommendation could be looked at one by one after people have had time to digest them. Ms. Hadaway agreed that was a good idea.

9.   Other Business:

Mr. Bolton reported that the Director of the Division of Vital Statistics of the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) would be visiting Vital Records on Monday and Tuesday to look at the NHVRIN software because it is so highly regarded. His main interest is the rapid report of death for something like Avian Flu detection. He would be joined in Concord by his deputy, Mr. Delton Atkinson, and the head of the Mortality Division, Mr. Bob Anderson.

Ms. Hadaway asked if there was any other business. She explained that she was just wondering about the status of HB645, the physician certifying bill. Mr. Bolton stated that it was HB345 and it involved requiring physicians to electronically certify death, and would allow Advanced Registered Nurse Practitioners (ARNP) to certify death as well. He reported that the bill had been received by the Senate, but there was no date set for it yet. Ms. Hadaway stated that she was concerned about that as it would have to do with the computer-based training module and she wanted to remain on top of that.

Approved Minutes

Ms. Hadaway asked for any additional business. Ms. Gaouette replied that she just wanted to thank everyone. She added that her time on the committee had been interesting to say the least. Hearing no further business, Ms. Hadaway asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Hall made the motion and it was seconded. The remaining members voted unanimously to adjourn.