

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

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
May 17, 2001***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

May 17, 2001

Health and Welfare Building
Conference Room 312
6 Hazen Drive
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Armstrong, IT Manager, Division of Information Technology Management (DITM) Appointment
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
Jane Ireland, Town Clerk Appointment
Tom Janosz, Funeral Director Appointment
Patricia Little, City Clerk Member
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Medical Examiner's Office Appointment
Debra Eastman, Town Clerk Appointment
Pat Seskes, NH Hospital Association Appointment

STAFF PRESENT:

Mark Andrew, Administrator, Division of Epidemiology and Vital Statistics, OCPH
Melanie A. Orman, Program Specialist, DEVS
Don Gerow, Office of Information Systems
Rick Bailey, Office of Information Systems, DHHS
Tom Towle, Director, DITM
Mark Parris, Information Technology Manager

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

Approved Minutes

1. Introduction of Guest:

Ms. Little introduced Linda Bourke one of her clerks in Keene and her resident VRV2000 expert. Ms. Bourke would be discussing how the Keene office helped a new VRV site in their area (Peterborough) become better acquainted with using the VRV software. That they had learned some valuable lessons that Ms. Little thinks will be applicable to other locations throughout the state. Ms. Little asked committee members to introduce themselves to Ms. Bourke.

Minutes Approval:

Ms Little offered two corrections to the March 15, 2001 minutes. On Page 8, it states that Login is made up of regular citizens. That is incorrect; it is made up of municipal officials. There also appeared to be a word missing from a sentence. "Little believes that eventually NHMA will become so involved with this that may even need to hire support staff, hopefully." With that cleared up, Ms. Little motioned to accept the minutes as corrected, Dr. Mevers so moved, Ms. Little seconded and the committee voted to accept the minutes with corrections.

2. DITM Update:

Frame Relay Pilot:

Ms. Little called on Mr. Armstrong to report on the status of the pilot site in Pembroke where the municipal agent application and VRV application are co-existing on the same communication line. They are currently waiting for town officials to say whether they consider this pilot a success and are happy with the utilization and performance of both agencies on one circuit. There are approximately 20-30 sites where we will have 100% overlap of the two software packages at the same location. Once Pembroke has signed off on the pilot we can start moving ahead with them. Mr. Armstrong was unaware of a timeline.

He went on to explain that DITM is primarily in an observation mode at this point. They will respond if there are any issues or if they are called upon. Until this dovetails into the statewide telecommunications RFP, they are waiting and watching. The overall state telecommunication needs will be more clearly defined as they go through the planning of the the statewide IT plan. Mr. Armstrong mentioned that although he was unaware of it, Mr. Bailey may have better idea of the schedule planned for adding more sites in conjunction with the Department of Safety.

Ms. Little asked for the User Agreement that we would be asking towns to sign, to be explained further. Mr. Bailey explained that because Pembroke was a pilot site, Safety and our IT departments had put aside any issues around any agreement between the two departments. They are now working on several agreements; one between the two state agencies; one between each agency and the user town; or one between the town and the two state agencies. One item still to be worked out with the Department of Safety is compensation for our usage of their line. If so, what formula will be used? If the line

Approved Minutes

goes down, who will be notified and at what number. Those issues will take a while to work out and then to make it through to the respective Commissioner for signing.

Historically the Bureau of Vital Records has been hands off when it comes to an end users agreement. They provided the PC and vital records software to the clerks. Clerks were given permission to load other software onto their state issued PC with the knowledge that they would be responsible for any repair if a software they loaded caused the computer to fail. The Department of Safety has been much more restrictive. They do not allow their computers to be used for anything other than Department of Safety business. If we are planning to share communication lines we have to come up with some protocol of how we are going to connect machines. Could smaller towns conduct business for both departments on one machine is one of the questions. If a town does use only one PC, then it would have to be decided whose rules would govern. The Department of Safety prefers that their more restrictive user agreement prevail in such cases and presented that idea to LOGIN recently.

The two departments have not discussed the matter in great detail as they were working on the pilot and will now begin these discussions. Mr. Bailey went on to say that because of their configurations, there are some towns that we will not be sharing lines with Safety. The agreements would have to make room for these differences. Ms. Little asked Mr. Towle what the role of DITM in terms of the agency to agency agreement was, did they facilitate these types of agreements. Mr. Towle advised that DITM is not typically in the business of brokering these arrangements.

Mr. Bailey went on to say that inter-agency agreements are very common. He was not aware of any agreements similar to the one we need to enter into or he would see how their agreement is worded. Ms. Little asked that since there has been success in Pembroke, is it expected that the project will be expanded to those sites that really do have two locations. Mr. Bailey replied that it is successful in that it technically works.

They don't expect a town the size of Pembroke to have difficulty with Vital Records and Motor Vehicle transactions conflicting because of large numbers of transactions. They need to run it awhile and look at some of the utilization numbers. They do not anticipate there being a major problem with traffic, but want to take a little time to study the numbers. More than likely there will be towns that have so much traffic in vital records and motor vehicle records that it will not be feasible for us to share communication lines. Mr. Bailey would like to get an estimate of that earlier than later.

While OIS is evaluating the pilot, they will begin negotiations with the Department of Safety. They feel it is important that some guidelines be agreed upon before it is rolled out to more towns. Ms. Little asked if the negotiations were exclusively between OIS and the Department of Safety. Mr. Bailey explained that the cost information would be brought back before the board. He also said that there has been a line in the budget for this type of expenditure for some time and he is confident there is enough to cover this project.

Mr. Bailey also stated that there will come a time when it will be important for us to decide if the utilization is enough to warrant the 50-75% we will be paying for the line. Mr. Gerow stated that the Department of Safety is paying \$115-120, so if we were to split 50/50 it would be \$60 per month per location. Mr. Bolton asked if Safety has the tools to check utilization. Mr. Bailey said that we have some tools, but they are not monitoring

Approved Minutes

full time. Mr. Gerow added that until they get the feeling that Pembroke is actually doing something, monitoring would not be helpful.

He went on that more important at this point is talking to the Pembroke clerk to see how the VRV application is responding to him. If he is getting a better response than from the modem, it is more cost effective for him. Other than having to share the cost of the line, it is a win win situation for everyone involved. Ms. Little asked about Peter Croteau's concerns about the User's Agreement that will require that the PC not be hooked to any LAN and cannot have other software loaded onto it. Mr. Gerow explained that the issue of security is one that needs to be worked out during the negotiations. He went on to say that Safety has a router at each of these locations and the only thing that should go out are the requests for the Vital Records database connection. If you did have this hooked to an internal network there would be other traffic so if we allowed that, it would increase the workload that would have to be done at the site to block all the information from going into his network.

Safety is trying to maintain the integrity of their network and if we start adding a lot of things in, we will cause problem for them. Ms. Little asked if anyone wanted to speculate on how the situation was going to play out, if Mr. Croteau maintained his current position. Mr. Bailey said that if he remains firm on the requirement that nothing local come in contact with his software they would have to offer some municipalities an option. "If you want improved communication, we can take these PC's out of your LAN, not run the dog licensing application on them but give you dedicated contact to Vital Records. Or if this is your PC and you are running everything in the world including dog licenses on it, you will have to stay with a dial up connection until a solution is found." Mr. Bailey feels that even if Mr. Croteau does take the hard line, it won't be that negative going forward. It will just mean we will not see as many benefits in as many places, because that decision will have to be made on a case by case basis.

Mr. Gerow added that right now they (Safety) are basically hitting the small towns that have no municipal agent automated software. Claremont has actually pulled out of the project. Ms. Little asked why. Mr. Bailey thinks it was because of the fact that they have to enter some licensing information twice, once in their own software and once in the Safety computer, because of security. He thinks they are looking at a way of transferring files with those larger municipalities that have their own system of automation.

Mr. Gerow reported that he has received a few e-mails from Nashua, who is talking with Safety and are thinking about getting one of the connections in so they can do the quick turnaround in case someone comes in and wants a vanity plate, or a customer that is transferring and forgot to bring the registration. By having the municipal software that Safety has, they would have that information at their fingertips. Mr. Gerow added that Safety is actually locking the computers with a password so that they are the only ones that can load any new software. These requirements also prevent a lot of problems requiring software support, which the Department of Safety does not have the manpower nor resources for. Mr. Bailey told the committee that had we walked into a blank page agreement, we would have asked for the same kind of control. He also mentioned that the barn door had been left open a long time ago and now it would be hard to close it.

Mr. Gerow also mentioned that the advantage to going to these sites is that Safety has already spent the money to hook up the network which is anywhere from \$3,000 to \$5,000 per location. So all we are required to do is split the cost of the line with them. In

Approved Minutes

the future, if they become stymied and cannot go on with more sites, we told them that we may be able to split the cost of adding new sites to the network. That is one of the things that also needs to be worked out, because they don't want us owning/maintaining the equipment on their network.

Mr. Armstrong stated that this type of problem clearly illustrates why we need a statewide initiative. There would be no boundaries barring one department from doing things. Mr. Gerow pointed out that in the majority of the small towns there is no network, just the clerk adding their own software, but they are using Access and other software already there. He believes that we have built a rapport with the IT staff of the larger cities, and have a good understanding of what we will do and what they will be responsible for. Ms. Little hopes that understanding will continue on the Department of Safety side as well. Mr. Gerow hopes to get a good two weeks worth of info on Pembroke and will then set up a meeting with Safety to start doing the follow up.

Right now there are 16 other sites, besides Pembroke we can take Vital Records to as Safety is already there. There are several things that need to be done in order to do this: we have to get network numbers in order to hook up the towns; set up the machines; decide when training will be held for the new users and their deputies. Ms. Little asked if OIS would be coming back to the committee when the agreement was reached with Safety. Mr. Bailey agreed that they would. Mr. Towle asked if Vital Records is web enabled and the installation is web enabled, will that change any of this discussion? Mr. Bailey agreed that it did because at that point Safety could put whatever security it wanted in its authentication process with the transaction.

He feels that at that point Safety will try to divest itself from its homegrown network, because it would not work over an internet connection or a shared basic TCP/IP connectivity. He added that they would be unable to get rid of all the frame relay lines overnight and they would still be a bit concerned until they were out of the networking business. Mr. Towle stated that web enabling would certainly solve some of the problems/roadblocks. Mr. Bailey agreed. Mr. Gerow added that it would increase the complexity of who would manage the four or five providers of these internet accounts for the all of the users. Who will provide the machines, who will be called when there is a problem, is it the application, the provider? He said that web enablement would change a lot of things.

Ms. Little asked about the status of the statewide communication contract. Mr. Towle explained that there has been a team in Administrative Services working on it for several months and it has recently been expanded to include some other agencies. They have been working on the scope of the contract as it will be a multi-year, multi-service contract. Similar to the current contract Admin. Services currently holds for voice and data. This contract will be the next generation of that contract. They are still discussing some of the telecommunication products and services that would be included. It is on schedule and they are hoping to release the RFP in August. Mr. Bailey added that he is expecting a draft of the RFP in a week or so.

Mr. Andrew asked if by on schedule meant that the contract would be in place by when? Mr. Towle said that they are hoping to have the contract in place by the end of the year. The plan is for the new vendor to be up and running by fall 2002 and there would be at least a six month transition period. Ms. Little asked for clarification as to who would be affected, would it just be for state agency to state agency communication or to

Approved Minutes

municipalities? Mr. Towle replied that at this point it would not go to municipalities, but that doesn't mean it has been ruled out. It would be like other state contracts in that municipalities could use the state contract to get the same services. There is still a little bit of gray area in terms of the scope. Mr. Armstrong mentioned that they are very close to announcing the state IT contract, that there would be an announcement in the next couple of weeks. It would run through the rest of the calendar year.

3. DHHS OIS update:

A. VRV2000 New Build Roll Out Status:

We released and distributed VRV version 3.01 last Wednesday, May 9. We held a User's Meeting the following day. Some hospitals and funeral homes did not attend. Ms. Little asked if there had been comments about funky things they had been finding on the new version. He responded that the only things they had been made aware of was a print problem on the Concord City Clerk's office and on Steve Wurtz' computer. When it prints a death certificate the cause of death is highlighted, but the rest of the document is fine. It appears that the problem is with the machines and that Powerbuilder 5 always had a font problem and our upgrading Oracle only enhanced the problem. Ms. Little recommended that Mr. Gerow speak with Ms. Bourke regarding some of the problems they have been experiencing with the new software.

Ms. Bourke explained that the "select" button had been lost. Mr. Gerow informed her that ManTech put on blinders when it made changes or fixes on the software, not acknowledging the domino effects of changes they make. That historically they do not proactively seek out the ramifications on the rest of the program when they make changes to a specific portion of it. Ms. Little asked if we pay them for this type of service. Mr. Gerow explained that twice they have sent us "new" versions that did not reflect the changes we had requested and we refused them.

He went on to say that because this software allows for many different users, changes need to be made for all users when they are made. When OIS asks for a change to be made in birth, they expect it to apply to all users, but it doesn't always. When they fix things they break others. Ms. Bourke was asked if she found things confusing or if they were unusable. She replied that it is usable, just confusing. Those items are being brought back to ManTech for correction. Mr. Bailey stated that it is safe to say at some point ManTech will stop fixing these things. Not because they shouldn't, but because this software was accepted, before it was tested. Under the terms of the contract it should not have been accepted.

When the contract expires at the end of August Mr. Bailey will recommend we not renew with ManTech. The cost of the new contract will be \$130,000 and we won't be getting any bang for our buck. Mr. Armstrong asked if we were going to do an RFP. Mr. Bailey said that we could do targeted support for x number of thousands of dollars to coincide with the release and bring in a lot of other people. Mr. Gerow's crew has been forced to go in and familiarize themselves with the software and basically tell ManTech what needs to be done to correct the errors they find. Mr. Bailey thinks we can get a lot more efficiency doing it internally.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Bolton added that there are upsides and downsides to that idea and that we are looking into both. Ms. Little expressed little confidence in a future with ManTech. Mr. Bolton explained that ManTech has gone through some major structural changes over the course of the last year or so and that may be partly to blame for their poor performance. They made a lot of the fixes for free in an effort to accommodate us. Mr. Gerow countered with the point that they have been paid for the past two years for maintenance for which they didn't have to do anything.

He explained that they took this contract with the understanding that we use and HP Unix machine here with an Oracle database and that we wanted a PowerBuilder 6.5 and Oracle 8I and they knew what our platform was. They then found that they had let maintenance on their HP Unix machine lapse and they also let their Oracle lapse. As a consequence, we tested the software on the 8I database on a HP Unix machine before they did. We had initially hoped to put this version out in the fall, but with all the errors we couldn't. He also explained that in the beginning there wasn't a developer assigned to VRV, but now there is one available. It won't be us handing a list of 300 errors to fix, they will be handled as they arise.

Regarding the Helpdesk trouble calls, there were 40 calls to the helpdesk and 15 to OIS. Of those, five of them were trying to set up new machines. In the future, users will be asked to postpone adding new machines during the first week of a new version's release. It ties up one person for an hour or more when they are supposed to be supporting the new software. During the last users meeting, some asked about refresher training sessions or sessions for new employees. Mr. Gerow suggested we hold User meeting on a quarterly basis. He also suggested we more firmly encourage them to attend. Ms. Little agreed that we need to be firmer with the users. Mr. Armstrong suggested that we look at one of the outside vendors for a reference material for users. Mr. Gerow described a flip card reference that had been created for the Bridges Program.

B. CD ROM Distribution:

OIS made sure to put the Seneca helpdesk telephone number everywhere it was possible, on the disk label, the packaging, instruction sheet and also reiterated it at the User meeting. They were hoping to convince users to use the helpdesk rather than getting hung up on the phone trying to reach someone from OIS. There was also a problem with the mailing label. There were multiple addresses for funeral homes and hospitals. We also heard of hospital staff getting the disks/info three days later than others because of a distribution problem, internal to the hospital. It was discovered and explained to those in attendance that all the contact information needs to be updated regularly. The CD was sent to every hospital, funeral home and VRV town clerk.

The CD had everything to install the new version and everything needed to set up a machine that VRV had never been loaded on before. The CD contained a "host element" which basically turns the user's computer into a host computer waiting to be taken over by us. Mr. Gerow explained that the host element was set up to be installed on the computer and sits benign until you are asked to turn it on. In the instructions it was outlined and users were instructed to inform their IT staff that it was there in case they did not want it on the machine. OIS then locked it down so no one can use it but us. The only way it can be used is for the user to turn it on, give us the phone number and we

Approved Minutes

have to use the correct password and username within three tries or we will be disconnected.

Ms. Little asked if we know that every site has updated their version. Mr. Gerow responded that we haven't polled the sites. Ms. Little asked if maybe we shouldn't inquire, rather than assume. Mr. Janosz said that they wouldn't be able to use the old version after the deadline. Mr. Bolton and Mr. Gerow told him that it would be possible to use the old version. The new version just sent out, included a version check to prevent it from being used after later updates. Mr. Gerow explained that they did find some really old applications that had not been previously updated. They were found because when the latest edition was installed it shut down their computer.

C. SSA/NAPHSIS Electronic Death Registration Project:

Mr. Bolton reported that he is trying to work out a mechanism with OIS where it will become feasible for us to participate in an online verification process. If we are able to stick with the Social Security Administration on 24 hour death event notification, SS# and name verification, we stand to get some budget enhancements. One of the things we need to do in order to satisfy SSA is to be able to do verifications on either a weekly or even daily basis. Originally the SSA wanted to notify the funeral home of invalid social security numbers as they were entering the record. They have softened their stand to allow the bureau to handle the queries. They are now scheduling meetings to look at an existing process or a new process that will allow us to speak with the SSA. Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Parris to elaborate further.

Mr. Parris described one of the OIS concerns regarding the transmission of data. There is already a mechanism in place to transmit data to SSA and they prefer not to reinvent the wheel. All that they want from New Hampshire is one file. What that implies is that we would somehow have to append this data to the file that is going from the other application and send it all at once, which is probably not the largest of the problems we face. One of the problems with that is we are operating on two different platforms, the HP Unix and the IBM, which is where the other data is sent. Our file would have to be converted to an IBM format. He said that they do have a lady in their office, Rita Royer who is very good with the functions we would need to do in order to do that and automate it. He is hoping to set up a meeting between Bill, Rita and the others involved to discuss how difficult or easy that will be.

Another alternative is one Mr. Bolton brought to his attention is NetPost Certified. A product of the U.S. Postal Service that SSA has approved. Mr. Parris feels that this is once again, another mechanism that we will have to deal with and maintain. He and Mr. Gerow feel that NetPost would still require a lot of manual work to do it. What we do with NetPost is send them an encrypted document; they verify with us what exactly we sent. Then they forward the document to the addresses we provide, verifying their receipt and then notifying us when the transaction is complete.

Ms. Little asked if those issues were what Mr. Bolton meant when he said looking into whether it is feasible. Mr. Bolton said yes and that NAPHSIS was being patient. Some other issues Mr. Parris outlined were some table changes and some actual programming changes we would have to make. Ms. Little asked if it was because of the budget enhancements that we were so interested in doing this. Mr. Bolton said that yes, upfront

Approved Minutes

they would be paying for anything we have to do to our database or any kind of contracts. He added that ultimately their goal is to web enable everyone. Mr. Bolton said that it is very important for them so that they will be able to terminate benefits immediately when a person dies, which will save them an incredible amount of money.

Ms. Little asked about the timeline if we decide it is feasible. Mr. Bolton replied that they are currently getting New Jersey up and would probably like to see us up in June. Ms. Little asked about the timeline for us to receive the budget enhancements. Mr. Bolton explained that the last time he had spoken with SSA, they had mentioned April of 2001, which has already passed. He was unsure of the length of the pilot, but felt budget enhancements would be included in the new contract with the SSA, following the pilot.

Ms. Little asked if anyone knew if our web enablement project had been discussed in the Senate Finance committee meeting the day before. Mr. Bailey informed her that it had, but not at length. She asked in what context and who discussed it. Mr. Bailey informed the committee that Senators Boyce and Gatsis were generally interested in expenditures for IT and what they were for. As it sits now it is a \$500,000 budget item, \$200,000 of which would be charged back to the VRIF for each of the two years. They added a footnote that the funding be continued for the third year. So in reality it would be \$300,000 of General funds that would not otherwise be available for the next two years.

Ms. Little added that a few weeks ago after the House vote she was inclined to think we could make do with the \$600,000 over the two years and maybe we should let it go. Thinking that maybe the SSA money and the VRIF could be an option. At this point she doesn't think that will be feasible, especially the VRIF because of the unknown future communication cost. Mr. Bailey testified to the House Division III, that it would allow us to go forward with the web enabling of some of the options. Hospitals and funeral homes would benefit, but Town Clerks would not as they use all the functions rather than a select few.

Ms. Little does not think three years would be acceptable to the clerks. Ms. Little said that what we are doing is suggesting to some members of the senate is to just take another look to see if we can squeeze out a little more money. Even if that means having to go to committee conference, it is worth the risk. Mr. Bolton mentioned that the clerks have shown great patience. Ms. Little reported that she has been in contact with Senator D'Allesandro and Senator Eaton and she hopes that Debra Eastman has been in contact with Senator Boyce, who is a member of the committee. She asked if Mr. Bailey knew the timeline. He replied that they went through their whole department budget in about three hours and he is unsure of when anything will be done.

Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Bailey when he anticipates an RFP going out for web enablement. Mr. Bailey replied that until we know what is going to happen with the budget. If the funding stays the same the scope of the project will have to change. OIS may need to come back to the committee. He said that \$300,000 isn't a lot to start with and if the project has a total budget of \$600,000 that money will have to span the whole two years. Mr. Armstrong and Bailey agreed that it will probably be fall or winter before anything gets out. Mr. Bailey also mentioned that there are several other initiatives going on that he wants to watch.

The department is looking at web strategy for departments other than Vital Records. They hope to get some information out of that by late summer early fall. One of the

Approved Minutes

things that will do is web enable some functionality to an Oracle database, which would mirror what we want to do with Vital Records. Also, the state's IT project will be generating some web architecture documents probably in the fall. Mr. Andrew mentioned that he heard that there was also a footnote stating that money in budget marked for 2002 would be available into 2003.

4. Regional Help/Training Provision:

Ms. Little told the committee she had invited her expert from Keene to describe their experience with helping a new site (Peterborough) become acquainted with VRV. Ms. Bourke spoke about discussions last year regarding regional help. Since Ms. Dery left, the idea has fallen to the wayside.

She and Ms. Little have discussed the possibility of revisiting that idea. The main complaint she heard from the newly trained clerks was that they came to the training, but when they returned to the office, much of the information they had been given was forgotten. Ms. Bourke said that she had approached him about helping him with some of the more common uses. He was unsure of what types of reports he could access through the software and did not have the time to just go in and explore it. He was also trying to train the deputy clerk as well. So there are two people running around in this office that don't know what they are doing. There are a lot things as a pilot site that they could do and know (backdoor items). Mr. Gerow replied that OIS is aware that the Access database has to go.

She feels that if a small group of users would volunteer to help the new users with basic user questions, it would lessen the number of calls to the helpdesk. She also suggested that the group of volunteers be trained a little more extensively. They are aware of the helpdesk and do not want to step on any toes, but getting help from a peer, which may be more comfortable. Mr. Bolton stated that this type of idea would be good for funeral homes and hospitals too. Ms. Bourke feels that receiving the training in their own office would be very helpful to new users. It is understood that not all offices have the manpower or can afford to send their staff out to train other offices.

Mr. Bailey thinks that training is a good idea, but would like to see Bill and Steve and possibly Don attend these sessions. Maybe hold a regional meeting at the Keene Town Hall. Ms. Bourke thinks it would still be nice to have a regional person to talk with. Ms. Little added that many of the folks in the town offices do not have a lot of computer experience. They are afraid of leaving their tried and true AVRIS programs. Ms. XXX explained how she has tried to tell them VRV is not bad at all after you have used it awhile. Mr. Gerow agreed that many of those that resist it, find it is better in the long run, but it is a difficult sell. Most offices complain about the "synching" that occurs every morning. The new version should eliminate that complaint as now, not everyone is changing the table.

Mr. Andrew asked if it makes sense to look into regional meetings and start something that makes sense and will last until VRV is no more. Mr. Gerow said there are many options available from videos to in-person meetings. Mr. Armstrong said that it could be documented in the state IT plan. He also feels that because the pilot sites are well versed in VRV now, they might be better equipped to articulate a problem to the helpdesk. It would be more of team approach and the clerks would not feel isolated. Mr. Andrew brought up the fact that the committee has discussed this type of issue several times now

Approved Minutes

and he wanted to know if they were going to make a decision today regarding videos, regional training, etc.

Ms. Little replied that she was hoping, with Ms. Bourke's help, to reach out to some of the other clerks informally and possibly start a grass roots movement. The subgroup could meet, brainstorm and then come to the committee with their ideas and commitments from volunteers. Mr. Bolton suggested that they also involve he and Mr. Gerow. Mr. Bolton then asked Mr. Janosz if he felt funeral directors would be interested in this type of group. Mr. Janosz replied that the funeral directors don't generally have that many problems. The funeral directors are organizing a listing of all their email addresses so that when there is a problem they can be emailed. Faxes do not work well for them. Ms. Bourke mentioned that because Keene is on the Massachusetts and Vermont border she gets to enter death certificates like a funeral director. Ms. Little suggested this item be on the agenda for the next meeting and she will get together with the subcommittee to formulate some ideas.

5. Other Business:

Dr. Mevers spoke about paper record and preservation. About a year ago the committee welcomed a young man from Dartmouth College to come in and present a project he was working on where he was seeking a grant from the National Archives. Dartmouth College has since received that grant. It is one of three they have been able to make this year and they are expecting that project will get underway this year. Dr. Mevers believes that project will dovetail nicely into the project our subcommittee on records preservation is hoping to do. They have been sort of, holding off because of the activity in regard to municipal records funding from the legislature.

The House side of the committee was active last fall and there was a spurt of activity last month, but no real meetings held. The meetings were not held because the Senate never appointed new members to the committee. So that is still ongoing and the bill is still being investigated. It is supposed to be brought up again during the next session. In the meantime the committee is still continuing to obtain consideration of it.

Ms. Little said that we are looking for a funding mechanism for records management. That funding mechanism is going to attempt to tag onto a small fee that a town clerk will collect in preparing paperwork on a car registration. Namely increasing the \$1 record preparation fee that the clerk gets. Possibly raising it by another \$1 and have \$.50 go to the fund and \$.50 would remain local. Ms. Little reported that Paul had attended the regional meeting she attended last week, but she didn't feel he was given enough time on the agenda. They received no feedback, which didn't concern Paul, but did concern Ms. Little.

She went on to say that there has always been reluctance on the part of the clerks when it comes to the vehicle registration fees. Ms. Ireland thinks the reluctance is in adding yet another fee to the process. She felt that increasing an existing fee would be better received than adding a new one. Ms. Little asked if she could count on Ms. Ireland's support at her regional meeting. Ms. Ireland said that she could. Ms. Little is sure there will be resistance as she has already seen a letter sent to Paul from a clerk stating that the fee has not been increased since 1983 and now is not the time to increase it either. If we increase it for us, someone else is going to tag onto it is the thought. Ms. Little feels that if that measure were to be put in effect then the VRIFAC and the money we earmark for

Approved Minutes

restoration is going to be much more viable. Dr. Mevers said that with all due respect to electronic records he thinks everyone should understand that we are seeing paper records are mushrooming and someone is going to have to pony up pay for all the needs that are involved in it. Ms. Little agreed.

Mr. Armstrong asked if Ms. Little was involved in the credit card testimony and if she wanted to talk about it. Ms. Little explained that there is a statute that currently would require municipalities to charge a “convenience” fee when they allowed customers to pay with a credit card. The major credit card companies are telling the state that they cannot charge this fee. So until this legislation is changed we are caught between a rock and a hard place. It is HB435 and it has passed the house with a mainly editorial amendment and will be heard by the Senate next Tuesday. Everyone is expecting a favorable outcome.

That will be playing a very critical role since the Motor Vehicle Map initiative has just completed a credit card logical design committee. That means they are planning to incorporate the acceptance of credit cards in the map initiative, so it is important that we get this legislation in place. Whether it be e-government or over the counter, more and more of our customers want to use credit cards.

Ms. Little asked for other business and there was none.

Next meeting date: July 19, 2001

Meeting adjourned at 11:41 a.m.