

LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

State House, Room 100

Concord NH

Friday, June 6, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Gerald Griffin, Chairman

Representative Keith Erf

Representative Lucy Weber

Representative Karen Ebel

Senator Timothy Lang

Senator Howard Pearl

Senator Cindy Rosenwald

1. **Acceptance of the May 2, 2025 meeting minutes.**
2. **Potential Audit Topics - Review status of prior Performance Audits.**

JAY HENRY, Performance Audit Supervisor, Audit Division, Office of Legislative Budget Assistant: Yes, good morning. My name is Jay Henry.

GERALD GRIFFIN, State Representative, Hillsborough County, District #42, and Chairman: {Inaudible}

MR. HENRY: Yes. Uh -- my name is Jay Henry. I'm with the LBA Audit Division. I -- you had sent -- the Chair had sent a letter to OPLC and -- uh -- I think it was five boards who were part of the audit of the Mental Health Workforce Audit. Um -- in your packet you'll see the response from OPLC and the Director's here -- uh -- I think to present the status. And if you have any questions, you can address it to her.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: That would be wonderful. Welcome.

DEE JURIOUS, Executive Director, Office of Professional Licensure and Certification: Thank you so much. Uh -- good

morning. Just for the record, my name is Dee Jurius, Executive Director at OPLC. I appreciate you all being here in the morning. I'm -- and I know some of you had quite a late night. I think you all had a busy day yesterday. So appreciate that.

So I'm happy to discuss. We did provide an update on all of the 12 audit findings point by point here. And then you can see on the first page there's kind of a table just to give you a sense of where it is in terms of resolution.

So I'm happy to walk through that or just take questions, whatever your preference is. And I'm also happy to address the -- um -- kind of the Agency's plan moving forward to provide you updates on the rest of the audits that you have before you. So whatever you'd like to do.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: I -- I think what we'd like you to do is go -- go through item by item. And if there's questions, we'll ask them as each item comes up, rather than wait till the end.

MS. JURIOUS: All right. Sounds great. So just give you a broad overview, we -- we do have the vast majority, the ten of the 12 are in the substantially resolved section. The first one we would consider fully resolved, and then down here number 11 you can see partially resolved. So I'll just walk through. Um -- again, feel free to stop me with questions. Some of this language is -- um -- is repeated because a lot of the findings are -- are -- they're interrelated. A lot of them have to do with the Office just promulgating rules.

Just as a general statement, I will -- uh -- to set the context. The rulemaking process when you introduce a Board into the timelines between 541-A and then the Board process and the drafting is about 13 months from when they -- when we start to when it is actually the Final Proposal is adopted, based on meetings, public comment periods, the drafting, all of those pieces, FIS requests. So you can

imagine the dynamic within the Office as the governing statute has been -- the Legislature has made a lot of changes to what used to be 310-A is now 310.

As those changes, we have to make adjustments with all 57 boards and there's -- we have a few other professions. I believe we're up to 61 different professions we regulate, and it requires changes generally across all of those.

So if you can imagine, in a -- in a 12-month Calendar Year where we get bills that come out in June we, you know, we begin our process when they're effective. We have to prioritize the Office. If you've read through the report or you'll see as we go through, I have one full-time and two part-time rules drafters. We do about 25% of the State's rulemaking; and, again, on that thirteen -- on that 13-month timeline. So the Legislature passes the laws. We start getting to work. Even if we're right on top of it and we could draft everything the day that it's -- that it's passed, we're already past the time the next bills are coming out to make those changes.

So we've been in, I would call, a little bit of a rip tide of legislative changes. We implement the rules. It takes us a few months to get through all of that with the current staffing. Then they change. We're changing midstream trying to prioritize those legislative changes again.

So just to set the table, that's -- that's kind of the -- the landscape that we're navigating here. So a lot of what you're going to see in this report is the substantially resolved means we're in the middle of rulemaking. Boards are at some stage within that process as we've been trying to prioritize finding these legislative changes; but then, also, within those which are the higher priority.

So Observation Number 1 about license portability was a very clear priority for the prior gubernatorial

administration and for both bodies of the Legislature. It's not surprising to me that that's the first Observation on this audit, and it also received the highest priority within the Office, that statutory mandate. The idea of the -- kind of the public policy term is reciprocity. We use the term endorsement because just reciprocity implies that it goes both ways, but we can't obligate another state to recognize our credentials so it's the endorsement in.

So in 2023, the Legislature passed RSA or amended RSA 310:17 to have the universal recognition. So, a license in good standing from another state that's substantially similar a person can provide evidence of that and then be licensed in New Hampshire.

Um -- that required rulemaking for every -- not just for every Board, but every profession within that Board, which is over 200 of them that -- that review to determine what is substantially similar. And it also obligates the Office to regularly update that because, as I mentioned, our regs are constantly changing and other states are as well. So there's a fairly consistent review because at any time Maryland could be on the list for one profession. Those regs could have changed, and then it could not be anymore. So we're working on standardizing that review to make sure we're as up-to-date as possible.

Um -- but because, again, this is a newer, we've only been doing this reciprocity in terms after the rules were adopted for just over a year. So that's the status there. I'm happy to talk about that if there's any questions. I know there was a lot of conversation two years ago about that.

HOWARD PEARL, State Senator, Senate District #17: Mr. Chair, may I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Senator Pearl, yeah.

SEN. PEARL: Thank you. Thank you for coming in,

Director. So when -- um -- I -- I know that must be an arduous task to look at every single state and understand what they are, what their rules are. Do you -- do you review that so that you're prepared for whatever license comes in or do you sort of do it on a case-by-case basis where someone may come in with a request from Arkansas --

MS. JURIUS: Hm-hum.

SEN. PEARL: -- for a cosmetology license or something? I don't know, I -- I'll pick one.

MS. JURIUS: Yeah.

SEN. PEARL: And -- um -- I mean, do you try to review all of those licensed areas? I know you have 50 plus boards --

MS. JURIUS: Hm-hum.

SEN. PEARL: -- that are under your purview, and I just was curious what your process was for doing that.

MS. JURIUS: So at the outset when the Legislature passed that law, I believe it was House Bill 594 if memory serves the number there.

SEN. PEARL: I think it was 96 but that's all right.

MS. JURIUS: Okay. We're close. Either way -- um -- it was every -- every state, every profession all at once, which is a monumental task, quite frankly. It was enormous to get into. So it's the Plc, which is the Office rules is the 313s or three one threes, that's our endorsement reciprocity section. So every profession is listed there. So that was an all at once everything.

What we're working on now is trying to establish and, again, we're not fully there yet, a standard timeline, is it annually, is it biennially to review any changes. I think

at the risk of opening a can of worms there might be some opportunity for AI to assist in the, like, going out and finding information in terms of the collection, and then verifying that -- um -- to say were there changes made. Um -- again, I'm not -- I'm not going to have AI actually verifying it, but just doing the actual research and compiling the information. I think -- um -- the State is doing some really interesting work in that space, and I'd be interested in exploring if that might be helpful for the workforce for the ongoing piece.

The other thing that we've implemented is so if an individual application comes in from a jurisdiction we've not determined, predetermined in rule, we -- we will do the analysis based on that individual. If it goes to a hearing, if there's a review with the Board, right, if the Board is needed for expertise, we are also now tracking those so that we don't have to go back and reinvent the wheel.

So, actually, just this week Heather Kelly is my Director of Operations. She'll correct me. Eight or ten different jurisdictions we were -- we did a full review and added those to the website. Be like, yep, now our staff know and the public knows, good to go. These ones we've done the legal analysis. It's similar. If another manicurist from this jurisdiction comes, we can just -- we can approve it.

SEN. PEARL: Fantastic. May I follow-up?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yes.

SEN. PEARL: What do you think your average turnaround time is? By the way, thank you for your work on this. I know it's been a lot, and I -- we had a lot of debate and a lot of work on that bill as we were pushing it through. What do you think the average turnaround time is if someone comes in with an application says, you know, I -- I want to -- I'm from this state, and I'd like to get my license here in New Hampshire using the reciprocity.

MS. JURIUS: So if it's a complete application, right, there's always some variability if it's back and forth, they've missed something. If it's a complete application with the universal application and the license is actually in good standing, many of them are issued in the same day.

SEN. PEARL: Fantastic. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Other questions? Senator Lang.

TIMOTHY LANG, State Senator, Senate District #02: So I know we're still dealing with the universal app. I think we'll have it in JLCAR next -- this month.

MS. JURIUS: On the 20th. I'll see you there.

SEN. LANG: Yeah. So we'll have that universal app and approve the universal app. My question is particularly in this finding, you know, a lot -- we brought a lot of stuff in regarding mental health services, specifically because of what's going on in the state. And this Observation while, in theory, improve license portability can deal with, you know, electricians and plumbers and all the other things, this -- this one specifically talks about, again, mental -- mental health practice license and other drug professionals, medicine, nursing, and psychologists.

So I'm interested in whether we are prioritizing, again, what the finding was here relative to mental health over, again, plumbers, electricians, you know, all the other Boards still need this service; but in this particular audit was particularly focused in this area and the findings focused in the area of mental health. So are we going to be able to prioritize these four, five boards on here to be able to get to a faster resolution so we can check this thing off and saying done?

MS. JURIUS: So this is the only one that is done. This one is done.

SEN. LANG: This one.

MS. JURIUS: This finding, Observation 1, portability, is completely done.

SEN. LANG: Perfect.

MS. JURIUS: So that is complete. I am -- pardon me. I'm not being rude. I don't have my computer in front of me. I was going to try to pull up quickly the list for these specific boards that are listed. How many qualifying jurisdictions we have found just to get you a sense. So if you'll just permit me a minute, I can pull that up for you.

One of the challenges within the mental health profession and -- um -- LADC is another one there's been conversations, I know the Legislature has considered compacts in a number of different areas. Um -- there's been some conversation about a LADC compact.

One of the challenges is the regs are -- vary widely across all 50 states. There's not a lot of even regional -- um -- similarity, whereas -- um -- and this is not a slight at any -- at any profession by comparing. Just an example is the Board of Nursing, the regs are very, very similar. There's a compact that the vast majority of U.S. states are in and the reciprocity all 50 states and U.S. Territories are good for the Board of Nursing. If you have a license in another state, you can come to New Hampshire, no questions asked.

These other professions it's just not the same landscape. So -- um -- I'm just trying to get to you to give you a sense. Yeah. So I -- it might be for the Master LADC, you've maybe got a dozen states that it -- that are substantially similar.

LUCY WEBER, State Representative, Cheshire County, District #05: Um -- I'm sorry, I didn't hear.

MS. JURIUS: Maybe about a dozen states. I -- I don't want to sit here and count in front of you. It is available on my website. But you'll see there are other ones that it just says, like, for an architect, all U.S. states and the District of Columbia qualify, no questions asked. That is not the case for some of these. So we've done -- we've done the assessment but yeah.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Representative Weber.

REP. WEBER: If you can take my questions. Thank you for -- I -- I didn't realize quite the scope of the facts that the fact -- um -- I thought I heard earlier that you were still in the process of evaluating some jurisdictions, but then you said that this one was complete. So -- um -- could you just fix my confusion because I thought what I was hearing was that quite a lot of it's done, but sometimes somebody comes in and they have license X from {Inaudible}, and you just go look at that state.

MS. JURIUS: Hm-hum.

REP. WEBER: And make a determination based on that {Inaudible} database. So you have -- I mean, the idea of 200 times 50 plus whatever {Inaudible} --

MS. JURIUS: Yes, yes.

REP. WEBER: -- is kind of {Inaudible}.

MS. JURIUS: Yes, I'm happy to clear that up. So there were somewhere it was just there is no substantial equivalent. It's so specific that we -- um -- or it was going to be a much longer conversation, and we needed rules to be out so we could start taking these applications for the ones where it's simpler.

A good example of that is in the real estate field. It is very New Hampshire specific, right, the New Hampshire laws and rules. So there's been some -- so that is one of

the components of that.

Another piece is when I say a different jurisdiction, there are some states, the State of New York licenses electricians by county, I believe, or maybe even by city. So, again, then it's like the State of New York doesn't have any regs. So when we looked at it we're like, okay, well, New York's not good, but this specific county if we can get to find them which we, you know, the Office does some work, we can put that specific county or even city on the list. I believe the City of Rochester is one that we were looking into specific to the electricians.

Another example is foreign countries. So -- um -- like the country of Columbia was one that we were looking into a few weeks back. So we didn't go to every jurisdiction on the earth that has any licensing regs, right? So we started with the 50 states. And so it's more of those kind of one-offs, whether it's a county or a different level or another country.

REP. WEBER: Yeah, thank you very much. And thank you again for -- for the amount of work that went into that.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Any other -- um -- questions? I guess we can go on to the next item.

MS. JURIUS: Okay. That is the biggest one I would say. I'll try to be more brief on the other ones. I don't want to keep you here for four hours today, although I can talk licensing all day. I will say that.

Um -- Improving Expedited Licensure Process. So there was a task about higher licensing risk, Board input when necessary, expedited applications, basically saying we don't want these sitting for months, even a month at a time for processing. If there's any way that we can move them through more quickly.

Uh -- so many changes have happened. So the

reciprocity is one piece for them to be expedited; but another piece is that now the -- the Office is the one that the entity that is responsible for the issuance or the denial of a license. So the Board set the criteria based on their subject matter expert -- expertise, but the Office is the one that does the review.

So -- uh -- prior to 2023 what was happening is a Board would have to look at the application, every application. Some of, you know, Boards -- most Boards meet monthly, some meet quarterly. So if you had a Board that met quarterly and you submitted an application the day after their quarterly meeting, you are waiting three months to even be reviewed, and that's the system. There's no -- there's no judgment, right. It's nobody's fault. It's just the way that it was built. So now it's much more streamlined.

So those higher risk applications that the -- the process has really evolved for all applications, including those that need to be expedited. So, again, the reciprocity allows for that to be very quick because of the -- the expedited process where, hey, I've got a license here. We've determined it's substantially similar, good to go, rather than the full list of initial licensure requirements for a regular app; but even those are being processed much more quickly just in terms of that timeline.

Um -- one of the biggest -- sticking point is not quite the right word -- but one of the -- one of the delays that can be caused is waiting for a criminal record check or FBI fingerprints to be processed. And -- um -- that is complicated because it involves the Feds, it involves the Department of Safety, who are extremely fast at turning these around. It's -- it's not just for these licenses that they're doing those records checks and that office is extremely efficient. They've done a lot of really good work to streamline their process and make sure they're moving through quickly.

But even before it gets to the Department of Safety, the statute currently requires that licensees submit the release to my office. And then I send it to the Department of Safety and say, here's this person filled out a release. You can release it to me. And there's a lot of back and forth in that process. So if they fill it out incorrectly, my staff send it to Safety. Safety says, hey, this is wrong. Then we send it back to the licensee, sends it back to us, back to, right, so there's a lot of potential log jams in that process, in addition to just waiting for the actual fingerprints to come back.

That information, those are paper. So -- um -- we're expediting them where we can; but that is -- that is just something that causes delay and you can only do it so soon. So that -- um -- seems like I might have some questions on that.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Representative Erf.

REP. ERF: I have two questions, if that's okay. So the easy question is -- um -- did I understand you to say that the Boards used to have to review every application but that's no longer the case. Now you just review them yourselves once the -- once the rules have been set up?

MS. JURIUS: Yes. Yeah. So the current statute -- yes, the current scheme is that the Office is responsible for examination and review, issuance or denial, based on objective criteria established by the Board. Yep.

REP. ERF: Okay. The more difficult one. You just talked about the Department of Safety is interesting to me because I've been dealing with another issue with this whole back and forth thing. I think this is a big problem in the Department of Safety. And if there's anything that you all can give us an insight into how we can help there, because I run into this with one of my constituents unrelated to OPLC as -- as related to the courts; but it's the same sort of thing where the Department of Safety says,

oh, no, that's blah, blah, blah. We can't do that. You got to go through this. And then they go over there and they say, well, no, no, no, you've got to go through this.

MS. JURIUS: Hm-hum.

REP. ERF: So if there's some way to correct this problem. Can we do something legislatively to help the Department of Safety or you being more successful in expediting that? Because this seems like a real problem in the state generally.

MS. JURIUS: Yeah. I -- um -- I would not like to characterize it as a Department of Safety problem. Not just because it's another agency, but I think it's -- it's the back and forth of the system more than specific to Safety. And it's not a resistance on their part to doing the work. Like I said, if they have a complete release they're turning them around, most of them, the same day. The challenge is that there's a lot of federal involvement with these, with this piece.

My entire Office has to do annual training with the Feds to be able to -- so that we can process this, that we're eligible. Every statute - Senator Pearl is well-acquainted - anything that has to do with these background checks has to be reviewed and approved by the FBI. That process can take unknown amounts of time. But one of the challenges, I've had a few conversations about do we -- do I really need to be in-between a -- a potential licensee and the release, right? Can -- can they submit the release that says send it to me, but can it go right to the Department of Safety and take me out of it. That is currently in statute, so I can't do that currently.

But then the reticence is if I change the statute again, then we have to go back through the FBI approval process again. If they don't approve the statute, then I cannot receive them. So then I'm not look, I can't see them. And then we're issuing -- either holding up issuing

licenses that require this background check or I'm issuing them and waiving the requirement for the background check. So that's a difficult situation.

REP. ERF: Follow-up.

SEN. PEARL: Can I add --

REP. ERF: Can I have follow-up first?

SEN. PEARL: Can I add just a little --

REP. ERF: Go ahead.

SEN. PEARL: -- to what you're -- so we -- we've been working on legislation and I've worked with the Director because this is an issue that's beyond just OPLC. Also is DES is having the same issue. And we -- we've been working on language, on my third iteration now of doing background checks for solid waste facility owners. And I -- I think the model language we have now is going to work. And the issue has been with the FBI accepting the request from our New Hampshire Department of Safety, and we get the Department of DOJ and the AG's Office involved this time, and I believe the language we have now, according to FBI, will be acceptable.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: So do you have a follow-up?

REP. ERF: Yeah. So that's great to hear; but the problem you just mentioned was the appli -- one of the things you mentioned was the application was not complete. And this is what I've run into. How is it that the application isn't clear enough, which has been the problem I've run into, that the applicant is unable to fill it out properly? It's crazy that an application would come in, you couldn't detect it was incomplete, and you pass it on to the Department of Safety and they come back and say it's incomplete. This is what I've encountered.

MS. JURIUS: Yeah, I don't -- I don't think, Heather -- Heather can correct me if I'm wrong, I don't think we review them for completeness. I don't think it would be appropriate for us to do that. We are just a pass-through to the Department. We don't know what the requirements are that they're trying to establish and it's -- I don't know, it's things like somebody doesn't fill out the profession that they are a member, like the Board that they're applying for a license under. I don't -- I don't know if it's a form issue or if it's just user error, which happens with any of us filling out forms. So I don't know if it's an issue there. But, again, all of these, the Department of Safety is working on federal regs. So I don't -- I would hesitate to say that it's a Safety issue or a Safety form problem. I think -- I think it's complex and there's a lot of moving parts.

REP. ERF: Okay.

MS. JURIUS: We're frustrated.

REP. ERF: But I would suggest then if you're working with them, this is a -- it is a Safety problem, at least in some of the cases that I've encountered. So it's something to look into.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Senator Lang.

SEN. LANG: I was -- you mentioned it was statutory problem. Again, this sounds like a process issue or procedural issue about being able to get that and whether -- I know when I was coaching for the middle school, I had to do my CORI check. But the school just handed me my form. And there was a number to call Safety to schedule. I had to fill out the form and call Safety and schedule it. And then Safety -- and on checkbox it there was an authorization to release the information back to the school. So it was all my responsibility to call Safety. I went down, got my fingerprints. So then I had already signed the waiver for Safety when I was there to send it back to the school to

say I was clear. By the way, I was. I was able to coach.

But -- um -- but, again, is this the kind of process we need to fix? So there's not like they're giving you the form for Safety and you send it to Safety, and then they try to schedule. Is there a way of streamlining? Is it a statutory problem that we can fix to allow the applicant just to take the Safety form and go straight to Safety and schedule the thing. And then have them, again, on that same form have the release for OPLC or DES maybe even so that it's, again, the applicant going directly to Safety and getting the Agency out of the middle of back and forth and trying to coordinate.

MS. JURIUS: I would love that. It is statutory. I'm trying to find the reference for you. I -- I may have to get back to you on that specific reference.

SEN. LANG: {Inaudible} Senator Pearl. He's {Inaudible}.

MS. JURIUS: We did -- I did -- at one point my staff were explaining to me, because it's very challenging, and they're like we have to do this, and then they fill it out wrong and then we have to go back and sometimes they haven't even filled out an application. They've just done the fingerprints. So we don't even have a record of who it is. So then we have to chase them down. And I'm like, gosh what if we didn't do any of that. And then I did that crazy thing which is read the law, and so here we are. Yeah. So I will find that reference for you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Representative Ebel.

SEN. LANG: One more. So you're -- you're okay with that to get out of that mix of taking the application and forwarding it to Safety and going back with the back and forth. Then trying to get back to the applicant because something wasn't signed properly or done properly. You'd be completely happy to get out of the middle of that.

MS. JURIUS: The fewer people that touch it, the better; right? So let me -- I'll get you that reference.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Representative Ebel.

KAREN EBEL, State Representative, Merrimack County, District #07: Yeah, thank you. It's a pleasure to join you all today. I wanted to ask you, do you have a problem when determining that an applicant's license is in good standing from the -- in the state where they're coming from, if that's the term?

MS. JURIUS: No. I -- I don't because it -- if they have an active license, then they're in good standing. If they don't, then they're not.

REP. EBEL: Oh, I see. Okay. Great.

MS. JURIUS: Yeah. Thanks for asking though. Thankfully, there's not that many variables in that one.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Representative Rosenwald.

CINDY ROSENWALD, State Senator, Senate District #13: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Excuse me, Senator Rosenwald.

SEN. ROSENWALD: That's okay. Um -- are you able to determine whether there are pending disciplinary actions from another jurisdiction? I mean, they may be licensed, but there could be something pending.

MS. JURIUS: That information is collected in our universal application.

SEN. ROSENWALD: Okay.

MS. JURIUS: That they have to fill out, yep.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: There's no other questions, then we'll move to item three.

MS. JURIUS: Thank you. Temporary Licensure, Laws and Practice. So this is really a finding for you all to consider clarifying 310:6, V. Um -- there is some legislation. I believe it has passed both houses in HB 82 -- um -- which is eliminating some of the confusion of the temporary licenses in different places.

Um -- the Board of Nursing still maintains its own specific temporary license because it's a slightly different situation. Um -- so we're coordinating with Boards to eliminate rules. So what -- that would no longer comply with current law, including the temporary licenses.

So this is, again, the kind of the -- the landscape that I was talking about earlier is when laws change, we have to adjust the rules, which means sometimes adding rules; but it also often means getting rid of them or changing them.

So we're -- we're in the middle of that process of saying, okay, which Boards have temporary licenses in their rules that it's no longer in statute that they have their own special temp license. Because the Office has the ability to grant temporary licenses for a short duration of time to streamline that.

And it's confusing for applicants, too, right? Do I get the OPLC temp? Do I get this one that says my Board specific? When do I look at that? So we're in the middle of that process presently. Um -- happy to get you a lot more details to follow-up in writing. I don't know that you want that, but I'm happy to if that's interesting to you all.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Any other questions on item three? I guess we'll move forward.

MS. JURIUS: All right. So Observation 4 is developing rules for military-related applications. Um -- that is RSA 310:17 requires that all Boards, the OPLC in consultation with Boards, right? So we have to facilitate licensure. Um -- we have some fee waiver requirements, and then also they have to establish basically the 313's, our reciprocity piece; but for every MOS within the military specialty how that, the training and the experience for that crosswalks with the regs for the licensed types. Um -- so that's another quite expansive project.

We -- again, one full-time, two part-time employees are meeting with the Boards saying, hey, we have the statutory obligation. How can we support you? Let's look at these pieces board by board and discussing that with them. I don't -- um -- yes.

So we're in the middle of rulemaking with a number of Boards on that. I know I'll give a shout out to the Cosmetology Board. Each Board member has taken a set of every -- a branch, actually, of the military to comb through to say is there -- are there any that would crosswalk that we should compare with our professions that we regulate.

So many Boards are doing that work; but that's the one most recently I've been aware of. That each individual Board member is -- is committed to -- to doing that review. So that's what we're looking at there.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Seeing no questions, we'll move on.

MS. JURIUS: All right. So Observation 5, Ensuring Board Rules for Acting on Applications Align With State Laws. Same thing. We're -- we're working on it. We're in the middle. They change every year and we don't always get the rules through every year. So that's where we are. But we're working on it -- uh -- mercifully and thankfully, one of the -- when I took this position this fall, one of the

conversations I had, honest, with many of you at this table, actually, was give us a year to try to catchup on these rules.

There's been so many changes over the last three sessions. Let's -- let's really actually get it set here -- um -- in rules. Let the process play out. Because, again, right, you've got statutes, then we write rules, then we have to draft policies for staff to implement those. So we're barely touching the policies. We're just starting to get to some of those. So thank -- again, we're -- we're mid-progress on that -- um -- to make sure that it aligns with the current law.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: I think it's becoming pretty clear to the Board that you really have your hands full. You have a lot of work ahead of you.

MS. JURIUS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: You've made some accomplishments.

MS. JURIUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah. Okay. I think -- what are we on, item seven at this point?

MS. JURIUS: Yeah. So, I -- I will touch six very briefly. Measure Timelines for Application Processing.

Um -- when I was reviewing, again, this morning just looking through, I -- I think we're about a year away from me being able to say that this is substantially complete for the timelines for processing. In addition to all of the changes to rules, we're working on updating policies that is largely Heather Kelley's job in her -- in the operations side of the house; but we're also creating a brand new -- and many of you have heard about this as well -- we're creating a new licensing system, a big IT project. Oh, my gosh, are we at seven -- a \$7 million appropriation?

I think that we've been building this brand new portal. It is -- it's not just for receiving applications. It also serves as our system of record. It really is the IT infrastructure that undergirds the whole office. It is a massive project that we're working on.

I'm hoping to -- it should be just about a year that we will have all the Boards live and in there. I'm speaking that into existence. There's a lot of variables. Anybody who knows if they've done an IT project of any size that that's very bold for me to state that. But I think I'll have my rules in a place.

They're never going to be totally set because the laws are always going to change, right? This is just a fluid situation at -- basically at all times. But I think we'll have a good sense of what the -- the rules will have, the requirements set in a way that we can process them in an efficient way with a new system into the 21st Century. And -- um -- then I'll have a much better sense of the timeline; but it will be much more standardized as well.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Item eight.

MS. JURIUS: Okay. Sorry. So -- um -- seven and eight are quite connected, right? More licenses can be issued without full Board review. And then all LADC Board applications need full Board review. So on both of those I've kind of already addressed that the -- addressed that the Office has the authority.

I would just like to note that these -- at any time if a member of my staff looks at an application, looks at the requirements and says, I'm really not sure if -- um -- this education -- this course that somebody reports is about alcohol and drug counselling actually is; right? The course of the names vary. If there's any vagueness, we have the ability and the Board is very good to say, hey, Board, can you take a look at this. Like we're not LADC. We're not counselors. Can you take a look and say in your

professional expertise does this say what I think it says? Does this actually meet the requirements? And we do exercise that mechanism from time to time.

The hope is that Boards continue to make their rules even more clear, more standardized, and more objective to remove more of that need for review. Um -- and so the more specific they can be, the easier it is for us to review, the fewer that will need to be sent for that review. Uh -- but we still can do that and do that -- um -- on a -- on a regular basis as needed, so.

SEN. LANG: So, Dee, do we still have problems? I know there were -- there were conflicting laws when it comes to who has the right to issue licenses.

MS. JULIUS: Oh, yeah.

SEN. LANG: Have we cleaned all that up to say that some say the Board has the right to issue, some say OPLC has the right, and -- and some say both -- both the Board and OPLC --

MS. JULIUS: Yes.

SEN. LANG: -- have the right. Have we cleaned -- I know Carol McGuire and I worked on a bill to clean-up a lot of that but.

MS. JULIUS: I think statutorily we're -- gosh, I don't -- putting in percentage is a scary thing. I think we're -- we're largely there, maybe 85% of the way there. And the way that we've been interpreting it is if a law has been -- hasn't been changed since 2010, but we have RSA 310, which is pretty clear, that the -- the Office is responsible for that. Um -- there's just -- it's saying like that the more recent statute controls as we're catching up with some of that clean-up. We're largely there. And in terms of the issuing of licenses, I think that the vast, vast majority of those conflicts have been eliminated. There's smaller --

um -- kind of one-off pieces. I, honestly, as we dive into it and as we're looking and we open up all these chapters of rules, we're finding more pieces and questions either for clarification, for interpretation, things like under 541-A, any approval granted by the Office or the Board would be considered a license. So which under 310 then is required to be of two years of duration. So we've identified some that are approvals but had no -- did not have an expiration date. So then saying, okay, to comply with 310 we need to have a two-year date.

Um -- so there's still -- we're still interpreting a lot of things in that regard as we're finding them. Um -- so we're in a much better place than we are. Um -- House Bill 82 was the last big lift for clean-up this year when we didn't have any hundreds of pages of -- of clean-up this year, which is very helpful for all of you. No one really wants to read that much in our admin law, so.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. I guess now we're ready for eight.

MS. JURIUS: I think I probably touched, like I said, seven and eight. One was specific to kind of all of the Boards at play, and then eight was related just to the LADC Board. So I think -- I think I've covered those both. If you have specific LADC questions, I'm happy to take that or I'll just go to criminal history.

Um -- Review Information Collected Regarding Applicant's Criminal History. So I -- we talked a fair bit actually about background checks when we were talking about potential delays. So we have universal rules in our Plc 300s and then 200s involving criminal background checks and Board review that are compliant with the current statute. So 332-G and then 310:14. So we -- we are ensuring that compliance.

We made a few adjustments to -- um -- to make sure. One of the pieces, I believe -- yes, in the summary a

finding was ensuring that it's only convictions for crimes with a substantial and direct relationship are used to disqualify applications from licensure. I don't know if that's direct language from the statute, but it's quite close. So it's a fairly high bar for what we can deny a license based on. And we've created a lot of objective procedures so that it's not -- somebody doesn't just look at a criminal history and say well, too bad, can't get a license because of X, Y, and Z. That there's -- there's real criteria there.

We have a hearings process as well that provides the opportunity for somebody to come in and explain what's going on, either before the Board or before a hearings officer. I'm feeling confident about the standardization and making sure that we're protecting the confidentiality of licensees, and then we're not preventing people from working who don't need to be, while ensuring public safety, of course; but there's -- there's a balance there.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Does the Board have any questions on that? I guess we're ready to move on.

MS. JURIOUS: Okay. So number ten is adopting rules for -- um -- some licensing requirements and processes. Um -- there was -- this goes back to the endorsement as well. There was some fast-tracking and other Boards had been working on this on kind of an individual level to say how can we get people more quickly through our process.

When 310:17, which is our endorsement came through, that kind of took it over and said, okay, whatever you're doing, we're going to do that times 60. Um -- so that requirements in the process of moving that. So now we're kind of peeling through and saying, all right, we don't need these extra processes specific to the Boards because we have one big office policy. Um -- so we're in the middle of that piece there.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: And then -- yes, Senator Rosenwald.

SEN. ROSENWALD: Thank you. So I've been hearing that the -- um -- license for Social Work Associate has been very slow in coming. Do we have that up and running yet?

MS. JURIUS: I'd have to double-check for you. I know that the Board has been working on rules. I also know there's a pending legislative change, again, that I believe has passed both bodies that -- uh -- changes the requirement for the exam for that associate.

The current statutory requirement is that they pass -- um -- a nationally proctored exam. My understanding from the testimony in that legislation was nationally the -- the pass rates have been lower. It has -- it's been quite challenging. It's a very challenging exam. So, anecdotally, it seems that that -- there -- there might be a barrier in that regard that people might not be pursuing that as much. And I will have to double check. I can get back to you on the chapter if those rules are --

SEN. ROSENWALD: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Do you have a question? Your light's on. I have a question, if I could? When we talk about criminal background checks and other things, do we check to make sure that people are in this country illegally or legally, or that they citizenship or green card status?

MS. JURIUS: Our -- um -- by statute we are required to have Social Security or other tax ID in the application. So -- um -- there are a variety of different ID's that can be used -- um -- but we do have to have that. So I would say we're not -- um -- it's not a question that I ask specifically, but we do have that requirement to collect that identification.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Thank you. I guess you can move on to the last field.

MS. JURIUS: Okay. Um -- so now we're in number 11. My only, what we would say, partially, so less than substantively resolved. And that's mostly due to the fact that we are, again, we've got statutes fairly consistent. Rules are catching up. Policies are next and our IT infrastructure. So we're making sure that it's the same for everybody.

Um -- so we have established universal timelines for the processing of applications, and we're in the middle of policy drafting right now. Um -- so, again, you can read it there; but it's -- it's kind of the same conversation we've been having. We have limited staff. Also in a hiring freeze. Trying to create that standardization as much as possible. We are making good progress. I'm very happy with the trajectory -- um -- and I hope -- I don't know how many times I'll have the privilege of being before this group, but maybe it'll be a year and I'll have a lot more progress to update -- uh -- on these -- on these initiatives. Happy to take any questions on that but very similar.

All right. The last one is that review examination requirements. Um -- happy to report both the Board of Psychology and the Board of Mental Health Practice have been hard at work specific to these exams. I think one of the concerns was the psychologists juris prudence exam - I'm looking at Heather - was essay questions, which is very subjective, hard to grade for anyone, let alone somebody with subject matter expertise. So they've been hard at work, probably for the better part of the year, taking -- making sure that they're getting the same substance but being able to make it a multiple choice exam on the State laws and rules. So that criteria. So they're hard at work.

I believe the exam is complete. Whether the rulemaking is finalized, I'm not sure where we are in the timeline; but I know that they have finished kind of their conversion from essay to multiple choice.

Um -- the Board of Mental Health Practice, one of them, the pastoral psychotherapy exam, I know the Board has had a bunch of conversations about because that was also an essay, maybe even an interview component to that piece. So they are aware and they're actively working on those.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Senator Pearl.

SEN. PEARL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Well, Director, I think you've done a pretty good job in answering the questions we have here, and I know you've had a monumental task with all the changes we've thrown at you the last three years. You've been there a year and a half, two years now?

MS. JURIUS: Oh, no, I'm not even -- September is when I started. So nine months here.

SEN. PEARL: Oh, you're nine months. That's right. Gosh, it's just --

MS. JURIUS: Just getting settled in.

SEN. PEARL: Well, keep doing what you're doing.

MS. JURIUS: Thank you, sir.

SEN. PEARL: You're making good progress on the thing, and I know that there is a lot we have thrown in your direction. We -- we've worked very closely on a lot of issues and legislation. I will assure the Board that the Director has been reading through this, a lot of the statutes, and -- and we've made some good clean-ups this year. I believe they've passed both the bodies now. I'm not certain, either on the last one. And -- uh -- and -- um -- but keep doing what you're doing with it.

The Social Worker Compact, is that -- where are we on that? I don't think we talked about that specifically, did

we?

MS. JURIUS: Let me check. I know that they are having regular meetings. Um -- my -- the Director of Licensing and Board Administration -- um -- has resigned effective this week -- last week. Um -- so the Governor made a nomination before the Executive Council on Wednesday to fill that position. That person was sitting on the Compact was part of those initial meetings and the drafting.

As you all know, I'm pretty sure all of you are somewhat familiar with compacts. Once it passes, if you're within the first seven states -- uh -- there's a lot of drafting and input that happens at that level before they're even fully enacted. We're somewhere in that process. I think they're pretty far along.

Um -- I don't believe -- Heather will double-check -- I don't believe I'm granting compact license currently. So I'm not -- we're not at that point yet; but they are making good progress, yeah. I can get a more detailed update for you on that.

SEN. PEARL: Thank you. Mr. Chair, I do have to run. I have another meeting that I'm supposed to be at at 11 o'clock. So I'm going to take this opportunity to exit, but I just wanted to thank the Director for her work. I think this was a great review, and I hope we do more of it here at this level. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Absolutely. We very much appreciate --

MS. JURIUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: -- you coming and updating us on every one, and we do recognize that you have your hands full.

MS. JURIUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: It's kind of like herding cats, I think, with as many Boards as you have.

MS. JURIUS: You guys are familiar with the dynamic over here on this side of the world, I think. If I could mention just briefly. I know that we have a number -- you have a color-coded list of audits dating back for progress reports. I know that we have a number that are in the red. I would like to note we are double counted because it has the Office and the Board. So whatever you see cut it in half and that's what I have. Um -- I -- I just wanted to provide some clarity.

So I did -- I should have led with this. I apologize. I met, except for the Board of Psychology who did not -- um -- did not meet between when I received the letter and the notice of the meeting. They have a meeting scheduled in July. So I spoke to the Chair directly and then e-mail corresponded with him. But I met with the other Boards and said we're, you know, we're providing this update. They -- they have it. They reviewed it -- um -- and delegated me to come to represent them and the Office. And then statutorily the Office is the one that's responsible for these audits. Obviously, the Boards have a lot of responsibility. That's the reason that we're here before you. So I would follow the same suit for the other ones that we have dating back there.

Um -- Heather here is -- uh -- one person who's responsible for my budget. Also my other operations. So you can imagine how we're -- things are going right now, and then the audits there. And like I mentioned before, no excuses at all. We're in a hiring freeze. I'm short staffed in my operations and my finance side, and in internal controls as well. I'm hoping to have reports to you by the end of the summer on the five pending audits that have you so that you'll get an update on all of those.

So I just wanted to mention that while I was here and

just let you know we'll be getting those to Administrative Services for publishing on the website; but I'll provide them, as well to Mr. Henry, so that you can see those.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yes.

SEN. LANG: Dee, thank you for this. It's been great. And I know you've been dealing with a moving target. You know, every year we change your goal; but, again, I think that's great you provide the letters. When you're providing the letters if you can give us some sort of estimate when you think the goal is going to be met or close to it, right, that may preclude us calling you in for another inquisition. Um --

MS. JURIUS: I will say the more you audit us, the less we're working on the other audits.

SEN LANG: I --

MS. JURIUS: All right. Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Thank you again.

MS. JURIUS: Thank you.

3. Other business

4. Date of next meeting and adjournment

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: The last item in that packet is an update of some audits that Mr. Henry updated a spreadsheet for us. I don't know if there's any questions on the updated spreadsheet or any comments.

MR. HENRY: The question to the Committee is what do you want to do next? Um -- I think you just heard from OPLC that they've recognized there's, I think, four of their audits for Boards that I -- I believe she said by the end of the summer she plans to have written responses. So

that's good. But there's -- uh -- five other -- um -- audits in the red. Um -- I know two of them are for the Department of Corrections. Uh -- yeah. I know there's some leadership changes over there which may complicate things for a little while.

Um -- it was funny, Department of Corrections a few years ago -- uh -- Commissioner Hanks actually contacted me and asked for all -- what are all the audits that were done on the -- on Corrections because she wanted to make sure that they responded to everything. And last November she actually sent this audit with all these responses. It was for an audit that I think was in 2002 on sexual harassment, like within the prison -- um -- which predates the requirement of any reporting. But she -- they had gone through the whole process of answering all the -- responding to all the Observations, providing documentation of what they changed, and it looked like what I thought was they were going to be moving through a number of other audits that had been done over the years -- um -- but, again, that -- I don't know what -- what the status of that is now.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: I don't think any of us know at this point. It's a little early. Okay. Senator Lang.

SEN. LANG: Yeah. So -- so, again, I -- I think OPLC is taken care of. Dee is going to follow-up with all the other audits that are on this list, especially in the red, with a written, you know, requirement. I think we probably should hold off on Department of Corrections considering they don't -- they only have an interim head right now. And until that search is completed and they get settled in, we probably should hold off on anything with the Department of Corrections.

So as I read this, that basically undoes everything in the red. There's no more anything in red. I don't think we can act with the exception of Police Standards and Training, and I'd almost say because the Commission -- the

Executive Director, Commissioner, I'm not sure what he is of Police Standards and Training, is the guy who's running Department of Corrections right now. We probably shouldn't overburden him with a whole lot of work either while he's trying to figure out what's going on in DOC. So I -- I think we're down to the yellow, if we actually want to bring anybody in and have a conversation.

MR. HENRY: There's actually -- um -- there's the Adult Parole Board, which is really, you know, it's separate from the Department of Corrections. So, that -- that --

SEN. LANG: Right. Isn't it -- isn't it got a companion because it says right underneath DOC as well?

MR. HENRY: There was some -- um -- I mean, but they're their own agency. I think they're like administratively supported by Corrections. Of course, there's a big connection in how it operates; but that is one agency that, you know, we haven't heard from. That's a possibility.

The other one is the Wetlands Council, which never -- they've never responded to the Wetlands Audit. And then there's just like one Observation for the Liquor Commission at the very top of the list. It was this audit we did on recycling, and there was just one specific little Observation that was just for Liquor Commission. And, you know, the Liquor Commission just never, you know, responded to that. It's not, you know, it's only one Observation, but could be an easy thing for them to do.

SEN. LANG: So, Mr. Chair, we're going to take those three items; the Liquor Commission on recycling, the Adult Parole Board itself, not the DOC component, and the Wetlands, and send letters out to those three saying give us an update. What's going on? What's the -- either update your response, because, like you said, some of these they haven't even responded to. I'm looking at DES in 2019 had an audit with Observations. They've done nothing. They reported nothing. Um -- so DES is probably one I want to

have come in and have a -- bring an update and chat with us to see where they are.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: I -- I certainly would agree with that. I think those are good choices.

REP. WEBER: The Wetlands would be the top of my list, too, based on the lack of response. It would be nice to follow-up with the other two, but --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: It'll -- it'll be in the Fall, I'm sure, because we won't be meeting in July. So I think we need to plan that for September.

MR. HENRY: Okay. We can -- I can draft out the letter again for your -- for your review for the three. We could leave it vague, sometime in September.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Right.

MR. HENRY: And then we'll get back to them. That'll give them all summer to sort of, hopefully, get ready for you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: I think it may be a little early to actually set a date in September. I think we all want to see where we're going to be and what the layout is; but -- um -- unless this room's available.

SEN. LANG: Yeah, it is, on Fridays. So we can meet here.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: That would work good. So do we want to look at the --

SEN. LANG: It just has to {Inaudible} through Sonja, my aide. She's the one that manages this room.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: We probably don't -- I wouldn't think we'd want to do it too early in September with Labor

Day and everything; but let me look at the calendar here. Maybe like the Friday mornings are usually pretty good. There's no conflicts, right?

REP. WEBER: {Inaudible.}

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Excuse me?

REP. WEBER: I beg your pardon. The 12th would be particularly good for me because I'm away after that.

REP. ERF: And my daughter is getting married that weekend so I won't be here either. I won't be here on the 12th.

REP. WEBER: Okay. Well, I can always prevail upon Representative Ebel to or -- or we can do it another time.

SEN. LANG: Can we -- can we just stick to the first Friday in the month?

REP. WEBER: Yeah, the first Friday is going to be problematical.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: We could do it on --

REP. WEBER: {Inaudible} be double booked.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: -- the 5th, yeah.

SEN. LANG: On the 6th.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: We probably could do it on the 5th.

SEN. LANG: Sixth would be --

REP. ERF: Sixth is Saturday.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah.

REP. WEBER: House Democrats have a retreat that day.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Excuse me?

REP. WEBER: House Democrats have a retreat on the 5th. That's an all day retreat.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: What time?

REP. WEBER: All day.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay.

REP. WEBER: As far as I know. I will check and -- and let you know if it is less than that; but I think it was planned as an all day event.

MR. HENRY: So when is Labor Day?

REP. ERF: Well, the first Monday.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: You can't make it the 12th?

REP. WEBER: I'll -- I'll verify that because Representative Ebel says she thinks it's the 4th. So that would be fine.

REP. ERF: Thursday, the 4th, would that work for you?

REP. WEBER: Sorry?

REP. ERF: Would Thursday the 4th work for you?

REP. WEBER: Well, what Representative Ebel just said was she thinks that our retreat is actually on the 4th and not on the 5th, and leave the 5th open. Are you texting the office to check? Okay. Great. So we'll have an answer on that in a minute. If it's -- if our retreat's the 4th, then the 5th is clear.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: So the 5th's open?

REP. WEBER: We're -- we're finding out.

SEN. LANG: Maybe.

REP. EBEL: {Inaudible}.

SEN. LANG: Mr. Chair, one other thing. If we can add one more item. Um -- and the Agency doesn't exist anymore, DRED; but -- um -- maybe we can take the first item in the yellow as well. They haven't responded since 2017. They're -- they're 89% of the fully addressed. So there's not a lot of items left for them. Maybe whichever, whether it went over to BEA or DNCR, wherever, this workforce -- Office of Workforce Opportunity ended up, maybe we can send them a letter as well and just maybe they can give us an update on where they are.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah, I --

SEN. LANG: It's been since 2017 since they've responded. Most of the other ones I've got 2024 or '25, but that one goes back awhile.

REP. WEBER: We have a winner. Uh -- our retreat is the 4th. So the 5th is open.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. So why don't we tentatively plan it for the 5th then. And if we have to change it, we'll change it, but.

SEN. LANG: I have a question for Henry.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yes.

SEN. LANG: So, Mr. Henry, Jay, so we heard from OPLC and a lot of their stuff is either in progress or still a moving target, right? They're not going to probably have ever I'm 100% done. They're never going to probably get

there at the rate we keep changing statutes.

Um -- and so the question is at what point do we take them off our list and say this is like I think Dee's everything she can do she is doing to achieve the goal. But like the military reciprocity is probably going to be a three year process for every single MOS and every single license in the State of New Hampshire to validate that.

Do we literally leave it on there even though we know we've made substantial progress and everything's done? Do we just stay on the list forever until we get to 100%.

REP. WEBER: I would vote for -- for having them finish up the Boards that they're going to report on. But as you said, not only are we changing things as time goes on, but every jurisdiction in every state changes, also. So I think if we got through those -- um -- Boards that we really had on our list, I would be very comfortable leaving them off at that point, because it is a moving target and maybe they could come in and chat with us occasionally just to give us an update.

SEN. LANG: Well, doesn't look like they're -- they're non-compliant, right, because I think -- I think that they probably are complying to the audit, response of the audit, but they'll never get to 100%. How do we get there?

MR. HENRY: Well, again, this list is your list. So you can do what you want with it. You know, they were in the red because there was no response and now you're forcing everyone to -- to respond, which is a good thing. And then you get down, oh, are they yellow or green? But like you're saying they -- they could be yellow for a long time because, oh, there's -- there's one Observation that maybe we said, oh, they need a new system but they're not going to get money for the new system. You know, it sort of stays out there. And whether you want to bring them in because of that or you decide that that's enough, I mean, it's up to you how you want to use the list. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: So you'll make arrangements for this room?

SEN. LANG: {Inaudible}.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Is there any other business? Seeing none, I guess we're done. We can adjourn.

SEN. LANG: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

(The meeting adjourned.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Cecelia A. Trask, a Licensed Court Reporter in the State of New Hampshire, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a correct transcription from the official audio recording of the proceeding in the above-entitled matter. I was not present and have transcribed said audio to the best of my professional skill and ability.

Cecelia A. Trask, RMR, RPR
NH LCR#00047