

**LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

1 Granite Place, Room 234

Concord, NH

Friday, November 7, 2025

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Representative Gerald Griffin, Chair

Representative Kenneth Weyler

Representative Keith Erf

Representative Mary Jane Wallner

Representative Lucy Weber

**1. Acceptance of the October 3, 2025 meeting minutes**

GERALD GRIFFIN, State Representative,

Hillsborough County, District #42: I will call the meeting to order. Uh -- the first thing on the agenda is the acceptance of the minutes of our last meeting on October 3rd. Uh -- someone want to make a motion?

**\*\*** LUCY WEBER, State Representative, Cheshire

County, District #05: I'll move.

KENNETH WEYLER, State Representative, Rockingham

County, District #14: Second.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Who made -- uh -- motion by Representative Weber, seconded by Representative Weyler. All in favor? Any opposed? Unanimous.

\*\*\* {MOTION ADOPTED}

2. Potential audit topics - Review of status of prior Performance audits on 10-year list:

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. The second thing on the agenda is potential audit -- uh -- topics. Uh -- and the review of the status of prior performance audits on the ten yearly -- ten-year list. We're going to start with the Department of Corrections, the Sexual Offender Treatment Program.

JANE GRAHAM, Communication and Legislative Affairs Liaison, Department of Corrections: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. For the record, my name is Jane Graham. I am the Communications and Legislative Affairs Liaison for the Department of Corrections. Um -- to my left is Abbey Simon. She is our Behavioral Health Administrator and handles the Sex Offender Treatment Program. Um -- from the time -- so the audit was in 2016, and during that time we were able to fully resolve all items, except for one. And that one item is No. 6, which is the -- um -- the mechanism for us to be able to track benchmarks, progress, recidivism with the Sex Offender Treatment Program.

At the time we were running our old offender management system, Version 4 of that system, and it didn't have

the capability to be able to track metrics in the way that we needed to -- to check if this -- if our programs were effective.

We have since in the Spring implemented a new offender management system. Uh -- the name of the system is CORIS. So we're now on to Version 8 of that program. We have had a difficult rollout with that offender management system, and it's impacted some operational concerns for us.

Uh -- so the -- um -- right now we're working with the vendor to try to fix some of those concerns, but some of the hotter issues that we've had with it are we haven't been able to issue checks to victims, so restitution. So we have some really pressing issues that we're start -- we're taking care of first. And when we touched base with our technology department, they said that right now they're working on those operational impact issues before they start working on creating new reports. But we're hopeful. I'm hoping that sometime within the next six months we'll be able to get to a place where our offender management system is stable enough for us to be able to start tracking those metrics in sex offender treatment.

Um -- and, you know, Abby is the expert in this

area. So if you have any questions about our programming -- uh -- she's -- she's the person to answer those.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Thank you. So the timetable to complete this is within six months?

MS. GRAHAM: I would say six months.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. Thank you. Any of the Committee Members have any questions? Uh -- Representative Weyler.

REP. WEYLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So the -- uh -- follow-up on this treatment system, how is that done? Is this done within the prison or can you still follow-up after they're out, and what sort of measures do you use?

ABBEY SIMON, Behavioral Health Administrator, Department of Corrections: Sure. So -- um -- the long version is that we assess everybody who has a sex offense or a pled down sex offense, and we have certain actuarials that we use to determine what their recommendation of treatment is. So for the people who are recommended to do our intensive program within the prison -- um -- that is still being done. And then your question was are they being followed on the outside. So from it being complete treatment, and they receive parole, they then go into what's called like an after care where we have after care providers that meet with them in a group setting, as

well as checking in with their probation and parole officers. They receive what's called a Administrative Review Committee recommendations of what they can and cannot do while they're out in the community. So it's a lot of like check and balances, as well as continuing on with treatment. And in those conditions, we could ask for other things, right. So if they have substance issues, or if they need to work more on some of their mental health symptoms, like we're recommending that they're following through with other resources, other than just being in like an after care program.

REP. WEYLER: How often after they're released would you be following up?

MS. SIMON: You're asking if DOC follows up? So I -- I think what the best way you could say is that we rely on our probation and parole officers as part of our check and balance. Because if they're not doing the right things, then they're going to be returning them back to us in the prison, and then we reassess them to see what they need.

REP. WEYLER: The belief always seemed to be once you had these problems, they were lifelong. You couldn't do anything about it. But are you finding any success in changing minds and attitudes and behaviors?

MS. SIMON: Changing minds and behaviors of the

people who are incarcerated or changing minds and behaviors of people thinking that some people can't be kind of, I guess, you'd say restored.

REP. WEYLER: Well, I see you say in there you're not sure if the one that you've solved will they be long -- incarcerated long enough to undergo their treatment program. So I guess it's a very lengthy program.

MS. SIMON: Yes. Um -- if -- if the person who's going through the -- um -- program is doing everything correctly, they are done with about a year. Um -- but we have policies in place as -- as when they enter the program, if they are recommended for the program, and then we have a -- a pretty lengthy curriculum that they have to reach each area to complete, before they move on to the next phase of treatment. And then their clinician is the one that's writing a discharge summary and that discharge summary is being presented to this Administrative Review Committee where it's looking at them -- uh -- and saying, like, have they worked through certain items that they were struggling with.

REP. WEYLER: Glad we have this program, and I hope it's successful. Thank you.

MS. SIMON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Anyone else? Well, we want

to thank you for coming, and we're very happy that you're down to one item to get resolved, and we look forward to the -- uh -- that item being resolved.

MS. GRAHAM: Absolutely. Thank you. We'll be sure to follow-up.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: You can let Mr. Henry know.

MS. GRAHAM: Absolutely. I will follow-up with Mr. Henry on that.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: When that gets done.

MS. GRAHAM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Thank you all. Okay. The next item on the agenda is OPLC Real Estate Commission. There were 13 Observations open.

DEE JURIOUS, Executive Director, Office of Professional Licensure and Certification: Good morning, Members of the Committee. Uh -- just for the record, my name is Dee Jurious, Executive Director at OPLC. And with me is Heather Kelley, Director of Operations. Uh -- pardon me. I do have my water. I'm recovering from a cold. So if you do excuse me I'll mute the mic and take a drink if I need. So pardon me on that.

Yep, so we have the Real Estate Commission Audit. I'm happy to report that the -- all but one is

substantially or fully resolved with that outstanding item being No. 3. So improving review of applicants disclosing adverse financial history and liabilities. So I'm happy to speak briefly to that.

The primary reason for it being only partially resolved is just we've talked about this in several Committee meetings. It's just the length of time that the rulemaking process takes. So the Commission is currently in the middle of amending what we would say it's their Rea 300s, which is the criteria that -- the objective criteria that they set, which is a requirement in RSA 310. We do have universal application process rules and procedures -- um -- to ensure that there's standards, minimum standards and review -- um -- ensuring compliance. We're still in the process of fully integrating that into each of the Board rules in the process, and so that's the reason for the partial resolve. It's just that we need -- we are continuing to move forward.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: What is your timetable?

MS. JURIUS: So our goal to be completely done, so everything substantively is fully is March of '27. So looking at about 18 months. I think we will have everything in the substantively resolved category within six months maybe with the rulemaking process. They're -- they're close to --

they have been drafting for some time. So they're close to filing that proposal. So I would say that getting everything into substantively, getting rulemaking filed is we're nearly there.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Do our Members have any questions? Seeing none, we thank you for coming, and we congratulate you on getting down to the last one, and we look forward to -- uh -- your completion of that.

MS. JURIOUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: And as in the last case when you have that cleared up, will you let Mr. Henry know?

MS. JURIOUS: Happy to do so. Yep.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Thank you.

MS. JURIOUS: Yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: The next item is OPLC, Board of Pharmacy.

MS. JURIOUS: Heather thought she was just going to get out of here. I thought you might say that. All right. So -- uh -- the Board of Pharmacy, this is specific to inspections which is kind of a unique space, even within our office, which has its own oddities in itself. Um -- so I will say this will take me a little bit more time. Most of the majority of these findings are in the partially resolved state.

So I'm -- I will just run through that list with your indulgence, and I'll just start from top to bottom.

So starting with No. 2. Actually, let me make a broad statement first. Um -- pharmacy inspection. So we have three inspectors. They're unclassified positions within the office. These are -- one is a licensed pharmacy tech and two are licensed pharmacists that are performing these inspections. They also, per statute, are agents of the DEA, and so they have some federal responsibilities within the state. And so they're -- they ensure compliance in a number of different areas. And they're responsible for inspecting all the in-state pharmacies. I think the last time I pulled in we have 252 -- I'll say 250 plus so that I don't misquote myself. Um -- it was closer to three hundred; but as you are all are aware, over the last year or so, that we've had about fifty Rite Aids that closed in the State of New Hampshire. So that number of pharmacies in New Hampshire has come down. Um -- so that's just a broad overview of what we're talking about here.

So I will go ahead and just start with Observation 2. Excuse me. Um -- updating and periodically review compliance policy manual and provide training to inspectors.

So we are -- the Board of Pharmacy -- you'll

sense a theme – is also in the middle of rulemaking. Um -- they -- they have done an overhaul. The Board has been working really hard with a dedicated staff member from our office. They have a -- a work group of two Board members that meets, I believe it's either every week or every two weeks. So they're meeting twice in-between every monthly Board meeting to go over these rules, to consolidate, update -- um -- to get rid of duplicative pieces the chapters had. I think they had gotten up to 26 plus chapters of rules. Typically, we have between five and seven chapters. So they're working on condensing that as well and making that make more sense, which it's a huge project. They've been working for the good part of a year and a half on that just kind of consolidating there. So you'll hear that throughout. That's a big part of it. They're in the middle of it, but they're actively working on it.

So as they're making all these changes to rules, obviously the compliance that investigators are going out to inspect and to ensure is going to be changing drastically. So what we're trying to not do is update manual policies and procedures while they're in spending staff time and administrative time doing those updates while we know they're actively changing the rules. So that's one piece there. So that policy manual will be updated in accordance with those

rules. This is the most I've had to speak in several weeks.

Observation 3 is to ensure inspection forms reflect all statutory and administrative rule requirements. That would be the same thing there with the Boards working on their rule changes. We also -- so this -- um -- in the summary of the finding it references whether the new licensing software will meet the Board's inspection needs. I will just note that the new licensing software referenced here in 2015 is now extremely antiquated, and we're in the middle of building a "new new" software. So -- um -- that we will be using a new -- a new even more advanced, more technological licensing system. So those forms will be updated as technology and the rules allow.

All right. So that's two and three. I will skip down to Observation 6, Establishing Performance Goals and Metrics. There's been significant statutory changes. I -- I won't regale you with the entire office history again. I did that a few months ago for you all; but the OPLC as an office, an umbrella agency, was created in 2015, which is the year of this audit. So you can imagine there's been a lot of changes since then. Um -- many of you, I -- I -- all of you, I think, have been serving for several terms and so in 2022, three and four there were pretty substantial changes to the structure of

this office, and the relationship between the office and the Boards. So when we're looking at performance metrics, comparing goals to actual performance, those are all things that we're working on for all Boards, including this -- this process. And -- and then updating our technology. So that's a broad -- a broad theme throughout all of our Boards to work on that piece. So, again, in progress.

Observation 7 about improving reliability of agency inspection data, that would be the same thing. Again, working on -- um -- a more advanced licensing software system. We also have created a compliance bureau -- um -- within the office. So that is a bit more focused. Uh -- previously inspectors had just been -- um -- part of the enforcement. And what we -- we've kind of made the shift to say that compliance and -- um -- ensuring that you're fulfilling regulatory -- um -- all the -- the rules and laws, really that compliance fits -- fits more with licensing to say we -- in order to keep your license, you need to do these things. And so it's kind of a bit of a more proactive and a more friendlier approach. Not to say that we're lowering the standard, but just to say it isn't only when a complaint comes in that we're going after somebody to inspect. It's not predatory. That they're routine and it's ensuring that compliance. Um -- and so that reliability of

data with some scheduling and some more parameters around that is going to be helpful as well. So that structural change is going to help with this, with fulfilling that Observation as well.

The last two, No. 9 and 10, ensuring out-of-state licenses are inspected similarly to in-state licenses. I'll reference you back to our response on No. 2 where we're talking about the rules. So when the Board establishes those rules that will be helpful. As you can imagine, doing inspections out-of-state is a totally different animal than just driving, you know, even up to the North Country. So there will be a lot of work to do once those standards are set.

And then Observation 10 is scheduling inspections based on risk or risk-based inspection schedule. So, again, with rule changes that will determine some of those decisions. But the other piece of it is that we have the -- the inspections that we would like to have them on a -- a regular schedule, as well as in response to incidences that come up to say this is a routine whether -- um -- whatever the rule and statutory requirements, whether it's annual, twice a year, whatever that is, that it would be regular and it would be scheduled to ensure that people are complying with the

regulations. But then also with the flexibility to say, again, risk-based are -- are we hearing a number of complaints. Are there -- have we gotten complaints from, you know, professionals, six of whom all are in the same place, the same facility. Do we have other concerns and can respond that way.

So all of that would be a collaboration -- um -- between the inspectors, their supervisors in the Bureau, and then also with whatever the Board sets for the standards. So very much in flux, but.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: I'd like to ask the Committee Members, do you have any questions? Uh -- Representative Weber.

REP. WEBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for being here, and thank you for taking my question. Um -- am I understanding correctly that right now the inspections are entirely based on complaints or do you have some that are being routinely scheduled as well?

MS. JURIUS: Uh -- they are going out routinely. I wouldn't say -- so we have inspections in other areas of the office where it's scheduled and it's every year you're going to be seen. We don't have that level of rigidity, but they do have routine inspections that are occurring presently.

REP. WEBER: Okay. Thanks.

MS. JURIOUS: Yep.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Representative Weyler.

REP. WEYLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was rather shocked at Rite-Aid in closing all those. Where were they standing in -- in reference to their licenses and registration? Were they any worse or any better than any -- any other?

MS. JURIOUS: Thank you for the question. I'm -- I'm trying to think about how to answer that. I would say anecdotally I don't know of Rite-Aid being in any different place than any other pharmacy. Um -- again, as complaints would come in, as there were enforcement challenges or issues with inspection, everybody would have been dealt with routinely the same way. Um -- there are some reports, depending on if it's a -- I'm trying to answer more broadly.

If -- if a Pharmacy of a specific facility was having some ongoing challenges, sometimes the Board would have them giving regular reports to the Board. Here's the up -- similar to this actually, right? Here's the update of what's going on. Um -- so I know that that -- that could be the case for any number of facilities. So, it could be even a specific building within a larger branch. Um -- so that is -- is a tool that the Board had used to monitor pharmacies that have had

challenges, whether it's specific location or a larger corporate piece. Um -- so the Board had been, you know, had been regulating them the same as any other pharmacy. I don't know necessarily that we could have predicted like, yep, oh, they're definitely going to be out of here. I wouldn't say that is -- like there was no writing on the wall, I guess, in terms of that. I don't know if that answers your question, but.

REP. WEYLER: Well, I guess some of the things we've heard would apply to everybody. The Pharmacy Benefit Managers were -- were setting the -- uh -- the allowable prices in an -- which was unaffordable for them. I heard something to that effect. Um -- you know anything about that?

MS. JURIOUS: I -- I couldn't speak to that. I will -- I will say the regulation of the Pharmacy Board is not necessarily connected to the Pharmacy Benefit Managers. Those companies would be a separate -- a separate piece.

REP. WEYLER: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Anyone else? Well, it sounds like you've made some progress; but I think you're far from complete here.

MS. JURIOUS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: And we probably will be scheduling another meeting in the future, a future date to check to see how you're doing.

MS. JURIUS: Yeah, I would just note we -- our goal to be completed is that same March 2027, so 18 months. Again, so much of it is contingent on that rules process, and then enough time after the rules are adopted for us to make all of the changes kind of down the road there, but happy to report on that progress whenever you invite us.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: We thank you for coming.

MS. JURIUS: Thank you. Have a great day.

**3. Status of ongoing audits:**

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: So the next item on the agenda is the status of ongoing audits.

CHRISTINE YOUNG, Director, Audit Division, Office of Legislative Budget Assistant: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and Committee Members. For the record, I'm Christine Young, Director of Audits for the LBA. And with me is Jay Henry, Performance Audit Supervisor.

I don't have too much new information to report on since the October 3rd meeting; but there are a few things. So, I will go ahead and get started with Special Education.

We are writing the report. We currently have 25 completed Observations. Some of the Observations are lengthy. And -- uh -- we've decided to separate certain topics, which brings the current count of Observations we've identified to 70.

A full draft report is expected to be completed sometime in the first quarter of Calendar Year 2026, and we hope to have a report by the Summer of 2026.

Moving on to Education Freedom Accounts. We are doing some field work analysis as we are writing Observations. Forty Observations have been identified so far. Fifteen of those have been finalized, and those are mostly dealing with eligibility. We have another five Observations in progress right now and about 20 more Observations left to write after that. And we're hopeful to have a draft report by mid-Spring, and a presentation to the Fiscal Committee sometime in the Summer.

With the Doorway Program, we finalized the audit plan with the Department of Health and Human Services assistance. We were successful in isolating the financial activity for the program in NHFirst. We will be able to report on the cost of operating the program for a four-year period, and that will be State Fiscal Year 2022 through 2025. There

was a change in vendors, so we are still waiting to receive operational data for the program for Fiscal Year 2025.

We're scheduled to be done with field work for the Doorway Program by Thanksgiving, and the plan is to have a draft report in January or February time frame, and a final report to the Fiscal Committee by March or April of 2026.

And that concludes my update, Mr. Chairman. Be happy to take any questions.

**4. Other business:**

**5. Date of next meeting and adjournment:**

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Does the Committee have any questions? So it sounds like you're -- you're getting these things wrapped up. When are we going to be dealing with the -- what Departments go next, I guess.

MS. YOUNG: Jay, I'll let you take that one.

JAY HENRY, Performance Audit Supervisor, Audit Division, Office of Legislative Budget Assistant: Well, let's see. We'll probably want a list or, you know, topics that you're interested in. Um -- we could do that at any time, but no one's going to be starting -- no one will be available to start working on it until the Doorways Program is -- the report's been written at least. So that was -- uh -- Spring

of --

MS. YOUNG: Right.

MR. HENRY: Yeah. So we have time. But it gives you time, too, to think of topics, things you want us to look at in coming up.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: The reason I ask that is I thought probably we'd skip a meeting in December and schedule a meeting in -- in January sometime. Uh -- and -- and then we can bring it -- bring those items up at that point or is that too early?

MR. HENRY: It doesn't matter to us, as long as when we're ready to -- to work on it, we have the topic. So whether it's January or March, you know, doesn't -- doesn't matter; but you -- you may want things in place.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. Well, may -- maybe since the -- uh -- the first week in January is the start of a new -- a new session, maybe we should push it to the next meeting to Jan -- to February. Does that make sense? So what is the -- what is the -- the first Friday in February be the 6th. Does that work for everybody?

REP. WEYLER: I don't know yet. {Inaudible}.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: And let me ask you another question. We don't have a single Senator here today. Uh --

and I think part of the problem is the ten o'clock hour. Uh -- they seem to -- do you think that's a problem or not?

REP. WEYLER: They show up at other ten o'clock meetings but call for Fiscal they prefer 11. I don't know if that would make any difference. I just --

KEITH ERF, State Representative, Hillsborough County, District #28: I know one of them's out of town.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah.

REP. WEYLER: Well, I would note those of us that are on Fiscal --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah.

REP. WEYLER: -- that when we call for the audits, we need a quorum. Four of them leave traditionally. So they don't show the attention to the audits that I chided them on. They don't read the audits and don't --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. Well, we'll make it --

REP. WEYLER: When we do the budget they don't -- they don't seem to be aware of the audit information that you people have worked so hard to provide us, and the Senators aren't aware of much of it. So -- uh -- problem with Senators in general rather than --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. So we'll make the next meeting February 7th, 10 a.m.

REP. ERF: Six, February 6th.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Six, I'm sorry.

REP. WEBER: Mr. Chairman, I was going to  
just --

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: We don't want to come in on a  
Saturday.

REP. WEBER: I was just going to suggest, if I  
might, that perhaps you might want to contact your opposite  
number in the Senate, and if they need an adjustment in time we  
could certainly do that -- uh -- particularly, if we know well  
in advance. So you might -- it -- it just takes away one more  
excuse. It may not have any -- any bearing on whether they  
show up or not; but -- um -- just a suggestion.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: How -- how does the Members  
feel?

REP. ERF: Just talk to Tim Lang. I mean,  
they've been here pretty regularly.

REP. WEBER: Hm-hum.

REP. ERF: I think they're just out of town  
right now a number of them. Certainly one of them {Inaudible}.

REP. WEBER: Right, and Senator Lang has been  
here quite regularly.

REP. ERF: Yeah. I mean, we can book it for

this as you said you want to do now, {Inaudible} change it.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah. Well, why don't we go with what we've got and if we decide to change it, we will. So that's -- that's February -- February 6th at 10 a.m. Okay. So with this -- yeah, excuse me.

REP. WEYLER: I see we're doing something we haven't done before. This is good. This is follow-up on all these audits we've looked at through the year and -- and once we've given them some things to report to Fiscal about we never hear again. But as you have pointed out rightly, some of these go back many years. And, you know, if we are not doing a follow-up, it gets ignored. It's always so interesting when we have people before us that have only been on the commissioner job or director's job for three or four years and they're not even aware of the previous audit. And I think it's important that, you know, you newly take over a division or a -- you should look at the audits that have gone, even if they're ten years, five years before. You should see what the problems were and try to make sure they don't still persist.

So I don't think we're -- we're making a proper use of all the work that goes into these audits. And -- uh -- you know I'll be pushing for it as I always have that, you know, this is a very important tool for those of us that make

the budget. And I'm very disappointed that some of the ones that make the budget haven't really looked at any of these audits. And how can you make a proper decision if you're not aware of what's been the problems in the past, so, and whether or not they've been fixed. So I appreciate this way of -- I don't know whose idea was it, yours to do this follow-up?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Well, it was -- yeah, it was the -- it was -- it was my question that generated, and I think Senator Lang pushed it pretty hard.

REP. WEYLER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: And I was struggling at the beginning of what a long-term solution was.

REP. WEYLER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: But as it went on and we called them in, it appears that what we're doing is a long-term solution.

REP. WEYLER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: So, I think we'll keep doing it. Uh -- it will be a while now before we have other audits to follow-up on; but we-- uh -- we've done a pretty good job on the backlog and everybody -- everybody involved deserves some credit for. I think it's working.

REP. WEYLER: Yeah, thank you very much. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: So if there's nothing else,  
we'll adjourn. Thank you.

REP. WEYLER: All right. Good work.

(The meeting adjourned at 10:31 a.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Cecelia A. Trask, RPR, RMR, and a Licensed Court Reporter in the State of New Hampshire, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcript of the YouTube video/audio recording taken on said date. I was not physically present and have transcribed said video/audio to the best of my ability, skill, knowledge and belief.



*Cecelia A. Trask*

Cecelia A. Trask, RPR, RMR

New Hampshire LCR #00047