

LEGISLATIVE PERFORMANCE AUDIT AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

State House, Room 100

Concord, NH

Friday, September 5, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Representative Gerald Griffin, Chair

Representative Keith Erf

Representative Mary Jane Wallner

Representative Lucy Weber

Senator Timothy Lang

Senator Keith Murphy

Senator Howard Pearl

1. Acceptance of the June 6, 2025 meeting minutes.

(No audio from 10:04:20 a.m. to 10:06:29 a.m. using the date and time in right bottom corner of video.)

2. Potential audit topics - Review status of prior Performance Audits

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

(Inaudible).

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Do we need another handout?

(Senator Rosenwald enters the committee room.)

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you. If you could please turn to the last page of this document. You'll notice that this was an audit of the Department of Administrative Services. Liquor was named on

Observation 8, because we were part of the recycling program at the time. Um -- so it -- we were Observation 8. We responded.

If you turn back to the first page, this was DAS' response. This was their Action Plan. Again, they list all the items. We're number eight. They added an Action Plan 9. Again, that was the Liquor Commission should respond to. We were unaware of that response being due. When we were notified by this Committee, we subsequently reached out to the Department of Administrative Services, asked them what happened, and gave them a response.

In speaking to Cynthia Jones Bryer, we asked her, you know, how this happened. How the Liquor Commission could have known about this, considering it was their Action Plan. They responded that they usually track these for the agencies, especially when there's multiple agencies. It gets a little complicated. Unfortunately, we never made it to their tracking list. So they never notified us that this was an open item. I welcome any questions.

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

{Inaudible}.

TIMOTHY LANG, State Senator, Senate District

#02: If I may, my question's for Henry. So, Henry, given their response, would we just mark this as fully complete and -- and clear the one observation that says it's not been resolved?

JAY HENRY, Performance Audit Supervisor, Audit

Division, Office of Legislative Budget Assistant: Yeah. {Inaudible} submitted to Transparent New Hampshire then, yeah. Probably {Inaudible}.

SEN. LANG: Because in accordance there were, again, nine Observations, eight of which have been marked prior to coming in here as resolved. This was the last one. So we're nine for nine now at this point; correct?

MR. HENRY: Yep.

SEN. LANG: Okay.

{Inaudible}.

RICHARD LAVERS, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Employment Security: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. For the record, Richard Lavers, Deputy Commissioner with the Department of Employment Security. Good to see everybody.

Uh -- the Department did submit a letter last week explaining the open item from the 2016 audit. So this was an audit of a -- a department that no longer exists. This is of the Department of Resources and Economic Development. Uh -- Employment Security now runs the Job Training Program as a result of 2019 changes made by the Legislature. So we've inherited the -- um -- um -- responsibilities that previously had been assumed by DRED for the WorkReadyNH Program, which was the open item, the remaining open item from that 2016 audit.

So WorkReadyNH's a program that's funded out of the Job Training Program. It's administered through a Memorandum of Understanding between the Department and the Community College System. I did ask Chuck Lloyd and Chris Dudley to join from the Community College System. They're behind me here. So I thank them for coming this morning as well. And I believe that the item, the

concern raised in the audit, has been addressed as part of the 2019 changes. So the concern really was that there was no real statutory recognition of the WorkReadyNH Program as being part of the Job Training Program.

Um -- the Legislature in 2019, they made significant changes with the Job Training Program. They reassigned it from then Business and Economic Affairs over to Employment Security. The annual appropriation out of employer taxes got increased from two million to six million. Different types of training for individuals were put into the program with programs the Department had to create. And the WorkReadyNH Program was specifically addressed within the statute. So, 282-A, Section 181, now contains multiple references to WorkReadyNH Program, so recognizing it as part of the programs to be funded through the Job Training Program and requiring a base-level of funding as well.

So I think that the item has been addressed -- um -- but obviously that if there are any questions with regard to that from the Committee, more than happy to answer.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: {Inaudible}. Any questions?

Yes.

SEN. LANG: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So same questions for Henry. Henry, again, they had nine Observations, eight of which were fully addressed. This was the last item. But given the legislative changes in 2019 by the Legislature incorporating that into the program, we're now nine for nine again. This is going to move to the green? Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Anything else? We thank you for your testimony.

MR. LAVERS: All right. Thank you.

ROGER PHILLIPS, Chair, Adult Parole Board, Department of Corrections: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Good morning.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm Roger Phillips. I'm the Chair of the Adult Parole Board, and I've held that position since 2022. Um -- I got on the Board in 2019 after that initial audit and so have been aware of the

progress the Board has made since that time; but I was not aware of the reporting requirements that to go back to this Committee. But we have submitted a written response -- um -- and along with the -- I think all of you have received the -- from Jay Henry the -- our -- our summary. But it shows that of the 26 items, 18 have been fully performed. Uh -- and then there are eight that remain, three of which needs more work. And the other -- other five are almost done.

Uh -- much of -- one of the reports -- I should say one of the recommendations, observations, was that we -- the Board do a weighted decision-making. And, fortunately, we are members of the Association of Parolee Authorities International, and I have beginning in 2023 was the first time I could attend a conference. But with me is -- is Jay Mackey, who's our Director of Operations. And he has been able to attend really since 19 -- since 2022. And -- um -- we have learned about structured decision-making through the benefit of the -- the educational programs within that conference.

Um -- I also underwent training in 2024 from the National Institute of Corrections, which also addressed decision-making. The National Institute of

Corrections provides to the State training on structured decision-making. And we were successful in being named for or -- or awarded training for 2025, just as soon as they complete the training of New York. The only caveat with that is they didn't know how long that would take or how long it would cost. So the caveat is it depends on -- on the federal funds that are available.

Also, our entire Board was able to go to a conference to receive training on structured decision-making -- um -- but the program itself is rather intense. It's a six to eight week program. And it's recommended that we try not to adopt it before they tell us the right way to do it. Some states have done that and -- um -- their implementation has not been as effective had they waited and received the appropriate training.

So the things that are not accomplished are sometimes related to that and, also, sometimes related to the fact that we need help from -- from IT to get certain things accomplished.

The Department of Corrections recently underwent a -- a software program change from the Coris

4 program that they had that kept track of all of the activities of the Department of Corrections, and installed and awarded the -- the updated program, which was supposed to be easier to use -- uh -- uh -- which is Version 8 of Coris. Unfortunately it's not easier to use and has not been implemented fully, and we're waiting for a lot of that to be populated. And, hopefully, the bugs can be worked out, and then we can do such things as -- I mean, they're simple things. Like we ought to post all of our meetings under the -- the Right to Know Act, but IT is really busy getting other things done with that program right now.

But I can easily go through and discuss any of the recommendations and indicate where we are along the -- the way, but I don't want to -- I think the eighteen that have been accomplished, I think that's -- that's fair to -- to say those programs have -- have -- have been successfully completed.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Well, the program we were just talking about, is that one of the three that you listed as requiring more work?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: What are the other two?

MR. PHILLIPS: The -- the -- the -- on the first page of this it -- it's a -- developers procedures to weigh decision-making criteria. And, also, on the last page of that little summary -- um -- there's some -- a tracking mechanism that will be used. Uh -- establish a performance measure system which is the -- that's also part of the structured decision-making program. All right. Um -- establish a records retention policy. That could more easily be addressed by the Director of Operations. But we need room and, first of all, we need to scan old records and get them into what they call file hold -- uh -- as part of the computer program. Um -- unfortunately -- um -- because of budget concerns or this, we lost 20% of our workforce. Uh -- so -- so we're not quite able to -- to get all of that scanning done. And not only that, IT hasn't created that part of file hold where those records can be kept confidential, because there's some -- we want to make certain it's only accessed by folks who have the authority to do that. So we've got to work out that glitch. So those three items will really be dependent upon structured decision-making and the

implementation of the file hold -- uh -- change.

Uh -- I think of those things that are substantially resolved, we're very close to -- to doing those things. Um -- um -- for instance, giving the Board -- on the very first page it says giving the Board access to inmate mental health and substance abuse information. The Department of Corrections does that through the materials that supplies to us for our parole hearings; but sometimes the behavioral health discharge summaries are incomplete, and sometimes they're delayed in getting to the Board. So I think what we're trying to do is work with the Department of Corrections to adjust that so we get that information earlier. In other words, sometimes it comes in the day before the hearing. Well, we try to -- we -- we try to have this information available several days before so -- uh -- the three members of the hearing panel have plenty of time to digest the material.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Senator Lang.

SEN. LANG: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. So further question. Senator Rosenwald has a question afterward. Um -- so my question says 26 Observations

that were made, recommendations that were made. Your presentation is that eighteen of those have been fully resolved?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

SEN. LANG: And then remaining eight are open issues.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes.

SEN. LANG: So what -- I think what this Committee is looking for is, number one, you need to update LBA because according to our list, zero are resolved -- um -- according to our documentation because no reports have been filed saying, hey, here's what's going on. And then the last thing I think the Committee is going to want is on those eight open items timelines on when those recommendations are going to -- are going to be resolved, if they're going to be resolved. So we -- so we know when the -- all the recommendations that were -- uh -- cited are -- are taken care of. So this is more of a reporting issue about making sure that, again, we didn't know that you completed eighteen of these items because the required documentation is

supposed to go back didn't happen.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yep.

SEN. LANG: And so if we can get that required report done to the LBA Audit Division so they can up -- Henry might -- is it go to them or does it go to DAS?

MR. HENRY: DAS.

SEN. LANG: It goes to DAS. Um -- get that required report saying here's the eighteen items. We've resolved these. Here's the eight items and, oh, by the way, here's our timeline to resolve these. Uh -- because that's what this Committee has oversight. That's what we're looking to do is making sure that someone made recommendations. Now let's make sure they're being addressed.

MR. PHILLIPS: If this hearing were at the end of the September, I could give a deadline for -- for such things as when would that six week training be completed, six, eight week. But we don't know because the National Institute of Corrections hasn't told us yet. They will later this month. Uh -- and, of course,

I was unaware that we should be reporting. You know, I was new to the position.

You know, it's strange, I would meet with the -- monthly with the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections. We discussed the audit. We discussed the changes we were making. But not once was I told, well, make sure this is reported, too. So that's -- I'm the Chair. I'm responsible for that. I -- I -- I -- I have to admit, I was ignorant of -- of what --

SEN. LANG: You're not the first person to sit in that chair and say that. So we fully understand, you know, but we just want to make sure now let's get caught up, and let's get it taken care of going forward, not looking in the rearview mirror, but just moving forward so we can make sure that these audit findings are dealt with.

MR. PHILLIPS: I would hope that within six months we can report that -- that these are completed. But that is going to be dependent upon other agencies, sometimes IT, sometimes the Department of Corrections, and able to get their -- their material to us -- um -- and -- and -- and sometimes things that we should do.

For instance, the minutes of the -- of the meeting, that should be posted. The Attorney General's Office had -- had recommended that to us; but it requires that I go through and read all of those minutes going back, you know, several years, and make certain that there's no confidential information that inadvertently got included. Well, things have been rather busy, and I haven't had time to do all of that reading. But within the next six months, if not, maybe I personally won't do it, but someone -- uh -- who's appointed to this position or who fills the -- or a present board member can go through and accomplish that, so.

SEN. LANG: One more follow-up?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: {Inaudible}.

SEN. LANG: One more.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Follow-up, yeah.

SEN. LANG: So, again, I think it's more about getting an updated to DAS. Know so everyone who's looking at this saying parole board's falling down on the job, but you've already done eighteen of these. So

we recognize -- we want to recognize the work you've already done.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah.

SEN. LANG: But then we also want a timeline in that report as to when and the conditions, understanding that DoIT may be a bottleneck for you and you can put that in your -- in your recommend -- in your -- your updated report --

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay.

SEN. LANG: -- to DAS saying, hey, here's the eight items and, oh, by the way, here's what we're doing, and the anticipated time for each of these items to be done. If we can have a simple report like that getting to DAS so that our audit documents can get updated that we know that you are, in fact, working on these and not -- they not just been sitting 26 Observations and nobody's done anything about it, right? So that's important for our citizens to see that, that they read these audit reports. And so without that -- that report back to DAS. So if we can get that report back in a timely fashion, not wait six months but next

month or so, and then with the outline, and this Committee can take a look at those eight recommendations that are left and what the timeline looks at and if we can have a discussion about that as well.

MR. PHILLIPS: We -- we will certainly within 30 days be able to provide, I think, a timeline.

JAY MACKEY, Director of Operations, Adult Parole Board, Department of Corrections: I have actually submitted all of this documentation to DAS and they were posting it today after this meeting is what I was told. I gave it to them last week.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Senator Rosenwald.

CINDY ROSENWALD, State Senator, Senate District #13: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I congratulate you, Mr. Phillips, on having fully resolved some, particularly complicated Observations -- um -- specifically having to do with medical parole and those issues.

The one I'm confused about though is Observation No. 24, establishing a records retention policy. And I'm confused because in your discussion on

Page 10 -- um -- what you refer to is how -- how you are storing files, not how long you should be keeping them.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well --

SEN. ROSENWALD: Or where -- what format they should be kept in, which seems like you could have said we're going to keep them for seven years or ten years or we're going to keep them forever or whatever the policy is. So I -- your -- your explanation leaves me confused as to why you haven't been able to create a policy of retention.

MR. MACKEY: Um -- we -- when I went through -- I got hired in this position in 2021. I had gone through the audit, went through our administrative rules and our administrative rules were in conflict with the State's records, the State's -- the statutes for record retention, where we were destroying like audio recordings of hearings after one year, but we have to keep them for four years according to the State's Act.

So we are going by the State's Archives and Records Management Act when it comes to the storing of records. But we have just not come up with an actual

physical policy of record retention. We have not, since I've been in the office, we haven't destroyed any records -- um -- and we are keeping them for at least for the minimum of four years. More likely I -- I came from the DOC as administrative classification and offended records. The DOC's policy is destroying records after ten years. So I was going to go more along those lines to stay in line with how the DOC does their records retention policies. Um -- and in addition to the digital storage, I have been working with IT for -- about file hold -- um -- per the Right-to-Know laws, 91-A:5, parole board records are exempt.

So the problem I have is in some areas of file hold every single staff member of the DOC has access to that. I've been asking to create a separate area where only specific job assignments can have access to it, whether it be Parole Board members, Parole Board staff, as well as the Division of Field Services, as they're the ones that oversee the parolees while they're out on parole and have to add to their files. Um -- so that's -- that's where we stand with the whole records retention policy. But it is on my list of things to get done immediately so we can update this.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Follow-up.

SEN. ROSENWALD: Just really more of a comment. Prior to 2010, the Board of Medicine kept all of their investigative files forever in -- in, like, shoe boxes. I mean, if some doctor had -- had a complaint, they kept it for ever. So I think it's really important to have a policy of how long you're going to keep records for and maybe it lines up with DOC and maybe it lines up with something else. But I think it's really critical to have a policy of how long in addition to what format you're going to keep the files in.

MR. MACKEY: That's the issue we're dealing with right now as -- um -- a lot of the records that the paper file records that were stored in the DOC basement that flooded and the air quality is too hazardous to allow anyone down there anymore. Um -- and the DOC had spent money to bring a company in for that air quality, as well as to get those records scanned; but then it became too costly and they stopped before we had a chance to get down there for our records. So we are storing records in our office right now. And so it's -- it's a major -- I mean, one of the major things that we need to get going on so we cannot have all these records

sitting in boxes at our office.

SEN. ROSENWALD: One more if I could? So some of those records might be so old that you're not going to put them into digital format. You're just going to throw them out, right? I mean, can nobody go look and say they're older than ten years, we're not going to keep them?

MR. MACKEY: Right. So that's -- nobody can go down there. We don't even have a key for the area anymore. The DOC does not allow anyone to go down to that basement.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Representative Weber.

LUCY WEBER, State Representative, Cheshire County, District #05: Well, I had a different observation, but I will follow-up with Senator Rosenwald's. Uh -- it -- first of all, just to -- to continue with I think the line that she was talking about. Um -- if we know how old those records are that may help. But if you have an actual policy that you go back eight years, you go back ten years, whatever your policy requires, consistent with all the statutory

stuff, then older than that at least you don't have to scan them. You don't have to see what kind of confidentiality is in there.

MR. MACKEY: Hm-hum.

REP. WEBER: And as for records that have been possibly contaminated beyond repair, then I think that the point is incorporating into the policy the note that some of your records simply had to be, as one who has had a flooded basement and a lot of wet paper -- uh -- simply had to be -- um -- appropriately disposed of. And that disposal is going to create a whole nother set of issues; but that also needs to be done. I mean, I assume that nobody's proposing just locking it up and never going there again.

MR. MACKEY: Right.

REP. WEBER: But the -- the observation -- the other observation that I started with before we started down this road is that one of the other things that's very useful in following up with these observations is knowing where the roadblocks is. If there's a roadblock with IT, knowing that is something the Legislature

ought to know about. And if there is a roadblock of work that is necessary that cannot be done because of staffing issues, that's also something the Legislature ought to know about. And how the Legislature handles that is a whole nother issue. But it is a matter of our taking accountability for it as well as you taking accountability for it. So I just wanted to make sure that that was on the table there as well.

MR. MACKEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Other questions? Um -- so I get the sense that probably the Committee would like to see a report from you guys -- uh -- after the first of the year, maybe by the end of March, on the status of the eight open items. And -- uh -- if they're -- uh -- if they're all resolved -- uh -- it won't be necessary for you to come back in. But if -- uh -- we'll see what the report says at that time. That gives you pretty much a full six months to -- to get it resolved. Is everybody agreeable with that? Okay. We thank you very much for your testimony.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Um -- I know Senator Lang talked to me about potential audit top -- audit topics and --

SEN. LANG: I do have one question for Henry. So on the last month's minutes, we talked about the Wetlands Council, and they were supposed to be here today; but it looks like, I'm looking at the sheet, they're green now and -- uh -- a hundred percent. So is that the reason why they weren't brought forward on here? What I'm looking at the minutes from last month. It said that agency heads will be asked to address LPAOC at the next meeting and one of which was Wetlands Council; but now, obviously, they're not here today. And -- and when I look at the sheet now they're in green and at a hundred percent.

MR. HENRY: Yeah. When I talked to DES, they informed me that the Council's answers were included with the Department's answers. We didn't know that at the time. So -- and they had completed their -- their -- they made -- they -- they addressed all the Observations. So I told them you guys were -- did not want to drag them in front of the Committee if everything's complete.

SEN. LANG: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we didn't.

The other item I talked to the Chair about is in one of the earlier meetings in this -- last year I think it was or maybe in the spring, we talked about the right of the Audit Committee to audit non-state agencies. Non-state, we were talking about Special Education, if I remember right, in School Districts, and what we wanted to do about possibly auditing and trying to get an understanding better of what's going on in Special Education. We talked about using a low, medium, high. You know, going to the Department of Education and saying let's find someone who's doing Special-Ed. costs per student at a low level, someone who's doing at the medium level, and someone who's Special Education costs seem to be out of control and auditing that to see if there were any findings on what's on there. And we were told we had statutory authority to do that, but I don't think we ever took any action on it or discussed it any further other than just a discussion.

So do you remember that conversation, and do you know where we stand with what we were -- what --

what was going to happen?

MR. HENRY: I think you stand right where you are in that no decision had been made at the time. I -- I know that we're continuing our work on the Special Education at the Department. And as we've told this Committee, it's -- it's going to be a big report with a lot of Observations, which may affect that audit that you're thinking about. Uh -- what I would say is you may want to see that audit first, and then decide what -- what else you want to do.

SEN. LANG: So how -- how -- when do we expect that audit, I guess, is my question now.

MR. HENRY: Right now we're looking at into 2026.

SEN. LANG: Okay.

MR. HENRY: We've -- um -- what we've -- uh -- I think we've done about -- drafted out 20 Observations out of 50 or so. Uh -- they're -- a lot of the Observations are long and detailed. Um -- so we are giving those to the Agency to respond. And then after

we get through writing all the Observations, you know, then we sort of go into, we'll say, negotiations with them. We're trying to, you know, get to a meeting of the minds with the Department to see if we can get more concurrence.

SEN. LANG: So this -- so I want to make sure in my head I have this clear. So, again, but your -- that audit is basically just an oversight audit of -- the performance audit of the Agency and how it's oversighting School Districts and the spending of the programs, right; but not actually how School Districts are doing it.

MR. HENRY: Right. But the Department would be, you know, should be overseeing -- I think a lot of questions you have are probably issues the Department should have been doing all along if they were doing -- running the program at least the way we think they should have been running it. So that's why I'm sort of, you know, if -- if they were doing a good job, you'd probably have more answers.

SEN. LANG: Okay. I guess we'll wait till '26 when we get that report.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yes.

SEN. ROSENWALD: I -- my memory may be faulty, but I recall that you told us you had shared some Observations with the Department, and we're waiting for their response that concur, not concur, partially concur. Um -- is that true and have -- have those responses come back yet, if true?

MR. HENRY: Yes. We're -- we are giving them in, like, little batches of, like, here's five because they're big and they give them time to -- to think about an answer. They're responding, but that's only sort of the first round of it. Then if we have problems with their responses, we can write rejoinders, meaning we disagree with something they said. We give it back to them for -- for them to respond. Again, we're trying to, you know, see if we can reach an agreement. And, also, it gives them a chance to give us more information that may change what we say. So it's -- it's a -- it's a back and forth process.

SEN. ROSENWALD: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Anyone else have any questions? Yeah.

SEN. ROSENWALD: I'm just looking at this fabulous chart and -- um -- looking at the Board of Naturopaths, they had a lot Observations in 2017 and have apparently completed none of them nor reported. So I'm wondering if we could ask them for a status report at a future meeting.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah.

SEN. ROSENWALD: Thank you.

SEN. LANG: Mr. Chair, for recommend -- I -- I was going to make a recommendation that was two of the Boards. There's two of the Naturopath Board, and then there's the Board and the OPLC combined had different Observations it looks like. And then, again, with OPLC we have the Dental Examiners at the bottom of the red list that had some Observations that made -- that -- that were done in '22 that we haven't had any update on to know where that is. And the last one was I was going to do Police Standards and Training. So bring OPLC and their two Boards and Police Standards for the next

meeting maybe, if that'll work.

SEN. ROSENWALD: And Naturopaths.

SEN. LANG: Yeah, yeah. Those five items that run in the red.

MR. HENRY: Yeah, I think there's four boards on -- in the red list. Um -- but if we remember, OPLC is sort of taking over responding to all of them. And if you look at all of them, they all have a lot of Observations. I just would be careful not to ask OPLC to try to do, like, three of them in one day because that -- that's a lot. That'd be a lot for the Director.

SEN. LANG: Two boards basically. The -- the Naturopath and the -- um -- the Dental Examiners. And but it's Board and OPLC because each one has a different Observation. So I'd rather not bring Dee in multiple times if we can help it. She can update for next meeting for those two requirements of her, the Naturopaths and the Dental, have her come in just to respond to where they are. Some of this might just be, again, just like the Parole Board just needs a report filed. That's been addressed and not been -- um --

because they've been working, OPLC's been -- been banging pretty hard. She's doing a great job over there -- um -- but we'd just like an update, that's all. And then do Police Standard and Training, which is one of the other ones that's outstanding.

MR. HENRY: Yeah, I think Police Standards and Training they -- they had reported twice at least and they're 50 or 59 percent complete. I think something like that. So, I mean, they were on the pro, you know, on the roll to --

SEN. LANG: Yeah, the last update was 2023.

MR. HENRY: Yeah. That's why they're on the list.

SEN. LANG: Maybe we can have a conversation with them and get them to give -- have John come in and give us a new update, the Director over there.

MR. HENRY: And the only other two, I think there's two Corrections audits still. One of them is the Adult Parole Board, there's 13 Observations which affected the Department. So it's not just the Parole

Board.

SEN. LANG: Hm-hum.

MR. HENRY: But, then again, you have a brand new Commissioner there.

SEN. LANG: Yeah. You can let him know that we're going to be asking, but I don't think we want to push him to come in right away.

MR. HENRY: Right.

SEN. LANG: He has a lot of other problems to manage right now.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Absolutely. I think the -- we need to get the word out to the Departments that there will be follow-up in the future on -- on recommendations that haven't been closed, you know.

3. Other business

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. Other business.

SEN. LANG: Mr. Chair, I know you and I had

this conversation; but again, I think this process is working well to get the Agencies to update and do what they're supposed to do and -- and take care of the issues in these audits that we're seeing. And I think that as we keep this up as part of the oversight, the oversight part of our Committee of making sure that these agencies are doing what -- correcting the problems that have been identified, I think it'll make everybody's life much better.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Well, when we first got into this, I think most of us were saying, well, what's the long-term solution of it? We can send the audit people back in, but then that dilutes the effect of the audit people, make -- takes more of their time, and we get less done. This seems to be working fairly well. We are now getting them to answer the open items. So I -- I think probably we'll go forward with it for a while, if everyone agrees. Anyone -- and I -- I think it is working. I think so. And -- and the more the word gets out to the Departments that there will be follow-up, I think the more effective it's going to be. And maybe -- maybe we won't have anybody come in. Representative Weber.

REP. WEBER: Well, I'm -- I'm just thinking that just like the Departments we will catch up.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Right.

REP. WEBER: Given that we're doing five or six, you know, and -- and at that point our job and their job will be easier because we'll not be looking at 2016 and the things that are in the flooded basement. We'll just be looking at the reasonable progression from having received the Observations to when they're going to be taken care of. So I think it's a great -- I will say that when we started the work, my heart sank and although it needed to be done; but I've been very heartened by the process that we've been through to date. So I thank all of you for the work on it, and thank you for the work on it.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Anything else?

SEN. LANG: Yes, just more going back to our previous type of work we used to do, which was looking at what audits are outstanding, and when they're due, and whether there's headroom for queuing up the next audit to happen. Is there any update on that? Is there

anything we need to worry about?

MR. HENRY: Not -- not immediately. I think we're going into 2025 -- '26 before the next team is freed up. {Inaudible}.

SEN. LANG: Okay.

MR. HENRY: So, you know, we have time. You know, we went through the budget cycle. We may have new topics besides that, you know, local; but, I mean, I don't need a list right now.

SEN. LANG: Okay.

MR. HENRY: I mean, we'll -- we'll make sure that we inform you when we need a list.

SEN. LANG: Yeah.

MR. HENRY: When we have people become free {Inaudible}.

SEN. LANG: {Inaudible} if possible, put it on the next agenda, just informational block that just says

these are the audits that are -- we're currently involved in, what the dates are, and we have this queued up already so we have an idea what's going on. Keep that. If we just add that to the agenda as an informational audit because I don't remember what those three audits you're doing other than Special Education are. So be nice to have a reminder.

4. Date of next meeting and adjournment

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. The final thing on the agenda here is the date of the next meeting. So I -- I know I'm gone the -- I don't have to be here. We have Cindy as Vice-Chair anyway, but I'm gone the first full week in October, which I think is the 6th to the 10th or 11th. And --

SEN. LANG: So do you want to -- I think we've been doing -- trying to do the first Friday of each month.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Hm?

SEN. LANG: I think we've been trying to do the first Friday of each month.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah.

SEN. LANG: So we last few months that's what we've done, which would be the 3rd of October.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Third will work, yeah. The 3rd work for everybody? Okay. Can you get this room?

SEN. LANG: I will get Sonya to get this room.

REP. WEBER: Also ten o'clock.

SEN. LANG: Same time, ten o'clock?

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Yeah.

KEITH ERF, State Representative, Hillsborough County, District #28: Might we consider meeting up at Granite Place since the parking there is going to be much better.

SEN. LANG: So I -- I -- I do know that someone just tried to schedule a meeting up at Granite Place and was told no.

REP. ERF: By who?

SEN. LANG: By staff. By -- it was for a Committee that was forming and needed an organizational meeting, and they were told not yet. I'm -- I'm telling you what they said. I just told --

REP. ERF: Who told them not yet?

SEN. LANG: Some of the House staff and --

REP. ERF: Speaker's Office? Majority Office?

SEN. LANG: Yes. Yes, yes, and Facilities, and they were told no yet. I'm just telling you I literally talked to a Chairman this morning when he used --

REP. WEBER: {Inaudible}.

SEN. LANG: Yeah. So. I was talking to the Chairman, House Chairman trying to schedule. He's the first named House member to be considered.

REP. ERF: We're not meeting till October because it's a pain to -- the parking lot here, and there's lots of room up there. For parking, I mean.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: So --

SEN. LANG: I'll get 100 for October, and then going forward we can move over to Granite Place.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: Okay. I guess that's it. We can adjourn.

SEN. LANG: Second.

CHAIRMAN GRIFFIN: In favor? Opposed? None.

***** {MOTION ADOPTED}**

(Meeting adjourned at 10:51 a.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, Cecelia A. Trask, a Licensed Court Reporter in the State of New Hampshire, do hereby certify that said transcript is an accurate transcription of the official audio recording of the proceeding in this matter. I was not physically present at this hearing. I have transcribed said audio recording to the best of my professional skills and ability.

Cecelia A. Trask, RMR
NH LCR #00047