



Locally Coordinated Meeting Minutes

05-23-07

Attendees:

Jebb Curelop, Life Coping
Eileen Brady, Nashua Soup Kitchen
Tim Roache, NRPC
Matt Waitkins, NRPC
Karen Baker, NRPC
Ellen Groh, Granite State Organizing Project
Ruth Hadeen, GSOP

Louise Woodworth, Nashua Transit
Meghan Brady, St. Joseph's Comm. Serv.
Pat Murphy, Town of Merrimack Welfare
Sarah J. Knoy, Granite State Organizing Proj.
Sharon Paley, Nashua Soup Kitchen
Suzanne Keller, Southern NH Medical Center
Lance Forrester, Care Ride

The meeting began at 12:11 pm.

Agenda Item #1

Tim Roache opened with introductions. He thanked everyone for hanging in there during the LCTP process and passed the floor to Matt Waitkins.

Agenda Item #2

Matt reviewed how the Locally Coordinated Transportation Plan (LCTP) process from its inception in May of 2006 to its approval in December 2006. **The stakeholders group continues to meet with the intention of implementing the recommendations in the plan. The LCTP had a number of immediate, short-term and long term goals. One of the mid-term recommendations is for the stakeholders to take steps towards becoming involved in the Statewide Coordination Council (SCC), provided it ultimately becomes reality. The idea is that the Locally Coordinated Committee would become the Regional Coordinating Council (RCC).** He updated the group regarding his communications with Kit Morgan of the NHDOT and Patrick Hurlihy of DHHS. Both Kit and Patrick report that the development of a Statewide Coordinating Council (SCC) is ongoing. The Governor's Task Force on Transportation had initially suggested that the SCC be created by Executive Order. However, since the Governor's Task Force on Transportation was itself created by executive order it has been decided that the SCC should be created through legislation. Senator Lou Dallesandro was going to try and introduce it during the current legislative session and if that didn't happen he would try for the winter session. There was also a possibility that it would be considered during the current legislative season in a special session. Patrick Hurlihy (DHHS) reports that the RFP for the Non Emergency Medicaid Brokerage was working its way through DHHS. Eileen Brady said that significant cuts in the DHHS budget are holding up progress of the RFP. The hope is that in the end everything (SCC and Medicaid Brokerage) would meld or dovetail together.

Agenda Item #3

Matt reminded the group of the subcommittee that was formed to review the model (from Nelson-Nygaard Report) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Bylaws. The reason for reviewing these documents is because of the potential for the LCTP group to become the RCC for the Nashua region. The members of the subcommittee are Matt, Mark Sousa, Meghan Brady, and Suzanne Keller. The hope is to adopt the MOU and Bylaws by July or September which would be good timing if the SCC (and the associated RCCs) becomes reality in 2008. Matt proceeded to pass around copies of the draft MOU and Bylaws for review by the group. Matt read through the entire draft MOU first and suggested that those in attendance take the information to their organizations to get feedback. Matt also noted that text in

blue and italicized was information added or changed by the subcommittee. He asked if there were any comments or red flags.

Ruth Hadeen felt that in the first WHEREAS, that Milford area and beyond should be included adding that there are people without any public transportation at all and have no car or access to public transportation. She reminded the group of the State's vision or understanding of not limiting anyone or being all inclusive.

Ellen Groh felt that the sentence "as funding allows" should be added due to the issues with certain groups that have to be included based on certain funding.

Pat Murphy said that it should be prioritized. Another suggestion was to include people that don't have access to transportation via family or friends.

Tim asked if there were any further questions or comments on the MOU. Meghan Brady said that other groups were not as far along in this process and may look at this group's work as a way in helping to recognize transportation issues.

Tim said the SCC would have to sort out the details of how this program will work and this should be discussed at a future date.

Lance Forrester asked what the first bullet on page 1 of the MOU was. Tim said if goes back to having the RTC to broker out the trips adding that agencies would be able to contact that RTC to schedule a ride and the cost associated. Lance asked if this RTC would speak to the providers. Matt reminded the group of the stakeholder list that all the information was initially sent to. Meghan added that the underlying idea was to pull all resources (ex. buying rides, shared services). Tim suggested moving the 2nd bullet on page 2 to the top adding that the RTC would be there burden and our task to seek out that person or organization.

Ruth questioned Tanff funding adding that the Human Service Agency refers to that. Response was that the coordinator will know what folks they can service based on funding or lack of.

Tim added that DHHS and Medicaid are supposed to tie into this process at the State level. Meghan added that consideration should be taken during this whole process.

Ruth thought the intent was to look at transportation for everyone and did not feel it could be done at this time. Response was that the ultimate purpose of the LCTP was to focus on human service agencies, not the general public transportation needs.

Jebb Curelop suggested starting with smaller groups (human service agencies) would be a good way to start due to their access to funding and information. Meghan agreed but felt the other point of non-funded rides needed to be addressed, adding that she agrees with Ruth's concerns. A member of the group added that the human service coordination process is a different process and there is very little money for regional transportation services.

Matt reminded the group again to take back the information to their agencies for review and comments if necessary and bring back next time.

Eileen Brady referenced the Continuum of Care; a group of agencies that would be a good group to send information to in the future.

Matt moved onto the Bylaws. Matt said that changes reflected in the MOU during the discussion would also be reflected in the Bylaws. Issues were as follows:

The first issue with the Bylaws was in Section 111.1. The concern was with the 10%, what if it becomes 12%? Do we eliminate one of the citizen member positions? Matt said that the SCC was used as a model and suggested adding language; "at initiation of any term, citizen membership should equate to no more than 10%".

Agreement in the language in Section 111.3 was acceptable at this time, but as the group got closer to implementation, modification as necessary may be needed.

Article IV Executive Committee should be italicized. Lance Forrester felt uncomfortable with the 50% quorum. He said the members that show are the quorum.

Section 111.2 brought concern about citizens present for votes and proxy. Matt felt the quorum had to exist. Meghan Brady said she had phoned other agencies to get information on their bylaws and how they have set up governing committees.

Matt asked the group to take a look at the MOU and the Bylaws and to come to an agreement. He would then bring them to Kit Morgan and Patrick Hurlihy for review. Jebb Curelop asked who the liaison with the legislature is. Tim explained that it would be up to agencies and individuals to lobby to the legislature for formation of statewide effort.

Eileen Brady said some of the legislators are on fire about transportation, while Meghan Brady referred to a bill which she was not sure passed regarding insuring volunteers for transportation.

There was another question on the difference of Board and Council regarding the section on consumer liaisons on page 7. Tim answered saying that the Board is all the representatives of agencies that signed on.

Ellen Groh had a concern that non-emergency transportation, but not Medicaid may not fit into Human Services Agency the way it was written and suggested changing the language to make room so they can be added. Tim answered that the services to determine this would be done by the RC adding that the goal would be to bring hospitals into this. A suggestion on who to put this language in was "towns could by a block defining the disabilities of qualifying individuals based on the municipalities funding services (funding permitted that those people are included)".

Matt passed around and explained the memorandum about RSA 261: 153 VI (a) which allows municipalities to collect a fee at time of motor vehicle registration. The revenue generated can then be used to fund transportation related projects. The memorandum listed each town in the region, the number of vehicle registrations and how much revenue could be generated if towns charged a \$5 fee. Eileen had concerns that the fees would be used for traffic calming which she was against. She added that in lots of cases, as soon as an item is brought to town meeting, someone hijacks it and suggest how it can be used in some way other than its original intended use. Pat Murphy said that if a warrant article proposed through a citizen petition is approved by the voters then the language in that warrant article is typically honored. There was also a concern with the \$5 fees in regards to graduation based on type of motor vehicle.

Matt asked for comments back on the MOU and Bylaws by mid-June.

Next meeting will be on July 25th, 2007 at 12 Noon.

Meeting adjourned at 1:26pm