



# Locally Coordinated Meeting Minutes

09-26-07

## Attendees:

Ken Hazeltine, Granite State Independent Liv.  
Eileen Brady, Nashua Soup Kitchen  
Tim Roache, NRPC  
Matt Waitkins, NRPC  
Karen Baker, NRPC  
Ellen Groh, Granite State Organizing Project  
Emily Cooney, Area Agency NH  
Kim Schottes, The Plus Company  
Mark Sousa, City of Nashua  
Fred Roberge, Easter Seals

Raymond Blethen, Nashua Transit  
John J. Nicoloro, Nashua Soup Kitchen  
Ruth Heden, Granite State Organizing Proj.  
Meghan Brady, St. Joseph's Comm. Serv.  
Sylvia McLeod, Grantie State Organizing Proj.  
Sarah J. Knoy, Granite State Organizing Proj.  
Pat Murphy, Town of Merrimack  
Louise Woodworth, Nashua Transit  
Robin Gage, Southern NH Medical Center  
Mickey McIver, Easter Seals

The meeting began at 12:13 pm.

## Call to Order/Minutes

Tim Roache opened the meeting at 12:13 pm with introductions and asked if there were any comments on the minutes from the July 25<sup>th</sup> meeting. There were no comments. Matt Waitkins reminded the committee that they originally came together to develop the Locally Coordinated Transportation Plan (LCTP). Once that plan was completed the group continued to meet to implement recommendations from the plan. One of those recommendations was to be involved with the development of the Statewide Coordinating Council and the Regional Coordinating Council. This involvement has been a major focus of recent LCTP Committee meetings.

## Update on the State Planning Efforts

Matt said he had spoken with Kit Morgan about SCC developments. Kit said that the SCC held their first meeting on August 30<sup>th</sup>. Six non-agency members were elected to be on the Council and they were confirmed at the September GACIT meeting. Matt said that the next SCC meeting would be held at DHHS in Concord and that either he or Tim would be attending that meeting. Mickey McIver and Fred Roberge, representing Easter Seals, informed the group that Fred is a member of the SCC and Mickey is his alternate. Mickey added that the next SCC meeting would be a continuation of orientation and he was also hoping that the Council would elect the chair of the group. Fred said he thought the Council would be meeting monthly, but there was no formal schedule yet.

Matt informed the group that Patrick Herlihy from the Department of Health and Human Services is in the process of rewriting the RFP for non-emergency Medicaid transportation because the original scope was too ambiguous for the DHHS legal team. Fred said the RFP was hundreds of pages long. Ken Hazeltine said that he spoke with Patrick about when the rewrite would be complete and the estimate was that it would be complete in about a month. Mickey said that DHHS RFP had a 30 day comment period which ended last Monday. He had a concern with the language and added that the Easter Seals wrote a response addressing the tone of the document and some apparent restrictions that it created. Ken added that he felt there would be a lot of comment on this. Pat Murphy said that in her meeting with Patrick, she said they were totally committed to bringing this forward.

## Regional Coordination Council (RCC) formation process

Tim reminded the committee that the RCC Memorandum of Understanding was adopted by the committee at the previous meeting. The committee had also begun working through the draft Bylaws at the previous meeting but had gotten hung up on the issue of term limits. Matt proceeded to review the



Bylaws. Ken Hazeltine referred to Article II and said that the word “client” in the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet should be changed to “consumer”. The sentence was therefore changed to read: “... (1) seniors, persons with disabilities and human service agency *consumers* can safely...”.

Matt explained that Article III of the Bylaws is about membership on the council and term limits. Regarding membership, Tim said that citizen membership is typically an issue on committees and citizens/users will be a key to the success/viability of the RCC. Meghan said that generating citizen/user participation in the RCC might require a heavier recruitment process. Ruth Haden said she is an advocate for strong representation on the RCC of users of the coordinated transportation system because a truly dedicated user would be aware of issues that are important to the typical user. It will therefore be important to recruit citizen members who use the system on a regular basis.

A discussion about term limits began. At issue was the statement in Article III-1 that the term of each citizen member shall be limited to two years. Some member of the Committee expressed concern about limiting the terms of citizen members of the council but not the terms of representatives of agencies on the council. Matt and Tim reminded folks that this discussion was a carry-over from a discussion that began at the previous meeting, and that NRPC had done some research into the pro’s and con’s of term limits. See list below:

PRO’S	CONS
Keeps board fresh	Can lose best people
Promotes new blood/interest	Whose organization is it?
Removes deadwood	Balance between Executive Director & board
Avoids having to ask someone to leave	Loss of institutional memory
Gives a graceful out for members (added by Meghan Brady)	Most businesses don’t have term limits

It was pointed out that citizen members can serve multiple terms, and that they just have to re-apply for membership on the council after their 2-year term has expired. The discussion continued and Tim noted that a citizen member that does not get re-appointed does not mean they can’t still be involved as a concerned citizen. Meghan suggested that a good orientation process for members of the Council would be a good idea. Ray Blethen asked if citizen members have a vote at the table and if any user was allowed to attend. Tim confirmed yes on both.

Mark Sousa asked about adding “open to the public” under Article V (Meetings of the Council). Ellen Groh noted that the “open to the public” issue is addressed in Article V.7: Public Participation at Meetings.

Mickey noted that Article III.2 specifically says that proxy votes for citizen members will not be allowed yet Article III.1 notes that representatives of agencies can send their alternates, who are allowed to vote. He suggested that this is a double-standard and treats citizens as a sub-class. He also asked if a citizen member has a right to send an alternate and if that alternate should be able to vote. Ellen said that a representative from an agency should be present if that agency wishes to vote on an issue before the Council, and that citizen members should also be present to vote on any issue before the Council. Tim suggested removing the reference to “proxy” in article III.2 (paragraph 1). Consensus was to do this. Therefore, the statement “proxy votes by citizen members will not be allowed” in Article III.2 was removed. Tim asked the group if the Membership section (Article III) was okay. All agreed that it was. Tim added that it could be changed down the road if necessary.

There was discussion about whether citizen member should have to pay dues and if the Council should decide if a specific citizen should have to pay. Some felt it would be awkward for the Council to make



that decision and that it should be left up to citizen members to pay as they can. Meghan said citizen dues should be voluntary and to leave it open. Ellen and Mark felt they should be voluntary or not at all. It was agreed that citizen dues would be voluntary.

Ruth was uncomfortable with the idea that a membership committee will review and approve applications for citizen membership on the council. Meghan pointed out that citizens would be on the nominating council.

Meghan pointed a couple of other changes to the Bylaws; Article VII.1 should read: Governance Committee.

Tim said that the Bylaws and the MOU are complete for now and that the RCC process could move forward. The RCC will begin to take form as stakeholders begin signing the MOU.

### **Round Table on Groups Future**

Ken explained that the RCC stakeholder group selects the regional broker and then the selection is sent to the SCC to make the final decision. Proper funding requirements are followed and it is not a popularity contest. He added that the group at the table today would need to select someone with the capability to become the RCC. The RCC would then select the RTC which would be the entity to lead the group and would set the standards. The LCTP committee would be the ones who would select who should be the operating entity to refer to the state. The SCC assigned by the Governor would oversee, break down barriers, and handle funding aspects. The RTC is the actual broker.

Mickey added that the regions would identify themselves and that the original map was just a guideline. There would be no boundaries, only a working group. Mark felt that most travel patterns follow the Regional Planning Commission region. Fred pointed out that there would continue to be large voids in the state and that hopefully the SCC will be a resource developer with the RCC's.

Eileen Brady referred to a group of townspeople that joined together in an agreement to form a cooperative alliance for transportation. Fred referred to CART as a great example of 3 RPC's working together for transportation needs.

A member asked if NRPC had authority to facilitate in sending MOU's to the stakeholders with the thought of having NRPC as facilitator/staff for the RCC until the broker is selected. Part of NRPC's duties would be to handle getting out the MOU's to stakeholders for their signatures. There was some further discussion and most were in favor of this. There was a motion by Ken Hazeltine, seconded by Mark Sousa, to empower NRPC to facilitate the process of moving the RCC forward. NRPC will begin the process of getting stakeholders to sign the MOU.

Ellen asked how to find citizens and how the process would go. Tim answered that once the MOU was signed it would be up to the RCC.

### **Announcements:**

Mark Sousa informed the group of the Nashua Transit Open House being held on October 13<sup>th</sup> at 10:00am.

Next meeting will be on November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2007 at 12 Noon.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:13pm**