

Monadnock Region Coordinating Council for Community Transportation

MINUTES

January 25, 2017

Present: Michael Acerno, *Home Healthcare, Hospice Community Services (HCS)*; Susan Ashworth, *HCS*; Ellen Avery, *Community Volunteer Transportation Company (CVTC)*; Bill Graff, *Monadnock At Home*; Bob Perry, *Volunteers Enabling Transportation (VET)*; Kelly Steiner, *Monadnock United Way*; Chuck Weed, *Citizen Member*.

Staff members present were J. B. Mack, *Principal Planner*; Raul Gonzalez, *Planner*; and Liz Kelly, *Planning Technician*.

Guests included Stephanie Fields, *Monadnock Developmental Services* and Jane LaPointe, *HumanKind Consulting Inc.*

I. Minutes of December 7, 2016

The minutes of December 7, 2016 were approved by unanimous vote.

II. Co-Treasurers' Reports

J. B. Mack made reference to the co-treasurer reports in the meeting packet and asked if there were any questions. Chuck Weed noted that many volunteer drivers at CVTC are choosing to not accept the mileage reimbursement fee that CVTC offers, and that CVTC is encouraging them to accept it as a way to ensure all grant funds are being used.

III. Subcommittee Reports

a. Data Collection Subcommittee

Raul Gonzalez reminded the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Purchase of Service transportation providers that they can contact him if they have any questions or comments on the MRCC's six-month pilot data collection project.

b. MRCC Allocation Subcommittee

J. B. Mack summarized the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee's recommendation, which outlines a process for the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee to review the State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2018 5310 Formula application and the SFY 2018-2019 Purchase of Service (POS) applications on behalf of the MRCC. The recommendations include a timeline that identifies deadlines for the MRCC to complete as it prepares applications for NH DOT. Monadnock United Way offered its website to the MRCC to use as a platform in reviewing applications so that there can be online dialogue between reviewers and applicants. On February 2nd, the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee will hold interviews with each of the agencies applying for funds at SWRPC. The MRCC Allocation Subcommittee will make recommendations based on the draft applications and interviews and bring a recommendation to the MRCC at a meeting on February 8th at 9:00 a.m. to approve the final applications. He noted that it would be important to have non-applicants present at the February 8th meeting, because agencies who applied for funding cannot vote for their own

applications. Ellen Avery asked why agencies cannot vote for themselves. J. B. Mack responded that it represents a conflict of interest. He referred to the conflicts of interest section in the MRCC bylaws.

J. B. Mack noted that a 5310 Formula fund application has not been submitted yet, and suggested that the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee recommendation regarding 5310 Formula funds be adjusted to allow more time for application submission and MRCC Allocation Subcommittee review. It was suggested that the deadline for MRCC providers to submit applications will be 4:00 p.m. on January 26th. The deadline for the Allocation Subcommittee to respond to applications with questions could be January 31st at 3:00 p.m. J. B. Mack suggested that the committee vote on the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee's recommendations with the two proposed date changes. Suzanne Bansley requested that Cheshire County get the responses to applications from Subcommittee members in writing, since Cheshire County will apply as a lead agency for the 5310 Purchase of Service funds. Bob Perry noted that he would not be able to attend the proposed February 8th MRCC meeting if it is held at 9:00 a.m. J. B. Mack responded that he would be willing to poll the group to see if an earlier time would work better for most people.

Motion: To approve the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee's recommendations with two deadline changes associated with the 5310 Formula funds.

Motion by Ellen Avery. Seconded by Chuck Weed. Approved by unanimous vote.

c. Outreach Subcommittee

Ellen Avery announced that the MRCC brochure has been completed. She suggested that the Outreach Subcommittee should meet soon to plan future activities.

IV. Continued Discussion Regarding Coordinated Community Transportation Plan Goals, Objectives and Strategies

Kelly Steiner welcomed Jane LaPointe who reminded the group that she is present to help the MRCC update its Coordinated Community Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan), clarify the MRCC's goals, objectives, strategies, and priorities, and ensure they align with the MRCC's mission and vision. She said that she spoke to J. B. Mack about the Coordinated Plan update and he noted that SWRPC had planned to conduct a 30-45 day public review period before adopting the plan by July 1, 2017. J. B. Mack stated that he is interested in any feedback from the MRCC on what they would like the public review process to look like, but it must at least require a public notice.

Jane LaPointe explained that the goal of today's meeting is to discuss the MRCC's goals in terms of outcomes, rather than merely activities. What outcomes does the MRCC want to see from its outreach related goal, for example? What are the reasons behind each of the MRCC's goals? What is the MRCC hoping to achieve? Understanding the results desired from each goal might help the MRCC better communicate their goals to others. She proposed that the MRCC go through each goal and answer these questions.

A group discussion began by focusing on Goal 1: improve general awareness about community transportation resources, needs, and the benefits of coordination. Ellen Avery said that she automatically thinks of the individual who needs the ride. The desired result would be that more rides are being provided and more riders have access to transportation providers. Susan Ashworth pointed out that general awareness could lead to individuals wanting to contribute financial resources or becoming volunteer drivers. Bill Graff stated that "coordination" is a desired outcome because it could lead to agencies becoming more efficient at providing rides. Chuck Weed said that the MRCC should engage and speak with public, non-profit, and private transportation agencies and determine their goals and capacity. Jane

LaPointe distinguished the two audiences the MRCC desires to speak with - those who need rides and those who provide rides - and identified the importance of having a strong message and compelling reason for organizations and individuals to get involved. Ellen Avery mentioned that better access to essential service destinations is an important outcome. Kelly Steiner noted that it seemed like the group is stating outcomes that describe what the MRCC is already doing and wondered if they need to state outcomes of what the MRCC is not doing but could be doing.

Jane LaPointe displayed a matrix often used in the business world that is helpful for thinking about service delivery. The matrix is a way to think about how an organization can take advantage of their current resources and expand to meet its future goals. The matrix showed different categories goals could fit under, such as diversification (i.e. new products and markets) or market development (i.e. markets that still need to be served). Ms. Steiner asked if there were other stakeholders or groups that the MRCC should communicate with. For example, how can we connect with groups that still aren't getting rides? Jane LaPointe recommended that whoever works on updating the Coordinated Plan should start with this matrix to think about priorities. What does the MRCC need that it doesn't have? What is the group going to focus on?

Bill Graff suggested connecting with medical professionals and asking them what the problems are in getting patients to hospitals. Jane LaPointe said that this would fit under a strategy like "strengthen the existing network". Other actions under this strategy could include collecting information and testing assumptions the MRCC already has about specific populations. J. B. Mack noted that the matrix was very helpful in thinking about the MRCC's goals. He used the example of 5310 funding. What VET, HCS, and CVTC are currently providing in terms of services would fall under the "market penetration" category. Setting aside unmet need funds falls under the "product development" category (i.e. using funds to design new services and address gaps in services). Kelly Steiner stated the importance of generating new revenue to assist underserved populations. Ms. LaPointe said that is why Goal 1 is so important. Outreach, marketing, and fundraising will help the MRCC expand existing resources and grow new funds.

Jane LaPointe showed the group a Venn diagram demonstrating the relationship between the three goals outlined in the Coordinated Plan. She asked the group to think about the priorities for each of the goals and to ask what the relationships are between them. She recommended that, whatever subcommittees are formed they should look at these three goals and communicate with each other to better coordinate strategies.

The group continued with a conversation about Goal 2: improve and maintain the governing framework. Jane LaPointe pointed out that many objectives listed under this goal have already been accomplished. J. B. Mack mentioned that this section came from the state's requirement that every RCC has to have a governing body to facilitate decision making and coordinate activities. Jane LaPointe noted that the focus seemed to be on internal activities and asked the group to think about the role of the MRCC in building external networks.

Bill Graff identified "evaluation of progress" and "compliance to the state" as desired outcomes. Kelly Steiner stated "identifying and navigating challenges" as an important activity of a governing body. Jane LaPointe agreed, saying that flexibility is key. J. B. Mack mentioned that the MRCC is helpful in determining how to organize transportation agencies and activities at a regional level in order to solve complex transportation problems. Suzanne Bansley stated "identify and eliminate redundancies in services" as a possible outcome. Kelly Steiner noted that providing strong leadership would lead to sustainable change in transportation.

The group then moved on to Goal 3: develop new funding sources and continue to maintain existing funding streams. Suzanne Bansley noted that sustainable sources of funding were key in order to maintain the level

of service we have now. More funding will be needed to expand capacity in the future. J. B. Mack brought up the analysis that has been done on unmet need by the Data Subcommittee which can be used to explain unmet need and potentially secure more funding. Jane LaPointe asked how unmet need is defined. Ellen Avery replied that unmet need refers to someone who requests a trip but doesn't receive it, someone who is unaware of the services available, or people with a need that cannot be met by existing transportation services. Bob Perry noted that sustaining volunteers would be an important part of this goal, since the system relies heavily on volunteers. Suzanne Bansley noted that the MRCC has had two funding opportunities it's had to pass up because there isn't a list of project ideas ready to go. Federal grant timelines are usually only a few months. She noted that what's needed is a queue of project ideas that are ready to be taken to the next level with a grant. J. B. Mack noted that he recently developed a worksheet with Jane LaPointe designed to evaluate the willingness and capacity of agencies to participate in a grant that expands service. He noted that the MRCC doesn't really have a good understanding of which agencies are willing or able to take on more work or expand their services. The worksheet is a possible tool to improve the MRCC's "readiness" for grant opportunities. Bill Graff asked Suzanne Bansley if these grants are start-up funds or continuing funds. Suzanne Bansley explained that they are neither. They're grants for specific programs with a beginning and end date.

Jane LaPointe asked the group to think about the relationships between the goals and the strategies and actions to achieve them. She referred to a handout meant to help subcommittees or individuals work on developing the goals and strategies. She went through an example of Goal 1 and showed her own attempt at clarifying the goal and offering objectives and strategies. She asked the group to think about how clear the objectives and strategies are, if any actions and strategies are related to other goals in the plan, and what challenges the group can anticipate moving forward.

Jane LaPointe announced that she will capture and send notes and observations of goals to the MRCC. J. B. Mack asked if there was interest in people meeting in sub-committees that address each goal. Ellen Avery volunteered the Outreach Subcommittee to address Goal 1. Kelly Steiner volunteered the Executive Committee to address Goal 2. Suzanne Bansley excused herself from participating in the Goal 2 effort, and volunteered to help address Goal 3.

Ellen Avery asked if, before tackling Goal 3, agencies should discuss what their "dreams" are for expanding services. J. B. Mack responded that one of the objectives for Goal 3 could be talking to groups like the transportation agencies about their "dreams". Ellen Avery mentioned that the MRCC should discuss whether they're talking about funding for organizations or funding for this group. Jane LaPointe noted that the aging population and decline of workforce in the region could be appealing to funders and suggested the group consider "scenario planning" to attract funders (i.e. paint a picture of what the region would look like if there was no investment in coordinated transportation in the next 10-15 years). Kelly Steiner said she would like to encourage people to stop thinking solely about funding individual organizations and rather fund the issue of transportation. Ellen Avery volunteered to be on the Goal 3 subcommittee.

Kelly Steiner said that an email will be sent around to ask if other MRCC members not present would like to be involved in one of the three efforts. J. B. Mack offered that SWRPC staff can sit down with each group and take notes. Suzanne Bansley asked Raul Gonzalez if he'd like to be part of the Goal 3 subcommittee since he has ample experience with grants and funding and he accepted. Discussion on Goal 4 was tabled until the MRCC sees the new State Coordinated Community Transportation Plan.

V. Other Business

No other business was brought before the MRCC at this time.

VI. Partner Updates

J. B. Mack referred to the handout that was distributed which shows the goals and objectives of the draft State Coordinated Community Transportation Plan, as well as the hyperlink to the document.

VII. Public Comment

There were no public comments made.

VIII. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the MRCC to make decisions on 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula fund applications will be on **February 8, 2017** at Southwest Region Planning Commission. J. B. Mack announced that he would see if an 8:00 a.m. start date will work better for more members. He will send out a doodle poll to determine the best time.

IX. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Kelly
Planning Technician