

# Monadnock Region Coordinating Council for Community Transportation

## DRAFT MINUTES

February 8, 2017

**Present:** Michael Acerno, *Home Healthcare, Hospice Community Services (HCS)*; Ellen Avery, *Community Volunteer Transportation Company (CVTC)* (by phone); Kathy Baird, *Monadnock RSVP*; Liz Chipman, *Keene Housing Kids Collaborative* (by phone); Bill Graff, *Monadnock At Home* (by phone); Bob Perry, *Volunteers Enabling Transportation (VET)* (by phone); Kelly Steiner, *Monadnock United Way*; and Chuck Weed, *Citizen Member*.

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

### I. Minutes of January 25, 2016

Kelly Steiner called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m. J. B. Mack conducted a roll call of all meeting attendees. The minutes of January 25, 2016 were approved by unanimous vote.

### II. MRCC Allocation Subcommittee Recommendations

J.B. Mack listed the recommendations that the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee made regarding the distribution of Purchase of Service and Formula funds.

#### a. FTA 5310 Purchase of Service Applications

J. B. Mack stated that the three agencies that applied for Region 5 and 6 FTA 5310 Purchase of Service (POS) funds, CVTC, HCS and VET, requested more funding than is available. He explained the process that the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee went through to review Purchase of Service (POS) applications submitted by CVTC, VET, and HCS for SFY 2018 and 2019. The Subcommittee determined how to allocate funding based on each organization's draft application for funds. In addition, the Subcommittee looked at each organization's past performance delivering 5310 POS services, as well as each organization's service characteristics (ie. hours, vehicles, service area). J. B. Mack noted that there are meeting handouts with additional detail associated with the 5310 POS and 5310 Formula application recommendations which are consistent with the recommendations already communicated with the 5310 POS and Formula applicants (handouts attached).

J. B. Mack explained that the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee recommended that Cheshire County continues to serve as the lead agency for the POS contract and receive approximately \$10,000 for contract administration services. It also recommended that CVTC receive \$74,270, HCS receive \$71,500, and VET receive \$42,740 to provide 5310 eligible rides. In addition, the Subcommittee recommended creating a line item to address unmet need and accessible ride requests. The recommended budget for the line item is \$9,450. The Subcommittee also recommended that, a few months before the end of the fiscal year, the MRCC evaluate the performances of each agency and, if necessary, adjust the allocations based on each agency's progress in drawing down funds.

Kathy Steiner noted that the funding normally provided to each agency for accessible rides has been removed and pooled into the new, shared unmet need/accessible ride line item that CVTC would manage. Ellen Avery asked how the Subcommittee decided on the \$9,450 budget for unmet needs and accessible ride requests. J. B. Mack explained that CVTC and VET had included \$2,000 in each of their applications to accommodate accessible trip requests. HCS did not have an accessible trip line item because it has accessible vehicles. He noted that the MRCC's guidance for the applications expressed a strong interest in

having a POS program that provided unmet need rides (ie. ride requests that CVTC, HCS or VET are not able to accommodate), but no one included this concept in their application. The Subcommittee did not think \$4,000, which was budgeted only for accessible rides, to be an adequate budget for accommodating unmet need and accessible trip requests and therefore, the \$9,450 was agreed upon as an appropriate amount by the Subcommittee. Ellen Avery asked if this budget is a lump sum or broken down by need. J. B. Mack said that the subcommittee did not make that distinction in the recommendation. Kelly Steiner said that it could be used as a lump sum.

**Motion: To accept the Purchase of Service recommendations by the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee as stated.**

Motion made by Kathy Baird. Seconded by Kelly Steiner. Approved by unanimous roll call vote with Michael Acerno, Ellen Avery and Bob Perry abstaining.

#### **b. FTA 5310 Formula Application**

J. B. Mack stated that the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee is recommending that CVTC provide mobility management services during SFY 2018. The Subcommittee also recommended that a lead agency act on behalf of the MRCC to provide contract management services overseeing CVTC's mobility management activities. J. B. Mack reported that Cheshire County initially expressed interest in serving as the lead agency, but is not able to provide services this year. SWRPC and Monadnock United were also both asked if they would consider serving as a lead agency, but neither agency is able to commit to the role at this time. He noted that the Subcommittee's idea behind this recommendation is that there would be more transparency regarding future mobility management activities. The Subcommittee noted that if no appropriate lead agency could be found, CVTC would continue serving as lead agency and working directly with NHDOT on billing reimbursement and reporting activities. However, the Subcommittee recommended that, a memorandum of agreement between CVTC and MRCC should be developed that requires CVTC to report its progress with performance measures on a monthly basis. The MOA would also provide the MRCC recourse options if CVTC is unable to meet its performance measures.

Liz Chipman asked if the lead agency recommendation is a requirement, since no agency has stepped forward to oversee monthly reporting as of yet. She also asked how much money will be taken from CVTC for this reporting? J. B. Mack responded that it is not a requirement by NHDOT. CVTC has actually been the lead agency of the 5310 Formula grant for several years. He also explained that the amount used for contract management depends on how much that lead agency would require in funds to provide the administrative support. For example, Cheshire County takes five percent to conduct contract management for the 5310 POS program. Liz Chipman asked what kind of impact this would have on CVTC. Ellen Avery noted that all of CVTC's mileage reimbursement comes from Purchase of Service funds. Formula funds provide salary for the driver coordinators at CVTC and part of the Executive Director salary, so the impact would be minimal. Ellen Avery mentioned that CVTC is happy to continue working with NHDOT on reporting this year and if Cheshire County wants to provide reporting services the second year, then that's fine. J. B. Mack reminded the group that this grant is for a one-year period and that the MRCC would have to discuss this 5310 Formula funding again for the next fiscal year.

J. B. Mack reviewed some of the mobility management activities the Subcommittee recommends CVTC perform, including managing the unmet need/accessible ride line item, meeting with municipalities and state legislators to provide information about the MRCC and transportation need, and including clear performance measures associated with each coordination activity in a scope of work attached to the application.

As part of the unmet need and accessible ride line item, J. B. Mack explained that the Subcommittee recommended that CVTC form relationships with five transportation vendors (including VET and HCS) so coordination of rides can be accomplished effectively. He stated that the goal of this network is that CVTC will be able to provide transportation services to the entire MRCC region with both local and long distance rides being available twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. As part of the recommendation, the Subcommittee recommended that CVTC secure vendor relationships by July 2017 using their existing mobility management funds. He noted that the definition of unmet need, as stated in the Subcommittee recommendations, is any 5310 eligible ride request (i.e. senior or person with a disability) that CVTC, VET, or HCS are unable to accommodate. As part of this unmet need line item, CVTC may propose trip purpose limitations or other rules associated with this the use of the line item. For example, CVTC may decide that hair cut appointments is a trip type they would like to exclude. It's recommended that CVTC will come to MRCC with a list of what type of trips would be accommodated with this funding before SFY 2018. Bob Perry asked if, by definition, unmet need referred to any type of ride requests. J. B. Mack clarified that this would be up to CVTC to determine and that CVTC would share the proposed trip limitations with the MRCC for concurrence. Michael Acerno asked if HCS received an accessible ride request during their regular hours of operations, can they draw money from this unmet need/accessible ride line item. J. B. Mack responded that if VET or CVTC receives an accessible ride request and contacts HCS to fill that request, then HCS can provide the ride, and the unmet need/accessible ride line item could be used to pay for that ride.

J. B. Mack also provided detail on the Subcommittee's recommendations on CVTC coordinating meetings with municipalities and state legislators to conduct outreach on behalf of the MRCC. CVTC would get concurrence with the MRCC on what a reasonable number of meetings should be for this contract. Liz Chipman asked if there wasn't concurrence, what would happen. J. B. Mack responded that CVTC and MRCC would then negotiate. He asked Ellen Avery if she has determined a number yet. Ellen Avery responded that she hasn't figured out how many meetings she will coordinate yet. Chuck Weed asked Ellen Avery if she was expecting other members of the MRCC to accompany her to speak with municipalities. Ellen Avery responded that she would appreciate attendance from other MRCC members.

Kelly Steiner asked Ellen Avery if she could send the MRCC a copy of the 5310 Formula application that she will be submitting to NHDOT. Ellen Avery agreed.

**Motion: To approve the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee recommendations for the use of 5310 Formula Funds.**

Motion by Chuck Weed.

J. B. Mack noted that HCS and VET representatives can vote on this measure. Liz Chipman asked if the MRCC is unable to get a third-party lead agency, should that item be omitted from the motion. Chuck Weed said it seemed appropriate to still include it as a recommendation. Liz Chipman asked what the difference between a recommendation and a requirement is. J. B. Mack responded that the application submitted to the NHDOT will be a requirement for CVTC during SFY 2018. Chuck Weed said that he would like the MRCC to nail down a process as to how CVTC will interact with the MRCC to achieve concurrence. If there is no concurrence between CVTC and MRCC, what will happen? Kelly Steiner agreed that a written process should be formed at a later date so that there is accountability. J. B. Mack suggested the MRCC decide on a deadline to secure an agency for reporting this year and if that deadline passes and no agency is secured, to omit that recommendation from the application. He also reminded the group to consider the requirement for a public notice and review process and to leave enough time for those processes if a new agency is secured. Kelly Steiner suggested that if the MRCC cannot find a lead agency by February 15, 2017 to exclude that recommendation from the application so that adequate public notice can be given.

Chuck Weed retracted his motion.

**Motion: To approve the MRCC Allocation Subcommittee recommendations for the use of 5310 Formula Funds. However, if no third-party lead agency volunteers to provide lead agency services by February 15, 2017, CVTC will be the designated lead agency.**

Motion by Chuck Weed. Seconded by Kelly Steiner. Approved by unanimous roll call vote with Ellen Avery abstaining.

### **III. Public Comment**

There were no public comments made.

### **IV. Next Meeting**

J. B. Mack announced that the next MRCC meeting date will be decided based on the progress of the subcommittees working on developing the goals, objectives and strategies for the Coordinated Plan update.

### **V. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Kelly  
Planning Technician

DRAFT