

Monadnock Region Coordinating Council for Community Transportation

DRAFT MINUTES

May 24, 2017

Present: Michael Acerno, *Home Healthcare, Hospice Community Services (HCS)*; Susan Ashworth, *HCS*; Ellen Avery, *Community Volunteer Transportation Company (CVTC)*; Kathy Baird, *Monadnock RSVP*; Susan Bansley, *County of Cheshire*; Jim Duffy, *Cheshire Medical Center*; Bill Graff, *Monadnock At Home*; Sam LaFortune, *CVTC*; Bob Perry, *Volunteers Enabling Transportation (VET)*; Kelly Steiner, *Monadnock United Way*; and Chuck Weed, *Citizen Member*.

Staff member present was J. B. Mack, *Principal Planner*.

I. Minutes of February 8, 2017

Kelly Steiner called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. The minutes of February 8, 2016 were approved by unanimous vote.

II. Co-Treasurers' Reports

Ellen Avery described the contents of the SFY 2017 FTA 5310 Formula grant. CVTC has expended \$43,254.77 of the federal grant funds and there is a balance of \$9,140 remaining until the end of the fiscal year.

Ellen Avery handed out a document entitled "Mobility Management Activity Report" and explained that she will be creating and distributing this new report to the MRCC as part of her reports on CVTC's SFY 2018 mobility management activities through the FTA 5310 Formula grant. Kelly Steiner asked about the reference in the report to "Will be a guest on Chris Coates' Saturday morning radio show." She asked what Ellen will be talking about on the radio show. Ellen Avery responded that a date for the radio show has not been set yet, but she plans to talk about CVTC, the MRCC and transportation needs. She said she might invite other MRCC members to join her on the radio show. She added that she has met with Chris Coates and talked about meeting with towns and legislators, and he has suggested that Ellen meet with the County Commissioners. Chris also told Ellen that there is a regularly scheduled meeting that includes towns and legislators which may help with MRCC efforts to educate them about the MRCC and regional transportation needs. She will be checking back in with Chris for more information.

Chuck Weed entered the room.

J. B. Mack announced that Suzanne Bansley would be running late, but that all the transportation providers associated with the SFY 2017 5310 Purchase of Service report are in the room. He suggested the MRCC move forward in considering the report and if they have any questions they can ask the transportation providers. There were no questions about the report.

III. Reallocation of 2017 FTA 5310 Purchase of Service Funds

Kelly Steiner explained that the MRCC Executive Committee met recently on various items including checking in on the status of SFY 2017 FTA 5310 Purchase of Service (POS) funds. The Committee examined the pace of each transportation provider's drawdown and concluded that HCS is likely to drawdown its funds before the end of the fiscal year, while Disabled American Veterans (DAV) is not

expected to drawdown all of its funds. The MRCC Executive Committee is recommending that \$6,000 be transferred from DAV to HCS.

Motion: To accept the MRCC Executive Committee's recommendation to transfer \$6,000 in SFY 2017 FTA 5310 POS funds from the DAV line item to the HCS line item.

Motion by Bob Perry. Seconded by Bill Graff.

Michael Acerno asked whether the motion should include a provision that allocates any additional remaining expended funds to agencies at the end of the fiscal year. J. B. Mack responded that he will be suggesting later on in the agenda that the MRCC meet again on June 21, 2017 to take care of some other business, and that perhaps this could be put on the agenda.

The motion was approved by unanimous vote with Michael Acerno and Ellen Avery abstaining.

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

J. B. Mack provided a summary of the MRCC's progress in developing goals, objectives and strategies for the Coordinated Community Transportation Plan (Plan). He explained that at the last MRCC meeting, the MRCC formed three subcommittees to reassess goals 1 through 3 in the existing Plan. The fourth goal was deferred by the MRCC until the first three goals could be addressed. He explained that the goal of the discussion today would be to come to a consensus on the goals and objectives. His plan is to have the MRCC assess each goal first, and then assess each objective. He provided assessment criteria offered at earlier meetings by Jane LaPointe as a way to evaluate each goal and objective. He suggested that strategies for each objective be addressed at a later time in an annual MRCC workplan. The group agreed to this approach.

J. B. Mack noted that he had printed posters showing the MRCC mission and vision statements. One of Jane LaPointe's suggestions would be to make sure that goals and objectives directly relate to those statements.

Suzanne Bansley entered the room.

J. B. Mack noted that the Subcommittees worked hard on the language for each goal and objective and he hopes the Committee can move through each goal and objective relatively quickly without too much wordsmithing. Before the meeting, he asked Michael Acerno to serve as a timekeeper to help us move through our discussion for each goal and objective. He suggested the group set aside an hour and fifteen minutes to do the exercise. Michael Acerno said he would need to leave the meeting early, but has arranged for Susan Ashworth to serve as timekeeper in his absence. J. B. Mack also informed the group that he asked Ellen Avery to serve as a scribe for a "parking lot." If the group is not able to come to a consensus on the wording for a goal or objective, it can be put in the parking lot and reassessed at a future meeting or through a homework exercise.

The group began its assessment of goals and objectives.

Goal 1: Improve partner and user awareness about community transportation resources, needs and the benefits of coordination in order to develop a strong commitment and capacity to support and build a diverse and integrated regional transportation network.

Ellen Avery said that she thought the goal was too long. J. B. Mack said that he thought it might be a good approach to split this goal up between “partner” and “user”. Although both partners and users should be aware of community transportation resources, he thought most of the wording in the rest of the goal were “partner” concerns. He suggested that it is important, however, to have a goal that focuses on “users” and suggested that it be about improving the user’s experience rather than just “awareness.” Suzanne Bansley said that she thought the two terms could be changed to “stakeholders.” She said she likes the term “awareness” rather than “experience with”. She did not think that the MRCC has control over user experience and that experience is a concern of individual providers. Kelly Steiner asked if it should be about “stakeholders” or the “general public?” She suggested changing the goal to “Improve community awareness about transportation resources.” The time allotted for discussing the goal expired, so the group asked Ellen Avery to place Goal 1 in the parking lot.

Goal 2: Improve and maintain a transportation framework to ensure compliance, communication, collaboration, capacity and coordination.

Kelly Steiner reminded the group that this goal was originally related to MRCC governance. Kathy Baird suggested that “framework” should be changed to “network,” making the goal align better with the mission and vision statement. Ellen Avery suggested modifying the term to “regional transportation network.” Chuck Weed asked how the MRCC ensures compliance. Suzanne Bansley said that lead agencies ensure MRCC provider compliance, but the MRCC has a compliance role as well by providing oversight to the entire MRCC network. Jim Duffy suggested reframing the sentence by replacing “to ensure” with “that ensures.” The group reached consensus on the following goal wording: Improve and maintain a regional transportation network that ensures compliance, communication, collaboration, capacity, and coordination.

Goal 3: Develop new funding sources and continue to maintain existing funding streams.

J. B. Mack reminded the group about Jane LaPointe’s guidance to think about developing a “so that” or “in order to” statement behind a goal to ensure that the goal is well understood by everyone. Suzanne Bansley said that the reason for developing new funding sources would be to expand capacity. Kelly Steiner said that the reason was to meet the transportation need. Suzanne offered that the reason would be “to develop a network for everyone.” Bill Graff said he would like part of the reasoning in the goal to be about addressing need. Chuck Weed asked what kind of funding sources are we talking about? Suzanne Bansley said that the intent of “new funding sources” was any funding for transit that we are not currently obtaining. The group reached consensus on the following goal wording: “Develop new funding sources and continue to maintain existing funding streams in order to meet the transportation needs of the community.”

Goal 4: Implement regional coordination activities.

Ellen Avery said the MRCC is not ready to implement regional coordination activities until the other goals are addressed. She said that “implement” is the wrong word. Kelly Steiner offered replacing “implement” with “identify” and “develop.” J. B. Mack said that this goal is missing a “so that” statement. It is very vague. Suzanne Bansley offered “Identify and develop regional transportation coordination activities that lead to a transportation network for everyone.” Ellen Avery suggested adding the word “optimal.” Kelly Steiner said she doesn’t think we should lose the word “implementation.” Suzanne Bansley suggested that Goal 4 be worded and used as an objective under Goal 2. There was consensus among the group to go with Suzanne’s recommendation.

Goal 1, Objective A: Develop a communications and marketing plan and implement, evaluate and update annually.

J. B. Mack pointed to the objective recommended for Goal 1. He also showed a poster which indicated elements that the Goal 1 Subcommittee thought should be included in a communications and marketing plan. Suzanne Bansley said she thought the objective was very comprehensive. Chuck Weed asked a

question about the timing between doing a community transportation “survey” and how that would be used in a communications and marketing plan. Kelly Steiner noted that Goal 1 is still in the parking lot. However, there was consensus from the group that this would be a good objective for Goal 1. Suzanne noted that Goal 1 should be all about increasing awareness.

Goal 2, Objective A: Cultivate relationships and engage transportation networks (SCC, other RCCs) and providers to enhance better governance and achievement of mission.

Jim Duffy said “enhance better” is awkward and suggested changing it to “improve.” Kelly Steiner suggested replacing “achievement” with “goal performance.” Chuck Weed suggested changing the ending to “improve governance and outcomes.” There was consensus from the group to change the wording of Objective A to “Cultivate relationships and engage transportation networks (SCC, other RCCs) and providers to improve governance and outcomes.”

Goal 2, Objective B: Define and implement mobility management model for the Monadnock Region.

Suzanne Bansley suggested adding “so that there is an efficient coordinated network.” The group agreed to change the wording to “Define and implement a mobility management model for the Monadnock Region so that there is an efficient coordinated network.”

Suzanne Bansley, said that this reminds her that Goal 4 should come in as an objective. She suggested that it become the last objective and it be worded “Identify, develop and implement coordination activities in order to have an efficient coordinated network.” The group agreed with Suzanne’s recommendation.

Michael Acerno left the meeting.

Goal 2, Objective C: Evaluate actions and progress regarding data collection, metrics, bylaws, goals and accomplishments on a yearly basis to set strategic direction for the next year.

There were no proposed changes to Objective C.

Goal 2, Objective D: Set policies for MRCC operations and communications (internal and external).

J. B. Mack noted that the “communications” part of the objective is related to Goal 1, Objective A. Ellen Avery said that several regional coordinating councils have developed policies that apply to all of their participating transportation providers. Chuck Weed offered “Set policies for MRCC operations and standards for congruency between providers.” This will increase the transparency of policies to new entering transportation providers. The group settled on the following wording for Objective D: “Set policies for MRCC operations and standards in order to achieve congruency between providers and enhance regional capacity.”

Goal 2, Objective E: Improve fiscal oversight and revenue generation.

Bob Perry questioned whether this objective should be under Goal 3. Ellen Avery said that the “so that” statement should be “for sustainability and strategic planning.” Kelly Steiner said that she thought fiscal oversight was important to keep under this goal as it is governance related, although revenue generation is related to Goal 3. She suggested that the wording be changed to “Ensure fiscal oversight and accountability to ensure resources are used efficiently.” The group agreed with this wording.

Goal 3, Objective A: Continue to apply for 5310 funding from NHDOT.

J. B. Mack suggested adding “in order to meet the needs of seniors and people with disabilities.” The group agreed with J. B.’s recommendation.

Goal 3, Objective B: Help providers understand and comply with NHDOT contract requirements.

Suzanne Bansley suggested that the objective take out “NHDOT contract requirements” and that the purpose behind the objective is so that MRCC transportation providers remain compliant with current resources and are competitive for other resources.” The group asked J. B. Mack if he could work on the wording and send new wording out to the group.

Goal 3, Objective C: Identify and leverage local, state and federal funding and encourage joint pursuits of funding among MRCC stakeholders.

Kelly Steiner suggested that private funding should be part of the objective. Suzanne Bansley said that the “so that” statement is about expanding service. The group asked J. B. Mack if he could work on the wording and send new wording out to the group.

Goal 3, Objective D: Continue to work with SCC and state officials to increase funding flexibility in order to expand services.

Chuck Weed asked if the SCC and state officials can increase funding flexibility. J. B. Mack described how the 5310 Purchase of Service funding is derived from federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) dollars awarded to NHDOT. NHDOT currently flexes about \$800,000 annually. NHDOT and legislators could choose to dedicate more STP funds towards transit. Chuck Weed suggested that the word “advocate” be added to this objective. The group asked J. B. Mack if he would work on the objective’s wording.

Goal 3, Objective E: Inform taxpayers and legislators on the need for preserving existing funding streams for community transportation.

Goal 4, Objective F: Update educational resources for taxpayers and legislators that inform them about the gap in community transportation funding.

Ellen Avery suggested that Objectives E and F could be combined. J. B. Mack suggested that these two objectives could be folded into the communications and marketing plan recommended as Goal 1, Objective A to which the group agreed.

Goal 3, Objective G: Evaluate expansions or new services in the region and develop a wish list of projects and programs.

Suzanne Bansley suggested that this objective could be moved under Goal B. The group asked J. B. Mack to look for a way to fit it in under Goal B.

Goal 3, Objective H: Develop sources of traditional fundraising at the local level.

Suzanne Bansley explained that “traditional” in this case means non-grant monies. Kelly Steiner suggested that the “traditional” be changed to “alternative revenue” and that the “so that” statement would be “to ensure sustainable service delivery and expanding services.” The group agreed with Kelly’s recommendation.

Chuck Weed recommended the next step should be for J. B. Mack to send all of the goals and objectives as revised today along with a firm deadline for sending in any editing changes. The group agreed with this approach.

V. Partner Updates

There were no partner updates.

VI. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

VII. Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for June 21, 2017 at 1 p.m. J. B. Mack stated that the plan for the next meeting time will be to discuss future mobility management activities, discuss the draft Plan, and address the reallocation of any remaining SFY 2017 FTA Purchase of Service funds. Suzanne Bansley asked if the MRCC would consider providing her the authority to transfer any remaining POS funds on June 30, 2017 instead of waiting until the next meeting.

Motion: To give the County of Cheshire the authority to transfer and divide any remaining SFY 2017 FTA POS funds proportionately to transportation providers with deficit balances as of June 30, 2017.

Motion by Bob Perry. Seconded by Bill Graff. The motion was approved by unanimous vote with Ellen Avery abstaining.

VIII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J. B. Mack
Principal Planner