

# General Membership Meeting

## Minutes – January 9<sup>th</sup> 2019 - 9:00am, McConnell Center, Dover

---

The meeting was called to order at 9:10

### 1) Introductions

**Members Present:** Deborah Bartley (Lamprey Health Care), Pamela Becker (Community Partners), Scott Bogle (RPC), Colin Lentz (SRPC), Rad Nichols (COAST), Debbie Perou (Rockingham Nutrition MoW), Sharon Reynolds (Citizen Member), Fred Roberge (Easterseals and Homemakers Health Services), Cheryl Robicheau (Strafford CAP), Nick Toumpas (Region 6 Integrated Delivery Network)

**Staff Present:** Jeff Donald (COAST)

**By Phone:** Shellie Lemelin (Granite State Independent Living Council),

### 2) Approval of Meeting Minutes (11/7/18 meeting) {VOTE}

R. Nichols noted a typo on page one, section three, where it said “and amendment” rather than “an amendment”. C. Lentz said he would make the adjustment

S. Reynolds made a motion to approve the November minutes with the identified change.

Seconded by S. Bogle.

Vote: all in favor with D. Bartley abstaining

### 3) Update to the ACT Bylaws - reduce the quorum requirement from 7 to 5 {VOTE}

“~~Seven~~ Five members present of the membership constitutes a quorum.”

R. Nichols explained that discussion at previous meetings had been around reducing the number of members required in the bylaws for achieving a quorum to ensure business could be conducted consistently.

J. Donald noted that quorums had been missed in May and July and that there were several members who were from state agencies who regularly were unable to attend meetings.

S. Bogle made a motion to amend the bylaws to require *five* members for a quorum rather than the current *seven*.

Seconded by D. Perou

Vote: unanimous in favor

### 4) Update to the ACT Bylaws - change the limitation on officers' terms as follows: {VOTE}

R. Nichols explained that the bylaws currently limit the number of terms that officers can serve. He said there was a proposal to strike the current language and allow officers to serve indefinitely.

Current language:

“An individual must participate in some facet of the RCC’s work to be elected as an officer. Except for the Secretary’s initial term, a term is to be for a two (2) year period. Officers may serve up to two (2) consecutive terms.”

N. Toumpas noted that other organizations he worked with had made similar changes. J. Donald explained that the pool of members who were able and available to serve as officers was limited, and it made sense to retain their participation and knowledge as long as possible. N. Toumpas asked if there were provisions in the bylaws for removal of officers by the board. R. Nichols cited a section of the

bylaws that enabled the board to vote an officer out of their position, and noted that officer positions were also tied to attendance.

S. Bogle made a motion to remove the language from the bylaws restricting the number of consecutive terms allowed for officers.

Seconded by C. Robicheau

Vote: unanimous in favor

8:00

#### **5) 5310 Capital Grants - Letters of Support {VOTE}**

J. Donald explained that the NHDOT had released the notice of funding availability for 5310 late on December 24th. He noted that the application requires applicants to show how they are contributing to fulfilling the regional Coordinated Plan and receive a letter of support from the RCC. The applications will also be prioritized for RCC members in good standing. J. Donald said that 5310 funds are divided up into three categories by geography (Boston UZA, small urban, and rural) and that he expected about four ACT members to apply. He said he felt it would be appropriate to have a ranking system for letters of support based on level of coordination of each applicant. J. Donald provided a draft list of potential criteria and categories for level of support that had been reviewed by the executive committee:

1. TripLink Member Agency
2. Signed contract to perform Community Rides and/or Ready Rides' accessible trips
3. ACT member in good standing (60% attendance at meetings)
4. Provision of service in un/under-served communities in the ACT service area
5. Coordinate informally with other providers
6. Commitment to future participation

##### Three categories of level of support

A Level - Strongly support

B Level - Support

C Level - Support resources being brought into the region

J. Donald added that the applications are due Thursday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, so he would be drafting letters of support for review by the Executive Committee prior to the deadline.

R. Nichols suggested that having a signed contract agreement with ACT should be required for a "A" level support letter.

13:50 Scott suggested that different levels of support should require a specific set of criteria.

16:00 – C. Lentz asked if the specific ACT criteria and weightings will be explicit in each letter. J. Donald said he was open to suggestions but that the letters could list the criteria specifically. The goal was always to support resources coming to the region.

Debbie Bartley said Lamprey Health Care was in a difficult position because they had their own in-house appointment and transportation scheduling staff, and that it didn't make sense to be part of TripLink. J. Donald noted that Lamprey could have a service agreement to provide Community Rides trips through POS without joining TripLink. D. Bartley said she thought there were fees associated with that. J. Donald clarified that there was a fee for having all rides scheduled through TripLink, but not for being a part of Community Rides. If an agency requests POS funding directly, then they would need to have their ride scheduling done through TripLink.

R. Nichols reiterated that every application from the region will receive a letter of support, but there will be more requests than available funding this round so there is a need to prioritize letters based on the level of coordination and collaboration.

J. Donald said he could write the criteria as narrow as possible to remove subjectivity and base them primarily on elements in the Coordinated Plan, or there could be more context and explanation included.

S. Bogle suggested that applications would likely fall into the different pools of funding (by urbanized area) and therefore would not be competing with other applicants from the region.

D. Bartley said she was not sure the board should vote on the criteria since letters are due next week. S. Bogle suggested that if the criteria were not voted on, then the most likely course of action would be to follow what's in the Coordinated Plan regarding letters of support (specifically, members in good standing and signed service agreements).

P. Becker noted that ACT was in difficult position to prioritize letters of support but still support vehicles coming to the region.

R. Nichols suggested that support could be divided into the three levels in the following way:

| <b>A level of support requires:</b>   | <b>B level of support requires some combination of:</b>  | <b>C level of support requires some combination of:</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>1</b> - TripLink Member Agency<br>OR<br><b>2</b> - Signed contract to perform Community Rides and/or Ready Rides' accessible trips<br>AND<br><b>3</b> - Member in good standing (60% meeting attendance) | <b>3</b> - Member in good standing (60% meeting attendance)<br><b>4</b> - Provision of service in un/under-served communities in the ACT service area<br><b>5</b> - Coordinate informally with other providers | <b>4</b> - Provision of service in un/under-served communities in the ACT service area<br><b>5</b> - Coordinate informally with other providers<br><b>6</b> - Commitment to future participation |

**40:45 MOTION**

S. Bogle made a motion that the letters of support for agencies applying for 5310 capital grants be evaluated based on three levels and the criteria listed above: "A" level requiring a member to satisfy criteria 1 or 2, and 3; "B" level requiring some combination of 3, 4, and 5; and "C" level requiring some combination of 4, 5, and 6.

Seconded by P. Becker

Vote: 8 in favor; D. Bartley opposed

**6) SFY19 5310 POS Budget Adjustment {VOTE}**

J. Donald handed out materials for an adjustment of the POS budget and explained the reason for the adjustment request. He said some agencies were over budget (they provided more rides than were initially anticipated), and some initiatives hadn't been able to be implemented in time to use funds that were theoretically allocated to them (e.g. Tri-City VDP).

J. Donald pointed out proposed changes to Ready Rides, Community Rides, RNMOV, the proposed Central Rockingham and Tri-City VDP initiatives, and how those changes impacted matching funds and administrative costs. He noted that Community rides had tightly budgeted rides and funding, but would likely finish under-budget because a high-frequency rider had passed away.

P. Becker asked for clarification that the budget would still likely be under-budget with the proposed changes. J. Donald confirmed and said any surplus hours were normally shifted to Community Rides as a hold-all.

J. Donald noted that the state doesn't care if funds are moved around in the budget, but they require ACT committee to vote on any changes.

S. Reynolds made a motion to accept the budget amendment as discussed [approved budget total is \$277,358; the proposed amendment has a total request of \$248,718. The difference (\$28,640) will be allocated to Community Rides]

J. Donald added that cash match would have to be found to utilize the remaining funds.

The motion was seconded by P. Becker

Vote: unanimous in favor

#### **7) SFY20 5310 RCC Program Grant Notice**

J. Donald explained that in the past, RCCs applied for FTA 5310 POS and Formula funds (administrative costs) separately, but now there is a unified grant application for the "RCC program". He reminded them the RCC is now required to have a single lead agency, so COAST has taken over that role from RPC (as voted on at the previous meeting).

The application is due February 27<sup>th</sup> and it was only released on January 1<sup>st</sup>, so ACT will have to have a special February board meeting to discuss and vote on an application.

J. Donald noted that there is a five percent increase in available funding and that there is no requirement in how funding is split between operating services and mobility management. He added that the grant will only be for one year because BEAS grants end at the end of the coming year so the state wanted to coordinate those grant cycles.

J. Donald provided some draft budgets he had been working on for the application. He reviewed some of the proposed items, including an additional half-time person to TripLink. He said there would be more details to be discussed at the special meeting in February

J. Donald said he was working on a universal application for prospective clients that would help them apply for eligible services through Trip Link. This would ideally replace multiple, duplicative provider-specific applications. He would like to discuss this idea with providers at upcoming meetings.

#### **8) Schedule Special February Meeting - 5310 RCC Grant Application**

The committee discussed possible dates for a special meeting to discuss the FTA 5310 RCC program grant application. February 13<sup>th</sup> at 9:00am was selected because it worked for the greatest number of members.

#### **9) Updates & Statistics**

J. Donald provided a chart of trips booked in TripLink, noting that things are going as expected.

S. Bogle asked if there was any way to normalize the trip numbers. J. Donald said there wasn't really a way to do that because of software-specific issues.

#### **10) SCC Report**

J. Donald said the SCC has been changing their meetings to be more specific workshops. They had discussed specific mobility management issues, and had several topics lined up for future meetings, including guest speakers.

#### **11) Information Exchange**

F. Roberge added to the comments about the SCC/RCC meetings explaining that the role of the SCC will be expanded – including more oversight.

#### **12) Clients in Need**

No clients in need were discussed.

**13) Public Comment**

No public comments were brought forward.

**14) Adjournment**

F. Roberge made a motion to adjourn

Seconded by S. Reynolds

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45