

**Joint Regional Coordinating Council
Carroll County RCC & Grafton-Coos RCC**

March 19th 2021, 1:00PM

Zoom:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82900047405?pwd=WWVTbVNEOWh5dFMxTmVnV3l6WTdCdz09>

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Mary Carey Seavey	Carroll County RSVP (RSVP)	Doug Grant	Transport Central
Christine Lee	Tri-County Transit (TCCAP)	Kathleen Vasconcelos	Grafton County Senior Citizens Council (GCSCC)
Marianne Jackson	Gibson Center for Senior Services	Fred Butler	New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NHDOT)
Crystal Sawyer	Carroll County Adult Education	Steve Workman	Transport NH
Mark Frank	North Country Veterans Committee	Dave Jeffers	Lakes Region Planning Commission (LRPC)
Van Chesnut	Advance Transit	Katie Lamb	North Country Council (NCC)

1. CCRCC vote on 2020-2021 5310 Budget Adjustment

Meeting began at 12:58PM when Katie Lamb performed a roll call of Carroll County RCC members to discuss and take a vote on a budget adjustment for their 2020-2021 5310 contract. Following the roll call, Katie explained that the Gibson Center had calculated a surplus of \$9,000 in the remainder of the contract due to the impacts of COVID-19. Carroll County RSVP has requested this money to be reallocated to support their services.

Christine Lee made a motion to reallocate \$9,000 from Gibson’s portion of the 2020-2021 5310 contract to Carroll County RSVP. Marianne Jackson seconded the motion. A roll call of all CCRCC members in attendance was taken and the vote was unanimous.

2. Mobility Manager Discussion

Before starting the discussion, Katie Lamb initiated a full roll call of the members who were in attendance. Once the roll call was complete, Katie began the discussion off by providing an overview of the mobility management discussions at the state-level. She noted that the regions had agreed to a budget of \$50,000 for all the regions, aside from the urban regions of 8 and 10 who will be receiving \$65,000. Additionally,

it was noted that NHDOT estimates a full-time position would cost roughly \$120,000 when factoring in direct expenses and overhead costs. Katie confirmed with Fred Butler from NHDOT about being able to supplement the mobility manager position with 5310 if the regions' allocation is not enough to cover it.

Steve Workman emphasized that providers consider the long-term goal of the mobility manager positions across the state. He urged providers to think big for the overall goal of the mobility managers, but find practical actions to take in the near future to work towards the big overall goal. Steve noted that the work of the mobility managers will be complementary to the goals and objectives outlined in relevant statewide transportation plans.

Katie explained the advantages of combining the resources of Region 1 and 2 together:

- less resources spent on advertising, interviewing, and on-boarding
- likely to have a limited pool of candidates to choose from, so splitting would make it even more difficult
- less likely to produce turn-over in a fulltime position versus a parttime position

Doug Grant stated he thought \$120,000 was too much for a salary and Katie and Fred explained that the estimate of \$120,000 covers salary, benefits, overhead costs, and direct expenses. Doug then asked about the differences between the North County and the rest of the state and how the mobility manager would operate in regards to those differences. Katie noted that all the mobility managers will have the same core roles and responsibilities but that each Region will determine what they would like to focus on, depending on what is needed the most in that region.

Mary Carey Seavey asked about the Region boundaries and Katie responded that Region 1 includes all of Coos County and the northern portion of Grafton County and Region 2 includes Carroll County. Mary then asked where the mobility manager(s) would be "housed" and Katie said that the RCCs have three options:

- lead agency
- providers within the RCC that are not a lead agency
- independent contractors

Mary stated that she believes the Regions have different needs and it would be difficult for one person to cover both Regions, as she sees it's difficult enough trying to cover just Carroll County.

Van Chesnut reiterated some of the points Katie made about combining versus splitting resources, noting that splitting the resources would double the resources needed of bringing in people to fill the position and worries that a parttime position would make it difficult to staff the position and keep it staffed. Van stated that the work of the mobility managers would be similar but needs of each region may differ, but noted that speakers from each region have already alluded to the same needs. He mentioned that by combining efforts, mobility management could be done more cost effectively in the North Country.

Kathleen Vasconcelos agreed with the points previously made by Van and Katie regarding combining the Regions to fund one fulltime mobility manager and noted that the overall goal is better coordination, so combining resources and having the Regions work together is already a step in the right direction. Kathleen asked about the mobility manager's role and how it would effect the mobility management already being done at the provider's agency. Steve chimed in and noted that the mobility manager's role is to provide mobility management to the entire region and even though they may be housed at one of

the providers, they must make sure to not become that provider's sole mobility manager. He also noted that if the Regions were to combine resources, the mobility manager would still have to meet performance measures for each Region.

Mark Frank noted that Regions 1 & 2 have a lot of connections and the services available through the VA is a prime example of this. There is a VA medical facility in Littleton and Conway and the social worker there says she spends a lot of time sorting out rides for patients between those facilities. He stated that the mobility manager would be able to help folks like the VA social worker by being a source of knowledge and ability to help coordinate rides. Mark also noted that there are all sorts of reasons people may need help with transportation and residents within the North Country travel between the two Regions for various needs.

Marianne Jackson asked about the structure of the mobility managers within the existing system and expressed concern for adding another level of people to go in between. Steve explained that the mobility managers would work with the RCCs to feed information up to the state level (SCCs). Marianne then expressed concern about an admin-heavy result from the incorporation of a new regional mobility manager. Steve noted that there are best practices for mobility managers and that studies show that mobility managers help improve the management of services and do good work.

Mary Carey Seavey expressed concern about the value added of the mobility managers as they are already overrun with rides and don't need help with client outreach, but rather need help on finding drivers. Steve responded that mobility managers are not only about coordination of efforts but building capacity as well. He noted that part of their job is to go out and build relationships with groups and agencies, no matter how big or small, and find ways to build capacity.

Dave Jeffers highlighted the need to figure out who the mobility manager will work for and report to. He noted that Region 1 has about 80 communities and Carroll County has about 20 and that there is some history of Carroll County feeling like they've been left out and not listened to as well. Dave ended by saying that this is a big discussion to have for one meeting and that it's a lot to think about.

Mark Frank referenced the working recommendation document that Steve has been working on for the roles, responsibilities, and guiding principles of the mobility managers. He noted that the mobility managers are held to a standard of serving all the providers and all types of transportation. Mark shared a story about a van in Colebrook that was given up since the agency there couldn't keep up with the maintenance costs. He noted that the VA would've gladly helped with the costs if they had known about it, and other organizations and even towns could help. He followed by saying that the mobility managers would help make those connections and coordinate efforts since the providers themselves often do not have the capacity to do that themselves.

Van Chesnut added that Advance Transit has only used its 5310 money the last few rounds to fund rides and hasn't spent any money on mobility management. He asked about how the funding would be used if the regions do not decide to combine resources for a single, fulltime mobility manager. Fred noted that there is time to still figure out what the regions would like to do with the funds and that there are options to move funds around if the regions want to combine efforts later on.

Katie Lamb answered Van's question in the chat about a Regional Planning Commission being able to be the employer/"housing" of the mobility manager and stated that North Country Council is unable to take an additional person on and Dave added that Lakes has a similar issue. Van followed up with mentioning

how the regions benefited significantly from the recent SCC decision on funding distribution to the regions and he was the one who prompted the ultimate result. He reiterated concern about attracting and keeping someone for the position without the combination of resources and made a motion to vote to combine resources for a single mobility manager to serve both regions. Doug Grant seconded the motion however since Marianne had to leave the meeting earlier and is not in attendance for the vote, so Van withdrew the motion.

Mary Carey Seavey asked about the additional \$20,000 potentially needed to fund the mobility manager position and where that would come from. Katie responded with saying that the additional funds would come from 5310 money, if needed. She noted that funds should be available since the mobility managers are meant to free up funds within 5310 since they will be performing work that has been set aside within 5310 funds for individual providers. Dave noted that the new mobility manager funds do not need a match whereas funds within 5310 do need a match. Steve chimed in and stated that the \$120,000 is an estimate from the state and the RCCs may find that they can fund a fulltime position with just the \$100,000 since the RCCs will decide the rate of the mobility manager.

Fred Butler made a comment about how funds within the 5310 applications that are matched with in-kind volunteer hours are to draw down from the total project cost versus the 80%. Katie noted that she will connect with Fred after the meeting to discuss the application further.

Steve Workman made closing remarks about how he appreciates the differences the North Country has compared to the rest of the state and the challenges that come along with those differences. He remarks that the funding for this is 100% with no match which rarely happens for transit projects and that it is remarkable how the SCC was able to get unanimous consensus on the funding allocations despite the rural / urban divide. Steve then noted that he is now working on creating performance measures for the mobility managers and the core competencies will be more finalized following an upcoming meeting with the statewide subcommittee.

Motion to adjourn was made by Van Chesnut and seconded by Mary Carey Seavey.

Meeting adjourned at 2:24PM.

Respectfully submitted by Katie Lamb