

Planning Committee for Regional Coordinating Council 6

MINUTES

May 5, 2009

Present: Ellen Avery, *Monadnock United Way*; Rebecca Harris, *Contoocook Valley Transportation Company*; Ken Hazeltine, *Granite State Seniors*; Patrick Herlihy, *NH Department of Health and Human Services*; Christopher Morgan, *NH Department of Transportation*; Janet Warren, *American Red Cross*.

SWRPC Staff members present were J.B. Mack, Senior Planner; Rebeckah Bullock, Planning Intern.

Staff Member J.B. Mack called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Those in attendance introduced themselves noting the organizations they represent.

II. Review of 5304 Scope of Work (formation of RCC 6)

J.B. Mack began by explaining that Regional Coordinating Council 6 (RCC 6) has received the State-wide 5304 funding. He noted that today the Committee will review the Scope of Work, discuss recent State Coordinating Council (SCC) activities, and potentially plan a summit event.

J.B. Mack opened the review of the 5304 Scope of Work by noting that the document was completed in December of 2006, and therefore some of the item descriptions are vague and may need updating. He additionally noted that part of the Scope of Work is the formation of RCC 6.

The Committee briefly discussed the division of RCC 5 and RCC 6. J.B. Mack mentioned that the regional division of RCC 5 and RCC 6 has been discussed with a number of transit providers and human service groups, who have expressed their confidence that the division is well placed. Janet Warren commented that she is open to considering combining RCC 5 and RCC 6 into one region. Rebecca Harris noted that Contoocook Valley Transportation Company (CVTC) would prefer to see RCC 6 remain its own region, as it sits on the edge of three distinct service areas. J.B. Mack suggested that the issue of combining or dividing RCC 5 and RCC 6 be a topic at the summit that will be discussed later in the meeting.

J.B. Mack explained that the 5304 funding award from NH Department of Transportation (NH DOT) called for a balanced membership for RCC 6. He explained that this Committee will determine the bylaws, memorandum of understanding (MOU), mission/vision statements, and work on the Coordinating Community Transportation Plan.

J.B. Mack noted recent efforts to coordinate RCC 6 with other related groups. He handed out a proposed flow chart fitting RCC 6 within the SWRPC framework. He noted that the SWRPC Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) focuses mainly on technical issues, while the RCCs focus on transit, paratransit, human services and community services. He additionally noted that the Monadnock Regional Transportation Management Association (MRTMA) will focus on transportation development in the area, not infrastructure. He explained that the mission of the RCCs is connected to the Bush Administration's "United We Ride" initiative, and is supposed to utilize Federal monies in addition to funding from transit, paratransit, human services, and non-profit entities. He specified that many of these entities have not yet contributed funding. He proposed forming a subcommittee to look into the structure issue, including how to include pedestrian and bicycle groups into the framework. He noted that the MRTMA is interested in playing a central role in the process. The Committee expressed interest in having SWRPC play a central role for RCC 6.

Ellen Avery asked for the status of the other RCCs. Patrick Herlihy, Ken Hazeltine, and Christopher Morgan gave an update on the RCCs, noting which are currently starting up. They stressed that each RCC is at a different point of development. Christopher Morgan mentioned that the issues of boundaries has repeatedly come up, specifically how the boundaries relate to brokerages.

Rebecca Harris asked for a description of the MRTMA. J.B. Mack went over the MRTMA vision statement. He explained that all other smaller groups will become part of the MRTMA when it is developed. He stressed that the MRTMA should look into freight transport in addition to transporting people.

J.B. Mack noted that the Monadnock Region has a number of active planning projects, including the Route 10 Corridor Study, the Route 119 Study, and a potential Route 12 Study. He indicated the importance of having the Coordinated Plan address these studies.

J.B. Mack then discussed the work plan for RCC 6, including creating a balanced membership, reporting to the State Coordinating Council (SCC), and developing a Memorandum of Understanding, bylaws, vision statements and mission statements. He also noted that they will be involved in updating the Coordinated Community Transportation Plan, as applicants for funding in the region will need to use it as a source.

III. Review of Updates to Coordinated Plan for the Southwest Region

J.B. Mack began the plan update discussion by indicating the information in the Plan that needs to be updated. He recommended updating the list of providers whose services go across the State lines, expanding the list of origins and destinations, creating a broader demographic inventory, and strategizing the needs of the region.

J.B. Mack asked if there was a recommended schedule for updating the Plan. Ken Hazeltine noted that other groups have updated the document on an as-needed basis. J.B. Mack commented that the plan will be updated purely regarding data at this time, adding that some data has already been collected.

Christopher Morgan brought up the issue of membership, suggesting that a larger group may be initially better to get the brokerage started. He noted that after the brokerage is going, a smaller group of the Board of Directors could continue overseeing the day to day operations. Ken Hazeltine pointed out that this arrangement wouldn't "drain" key people for the process.

Patrick Herlihy proposed having the voting members be part of the RCC, and other interested parties forming an advisory committee.

J.B. Mack asked Patrick Herlihy to provide an update on other RCC activities and the SCC. Patrick Herlihy noted that the SCC has a list of proposed bylaws for the RCCs, adding that some RCCs have accepted a laid-back framework while others have more complex bylaws.

Ken Hazeltine commented that changes have occurred since the proposed bylaws were suggested by the SCC. It was originally thought that the RCCs would stand “on their own”, but now it appears that they will not. He mentioned the possibility of absorbing the SWRPC advisory committee bylaws for the RCC.

Patrick Herlihy recommended forming a larger group at first, as usually more people drop than join. Ken Hazeltine additionally suggested keeping the bylaws open, as it is hard to get all involved groups to sign the MOU.

IV. Discussion of RCC 6 Summit

J.B. Mack began the discussion of the RCC 6 Summit by stating that his original focuses for the summit may change based on what has been discussed at today’s meeting. He then described his suggestions for the summit, which included a presentation by the SCC to cover barriers to RCC development and feedback on RCC 6 potentially joining with RCC 5.

Patrick Herlihy cited another summit that had a three RCC panel answering questions. Other topics he suggested included “united We Ride”, a consumer panel to discuss user needs, and speakers discussing demographics. Ken Hazeltine additionally suggested a speaker to discuss any changes to “United We Ride” that may occur with the new administration.

Ellen Avery asked who the audience would be for the event. Ken Hazeltine responded that the audience would include transportation providers, users, and local municipal officials. J.B. Mack added that potential funders may also attend.

J.B. Mack asked if a weekday or weekend day would be more appropriate. Patrick Herlihy cited potential issues with both, but noted that most are done on a weekday.

Christopher Morgan expressed the importance of including a discussion covering what RCCs do for the event.

J.B. Mack suggested providing a brief overview of the Coordinated Community Transportation Plan on Region 6 for the summit. He recommended going over the structure by defining the role, vision statements, and mission statements of RCC 6. He additionally suggested discussing how the RCCs are addressing the funding issue. J.B. Mack stated that he hopes to hold the summit within the first two weeks of June.

J.B. Mack suggested providing summit participants with materials to look over before the event. Ellen Avery recommended a follow-up mailing with an event overview to help keep participants “hooked”.

V. State Coordinating Council Updates

Patrick Herlihy gave a brief update on SCC activities. He explained that the SCC has been discussing the definition of an RCC, and how they connect to other groups in the State. This is similar to the flow chart that J.B. Mack provided for today's meeting. Some outstanding issues that exist regarding the inclusion of the RCC into the Regional Planning Commissions (RPC) include the RPCs liability insurance and the potential need for the RPCs to rework their bylaws to accommodate the RCCs. He noted the importance of having the RPCs involved in the process.

J.B. Mack commented that a Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats Analysis (SWOT) has been done to analyze the RPCs involvement with the MRTMA. One issue that arose is that the RPCs answer to the towns, not the private sector.

VI. Other Matters

J.B. Mack stated that the next step will be to create an agenda for the summit, which he will work on in addition to scheduling the event date and location.

VII. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebeckah Bullock
Planning Intern