RCC Survey Fall 2015

Key information for the nine Regional Coordinating Councils:

REGION	*NAME*	*WEBSITE*	*CHAIR*	*LIAISONS*	*MEETINGS*
1	Grafton-Coös RCC	https://sites.google.com/a/grafton-coosrcc.org/grafton-coos-regional-coordination-council/home	Patsy Kendall prkendall7@gmail.com	Pat Crocker pcrocker@uvlsrpc.org Mary Poesse mpoesse@nccouncil.org	Qtrly: 4th Fri each mo @NCC in Littleton, or @Littleton Regional Hospital
2	Carroll County RCC	http://www.carrollcountyrcc.com/ https://www.facebook.com/pages/Carroll-County-Regional-Coordinating-Council-CCRCC/557493634358499?fref=ts	George Cleveland george@gibsoncenter.org	Mary Poesse mpoesse@nccouncil.org David Jeffers djeffers@lakesrpc.org	1st Tue/mo in even months @Gibson Center in N. Conway or @Northway Bank in W. Ossipee
3	Mid-State Regional Coordinating Council	http://midstatercc.org/	Chair: Vivien Green vfgreen@goodlifenh.org 603.228.6630 Vice Chair: Pam Jolivette pjolivette@bm-cap.org 603.225.3295	Larisa Djuvelek-Ruggiero, Regional Mobility Mgr. lruggiero@bm-cap.org 603.225.3295 Dean Williams Transportation Planner dwilliams@cnhrpc.org 603.226.6020 David Jeffers Regional Planner ~~djaffers~~ djeffers@lakesrpc.org 603.279.5341	2nd Tue/mo in even months, alternating between Concord and Lakes Region (e.g. 2/9/16 @NH Assoc. for the Blind, 25 Walker St., Concord)
4	Sullivan County RCC	http://www.sullivancountyrcc.org	Corey Gagnon CGagnon@communityalliance.net	Pat Crocker pcrocker@uvlsrpc.org	4th Wed/mo: 10/28/15, 1/27/16, 3/23/16, 6/22/16 @ CAHS Transportation,

					941 John Stark Hwy, Newport, NH
5/6	Monadnock Regional Council for Community Transportation	http://monadnockrcc.weebly.com	Kelly Steiner kelly@muw.org	J. B. Mack jbmack@swrpc.org	Quarterly @ SWRPC in Keene
7	Nashua RCC	no website	no chair at present	Camille Pattison camillep@nashuarpc.org Matt Waitkins mattw@nashuarpc.org	no set schedule, held at NRPC office in Merrimack
8	Greater Manchester RCC	http://www.greatermanchesterrcc.com/	Maureen Nagle mairin12@comcast.net	Tim White twhite@snhpc.org Adam Hlasny ahlasny@snhpc.org	2nd Tue/mo in odd months @ SNHPC in Manchester
9	Greater Derry-Salem RCC	http://rpc-nh.org/Derry-Salem-RCC.htm	Rick Hartung richard.hartung@comcast.net	Tim White twhite@snhpc.org Scott Bogle sbogle@rpc-nh.org	2nd Thu/mo in odd months @ Derry Municipal Center
10	Alliance for Community Transportation	http://www.communityrides.org/	Jennifer Flannery jflannery@communitypartnersnh.org	Jeff Donald jdonald@coastbus.org Scott Bogle sbogle@rpc-nh.org	1st Wed/mo in odd months @ McConnell Center or COAST in Dover

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #1

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.

Two of the regions have shared vehicles due to vehicle breakdown needs or to provide service for other agencies located in the same service area.

Two regions have worked on coordination through call center dispatching and some for trips referrals to other agencies when their services were unable to provide the service. One of these regions has several services working together and also working with a private taxi as a partner for service around agency hours (through a voucher program).

One region found coordinating was mainly done through the implementation of the FTA 5310 POS and Formula Funding Contracts. No examples were given.

Three regions found there were opportunities for providers to learn about each other's service by the receipt of the 5310 and Formula Funds, another held educational sessions that will reoccur every few years, and another provided a forum for regional providers to communicate.

Two agencies reported successful collaboration through their volunteer driver program, the creation of Regional Transportation Directories, and one established a vehicle maintenance agreement with another provider.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #2

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established?

Only one region increased membership in its RCC since inception. Three stayed level, and five decreased, although one is starting to increase again.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #3

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation?

Word of mouth, newsletters, websites, emails, information sharing, active collaboration, social media, phone calls, personal outreach, accommodate needs of members

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #4

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name).

See table below.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #5

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

Little awareness among the general public, some awareness among agencies.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #6

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?

Word of mouth, reports, town budget hearings, newsletters, social media, websites, emails, radio ads, TV PSAs, brochures, print ads, bus posters, information boards, presentations to civic groups and to every town in region, transportation directories, senior services fairs, ads in senior audience publications, ServiceLink

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #7

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.

Positive: new services funded by 5310, information sharing, learning how other providers and regions operate, awareness of region's needs, establishment of call centers. Negative: conflict over funding, inadequate funding, lack of interest, limited capacity, lack of clear purpose. See more in table below.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #8

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.

Lack of shared scheduling software, lack of awareness of transportation needs in towns, lack of capacity to implement project ideas, insurance and regulatory barriers especially for vehicle sharing, lack of interest among smaller VDPs, smaller VDPs unable to meet minimum standards, prohibition against provider being RTC slowed coordination, shortage of paid and volunteer drivers

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #9

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?

5310 funding, bringing partners to table, sharing information on coordination models, VDP forums. More in table below.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #10.

10: What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?

The major themes of the RCC responses fell into 5 areas as highlighted below.

ADVOCACY:
RCC'S felt that the SCC could be helpful in assisting with advocacy concerning making the case for community transportation (4 RCCs), locating funding for equipment (1), creating partnerships with stakeholders, politicians, organizations and others (4), work with state and federal in regard to silos of funding and restrictive rules (2) create a toolkit re awareness (2)

TECHNOLOGY:
There is a need for a free computerized scheduling system to work with Trapeze (1).

FUNDING:
SCC should assist with locating non-traditional sources of funding for technical assistance and other needs (2)

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:
Coordination with other providers, sharing information (forums), data collection and common metrics (3), Inter-regional coordination, vision setting, strategic planning, advertising/marketing (2), continued access to FTW 5310 funds (1).

OTHER:
Clarify SCC's vision and role and communicate it to stakeholders (2), appreciation for representation at BEAS (1), expand fixed route services (1), resolve outstanding issues such as role of Regional Planning Commission, state agency participation, SCC and RCCS (1).

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #11

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?

Pooling in-kind match, finance subcommittee, bank funding, appeals to towns and county, volunteer driver time as soft match, Monadnock United Way funding, reducing indirect expenses to send more funds to services, large private contributions, innovative scope of work, contributions from grocery store destinations, vehicle advertising wraps, subsidy as match for taxi voucher program.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #12

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIB?

Most regions seeing reduced funding and many are cutting back on service.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #13

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

Great way to fund transportation for seniors and people with disabilities, but need goes beyond those groups. Rural programs get less money but have greater cost per trip because of distances and population density. Groups not receiving 5310 funds tend to drop out of RCC. Real coordination will take more than a pot of money to share.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #14

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs?

Don't use 5310 funds for people covered by another program such as Medicaid. Reach out to RPC staff. Watch expenditures and have a triage policy so funds don't run out early. Keeping good data will help with funders. Engage a broad spectrum of people and groups.

Summary of RCC Survey responses on coordination Question #15

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

Late reimbursements, silos, demand exceeds funding and capacity, need goes beyond seniors and people with disabilities, need more alternative service models, municipalities struggle to provide matching funds, providing accessible transportation as part of VDP, small VDPs have trouble meeting service standards

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #1.

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.

REGION	Y/N	EXAMPLES	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS
1	yes	vehicle sharing, cross referrals, coordination with service agencies	AT & GCSCC have shared vehicles in the past; GCSC now giving rides to younger adults with disabilities due to 5310; TC planning vehicle sharing with 2 other groups
2	yes	providers learning about other types of services in their region	
3	yes	coordinated dispatching, accessible vehicle sharing, volunteer driver network of 12 programs, sharing information on unmet need, creation of transportation directory, education about agency transportation systems	Coordination has progressed within our region due to close partnerships and collaboration with community stakeholders, transportation providers, working to enhance community transportation without competition and duplication of efforts.
4	yes	collaboration between service agencies, VDPs and transit	Coordination in this region has been successful in that we have one transit operator for the region who is successfully delivering services to every town in its county using 5310 funds combined with local contributions to the volunteer driver program. They are also able to serve individuals with their deviated route service when it is more appropriate and as convenient as volunteer transports. The provider is successfully working with adult day, hospital, and Department of Corrections to provide transportation.
5/6	yes	transportation directory	
7	no		True coordination requires client sharing, and a sharing of liability between providers for the safety and quality of service. Also it needs the equitable distribution of trips between providers, to ensure that each provider has equal access to the most cost effective trips.
8	yes	collaboration through 5310 contracts, vehicle maintenance agreement between providers, forum for communication	
9	yes	collaboration between agencies on	

		shuttles, taxi voucher program	
10	yes	new VDP w/ACT as call center, COAST call center takes calls for COAST's ADA service, the North Bus, & Ready Rides	COAST will soon be call center for Community Partners and will create their daily manifests.

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #2.

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established?

REGION	***Increased***	***Decreased***	***Stayed the Same***
1			X
2		X	
3	17 in 2010, 21 in 2015		
4		X	
5/6		X	
7		X	
8		down from 2009, but increasing lately	
9			X
10			X

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #3.

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation?

REGION	***EXAMPLES***	***ADDITIONAL COMMENTS***
1	newsletters, websites	promote and share info via newsletters & websites; less outreach now than in the beginning
2	word of mouth, provider directories	
3	active collaboration, information sharing, addressing relevant issues, use of website and emails, might use social media	
4	continue to send meeting information	

	and minutes to original larger audience	
5/6	emails to prospective stakeholders and word of mouth	We have found that the level of participation is issue-based. By providing advocacy opportunities for policy change, we have been successful in mobilizing interested parties.
7	phone calls, individual emails, e-news	We had great momentum in 2007, which lasted for a few years. However, with the lack of funding and effective model for coordination at the state level there was little reason to ask volunteers to come to the table month after month without a clear goal. We eventually made the conscious decision to focus on the SVTC service and continue to monitor the activities of the SCC.
8	Meeting materials and invitations are sent to a stakeholder list and the meeting notices are posted on the SNHPC website.	Recently SNHPC staff has spent time contacting individual stakeholders in an effort to increase participation.
9	direct outreach to municipalities	
10	- adjusted the meeting time to best meet members' needs - hold the meeting in an accessible building on the bus route - only hold meetings every other month	We have invited for-profit providers and hospitals to attend, but to no avail. We do have one for-profit member, but they have not been very active.

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #4.

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name).

REGION	***MEMBERS***
1	Roberta Berner, GCSCC; Van Chesnut, Advance Transit; Teirrah Hussey, Staff for Transport Central; Beverly Raymond, TCCAP; Patsy Kendall, ED Transport Central; Doug Grant, Transport Central; Mark Frank, State Council on Aging, Lancaster; Frank Claffey, Citizen Member, Bethlehem; Carole Zangla, GCSCC; Pat Crocker, Staff UVLSRPC; Mary Poesse, Staff NCC
2	Town of Albany and Carroll County Transit - Jack Rose; Gibson Center for Senior Services - George Cleveland; Tri-County CAP - Beverly Raymond Peter Reynolds; Carroll County RSVP - Benny Jesseman, Mary Seavey; Ossipee Concerns Citizens - Donna Sargent; Citizen Member Albany - Dorothy Solomon; Citizen Member Conway - Sharon Strangman

3	Bank of NH – Karen Willson; CAPBMCI – Pam Jolivette; Central NH Regional Planning Commission – Dean Williams, Steve Henninger, Sam Durfee; City of Concord – Heather Shank; Friends Program-RSVP- Cindy Yanski; Genesis Behavioral Health – Carry Chandler, Kathy Randazzo; Good Life Programs & Activities – Vivien Green; Granite State Independent Living –Phyllis Brooks; Lakes Region Chamber of Commerce –Kathy Pevine; Lakes Region Community Services – David Emond; Lakes Region Planning Commission – Dave Jeffers, Joseph Jesseman; Merrimack County Department of Corrections –Dora Lavigne, Melissa Palelli, Matt Lamanuzzi; NH Association for the Blind- Donna Fanny
4	Corey Gagnon Community Alliance Transportation; Doreen Kusselow, BEAS Claremont; Brenda Burns, Sullivan County Nutrition Program; Aare Ilves, Citizen Member; Pat Crocker, UVLSRPC
5/6	American Red Cross (Gary Welch and Bob Perry); Cheshire County (Suzanne Bansley); Contoocook Valley Transportation Company (Ellen Avery and Sam Lafortune); Home Healthcare Hospice and Community Services (Michael Acerno and Susan Ashworth); Monadnock at Home (Bill Graf); Monadnock RSVP (Kathy Baird); Monadnock United Way (Kelly Steiner and Shawn Ballard); Southwest Region Planning Commission (Tara Germond and J. B. Mack); and a citizen member (Chuck Weed)
7	Beth Todgham – S. NH Services; Marcia Nelson – SVTC, FISH; Pat Murphy – Merrimack Town Welfare; Janet Langdell – SVTC; Alan Cohen - NH House of Reps; Dennie Townsend – SVTC; Carol Brooks – SVTC; Meghan Brady – SJCS; Martha Greene; Chris Clow – NTS; Louise Woodworth – NTS; Rebecca Crowther – SVTC; Carolyn Mitchell – SVTC; Camille Pattison – NRPC; Cassie Mullen – NRPC; Rebecca Crowther, SVTC – Hollis; Nate Carmen, SVTC – Milford; Eileen Brady – Nashua Soup Kitchen; Ray Blethen – NTS; Scott Bogle – CART; Tim Roache, NRPC; Tom Young, Litchfield Planning Board; Rebecca Harris, Transport NH; Matt Waitkins, NRPC; Karen Baker, NRPC
8	Easter Seals of NH, Special Transit Service – Fred Roberge; Greater Derry-Salem CART – Mark Nelson; The Caregivers, Inc. – Donny Guillemette; Citizen Member – Maureen Nagle; Manchester Transit Authority – Mike Whitten; Rockingham Nutrition/Meal on Wheels – Deb Perou; Southern NH Planning Commission – Adam Hlasny, Tim White; Town of Derry – George Sioras; Goffstown Transportation Committee – Fred Robinson; St. Joseph's Community Services – Maria Boren; Transport NH – Rebecca Harris; Town of Hooksett – Jo Ann Duffy, Carolyn Cronin, Joy Buzzell; Town of Bedford – Rick Sawyer; Town of Goffstown – Brian Rose; Manchester School District – Leah Belanger
9	Easter Seals of NH, Special Transit Service (Fred Roberge); Greater Derry-Salem CART (Mark Nelson); Greater Salem Caregivers (Dick O'Shaughnessy); Green Cab Company (Natalie Avila); Lamprey Healthcare Senior Transportation (Debra Bartley); Rockingham Nutrition/Meal on Wheels (Deb Perou); Rockingham Planning Commission (Scott Bogle); Southern NH Planning Commission (Adam Hlasny, Tim White); Town of Hampstead (Rick Hartung); Town of Derry (George Sioras); Town of Chester (Shelli Scott); Citizen Member (Jocelyn Gallant)
10	COAST-Rad Nichols; Strafford CAP-Susan Geier; Rockingham RPC-Scott Bogle; Strafford Regional Planning Commission-Colin Lentz; Community Partners-Jennifer Flannery; Great Bay Services-Jennifer Sweatt; Rockingham Nutrition and Meals on Wheels-Debbie Perou; Lamprey Health Care-Debbie Bartley; Carol Gulla-TASC; Meri Schmalz-Ready Rides

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #5.

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

REGION	COMMENTS
1	Somewhat; more so with time
2	Not really
3	While 36 outreach presentations were completed during the FY 15 to town select boards, city councils, non-profit organizations and hospitals (nurse navigators), the general public and other community stakeholders are generally unaware of the existence of the Mid-State RCC and its mission. In order to raise awareness, the Mid-State RCC has created the regional transportation directory which is updated quarterly, as well as outreach cards with the purpose of informing the public of the Mid-State RCC mission and to help steer the public to the Mid-State RCC website.
4	There has been significant coverage in the news and presence at community events so that many people are aware that the service exists.
5/6	limited awareness
7	no
8	some visibility with stakeholder agencies; need to raise awareness of the RCC and its mission with the public
9	no
10	social services, yes; general public, no

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #6.

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?

REGION	METHODS
1	Word of mouth, reports to providers' Boards of Directors, notifications at town budget hearings, other meetings, newsletters, Facebook, websites, meetings, emails
2	Email, newsletter articles, annual report, transportation plans, radio ads, and community-access TV PSA, brochure, print ads
3	The Regional Mobility Manager and the former Regional Transportation Coordinator, as well as the Volunteer Driver Program Coordinator have raised the awareness about the existence of the Mid-State RCC and it's mission through a variety of meetings, presentations, brochures, website, and radio appearances. The Mid-Sate RCC members have also participated in raising awareness when communicating with their partner agencies and promoting the regional transportation directory. The Mid-State RCC members are working together on including the Mid- State RCC information in their individual organizations' newsletters, on their buses, information boards, websites, social media, etc.
4	Directories, Websites, speaking to community groups such as Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, Selectboard meetings, RPC

	meetings, radio interviews. All towns are represented in the outreach efforts.
5/6	transportation directory
7	Direct calling, NRPC e-news, and direct e-mails to staff at social service and transportation agencies (30 in all)
8	stakeholder list; website
9	no significant outreach; SCC updates included in RCC meetings
10	Senior services fairs, ads in Seacoast Seniors, ServiceLink offices

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #7.

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.

New services funded by 5310, information sharing, learning how other providers and regions operate, awareness of region's needs, establishment of call centers. See more in table below.

REGION	***POSITIVE***	***NEGATIVE***
1	Providers that receive 5310 funds attend meetings and exchange information such as trips, difficulties encountered with providing trips. Meetings make it possible to get to know other providers and understand their services more fully, leading to cooperation on funding.	Providers sometimes have conflicts over funding. Funding is sparse.
2	Providers are discussing what they are doing for transportation and who they are providing transportation to.	Seems to be lack of interest in coordination.
3	Enhanced mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities, more transportation options, elimination of redundancies and improved efficiency	barriers such as limited capacity and resources some member organizations are faced with are adversely affecting coordination and efforts in the region
4		
5/6	Mobilizing membership to convince the Monadnock United Way to recognize "transportation" as a basic need service that the organization should fund	SWRPC lost staff person who was key to process. Red Cross is discontinuing its volunteer driver service.
7	- 5310 POS supports SVTC demand response bus service to residents of Amherst, Brookline, Hollis, Milford, Mont Vernon and Wilton - 5310 FF supports Mobility Manager for SVTC service.	One of the struggles has been having a clear purpose for the RCC in our region. As the Nelson Nygard plan dissolved and with it a source of funding, it left the local RCCs in a difficult position without a clear mission and funding

		source. This also makes routine meetings challenging if there are not sufficient items to address.
8	- development of FTA 5310 services in Region 8 - development of Region 8 RCC as a forum for coordination of Community Transportation in the Region	- inability to sustain a more comprehensive stakeholder base for the Region 8 RCC - lack of real coordination in the development of the Region 8 RCC FTA 5310 projects
9	- Startup and expansion of new transportation services in the region (CART taxi voucher program, Derry-Londonderry and Hampstead Shuttles, Salem Caregivers driver recruitment and training, RNMOW Vic Geary Center service) - Forum for discussing issues of shared concern	- Derry Shuttle funded by 5310/RNMOW at no cost to the town has given Derry incentive to underfund CART - Have had limited success in getting additional agencies beyond RNMOW to work through call center and coordinate/consolidate scheduling and dispatching
10	COAST taking over Community Partners' call-taking and scheduling. COAST and Community Partners meeting the service standards to participate in the coordinated service, formation of Ready Rides, purchase of accessible minivan for a volunteer driver program (in process)	More progress in Strafford County than Rockingham County

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #8.

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.

REGION	***BARRIERS***
1	There are still some territorial barriers and lack of shared software for scheduling. Transport Central could not put together an advisory council with representation from all 19 towns because town leaders and community members are not aware of transportation needs.
2	Working with other providers to perform some trips that we could not do but they also were unable to provide them either due to lack volunteers or the trips were not within their operating hours.
3	A pilot taxi voucher program had to be postponed to 2016. Small volunteer driver programs have trouble meeting the minimums in the Mid-State RCC Drivers' Standards and are therefore unable to share 5310 funds.
4	
5/6	Some insurance and state and federal regulations and policies make it difficult to coordinate. For example, HCS had difficulty working with ARC to loan vehicles to volunteer driver programs.
7	Would like to coordinate volunteer driver programs with SVTC, but the VDPs show little interest.

8	- Discussions on selecting an RTC broke down because lead agency couldn't also be a provider. - Couldn't get taxi voucher project started due to lack of champion willing to take on project.
9	- We have had limited success in getting additional agencies beyond RNMOW to work through call center and coordinate/consolidate scheduling and dispatching. - Also in SFY14-SFY15 contracted providers had difficulty finding additional drivers to staff up and fully utilize budgeted funds.
10	

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #9.

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?

REGION	***DESCRIPTION OF SUPPORT***
1	Due to the establishment of the SCC, DOT has provided funding for service, mobility management, and marketing.
2	Provided funding through the NHDOT and working on various ways to bring new partnerships to the table.
3	Shared information on coordination models; facilitated discussion about coordination efforts across New Hampshire; led VDP sessions to help bring programs together across the state
4	Attended local meetings, provided regular opportunities for updates and information
5/6	Provided a structure for regionalized decision making about transportation services; helped provide transportation services with 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula funds; held two volunteer driver coordination workshops that were very helpful; provides networking opportunities for RCC participants at SCC meetings; helped get Transport NH started, which is now advocating for community transportation
7	Advocated for 5310 POS funds
8	valuable resource for information on the development of Community Transportation coordination
9	- Continued access to 5310 POS and Formula funding - Volunteer Driver Program forums have been helpful - The SCC has been a useful forum for information sharing among regions – for operational as well as policy concerns - Beyond this, the effectiveness of the SCC is somewhat limited. The absence of DHHS, and no clear coordination intention from other state departments, means NHDOT is really the only player effectively at the table. The presence of state agency representatives limits the role the SCC can take as an effective advocate on state policy, but doesn't seem to yield much gain in state agency buy-in except for NHDOT.
10	Volunteer Driver Forums

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #10.

10: What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?

REGION	ADVOCACY	TECHNOLOGY	FUNDING	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RE:	OTHER
1	For community transportation, funding & Equipment from state	Want a free computerized scheduling system to work with Trapeze	Assistance with non-traditional sources.		Appreciation for representation at BEAS
2	In making the case for community transp.			TA could be an asset re coordination with other providers	
3	Re agency partnerships			Inter-regional coordination, Sharing Successes. Data collection	
4	For community transportation				
5/6	Toolkit re awareness re Community Transp. – SCC communicate with State and Federal re siloed funding and restrictive rules		SCC locate grants for Tech Assistance to RCCs.	Vision setting, strategic planning, advertising/marketing. - Develop common metrics for RCCs -	SCC needs to communicate and clarify its vision
7	Assist in energizing the interested parties to advocate				Expand fixed route services - Need hope for future
8				Support continued access to FTW 5310 funds	Resolution of outstanding issues such as definition of role of Regional Planning Commissions and intention of other state agencies re participation) - . Further

					definition of role of SCC and RCCs
9	Partnerships with EFH, TNH			More information sharing forums	
10	With Governor, Legislature and DHHS				

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #11.

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?

REGION	***DESCRIPTION OF FUNDING***
1	Pooling in-kind match
2	Not really
3	Formed a Finance Subcommittee to help raise the match for the VDP and RTS. Obtained a small amount of Bank Funding.
4	Just the usual: appeals to county, towns, and using volunteer driver time as soft match
5/6	volunteer driver time as match; Monadnock United Way funding; reducing indirect expenses to send more funds to services
7	Substantial private contributions from residents of the region who value transportation service
8	- working with NHDOT to develop innovative scope of work that ties distribution of funding to services provided - grocery stores contribute funds to be a destination for the MTA Shopping Shuttle
9	- Agency match from RNMOW, agency match from Greater Salem Caregivers - Advertising wraps on shuttle vehicles - User Side Subsidy as match on Taxi Voucher Program
10	vehicle advertising/sponsorships, pooling of in-kind match, municipal funding, and foundation grants

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #12.

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIB?

REGION	***COMMENTS***
1	- BEAS reimbursement only covers a small % of actual cost of trip, so providers are cutting back on # of trips provided.

	- $419,000 out of $1.4 million did not get spent because contractors were unable to draw down their full contracts under the new BEAS Title IIIB reimbursement scheme.
2	Some providers in the region decided not to apply for BEAS Title IIIB funds due to how they decided to fund agencies.
3	BEAS Title IIIB changes reduced revenue to existing senior transit system. Looking for ways to change the rate structure.
4	
5/6	The BEAS's lower rates have definitely affected services in the region. In addition, we have noticed that individual and corporate giving is down making it more difficult to capitalize on the Monadnock United Way matching funds.
7	5310 funds to our region have decreased and this will eventually have more significant impact on the total hours of service that SVTC will be able to provide on an annual basis.
8	concerned about breaking even with BEAS
9	The new BEAS rate structure seems to have created significant problems for provider agencies, shifting from a per trip reimbursement to a per day/per mile structure. BEAS providers in Region 9 have seen about a 20% cut in reimbursement plus additional administrative work. It also seems to create a perverse incentive system that discourages trip chaining and discourages providing service to seniors in rural areas where distances are greater and there is less potential to combine trips. Our understanding is that as the program covers less of the cost of providing service some agencies are cutting back on service and up to $400,000 in program funds have not been drawn down.
10	Agencies might discontinue Title IIIB funding because the net loss eats into their general fund.

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #13.

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

REGION	***COMMENTS***
1	- It's a good way to fund service for people with disabilities. - There is a great need for lift-equipped and rural transportation for numerous populations, not just older adults.
2	- The funds have been a valuable resource. - Agencies cannot continue to provide services to elderly at the reimbursement rate from BEAS. - 5310 funds helped agencies provide rides for people with disabilities which BEAS does not reimburse.
3	- 5310 Formula funds have been critical to the coordination process because of a staff dedication to the project. - 5310 P.O.S funds have expanded the ride opportunities.
4	
5/6	We have found that rural transportation programs are shortchanged of 5310 funds, because of our smaller population numbers, even though we provide longer trips than urban center programs. Since 5310 is one of the few programs available to support transportation services, it has been difficult to budget. MRCC service providers have to budget trips, despite the

	demand. The result is that rides need to be denied. This is often handled by denying the number of trips an individual is allowed to take per day.
7	- Transportation need in our region goes well beyond seniors and people with disabilities. - Some funders think accepting federal and municipal funding makes it "public transportation" that should be funded 100% with tax dollars. This perception creates a barrier to raising adequate funds. - We need advocates for community transportation options.
8	- 5310 funding was principal attraction for stakeholders, leading to worries about future role of RCC. - Still need to fund transportation for people who aren't seniors or who don't have a disability.
9	Funding availability keeps people at the table, but restrictions on funds make it difficult to expand volunteer programs.
10	While we have funded services provided by only 1 provider (Lamprey Health Care and Ready Rides), we have been trying to launch a service that actually coordinates providers and has multiple agencies working together. We have learned that this process will always take longer than expected. We also learned that simply having funding available isn't a sufficient motivator if potential partners aren't convinced that the service will be a good fit for them or that it will work logistically.

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #14.

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs?

REGION	***COMMENTS***
1	- Only use 5310 funds for people not covered by another program such as Medicaid. - Reach out to your RPC staff: they are an important ally.
2	
3	- 5310 Formula funds are good to use for mobility management staff, and to expand routes to study their effectiveness. - 5310 POS funds increase rides to eligible rider pool.
4	- Keep close track of funds and enact a triage policy so the funds are not depleted before the end of the program year. - Tracking the way it is done on the attached spreadsheets helps to see impact of the program and to inform potential funders who is being served in their town/region.
5/6	
7	- Engaging a broad spectrum of people and groups including members of the target population in planning and evaluating transportation services. - Having access to information about what other regions are doing as a way to spur new thinking locally.
8	- Coordination should be the responsibility of a Regional Transportation Coordinator, with a call center and close collaboration with the RCC. - NHDOT and other State agencies need to have a well-defined role in Statewide coordination of Community Transportation

	along with the SCC.
9	- Ideally, funded services should be coordinated through a central call center as Region 9 and Region 10 have sought to establish with some success, though with delays, hurdles and still limited participation. - Region 9 has sought to use funds to engage as many agency partners as possible, targeting specific need areas identified in the regional coordination plan.
10	

Table of RCC Survey responses to Question #15.

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

Late reimbursements, silos, demand exceeds funding and capacity, need goes beyond seniors and people with disabilities, need more alternative service models, municipalities struggle to provide matching funds, providing accessible transportation as part of VDP, small VDPs have trouble meeting service standards

REGION	***COMMENTS***
1	- Late reimbursement of funds from DOT. - Sometimes, but not always. GCSCC has had to refine their database and data collection substantially to make sure that we put the different populations/payer sources into silos: IIIB, POS, Medicaid. - Easy to exceed budget because demand is very high and always growing.
2	- Our hurdle is always raising the matching funds. - Finding ways of letting people know that rides are available and how they can access those rides
3	Matching funds
4	In some years demand exceeds available funding.
5/6	5310 funds serve the elderly and people with disabilities, but youth and people with low income also need rides, and there is little funding available to help them.
7	- We would like to look at alternative service delivery models to more efficiently use the available funding, however alternatives are limited and many options keep coming back to volunteer driver based programs. Unfortunately, the lack of volunteers willing/able to drive is a barrier. - Suggesting “change” is a barrier to engaging other groups in coordination and collaboration. Locally, the few other groups providing transportation are resistant to doing anything “new” or different than what they have been doing or organizations are unable to modify their programs due to larger agency considerations/funding rules/insurance issues etc.
8	Difficult to attract the region’s municipalities to participate because of the challenges they face in supplying the local match.
9	- Municipalities are generally moving toward less funding of community services rather than greater funding commensurate

	with growing need. - Responding to declining state and local funding, human service agencies are generally providing less service, so there are fewer resources to potentially coordinate - The accessible transportation requirements that come along with 5310 funding have been a challenge in rural communities where there are transportation needs that can be largely met by volunteers, but the cost of providing wheelchair van service is especially high given long distances and low development density making for limited trip sharing potential.
10	- accessible transportation for VDP's - meeting Service Standards

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: Please fill in your answers beneath each question.
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>.

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 1	**Website:** https://sites.google.com/a/grafton-coosrcc.org/grafton-coos-regional-coordination-council/home	**Liaison:** Pat Crocker pcrocker@uvlsrpc.org	**Meeting Schedule:** *Quarterly. Fourth Friday of the month.*
Grafton-Coös Regional Coordination Council	**Chair:** Patsy Kendall prkendall7@gmail.com	**Liaison:** Mary Poesse mpoesse@nccouncil.org	**Location:** _X_ varies (please list if possible) NCC offices in Littleton Littleton Regional Hospital __ fixed (please provide)

5310 Purchase of service	**Lead agency:** North Country Council (2015, 2014) UVLSRPC (2013, 2012)	**Services provided*** Purchase accessible demand response & volunteer driver transportation service for elderly individuals & individuals with disabilities in cooperation with the Region 1 Grafton-Coos RCC Service area	**Source of match** 20% matching funds will be provided by cash & in-kind match. In-kind match to include donated volunteer driver time. Cash match to include client donations, Town & County support, & philanthropic support	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per mile = _____ Per ride = _____ Loading fee = _____ + per mile ($__/mi)

*If services varied over time, please give a brief description of how they changed, for both POS and Formula.

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$117,593	$117,593	$111,712	7,479	
2014	$124,206	$124,206	$119,734	6,365	
2013	$84,127	$84,127	$105,415	6,574	
2012	$84,127	$84,127	$55,173	940	

*Does not include non-federal funds

5310 RCC-DISTRIBUTED FORMULA FUNDS (SFY2015)	**Lead agency:** North Country Council (2015) Transport Central (2014)	**Services provided:** Provide a mobility manager position for Region 1, Grafton County service area, to manage a volunteer driver program in Plymouth & 19 surrounding towns, providing accessible transportation services; also demand response accessible transportation in Region 1, Grafton-Coos service area.	**Source of match:** 20% match provided by cash & eligible in-kind match through the lead agency & regional transportation providers	**Trip Reimbursement:** TCCAP: Per mile =$.55 Loading fee = $7.35 + per mile ($.55/mi) GCSCC: Per ride = $14.52 Transport Central: Per mile =$.45

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$73,532**	$73,532	$85,033	1,341	
2014	$63,366	$53,200	$45,256		
2013					
2012					

*Does not include non-federal funds

**$63,366 regional allocation plus $10,166 carryover from SFY 2014 for total allocation of $73,532

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.

   Opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other. In prior years, Advance Transit had GCSCC a vehicle to use for an extended period of time when one of our Upper Valley vehicles was in need of repairs. GCSCC handles dispatching at the local level, but always refers clients to regional alternatives when it makes sense and when they can't accommodate a request for transportation. Approximately 15% of GCSCC rides are now for younger adults with disabilities. We might have provided some of these rides in the past without reimbursement. There is no other shared equipment or coordinated dispatching at this point.

   Transport Central coordinates more with the Plymouth Senior Center and handles their long distance transports. We also coordinate a little bit more with TCCAP. There is also a project being planned in Plymouth to share a vehicle between TC, Whole Village and Plymouth Youth Center.

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established? **Stayed about level.**

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation? **Haven't done much outreach as of lately. Promote and share info about the RCC through newsletters and websites.**

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name).
   Roberta Berner, GCSCC
   Van Chesnut, Advance Transit
   Teirrah Hussey, Staff for Transport Central
   Beverly Raymond, TCCAP
   Patsy Kendall, ED Transport Central
   Doug Grant, Transport Central
   Mark Frank, State Council on Aging, Lancaster
   Frank Claffey, Citizen Member, Bethlehem
   Carole Zangla, GCSCC

   Pat Crocker, Staff UVLSRPC

   Mary Poesse, Staff NCC

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

   Somewhat. More so with time.

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?

   Word of mouth, reports to provider's Board of Directors, notifications at town budget hearings, other meetings.

   NCC: newsletters, Facebook, www.nccouncil.org, meetings, emails

   UVLSRPC:

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.

   TCCAP: Providers receiving POS and FF funds attend meetings and exchange information such as trips, difficulties encountered with providing trips.

   GCSCC: Positive: at the very top, the 5310 Purchase of Service funding; second, getting to know other providers and understand their services more fully; Negative: sometimes in-fighting over $ isn't pleasant, but probably is to be expected)

   Transport Central: Positive: understanding the possibilities for coordination between the 3 agencies and making better financial decisions – cooperating on funding. Negative: Funding is sparse.

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.

   There are still some territorial barriers and lack of shared software for scheduling. Transport Central could not put together an advisory council with representation from all 19 towns because town leaders and community members are not aware of transportation needs.

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?
   Due to the establishment of the SCC, DOT has provided funding for service, mobility management, and marketing.

10. What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?
    Any and all support in making the case for community transportation is helpful. Advocacy for receiving the funding and the vehicles from NH-DOT in a timely way would be helpful. There's an appreciation for Fred Roberge's seat at the BEAS table right now regarding transportation funding issues. Transport Central **would like a free computerized scheduling system which would interface with Trapeze and assistance with non-traditional sources of funding.**

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?

    Pooling in-kind match

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb? **Changes made to Title IIIb funding has made it difficult to provide trips. The reimbursement cost from them to the provider covers only a very small percentage of what it costs to provide the trip thus providers are forced to cutback on how many trips they can provide.**

Struggling right now with BEAS Title IIIB and the new data paradigm for reimbursement + the fact that $419,000 out of $1.4 million did not get spent because contractors were unable to draw down their full contracts under the new paradigm.

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

    There is not funding for disabled person's and the POS funds enables providers to serve those individuals because they do reimbursement for those trips.

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs? **Ensure that those funds are used for person's not covered by another reimbursement resource such as Medicaid. The great need for lift-equipped and rural transportation for numerous populations, not just older adults. RPC staff is an important ally.**

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds? **Late reimbursement of funds from DOT. Sometimes, but not always. GCSCC has had to refine their database and data collection substantially to make sure that we put the different populations/payer sources into silos: IIIB, POS, Medicaid. Easy to overspend because demand is very high and always growing.**

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: Please fill in your answers beneath each question.
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>.

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 2	**Website:** http://www.carrollcountyrcc.com/ https://www.facebook.com/pages/Carroll-County-Regional-Coordinating-Council-CCRCC/557493634358499?fref=ts	**Liaison:** Mary Poesse mpoesse@nccouncil.org	**Meetings:** monthly on the first Tuesday, 2:00 pm (switched to even-numbered months beginning fall 2015)
Carroll County RCC	**Chair:** George Cleveland george@gibsoncenter.org	**Liaison:** David Jeffers djeffers@lakesrpc.org	**Location:** varies (please list if possible) - Gibson Center for Senior Services - North Conway, NH - Northway Bank West Ossipee, NH

5310 Purchase of service (SFY2015)	**Lead agency:** Mt. Washington Valley Economic Council	**Services provided:** Purchase accessible demand response public transit & volunteer driver transportation service for elderly individuals & individuals with disabilities in cooperation with the Region 2 Carroll County RCC Service area	**Source of match:** 20% matching funds will be provided by cash & in-kind match. In-kind match to include donated volunteer driver time. Cash match to include donations, advertising signage, & sponsorships	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per trip = _____ Per mile = _____ Other:

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended**	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$58,715	$58,715	$46,761	6,849	
2014	$61,339	$61,339	$61,339	6,767	
2013	$90,878	$90,878	$72,990	7,718	
2012*	$45,439				

*Did Region 2 apply for 5310 POS funds in 2012? ___

5310 RCC-DISTRIBUTED FORMULA FUNDS (SFY2015)	**Lead agency:** Lakes Region Planning Commission (SFY2014 carryover) North Country Council – CCRCC (SFY2015)	**Services provided:** Expanded demand response accessible transportation in Region 2 Carroll County service area	**Source of match:** 20% match provided by cash & eligible in-kind match through the lead agency & regional transportation providers	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per trip = _____ Per mile = _____ Other:

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended**	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$25,106	$25,106			
2014	$25,106	$25,106			
2013					
2012					

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other. Yes, I think the providers receiving funds have learned more about the types of services being provided by other providers. Not so much around vehicle sharing and coordinated dispatching.

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established? Membership has decreased since inception.

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation? Word of mouth at other meetings attended, one on one conversations with other providers/agencies. Provider Directories.

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name).
   Town of Albany and Carroll County Transit - Jack Rose
   Gibson Center for Senior Services - George Cleveland
   Tri-County CAP - Beverly Raymond, Peter Reynolds
   Carroll County RSVP - Benny Jesseman, Mary Seavey
   Ossipee Concerns Citizens - Donna Sargent
   Citizen Member Albany - Dorothy Solomon
   Citizen Member Conway - Sharon Strangman

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission? Not really

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC? Email, newsletter articles, annual report, transportation plans, radio ads, and community-access TV PSA, brochure, print ads

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years. Positive: Providers are discussing what they are doing for transportation and who they are providing transportation to. Negative: Seems to be lack of interest in coordination.

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe. Working with other providers to perform some trips that we could not do but they also were unable to provide them either due to lack volunteers or the trips were not within their operating hours.

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts? Provided funding through the NHDOT and working on various ways to bring new partnerships to the table.

10. What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?

Technical assistance could be an asset to some providers so they can coordinate with other providers. Support in making the case for community transportation.

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions? Not really.

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb? Some providers in the region decided not to apply for BEAS Title IIIb funds due to how they decided to fund agencies.

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds? The funds have been a valuable resource. Agencies cannot continue to provide services to elderly at the reimbursement rate from BEAS. They have also been valuable for agencies to provide rides for disabled person which BEAS does not reimburse.

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs? The trip reimbursement and mobility manager funds

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds? Our hurdle is always raising the matching funds. Finding ways of letting people know that rides are available and how they can access those rides.

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: *Please fill in your answers beneath each question.*
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>. Thank you!

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 3	**Website:** http://midstatercc.org/		**Meeting Schedule:** *Every other month on every second Tuesday of the month, 1PM-3PM*
Mid-State Regional Coordinating Council	**Chair:** *Vivien Green* *vfgreen@goodlifenh.org* *603.228.6630* **Vice Chair:** *Pam Jolivette* *pjolivette@bm-cap.org* 603.225.3295	**Liaison:** **Larisa Djuvelek-Ruggiero** Regional Mobility Manager lruggiero@bm-cap.org 603.225.3295 **Dean Williams** Transportation Planner dwilliams@cnhrpc.org 603.226.6020 **David Jeffers** Regional Planner djeffers@lakesrpc.org 603.279.5341	**Location:** _✓_ varies *(please list if possible): between Concord & the Lakes Region* __ fixed *(please provide)*

5310 Purchase of service	**Lead agency:** Central NH Planning Commission (2015, 2014) Merrimack County (2013, 2012)	**Services provided*** Purchase accessible transportation service for elderly individuals & individuals with disabilities within the Region 3 Mid State RCC Service area	**Source of match** 20% matching funds will be provided by cash & in-kind match. In-kind match to include donated volunteer driver time. Cash match provided by Community Action Program, Belknap-Merrimack Counties, Inc. from the agency's non-federal unrestricted funds and/or the Community Service Block Grant.	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per trip = $ 14.00 RTS Other: $14.00 + then $18.00 for VDP

*If services varied over time, please give a brief description of how they changed, for both POS and Formula.

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers RTS**	**Unduplicated Passengers VDP**
2015	$168,249	$164,463	$129,645	9,586	35 EST.	204
2014	$178,295	$134,725	$96,952	8,279	35 EST.	227
2013	$117,413	$107,503**	$46,514	3,521	N/A	145
2012	$117,413	$117,413	$9,910	820	N/A	N/A

*Does not include non-federal funds

**Budgeted funds reflects contract amount $117,413 (for SFY 2012 & 2013) less $9,910 expended in SFY 2012

5310 RCC-DISTRIBUTED FORMULA FUNDS	**Lead agency:** CAP, Belknap-Merrimack Counties	**Services provided:** Support of a Regional Transportation Coordinator position to serve as a key resource & point-of-contact for the Region 3 Mid-State RCC transportation providers to enhance coordination & service delivery	**Source of match:** 20% match provided by cash (agency support) through the lead agency	**Trip Reimbursement:** N/A

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$96,343	$57,370	$15,446	N/A	N/A
2014	$96,343	$63,825	$30,794	N/A	N/A
2013				N/A	N/A
2012				N/A	N/A

*Does not include non-federal funds

1. **Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.**

   -Yes. The coordination has progressed within our region due to close partnerships and collaboration with community stakeholders, transportation providers, as well as with the Regional Planning Commissions (CNHRPC & LRPC) and NHDOT that are working together toward a mutual goal of enhancing community transportation without competition and duplication of efforts. Coordination efforts have been achieved through coordinated dispatching, accessible vehicle sharing, collaboration with twelve (12) Volunteer Driver Programs (VDPs) in the region and formation of the VDP Network, as well as information sharing for the purpose of determining unmet transportation need in the region and creation of Regional Transportation Directory. Additionally, educational sessions explaining each agency's transportation system occurred early in the process and will happen again every few years.

2. **Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established?**

   -The Mid-State RCC membership has increased; there were seventeen (17) members that joined the Mid-State RCC in 2010 and today we have twenty one (21) members. We expect that the Mid-State RCC membership will continue to grow over the next couple of years.

3. **In what ways have you encouraged participation?**

   -The Mid-State RCC has been encouraging members to participate at the meetings and conversations by encouraging active collaboration and information sharing, as well as addressing an array of organization specific and collective transportation needs that would benefit communities throughout the region as a whole. The Mid-State RCC utilizes the website and e-mails for the purpose of enhancing communication and collaboration. The Mid-State RCC is also exploring the idea of connecting with the members and the public through the use of social media. Participation occurs at the subcommittee level to address marketing, fundraising and project development (i.e. taxi voucher program, etc.).

4. **What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name). Do you have a citizen member?**

   -The Mid-State RCC has a Chair (Vivien Green), a Vice-Chair (Pam Jolivette) and a Regional Mobility Manager (Larisa Djuvelek-Ruggiero). The Mid-State RCC is also supported by Central NH Regional Planning Commission (CNHRPC) and Lakes Region Planning Commission (LRPC). There are currently twenty one (21) members and the following members attended the Mid-State RCC meetings in the last year:

   - Bank of NH – Karen Willson
   - CAPBMCI – Pam Jolivette
   - Central NH Regional Planning Commission – Dean Williams, Steve Henninger, Sam Durfee
   - City of Concord – Heather Shank
   - Friends Program-RSVP- Cindy Yanski
   - Genesis Behavioral Health – Carry Chandler, Kathy Randazzo
   - Good Life Programs & Activities – Vivien Green
   - Granite State Independent Living –Phyllis Brooks

- Lakes Region Chamber of Commerce –Kathy Pevine
- Lakes Region Community Services – David Emond
- Lakes Region Planning Commission – Dave Jeffers, Joseph Jesseman
- Merrimack County Department of Corrections –Dora Lavigne, Melissa Palelli, Matt Lamanuzzi
- NH Association for the Blind- Donna Fanny

Non-Members attended:

- Greater Hillsborough Senior Center – Marie Mogavero
- Merrimack County Area Committee on Aging – Roger Vachon
- Volunteer Driver Program, CAPBMCI – Juliana Dapice

The Mid-State RCC does not currently have a citizen member.

5. **Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?**
   -While 36 outreach presentations were completed during the FY 15 to town select boards, city councils, non –profit organizations and hospitals (nurse navigators), the general public and other community stakeholders are generally unaware of the existence of the Mid-State RCC and it's mission. In order to raise awareness, the Mid-State RCC has created the regional transportation directory which is updated quarterly, as well as outreach cards with the purpose of informing the public of the Mid-State RCC mission and to help steer the public to the Mid-State RCC website.

6. **What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?**
   -The Regional Mobility Manager and the former Regional Transportation Coordinator, as well as the Volunteer Driver Program Coordinator have raised the awareness about the existence of the Mid-State RCC and it's mission through a variety of meetings, presentations, brochures, website, and radio appearances. The Mid-Sate RCC members have also participated in raising awareness when communicating with their partner agencies and promoting the regional transportation directory. The Mid-State RCC members are working together on including the Mid-State RCC information in their individual organizations' newsletters, on their buses, information boards, websites, social media, etc.

7. **Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.**
   - Positive coordination outcomes: enhanced mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities, more transportation options, elimination of redundancies and improved efficiency.

   -Negative coordination outcomes: barriers such as limited capacity and resources some member organizations are faced with are adversely affecting coordination and efforts in the region.

8. **Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.**
   - A pilot taxi voucher program that was initially scheduled to launch in FY15 was transferred to the FY16 work plan

- The Mid-State RCC Drivers' Standards have been a barrier to successful coordination in some instances, assuming that accessing 5310 funds is what is referred to as coordination. Small volunteer driver programs can not meet minimum standards.

9. **What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?**
   -The SCC has played active role in supporting the Mid-State RCC coordination efforts by sharing information on coordination models, as well as by facilitating discussion about coordination efforts across New Hampshire. Additionally, the SCC has lead VDP sessions to help bring programs together across the state.

10. **What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?**
    -The SCC could support future coordination efforts by:
    - encouraging inter-regional coordination
    - encouraging agency partnership at all levels
    - sharing successful coordination efforts in other regions
    - considering data collection
    - leading discussions with insurance companies

11. **Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?**
    -The Mid-State RCC has formed a Finance Subcommittee in order to help raise money to meet the requirement for the matching funds for the VDP and RTS and is considering other creative ways for sustainable funding. It has successfully obtained a small amount of Bank Funding.

12. **How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb?**
    -The new billing matrix from Bureau of Elderly and Adult Services (BEAS) Title III-B has reduced revenue to the existing senor transit system. Discussions are underway to look at transportation expenses and then avenues to change the rate structure.

13. **What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?**
    -The 530 Formula funds have been critical to the coordination process because of a staff dedication to the project. 5310 P.O.S funds have expanded the ride opportunities.

14. **What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs?**
    -Formula funds are excellent in mobility management staff. They also are helpful to expand routes to study their effectiveness. P.O.S. funds expand rides to an expanded eligible rider.

15. **What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?**
    -The primary barrier is finding the matching funds in order to access the Mid-State region allocation.

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: *Please fill in your answers beneath each question.*
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>. Thank you!

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 4	**Website:** http://www.sullivancountyrcc.org/	**Liaison:** Pat Crocker pcrocker@uvlsrpc.org	**Meeting Schedule:** *4th Wednesday of month 9:30-11:30am*
Sullivan County Regional Coordinating Council	**Chair:** *Corey Gagnon* *CGagnon@communityalliance.net*	**Liaison:** Pat Crocker pcrocker@uvlsrpc.org	**Location:** CAHS Transportation, 941 John Stark Hwy. , Newport, NH October 28, 2015; January 27, March 23, and June 22, 2016.

5310 Purchase of service	**Lead agency:** Upper Valley Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission	**Services provided*:** Purchase accessible volunteer driver transportation service for elderly individuals & individuals with disabilities in cooperation with the Region 4 Sullivan County RCC	**Source of match:** 20% matching funds will be provided by in-kind match - donated volunteer driver time	**Trip Reimbursement:** Loading fee = $9.42 per owt + per mile = $.50 Other:

*If services varied over time, please give a brief description of how they changed, for both POS and Formula. [From Pat: my trip counts did not agree with DOTs, so I've changed that. Note that the loading fee is currently $9.42 per one-way trip. This is an increase from $8.75 in previous years.]

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$55,899	$55,899	$55,900	2,476	156
2014	$58,332	$58,332	$58,294	3,067	206
2013	$43,589	$43,589	$57,398	3,356	190
2012	$43,589	$43,589	$29,780	2127	204

*Does not include non-federal funds

5310 RCC-DISTRIBUTED FORMULA FUNDS	**Lead agency:** Community Alliance of Human Services	**Services provided:** Support of a volunteer driver coordinator position to serve as a key resource & point-of-contact to enhance coordination & service delivery in Region 4	**Source of match:** 20% match provided by cash (agency support) through the lead agency.	**Trip Reimbursement:**

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$23,297	$23,297	$23,297	See Above	See Above
2014	$23,297	$23,297	$23,297	See above	See above
2013				Not reported Separately	Not reported Separately
2012					

*Does not include non-federal funds

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.

   Coordination in this region has been successful in that we have one transit operator for the region who is successfully delivering services to every town in its county using 5310 funds combined with local contributions to the volunteer driver program. They are also able to serve individuals with their deviated route service when it is more appropriate and as convenient as volunteer transports. The provider is successfully working with adult day, hospital, Department of Corrections, to provide transportation, etc.

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established? **Decreased (program runs smoothly, no controversy)**

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation? **Continue to send meeting information and minutes to original larger audience.**

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name).

   a. **Corey Gagnon Community Alliance Transportation**

   b. **Doreen Kusselow, BEAS Claremont**

   c. **Brenda Burns, Sullivan County Nutrition Program**

   d. **Aare Ilves, Citizen Member**

   e. **Pat Crocker, UVLSRPC**

   Do you have a citizen member? Yes see above

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

   a. **Yes, and Yes, there has been significant coverage in the news and presence at community events so that many people are aware that the service exists.**

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC? **Directories, Websites, speaking to community groups such as Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, Selectboard meetings, RPC meetings, radio interviews. (all towns are represented).**

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years. **N/A**

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe. **No**

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts? **Attended local meeting, provide regular opportunities for updates and information.**

10. What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? **Support in making the case for community transportation?**

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions? **N/A – traditional fund appeals to county, towns, and individuals and soft match of volunteer driver time.**

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb?

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds? **This is such a broad question, not sure how to respond to it.**

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs? **Keep close track of funds and enacting a triage policy so the funds are not depleted before the end of the program year. Tracking the way it is done on the attached spreadsheets helps to see impact of the program and to inform potential funders who is being served in their town/region.**

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds? **In some years demand exceeds available funding.**

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: *Please fill in your answers beneath each question.*
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>. Thank you!

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 5/6	**Website:** http://monadnockrcc.weebly.com/	**Liaison:** J. B. Mack jbmack@swrpc.org	**Meeting Schedule:** *(e.g. first Tues. of the month at 2 pm)* Quarterly
Monadnock Regional Council for Community Transportation	**Chair:** *Kelly Steiner* *kelly@muw.org*	**Liaison:** (same as above)	**Location:** __ varies *(please list if possible)* _X fixed *(please provide)* SWRPC 37 Ashuelot Street Keene, NH 03431

5310 Purchase of service	**Lead agency:** Cheshire County (2013-2015) Regions 5 & 6 were separate in 2012, with Cheshire as lead agency for 6 and Hillsborough County for 5	**Services provided*:** Purchase accessible demand response & volunteer driver transportation service for elderly individuals & individuals with disabilities in cooperation with the Region 5/6 Monadnock RCC	**Source of match:** 20% matching funds will be provided by in-kind match to include donated volunteer driver time	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per mile = $0.41 (CVTC only) Per hour = $65.00 (HCS only) Per trip = $15.00 (American Red Cross only) up to $100 for wheelchair transport per trip Other: HCS offers its own wheelchair transport and ARC refers wheelchair transport to HCS

*If services varied over time, please give a brief description of how they changed, for both POS and Formula.

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$114,849	$114,849	$114,849	7,048	None of the MRCC agencies currently track this information, however they intend to do so in the future. CVTC reported that it had 139 unduplicated passengers during this fiscal year (POS and Formula combined)
2014	$99,921	$119,921	$119,921	6,861	CVTC reported that it had 121 unduplicated passengers during this fiscal year (POS and Formula combined)
2013	$89,182	$94,182**	$102,954***	5,867	
2012	Region 5: $53,142 Region 6: $36,040	Region 5: $53,142 Region 6: $36,040	Region 5: $44,370 Region 6: $31,040	Region 5: 1,588 Region 6: 2,100	

*Does not include non-federal funds
**Regions 5 & 6 merged at the end of SFY 2012 and remaining funds from Region 5 were used for combined region.
***Expended remaining SFY2012 funds ($8,772.33) and SFY 2013 allocated contract funds

5310 RCC-DISTRIBUTED FORMULA FUNDS	**Lead agency:** Contoocook Valley Transportation Company	**Services provided:** Mobility management activities including the management of an accessible volunteer driver program that includes mileage and trip reimbursement in the Monadnock Region	**Source of match:** 20% match provided by CVTC and American Red Cross through in-kind match towards trips. CVTC mobility management is a cash match from the Monadnock United Way.	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per mile = $0.41 (CVTC only) Per trip = $15.00 (American Red Cross only)

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$48,612	$48,612	$44,313	822	None of the MRCC agencies currently track this information, however they intend to do so in the future. CVTC reported that it had 139 unduplicated passengers during this fiscal year (POS and Formula combined)
2014	$48,612	$48,612	$45,276	673	CVTC reported that it had 121 unduplicated passengers during this fiscal year (POS and Formula combined)
2013					
2012					

*Does not include non-federal funds

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.

Perhaps our largest success in improving coordination was the creation of a Community Transportation Directory. The Directory helped regional transportation providers, health care professionals and social service providers learn about transportation services in the area. Transportation providers can now more easily refer to each other if they are unable to provide services. The MRCC has not achieved any of the other examples of coordination cited in the question.

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established?

Our membership has decreased since it was established. Private transportation companies, town representatives and some social service agencies are examples of entities that have stopped attending meetings to discuss coordination.

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation?

We have encouraged participation by sending mass e-mails to prospective stakeholders and by talking about the coordination effort through word of mouth. We have found that the level of participation is issue-based. By providing advocacy opportunities for policy change, we have been successful in mobilizing interested parties.

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name). Do you have a citizen member?

The MRCC recently updated its bylaws which defines who can be members and redefines members in good standing. Members can be: a) Any county, municipality, private non-profit or for-profit organization based in the Region that funds or purchases transportation services; b) Public or private transportation organizations that arrange and/or provide transportation services for the general public or human service agency clientele either incidentally or under contract; c) Any regional agency involved in the planning of public/passenger transportation in the Region; d) Any state agency involved in the planning of public/passenger transportation in the Region; e) Organizations representing groups of consumers that would be positively affected by such mobility and access improvements in the Region including the elderly and persons with disabilities; f) Medical Centers, hospitals and rural healthcare providers; g) Organizations representing the needs of low income citizens; h) Institutions providing adult and post-secondary education; i) Employers in the public and private sectors; and citizen members.

Members that have attended meetings in the last year have included: American Red Cross (Gary Welch and Bob Perry); Cheshire County (Suzanne Bansley); Contoocook Valley Transportation Company (Ellen Avery and Sam Lafortune); Home Healthcare Hospice and Community Services (Michael Acerno and Susan Ashworth); Monadnock at Home (Bill Graf); Monadnock RSVP (Kathy Baird); Monadnock United Way (Kelly Steiner and Shawn Ballard); Southwest Region Planning Commission (Tara Germond and J. B. Mack); and a citizen member (Chuck Weed). Our upcoming meeting on November 17th—which will focus on a community transportation vision for the Monadnock Region—will try to pull in some new members.

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

No, general awareness about the Monadnock Regional Coordinating Council is very limited. People do know about individual partner's transportation services, but do not tend to be aware of the coordination effort.

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?

The Community Transportation Directory was a very helpful outreach tool.

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.

One of our most positive coordination outcomes was mobilizing membership to convince the Monadnock United Way to recognize "transportation" as a basic need service that the organization should fund. The MUW provides much needed support to area transportation services including match support for CVTC's 5310 Formula Fund mobility management. Another recent success was the revision of the MRCC bylaws, which we think will make it easier to attract members, as well as easier to make 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula fund allocations.

Some negative outcomes include the recent loss of a staff person from SWRPC who had been helping steer the MRCC process for several years and brought a wealth of knowledge as well as energy to the process. Another potential negative is the recent announcement by American Red Cross that it will be discontinuing its "Rural Rides" program.

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.

There are many barriers that MRCC faces including insurance and state and federal regulations and policies that are imposed by that make it difficult to coordinate. For example, HCS had difficulty working with ARC to loan vehicles to volunteer driver programs.

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?

The MRCC is grateful that the SCC has provided a structure for regionalized decision making about some transportation services and for the opportunities for providing transportation services with 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula funds. The two volunteer driver coordination workshops sponsored by SCC were very helpful. The MRCC appreciates the networking opportunities for RCC participants at SCC meetings. We also are happy to have Transport NH lobbying for community transportation, and we understand that part of its origins came from the SCC.

10. What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?

A toolkit to build awareness campaigns about community transportation is really needed. The SCC could potentially find grants or other resources to make technical assistance to RCCs on such topics as vision-setting, strategic planning and advertising/marketing. The SCC should map out, track and communicate funding options to RCCs on a regular basis. The SCC should consider adopting metrics that RCCs across state can use to measure progress. The SCC needs to work on communicating and clarifying its vision. When the Bush administration required local and regional coordination, it forced all the problem solving around providing transportation services on the backs of local and regional service providers without doing its own work to break down silo funding. The SCC needs to work on communicating to the State and especially the federal delegation about breaking down silo funding and all the rules that restrict who, when and how transportation services are provided.

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?

MRCC's nontraditional sources of funding and match have included the broad use of volunteer hours, the incorporation of Monadnock United Way funds as a match for mobility management (perhaps the only United Way organization in the State that provides transportation funding), and applying reduced indirect rates towards grant administration in order to ensure more funding is going towards transportation services.

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb?

The BEAS's lower rates have definitely affected services in the region. In addition, we have noticed that individual and corporate giving is down making it more difficult to capitalize on the Monadnock United Way matching funds.

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

We have found that rural transportation programs are shortchanged of 5310 funds, because of our smaller population numbers, even though we provide longer trips than urban center programs. Since 5310 is one of the few programs available to support transportation services, it has been difficult to budget. MRCC service providers have to budget trips, despite the demand. The result is that rides need to be denied. This is often handled by denying the number of trips an individual is allowed to take per day.

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs?

We are eager to hear the examples that other RCCs provide for this question.

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

The issue around 5310 POS and formula funds are that they are designed to provide elderly and people with disabilities rides. We find that youth and low income individuals are other groups that also need rides, but it is more of a challenge to find them rides.

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: Please fill in your answers beneath each question.
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>.

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 7	**Website:** No website	**Liaison:** Camille Pattison camillep@nashuarpc.org	**Meeting Schedule:** *No regular schedule*
Nashua Regional Coordinating Council	**Chair:** *No Chair*	**Liaison:** Matt Waitkins mattw@nashuarpc.org	**Location:** NRPC Offices 9 Executive Park Drive Merrimack, NH

5310 Purchase of service	**Lead agency:** Nashua RPC	**Services provided** Purchase demand responsive accessible transportation service for elderly individuals & individuals with disabilities & will support mobility management & strategic planning activities within the Nashua RCC service area	**Source of match** 20% matching funds (cash match) will be provided by Souhegan Valley Transportation Collaborative through municipal contributions & private donations.	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per trip = _____ Per mile = _____ Per hour = _____ Other:

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended**	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$144,243	$144,243	$137,133	2,422	
2014	$152,662	$152,662	$134,549	2,700	
2013	$101,638	$101,638	$102,841	2,717	
2012	$101,638	$101,638	$88,011	2,100	

5310 RCC-DISTRIBUTED FORMULA FUNDS (SFY2015)	**Lead agency:** Nashua RPC	**Services provided:** Support a part-time independent contractor to assist with mobility management activities for Souhegan Valley Transportation Collaborative (SVTC) & the Region 7 RCC. The independent contractor will assist the SVTC Board of Directors with mobility management & strategic planning activities.	**Source of match:** 20% match provided by SVTC through cash (public & private sources)	**Trip Reimbursement:**

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended**	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$15,443	$15,443	$15,548		
2014	$15,443	$15,443	$15,443		
2013					
2012					

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.

   No. Coordination has not progressed. One of the fundamental problems that I see is that true coordination as originally conceived in the Nelson Nygard Plan requires client sharing. This in turn assumes a sharing of liability between providers for the safety and quality of service. Another road block that has never been solved to my knowledge is the equitable distribution of trips between providers. How do we ensure that each provider has equal access to the most cost effective trips.

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established?

   Decreased overall due to the lack of momentum and funding at the state level with the implementation of the Nelson-Nygard Plan. We currently have a smaller group of dedicated members, largely comprised of Souhegan Valley Transportation Collaborative (SVTC) members. The SVTC service has been very successful and we have decided to focus our energy where we can make a difference and improve transportation to the region.

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation?

   Direct calling, NRPC e-news, and direct e-mails to staff at social service and transportation agencies. The reality is that we had great momentum in 2007, which lasted for a few years. However, with the lack of funding and effective model for coordination at the state level there was little reason to ask volunteers to come to the table month after month without a clear goal. We eventually made the conscious decision to focus on the SVTC service and continue to monitor the activities of the SCC.

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name).

   According to our 2007 Bylaws:
   III.1 Membership Eligibility Criteria
   The Council shall be composed of organizational and citizen members as follows:

- Organizational members — Any of the following organizations are automatically a member of the Council upon formal adoption of the Council's Memorandum of Understanding by that governmental unit or organization, and formal acceptance by the Council:
  - Any public, private non-profit, or for-profit organization based in Region 7 which currently funds, arranges or provides such transportation services for its citizens, clients or customers;
  - Any regional public transportation agency or state/regional agency involved in the planning or provision of public/passenger transportation in Region 7. The agency will have the right to choose the person who will be their representative;
  - Organizations representing groups of consumers and constituents that would be positively affected by such mobility and access improvements in Region 7.

Meeting Attendees

Beth Todgham – S. NH Services
Marcia Nelson – SVTC, FISH
Pat Murphy – Merrimack Town Welfare
Janet Langdell - SVTC
Alan Cohen - NH House of Reps
Dennie Townsend - SVTC
Carol Brooks - SVTC
Meghan Brady - SJCS
Martha Greene
Chris Clow - NTS
Louise Woodworth - NTS
Rebecca Crowther - SVTC
Carolyn Mitchell - SVTC
Camille Pattison - NRPC
Cassie Mullen - NRPC
Rebecca Crowther, SVTC – Hollis
Nate Carmen, SVTC – Milford
Eileen Brady – Nashua Soup Kitchen
Ray Blethen – NTS
Scott Bogle – CART
Tim Roache, NRPC
Chris Clow – NTS
Tom Young, Litchfield Planning Board
Rebecca Harris, Transport NH
Matt Waitkins, NRPC
Karen Baker, NRPC

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

   No. I would say most are not aware. Again, we ask a lot of our volunteers in the region and I'm hesitant to take peoples time until there is some clear direction for the future of coordinated transportation in the state and region.

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?

   Direct calling, NRPC e-news, and direct e-mails to staff at social service and transportation agencies.

   Number of agencies that we included in our e-mails? 30

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.

   Positives:

   1. Souhegan Valley Rides (SVR) is the dial-a-ride type demand response bus service available to residents of Amherst, Brookline, Hollis, Milford, Mont Vernon and Wilton NH, provided by the Souhegan Valley Transportation Collaborative.
   2. Funding a Mobility Manager to support the SVTC service.

Negatives:

1. One of the struggles has been having a clear purpose for the RCC in our region. As the Nelson Nygard plan dissolved and with it a source of funding, it left the local RCCs in a difficult position without a clear mission and funding source. This also makes routine meetings challenging if there are not sufficient items to address.

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.

   We have considered and discussed the idea of coordinating the SVTC Service with volunteer drivers. Essentially using volunteers to compliment and or feed into the SVTC Service. There is little interest from existing volunteer drivers programs. More effort would be needed to investigate the feasibility of this concept.

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?

   Advocated for the 5310 POS funds.

10. What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?

    If we really want to coordinate transportation then we need to find a model that addresses the concerns I mentioned in my response to question 1. I think we might be better served pursuing expansions of fixed route service and making regional connections between Nashua Manchester, Derry/Salem and the Seacoast.

    We could use some help in energizing the interested parties. There needs to be some hope of impacting the future service in the region. We also need people to advocate for transit at the local level.

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?

    There have been substantial private contributions made by residents of the region to support the SVTC service. It speaks to the desperation of residents for service.

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb?

    The 5310 funds to our region have decreased and this will eventually have more significant impact on the total hours of service that SVTC will be able to provide on an annual basis.

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

    At least in our area, the need for transportation goes well beyond just "seniors and the disabled".

We encountered a perception issue among potential funders especially foundations. Since we receive federal and municipal funding, our service is viewed as "public" transportation and from some perspectives should be funded 100% via tax dollars. This becomes a barrier when government funding is insufficient.

While many residents and community leaders agree there is a need for transportation options for seniors and the disabled, when faced with competing community needs and priorities, transportation does not necessarily rise to the top half of the budget. For that reason, there needs to be a consistent group championing the case for community transportation options.

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs?

    Engaging a broad spectrum of people and groups including members of the target population in planning and evaluating transportation services.

    Having access to information about what other regions are doing as a way to spur new thinking locally

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

    We would like to look at alternative service delivery models to more efficiently use the available funding, however alternatives are limited and many options keep coming back to volunteer driver based programs. Unfortunately, the lack of volunteers willing/able to drive is a barrier.

    Suggesting "change" is a barrier to engaging other groups in coordination and collaboration. Locally, the few other groups providing transportation are resistant to doing anything "new" or different than what they have been doing or organizations are unable to modify their programs due to larger agency considerations/funding rules/insurance issues etc.

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: *Please fill in your answers beneath each question.*
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>. Thank you!

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 8	**Website:** http://www.greatermanchesterrcc.com/	**Liaison:** Tim White twhite@snhpc.org	**Meeting Schedule:** Second Tuesday of every other month @11AM
Greater Manchester Regional Coordination Council	**Chair:** Maureen Nagle mairin12@comcast.net	**Liaison:** Adam Hlasny ahlasny@snhpc.org	**Location:** SNHPC

5310 Purchase of service	**Lead agency:** Southern NH Planning Commission	**Services provided*:** Purchase accessible transportation service for elderly individuals & individuals with disabilities within the Region 8 Greater Manchester RCC service area (information from FY 2016 – FY 2017 POS projects)	**Source of match:** 1. The CareGivers, Inc. – match provided by supporters of The CareGivers, Inc. 2. MTA Shopper Shuttle – match provided by participating grocery stores 3. MTA Goffstown Service – match provided by Town 4. ESNH Demand Response Service – match provided by ESNH	**Trip Reimbursement:** 1. The CareGivers, Inc. – reimbursement at $24.00/hr. for services provided by each new volunteer recruited through the program 2. MTA Shopper Shuttle – service provided at $52.00/hr. 3. MTA Goffstown Service – service provided at $52.00/hr. 4. ESNH – services provided at $38/hr.

*If services varied over time, please give a brief description of how they changed, for both POS and Formula.

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$163,392	$163,392	$133,388	9,629	
2014	$173,109	$173,109	$126,353	9,422	
2013	$114,211	$228,442**	$228,442	5,610	
2012	$114,211	$114,211			

*Does not include non-federal funds

**Contract approved 4/18/2012 through 6/30/2013 using allocated funds from 2012 and 2013. Allocated funds were $114,211 for each year for a total allocation of $228,442.

5310 RCC-DISTRIBUTED FORMULA FUNDS	**Lead agency:** Southern NH Planning Commission	**Services provided:** Beginning 07/01/15, Mobility Management services provided for The CareGivers, Inc. “Drive to Care” Volunteer Recruitment Program – budgeted Federal funds for FY 2016 - $58,280	**Source of match:** Match provided by supporters of The CareGivers, Inc.	**Trip Reimbursement:** The CareGivers, Inc. reimbursed at hourly rates of $16-$25

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$93,564				
2014	$93,564				
2013					
2012					

*Does not include non-federal funds

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.

   Coordination has made progress in Region 8, principally through the implementation of the FTA 5310 POS and Formula Funding contracts. ESNH has established a vehicle maintenance agreement with St. Joseph's Community Services. The Region 8 RCC has provided a forum for regional providers to communicate.

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established?

   When the Region 8 RCC was established in 2009, membership was based on 17 stakeholders who signed MOU's agreeing to participate. In terms of actual attendance at meetings, participation has fallen off to the point where attendance was limited to those stakeholders involved in FTA 5310 projects. Additional recruitment activities have recently begun to increase attendance at Region 8 RCC meetings.

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation?

   Meeting materials and invitations are sent to a stakeholder list and the meeting notices are posted on the SNHPC website. Recently SNHPC staff has spent time contacting individual stakeholders in an effort to increase participation.

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name). Do you have a citizen member?

   RCC Makeup

   1. ***Easter Seals of NH, Special Transit Service – Fred Roberge***
   2. ***Greater Derry-Salem CART – Mark Nelson***
   3. ***The Caregivers, Inc. – Donny Guillemette***
   4. ***Citizen Member – Maureen Nagle***
   5. ***Manchester Transit Authority – Mike Whitten***
   6. ***Rockingham Nutrition/Meal on Wheels – Deb Perou***
   7. ***Southern NH Planning Commission – Adam Hlasny, Tim White***
   8. ***Town of Derry – George Sioras***
   9. ***Goffstown Transportation Committee – Fred Robinson***
   10. ***St. Joseph's Community Services – Maria Boren***
   11. ***Transport NH – Rebecca Harris***
   12. ***Town of Hooksett – Jo Ann Duffy, Carolyn Cronin, Joy Buzzell***
   13. ***Town of Bedford – Rick Sawyer***
   14. ***Town of Goffstown – Brian Rose***
   15. ***Manchester School District – Leah Belanger***

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

   The Region 8 RCC has established some visibility with stakeholder agencies in the area through attendance at meetings and through implementation of FYA 5310 projects. However, work is needed on raising the awareness of the RCC and its mission with the public.

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?

   Regular outreach has been limited to development of a stakeholders list for Region 8 RCC meetings and development of a Region 8 website – additional outreach is required to develop regular attendance at Region 8 RCC meetings

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.

   The top two positive outcomes over the last three years have been 1) development of FTA 5310 services in Region 8 and 2) development of Region 8 RCC as a forum for coordination of Community Transportation in the Region. The top two negative outcomes have been 1) inability to sustain a more comprehensive stakeholder base for the Region 8 RCC and 2) lack of real coordination in the development of the Region 8 RCC FTA 5310 projects

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.

   Since the initiation of the FTA 5310 program in Region 8, SNHPC has acted as Lead Agency. This was required because during the first round of Region 8 5310 projects that occurred in 2012 it was understood that the Lead Agency could not also be a service provider. This issue also impacted the Region's ability to seriously discuss the selection of a Regional Transportation Coordinator for Region 8. Funding for a Region 8 Taxi Voucher program similar to the one currently operating in Region 9 was included in the SFY 2015 Region 8 contract. Despite some financial and planning support from SNHPC, the project never got started because of an inability to locate a stakeholder "champion" within the Region 8 area willing to take on the project.

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?

   The SCC continues to be a valuable resource for information on the development of Community Transportation coordination and having a representative at monthly SCC meetings is a priority for SNHPC acting on behalf of the Region 8 RCC.

10. What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?

    SCC support for continued access to FTA 5310 funding though NHDOT is important for the continuation of Community Transportation coordination in Region 8. Further definition of the future role of the SCC and the RCCs including resolution of issues that have impacted these organizations' effectiveness in the long term will be helpful. Two examples of these issues would be a more clear definition of the role of the Regional Planning Commissions and clear direction of the intention of other State agencies to participate in the SCC process.

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?

    The willingness of NHDOT to work with SNHPC in 2012 to develop an acceptable scope of work for the initial CareGivers' "Drive to Care" Volunteer Recruitment program was instrumental in getting that project off the ground. An innovative scope to enable distribution of funding to be tied to services provided has worked out positively for The CareGivers', Inc. and the project is continuing. MTA's design of the FTA 5310 POS Shopper Shuttle project was creative in that it requires a limited financial commitment on the part of area grocery stores. Because of the grocery stores opportunity to make a profit, the program is expanding throughout the region.

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb?

    During RCC meetings there has been discussion of the impacts of changes to programs such as BEAS Title IIIb on the ability of Region 8 stakeholders to provide services even at a break-even point.

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

    The FTA 5310 funding program has proved to be the principal attraction for Region 8 RCC stakeholders. While this has been positive, it has also made it clear to us that there will need to be answers to the question of the future role of the RCC. We will need to answer this question in order to continue to attract stakeholders to the RCC who do not wish to be involved in the FTA 5310 program. Despite the relative success of the FTA 5310 program in Region 8, there is still a sense that we need to make more effective use of funding to fill up Community Transportation vehicles regardless of age or disability stats.

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs?

    Ideally, the FTA 5310 program as well as other regional coordination should be the responsibility of a Regional Transportation Coordinator (RTC) as defined in the Nelson-Nygaard Study. The RTC should include a call center as well as close collaboration with the RCC. The early Region 8 RCC discussions on this topic centered on having one of the principal providers in the region (i.e MTA, ESNH) act as the RTC. Additionally, real best practices for the FTA 5310 program administered through NHDOT would really require a situation where NHDOT and other State agencies would have a well-defined role in Statewide coordination of Community Transportation along with the SCC.

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

    One of the barriers to the success of the FTA 5310 program administered through NHDOT has always been the ability to attract the region's municipalities to participate. The barrier to attracting the municipalities has always been the challenges they face in supplying the local match.

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: *Please fill in your answers beneath each question.*
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>. Thank you!

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 9	**Website:** http://rpc-nh.org/Derry-Salem-RCC.htm	**Liaison:** Tim White twhite@snhpc.org Southern NH Planning Commission	**Meeting Schedule:** *Currently meet the 2nd Thursday of odd months at 9:00am.*
Greater Derry-Salem RCC	**Chair:** Rick Hartung richard.hartung@comcast.net	**Liaison:** Scott Bogle sbogle@rpc-nh.org Rockingham Planning Commission	**Location:** _X_ fixed *(please provide)* *Derry Municipal Center, 14 Manning Street*

5310 Purchase of service	**Lead agency:** CART (2016) SNHPC (2015) CART (2012-2014)	**Services provided*:** Purchase accessible transportation service for elderly individuals & individuals with disabilities within the Region 9 Greater Derry-Salem RCC service area	**Source of match:** 20% cash match for shuttles provided by Easter Seals of NH & Rockingham Nutrition Meals on Wheels	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per mile = $____ Per hour = $32.00 (ESNH) Per hour = $32.00 (RNMOW) Loading fee = $____ Other:

*If services varied over time, please give a brief description of how they changed, for both POS and Formula.

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$94,221	$94,221	$60,161	4,818	2,376
2014	$99,251	$99,251	$60,752	5,455	
2013	$68,347	$68,347	$75,561	2,900	
2012	$68,770	$68,770	$20,290	632	

*Does not include non-federal funds
**Contract approved 4/18/2012 through 6/30/2013 using allocated funds from 2012 and 2013. Allocated funds were $114,211 for each year for a total allocation of $228,442.

5310 RCC-Distributed Formula Funds	**Lead agency:** CART (2016) SNHPC (2015)	**Services provided:** Early bird/night owl taxi voucher program, Volunteer recruitment & outreach efforts, Expanded demand response transportation services in Plaistow & surrounding towns, Call center staffing (trip scheduling & dispatching)	**Source of match:** 50% user side subsidy is provided as cash match on taxi vouchers. 20% cash match by Salem Caregivers and RNMOW. 20% cash match from CART on call center expenses.	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per mile = $3.20 (taxi) Per hour = $32.00 (RNMOW) Per hour = $____ Loading fee = $3.80 (taxi) Other:

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended***	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$26,217	$52,434	$47,614	1,486 (incl Green Cab & RNMOW)	59 (incl RNMOW)
2014	$26,217			plus share of Call Center cost for POS shuttles, plus volunteer recruitment and training	
2013					
2012					

*Does not include non-federal funds

1. **Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.**

   - Derry-Londonderry and Hampstead Shuttles have worked well. These are a coordinated effort between CART, Easter Seals NH and Rockingham Nutrition Meals on Wheels program.
   - CART Early Bird/Nite Owl Taxi Voucher Program has worked well – This is a coordinated effort between CART and Green Cab Company of Derry using Section 5310 formula funding. It provides a 50% subsidy on cab fare to eligible riders for transportation primarily outside of CART service hours (Weekdays 5:00-8:00am & 5:00-8:00pm, and Saturdays 5:00am-8:00pm). Medical trips are also eligible during business hours as a backstop for when CART is overbooked.
   - CART/ESNH Call Center has potential to be more extensively used by other agencies

2. **Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established?**

   Membership numbers have held roughly constant. Two providers who initially participated no longer come (Rockingham CAP and GSIL), though we have added town representation from Hampstead and Chester.

3. **In what ways have you encouraged participation?**

   We've encouraged CART member communities to take part with some success. Access to 5310 funding is certainly helpful. We have not made recent outreach efforts to bring agencies back to the table (Derry Caregivers, Windham Senior Van, Center for Life Management, adult daycare facilities)

4. **What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name).**

   <u>Current RCC Membership</u>
   1. Easter Seals of NH, Special Transit Service (Fred Roberge)
   2. Greater Derry-Salem CART (Mark Nelson)
   3. Greater Salem Caregivers (Dick O'Shaughnessy)
   4. Green Cab Company (Natalie Avila)
   5. Lamprey Healthcare Senior Transportation (Debra Bartley)
   6. Rockingham Nutrition/Meal on Wheels (Deb Perou)
   7. Rockingham Planning Commission (Scott Bogle)
   8. Southern NH Planning Commission (Adam Hlasny, Tim White)
   9. Town of Hampstead (Rick Hartung)

10. Town of Derry (George Sioras)
11. Town of Chester (Shelli Scott)
12. Citizen Member (Jocelyn Gallant)

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

They are aware of the services offered through the RCC, but mainly as a function of the agencies that provide them (CART, RNMOW, Caregivers) rather than linking them to the RCC. There is not broad awareness of the RCC itself as an entity.

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?

We have not done significant outreach in the past two years, largely due to time consumed with CART staffing transition in 2013-2014. We include an SCC update as part of each RCC meeting agenda.

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.

Positive:

- Startup and expansion of new transportation services in the region (CART taxi voucher program, Derry-Londonderry and Hampstead Shuttles, Salem Caregivers driver recruitment and training, RNMOW Vic Geary Center service)
- Forum for discussing issues of shared concern

Negative:

- Derry Shuttle funded by 5310/RNMOW at no cost to the town has given Derry incentive to underfund CART
- Have had limited success in getting additional agencies beyond RNMOW to work through call center and coordinate/consolidate scheduling and dispatching

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.

We have had limited success in getting additional agencies beyond RNMOW to work through call center and coordinate/consolidate scheduling and dispatching. Also in SFY14-SFY15 contracted providers had difficulty finding additional drivers to staff up and fully utilize budgeted funds.

9. **What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?**

- Continued access to 5310 POS and Formula funding
- Volunteer Driver Program forums have been helpful
- The SCC has been a useful forum for information sharing among regions – for operational as well as policy concerns
- Beyond this, the effectiveness of the SCC is somewhat limited. The absence of DHHS, and no clear coordination intention from other state departments, means NHDOT is really the only player effectively at the table. The presence of state agency representatives limits the role the SCC can take as an effective advocate on state policy, but doesn't seem to yield much gain in state agency buy-in except for NHDOT.

10. **What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?**

More information sharing forums such as the volunteer driver forums. Partner with EFH, TNH and other parties to develop a more effective advocacy approach for community transportation

11. **Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?**

- Agency match from RNMOW, agency match from Greater Salem Caregivers
- Advertising wraps on shuttle vehicles
- User Side Subsidy as match on Taxi Voucher Program

12. **How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb?**

The new BEAS rate structure seems to have created significant problems for provider agencies, shifting from a per trip reimbursement to a per day/per mile structure. BEAS providers in Region 9 have seen about a 20% cut in reimbursement plus additional administrative work. It also seems to create a perverse incentive system that discourages trip chaining and discourages providing service to seniors in rural areas where distances are greater and there is less potential to combine trips. Our understanding is that as the program covers less of the cost of providing service some agencies are cutting back on service and up to $400,000 in program funds have not been drawn down.

13. **What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?**

Certainly having funding available helps get/keep people at the table. These funds can make a substantial difference in terms of supporting increased access. We have sought to spread these funds out among various agencies willing to participate, provide match and meet the funding requirements. That said, strings attached to these funds (for example the accessible transportation requirements for volunteer driver programs) are significant enough that they rule out what could otherwise be very effective use of the funds, such as expanding volunteer driver services into rural areas lacking other services.

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs?

Ideally funded services should be coordinated through a central call center as Region 9 and Region 10 have sought to establish with some success, though with delays, hurdles and still limited participation. Region 9 has sought to use funds to engage as many agency partners as possible, targeting specific need areas identified in the regional coordination plan. We have not made participation in the regional call center a requirement for 5310 funded services as we saw that as too much of a delay to getting service on the street. Incorporating more agencies into the regional call center remains a goal.

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

- Municipalities are generally moving toward less funding of community services rather than greater funding commensurate with growing need.
- Responding to declining state and local funding, human service agencies are generally providing less service, so there are fewer resources to potentially coordinate
- The accessible transportation requirements that come along with 5310 funding have been a challenge in rural communities where there are transportation needs that can be largely met by volunteers, but the cost of providing wheelchair van service is especially high given long distances and low development density making for limited trip sharing potential. This is somewhat less of a problem in Region 9 than in some other regions as CART provides accessible rides in much of Region 9.

RCC Survey

We need your help to see how coordination is going in the regions and to share your successes and challenges with other regions so you can help each other succeed.

We hope you'll be able to discuss some of these questions at your next RCC meeting, but if that's not possible, perhaps your executive committee could hold a meeting, in person or by phone, to collect the answers.

Thank you for your help,

The State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation
Fred Roberge, Chair
Pam Jolivette, Vice Chair
Pat Crocker, Secretary
Bill Finn, Treasurer

Instructions: Please fill in your answers beneath each question.
When you've finished, please return this document to Pat Crocker, <PCrocker@uvlsrpc.org>.

With help from NHDOT, we've prepared some basic information about your RCC below. Please review this and if any information is missing or incorrect, please provide updated information where possible. After these tables, we'll ask more open-ended questions about coordination in your region.

Region 10	**Website:** http://www.communityrides.org/	**Liaison:** Jeff Donald jdonald@coastbus.org	**Meetings:** every other month on the first Wednesday at 9:00 AM (e.g. Sept. 9)
Alliance for Community Transportation	**Chair:** Jennifer Flannery jflannery@communitypartnersnh.org	**Liaison:** Scott Bogle sbogle@rpc-nh.org	**Location:** __ varies (please list if possible) Usually held at McConnell Center, 61 Locust St, Dover, NH. Sometimes held at COAST, 6 Sumner Dr, Dover, NH.

5310 Purchase of service	**Lead agency:** Rockingham Planning Commission (as of July 1, 2015)	**Services provided** 2015: VDP Reimbursement & Community Health Center Transportation 2014: VDP Reimbursement 2013: Coastal Route 2012:	**Source of match** 2015: In-Kind from VDP 2014: In-Kind from VDP 2013: Endowment for Health 2012:	**Trip Reimbursement:** Per trip = $5/n/a Per mile = $4.50/$.25 Other:

5310 POS	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended**	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$195,960	*	$35,458	1,778	139
2014	$207,884	$207,884	$11,218	171	88
2013	$135,621	$135,621	$8,375	59	unknown
2012	$135,621	$135,621			

*used remaining SFY2014 contract funds instead of going in for additional SFY 2015 funds

5310 RCC-DISTRIBUTED FORMULA FUNDS (SFY2015)	**Lead agency:** COAST	**Services provided:** Operation of a one-stop transportation call center to coordinate transportation services in the Southeast NH RCC service area	**Source of match:** 20% matching funds will be provided by cash and eligible in-kind match	**Trip Reimbursement:** n/a

5310 Formula	**Regional Allocation**	**Total Contract Funds Budgeted**	**Contract POS Funds Expended**	**Total Trips**	**Unduplicated Passengers**
2015	$114,388	$227,901	$176,492		
2014	$114,388				
2013					
2012					

1. Do you think coordination has progressed within your region? If yes, please explain. Some examples of coordination include vehicle sharing, coordinated dispatching, services purchased with 5310 POS funds, and opportunities for regional providers to learn about each other and refer to each other.

Yes, coordination has progressed. ACT helped to launch a new volunteer driver program and serves as its call center. The COAST Call Center takes calls for COAST's ADA service, the North Bus, Ready Rides, and will begin taking calls soon for Community Partners. In addition to call-taking for Community Partners, the Call Center will create their daily manifests as well.

2. Has your RCC membership increased or decreased since it was established?

It is essentially the same size.

3. In what ways have you encouraged participation?

We adjusted the meeting time to best meet members' needs, hold the meeting in an accessible building on the bus route, and only hold meetings every other month. We have invited for-profit providers and hospitals to attend, but to no avail. We do have one for-profit member, but they have not been very active.

4. What is the makeup of your RCC? Please list members who have attended RCC meetings in the last year (agency name and of representative's name).

COAST	Rad Nichols
Strafford CAP	Susan Geier
Rockingham RPC	Scott Bogle
Strafford Regional Planning Commission	Colin Lentz
Community Partners	Jennifer Flannery
Great Bay Services	Jennifer Sweatt
Rockingham Nutrition and Meals on Wheels	Debbie Perou
Lamprey Health Care	Debbie Bartley
Carol Gulla	TASC
Meri Schmalz	Ready Rides

Margie Longus	Ready Rides
Sharon Reynolds	Public Member
Carol Garlough	Goodwin Community Health
Health & Safety Council of Strafford County	Tory Jennison
The Homemakers Health Services	Linda Howard
Town of New Durham	Theresa Jarvis

5. Has your RCC found that agencies and the general public located in your service area are aware of your RCC's existence and mission?

Not the general public; we are making some headway with social service providers

6. What outreach methods have you utilized to inform others about your RCC and the SCC?

Senior services fairs, ads in Seacoast Seniors, ServiceLinks

7. Please summarize the top two positive and top two negative coordination outcomes over the past 3 years.

Positive: COAST taking over Community Partners' call-taking and scheduling. COAST and Community Partners meeting the service standards to participate in the coordinated service, formation of Ready Rides, purchase of accessible minivan for a volunteer driver program (in process); Negative: there has been more progress in Strafford County than in Rockingham County

8. Are there coordination efforts you tried which were unsuccessful because you met with barriers? Please describe.

Software implementation has been a great barrier. Meeting service standards has been a barrier, driven as much by resistance to change and a desire to see real evidence that the program will work, as by real costs and difficulties

9. What has the SCC done to support your RCC's coordination efforts?

Volunteer Driver Forums

10. What can the SCC do to support your coordination efforts in the future? For example, do you need technical assistance? What sort? Do you need professional development? Help with financial efficiency? Support in making the case for community transportation?

Advocacy with the Governor, Legislature, and especially with DHHS.

11. Has your region been able to utilize nontraditional sources of funding, e.g. creative sources of match for providers? Are you able to share that information with other regions?

Our sources of funding have been vehicle advertising/sponsorships, pooling in-kind match; municipal funding for a particular agency or project, and foundation grants.

12. How have changes in sources besides 5310 Purchase of Service and Formula Funds affected your ability to provide transportation in your region, e.g. BEAS Title IIIb?

At least one agency in our region is currently looking at its Title IIIb program with an eye toward discontinuing it, as providing transportation under this funding source is eating into their general fund.

13. What lessons have you learned through providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

While we have funded services provided by only 1 provider (Lamprey Health Care and Ready Rides), we have been trying to launch a service that actually coordinates providers and has multiple agencies working together. We have learned that this process will always take longer than expected. We also learned that simply having funding available isn't a sufficient motivator if potential partners aren't convinced that the service will be a good fit for them or that it will work logistically.

14. What do you consider best practices for 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula programs?

15. What hurdles or barriers to success have you encountered providing services funded by 5310 Purchase of Service and/or Formula Funds?

Accessible transportation for VDP's; Meeting Service Standards;