

**MID-STATE REGIONAL COORDINATING COUNCIL MEETING**

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2025**

**2-4 PM**

**LOCATION:**

**FUTURE IN SIGHT CONFERENCE ROOM**

**25 WALKER ST, CONCORD**

**Join Zoom Meeting**

**<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89136602724?pwd=IPrCJneJMtZaEZtYIUeQGeVLOeKbbX.1>**

**Meeting ID: 891 3660 2724**

**Passcode: 854578**

<b>Attendees</b>	
Joyce Cameron, Partnership for Public Health, virtual – via Zoom	Charles Lewis, Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, Department of Education
Terri Paige, CAPBM (Vice-chair)	Tom Schamberg, Board of Selectman, Town of Wilmot (Chair)
Andrew Harmon (Secretary), Citizen member, virtual – via Zoom	Teri Palmer, State Mobility Manager, virtually – via Zoom
Matt Baronas, Regional Planner, CNHRPC	Cindy Yanski, Region 3 Mobility Manager (CAPBM)
Jane Alden, Citizen Member, Resident of Tilton	Susanne Peace, Volunteer Services Coordinator, Future In Sight
Victoria Lane, Executive assistant, Granite State Independent Living (Alternate to Deb Ritcey)	Deborah Ritcey, C.E.O., Granite State Independent Living
Kimberly Smith, Laconia Home Housing (Choices for Independence) – via Zoom	Lisa Steadman, Region 5 Mobility Manager (Southwest Regional Planning Commission(SWRPC))
Angelique Pandolph, Transportation Director for Easterseals NH – via Zoom	

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Tom called the meeting to order at 2:02 pm. We all introduced ourselves. We had six (6) voting members in the room. Due to being unable to obtain a ride to the meeting, a motion was made to allow A. Harmon to participate virtually by Zoom. A vote was called with the individuals in the room.

m/s/approved T. Paige/J. Alden, unanimous

**2. Review and approve minutes of July meeting – Quorum needed for vote**

m/s/approved J. Alden/A. Harmon

6 yea, 0 nay, 1 abstention: D. Ritcey

**3. Notice of Funding: FTA Section 5310 Capital Grant Program – Due 1/22/26**

T. Schamberg asked for presenters, and C. Yanski began by mentioning that NH Department of Transportation (NHDOT) had announced a new capital grant was available through 5310 grant funds. She then explained that the funds could go towards any purchase of physical assets like buses, vans, computers, or even software. She further added that while CAPBM was not seeking funds as they are not currently using them, CAPBM would be willing to help anyone who was seeking make such purchases in the process of applying. T. Schamberg asked if anyone had applied, and C. Yanski replied that no one has expressed an interest and nobody had sent in any applications. Any applications would need approval from the RCC before it could be submitted. She added that this announcement was a second announcement, further adding that she had sent out an email to all RCC members approximately one month ago with no responses. T. Paige asked when the application was due, and C. Yanski replied January 22<sup>nd</sup>. A. Harmon noted that the next scheduled meeting is after the deadline, which prompted further discussion. T. Schamberg asked if the RCC could meet virtually by Zoom should an application be submitted, and C. Yanski thought that it would have to be in person. T. Schamberg noted that that would be with weather permitting, to which there was general agreement.

**4. Legislative amendments to RSA 91-A:2**

C. Yanski mentioned that Fred Butler at D.O.T. had forwarded her an email outlining upcoming changes to Revised Statutes Annotated (RSA) 91-A:2, which sets rules regarding public meetings and conduct of “public officers” during those meetings. Some discussion followed, during which T. Schamberg read aloud the new language: “Minutes of all such meetings, including nonpublic sessions, shall include the names of members, persons appearing before the public bodies, a brief description of the subject matter discussed and final decisions, the start time and end time of the meeting, and name of the person who produced the minutes. The names of the members who made or seconded each motion shall be recorded in the minutes.” C. Yanski noted that the RCC is in compliance with all of the requirements except for the name of the person taking the minutes. J. Alden also noted that the minutes taker also needs to sign the minutes, to which A. Harmon added he could sign the minutes with no issue before submitting it to C. Yanski for any necessary alterations.

**5. CAPBM 2026-2027 5310 Project Funds adjustment – Quorum needed for vote**

CAPBM MST-POS rate adjustment from \$27 per trip rate to \$37 per trip. See line 1 on invoice. T. Paige started by explaining how the senior transportation services are funded with a bit of a background. She further added that she thought the budget was set up with the funds noted as a payroll allocation rather than tying the funds directly to the rides for the expansion services in case of a dip in ridership for a given period of time. After receiving the grants, the new grants manager asked for clarification on the process when receiving invoices for the grant, which prompted D.O.T. to require that the invoices be covered under the “Purchase of Service” model, and thus needing to be tracked directly per ride. Some discussion followed regarding clarification of the

requested change, during which J. Alden made a motion to approve CAPBM to increase the purchase of service per trip rate from \$27 per trip to \$37 per trip. A. Harmon asked to clarify the reason for the increase, asking if it were due to DOT increasing their costs? T. Paige responded that no, it was due to how CAPBM invoices DOT.

Some further discussion followed, during which T. Paige added that the necessity for the rate increase was because the change in invoicing would cause CAPBM to have a cost per ride that could not be reimbursed from 3B funds. She further added that during the fiscal year of 2024, it worked out to \$31,000 for roughly 4,000 rides. D. Ritcey asked if the term “per trip” meant for each one leg of a round-trip ride, or the entirety of the ride. T. Paige explained that for all other providers present at the RCC, “per trip” referred to one ride in one direction, regardless of whether or not the ride would be a round-trip ride. D. Ritcey also asked if the invoices would be for just the expansion town ride services? T. Paige replied that the 3B funds could be used to cover any rides provided by CAPBM, but that if the funds run out the rate increase would help cover rides provided to expansion towns. S. Peace asked if the increase in ride rates would be for just CAPBM rides or for other organizations, and T. Paige responded it would be for CAPBM rides only. C. Yanski also noted that the taxi voucher program funds had been reallocated. She further noted that as a result, the full budget for the RCC of \$506,800.00 had not been fully used. A. Harmon called the question, and C. Yanski called the roll call, noting that J. Cameron had joined the meeting.

m/s/approved J. Alden/M. Baronas

7 yea, 0 nay, 1 abstention: T. Paige  
A motion was then made to allow J. Cameron to attend virtually as a voting member as she could not participate in person due to a lack of transportation to the meeting.

m/s/approved T. Schamberg/J. Alden , unanimous

7 Yea, 0 Nay

T. Paige then raised the point that the RCC may need to make a formal motion as C. Yanski previously noted that the budget line-items for the taxi voucher program in the budget were removed and re-allocated to Mid-State Transit. Some discussion followed, during which C. Yanski and A. Harmon pointed out that the motion had been formally made and approved at the previous meeting. C. Yanski further added that the motion is in the previous minutes.

#### **6. Paratransit service to complement the VDP update**

T. Paige began by noting that CAPBM took over providing accessible rides for the CAP VDP from Granite State Independent Living (GSIL) effective October 1<sup>st</sup>, and mentioned that while there was some acclamation needed, the new program has been going well. She clarified that under CAPBM VDP policy, the program only

provides medical rides but added that there were two vehicles acquired from GSIL, and that some of the previous riders have remained regular users of the program. She further added that there were three new regular riders going to dialysis appointments, two of which were in Penacook, and one was possibly living in Hillsborough. Some discussion followed, and K. Smith asked if the VDP drivers were providing the rides, and T. Paige replied that they were not. She added that with the acquisition of the two vehicles from GSIL, she is hopeful that a volunteer driver may go through the process necessary to get the credentials to operate the van. She further added that most volunteer drivers are hesitant to do so as they are required to obtain a DOT physical as part of the process, but she is hopeful that someone may volunteer in future.

D. Ritcey asked when CAPBM takes riders to dialysis, how are the rides paid for? T. Paige replied that the program uses regular RCC-awarded funds, adding that the rider cannot be a Medicaid recipient as CAPBM is not a Medicaid provider, adding that Medicaid-eligible riders must use the Medicaid brokerage system. D. Ritcey asked if the riders using the program are receiving Medicare coverage or commercial insurance? T. Paige responded that theoretically either. D. Ritcey then clarified that if the riders are receiving commercial insurance, the program could approach the insurance providers to be registered as dialysis drivers and get paid from the Dialysis fund. K. Smith added that commercial insurance has a liability to pay for dialysis treatment as it is considered the last health treatment, or “end of life” without dialysis treatment. Some discussion followed, during which T. Paige mentioned she has several riders who seek dialysis treatment at home, to which D. Ritcey mentioned it is because of the liability paying for the treatment. S. Peace asked if the same liability program would reimburse volunteer driver program for dialysis rides? D. Ritcey replied that they potentially would as the program does not know who within the organization is providing the rides, just that the organization has an expense allocated to the purpose of providing rides to dialysis treatment. She added that the insurance needs to know that a driver is being provided to one of their members who would face an otherwise life-ending diagnosis. Some further discussion followed, during which J. Alden mentioned that she had provided rides three times a week to three customers as part of the town of Tilton, until they became riders of the current program being provided by CAPBM. D. Ritcey suggested this could be a new source of revenue to support the program. T. Paige thanked D. Ritcey for the suggestion.

T. Schamberg mentioned that T. Palmer joined the meeting virtually, and C. Yanski added that both L. Steadman and A. Pandolph also joined. T. Schamberg welcomed them, and A. Pandolph mentioned T. Palmer would be arriving in person shortly. A. Harmon asked if A. Pandolph was also in transit, or if she would be participating online, to which A. Pandolph replied she would be participating remotely. T. Schamberg made a motion to allow A. Pandolph to participate remotely, as she is working from her office and unable to travel to the meeting in time.

m/s/approved T. Schamberg/A. Harmon , unanimous

8 Yea, 0 Nay

## **7. SCC (State Coordinating Council for Community Transportation)**

a. **Annual Report**

C. Yanski began by mentioning the annual report the SCC provides to legislators and other interested members of the public. Some discussion followed, during which T. Schamberg pointed out the two graphics reflecting “current network” versus “network as envisioned”. Some discussion followed, during which C. Yanski handed out paper copies of the report to members in the room. T. Schamberg asked the opinion of the body about the potential of reaching the goal of “Turning the fragmented into the coordinated”, to which the group responded with hopeful skepticism. C. Yanski added stay tuned, to which there was general agreement.

b. **SCC Goals**

C. Yanski introduced the goals by inviting any of the several members of the SCC present to speak to the topic. D. Ritcey volunteered, and began by mentioning that the SCC leadership worked with a consultant over the summer of 2025 to develop a two-year plan consisting of originally eight goals, which has since been condensed to five instead. The plan is intended to engage all members of the SCC as well as members of the community who have a vested interest in transportation. She added that many of the points of the five goals have already begun being implemented at the RCC level, and further added that members of the SCC volunteered to be “champions” of the goals, as well as developing sub-committees for each goal. Unfortunately the sub-committees have not been able to begin working officially due to issues with fulfilling requirements of RSA 91-A; the primary concerns are what officially meets the definition of “committee”, and whether or not that committee’s members need to meet in person publicly, which has prompted consultation with the NH Department of Justice (DOJ). Some discussion followed, during which D. Ritcey mentioned the goals had originally been presented in September, but have been worked on in the following months at the full SCC meetings, and now the SCC is waiting on receiving input from the DOJ. T. Schamberg invited any other members who were present at the SCC meetings to speak, and some discussion followed during which A. Harmon put his support behind the goals. D. Ritcey suggested going through each of the goals, and C. Yanski agreed, apologizing to all members attending virtually that the list of goals was not able to be shared via the Zoom interface. A. Pandolph offered to put the information into the chat, and C. Yanski agreed.

Some further discussion followed, during which T. Schamberg asked if the goals would be part of an upcoming meeting on December 15<sup>th</sup>, to which D. Ritcey clarified that the meeting mentioned was a meeting between the SCC leadership team and the leadership teams of the eight RCCs. T. Schamberg suggested that the discussion of the individual goals be postponed until after the December meeting so as to give the Mid-State RCC time to read and reflect on the goals. He further added that it might also be helpful to wait as the discussion with the other RCC leadership members might reveal points worth sharing with the RCC.

There was general agreement, and T. Paige suggested in the meantime if members had any concerns, they could reach out to C. Yanski regarding the goals. D. Ritcey added that it was very important to her that the RCCs have a voice in the discussions of the SCC meetings, as the RCC members are the people doing the work “on the ground”.

## **8. Mobility Manager Update**

### **a. FTA 5310 service #s**

C. Yanski began by sharing via Zoom the numbers of 5310-funded rides for the various RCC providers, and added that Fred Butler at DOT sent an email containing ride numbers for the NH public transit ridership for all eight regions. C. Yanski thought that it would be interesting to compare and contrast the numbers, so she included them in the packet sent to all members electronically as well as to the members in the room. C. Yanski pointed out that Concord Area Transit increased by 8% for the current fiscal year, adding that it instead increased by 52.2 percent over the full time period shown of 2019 to 2025. There was general approval for the increase. Some discussion followed, during which C. Yanski noted that during the Covid pandemic there was a dip in ridership; the rural community providers have managed to bounce back in their numbers well, but the urban communities have not increased again as thoroughly. D. Ritcey asked if this was due to people getting their needs met through other means, such as other transportation options, or having goods and services delivered? T. Paige agreed that it may have been a piece of the reason for the lower return to pre-pandemic ridership numbers. Some further discussion followed, during which A. Harmon asked if that might have also been affected by some services closing, but T. Paige disagreed, saying she was unaware of any major services being unavailable. She added that there were changes in the ease of use of the services which may have had an impact, and added that many people also transitioned from in-person to remote work, and that they have not transitioned back which also has had an impact. D. Ritcey was surprised at how seven-and-a-half counties of the total counted as rural within the state, and how that also impacted the differences in ridership numbers. Further discussion followed, during which M. Baronas pointed out how the University of NH (UNH) numbers were very low, and wondered why. C. Yanski pointed out that there has been issues with low student enrollment, and A. Harmon added that state funding has also been a major issue for the last several years.

C. Yanski then began reviewing the RCC specific ride numbers by category, including BEAS (Bureau of Elderly and Adult Services) funded rides, VDP (volunteer driver program) numbers for CAPBM and Mid-State Transit specifically, as well as for Future in Sight and other providers. S. Peace asked who does BEAS fund? C. Yanski noted they fund Mid-State Transit (MST), and T. Paige further explained that BEAS will fund any public trips for elderly people over the age of 60, as well as people with a disability under that age. She further explained that CAPBM collects all the ride numbers for MST and invoices DHHS's (Department of Health and Human Services) BEAS III-B program for the expense of the rides for each one-way trip at a rate set by BEAS. She further added that BEAS used to only reimburse for round-trip rides, but CAPBM

negotiated successfully when the contracts were being written four years ago as it was costing MST too much to offer the rides if they were not reimbursed based on one-way trips instead. T. Palmer added that this discussion was why the SCC is focused on attempting to streamline the management of public transit systems, adding that if there was one set pot from DHHS going to public transit, the individual agencies could do what they do best without having to submit multiple reports to multiple agencies. Further discussion followed, and T. Paige explained that the Title 3 funds do not cover the MST rides for the full year, and the shortfall is then covered by RCC allocated funds, so they are not over budget. C. Yanski noted that a specific graph shows that allotment of rides are much smaller for that reason, and added that the rides are usually just expansion town services, highlighting Tilton, Loudon, Danbury, and Hill as well as specific rides for people with disabilities under 60 years old.

While reviewing the MST VDP rides, C. Yanski noted that the number of volunteer drivers is very low, adding that there are maybe five or six drivers covering the entire program. T. Paige agreed, and asked if anyone knows of someone wishing to volunteer, please give them a flier she has prepared so they can connect. D. Ritcey asked if the VDP was out of CAPBM, to which T. Paige and C. Yanski agreed. During the review of the number of denials for rides, D. Ritcey asked if there was seasonality to the increase in denials, to which T. Paige disagreed. She added that many of their drivers left when a change in when 1099 tax forms would be required for volunteer mileage reimbursement, and further added that she has not been able to entice any of those drivers to return. D. Ritcey asked at which dollar amount a 1099 form is required, to which several people replied with \$600 minimum. S. Peace asked if the RCC knows if there has been any advocacy directed at changing this, to which T. Paige replied that T. Palmer may know. T. Palmer said to contact your representatives on the issue, adding that many agencies including the SCC, many partner agencies, as well as the Alliance for Healthy Aging have been pushing to change the requirement. Some discussion followed, during which C. Yanski said that a coalition was meeting the next day to discuss efforts related to national legislation to change the volunteer reimbursement rate from 14 cents a mile to the business rate. A. Harmon asked if anyone knew what the specific bill numbers were, as T. Palmer had mentioned there was a bill in both the federal House of Representatives and Senate, to which T. Palmer replied HB 3032. She added it is referred to as the Volunteer Driver Tax Appreciation Act. A. Harmon also asked if any materials could be sent, saying he would be happy to write an editorial piece for either the NH Bulletin or other newspapers. T. Palmer said she would send something within the next few days. During the review of the Future in Sight ride numbers, C. Yanski noted a large increase in ridership for the month of September, and asked what was behind the surge. S. Peace responded that there is some amount of seasonal fluctuations in the number of ride requests, adding that she was unaware of any other reason for the jump in ridership. Some discussion followed regarding Lakes Region Mental Health (LRMH) center, during which C. Yanski mentioned the representative from LRMH had stepped down from the RCC where they had been serving prior to leaving the organization. She will have an update for the next meeting in February. T. Paige added that the overall partnership with LRMH

and MST is going very well, adding that a radio was transferred from a MST vehicle that was being retired so that the LRMH driver Don can now do real-time communications with the dispatcher regarding ridership. She further added that the partnership allows LRMH to take rides in the Laconia area when MST is unable to cover the rides, and the same when LRMH is unable to cover a ride for their system. She further added that LRMH is also investigating the possibility of becoming a Medicaid broker so as to increase the number of potential revenue sources. A. Harmon asked if there is any involvement with Representative Bill Bolton in Plymouth regarding the potential expansion of the services offered to the LRMH center in Plymouth? Some discussion followed, during which T. Paige replied that LRMH was not working with Rep Bolton as he was more interested in pursuing general fixed-route services, adding that LRMH would then shift their focus to demand response services to get their members to the Plymouth clinic.

C. Yanski then mentioned that T. Paige had put together a funding workplan. C. Yanski added that she is helping T. Paige with approaching potential corporate sponsors among other potential new revenue sources. Some discussion followed, during which D. Ritcey asked if T. Paige had approached any banks? T. Paige replied that the banks had all shifted to a grant system, and that while she had missed the window to apply for some, she has added their application deadlines to her calendar for the coming cycles. Further discussion followed, during which T. Paige added she is considering approaching some of the businesses that are near major stops in the system including the hospital systems like Dartmouth-Hitchcock and Concord Hospital. She further added that another idea she is considering is launching a "Adopt a bus stop" system where businesses could give a smaller but significant contribution and have a bus stop with their business's information available on it. D. Ritcey agreed that it was a good idea, adding that once businesses get their name on a stop, they are likely to keep supporting the "adopted" bus stop. T. Paige also mentioned that bus advertising is significantly decreased, and C. Yanski mentioned hoping to increase interest by posting fliers and a QR code at bus stops so that if people enjoyed the ride, they may feel like donating to MST or CAPBM.

## **9. Other or New Business**

C. Yanski mentioned some efforts on outreach to customers of CAPBM and MST to either ask for donations or to complete satisfaction surveys. T. Paige mentioned a potential partnership with Central NH Regional Planning Commission to perform a boarding and alighting study on the Concord public transit fixed-route system. She further added that CAPBM has an intern from UNH who is very focused on transit and has decided to focus his honors thesis for UNH on studying the Concord area transit system. She added that prior to the Covid pandemic, Concord Area Transit had launched a study to investigate potential changes to update and enhance all their bus routes, but prior to being able to offer public input for the study was forced to pause as the pandemic began. She concluded that the intern is willing to look over the study and see if new changes need to be made post-pandemic to the study for the routes. D. Ritcey asked when the internship ends, and T. Paige responded possibly in May.

T. Paige also mentioned that CAPBM is transitioning their software from Route Match to QRide, and added that while there are some small issues adjusting, there is forward progress and she is optimistic it will improve services at CAPBM. C. Yanski mentioned she has attended all the GACIT (Governor's Advisory Council on Intermodal Transportation) meetings in the region for the ten-year highway transportation plan, except for Franklin. T. Paige mentioned she had attended the Franklin meeting, and A. Harmon added he has also attended virtually.

C. Yanski mentioned on behalf of Glenn Trefethen at Lakes Region Planning Commission (LRPC) that LRPC is working on updating their 2015 Regional Master plan, and had sent several materials to C. Yanski. She said he wanted to be present, but could not due to a conflict with an all-day seminar. She further added that G. Trefethen had sent a survey, as well as a flier and a QR code to the survey. A. Harmon asked if any electronic copies of the materials could be forwarded, and C. Yanski replied that it was included in the meeting packet that was sent out. T. Paige asked how accessible QR codes were, and if A. Harmon has worked with such codes? A. Harmon replied that he has not checked specifically the codes sent in the packet, and added that his experience with the accessibility of QR codes in general is mixed due to some personal issues understanding how to interact with the technology on his smart phone. Some discussion followed, and several members attempted to read the QR code on the paper copies of the poster C. Yanski handed out. Some members were able to access the information using their phones, while others had some issues. T. Schamberg invited other members to share updates, and J. Cameron thanked the members of the group for letting her participate virtually, adding that the QR code worked great for her. A. Pandolph thanked the group for allowing her to participate. K. Smith thanked the group for inviting her, and said there was a lot of exciting information she will take back to her team. L. Steadman thanked the group for welcoming her, and thanked C. Yanski for sending her an invitation. C. Yanski replied any time! A. Harmon thanked the group and added that he spoke with Executive Councilor Joe Kenny after the Franklin GACIT hearing as he felt very nervous during his testimony. They spoke about several issues relating to the transportation plan, and A. Harmon was invited to attend a transportation round-table focused on an upcoming Rural Health Transformation grant that would provide some funding to transportation in the next year. C. Yanski also mentioned that A. Harmon had appeared on NH Public Radio, and A. Harmon added that he had given an interview relating to changes coming to Medicaid recipients and how they qualify between federal and state legislation. He explained that there would be work requirements being implemented, and as part of those requirements anyone on Medicaid would have to prove that they are exempt from the requirements or that they fulfilled the requirements. He further added that one of the biggest problems is that applicants could not self-attest, so either an employer, educational facility, or some other person would have to vouch for the recipient.

M. Baronas mentioned that the October Commute Smart Fall Challenge went very well, having its highest participation since the creation of the program at just over 120 participants. He added that as a result, there were 26,000 miles not driven. He added

that a colleague named Riley has taken over administering the program in the region, and hoped that this would be good momentum for driving app usage in the spring competition that consists more of organizations rather than individual users. C. Yanski mentioned that she had promoted the Commute Smart app to the mobility manager network at their most recent meeting, and a concern had been raised regarding privacy of data submitted to the Commute Smart site given the various tools the site and app use. She suggested that if there was a representative from Agile Mile who could give a presentation and allay those concerns, she would be very interested. M. Baronas agreed, and said that there is an account agent for Agile Mile he could speak with. He agreed to speak with both the agent as well as Riley regarding the concerns and follow up with more information in future. T. Palmer added she had already emailed Commute Smart about this issue, and some discussion followed. M. Baronas thought that the more contacts made to Agile Mile about the topic, the better chance that someone would be able to connect with the mobility manager network on the concerns raised.

S. Peace mentioned that she had attended the RCC meeting for Region 8 prior to the meeting, and one concern that was mentioned was the potential gaps in service for VDPs and other services. She suggested it could be a good topic for future conversations for Mid-State RCC on a future meeting when the agenda was not so full. Some discussion followed, and S. Peace pointed out that looking at a map of services for the region, the area of Concord seems very well covered, but there are gaps that emerge when the number of dropped ride requests are analyzed. C. Yanski agreed and added that one of the focuses of the SCC has been a state-wide needs assessment on gaps in service. Several members expressed a desire to see the results of the assessment as soon as it is concluded. T. Schamberg agreed that this topic could be revisited at a future meeting as an agenda item.

D. Ritcey echoed A. Harmon's discussion of the Medicaid requirements from earlier, adding that GSIL put out an advocacy alert the day prior discussing in depth the changes to Medicaid regarding the requirements. She offered to email that alert to C. Yanski so it can be shared with the RCC members, to which C. Yanski agreed. D. Ritcey added that the implementation of the changes would be in place by the same time the following year. S. Peace asked if D. Ritcey thought Service Link could handle the assisting in attesting to the exemptions or fulfillment of the work requirements, and some discussion followed. D. Ritcey said that she thought whomever would be tasked with assisting on that piece would need to improve their systems to handle the volume of work that would be involved, adding that she thought the system could be properly solidified in the years' time if the correct people were "at the table", but that they were not currently. Some further discussion followed, and S. Peace expressed the concern of wondering who to direct people to in order to complete the requirements. T. Paige was concerned the ADRCs, formally known as Service Link, would not be able to address the topic, as she thought they only worked with Medicare clients. J. Cameron responded that she worked previously for the ADRCs for Belknap and Carroll counties and added that the focus is on the individual client and

their needs, regardless of if they are a recipient of services from Medicare, Medicaid, or other services.

T. Schamberg thanked C. Lewis for attending, and C. Lewis thanked the group.

T. Palmer mentioned that the statewide needs assessment is wrapping up its study phase, and asked if any paper surveys were still pending to please get them to Jenn Buteau at Impact Consulting or a mobility manager. She further added that hopefully some draft reports would be generated in December or January, but that they would go to the Commission on Aging first as they are the organization hosting the assessment process. She repeated the announcement about the meeting between SCC Leadership and the RCC leadership teams on December 15<sup>th</sup>. She further added that the Keep NH Moving web site's event calendar is still not working correctly, and as a result the events calendar cannot be updated with new information. She asked to still have information sent to her regarding events as since as soon as the web site is fixed, she will upload the event information to the site.

T. Schamberg reiterated the need to pass the Volunteer Driver Tax Appreciation act, adding that it is important not to take away what few supports they have remaining.

**10. Adjournment**

T. Schamberg asked for a motion to adjourn. C. Yanski mentioned the next meeting would be held on the 10<sup>th</sup> of February, with a location to be determined.

m/s/approved M. Baronas/D. Ritcey, unanimous

Adjourned at 3:31 PM.

Minutes recorded by Andrew Harmon

