JOINT LEGISLATIVE FISCAL COMMITTEE

Legislative Office Building, Rooms 210-211 Concord, NH Friday, July 20, 2018

Committee Members:

Rep. Neal Kurk, Chairman

Rep. Lynne Ober

Rep. Frank Byron (Alt.)

Rep. Mary Jane Wallner

Rep. Dan Eaton

Sen. Gary Daniels

Sen. Lou D'Allesandro

Sen. Regina Birdsell

Sen. Bob Giuda

Sen. John Reagan

(The meeting convened at 10:04 a.m.)

(1) Acceptance of Minutes of the June 15, 2018 meeting

NEAL KURK, State Representative, Hillsborough County,

District #02 and Chairman: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to
the July 20th, 2018, Fiscal Committee meeting. I'd like to
welcome as our newest permanent member Senator Birdsell. Good to
have you with us.

REGINA BIRDSELL, State Senator, Senate District #19: Thank you.

 $\underline{\text{CHAIRMAN KURK}}\colon$ The first item on our agenda is the -- agenda Item No. 1, the acceptance of the minutes of June 15th, 2018.

** DANIEL EATON, State Representative, Cheshire County, District #03: Move.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Moved by Representative Eaton.

GARY DANIELS, State Senator, Senate District #11: Second.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Seconded by Senator Daniels. Discussion. Questions. There being none, are you ready for the question? All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye? Opposed? The ayes have it and the minutes are approved.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

(2) Old Business:

CHAIRMAN KURK: Now turn to agenda Item No. 2, Old Business. I understand there's going to be a motion to remove Fiscal 18-136 from the table.

** LOU D'ALLESANDRO, State Senator, Senate District #20: Mr. Chairman, I move 18-136 from the table.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Is there a second?

ROBERT "BOB" GIUDA, State Senator, Senate District #02: Second.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Senator D'Allesandro moves, seconded by Representative Giuda, that the item be removed from the table. This is non-debatable. I'd like a show of hands on this. If you're in favor of removing this from the table, please indicate by raising your hand. Opposed? The motion carries.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

** SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: I would like to move the item.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Senator D'Allesandro moves the adoption of Fiscal 18-136, which is a request from the Adjutant General Department for authorization to accept and expend \$200,000 in Other Funds and establish two full-time temporary Veteran Service Officer positions. This was tabled at our last meeting. Is there a second? Senator Giuda seconds Senator D'Allesandro's motion. Senator, do you wish to speak to your motion?

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: I think we -- everyone -- Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe everyone has received additional information which was on our desk. And I think there's a dramatic need that's been manifested in the narrative. And I would hope, recognizing the fact this is only for Fiscal Year 19, and if the process is to continue it has to go through the legislative process. I think veterans need our support, they need our help. If you just look at the magnitude of phone calls and the services that are required, I think it's essential that we move this item. With that, I end my narrative, Mr. Chairman. I want to be very brief at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Thank you, Senator. Representative Ober.

LYNNE OBER, State Representative, Hillsborough County,

District #37: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm in opposition to this

for a variety of reasons. The new document we start with, the

new documentation has some inaccuracies in it. We had some

additional information yesterday. If you read the Executive

Order, the Executive Order clearly states that a prime mission

is to get a central point of contact for veterans to call.

I checked the Adjutant General's website last night at 8:00 p.m. There is no mention, zero mention of any veteran services. No phone call to call, no number, no mention of anything. That was one of the prime things when we had this before last month, I pointed out that there were some things that needed to be done.

We have a bill in the House that is in interim study on this. My husband was the prime sponsor. Many of the people here already know this, but my husband flew more than 400 combat missions over North Vietnam. He did four tours of duty. He has a silver star which is not very often awarded. He is contacted constantly, veterans who don't know how to reach this or reach that.

Representative Baldasaro is in the room. He and I are co-sponsors of this legislation. Both of us also have instances where people call us, VFWs, American Legions, trying to help a vet, wanting a central point, not even knowing where to call. That was in the Executive Order. And there is nothing on his website yet to even indicate that they're doing veteran services.

Yesterday, I asked Commissioner Meyers, who's a consummate team player, if we take 200,000 out of the Expanded Medicaid dollars, which is what this is going to do, out of Expanded Medicaid, we had that confirmed by the CFO at HHS yesterday, Commissioner Meyers said he would, can you meet your lapse? And Commissioner Meyers said the Governor asked me to provide this money. I am going to work with the Governor and do everything I can to help everybody, the consummate team player. We do not give crystal balls to any agency. If we did, everybody could meet their lapse.

We have a disagreement with Mr. Meyers. We think a lapse is you reduce spending. He think it's a combination of I reduce spending and I got more money. We have a respectful disagreement. We are just going to continue to disagree, but we have not seen a lapse met in HHS for three years. I'm very concerned about transferring money because of that.

Two years ago we had to have a bill to put 37 million extra into HHS because they not only weren't meeting their lapse, they had money to spend. So the Adjutant General has not done the prime thing, which is set up the central point of contact. He just wants more money, and he wants to add staff. That is why I continue to be against this. We need to provide our veterans one phone number where they can call and easily reach the people that are going to be served, and this proposal does not do that. I am going to be a no vote.

I also know from talking to Commissioner Goulet, and you have in your books DOJ is adding the staff, they need \$1,400 to buy a computer, hardware and software. Somehow the Adjutant

General needs 2,000 per PC or asking for an additional 1,200 in that level. I think at the very least you could cut this request if you're determined to pass it down to be 160,000, and tell Commissioner Meyers you are also doing a good job, we are leaving at least 40,000 thousand extra. And thank you for being a team player and giving up the money, but I'm going to be a no vote on this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further discussion or questions? There being none, the motion before us is to pass Fiscal 18-136. If you're in favor of that, please now raise your hand? If you're opposed.

(Representatives Kurk and Ober were opposed.)

CHAIRMAN KURK: The motion carries 8 to 2.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

(3) RSA 14:30-a, III Audit Topic Recommendation by Legislative Performance Audit and Oversight Committee

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: We now turn to Item No. 3 on our agenda. This is an audit topic recommendation by the Legislative Performance and Oversight Committee. Is there a motion?

** JOHN REAGAN, State Senator, Senate District #17: Move to approve.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Senator Reagan moves to approve Fiscal 18-141.

REP. OBER: Second.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Somebody other than Representative Ober want to second this? Thank you, Senator Daniels.

REP. OBER: I wrote the letter asking for it.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Senator Daniels is seconding this, to approve the recommendation for a performance audit of the Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation. Discussion? Questions? There being none, are you ready for the question? If you're in favor of the motion, please now indicate by saying aye? Opposed? The ayes have it and the motion passes.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

CONSENT CALENDAR

(4) RSA 9:16-a, Transfers Authorized:

CHAIRMAN KURK: We turn now to agenda Item No. 4, the Consent Calendar. There are two items on this, Fiscal 18-142 and Fiscal 18-147. Does anyone wish to remove either one of these from the table? Is there a motion?

** SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: So move.

SEN. BIRDSELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Moved by Senator D'Allesandro, seconded by Senator Birdsell that the two items on the Consent Calendar under agenda item four be approved. Discussion? Questions? There being none, are you ready for the question? All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye? Opposed? The ayes have it and the item is approved. The two items are approved.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

(5) RSA 14:30-a, VI Fiscal Committee Approval Required for Acceptance and Expenditure of Funds Over \$100,000 from Any Non-State Source:

CHAIRMAN KURK: Turn now to agenda Item No. 5. There are three items on this, Fiscal 18-144, 148, and 149. Does anyone wish to remove any one of these from the table? The Department

of Education. I'd like to remove that from the table. So there are two remaining, 144 and 149. Is there a motion?

** SEN. BIRDSELL: So move.

SEN. DANIELS: Second.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Senator Birdsell moves that agenda Items 144 and 148 -- 149 -- 144 and 149 be approved. Is there a second? Seconded by Senator Daniels. Discussion? Questions? There being none, are you ready for the question? All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye? Opposed? The ayes have it and those two items are approved.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

CHAIRMAN KURK: We'll now take up Fiscal 18-148, a request from the Department of Education for authorization to expend \$500,000 in Other Funds through June 30th, 2019. Is there someone from the Department who is interested in answering questions? Good morning, Commissioner.

FRANK EDELBLUT, Commissioner, Department of Education: Good morning, how are you?

CHAIRMAN KURK: Now that you're here, we are doing much better.

 $\underline{\texttt{MR. EDELBLUT}}$: For the record, Frank Edelblut, Commissioner of Education.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Thank you.

TAMMY VAILLANCOURT, Department of Education: Tammy Vaillancourt, Department of Education.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Good morning to both of you. This is a grant of -- gift -- grant of 500 -- \$500,000 from the Pfizer Foundation to be used for a variety of purposes, and I have two

concerns. The first one deals with how you're going to evaluate this program. It doesn't look as though you're interested at all in outcomes. Could you please indicate whether or not you're going to measure the success of this program by the outcomes it achieves as opposed to describing engagement and reach and things of that nature?

MR. EDELBLUT: Yes. So this item came before the Fiscal Committee probably about nine months ago at this point in time, and you granted us the ability to receive the funds but not expend the funds. In the interim time, we have spent a lot of time with the grantor, as well as with possible suppliers of these services, to try and get a sense as to how these services might affect the clients that they're serving. I think the best way to describe this is the grantor, so in this case it was Pfizer Corporation, who has provided us the funds, holds the belief that transition housing is an important component of the ultimate recovery process, and so they have given us these funds to be able to use for transitionary housing.

They have not created in the grant any type of a performance requirement. They have not said that this money, because it's received as a grant, will necessarily move the needle for these individuals, but that is a service that they are interested in providing. And so we are coming before you today so that we can now execute the grant the way that the grantor had asked us to do that.

CHAIRMAN KURK: You spoke about the next question I was going to ask because the relationship between housing and the opioid crisis for the Department of Education as opposed to the Department of Health and Human Services is murky to me. But let's get back to my first question.

MR. EDELBLUT: So just to respond to that. I think that the reason why we are dealing with the, you know, the transitionary housing is simply because it was bundled within this grant. The most -- the bulk of this grant is going to be used for educational programs. And I think that that is why it resides at

the Department of Education. There is a small portion of this grant which is what I was referring to which is dealing with the transition housing and that came along really with the grant.

CHAIRMAN KURK: I'll ask the question about that in a moment, But let's get to outcomes. I understand that the grantor may not want outcomes, but in this state I would hope that we are looking not simply to spend money on a project and see what happens. We'd like to spend money on a project and know what we're getting. So, for example, I assume the purpose of this is to reduce the amount of opioid abuse by students in this state. Is that --

MR. EDELBLUT: So if you look at the overall grant that would be the case. And so there are the first two components which are going to deal directly with that. The third component is really to provide the transition housing.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Let's talk about the first two components.

MR. EDELBLUT: Great.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Are you going to be able to tell us at the end that this program worked in such a way that those students -- of those students who were reached by the program, there was a lower abuse of opioids for X period of time into the future compared to students who were not reached by the program?

MR. EDELBLUT: So the way that this grant -- the way we anticipate moving forward with this grant is using a model called the 40 Developmental Assets. It is a framework for -- what's referred to as a Framework for Resiliency that build resiliency in students and families and communities. It has been around for 40 years and has quite a bit of research that demonstrates that it is able to build a resiliency that is on the front-end in terms of prevention of students getting involved in drugs or other adverse behaviors that result in poor outcomes for the student. So there is actually quite a bit of research backing up how that portion of the grant will be

developed and deployed. And just to your point, during this interim period, we have had three different RFPs out to different communities to try and get responses to those. None to date has been satisfactory in terms of demonstrating an ability to actually move the needle which is why it's taken us some time to bring this back till we find something that is actually going to make a difference.

CHAIRMAN KURK: So your answer to the question is I don't think we really need to do that because this is an ongoing program that has been researched so heavily that we know statistically from other efforts that if we institute this program, the following — and I'm not talking about the specifics — the following will happen.

MR. EDELBLUT: We do know that it has efficacy.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Thank you. Now let's get to the -- the housing element. Is this for parents and for children? I mean, could you explain who's going to take advantage of this?

MR. EDELBLUT: So this would be for individuals who are in recovery and when they leave the recovery facilities they --

CHAIRMAN KURK: Are these students?

MR. EDELBLUT: So they could be students or they could be adults. No determination has been made in terms of who would qualify for that. The grant allows it to be open to all different categories.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: And is it possible that you'll involve the Health and Human Services Department?

MR. EDELBLUT: I think it would make sense to coordinate with the Health and Human Services Department on that.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Overlapping programs sometimes are not efficient.

MR. EDELBLUT: Right.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Thank you. Senator Daniels.

SEN. DANIELS: Thank you. To that point, is it permissible for Health and Human Services to be one of the providers that you would go out to where funds could be co-mingled with those that are already being used for transitional housing?

 $\underline{\text{MR. EDELBLUT}}\colon$ So the grantor has expressed some -- some desire to direct the funds. And so I would have to check with them.

REP. OBER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Representative Ober.

REP. OBER: Commissioner, thank you for coming. One of my concerns with the transition housing here is not you guys using it or whatever. But we have, I think, staff at HHS who probably do that. And I have a feeling you don't have staff in Department of Education who spend their life getting housing. So how is the staffing going to work and how can you collaborate with HHS and perhaps get some synergy even if the grantor wishes to direct how some of the money is spent?

MR. EDELBLUT: So we have been working with an organization in Portsmouth called Safe Harbor which is a recovery center to help them boost their capacity, really, to be able to provide this transitionary housing. And so that is kind of how we have been engaging the funds so far.

REP. OBER: Thank you.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Further questions or discussion? There being -- thank you, Commissioner. The motion before us is -- no, there is no motion. Is there a motion?

** REP. OBER: I'll move.

SEN. GIUDA: Second.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Representative Ober moves, second by Senator Giuda, that the item be approved. Discussion? Questions? There being none, are you ready for the question? All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye? Opposed? The ayes have it. The item is approved. Thank you, Commissioner.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

(6) RSA 124:15 Positions Authorized:

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: We now turn to item number -- agenda Item No. 6. Again, Consent Calendar item ,but there's only one on here, Fiscal 18-150. Is there a motion?

** REP. OBER: Move to approve.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Is there a second?

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: Second.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Moved by Representative Ober, seconded by Senator D'Allesandro, that the item be approved. Questions? Discussion? There being none, are you ready for the question? Senator Giuda.

SEN. GIUDA: Is there someone from DOJ?

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Good morning, Mr. Attorney General. Welcome.

GORDON MacDONALD, ESQ., Attorney General, Department of Justice: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Could you and your assistant identify yourselves for the record? Thank you.

MR. MacDONALD: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Gordon MacDonald. I'm the Attorney General. With me is Kathy Carr who's the Director of Administration for the Department of Justice.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Senator Giuda.

SEN. GIUDA: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Attorney General, for taking my question.

As I read through the body of this 18-150, on Page 3 of 4, top paragraph, it talks about expected costs and increase and so forth. And then there's a statement that this will likely result in an additional increase in the number of subgrants needed to be overseen. So what we're doing here was a pre-funding based on an expectation, and I find that concerning as far as fiscal response, you know, fiscal conservatism. And so I guess my question is what's the current workload, how many staff do you have to carry that workload, and are these positions going to be new or replacement positions?

 $\underline{\text{MR. MacDONALD}}$: Thank you, Senator, for the question. For the Committee's benefit, maybe I can step back and explain what's going on here.

In 1984, Congress passed the Victims of Crime Act. And as part of that Act it created the Crime Victim's Fund. The Crime Victim's Fund is comprised entirely of fines, restitution payments, and the like, paid by federal defendants. No federal tax dollars are in the fund.

Under law, the fund is supposed to be distributed to states, responsible agencies, in our case, the Department of Justice, for distribution to service providers who provide direct services to victims of crime. For many years, the amount coming out of the Crime Victim's Fund was kept artificially low, in my opinion, by Congress, and the balance built up. There is a very considerable balance in that fund.

In recent years, Congress has started to release funds on a more appropriate basis. Over the last two years, the amount coming to New Hampshire has increased by \$6.6 million from approximately \$2 million to \$8.6 million. Earlier this year and well after our budget submission, we learned that the VOCA Grant coming to New Hampshire at the end of this federal fiscal year will increase by another \$4 million. So our state will be receiving \$12.6 million in VOCA funds.

This presents an incredible opportunity, in my opinion, to transfer -- to step back, assess how we are delivering victim services, and to make good decisions about the use of these funds going forward. And to that end, we have commenced a process where we're doing a needs assessment, a broad survey about the way we're delivering these services now, our needs going forward, 5, 10, and 15 years into the future. As part of that, I have established a steering committee made up of members of the General Court, leaders in the victim services community, and law enforcement, and we're collaborating on this needs assessment.

With that opportunity, though, Senator, and Members of the Committee, comes an obligation. We must be good stewards of these funds. And under Federal Law, we have responsibility to make sure that the funds are appropriately used and that responsibility falls to my office.

We have a Grants Management Unit in our office. There are 5.5 employees within that unit. And with respect to VOCA funds, their responsibility is to conduct annual audits and biennial on-site visits.

Senator, I -- I acknowledge your point and, believe me, I did not become Attorney General to grow government. But I also have a responsibility, as do we all, to use these funds and spend them responsibly. I anticipate that the number of subgrantees receiving these funds will substantially increase from the current 80 in the program, and that's going to happen

over the course of the current Fiscal Year, between now and July $1^{\rm st}$. And that, Senator, is the basis for the request.

Can I tell you today how much -- how many more sub- grantees there are going to be? No. That is going to be a function of this needs assessment. But even doing the needs assessment and making responsible decisions about where this money is going to go is going to require additional staff from our office.

So I hope -- sort of a long winded answer, Senator, but I hope gave a little bit of background and context.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Follow-up.

SEN. GIUDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can understand the situation you find yourselves in. The question that rises to me is why do you not wait until the needs assessment is complete? That will give us a clear picture of where we need to go and how we need to spend.

MR. MacDONALD: One of the issues we are dealing with, Senator, is we are losing -- we have got turnover within the Grants Management Unit that we're anticipating we are losing one long-standing staff member to retirement. And so there is -- there is a need for the capacity within the Grants Management Unit and that's point one. And point two is to do this needs assessment, we need some staff help.

SEN. GIUDA: Thank you for taking my question.

MR. MacDONALD: Thank you, Senator.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further questions?

** REP. EATON: So move.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Seeing none.

FRANK BYRON, State Representative, Hillsborough County, District #20: The motion is approved by Representative Ober, seconded by Senator D'Allesandro.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further discussion or questions? Are you ready for the question? If you're in favor of the motion approving this item, please now indicate by saying aye? Opposed? The ayes have it. The item is approved. Thank you, both.

MR. MacDONALD: Thank you.

- *** {MOTION ADOPTED}
- (7) RSA 14:30-A, VI Fiscal Committee Approval Required for Acceptance and Expenditure of Funds Over \$100,000 from Any Non-State Source and RSA 124:15 Positions Authorized:

CHAIRMAN KURK: We now turn to agenda Item No. 7, Fiscal 18-143, a request from Health and Human Services for authorization to accept and expend \$2,966,646 in federal funds and contingent upon that approval, establish Class 046-Consultants. Is there a motion?

** SEN. REAGAN: So move.

SEN. BIRDSELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Senator Reagan moves, seconded by Senator Birdsell that the item be approved. Discussion? \$3 million and no discussion. I'm impressed. Are you ready for the question. All those in favor --

REP. OBER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Representative Ober.

REP. OBER: Can we talk to Commissioner Goulet, please.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Good morning, Commissioner. Welcome and thank you for being here.

<u>DENIS GOULET</u>, Commissioner, Department of Information <u>Technology</u>: Good morning, Chairman, Members of the Committee. For the record, Denis Goulet, the Commissioner of the Department of Information Technology

CHAIRMAN KURK: Representative Ober has a question.

REP. OBER: Thank you. I know Commissioner Meyers is so happy I didn't call on him. He's wondering why I called on you. But every time we move forward with more storage, more this, digitizing records, whatever, we are encountering multiple agencies, because many of our records have to be also archived with the State Archives and some of those need to be available to the public; but we're also looking at how to keep them backed up, how to store them, how to do appropriate handling. In a digital world, and since you're DoIT Commissioner, in a digital world can you talk to us about how globally we're going to do this? Because I don't want to see the state start buying one system for one agency, one system for another, and then have to backup 50 systems and have off-site backup for 50 systems. We need to think enterprise wide, not agency wide, and this is definitely a piece of that.

MR. GOULET: Correct. And that issue that you identified and highlighted there is -- is the main reason that we requested and received the appropriation for an archiving assessment that is now in our 18-19 Capital Budget. So as part of that appropriation, the requirement was that we work with the State Archivist on -- excuse me -- on an assessment of how -- where we stand with respect to enterprise archiving, meaning how would we do it, state writ large versus agency, by agency, by agency. So that is the scope of work.

We have not for various reasons, which I'd be happy to explain, we haven't made much progress on that, to be frank; but we are intending to and that is in our backup. But other things

have kept us busy and both on the State Archivist side, as well as the DoIT side. So, clearly, an enterprise solution is required, and that's why I thought the assessment was so important because to get outside evaluation and people who have expertise in that can look at it objectively and say, all right, you know, what are we doing well, what aren't we doing, and what are the best practices associated with that by looking at each entity. Because if you walk around many of the State buildings you'll see paper all over the place. And so, to me, that's a real problem, in addition to the fact that, you know, we are building space to store things.

There are challenges with digital archiving, that is, when digital media ages out over time so that's one of the big -- so on the one side we can store stuff in a lot smaller area if we digitize it. On the other side we have to be really careful that we don't -- we fail to meet our requirements to archives by virtue of the fact that the digital media ages out and then becomes useless. So that's at the high level summary of where we are, Representative Ober.

REP. OBER: May I follow-up?

CHAIRMAN KURK: Follow-up.

REP. OBER: So, Commissioner Goulet, you'd be approving this, which I'm inclined to do, but I just wanted to know if we approve this are we fitting within your vision for an enterprise or are we starting down a road where only one agency will have something and not fit into the whole global enterprise piece when you get ready?

MR. GOULET: No, this would not compromise our needs, because archiving systems will be -- will be downstream of system of record.

REP. OBER: Thank you.

MR. GOULET: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further questions? Representative Byron.

<u>REP. BYRON</u>: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner Goulet, part of this, about 34,000 of this, I guess, goes towards the archiving function that DHHS is going to be implementing?

MR. GOULET: Hm-hum.

<u>REP. BYRON</u>: When will that equipment be purchased and installed and up and running?

MR. GOULET: I don't know the answer to that, sir.

REP. BYRON: Are you aware that there's a drop dead date of November 1, 2018, in which a report has to be issued for the Senate Bill 62 title program? Will the installation be done by then?

MR. GOULET: Yes, that's the intent.

REP. BRYON: Yes?

MR. GOULET: I'm sorry, that's the intent, sir.

REP. BYRON: Okay. Thank you.

REP. OBER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Representative Ober.

REP. OBER: You're going to install, but isn't it Commissioner Meyers and his staff who has to write the report? And so the real question is you get it installed. Maybe we should ask Commissioner Meyers how he is feeling about the schedule and get you off the hot seat, Commissioner Goulet.

MR. GOULET: Well, I'll make a comment on that, and then you can proceed to ask follow-ups, if you wish. You know, the effort's collaborative. So on the one side, you know, we work

with Commissioner Meyers' team on all of these issues, what do we have to deliver, and which piece of it is the DoIT responsibility, and what are our required dates. We are very accustom to working on and in these particular areas with -- with, you know, tight dates that requires everybody to rally and make it happen. So from a process perspective that's what we do. It's not one over the other. It's a very collaborative effort, and we're accustom to doing these kind of things and that's all I can comment on that.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further discussion or questions? Thank you, Commissioner. Are you ready for the question? The motion before us is to approve this item. If you're in favor of that motion, please now indicate by saying aye? Opposed? The ayes have it, and the item is approved.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

(8) RSA 126-AA:2, I(d), New Hampshire Granite Advantage Health Care Program Established:

CHAIRMAN KURK: We turn now to agenda Item No. 6 -- number 8, Fiscal 18-153, a request from the Department of Health and Human Services for review and approval for the Granite Advantage Health Care Program waiver application and related State Plan Amendments. Good morning, Commissioner, thank you for sitting in the hot seat.

<u>Human Services</u>: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee. For the record, Jeff Meyers, the Commissioner of Health and Human Services; and with me this morning is Medicaid Director, Henry Lipman, as well as Deputy Medicaid Director Deb Scheetz, and she may participate in this depending on the questions that are asked as well. Would you like me to proceed?

CHAIRMAN KURK: I would like you to proceed very much.

MR. MEYERS: Thank you. What is in front of you are five documents; a waiver application in the form that it is required to be put in for submission to the Federal Government, as well as four State Plan Amendments that implement the waiver that are required by Federal Law. The waiver application, as the Chairman just noted, is for the issuance of authority by the Federal Government for New Hampshire to create and establish the Granite Advantage Health Care Program that was established in Senate Bill 313 into which the new adult group, the Medicaid Expansion population that is currently being served in New Hampshire Health Protection Program would be placed, and would be transitioned from coverage and qualified private plans on the Exchange to our Managed Care product to be served by -- initially to be served by our two existing Managed Care Organizations and to be served by, hopefully, three Managed Care Organizations, once the re-procurement is completed next year.

What the Department has done is this application is a verbatim reflection of the requirements of Senate Bill 313. So under this waiver application, we are requesting the Federal Government for authority to move folks, which we have to do, we have to make this request, to move them from the individual health plans on the Exchange into Managed Care.

We have requested the re-issuance of our Work and Community Engagement Waiver that was granted for the Health Protection Program to be extended and granted for this Granite Advantage Health Care Program. The Work and Community Engagement requirement that was issued some months ago was solely for the New Hampshire Health Protection Program. That program goes away on December 31st of 2018. And starting on January 1st, 2019, assuming that the requisite documents are approved by the Federal Government, under 313 the State will start the Granite Advantage Health Care Program.

So the waiver application requests that, and it makes clear what the benefits structure is for the population, and every other aspect of Senate Bill 313. So we believe we have faithfully incorporated every aspect of Senate Bill 313 into

this application. And the State Plan Amendments, as are noted, are for various requirements under that bill and under Federal Law. So the Alternative Benefit Plan — the Federal Government requires that the benefit plan, even though it is going to be the same for the standard population in this new program, is actually placed into what is called an Alternative Benefit Plan that is regulated under a State Plan Amendment. There are cost-sharing requirements. We are submitting the cost-sharing SPA.

There was a lot of attention in the process of formulating Senate Bill 313 to limiting the costs of the state and county correctional authorities when someone is about to leave and go back to the community that they be able to be able to turn on to Medicaid if they qualify and to ensure that while they're incarcerated they are eligible for Medicaid in the sole instance that the Federal Government authorized a payment to Medicaid to someone who is incarcerated and that is when they have to be admitted as an inpatient for more than 24 hours for a medical procedure. And we wanted to ensure that the Department of Corrections would not lose funds. We would not increase, in fact, the General Fund obligation of the Corrections Department because we could not tap into the Medicaid reimbursement for those prisoners in that one situation.

So we are dealing with that by seeking authority from the Federal Government to allow the State and County Correction Departments to do presumptive eligibility. In other words, that they can determine an inmate eligible for Medicaid under guidelines and under training that we will provide, obviously, to the correctional authorities so that they can capture that Medicaid reimbursement.

And then, lastly, as noted on Page 2 in the letter addressed to the Chairman, we are moving the population into Managed Care. We have to do so under State Plan Amendment. I am happy to answer, and Henry is with me, we're happy to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Thank you, Commissioner. I understand you're in a position to explain to us some of the long-term care aspects here. Would you?

MR. MEYERS: Right. Do you want to state your question or you just like to explain the question that you posed yesterday?

CHAIRMAN KURK: The concern that I raised was this. Under our current system when a person who is on Medicaid requires long-term care services, it's not covered under the Managed Care Program. It's covered under a fee-for-service arrangement, and the County nursing homes and the State split the non-federal share 50/50.

MR. MEYERS: Right.

CHAIRMAN KURK: There's a provision in this waiver request that the expanded population, from 18 to 64, who are not eligible for traditional Medicaid, will receive some long-term care benefits. My concern is to understand what the relationship is between those benefits and the traditional benefits, both in terms of what they are, and who pays for it?

 $\underline{\texttt{MR. MEYERS}} \colon$ Thank you. I'm going to ask Henry to address it initially.

HENRY LIPMAN, Director, Office of Medicaid and Business Policy, Department of Health and Human Services: Sure. The definition of long-term services and supports there's a state definition and a federal definition starting point. But with respect to the County's obligations under this, the County share, the change that's requested in this waiver will not change the obligations to the County. What is paid under the Managed Care Organizations does not add to the County share burden, if you will. And that is the way it works today, and that's the way it will work when they're transitioned from the Exchange onto the Medicaid Care Management Program by the MCOs.

CHAIRMAN KURK: So let me see if I understand this. For the traditional Medicaid population there's no change. Counties will not have a greater or a lesser burden as a result of this new program. With respect to the new expanded population, the Counties will not have an increased burden because this will be covered under the Managed Care Organizations, and they will be paid with 90% Federal dollars, 10% State dollars, and none of the 10% State dollars will be split 50/50 with the Counties.

MR. LIPMAN: That is correct.

MR. MEYERS: Correct.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: So there will be no additional financial burden on Counties.

MR. LIPMAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Thank you. Senator Daniels.

SEN. DANIELS: Thank you. The question Representative Kurk asked was regarding long-term care. You answered with the term long-term services. Am I to assume that those terms are synonymous?

MR. MEYERS: They are. I'm sorry, they're synonymous.

SEN. DANIELS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Senator Giuda.

 $\underline{\text{SEN. GIUDA}}\colon$ Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner, thank you for taking my question.

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

SEN. GIUDA: Do you anticipate any difficulty with the work requirement being constituted under Granite Advantage under the current program?

MR. MEYERS: No, I don't.

SEN. GIUDA: Thank you.

MR. MEYERS: We received no indication from CMS. We have weekly calls. Everything is going forward according to what we would expect and we don't foresee any difficulty in having it approved.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further question or discussion? Before we vote, Commissioner, let me repeat what I said to you yesterday. I've read a lot of waiver applications and a lot of documents that come before Fiscal Committee, and they're usually written in very technical legalese type language that's difficult to understand. But this particular application was written in a way that was in what I would call plain English, easy to understand, and I want to applaud you and whomever helped you write this --

MR. MEYERS: Yes, yes.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: -- for doing that. If everyone, and your agency in other cases, also were held to these high standards, it would be much easier for citizens and members of this Committee to deal with. So thank you for doing that.

MR. MEYERS: Thank you for the remarks.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further discussion? Questions? There being none, are you ready for the question? The motion is to approve.

REP. BYRON: There is no motion.

** SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: Move to approve.

SEN. BIRDSELL: Second.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: 18-153.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Thank you. I thought we had a motion. Senator D'Allesandro, seconded by Senator Birdsell, moves we approve item 15 -- sorry -- 18-153 under agenda item number eight. Are you ready for that question? All those in favor, please indicate by saying aye? Opposed? The ayes have it. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. LIPMAN: Thank you.

*** {MOTION ADOPTED}

(9) Miscellaneous:

(10) Informational Materials:

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: There are no other items before us that require our action. Are there any questions under any of the informational items? Senator D'Allesandro.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: I thought the Commissioner was going to come before us to give us a quick précis -- I thought the Commissioner was going to come before us today and give us a quick précis on the \$22.9 million and the application he's submitting and where -- what direction we were going to be moving in with regard to that -- that allocation of funds from the Federal Government as there's an urgency in that you have to have the completion by August; correct?

MR. MEYERS: Correct.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: I thought he was going to give us a quick overview of what's going on at the present time. I would like that.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: I agree that we had requested that, and if the Commissioner is willing to do that now that would be fine.

 $\underline{\text{MR. MEYERS}}$: I'm willing to do it any time you want. I'm assuming it would be done after the other items were dealt with

on the agenda. But if it's the time to do so now, I'm happy to do so now.

CHAIRMAN KURK: As far as I know we've completed our agenda,
is that correct, Mr. Shea?

CHRISTOPHER SHEA, Deputy Legislative Budget Assistant,
Office of Legislative Budget Assistant: That's correct. You acted on all action items. There's only information items.

CHAIRMAN KURK: So if you would talk about the state opioid
response grant at this time --

MR. MEYERS: Sure.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: -- that would be fine, and subsequently I think some of us will have questions about the Dashboard.

MR. MEYERS: Absolutely. Yeah. And I'll ask my CFO to come up when we get to the Dashboard.

So I had circulated earlier and I have additional copies here with me today which I can give to Mr. Shea afterwards that is going to be presented next Monday night.

As Senator D'Allesandro just referenced, the State has received a preliminary award from the Federal Government of \$22.9 million to go toward fighting the opioid crisis in New Hampshire. The State is required to apply for those funds. We must do so by August 13th.

We anticipate the award will be made on or before September 30th of this year. And we are currently in the middle of a process of talking to stakeholders and soliciting public input and, obviously, working internally and with the Governor's Office in terms of building an approach as to how the State would spend the money. We do not get all 22 million at one point in time. We get 11 -- roughly it's \$11,448,673 in each of the Fiscal Years; the current Fiscal Year and the next State Fiscal

Year, I should say so half in State Fiscal Year 19, half in State Fiscal Year 20.

There's a percentage of that that must be spent on administrative overhead. We are required, for example, to employ and appoint a State Opioid Coordinator. We are required to have a State Project Director. Because of the very significant amount of money that is coming in here, we are going to hire a dedicated finance person. It will be a single person at DHHS who will have day-to-day responsibility for tracking the money.

We are going -- we were going to hire an auditor, internal auditor, to ensure this money is being used appropriately; obviously, by all of the organizations that get it. Those are absolute necessities if we're going to administer this grant. We are given authority to do so under the terms of the grant.

The grant is fairly specific. It requires that, first of all, all the funds be used for evidence-based programs. So they are allowed -- the funds are allowed to be used for prevention, treatment, and recovery, but all of those programs must be evidence based. Significantly, although there's not a dollar amount specified, it is the expectation of the Federal Government that a very significant portion of these funds be used for what is called medication-assisted treatment so in order to treat individuals who are suffering from opioid use disorder.

One of the requirements is that the State ensure that providers are starting to spend the money within 90 days of the award. So it's not enough just to put it into a contract that's approved by the G & C. A provider has to start expending funds.

There's not a specific dollar amount that is identified with respect to that requirement; but because of that, and because of the tight timetable, we have decided on an approach that would -- will result in some sole source contracts going to the Governor and Council in order that services, particularly, and key services continue and are expanded within the required

time frame. But it's my intention that a majority of the funds that are coming in be awarded as a result of a competitor procurement.

So we are in the process of piecing together our internal thoughts about that. We are having a public hearing on Monday at 5:30 at the Brown Building on Pleasant Street, at which time the public and stakeholders are invited to come and to actually submit to us and testify with respect to how they think we should prioritize the use of this money.

I've informed the Governor that after that hearing and after we receive the input through June -- through, excuse me, July 27th, that we will put together a plan that will then be made public, obviously, in terms of how we intend to proceed and will identify those sole-source contracts that we would propose to bring forward.

We are currently working on RFPs that could be issued so that, as I said, a majority of funds can go out over time through a competitive process. So I'll stop there and happy to answer questions.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Senator D'Allesandro, did you have any
questions?

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Commissioner. I'm kind of going through the thing, but you have been talking to people --

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: -- at the present time.

MR. MEYERS: Absolutely.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: You talked to -- I believe you've spoken
with the City of Manchester --

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: -- and got input. Is it your plan to do that throughout the state or to have these public hearings here in Concord?

MR. MEYERS: Well, we have a public hearing, a single public hearing scheduled for Monday night at our office. We broadcast it very widely. We sent out e-mails. We solicited people to come. We want public input, obviously, and so we are keeping a public comment period open through July -- through 5:00 p.m. on July 27th. We need to close it at about that time because we need the two weeks in order to make decisions and, obviously, come forward with a public plan.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: Further question, Mr. Chairman? But, indeed, the ability to spread the word about this to the interested parties --

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: -- how successful have you been in that respect? It's a very important situation.

MR. MEYERS: Absolutely. I couldn't agree more. I think we have been successful. I think we have -- we have asked for RSVPs so that we would ensure that we have enough space for everybody on Monday. And I think the response has been very, very healthy and a number of people -- I've been out and about across the state the last ten days presenting our re-procure -- our Managed Care re-procurement plan and describing what's in the RFP and so forth that were supposed to be commented on as well. And a number of people have said to me they were planning on being there. I've been in Littleton. I've been in Manchester. I've been in Portsmouth and other places as well. So I think the response has been very good.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: One further question.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further question.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: Is there an ability through this grant to interact with existing programs and either beef them up or find out how they're doing, their accountability?

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: There is.

MR. MEYERS: Absolutely, yes. And I believe at the end of the day I think some of these funds, I don't know exactly what the dollar amount would be at this point, but some of those funds will go to existing providers who will provide in-services.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: And final question.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Final question.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And at the end
of the first year --

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

<u>SEN. D'ALLESANDRO</u>: -- will there be a report issued to the Legislature as well? I'm sure you have to make one to the Federal Government as to the progress.

MR. MEYERS: We have every intention of reporting regularly, probably more than annually to the Legislature and to the Governor and to the Governor's Commission and to stakeholders, to the public in terms of how this program is operating and how the funds are being used, yes.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: And as part of your program, are you going to create benchmarking as to where you should be at certain points?

MR. MEYERS: Yes, I should tell you -- yes, we're required to. There's a small earmark in these funds is about \$450,000, I believe, for data. But we have separately, it hasn't -- hasn't happened yet, but we've received preliminary indication from the CDC that we are getting up to \$4 million from the CDC to help track, to establish outcomes measurements for opioid use and other SUD use in New Hampshire to create a SUD Dashboard for the state. That's a very significant amount of money. So we're, obviously, going to utilize those funds as well in combination with this to build the type of reporting oversight mechanism that we need in New Hampshire.

SEN. D'ALLESANDRO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Commissioner, I'd like you to elaborate on that. Let's say it's three, four, five years from now and our successors are at this table, and they ask you what were the results of the \$22 million you spent way back in 2018, '19, perhaps '20?

MR. MEYERS: Hm-hum.

CHAIRMAN KURK: I understand these are going to evidence-based programs, but evidence-based programs are not very exacting definition. Would you be able to tell us at that time that of the X number of people who were treated and were put in recovery programs, Y percentage did not lapse and revert to abuse for a period of one, two, three, four, whatever it is years after this program was over, or will you only be able to tell us we treated this number of people, but we have no real idea of whether the treatment was effective in terms of not relapsing?

MR. MEYERS: We have every intention of tracking outcomes. And by doing so, we will be able to track who is accessing services or whether they're accessing services. If somebody leaves the State of New Hampshire who's been treated, then we would not know whether they have relapsed or not. As you know, we've had this conversation over years that addiction is a

terrible disease and one is not cured of addiction overnight. But we have every intention of establishing real outcome measurements to measure the effectiveness of these programs and to track how people are accessing or not accessing service, what services they are accessing, whether they're employed, whether they're in education, whether they're doing other things over a period of time to see -- to look at the effectiveness of these programs, yes.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Thank you. Further questions. Senator Daniels.

SEN. DANIELS: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner.

MR. MEYERS: Sure.

SEN. DANIELS: On Page 3 of your PowerPoint.

MR. MEYERS: Yeah.

SEN. DANIELS: It indicates that up to 5% may be spent on administration of the grant.

MR. MEYERS: Right.

SEN. DANIELS: I believe you just stated there was a
requirement --

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

SEN. DANIELS: -- that it be spent on the grant. So could you --

MR. MEYERS: There's not a requirement that we spend all 5%. We're allowed to spend up to 5%. There are requirements of certain types of spending. I think at the end of the day I'm not sure we're going to spend -- 5% is about \$1.4 million, so I don't think we are going to necessarily spend all that money. But there are some positions that we are required to fund and

we'll fund them appropriately, obviously; but we're not required to spend every dollar of that 5%, if you will.

SEN. DANIELS: So follow-up.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Follow-up.

SEN. DANIELS: For clarification then. The may in this context here says that you may spend up to 5%.

MR. MEYERS: Right.

SEN. DANIELS: But there is a requirement that you spend some.

MR. MEYERS: Correct.

SEN. DANIELS: Follow-up.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Follow-up.

SEN. DANIELS: And since this is -- you have two years to spend this money. You talked about bringing on additional resources.

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

SEN. DANIELS: At the end of that two years, will those resources sunset?

MR. MEYERS: Yes, that's the plan.

SEN. DANIELS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Further questions? Thank you, Commissioner.

MR. MEYERS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KURK: As long as you're here, can we discuss
the --

 $\underline{\text{MR. MEYERS}}$: I'm happy to. I'm going to ask my CFO, Kerrin Rounds, to join us.

CHAIRMAN KURK: She's already joined you. We're talking about the Dashboard which is Fiscal 18-154. On Page 2, Caseload, Medicaid, FANF --

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: I'm looking to get the page numbers. I'm looking at the top of the document.

MR. MEYERS: Yes, yes.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Table 2b, Caseloads. Why is there such a large increase from May of '17 to May of '18?

KERRIN ROUNDS, Chief Financial Officer, Department of
Health and Human Services: So this is due to -- Kerrin Rounds,
CFO, Department of Health and Human Services for the record.
That change is due to eligibility requirement changes. And if
you want detail on that, I can ask my Deputy CFO can talk about
the eligibility changes.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Were these mandated by the Federal Government?

MS. ROUNDS: Yes.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: They were not voluntary on the part of the State?

MS. ROUNDS: We made the changes.

CHAIRMAN KURK: I'm sorry?

 $\underline{\text{MS. ROUNDS}}$: We made the changes. Let me ask my Deputy to come up.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Please.

MR. MEYERS: Yeah, so I'm going to let Mary Calise speak to it in more detail; but we presented on this, I think, once or twice before. We changed the eligibility criteria from TANF program because the benefit was set and had not been changed in, I don't know, 20 years or more, and we provided a cost-of-living increase. That increased the size of the program. In fact, I submitted to both you and Senator Daniels an extensive letter back last November outlining why we were doing it, what impact it was going to have, and what the cost of that was. I'm happy to re-submit that to the Committee; but we presented fairly extensive information on why we made those eligibility changes.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: There were two things that you said. Number one, you said that we increased the benefit to reflect --

MR. MEYERS: Cost-of-living increase.

CHAIRMAN KURK: -- cost-of-living.

MR. MEYERS: Right.

CHAIRMAN KURK: But the question here deals with the caseload, not the amount.

 $\underline{\text{MR. MEYERS}}$: But as a result of how we adjusted eligibility it increased the caseload, because more people became eligible for the benefit.

CHAIRMAN KURK: And the additional people who became eligible were required to become eligible by Federal Law?

MR. MEYERS: No, no.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Was this a decision that was made through the budget or was this a decision that was made by the Department --

MR. MEYERS: It was made in the budget.

MS. CALISE: It's in House Bill 517.

MR. MEYERS: It was in 517.

CHAIRMAN KURK: The next question is on Page 7, Social Services. I guess that's the same numbers, the increase from roughly 5,500 in August of '17 to 7,300. It's almost 2,000 -- almost a 40% increase over a year for the FANF population, and you've discussed that.

The next question is Page 9, Elderly Long-Term Care. The population in July '17 -- this is Column B.

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KURK: This is nursing home clients. You budgeted at 7,036 and in July of '17 we had 7,395 and that's increased to 7,583. It went up significantly and seems to have leveled off. Is there some -- something going on that we should be aware of?

MS. ROUNDS: So what's going on is how the statistics are compiled, which I will mention that we're reviewing all of the Dashboard, especially where we will have a month off this summer from presenting our Dashboard to Fiscal. So it gives us a great opportunity to re-evaluate all of our charts and how we put this together.

The way that we're currently putting these numbers together is based on billing and we want to change that so it will be based on census. So what you're seeing there is we had a vendor who billed us a couple months late. So that's what you're seeing there.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Do you have any sense based on head counts census what these numbers are, or you don't know that?

MS. ROUND: I don't have them at this moment, but that's how we're looking to compile those numbers going forward. The person who compiled these currently is out, unfortunately, and fairly sick so we are re-evaluating now.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Okay. Because if you look at the annual averages down on Line 124 and 125 for Fiscal 17, we had 7,126 folks receiving these services. And, to date, the average for Fiscal 18, the average is 7,491 and that's a major increase.

MS. ROUNDS: Yeah, we'll look at that.

MR. MEYERS: Not in the budget.

MS. ROUNDS: Correct, so we'll look at that and see if it is a timing issue or if it is -- if it's related to the census, and we can report back to you on that next meeting.

CHAIRMAN KURK: Okay. And the reason why I mention this is that up through February of '17, maybe March of '17, the numbers were roughly the same, 7,100 people. At that point, things started to become very different and there's been a substantial increase. And this is of concern to us because, obviously, the Counties pick up some of these costs.

MR. MEYERS: Right.

CHAIRMAN KURK: So it's not just State General Funds, it's County taxpayers who are picking up this extra cost. So it would be nice to know if this is an aberration or a statistical issue or whether we're actually seeing a larger number of people, which wouldn't be surprising considering the age of the population.

MR. MEYERS: We have an aging population, exactly.

CHAIRMAN KURK: But we need to recognize whether this is happening or not. We've had an aging population for decades and we haven't seen an increase here because as the population aged, got healthier, and no one wants to go into a nursing home. So these folks who were healthy just didn't go in and we saw a relatively consistent level of nursing home need. If this is changing, the Legislature needs to understand this.

MR. MEYERS: Yes.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: So we can appropriately take it into account.

MS. ROUNDS: Absolutely.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Other questions on the Dashboard? There being none, thank you.

MR. MEYERS: Thank you.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: Are there any other informational items that people need to raise questions on? In that case, we will not be meeting in August.

REP. OBER: Yea!

CHAIRMAN KURK: Our next meeting will be September 21^{st} . Is there anything else to come before us, Mr. Shea?

MR. SHEA: There's not.

<u>CHAIRMAN KURK</u>: In that case we stand adjourned, and to all of you a very happy summer.

(The meeting adjourned at 11:08 a.m.)

CERTIFICATION

1, Cecelia A. Trask, a Licensed Court Reporter-Shorthand, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate transcript from my shorthand notes taken on said date to the best of CECELIA

TRASK
NO. 47

OF NEW HAM my ability, skill, knowledge and judgment.

Cecelia A. Trask, LSR, RMR, CRR

State of New Hampshire

License No. 47