



State of New Hampshire
Governor's Office
FOR
EMERGENCY RELIEF AND RECOVERY
(GOFERR)
LEGISLATIVE ADVISORY BOARD

PUBLIC MEETING

FRIDAY, MAY 8, 2020

1:00 p.m.

in

One Eagle Square

Concord, NH 03301

Legislative Advisory Board Members:

SENATOR	Senator Lou D'Allesandro
SENATE PRESIDENT	Donna Soucy
SENATE LEADER	Senator Chuck Morse
SENATOR	John Reagan
SPEAKER	Steve Shurtleff
HOUSE LEADER	Rep. Dick Hinch
CHAIRWOMAN	Maryjane Wallner
REPRESENTATIVE	Erin Hennessey

AGENDA

- Open - Reading of GOFERR 91-A compliant guidance
- Roll Call
- Discuss:
 - Stakeholder Advisory Board (SAB) joins call
Update Legislative Advisory Board (LAB) on
SAB
Opens for questions
 - Review Senator Soucy's Draft Proposal letter to
Governor Sununu
 - Follow up review of proposed allocation
- Wrap Up
- Next Scheduled Meeting

1 Advisory Board and the Stakeholder Advisory Board, I will
2 run through the roll call for the Legislative Advisory Board
3 first, and then I'll hand it off to Joe Doiron, who will run
4 through the roll call for the Stakeholder Advisory Board.

5 And we do have one special request today for
6 whatever technical reason we're not aware of: Not all of
7 the speaker call-in lines are populating today. So when we
8 call your name, if you would please hit 5*, that will allow
9 us to identify which phone line you are calling in on.

10 I am Jerry Little, Director of the GOFERR in the
11 GOFERR office at One Eagle Square on Main Street in Concord.
12 In the room with me are Joe Doiron, Rhonda Hensley,
13 [00:01:50 indiscernible proper name] -- Lisa English, and
14 Wendy Gilman.

15 President Donna Soucy?

16 DONNA SOUCY: This is Donna Soucy. I am at my
17 home in Manchester, and I am alone.

18 JERRY LITTLE: Very good. We heard you, but we
19 did not -- we were not able to identify what line you're
20 calling in on. President Soucy, could you hit 5*, please?

21 There we go. We've got you. Thank you very much,
22 appreciate that.

1 DONNA SOUCY: Certainly.

2 JERRY LITTLE: House Speaker Steve Shurtleff?

3 STEVE SHURTLEFF: Steve Shurtleff. I'm at my
4 cabin in Bethlehem, and I am alone.

5 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, sir. Senate Minority
6 Leader Chuck Morse?

7 CHUCK MORSE: Chuck Morse. I'm at my office in
8 Atkinson, and I am alone.

9 JERRY LITTLE: House Minority Leader Dick Hinch?

10 DICK HINCH: This is Dick Hinch. I'm in my office
11 in Merrimac, and I am alone.

12 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, sir. Chairman Lou
13 D'Allesandro? Senator D'Allesandro are you with us, sir?
14 We're good. We see your raised hand. If you could just
15 take the phone off mute, maybe, and tell us where you are?

16 LOU D'ALLESSANDRO: Okay, you got it? Lou --

17 JERRY LITTLE: We got you.

18 LOU D'ALLESSANDRO: -- D'Allesandro. All right.
19 Super. Thank you.

20 LOU D'ALLESSANDRO: Thank you, sir.

21 JERRY LITTLE: You're welcome.

22 LOU D'ALLESSANDRO: Chairwoman Maryjane Wallner?

1 MARYJANE WALLNER: Maryjane Wallner. I'm at my
2 home in Concord, New Hampshire, and I am alone.

3 JERRY LITTLE: Senator John Reagan?

4 JOHN REAGAN: John Reagan, I'm at my office, by
5 myself.

6 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, sir. Representative
7 Erin Hennessey?

8 ERIN HENNESSEY: Erin Hennessey. I'm at my house
9 in Littleton, and I'm alone in the room.

10 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you. Joe Doiron will now do
11 the roll call for the Stakeholders Advisory Board.

12 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, and again if members of
13 the Stakeholder Advisory Board would hit 5* when I call your
14 name, and I'll be going alphabetical. Bill Ardinger?

15 BILL ARDINGER: Hello, Joe? This is Bill
16 Ardinger. Hello to everyone. I'm glad to hear your voices.
17 I am in my home office in Concord, New Hampshire, and I'm
18 alone.

19 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Bill. Dean Christon?

20 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Joe, it's Donnalee.

21 JOE DOIRON: Yep.

22 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Dean e-mailed us that he can

1 hear us, but he can't free up -- push the -- the code's not
2 working for him to be able to be heard. But he is
3 listening.

4 JOE DOIRON: Great. Dean, if you could hit 5*, we
5 might be able to assist with that technical difficulty.

6 DEAN CHRISTON: Great. Well --

7 JOE DOIRON: Again, 5* Dean. There we go. I
8 think we got you. Dean, could you try it now for us,
9 please?

10 DEAN CHRISTON: Sure. This is Dean Christon. I
11 am at my office in Bedford, and I am alone.

12 JOE DOIRON: Thank you for your patience, Dean.
13 Lisa Drabik?

14 LISA DRABIK: This is Lisa Drabik. I'm sorry.
15 Good afternoon, everyone. I'm at my home office in
16 Londonderry alone in the room.

17 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Lisa. Jim Jalbert?

18 JIM JALBERT: Good afternoon, everyone. This is
19 Jim Jalbert, and I am at my office in Portsmouth, New
20 Hampshire, and I am alone.

21 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Jim. Amy LaBelle?

22 AMY LABELLE: This is Amy LaBelle. I'm -- can you

1 all hear me?

2 JOE DOIRON: I can hear you.

3 AMY LABELLE: Wonderful. Amy LaBelle. I'm in my
4 home office in Amherst, New Hampshire.

5 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Amy. Al Letizio Jr.?

6 AL LETIZIO JR: Hi. This is Al Letizio Jr. I am
7 in my office in Windham, New Hampshire, and I am alone.

8 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Al. Donnalee Lozeau?

9 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Hi, this is Donnalee Lozeau. I
10 am in my office in Manchester, and I am alone.

11 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Donnalee. Scott Mason?

12 SCOTT MASON: This is Scott Mason. I am in my
13 farm office in North Stratford, New Hampshire, and I am
14 alone.

15 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Scott. Michelle McEwen?

16 MICHELLE MCEWEN: Hi, this is Michelle McEwen. I
17 am in my office in Plymouth, and I am alone.

18 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Michelle. Nancy Merrill?

19 NANCY MERRILL: Hi, this is Nancy Merrill, and I
20 am at my work office in Claremont, and I am alone.

21 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Nancy. Jeffrey Myers?

22 JEFF MYERS: It's Jeff Myers, it's Jeff Myers. I

1 am in my home in Concord, New Hampshire, and I am alone.

2 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Jeff. Hollie Noveletsky?

3 HOLLIE NOVELETSKY: I'm Hollie Noveletsky. I am
4 in my office in Greenland, New Hampshire and I'm alone.

5 JOE DOIRON: Hollie, could you hit 5* for us,
6 please?

7 HOLLIE NOVELETSKY: Can you see that? Because
8 I've done it twice now.

9 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Holly. Kathleen Reardon?

10 KATHLEEN REARDON: Hi, this is Kathleen Reardon.
11 I'm in my office -- in my home office in New Boston.

12 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Kathleen. Benjamin Wilcox?

13 BENJAMIN WILCOX: Hi, this is Ben Wilcox, and I am
14 in North Conway, New Hampshire, at my office at Cranmore
15 Mountain Resort, and I am alone in my office.

16 JOE DOIRON: Thank you, Ben. Director Little,
17 that concludes the roll call with all the staff members in
18 attendance.

19 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you very much, Joe, and thank
20 you everybody for joining us today. Just as a matter of
21 course, if you choose to speak or would wish to speak, hit
22 5* to let us know that you're queued up and you have a

1 comment or a question. And then please identify yourself
2 before beginning to speak.

3 Finally, should either of the Boards choose to
4 take any votes today, they're going to need to be done using
5 the roll calls in the manner that we just exercised.

6 This is the first joint meeting of the Legislative
7 and the Stakeholder Advisory Boards. My understanding is
8 that the Chairs of each Board -- Senator Morse and Donnalee
9 Lozeau -- have spoken, and that we're going to start today
10 with brief presentations from each Chair about their Board
11 and their status.

12 Senator Morse, are you leading off?

13 CHUCK MORSE: Sure. Donnalee, thank you for
14 agreeing to get together. I think the challenges of working
15 remote like this, we can't see your smiling face, but you
16 definitely have a distinguished group working with you,
17 which we miss them dearly.

18 I believe you all heard that the Center President
19 and the speaker are on the phone. I'm only sharing this on
20 our side just to basically develop something that we can
21 have a conversation with.

22 And I think as we put out our document, the

1 document was meant to be interactive based on everything
2 that's pretty fluid between the state of New Hampshire and
3 the Federal Government.

4 So as you get to see our document, you certainly
5 can click on a lot of different categories and find out
6 where the federal funding's going and where the state
7 funding's going.

8 The purpose of doing that was so that I pretty
9 much think in -- I don't know, some 20 hours of meeting,
10 we're getting a good sense of what people believe are
11 priorities in the state of New Hampshire, whether it's the
12 Federal Government, or the Governor himself in the state of
13 New Hampshire.

14 And with saying that, I think our document, maybe
15 close to the bottom of it, it certainly shows that \$255
16 million has already been appropriated by the executive
17 branch, and what we've proposed to date is another \$330
18 million on top of that.

19 Now, that'll change -- I'm sure it'll change, and
20 our mission's to stay on the phone after we get through this
21 45-minute call, because we certainly have things to go over
22 today.

1 But we were proposing originally through a series
2 of debates that we fund somewhere around 45 percent of the
3 \$1.25 billion now. And I'm sure we'll have discussion later
4 this afternoon whether that's enough or whether it's too
5 much.

6 But having said that, I think what we're hearing
7 each and every time we interview a new group, which is
8 showing up on this document, is what the Legislature I think
9 is very good at is what priorities are needed today.

10 And that's why, I think, the document certainly
11 points to let's get this money out, and let's come back and
12 come back and come back and continue to listen to the people
13 of New Hampshire, so that we can essentially do what I
14 believe Donnalee and your group is doing, and that's work
15 out the Intended Use section of our document.

16 Because as we talk to different groups, I think
17 everyone believes there's a better way than the state being
18 the group that controls the money once we make this
19 allocation. We've all talked about BFA as one of them, New
20 Hampshire Charities as another.

21 I think when we look at Intended Use in our
22 document, we're certainly talking about who should fall

1 under each category, and who should be the group that's in
2 charge.

3 As Donnalee speaks after myself, I think you've
4 been working on a lot of that, and that's why I thought it
5 would be good to get together and talk about what you're
6 seeing as maybe the group that should be in control of this
7 money once it leaves our hands.

8 And along with that, I think there's been a lot of
9 discussion about what uses are acceptable, based on federal
10 guidance. And I think that needs to get updated.

11 We did put at the bottom of our document things
12 that keep coming up, that we believe we need to come back
13 to, as we get into another month; whether we're going to
14 table the state of New Hampshire or not. I think that's an
15 issue that keeps coming up.

16 So I think we've -- in our document we've noted
17 that, and we certainly said it's something we want to talk
18 about, but there's priorities that need to get out the door
19 right away.

20 We've dealt a lot with the numbers, and the
21 numbers used to have a ranking column in there. After our
22 first meeting, it was pretty obvious you don't need to do

1 that. You can see what the rankings are based on the level
2 of funding we're putting in there.

3 So I think it's a good guide to hand to the
4 Executive Branch, as to where our Advisory Board thinks the
5 funding should go to first, and then I think it becomes what
6 else is going to hit us.

7 When we put out this round -- you know, obviously
8 the Governor put out \$255 million -- if there's agreement to
9 go forward from the Executive Branch with some of the things
10 we're suggesting, I think that starts to trigger where we'll
11 start to hear further debate in the state of New Hampshire
12 about what we need to do more.

13 And we certainly at this point don't know how much
14 more federal funding is coming our way. So I think that's
15 all the process of learning, learning, learning.

16 But the interactive documents seem to be working
17 for that debate. I can tell you I have two proposal in
18 front of me right now from a pretty distinguished group that
19 certainly sees things different than our document right now.

20 So that will all be debated, and that's what's
21 good about this document. And it's a starting point, and I
22 certainly think the amount of work that went into it so far

1 has been great.

2 And I think not only is Jerry listening to us all
3 the time, because I believe he's the one making the
4 recommendations -- or his group -- to the Executive Branch;
5 I think the public is, because the letters are coming in
6 fast and furious to the eight-member commission about things
7 that they want us to hear.

8 So I think it's working. I look for to hearing
9 from Donnalee, and then we would like to take your questions
10 after that.

11 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, Senator Morse.
12 Donnalee?

13 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Thank you, Senator. I very much
14 appreciate it. I do think that it's probably time for us to
15 touch base and see which direction both of us are heading
16 in.

17 For our group, we began by looking at developing a
18 list of specific questions that we wanted to send out to
19 different sectors in our state, to try to get to some
20 assistance with a systemic approach -- kind of the logistics
21 of things, the operational issues that businesses and others
22 are facing, so that we could try to get our arms around how

1 could we do this.

2 We have had -- we meet twice a week, Tuesdays and
3 Thursdays. We try to limit our meetings to just a couple of
4 hours. We have had a -- each day, with the exception of
5 this past Tuesday, presentations from different sectors -- a
6 cross-sector day of businesses, which included some non-
7 profits; a day of non-profits.

8 Yesterday, we had a day around Housing. Coming up
9 we have a day for Health Care, a day for Agriculture, a day
10 for Hospitality and Tourism.

11 And it has helped inform our work by the specific
12 questions that we have asked. So we ask them, basically
13 what are you up against? What's the, you know, situation
14 right now for an immediate need? What do you see as
15 recovery? And how do you see this helping -- you know, in
16 the long term?

17 And I think that that's helped focus our work.

18 One of the benefits of our group I think is the --
19 a lot members on our group have a wide network of people,
20 both from the sector that they work in, as well as -- like
21 all of us on the phone today are -- you know, are friends
22 and neighbors who also live and work in our state.

1 And so, they've reached out to a broad range of
2 people asking for their responses.

3 We've received probably close to 100 now
4 responses, most of which are now posted on the website for
5 people to be able to take a look at.

6 And we made our first recommendation on Tuesday
7 after a lengthy discussion utilizing a PowerPoint that I
8 shared with you, and that it also posted on the website
9 under May 5 -- a discussion template to just, again, set the
10 table about, you know, what has Congress enacted so far, how
11 did the funds break down by the legislation passed as well
12 as the program type, and where do we focus on, you know, the
13 CARES Act? And what's New Hampshire's allocations of
14 federal funding?

15 Which brought us to that discussion that you
16 mentioned as well -- a conclusion that I think many of us
17 had come to, which is: How do we distribute these funds as
18 quickly, efficiently, transparently and accountably as
19 possible?

20 Which led us to slide 6, which I like to say the
21 recommendation that we passed on Tuesday is the narrative of
22 the map on page 6, which does identify the New Hampshire

1 Charitable Foundation, the BFA, the Regional Economic
2 Development Corporations, Housing Authority -- different
3 groups to be able, who are in these roles currently, pre-
4 COVID, to use their expertise and their sources of ways to
5 get the money out the way that we determine.

6 We have had some additional conversations around
7 the work that you have done. I've shared your Excel sheet
8 with the members of our Board, just to be able to show the
9 approach that you're taking.

10 So from my perspective, when I look at the work
11 that your group is doing, it is the work of policymakers
12 saying, "Let's look at sectors, let's look across dollars,
13 let's see if we're going to prioritize."

14 You have opened up the presentations that people
15 have done before you to basically be, "What do they want to
16 tell you?" Which I think is very much the policymaker in
17 all of you.

18 In our group, I think there is -- as I said, that
19 operational look at things. So we are going to revisit our
20 conversations around the timing of distributions, the
21 conditions that might be on them, whether applications will
22 be reviewed.

1 One of the things that has come up in our
2 discussions is administrative costs of getting the money
3 out. I think we'll recognize that there's no single pipe in
4 the state that's big enough to get all of this out quickly
5 and efficiently.

6 So we will continue to have our presentations and
7 to -- we've now put on our agenda a standing item for an
8 update from GOFERR on what's happening within your group,
9 what's happening within the Reopening Group, and, you know,
10 a discussion on recommendations going forward.

11 There's a lot of discussion in our group about
12 looking at sectors and whether or not we want to give dollar
13 amounts in those sectors. I do think that we would like to
14 see some money get out immediately for those that need it
15 right now.

16 We talk in terms a lot of, you know, like a trauma
17 patient, right? Where the state's kind of in this crisis,
18 and you want to stop the bleed, and then you want to look at
19 what recovery looks like. You know, there's different
20 stages of that. And then how do you come out on the other
21 side, and what are the changes moving forward?

22 So I think it's great that we're all looking in a

1 way that's trying to be flexible.

2 We've talked about trying to mitigate as much as
3 we can unintended consequences of decisions we make, and I
4 know that my group is ready to talk more specifically about
5 what are some of the immediate categories... and by looking
6 at your spreadsheet, seeing how we line up with some of what
7 you've done, and whether we would add to those
8 recommendations, or support those recommendations, or -- you
9 know, add more operational information.

10 The last thing I'll point out is we talked about
11 the value of getting funding out to the entities that
12 support the groups that we've talked about being
13 distribution entities. So for example, the BFA works
14 closely with the regional Economic Development Councils as
15 well as probably the FBDC.

16 The New Hampshire Charitable Foundation would work
17 closely with the Center for Nonprofits. All of those
18 advisory groups that will help to have people come in with
19 their best possible plans for their application to help
20 ensure as much success as possible once they get through the
21 process.

22 And so, looking at getting funds out. So all of

1 those organizations for capacity building.

2 And not to leave out the state and some of those
3 systems in place. And I'll use for example something I'm
4 very familiar with, which is the work at DHHS, that is being
5 done around child care in all different looks.

6 So child care as far as caring for children while
7 their parents are working, along with children that are
8 subject, sadly to abuse and neglect, or victims of crime --
9 that kind of work -- and the money that has come in, that
10 has been going out, that quickly got up emergency child care
11 thought the state.

12 So there's a lot of opportunity, I think, and a
13 lot of lessons that can be learned. And I think if we keep
14 growing in the same direction, we can probably do a heck of
15 a job getting this work done.

16 So thank you for the invitation, and I hope I've
17 given as clear a picture as I can about our work. It's
18 certainly not comprehensive, but enough to give you a sense,
19 I hope.

20 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, Donnalee. Senator
21 Morse, you have a question or comment? Senator Morse, I
22 believe your hand is up?

1 CHUCK MORSE: Yes, I'm sorry. It's the mute
2 button. I was trying to eat lunch and do this work at the
3 same time.

4 The -- now the question is if Donnalee could give
5 us maybe what her city is looking at on the -- you know,
6 we've got \$1.25 billion, you know I'm certain that the
7 debate is should it all be spent today, in hopes the Federal
8 Government is going to come in with more help, or have they
9 talked about the future of this money?

10 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Well, Senator Morse, I certainly
11 can't speak for all of us, because we have not yet taken a
12 formal vote on our approach to that.

13 But I know that there's a fair amount (sic) of
14 members of the committee based on our discussion that would
15 like to get some money out for the immediacy right now?
16 What are some of those basic needs -- you know; housing,
17 food, you know, that type of thing? Small businesses are --
18 you know, that kind of thing.

19 And then, feeling like if we could get some of
20 that out the door, we could then look at what's next. I'm
21 sure that there are some members that may feel that maybe a
22 lot of the money should be spent right away.

1 I don't know that that's a majority of the group
2 yet, but I know that everybody likely has an opinion about
3 what that might look like, and how that might get out the
4 door.

5 But I think right now, our next conversation is
6 probably going to be around that, and what do we need to do
7 right away or recommend right away that should happen?

8 We talked a little bit about should some of that
9 match the reopening? So for example, you know, if hair
10 salons are opening in a week, are those businesses ready?
11 Do they have what they need? Have they had the funding? So
12 let's talk about whether that timing is important.

13 So -- but we have not taken a formal position yet
14 about that timing. I can tell you personally, I'm a fan of
15 -- I know there's a deadline of December 31. I'm not
16 convinced it's clear on what the spend means for that.

17 But I do think that we -- that there is a value to
18 getting some work done right now, and then looking at what
19 the results of some of that are as we're working towards the
20 next batch of money going out.

21 So I would see it in at least more than one phase
22 myself, personally. And I'm sure that members, you know,

1 could weigh in if they feel strongly differently than I've
2 just described.

3 CHUCK MORSE: Thank you.

4 JERRY LITTLE: Other questions for either Senator
5 Morse or Donnalee Lozeau? If you have a question, if you
6 would hit 5*, we'll know to unmute your line. I don't see
7 any requests. Oh, just saw something. Scroll down a little
8 bit, scroll up. Amy LaBelle, please?

9 AMY LABELLE: Yes, thank you. I'll be brief. My
10 question quick is relative to the distribution channels, and
11 whether or not we have zoned in on using existing state
12 channels, or if we are open to using a banking institution
13 who might have, you know, more speed to market power?

14 [00:30:40 not sure who is speaking, sounds like

15 CHUCK MORSE]: Well, I'll take a stab at that. I
16 think the -- we're all trying to find channels -- I believe
17 the GOFERR office is receiving documents, probably on a
18 daily basis, where proposal are coming in to be the channel,
19 whether it's the non-profits coming in and saying, "This is
20 what we're proposing towards, you know us being able to do
21 the distribution process."

22 I know on your committee, Bill Ardinger, I spoke

1 with him for a while. I actually read a document that was
2 sent to me that kind of took all the different programs of
3 BFA that could possibly be worked through.

4 I -- you know, as for the banking industry, we've
5 certainly been in communication with them when we've talked
6 about the Payroll Protection Plan -- about how you could
7 pay, you know, and grab peak businesses to file for this.

8 And I think that worked. I mean, it really -- I
9 think on our document it shows the \$2 billion that came to
10 New Hampshire so far.

11 So yes, I do think the theory is to find the right
12 organization to work with. We've certainly been watching
13 what your committee is doing about that, and I think that --
14 like I said, if we're going to build out our documents,
15 which is a work in progress, it's the intended use, and
16 where we could best park this money.

17 Along with that, I'll give you an example of where
18 I don't think that's necessary. If you -- we're going to
19 have discussions today I'm sure about hospitals. More and
20 more I'm hearing from them where, you know, cash flow is
21 going to become an issue.

22 Can we build a system as a state to look at, so

1 that we can make that distribution, you know, straight to
2 them immediately?

3 So I think all these things are things we're all
4 working on, and I think the right place for all that to end
5 up is at GOFERR in Jerry's office, and then these -- he's
6 certainly talking about it, with a whole bunch of people.

7 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you. Senator Morse, did you
8 raise your hand for another comment, beyond that response to
9 Ms. Labelle?

10 CHUCK MORSE: No. I didn't think anyone else was
11 going to ask a question or say anything. I just -- you
12 know, Donnalee alluded to the fact that we're legislators.
13 I seem to remember when she was teaching me.

14 You know, that was a little while ago. But the
15 reality is I do think we look at things differently than the
16 private sector does, and I think that's what's great about
17 these two groups working right now.

18 So I think it probably benefits both of us to look
19 at each other's work as we move along here. I think you'll
20 learn something from each group, to be honest with you. I
21 think that's important.

22 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, Senator Morse. We have

1 a question from Jim Jalbert.

2 JIM JALBERT: This is a question for both Donnalee
3 and Senator Morse, and the question would be: Do you both
4 expect us to work in our respective groups and then come
5 back with suggestions related to the Legislative Advisory
6 Board proposal? Or do you want any comments at this time?

7 CHUCK MORSE: Donna, do you --

8 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Well, thank you, Senator. I
9 think Jim, I think today's -- the point of us talking today
10 was to just have a better sense of where each of us are --
11 or how each of us are doing our work, I guess? The
12 approach.

13 JIM JALBERT: Okay, okay.

14 DONNALEE LOZEAU: But I do want to just follow up
15 on a couple of things. I think exactly as Senator Morse
16 said, there's a benefit to the perspective that our group
17 has, which is different than the perspective of the
18 Legislative group. And the value of both groups I think is
19 really going to shine as we complete some of this work.

20 And in that very first spot, where I think that it
21 is showing that both groups see a value in something which
22 is this distribution entities -- the systems that we've

1 talked about -- being the way to do this work. I think it's
2 a huge plus that we both feel that same way, both groups,
3 and understand the value of it.

4 So I think there may be more of that as it comes
5 along.

6 I wouldn't want to be in a place where I comment
7 on the legislative work on whether they should or shouldn't
8 have done something, or their approach is different, or --
9 but I think there's an opportunity to come back together in
10 another joint meeting at some point, maybe after a little
11 bit of time has passed.

12 And some of -- we see the recommendations that are
13 actually utilized from the two groups taking place, that it
14 might be again valuable.

15 I think it's so hard to -- if we listen to each
16 other's work every day, that's all we would do, because, as
17 you know, the Legislative group meets three days a week; we
18 meet two days a week.

19 And pretty much everybody, I think in both groups
20 is not just wearing that hat in their life. You know,
21 they're running their business, they're worrying about their
22 family, and they're operating in an unusual way, which

1 sometimes means it's more work instead of less work.

2 And of course, when we're not in a meeting, we're
3 still hearing, as Senator Morse mentioned, people are
4 calling us, e-mailing us, making suggestions, sending more
5 information.

6 And I think all of that input is helpful, and
7 there needs to be time to be able to really read through
8 everything and give it some thoughtful reflection.

9 So I think this is just the first courtesy
10 conversation, and I approach the group willing to ask us to
11 attend.

12 JIM JALBERT: Well, certainly it wasn't to
13 critique anything at all, and I am very grateful that we're
14 -- that both groups are together, and that we get to meet
15 and chat with our -- with the Legislative Advisory Board.

16 And it was merely suggestions, but we can
17 certainly do that in our respective committees, Donnalee,
18 and I'm happy to yield that.

19 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Thank you. Appreciate it.

20 CHUCK MORSE: I don't think we took it any
21 different than the -- you know, when you're in the
22 Legislature, you've got broad shoulders anyway, so. I think

1 the interesting thing is I believe others are listening to
2 every word that comes out of the committee.

3 JERRY LITTLE: Sure.

4 CHUCK MORSE: \$255 million has already been
5 appropriated. You know, if you go with the belief that I
6 believe in, you know, you're probably \$300 million dollars
7 away in the first round of appropriation.

8 Now, I know there's been debate on that -- whether
9 it's enough, whether it's not. But I think what you're
10 learning and what we're learning will be in that \$300, \$400
11 multimillion-dollar range of where the Executive Branch is
12 learning from us.

13 So -- and they're doing their own work, because I
14 don't -- you know, every time I make a phone call to
15 someone, they've already told me that people in the
16 Governor's Office have beat me to it.

17 So I think everybody's doing what they have to to
18 research where things are needed, and I do believe there's
19 some level of appropriation; that's why I asked the
20 question, and it needs to get out right away. And we'll see
21 where that goes.

22 JIM JALBERT: Thank you.

1 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Jalbert. Thank you,
2 Senator Morse. Our next question is from Hollie Noveletsky.

3 HOLLIE NOVELETSKY: Thank you very much. I
4 noticed on the proposal from the LAB that there were
5 proposed spending dates. Are those dates that you plan to
6 get the money out by?

7 And also, would it be beneficial if we had set the
8 initial deadline for spending that we could both work
9 towards the critical needs, where people really are hurting
10 now, and they're looking for money?

11 JIM JALBERT: Yeah, those dates that are in the
12 documents sent from our committee were merely to start a
13 debate. The -- it was two-fold; 1) I'm sure all these
14 expenditures are going to get reviewed, not only by our
15 group, but by the public; and in Jerry's case, he's going to
16 be the one auditing all those, I believe.

17 So, you know, we basically thought maybe it made
18 sense to come back at certain points in time. Now, our
19 group -- you know -- definitely some part of want to put
20 more out now and, you know, so on and so forth.

21 But that's why that number was there, and the
22 dates were there so that we basically had a discussion about

1 exactly that. How much did you want to come back and deal
2 with each and every month or week, or -- you know, I think
3 that's the key?

4 So I'm sure the Governor's office is listening to
5 what both groups are saying on that, you know? They'll make
6 up their own mind, though, and I've made that clear to our
7 committee. So I think merely the hard work of all these
8 people is in what they're listening to, and then they'll
9 make a decision.

10 HOLLIE NOVELETSKY: They'll make the decision as
11 to the first allocation date, is that what you mean?

12 JIM JALBERT: They've already made that decision.
13 They have \$255 million working already. That's out there,
14 and if you go into the column under the Governor's
15 allocation, you can click on any one of those numbers and
16 see what's been allocated.

17 Our Committee has spent a lot of time talking
18 about the health care button, where there's \$50 million
19 dollars, and I believe -- somebody can correct me if I'm
20 wrong -- about \$20 million of that's already out in the
21 public.

22 We're concerned that the other \$30 million needs

1 to get out. And I think that's part of the debate we'll
2 probably have this afternoon, because we're hearing from the
3 hospitals, especially, that cash flow is starting to be an
4 issue.

5 So, you know, the Governor's Office I think is
6 already working to spend this money while we do all our
7 debates.

8 HOLLIE NOVELETSKY: Okay, thank you.

9 JERRY LITTLE: Any further speakers, for either
10 Speaker Morse or Chairwoman Donnalee Lozeau? I don't see
11 any. Give you a couple more seconds to raise your hand
12 using 5* if you have a question for either of them. All
13 right.

14 Well, thank you both Donnalee and Senator Morse
15 for that conversation, and for everybody on both Boards for
16 joining us for the joint meeting.

17 At this point, we will move forward with the
18 agenda for the Legislative Advisory Board, and the next item
19 on our agenda, Senate President Soucy, is discussion of the
20 draft letter that you have forwarded to everyone as a cover
21 to send to Governor Sununu, with the spreadsheet that you've
22 just been discussing.

1 Senator Soucy, are you there?

2 And members of the SAB, you're welcome to stay
3 with us, it's a public meeting, or you're welcome to jump
4 off, it is your call as to how you spend the rest of your
5 afternoon. So thank you.

6 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Thank you very much. Thanks
7 again for inviting us.

8 JERRY LITTLE: Senator Soucy, are you with us?

9 DONNA SOUCY: Yes, I am, Commissioner Little. I
10 am just scanning through because I've lost Internet service
11 at home. So luckily, I'm doing it from a phone, so it's a
12 little bit smaller.

13 As you can see, the draft letter has all of the
14 areas of discussion that we have had to date, that are part
15 of the spreadsheet.

16 You'll also note that the funding amounts were
17 left blank, figuring that we would go through the sheet one
18 more time and finalize those numbers. So once the committee
19 has completed that, we can add those back in, I think fairly
20 quickly.

21 This was an attempt to sort of capture our topline
22 concerns, and I will leave it at that. Happy to discuss any

1 questions or concerns people may have.

2 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you for the overview. Are
3 there questions for Senator Soucy? Senator Morse, please.

4 CHUCK MORSE: Thank you. Senator, thank you for
5 what you did with this document. The third paragraph on the
6 bottom where it says, "Perhaps the most important, our
7 spending proposal also stabilizes."

8 Can you tell me what the intent of that paragraph
9 is, or -- yes, just tell me? I'm trying to figure out what
10 we're going to be plugging in for a number there.

11 DONNA SOUCY: Yes. This was -- and I, as I said,
12 I'm sorry don't have the spreadsheet open in front of me,
13 but this was about covering the existing -- the set aside
14 number, and also covering the funds that are already
15 extended.

16 So for example, the two announcements the Governor
17 most recently made about municipal aid and first responders,
18 this was to cover that. So to recognize the expenditures
19 that have already occurred.

20 CHUCK MORSE: Which I would agree with that. I --
21 where I -- and I was trying to figure out --

22 DONNA SOUCY: And the set aside number as well.

1 So expenditures that have already occurred if we're going to
2 decide for the budget.

3 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah. That's the number that I'm
4 not sure I'm prepared to support right now, and so I
5 understand if we can legally do it, and the -- I'm not sure
6 that we're not getting federal funding in a different bucket
7 for that. The -- but that was the paragraph that, you know,
8 in this letter that I was concerned about, but --

9 DONNA SOUCY: Okay.

10 CHUCK MORSE: -- if we're alluding to what's
11 already been proposed in the document, I think it's the
12 right way to do it. If we're going to talk about what we're
13 taking out of this \$1.24 the budget, I'm not sure I'm ready
14 for that.

15 DONNA SOUCY: I think it's primarily -- and
16 perhaps we could rephrase it or edit the language a bit, but
17 I think it's particularly important for the funds that were
18 expended before we got the CARES Act fund, and that we use
19 General Fund dollars for. I think that's what we were
20 trying to get at there.

21 And that number should be quantifiable.

22 CHUCK MORSE: And I'm -- if I'm not -- if I'm

1 correct, does our document right now quantifies it. So I
2 could -- that's --

3 DONNA SOUCY: Mm-hm.

4 CHUCK MORSE: I could support that. So.

5 DONNA SOUCY: Mm-hm. Okay.

6 CHUCK MORSE: It's just the -- and I know as we go
7 through the document today, I don't want to shock you all,
8 but the requests from, you know, everyone, but the -- it's,
9 you know, some of the items, in my opinion, if we're going
10 to -- I think I've heard the urgency thing, and I'm in the
11 urgency category.

12 And matter of fact I'm going to make a proposal in
13 a minute that one of the items that I was working on yet put
14 out to, you know, future discussion -- the, I think there's,
15 I think the urgency thing has to get across. And whether
16 that's today or next week, that's up to the committee.

17 But I certainly believe, you know, the intensity
18 of the letters, the phone calls that are coming in -- I'm
19 sure all of you are getting the same thing.

20 You can tell it's getting tight, and I don't --
21 you know, like I said the other day, you're talking about
22 food on the table and roofs over their head at this point.

1 You know, some categories we don't have enough
2 information on yet, but there's certainly some groups that I
3 think we have enough to move forward.

4 DONNA SOUCY: Senator Morse, I would agree, and I
5 envision the work of this committee continuing -- not just
6 for the existing funds, but obviously for the potential of
7 additional federal funds. But I think we do need to
8 identify certain key areas that should go out door
9 immediately, and then continue to work through the other
10 areas.

11 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah. I'm in that category. I
12 agree with you. So in general, 99% agreement with the
13 letter the way it's been written. I just didn't know what
14 number was being quoted in that paragraph, and as we get
15 through the document today, I think whether I can support
16 that paragraph or not we should talk about.

17 I mean, it's -- other than that, I think the
18 documents will tie to the letter, and I think most of us
19 believe this funding can go out now. So the -- I think
20 that's probably a positive thing.

21 Let me go back to the -- our original document, if
22 everyone's comfortable with that. Don't nod, I can't see.

1 DONNA SOUCY: Yeah. We are comfortable with that.

2 JERRY LITTLE: May -- Senator Soucy, may I just
3 ask a quick question for -- this is Jerry Little -- for
4 clarification --

5 DONNA SOUCY: Yeah.

6 JERRY LITTLE: I want to make sure that I
7 understand the conversation and the answer about that third
8 paragraph from the end.

9 Are you anticipating that the blank in that
10 paragraph looking for a dollar amount, that that dollar
11 amount includes an amount that we'd like to hold for
12 basically the fourth quarter of 2020 for unanticipated
13 problems that may arise plus the funds that have already
14 been expended -- initially of General Funds, but which have
15 now been backfilled with CARES Act dollars?

16 Is that the figure that you're looking for there?

17 DONNA SOUCY: Commissioner, I believe it can be
18 both. I think that the first, most critical number, though,
19 is the number to cover funds already expended or allocated.

20 And then if we do make changes to the document
21 from where we're at, we could then conceivably add either a
22 second number or add to that number funds that we anticipate

1 spending later.

2 But at the very least, I think that number needs
3 to represent what has already been expended by the Governor
4 in General Fund dollars, that we would hope to recapture
5 using some of these funds.

6 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you very much for that, I
7 appreciate it. Thank you.

8 DONNA SOUCY: No.

9 JERRY LITTLE: Sorry to interject it.

10 DONNA SOUCY: No, no. It's important that
11 everybody have a clear understanding. And I'm hopeful that
12 it's a letter -- I tried to, with help, tried to make it
13 more of a template so that the narrative would describe what
14 we're doing, and then recognizing that we're going to have
15 discussions now to either confirm or amend some of the
16 numbers that we have already placed into the working
17 spreadsheet.

18 So it was an attempt to capture all of that, and
19 recognizing it's going to require final edits before it can
20 be presented.

21 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you. Senator Morse, I
22 believe you were asking if we could go to the document next?

1 CHUCK MORSE: Yes.

2 JERRY LITTLE: Okay.

3 CHUCK MORSE: The -- if you go into Unemployment,
4 I think it's -- at this point I think the discussion on
5 Unemployment has been positive, to be honest with you. But
6 I believe that's one item that we should move to future
7 discussion.

8 I don't know that the \$50 million is, you know,
9 needed right now, quite honestly, and I certainly am headed
10 in the direction of, "Let's build a document that we believe
11 needs to get out today, and send that message."

12 So this number I would take out of here. I mean,
13 I certainly believe it's -- in my opinion, it should go into
14 the non-profits after listening to all of you and everyone
15 else. The -- but, you know, there's certainly been a lot of
16 proposals for spending it.

17 But in any case, I would -- I think we could take
18 the unemployment and move it down to the bottom of the
19 document for future discussion, and use the \$50 million-
20 dollar -- you know, in my opinion, it should stay somewhere
21 in that 45 percent range.

22 I mean, I know there's other opinions, but having

1 said that, if we did that, I would move this money into non-
2 profit.

3 DONNA SOUCY: Are you recommending moving all of
4 it into non-profits or a portion?

5 CHUCK MORSE: Well, if I move it all into non-
6 profit, that basically puts that number at \$65 million,
7 besides what we suggested, and I even debated this. I mean,
8 I'm not -- the food bank, I mean, we're singling out one
9 group. I mean, I think we'll believe they need help.

10 But, you know, in general we're just sending the
11 message to the Executive Branch that non-profits should get
12 X. \$65 million is not \$125 obviously, that I heard the other
13 day.

14 But the -- you know, again, you can always come
15 back to it. I mean, I think \$65 million is a lot of money,
16 even for charities to deal with right now. So I was
17 suggesting we move it all back.

18 JERRY LITTLE: Questions or comments, if I can
19 restate I believe what I just wrote down, Senator Morse?
20 There's a proposal to move \$50 million in the Unemployment
21 Trust Fund shortfall from there to the non-profit sector,
22 adding it to the \$15 million from that category?

1 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah, and I don't think -- you know,
2 I think we can go through the document. That's probably not
3 what I would do first.

4 The first thing I would do is move Unemployment,
5 the \$50 million-dollar discussion down to -- I don't want to
6 take it away completely, I think it could go with the future
7 discussion that -- you know, Unemployment Fund, you know,
8 shoring it up.

9 And the -- I just -- I think that's an important
10 piece, to move it out of this document and put it down in
11 things to be, you know, talked about afterwards.

12 LOU D'ALLESSANDRO: Jerry -- Lou D'Allesandro --
13 that's -- I think that's reasonable. I spoke with
14 Commissioner Copadis today about the Unemployment Fund, and
15 about the drawdown that's taking place.

16 And he mentioned, even though the pressure on our
17 fund is severe, we're still in pretty good shape, as
18 compared to others. California is broke. They've drained
19 all of their Unemployment Fund, and will begin borrowing
20 from the Federal Government.

21 So others are in worse shape than we are at this
22 point in time, and if indeed you could hold that, and put it

1 in the second round of discussion, it makes sense, where
2 other deeds have really kind of manifested themselves.

3 And one deed that I got many calls on is food and
4 feeding, particularly for the summer months for the school
5 children who have been fed through the school year, but
6 because of the fact that the school year is ending, won't be
7 able to receive food as they move through the summer. And
8 that's a real concern.

9 So something -- we put \$5 million aside for the
10 food bank, but that really doesn't address the meals program
11 that's currently in place, and taking care of the school-age
12 kids. So there's an item that we have to look at in terms
13 of maybe expansion.

14 And I think a waiver has to be applied for in
15 order to maintain that feeding, that -- because it shuts
16 down, I think when the school year shuts down. And there's
17 a dramatic need there, as I see it, and as I have heard from
18 people. Now, how that fits into the picture is something
19 that I think is worthy of discussion.

20 JERRY LITTLE: I'm looking at the Board, and I see
21 that we have a question from representative Dick Hinch.

22 DICK HINCH: Yes, thank you, Jerry. So I think I

1 would be comfortable if we could come to an agreement today.

2 Because I thought we were at an agreement on what
3 do you, that we liked the allocation scenario of -- you
4 know, like, 45 percent now, and then further spending, which
5 by the way I agree should go out right away -- and then by
6 May 31 we're looking at this again for another disbursement
7 of approximately 15 percent, and then again June, et cetera,
8 et cetera.

9 What I'm a little concerned about -- more than a
10 little concerned about, is that I have received some
11 recommended spending that really takes that 45 percent, and
12 if we add up everything that was requested, then that number
13 is much, much higher.

14 It could be 70 or 75 percent right away. And I
15 think we lost track of get some emergency funding out right
16 away for those items that are critical.

17 And that doesn't mean that any one of these would
18 not be coming back for a second or even a third
19 disbursement. But before we start adding in too much and
20 getting away from the 45 percent theory, before we know it,
21 we're going to spend the whole \$1.25 million dollars this
22 afternoon.

1 And I don't mean any disrespect to anybody, but
2 when I saw the allocation -- the request, that's kind of
3 what it is.

4 So we're all in agreement that we should stick
5 with the 45 percent number on an immediacy, and then come
6 back, come back, come back. Because I think that's going to
7 dictate how we fill in the spreadsheet. Thank you.

8 JERRY LITTLE: Senator Soucy?

9 DONNA SOUCY: Well, I understand Representative
10 Hinch's comment for his discussion. It's that we should
11 come up with the number that we want in reserve, before we
12 decide on the spending.

13 I think it might be a better exercise to just go
14 through the recommendations of the spreadsheet and then at
15 the end we'll determine if that last number is a reasonable
16 number.

17 Because I think we are prioritizing the spend. I
18 think the \$50 million, the timing of that -- obviously for
19 unemployment, if we add some to non-profits, it would
20 probably go out at a different time.

21 If we leave it sort of to the side and say, "\$50
22 million later for the funds" it means that we might not be

1 expending that money until June, perhaps. I don't know what
2 Senator Morse intended, but, you know, based on Senator
3 D'Alessandro's discussion with Commissioner [01:02:48
4 indiscernible proper names] the dollars aren't needed
5 immediately.

6 So I think if we go through the rest of the items
7 individually, I think we may get to that number differently
8 than we might have anticipated from the spreadsheet.
9 Because the original spreadsheet had all \$50 of the
10 Unemployment, I think going out sooner.

11 So I just think we need to go through each item
12 before we make that determination about how the balance is
13 going to be allocated, that's all.

14 JERRY LITTLE: Senator D'Allesandro?

15 LOU D'ALLESANDRO: Thank you, Jerry. I agree with
16 what Donna said. But I think one thing that we have to take
17 into consideration was what that number really is. Because
18 there are times the Governor has allocated monies and spent
19 monies out of the \$1.25--.

20 That leaves the corpus at a number, another
21 number, or -- for example what happened on Monday. There
22 was a big spend --

1 DONNA SOUCY: Good point.

2 LOU D'ALLESSANDRO: -- which reduced the amount of
3 money that was available to us to spend.

4 So if you're going to create reserve, I think
5 you've got to go through all of the items first, allocate
6 all of the money that has been spent, and then begin to
7 build your reserve and your percentage, because the corpus,
8 the main corpus, has changed to some extent because of
9 appropriations that have already been expended.

10 Thank you.

11 JERRY LITTLE: Senator Morse? Senator Morse, I
12 believe your hand is up?

13 CHUCK MORSE: You know, I keep hitting that mute
14 button. I believe we've accounted for all the spending with
15 \$255 million in the Governor's Office today, unless happened
16 more recent. But I wouldn't suggest on Unemployment that we
17 carry the \$50 million to the bottom of the document. I
18 would just bring the topic to the bottom.

19 Because I agree with what's been said, which we'll
20 have a debate, you know, and I don't know the timeframe, and
21 nor do I know if 15 percent is the right number. But, you
22 know, if we come up with something today or Monday that we

1 can believe in the first round, there's nothing saying we
2 don't spend it all in the second round because -- I mean,
3 some of you will know before me, what if the Federal
4 Government is working on another document?

5 I mean, at that point, maybe it makes sense to
6 move the rest of the money, you know, because you're dealing
7 with a much bigger number. So I don't know that we have to
8 -- you know, go there.

9 I think if we go through each item, which the
10 President suggested, we can, you know, if we buy into the
11 fact that Unemployment comes out of this document, goes down
12 to future discussion, that's aside of the point.

13 Now we get to state government. All of those
14 numbers are already being -- you know, they're already out
15 there. I'm not sure we have to debate any of those three
16 numbers, because the \$65- to \$25- and the \$75- are already
17 accounted for, and we're not -- we didn't propose adding to
18 any of those.

19 So then you go down to local and county
20 government. Just correct me; I'm reading two documents that
21 basically have additional spending. So if they fall into
22 these categories, we should have those debates while we're

1 in these categories.

2 I mean, I don't think they do, but I tried to take
3 the numbers from all these proposals and put them into a
4 place where it looked like it came to on our document, but I
5 could be wrong.

6 But I don't want to go too fast, but I think the
7 real debate's coming up in sections afterwards, to be honest
8 with you.

9 JERRY LITTLE: This is Jerry Little. I would just
10 like to point out that at your meeting on What do you, you
11 asked us to arrange to have Deputy Commissioner Lavers join
12 us today, and he is on the phone. Would you like him to
13 continue? He was next on the agenda.

14 Would you like him to wait until that point, since
15 you've been discussing unemployment insurance, and possibly
16 moving this to a future consideration, would you like him to
17 jump in now?

18 CHUCK MORSE: I'm fine with it.

19 DONNA SOUCY: Commissioner Little, this is Donna
20 Soucy. I would be happy to speak with him if he's on the
21 phone. I just he's got a lot of demands on his time. I'm
22 happy to hear from him for a few moments, if we could. He

1 can answer questions.

2 JERRY LITTLE: Exactly what I was thinking, he's a
3 busy guy. Rich, are you with us this afternoon now?

4 RICH LAVERS: I am, Commissioner. Can you hear
5 me?

6 JERRY LITTLE: I can hear you just fine. Do you
7 have --

8 RICH LAVERS: I've enjoyed listening in, without
9 actually having to participate. That was a fun break in my
10 day, actually.

11 JERRY LITTLE: I'm sorry, I ratted you out, didn't
12 I? I'm sorry. Do you have reactions, or do members of the
13 Committee have specific questions for Mr. Lavers?

14 RICH LAVERS: I had some quick numbers I could go
15 over for folks. I won't take too much of your time, and I'd
16 leave the time to the questions from the members, so they
17 could make the best use of the meeting.

18 I just want to -- I had some -- these are some
19 updated numbers since we had last spoke, as every day that
20 goes by, we learn a little bit more about what we might be
21 looking to expect, and how to prepare for it.

22 So, as I had previously said, we started with the

1 spike in unemployment caused by the pandemic. We started
2 with a solvent trust fund at \$300 million dollars.

3 As Commissioner [01:09:3 indiscernible proper
4 name] had pointed out to Senator D'Allesandro, many states I
5 believe we have -- it might be as many as seven states have
6 already gotten approval to start borrowing from US Treasury
7 -- includes California, New York. These were states that
8 had not actually gained solvency following the Great
9 Recession.

10 So we started at \$300 million, determined solvent
11 by U.S. Department of Labor when they reviewed our trust
12 fund back in February of this year. We are at -- right now
13 our balance as of May 6 is \$254 million.

14 How the payment activity has looked thus far, and
15 a breakdown of which programs and who's responsible for it:
16 We have paid out through this morning \$329.6 million dollars
17 in benefits. That's in a month and a half. My total
18 benefits paid last year were \$43.6 million.

19 \$110 million of that \$329 -- has been paid out in
20 state UI and federal pandemic benefits. So those are the
21 two programs that are paying individuals for their first 26
22 weeks of eligibility. So those are all the newly eligible

1 people that have suffered a job loss as a result of COVID-
2 19, starting back on March 17.

3 The other -- the balance of the total amount paid
4 thus far, the \$219.6 million, has been paid out in those
5 federal \$600 payments. Those come out of a completely
6 separate fund from the New Hampshire Trust fund. US DOL
7 regularly replenishes that, and we draw down from that
8 separate fund for those \$600 payments that continue through
9 July.

10 The \$110 million that has been paid out for the
11 first -- the people that have become initially eligible --
12 and this is for their first 26 weeks, that is a breakdown
13 between state-funded UI and federally funded pandemic
14 benefits at a 55:45 split right now.

15 So 55 percent of that, or \$60 -- six, zero, 0.5
16 million -- is being shouldered by the state trust fund, and
17 45 percent of that, or \$49.5 million -- is federally
18 reimbursable, pandemic unemployment paid under the CARES
19 Act.

20 Our current weekly disbursement rate of what is
21 being paid out each week, is right at \$30 million dollars.
22 And so, if we carry that forward and look at that split,

1 that is about a \$16.5 million weekly obligation on the state
2 UI fund, and that balance of \$13.5-- is federally
3 reimbursable PUA, the pandemic money.

4 So if we make an assumption, which I don't think
5 it is an assumption, that I'd be comfortable making at this
6 point, that \$30 million is going to be our weekly burn rate
7 for disbursements going forward. I think there's a strong
8 likelihood it could be higher than that.

9 But if you assume that burn rate of \$30 million
10 for what we're seeing right now, you'd be looking at 15
11 weeks without assuming any additional revenue coming into
12 the Trust Fund for that period of time. Revenue is
13 difficult to be projecting right now, because of timing.

14 As folks now, our majority of the Trust Fund
15 revenue comes in as a result of the wages paid by employers
16 during the first calendar quarter of the year.

17 So those wages paid in January, February, March:
18 employers then have until the end of April. Usually a lot
19 of it comes in in the first week of May, where we are, to
20 pay the taxes that are based upon wages paid by those
21 employers during the first quarter.

22 What we are seeing right now, and I can't say this

1 as being final, because revenues continue to come in, and we
2 are still here only at May 8, but the initial numbers are
3 troubling -- more troubling than I would have expected for
4 the first quarter, knowing that employment really dropped
5 off a cliff in March, but the revenues coming in for the
6 first quarter compared to 2019 revenues for the same period
7 just going over both, going from -- just looking at the May
8 1 to May 7 of 2019 to 2020, we are looking right now at a 47
9 percent drop in revenue.

10 In 2019 during that period, where it's the lion's
11 share of the first quarter payments coming in, was \$10.7
12 million dollars, and we've seen \$5.6 million during those
13 same days.

14 So almost cut in half, and the pandemic didn't hit
15 really in that first quarter until what we had thought was
16 in March, which is when we saw the unemployment spiking once
17 the Governor had announced expanded eligibility on the
18 seventeenth.

19 So in looking at that burn rate of 15 weeks, that
20 gets New Hampshire to about mid-August, when the fund would
21 continue to have revenue to pay benefits. That burn rate
22 also doesn't assume any revenue for the two surcharges that

1 are both a half percent, that would need to be put on at
2 some -- that would both be put on at this point in the third
3 quarter of this year.

4 With looking at trying to project out, where I
5 said I was not at a point where I would say the \$30 million
6 was our new disbursement weekly rate, because I don't think
7 that's necessarily the feeling yet.

8 And I think your high rate of collecting, in terms
9 of right now we have about 115,000 actively, weekly filers.

10 And you're going to continue to see that for a
11 whole host of reasons through the end of July, because of
12 the availability of enhanced benefits, and also the
13 continuation of the stay at home order for the state, as the
14 Governor's been very clear that despite his gradual
15 reopening, that the stay at home order still is very much in
16 place.

17 So it's difficult to project out. We do have the
18 benefit of having Brian Gottlub, longtime state economist
19 now working here at the department for -- he came in a few
20 months before the pandemic, and I think from an economist's
21 perspective, this is probably that perfect storm of what
22 you've been waiting for for your entire career to try to

1 look at and figure out where things are going.

2 I think over the next two weeks, and what we see
3 for weekly payouts, I think we'll have a really good idea as
4 to whether or not that \$30 million a week is what
5 stabilized, and then as what we will see through July, or
6 does that grow to \$35- or \$40 million, which when you
7 compound that over that many number of weeks, obviously has
8 a dramatic impact on our burn rate.

9 Trying to figure out what we could draw from prior
10 experiences, I -- with what I've been seeing in terms of the
11 spike and how aggressive it has hit, I don't think there's
12 anything we can draw from lessons from the Great Recession
13 or any perioperative recessionary period, to be quite honest
14 with you.

15 You know, we started this as one of 31 states that
16 was considered solvent. But you got to look at what were
17 they considering us solvent for?

18 And they were looking at our total wages paid for
19 the prior year, and then they were taking our three worst or
20 highest benefit payment years over the last 20 and averaging
21 that and saying that's what we were solvent for, and they
22 were giving us a stamp of solvency.

1 Well, that's not what we're experiencing right
2 now. The fact is, in the last four years, we had -- and
3 this is from 2016 through 2019, we had 130,000 initial
4 claims. We had over 150,000 in just a month and a half.

5 So there's nothing that I can look to for prior
6 experiences that is really going to be useful in trying to
7 predict, other than looking at what is on the ground in
8 terms of what is going to -- what are the levers that are
9 going to control continued filing, and what benefits are in
10 place, and what are the needs on the ground as well with
11 public health concerns, as we continue to be where we
12 currently are.

13 So at that rate, I don't know if -- you know, the
14 numbers that have been discussed for amount from the CARES
15 Act Flex funds, I don't know if a \$50 million-dollar amount
16 would be very well spent on supporting the state trust fund.

17 You look at we have -- as other states are already
18 doing, there's -- you know, the Federal Government provides
19 limited-purpose, interest-free borrowing for states for
20 their Unemployment Compensation Trust Funds.

21 And that right now we know is interest free for
22 the remainder of calendar year 2020. We don't know exactly

1 what that will look like for 2021. That will have to be
2 addressed by Congress in one of the next pieces of
3 legislation.

4 But it is right now for the rest of the year, it
5 is interest free, limited purpose borrowing that we can take
6 advantage of that can be our backstop, to make sure that we
7 continue to be able to meet the demands for payments of
8 benefits, whereas the Flex funds that you folks are
9 discussing about, you know, where those are more general
10 purposed, and we have a limited purpose pool of interest -
11 free money available for the Trust Fund, I just put it out.

12 I obviously don't -- I'm not going to -- I can,
13 not going to tell you what to do from a policy perspective,
14 but I think just in looking at that with the amount of money
15 that we will likely need to borrow, that the limited purpose
16 funds from the US Treasury for state trust funds have
17 interest-free right now for the rest of the year I think
18 would probably be the best option for New Hampshire.

19 And that is what other states are all doing right
20 now as well.

21 So I can -- I'll just stop right there. I
22 probably took more time than I should have, but I'll open it

1 up for questions, and you guys have me for as long as you
2 need me.

3 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Lavers. Do we have
4 a question from Senator Morse? Senator Morse?

5 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah, I -- first, let me thank Rich
6 for everything he's doing for the state. Two questions are
7 that first, are we hearing anything besides taking a no-
8 interest loan from the Federal Government that might be
9 coming down the pike?

10 RICH LAVERS: Senator, I think there's one other
11 consideration out there. You know, we've got the no-
12 interest loans, but then there's also a provision that was
13 tucked away in the CARES Act that would allow states to
14 obtain -- it's dealing with non-profits -- okay, so either
15 public or private non-profits.

16 So both your local and county public employers,
17 and then your non-profit employers.

18 But there's a provision in the CARES Act that
19 allows states to get 50 percent of benefits paid out for
20 state UI, of benefits paid out to former employees of non-
21 profits, the states can get 50 percent of that from the
22 Federal Government, dan can then provide a reimbursement to

1 those non-profits.

2 So the problem that we're having with that
3 provision in the CARES Act and I think a lot of states are
4 having is in order for states to take advantage of that, it
5 requires the non-profits to first pay, so they would have to
6 reimburse the fund dollar for dollar for the benefits that
7 are paid out.

8 Right now, under the Governor's emergency order,
9 those employers, are all employers, they are not being
10 charged those benefits.

11 With non-profits, because they don't regularly
12 contribute to the Trust Fund and its growth, right now all
13 that they are contributing to is the decline of the Trust
14 Fund, where they, because of statutory provisions where they
15 reimburse only for those benefits that are paid out, they
16 don't pay in on a quarterly basis.

17 So they are utilizing the fund for which they
18 didn't contribute to. A lot of good reasons for doing that,
19 considering the importance of the health care sectors, and
20 our hospitals and the financial difficulties that they're
21 having with just the revenue problems, without being able to
22 really have anyone that want to engage in elective

1 procedures.

2 So the difficulty with that provision from the
3 CARES Act is great that we can go and get 50 percent of
4 those benefits paid out, and we can bring that back in. The
5 problem is we would have to be charging the non-profits at
6 least 50 percent of the benefit payments, and they would
7 have to actually pay that.

8 They would have to -- you know, they would have to
9 hand over cash to the Trust Fund in order for us to get that
10 50 percent, that could then be -- go and reimburse those
11 non-profits.

12 So that's another opportunity to get money from
13 the feds. But I don't know whether or not it's worth the
14 procedure that they've put in place, where you actually have
15 to make those employers who are in difficult circumstances,
16 if you have to make them pay before you can actually -- you
17 know, you're taking it from the left hand and then
18 eventually giving it back to them with the right hand. I
19 don't know if that makes much sense.

20 There is discussion -- I know a lot of states
21 have been pushing Congress to act on that and to change the
22 process, so that the non-profits wouldn't actually have to

1 pay, which in that case then we would be able to get at
2 least some limited relief to the Trust Fund, but it would be
3 only for the benefits that are paid under regular state UI,
4 and it wouldn't be any of the benefits that are paid under
5 any of the federal programs.

6 So it's a limited amount of money that we'd be
7 able to get back. You're probably looking at -- right now
8 that would be less than \$10 million dollars.

9 CHUCK MORSE: Okay. And then my second question -
10 - I understand the concept of taking a loan for 0%, but I
11 believe I've had this conversation, when do we start paying
12 back that loan, and 2) don't the same entities that are
13 paying back that loan have to rebuild the Trust Fund to a
14 certain level?

15 RICH LAVERS: Yeah, Senator, absolutely. And I
16 know you've had a lot of experience with look at this in the
17 last recession and the 2010 reforms that were put in place,
18 and that's exactly correct.

19 So the Trust Fund and the amount that we would
20 borrow would need to be repaid, and we'd have to obviously
21 be -- we would want to repay that ahead of accruing any
22 borrowing costs, which right now we do not know. Well, we

1 do know.

2 We know that January 1 of 21, that those are no
3 longer scheduled to be interest free. However, that could
4 be changed -- I would expect it to be changed, but I don't
5 know that for sure.

6 But employers through their tax rates for
7 unemployment comp, would be the ones that would be paying
8 that back. So it would be money coming in to replenish the
9 fund, but also paying back the Federal Government at a rate
10 that we would avoid -- hopefully avoid borrowing costs.

11 We were fortunate back in SDH when we borrowed in
12 2010 and '11, we borrowed about a total of \$120 million in
13 about two \$60 million-dollar chunks.

14 And we were able to pay all of that back without
15 incurring any borrowing costs, but that was because of the
16 reforms put in place in 2010, where the surcharge was added
17 so there were two ½ point surcharges; the taxable wage base
18 went up from \$8000 to \$14,000 gradually. It went \$8000 to
19 \$10,000 next year to \$12,000 to \$14,000, where it still
20 stands; the waiting week was put into place.

21 So there were a lot of measures that were put in
22 place to control disbursements, but to also increase

1 renovate. That was largely balanced on the back of NH
2 Highway Business, and their rates went up significantly as a
3 result of that.

4 And just looking at a lot of cases, I had gone
5 back and dusted off the Trust fund Solvency Report that we
6 had done for a subcommittee of our Advisory Council back in
7 2016, 2017.

8 And for a -- just to give you an example, prior to
9 just looking at recessionary experience with those reforms
10 put in place for an employer that had 50 employees, in 2007
11 they were paying about \$5000 a year in Unemployment Comp
12 taxes.

13 And then in 2011 -- rather 2012, they were paying
14 over \$24,000 a year in Unemployment Comp taxes. So in many
15 cases, they nearly quintupled what they were paying in in
16 order to replenish the fund.

17 So that obviously is a considerable ask of New
18 Hampshire businesses for continued support of the Trust
19 Fund.

20 JERRY LITTLE: Senator Soucy, do you have a
21 question?

22 DONNA SOUCY: Yes, I did. Assistant Commissioner,

1 Commissioner, first of all thank you the Commissioner, and
2 most of all, all of you folks on the front lines of this. I
3 know that the Department is about as stressed as it can
4 possibly be, but continues to do great work during all of
5 this.

6 My question is regarding assistance that your
7 office might continue to need. One of the conversations we
8 had previously was regarding software upgrade, and whether
9 or not there are additional funds required that may assist
10 you and your employees to continue to do this good work, or
11 if it's simply additional employees that you need at this
12 time.

13 What is it that we might be able to do in the
14 short-term to help you deal with this overwhelming capacity
15 issue?

16 RICH LAVERS: You know, thank you for the Comment,
17 Senator and the question. So really, I think probably what
18 New Hampshire could use, as similar to other UI agencies, I
19 need more experts right now, right?

20 But because of the nature of the spike where I
21 went from 500 claims in one week to \$30,000 in the next, and
22 we were at a historic low in terms of our federal grant

1 dollars.

2 I was actually -- ironically, I looked at one of
3 our reports when I was cleaning up a pile of stuff just this
4 week, and the Federal Government actually considered me 16
5 positions overstuffed in the month prior to the pandemic.

6 So we were actually kind of living beyond our
7 means, right? According to what our staffers were, as
8 allotted by our federal grant.

9 So right now, really, we've been fortunate with
10 the assistance from the men and women from the New Hampshire
11 National Guard, and what they're doing for us in the call
12 centers.

13 You know, those call centers have received over
14 230,000 calls since March 17, and the men and women from the
15 Guard in a short time period have turned into experts on UI.

16 So right now, I think from a computer -- from a
17 software hardware perspective, software we're in a great
18 position. New Hampshire is one of 16 states nationally that
19 has what the U.S. Department of Labor would consider a
20 modernized Unemployment Benefits system.

21 So other states, where you've heard or seen people
22 actually filing paper claims, waiting in lines outside of

1 offices: That's because those states are operating on,
2 like, 1970s or '80s COBOL systems.

3 New Hampshire upgraded back in 2009, and we've
4 enhanced through the use of federal dollars every
5 opportunity we've had since then. So that's why individuals
6 have the conveniences that they have in terms of how they
7 file, and why our system has been able to handle the volume
8 that we have seen thus far.

9 And we've done really well. And there's a quick,
10 four-minute video that I had sent out to Lisa English to
11 pass onto the members that the Wall Street Journal did, just
12 looking at what the problems have been from State UI
13 agencies in general, and they focused on technology and
14 staffing.

15 And I'm not sure what the current status is, but
16 at the time that they did that video two weeks ago, the
17 state of Arizona was still 18 weeks away from being able to
18 pay federal pandemic benefits.

19 New Hampshire started paying those on March 24,
20 and that was because of the strength of the system that we
21 have built over the years.

22 What we do need, and what we have -- we had an

1 informational item that was on the Council agenda this week
2 -- and again joint fiscal today, was we have -- New
3 Hampshire received \$4.4 million dollars as a result of the
4 \$1 billion that the Congress authorized under the Families
5 First Coronavirus Response Act.

6 And that \$4.4 million was for states to assist
7 with staffing and IT needs as they started to face the spike
8 in claims.

9 \$315,000 of that \$4.4 million is what we're using
10 for hardware upgrades. So we had fairly new system hardware
11 for our benefits system. But it was sized for what we
12 thought was a spike in claims before this pandemic, and now
13 it's -- now we're realizing that just this volume is, you
14 know, far and away exceeds anything that anyone had ever
15 sized their system for in terms of speed, performance,
16 capacity.

17 And so, we're actually using that \$315,000 to
18 purchase four new solid-state SANs to replace our older
19 servers that still, you know, they have spinnable disks, so
20 more moving parts.

21 And the way I understand it is a non-IT guy has
22 more movable parts, more things that could break easier, and

1 less sleep for me at night.

2 And so, we're actually going to be implementing
3 those new SANs that are actually sized for more than what
4 we're experiencing now. So we have greater capacity,
5 memory, CPU, greater speed not only at our main server room
6 here in Concord, but at our redundancy center in Nashua.

7 So we're actually going to have new hardware
8 that's going to increase performance and reliability and
9 eliminate downtime for our system, when we have to push
10 through enhancements our data fixes.

11 So we're out. We're going to actually be able to
12 keep it standing up, so no more of those annoying messages
13 that. "Wednesday night you're going to have two hours of
14 downtime, I'm sorry for the inconvenience."

15 We're also actually installing new switches
16 between Concord and Nashua to increase the speed at which
17 data is transferred. And we're actually installing the new
18 switch going from 1G to 10G between Concord and Nashua, and
19 then between our Concord office and DOIT's main hub on
20 Hazen.

21 We're also increasing the fiber lines between each
22 of those locations as well.

1 So again, we're trying to learn from the
2 experience that we've had in this first month and a half. I
3 don't know what we're going to see for a lull this summer,
4 and I don't know whether we're going to see a spike in the
5 fall, but you can be sure that we're going to be prepared
6 for it, and that's what we're using the money that we
7 received from the Federal Government for -- the rest of that
8 \$4.4 million has been budgeted towards personnel costs.

9 Our -- as you can imagine, our overtime cost
10 changed significantly from what we had been budgeted for,
11 where we implemented our mandatory overtime staffing plan
12 back at the end of March, and we have been working seven
13 days a week, 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday
14 and 9:00 to 5:00 on Saturdays and Sundays. So that's a lot
15 of additional staff charges.

16 We are giving people some breaks, so that you're
17 not working two evenings in a row, and you're not working
18 both weekend days.

19 So we're giving people breaks in order to
20 encourage some balancing and mental health, but it's really
21 the experts that we have on the ground that we have to rely
22 upon as we get through this first surge.

1 Come this summer, if we see a lull, then that will
2 be a good opportunity to bring on some additional staffing
3 and give us time to train without taking away our best
4 resources away from processing claims.

5 So that's kind of where we are and where our
6 thought process is right now on the technology side.

7 DONNA SOUCY: Great. That is helpful. And just
8 one last question, if I may, Assistant Commissioner.

9 One of the issues that seems to be a challenge for
10 folks, and I just wondered if you had any tips that you
11 could share and we could continue to pass on: Self-employed
12 individuals applying seem to have greater difficulty than
13 any other category I've heard from.

14 Is there anything in particular that has improved
15 in that process, or that individual claimants need to
16 improve, to manage through it more quickly?

17 RICH LAVERS: Yeah, so that is -- that's a good
18 question. You know, historically the unemployment system
19 and the self-employed, they don't get along very well. You
20 ok, their self-employed were not part of the system.

21 And so, that presents some challenges, right? In
22 trying to figure out how do you uphold the integrity of the

1 fund and pay at a verified, correct rate for a weekly
2 benefit amount, with someone whose wages and earnings have
3 not been reported into the system?

4 So that was the challenge. But we obviously, we
5 knew -- you know, New Hampshire is a small business state, a
6 lot of self-employed, and we knew that in order to really
7 effectively broaden eligibility to encourage effect
8 quarantining, you had to address self-employed. And so,
9 that's why it was addressed in the Governor's Emergency
10 Order.

11 What we have currently in place and I think is a
12 good process, and there -- you know, there's always, as
13 you're trying to stand up new functionality, there are
14 always going to be some bumps along the way.

15 But I think the process we have in place works
16 well, where an individual that has self-employed earnings
17 and is able to certify to meeting one of the criteria under
18 the CARES Act under their weekly claim, now when they're
19 coming in, they're automatically put in at the federal
20 minimum rate of \$167 a week. That gives you eligibility for
21 the \$600 payment as well.

22 And then, to the extent the individual has

1 earnings higher than that which would equate to a \$167 a
2 week rate, they then have the opportunity to submit to the
3 Department either their federal return for 2019, just the
4 Schedule C, or 1099s from 2019.

5 And to the extent they are able to document
6 earnings above \$16,500, that would actually provide them
7 with a higher weekly benefit amount. We would then take
8 that in, we would then have verified earnings to get them
9 above the minimum rate under the Federal CARES Act, and then
10 we would correct back to their first week of eligibility.

11 So there have been in some instances a lot of the
12 problems within self-employed is not necessarily self-
13 employed, it's a lot of people have mixed earnings, right?
14 You have traditional employment and you have self-employment
15 as well, and you'll have individuals with self-employment he
16 earnings, they've heard, "Oh, yeah, I'm now eligible for
17 unemployment. I'm going to file because my self-employed
18 has impacted, and it's gone and dried up, so I want those
19 benefits."

20 But a lot of those people are maintaining their
21 regular W-2 employment, because it was part-time. And so,
22 what the federal CARES Act requires states to do is that

1 before I can look at your federal eligibility, I got to make
2 sure that you don't have state eligibility.

3 That was a point of contention from the very
4 beginning, and that we argued against being included in the
5 CARES Act, but it's there, we'll live with it.

6 But we have to look to see if you have state
7 eligibility. And that person who longer has their self-
8 employment earnings, but has W-2 wages, they have state
9 eligibility, it doesn't matter from which they've been
10 separated or lost employment. They have earnings if they're
11 over \$2800 in that four-quarter base period, they have
12 enough earnings to earn them, to have a state rate.

13 And so, they're paid at their state rate. Federal
14 Government have said we can't consider their self-employment
15 earnings in that situation. And so that has created a lot
16 of frustration amongst self-employed individuals, and we've
17 been trying to explain it. It's not the easiest thing to
18 explain. Doesn't message very well on a website.

19 But we've been trying to do that as we work with
20 each of those individuals, and our messaging has gotten --
21 has gotten better. Assistant Commissioner Bailey over at
22 Department of Safety made the comment to me, "I didn't have

1 a wartime website." And he and I have been working very
2 closely together.

3 And I said, "Rick, that is true. But it also is
4 difficult to change a website during a war, and we managed
5 to do that this week.

6 We put up a new website on Tuesday of this week,
7 it's "unemploymentbenefits.nh.gov." We've got video
8 tutorials; we've got a side-by-side narrative with
9 screenshot tutorials. I got a chat feature that we're
10 launching tomorrow morning. We have great FAQs.

11 Really able to provide some timely information to
12 folks around the CARES Act, what it means, what do those
13 eligibility questions really mean, and we're able to message
14 some of the information we've gotten from the U.S.
15 Department of Labor around, you know, "Am I still eligible
16 under the CARES Act if there's a stay at home order in
17 place?" And, you know, that answer is yes.

18 And we're able to get that information out to
19 people prior to them going in and panicking when they're
20 trying to fill out their form and not knowing what to do, so
21 we're able to get that out earlier, and it's just a constant
22 battle. Let's keep our messaging relevant, let's keep it

1 timely, and let's stay ahead of what the questions -- let's
2 try to anticipate those questions coming in.

3 And that website right now has just been -- I
4 don't know what I'd be doing without it. It's just provided
5 a great feature for getting information out to, you know,
6 the 115,000 people that are now everyone wants -- everyone
7 has questions that need to be answered, and that's the best
8 way to get it out to them.

9 DONNALEE LOZEAU: Thank you.

10 JERRY LITTLE: Are there any other questions for
11 Assistant Commissioner Lavers? Seeing and hearing none:
12 Rich, thank you very, very much.

13 RICH LAVERS: All right. Hey, thank you everyone
14 for your time and the work that you're doing.

15 COLLECTIVE: You're welcome.

16 JERRY LITTLE: So that brings us back to our
17 agenda. I think, Senator Morse, we were discussing the idea
18 of moving the --

19 CHUCK MORSE: Moving --

20 JERRY LITTLE: On unemployment from the first line
21 down to what I believe you were saying, the end of the
22 proposal, which I think meant moving it under future

1 consideration. Is that correct, sir?

2 CHUCK MORSE: Yes. But I also would like to point
3 something out. There's no free lunch in any of these
4 categories, because the number that we didn't discuss was,
5 you know, that going from -- on a 50 employee company, your
6 tax is going up \$20,000 a year.

7 So we may not be getting charged at companies
8 today, but in order to refill that bucket, and to pay back
9 the money that's going to end up being borrowed, whether
10 it's at 0 interest rate, which is great, but it's still
11 going to have to be paid back, your rates are going up
12 considerably.

13 So I just say that today for a future debate. But
14 I would just move this down to a future discussion.

15 JERRY LITTLE: Any thoughts or comments from the
16 committee? All right. Do we want to move onto the -- I
17 don't think there was anything under "State Government" on
18 any one document that was presented? I'll just wait a
19 second. The -- all right. So the next thing is local and
20 town government.

21 I didn't see anything under this also that anyone
22 was proposing any changes. That figure, I believe, that's

1 already been funded, Senator Morse.

2 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah, I just -- with the letters
3 that I received today, there are some proposals -- you know,
4 to make changes to the different categories. So I just want
5 to make sure I didn't miss anything. The -- oh, there we
6 go, all right.

7 Under Business Relief Plan, there's a proposal to
8 reduce this from --

9 JERRY LITTLE: Senator Morse?

10 CHUCK MORSE: Yep?

11 JERRY LITTLE: Before we move on, there is an item
12 on the e-mail from Representative Wallner, relative to local
13 and county government. Representative Wallner, do you want
14 to speak about that?

15 MARYJANE WALLNER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Little. I
16 actually was wanting us to possibly take a look again at the
17 front line [01:49:05 indiscernible]. And being sure that we
18 have enough funds available so that in long-term care
19 facilities particularly, that all of the staff, including
20 the support staff -- just the people who are cleaning, the
21 food service people -- all of those are also receiving that
22 \$300 a week bonus.

1 Plus, my understanding is that some of our
2 protective workers are going to start again doing face-to-
3 face visits. And I think they would be -- we should
4 consider providing some reimbursement, some bonus to them
5 also, as they start going out to families, and going face-
6 to-face in their working.

7 So the child protection workers, and just being
8 sure that in a long-term care facility, where the situation
9 is so drastic that we are sure that we've got enough funds
10 in there, that everyone in those facilities is getting the
11 additional \$300.

12 JERRY LITTLE: Any other thoughts or comments
13 about that?

14 RICH LAVERS: Well, I just think that's why we
15 need to keep coming back to this document, the -- you know
16 the \$40 million in local and county government. I mean,
17 nursing homes I would assume that the \$20 million in the
18 future proposal is something different than this \$300. But
19 I just don't know enough about what the impact of \$300
20 means, I mean, at all.

21 JERRY LITTLE: Representative Wallner?

22 MARYJANE WALLNER: Yes, thank you. And I don't

1 know the dollar for dollar impact either.

2 So I would like to see us at least put this -- for
3 us to do an evaluation of what is happening. I know that
4 we've already -- I believe we've got \$25 million in there
5 for front line workers that has already gone out. So it
6 would be important to me to know in the next week or so how
7 that's being drawn down, and what the balance there is.

8 JERRY LITTLE: Very good. That's --

9 RICH LAVERS: I think there's a couple of
10 different things going on. The \$25 million is -- and the
11 \$75 million are in a different category. The -- I just
12 don't know enough about it, to be honest with you, to talk
13 about it.

14 JERRY LITTLE: So I believe the -- this is Jerry -
15 - I believe that fund for the front line worker's hazard pay
16 is at Employment Security, no?

17 RICH LAVERS: The long-term -- that's the long-
18 term care, the nursing home is what we're talking about,
19 right? Or are you talking about Police and Fire?

20 MARYJANE WALLNER: I was talking about -- I was
21 talking about, particularly about nursing homes, long-term
22 care.

1 RICH LAVERS: Yes, the long-term care is at
2 Employment Security. That's where that fund is, and where
3 it's being managed out of. So you're requesting an update
4 on how much of that fund has been spent so far, what the
5 balance is remaining in this fund?

6 MARYJANE WALLNER: Yeah, just so that we keep
7 track in our next round, if that fund is getting low, that
8 we consider adding additional funds to that fund, to that
9 hazard pay.

10 RICH LAVERS: We will look into that. We're
11 checking to see whether or not we have that on our website
12 right now, but I'm not sure, there's a flood of information
13 there. But we all get you an updated number,
14 representative.

15 MARYJANE WALLNER: Thank you.

16 DONNA SOUCY: May I ask Representative Wallner a
17 question?

18 RICH LAVERS: Certainly. I'm sorry, Senator
19 Soucy, I did not see your hand up there on the screen, my
20 apologies.

21 DONNA SOUCY: No. So in that fund, the current 75
22 million that's being administered through Employment

1 Security, it says, "Eligible Workers" am I correct,
2 Representative Wallner, you want to see that definition
3 expanded a bit to additional workers within the long-term
4 care system?

5 MARYJANE WALLNER: Yeah. I would like to see that
6 expanded to include people who are working at food service
7 in long-term care, working, cleaning the building, those
8 kinds of workers. So expanding --

9 DONNA SOUCY: Great, and there's --

10 MARYJANE WALLNER: -- expansion. Also, also,
11 under the state, I would like to see the protective care
12 workers included as they start those family visits again.

13 DONNA SOUCY: Great, thank you.

14 RICH LAVERS: Senator Morse, a question, a
15 comment?

16 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah. I think -- I mean instead of
17 dropping anything that's in this document down -- future
18 discussions, in my opinion are things that are not in this
19 document. Anything that's in this document, I would think
20 we'd want to review every Monday, I mean, or whatever period
21 of time this group chooses.

22 Because, I mean, anything we do now we're going to

1 want to go back and make sure it's working.

2 I mean, the -- I don't -- I would just think
3 that's going to be an assumption that we can all make is if
4 we fund the category now, you know, next month when we come
5 back, we start to review each category and "fluff" out where
6 they are.

7 JERRY LITTLE: So Lisa English from our office has
8 been busy on the keyboard, and has some data for you,
9 Representative Wallner.

10 MARYJANE WALLNER: Great, thank you.

11 LISA ENGLISH: Representative Wallner, this is
12 Lisa English. For the spend on the long-term care
13 stabilization stipend, it was sent through yesterday. It's
14 \$3,054,600. The total committed through yesterday is
15 \$5,536,950.

16 And I pulled up the guidance on New Hampshire
17 Employment Security about what is a qualifying front line
18 employee?

19 And front line means work provided by employees
20 that work in direct care - food service, maintenance, et
21 cetera for a Medicaid enrolled provider. So it's for
22 employees that are not able to do their work remotely, and

1 their service is vital to patient care.

2 MARYJANE WALLNER: Thank you, Lisa, I appreciate
3 that. Can you tell me how long has the payment been being
4 made? So the \$3 million, with \$5 million being committed to
5 it, how many -- what period of time does that cover?

6 LISA ENGLISH: So the program rolled out I believe
7 on April 16. Now, I suspect this it took some time for
8 individuals -- for the employers to apply and then get
9 approved and then have the funding go out. So I don't have
10 those details, but it's been about three weeks since the
11 program was first rolled out.

12 MARYJANE WALLNER: Okay, great. Thank you very
13 much. And I did want to know under the -- what about the
14 Child Protective workers, are they included in any of these
15 categories?

16 LISA ENGLISH: They are not. There may be
17 categories for residential treatment, but I would have to
18 take a look at the guidance for that.

19 MARYJANE WALLNER: Okay, thank you. Yeah. I
20 would appreciate if you could find out more about that.

21 LISA ENGLISH: I do have -- sorry, I do have it,
22 it just took me a second. Residential SUV, mental health

1 providers used residential treatment providers are included
2 as qualifying Medicaid providers, according to the May 4
3 COVID-19 Long-term Care Stabilization Program Guidance.

4 MARYJANE WALLNER: But not the child protection
5 workers that work for the state?

6 LISA ENGLISH: I do not believe that they're
7 included, other than frontline workers at Sununu Youth
8 Services Center.

9 MARYJANE WALLNER: Okay, thank you.

10 JERRY LITTLE: I don't see any other hands raised
11 on the screen, so I guess we're going back to you, Senator
12 Morse. I think we were at -- I just finished, "Local and
13 County Government," and you were moving forward to,
14 "Business Relief Funding." On the Business Relief Funding on
15 one of the documents I received, it was suggested that we
16 reduce this to \$75 million.

17 CHUCK MORSE: Yes, I think that was Representative
18 Wallner's request that was just discussed. Her suggestion
19 was to move \$25 million from Business Relief and move it to
20 the \$300 stipend program we were just discussing.

21 MARYJANE WALLNER: Right. And this is
22 Representative Wallner -- I, you know, that's exactly what I

1 was trying to -- I was trying to stay within -- trying to
2 stay within our limits of not spending the total amount of
3 money available to us.

4 So, you know, I -- the \$100, I think the \$100
5 million, I would like to see us be able to go back and
6 revisit that one at a later date.

7 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah. And I'd be -- the only thing
8 I did in this category is trying to get some logic to
9 numbers, is, you know, what was presented to us was \$700
10 million. The -- when we listened to the debate and with the
11 hospital, it was \$500 million.

12 So I basically tried to pick a percentage that
13 worked for each situation and sought to get something going.
14 That's how I came up with these numbers, and it just so
15 happens that Senator D'Allesandro put the same numbers down.

16 JERRY LITTLE: That's why I put them in there.
17 Questions or comments? I don't see any. We'll note that
18 we're a little bit after 3:00. Representative Hennessey, do
19 you have a question?

20 ERIN HENNESSEY: Thank you, Director Little. I
21 just wanted to make a comment on the intended use for these
22 funds, and also reference something that one of the other

1 Advisory Board members said earlier in our conversation.

2 1) is that I hope when these are allocated to the
3 RDCs that it would be in a fair manner where not all those
4 funds go to one part of the state. As you know, I'm from
5 the North Country, and I'd like to see some of those funds
6 go up here.

7 Also, I don't know that \$100,000,000 could be
8 easily divided into those 10 RDCs and gotten out. I'm not
9 the expert on that. So I did like the idea, and I apologize
10 who mentioned it from the other Advisory group, that maybe
11 local banks would be involved in this process as well,
12 similar to the FDA loan process that's going on for the
13 federal program.

14 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you. Any other questions or
15 comments at the moment? Noticing it's a bit after 3:00. Is
16 there a -- do you have guidance courses to how you would
17 like us to proceed through the rest of the agenda this
18 afternoon?

19 You've got a couple of e-mails, communications
20 relative to changes people would like to see. Speaker
21 Shurtleff asked for some changes, Representative Wallner had
22 another one that she would like to toss out there.

1 Senator Morse, do you want to ask if there are any
2 other changes in any of the categories on the document that
3 you and Senator D'Allesandro put together that people would
4 like to discuss?

5 CHUCK MORSE: Well yeah, I would, but I think this
6 is going into Monday anyway. But the -- I just -- maybe the
7 best way to end this, because it is Mother's Day weekend and
8 I definitely have been on the phone for, like, four hours so
9 far today.

10 The -- when we do come back, and I suggest you
11 come back today -- if I total all these documents, it came
12 to a billion dollars if we add everything in.

13 And I just don't think if we want to send a
14 message -- and remember, we're not the ones that are going
15 to make this decision -- if we want to send a message that
16 this needs to go out today, I think that message needs to be
17 closer to where the document is right now, and then start
18 working on all these other categories.

19 We're definitely diving into things today that I
20 have no knowledge of, none. And I would think like anyone
21 else in this group you want to bring somebody in and discuss
22 it, you know, much like we brought Rich in today. I think

1 it's pretty obvious what that's going to cost in the long
2 run, so if anything the \$50 million is not enough. But
3 that's a future debate, and I'm willing to put it out for a
4 future debate.

5 I thought document was pretty strong right now,
6 except for non-profit, because of what I heard from Jerry
7 the other day. I don't know if anyone's had time to look
8 into that, but the -- you know, the fact that they wanted
9 \$125--, that's a big number, and I didn't see a way to get
10 there and make this document realistic today, but, I mean, I
11 think we have to figure that one out, so.

12 JERRY LITTLE: So what Senator Morse just referred
13 to is that we have received a proposal to address nonprofit
14 issues in the state of New Hampshire from the Charitable
15 Foundation, the CDFA, the New Hampshire Center for
16 Nonprofits.

17 And we have been chatting with them with the all
18 in allotment for covering very, very broadly from child care
19 and health care at the regional centers to ARS, which is an
20 economic driver, so very broad coverage of the non-profits
21 in the state of New Hampshire, at about \$125 million
22 dollars. So that is in our hand at this point in time.

1 We also have a proposal from the BFA to bring
2 small business relief, and we heard from the folks on the
3 Stakeholder Advisory Board and from many of you multiple
4 times that they recommend we use the experienced agency and
5 experts in the state of New Hampshire to deliver services to
6 those broader general "swab" sectors of society and the
7 economy. So we have those to look at too.

8 We're also getting a lot of questions on the
9 screen right now, and I sort of lost track of which came in
10 which order. But I think it's Representative Hinch is next.

11 DICK HINCH: Thank you, Jerry, I appreciate it.
12 So I agree with Senator Morse. I think that we all received
13 some recommended changes. The document came, you know, an
14 hour or so before the meeting started, and I think we need
15 to have time to look at those.

16 I did the same math exercise as Senator Morse did,
17 and came out as well to almost a billion dollars, which kind
18 of reinforced my comment of earlier.

19 So I think we really need to spend some quality
20 time over the weekend and look at these -- and try to put
21 some priority to it, so that we go back to the theory that
22 we had before of doing this in segmented spending proposals,

1 because if we were to say yes to all of these today, which I
2 don't hear us doing, but if we were, then, you know, we just
3 about spent the whole allocation that's come to us.

4 So I think we need to pause, step back and look at
5 these, and analyze what the effect is going to be.

6 By the way, I remind everybody the Governor is on
7 now. Thank you.

8 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, Representative Hinch.
9 Senator Soucy?

10 DONNA SOUCY: Thank you, Governor. Just a couple
11 things in response. I mean, there are about \$250 billion
12 dollars that have already been determined by the Governor.
13 So I think the requests are less than a billion dollars, but
14 that's formatting I think on the sheet.

15 I do think we would be remiss if we didn't pick a
16 few key areas. And I think there are two or three key areas
17 that we need to make recommendations on immediately. There
18 is some urgency. Many of you may have heard there was yet
19 another round of federal funding for the hospitals.
20 However, the money was characterized as money going to rural
21 hospitals.

22 So what that means is that the two major hospitals

1 in our two largest cities that are handling the largest
2 number of COVID patients didn't receive any of those funds.
3 I think the area of hospitals is one, where I think we're
4 all pretty much in agreement.

5 I have a minor suggestion and a suggestion for
6 distribution. I'd like to try and act on a few key things
7 to say, and then come back on Monday to finalize the order
8 of spending. But I would hope that we wouldn't just end
9 today without making some decisions.

10 DICK HINCH: Well, I've made my proposal for what
11 I felt I should vote on today and not move the \$50 million
12 into the non-profits. And then I think we -- there's one
13 thing that I would propose, and that's the \$75 million which
14 alludes to what you're talking about on the hospital line
15 via direct allocation based on their losses.

16 Because they've closed the month of April already.
17 They actually told me in one of my meetings within the last
18 month that by May 15 they actually have -- I don't know that
19 you'd call it audited documents, but they have documents for
20 the month before.

21 So I would think that that allocation could go out
22 right away, and that's why I thought the document was a good

1 document to get a vote on. I actually thought the letter
2 tied well to saying that, saying that we think it needs to
3 go out right away, and the only question I had was tying the
4 letter on that one paragraph.

5 I -- you know, these were my numbers originally.
6 I changed one group of numbers universally. I'm not willing
7 to change that yet, but I think we could come back and talk
8 that.

9 You know, the university I think called at least
10 my office and said they want the money applied in a
11 different manner. I haven't even looked into that. It's
12 just the call I believe was this morning.

13 That's why this is evolving every day, and I just
14 thought we were pretty strong. I -- you know, the letter
15 and everything, it would be a good package to vote out
16 today. But if you're not comfortable doing that, I don't
17 want to split the package and just vote on hospitals today.
18 Because I'm not willing to do that.

19 JERRY LITTLE: Senator D'Allesandro?

20 LOU D'ALLESSANDRO: Oh, thank you, thank you very
21 much. I think there are items of urgency, and we always --
22 we have been talking about priorities. It seems to me the

1 hospitals are a significant priority. We ought to think
2 about that and get new information every day about what's
3 happening with more money going that isn't included in this
4 amount of money too, to hospitals.

5 Obviously, that's a very urgent situation. And I
6 put the number of \$100 million in. I think that's the
7 reasonable number for the hospitals.

8 And remember that within the area that I
9 represent, we have barely three major functioning entities
10 that the Catholic Medical Center, Elliott and then we have
11 Hitchcock, and then you got the stuff for Nashua.

12 Their burn rate is pretty significant, and their
13 inability to do elective surgeries has really put a dent in
14 their balance sheet. So I would think that this is a
15 priority item, and we ought to be thinking above that.

16 And we've got to send some recommendations
17 forward. Time is wasting, if we don't do that. And
18 everybody's getting different proposals every minute of the
19 day. People are listening in here and sending e-mails or
20 sending texts, and so forth.

21 But it just seems to be we have -- we've got to
22 begin the decision-making process. We've had a lot of

1 conversation, we've had many, many people present to us.
2 The rubber has begun to hit the road, and we have to move
3 forward. Thank you.

4 JERRY LITTLE: Senator Morse?

5 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah. I don't disagree with the
6 \$100,000,000 number, but where I think it should come from -
7 - you've been very obvious, and everybody on this
8 committee's been obvious for the last three weeks there's
9 \$30 million dollars sitting in another bucket right now, and
10 talking to the hospital, they've all applied to that same
11 fund.

12 JERRY LITTLE: Right.

13 CHUCK MORSE: So in my opinion, you take the \$75
14 million, you put the suggestion in our letter or some other
15 into this document that that \$30 million will go out now. I
16 think that's a strong way of getting it done.

17 But I don't -- the money's there, it's just not --
18 it hasn't gone out. So I think you could tie it all
19 together with what we're doing and get it done.

20 And I also would like to point out, we're all
21 getting these things every minute, I just got one from my
22 local nursing home with a great idea to solve the Medicaid

1 problem, and quite honestly, Senator, it's right up to alley
2 of finance. It's raised the rates. One of the states
3 raised it by \$20 per resident per day.

4 I know it doesn't sound like a lot, but if you're
5 carrying all Medicaid residents, that's a way we can go back
6 next week and look at how to solve the nursing home problem,
7 you know, and it's a pretty well-written document.

8 I can send it out to all of you from Salem Haven,
9 but we're all getting these every day, and I know there's
10 more decisions to be made, but I'm not so sure we haven't
11 done a good job on something that we could say today this
12 needs to happen.

13 We're going to have serious discussions on every
14 item below where we are right now, because everybody's got a
15 different proposal.

16 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, Senator. Any further
17 questions or concerns?

18 CHUCK MORSE: Just if I could, Jerry, I think
19 Chuck's comment is quite clear. If you have the \$75-- and
20 the rest of the money that's left in that \$50 million-dollar
21 fund, you've come up with the number, you've come up with
22 the \$100 billion for the hospitals. And that could be

1 something that could be moved out. And as he said, other
2 proposals are coming in all the time.

3 But the question is how fast are we going to move
4 to address what we know are the significant problems that we
5 see at the moment. I think that's the key issue.

6 JERRY LITTLE: Speaker Shurtleff, you have a
7 question, sir?

8 STEVE SHURTLEFF: Well, to comment Jerry, and it's
9 a little off subject, but I'd like to see this group vote
10 out and get \$5 million-dollar request from the Agriculture
11 Department off to the Governor just as soon as we can. For
12 our dairy farmers, they've only got about two and a half
13 more weeks before they can start planning corn for silage.

14 Of course, our commercial gardeners in the state
15 want to get their gardens planted, but they don't quite know
16 what their future is. So I'd hope that this group would
17 send that request for the \$5 million off to the Governor, so
18 it can get to the Department of Agriculture.

19 Thank you.

20 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, sir. Senator Soucy?

21 DONNA SOUCY: I was just going to agree with
22 Senator Morse about the hospital piece -- not that the money

1 is sitting there. I do think, you know, we've had a great
2 deal of trouble trying to figure out what the Governor's
3 Committee has done with that \$50 million set aside. I know
4 that not every hospital applied. Most did, but not everyone
5 did.

6 I do think that if we made that number \$100
7 million, we focused it on their losses for March and April,
8 and any federal revenue, less any federal revenue source
9 they've received, up to -- and let's pick the date --
10 today's the eighth, let's say the eleventh or the fifteenth,
11 because of that new money that just came out today that was
12 announced to rural hospitals.

13 I think that would be a very easy formula. That
14 would do a lot to get them in better shape. And I think
15 most of the other things we are going to have to keep coming
16 back and revisiting. But I do think there is an urgency,
17 particularly there to move that along.

18 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you. Senator Morse?

19 CHUCK MORSE: Yeah, I'm just going to make an
20 offer here. So if we raise the hospitals to \$100 and move
21 the \$50 million into charity so that we could get a document
22 out and tie it to a letter, is that something we could all

1 agree to? I mean the \$5 million for the agriculture is
2 already in this document.

3 So if I -- Representative Hennessey?

4 ERIN HENNESSEY: Boy, I just want to get a
5 clarification from President Soucy. The -- my concern over
6 your proposal is that some of the hospitals, the rural money
7 that just came in, that I am sure -- I don't know the dollar
8 amount that were received, but I'm sure it was very helpful
9 to these hospitals now.

10 But if we frontload the \$100 million and it goes
11 to the nonrural hospitals, are we then going to help the
12 hospitals that weren't -- that have used the federal
13 dollars, and then -- I mean, how do you see that working?
14 Do you think that \$100 million dollars is what the nonrural
15 hospitals would need?

16 DONNA SOUCY: So I'm just referring to the -- I
17 think all hospitals would be eligible for the \$100 million.
18 I'm just saying that that latest round of funding -- federal
19 funding -- was inconsistent.

20 So one way to look at how you would apportion the
21 money, you'd look at everybody's losses for March and April,
22 regardless of the characterization of the individual

1 hospital, but then in addition to that, you would take into
2 account those hospitals that have been able to offset some
3 of their losses with this federal revenue.

4 So to the extent rural hospitals got more or less,
5 they would still have losses, and we would use that hundred
6 million towards helping them.

7 I'm just saying it's one way to try to be a little
8 bit more fair, because it seems to me that here in New
9 Hampshire, we're better able to identify the fact that the
10 largest number of COVID cases, as we sit here right now, are
11 at Catholic Medical Center. Catholic Medical Center did not
12 receive any of the funds.

13 Concord Hospital I would argue is not really rural
14 in my mind, but based on the federal definition it is; They
15 received significant amount of funds today.

16 So I'm just trying to come up with a way to very
17 quickly in a data-driven way balance that out, so that we
18 are trying to help those entities that have the heaviest
19 burden, because 1) It's not only the fact that they have so
20 many COVID patients and cross-associated, you know the PPE
21 and everything with those, the more COVID patients you're
22 treating, it means that you are less able to go back to

1 those elective procedures and bill for those and build your
2 revenue back up.

3 So it's almost a double hit. You can handle more
4 COVID patients, they cost more. And you can't, on the other
5 hand, deal with the patients --

6 ERIN HENNESSEY: Elective procedures.

7 DONNA SOUCY: -- yeah, yeah. So I was just trying
8 to --

9 ERIN HENNESSEY: Yeah, no, I agree with everything
10 you're saying. My concern is that if we put the hundred
11 million dollars in now, and the accounting for when --
12 you're saying look at March and April, but take all the
13 revenues that they've gotten through the middle of May, that
14 --

15 DONNA SOUCY: Mm-hm.

16 ERIN HENNESSEY: I'm hopeful that a lot of the
17 hospitals in New Hampshire received a lot of free money or
18 the state received the PPP loans, if they're under 500
19 employees that they're able to turn that into free money.

20 But my concern is that if we come back in a month
21 or two and we don't have any additional funds to allocate
22 the hospitals, that we will have given all of the hospital

1 money away to the people who haven't received it yet. But
2 maybe when we look at the hospitals a month or two from now,
3 the greatest need is not going to be in those locations.

4 DONNA SOUCY: Well, I mean --

5 ERIN HENNESSEY: And we won't have money to give
6 out then.

7 DONNA SOUCY: Ideally, representative Hennessey, I
8 would think we would do 100 now, because the need is so
9 significant -- get that out. I do think we will have to
10 revisit it, and I do think when we revisit it, there will be
11 additional federal funds that will have been redistributed.

12 So I want to look at it right now, in that
13 picture, and fulfill those needs, and then revisit a month
14 from now. Because I do think the situation is going to
15 change. And I think that will also require reallocation.

16 But I think there's more than enough urgency based
17 on the losses I'm hearing. You know, some hospitals as much
18 as \$40 million just for the month of April. So I think \$100
19 is a very good start, but I don't think it's going to
20 address everything.

21 JERRY LITTLE: Representative Hinch?

22 DICK HINCH: Yes, thank you, Jerry. So in an

1 effort to move along here, I think I heard a recommendation
2 from Speaker Shurtleff to approve today and ask for an
3 expedited disbursement on the Agriculture Relief for \$5
4 million dollars and have you heard that? I would make a
5 motion that we approve that, and move that process along.

6 It's showing on the document, but to Speaker
7 Shurtleff's point, I think we need to say, "Okay, we all
8 embrace the \$5 million dollars for Agriculture Relief, and
9 we likewise embrace the need for the sense of urgency to get
10 that out. So let's approve that item on the dock and get it
11 moving."

12 STEVE SHURTLEFF: So we are in a 91-A situation,
13 so we'll have to do a roll call vote, but I want to make
14 sure that I fully understand what it is that you are voting
15 on, so we can properly write it down here and document the
16 motion.

17 Can somebody state for me what they believe you
18 are voting on?

19 **SPEAKER UNIDENTIFIED:** I can state it, because I
20 made the motion. I move that the Legislative Advisory Board
21 authorizes or -- no, excuse me -- makes a recommendation to
22 the Governor that we approved \$5 million dollars for the

1 Agriculture Relief Fund, and secondarily, that we request
2 that it be expedited to complete that.

3 I am looking around the room to see if there's an
4 attorney here and I don't see any. I feel like I'm sitting
5 here acting as a Chair of this meeting, and I'm not, so.

6 CHUCK MORSE: Well, I've raised my hand a couple
7 of times so --

8 STEVE SHURTLEFF: I'm sorry, Senator. Certainly.

9 CHUCK MORSE: The reality is I think that I
10 support agriculture as much as anyone. Trust me, I'm in it.
11 The -- we are sending such a [02:27:44 indiscernible]
12 message right now, based on the fact that I've heard from
13 just about every other group that's on this document how
14 urgent it is that we act -- we're just going to vote on
15 agriculture. That's wrong. I'm not there.

16 You can have your vote, but I mean I'd like to see
17 that letter that goes along with that. Because we're going
18 to basically have to explain to everyone that's asking for
19 help this weekend that doesn't think they can make it, that
20 we voted on agriculture, period. Because that's all we
21 could agree on. I just don't -- I don't see that's where we
22 should be going.

1 And I just -- while we're on hospital, I brought
2 up a document, because I thought it was a logical solution.

3 This one was pretty easy based on we could take a
4 percentage of each hospital's operating losses for March and
5 April, which is what we asked them for -- and I do have that
6 document -- and then offset that amount by what they've
7 received to date in federal grants.

8 It's a fairly simple thing to add to our document
9 to make sure that we're funding the ones that need it.

10 I'm not comfortable breaking this document apart
11 when I'm sure everybody on the document has the same level
12 of need right about now.

13 DICK HINCH: And Jerry, this is Dick Hinch. Just
14 for clarification, it wasn't my intention to just single out
15 agriculture, it was my intention to go down through this
16 document and reach agreement on those things that we can
17 reach agreement on so that we can make an effort to get the
18 letter out, but also come to some agreements on this first
19 disbursement of funding.

20 So I think there's other motions that would need
21 to be following this as well. So I didn't want anybody to
22 misunderstand that agriculture was the only priority on

1 here.

2 JERRY LITTLE: Speaker Shurtleff?

3 STEVE SHURTLEFF: Thank you, Jerry. First of all,
4 I want to thank my friends from Merrimac for the motion, and
5 I would just say to Senator Morse, I totally agree with what
6 he's saying and what he's thinking, but I think this motion
7 for agriculture is somewhat unique.

8 We have people that have been impacted by -- so
9 many people in New Hampshire by the pandemic, and they're
10 facing that crisis, but they're also facing another crisis,
11 and that's looking at the calendar.

12 And as someone like yourself who has an
13 agricultural background, you know that there's certain times
14 they've got to start planning if they want to raise silage,
15 dairy cattle for next -- for over the next winter, and that
16 clock is running out.

17 So I understand your concern, but I think this is
18 a little bit unique, insofar as money needs to get out to
19 those in the dairy industry, as well as those commercial --
20 those people operating commercial gardens, so they know that
21 there's a reason for them to start planting. Thank you.

22 JERRY LITTLE: Senator Soucy?

1 DONNA SOUCY: Well, I appreciate Representative
2 Hinch's clarification. If Agriculture is but one thing that
3 we're going to talk about, but we're going to go through the
4 rest of the list, then I'm fine with it.

5 But if we're going to just decide that that's all
6 we're doing today, I agree with Senator Morse, this doesn't
7 send a good picture.

8 So I think we just need to decide, are we working
9 our way through the list and dealing with all the items, and
10 then sending a letter, or are we deferring to Monday?
11 Because I think it's got to be all -- at least a whole
12 package.

13 And there are some other topics that I know other
14 people raised to discuss. Hospitals was one that was very
15 important to me, but I also want to talk about child care,
16 so.

17 DICK HINCH: Jerry, this is Dick Hinch again.
18 Just for clarification once again, I think I pointed out
19 earlier that I thought it was prudent for us to look at and
20 study some of the recommendations that were made by -- I
21 have the President, I have Senator D'Allesandro, I have
22 Steve Shurtleff, and I have Representative Wallen that made

1 recommendations.

2 So either we agree to look at those
3 recommendations, absorb them over the weekend -- excuse me -
4 - and then move the document forward, whether we agree today
5 on one or more of the items, you know, that's not as
6 critical. I think we just need to come to a resolution,
7 what are we going to do today? Thank you.

8 JERRY LITTLE: Representative Wallner?

9 MARYJANE WALLNER: Yes, thank you, Jerry. So
10 we've already been at this for about two and a half hours
11 today. I do think there were some materials that we got
12 sort of late, right before we came in to the meeting.

13 And I think it would be better, personally, to put
14 together a full package with the letter, and we would do
15 that on Monday, where we would put everything out at the
16 same time.

17 I think it's hard to say here what's more urgent
18 than one thing over another, and I think we need to see the
19 total package before we start sending just one thing at a
20 time out. So I would like to wait.

21 I personally would like to wait until Monday and
22 put the whole thing today, and if we have to stay here on

1 Monday until 10:00 at night putting it together, we come
2 prepared to do that.

3 JERRY LITTLE: Other comments? Let me see.
4 Representative Hinch?

5 DICK HINCH: Yes. Thank you, Jerry. Based upon
6 what I heard from Representative Wallner today, I'm prepared
7 to withdraw my motion at this time, and we can revisit it on
8 Monday along with the rest of the document, so that we can
9 put everything into proper priority order, and then send the
10 letter out. Thank you.

11 JERRY LITTLE: Speaker Shurtleff?

12 STEVE SHURTLEFF: Thank you, Jerry. I just wanted
13 to say to Representative Hinch I thank him for the motion,
14 but I think his last comments are well made.

15 I think it's better that we look at the numbers
16 over the weekend and make sure that we're prepared on Monday
17 to just go forward and complete this document and take our
18 votes. So thank you al.

19 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't
20 believe I see any other hands up on the screen at this
21 point. Maybe I could just sort of try to summarize what I
22 think I've heard today. The first conversation was to move

1 the unemployment Trust Fund shortfall to the end of the
2 document under, "Future Considerations."

3 I believe that Representative -- Senator Morse
4 recommended moving \$50 million dollars -- that same \$50
5 million dollars of unemployment to non-profits, to make it a
6 total for non-profits of \$65 million, which Senator
7 D'Allesandro agreed to.

8 Representative Wallner asked to make sure that the
9 \$300 dollar stipend includes Child Protective Services, and
10 to take \$25 million from the business support line to
11 accomplish that.

12 There was a discussion about funding for
13 hospitals, and I believe the recommendation was to add \$75--
14 - to make that hospital line \$75 million added to the \$30
15 million that's there now for a total of \$100 million.

16 DONNA SOUCY: Commissioner Little?

17 JERRY LITTLE: Yes, ma'am, Senator.

18 DONNA SOUCY: That was Senator Morse's
19 recommendation. I differ with that. My recommendation was
20 to just make that line \$100, because I think the existing 30
21 is still in question, and I honestly for the life of me
22 cannot figure out who's still in the queue and why some

1 hospitals have not gotten responses. I just don't even know
2 how to account for those dollars, other than to say that
3 they're maybe halfway spent.

4 I think the \$100 million from my estimation needs
5 to be a clean number, and that we can't rely on that \$30.

6 JERRY LITTLE: Thank you. So the \$100 million
7 irrespective of the money in the Health Care Fund for
8 hospitals, if I heard that right. Representative Shurtleff
9 would like the agriculture money out immediately, but if we
10 do this entire document as presented, that \$5 million is
11 there.

12 And I think that's all I have in my notes. Did I
13 miss anything. I'm just trying to set a baseline for the
14 conversation on Friday. I'm sorry, this is Friday; on
15 Monday.

16 And I know that there are several other items on
17 the changed memos that went out earlier today? Did that
18 sound about right to folks, for where we start on Monday?

19 Representative Wallner? No, I'm sorry, I thought
20 maybe we still had your hand up from before. Thoughts?
21 Chairman Morse? Any comment?

22 CHUCK MORSE: No, I think we let it go to Monday,

1 and try to get it wrapped up on Monday.

2 JERRY LITTLE: Very good. Senator Soucy? You've
3 just raised your hand?

4 DONNA SOUCY: Yes, I agree. I think that we can
5 very succinctly on Monday just go through the line items,
6 finalize our recommendation and get this out.

7 JERRY LITTLE: Very good. Any final comments?
8 Happy Mother's Day. Happy Mother's Day, everybody. This is
9 the Legislative Advisory Board of the Governor's Office,
10 Minister of Relief and Recovery, and our meeting for today
11 is ending at 4:41 --

12 JEFF MYERS: 3:00.

13 JERRY LITTLE: 3:41, I'm sorry. Thank you, Jeff.
14 3:41. Thank you all very much.

15 COLLECTIVE: Thank you, Commissioner.

16 [End of Proceedings]