

**Approved Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, January 16, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**



**Facilitator:** Anne Losby

**Task force members in attendance:** Steve Cawley, Brent Christensen, Tom Garrison, Jack Geller, Barbara Gervais, John Gibbs, Gopal Khanna, JoAnne Johnson, Khanna, Rick King, Tim Lovaasen, Mike O'Connor (joined via phone), Kim Ross, Jack Ries (for Gopal Khanna), Joe Schindler (for Mary Ellen Wells), Vijay Sethi, John Stanoch, Craig Taylor, Dick Sjoberg, Chris Swanson, Robyn West, Glen Wilson, Peg Werner (joined via phone)

**Public attendees:**

**Staff in attendance:** Shirley Walz, Carlos Seoane from Thomson Reuters; Diane Wells from the MN Department of Commerce.

**Opening comments; review meeting agenda – Rick King**

Rick asked members to comment from  
St. Cloud – none  
Rochester – none  
Duluth – none  
Crookston – ViJay Sethi, Jack Geller, Dick Sjoberg  
Marshall – none

The meeting was called to order 9:39 a.m.

Welcome to the first meeting via video – two way video conferencing is allowed so task force members that are on video can vote on things that the task force can vote on. People via phone only cannot vote per the state's open meeting guidelines.

Make sure if sites are not speaking – mute the site. Allow for delays if you are speaking. The last site that talks usually keeps the video up. If this goes well – we'll try to do this for the next few meetings.

Thanks Steve Cawley and his team to get this set up for us at all the sites.

We have a pretty robust agenda and things to add.

The first item of business is to approve the agenda for today. Talk about how to get public information out about video meetings and other outstate meetings.

John Gibbs asked if we can get to the shovel ready projects topic earlier

Rick King – we'll try to get it in earlier

John Gibbs - Has to leave at 12:15

A motion was made to approve agenda – ok and seconded.

Rick King – Called to approve December 19 meeting minutes – motion to approve – seconded – approved

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Rick King asked if members of the public wished to make any comments.

Tom Garrison mentioned one item on page 8 of the agenda. As an action item he requested that the cable providers had a chart that showed how long it takes to download different speeds and was requesting that the telephone companies prepare something similar using their commonly offered speeds.

Rick King asked if this was something that could be worked through.

Jack Geller responded – could not hear –

Tom Garrison repeated. He wanted to make sure that the task does not drop off the list. There was a helpful chart presented by the cable providers and he is asking for a similar thing from the telephone providers. Noted as an action item.

Rick King asked how the task force wants to respond to shovel ready projects for MN. The legislature would like information in February and would like something from the Task Force. Rick commented that we should at least acknowledge.

Tom Garrison indicate that from a state government side of things that there are needs for shovel ready projects.

Gopal Khanna indicated that they are in the process of looking at the opportunities that exist. They are working with MMD, government and finance to identify projects.

Rick King indicated that it sounds like the committees are getting multiple inputs from constituents. He asked what do we want to give them from a task force perspective? Help prioritizing, plot how we want to react.

John Gibbs indicated that in thinking about this after the e-mail, are we making any suggestions? His view is that we should not send a list as this goes outside the goal of the task force. What is in our preview that could help the exercise? We are really in the process of developing an extraordinary web site. We should make it known that we are an equal opportunity poster. This could be used to disseminate information that all of the inputs are getting. Has seen something that the local government has submitted. Could offer this up for the opportunity to post and the opportunities that can come from an e- government. If we were going to go deeper – if there is a consensus. We could think about this a little bit more – from what he hears we will have a lot better idea of federal stimulus.

ViJay Sethi asked, at the county level are we looking at transformation for the federal stimulus package? There will be two rounds. Shovel ready in the next two months and other projects that would have a timetable of 2 years. Is there indeed another round?

Rick King indicated that there are going to be two rounds – the expectation is that those projects that may have dates around 45 to 60 days. The idea is to get money into the economy right away by functioning on a fast time-frame

Vijay Sethi indicated that if second round was a little further down the road there would be more time.

**Approved Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, January 16, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**



Rick King indicated that in a way he hoped that's why the committee chairs had asked. They are going to have to step in line in Feb./March to get the money. Want to hear what task force recommends. It is outside our charter but we are the statewide appointed group. The two chairs of the committees have asked for this and they did not know about this when the legislation was put into place. Thinks we should respond, but if the will of the task force is different. We could respond without prejudice. We may not have a lot of to debate. We could get a list of alternatives – low cost loans, matching grants, there are certain people that don't want . Whatever the ideas are we bucket them. We could just come up with a list and the legislature could decide. What do you think of that type of approach?

Jack Geller – likes the idea, but does agree it is outside of the scope. Does think we have the authoring to collect input, aggregate ideas, and bring forth via the task force. We may want to solicit beyond the task force. Get input from others. If we are the aggregator he is fine with that. If we are defining what is good and bad – uncomfortable.

Brent Christensen – I don't know that we are being asked to put together a shovel ready program or come up with a process. I think they are asking for directions.

Rick King clarified, they are asking for direction and projects.

Mike O'Connor – there is a certain amount of urgency there. If we can respond quickly in an aggregated way, we do the state a lot of good. If we have a list of project that show up late, we do the state harm.

Peg Werner – Supports the position that Rick is taking – the legislature for all they have to do, does not have expertise in the area. I think the committee should take the opportunity. We do our best to fulfill what they ask.

Brent Christensen – Maybe we need to have a special meeting in Feb. to do this

Tom Garrison – put a message out that we want to hear about this. If the committee wants us to, we could make ourselves available for a special meeting.

Rick King – Could break this into a couple pieces. Could spend some time with our ideas of shovel ready projects for phase 1 and 2 and offer the list as people who are covering the state. Will offer process help? Do the post and get them a list by the end of the month of Feb. Do we believe that is a good approach? Did not hear objections.

Mike O'Connor – lobby for faster rather than slower. Step up the pace a little.

Rick King – Let's discuss how we get there. Major decision is how we are getting there. The February meeting is tied up. We could have a special meeting as long as there is a quorum. Open to how we do this. This is something extraordinary – might warrant a special meeting and we could do this like we are doing this today.

Jack Geller – an observation is, this committee is remarkably networked with others in the state. Gov. Cable, wireless, being able to utilize this infrastructure and the web site to input it through the web site. Compile so that it is broad in reach and efficient in process. Possibly use the web site

**Approved Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, January 16, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**



Rick King – We should put something on the web site that publicizes and that this is a basis of the special meeting

Jack Geller – member are not sitting around the table by chance, but who they represent. Use the members as ambassadors. Would hate for someone to come after the information was provided. Use our human infrastructure to really broadly fan out and use the web site as an aggregator. Then get together and review and package.

Dick Sjoberg – one of the things we need to do is get some understanding of the ground rules that if it has to be started by \_\_\_ and finished by \_\_\_, the amount of money that they have to put up. Some of the projects may be ill-conceived if we do not have the guidelines. We should not release the mechanism until we have the guidelines.

Rick King – we don't have guidelines yet. When we do we can get them out. Worried about getting the ideas.

JoAnne Johnson – have some things from the draft circulated yesterday. A couple of the things that are pertinent. Funds are distributed through existing formulas, accountability. Personally certified by the Government. There are now earmarks. Have approximately 6 billion so that unserved and underserved areas get focus. Work needs to within 30 days. There be 41 billion to local school district, 20 billion for health information technology. They talk about scientific research, particular concerns to getting smaller business in America. Those programs will get a boost.

Tom Garrison – can the information be routed?

JoAnne – will route the information.

Chris Swanson - Sounds like the things are getting defined , so let's get the list and guidelines, match them up and move forward

Rick King – we could get guidelines and get the list and sync them up for the legislators.

Tom Garrison – for round two funding we should also know about these projects.

Tim Lovaasen – Would like to see us take a look at mapping and it should be done in such a way that providers of last. CWA says – let's see what you need, not any sized company can be part of this.

JoAnne Johnson – phase 2 will be interest free loans for boasting speeds – interest free loans are problematic. The initial phase 1 will be grants

Mike O'Connor – has a process point – the video is nice, but can't tell who is talking – will you identify yourself prior to speaking

John Gibbs – likes what he's heard. When we meet in Feb. to talk about this, hopes that we think about suggestions about applications that are on the demand side and looking at the government and all the bail-outs. Perhaps it would be useful if we tie to our mission and charter – if there are taxpayer dollar to be spent it is focused on users or libraries to make access points more available. That helps the individuals that are trying If we have the conversation – we focus on the consumer side.

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Rick King – your point is right on. We will come forward with both supply and demand side things. Heard that the use of and access to PC's. Not all access points are PC's, but there are ways to stimulation access

JoAnne Johnson – agrees with what John said. What we can do as we move forward is structure things so that – missed this – use frontier – frontier has high speed internet – does not mean that they get everywhere. If the grant money can get the last 10% hocked up. In regards to training for housewives, prisoners, my company is doing this. Their first quarter promotion is that they get a free small dell computer to get hooked up. In some houses it is their first computer.

John Gibbs – suggests that should be another business plan – rather than 89% - upgrade 100% of their plan and make it available to 100% of the customers. 40% of families don't have access – there is a lot of low hanging fruit on access side. Huge number of home and families that can't access either by choice or financial limitation. That is a valid strategy. Seems we enhance MN infrastructure. There is a whole lot of opportunity on demand and acceptance.

Rick King – cut the discussion at this point. What we see by this discuss is let's put those on the list. What it means to do those things is what we want to provide. We want to give them a broad list. Did caution – that where placing money out there discourages investment – it should be additive. What I am interested is that we have formed what we want to do. Does this warrant a special meeting between now and the Feb. meeting? We will have the mapping. Thinks that we should try to have a meeting – even if it is shorter and just around this topic.

John Gibbs – sees mapping as a start to their deliverable. Wants to see what it would take to put broadband to every member of the state. Think the mapping information would allow them to focus. Personally interested in seeing the mapping information as a way to direct the dollars.

Rick King – my timeline is adjusted by the time the group is going to have access to mapping, and the timing that the. Can wait on the mapping.

Diane Wells – Maps will be available Feb. 2.

Rick King – agrees with John's point.

Steve Cawaley – should have a meeting and have it shortly after the mapping data is available.

Rick King – can we look at Feb 6 and find out if we can get a quorum.

Diane Wells – they (mapping project) will be ready to go.

Tom Garrison – that would solve another issue. We had requested we handles mapping in a special meeting – move that we do have a special meeting. Feb 6 works. – motioned to have the meeting

Chris Swanson – 2<sup>nd</sup>

Gopal Khanna – Would it be good to set up a small working group to put together all the pieces for the 6<sup>th</sup> as apposed to full task force meeting?

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Tom Garrison – think that might be doable. If less than a quorum were to meet and report back its information to the quorum.

John Stanoch – if the report is available on the 2<sup>nd</sup> we should use the 6<sup>th</sup> to get a readout of the mapping meeting and then come back at the 15<sup>th</sup> and process at the regularly scheduled meeting. Have report and minutes available

Tom – hear the mapping report and begin to aggregate. The specific task that the legislators have

Rick King – have a special meeting – take the mapping data and have a special discussion about the topic. We would also bring up and finalize in the Feb. meeting.

John Gibbs – likes the suggestion – if we have a special meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup> – then by 2 weeks later, we can have something that folk could vote on. Hopefully the 6<sup>th</sup> will be a special meeting.

Steve Cawley – regular Feb. meeting we may want to lighten up.

Rick – may want to put off some of the Chapter review or push Rays presentation. First would be to agree to have a meeting on Feb 6. Set up with video conference. Use the same start time. Hear about mapping, discuss and go forward.

Jack Geller – supportive of the meeting on the 6<sup>th</sup>. He is dying to see the mapping. If in fact there are no action items on the agenda – if they are just discussing mapping.

Robyn West – have a few people that we know of the municipal meeting that could be moved to March.

Rick King – if we are moving the mapping out of the meeting, would like to see that would be a big chunk of the meeting if we can get the municipal in . May have to move the speaker. Would like to post the meeting. We do not necessarily need to vote to have a meeting. I suspect that there are a lot of people clearing the date. The special meeting will be Feb. 6<sup>th</sup>, mapping report and then a focus on the list. An aggregation of the project list and focus on both supply and demand side. Anything further? All in favor – I, no one opposed. We will plan for the 6<sup>th</sup>. The earlier point – staff will start the work on the web site to gather the input.

Propose that we take a 10 minute break and come back and discuss the state reports.

**11:00 – 11:15 – Review Summary of State Reports** – JoAnne Johnson, Jack Ries, John Gibbs, Mike O'Connor

JoAnne Johnson – asked Mike O'Connor to explain how he visually arranged.

Mike O'Connor – introduced the task force to the web site – [www.urbanusers.com/statereports](http://www.urbanusers.com/statereports). What they did as a group, we took a look at a number of state reports and gave themselves a template – went through and identified key aspects. The compilation is on the web site as background. Decided to use a tool – this is the web version of the output. What he did in each of them as the state summaries came in he. Had Ann Click on the goals.

Thinking this could be used as a resource for the group and if we want a goal that can be used that another state has – other states may have language that we may want to leverage. There

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



are a lot of overlapping reports. All the information is in the word document. Main things to point out. How to get at the web site and use it so you can explore on your own. Highlighting the big themes – click on Statement of Values – what we find is a lot of overlap, there was a lot of statements about – most ideas were pretty good in other reports. Click on where we are today – there was a lot of overlap and description of barriers and constraints, local right of way, The last two big ones – where we want to be – go down one layer – click on goals – almost all states set some sort of goal. That is some sort of indication that our item of setting a goal is a good idea. The next one to highlight is how are we going to get there. Interesting theme – click on leadership – there is a lot of conversation in the reports on how we want to get there. If for example we wanted to describe how we want to do a consolidated coordinated entity, up in the very first recommended - # of states are. There is a lot of clumping to do. Would like to take one more pass through the document and put all like recommendations together. Back to Joanne to finish.

JoAnne – thank you Michael. There is a lot of information in the summary, but a lot of information in the report itself. Within both the word report and on the visual there is a list of all the links and URL's for the reports. There is a 1, 2, or 3 page summary. Total looked at 25 states and the District of Columbia and a report from Connected Nation. Summaries follow the structure that you saw in the visual. Word document is a tool that gave us the ability to look at and find companies. We could do a simplified count to determine where the most attention is being paid in other states. The Overwhelming recommendation is leadership. Leadership ranged from providing local to 14 states and permanent coordination entity. For some it's an advisory council for others it is an advisory agency.

John Gibbs – It's worth looking at the coordinating entities, MI created an entity but later removed funding. Tennessee following connected nation. Washington, there is not one in place, that is an interesting question that comes out. Underscore our summary and look at the details summary.

Joanne Johnson – this is simply a list of resources for you to dig deeper into the state reports. This is not simple – this is complex information. We do not simply do a CA report and reprint. Many are thoughtful, well-planned. Ways and means is all about how you plan and fund things. For Minnesota, these are ways to put together a structured environment to barriers, permitting. Had hoped to find more states that it would update a telecommunication law. The only one that had specific mention of it was IL. There is also some interesting information in the key programs initiated. When they talk about state supported advocacy agencies. There are other states that have done other things – best things regarding – 7 million in tax credits to 4.9 million in matching grants to build out in unserved areas. Hugh number of new Idaho residents that should tap in. There is more information for us to learn about outside. Give you a roadmap – CWA also has a summary of summaries of states. Only other thing before questions – is statement of values. There were many reports that did not have statement of values – they had goals or mission versus values. When we saw Diane's summaries we have goals, values, vision mission. Something we have to decide – what goes into our values statement. Is it what we want to accomplish for the state of MN. In the summaries it broke down to economics or importance of Broadband for participating in the Global economy – 8 states that talked about economic development as being the driver. Took the time to address different aspects of the economy. Between CA & CO, read CA values statement – add this. The governor. also request that the task forces pays close attention – **missed this** - CO – must do more to position itself – read CO value statement – get this. While the difference are subtle there are similarities. Take some time to take a look at these state reports

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Rick King – excellent work – this is going to make it some much easier for use to prepare – Loves the tool – gives you a great way to look at things. Let's go out as a task force and get familiar with things. When you look at the online organization. The subgroup needs to give Mike the answer to some of the questions that we are thinking about start to fall out.

JoAnne Johnson – the next step that they began to take is best that everyone does and take a good look and find your particular interest area and see how others have included – look at the best practice and send to the team. We can use that to guide us as we go forward. You can send to any one of the four of us.

Rick King – Action for task force members

Tom Garrison – now we need to go out and find language that speaks to us the most individually. This also enables us to go back and find things about the language that we use.

Anne Losby – directed the task force to the web site for accessing all the materials - [www.urbanusers.com/statereports](http://www.urbanusers.com/statereports).

Jack Geller – Want to give kudos as well. Thanks to Mike, John, Jack, & Joanne. This will be useful for a number of different. Needs to be pulled out. Our charge of trying to educate others in Minnesota and they can come here to this site to see the work product. Need to link to that. Mike indicated that he wanted permission to take another pass. He thinks it will be useful to many others.

Gopal Khanna – second the suggestion – this is a great

Rick King – asked staff to pull the report summaries to the front page. Make it a more front page look.

JoAnne Johnson – almost all of them have a place where you can choose resources.

You have a multi-page document. For people who put these things in it is the time to highlight. When we talked about values – it's mission, principles – outcome – some refinement of what has been written.

Anne Losby – anyone that has made a submission – are there items we can agree on? First any commentary or observations.

Rick King – logistical – 4-5 pages stapled and a one page addendum.

Anne Losby – both posted on the web site.

John Gibbs – start with the first one overall.

Anne Losby – process point, identify where we think there is agreement. Suggesting that we try to identify if there are themes, maybe there are observations where there were themes.

Rick King – ubiquity of service as a guiding principle. Seems pretty important and we've touch on it a lot.

**Approved Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, January 16, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**



Joanne Johnson – good to include as there is a neutrality to what we are doing. We are not picking winners or losers by location or by technology.

Steve Cawley – Commented that Crookston needs to be on video.

Rick King – indicated that if we can't see them they can still vote as we are video conferencing. Commented about proposing neutrality?

Joanne Johnson – The ton of what we want to do is neither advantage nor disadvantage

Tom Garrison – neutrality as it related to technology, as it relates to stakeholders. What are you referring to?

JoAnne Johnson – we don't insist it's fiber in every building, in some cases it will be wireless.

John Gibbs – is the bullet point – technology neutral. Technology neutral is where she started, but if all MN citizens are equal we don't concentrate on one or the other. Break out technology neutral as one potential. It is really equity

Brent Christine – a little confused – talking about ubiquity, but different levels of service

Rick - Ubiquity – everyone served versus equally served.

Tom Garrison – what I think we are saying is that everyone in the state has access to the capability that they need. If you only need wireless and that's what you want – great. It's available if you want it.

Jack Geller – when I think of ubiquity we are going get to the part where we define a minimum standard. We decided an access to 10 MB is kind of a floor – ubiquity means that everyone has access to that. There is some kind of standard that all MN has access to . The point as Tom that making – suggest that if a university or company – that pipe needs to be ubiquity and – think there is a minimum standard that needs to be defined.

Rick King – agrees with what Jack has said – I concur

JoAnne Johnson – one thing from what we said before – only one came out with 1 GB speed. Others indicated that for this we need this as a minimum – for this we need this... All MN will have access to what they need in order to

Tom Garrison – the biggest single response is that we heard was affordable.

Rick King – I've heard the levels of service based on requirements. This seems to be what people are thinking versus a minimum standard (smart standard)

ViJay Sethi – as we are talking about setting a standard – where does the affordability fit in.

Rick King – we did add affordable as an item that would fit in there.

Robyn West – as we talk about affordability – we need to be careful to present something in the end that legislator can pay attention to and to.

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



John Gibbs - If our study suggests that usage is hampered by affordability. There could be some lifeline type program. Affordability could be attended to at some segment. Don't know if there would ever be a consensus on broadband being treated as a utility. Think through the defined and used terms – what concept are we getting at.

Dick Sjoberg – think we need to use common sense and look at some standards. If we say 1 GB we are looking at some lower cost potential at getting to some areas. You won't be able to get. Can't use wireless, have to balance and think it terms of common sense and reality. In a perfect world we set up and run 1GB solution. You also need a more expensive computer. We have a fiber ring to the schools and the schools are running at 100 MB. Just have to use some common sense and not paint ourselves into a corner. If we want ubiquity and smoking hot speeds, you won't get both.

Peg Werner – I think there is another side to look at- standards that have gone into legislation have changed. Encourage us to take the idea that we will have different standards all over the state. If we give those terms now, the standards will be outdate in a year.

Vijay Sethi – as we are talking about being able to reach someone on the first 2 miles/20 miles and there is a minimum standard defined – if there is someone who has the need and financial means - would they have access. What would happen?

John Gibbs – idea for record base representation was made if someone is willing to pay, we have providers that will bring the infrastructure there. WE have in fact developed in MN an industry that if someone is willing to pay they will get the infrastructure. We don't want policy that put corporate thinkers in a corner.

Mike O'Connor – leap on the future looking bandwagon – remember we are setting the goal – Made his living leading ahead of the pack. I think if you look out about 10 years – the pipe will be fiber – there will be one pipe. The notion of building two mediocre networks – once the loosing providers networks will be gone. Need to set the goal with the eye to 1 gig is speedy – we need consumer protection. Consumers have been screwed by providers. Consumers need a recourse.

John Stanoch – disagree with what was said – service is provided – disagree with fundamental assumptions that Mike stated.

Mike O'Connor – undesirable to have two providers in his opinion

Rick King – this will not go on the common agreement board. Want us to stay on one side of the line – want to stay away from the bill - credit card. We will take that piece and put aside.

Steve Cawley – want to see where we stand on cooperation across all players and public/private partnership.

Rick King – wants to add – trying to put up things that we all subscribe to. The whole notion of trying to spur supply and demand

Craig Taylor – encourage competition in the state of MN the better we are off with the supply side.

Mike O'Connor – disagree with that one.

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Kim Ross – Sen. Kelley – there was a “public good” terminology that might serve us. Peg used dated, Mike used futuristic. Should be a value longer term.

Jack Geller – Commented on minimum standards, as soon as you set a minimum standard it is going to be outdated shortly. If there is not a standard, ubiquity is in the eye of the beholder. Has to be something of minimum standards and then you update things.

John Stanoch – key point that we have to come back to about Utility – utilities are regulated. In fact that is what we mean – that is ok, but let’s make sure that is what we mean – a level of regulation around broadband that would be introduced.

Rick King – my statement about ubiquity does not mean utility

Chris Swanson – symmetrical speeds – a lot of people discusses and would like to get up on the board – it is hard to deliver products if you can’t upload as fast as you can download.

John Gibbs – would like to pull off

Tom Garrison – how do we reality test of what we are trying to do here. Echoes the public good statement. There are things that we all arrive at that others don’t agree, but if it is for the public good.

John Stanoch – under public good – education, government., services, economic, library, health care – focus on areas where we think there is public good. Comments about symmetrical service – in the CA report – if you were this type of user this may be the – encourage us to go down the path of not one size fits all. My view is that if we get - need to segment the sets of populations.

Rick King – We are capturing – got a list of 10 -12 things that we are not going to take that we totally agree – we will use this as a start. We have others that we will incorporate.

Action item – take a look at the ones we captured today and reflect on them. This may help us think about pieces in the report.

12:15 – 12:45 Lunch Break

**12:45 – 1:45 – K12 Education & Public Libraries**

Mary Mehsikomer

See slides

Gave out a paper on the history of the learning network.

Map shows how school districts and public libraries are clustered.

Do a lot of distance learning, foreign languages  
Online college in high school

Pete Royer – Director – Little Crow -

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



[www.letn.org](http://www.letn.org)

merged with the MN Valey  
inside the telcom clusters there

e-central Mn – what those two networks started in 1989 and

1983 – no fiber prior to 1983. Handy back then to talk with

Leases from telephone companies – have a gig wide area network. That connects all their school buildings 1 GB Ethernet – one internet pool of presence on their WAN. They are now at 50 MB bandwidth across

Cost per month - \$140 – shared network service. Connected to the learning network of MN.

Doing shared ITV scheduling – did a total knee replacement surgery – do an internet point of presence. Each individual school has their own firewall. Have video conferencing capabilities. All these are hard shared devices. Doing staff development, Web 2.0 applications, through ITV, do some curriculum development. Getting science teacher to talk about curriculum. Would not have happened if it weren't for their WAN.

Dept of education came up with METT – to try and look at standards. Talked about what would be passable, good, and best. Mandating is not effective unless you bring funds.

Try to get people a handle of where they need to be at. Telling legislators that we need a MB per student is hard to get their arms around.

Rick King – we are consumers of education we would like any handouts you may have.

Marla Davenprot – Director of learning technologies at TIES – Engaging MN students with

Working with internet2 since 2002 –

Give an overview of what they've been doing.  
Not doing this alone working with the K20 Committee –  
One of 38 sponsor group participants  
Blue on the map indicates connections  
Talk about how they relate to Internet2  
All participants have to pay a fee to sue internet2  
Growth - 2002 – 9847 – 2008 – 2009 - 53,864

Why – to build out 21<sup>st</sup> century skills for students.

Examples – brings students into collaboration opportunities. Every year – mega conference Jr. students all over the world do presentation for each other that talks about something that they are doing in school or what is going on in another society. They have access to all kinds of experts – they can actually connect and learn about things first hand and get information about

Class to class collaboration – could be in the same community or world-wide  
Authentic learning and highly engaging  
One pictured showed the reading group. They are reading to each other over

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Virtual field trips – supplements curriculum and do different activities with students.

More and more digital libraries available – WGBH

Can use equipment through the internet – remote cameras in monetary bay that the students can control.

Can play music

Simulations – immersive simulations – virtual reality

In order to help teachers – developing partnership, professional development,

2002 – Joined SEGP

Started MN TVbyGirls

MN TV list serv

Listed numerous examples of what they can do.

Where they're heading

Ken Behringer – Director of Dakota Co. Library System – add link to his presentation

See slides – MnLINK operated through

When you go onto MnLINK

[www.mnlinkgateway.org](http://www.mnlinkgateway.org) – operated from a server in Ohio – now owned by OCLC

Rick King – a little time for Q & A

Peg Werner – thank the speakers – open for discussion

Tom Garrison – Marla – as you look ahead this group is charged to look ahead – what capabilities do you envision do you need, would like to have to keep MN libraries competitive?

Marla – as schools start using it – info. Coming back and forth slows as more schools join. She's an application person, but need some pretty good bandwidth to do instrumentation.

Pete does have some bandwidth per student numbers.

That is the experience in the public library system – Ken asked to see bandwidth utilization when he started – now they are

If you build it they will come...

They get an awful lot of people in who are trying to move major files in the library to people who don't have computes

The infrastructure varies widely across the state.

In some places if a teacher wants to do class to class collaboration they need to shut down the network to other things in order to do that.

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Have to deal with

Brent Ch – do you have an idea where MN falls in comparison with other states.

Mary - We are more locally controlled – other states have implemented agency that is statewide. Sofitication – somewhere in the middle. Some states are dealing with T1 – others do not have fiber networks.

Ken - Libraries are structured much the same way

Rick King – other questions.

Tim Lovaasen. – do you deal with individual students and what they are doing at home. Do you know how many students are out there that could utilize it but they do not have computers.

In MN our concentration of access to students at home is high, but they do not have stats. They are always looking at equity of access – they have to be congincent of how much lab time they have. Some schools have laptops available for check-out

Tim Lovaasen - Could be something this committee could look at – looking at those that do not have – help them out.

That is a big equity divide as schools are trying to come down to

Tim Lovaasen - One thing CWA is been looking at so that those that are less fortunate can gain access and educate on how to use it. Thinks there is legislation on

Rick King – did talk about the PC access as a potential shovel project

JoAnne Johnson – talked about the system coming down for a couple weeks – what

What has happened is that because of the accountability of no child left behind – using NEW m

In terms of state testing all was paper pencil mode – the first test to go online is science – kids prefer to take the tests that way. Having enough works stations, having - the labs are ou

Dept of education does not have plans to move other

JoAnne Johnson – any instructions on how that can be improved this

Marla - Build growth into state plans. MN dept of education – they are planning to do extensive surveying about what capacity exists. Puts the district through a process to ensure the district is able to conduct the test.

Is there any kind of clearing house where people can send their computers

Robyn West - School district tend to cycle their own –

Marla - MN Computers for Schools program – refurbished and sold back to schools – get a warranty

Include the web site in the notes -

**Approved Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, January 16, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**



**1:45 – 2:15 – Report History Chapter – Mike O’Connor**

After the introduction you’ll see a chronological sequence/visual of what took place. Review the events and send one of the four subgroup members an e-mail and they stick in the event.

National drivers – same sort of thing – links to things that folks can read.

The major section that people should read – we are not the first statewide BB initiative and we’ve found at least

Initiatives and ideas that we are talking about are not new – think creatively about how we create a report that is not shelf-ware. The reports are in that section. If people know of more – send them.

Action – everyone – review the sections and send the subgroup comments – identify events that you think should be added or add report that you know about.

JoAnne Johnson– Mike has been the driving force for getting this pushed into the 27<sup>th</sup> century – actually having us write this thing on the wiki – it’s a work in progress.

Brent Christensen – tasked with giving a first draft

Chris Swanson – intriguing that there have been studies done in the past. Encourage us to look at the studies and look at why some of those items were not implemented so we don’t make the same mistakes.

Rick King – other comments? Great work on this. Thinking about the other chapters and maybe flavors of some things – people that have brought in specialty groups we want to make sure that information gets into the report and reflected throughout. Will have material from health care in a few months and have K-12 and libraries and what we’ve heard today. The tools that Mike has introduced have started to form some things for us. Do what Mike did and expose to others.

Rick King thought today was excellent – a good session – was going to say the technology worked great. One point – the only problem that we’ve seen is that we need to

Make sure we can get handouts to people – and everyone can pull them down.

What did people think and should we continue

Mike O’Connor – for Mike it was a lifesaver – he would not have been able to participate

Peg Werner – we are both at a non-video conferencing site. Give you the ability to stream into your computer.

Mike O’Connor – Participation in the meeting – anyone can sit in on the meeting

**Approved Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, January 16, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**



Tom Garrison – why we are still fact finding – this works great – would help to be face to face to vote.

Joe Schlinder – if he has video conference equipment can he use that to connect?

Cost – is the cost absorbed

Steve Cawley – limited the locations as this was just starting - caution members coming in from random sites.

Jack Geller – thinks it worked quite well. When he raised his hand and was acknowledged – worked well when needed.

ViJay Sethi – only thing it was hard to hear speakers at times – can you be closer to a mike.

Rick King - There is only one mic in the room

Steve Cawley – more people need to speak up – it's just a discipline of the group.

Rick King – if you can hear Rick – we can all make this work.

Vijay Sethi – we can hear you.

Rick King – then it is a projection issue

Mike O'Connor – have people address the mike on the far side of the room

Jack Ries – for the greater MN area – is there a way for the camera to be broader

Jack Geller – can't see to the right of Joanne

ViJay Sethi – at one time the camera did swing from one end of the room to another

Rick King – you are missing two people at the table. This might be a good alternative for the next few months. Then the greater MN meetings. Just because we have the remote sites up doesn't mean we have to do this. Gives us the option to stream. What we would do – make available more publically and they can pick it up. Is that ok with all of you we will proceed

Jack Geller – great.

Rick King – go back to Peg. Anything you want to talk about with regard to the greater MN meetings.

Peg Werner – locations will be Mankato, Fergus, grand rapids

Rick King – we will get that prior to the next meeting.

Michele Engdahl – want to bring up a document about BB taskforce outreach – talked with her about what we might want to do with making the video available and what we try to schedule around the outstate meetings. Maybe a leadership meeting with local leaders, then the meeting. These are ideas

Approved Meeting Minutes  
Friday, January 16, 2009  
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Someone who works on this generically – try to make this event – Michele will help us with the publicity.

Jack Geller – Brent and I know everyone worth knowing. It's a pretty small town – it's be half a day of calling and we'd have everyone lined up, media folks –

Brent Christensen, works closely with all the legislators in the area –

Jack Geller – Brent is chair of the Mankato committee

Tom Garrison – we always look for photo opportunities – if some thought can be given.

Chris Swanson – how did those three communities get picked

Rick – missed this?

Joanne Johnson – follow on to Tom's suggestion – coffee break session in the morning. Possibly arrange something in the morning. A photo opp. is a good opportunity to get legislators in the room.

Joe Schlinder – knows that everyone knows everyone, but he could recruit hospital representative.

Vijay Sethi – from the Fergus area there is a lot of companies – regional newspaper, businesses, that he could contact.

Mike O'Connor – another gang that could MN voices online – a community – working phrases that could go into this and they could be good allies – if Michele could write up a template that could be sent

Rick King – we got video conference, outstate meetings, - one of the things to be caution about is – we have 22 strong opinions about what is going on- need to work on a basic simple message that we all can repeat. We all have certain opinions, but I think what we would like to do is that we are the same task force that moves around the state – work on the messaging and then use that messaging. Other orgs may have a spokesperson. Everyone in their own local should be cultivating the spokesperson activities – make sure we are using the same basic message.

Tom Garrison – suggestion – a good starting point may be something that we could incorporate into the message

Brent Christensen – disagrees – important that the chairman is the local voice – if we get too many faces up there we could do more harm than good.

JoAnne Johnson – as far as the face, the message – I see nothing wrong with formulating and having you do that. When we get to the meeting – I don't think there are problems with people seeing how seriously we discuss these issues. People want to know that we

Rick King – totally agree on the meeting – nothing I suggested was to change the meeting.

**Approved Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, January 16, 2009**  
**9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.**



Mike O'Connor – JoAnne took the words out of his mouth – Mike has said no thanks that they have to talk with the Chair. He can say that Urban users is his work, but if you want a quote for the task force – go to Rick. At the same time if we had a shared set of statements

Brent Christensen – when we are in Mankato – the quotes need to be yours on behalf of the committee – we don't have continuity.

Jack Geller – if you have a homer in the crowd – they are going to that homer and that will be the person of interest and then the Chair –

Brent Christensen – the message from the task force has to come from the chair

Jack Geller – I agree completely

Rick King – if others agree, he is ok.

Dick Sjoberg- We have not been able to nail down Feb.

Rick King – March will be better – pursuing Dan McElroy and the economic piece. Tim is working on the CWA stuff.

Peg Werner – have not heard anything on the gates foundation

Rick King – and high tech for April

Tom Garrison – question for Feb. would the city group slide into Feb.

Jack Geller – Feb 6 – how soon will we have the logistics. In a

Rick King – try for the same locations – we will do a video for sure. We'll be in the same rough geographies. Starting to shape up for those meeting. The only thing we do not have is the actual consumer – we might want to give consideration to that. Last point on the agenda would like JoAnne or Brent to be as back-up.

All in favor – yes.

Any other items that you want to bring up

Vijay Sethi – it was hard to hear about municipals in counties group – move to March?

Tom Garrison – no – staying in Feb.

Robyn West – will give ViJay a call on the way home.

Rick King – pretty good meeting today – all of you have spoken to rick about getting into the action. At the tail-end of the education. Have to get well read on what has been done and then need to get writing started. Pieces and then we'll stitch it together. We'll need to work o writing and reviewing. The real tough work is ahead of us. Coming up with the list.

Motion to adjourn – 2:50 in favor – approved.