

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



Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting

January 16, 2009

Location: Main Meeting at Metro State University, St. Paul with videoconferencing sites at St. Cloud State, Rochester Community and Technical College, Lake Superior College in Duluth, University of Minnesota at Crookston, and Southwest Minnesota State University at Marshall

Facilitator: Anne Losby

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

Public attendees: Randy Young, Ann Treacy, Jodie Miller, Tucker Carlson, Emmett Coleman, Mike Martin, Andy Shriner, Tom Berkelman, Dennis Fazio, Michelle Schlie, Mike Reardon, Tim Finnerty, JoAnne Wetherell-Moriarty

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

Opening comments; review meeting agenda – Rick King

Rick asked members to comment from the videoconferencing sites
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.

Rick King welcomed everyone to the first meeting via two way video conferencing. Task force members that are on video can vote on things that the task force may be voting on. Task force members participating via phone only cannot vote per the state's open meeting guidelines. Rick said that since this is the first time we are using video conferencing as a group, there will be some trial and error. If sites are not speaking, then we should mute the site. If you are speaking, allow for delays. 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 and also try to make the streaming available.

Rick King thanked Steve Cawley and his team at the University of Minnesota and Minnesota State Colleges and University System (MNSCU) to get this set up for us at all the sites.

Rick King went over the substitutes for the meeting. Jack Ries will substitute for Gopal Khanna this afternoon. Joe Schindler will be joining us this afternoon for Mary Ellen Wells. Karen Smith

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



is unable to attend nor is her substitute. Dan McElroy was unable to attend as was his substitute.

Rick King then noted we have a pretty robust agenda and things to add. The first item of business is to approve the agenda for today. Rick mentioned that he would also have some comments on shovel ready projects for the economic stimulus plan per the request of the Minnesota House and Senate committee chairs and on 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 as he has to leave at 12:15.

Rick King said we will try to get it in earlier.

A motion was made to approve the agenda and seconded. Agenda approved.

Rick King then called for a motion to approve the December 19, 2008 meeting minutes. A motion to approve was made and seconded. Minutes approved.

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

Tom Garrison mentioned one item on page 8 of the December 19 minutes. As an action item he had noted that the cable providers had a chart that showed how long it takes to download materials at different speeds and was requesting that the telephone companies prepare something similar using their commonly offered speeds. This was noted as an action item.

There was also a brief discussion about Jack Geller working to break out the rural data in the Rural Policy Institute survey by region of the state, if possible.

Rick King asked how the task force wants to respond to shovel ready projects for Minnesota. 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 indicated that from a state government side of things, there are needs for shovel ready projects. He asked whether the state had any shovel ready projects.

Gopal Khanna indicated that they (Minnesota Office of Enterprise Technology) are in the process of looking at the opportunities that exist. They are working with Management and Budget (previously the Department of Finance), MMD (Materials and Management Division, part of the Department of Administration), and with the Governor's office. So the state is in the process right now 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. We could provide input; we could offer a statewide view since we have a lot of constituencies represented in our task force membership; we could help prioritize. We need to decide how we want to react.

John Gibbs indicated that in thinking about this after the e-mail, are we going to make any suggestions? His view is that we should not send a list as this goes outside the scope 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

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



opportunity poster. This could be used to disseminate information that is being input. We 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 we could put on the agenda for February and vote on some things. We could think about this a little bit more. More importantly, from what he hears we will have a lot better idea of what is in the federal stimulus by then.

Vijay Sethi (in Crookston) stated that, at the county level we are looking at transportation for the federal stimulus package. We are hearing that there will be two rounds, projects that are 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 from the information that he has, there are going to be two rounds. First are those projects with the expectation to implement around 45 to 60 days. The idea is to get money into the economy right away by functioning on a fast time-frame. The expectation is that there might be some low hanging fruit in broadband but the second round will also happen quickly to get money into the economy. Sen. Klobuchar backed this up with statements at her Rural Broadband Roundtable in late December, that the second round would have more broadband but that the second round wouldn't be that far off.

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

Rick King indicated that in a way he hoped that's why the committee chairs had asked. They believe that they are going to have to step in line in February and March to get the money so they want to be ready. Rick asked for some comments from the task force on this. Rick appreciated John Gibb's comments. It may be we can think about this some more. If you read our charter, it is outside. But we are the statewide appointed group and the two chairs of the committees have asked for this. They did not know about this when the enabling legislation for this task force was put into place. Rick thinks we should respond, but if the will of the task force is different, he respects that. If you subscribe to the notion that we should respond, we could respond without prejudice. We may not have a lot of to debate, we could just compile a list of all projects or a list of alternatives, like low cost loans, matching grants, etc. We could just come up with a list and bucket them and the legislature could decide. What do you think of that type of approach?

Jack Geller (in Crookston) likes the idea, but does agree it is outside of the scope of the task force. On the other hand, as citizens we do have the authority to collect input, aggregate ideas, and bring forth via the task force. We may want to solicit beyond the task force and very quickly get input from others. If we are the aggregator he is fine with that. If we are defining what is good and bad, he is uncomfortable with that.

Brent Christensen questioned whether we are being asked to put together a list of shovel ready projects or come up with a process. I think they are asking for directions.

Rick King clarified, they are asking for projects but would also take process.

Mike O'Connor (by telephone) indicated support for Jack Geller's comments. There is a certain amount of urgency here. If we can respond quickly in an aggregated way, we do the state a lot of good. If we sit on our hands for three months with a list that shows up late, we do the citizens of Minnesota some harm.

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



Peg Werner (by telephone) agreed with the position that Rick is taking. We are living in extraordinary times. The legislature, for all they have to do, does not have expertise in every area. She thinks the task force should take this as part of our purview if the legislators have asked.

Brent Christensen suggested that, given the speed and what needs to be done, maybe we need to have a special meeting in February to do this.

Tom Garrison would combine the ideas he has heard. He would suggest we put a message out that asks for suggestions. We could set up a committee to review. If the task force wants us to, the committee could make itself available for a special meeting. Our regular meeting on February 20 is already too full.

Rick King suggested breaking the idea into a couple pieces. Is there any objection to spending some time getting ideas for shovel ready projects and then, if a phase two, offer a list as an aggregated list from a group (ours) that covers the state? We could also offer process help. Our deadline would be to do the post and get them a list by the end of the month of February. Do we believe that is a good approach? He did not hear any objections.

Mike O'Connor indicated that the only thing he would lobby for is faster rather than slower. Step up the pace a little. Six weeks is a long time.

Rick King so noted. We should discuss how we get there. We should capture this as a major decision in our minutes. If we go the regular pace as Tom Garrison noted, we have a municipal panel scheduled for February, etc. The February meeting is tied up. We could have a special meeting as long as there is a quorum. Rick is open to how we do this. This is something extraordinary. Rick's opinion is that this warrants a special meeting and we could do this like we are doing today, without travel.

Jack Geller made the observation that this group is remarkably networked with every institution in the state. We have a great representation of the cross section of users and providers, government, cable, wireless. It would be marvelous to use this human infrastructure and our website and then call a meeting to be able to compile ideas. This would be both broad in reach and efficient in process.

Rick King suggested two things. First, as John Gibbs earlier suggested, we should put something on the website that is new to indicate we are soliciting input and that publicizes we are doing this. Second, Rick said if he had this right, this would be the basis of the special meeting.

Jack Geller stated that the members of this task force are not sitting around the table by chance. The institutions they represent should be used as ambassadors to these industries. He would hate for someone to come up with a meaningful idea too late and after the information was provided. We should use our human infrastructure to really broadly fan out and get input and use the web site as an aggregator. Then get together physically or electronically and review and package.

Dick Sjoberg (in Crookston) said that one of the things we need to do is get some understanding of the ground rules for projects that are submitted, such as when it has to be started by, the amount of money that they have to put up as a match, etc.. Some of the projects may be ill-

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



conceived if we do not have the guidelines. We should not release the mechanism until we have the guidelines.

Rick King stated that Dick makes a good point but that we don't have guidelines yet. It is a chicken and an egg problem. When we do have the guidelines, we can get them out. Rick is more worried about getting the word out and getting the ideas. We can always chop back if a project doesn't meet the guidelines. Guidelines will probably include a requirement for matching funding and getting jobs quickly. He hasn't seen other guidelines discussed yet.

JoAnne Johnson has some things to add from the House draft circulated yesterday. A couple of the things that are pertinent: Funds are distributed through existing formulas, where accountability measures are already in place. Everything would have to be personally certified by the government or local official that the project is an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. There are now earmarks. There is approximately \$6 billion to expand Internet access to rural and other unserved areas. That is the first shot of money for broadband. Work needs to begin within 30 days. So it will go better and quicker to those companies that are there now and serving the network. There be \$41 billion to local school districts and \$1b for technology, \$20 billion for health information technology. We have a project ready to go on that in Minnesota. They talk about scientific research, particularly concerns for getting connections to smaller businesses in rural areas with small telephone companies using RUS and REA getting a boost.

Tom Garrison asked if the information could be routed. JoAnne indicated she would.

Chris Swanson said that it sounds like the things are getting defined, so let's get the list and guidelines, match them up and move forward

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

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

Tim Lovaasen said that part of our process is to look at the broadband mapping and see where things are at. The draft legislation refers to unserved and underserved areas. He would like the task force to see what is out there and who needs service. Tim referred to the CWA which has the position that you see what you need, not any sized company can be part of this.

JoAnne Johnson said as it stands right now, phase two will be interest free loans for boosting speeds. Interest free loans are problematic for the larger companies although they did change the federal rules. The initial phase one will be grants.

Mike O'Connor had a process point, that is while the video is nice, he can't tell who is talking so he requested that people identify themselves prior to speaking.

John Gibbs said that he likes a lot of what he's heard. When we meet in February to talk about this, he hopes that we think about suggestions for applications that are on the demand side and the application side. If you look at the government and all the bail-outs are any of these bail-out dollars going to people having trouble actually paying their mortgage. Perhaps it would be useful if we tie to our mission and charter, if there are taxpayer dollars to be spent it is focused on users or libraries to make access points more available. That would be shovel ready and helps the individuals that are trying to find a job or pay an overdue mortgage. If we have the conversation, let's put some focus on the consumer side.

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



Rick King agreed that John's point is right on. Rick indicated he told the committee chair that we will come forward with both supply and demand side ideas. We've heard that the use of and access to personal computers is needed. Not all access points are personal computers, but there are ways to stimulate the application side via just the devices. Ideas should be broader than broadband.

JoAnne Johnson also agrees with what John said. What we can do as we move forward is structure things so that the softer side, the demand side, is stimulated. She would use Frontier as an example. Frontier has high speed Internet to 100% of its exchanges and can reach 89% of its subscribers. If the grant money can get the last 10% locked up, that would be great. Then you need to look at the other side of the equation, at training people on how to use computers. We haven't thought outside the box. Our company's first quarter promotion is that customers get a free small Dell computer when they subscribe to broadband. Last year they ran a PC promotion that was incredibly successful. So whether it is a first computer or the third, it works.

John Gibbs suggested that there could be another business plan. Comcast's footprint is 100% broadband. Maybe we don't chase the 11% but the 40% that don't have the equipment. Maybe we should go to shovel ready projects to get the 40% families that don't have computers to use the access. There is a lot of low hanging fruit on the access side. There are a huge number of homes and families that can't access either by choice or financial limitation. That is a valid strategy. Seems we do enhance Minnesota's infrastructure for the future if we chase the opportunity. There is a whole lot of opportunity on demand and acceptance.

Rick King wanted to cut the discussion at this point and get to a couple of questions that we need to resolve. What we see by this discussion is the need to develop a list. What it means to do those things is what we want to provide in our response. We want to give them a broad list. Rick indicated that he did caution in his testimony that where placing money out there discourages a company's own investment, we don't want that result. Investment from the economic stimulus should be additive. What he is interested in is that we have formed what we want to do. The question now is does this warrant a special meeting between now and the regular meeting on February 20? We will have the mapping. Rick thinks that we should try to have a meeting, if it is shorter and just around this topic.

John Stanoch sees mapping as a start to the deliverable. He would like to see what it would take to put broadband to every member of the state because he doesn't think \$6b is a final number. He thinks the mapping information would allow the group to focus. He is personally interested in seeing the mapping information as a way to direct the dollars. Also, underserved is not defined. Once it is, we can discuss whether unserved takes precedence over underserved.

Rick King sensed that the group was coming together.

Steve Cawley suggested having a meeting shortly after the maps become available.

Diane Wells said the maps should be available February 2.

Rick King agreed with John Stanoch's point and also suggested February 6 as a meeting date.

Tom Garrison indicated a meeting on February 6 that included the mapping presentation would solve another issue which is the tightness of the agenda for the February 20 meeting. We had requested we handle mapping in a special meeting. Tom moved that we do have a special meeting on February 6, 2009.

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



Chris Swanson seconded the motion.

Gopal Khanna asked whether it would be good to set up a small working group to put together all the pieces for the February 6th meeting as opposed to the full task force meeting.

Tom Garrison thought it might be doable but wondered if less than a quorum could meet for this specific purpose but then report back its information to the full group. Or he asked if electronic voting would be possible. Tom would also like the full task force to put staff on it.

John Stanoch indicated that if the maps are available on the 2nd we could use the 6th for a small group meeting but develop the full list at the February 20 meeting.

Tom Garrison reminded the group that that would not solve the problem of having too much on our February 20 agenda. He said that the special meeting could be used to hear the mapping report and begin to aggregate a list of shovel ready projects. The task force would have to decide what it needs for the report to the legislators.

Rick King's thinking is that we will have a special meeting and have as many people as possible attend. We will have the mapping data and have a full, robust discussion. We would finalize at the regular February 20 meeting.

John Gibbs liked the suggestion. It goes to the idea of a working group but full group can participate so all voices can be heard on February 6. Then by 2 weeks later, we can have something that can take final shape and folks could vote on.

Steve Cawley said for the regular February meeting, we may want to lighten up the agenda.

Rick King said we may want to put off some of the Chapter review or push Rey's presentation. The first step would be to agree to have a meeting on February 6. We will set up with video conference. Use the same start time and figure out the length of the meeting for just those topics: mapping and a discussion of shovel ready projects and go forward.

Jack Geller was very supportive of the plan. He is very anxious to see the mapping. He doesn't know if it should be a special meeting or a regular meeting. If in fact there are no action items on the agenda, and if informational only, as long as not making motions he is not sure if it matters if there is a quorum. Either way, he is supportive of a meeting on February 6.

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

Rick King said if we are moving the mapping out of the February 20 meeting, and have the municipal panel that day and a decision on the shovel ready projects, we should be ok. We can move Dick Sjoberg's speaker. Moving one speaker is easier than moving several people on a panel. Rick would like to post the special meeting. To Jack Geller's point, we do not necessarily need to say we are going to have a vote to have a meeting. Rick hopes people are able to attend though he suspects that there are a lot of people that will have to work to clear the date. The special meeting will be Feb. 6th with the mapping report and then a focus on the list. We will do an aggregation for the project list and focus on both supply and demand side. Anything further?

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



Tom Garrison called the question.

Rick King repeated that the proposal is a special meeting on February 6, 2009 to focus on mapping and the list of projects that could be used either in phase one or two and either on the demand or supply side. Any further discussion?

All in favor – aye, no one opposed. Motion approved.

We will plan for February 6th and get the sites and replicate where we are videoconferencing today. Staff will start the work on the web site to gather the input. Rick apologized for taking so much time for this but we want to be seen as a resource. Rick congratulated everyone for a good discussion. He proposed a ten minute break now and at 11:00 a.m. we would begin discussion of the state reports. We will work on a reallocation of time for the rest of the agenda this morning. So, resume at 11:00.

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

It was noted that while we are viewing an image from the website on the screen, we will not see the video participants in Crookston.

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

Mike O'Connor introduced the task force to the web site www.urbanusers.com/statereports. He also said that if you want to follow on your local browser because the video link is blurry, you could go to the website now.

Mike O'Connor explained that what the group did was to take a look at a number of state reports and set up a template by going through those reports and identifying key aspects. The compilation is on the website as background. Then Mike decided to use a tool that he sometimes uses to navigate a lot of material. This is the web version of the output. What he did in each of them as the state summaries came in was to start clumping the summaries by goals, leadership, tracking progress, ways and means, address underserved, and innovation. As an example, under goals, there is a lot of material. Several states had the recommendation to ensure that all citizens had access to broadband. The subgroup thought this could serve as a resource as we are putting together our report: if we decide we want a goal that is similar, then we can look to these states and maybe borrow language. All the information is in the Word document.

Mike O'Connor went over how to get to the website and highlighted big themes. You can click on "Statement of Values" and what we find is a lot of overlap. Now click on "Where We Are Today" and here again there was a lot of overlap with rankings, maps, surveys, barriers, constraints, and local right of way. If you click on "Where We Want To Be" the really interesting stuff is if you go down one layer. Click on goals, to give you a sense, 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 as long as we don't get too specific. The next one to highlight is "How Are We Going To Get There". Interesting theme, click on "Leadership" and there is a lot of conversation in the reports on how we want to get there. This will be a huge resource for us. If, for example, we wanted to describe how we want to do a consolidated coordinated entity, interestingly enough there are 7 or 8 other states that are recommending a coordinated entity. There is a lot of clumping to do. Mike would

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



like the task force's permission to take one more pass through the document and put all the like recommendations together. Mike then handed the discussion back to JoAnne Johnson to finish.

JoAnne Johnson thanked Mike for his work. She will talk from the Word document but found the visual to be very helpful. As we go along, we will find the work that this group did to be very helpful. There is a lot of information in the summary, but there is, of course, a lot of information in the state reports themselves. Within both the Word report and on the visual there is a list of all the links and URLs for the reports. There is a 1, 2, or 3 page summary. In total, the subgroup looked at 25 states and the District of Columbia and a report from Connected Nation. The summaries follow the structure that you saw in the visual. The Word document is a tool that gave us the ability to look at and find common themes. 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 leadership at the local level to state resources. The most common one is 14 states said that it is important to create a permanent coordinating entity. For some it's an advisory council, for others it is an advisory agency.

John Gibbs noted that in addition to looking at the state report, it is also worth looking at what the state actually did. Michigan had a coordinating entity, but later removed funding. Tennessee is following Connected Nation. Washington doesn't have a coordinating entity and is doing a needs assessment to decide whether to have one. There is not one coordinating entity in place, that is an interesting question that comes out. Underscore our summary and look at the details and what the state is really doing.

Joanne Johnson said that this is simply a list of resources for you to dig deeper into the state reports that strike you as interesting. This is not simple, this is complex information. We do not simply want to do a reprint of the California report. Many state reports are thoughtful, well-planned. The ways and means is all about how you plan and fund things. JoAnne had hoped to find more states where they would update their telecommunications law. The only one that had specific mention of it was Illinois. 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, including \$7 million in tax credits to \$4.9 million in Idaho in matching grants to build out in unserved areas. As a result, there were a huge number of new Idaho residents that could tap in to broadband for the first time. JoAnne's point is that there is also more information for us to learn about outside of the state reports. But the state reports give you somewhat of a roadmap. JoAnne said she would also be remiss if she didn't mention that the CWA has a summary of summaries of state reports.

The only other thing before questions that JoAnne wanted to mention were the statement of values. There were many reports that did not have statement of values; they had goals or mission statements instead. Many of these terms were interchangeable. When we saw Diane's summary of the statement of values that we had submitted, what we have is a kind of mix of goals, values, vision and mission. In the summaries it broke down to economics or importance of broadband for participating in the global economy, there were 8 states that talked about economic development as being the driver. Some states took the time to address different aspects of the economy. For example, JoAnne explained the difference between California and Colorado. California's is to remove barriers to broadband access and the governor also requested that the task force pay particular attention to how to benefit education. Colorado's statement of values does more to position itself for competition in an information tech world and to do more to get ahead of other states in deployment and a commitment to ubiquitousness. This is something we have to decide: what goes into our values statement. It is what we want to

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



accomplish for the state of Minnesota. The differences are subtle and there are similarities. JoAnne suggested taking some time to take a look at these state reports for their value statements.

Rick King thanked the group for their excellent work. He said that this is going to make it much easier for us to look at the state summaries. He really liked the tool Mike developed. Even though you have to dig in, it 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 that's been put together, you can start to see a report there. Some of the questions we had as we were talking about the design of the report, we can start out by collecting what other states are doing. There are a whole bunch of chapters right there. The subgroup needs to give Mike the answer to some of the questions that we are thinking about that start to fall out.

JoAnne Johnson said that the next step that the subgroup was going to take is something that is best that everyone does and that is to take a good look at your particular interest areas and see how other states have addressed them. If you see a best practice, send it to the team and we'll summarize. We can use that to guide us as we go forward. You can send to any one of the four of us (JoAnne Johnson, Mike O'Connor, John Gibbs, Jack Ries)

Rick King said that we will capture this as an action item for task force members.

Tom Garrison agreed it was great work and 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 areas that we haven't talked about and find who has the best language that we can use.

Anne Losby clarified for the task force where all of the material can be found. If you go to the task force website at www.ultra-high-speed-mn.org under meeting agenda and minutes. All of the materials for this meeting are posted, including the state report summaries prepared by this subgroup which has a link to the full report. Mike O'Connor's is www.urbanusers.com/statereports.

Jack Geller wanted to give kudos as well. Thanks to Mike, John, Jack, & JoAnne, great work. This will be useful for a number of different parts of our work. However, Jack said that if he understands the organization correctly, you would have to know if the information was part of the agenda material in order to find it. Jack believes it needs to be pulled out as a work product, for its value to us and for trying to educate others in Minnesota and they can come here to this site to see the work product. Mike O'Connor's product is part of the task force work product and it doesn't need to be on our website but needs to be linked. Mike O'Connor indicated that he wanted permission to take another pass at the material. Jack wholeheartedly supports and thinks it will be useful to many others if he does so.

Gopal Khanna second the suggestion. This is great information.

Rick King said he will ask staff to pull the state report summaries to the front page and make it a more front page look. He will also ask them to provide a shortcut to Mike O'Connor's tool.

JoAnne Johnson said it occurred to her during this discussion that almost all websites have a place where you can choose "Resources" on the bar.

Tom Garrison suggested also leaving the material with the January 16 agenda as some people will go to the website to see what happened at that meeting.

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



11:30 to 12:15 Values Discussion

There is a multi-page document in the package. For people who suggested values, it is the time to highlight. When we talked about values, it's mission, principles, outcome.

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

Rick King reminded everyone that the summary of value statements was 4 or 5 pages stapled and then a separate one page addendum, so two papers, if people were having trouble locating.

Anne Losby added that both are posted on the web site.

John Gibbs asked if we should start with the first one overall and then work our way down.

Anne Losby said from a process point, it might be better to see if we can 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. We don't have time to discuss all of them today.

Rick King said he would throw out a couple of ideas. First, ubiquity of service as a guiding principle seems pretty important and one we've touched on a lot. It's on the handout under Rural/Metro #3 and a few other places.

JoAnne Johnson said that along with ubiquity it would be good to include neutrality to what we are doing. We are not picking winners or losers by location or by technology.

Steve Cawley suggested that if we are going to have the task force members in Crookston participate, they should be on the video. It is easier to interact if we can see them.

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

JoAnne Johnson said that the tone of what we want to do is neither advantage nor disadvantage

Tom Garrison asked whether we mean neutrality as it related to technology, as it relates to stakeholders. What are you referring to? He is trying to reconcile that with certain types of services being needed in one part of the state but not others, like in California, the needs differed.

JoAnne Johnson agreed that is where she wanted to go as well. We don't insist it's fiber in every building, in some cases it will be wireless.

John Gibbs asked if this is the bullet point technology neutral.

JoAnne Johnson responded that technology neutral is where it started, but if all Minnesota citizens are equal we don't concentrate on one or the other. Break out technology neutral as one potential. It is really equity.

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



Brent Christensen indicated that he was a little confused talking about ubiquity on one hand, but different levels of service on the other.

Rick indicated that ubiquity meant everyone is served, not everyone served equally.

Tom Garrison does not disagree. What he thinks 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 thinks this could be a really long conversation. When he thinks of ubiquity, we are going to need to get to the part where we define a minimum standard. At some point, we are going to decide, for example, that access to 10 MB is kind of a floor. So then ubiquity means that everyone has access to that. There is some kind of standard that all Minnesotans have access to. That is different than saying there are different levels needed for different functions. I don't think we are saying that the big pipe has to go everywhere.

Rick King said that since he brought up the issue of ubiquity, he would say that he agrees with what Jack has said. He noted that Anne has written down on the whiteboard another potential area which is a minimum standard.

JoAnne Johnson noted that from what we've just said with regard to other states, no matter where they started, only one came out with 1 GB speed to everyone everywhere. Others went the way Tom suggested, for this service, we need this as a minimum; for that service, we need this speed. JoAnne would say that all Minnesotans have access to the broadband connection that allows them to do what they need to do for the applications they use.

Tom Garrison would like to couple that value with another one. Going back to the first meeting, the biggest single response we heard was that it be affordable.

Rick King indicated that what he is hearing is that the levels of service be based on what it is used for. This seems to be what people are thinking versus a minimum standard. It's really a "smart standard."

Vijay Sethi said that as we are talking about setting a standard, where does the affordability fit in.

Rick King indicated that we did add affordable as an item. We haven't gotten into any detail on what that means.

Robyn West said that as we talk about affordability, it would be great to do everything possible, but we need to be careful to present something in the end that legislators can pay attention to and get done.

John Gibbs stated that if what we recommend is going to be hampered by affordability, we need to address that. There could be some lifeline type program or coupons. Affordability could be attended to at some segment. Obviously not everyone can afford the same things. Some of these terms are fairly loaded. He doesn't know if there would ever be a consensus on broadband being treated as a utility. We need to think through the defined and used terms, what concept are we getting at.

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



Dick Sjoberg thinks we need to use common sense and look at some standards. For example, if we say 1 GB is the minimum standard, then you may eliminate some of the lower cost options and then ubiquity goes out the door because it is too expensive to plow fiber to every farm and you can't use wireless. You have to balance and think in terms of common sense and reality. In a perfect world we set up and run 1GB solution, but even then you would also need much more expensive end user equipment to handle that speed. We have a fiber ring to the schools in Thief River Falls and the schools aren't able to use the speed available because of their equipment. Just have to use some common sense and not paint ourselves into a corner. If we want ubiquity, affordability and smoking hot speeds, you won't get all three.

Peg Werner indicated that there is another side to look at and that is in setting a standard that loses its credibility right away if set too low. She would encourage us to take the idea that we will have different standards all over the state. If we set those terms now, the standards will be outdated in a year.

Vijay Sethi had a comment that if we set a standard but if there is someone who has the need and financial means, would they have access. What would happen?

John Gibbs said that one of the guides was that if someone is willing to pay, we have providers that will bring the infrastructure there. We have, in fact, developed in Minnesota an industry that if someone is willing to pay, the industry has publicly stated they will deliver the infrastructure. We don't want policy that puts corporate thinkers in a corner.

Mike O'Connor said that he wanted to leap on the future looking bandwagon for a minute. One of the things we should probably remember is that we are setting a goal that will be for sometime in the future. He has made his living being a little ahead of the pack. He thinks if you look out about 10 years, the pipe will be fiber; there will be one pipe, not two mediocre networks. This is a natural monopoly. The losing providers' networks will be gone. We need to set the goal with an eye not to next year but further out. It is perfectly ok to set an aggressive goal and to take care of consumers. Put on the whiteboard consumer protection of some sort. There needs to be a mechanism so consumers have recourse.

John Stanoch noted that if we are looking for consensus, he disagrees with what was said. The idea of one pipe to every home is not agreed upon. We have two pipes for competition

Rick King noted that this is an issue that we will have good-natured discussion on and that it will not go in the common agreement board. He does want us to be careful about staying on one side of the line with a free flowing discussion. We should stay away from the more specific examples. We will take that piece (a personal example) and put aside.

Steve Cawley wants to see where we stand on cooperation across all players and public/private partnerships.

Rick King said that he wants to add one and what we are trying to do is to put up things that we all subscribe to. With that in mind, he would like to add the whole notion of trying to spur supply and demand.

Craig Taylor would like to add encouraging competition. The more we can do to encourage competition in the state of Minnesota, the better we are off with the supply side. It will benefit everyone.

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



Mike O'Connor said if we are going for complete agreement, he would register his disagreement with that one.

Kim Ross had a couple of suggestions. First, Sen. Kelley used a term called the "public good" and that terminology might serve us. Second, there have been a few allusions to this goal being what Peg called dated and Mike used futuristic. Our report isn't a one shot thing, so it should be a value longer term.

Jack Geller commented on minimum standards, and said that as soon as you set a minimum standard it is going to be outdated shortly. At the same time, if there is not a standard, ubiquity is in the eye of the beholder. We don't want it to be, "Well, I got mine so it's ubiquitous." There has to be something of minimum standards and then you update things. Second, he thought John Gibbs made a key point about the use of the word utility. Every utility he knows of is either publicly owned or publicly regulated. If, in fact, that is what we mean, that's okay but let's make sure we understand that is what we mean and involves a level of regulation around broadband that he didn't think anyone was interested in going towards.

Rick King said that his statement about ubiquity does not mean utility.

Chris Swanson requested that symmetrical speeds be included on the list. It is hard to deliver products if you can't upload as fast as you can download.

John Gibbs would like to pull that suggestion from the agreed upon list because it requires more discussion.

Tom Garrison asked how do we reality test what we are trying to do here. He echoes the public good statement. There may be things that we all arrive at the end of the day that others don't agree, but if it is for the public good we can say we've done our job.

John Stanoch said that under public good it seems that we also have some level of consensus of focus on education, government services, economic, library, health care. Focus on areas where we think there is public good. Comments about symmetrical service, in the California report what they tried to do was if you were this type of user, this is what symmetrical service uses. He would like to encourage us not to go down the path of one size fits all. John's view is that if you are running a business out or your home, you need something different than someone that just does email. We need to get to where we segment the sets of populations.

Rick King agreed that we will have to discuss how to handle that. We are capturing a list of 10 - 12 things that we are not going to take that we totally agree but 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. Look at the other items on the list. This may help us think about pieces in the final report just as the state summaries did.

12:15 – 12:45 Lunch Break

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

K12 Education

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



Mary Mehsikomer, NW-LINKS Coordinator

See slides. Provided a paper on the history of the learning network. Also provided a map that shows how school districts and public libraries are clustered today. They provide network management, technical support, maintenance, help with e-rate applications, cooperative shared service purchasing, applications for lifelong learning. They also try to assist districts to integrate technology with curriculum. They do a lot of distance learning, specifically mentioning foreign languages, advanced math, health, science, sign language. They also offer online college in high school.

Pete Royer – Director – Little Crow Telemedia Network (by phone and video streaming)
www.lctn.org

Little Crow Telemedia Network started in 1989. Merged with the MN Valley. East Metro (ECMC) is a similar cooperative that started in 1983. Both started by working with a local telephone company or cable company. There was no fiber in the ground when they started. It was easier back then to just walk to a local company office and talk to someone. Both networks now have 1G to all the school buildings today. Now instead of 19 school districts each with their own Internet access, they have one network which saves \$23,000/month. Each has 50Mbps to each school district. The cost of Internet access is \$140/month per school district. They also get some IPTV. They are connected to the learning network of Minnesota. He mentioned the services and equipment provided: 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. They have 5 or 6 school districts' science teacher working together to talk about curriculum. Would not have happened if it weren't for their WAN.

Rick King indicated that we are consumers of education so we would like any handouts you may have.

Marla Davenport – Director of Learning Technologies at TIES
See PowerPoint presentation.

Ken Behringer – Director of Dakota Co. Library System
See PowerPoint presentation.

Rick King indicated that there was a little time for Q & A.

Peg Werner thanked the speakers and indicated that it was open for discussion.

Tom Garrison asked Marla Davenport as she looked ahead, what capabilities do you envision do you need or would like to have to keep Minnesota libraries competitive?

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

Pete Royer indicated he does have some bandwidth per student numbers.

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



Ken Behringer said that if you build it they will come. He said Dakota County gets an awful lot of people in to use the library computers, including business people to send big files. Dakota County doesn't have a lot of the demographics of those that can't get broadband hook up. In other words, people can get broadband, it's just not fiber.

Mary Mehsikomer said that she represents a region that has some pretty remote access. They are using T1s. There is also the requirement for things like statewide testing that uses all of their computer capacity for two weeks. 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.

Brent Christensen asked whether the panelists had an idea where Minnesota falls in comparison with other states.

Mary Mehsikomer said that in Minnesota we are more locally controlled or have regional collaborations. Other states have implemented through an agency that is statewide. In terms of sophistication, we are somewhere in the middle.

Ken Behringer said that libraries are structured much the same way. For MNLink, we are the only state that he knows of with a statewide library search system.

Rick King asked if there were other questions.

Tim Lovaasen asked the panelists if they 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.

Mary Mehsikomer said that In Minnesota our concentration of access to students at home is high, but they do not have statistics. One of the issues educators are always looking at is equity of access. Educators have to be cognizant of how much lab time they have or how many kids have access at home. Some schools have laptops available for check-out but that doesn't resolve the Internet hook-up at home issue.

Ken Behringer said that the popularity for using libraries for Internet access is due to librarians being able to provide help and the lack of computers at home.

Tim Lovaasen said that one of the things CWA has been looking at is getting access and providing training so that those that are less fortunate can gain access and education on how to use the Internet.

Rick King indicated we did talk about the PC access as a potential shovel ready project.

JoAnne Johnson asked about the system coming down for a couple weeks during statewide testing. It seemed that when statewide testing first started, everything worked ok.

Mary Mehsikomer said that what has happened is that because of the accountability of no child left behind, every time there is a testing round of any kind, computer labs are taken out of commission for testing. Previously all testing was done with paper and pencil. Today, science is totally on line. The challenge being bumped up against is the schools having enough work stations, making sure the LAN can pull down and deliver the tests to the machines, and then it is

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



two to three weeks to cycle all the kids through. Mary added that the Department of Education is scheduled to release its survey of school district capabilities on January 28.

JoAnne Johnson indicated that any instructions on how this can be improved would be welcome.

Mary Mehsikomer said that we need to build into any bandwidth growth plans the state's plans for online testing. The Minnesota Education task force is planning to do extensive surveying of school districts on their computers and what capacity exists. Right now the Department of Education does puts the district through a worksheet process to ensure the district is set up to conduct the tests.

Marla Davenport added that the ability of school districts varies widely.

Robyn West asked if there was any kind of clearinghouse where people can send their previously used computers for refurbishing and then reuse.

Mary Mehsikomer said that a lot of districts cycle their own equipment until its last gasp. There are a lot of individual and business options. She is on the board for Minnesota Computers for Schools which takes donated computers that are then refurbished by inmates and sold at low cost with a warranty to schools. (See www.mncfs.org)

Rick King thanked Peg Werner for setting up the panel and the panelists for participating.

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

Mike O'Connor indicated that this was a first draft and a first public viewing. He explained that what is shown on the screen is the wiki screen. (See www.urbanusers.com under links.) After the introduction you'll see a chronological sequence/visual of what took place. We took everything we could find and put a year on it. When the format for the final report is established, we'll have something to format for the report. Members should review the events in the chronology and if there is something we didn't get, send one of the four subgroup members (Mike O'Connor, JoAnne Johnson, Brent Christensen, Diane Wells) an e-mail and we'll get it. The following section is the national drivers. Same sort of thing and if you see something that is missing, let us know. If there was a report, we can link to it for folks to read. This history section is shaping up like the state summaries section.

Mike O'Connor noted that we are not the first broadband task force in Minnesota to look at this. The initiatives and ideas that we are talking about are not new. We need to think creatively about how we create a report that is not going to just take up shelf space. The previous reports are in the history section. If people know of more, let us know.

In conclusion, Mike asked everyone to review the sections and send the subgroup comments of events that you think should be added or any added reports that you know about.

JoAnne Johnson stated that Mike has been the driving force for getting this pushed into the 21st century. Actually having us write this thing on the wiki, it's a work in progress.

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



Chris Swanson said that it was intriguing that there have been studies done in the past. This should 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 asked if there were other comments. He commented that this was great work. We want to make sure that task force members that have brought in specialty groups, make sure that information gets into the report and reflected throughout. We will have material from health care in a few months and have K-12 and libraries today. The tools that Mike has introduced have started to form some things for us. We should do what Mike did and expose to others.

2:15 – 3:00 – Task Force Action Items and Plans for Upcoming Meetings

- **Use of Videoconferencing**

Rick King thought today was excellent. The videoconferencing technology worked great. One point is that we need to make sure we can get handouts to people and everyone can pull them down. Rick King asked what people thought and whether we should continue to use videoconferencing.

Mike O'Connor indicated that for him it was a lifesaver. He would not have been able to participate without the video streaming.

Peg Werner noted that she and Mike were both at non-video conferencing sites. The videoconferencing set-up gives you the ability to stream to your computer.

Tom Garrison said that while we are still fact finding, this works great. However, when we get to voting on issues it would be helpful to be face to face.

Joe Schindler asked if he has video conference equipment other than the locations selected, can he use that to connect.

Steve Cawley noted that one of the presenters did that today. That presenter is part of the learning network so knew how to log in. One of the reasons that we didn't allow other sites was that each site is a public meeting location and would need to be published. He is cautioning members from coming in from random sites.

Jack Geller thinks it worked quite well. There were a few glitches. He noted that when he raised his hand, he was acknowledged right away. He also said that he used the videoconferencing more out of necessity than desire as he had a competing meeting this morning in Crookston that he had to be at. His intent is not to use it regularly. But it worked well when needed.

Vijay Sethi noted that the only issue he had was that it was hard to hear speakers at times and asked if they could be closer to a microphone.

Rick King said that there is only one microphone in the room and he and Robyn West were the farthest away from it.

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

Rick King said that if you could hear him, we can all make this work.

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



Mike O'Connor suggested that when people are sitting by Rick it's a natural tendency to speak softer so people should address the microphone on the far side of the room.

Jack Ries said that there is only one camera at Metro State and wanted to know if that worked ok for the Greater Minnesota sites.

Jack Geller stated that they could not see anyone to the right of Joanne Johnson.

Vijay Sethi noted that at one time the camera did swing from one end of the room to the other.

Rick King said that you are missing two people at the table with that camera view so we could try to move the table back. The camera is panning back as far as it can. Rick said that this might be a good alternative for the next few months and with the weather. Once we get done with the Greater Minnesota meetings, we probably all want to be in the same room. We could still stream it for people that can't make it or the public that may want to watch it. It would give us more exposure. Rick indicated if that was ok with all of you, that are how we will proceed.

Jack Geller agreed.

- **Greater Minnesota Meetings**

Rick King then wanted to go back to Peg Werner to thank her for organizing today's panel and ask if there was anything she wanted to talk about with regard to the Greater Minnesota meetings.

Peg Werner reminded the group that the locations will be Mankato, Fergus Falls and Grand Rapids. She would be talking to Rick regarding parameters. Rick King indicated that they would get to that prior to the next meeting.

- **Task Force Message**

Rick then indicated that he wanted to bring up Michele Engdahl who does public relations at Thomson Reuters.

Michele Engdahl referenced a document about broadband taskforce outreach in the packet. The handout talks about what we might want to do with making the video available and what we want to try to schedule around the outstate meetings. For example, maybe a leadership meeting with local leaders, then a shorter regular meeting. Maybe partnering with Blandin to do some education. These are just ideas.

Jack Geller indicated that for Mankato, certainly he and Brent Christensen know a lot of people there.

Brent Christensen added that he works closely with all the legislators in the area and could contact them.

Tom Garrison said that one of the things to look for are photo opportunities. So in each of these locations, can we give some thought to photo opportunities that are afforded the media in those locations.

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



Joanne Johnson suggested as a follow on to Tom's suggestion that we have a coffee break session in the morning. It would be a good opportunity to get legislators in the room.

Joe Schindler said that he could recruit healthcare representatives in Mankato and Fergus Falls, possibly also some from education.

Vijay Sethi said that from the Fergus Falls area they get a lot of coverage from regional newspapers. He can contact those people and legislators in the extreme western part of the state. He volunteered to work with Peg for the Fergus Falls meeting.

Mike O'Connor said that another group that we could enlist is Minnesota Voices Online. Probably folks in those areas are doing some intensely local media. They could be good allies. If Michele could write up a template that could be sent, that would be helpful.

Rick King said that while visibility is good, we have video conferencing, outstate meetings, but one of the things to be caution about is that we have 22 strong opinions about what is going on. He thinks we need to work on a basic simple message that we all can repeat. We all have certain opinions, but Rick thinks what we would like to do is that we are the same task force that moves around the state. We should work on the messaging and then use that messaging. Other organizations may have a spokesperson. But there is a lot of power in all the local spokespersons that we have.

Tom Garrison suggested that a good starting point may be something like the values discussion we had earlier that we could incorporate into the message.

Brent Christensen disagreed with Rick's suggestion of 22 spokespeople. It is 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 said that as far as the face or the message of who we are, she sees nothing wrong with formulating and having Rick do that. It's efficient. When we get to the meetings themselves, there is nothing wrong with people seeing how seriously we discuss these issues.

Mike O'Connor said that JoAnne took the words out of his mouth. When people call him for stories, he 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 we could send them out to those we know in our sphere.

Brent Christensen said that when we are in Mankato, the quotes need to be from the chair on behalf of the task force or we don't have continuity.

Jack Geller said, however, that if there is a homer in the crowd, the paper is going to that homer and that will be the person of interest and then the Chair.

Brent Christensen said that local people on the task force may add color to the story but the message from the task force has to come from the chair.

Jack Geller agreed.

Rick King said that if others agree, he is ok.

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



- **Planning for Future Meetings**

The task force members talked about the special meeting. Robyn West indicated she has the lead with the municipal/county presentations scheduled for the February 20 meeting. The broadband mapping presentation by Connected Nation will move to the special meeting on February 6. The task force will discuss shovel ready projects on February 6 but will finalize the shovel ready discussion at the February 20 meeting.

Dick Sjoberg had offered to bring in a speaker from One Economy and wanted to know whether to plan on that for February or March. Rick King said that March would probably work better for that and we are also pursuing Commissioner McElroy's economic piece tied to the mapping. Tim Lovaasen is also working on a CWA piece. Dick said he would set it up for March. We have not been able to nail down February.

Rick King indicated that Joe Schindler and Mary Ellen Wells will work on a healthcare presentation. Rick asked Peg Werner if she had heard anything on the Gates Foundation. Peg indicated that she has not.

Rick King said we have the high tech presentation scheduled for April. If there are other areas for which we want a panel, we could probably do one more in May.

Tom Garrison noted that the municipal/county group was working on getting a national speaker and wanted to know if that would fit on the February 20 agenda or slide into March. Rick indicated the February meeting.

Jack Geller asked how soon we will have the logistics worked out for the special February 6 meeting.

Rick King indicated that we would try for the same locations as today. We will also plan to do videoconferencing. We'll be in the same rough geographies for the outstate videoconferencing locations. Rick noted that we are starting to shape up agendas for later meetings. The only panel we do not have is an actual consumer panel. We might want to give consideration to that. Rick indicated that the last point he had on the agenda would be the task force's permission to name a couple of people to back up for him if he is late or has a conflict. He suggested JoAnne Johnson and Brent Christensen as two people that could be called upon to serve as chair as back-up. Rick King called for a vote. Approved.

Rick King asked if there were any other items that members wanted to bring up.

Vijay Sethi indicated it was hard to hear what was said about the municipals/counties panels for February and wanted to know if any had moved to March. Tom Garrison responded that they were still all on for February 20. Robyn West indicated that she would call Vijay.

There being no other items, Rick King summarized that we had a pretty good meeting today. There were a lot of differing pieces. We got into a little action today. We are on the tail-end of our education process. We each have to get well read on what has been done and then need to get writing started. We have the pieces and then we'll stitch it together. After the outstate meetings this summer, we will be to the point of having to get any information we don't have quickly to complete writing. The real tough work is ahead of us. Like most things, we just got a new to-do on our list.

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



Motion to adjourn. Approved.
Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.