

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Location: The Sawmill Inn
Highway 169 South
Grand Rapids, MN

Facilitator: Anne Losby

Task force members in attendance: Steve Cawley, Brent Christensen, Tom Garrison, Jack Geller, Barb Gervais, John Gibbs, JoAnne Johnson, Rick King, Tim Lovaasen, Dan McElroy, Mike O'Connor, Vijay Sethi, Dick Sjoberg, Karen Smith, John Stanoch, Chris Swanson, Craig Taylor, Joe Schindler (for Mary Ellen Wells), Peg Werner, Robyn West, Glenn Wilson.

Replacements:

Joe Schindler for Mary Ellen Wells – jschindler@mnhospitals.org

Kim Ross – not in attendance

Gopal Khanna – not in attendance

Public attendees: Ann Treacy, Dick Nordvold, Lylo Macvey, Matt Gross, Bill Arthur, Richard Watson, Steve Howard, Scott Wiggins, Bob Fenwick, Jim Weikum, Brian Redshaw, Tom Berkelman, Bill Coleman, Mike Kongsjord, Becky LaPlant, Cindy Kevern, Pat Henderson, Mike Martin, Perry Werner, Bernadine Joselyn, Robert Ryan, Allison Ahcan

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

Opening comments; review meeting agenda – Rick King

Rick King called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Rick King commented that it's good to be out and about in the real world. He thanked Jack Geller for organizing the meeting here in Grand Rapids. It sounds like there was a good meeting that was hosted by Blandin. We had a good turnout at our reception and we are looking forward to a good meeting today. Now to some brief task force business, this is one of three greater MN meetings. We will fine tune the next two based on this one.

We still have our normal workload to do at these meetings and then we will be getting to the report. We will also be hearing input and information from people around Minnesota at these outstate meetings. I'm glad to see such a strong contingent of the task force here. We welcome Joe Schindler as the alternate for Mary Ellen Wells and we only have two other task force members that were not able to make it or send a substitute. Thank you for making the effort to be at this meeting.

In the packet with the agenda you also got a draft version of the report. Maybe it was a little surprising, maybe not. If you look through it there are a lot of things that we have done and talked about. It is a broad and comprehensive set of data and recommendations. We have a lot of work to do on it, but hope that this will show that we have some serious discussions and this is only the first draft and it will show you that it is taking shape. There is a room copy for those in the public. It is the first draft copy, a work copy. Draft #1 of about 250 drafts but we'll get there by November.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Rick said that part of the plan going forward is to plan a little bit more and at this point he is going to jump toward the end of what is on our agenda today. He is going to ask people to look at some dates in September or October. July and August are pretty set with vacations and the greater Minnesota meetings. The fact that there are 5 Fridays in October, he's come to the conclusion that if we can meet on the 2nd of October and the 30th of October in addition to October 16, that would get us close. So in addition to September 18 and October 16 look at the 2nd of October and the 30th of October as meeting dates. The goal of the October 30th meeting would be looking at the final copy. We will define the delivery of the report and the event.

Brent Christensen asked if the Task Force would you consider adding a Thursday/Friday meeting for those that travel from outstate to minimize trips.

Jack Geller indicated that he believes that DEED has its economic development conference on October 1 and 2 and a meeting on October 1 would be a conflict for Jack and Commissioner McElroy.

Rick King asked the Task Force, what is the feeling about the 2 days?

Vijay Sethi responded for those that travel a distance a two-day meeting is a good idea. But he wondered whether there would be time between meetings to do prep work.

Rick King indicated a two-day meeting would cause some issues with back to back, but if we did it that way we maybe pick where we double up. For me clearing two days in a row is harder, but maybe it can be done.

Tom Garrison asked if clearing two days would be hard, would it be the same if we did a Friday, Saturday meeting?

Mike O'Connor commented that he agreed with Vijay and that we need the gaps in between to study and react.

Rick King replied that you can see the result of the gap is that we create the report.

Tom Garrison suggested maybe one day is subcommittee work and the other is where you come back together.

Rick King asked for other thoughts? Mark those two dates and give consideration of structure. What about Tom's suggestion, any discussion?

Peg Werner indicated that she is fine with Saturday. As one of the task force members that travels, we are getting to the end so that is less of an issue.

Chris Swanson indicated that staff likely needs time to retype things. It is hard in a short amount of time.

Rick King asked should Saturday be on the table.

Steve Cawley and Brent Christensen indicated support for sticking with the original dates.

Rick King said we'll see what we can do with the dates. With what we have to do and wrestle through can be done in that time. This will be the time when we are going to have to nip some

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



of the conversation off and get to the question at hand. Will ask for your indulgence. We want to make sure that data is out and then getting to the answer. Positions will be taken but should be pretty steady.

Rick said that you have in front of you the agenda for today. Are there any questions.

Mike O'Connor asked if we could we re-jigger the portion of time for public comment and the speaker. Fifteen minutes is a little light for public comment.

Rick King said that we can rejigger but the chair would ask the public to be concise.

Motion to accept the agenda. Seconded. Approved.

Rick King moved on to the minutes for the May meeting. Comments, suggestions? Motion to approve. Seconded. Minutes approved.

Rick King indicated that it is time for public comment. Rick asked the commenters to please indicate who you are and where you live.

Brian Redshaw – City Administrator in Hibbing read the following statement:

To: Ultra High-Speed Broadband Task Force
From: Brian J. Redshaw, City Administrator
Date: June 19, 2009
Re: Broadband Experience in Hibbing MN

Immediately upon starting my position with Hibbing in September 2004, I began working on this project with Iron Range Resources. My contact was Dick Nordvold who represented the Do It Council. We made a trip to Salt Lake City UT to look at the UTOPIA system. After two years of preliminary work, the Iron Range Community FiberNet was formed in November of 2006.

After two years of looking at proposals from Dynamic City, Hiawatha Broadband and ValleyNet the organization was disbanded in August of 2008. The City Council of Hibbing had elected to withdraw from the organization and not pay the \$15,000 required to commission further study on the project. The action taken was Resolution 8-8-2 which was adopted on August 18, 2008.

At one point there were thirteen (13) communities represented in the Iron Range Community FiberNet. They were: Babbitt, Biwabik, Chisholm, Coleraine, Ely, Gilbert, Hibbing, Hoyt Lakes, Keewatin, Mountain Iron, Nashwauk, Tower, and Two Harbors. The Bois Forte Band was another participant. Four of these members dropped out but the organization continued.

What had been envisioned for this area was a wholesale system similar to UTOPIA in Utah. The Iron Range Community FiberNet organization would provide the "airport" which would be available to local providers. Our goal was to provide ubiquitous service to all customers in our respective jurisdictions. We are convinced that the future of commerce lies with our ability to compete globally. Ultra-High Speed Broadband is a critical component in that strategy.

The reasons that I supported this project are still the same as listed in a memo to the City Council dated July 16, 2008. "The first reason is that there is no guarantee that the incumbents will address service issues which they have traditionally ignored. If you decide not to go with the FiberNet solution, at a minimum you should get commitments from Qwest and Mediacom to improve service delivery to Hibbing and in particular to the rural areas. During this discussion, Qwest has not offered any solutions to the problem. All of their energy has been directed to criticism. There are no financial incentives for them to pursue this business and this is blatantly unfair to these residents. Mr. Johnson of 3773 S. Pintar Road

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



has provided a list of thirty-six customers to Qwest. He has been talking to them for at least a year and has generated only one phone call from Mr. Schriener. Technicians visited his residence in April of 2008. Minn Tech Electronics has been having problems with their service and may be considering moving to another community unless the system is improved and enhanced."

"The second reason that I support this project is the boost that it can give to the local economy. To encourage commercial and industrial development, we need to offer high speed connectivity. It also needs to be offered at a reasonable cost. Residential customers also demand high speed connectivity. This system would be a positive factor in encouraging people to locate in Hibbing. If the system is ubiquitous as presented, rural customers would be particularly benefited. More and more businesses are allowing their employees to work from home and this level of connectivity would allow them to do so. Fiber would also help us in retaining the present businesses like Minn Tech Electronics which was mentioned in the previous paragraph. This project should be considered as valuable infrastructure and would be an investment in the future of Hibbing."

"The third reason is that this project addresses the future needs of Hibbing. For this project to be successful, we need a PARADIGM SHIFT in Hibbing. My first exposure to the internet occurred in 1995. Prior to that year, I had no clue about the impact that it would have on me personally nor to my business. Technological advances in communications have occurred in the last thirteen years. HD television will need significant bandwidth to satisfy their customers. As baby boomers retire in the next several years, there will be an increase in the demand for broadband services with triple play options of voice, video and data. This platform will allow Hibbing residents and businesses the best set of options for the future. We would be on the cutting edge of technology and would put us in the best competitive position to attract businesses to locate in Hibbing. Remember, Qwest and Mediacom will be allowed to ride the system and continue to serve their customers. Qwest may decide to boycott the system, but that will be their decision. One might argue that the take rates will never be achievable. I believe that as public awareness is improved, these numbers will increase dramatically. People will begin utilizing services as they become aware of their availability in the marketplace. Even people who do not upgrade their service will benefit, as FiberNet's anticipated prices are lower (and more broadly available) than existing services. Hibbing's reputation for being a "technology town" would attract new users as well as new residents to the community. This debate is not about the present but rather about the future. We cannot afford to be "left behind."

In my opinion, the reason that this project failed was that the incumbents were successful in creating doubt and fear among the various City Councils in the Range. This was a project which had never been undertaken in Range history and it was difficult to convince them that the take rates would be sufficient to make the system financially sound. They were concerned about the possibility of the network going bankrupt and how this would affect the credit ratings of the various cities in the network. Qwest hired the Costin Group as a consultant to provide information to discredit the effort and doubt its viability. The situation that we find ourselves in is very similar to the issue of rural electrification in the 1900s. The private utilities had every incentive of bringing electricity to densely populated cities, but less incentive to bring the same services to rural customers. We have the same problem now with broadband services because we do not have a large customer base which would make these services profitable to companies like Qwest. We need to band together on a county-wide basis and generate systems which would be subsidized by the Federal government to make this work."

Mr. Redshaw added that basically he wanted to say we are not opposed to a public/private partnership and he is concerned about our citizens – it's a critical piece of infrastructure that is just like the roads. He is in favor of getting it no matter how we can. Geographically we are isolated in some ways. If you use the internet – people in Malaysia can buy – they don't need to know where we are. He senses that this group is heading in the direction of a solution and applaud you.

Pat Henderson, Executive Director of the Arrowhead Regional Development Commission (ARDC) in Duluth. We welcome you to this region and are very pleased that you are here

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



today. The ARDC is one of eleven regional development commissions in the state. There are 9 greater Minnesota regional development commissions. It is important for you to know that there are tools are there for you to use. Cook, Lake, St. Louis, Itasca, Koochiching, Carlton and Aitkin are the seven counties in this region. The board has representatives from all levels of government. An important piece of this mix are the three tribes in our region are also represented. We have four divisions including a planning and economic development division and a senior division. Bob Fenwick is vice chair of the board and is also on today's panel. Today she wants to address specific regional concerns. They brought members together and asked what is needed that the ARDC could help you with. The answer they got was that we need help with accurate mapping. Be on top of mapping as this develops. We have a very powerful GIS mapping component at ARDC. What we are looking at is accurate mapping and that we feel it is important to verify the map because what it is based on and what we are hearing is that there is mixed information. Who is and is not reporting. The mapping piece is where broadband exists and where are the initiatives related to broadband that is another component that we will be discussing. We are all about partnerships and collaborations. The goal is to keep this region of the state economically viable and vibrant and vital.

Tom Garrison asked if there were some statement from the tribes and what their needs are; perhaps there could be a letter in respect to their needs. We could include it in the report as this is an area we don't have yet.

Dan McElroy said that rather than put this on the ARDC, we may want to ask the MN Indian Affairs Council. The eleven tribes are going to have different needs.

Pat Henderson said that she would ask that a letter come from each tribe because they have different needs. At least two of the three tribes in this region are very aggressive on this issue. She offered her assistance.

Rick King said that we will pursue a central approach.

Bill Arthur representing the Orr Economic Development Council. Our board of directors includes representatives from the Bois Fortes tribe, former mayors, etc. When we hear that policy is going to be recommended and we hear rural in the same breath, we are very curious to come and attend and see what is on the horizon. You could say a scalded cat fears all water. We've had experience with rural policies that have not met our needs. With some gratifying discussion with task force members last evening, we feel that the Governor's charge is in good hands.

We did not know our friend and neighbor from Hibbing was going to be here today. Mr. Arthur did want to indicate that he does not think an adequate post mortem has been done on the Iron Range project. We are a collection of competing and conflicting interests. He is not sure if John Stanoch is here but he has spoken to Andrew at Qwest and they have been very helpful as has Mediacom and Paul Bunyan Telephone Company. We believe that if these folks are engaged in the right channel they are great contributors to all of us.

In terms of this mapping business, we would like to see mapping done in more than one dimension. Mapping needs to be done for connectivity and capability, capacity and performance, otherwise we have no adequate way to measure outcomes or the knowledge of what is available. The problems we have with under mapping there are three sub categories, communication, shared applications, and risk management – sub categories that we need to do. Going forth if we are going to be part of a notion in the U.S. to catching up to other countries, we can be ingenious if we do not get wrapped around our own axle. There are lots of things that

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



policy can do; it can constrain and enable. Your policy should enable. Maybe we don't want to use Ultra High Speed because in ten years that could be an embarrassment. Rural should be considered more than moving to a Mayberry 2.0. Each community has a unique information landscape that should be mapped going forward. Everyone in business that designs knows you build from the bottom up and implement from the top down. Implementation begins with thoughtful requirements.

Thank you for your time.

Ross Williams, business man in Grand Rapids. For those that look at the trees, good to remind that there is a forest out there. Broadband is a piece of how we do economic development. The new economy is a knowledge economy; how they use that knowledge and that experience in a collaborative way with people all over the world. Innovation happens by working with people everywhere. Twenty years ago the Internet was on college campuses and the military. When we look ahead, when the baby boomers retire, we are going to be looking to the next generation to be more productive than we are. We need to leave behind the same type of tools that our parents left for us so that we could be more productive.

He was at a conference in Portland, Oregon. We worry about what Dell is selling today so we can produce what is being bought. Tightening the noose so they can adjust their manufacturing, that was 10 years ago that is where the technology starts. Twenty years ago the Internet was on college campuses and the military. When we look ahead, when the baby boomers retire, we are going to be looking to the next generation to be more productive than we are. We need to leave behind the same type of tools that our parents left for us so that we could be more productive. What that means for rural areas is that they can't leave they have to be able to use those skills here or we are not going to be able to produce the goods and services to purchase. This isn't really about the technology or who delivers I but us providing technology for the 21st century, not to catch up but get ahead of Korea. That's the big picture so when looking at this for the long run so you are looking at unlimited bandwidth at minimal cost. Yes there are costs, but in the end it is providing tools so people can be innovative in the new economy; that they are all engaged in ways that they will be productive. How do you move to the level of service? How do we get fiber optic cable to every household if it is needed? It does not make sense that Qwest will come and put another fiber optic cable to my home when I already have one from Paul Bunyan. We need to think about some kind of common carrier service instead of three different cables coming into one house. That doesn't make financial sense and it isn't going to happen.

Matt Gross, superintendent in Deer River, chair of Itasca Area Schools Collaborative which shares fiber among 7 schools and Itasca Community College. He is advocating for rural school districts. His area benefits from some of the things that Paul Bunyan Telephone Company has provided that isn't available to other rural school districts. It used to be that schools could produce graduates to work in the mines and in tourism, that isn't the case anymore. What education is up against, with our requirement to produce knowledge workers and there is a huge allegiance to live here and work here and in order to do that we have to have the infrastructure. In regards to access, school districts have to change the paradigm. Thirty students with one teacher isn't going to work anymore. He would encourage you to read the book *Disrupting Class*. We need to be able to educate students individually. We need to individualize instruction which has enormous technical applications. If a student needs to learn to read and write they can make meaning out of the environment they are in. Affordability is also important. People who are choosing between buying groceries and paying the phone bill. He has some kids sitting on a bus for an hour or more each way. Those students have a 3 hour

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



commitment to education; we need to make that look different, more meaningful. He needs to be able to push education to them, high quality rich education to their house so maybe they are only in the school building two days a week. We need to provide a technology rich access to web 2.0 tools. We can push work on a project where students would be working on them together and have never have met face to face. School districts, because of requirements, are also stepping up our need to make data driven systems, enterprise data warehouse. He can determine where his greatest security risks are. School districts also need to access high quality staff development for teachers and should not be hindered by distance.

Rick King asked if there were any other comments. He thanked the public for their comments. Next he would like to ask Scott Wiggins, Director, Division of Emergency Communication Networks to give us a briefing on public safety related issues.

[Scott Wiggins presentation](#)

Q&A

John Gibbs said that it sounds like wireless is what you are looking for and the state is a customer of what the wireless providers can provide. He thinks there is a solution in the marketplace immediately from the private sector. John thinks there are areas that do not have reliable cell phone coverage.

Scott Wiggins replied that it is a partial solution. There are still areas without reliable wireless service. There is coverage along highways and freeways but it's more than occasional if you get out on the county roads.

John Gibbs asked is it about towers.

Scott Wiggins said it is about infrastructure but that is more than just towers. We are going to provide a system that will have 95% coverage. If we can add or improve on data coverage.

Mike O'Connor said that he would speak to the idea of collaboration and is this something we are interested in, yes, a public private partnership and well worth pursuing. He was going to ask you a similar question. As you were going through your presentation, what were some of the most enabling regulatory actions that helped your project move forward because that is one of the areas we are looking at is how can we recommend helpful regulatory and legislative actions? We are interested in policy that would enable. What were some of the biggest regulatory enablers?

Scott Wiggins said that it was before his time, but in 1995 there was legislation passed (and back in 1995 this was a metro project) that required counties to do a 20 year needs analysis. The people that passed the legislation knew that the counties would all come back with the answer that there are not enough frequencies. In terms of actions by the PUC, there hasn't been anything. The biggest thing is funding and the legislation has funded. We have enough money to build all of the towers. Before we build the system, the legislature required that we show that we could pay for the system. An independent consultant came in and ran all the numbers and we have the case to build with about an 8% cash contingency.

Dan McElroy said that the concept was that we would pay for this out of the 911 surcharge and you wouldn't have gotten the money without the governance.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Scott Wiggins agreed that there is nothing more important than governance.

JoAnne Johnson had one thing to suggest that may be a viable next step is to take some real world examples. Last year Babbitt had no cell phone coverage. A community can't grow if they don't have cell phones not just for data but also for voice. Data and voice are imperative. If you can find communities and go to Verizon and describe how this would benefit everyone.

Vijay Sethi said that the question of whether or not there is cell phone coverage brings up two things. The rural portions of the state have issues and we have a specific concern in Clay County where we are part of another metro area in another state and there are issues about the interoperability across the state and with the Fargo area there are some capability issues regarding the system they have installed and we have not gotten answers. The other issue is that there is a tremendous coverage on I-94 and the north-west part of Clay County is a dead area and we have been struggling with that.

Scott Wiggins said that we do understand that the Fargo-Moorhead area was a benefactor of some federal money. Will we be able to communicate; we will be able to link those in, absolutely. By being on a different system, it will be a more limited form of communication.

Karen Smith said that she represents a wireless carrier but this is outside her realm of expertise and she would like to get her network people involved. She knows that they have worked closely with public safety in the event of fires, etc. They will be launching their 4G network which has 8 to 12 Mbps so the slides were a little high. That would be a phased roll-out. In terms of Northern MN, Verizon has converted and upgraded to 3G network and will continue to build out towers. We know what areas do not have coverage. Verizon invested \$87 million last year to build out. They do have strong requirements for their towers such as they have backup generator onsite. She is not sure what partnerships would be available in rural areas but it is important.

Mike O'Connor indicated that we are going to have a conversation today about the role of government so if you can stay for that part of the conversation we should be including the leadership role that was evident when the ARMER system was developed and one of the next steps is that government leadership role that worked so well in the past as a starting point.

Scott Wiggins had one other comment. He was intrigued by the comment about GIS. They are also rolling out next gen 911 which requires very accurate GIS mapping. It's a critical element of 911 mapping. With GIS, every county is doing this independently, everyone has their own data. If GIS, there should be an overall state organization that takes a lead and participation from local entities and the data should be interoperable.

Rick King supported the notion of a partnership that might give coverage to rural areas. He would welcome ideas if there is a way to use towers that are there and give coverage to underserved. He'd like to take a 10 minute break and then we'll start at 10:35

The task force took a ten minute break.

Rick King stated that we are going to hear from our regional panel. We will have 30 minutes of presentation and then time for questions and discussion. We won't have a break. Let me welcome Bernadine for putting together the panel. Appreciate Blandin hosting their event yesterday, which was not an official event of the task force.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Regional Panel

- **Bernadine Joselyn**, Director of Public Policy, Blandin Foundation
- **Fred Bobich**, Ruttger's Sugar Lake Lodge
- **Bob Fenwick**, Commissioner, Arrowhead Regional Development Commission

Bernadine Joselyn welcomed the task force to Grand Rapids, the real world. We will confine our remarks to 30 minutes. A brief overview of Blandin and some input and then end with Blandin's plan for the stimulus funds. [Bernadine's presentation](#).

Bernadine talked through her presentation which contained the following notes.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you this morning on behalf of BF BB initiative. I'm going to begin, then Fred Bobich of Ruttgers Sugar Lake Lodge, also past president of MN Chamber of Commerce. Bob Fenwick, Cook County Commissioner since Jan 1999. Past president Association of Minnesota Counties, National Association of Counties Board of Directors, Manager of Sawtooth Lumber in Grand Marais and Arrowhead Regional Development Commission Board (vice president). I'll suggest that we each speak and once we've all concluded, we'll respond to questions and comments

As I begin, want to note that I'm violating some of the best advice I ever got: never kiss someone leaning away from you, never climb a ladder leaning toward you, never speak to a group on a topic they know more about than you do. To compensate for that I'm going to try and stick to what we know best, and that is our work in communities and community perspectives on technology and economic development.

Here's an overview of my remarks:

1. Background on Blandin Foundation and BBI
2. Overview of our plans regarding ARRA broadband funds for MN
3. Share our input, based on what we've learned from our work over the past 5 years or so

Blandin Foundation's mission is to strengthen rural MN communities, esp. in the Grand Rapids area. So, why do we care about broadband? The answer is pretty straight forward. It's because we believe that broadband vision, connectivity and utilization are necessary, though not sufficient ingredients for strengthening rural MN communities. That is we care about broadband because we believe that communities have to be plugged in to play. To survive, rural places have to be in the game, technologically speaking, and that means they have to have fast, robust networks and a technologically sophisticated local culture. Broadband connectivity is important to rural communities because it can help them overcome the traditional disadvantages of rural places: smaller labor force, fewer capital resources, reduced access to research institutions and greater distances to markets and suppliers. Broadband is becoming more important for rural places because in the new wired future, quality of place will replace location as a key driver of economic activity. In this new world, communities that have made the necessary investments in technology infrastructure, training and education, can turn their traditional challenges into advantages. Governor Pawlenty is on record as acknowledging this point as well. As long ago as 2005, addressing a Blandin broadband conference he said, "Broadband is as important to economic development today as electricity was at the turn of the

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



20th century – vital to our quality of life, and essential for business, government and our communities.” And to quote our own Ann Treacy from last week, in responding to a conversation prompted by Aaron Brown’s blog : “Broadband allows people the opportunity to put a chicken in their own pot.” She wrote: “A host of jobs open up when you have access to broadband. Your town becomes more attractive to businesses looking to relocate, not to mention the education and healthcare applications.” See broadband application stories: mnbroadbandcoalition.com

The broadband initiative began in 2003 by convening a state board to identify challenges and opportunities and provide overall guidance to the foundation’s efforts to help rural communities address them. The state board identified the need to increase broadband use as an urgent goal of first priority.

Blandin’s broadband vision is to ensure a high quality of life and a globally competitive future for its citizens, businesses and communities, Minnesota is committed to making the necessary investment to become a world leader in the universal deployment and use of ultra high-speed next generation broadband. Governor Pawlenty and his administration formally endorsed this vision and principles in February 2006. In his statement of endorsement he noted that it “reflects the shared interests of communities, industry, state and local government, health-care institutions, and public education.” We’ve learned big challenges require collaborative approaches. Likewise, the task force should look to collaborative approaches to successfully address the broadband challenge before it. Communities are very important players in this collaborative work – even though their voices are sometimes harder to hear.

Some of Blandin’s principles are the same as those that show up in the task force’s current draft of Statement of Values: Ubiquity; Neutrality; Affordability; and Partnership.

Community leaders believe that world class infrastructure and services are vital to economic competitiveness.

1. Competition benefits communities:
 - Note that communities with either public or private competition benefit from lower costs and enhanced services
 - With a third player is where benefits accrue to consumers. Not necessarily with duopoly. We also see this with a shared network. Multiple providers, we do see the benefits of competition
2. Municipal ownership takes an intensity of effort that can distract them from other business
If they are not engaged in this issue they don’t get attention

Examples:

Brainerd lakes area: when Brainerd announced its work with Consolidated, Qwest and Charter came in with rural DSL access devices. Brainerd Lakes area is a “black hole”. City of Clearwater, invited providers to come in and talk about their plans, Frontier doubled speed of DSL that day, even before city had done anything, just news of city asking about what it needs.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Twenty six of twenty eight communities enhanced broadband utilization rates relative to state increases. Why? Engineering and construction is easy compared with changing people's behavior. Infrastructure is sexier and more exciting. Quoting John Horrigan, Director of Pew Internet & American Life Project: "It's Economic Development 101 to try to improve the supply of infrastructure to make a locality more attractive for businesses, but you do need a skilled workforce to fully exploit that." In rural America, for broadband adoption, skills and relevance still remain a barrier."

It is important to focus on the "soft" stuff of market development and utilization: The economic development model of: "If you build it they will come" doesn't work. But translating the availability of broadband to economic growth is not a given. It can be hard to achieve. It takes partnerships and collaboration. Larry Irving, former head of NTIA: "you can't just drop an Internet line and expect job growth. Getting broadband access is only the first part."

Note that smaller companies and coops are more engaged. Note that CLECs and small ISPs are often more engaged. You could note that only incumbents are on the task force. Call on the task force to be mindful of this in that this perspective is missing. Other providers are out there doing competitive business that have different perspectives. Some providers are CLECs in some markets and ILECs in another, and that brings different perspectives. Where you sit is where you stand. To give themselves cover to not make the investments in new infrastructure needed for ultra high speed broadband. "You'll never need that much of our product" (e.g., you'll never need that ultra high speed capacity).

There are many win-win solutions available.

Q: Why not better collaboration to show for it?

A: Lack of effective communication and engagement.

Communities that want more capacity are a business opportunity for providers. Engagement can be a path towards meeting community and provider needs. That's what the foundation does a lot of, translation between communities and providers. Getting them to think about that shared interest. It's a great role for the task force as well.

KEY MESSAGE: Leadership matters. Your deliberations matter and can make a tremendous difference. We call on you to be visionary, to be bold! If not now, when? If not you, who? To illustrate the importance of vision and leadership, I'd like to quote the "2 Tom's" – Stinson and Gillespie, who in turn often like to Garrison Keillor – MN is in many ways "above average."

Examples include:

- economic growth that has exceeded the national average;
- per capita personal income exceeds national average,
- successful transition over the past 50 years from largely resource-based economy to a diversified service and manufacturing economy

These successes may seem surprising for a cold state in the middle of the continent far from major markets. The Toms assert that we enjoy these successes not by accident. The reason

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



because the leaders who came before us made wise, forward-looking investments in education and infrastructure. Investments that laid a foundation that allows us to be “above average” today. And least we think “above average” is good enough, let’s not forget that our competitors today are not Iowa and Wisconsin and the Dakotas, but Singapore and Finland and China. A whole new bar of comparison. Hence, we commend to you the notion that the TF should focus on WORLD CLASS as the key component the policy prescriptions you are developing. Great expression of this: Washington Monthly article by Nicholas Thompson that Rick King circulated: Thompson puts it starkly: If you divide speed by cost, Australia’s internet access is 3 times better than ours, France’s is 9 times better, and Japan’s thumps us 21 times. We’re catching fish with our hands, while they are out in trawlers and the reason doesn’t have to do with anything American. It’s not, for example, that the country is too rural. Broadband stinks even in Chicago. The problem is almost entirely a failure of policy and of imagination.

We call on you to keep “world class” as a key concept – indeed the key concept – top of mind in your work. Everything else Minnesota needs in terms of preparing for a prosperous future follows from a commitment to “world class.” That’s the benchmark, the vision, we need. It’s not good enough to compare Black Duck to New Ulm to Eagan. We call on the task force to think boldly when addressing the question of speed and capacity. “World class” is the standard by which people make the judgment of “what’s good enough?” Looking at what our competitors around the globe have. What that number will be in 2015, who knows? But “above average” compared to other places in the US isn’t good enough. Internet guru Jim Carlini has been quoted as saying that the 3 most important words in real estate these days are not: “location, location, location,” but “connectivity, connectivity, connectivity.” As he notes, this means that communities that lack ultra high speed connectivity will get left behind. As I’m sure you’ve heard, we’re finding that corporate site selection committees now include broadband as one of the top 3 criteria they look for in researching locations for corporate facilities. Similarly, the work force of tomorrow, knowledge workers, college graduates and entrepreneurs, the “creative class” have little interest in living and working in communities that lack connectivity.

Drilling down on the elements of “world class”: Public policy solutions: pay-per-use transportation options; managing public health challenges (pandemic flu); metering energy usage; 60% usage – we can’t do these alternatives; when it’s ubiquitous.

In Sum: our message to you is: Focus on world class. Set a high bar. Don’t be deterred by what’s difficult politically. Help the state set an ambitious goal to ensure a competitive future and quality of life for all Minnesotans into the future.

Look through a community lens. Keep needs of the public for economic and community development top of mind. This is about prosperity, wealth retention and creation, public good. Last tick is by far the biggest challenge. At the end of this deal, as the task force votes on this report, and if it comes out 12 to 9, and the community side “wins” and the providers “loose,” that would be failure on the part of the task force. Because all of the action to get the task force recommendations passed, providers will prevail. Have some collaboration built into this. Anything providers don’t support will be hammered at legislature through the lobbying and

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



nothing will happen, and it will be as if this task force never happened. Will take extraordinary leadership. Setting that high standard, compelling “world class” vision, and really pointing the state in the right direction.

The Blandin Foundation is planning to apply for American Recovery and Reinvestment Act broadband dollars. soft” funds only – not infrastructure. Not RUS.

Why: Benefit rural communities.

Our goal: to maximize the amount of federal broadband \$\$s allocated to Minnesota communities. Help serve communities that would otherwise not have the capacity to apply for manage federal funds. Hope to be able to put together a proposal that is of the scale of Minnesota’s “fair share” of the money - \$5-7 million. Have a good shot at pulling together the 20 percent required match. Our intent is to design and deliver an approach that is well coordinated, comprehensive, multi-sector, multi-regional. One that will bring clarity, structure and effectiveness to Minnesota’s response to this opportunity. Better together, not one community at a time. Leverage best practice and institutional capacity and economies of scale as well as local knowledge. Call for partners: We really want the providers to come on board and join us. Lots of win-win, lots of common ground. Welcome providers to participate in design and implementation.

Fred Bobich – former chair of the MN Chamber of Commerce. Speaking on behalf of tourism. He is on the Governor’s Explore Minnesota Tourism Board so hears a lot of comments from his colleagues. He grew up in the resort business. Who would have ever thought that good solid communication access would be an amenity, comparable to an indoor swimming pool or golf course? We used to shape ads that we should leave Blackberries at home but that has changed. Today everyone is looking for immediate access and constant communications with family back home. Our business, Ruttger’s Sugar Lake Lodge, relies 70% of their volume on group events. He sees people with their blackberry and iPhone. Communications is a given and expectation. It costs us business without it. We need to be able to compete with resorts that have communications. There was a large group that was going to tour us for a location for 200 people in the heart of the winter. The person drove in on the property and determined they did not have good cell coverage and they turned right around. He would never have expected vacationers that they would put such a high expectation on connectivity. We are hoping that you can help us better provide. Regarding the presentation on the towers, he puts their sheriff high on his list because he put one of his towers up across from Ruttgers and leased space to a private provider and that took us up another notice in accessibility. Tourism is huge and the expectation for communications continues to grow so we are looking for ways to increase access.

Bob Fenwick, Cook County Commissioner, Arrowhead Regional Development Commission, on National Association of County Commissioners. He also runs Sawtooth lumber in Grand Marais. The ground work has been laid already. You have heard from the citizens so he won’t put on that hat. Cook County in the grand far NE corner of Minnesota. If it wasn’t for Cook County there would be no point to MN.

Putting on the hat of county commissioner where you need to respond to what the citizens have told you. What we have done in this small county is based on what the citizens have said they need. By broadband we mean the three legged stool that will bring you the triple play of voice, video and data. In Cook County, why has this come to be such an important thing? Number

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



one, we have a great need to bring out citizens into the present day of where they ought to be. We are being served by one ISP in the area and we have some DSL in small parts of the county, limited to a 2 mile radius from Qwest facilities. DSL is not in the realm. We have satellite TV. They do not have access to over the air TV. He has a fiber running through his driveway and copper cable to his house. The fiber is useless to him for receiving service. Two, the economic stability of Cook County depends upon the availability of broadband and those jobs. It's the services, schools, hospitals, public safety. We can provide emergency services at our hospital but neither hospital in Duluth will consider us as an affiliate. It is vital for us to keep the hospital there. Because of the services provided, it can sustain itself. We are 600 children and dropping. Our school if it is going to be successful needs to be interconnected and interactive to that place. Public safety, in their area it is vital but wireless will not do it entirely. With their geography it will not be able to do it, need to look to fiber. There is money from the feds today for a microwave link across Northern Minnesota but you cannot get across a clear microwave link across the county because of the topography. We need to have some fiber some place to make this happen. For healthcare, it will allow elderly to remain in their homes and to be able to communicate with doctors. For energy, looking forward to smartgrids. We need ubiquity and omnipresence of service. Everyone on line with schools, hospital and government as anchor tenants. We need to get the phone, video and Internet to the citizens who really need it.

We saw the need for this a few years ago and the strategy was to have it a locally owned, operated, and managed in Cook County. History said we could do this, we had Boreal Access, locally owned and operated. We started to look for someone to do a feasibility study before ARRA funding. We have gotten some information back, most importantly, of the people that were surveyed in Cook County over 90% of them indicated that they would sign up for the services. They preferred that the service was locally managed and owned. Strategy has morphed a little and we are going to have to ask for stimulus money. At present our local electric coop will be asking for the stimulus grant. Their method would be to create a new business plan and use them as the management group and put together a business plan that uses the people that started Boreal Access. Why the urgency? It's twofold. First, economic necessity, we have lost the lumber mill, fur trading. A major employer, the lumber mill, is now down to 20 employees and they closed for three weeks this year. Second, no one else will do this. There are all kinds of reasons people don't form partnerships. If no one is going to do it we must. Other counties are doing this, Lake County for many of the same reasons. Our business plan is a little different with local ownership but outside management. Tribes are doing this. He wants to emphasize one more thing: ARDC, who he is also representing, is a great tool for you to think about using as a repository of information. We could leverage information, such as where is the fiber, what fiber is lit. Scott's point about using the resources. The ARMER build out system is a good example of getting the network out there and allowing us to make the choice for us to hook up. I would submit the role of the Government is get the backbone out there and then allow counties to leverage the RDCs and the resources that are out there. My needs are different. RDCs can help us and what the citizens have brought forward. We are important to the state of well being. Thank you for having us here.

Rick King indicated we will take questions.

Dan McElroy asked by way of illustration, could you share the population of Cook County.

Bob Fenwick said probably a total of 5500 people as permanent residents. In the summer, 25,000 to 30,000 people on any particular day. We are unique. Geography is important too. We

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



have about 1 million acres and about 900,000 are public. You'd see a big black area that is public and then private.

Tom Garrison asked as a private businessman and an elected official, could you elaborate about the role of Government and where the boundaries are. And in your national role, what do you see as facets for federal, state, and local?

Bob Fenwick replied that the most important asset to government is the citizens so get the service to the citizen. Who would think of only bringing electricity to government offices? He thinks this is one of the most important things. The ARMER plan is a fair model. ARMER is biting the bullet to bring the backbone out and then it is going to be incumbent upon the local units of government to link to it. My personal opinion regarding the broadband stimulus funding is how they should interpret unserved and under served for the benefit of the citizen and not just be an adjunct to private money. They should put that money to serve the unserved. It should not go to where a business would serve anyway.

Rick King thanked the panel for their time and remarks.

Recommendation from the "Speed" Subgroup (Contentious Issue #2)

Rick suggested to the task force members to get your mind adjusted. A group volunteered to look at the speed issue and Rick King would like to call on Mike to report about the activities and where they are and would like the other participants to offer their comments. Then discuss and get to agreement on what we will recommend. We need to be specific and reach some kind of consensus area. This will be an area where we have some disagreement and this will be something that people zero in on and extract for their own purpose.

Mike O'Connor said he would tell the story but fellow team members should correct his course. They met twice and worked in the middle. The conversations were collaborative and productive. If you look at page 38 of the report the essence of the recommendation. Page 9 has the details for the tiers. We discussed how you can come up with a speed number without any connection of what we can do with it? We have been asked by the legislature to come up with a number but the connection of what you do with the speed is very important. We had the California chart and went to the community and asked them to validate the numbers. The California chart numbers were very close with the one caveat that they don't acknowledge that more than one thing is likely to be going on at the same time. So we did some horse trading in the last meeting that is the outcome of this. No one was entirely happy, but no one was so unhappy that they walked away. Important to bind the speed number with what you do.

Dick Sjoberg said that we are putting out a couple of speeds and what will the purpose be in relation to policy. If we say we are going to have speed X, what happens to the services that are not at speed x., will they not get state funding? Will the area still be unserved? He has not gotten a clear understanding. What will policy makers do with that number? What is the end game?

Rick King said he could answer from his perspective. The most important numbers we can give on the low end is for certain applications, when you say everyone should be served by what we estimate that number to be in 2015. How should we position that? All citizens should have a minimum of that service. We would not recommend any punitive regulation, just encouragement. From my view it would not have teeth or consequences. If you lay out a goal people will strive to it. The minimum should make sense and is easier to grapple with. If you go

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



to more high end users or the aspirational number, you can say that people are going to use telehealth and it is likely that they will need this range today and another range tomorrow. To me, it is like saying I want to sail toward that island out there but I'm not sure of the wind speed or direction and if I get closer and see another island that looks better once I am out there, then I will change my destination and go to that island. I would never have seen that island if I hadn't been trying to get to the first island. I have not heard much different. Their desire is to know where we think this is going to go and to help guide policy and direction.

Dick Sjoberg asked if the goal we are trying to set is a residential goal.

Rick King said we can differentiate between business and residential. Some businesses are unserved. Generally speaking we do have to differentiate between the two.

Dick Sjoberg said he thinks it is important to differentiate that. If kids are doing school work at home versus a business and the business wants to have a 1Gbps or 10Gbps then they can make a business case or do a work around. It's a decision that they have to make. Schools, residents and libraries are more locked in. He thinks we should be talking more about residential.

Rick King agreed we need to discuss residential but we know there are businesses where they cannot choose high speed access even though they want to. If it were available and they could pick the speed then that is one thing but if it isn't available that is different. Ubiquity to a business means it's at the doorstep and you make the business case around that. On the home front the ubiquity, cost and access are different.

John Stanoch indicated he was a member of the speed group and attended the first meeting and Andy Schreiner participated in the second. We were using the CA ranges and if we are looking to 2015 we asked people to give us their best estimates. We got a range of responses from institutional and government use that was about 1Gbps on up. John would note that those speeds are largely available in the marketplace from private providers. We also heard from health care and generally, with some rural exceptions, there are private providers available. What he did not see was a lot of specific information about what we are going to see for the on ramp speed or data to back up. In the comments that were made, if you look at the types of uses, he did not see numbers. In the record established for the task force, he did see Dennis Fazio with a number of 10Mbps for services in 2015. If he looks at the CA, 5 to 10Mbps covers most of what the residents are looking for. Some specific to distance learning and telemedicine. He also went back to the presentations the task force has had and Virtual Radiologic talked about the usage and was at pretty good robust speeds at 3Mbps which is lower than the onramp. So his observation is perhaps to become more educated as to how the speed group arrived at the 10 and 20Mbps. Two final comments on why this is important, one is that we've heard people say it should be 1, 10, or 50Mbps but we have people that don't have anything right now and we are not going to leave those people behind because we've had pretty good consensus that everyone in MN gets some access. Second, another task is to price this out and when he puts this into the budget discussions, he doesn't want to have to make a choice of getting basic broadband to some people and faster service to others. He does not want to put out a speed that prices us out.

Tom Garrison had a similar confession that he was not able to be on the last call, but was part of the earlier call. He reaches a similar conclusion as John but for a different reason. We heard compelling testimony why we want to be world class. For the onramp, our numbers are what many people have available to them already. That is not aspirational. There is a cost to

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



provision broadband but there is also a cost of not provisioning broadband. Australia has made a national commitment to do 100Mbps and they are not even the highest, Singapore is. If we want to be world class, CA indicated what they wanted. That affects our world. He would take you back to Brett Swanson's testimony, internet traffic grew at an annual rate of 50 – 60%. Also talking about those very figures do not take into account a lot of things. Tom is comfortable with those numbers as a floor but he is not comfortable with those as a ceiling. Tom suggested that we include the idea that we try to be among the top 3 states nationwide, and among the top 5 in average available internet speeds. That would not lock us in, but would give us an island that we are aiming at. It is not a requirement but an indication that is where we want to go.

Chris Swanson noted that the speed group was a very interesting group and it was a fair process. One thing we looked at is that ubiquity is critically important. Telemedicine, knowing the rural area and aging demographics, also jumped out as critically important. Taking the CA information, telemedicine has 10Mbps to 100Mbps connectivity. Quite frankly these numbers are very low and we are not doing our state justice with those numbers. He experiences problems on a daily basis. We need to look at the rural person and what they are doing. Then look at page 10 and the technologies that are available today and then if you look at the numbers that the speed group brought forward, they are fair. He would love to see 1Gbps but the process was fair.

Jack Geller noted that Mike stayed true to reality in his description of how the group functioned. There was a bit of holding cards and putting them down at the end and a sense of horse trading. He is comfortable with where they landed for a few reasons. If you are truly talking about ubiquity, then you need to start with the hardest person to reach, the last person in the last farm at the end of the road. Very much like Chris said, so what does that guy deserve from a functional point? It's not just a number. He thought of telemedicine, educational applications, what is going to drive this is healthcare and education. So don't think of it as ubiquity of broadband but as ubiquity of healthcare and ubiquity of education. Those that are underserved by broadband are underserved by other things. Critical applications like Telemedicine, the CA bands played a role in his thinking. In regards to the aspirational number, he doesn't care what the aspirational number is. The report says that as applications require greater and greater bandwidth, Jack believes the providers will meet those needs so he believes what will set the tone is the onramp speed. He is not as concerned as Tom about the aspirational goal.

JoAnne Johnson said she would like to start out by echoing other comments. The meeting was civil, productive, and informative. By the second meeting we could offer enough reasoning behind the numbers. As a provider, she did not have a problem with the 5 to 10Mbps and 10 to 20Mbps range. The only trouble she had was with the recommended verbiage. During the discussions it was clear that we do not want this to be a mandate but what we anticipate people will need in 6 years. It has to be identified as an educated guess. If I go back 5 years it was 128 and 512Kbps. She would be more comfortable with language other than "we recommend a minimum of ____."

Mike O'Connor said he wanted the full group to hear this summary of our work product. It's a compromise and each of us lost it only once. In the remaining time we can tune it and hear from the rest of you.

John Stanoch said he did not mean to imply, if it came across that way, that it wasn't a fair process.

Tom Garrison added that he really wanted to praise the collaborative nature.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Brent Christensen suggested a group hug.

Rick King commended the subgroup for good work and good progress. You can feel the compromise nature of the result though he is not saying everyone agrees with it. The question we should first address are general comments that others have. Look at things in the recommendation and parsing out what we agree to, for example. Do we like the format of looking at this by applications and include the CA format as the rationale and then we get to what we will present. What we see is here is a minimum down and up, so we are throwing symmetry out with this. Specifying a minimum and making a decision and saying those all migrate to a different number by 2015. That is different to the approach that Tom suggested which wasn't an either/or. We will let people chip in and see where the consensus of the group is.

Steve Cawley wanted to compliment the group. He does not have major issues. He agrees the California table should be in the report and we should think about the applications that every citizen should have access to. The aspirational goal is too low, but he agrees with Jack that he really doesn't care about it. He would ask if we state 50Mbps as the aspirational goal then we put context to it in terms of what is happening. Explain why we think this is a reasonable goal. If we put it in there it is embarrassing low. It won't make us a world leader. We will have citizens react and say we did not listen.

Vijay Sethi said the question Mike sent out had ranges and he responded with small county needs. There is a question that he has been struggling with and Steve helped him with it a little bit yesterday. The CA ranges are 10 to 20Mbps and there is a big range here for healthcare needs, education, research applications, and video. The question is that if I was a resident living by Lake of the Woods what is that absolute minimum number. I am looking at it and the 10 to 20Mbps, is that what you have to have to access the basic services or is that what we want everyone to have by 2015. He doesn't have a clear answer. He is hearing from others that the number might not be high enough. But that is the number we have to have for basic services.

Rick King said he thinks the issue is if you were to go to the CA report and you just assumed everything up to that point you have two really important things there, telemedicine and education. So what you are really saying is to what degree would people access those as a basic service and how does that fall into the 10Mbps to 100Mbps range. If the person consumed, you look at a number like 20Mbps. The education pieces and telemedicine will continue to grow and those will be considered basic and the minimum will crawl up. Not all education needs that bandwidth today. Not all telemedicine will need that today. Both are right. If you think about what is on the horizon you can go higher.

Brent Christensen said he is going to walk out of this meeting with the same idea he had when he entered, he thinks it is a mistake to put any speed number in the report. The tiered system that we have, if we have to put a number in he thinks it should be tiered numbers.

Tom Garrison asked if he meant as the floor or ceiling?

Brent Christensen said anytime you put a number in it becomes the floor. You should not put in a ceiling. If we have to have a number, he would advocate for tiers.

Peg Werner said she did go to the broadband meeting yesterday afternoon hosted by Blandin. It was one group of citizens but they covered a large area. She said she thought they were

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



really well prepared and that more could have heard their comments. They made it very clear that we do not get to define what citizens want and that location does not matter. A business and residence distinction doesn't matter because you have no idea what people are doing in their residences. It does speak to the tier approach. It offers a range. If we look at the tiered approach, maybe 1.5Mbps is the onramp for some and it is what is affordable. That was the point that was made; we don't get to decide for them. If we could lay it all out in an approach like that. You do not get to tell us what they get. She thinks we have to present it to the legislature and then agree that if you put a number out there she agrees with Brent that it will be brought up for the next 10 years. She really liked Steve's idea about the aspirational goal even if he may not have been serious. You could do that with the goal. It made her think of donor cards where you could say if you want to be upper Midwest, use this number; if you want to be world class, choose this number. It would give the legislature with what they want to do. Maybe this thinking is pushing for the tiered approach and then getting the unserved on.

Dan McElroy urged us to set a symmetrical goal. Why did the group come back with a higher speed down versus up?

Mike O'Connor said that we talked about it and a lot of it is technical and if we make it symmetrical we have to build a different kind of network so he backed off. He still thinks it is the best.

JoAnne Johnson said that another important caveat we talked about were the needs of the network if everyone takes symmetrical or if they have symmetrical. If you are getting 20Mbps down and 10Mbps up that is 30Mbps but if you want 20/20 that's 40Mbps. Symmetrical service will be available but not mandatory. It is important it is available but it is clear that not everyone needs it.

Dick Sjoberg explained that some of the reason the network was designed this way is that it was about 18 to 1 download to upload. As you got into the Napster era where music is exchanged, it went from 3 to 1. Now in the age of video it has gone back to 5 to 1 because most people are downloading videos and not sharing. In the Napster days you might have been getting music from John and passing it on to Mike. Nowadays, I might be going to Hulu to watch a TV show it is a moving target and the prediction is that it is going back the other way, networks say it will be 8 to 1.

Mike O'Connor added that he has read different predictions.

Dan McElroy said that when he looked at the table on page 9, some of the applications by their nature are more symmetrical. Are symmetrical uses more common for medical uses or business uses versus residential? Many task force members responded yes. Dan suggested maybe we should mention it.

Mike O'Connor said that this was the compromise of the group. He likes JoAnne's suggestions.

Dan McElroy said that there is a difference between residential and medical uses. We wanted to be technology neutral but once you get to the speed and the symmetry needs between residential and business and you have fiber, it may not be an issue.

Tom Garrison said that when we were talking about the technology piece he was ok with that but he was trying to get some acknowledgement of that as you move to the higher speed. If you look at the Lakeville report the distinction between home and business is minimal.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Craig Taylor said that he thinks the numbers are practical when you link them to the applications. He has the same concern about differentiating between business and consumer. Some of this comes to role, we contract for speeds as a business but we are moving to more telecommuting and we need to contract on a business level or are they consumers. Some of our applications have pretty high bandwidth requirements. Some you can expect in the 10Mbps range but if you get multiples running at the same time then it goes up. We've been talking about education & medicine, but I think telecommuting is coming.

Chris Swanson wanted clarification on end user and telecommuting.

Craig Taylor said that 20Mbps is ok today for telecommuting but applications are increasing.

Mike O'Connor said as we move to more video driven, it will be going up.

John Gibbs said he is trying to get his head around the type of applications you are talking about for telecommuting.

Craig Taylor responded that he is talking about delivery of certain types of health care to people in their home. It has moved upscale in recent years to video chat. We are intending to move some of the interaction to be virtual and there will be specialized equipment. He is not talking chronic deep dive conditions, but we think some of those office visits they want to see the provider, but if you do not have a deep relationship and we are convinced that this will be done.

John Gibbs said that maybe we should get something into this record some discussion of what capacity is required that enables us to some of these types of applications.

Craig Taylor said that if the doctor is on our network or if the doctor is at home or on the road, 10 miles, it's the end point that is the consideration. At the business end, we can buy that. It's when we get to the consumer end point where you may only have a visit when your son or daughter is not on.

Tim Lovaasen said that he thinks our goal is that everyone in the state can get to broadband and what it takes for the cable companies and telephone companies to provide and what it takes for the last person to get on. Technology changes as demand changes. ISDN that's not broadband and now you are bringing fiber out to the node. You want to get within 6,000 feet of your customer so you get out to the neighborhood and bring the speed closer. If you get people onto broadband the technology down the line will have greater speeds added on. If someone wants to telecommute for medicine, it might cost them an extra \$10 a month for the greater speed once the basic speed is there. The goal here is to make sure everyone has broadband. Cost and affordability is not there.

Tom Garrison just wanted to tag onto Craig's comments and say that Blue Cross in Eagan has announced something similar in the Eagan community. He respects and heard Tim's comments but would also comment that the name of the Task Force is Ultra not just Broadband. He doesn't think we as the city of Eagan would be here if we were not getting pushed by our residents. What we can't forget is that as businesses are making decision about where to locate, they are willing to put some skin in the game for that. They need the same capability in homes as they have in the office.

John Gibbs thinks it is worth a deeper dive to discuss in the report.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Rick King added that Tom's point is valid from our point of view. When you are set up to have a call center you can route wherever you want. People can take calls during peak periods from their homes but they have to be able to get the screen information about the customer. You need to be able to reference the customer account and then you have to open the knowledge database to search for known problems and solutions so you are accessing back to wherever the data is and you are doing that with a person on a live phone connection. From a business perspective, we do not care whether those people are in the office or in their home; we just want them to get the same information for the same speed. Where they are should not be constrained by the system. We also want to take them off the road if they want to telecommute and that kind of set up is one of those complexities. It's heavy duty.

Steve Cawley said that on the chart that California did, that was done a little while ago. He wanted to frame up where big research/big science is now. All research is at 10Gbps today. The California recognizes that for big science and energy. When you look at big science and the Department of Energy, they just received, and he's not sure it's been announced, \$70 to 80 million to build a 100Gbps test network and it will push things. That will force things down to the campuses. Maybe we add that to our report and to show our world is changing fast.

Rick King made a suggestion that we take a lunch break and when we come back from lunch we should specifically more toward what we want in this recommendation and move to consensus. He can summarize when we come back what he heard and what people want. He doesn't want to cut this off, but his sense is that we are at a point where we can decide what we want to say and get the structure of that.

Peg Werner said that since Kim Ross is absent she would mention that K-12 education is certainly moving towards interactive and that you really need two way interactive video and audio. Students have opted to be online students and that can be from any residence.

Dan McElroy just wanted to add and point to a website that MNSCU is doing Rumba software. We are just using audio and text and the next generation will have video and talk to 30 students. Taking the class where they can start any time. He is not sure about the bandwidth requirements. The idea that we won't bring students to Grand Rapids from Swan River, that is what we are talking about.

Glen Wilson said that in looking at this from the Commerce Department, we have saved 22% stand by energy to 12% by better management of the energy distribution systems. The new energy production is coming from rural areas and the technology is expanding and the savings from better management is saving us from building new transmission. He added that he is on the healthcare cabinet and that he recently had an operation that was done robotically and we are looking at doing this in rural areas. We see the Mayo Clinic has expanded to a 120 mile radius but that is as far as they will go because that is as far as their doctors want to travel. With more and more technology they are looking to beyond in lieu of a doctor onsite. He hopes we do not set a higher end that is so low that we cut of the R & D that is going on. We don't know what transmission speeds are going to be. But we do know that an oncology center takes about the same as a hospital needed 6 years ago. The upside needs to be left somewhat open so that we don't turn people away from Minnesota.

Jack Geller said he did not want to lose what Tom said when we started and we were talking about the on ramp speed and the aspirational speed. It just made so much sense to him that if we really want that world class service and no one here is smart enough to say what that is

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



going to be in six years, then maybe the onramp speed is a number but the aspirational goal is not a number but when we talk about it we say Minnesota needs to be in the top 3 in the nation and we stay near the top. Maybe our aspiration is a status or a setting. Not put a number and have someone say what were you thinking or looking foolish in six years.

Task Force Lunch break

Rick King said that for today we had planned one thing but we will vary the report discussion. It is important that we come to agreement on the speed. It looks like there is agreement on recommendation #1 at page 9 to include the California table with the recommendation.

John Stanoch said it might be good to flush out the information.

Tom Garrison suggested adding the information Steve mentioned regarding big science.

Rick King said that there appears to be agreement on #4 that differentiation is by tiers of application. Therefore we are not differentiating between consumers and business. Telecommuting was discussed and everyone was happy with it. We are differentiating by application and if we are talking business and homes and business could be done from home. What matters is what they are doing. Want to get us to think about what we are doing. We are just saying as we tier things we are not going to worry about where they are doing what they are doing.

Craig Taylor agreed that when we talk about telecommuting we are not differentiating. That helps him with the symmetrical issue.

John Stanoch said that the other placeholder he had was how this relates to the cost discussion. If we are going to say business will benefit then we need to address cost implementation, are we going to have a funding source to say how we are going to fund.

Rick King added that another thing is if you are going to work out of your home and you want fast bandwidth but there is a different price for residential and business use, would you declare what you are doing.

Rick said that he is going to say on 3 and 4 we are a main differentiation point that we have to cover cost. Look at applications. Differentiate by application. Put an orange check on the chart which means consensus.

Agreement 2 we accept the minimum recommendation from the subgroup of 10 to 20Mbps/5 to 10Mbps and that implies acceptance of asymmetrical. We need to make sure there is an explanation of this, that symmetrical is available.

Peg Werner asked the tech people in the room if it is possible if we tier things that we would offers symmetry in the tiers and let people choose.

JoAnne Johnson responded that is how it is today. Anywhere you can get DSL, you can get symmetrical DSL.

Chris Swanson said it might be a slower.

JoAnne Johnson said that the speed may differ and the price may differ, but it is doable.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Peg Werner asked if that means it can be determined by the consumer and not by us. Should that be our position, that symmetrical is consumer determined.

Steve Cawley said that we can do that in the recommendation depending if symmetrical is a desired and required capability.

Dick Sjoberg said this is a minimum we are putting out there. If you have 20Mbps download and 50Mbps upload that may be available for you at an added cost.

Brent Christensen added we are talking about the last guy at the end of the road. Why not say 5 to 10Mbps both ways and then 10/20 but that is higher than the lowest threshold.

JoAnne Johnson she is more comfortable with 10/20Mbps and 5/10Mbps with the flexibility and as long as we say elsewhere how we are going to get it out there.

Robyn West said isn't the person who needs the service going to choose.

Rick King replied that people should have access to whatever they have at where ever they are. We can revert to Brent's number if we want to include symmetry.

Chris Swanson said he found it interesting when looking at those numbers that 10 is the common number; technically you have a 5/5 symmetrical connection. He wishes it were 10/10 and anything different than that. We can say symmetrical speed has to be this but anything above does not impact the consumer.

Brent Christensen said he is comfortable making the number a 10/10.

Jack Geller said he thought it was someone from the speed group that said if you have enough bandwidth to deliver 5/10 then you have enough bandwidth to deliver 10/10.

Rick King asked if we are saying 10/10 is that the same and you can ultimately make that choice. This would be shown as a range. Which means you can have symmetry in there and it would be ok.

Mike O'Connor wanted to chime in behind Dan that the one comment that would be nice to have in the report is the notion that symmetrical is very important to some people.

Rick King said that will go along with the number that we put in. This is what consumers see. Are we comfortable with this?

Chris Swanson asked if we could do both and have a 10/10 symmetrical.

Brent Christensen said he was not sure you needed to.

John Stanoch said that he knows we want consensus but for him, he is going to want to see how this fits with universal accessibility and cost.

Rick King said we are driving to consensus. In the interest of getting to consensus can we have agreement without knowing the other issues? In the context of everything we know, can we agree and he doesn't expect anyone to agree if the costs are out of whack.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Tom Garrison asked as a question that relates to the 10/10, do we know what we need for the applications Craig Taylor talked about.

Craig Taylor said those speeds are fine as long as you don't do high def video. They change for high definition.

Dan McElroy said there are some that will say to heck with cost. But let's be practical. The ILECs in the state are not going to replace every piece of copper in the state with fiber.

Rick King asked, for agreement on #3 can we set the aspirational goal as being in the top 5 in the U.S. by average speed and average penetration rather than targeting 50Mbps by 2015 so that would agree with Tom's points this morning. We need to be very specific by what the measures are. U.S. Dept of commerce keeps the metrics that we can use. Second is top 10 globally in average speed and average penetration, source OECD data. If it's problematic in people's minds, we could have a number and a date or we could do a competitive positioning. We would fulfill our legislative mandate by doing either. It depends on where we are six years out and his experience is that you usually spend a lot of time arguing about where the number ought to be and then you surpass it halfway through. We can do whatever you want.

Dan McElroy suggested that we could also reverse the paragraphs and say to set the goal in top 3 or top 5 and that if you needed a number it would be x but we expect that to change.

Rick King said that if we took these two rankings against those criteria the 50Mbps would be higher. It would be higher projecting it to 2015.

Chris Swanson said we do not know the answer and what it is going to be. There are a lot of things we do not know and he looks at that and it does not matter if we take it out. He personally thinks we should be in the top 3.

Rick King said he is ok if we put it in there then you have to go to the data and find out what it needs to be for 2015.

Peg Werner said you could phrase it that if you did as calculated Minnesota as being in the top 3 today the number would be _____. You are not giving them the 2015 number but what the number is today.

Rick King said we may still have the number.

John Stanoch said that he is not prepared to support this approach today. We all see many statistics. We could put this into a chart and where are we falling short on applications. These rankings aren't meaningful if they don't relate back to what the citizens of Minnesota want. This approach misses the mark. He needs time to look at what this means and compare to the applications we think are important.

Jack Geller said he is concerned as he thinks what is the path to getting there. If we are to be top 5 in the U.S., he does not know where we are at in state rankings today. There is a path to get there. He specifically likes the penetration goal. It is not about building infrastructure its building demand. If we go to the international standards, there are dense, small, and wired countries and he does not know when we look at it is there a clear path. With a little more information, he feels comfortable with top 5 in the U.S. but he just does not know about the global stuff.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Tom Garrison said that as the one who originally raised the idea, he thinks being in the top three in the U.S. is best and he agrees with John on getting more information. It is still aspirational. We need to find a metric and assuming we are going to look at how do we get better. For all the talk about speed, there is Speed Matters, Akamai, etc. and on every measure there is room for improvement in Minnesota. Within the country, maybe top ten is better than top 5. When you take out counties with high density, he things we are doing worse than France, Canada, Alaska. He wants to be better than France, but maybe we are never going to be better than those places.

Rick King said that the question is whether the aspirational approach of top3/top 5 is better than another like 50Mbps by 2015 or we like this one and there is more work that needs to be done. There just seemed to be more discontent around picking a number.

Vijay Sethi agrees there was discontent with picking a number but when this is submitted to the legislature they will want to see a number. He liked Dan's idea.

Rick King said if you want, think about Dan's idea which was to do both and John addressed in part, not sure about the measures.

Dan McElroy said he is sensitive to John's comment and we owe it to the legislature to have a follow-up section to this that says here's why we recommended what we did. It's not to be competitive with Lichtenstein but so people can do things that will be an opportunity to improve quality of life, like taking college courses online. We recommend x so people can do y.

Jack Geller said it made sense and he was on board.

Peg Werner asked if everyone has done a fist to five to see agreement. A fist is 0 and means you hate the idea and five you like it and everything else is in-between. Rick can look around the room and see agreement/disagreement.

Brent Christensen said that the only thing he would caution is, and he understands what Dan is doing, but he is still the guy that hates putting the number up there.

Mike O'Connor said he has the opposite headline, "Ultra high speed broadband task force can't come up with a number."

Rick King asked the group if they wanted to try fist to five. Zero you hate it and five is you love it. So voting on both items packaged together and we say if we use that standard today and then say this is why. It would be 50 today and the why would be added. How about voting on the whole thing.

Rick King noted after the vote that a few people that like it a lot and a few that do not like it.

John Stanoch said he does not care really what globally they are doing.

Tom Garrison said it matters a lot to keep this in. That is what keeps us honest. Would like to think the U.S is the best.

Rick King said we are comparing MN to the other countries. Does it make it better if we take out international rankings? For how many people does it make it worse? Another fist to five vote taken.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Rick King noted a lot of 2's and 3's so there might be a way to work this where it might be good for the people that did not like it much. Things that John mentioned we can look at and decide. This is a lukewarm compromise.

Tom Garrison said that he thinks the one thing that could help us by our next meeting are what metrics are out there that we could get behind. That might get us to the bottom of what we can agree upon.

Rick King said it seems like the issue of global is a tough one.

Tom Garrison said that then the question is whether there is a global metric that people can agree on.

Rick King said there are several metrics available.

Craig Taylor asked if the metrics are hybrid, consumer and business.

Steve Cawley said he was not sure if we support this, but what if we dropped speed and talked about penetration.

Dan McElroy replied that he was not sure but he thought just showing penetration would not meet the legislature's needs.

Steve Cawley –asked if it gets a little warmer if top 5 in U.S. and top10 globally only if it related to penetration.

Peg Werner said she thought the reason we went to the aspirational goal is we were uncertain what the number might be in 2015.

Rick King said that was the conversation. This was as written by the speed group. He viewed 50Mbps as the aspirational goal. As written, the group said we aspire to have 50Mbps by 2015.

Mike O'Connor said the subgroup also spent about 10 minutes on this. At the very end I pushed us hard to come up with our charter which is aspirational. Not sure that we put nearly as much thought on this as we did the other areas.

Rick King said we could work on this a bit and say we want to set a 2015 aspirational goal. The speed group came back with 50Mbps. We are not going to get a better group compromise on a number than this. This is a different approach. We can accept this as a aspirational goal and do some research to see if we want to add this piece of national and international goals to see what the measures should be. Do we want to put a stake in the ground and work on the totality of the recommendation?

Peg Werner asked what if we just disbanded this discussion and then go back and run the numbers and maybe we need to see where we are today and what the top 5 and top 10 are doing.

Dan McElroy said that one challenge is that the last OEDC numbers he has seen are from 2007.

Dick Sjoberg said that we want to be in the top 5, but the numbers may be different.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Mike O'Connor used the phrase "that which gets measured gets done." We are measuring our competitive position. We are going to compete against every other state and country. If every state came out and copies every other states report and we are competing to be in the top 3 we could get in a logjam.

Dan McElroy said it's like the coach saying that we need to score 5 runs a game if we do that we will win. Competition is just a fact.

Tom Garrison said that he realizes every action has a reaction. What he likes about the bottom up approach is by being the first out of the gate to state something, this positions MN very well and it says to the Ciscos of the world that Minnesota is being out there. When we get to that section of the report, we are going to have a reaction to it which gives you a very positive message and we want to be competitive and this might cause us to reassess our number later on.

Rick King suggested that we have a small group of people volunteer to put this into a proposal and check into some measures and we'll have this a week before the next meeting. My sense is that we are not that far away. Depends upon the energy that you have. Either decide not to do anything. Research and come back or do we have people that would work on – Brent, Craig, Dan, Peg. Take the holistic and he'd like to pull in the 1's and 2's we need to try and figure out how to adjust the recommendation. Some people are concerned about the stats and global. We had a lot of fives on this. Craig will be the lead.

Rick King said that was a good discussion. Now we have 45 minutes and he has one exercise that might be interesting to talk to in the role of government piece but it is more gathering data. The role of Government is one that we want to assign a subgroup too. He'll ask Anne to take over. We'll need everyone to grab a subgroup.

Rick King said looking back through the role of government discussion there are six pieces to talk about. One of the dimensions that would be interesting is that we never really broke down the government as a whole into levels, federal has one level, state has one level, county has another. Tom reminded me of the discussion. We never really broke down what group does what things – federal, state, county, local. In regard to broadband what areas are each of them involved in? Then the subgroup can take the data and differentiate. We'll go around and shout things out.

Anne Losby headed the flipcharts with titles: federal, state, regional, county, and local.

Federal

- Consumer
- Provider (content)
- Subsidizer
- Internet Security
- FCC – regulator
- Interstate regulation – regulator
- Consumer protection
- Tax policy
- Financing
- National policy

State

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



- Consumer
- Provider (content, infrastructure in narrow areas)
- Consumer education
- Public/private partnership (how)
- Government as both regulator and competitor
- Subsidizer
- Consumer protection
- Tax policy
- State policy
- Zoning and land use
- Planning – pulling together best practices, facilitation broadband deployment
- Better access - permitting process – regulatory process

Regional

- Consumer
- Provider (content)
- Subsidizer
- Zoning and land use
- Promoting collaboration/facilitator
- Infrastructure coordination

County/Municipal

- Consumer
- Provider (content, infrastructure)
- Government as both regulator and competitor
- Subsidizer
- Infrastructure coordination
- Planning – pulling together best practices, facilitation broadband deployment)

Local/City

- Consumer
- Provider (content, services, infrastructure)
- Right of way management
- Subsidizer
- Zoning and land use
- Promoting collaboration/facilitator
- Infrastructure coordination
- Planning – pulling together best practices, facilitation broadband deployment

Rick suggested we add what we want to see and if that develops into anything since the differentiation wasn't what he expected. Anne added in red.

Rick King referred to page 6 for recommendations that we could create subgroups around. The goal would be to actually write the recommendation, a couple of punchy paragraphs and some back up. The subgroup would make available one week ahead of the July meeting and the subgroups would present at the July meeting. We would like to go for decisions on speed and role of government at the July meeting. Rick would be happy if someone wants to be on more than one but everyone should be on at least one subgroup.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Recommendation 2 – policies and actions necessary to achieve ubiquitous broadband

Lead - Mike O'Connor

JoAnne Johnson
Brent Christensen
Peg Werner
Mary Ellen Wells
Diane Wells
Carlos Seoane

Recommendation 3 – opportunities for public/private partnerships

Lead - Brent Christensen

Steve Cawley
Tom Garrison
Tim Lovaasen
Vijay Sethi
Robyn West
Mary Ellen Wells
Diane Wells

Group Recommendation 4/6 – financing

Lead – John Gibbs

John Stanoch
Dan McElroy
Dick Sjoberg
Diane Wells

Recommendation 5 – evaluation and recommendations of security

Lead - Mike O'Connor

Craig Taylor
Steve Cawley
Shirley Walz

Role of Government –

Lead - Tom Garrison
Robyn West
Mike O'Connor
Vijay Sethi
John Stanoch
Karen Smith

Research top 5 U.S./Top 10 global

Lead - Craig Taylor
Dan McElroy
Brent Christensen
Peg Werner
Shirley Walz

Symmetrical is not assigned, Mike O'Connor, JoAnne Johnson, and Shirley Walz will work offline.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Ultra High Speed Broadband Task Force Meeting
Friday, June 19, 2009
9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.



Anne Losby asked if there is going to be a panel at the July meeting in Mankato. We are scheduled to have a speaker.

Rick King said that the most important thing that we can do is hear from the public. He would take the panel out first if he had a choice between public and panel. To do the timeline, we will send it when we recap the assignment so you will have about 3 weeks. The last two things have gone pretty well.

We are in Mankato and the events are documented with an open house from 2 – 5 at Brent's offices in Madelia on Thursday and Blandin has scheduled something from 3 – 5. It is good for some of us to go. We do not design the event. The fact that it is in our day. We need to make it as clear as we can that they are not talking to the task force if they talk with Blandin. A reception from 7:00 to 9:00. Peg is finalizing the schedule for August. There will be a reception from 7:00 to 9:00. Rick noted that he really appreciated everyone's attendance here. We have as many as we would have in other locations in the metro area. We have two more outstate meetings we need to continue to attend. We are making progress, feel free to feed stuff to Shirley on the report. We will have a chance to hack through it and will start dropping out stuff that should not be there and the names associated. Stuff that needs to disappear will start disappearing. We'll just start consolidating. If you see something that needs to go in there that you have a passion for, write it and we will highlight it for discussion and insert it where it belongs.

Tom Garrison asked if we want to assign folks that are not here today to a sub group.

Rick King said we will take a look at that.

Motion to adjourn meeting at 3:02 pm.