

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Meeting Minutes

Friday, November 14, 2008

9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Facilitator: Anne Losby

Task force members in attendance: Steve Cawley (Myron Lowe sat in for a portion of the time), Brent Christensen, Tom Garrison, Jack Geller, Emmett Coleman (for John Gibbs), JoAnne Johnson, Jack Ries (for Gopal Khanna), Rick King, Tim Lovaasen, Dan McElroy, Mike O'Connor, Kim Ross (arrived approximately 11:20), Vijay Sethi, Dick Sjoberg, Mike McDermott (for Karen Smith), Joe Schindler (for Mary Ellen Wells), John Stanoch (Andy Schriener sat in for a portion of the time), Chris Swanson, Craig Taylor, Peg Werner (joined via phone), Robyn West

Public attendees: Dennis Fazio, Ann Higgins, Michelle Schlie, Mike Reardon, Ann Treacy, Tom Berkelman, Randy Young, Jodie Miller

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

Opening comments; review meeting agenda – Rick King

Rick King called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

Substitutes were introduced and attendance changes were stated.

- Peg Werner joined the meeting via phone.
- Joe Schindler substituting for Mary Ellen Wells.
- Barbara Jo Gervais not in attendance.
- Emmett Coleman substituting for John Gibbs.
- Kim Ross will be late ~11:30.
- John Stanoch has to depart at ~11:00 – Andy Schriener will substitute at that time.
- Jack Ries substituting for Gopal Khanna.
- Mike McDermott substituting for Karen Smith.

The group reviewed the agenda

- Discussed the presentations that the group would be hearing about. Mentioned that there will be time for the task force to discuss what they have heard.
- After lunch the report format and style will be discussed. With Karen Smith not in attendance, Tom Garrison will be representing the whole team's ideas. This is meant to be a workshop. Tom Garrison will begin the discussion and Anne Losby will lead the facilitation.
- Mentioned that the task force will talk about the December agenda. John Gibbs and others have worked to organize.
- Rick King asked if anyone had anything to add.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Motion by Dick Sjoberg to accept the agenda. Second by Vijay Singh. Approved.

A motion was made by Brent Christensen to approve the October 24 meeting minutes and seconded by Tim Lovaasen. Approved.

Rick King asked for public comment. No comments, but Rick mentioned a communication that Vijay Sethi received.

Vijay Sethi received a communication from a gentleman, John Peters, who is a business owner in Browerville, MN. Vijay read the following email: "Mr. Sethi, I am a business person in Browerville MN and extremely interested in your committee. I currently am the adviser to the City of Browerville, on the Todd County Development Corporation study for bringing high speed Internet to Todd County, the Chair of Computer and Information Systems for the National Bipolar Foundation based in Memphis TN, and President of 2 internet based businesses. I am extremely interested in your Task Force and will be following your progress. I have a major concern that the task force is looking too far forward and not addressing the needs of rural communities today. Much of our area can get only dial up or satellite. This is not acceptable for businesses, especially ones tied to rural locations. Are there any plans in your task force to address intermediate steps?"

Vijay Sethi indicated that mainly he wants to make sure that the task force is looking forward. He did not know if the task force wanted to officially respond or just take note of the email.

Rick King commented that as much as the goal statements are to say where we should be in the future, we should deal with the current in addition to future looking. We intend to capture both short term and long term goals.

Rick King also mentioned that we have gathered and created a summary of what the Obama presidency may mean for internet broadband in the U.S. It appears likely that with the material we've seen on the new administration, there is likely to be more activity in the area of broadband and we should want to capitalize on that. He would put that out there for the task force to respond.

Jack Geller noted that as a rural advocate, and there are others in this room as well, we should not be in the position to defend ourselves for every comment. After two whole meetings, he's not sure that we can speak to the direction that we are headed. The statement contains a genuine concern expressed by a number of rural folks. It's something that we need to address, but it's not the entire focus of the task force. He is confident that it will be an issue that we address. He takes the input as meaningful, helpful, and sincere.

Joanne Johnson stated that if there is a way to respond to the concern, it is a high priority of the task force to consider the entire state, not just some communities or metro areas. It is the task force's intent, and one of our driving forces, to understand the big picture. Also mapping will give us areas we can pinpoint and areas where we can focus on. We will be dealing with good information in a couple months. It may seem like it is taking longer than it should, but these things always seem to.

Rick King asked if we want to take these kinds of comments and respond to them generally or just take as advice.

Steve Cawley indicated that we should take them as advice. Maybe we create some standard response.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



Vijay Sethi indicated that he did take the liberty to respond by saying that the concern expressed is a general concern that is out there and that he would bring it to the attention of the task force. He wasn't sure that the email sender was looking for a solution at this point but maybe waiting to see what the task force addresses.

Rick King asked the task force to always copy Diane Wells so that she can file the e-mail.

Tom Garrison had a question in terms of process that may help our standard response. He didn't know if this group had decided to take public comment either before or after adopting the report. Certainly when it goes to the legislature, public comment would be taken. Would it be helpful to everyone to indicate that our meetings are structured so that a public comment period is always a part of the agenda?

Rick asked if there were any other public comments that members wanted to bring to light. There were none.

Rick King indicated that Rep. Sheldon Johnson (DFL) 67B, chair of the Telecommunications Regulation and Infrastructure committee and a leader behind the task force being formed was present. He invited Rep. Johnson to address the task force if he was willing.

Rep. Sheldon Johnson noted that it's been a busy election season and that he's glad it is over. He is excited about the upcoming session despite the economy. He believes that his committee will have a number of items to address. He shared a couple of items from conversations that he has had with other committee members. First, there is a desire to see the task force move around the state. He indicated that the telecommunications committee moved around the state and it was enlightening and helpful. Second, looking at the ubiquity of access as well as speeds. The infrastructure needs to be throughout the state, not just metro. Rep. Johnson also addressed what he sees for the upcoming session. Affordability of access to broadband and video. The wireless bill. Statewide franchising is being studied so the committee will have time to look at that report and see where it is going. Telecommuting is something else where there has been a lot of interested expressed so we'll be taking a look at that.

Rep. Johnson thanked the task force for the work that they are doing and indicated that he looks at the web site. He asked if there were any questions.

Dan McElroy asked if there was anything that he could share about possible telecommuting legislation.

Rep. Johnson indicated that there was nothing specific. Research staff is looking first at some examples in other states. There may be a pilot project at the state level.

Rick King thanked Rep. Johnson for attending the meeting and addressing the task force and congratulated him on his reelection. He asked if there was any other public comment. There were none. He then indicated that the next panel would have a half hour allocated for each speaker and then time for feedback by the task force on today's speakers and also the speakers at last month's meeting.

Jack Geller – Broadband Enters the Mainstream

Think of a history that resides in the 21st century, not much broadband adoption before 2000 in MN. Back in 1999 there was a meeting at the Humphrey Institute and a lot of talk about DSL and how it will impact/change things. Jack was engaged in these discussions. They asked the simple question about what was going to happen with broadband in rural areas. Jack drove

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



home from those meetings thinking that this would be an interesting research question. That year he teamed up with the Humphrey Institute and some rural providers to report back in 2000 about what broadband might mean for the rural areas. That is when they started the first statewide surveys.

Questions like this were asked:

1. Do you have a compute in your home?
2. Is the computer connected to the internet?
3. How is the computer connected to the internet?

Found out a number of things and they have asked more question every year since. Found out that it did not make sense to ask people about connection speed as they did not know and they were not certain about the technology that they had. The next year they asked: how is your computer connected and who is your provider. They realized that people use the term DSL generically, much like Kleenex is used for the word tissue. They started asking questions in smarter ways. They also concluded that even though there are things we really want to know; don't ask questions if the responses are not reliable.

The main story is that this survey work shows responses from 2001 through 2007. The three main questions have not changed much over the decade. What you see is over much of the decade there is an uptick in people having computers, but not that much. If you don't have a computer in 2008, you will likely not have a computer in 2009. There are still people who do not have microwave ovens because they choose not to adopt the technology. Therefore, when talking about broadband adoption, the goal of 100% is not realistic. We have to get away from 100% of everything all the time. Also, if you actually look at the number with a computer and the number connected to the internet, they are fairly parallel early on. Back in 2001 a number of people had computers in their home. If you have a computer today, it is likely connected to the internet. In 2001, only 6% of households had broadband in some form, it's now up to 52%. The adoption developed without much government intervention, it just happened. When providers began to bundle services, broadband really started to happen. The important thing to recognize is that, whether we like to admit it, the primary tool that people use to connect to the internet is the computer. Maybe someday it will be the TV or telephone, but right now it is the computer. So if you don't have a computer, you won't be connected. If you buy that, 73% is the ceiling – there are 27% of households that do not have a working computer. Jack doesn't think that will change substantially.

Adoption rates in metro versus rural areas show that rural is catching up, the gap is shrinking, but there is always going to be a gap for several reasons. There is a rural lag. Twenty-two percent of metro homes do not have computers whereas 27% of rural homes do not have a working computer.

They've looked at adoption rate by age, they look at the trends. People who are 65 and older are less likely to buy a computer and get online. A great story was that grandparents would flock to the internet to keep up with their grandchildren, but not true. At every measure it does not move. Rural areas have a greater percentage of people that are 65 and older. That will play a role in some of the differences. Some of it has nothing to do with availability and some does. This is also true in metro areas, fewer people, rural or metro, have an internet connection.

Income plays a big role. The more money you have, the more likely you will have broadband in your home. Poor people are much less likely to have computers in their homes, be connected to the internet and use broadband. Rural areas have a greater percentage of lower income people. You may think that metro areas have a higher percent of their population that is poor.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



Poverty is just more overt in metro areas, but it's a lot less visible in rural areas. Wages are 15 to 30% less in rural areas and that will play a role in broadband adoption.

Households with kids between the ages of 6 and 18 are much more likely to have a computer and they have broadband. They want to game and connect. They are connecting in ways we had not imagined before. Households with kids greatly outpace broadband adoption over households without kids. There are a lower percentage of households with kids in rural areas. Off the top of his head, he thinks the figure is 72% of all households in rural Minnesota have no kids between the ages of 6 and 18. These are demographic and socioeconomic realities of our state.

If broadband is available, why do people not buy it? Price is still an issue (39% metro v. 38% rural, so very close). Second, a significant group of people in rural and metro areas say they just don't use it enough to warrant the purchase of broadband. It wasn't as true as we had hoped that once people were exposed to the higher speed, they would not be able to do without it. People may have broadband at work, but for whatever reason have chosen not to have it at home. Maybe they do their broadband tasks at work and then only email from home. Lastly, a reason given for not having broadband is that it is not available. Of those that have computers, 9% in the metro area and 30% in rural areas that have computers said they don't have broadband because it is not available. We know there are places where they do not have access. But keep in mind that we are dealing with self reports in this survey. In some cases it may be available and the individual just does not know.

Availability is more of an issue in rural Minnesota versus metro. However, if you live within municipal boundaries, even in rural Minnesota, broadband is available. There is remarkable penetration. Where you find the problem is where people are living out in the country. DSL can go out further. Those are the people we have to figure out. There are some significant policy considerations that have to be made. For example, if you assist a wireless provider to serve the countryside, once they are there they can serve towns too, and take customers away from the existing providers there.

Broadband adoption has been steadily increasing and now must be considered mainstream technology. The slow growth in home computers is likely going to create ceilings on broadband growth if you do absolutely nothing. Why aren't we trying to figure out how to get more computers into people's homes? A program they started in Kentucky, no child left offline, works to get computers in homes with school age children. Not aware of any policies to get more computers into homes here, but this would lift the ceiling.

Metro areas continue to outpace rural areas in broadband technology adoption but the gap is closing. The digital divide is much more a factor in rural areas due to demographics and socioeconomic factors versus geography. We do have areas that do not have broadband access, but it pales in comparison to demographic factors like age, education, income; all those are things that really drive broadband adoption.

The most cited reason why dial-up customers do not adopt broadband is price. Price still counts. Price does matter. In many ways, people have talked about affordability. Affordability is just as big of an issue in metro and rural.

Affordability is an issue that has to be addressed in the metro and rural areas. A couple of years ago some mapping was done and we were pleasantly surprised that rural providers deployed the technology much more wide spread than had been imaged, but it is still an issue as there are unserved areas. In general, it is fairly widespread but there are areas of unavailability

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



throughout the state, maybe not as big of a problem as in a state like West Virginia, but still a problem.

In doing research over a decade, we would ask people what they do on the internet. Early on we found that people who had dial-up were behaving the same way as those that had broadband. That has changed. With streaming video, gaming, other technology is changing. When people build web sites now, they assume you have broadband. If you look at the government, they are pushing more and more public services out on the web. We are unintentionally creating an inequity in the delivery of public services between those with broadband and those without.

In five years or less we will see the first test of voter elections on the internet. Having broadband will impact the nature of our democracy. Structurally we will have the inequities because there will always be people that choose not to have broadband. This will force policy makers to reconsider the public services that are provided online or their orientation toward telecommunications policies.

Jack Geller asked for questions.

Mike McDermott asked about Jack's statement that some people have no telephone service and wanted to know why? Is that by choice?

Jack Geller responded that there are a few places that do not have wired phone service today. You have to understand that some people live in some very remote areas in northern Minnesota. There are very few people there. Perhaps the providers can better answer the question.

Mike McDermott asked with respect to the senior curve whether Jack has studied how far they are from a library or public place at which they can get internet access.

Jack Geller indicated that he has not studied that. As we age, that category will take care of itself. As the population ages, we won't just stop using our computers but will continue to use them. Dealing with the low income issue is not as easy an issue. You cannot take the laissez faire approach. Trying to invest a lot of public resources in teaching an old dog new tricks is probably not a wise investment. Age will work itself out. Income is more difficult.

Mike McDermott asked about the uptick in use in rural areas that has occurred without government intervention to spur it. Is it due to technological advantages, such as compressing speed over copper or are they wiring rural areas?

Jack Geller said that it was a little bit of everything: cable, telephone, satellite and wireless. Technology is part of it. Investment is a big part of it. If you look at the investments our telephone companies have made in the last few years, it is substantial. A lot of it is also due to we have a lot of small family owned providers throughout Minnesota. Not to pick on Qwest or Comcast, but if you are a large provider you have more choices in regards to the state you will make investments in. If you are a small provider and have two communities to invest in and you look at excess revenue over expenses, the where isn't a question, there are fewer choices. There are a lot of small companies that have made those investments. The telecom bust in the late 1990s and early 2000s has helped as inventory became available for 25 to 30 cents on the dollar, making buying equipment much cheaper. Jack also indicated he did not want to underestimate the importance of when providers got smart and started bundling services and consumers finding that attractive. Triple play, one bill, reasonable price.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



Tom Garrison asked if we know, based on sample size, could the data be broken down to inner city information, or in rural areas like northeastern Minnesota or southwestern Minnesota, for example.

Jack Geller indicated that you can break it down but the margins of error in the data become greater.

Tom Garrison indicated that such information might be helpful to the policy discussions.

Rick King thanked Jack Gellar for his presentation.

Bruce Brorson – University of Minnesota, Crookston – Historical Perspective – Businesses – delivery methods, different speeds and what they do

Bruce Brorson indicated that he started as a business faculty member in 1975 so the perceptions that he'll share are from a marketing background and not a technology background. Broadband is wonderful and yes, we do need more of it. But he wants to share what it will do for him and colleges that he works with every day and what they have done at the university.

Bruce shared how they came to be involved at UMCrookston. They were the first college in the country, in 1992, to provide notebook computers to faculty and staff and it has had a profound effect. Student groups understood that there better be some value that could be acquired from the use of it. Faculty was involved in Gopher technologies which was widely distributed, and included email, gopher access, resources for a number of classes. They were ahead of the curve. Remember, internet connectivity was not yet in the public domain. They were going to work with 12 different companies and someone asked them about looking at Mosaic. From that discussion they had their first web site in 1995. They worked with sugar beet research and the education board. They had research dating from 1972 and they wanted to make the information available on the web. They went live in 1996. They also worked with the Minnesota wheat growers and students working with businesses to provide rich content. Initial focus was content with static web materials.

Then they moved to Minnesota business technologies, over 100 small manufacturing firms. Expanded nationally and did a Department of Labor project. Worked with 2 communities in 5 Great Plains states. Most recently working with instructional technology. Each day Bruce gets to work with students learning. This semester he is teaching all of his classes online. Over the last few years, he has been working with a number of software companies as service initiatives.

Bruce noted that he has a son who operates a business out of Anchorage, Alaska and they are looking at cloud computing. Things are moving rapidly in this area.

Early on the questions that were asked by people were questions like: how do I get to the internet? What hardware, software do I need? Then it was how do I claim a domain name? How do I build a static web site? How do I get email from my company vs. AOL. He used an example of a hockey stick manufacturer, Christen Brothers, and deciding on a domain name but taking too long and the name was already taken. If you can, engage students in projects from companies they are very engaged.

Many companies were making the leap to getting a web site then asking, how do I get a first page ranking on a search engine. That question is still relevant today.

Connectivity was an issue that they had to help businesses with, whether the connection was telephone, cable, point-to-point wireless, cellular or satellite. Even though the costs at times

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



were higher than most businesses would have liked, most businesses found that the investment was just the cost of doing business. No one complained about the value they received. Easy to talk with companies about expanding to the global market place. Companies that are driven to the internet also want to provide rapid response to their customers. They can use instant messaging to operate more efficiently internally. They can access information to operate more efficiently. Countless examples of companies that need to install based on suppliers.

No surprise that as they worked with companies, these companies clearly appreciated the value and understood that there was more that could be done with the technology.

Found the following quote to be true: "If any entity in the value chain begins to do business electronically, companies up and down the value chain must follow suit, or risk being substituted." (From Dr. Ravi Kalakota and Marcia Robinson from "e-Business – Roadmap for Success", Addison Wesley Longman, Inc., 1999.)

Bruce noted that we have a history of providing services to businesses that is not equaled by any other state.

In taking a look at 2008, what is he seeing? What are the challenges facing businesses today? The issues are more pressing as we see broadband alternatives that are more robust. The questions today are security and privacy, what measures can be taken to protect, issues about protecting the client and the servers, device security. Internal software or move to systems and technology talent that otherwise could not be afforded on staff fulltime. How to meet expectations of supply chain partners; it's a two way communication channel with the requirement to do business in both directions. How to become more than just another business on the web; how do I distinguish myself from others. What about social networking sites, companies want to know how they can take advantage of them. Businesses today have more sophisticated questions. The landscape in business applications has changed, Oracle has acquired PeopleSoft, Seibel Systems, BEA Systems, etc.; Microsoft Business Solutions has acquired Great Plains, Solomon, Axapta, etc.; and The Sage Group has acquired Peachtree, Business Works, State of the Art, MAS 90 and 500, ACCPAC and more. At Crookston, we are graduating less and less students in technology, 10 to 15 per year versus 35. Graduates are seldom staying in rural Minnesota, not surprising.

Business applications continue to improve with flexibility and interoperability. Business and MIS software has consolidated. Web services have become a significant focus of every major business software vendor. Open source and independent software vendors have found commercial opportunities for their work.

Cloud computing is about 3 levels. Infrastructure as a service, a service that provides computing resources and network fabric, security is managed for us. The idea is Microsoft introduced Windows du jour which makes the operating systems addressable over the web. Software as a service. Quicken online is available to anyone that wants to use it for free. Small business can work diligently and also employees can access from home. Most of the applications that we see coming to the Internet look and feel like applications that we have on our desktop. They don't look like websites. Bruce has moved all his university email into gmail, moved word processing and spreadsheets into Google applications. His job is to experiment. Businesses are finding more and more services that will require greater speeds. The advent of technology to support that high speed is already here. He is looking forward to working with companies that choose to go to cloud computing.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Bruce thanked the task force for inviting him to speak.

Rick King thanked Bruce for his presentation and hoped that he could stay for the discussion. The task force took a short break from 11:05 to 11:15. Rick King indicated that when we return we will discuss what we've heard about today and we can also discuss what we heard last month.

After break

Rick King opened the presentations up for discussion.

(Andy Schriener sat in for John Stanoch at this point and Kim Ross arrived.)

Rick King thanked the two presenters and asked for thoughts on what we heard.

JoAnne Johnson asked whether the task force, in its recommendations to the legislature, should be thinking about the avenues to pursue. Recommending that we bring high tech businesses like data centers to the state would help Bruce's graduates stay in the state and they are high paying jobs.

Rick King noted that this was an interesting concept.

Jack Geller said that data centers are a pretty big business and storage is going down and also the efficiencies. A small indication is the price of thumb drives.

For data centers, 50% of their operating cost is power, so we have an advantage in that we do not have the high cooling costs, but need the infrastructure. If it turns out that we are as wired as we think we are, this may be a good idea.

Steve Cawley noted that about 1 ½ years ago, Minnesota was listed as the most cost effective place in the country to build a large data center. Energy costs are important, as are fiber infrastructure, storage type; had discussions about wind energy, stability.

Tom Garrison noted that one of the Eagan's task force surprises were power blips. The issue about redundancy was mentioned by the individual from New York that testified at the telecommunications committee meeting in Eagan. New York has about 6 or 7 spots that could react for redundancy purposes. We don't have that in Minnesota.

Rick King noted that when Thomson Reuters announced that it was looking at locations for data centers, 4 of the surrounding states sent economic development proposals, most including tax waivers for extended periods of time and incentives for sales tax deferrals, etc. Iowa development people were here two or three weeks ago roaming around the state. When we surveyed places for the company, the most attractive is the power cost which is decent In Minnesota. Connectivity is good. People (employees) want to live here. Our facility is served by Dakota Electric and we do a lot of planning about capacity. We work very closely with them and have never been let down. At the same time, there is a firm in Eden Prairie served by Xcel who went to the city council and they wanted to expand but they can't as they could not get the capacity and reliability that they wanted. Reliable energy is a critical part of this and maybe we have people here like DEED that are interested in pushing forward. As you get into cloud computing, there is an issue of what can we do internally and what can we outsource.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Dan McElroy noted that DEED has had a couple opportunities in conjunction with call centers and we won some and lost some. There have been coalitions between the local power company, the data center, and connectivity. Some want to be in a university area for accessibility to talent. It is interesting that in the neighborhood where Thomson is located, we have a few data centers and it was the confluence of power and connectivity. He is a little concerned that we get distracted from our broadband mission if we stray too far into this area so we may want to consider this a side issue.

Rick King agreed but noted that cloud computing does put a strain on communications networks. There is a totally different dynamic of running these server farms. And data farms may not have the same work force requirements.

Tom Garrison agreed that we do not need to change focus. But we can simply mention that the Public Utilities Commission look into the power requirements. Tom noted that the companies were having problem from Xcel versus Dakota Electric.

Andy Schriener noted that to be fair, if we go down that path, we should let Xcel respond.

Jack Geller agreed with Dan McElroy that this is a side issue. Many more side issues will arise. We can note them as ancillary or adjacent issues that came up in our discussions but that are not our charge to address but that we believed may be worthwhile bringing to the governor and legislators attention.

Dan McElroy asked Jack Geller whether the data he had provided to show broadband penetration by household, computer ownership, age, income, etc., were other states doing this same type of data gathering.

Jack Geller responded that other states come to mind as having contacted him to use his survey instruments, like Iowa, Illinois and Michigan. He allowed them to use his survey instruments and also asked for a copy of their results as it would be nice to compare. He did not get the sense that it was kind of a sustained annual effort in these other states. But now with the other efforts around the rural dimension, like in Kentucky, there may be other states that are doing this.

JoAnne Johnson noted for the record that the state of Iowa does do a survey through the Iowa Utilities Board that tracks telephone companies, cable and wireless through maps. She hopes that Connect Minnesota will deliver that for us. Illinois did do the survey that one time and delivered that information to the broadband deployment council under the lieutenant governor there. Sen. Durbin was instrumental in pushing for data collection efforts at the federal level. Thinking possibly that it will depend a lot on who is doing the pushing.

Jack Geller stated that the PEW Internet and American Life Cycle Study did their first study a few years ago just looking at rural America, but they have not sustained it. Their rural studies are a little hit and miss. What Jack has found is adoption in rural MN matches up with the overall national picture. Our metro area is adopting at higher rates than the national average

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



and rural is adopting faster than rural America as a whole. We are slightly ahead, but not leaders of the pack, but we are not backwater either.

Steve Cawley noted that one of the things we should think about is if cloud computing is the future, dial-up won't support it.

Jack Geller indicated that he was speaking at a national convention and one state legislator he spoke with said his state had a program to subsidize deployment of broadband but they did not have a broadband threshold. The FCC is not changing their definition. He does think that we should address the threshold connection speeds for wireless, residential use, telecommuting, etc. We should help policymakers understand where we are at, are we ahead, are we behind.

Dan McElroy agreed. But the threshold today will not be the threshold tomorrow.

Jack Geller responded that the bar is constantly moving forward. Remember when realtors would upload all of their new home listings as they went out the door at the end of the day because they knew it would take an hour or more to upload.

Rick King reminded the task force that last meeting we heard about historical perspectives from Steve Kelley, and the fundamentals of broadband from Mike O'Connor and Bret Swanson, and then about Internet2 from Myron Lowe. Rick asked if there was anything the task force would like to discuss from any of these presentations.

Tom Garrison asked about the importance of educating the public about broadband use, computer use and whether Jack saw anything from the data whether targeting assistance to get people a computer or training would be helpful.

Jack Geller indicated that it wasn't in the data that he gathered but that there is some evidence. It is in a different set of data collected by the Blandin Foundation. Blandin identifies communities and those communities are given a certain amount of funding to do essentially education. He was to grab a baseline of the community before the grant and afterward to do a post evaluation study and compare that to see how the numbers changed. He compared that rise to other communities to see if the targeted communities had a greater increase in computer penetration and broadband use. Based on that evaluation, there is some evidence that educating on the applications of broadband helps increase use. Those that use it know what they can and can't do with it. People on dial-up understand what is on the internet and what they aren't able to access. But there are folks that don't use the internet at all that need to understand what is there and how you use it to decide whether to subscribe.

Dick Sjoberg indicated that the Blandin project is called Get Broadband. The approach we took was to get education and government groups together and asked them to imagine a world where everyone had high speed access and tell how it would make things like life, products, customers, etc. better off. Imagine if all students' parents had internet, all the applications that could be used. Arctic Cat was interested in doing employee e-education to keep their employees as sharp as possible and are working locally with the community college to provide. With broadband, they could expand to more universities if they had this access. One more

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



comment, as we talk about the definition for broadband and adjusting the definition of what the FCC has, a broadband application that you have for a household differs from what a service business needs which differs from what a service center needs. Have to watch a trap of where we say "it has to be this" because it might be unrealistic for the general household to afford but the data center might say, are you kidding. Price is a factor. The higher speed you deliver, the higher the cost and you don't want to price people out of the market.

Emmett Coleman was thinking about Jack Geller's study and wanted to know if he gathered information about the computers themselves? His question went to the fact that he had a computer that was 5 years old that had a single processor and he had to buy a new one for the new applications. Do you keep any type of data on what they use?

Jack Geller responded that they don't gather data on the types of computers out there. Most computers are good for 18 to 24 months. We tend not to update computers at home. Speed of the computer at home is going to play a role. Most people do not have an adequate computer. The provider's ability to push speed is ahead of people's computers.

Tim Lovaasen noted that one of his techs said that we could build a fast system, but just because you put a Yugo on the Audubon doesn't mean it will perform better.

JoAnne Johnson noted that we did have Ann Treacy in the room observing the meeting and she is an expert on some of the programs that Blandin runs.

Dan McElroy stated that the fact that there are old machines in the home shouldn't hold us back. We have to be concerned with business capacity and what it needs to be in Minnesota. The equipment is less of an issue on the business side.

Tim Lovaasen reiterated that this is the point Dick Sjoberg made. You have to be aware of the user types and the different speeds needed by each. Building a system is expensive. If we talk about rural systems where there may not be a lot of users, how are you going to structure paying for such a system so that you can deliver adequate speed at the cost they can afford? This goes way back to when we used to assess cost based on value of service. Regulators moved away from value of service pricing because business rates were higher because the value of telephone service was higher to them. This caused business customers to move to a cheaper provider. We have to be cognizant of the change. We are equating broadband to POTs service, but have to do in such a way that they can afford what is being offered. He agrees with what Jack Geller is saying, that the kids are what is going to drive residential usage so getting broadband into schools is what is bringing this out. With schools, parents can use to check what the kids do. What is the fairest way to pay for it?

Jack Geller noted that it is hard to have a policy today when everyone is right. In Eagan, you have many commercial customers that want big pipes now. Look at Dick Sjoberg's service area and some big customers there need the pipe too (like Arctic Cat). Consumers may get the 50 MB pipe but the residential customers only want to pay for 5MB. Everybody is right. You are deploying technology understanding that you may not need more than 5 – 10 MB. Companies

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



are building infrastructure for those that have not been born yet. Public utilities can do that. Private companies cannot.

Emmett Coleman stated that there is a fundamental difference in that a public utility can put in something that isn't going to change down the road, like water pipes have not changed much. But the technology that is being put in by companies for broadband is changing fundamentally before your eyes which is a phenomenal risk and difference.

Jack Geller noted that the general belief is that the demand for bandwidth will be much greater tomorrow than it is today. Maybe what you put out there is, how does the public sector mitigate the risk?

Brent Christensen agreed with Jack Geller and Emmett Coleman. As an interesting aside, using the water pipe example, with things changing so rapidly and demands going up, yesterday the Holy Grail was fiber. He heard of a professor at Clemson University that has developed silicon fiber which has better properties. So the guys who laid fiber yesterday now have obsolete plant. It's like buying donuts; you don't get a better price if you buy 10,000 donuts because you don't need 10,000 donuts. The excess becomes waste. It's just like when the technology bubble burst; even surplus routers bought cheap have limited life. We are on our 5th router in 10 years. He would love to say he replaced it and now will never need to replace it again. Technology is changing so fast, you can't replace and be set. As a provider, you have a strategy to provide the bandwidth when they need it

Steve Cawley would be interested in knowing how a large and small company makes those "bets" based on engineering a network and the investment decisions that have to be made.

Rick King stated that this is what we should hear about at our December meeting.

Steve Cawley noted that how you manage the technology is high risk. You always want to be at that right edge. What can we do for providers to help them?

Bruce Brorson said that an interesting technology trend is the low cost notebooks. They are essentially running web based applications, not hosted applications. This trend appears to be accelerated. While he appreciates the new computers that have great individual power, he would guess that most of us use computers for day-to-day use and are using web based applications. Critical decisions that you will make as a committee

Lunch break from 12:15 to 12:45.

Report Workshop 12:45 to 2:00

Rick King reconvened the group and noted that we need to agree on the layout of the report. There may be some things you may or may not care about. A lot of this has to do with how a writer would get their work done and how we efficiently collect it together. Everything is open to the best way of how to do it. Karen Smith, Tom Garrison, and Rick King were the subgroup that

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



talked about the content and the organization of the overall report: layout, content, chapter design.

We have some slides to focus the discussion. They are meant to guide the discussion and not to prevent the group from raising ideas. If we agree on the layout, how much templating you want, the chapter outlines, then we can actually take a couple individuals and have them start writing the first chapters. We just have to decide what we want to put into the report. We discussed last time that one of the reports that we liked for format/style was from California. The information in the California report “popped” for those that want to look for highlights and for those that wanted to read it word for word, the information was all there. We are spending a lot of time on this and other states that will be reading our report, so we want it to look good. Solidifying this section would be the goal for today. Then the last part of the meeting we’ll discuss future agendas.

Tom Garrison went into the discussion of the report layout. He noted that there are three pieces of information he will be referring to in our packets: content of the report, possible template, and visual example that we will be going through. The body will define the content and how do we visually create something that is aesthetically pleasing to read.

Tom reviewed what was discussed in August in regards to content of the report. We said we wanted an executive summary, a statement of values, cover where we’ve been, where we are today, and where we want to be, to define broadband by functionality, how we are going to get there and then a summary of recommendations. We also said we wanted a glossary. Tom also reviewed a number of reports for what they commonly included; some had acknowledgements, glossaries or definitions.

Tom Garrison referred to the color copy in the packet of information and said that this was an attempt by a graphic designer as to what our report could look like. It shows the challenge section, recommendations and the why. Depending on the section you write, you might have statistics in a graphic form. If there was a key quote or point made, highlight it and then a next steps section.

Tom showed PDF example. Something to think about as you go along and write the sections, flag those items as important. It is important to source our data. Felt we should have a title page, legislation page, member’s listed, and an executive summary, all up front.

In general we would give you a style guide and you could follow the conventions used in that guide. For example, the standard format for using an acronym. We can go one of two avenues. We can say give it back to us in this font or we could develop a template for you to enter the information into. Providing a template that assembles in a way that is closer to publishing.

Rick King asked if the organization of the report was ok and if it made sense.

Dan McElroy suggested putting the executive summary first before legislative charge and to put the list of task force members at the end.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



Jack Geller said that there is oftentimes value in creating a standalone document that is the executive summary. We could put it up front. Certainly this will be on the web and readers should be able to just download the executive summary.

Dan McElroy noted that the legislative auditor creates three versions of reports. First, a 2 page summary. Also, a 12 page or so more in depth paper, and then the full report.

Rick King agreed with moving the executive summary forward and to move members between the glossary and the footnotes.

JoAnne Johnson questioned why we are moving the members to the end. She thinks people would want to know upfront who created the report. In typical reports you have the standard title page and then the authors, then the table of contents, executive summary, and then the chapters. Comments from the chair can be at the front or back. She thinks the executive summary is likely to be printed out and distributed more so than the full report.

Vijay Singh noted that when you look at the legislative charge, it indicates who is going to be represented on the task force, so it follows to have the members listed at the front.

Tom Garrison stated that something you don't see in the handout is that one state report had recommendations up front summarized by topic and then cited to page numbers in the report.

Peg Werner noted that in looking through the chapter suggestions, one thing that has come up is who is going to run the network. People can get broadband any of the different ways and we have to say how the network is going to get there.

Rick King responded that it should be an outgrowth of one of the recommendations.

Peg Werner said it has to be an actual recommendation. The legislature can't deal with that.

Rick King said we need to be specific in recommendations. If a chapter is going to lay out, for example, that we are asking for a change in tax policy to facilitate that, we laid out the problem, and what is a recommendation to solve that problem and what everyone agreed to. We would say in the recommendation what we expect the legislation to do.

Dan McElroy indicated that the same holds for the content of the report. If I look at item 2 c under framework, is it fair to say we want to include what surrounding states are doing. If I were a legislator that is one of the first questions I would ask. And then under the data mapping project, we will have the economic overlay (per capita income, household income) as they overlay broadband availability. We'll have the data if we want to include it in the report.

Rick King thought the point about including information on surrounding states was good.

Mike O'Connor noted that he thought we had some things scrambled. We might want to step back from 1 – 8 and lay them out in an action plan format.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Brent Christensen wanted to know about dissenting opinions and how will they be incorporated.

Tom Garrison noted that you could have them in each chapter or they could be at the end of the report. It is really the will of the group.

Rick King thought it may depend on how much dissent there is and how big the divide. If a great many of the recommendations were split, we could create a minority report. If only a few, maybe you would want to note by the recommendations so it was clear they were not unanimous.

JoAnne Johnson said we could note dissent in the discussion under each chapter. Keep it small and have it included in a box and longer discussion in an endnote.

Tom Garrison said either way is probably doable.

Rick King noted that Mike's point is something that needs to be looked at. We probably need another step at this. We might need another couple people to join Tom.

Mike O'Connor said that rather than depart from the legislation is to have where are we now, where we want to be, how are we going to get there under each one of the eight items.

Jack Geller said that for him, it's a lot easier when you talk about recommendations, there are different types of recommendations, some are conceptual, some are strategic. If we stick to strategic recommendations, it seems to him that it is a little bit easier to have a flow. We are not only saying what should be done, but how it should be done.

JoAnne Johnson indicated that she is having a little bit of difficulty visualizing how the content will come together. She is thinking that it might be easier if it were broken into communities of interest areas, like speed, reliability, differences, education, business, residential. Whatever we can up with as appropriate targets and then use the points from the legislation that would be used to meet that application. This would be rather than talk about all of the eight points together. We want it to be readable and narrative. Is the idea that there will be one chapter for each of the 8 points rather than 8 points in each chapter?

Tom Garrison wasn't sure that the legislation helps you with the topics for the chapters. He would want to work towards getting realistic, chapter friendly headings. Need to do a better job of getting from the legislation to the chapters.

Rick King said he didn't think the idea was to use the legislative heading as the topics for the chapters. We should get to where we want to be and embedded in that you have to address the charge. The letter items are the chapter headings under the outline provided.

Peg Werner said it was helpful to indicate that the letter items are the chapters. Then make the subchapters under letter D and address those legislative items.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Rick King asked if what Peg was suggesting was to start with the letter as the broad chapter. Underneath say where we want to be, under that there are topical areas (rural, metro, education). There was agreement from JoAnne and Peg that that is what was meant.

Rick King said that makes a more natural breakdown of who will author what because they have a natural understanding.

Brent Christensen asked if we really want to talk about where we have been. How much history do we want to include. He can see the where we are and where we want to be.

Rick King said he thought the history was important to set our where we might have been innovators. Breadth wise, this would be a briefer piece than where we are or want to be. It's important to bring people up to the same baseline of information we heard the last time.

JoAnne Johnson agreed that it's good to have a starting point and what we have been able to do so far. There are a lot of people that have done a lot of good things. She is envisioning two to two-and-a-half pages so there is a reference point.

Tom Garrison asked if it would be a distillation of what we have heard in the presentations. The most essential thing is to how we got to where we are today.

Jack Geller agreed that there is value in knowing the history. His experience with legislators is that they want to know where we are at in the context of are we national leaders or national laggards, where we are at relative to our competitors. He's not sure we have the data or know where adjacent states are at. Where we are at and the context and references to our competitors serves as a ground for your recommendations as you know.

Peg Werner noted that the other obvious point is that including the history will establish the creditability of the report. We did our research, we did our homework.

Joe Schindler said that even if we do not have a comparison for other states, it is good to have information about the Border States. Going to the sector issue, he said he would be reading the healthcare section, so agree with that breakdown.

Brent Christensen agreed with breaking out by sectors.

Ann Losby asked a clarifying question, what are we combining or are we repeating.

Joe Schindler said different sectors may be at different points in the continuum.

Rick King said that the piece about how we will get there may also need the sector breakout as well as the where we are section.

Andy Schriener said that on the 8 points, the legislature is looking for answers to the questions they asked. He thinks the report needs to contiguously address those.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Rick King and Tom Garrison agreed. We could do both.

Brent Christensen asked if that wouldn't be the executive summary.

Rick King said that we were envisioning a chart. That could be a separate deliverable. If everyone is happy with the notion of the topical areas, he would recommend that we commission a group to write the history. He believes the history will add something to it. Does the framework make sense? Is it good enough to go on?

Jack Geller said that the 8 points are written in the law. Is the defining framework around the 8 fundamental items or is the framework around the topical areas of application. Maybe you have an eloquent way of wrapping around them, but Jack couldn't put it together in his head.

Rick King responded that if we wrote about where we are today and where we want to be by sectors, and we have to identify the sectors, and we are cognizant of the 8 points, do we tease it all out later or are we at different points on each of the 8 areas. By shooting for a singular goal, we may not get it. But writing how to get there for education v. healthcare, do we mix them or do we have different polices for different segments. He didn't have the answer to this yet.

Jack Geller asked if we are trying to write the business plan for healthcare in Minnesota, business in Minnesota, etc. or are we trying to focus on the telecommunications infrastructure understanding that there are different speeds needed for different types of uses or is there an elegant way to meld together.

Mike O'Connor said that the outline may be better than we thought it was. If you look at section "e" that may be the place where we talk about broadband by function. Put the sectors there. Take the numbered ones under d. and see which ones fit into where we want them to be and move some to f. if needed. Legislation is jumbled but we need to put it back together.

Jack Geller said he could put his head around that but need to address by sector.

Mike O'Connor said we could do by sector, but there may be a lot of repeating. Maybe we put e. ahead of d.

Tom Garrison said that Rick's point earlier is that one of the things that will happen is we'll organize when we see it.

Rick asked Mike what he was suggesting; divide it out by the functional areas?

Mike O'Connor said that all of the functional items have a category. He would like to use e. to get into the different sectors.

Rick King asked if that would allow for different goal needs by different areas.

Mike O'Connor said he thinks we'll wind up at tiers of speed or capability.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Jack Geller said if, in fact, we have followed the model that you are talking about, it may help people think about what they may based on the functional realities. Maybe it turns out you do not have a hospital in your area, it may think about the metrics of what is needed.

Dan McElroy asked if we should include what it would take to diagnose in various areas.

Emmett Coleman noted that there is a breakout in some of these as to whether it is a public function or a private function. Education is almost exclusively a public function.

Craig Taylors said that all areas have a residential and business component.

Dan McElroy said that Emmett raises what is public. Many legislators would argue that healthcare has a public purpose.

Emmett Coleman said that economic development is a public purpose but the success or failure of an individual company is private.

Jack Geller said that the numbers showed that people 65 and older and the poor are not on the internet. Yet if you talk about tele-health functions to ensure that they can stay a longer time in their home, the very population that is least likely to adopt the technology may be the population that is now most likely to adopt the technology. When you lose your job that is a private issue. Now when the unemployment rate is so high, it becomes a public issue. The private/public policy gets blurred.

Emmett Coleman asked if it becomes a function of this task force that pushing out the technology to a developed city is one issue, but pushing it out to a rural farmstead when a private company may not believe it will get a return on investment. A private company may not feel it is profitable to do that. If someone lives on a farm in Northern Minnesota, and they want to die there, we may not want to draw the line there.

Rick King said that what would be useful in terms of establishing the outline is for a few people to work with Tom Garrison and try to work on what we have here and come back to the group with a revised organization. We could flush out here or have the sub group do it but he doesn't think we are that far off. On how we fold in the sectors, we have heard ideas that seem to work. Whether it is a good idea to have us focus on specific areas or to take a broader approach is what Mike is recommending, while Peg and JoAnne are taking the more specific approach. We agree we have to specifically address the legislative issues. We'll have a separate chart and can include in the chapters. Rick noted that there was agreement.

Brent Christensen said he would be willing to assist.

Mike O'Connor also volunteered.

Rick King said that the charge for the subgroup is to come back with an organization scheme for the chapters so we can finalize next time.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Robyn West said she was having a side conversation with Mike McDermott on where we put how we will pay for this.

Mike McDermott said that is the \$64,000 question. You can make recommendations all day long but if you don't know how it is going to get paid for, it won't happen.

Rick King said that the subgroup is setting up a framework. We want to start to write something that is not controversial. We still have to discuss how we will pay of it. Schema is supposed to fit all, the subgroup will come back. How do you feel about the organizational handout, refer to handout for rough framework along with style? Other points? Good discussion, better to talk about before we write. Anything missing or that got lost that the subgroup needs to be aware of?

Myron Lowe said that the challenge that comes to him is how much do we include that is relevant and significant so that it gives it credibility. He would rather have us include examples of how broadband will address those issues, and a plan and recommendations. Have a strong emphasis of conclusion.

Jack Ries asked if there was a section for where we include what other states are doing, would that go in section C.

Rick King noted that Karen Smith, Mike O'Connor, Brent Christensen, & Tom Garrison will be the subgroup.

Rick King noted that that group will work the style, formatting, etc. If you look at a and b, we could have a volunteer or a couple to take a stab at writing one of those sections.

Mike O'Connor said he will help with the history. Brent Christensen said he will work with Mike. This section is not intended to get done prior to the next meeting.

Jack Geller noted that there are a lot of resources represented around the table. When the whole thing was going on in 1998 or 1997 there was a lot of history in the state building out. He thought the Department of Commerce has an enormous archive. There are a lot of helping hands. The state has not been quiet on this.

Rick King asked Diane Wells to be part of the team and report on that for Commerce. That would be something we'd target two months away for the draft.

The other group that Rick thought might be useful would be a group that might have taken a look at the state reports. Could some of the people that have taken a look at the other state reports come back with some of the stronger statements made and use that to kindle a discussion? And whether there are strong advantages of one report over another. We have not put a real emphasis on discussing. This might be good for the January meeting. Would people like to get together? Volunteers were JoAnne Johnson, Jack Ries, John Gibbs (suggested by Emmett Coleman) and Mike O'Connor. JoAnne is the organizer.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Tom Garrison asked if the goal is to pull out the best information.

Rick King indicated that they will verbally cliff note those reports for us.

JoAnne Johnson said that they will share everyone's conclusion and the salient points from each report.

Rick King noted that the group would bring things back like best practices. January would be a good time to discuss the results.

Mike O'Connor asked about authors for section A., Statement of Values.

Rick King suggested we leave that for another meeting unless a couple people want to volunteer.

Jack Geller noted that Statement of Value was an essential discuss, including values about public and private, ubiquity, from that discussion we hopefully define consensus.

Mike O'Connor stated we need to have this sooner rather than later.

Tom Garrison noted that everyone has values that they would like to see discussed. Maybe someone could compile a list?

Rick King asked members to think about the values that we are going to hold and what is important to you and send them to Diane Wells.

Rick King wanted to get back to talking about the schedule. He noted that the provider presentation subgroup had met regarding the portion of the agenda they were sponsoring for December. That subgroup included Brent Christensen, JoAnne Johnson, Dick Sjoborg, John Gibbs, Andy Schriener and they had talked about provider presentations with 3 panels of 40 minutes each.

Brent Christensen indicated that they were proposing for the morning that we have 3 panels, telco, wireless, cable, of 40 minutes each and they can divide up their own time. Than 60 minutes for a speaker that can give the big picture and tie the panels together.

Rick King noted that John Gibbs had indicated that the speaker for the hour long presentation would be an academic. We've said yes to the subgroups plan and this will take the majority of the December meeting. If we do have a piece of that time available, we can schedule something. Probably not enough time for the statement of values, but let's try to get those to Diane Wells by December 9, which is ten days before the next meeting.

Dan McElroy asked if there was some point where we need to propose someone that we would like to come in and talk about satellite, or some new things.

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Brent Christensen stated that the charge for providers is to cover where we are and where we are going.

JoAnne Johnson noted Frontier is doing point to point wireless stuff and Brent Christensen's company sells Wild Blue (satellite) so that will be covered.

Rick King stated that if we want to cover some of the other technologies, like broadband over power line, we can bring them in. For January, the afternoon session is still ok for K-12 education to come and talk. If we agree, Peg Werner can confirm with the presenters. Rick noted that he would like to reserve one time slot in January to discuss the report and maybe January would be a good time to include the discussion of values.

Peg Werner noted she was ok with this.

Mike McDermott stated that he and Andy Schriener had talked and they are looking for someone to come in from Washington to talk about 3G. Once confirmed, he'll get back to Andy.

Rick King said that this will take us through January. For February, we are hearing from Brent Legg from Connected Nation. Maybe we will also have some economic factor information by then from the Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED). Are there other items? He mentioned that one document that was distributed that we have not talked about is the Obama broadband handout and what kinds of opportunities there may be from the impact of the new administration. We should be cognizant of what is going on as there may be something that opens up briefly that we may want to comment to the legislature or Governor about.

Andy Schreiner asked that if we have documents like this, can we have authors and sources.

Rick King stated that yes, we will source. The handout on the Obama positions was prepared by Carlos Seoane and is a compilation of statements he found.

Tom Garrison indicated that as the new team is named, there may be an opportunity to get someone's name as a point person on the technology.

Brent Christensen noted that it is more relevant to us is what is going on with the FCC. They are making some broadband policy decisions.

Rick King asked about the color mock-up of the report that had been distributed. What do we think? Are we ok with what it looks like? Rick noted that the task force agreed.

Rick King said there was one more thing we should talk about, and that is, a couple times we have heard people say that we should move the task force meetings around the state and we hear different purposes for doing this. Steve Cawley and others are looking at the teleconferencing option, so we are still working on this. Do people think we should move our meetings around? If so, what reasons? If we move the meetings around, we should have a good purpose for doing so. Thoughts?

**Unapproved Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 14, 2008**



Jack Geller said that as the rural guy on the task force, it's a no brainer. We are trying to create a statewide strategy so we need statewide buy in. But where is the guy from Halstad, pick the region. We need to give people around the state the idea that we want input rather than just get on the internet. When we say we have a statewide concern, it is a time honored tradition to go out. It has worked in the past. There is a concern around the state, we should give them the opportunity just to sit and listen. We know it is a big state and we know it is hard to get around to all of it.

Rick King suggested we go around the room and let each task force member address the question of moving the meetings around to outstate areas.

Myron Lowe said that what he can relate to is that there is broad statewide Internet2 participation. This would not have happened if it were not for the start in Bemidji.

JoAnne Johnson said that, like Jack, she is a rural MN booster. She spent over 20 years living in Lake Park. There is a different environment in rural Minnesota than here in the metro. As she looks around the table, there are people here that drive for hours to get here. It's only fair that some of us hop in our car to go to the meetings too. It's also good public relations, and good public policy. We could make a good showing by having one in Fergus Falls.

Tim Lovaasen noted that he has no problem going to Fergus Falls. If we go outstate, it would be good if we had something for them or more discussion on the direction that we are heading.

Peg Werner said that if we meet outstate, we would try to make it a real event.

Kim Ross noted that Fergus Falls is a long way from Houston. He also said that about 75 percent of the school districts are not metro districts and about 50 % of legislators are not metro. In the rural area, our survival is dependant upon participating so we are here.

Andy Schriener agreed that we should go out. In the room observing are all members of the public that are insiders. If going out to rural Minnesota, might want to look at regional media centers so that there is more publicity to get the word out.

Jack Geller indicated he said his piece already, but if you really want to make a statement, hold it in Red Lake or White Earth.

Craig Taylor agreed that the locations should be in regional centers.

Jack Ries said that this brings back some good ideas when he traveled around the state with Dean Barkley under the Ventura administration. They held ten town hall meetings around the state. Greater Minnesota would be interested in hearing what the landscape is looking at from the provider's perspective, but not sure you were looking at this for the next meeting.

Dick Sjoberg agreed with moving the meetings around and noted that Fergus Falls is only 2.5 hours away and there is no rush hour there.

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



Tom Garrison had a couple of thoughts occur to him. He is respectful of people who have been traveling and doing this on their own dime since the legislature has not giving us funding to go out. It is important to go out there but there are some different approaches. When the legislature goes out, it is usually just a few of them. There may be a divide and concur strategy to be able to take. Also, Jack Ries raises a good point, are we there to listen to their needs or inform them. Are there statewide conferences that get people here anyway that enable us to get the word out. That is another way to get rural feedback.

Mike O'Connor said he didn't have a lot to add to what Tom said other than we need to know what in the world we are trying to do. We are a working task force trying to come up with recommendations. He is not sure how this would fit into the flow of our work. He is fine with going on the road but not sure he knows why we are going on the road other than good PR.

Joe Schindler said that coming from a trade association, a hospital group, we go out three or four times a year. It's to gather information. If we do this, we can invite legislators and we could start building that support

Brent Christensen noted that our constituency is the legislature. If we can go to their back yards, then we get some more credibility from legislators.

Vijay Sethi strongly believes that there should be some meetings in Greater Minnesota. It is good for rural legislators and counties that we go out there. There should be some local knowledge that we will be there or publicity. If there is a cost issue, we could use ITV as a supplement. If you are going to outstate areas, for example, in Moorhead there is a lot of activity so there could be a presentation on what is being done locally.

Dan McElroy agrees that we should get out but the question is when and for what purpose. Do you go out in February and March or do you go out in June and present recommendations and get feedback. We should take the advice to go out to areas that have TV coverage, Duluth, St. Cloud.

Emmett Coleman noted that if the desire is to have legislators there, you should not hold the meetings in Greater Minnesota during the legislative session.

Peg Werner said she doesn't think it matters between Moorhead and Fergus Falls, we will get the Moorhead television stations to cover the meetings. It is important that the legislators are invited. Hold the meeting and let people attend, which might be better in March, April, May. She thinks we should have an actual meeting and we will need businesses and citizens behind this.

Ring King said from his point of view it is a good idea to get around the state but the purpose has to be clear. Our work is to get a report written, so he doesn't think we actually do formal listening sessions. Public relations are important and we should do it. If we go somewhere for the regular meetings, we may want to lengthen the public comment section, but otherwise we would not modify the meeting much. That would mean this would be the whole group in attendance. If we are going to do more listening then it is special meetings in order to meet our timeline for getting the report done. We can meet wherever we want and do the work there; we

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



accomplish public relations and inviting the legislators. In order to do this, it would need to be after session. Rick indicated he wouldn't mind if we picked two places and a volunteer to chair getting all of the arrangements made for that location for us to meet there.

Jack Geller agreed with what Dan McElroy said, crafting recommendations and then getting the opportunity to solicit feedback is not a bad idea. If we do that during the summer, it gives people a sense as to what we are trying to do and where we are trying to go. It means we can stay close to home to get our work done and then go out. Often someone in rural Minnesota may ask you a question that can cause you to rethink an issue. He is a little uncomfortable with going to a crowd that is already gathered. The people that would then get to see us and hear us are those that paid \$100 to do so as part of a conference. Being on a panel is fine but not if the idea is to have a public meeting as part of a conference.

Rick King asked if we could have some of our greater Minnesota folks think of somewhere to meet in June, July, and/or August and think of two or three places. Visibility and being in someone's district is helpful to us.

Myron Lowe indicated that when he held a meeting in Bemidji, they worked directly with the people in the area.

Rick King suggested we lean on those from Greater Minnesota and after the locations are picked, select one person to handle all of the logistics for a location, so that would be two or three volunteers. Have them make sure others know we are coming. Can we ask Peg Werner to head up the outstate group to select the locations for summer. Will have a regular meeting, but by doing this in the summer months may have something to share at that time. Are people ok with looking at this?

Peg Werner noted that she is ok with taking this on.

Jodie Miller, from MACTA, indicated that community cable would be happy to be involved in hosting a meeting where cameras are already available.

Emmett Coleman indicated that once the locations are selected, he would be happy to work with Jodie Miller to see if a local cable site is available. He also wanted to ensure there were no issues with state employees on or serving the task force being able to attend outstate meetings due to cost considerations.

Rick King asked for other comments. There were none.

Tom Garrison made a motion to adjourn. Approved. Meeting adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

Anne Losby's flip-chart notes.

- Recommendation to create a standalone Executive Summary document
- In terms of the sequence of sections, move the Executive Summary to the front of the report
- Recommendations should be actionable

Unapproved Meeting Minutes Friday, November 14, 2008



- Outline what we expect the Legislature to do
- How are we going to get there
- Include a section on what other states (our competitors) are doing
- Include data from the Mapping Report
- Include a summary of the dissenting view within each chapter – expand upon the dissenting view later in the report, if appropriate
- Consider dividing section “e” – Define broadband needs by functionality – into Education, Healthcare, Business, Residential, Govt, etc.
- Consider addressing the 8 points from the legislation within the “letters”. For example “#1. Identification of the level of broadband service, including connection speeds...” could be included under section “e –needs by function”; “#5. An evaluation and recommendation of the security, vulnerability, and redundancy actions...” could be included under section “d-goals”
- Consider organizing the report by tiers of need
- Chapter Outline
 - 1 – Where we’ve been – a brief history – distillation of presentations
 - First draft assigned to Mike O, JoAnne J, and Diane W
 - 2 – Where we are today – be sure to include the context of where we stand relative to our border states
 - 3 – Where we want to be – perhaps organize this section by functional sectors
 - 4 – How are we going to get there?
- Consider bringing all the recommendations back together under the framework of the 8 Legislative items (towards the end of the report)