

Panelists:

Jim Northrup ✓
Catharine Rice ✓
Doug Noell ✓
Earl McKee ✓
Kathy Zopfi ✓
Sally Kadle ✓
Sally Greene ✓
Todd Broucksou ✓
Keith Conover ✓
Terri Buckner ✓
Anna Richards
Vasu Kilaru
Victoria
Patricia Hull ✓
Travis Myren ✓
Paul Cardillo ✓
James Bryan ✓
Ryan Miller – OC Public Schools ✓

Attendee:

Timothy Paul ✓
Jason Barile ✓

ACTION ITEMS:

- JNorthrup to send email afterward to let Task Force know status
- JNorthrup to put together a short schedule/timeline of what it will look like from the 15th and going forward
- JBryan to put together a “rule book” of how things have to go once responses are receive

DRAFT AGENDA December 8, 2021 @ 5:30 PM AGENDA

5:30 PM Welcomes and introductions - Greene/McKee
5:33 PM Approve Minutes (Nov 3, 2021) - Greene/McKee/Group
5:35 PM RFP Evaluation Criteria Discussion - Greene/Mckee/Bryan
5:50 PM Infrastructure Bill and General Update on Grants - Rice
6:00 PM Timing of Fixed Wireless Option - Greene/McKee
6:30 PM Adjourn

Welcomes and Introductions – Commissioner Greene

Approve minutes (Nov 3, 2021) – minutes are approved

RFP Evaluation Criteria Discussion - Greene/McKee/Bryan – Catharine: she and Terri put together the scoring on the categories (thanks to Terri for the work on the substrate); lets you determine if information you asked for was provided; discusses scoring; Terri: idea was to standardize the scoring process; PH: section 4, I & J – wasn’t clear on distinction; CR: did they provide info we requested and did

they answer our question; TM: scores assigned 10/5/0; EM: when are RFP's due? 12/14/2021; JN: Jovana is looking to make sure that we receive 3 bids – assuming we get 3 bids, Jovana will tell us who the 3 bidders are; will tell us if we had enough bids to open and to begin processing them; will then pass vendor info to us and can begin the process; SG: what if we have fewer than 3?; JB: for BB not a 3 bidder requirement but for ARPA funds may have different requirements. ACTION: JN to send email afterward to let TF know status; EM: asks someone to outline the process; JN: Jovana opens bids in public bid opening, assuming we have 3 she opens and sees if they're qualified and complete, then she will hand it over to Jim, he asked how long this process will take and she said fairly quickly (Jim thinks that means ~a week) so will then be able to meet to begin ranking them, doesn't think it needs to be done in front of a public meeting; TM: because Task Force is a public body, if we do want to score in closed session, have to limit # of people (staff, Catharine (paid consultant) and 1 member of Task Force); Todd: would like to participate no matter when meeting is; JN: any public meeting would require posting agenda 48 hours before meeting; SG: what are drawbacks to having scoring in public forum?; CR: when things are out in public, things are exposed and if have an unhappy vendor, they will try to learn everything possible to use to their advantage; Terri: doesn't object to one TF member being there, why can't we have 2 members (would meet the "less than majority" rule); JB: less than a majority would not count as a "meeting of the body" but appointing 2 members becomes a subcommittee; PH: can TF see the result and have an email exchange or would that still qualify as a meeting; JB: constitutes a "virtual meeting"; TM: can everyone see the proposals?; JB: as soon as someone reads them, they become public record so everyone would be able to read them; CR: closed session could be less chaotic, go through scoring process before making the proposals public; DN: is there such a thing as a closed session for this type of committee?; JB: school board has closed session for certain types of issues (personnel, for example); Terri: how many staff and what staff? Can Doug be on the committee (because he's a school employee)? ; JB: no, must be a county staff member; what about Keith Conover?; SG: designated members eligible to be selected as person participating in RFP evaluation meeting; JB: yes, one of them could participate; Terri: 5 appointed members, 5 other members so only one person from both groups could represent TF in RFP evaluation meeting?; JB: yes; JN: if Travis didn't sit on evaluation committee, Jim would be able to consult with Travis; Todd: all TF members want to see results of RFP (not just one that's chosen), no need for TF to meet again until all submissions are available to be reviewed; SG: want to have Glen Knox meet with us next Weds to get more info on fixed wireless solution since we're going to need to pursue that sooner rather than later; EM: may have funding source available for fixed wireless solution; CR: have we established for certain that we need 3 bids to move forward? ; JN: no, waiting to hear final answer from James and Jovana later this week; Terri: go over process – receive proposals, Jovana does her check, first pass review to reduce # of sub-finalists (only if more than 3), someone needs to call references – who does this – TF or staff?, wants to make sure everyone understands that checking references is a time consuming process; JN: didn't understand that references would be called at that point in time, thought reference checking would happen after responses were narrowed down; TM: instead of calling references, could have face-to-face interview; CR: on #8, points are incorporated in our totals; could change evaluation sheet if we wanted; SG: all agreed to only have 1 TF member in RFP Evaluation meeting, proposes that EM and SG huddle to decide on TF member recommendation; EM: who's interested? – Todd, Paul – accept nominations?; SG: welcome nominations but reserve the right to make the final decision; Paul and Todd nominate Terri; Terri declines and would like to see someone with more technical expertise; Doug (school employee so doesn't count as "staff"); SG and EM as elected officials (EM doesn't think he should be an RFP Evaluation member because doesn't have technical expertise, SG feels the same); review committee is Catharine, Jim and one TF member; PH: nominates Todd; Terri: wants to make sure committee understands that we want a community partner (not just the lowest price), Todd agrees and is motivated as a resident with inadequate internet; motion and a second for Todd, Todd accepts the

responsibility; EM: have subcommittee set, will get RFP's 12/14, meet on 15th, subcommittee will meet after Christmas?; TM: can roll schedule as soon as possible assuming all attendees are available; JN: evaluation will yield 1 or 2 qualified respondents then references will need to be checked; Terri: can do first pass before the new year but likely 2022 before Task Force can meet again; EM: once responses hit the street, county residents are going to expect a quick response; JN: ACTION: can put together a short schedule/timeline of what it will look like from the 15th and going forward; Terri: when she did interviews, she invited stakeholders to meet the interviewees so can learn more about them before final selection has been made; EM: ACTION: asks James to put together a "rule book" of how things have to go once responses are received...so participants understands rules.; JN/JB will put together a summary of "rules" and a timeline

Infrastructure Bill and General Update on Grants – Rice: infrastructure bill passed \$60+ identified for BB, about \$42 will go to NTIA, money goes to the states who then fan the money out, (\$1 billion for middle mile projects); NC legislature has pinched off some of the funds – redirected to GREAT grants, budget has legislative elements in it one that raises speed to 25/3 but only in certain areas, ~~if area is eligible for ARPA funds, then no longer eligible for GREAT grant. Even with ARPA funds, ~a billion dollars may just sit on the table.~~ Budget legislation says that if an area has been earmarked for any state or federal broadband funds it is not eligible for Great or CAB grants. Pinched off eligibility terms could be that \$700 million in State ARPA funds could sit on the table.

Will take a while for federal money to be issued, can't be issued until FCC comes out with new maps; money will be divvied up based on need of NC un/under-served areas ***compared*** to other states – maybe by 2023, wait and see. Nate Denny has good ideas so is hopeful that he'll be able to play with some of the funds. Treasure Dept says as long as we serve some homes that don't have access to 25/3 you can serve all homes. Going to take a lot of time to flesh out. Todd: lawsuit over FCC mapping could slow down the process.

Adjourn – Terri moves to adjourn, all in favor - 6:55 pm