

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 Deaton
Patricia Hull ✓
Travis Myren
Paul Cardillo ✓
James Bryan
Glenn Knox ✓
Erica Bryant ✓
Ryan Miller – OC Public Schools ✓

Attendees:

Jason Barile ✓
Katie Loovis ✓

ACTION ITEMS:

- JN: ask Todd McGee if we can notify folks and tell them that we're planning to have meetings but given the pandemic, could be short notice
- JN: ask Todd McGee can we go ahead and put announcement out saying we're going to have listening sessions as soon as it's safe to have in public again
- VictoriaD: forward notes to Jim to share with group
- SBK: correct minutes of 15December2021 meeting to include SG disclaimer regarding RFP
DONE
- Terri: talk to OpenBB to get installed customer info

DRAFT AGENDA January 12, 2022 @ 5:30 PM AGENDA

5:30 PM Welcomes and introductions - Greene/McKee
5:33 PM Approve Minutes (Dec 15, 2021) - Greene/McKee/Group
5:35 PM RFP Responses Update - Myren/Northrup
5:40 PM Neighborhood Listening Sessions / Ag Summit Agendas - Greene/McKee/Buckner
6:25 PM Old Business / New Business
6:30 PM Adjourn

DRAFT AGENDA January 12, 2021 @ 5:30 PM AGENDA

Welcomes and Introductions – Greene/McKee

Approve Minutes (Dec 15, 2021) – Greene/McKee/Group – Terri/Paul move and second with addition of Commissioner Greene’s disclaimer (get from recording)

RFP Responses Update – Myren/Northrup – evaluation team met twice; each member independently ranked 4 proposals and discussed; finalized ranking sheets and notes; approved report – “Evaluation team met twice since the last Task Force meeting – early January and today. Each member of the team independently ranked the four proposals. Today’s meeting was a consolidation of those rankings and discussion. The finalized ranking sheets and notes are to be or were collected and logged by staff. There may be some additional questions that the evaluation team members want to ask of the vendors or of themselves among the committee before coming to a final ranking or recommendation .” Terri: thought the next phase was interviewing the finalists; JN: based on looking at RFP, not a consensus from the evaluation committee to move into an interview to immediately assume that we were going to be doing interviews or any other type of interview. Some of us had questions and we were going to look at the questions and then after we saw the questions decide on whether or not we needed to have an in person follow-up or some sort of other type of follow-up. So we haven’t finished our ranking process to even get to that point. The ranking team had some other questions but we didn’t know what all those questions were when we finished our meeting today. And we wanted to get all of those questions together to have a discussion around those questions to decide if interviews were necessary based on the merits of the RFP that we already received. Does that clarify it? Terri: Yes, sounds like you’re doing interviews as part of the ranking process. If you talk to them you are interviewing them. JN: were going to see if there were questions we could forward to make some clarifications on the RFP that already met the criteria that we had, don’t need to ask questions of all 4 but there were respondents that we might have questions for; just making recommendations, the committee can tell us what to do; at the end of our process we can bring it back to this committee or at least let our chairs know what’s going on; CR: we made some significant progress and some outstanding questions we may need answered so will either not send the questions once we talk about them or send them via email or call the folks in for a short interview; JN: questions might warrant a larger actual discussion and that point we would look at the process; Terri your help on the evaluation and how to evaluate was extremely helpful; everyone used that to process the way they responded

Neighborhood Listening Sessions / Ag Summit Agendas – Greene/McKee/Buckner SG: went back to colleagues and general consensus was that they were a good idea; know that holding listening sessions wasn’t exclusively in the charge of this Task Force but just to be on safe side; EM: agrees; some questions we haven’t thought about may come up in listening sessions – need to include listening sessions just for outreach to community; we’ve been at this for ~9 months now so starting to have questions and being asked to speak to groups so would be beneficial; if questions asked that have yet to be discussed can note them and discuss with team; SG – can’t meet in person yet; doesn’t want to hold meetings if can’t be in person; outreach is most important; play it by ear to when we can hold in person; EM: same as what he’s getting in feedback because those we’re trying to help won’t be able to participate via Zoom; any other ideas?; CR: could meet via telephone; JN: Ag Summit moving to virtual, have set up area at Bonnie B. Davis center where can participate via Zoom; PC: is there a way to consolidate into fewer sessions and set up more locations where smaller groups can meet in safer environment; EM: hybrid may work out for folks that don’t have access to Zoom; or by phone; JN: no presentations at Ag Center, just Zoom meeting on screen; EM: Jim – get direction from Health Director/Manager’s opinion on how best to set listening sessions up; not sure exactly what we can do so need to understand policy before continuing to set something up; SG: uncertainty about where pandemic is going; Terri, weren’t you interested in session before Ag Summit?; Terri: yes, hoping things with Omicron will improve by Feb, suggests “wait and see”; Terri: thought Todd McGee was joining; JN:

just sent email from Todd asking about media outlets; how best to get information out, etc; Terri: question she has for Todd is can we go ahead and put announcement out saying we're going to have listening sessions as soon as it's safe to have in public again; ACTION JN: will ask and get back to everyone tomorrow; Terri: would like EM and SG feedback on that; SG: likes the idea but need to prep news release that contains what we're able to say by way of a progress report, also say intend to have meetings when we can have them in public, etc, just not sure because of pandemic situation; Terri: will work with Todd to come up with a draft statement for the group to review; EM: likes idea, will give community an update on progress as well as provide update on plan to do something community related; SG: further thought – question for scoring committee – will you have something more substantial to say in a week or should we wait until more info is available?' CR: suggests keeping it to evaluating for now, likely that will be further ahead in two weeks, and can announce results as they happen. SG: like that; TM: As of today hospital is modeling peak to occur mid-February; SG: more evidence to say that it's a fluid situation so can't decide a date yet; Terri: but can still announce that meetings are coming and want to provide more detail on progress; EM: give a general idea of what's going on in the outreach message, might generate questions also; VD: works with Digital Durham, convened 7 focus groups to find out what we needed, has extensive notes on how consolidated stakeholders, etc ACTION: VD to forward notes to Jim to share with group, essentially letting people know progress and planning for phone/Zoom, etc; JN: WUHP possibility for dissemination of info; JN: if any outstanding questions for RFP then should add to Listening Session agenda; SG: inform people that we have RFP and the scope of the RFP, maybe need to have better understanding of what we are asking for in the listening sessions, what do we want to know?; Terri: we do know what we want to know, that's the point of sessions; PC: questions are enumerated further down in agenda and questions are addressed in the agenda, goals are just overview, Terri made good suggestion – getting someone from dispute settlement to also be there; Terri: there's two issues need to discuss – content/logistics, how sessions are going to managed – which will come after we figure out content; ToddB: liable to find addresses that don't have service that we don't have record of so need to figure out how we want to handle that, did we decide we were going to do a short term fixed wireless solution?; SG: decided to keep talking about it; JN: discussed looking at RFPs before we investigate the wireless further, RFPs all came with schedules for how quickly they can deliver broadband service which will help inform a wireless discussion when at liberty to talk about it; ToddB: concerned about fixed wireless being discussed in listening sessions, would prefer it to be more mature before discussing with public; Terri: based on notes, decided on where the fiber was going to go or how much of the territory the fiber was going to cover and then we would pursue wireless from there, so telling people that we're going to look at how we can do wireless for anyone who doesn't get fiber within first year or two is a positive; ToddB: need to be careful about saying that the County would do that without a funding source for that, SG: change wording of #4 in agenda to not imply that it's a sure thing; Pat Hull: emphasize goal of informing public but also educating public on complexity, time it takes and constraints, emphasize public education and what it takes go get it done; PC: agree that background education is needed, topic before is about Open Broadband, feeling is that OpenBB isn't the solution that many people thought it might be, may have stakeholders who're angry about that; EM: may have many comments about disappointment with OpenBB, don't think OpenBB lived up to the promise; SG: who's best person to handle OpenBB update?; Terri: Task Force best to handle those questions; CR: basic things OpenBB had anticipated would happen didn't happen so someone with all information should be the one to answer those questions; Terri: emphasize that outline is bare basic outline, not detailed, once we get broad swath of agenda approved, Paul and Terri will flesh out details once preliminary is approved, goal is to serve everyone in county as soon as possible; SG: that's fair, what does Task Force think about the agenda?; TM: no longer under any contractual obligation with OpenBB so may be a vendor fairness issue if we talk about one vendor's service without talking about every vendor's service; Terri: are there any

other fixed wireless service providers in north Orange?; JN: Don't know but Verizon does offer point-to-point; ToddB: AT&T does; SG: what if we combine #3 and 4 and not calling out OpenBB specifically? TM: yes, just need to be careful not to favor any vendor; Terri: taken it out of her copy of agenda; Terri: is 90 min sessions a good duration?; EM: 90 mins most you'd want to go unless questions extend it out longer; Terri: are 5 areas good? Thinking do 2, pick one in north and one in south or west, do them first then determine, based on turnout, if we need all 5. Schedule some as definite and others as tentative based on need; which ones should we do first? SG: Schley and White Cross would give good coverage to two very different areas of the county; JN: all but Maple View are free, MV have to pay a fee; Terri: will check, also do we want folks to pre-register so have idea about what turnout will be; Terri: yes, section on pre-registration called "data to collect for future communications" so can start that out as pre-registration then add to the detail; JN: suggests asking for questions to be submitted prior to the meeting so can have answers prepared in advance, might help with agenda prep; EM: might help keep the conversation on track; JN: any interest in questions in item 5, we ask them to answer questions as they pre-register? To have info to guide the conversation? VD: understand that there will be questions about broadband connectivity, devices and training so acknowledge that up front and explain that focus for this forum is on broadband but will keep other questions and address them in another forum and, if possible, explain how and where those answers (re: devices and training) will be addressed/provided.; CR: if possible, figure out a way to add affordability to the discussion; final Treasury Dept rules have come out and included reasons for bringing broadband to an area is if current service is not affordable (gotten rid of speed limits). Terri: if want to make this info public, doesn't want to add affordability to the form as some people might not want world to know can't afford broadband service; CR: data is important; Terri: can collect in different way – work with library and schools because they are outreach for affordability; JN: contacted DSS director and asked for numbers on anybody taking advantage of federal money for lowering internet rates or cellphones, library gets more walk-ins (may speak to affordability), will report back with info; Terri: putting affordability on form as a "maybe"; SG: move on to information needed section, when is Kirby going to provide info on EMS re: towers?; TM: end of February is aggressive, can describe – from radio perspective – where needs are but won't know precise order in which towers will be constructed, no money yet even; SG: how do we want to talk about this?; TM: can be more general, in terms of short term fixed wireless solution may be opportunities if new radio project moves forward can take advantage of new EMS towers and Board has given clear direction to say that if any towers are constructed, must be constructed to a standard that supports wireless deployment.; SG: Can we still talk about OpenBB and who's being served by them? JN: we have that information, contract has ended but their equipment is still on our towers, still meeting with them monthly; ACTION Terri: happy to talk to OpenBB to get installed customer info; if available need a projected schedule for the RFP; CR: probably be in negotiations at that point, could probably talk generally; JN: part of RFP responses was signup timelines, could we discuss with group saying respondents answered those questions in whatever way? Also discuss responses with anticipated signup velocity?; SG: appreciation for work Terri and Paul have done on agenda; Pat Hull: update on OpenBB will be trigger for residents because areas served ¾ of people who want service and live in those areas aren't eligible because of trees/terrain to serve them. To present "areas served" is going to be misleading and will be a trigger for those people who can't sign up for the service. Fear that Listening Sessions will turn into gripe session.; JN: only have ~250 signed up in county so far; Pat H: she and neighbors are in the area but not eligible to be served, misrepresenting fact the many people want to sign up but aren't able to; EM: discussion will happen regardless, if issue comes up, EM will address as honestly and well-informed as possible; Terri: took OpenBB item off agenda; Pat H: focus on process and complexity because most people don't understand it; EM: having community meetings is more about engagement, keeping community informed and taking feedback so still very valuable, giving folks a chance to ask questions and give feedback.; JN: remind folks that RFP and OpenBB service area are

independent of one another, idea is to service area that OpenBB is currently servicing (and beyond).; SG: OpenBB had best intentions/hopes; Terri: this isn't all on OpenBB, County has contributed to lack of success by not working on it earlier and pointing out that proposed solution isn't consistent with topology of the County; EM: mutual issues that prevented more success with fixed wireless solution; Terri: county has to have a mea culpa statement; EM: keep focus on what Task Force is working toward now;

Old Business / New Business

CR: great news on Treasury guidelines – interim final rules, as long as money was used to reach homes w/less than 25/3, can serve those with 25/3. New rules - have thrown out any kind of limits based on speed. Giving local communities the authority to address the issue the way they feel it needs to be addressed. Recipients must ensure that the funds are designed to address “an identified need for additional broadband investment that is not being met.” Means if a home doesn't have 100/100 they should be considered unserved. Or if a home lacks affordable/reliable broadband service. Relieves communities of burden to meet requirements. Tomorrow is Broadband Matters Zoom cast.

Recap:

SG: Outline of what want meetings to look like, Terri to work with Todd about draft of announcement. Task Force looks forward to having community meetings as soon as it's safe to do so.

When next meeting? – February 4th

Adjourn – 7:13 pm