Task Force Members Present: Chair - Chris Clements - UC Davis, Jeff Mischkinsky - DavisGig, Autumn Labbe-Renault - Davis Media Access, Marcia Bernard - DJUSD, Carolyn Stiver - Davis Chamber of Commerce, Stephen McMahon - Community Representative,

Task Force Members Absent: Vice-Chair - Christine Crawford, Yolo County Broadband Working Group, Mike Adams - Davis Community Network, Jacques Franco - Utility Rate Advisory Committee, Scott Adler - Community Representative

Staff: Diane Parro, Director, Community and Business Engagement, Sarah Worley, Business Engagement Manager

1. Call to Order & Roll Call - 6:34 pm

2. Approval of Agenda – Motion to approve by Steve McMahon. Seconded by Marcia Bernard. Passes 6-0, 4 absent.

3. Brief Announcements from Staff and Task Force – Staff shared basis of their new titles. Carolyn Stiver shared local expert, Lori Raineri’s offer to assist when City was ready to evaluate network financing alternatives. Steve McMahon and Rob Nickerson shared Jeff Christiansen of Entry Point Network, an open access network provider offered to meet with the TF.

4. Public Comment –

Robert Nickerson:
- US Telecom Association has filed petition of forbearance to allow members to no longer comply with the 1996 Telecom Act requirement to unbundle services. It will be automatically accepted unless the FCC takes action against it. Wholesale costs will increase and competitiveness of smaller businesses & small ISPs will be dramatically reduce. Need to file any comments with FCC by July 9th.
- Recommend City send staff and TF member to conference in Fairlane, Minnesota for assisting city/county staff setting up a network
- Appreciate BATF work as dominant network providers will not drive innovation. Haven’t heard of serious economic development proposals in Davis other than Broadband. Request allocation of staff time to MDU outreach interviews. Concerned about lack of progress without allocation of staff time.

Brandon Fuller with Urban Prospector, represented several ISP’s attending meeting to learn about TF efforts.
5. Consent Calendar

All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are considered routine and non-controversial, require no discussion, as items are expected to have unanimous support, and may be enacted by one motion.

A. Approval of April 25, 2018 Draft Minutes – Motion to approve by Steve McMahon. Seconded by Jeff Mischkinsky. Passes 4-0, with 2 abstentions and 4 absent.

6. Regular Items

A. Recommended Action:
   i. Review CCG Consulting Residential Survey Proposal (Attachments 2 & 2A)
   ii. Direct staff to authorize CCG Consulting to conduct the Residential Survey incorporating Task Force recommendations.

Typo in staff report corrected, CCG cost to conduct a telephone survey is $8K in addition to cost to purchase telephone numbers, not $8,500.

Task Force members discussed survey cost, time frame and raised questions about differences and benefits of doing a random door to door or telephone survey, and how they would be conducted. Concerns expressed about time commitment and availability of resources organizing a door to door survey would require, given need to also inform public about the survey. Survey recommended to take place in October, after start of UC Davis fall classes to avoid summer holiday and vacation schedules. Survey would need to be very brief so people would be willing to take it.

Motion by Marcia Bernard, seconded by Carolyn Stiver, to proceed with authorizing CCG Consulting to conduct a random Residential Survey including TF review of proposed survey questions, and receiving CCG responses to list of TF questions (provided as Attachment A).

Motion Passes 6-0, 4 absent.

B. Task Force Work Plan -
   i. Update on Multifamily Dwelling Unit (MDU) Inventory
   ii. Guest Speakers & Outreach

Work plan to first focus on completing a Residential Survey and conducting MDU Outreach. A public communication strategy was also needed. Autumn Labbe-Renault volunteered to provide an outline of resources for a communications strategy. City data on multi-family residential projects and UC Davis apartment contact list used in their annual apartment vacancy survey would be shared with Task Force volunteers to prepare an initial MDU outreach list. Proposed creation of a MDU Outreach Subcommittee to define outreach approach, questions and contacts to be on June meeting agenda. Steve McMahon volunteered to organize MDU data by size categories before the next meeting was approved by consensus.
Marcia Bernard left meeting at 7:59 pm

7. **Task Force and Staff Brief Communications**
   A. Agenda Planning and Long Range Calendar –
      i. Confirm Task Force summer meeting schedule - June 27\textsuperscript{th} meeting already confirmed, August meeting previously cancelled, decision on July meeting still pending.
   B. Community News
   C. Recommended Reading – request to share link to article recommended by Christine Crawford on value of broadband with all Task Force members before next meeting.

8. **Adjourn** – at 7:59 pm by consensus
Attachment A

Task Force Questions for CCG Consulting

Q1 – What time commitment and City/CCG division of labor would be needed (total hours and duration of commitment) to organize and execute a reliable door to door survey vs a phone survey (e.g. recruit, screen, train, and monitor survey volunteers and document survey results)?

- How many d2d survey volunteers are needed?
- Who coordinates/organizes the volunteers?
- What is the volunteer training time needed and how is it executed?
- What is the estimated time frame needed to achieve the target number of completed d2d or phone surveys?

Q3 – Can you please describe how random selection (and survey consistency) is achieved for both a door to door, and telephone survey?

Q4 - How are increasing trends to block unsolicited callers/telemarketers/unknown callers on land lines and cell phones taken into account in current random telephone surveys?

Q5 - If there is no initial response, what is your re-contact strategy for door to door and telephone surveys?

Q6 – Is a blended door to door plus phone survey recommended or not, and why? (Any added value gained by doing both, e.g. reaching more people, and those who won’t participate by phone)?

Q7 - What type of community outreach and time frame do you recommend be used to solicit greater community participation in a random survey? E.g. requests to participate in authorized City Survey if contacted? Or is outreach not recommended to avoid influencing survey responses?

Q8 - What survey questions do you propose? What are you expecting to get out of each question?