

OBC Outreach Sub Committee Minutes  
For February 21, 2008  
Meeting

Attended:

Karen Hardie	Office of Ohio Consumers' Council
Gary Little	ITAAO
Chris Henney	Ohio Farm Bureau
Sharon B. Mitchell	OCCN/Dakota Center
Lou Gentile	Governor's Office of Appalachia
La Mar Wyse	Galion Community Hospital
Chris Chapman	OIT
Katrina Flory	OIT/OBC
Letha Butcher	Ohio Supercomputer Center
Denis Walsh	Ohio Supercomputer Center
Mark Forni	Ohio Department of Agriculture
Fred Deel	Governor's Office of Appalachia

Not able to Attend:

Ken Engstrom	Office of Congressman Zack Space
--------------	----------------------------------

Location:

Vern Riffe Center, 77 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215  
24<sup>th</sup> floor Large Conference room

Time:

1:00 pm – 3:00 pm

\*\*\*\*\*

1. Introductions & Opening remarks:

Fred Deel introduced himself as chair of the OBC Outreach subcommittee. He invited each member to introduce themselves as well. He reviewed the agenda and handouts and the meeting proceeded.

2. Review of Draft Documents

Draft documents were provided to subcommittee members for their review and comments. Documents included the subcommittee charter, proposal guidance, proposal template, proposal instructions and process flow.

Charter:

PASSED

La Mar Wyse: Moved

Chris Henney: Seconded

All Members agreed

No Members disagreed

- ❖ Under Hypothesis; last sentence, typo.  
Correction will be made to what is now written; Ohio Broad Council to Ohio Broadband Council.
- ❖ Rules were suggested in order to ensure compliance with open meetings law. The Charter will be amended to reflect as noted.

Guidelines:

PASSED

Sharon Mitchell: moved

Mark Forni: Seconded

Members Agreed: All

Members Disagreed: None

Procedures:

PASSED

La Mar Wyse: moved

Gary Little: seconded

Members Agreed: All

Members Disagreed: None

- ❖ Proposal Guidance page 2: Is DAS required to approve the projects as well?  
DAS/OIT was included in this section as the funding for these efforts resides in DAS/OIT budget.
- ❖ The Outreach budget is estimated at \$750,000.00 at this initial stage
- ❖ Discussion on “if” all leverage documentation should be disclosed either by having letters that state the commitment of other funds from that organization or company or a status report of those funds from the other organizations or companies that are providing funding.
  - Members agreed that there should be documentation as to where all other leverage is coming from in each application.
- ❖ Under Proposal Contents #4 – Budget Summary; Other Funding Options will now be changed to Other Funding. This is where the documentation stated above will be placed.
- ❖ Suggested that a sample proposal should be developed for the applicants to use as a template.

- ❖ The workgroup's function and purpose and how they will help the sub committee was discussed;
  - They are not members of the subcommittee
  - They are support to the sub committee
  - Currently include staff members from OIT and OSC
  - They review the proposals and put the project into a layman format better for the sub committee to understand.
  - They will answer questions to help bring clarity to the proposed projects so that the sub committee can make a sound recommendation to the OBC. It was then suggested that all application should be sent out to the sub committee prior to scheduled meetings so the committee members have time to review proposals and have their questions already answered before meeting to discuss those proposals start. All members agreed.
  
- ❖ Sub committee members are concerned with the time restraints that the workgroup will have with working with the communities once the word is out about these projects; they wanted to know if other people/organizations can get involved with helping the communities.
  - It was suggested that Community Improvement Corps and Connect Ohio are two components that will offer a great deal of support to the communities along side the workgroup.
  
- ❖ It was stated that this is a statewide effort and that all communities that submit a proposal will need to bring some source of leverage to the project.
  - Each county and each proposal will be a different type of leverage and the sub committee will need to be flexible.
  
- ❖ Timeline of process:
  - Workgroup works with Communities
  - Workgroup reviews proposals and puts information in layman terms for sub committee
  - Proposal sent out to sub committee to be reviewed and have their questions answered on proposal by workgroup
  - Sub committee to vote on proposals and send recommendations
  - OBC votes
  - Memorandum of Agreement is set between Community and State of Ohio
  - Project starts and project # and project manager will be assigned to each project called the Project Management Phase
  
- ❖ Who Qualifies to apply for these funds:

- OIT is not a granting authority so we are somewhat limited in the projects/organizations that benefit from these funds. City, County and State organizations and agencies as well as Port Authority are eligible.
- ❖ Question was asked - With such a small budget how will the word of this grant opportunity reach the communities and the organizations that can to apply?
  - No set plan has been formed yet to be able to answer that question; but it was discussed that just through OBC and thru the contact of the sub committee members the word will get out. Plus once the word is out about three (3) Quick Wins projects, interests will peak.

### 3. Pilot Projects

OIT & OSC have been working with a number of communities to assist in their broadband efforts prior to the establishment of the Subcommittee. To that end three projects were indentified as pilot projects as we get the outreach effort off the ground. Each project requires limited funding but will provide significant results. There will be a cap for each project not to exceed \$75,000.00. If a project does exceed the cap then the sub committee will need to address the approval of the extended amount at that time.

### Lancaster Local Network

PASSED

La Mar Wyse	moved
Mark Forni	seconded
Member agreed	all
Members disagreed	none

Objectives:

- ❖ Become the aggregation point for City, County and State broadband traffic as well as help distribute service to underserved areas of the county.
- ❖ Create WiFi hot spots in City and County Parks and common areas such as downtown (supports the Governor’s Revitalizing our Cites and Towns initiative).
- ❖ Extend their existing fiber optic network to their business parks
- ❖ Promote increased broadband distribution via local ISP or Municipal Network.

The stated needs are:

- ❖ Community Access Point in Lancaster

### University of Rio Grande

PASSED

Chris Henney	moved
La Mar Wyse	seconded
Members agreed	all
Members disagreed	none

Objective:

- ❖ The University of Rio Grande has connectivity to OSCnet services and wants to support Gallia County's strategy to leverage that connection by providing last-

mile distribution through existing county-owned fiber lines to a leading health care provider, a local industrial park and connectivity to a Wireless ISP for distribution to area small businesses and residences. The college will divert the dollars currently spent on the OSCnet connection and will start making broadband service distribution.

The stated needs are:

- ❖ Make the existing connection to the college an OSCnet backbone POP or Community Access Point

### **Crawford County/City of Galion**

PASSED

Gary Little                      moved

Mark Forni                        seconded

Members agreed                all; but La Mar Wyse did not vote due to his connection to the project

Objective

- ❖ Create jobs through increased availability of competitively priced broadband service.
- ❖ The City plans to team with a local ISP to manage an existing fiber plant to deliver service to area businesses, Hospitals, City, County and State entities. One area business has promised to create 20 new jobs if they can access the Internet via this new service. The business has projected up to 220 new jobs in the coming months as a result of this connectivity.

The stated needs are:

- ❖ OSCnet Community Access Point located in Galion

**Other potential Projects:** Fred asked if there were other projects on the horizon that will come before the subcommittee. Chris Chapman and Denis Walsh indicated that the following communities may be brining proposals forward for consideration.

- ❖ Delaware
- ❖ Ashtabula
- ❖ Hocking - 3 county project
- ❖ Marietta
- ❖ Columbiana
- ❖ Morgan

### **4. End of Session**

Chris Henney                    moved

La Mar Wyse                     seconded