Call to Order

Chairman Manzione called the meeting to order and asked that Council members re-introduce themselves.

Introduction of Council Members

- Rob Vietzke, Internet 2
- Rob Earley, Comcast
- John Emra, AT&T
- Mike Chowaniec, Cablevision
- Julie Cammarata, Ex-officio, OPM
- Anthony Santino, Laurel Woods Inc.
- Bill Vallée, Office of Consumer Counsel
- Robert Mundy, Ex-officio, DPUC
- Ed Murphy, JDSU
- * Jack McCoy, (via phone) Town of Manchester
- Lou Manzione, Council Chair, University of Hartford
- Greg Shimer, WebMD (not present)

DISCUSSION & APPROVAL OF JULY MEETING MINUTES

Chairman Manzione asked for a motion to approve the July 15, 2008 minutes of the CBICC. Earley brought out the point of whether Council would be addressing the legislature during the January budget session, as appears to be suggested in the section of the July minutes capturing Rep. Perone’s comments.

Vietzke brought up the fact that if input is not given, it will be two years before another budget session. Via phone McCoy pointed out that the Conference of Connecticut Municipalities (CCM) is proposing a $22 million budget which could be significant and the Council should consider working with CCM. Emra added that even if CCM makes recommendations to the Legislature, the Council does not have to act at the same time. Vallée said that the legislature could still be approached in March and that because of the DPUC and OCC being involved in the Docket on broadband, there is likely to be legislation proposed by DPUC. Mundy brought up the list of States with Positive Broadband Actions (see handout) and we might look to those actions as a guide for how the Council might proceed with the legislature.

The Council reached consensus on an amendment to the July 15 minutes in the Timelines, Reporting Schedules section that clarified that the Council would not aim for input for the January budget session. However, the door to approaching the legislature is not closed if the Council concludes that some action is warranted.

Emphasis on the economic benefits of broadband infrastructure was cited extensively in the Sept. 29 meeting. A motion was put forward to approve the July 15 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded. All were in favor. No abstentions.
COUNCIL VICE CHAIRMAN
Chairman Manzione explained that Speaker Amman and Senate President Williams requested that the Council make a recommendation to them for Vice Chairman, since -- per legislation -- it is their purview to select the Council’s Vice Chairman.

Manzione said that in off-line discussions Vietzke’s name was put forward as a nominee for Vice Chairman. He then opened up the floor for other nominations. None were given. Santino moved to close nominations; Earley seconded. A vote was taken: All were in favor. None opposed, and none abstained.

Santino motioned to recommend Vietzke’s as Council Vice Chairman. McCoy and Chowaniec seconded. A vote was taken: All were in favor. None opposed, and none abstained.

SUBCOMMITTEE STUDY AREAS
The Council discussed the study areas laid out in the agenda

a) Assessing US state initiatives to promote broadband infrastructure
b) Broadband as a facilitator of educational initiatives (distance learning, promoting educational equality across the state.
c) Municipality needs and gaps in broadband infrastructure.
d) Telecommuting and traffic congestion reductions.
e) Legislative and regulatory recommendations to promote enhanced and uniform broadband infrastructure in the state of Connecticut.
f) Internet 2

There was discussion about the fact that there are not enough people on the Council to form true “subcommittees.” Chairman Manzione clarified that he meant a person responsible for a certain topic may engage others on the Council or even outside experts. He said he would like to see one designated person on each topic.

f) Internet 2: Vietzke further defined “Internet 2” as advanced internet infrastructure and networking. It includes understanding the Internet of tomorrow and envisioning the types of uses, plus the frameworks needed to support it. He described it as a loop, citing the example of visiting the super collider in Switzerland: first building the networking to support the science, and then the science will inform the networking.

a) & e): Vallée and Mundy volunteered to look into a) & e) because they are already involved with the DPUC docket examining broadband issues. Vallée also mentioned Sharon Gillett, commissioner of telecommunications and cable in Mass., as a good source, as well as Mary Evslin, chair of the VT Telecommunications Authority.

Emra recommended that in (e) the words “recommendations to promote” be removed – that this topic is really about access. Manzione followed up on this by asking about the Northeast corner of CT. Emra said his understanding is that availability is the issue there. A small percentage of the population does not have access
to DSL or cable. McCoy asked if topic (e) is where the Wired/Wireless discussions are explored. Emra reiterated that to his understanding it’s more about availability.

Vallée brought up the OCC point from the DPUC docket about “Unserved vs. Underserved.” Emra pointed out the CT is better than many other states with 95% coverage.

b) broadband & education Chairman Manzione recalled the point from the last meeting that issues in using broadband in education are not just issues of access and bandwidth, but scheduling (with teachers, schools, etc.) Vietzke said he would be willing to pull people together on this topic. Emra added that he knows someone who can speak to this topic.

c) McCoy said he would take (c) and that it relates to (b) because towns are tied to educational needs. Emra said he takes issue with the idea of towns as “providers” competing with the private sector. Manzione added that it can be about delivery/terminal availability.

Vietzke pointed out that (f) can be lower priority; deferred until better understanding of the landscape. McCoy expressed interest in working on this topic with Vietzke.

“Broadband interconnection as economic enabler” was mentioned as an additional topic. Manzione emphasized his interest in terminals and Earley said terminals get to the heart of the access issue. Another Council member asked for clarification on “terminals” and Manzione listed consumer equipment: iPods, iPhones, wireless cards, etc., and said the Council should be mindful of the broadband needs of everyone from school children to senior citizen homes. Vietzke added that economic development, telecommuting, traffic, and terminals are all tied together. A Council member cited the Digital Improvement Program in Washington State where non-profits can apply for used computers and training for people who have never used computers before.

**OUTCOMES**
This study-area discussion led to the creation of four broader study areas that would encompass the more detailed issues. There was consensus that economic development would be captured by any and all of the areas the Council investigates and so does not need to have its own category. Vietzke added that there are contacts within the state that could help identify “low-hanging fruit.” There was discussion on adding a study topic on the supply side, which would be the network and service providers. Manzione pointed out that this was a major component of the study report to the Legislature that led to this Council. There was discussion about whether municipalities fall under the demand side vs. the supply side. McCoy said cities and towns could be part of the solution in terms of providing access and so should be included in Supply as well as Demand.

The Four Study Areas agreed upon by the Council and the Council member assignments are therefore:

- **A. Current landscape** (CT, other states, nations, and the FCC) – Mundy (with Vallée)
- **B. Demand Side - Uses and Users** (industry, citizens, municipalities)
  - Education enabling (unserved vs. underserved) – Vietzke (with Emra and McCoy)
  - Telecommuting – Santino
  - Municipalities – McCoy
C. Technology
   ▪ Terminals – Manzione
   ▪ Next Generation Internet – Vietzke (with McCoy and Murphy)
   ▪ Infrastructure – Wireline and Wireless (Murphy, Manzione)

D. Supply Side (public companies, municipalities, providing/allowing connectivity). – Earley (with Emra, Chowaniec and McCoy)

GOING FORWARD
Council members will be in touch via e-mail to each other and to outside sources to begin investigating these study areas.

For the next meeting, some possible guest speakers were identified:
- Pete Joia from CBIA, for broad-based economic development perspective
- Jeff Blodgett from CERC (Joia and Blodgett could be combined)
- Representative from Connected Nation, mapping issue. (Vallée to contact them).
- Curtis Hill on Education, and Emra said he had another contact on education side.
- Sharon Gillett was suggested by Vallée as a good speaker on what Massachusetts is doing. She is the MA commissioner for telecommunications. Also, Mary Evslin, chair of the VT Telecommunications Authority would provide important input. Vallee to contact Gillett.
- See also public comment section for CASE speaker suggestions

It was suggested that for whichever speakers are available for the Dec. 15 Council meeting, questions should be developed and sent to them in advance.

Future Meetings - SCHEDULE
Dec. 15, 9-12
March 30, 9-11
June 29, 9-11

PUBLIC COMMENT
Rick Strauss of CASE spoke, referring to the CASE Report which recommended keeping the state advised of advanced technology that would impact CT’s global competitiveness for business and residents. He also suggested that the Council consider crafting a clearly stated vision and mission to put the Council’s work into context of the state’s economy. He also recommended two speakers on the education side: a rep from “Virtual High School,” and Skip Laitner from the American Council on an Energy Efficient Economy.

RESOURCES, ARTICLES
Florida Organization with Global mission
http://www.digitalinclusion.net/

Press release about Broadband Study out of Penn State (Council member Greg Shimer submitted this)
http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/05/080519132448.htm