



**Telecommunications Commission
Meeting Minutes**

December 10th, 2008, 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Location: 1818 5th Street, 2nd Floor Main Building

Commissioners Present: Jesse Drew, Jim Frame, Bob Kehr, Stephen McMahon, Zackary O'Donnell, Darrick Servis,
 Commissioners Absent: Amy Slavich
 Staff Present: Rick Guidara, Information Services Manager (Liaison)
 Robert Schulz, Media Services Specialist
 Samantha Wallace, Assistant Community Services Director



Minutes in bold and italics

-
- | | |
|---------|---|
| 3:00 PM | 1. Welcome |
| 3:05 PM | 2. Approve Agenda -<i>approved by consensus</i> |
| 3:10 PM | 3. Approve Minutes from 11/13 -<i>moved by Frame, 2nd by kehr</i> |
| 3:15 PM | 4. Commissioner/Staff Announcements - <i>DJUSD is working with DMA to possibly take over some of the work that had been being done by part-time DJUSD staff</i> |
| 3:30 PM | 5. Public Comments - <i>n/a</i> |
| 3:45 PM | 6. Standard Updates |
| | a. I-net (Rick Guidara/Bob Kehr) - <i>i-net core switch is still being optimized by the vendor to provide for inter and intra agency links while maintaining the necessary levels of security (approx 90% completed)</i> |
| | b. Pending City Telecomm Requests (Rick Guidara/Samantha Wallace) - <i>Comsites West applied for a conditional use permit to erect tower on City owned property just north of Sutter Hospital, east of the City water tank. Scheduled to go before the Planning Commission in February - will still need to go before the City Council to work out lease details and approval</i> |
| | c. Power Backup for DMA Building - <i>The City recognizes the need for this and other generators which would allow the DMA building to share in the City's new generator however no City funds have been allocated for this purpose. Perhaps a grant can be found to help with funding?</i> |
| | d. Update timelines/plans for Upcoming year: |
| | <u>Timeline</u> |
| | June - Assessment Review - |
| | July - General needs discussion |
| | August - General needs discussion |
| | September - General needs discussion |
| | October-December: Public Forum on 11/13 |
| | January/march - Draft Staff report |
| | April - Draft staff report to council |
| 4:00 PM | 7. Discussions: |
| | a. Follow-up from previous public outreach meeting held 11/13 |
| | <u>Groups summary of meetings:</u> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Citizens seemed to lobby for their beloved resource (whichever it was) and wanted to emphasize the training they received and to not cut its funding</i> • <i>Lack of other telecomm issues</i> • <i>KDRT had good support</i> • <i>Combining of DCN and DMA mentioned by a few</i> |

- b. City year end review report of all PEG partners (Wallace) – *reviewed PEG documents distributed with agenda packet with a motion to forward the documents to City Council (kehr,O’donnell) by Wallace in Jan/Feb- Question also came up in regards to PEG partners – if a partner ‘fails’ who owns the equipment purchased by the previous Franchise fees? Wallace to run question by City Attorney*
- c. Discussion of each entities budgets and how they are currently being allocated to meet the needs as outlined. – *Steve distributed a draft document for discussion purposes outlining some general guiding principles towards PEG functions. Needs to be reviewed for discussion at next meeting.*

5:00 PM

8. Adjourn

- a. Proposed: Next Meeting: January 7th, 2009. Location TBD. – *Next Meeting to be held on 1/14/09*
 - b. Potential topics for Next Meeting (TBD at meeting) - *Review of “Steve’s” for discussion document (copy attached)*
-

Handed out by Steve McMahon during the meeting for discussion at the next meeting:

For Discussion

Proposition: the City of Davis’ spending on community communications is money well-spent and shows returns in community effectiveness and solidarity. It also encourages democracy and gives voice to many who might not otherwise be heard.

Proposition: The city has historically spent nearly all of its community communications funding on cable-casting. This made sense historically, because cable television was the only rich media available for community communications. The unfortunate side of this is that many citizens were not reached.

New avenues of communication have developed, particularly LPFM and the Internet and have received a high degree of support from local organizations and individuals. These can and are being developed in ways that encourage localism as well as cosmopolitanism.

Cable-casting will remain important, particularly for live events and communications requiring excellent video quality. They also have a dedicated capital-and-equipment funding stream that we should leverage for that purpose.

Proposition: Our community media organizations are well-poised to take advantage of new communications opportunities. They are well-organized and staffed and — where appropriate — take great advantage of volunteer work and community fundraising.

These organizations may be encouraged to take advantage of new media opportunities without significant funding or staffing changes.

Proposition: The community communication priorities discussed by the Telecommunications Commission give us a good way to evaluate and justify community communication efforts when they are not strictly oriented to cable-casting.

Proposition: Funding for community media is tight given the needs, and will remain so. We need to spend it as well as possible. In particular, every organization should be encouraged to share facilities, equipment and staffing whenever possible.