

City of Bloomington: Bloomington Digital Underground Advisory Committee

Date of Record: October 7, 2004

Prepared By: Matt Nagle, ITS/SPEA Intern

Prepared Date: October 12, 2004

Summary

Bloomington Underground Advisory Committee meeting held Thursday, October 7, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. in the McCloskey Conference Room of City Hall at Showers, 401 N. Morton St., Bloomington, IN.

Roll Call

Committee Members Present

Rick Dietz, Indiana University

Bruce Myers, Kiva

Charlie Webb, CallNet

Linda Williamson, Bloomington Economic Development Corporation

Committee Members Absent

Mark McMath, Bloomington Hospital

Dennis Morrison, Center of Behavioral Health

Brian Voss, Indiana University

City of Bloomington Staff Present

Matt Nagle, SPEA Intern, ITS

Rick Routon, User Support & Network Operations Manager, ITS

Greg Volan, Chief Information Officer, ITS

Guests Present

None

Handouts

1. September 2, 2004 Meeting Minutes
2. October 7, 2004 Meeting Agenda
3. InfoComm Systems Project Timeline

Minutes

Meeting called to order at 4:09 p.m.

- I. Administrative Business
 - A. Minutes from September 2, 2004 meeting reviewed and approved.
- II. Old Business: Strategic Plan Proposal from InfoComm Systems
 - A. Greg Volan stated that the Committee needed to review the Project Timeline (hereafter: Timeline) to ensure that InfoComm is on track and to address any concerns of the Committee members.
 - B. Charlie Webb expressed concerns that Timeline gave only two opportunities (November and December meetings) to review progress and to address outstanding issues.
 - C. Greg Volan stated that he thought that Timeline was ambitious and that the project would likely take longer to complete. He also said that the earliest start date would be November 4, 2004 and that the completion date of January 6, 2005 was unrealistic.
 - i. Rick Dietz stated that, at a minimum, the entire month of January would be necessary to handle all issues.
 - ii. Greg Volan agreed and added that a January completion date was not critical and that it would be better to take time to address all issues in a thorough manner. He stated that the Committee would have more than two opportunities to review progress and would review the survey and interview results.
 - D. Charlie Webb asked whether the Committee was in the position to review the deliverables on the dates and to express concerns.
 - i. Greg Volan replied that the Committee would review/critique the progress when they receive the following:
 - Survey/interview questions before being administered
 - Notes after focus group interviews
 - Notes after second round of interviews
 - Current State (CS) and Desired State (DS) analysis
 - ii. Charlie Webb replied that reviewing the survey questions and the CS/DS analysis were the only critical points because the first and second interviews would be summarized in the analysis CS/DS analysis.
 - E. Rick Dietz recommended that the Committee receive and review the survey list when they receive the survey questions, so that a suitable focus group would be selected.
 - i. Greg Volan and Charlie Webb agreed that the survey list should be included with survey questions.
 - ii. Greg Volan expected that InfoComm would involve the Committee in preparing the survey list.
 - F. Charlie Webb stated that little slack time was built into Timeline, potentially causing Timeline to be overloaded. As an example, only three days were available to review interview notes before CS/DS analysis was due.
 - i. Greg Volan agreed, adding that the interview process (preparing survey questions, interviewing focus groups) would be a two month process, pushing Timeline through January 2005. He stated that the Committee would have one opportunity to review CS/DS analysis before the final report would be prepared.

- III. Old Business: Reviewing Deliverables from InfoComm's Previous Clients
- A. Greg Volan stated that Jim Goldman did not want to distribute deliverables from previous clients via email. Rather, Jim wanted to meet in person with the Committee, discuss the information and take it back at that point. Greg asked two questions: (1) when would the Committee meet with Jim and (2) if the Committee wanted to conduct this meeting as due diligence before creating a contract with InfoComm.
- i. Rick Dietz responded by affirming he did want to use this meeting as due diligence so that the Committee could have evidence of InfoComm's past work as a gauge for future relations.
 - ii. Bruce Myers questioned whether some of InfoComm's client information was a matter of public record.
 - iii. Greg Volan stated that he did not know how much of InfoComm's work was with city governments. He stated that InfoComm, for instance, worked on the State of Indiana's I-Light 2 project, although it was hired by a private firm, Indiana Fiber Works, which bid on that project. Greg Volan recommended that the Committee ask InfoComm for information that is of public record or just to schedule a meeting in the next few weeks and view InfoComm's reports. If this matter is deemed not critical by the Committee before executing contracts, this matter could be handled at the next monthly Committee meeting.
- B. Greg Volan stated that he had worked with InfoComm in the past few years, was satisfied with their reports, and as a result could bypass the due diligence. He stated that if any other Committee members felt it necessary to have due diligence, he would organize the meeting.
- C. Rick Dietz stated that he would like to see results from other clients so that he could have a firm grasp on InfoComm's abilities. He further stated that those clients would not have to be a matter of public record.
- D. Charlie Webb stated that he would attend the meeting so that the Committee could state that they undertook due diligence as a matter of public record.
- E. Bruce Myers stated that he thought that InfoComm was "detail-oriented" as evidenced by Timeline, but would like to examine the depth and scope of a final product.
- F. Greg Volan agreed to arrange a meeting with InfoComm in the next few weeks and to send a copy of his report previously dealing with InfoComm to all Committee members.
- G. Greg Volan stated that, by November 3, 2004, the Committee should have a signed contract approved by the Board of Public Works and the necessary appropriation from City Council.
- H. Charlie Webb asked about the level of analysis that Public Works would perform on the contract. Greg Volan replied that they usually rely on the Legal Department to check the funding and timeline.
- I. Rick Dietz asked if Dave Sabbagh had been notified on these issues. Bruce Myers replied that the issue had arisen in a previous meeting with Dave so he should be aware. Greg Volan added that Dave Sabbagh has a strong reputation in these matters and that his support would be beneficial.

- IV. New Business: Telecommunications Council Restructuring
- A. Rick Dietz stated that he had an interest in the 2000 proposal from David Sabbagh and Jeffrey Willsey (City Council members) to expand the charter of the Telecommunications Council to encompass a broader area, including the BDU Committee.
 - i. Greg Volan added that the original proposal was voted down by a 4-4 vote but that the City Code erroneously reflects these changes.
 - ii. Rick Dietz and Greg Volan agreed that Regina Moore needs to adjust the City Code to reflect that the ordinance did not pass.
 - B. Rick Dietz stated that passing the ordinance would be beneficial to the city in that the Council, like the BDU Committee, acts as an incubator for new ideas and that expanding the scope of the Telecommunications Council would foster new ideas entering into the political process.
 - C. Charlie Webb asked why the original ordinance was vetoed. Greg Volan stated that he did research on the issue and found out that the original ordinance was not accepted on first reading because the ordinance combined multiple appropriations with the BDU proposal. The majority of the Council asked the Fernandez Administration to resubmit the appropriation ordinance as two separate ordinances the next week. The Fernandez administration did not resubmit.
 - D. Linda Williamson expressed concerns that the Telecommunications Council was too small to understand a broad array of functions such as cell towers, fiber-optics, etc. Rick Dietz responded that expanding the powers of the Telecommunications Council would allow it to serve as a centralized body, so that citizens would know exactly who to contact with concerns.
 - E. Greg Volan stated that, with the relatively stable environment and the limited amount of work that the Telecommunications Council currently handles, it would make sense either to abolish the Council or to expand its duties so that it could operate as a think tank. If the scope of the Council was expanded, it would make sense for it to incorporate the responsibilities of the BDU Advisory Committee. Linda Williamson agreed and added that it would make more sense to the public in knowing who to contact.
- V. New Business: BDU Committee Operations After Greg Volans' Departure
- A. Rick Dietz asked about the transition in leadership of the Committee after Greg Volan leaves. Greg Volan replied that administrative duties will be handed over to Ron Walker.
 - B. Linda Williamson stated that the Committee should discuss this situation with Ron Walker at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Matt Nagle, November 4, 2004