

CABLE TELEVISION ADVISORY BOARD

OCTOBER 12, 2007

A meeting of the Cable Television Advisory Board was held Friday, October 12, 2007 at 8:35 a.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

Members of Committee present: Andrew Cernota
Ed Lecius
Dennis Ryder, Citizen Representative
Alderman Fred Teeboom
John Barker
Charlie Matthews
Paul Johnson, Citizen Representative
Mariam Swanson
Brian Morrissey, Fire Chief
Dorothy Clarke, Esquire (arrived late)

Members of the Committee absent: Jeanne Marie Kennamer, Traffic Dept.
Rick Farrenkopf
Kathryn Vitale
Ben Dalianis

Also present: Jeff Poehnert

READING OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

MOTION BY JOHN BARKER TO ACCEPT THE DELAY THE FORMAL PRESENTATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 10, 2007 AND SEPTEMBER 14, 2007 MEETINGS AND PLACE THEM ON FILE

ON THE QUESTION

Paul Johnson

I don't recall seeing them. Are they circulated by e-mail?

Ed Lecius

I believe they were e-mailed.

Alderman Teeboom

Are they available on the website? I have not seen them and I have not seen an e-mail.

Andrew Cernota

I checked this morning. September is but for some reason August isn't. I'll have to double check on that again.

Alderman Teeboom

September is but August is not?

Andrew Cernota

Right.

MOTION CARRIED

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

- Proposed amendment language for Appendix B

**MOTION BY ED LECIUS TO ACCEPT THIS COMMUNICATION AND DISCUSS IT UNDER
NEW BUSINESS**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Teeboom

Mr. Chairman I just got this earlier so I have just now read it. Why haven't we received this ahead of the agenda earlier so we'd have a chance to study it?

Andrew Cernota

I believe that we were waiting for this. When we were preparing the agenda we received it this morning.

Alderman Teeboom

So we literally hadn't received this until this morning?

Andrew Cernota

I don't believe so unless Mr. Dalianis sent it out by e-mail last night.

Unidentified Male Speaker

Mr. Chairman I think I got it yesterday, but I'm also on the E Channel Committee. I'm not sure if it was sent just to the E Channel Committee or to CTAB.

Alderman Teeboom

Okay. I'd just like to make a point on this, but we will be discussing this later. If we have communications especially something that we have to consider under new business, I think it's a (inaudible) to the Chair to make sure that whoever prepares the agenda and knows ahead of time that this will appear, that we have advanced information. Just like on the financial report, at least get it a few days ahead so you can study it. We should be able to study this just a little bit ahead of time. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Jeff Poehnert

The current balance of the operating account – 305-6013 is \$323,427.56. The current balance of the capital equipment fund – 305-6012 is \$113,530.07. Expenses for the month of September 2007, including salaries, totaled \$5,767.55.

John Barker

There is something new in the budget this month that came as a direct request from CTAB last month. That was we were asked to provide a pro forma or a forecast of budgets and expenses for the next year or so, so we could determine how much resources would be available for our system design project. You'll see that there's a page there, I believe it's called...

Jeff Poehnert

(inaudible) forecast fiscal year 2008.

John Barker

Okay. I'd like to go through that with the members of the committee now. The first section lays

out what we believe will be expended for this fiscal year. There are some changes here that you need to be aware of. First I should advise the Committee that due to an administrative oversight at some point financially, the expenses for benefits on the salaried position of the PEG Program Manager had not been charged to the 305 department which is where the funds for CTAB go. That has been retroactively rectified. So the figures for salary in the future will be higher than you've seen in the past. It doesn't mean that there's any more money going into anybody's pocket. It just means that the full charging of the burden rate is now occurring.

Also you will see now on this forecast that the cost showed for salaries there is that full freight. Now what you will notice is that for the months of July through November, you see a value of \$5,465.09. That is the burdened rate for PEG Program Manager position at this time. Assuming that at the end of November and beginning of December we can employ an Education Channel Access Admin. we've located and successfully negotiated with one, then the costs for the estimate will go up to about \$10,340. So if that were the case, then we're approximately – and understand that these are all approximations – we approximate it to be about \$99,706 at the end of the year for salaries and benefits.

Then what we did is we took for videographers and stenographers when we have some sufficient historical data, we figured out the difference on average between what was spent in FY07 and FY08, which we are in now, and create a little factor out of that and applied it across all of the amounts that we saw in FY07. That's how we made our estimates. So we said we know it went up. I believe it was about 34 percent between then and now because we've got increased productions. So we took that 34 percent and applied it to the FY07 historical numbers and say we think this is what videographers will cost us over the next year. So that figure is \$21,983 or essentially \$22,000. Our stenography is about \$2,500, which we don't expect really to change much.

The rest of these are really just conjectures on our part based on our knowledge of what we even know is coming generally or what we spent in FY07. They are mostly minor items – miscellaneous reimbursements for connectors, wires and things like that, and tapes. Conferences and seminars – those are the ACM and the NHCC and those things. We've got about \$1,000 on that since we'll have 2 staff members. But mostly it's just small items. Then we have the first telephone of \$40. That's the cell phones that we have there.

Then the \$500. Let me explain what that is. I apologize for that. I forgot to change the heading. That's the anticipated monthly charge back that we would make to Court Street for the use of Court Street. So starting in November I added that in. Now it may not be November that we actually start that, but I wanted that on there as well. To the end of the year, that will be about \$4,000.

We also added in down at the bottom what capital equipment we could anticipate at this time. We have down really the CDA design consultant numbers in there. So we wanted to take these numbers and get these in there as well. We do not have any other equipment costs in there because the idea of this analysis was to make sure that you understood how much money there was for equipment. So we weren't going to add equipment into something where you're going to try and use that to make your judgment. But we did want the consultant figures in there. So we

understood that there's about 45 to 50K that needs to be held aside. So all that said if we take the balance forward from fiscal year 07 to 338 and the estimated revenue, which was held flat from where it is right now – we know that's an approximation of 238, and took out the estimated operating expenses of about 136K, and then the capital equipment purchases – in this case the CDA of 45K, we came up with the FY08 if we spent down everything but our expense money, we would have \$396,000 for the project. We also knew you would want to get a sense of how much money there might be available the next year to continue working on the project. There estimated revenue again would be held at the same amount of 238K. Once again an approximation, and operating expenses up a little bit of about \$160,000, which is mainly just the addition of the extra salary across the entire year. Whereas here we won't incur it until December. There we would incur that salary from the Educational Access Admin. salary all the way across the 12 months. We come up with about \$77,000 or \$78,000. That will actually be probably a little high. I'm sure that as we do more productions we'll have more videographer fees.

The message really is that my gut tells me about 50k a year unless we have a significant increase in revenue. About 50k a year would be available the following year to put toward incrementally building out our systems.

Paul Johnson

I noticed the CDA expenditures are amounts that I guess correspond to particular phases. We're paying out monthly essentially items on that not as a lump sum when they are completed. In reality or is this your anticipation (inaudible) at each phase?

John Barker

CDA has certainly up to this point not billed us on a monthly basis. They have told us that they will be invoicing us. Since they haven't, I'm not sure how they are going to do that. I aligned it on phases. I'm not entirely sure that phase III will be completed this fiscal year. For the sake of estimating what we want to put into this budget, this capital equipment budget, I wanted to see it on here so we didn't lose sight of it. So I've added in everything for phases I through III.

Paul Johnson

That lead to my next question was what our IT Peg services thinks is the estimated timing for (inaudible) as far as – it looks here like we're looking that they anticipate design phase completion in December? Anticipated procurement phase completed in March, and so on? Is that what you're thinking time wise?

John Barker

Well the difficulty is that in reality there are 2 distinct portions of the project that while they fall within each of the phases, they sort of spread the project out. I know it's a little harder to analyze it. Let me explain what I mean by that. There is the portions around the design of the Court Street facility for production and distribution. Then there's a portion around equipment for

production distribution that could be use elsewhere until Court Street is ready. So the difficulty is that we may not finish the design of the Court Street facility in this fiscal year. We may not do any kind of procurement with the Court Street facility in this fiscal year. It's hard to know what percentage of that will occur. It's going to be subject to our changing priorities on focusing on getting cameras, and field equipment, and those things as well as some additional expenses that are now becoming more clear to us such as we are going to need to acquire an architect engineer to go over to Court Street and do an initial analysis of the facility so that CDA understands what they might need to do there. That individual would have to do some level of design around that facility. What that individual studies and brings forward will help guide us in what our timeline can be, etc. So we're beginning to realize that that project as it's evolving, and this is a good thing, but our vision is becoming clearer that that particular part of the design process will take longer and needs to be somewhat separated out from some of the more technical IT related pieces of it – or production related pieces of it. Does that make sense?

Paul Johnson

That does make sense. So the Court Street then we're looking at – it depends we start working in there and start taking blueprints and start analyzing things for planning, that's the time that we actual start to pay and take "ownership" of that facility?

John Barker

At this point when the ordinance for seeing the PEG services into Court Street once that goes through, I believe it will probably officially have possession at that time. I'm unclear on what are the legal aspects of that. I can certainly by that point we would probably be committed to those charge backs.

Paul Johnson

But we might not have constructive use of the space for 5 or 6 months (inaudible) things actually being able to do anything (inaudible) out of it.

John Barker

Exactly yes.

Paul Johnson

It seems like its inevitable and not a problem (inaudible).

Alderman Teeboom

A few things. First of all on this projection, maybe I missed it, where is the CD costs – the consultant costs. I see consultant is zero on the line.

John Barker

It's down under the capital equipment fund. We had talked in the past about having CDA fall under the capital equipment expenditure and not the consultant fees up in the top. Those are more operating expenses. This is separate from the operating expenses.

Alderman Teeboom

But the capital equipment fund is not going to get replenished. That's down to 100 and some thousand dollars?

John Barker

There has been talk in the past. Mr. Johnson certainly proposed it and it makes sense to me that we should be taking money from the 6013 fund, the operating expense fund, and shifting the capital equipment fund. The gating factor to that was to understand how much money you need in operating expenses, which is why you asked us to create this analysis. Now that we've done so, I think it might be prudent to talk about how much you might want to shift over to the capital equipment fund so we can spend off of that.

Alderman Teeboom

To complete the picture here, this is part picture. All you see here is operating expense forecast. What we don't have is the engineering capital and investment forecast. That's a separate sheet. That's what CDA is going to cost us. That is what the Court Street renovation is going to cost us, and that's what the architect engineer is going to cost us.

John Barker

That's correct.

Alderman Teeboom

I should mention that the architect engineer in the construction of Court Street is not part of the CDA contract. What's in the CDA contract and we talked about that the last time we met is the design of the system. They are not (inaudible) contract to renovate Court Street. In fact when we arranged the contract with CDA there was not clarity about exactly what we were going place (inaudible). That's all happened when the contract - and CDA has been very helpful in helping us out in that. (inaudible) additional charges just because we added the Court Street to the job effectively. They did point out to us that we did have to hire - I don't call it a construction manager, but an engineer, an architect, construction - it could be all in one entity because it's a small job. But basically do construction. The design and construction of Court Street. That has to be put into this package. They want \$13,000 and it's only going to go so far and that's it. So we need to have that picture. We need to understand what's going to happen when the P Channel comes (inaudible). That's going to complicate this thing. So I think it's a good start. It's a long way to go but it's certainly better than nothing in any forecast, and that's terrific.

Having said that, I'm looking at the salary. You mentioned those are an administrative oversight. I guess that came out of this business about are we charging the salaries fully loaded. Fully loaded means Medicare, health insurance, dental insurance, whatever benefits we provide our employees this is potential. I'm looking at the numbers Mr. Barker about Mr. Poehnert. Just to get a feel. I'm looking at your adjusted numbers and that's on one sheet 2008. I'm preparing that with your forecast numbers where you say they were adjusted. There's a little confusion. In July of '07 the salaries - doing it the old fashion (inaudible) way, it shows salaries of 3880-56 and you show in the projection of 54,065 in July. In August it showed, again, the same number 54,065 for salaries and August actuals was 48,060. So one (inaudible) 40 percent increase and the other one is a 12 percent increase. I believe the overhead is typically is got to be somewhere between 20 percent to 30 percent depending on how you count vacations, and holidays. I don't know exactly how we've been charging, Mr. Poehnert as an example, holidays and vacation time – either it's a direct charge, it might have been – it depends how he felt like to charge account because you fill out account charge numbers. That winds up in the accounting system. So I'm not sure that it completely lines up yet because I know it's not 41 percent loaded, and I know it's not 12 percent loaded. Maybe you could explain that.

John Barker

The numbers that we see on the actual – coming from the ledger to the expense sheet on line by when they occur inside the account. They're really taken from the ledger. Because some months have 5 weeks and some months have 4 weeks, the actual accrual of a salary can shift. So August numbers seem higher because there was a salary assessed in that time frame in the August ledger that might be different than when it was actually incurred, which would have been probably the previous month. Rather than try to deal with any of that when we created the forecast, we took the straight salary value of each of the individuals. Both the anticipated salary for educational access admin. and the actual salary for the PEG Program Manager. We had contact payroll and asked what the percentage rate of the burden of costs should be. They told us somewhere between 25 and 30. Wanting to make sure we gave the worst possible case for planning so that we didn't spend money we didn't have, we took those salaries and times them by an extra 30 percent and then spread that over 12 months. So we did times 1.30 and then ran it across 12 months. That we felt was good enough for forecasting even though it wouldn't necessarily ever line up against the ledger costs.

Alderman Teeboom

So when are we going to start running into a deficit? Have you looked that far?

John Barker

Honestly I don't believe you would run into – it really depends on if you try to undertake the public with these funds – we'd run into deficit very quickly. It depends on the broadcasting, the production costs, which we can't estimate until we know what that broadcasting production system will really look like, and then how much work we can undertake around it. Meaning how many productions can we do bases on how much equipment we might have? So there's a lot of

conjecture on things.

If you're talking about the terms of the build out project and where we would run into the deficit, I don't believe we would because CDA is saying to us tell how much money you have and we'll design a time line, and a schedule, and a build out based on how much available money you have. So we don't plan to let CDA design something that would require us to spend money we don't have. That's why it is critical to know what this number is. One thing I need to point out is that there is money in addition to these operating funds. There is money still in 6012 right now of \$113,530 that you would add to this 396. So we're looking at potentially \$500,000 this year that we could devote to the project if you wish.

Alderman Teeboom

This is the final point that I'll make. You brought up the productions. Here's an example. We're talking about the turkey bowl. We're talking about producing and video the turkey bowl. Last year it was not a great success, but at least it was a trial. This time I think it looks a lot more productive. It's going to cost money. We have to hire 82 videographers to handle that one plus it would be more than one hour. That's going to be a lot more production. As we're picking up this design equipment, people expect to see more production. If you see more production, you see more costs. When you see more costs, we start to strip the pie more and more. At the same time we're doing production work; at the same time we're hiring an additional full-time person; at the same time we're building up Court Street in our studio facility soon to be followed by the P Channel operation. So I'm glad you did the forecast Mr. Barker. It's just going to take a lot more effort. I'm really glad you're on it.

John Barker

I think we're in agreement that this is just the starting point that we must – every month before we appear in front of CTAB and as we plan continue to refine and evolve this so that we have a clearer and clearer picture. It is going to be a moving target. If we just did this once and made all of our decisions solely on this, we would certainly be wrong. So you're right. After we get a better understanding of what our capabilities will be, we need to change this. As we get a better understanding of what one time or ad hoc expenses might come into a given year, we need to change this. This will be a moving target.

Paul Johnson

I just had a quick back of the envelope analysis on this. As I look at this, it looks like we have \$323,000 currently in the operating account and an operating need in the next year of \$136,000 – actually the first 3 months of that already taken out. So it's about \$120,000 – and anticipated revenue at \$60,000 a quarter for a Comcast - \$180,000 in the next 3 quarters. So if we just look at the Comcast revenue that the franchise fee revenue of 180 coming in over the rest of FY08 against 120,000 in operating expenses, we have \$60,000 in surplus right there to cover the turkey bowl, increases in production, and things like that based on the forecast here. So it looks to me like if we pick at the 235 that we have in the operating balance and we shift 250 over into the capital fund, we'd still have 75 left or 73 left plus the anticipated 60 additional surplus. So we

have plenty of cushion in operating if we took 250,000 and shifted it today into the capital equipment fund, which we anticipated is where most of our financial activity will be over the next year. So I'd like to make a motion of the fact that we transfer \$250,000 from the operating account 305-6103 to the capital equipment fund 6012.

MOTION BY PAUL JOHNSON TO TRANSFER \$250,000 FROM THE OPERATING ACCOUNT 305-6103 INTO CAPITAL EQUIPMENT FUND ACCOUNT 6012

Alderman Teeboom

\$50,000?

Paul Johnson

250. Would you like me to repeat the numbers?

Alderman Teeboom

Yes.

Paul Johnson

We currently have 223 in operating today. We have if you look at your estimated year end and an expense forecast for this year for the operating, we're looking at an estimate of \$136,000 total expenses less the first 3 months already spent, which is about \$20,000 leaves \$116,000 in expenses according to this data. We have a run rate for franchise fee revenue of \$59,600 a quarter, which times $\frac{3}{4}$ remainings is called it \$180,000. So 180 less 116 is 65 or something like that. The 65,000 in surplus in operating plus you would still have 75 remaining in operating after the transfer of 250. So we have 130,000 in surplus operating expenses over and above our anticipated budget over the next year.

Andrew Cernota

For the record I would like to note that Dory Clarke has joined the meeting.

Alderman Teeboom

Are we accepting a motion at this point?

Andrew Cernota

I believe a motion has been made to transfer \$250,000 from the operating account ending in 6013 to the capital equipment account 6012.

Paul Johnson

With a net remaining of 73,000 in operating and a balance after the transfer of 363530 in capital.

Alderman Teeboom

I'm not going to support that at this point. It's a quick reaction. We're just getting it to forecasting. One thing if we make any transfer, I'd like to see an analysis in writing. I hear your numbers, but I don't follow that. The details of the numbers are (inaudible) my financial sheets any more. So if you want to make a major motion, this is a major motion that transfers – the money doesn't disappear but it sort of reallocates the money. I'd like to see that analysis. Like a spreadsheet. I wish you'd withdrew the motion and maybe give us a spreadsheet the next time we meet what had actually, just like what Mr. Barker did. Mr. Barker can look at it and Mr. Poehnert look at it. I think it's a little early to make that kind of decision at this point. That's just my with a motion on the floor withdrawn. That's my – I would not support the motion at this point.

John Barker

I'd just like to suggest the following along with Alderman Teeboom that perhaps Mr. Johnson can buddy up with us – myself and Mr. Poehnert, over the next month so we can work together on an analysis and then submit it and ready for the next CTAB. There is adequate funds in the capital equipment fund now for the next month for us to buy things we might need. So we have the time to write it up.

Dennis Ryder

I'd just like to say that this is a very important document you've come up with, and I think you've got an excellent start Sir.

John Barker

Thank you.

MOTION WITHDRAW BY PAUL JOHNSON

**MOTION BY ED LECIUS TO ACCEPT THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT
MOTION CARRIED**

PEG MANAGER'S REPORT

Jeff Poehnert

I have around purchasing activity in the month of September totaled \$3,071.71. Those infer 2 different things that I had reported actually happening in our last meeting. One was the remote access equipment so we can monitor Channel 16 and Channel 99 anywhere on the internet that we are. The other one was a Stellos Stadium cable project, which has been completed and has been paid. It shows up on the financials this month. It's basically all set in that stadium ready for us to come with equipment and be able to broadcast from that location.

Today I will be asking authorization for the following purchases: one would be a studio in a box for our broadcasting events such as sporting events at Stellos, for the mayoral forums and debates that the ordinances have dictated that we do if requested – I will go further into that after my report to go back to this into further detail. Also for 2 Sony hard drive cameras and their tripod and dolly setups. That would total not to exceed \$1,700.

The Educational Access Administrative position has been finalized and the Mayor has signed off on it. It's posted in the City, jobs in New Hampshire, and various community television websites – the main one being the ACM national website. We will be posting it to the other community television sites – the northeast regional one and the NH community television site as well. Our Access Administrative search committee so far is composed of Ed Lecius, Fred Teeboom, and Bernie Delano and also Stacy Hynes. I apologize her name is not on this list.

John Barker

Let me make a point here. It has not appeared in the paper yet to confirm that personnel yesterday. It will appear this weekend; it will appear in the Nashua and certainly for our listeners if anyone has interest, it will appear in the Nashua Telegraph. It will appear in the Lowell Sun and the Union Leader. Then we will get it on the regional websites early next week. So we anticipate certainly receiving resume from qualified individuals starting early next week. We anticipate once they get through the HR screening and we participate in that, then there will start to be forwarded to the search committee members next week as well.

Jeff Poehnert

Again the committee so far is Stacy Hynes, Ed Lecius, Fred Teeboom, and Bernie Delano. There probably will be some more from the educational community added to that committee as well.

We had 33 broadcasts total in September. We had 21 meetings to cover; 15 were live and 16 were taped. Then we had 13 playbacks from the server on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Technical problems that occur during the month – the aldermanic chamber hum that I spoke of in the last meeting, after our troubleshooting I had thought that it was the volume switch up at the front desk. In reality it turned out to be the cable coming from the front desk over to the actual modulator that goes out for broadcast and the strip was actually ungrounded. By replacing the cable, grounding everything over there, we basically eliminated the hum in the system.

The other problem occurred on October 1st. Twenty minutes into the broadcast of the Budget Review Committee, the audio was lost. What had happened was they were giving a presentation and all the equipment was pulled out over here to the side and there's a wire setup in the back of the modulator cable that snapped. It accidentally took that audio right out. It's probably the weakest link in the whole system right now. The modulator itself will eventually not be in this room. It's supposed to be racking off to the engineering room. For being able to broadcast, this is how we've set it up now. What I did was I went and I got a more heavy duty cable and an anchor that the cable actually anchors to the top of the modulator so if it's jammed it's not going to yank out of the back. It's still precarious in a way, but at least that eliminates that.

Our manual updates are ongoing. We will document the broadcast setup that I just was talking about for meetings in the aldermanic chamber using the use of an LCD projector and screening so we will be able to pull this camera out and not damage anything.

John Barker

There are some readings now in particular infrastructure where they're going to be using the GIS system to display things during the meeting. We've been asked to make sure the camera is back here so it gets a good view of the screen during the meeting. So we're documenting the process because it can be a little bit of a fire drill to do it at the last minute documenting the process to get that set up over here, how the cables have to be run, etc., so that we don't slow down the meetings.

Paul Johnson

Is it our goal to eliminate that by having equipment eventually where we can feed directly from the laptop that's feeding the PowerPoint into some kind of equipment so that we can picture and picture or cut back and forth without moving cameras?

John Barker

That's been identified as one of the objectives of the design. However I want to remind everyone that there are many objectives defined for the design and some of which can be afforded and some of which will be – all will be prioritized. Will that be accomplished? It can't be sure right now. Is it something we desire and have identified? Absolutely.

Jeff Poehnert

We expect to have a new video server installed at the south high school by October 19th as well as next we'll have a new server installed here at City Hall. Upon the purchase of a new digital hard drive cameras, the schedule can be expanded to include all Board of Ed. meetings, assuming a videographer is available for all, and subsequent replays. The replays are the most important on that. In order to do replays properly, we need to have digital hard drive cameras.

Our accomplishments have been that we did an immediate need assessment with the design consultants. We identified the need for what I had mentioned before a studio in the box configuration as well as additional cameras able to record directly to hard drive, as I just mentioned.

John Barker

I'm just going to interject here to give people a real quick idea of where we are with CDA. As I mentioned earlier, we identified that the project has 2 distinct larger components to them or domains. One being the Court Street and the work around that, and the other around production and broadcast and distribution capabilities with equipment, etc. Then CDA has been very clear about telling us – and what do you need right now. So as there delays in these other areas, what

can we continue to work on so we can do progress. The identification of being able to field productions was the first thing we asked them to target. The second was how do we do advanced and extended broadcasting and pre and post production now. So their next focus is on those areas. So you're seeing now requests that I'm hoping we'll have a motion at the end of this for 2 purchases. But we're seeing on the field production and the additional cameras immediately. We're also going to see probably at the next meeting a request for some additional server equipment, production equipment such as being able to put titles and things like that on there. The other overriding concern as we bring any of those things forward is we have to make sure that they can be operated as efficiently as possible and automated as much as possible. So we're trying to make sure we're picking things that will streamline our operations and not increase our workload.

It is important for you to realize that the focus of the CDA right now is on identifying these most immediate needs, giving us recommendations, and helping us procure those things now, and then looking at Court Street when we have an architect engineer in there to work with them.

Jeff Poehnert

The servers were delivered as I said towards the months end last month. We're still awaiting finalized software licenses so that they can be deployed. That would basically they'd be able to play a play list of programs. Right now they're ready to go, they just need the software and we're pushing for that with the company that's supplying it.

System design. Again we've met several times during the month to work on the type line, the system design, and implementation. In the studio area the floor plans for 14 Court Street were acquired from the archives downstairs and copies were delivered last week to the design consultants. The line of site for the microwave transmission, if that's the way we go, was confirmed. So there is a line of site between City Hall and 14 Court Street. We're awaiting access control security system quotes from the vendors.

Just to go back to the studio in a box quickly. Basically what that is is I've used Stellos as an example. We would go to Stellos. We can hook on the side of the building. We take 2 cameras up to the announcer's box. We drop 2 cables down, hook them to the studio in the box, put a microphone or hook into the announcer's microphone, a microphone onto the field, and we go. That's literally we can go live from there searching between the 2 cameras. One total zoom and one cutaway camera.

John Barker

And they can be used for interviews, or they can be used for the non-profit if we'd like to do something there, they can be used out in the street if we have electricity. They can be used at meetings. It's not strictly for sports events. It's for anything. Certainly we thought seriously about sports events when we designed it.

Jeff Poehnert

That's basically my report.

John Barker

I'd just like to make 2 things. One will be a motion. First off I really want to acknowledge Mr. Johnson and Mr. Teeboom for the work, the time, the energy they've put into assisting us in this. We work hard certainly and we put a lot of hours in staff here, but we do derive a paycheck from this at the end of the day. These individuals get their money elsewhere and devote these energies for the good of the citizens, and the interest of the project, and they work exceedingly hard. I'm sometimes amazed at the energy level they put into it. There's days I kind of rue the fact that they drive us so darn hard and other days I'm glad there's somebody there that we can even delegate some things to. They've been participating all through this, coming to meetings, communicating via e-mail. There are other members such as Mr. Farrenkopf that participate as well. We really appreciate the efforts of all of them. So I want to acknowledge that. It's easily forgotten at times, but it's important to us.

The second is I'd like to make a motion for approval to PEG Program Manager Mr. Poehnert to make 2 purchases. The first will be the studio in a box system, and that is an approval for a purchase of that system not to exceed \$9,999.000. The second is the purchase of 2 hard drive cameras, the tripods, and other equipment necessary for that not to exceed \$1,700 so that we may expeditiously pursue those purchases following this meeting.

MOTION BY JOHN BARKER FOR THE PURCHASE OF A STUDIO IN A BOX SYSTEM NOT TO EXCEED \$9,999.00 AND THE PURCHASE OF 2 HARD DRIVE CAMERAS, TRIPODS, AND OTHER EQUIPMENT NECESSARY FOR SAID CAMERA NOT TO EXCEED \$1,700

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Teeboom

I see Attorney Clarke is here. I have a couple of questions. First of all I'm familiar with a studio in a box. Here's the whole list if anybody wants to go through it. The technical committee spent time on it. Basically the CDA has done all the work. So far I think I'm very pleased. Speaking for myself, I'm very pleased with the work they do. They've come down here – they've been here 3 times now all the way from Canton. They didn't ask for all that many meetings in the contract. My question is to Attorney Clarke. \$9,999 sounds suspiciously close to \$10,000. It's the magic line by which it goes to the aldermanic Finance Committee. So I've got to put my aldermanic hat on and say that's number one. I see also separately listed the \$1,700 camera, which basically work with that system.

I have a two-part question. The first question is, therefore, making this a part is that okay? The second because it sounds like it's an attempt to get it under \$10,000. I personally had a problem with that in fact with the fire department cause the fire chief is here before with the previous chief that they're breaking up furniture and the pieces total was less than \$10,000. That's a long story

for another time.

Unidentified Male Speaker

Are we going to go through that here?

Alderman Teeboom

No, we're not going to go through that again. But I'm going to get out - I'm trying to be consistent because we take \$9,999 and add \$1,700 you're suddenly over \$10,000. So that's a question to Attorney Clarke.

The second one is basically no one has seen the contract. There is not contract. There is no RFP out. I think there's an RFP out – well I don't even know if there's a RFP out. We see only a figure here. I have a list here, but I don't have an RFP in my hand. If I remember right when we did the audio thing, we didn't have an RFP in hand either. That might have been different. The way it works I guess this Board approves expenditures – this being allowed now throughout the Policy and Procedure Manual, but should we see more than just a figure on a piece of paper? So I have a two-part question. Do you want me to repeat the question?

Dorothy Clarke

No. I would say in respect to the first issue, it appears that the quote for the studio in a box is \$9,427, and I have a feeling that the motion was made not to exceed \$9,999 just in case there's incidental costs that increase that \$9,427 amount slightly. If that is in deed an accurate figure for this particular purchase item, it is under \$10,000. I mean there will be some things that are between \$9,000 and \$10,000. The purchasing manager certainly is sensitive to splitting purchases up in a way that would make them fall under the \$10,000 restriction. I'm not super technical in the terms of the additional Sony hard drive cameras. I don't know are they really just for use with this or are they something that we have other ones and we're buying additional ones can they be used for other things? I think there's probably a factual question as to are they really completely tied up with the studio in a box purchase such that it's clear as being divided just to get under \$10,000 or no these are legitimately a separate purchase that also are clearly under \$10,000. So those are sort of maybe a factual question.

Andrew Cernota

Maybe we'd address the factual question.

John Barker

Certainly in any complicated system such as the production and distribution system for broadcasting, things work with each other. One can't say that therefore we have to wait until we have an entire broadcast and distribution system and then put that all forward at once. They will work with each other. The studio in a box system is intended to be used all together at different events. These cameras are not intended to be a part of that package when it goes out. These

are intended to be used for other meetings and other purposes. There are times, I'm sure, where they might be added in to give extended capability to that studio in a box. But they are not part by design to be part of that. That is a separate piece. Things will always work together with each other so by extension; we don't want to imply that therefore as we buy them we are looking for an opportunity to bypass purchasing requirements. Just as hoses plug to each other and just as in many other departments different systems can possible work together, the reality is that we're basing these around different needs, different intended purposes, and the fact that they could cable to each other at some point in the future would not imply that they are the same system or that we're breaking it apart to in any way try to bypass the ordinances. As Attorney Clarke has said, the Purchasing Manager would not permit that, and frankly that would never be our intent.

Paul Johnson

Two questions. One is the studio in a box tied to a particular equipment list, or is it functional equivalence, or is it set in stone currently as to what the actual equipment is or do you have a budget based on something? That's the first question.

The second question is it is my understanding that the studio in a box was to include cameras, but you can't have a studio without cameras as part of the studio. So there actually is in that purchase a self contain – in the box are also cameras. So the other cameras are completed ancillary for school board meetings and things, right?

John Barker

Let me answer your second question first, which is yes. There are cameras in the studio in a box that is specific to that particular purpose. These cameras are not part of that. That's correct.

The second question is as to the list is it set in stone? It's not set in stone until the point at which we construct the invitation for bid. The invitation for bid will be constructed to send out – I mean we will at that point be specific about the products we want. But we will send them out to at least 3 vendors to get competitive bids on those products. Then we will select the vendor that gives us the best price for those. So we're not going to sweetheart hand this to anybody. We're still going to bid it. However, we will have arrived at through the recommendations of CDA and our own efforts arrived at a clear understanding of the particular components we are looking for.

Dorothy Clarke

Based on Mr. Barker's explanations of the 2 items, I'm comfortable saying it appears to me that it's too individual purchases and they're not being broken apart for various purposes. With respect to the other question in terms of how detailed a purchase request that CTAB would want to approve, I think it's really up to the committee. I'll say it again; I'm not a technical person so I'm more than happy to approve a purchase based on the general description that we just received. I know there certainly are other members of this committee that are more technically minded and might want to see more detailed information before making their vote, but that's really not a legal question. It's more of a sense of the committee and what the committee feels

comfortable seeing before they choose to vote.

John Barker

What my last point to that is that in the past I had come forward in two steps and one which I would discuss general approval for the concept of expenditure and then perform an invitation for bid or an RFP and then bring that forward to the committee and ask for sort of confirmation of that expenditure. The reason we're doing it differently in this particular case is that the committee meets once a month ad hoc meetings with a large committee like this getting a quorum can be exceedingly difficult. In the interest of meeting the immediate needs of both the government channel and the educational channel, we really don't want to postpone this purchase possibly 2 or 3 months as it moves through the whole process of bidding and the like.

So it was our intention to get approval for the expenditure so a clear understanding that we would not exceed a dollar value, and then move forward to process this through purchasing and get the equipment as very expeditiously as possible or we will delay some very significant events that we would like to cover and activities we would like to undertake such as the turkey bowl, such as additional meetings, such as aldermanic debates and things like that where we just don't have the equipment necessary for that right now to be able to cover this. We've done a good job of putting things out there. People are interested. They want to see more. We're bumping up against a very, very limited inventory of equipment.

Alderman Teeboom

I think Attorney Clarke answered it. I'm comfortable because – is there a motion on the floor?

Andrew Cernota

I believe a motion was made to approve the purchase in the amount of \$9,999.

Alderman Teeboom

Yes I have seen this list and of course I've attended the meeting where we discussed this list in quite detail. So I don't have a problem. I only really affect the other members that have not seen this list. Number two is in the past we have seen the RFP. It's one thing to see a list, another one to see the actual terms and conditions of the contract obviously buying it. This I think is a sealed bid for brand name products, right?

John Barker

Yes.

Alderman Teeboom

I don't want to see that we set a norm that says Mr. Barker comes in with a list that we haven't seen and we just approve it. In this case, I think its okay for a number of reasons. First of all the

CDA has gone through it in detail. Number two the turkey bowl. If we want to have any chance at all of getting the stuff in time into the turkey bowl, then we got to do it now. There's just isn't enough time. The next time we meet is in November. The turkey bowl is in November. You can't get the stuff in time, train yourself on it, and get it operating. So I support the motion in total.

Dennis Ryder

I'd just like to ask where the \$9,999 come from? If you haven't had any bids yet, is this one particular piece of equipment that costs that much?

John Barker

I chose that figure really to indicate to the committee that I had no intention of making a very large purchase that would have to go in front of the Finance Committee. As you can see from the actual figure on the spreadsheet we have, and Jeff has it here in the PEG Program Manager's report, its \$9,427. The reality is when we competitively bid it will be less than that. But I really wanted the committee to understand I didn't intend to make this a major purchase. I intended to make this a purchase of a specific system, and it would not be going above that amount.

Paul Johnson

I'd just like to make two points. I'm strongly in favor of this. I have reviewed the purchase list of equipment and the priorities anticipated in the process and I feel very comfortable with what's being recommended here today. Compare this to where we were a year ago sitting here talking about spending money on renting equipment with no long-term payback to cover our turkey bowl, this is much more fiscally prudent and really moves us forward on the path for the City to have it's own facilities.

The other factor here is that we currently have 2 cameras. One of which I'm pointing at that cover everything in the City right now. They're really over taxed. They are also very expensive. If one were to break, then we have one camera for the entire City. So adding cameras, adding this capability and not having as the other alternative would be to take these expensive cameras out into the field where they risk damage is another very sensible thing to do. So there's a lot of benefits to moving forward in this particular direction.

John Barker

Just one last point about the cameras since you brought this up Mr. Johnson. These cameras are analog cameras. They are not digital cameras. What that means is every production we do then has to be manually digitized, which is a very, very time consuming process. It is significantly impacting the PEG Manager operations to be able to participate with CDA and be able to do different things because we are babysitting equipment through a digitization process. These new cameras are quantum leaps ahead. They will digitize the image as it rolls so that we can take it from a camera and download it to a server and get it on air right away and be able to meet the requests of the educational channel to get their information – to get their productions on to

Channel 99 immediately and to get them on to 16 for playback if appropriate immediately. So it is another step ahead as well in that regard. That means that's saving us money because when we pay an individual at this pay grade to baby sit digitization of equipment of broadcasting, that is a very poor use of our money.

MOTION BY JOHN BARKER THE AUTHORIZATION FROM CTAB TO MAKE 2 PURCHASES – ONE FOR THE PURCHASE OF A STUDIO IN A BOX FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$9,800 AND FOR THE PURCHASE OF TWO HARD DRIVE CAMERAS AND TRIPODS, AND PERIPHERAL EQUIPMENT FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,700

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Teeboom

On the cameras you mentioned, and I had forgotten about that, that we're buying digital cameras with the \$1,700. You mentioned these are analog cameras. If I remember right they paid close to \$5,000 for that camera. Is there some point in time that these cameras get converted to digital so we're all digital? Are the cameras compatible with these analog so they can play here if we need that camera? Exactly how does that unfold itself?

Jeff Poehnert

These cameras actually record digitally but they record to linear digital. There is the difference. In other words, the new cameras are non linear so they are going to make a file simply that can be transferred into a server. It will always be the case with these cameras that they must be digitized. You must actually play the tape back into the computer. The computer then transfers it digitally into a file format, and then they play. So their usefulness will be there certainly for live. But they will always require digitization process in order to replay.

Alderman Teeboom

So when we do this purchase, and these are much less expensive than these cameras, are we going to replace these cameras eventually?

Jeff Poehnert

No these will still be used except that there will be a time factor on – eventually yes I will phase them out.

Paul Johnson

I would like to discuss briefly the possibility of increasing the budget on the second to not to exceed \$2,000 just so we have a little flexibility to review a couple of technical points. It maybe that this budget is fine, but a little bit of flexibility might be useful.

Andrew Cernota

Is that a friendly amendment?

John Barker

Sure. Absolutely. I would support that.

Jeff Poehnert

I'm experimenting right now Alderman Teeboom with a way to record these cameras directly into a CPU. So it may be that right there where these cameras will have the capability not the best way possible, but when we record a live chamber activity, they will record to a hard drive.

Alderman Teeboom

I would like to divide the question to 2 motions if the Chair doesn't mind. The first motion is for the \$9,800, and then the second motion a separate vote where I think it's now \$2,000. I'm asking to divide the question.

Andrew Cernota

If there's no objection, we'll divide the question and address the \$9,800 one first.

**MOTION BY JOHN BARKER THE AUTHORIZATION FROM CTAB TO PURCHASE A STUDIO
IN A BOX FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$9,800
MOTION CARRIED**

**MOTION BY JOHN BARKER THE AUTHORIZATION FROM CTAB TO PURCHASE TWO
SONY HARD DRIVE CAMERAS AND TRIPODS, AND PERIPHERAL EQUIPMENT FOR AN
AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$2,000**

ON THE QUESTION

Dennis Ryder

The only figure discussed was \$1,700?

Andrew Cernota

Yes. Then there was a friendly amendment made to increase that to \$2,000 to allow for technical issues that might arise that would require additional...

John Barker

We should clarify that it's not to exceed \$2,000.

Andrew Cernota

Right.

MOTION CARRIED

Andrew Cernota

Mr. Poehnert have you completed your report?

Jeff Poehnert

I have completed my report yes.

Committee Reports

- Education Committee

Ed Lecius

Mr. Chairman the Education Committee met this past Tuesday. Some of the items we acted upon as we approved our draft of the by-laws. The Policies Procedures Subcommittee is currently recruiting teachers to pilot periodic programming directly from the classrooms. We also approved programming to be covered out of the Board of Ed. meetings, out of the Board of Ed. Committee meetings, all educational channel meetings. We talked about and it will come up under new business the teacher approved north and south production by the students to include the production of The Telegraph editorial board candidate interviews with the presidential candidates, north and south fall sports games, announcements of the school district parent/teacher conferences, and the PTO sponsored mayoral forums scheduled for Wednesday, October 24th.

Some of the other items that were discussed and acted upon was to create a web-based template form for suggested announcement submissions, upgrading the school profiles that have been running on Channel 99. The Stellos Stadium cabling project has been completed, and the server acquisition is in process. WE also approved a schedule of our 2008 meeting dates.

MOTION BY ED LECIUS TO ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF THE EDUCATION COMMITTEE MEETING

MOTION CARRIED

- Federal/State/Industry (FSI) Subcommittee

Paul Johnson

No formal report this month. There continue to be things going on in Washington with the FCC

legislating essentially through rules changes some things that could impact the City of Nashua and the current type of franchise agreement we have. They are being posed by national organizations, including the one that we belong to the Alliance of Community Media. I'm sure it will be tied up in court for some time. So there's nothing we can do about things right now, but we continue to monitor. It's unfortunate that the trend in Washington with the FCC, which is divided 3-2 on these issues is currently going in a direction that is not favorable to the City as we'd like. I suspect congress will ultimately act to reign things in.

**MOTION BY CHIEF MORRISSEY TO ACCEPT PAUL JOHNSON'S REPORT ON
FEDERAL/STATE/INDUSTRY (FSI) SUBCOMMITTEE
MOTION CARRIED**

NEW BUSINESS

Stacy Hynes

Good morning. I'm here on behalf of the Education Channel Committee to advocate for 2 programs that we would like to see broadcast on Channel 99. One is the senior students TV production students who are working with The Telegraph editorial board to produce their interviews with the presidential candidates which will be ongoing over the next few months up until the New Hampshire primary presumably in January. Also another program one-time event on Wednesday, October 24. That's the school district PTO are sponsoring a candidate forum. Again, that's on Wednesday, October 24.

John Barker

I support this certainly, but I do have a question. The question is that this is a very narrow and specific focus. What was the discussion amongst the committee of whether a larger more wide focus might be there so that you would not have to perhaps try to amend it later on when there was a different date of the event or a different sponsoring organization of an event where the students were directly participating and filming? I'm just wondering did you give thought to how you might structure this so that you had flexibility the next time?

Stacy Hynes

We did discuss it, and we thought it was best because everyone felt strongly that the Appendix B was a very strong document, and everyone agreed with the spirit of the document and how it was written. So to be sure that sort of to put a safeguard in place instead of attempting to rewrite that to accommodate these 2 specific programs and possible others would be best to deal on a case by case basis with the programming to be sure it was appropriate, that it met the channels mission and guidelines.

Ed Lecius

Just to reiterate. The committee had a pretty lengthy discussion in terms of the integrity of Appendix B as it is now written. We didn't want to lessen its impact but be more specific to this

every 4-year phenomenon of the president primary where the kids are now doing hands on. I don't know how many people had a chance to see this morning's Telegraph, but yesterday they interviewed Governor Richardson, and it showed the panel doing the interview off in the distance and the TV monitor showing the production that was ongoing by the students. We felt that the hands on value and the educational piece of the students producing something as historic – obviously if everyone shows up, the next president of the United States is going to be sitting in the room with those children and students and we felt that that was very important.

On the second piece in discussions prior to the meeting this morning, I believe that the aldermanic action of earlier this year with respect to the mayoral forums pretty much covers that. I do want to emphasize that there was a strong consensus to keep the integrity of Appendix B and not do away with it but just to modify it to allow for these 2 specific with the presidential interviews specifically.

Paul Johnson

I share Mr. Barker's concerns about, I think, amending a document that is an ongoing document of Appendix B. For many years the common to specifically approve 2 events to take place in 2008. I'm strongly in favor of the broadcasting of them, I'm wondering if there can be some kind of a waiver or something that can be ran by this board in lieu of memorializing these 2 specific events in a document.

Stacy Hynes

I'm not sure what mechanism is needed, but I agree with exactly with what you're saying. I think that was the spirit of the conversation at Tuesday's committee meeting. So whatever needs to be done.

Alderman Teeboom

Well it brings up a whole bunch of issues. Let's take them in part one at a time. Pending BOE reads – the education access channel shall not cable cast political advertising nor interview or present political parties or candidates for political office advocating or promoting their candidacy for elected or appointed political office nor promote or oppose valid issues by supporting groups or lobbying organizations. That's the strong statement. It basically was coordinated in full with the education – I don't think the Education Committee existing at the time, but certainly Mr. Farrenkopf and the Superintendent at the time Julia Earl, and others.

So what happened is this question came up not long ago out of two local candidates because we don't have the P Channel up and running where this would appear. In fact particularly that's what the P Channel is for – to do political stuff. I hadn't seen the resolution because I just saw this piece of paper. Maybe Attorney Clarke as that resolution. We passed...do you have it Attorney Clarke?

Dorothy Clarke

I do. I can read it. “resolved by the Board of Aldermen and the City of Nashua that notwithstanding any ordinance, regulation, or policy to the contrary cable casts of candidate debates and forums incident to the 2007 municipal election to which all candidates who will be on the ballot have been invited in writing or e-mail at least seven (7) days in advance of the event may be shown on the government access channel or the education access channel, as scheduling permits, either live or on tape. Organizations sponsoring such debates or forums and wishing to have them cable cast must reimburse the City the cost of the videographers compensation but will not be charged for the equipment usage or cable cast itself.”

Alderman Teeboom

You can see that’s quite specific to 2007. It’s quite specific to municipal elections. Meaning the school board, Board of Aldermen, Mayor. It came with a lot of pain and suffering in terms of getting it done because it was turned down by this board several times and was finally brought up – because I did the sponsorship for this because I said I’ll go with what the board wants because Alderman Bolton brought it up. The board finally passed it in this particular resolution. Now you have to understand that Appendix B is not under the control of this board. Appendix B is the whole document is under the control of the Board of Aldermen. They have granted certain responsibilities to CTAB, including a financial one that we just voted on but have retained many rights, and specifically have that included in the document that they retain the right to amend. That had to go through the board. Now it can go the hard way with the resolution. It can go an easier way with a communication. It always takes a vote and debate and there’s different opinions about what should go on the education channel.

So first of all the presidential thing is out for now until we get something from the education channel in writing – you can send it to me and I’ll pass it to the board. If you want to hit this before January, you got to move pretty fast because the alderman board will meet at the end of this month. So you can something before the Board of Aldermen by the end of this month as a communication asking if you can take an exception as you’ve done for the local election as well for the presidential candidates. But now it’s different. You’re no longer in a forum. You’re now taking each candidate at a time. So you have to be rather specific. I think you need to take a look at the resolution that Attorney Clarke just looked at and read to us which took a while to even get to that language. Take a look at that, redraft it, send it to me, and I’ll send it to the Board and try to get it before the Board meets again which is not this Tuesday coming but a week from this Tuesday if I remember right.

Dorothy Clarke

The 23rd.

Alderman Teeboom

Then we’ll make the case and see where it goes. If the Board approves it, and they’ll approve it

for the narrow case for the presidential election fine. If you have supporting argument like you just made, it's good for the students obviously, and you'll have a debate. Some people feel that the presidential debate should not go on, and others feel it's good for the kids to have that background. That's for the presidential.

I think for the Board of Education, that's already approved. So that doesn't have to be any policy. You just go do it. You're already okayed on that. Just work with PEG Manager Poehnert in getting it done. That's for the Board of Education candidates.

Paul Johnson

Two points. One was the resolution covering both channel 16 and channel 99?

Dennis Ryder

That's what she said.

Dorothy Clarke

Yes it did.

Paul Johnson

The other point is just there's a difference between a debate where all the candidates are visible in the same program and specific – and I guess these are half hour or hour long interviews?

Stacy Hynes

One hour.

Paul Johnson

One hour. Hour long interviews featuring a specific candidate and I have some concern in terms of fairness in a situation like that particularly with that large number of candidates out there. If candidates are presented in chronological order as they appear, that the candidates that happen to get on closer to the election date have some advantage over candidates that were seen months earlier. So I do think there's some benefit to thinking about how the structure of those broadcast in a block so that they're reasonably close to each other in time and well promoted so that there isn't an advantage to one candidate over another.

John Barker

I just want to draw attention to and hopefully see it articulated well to the board that the (inaudible) to these are different than debates. Obviously a debate is done to hear the views of the candidates, and explore them, etc. The purpose of the things we're talking about here is for the students. That's exactly what the educational channel is about. So as these things were

thought about, political considerations really should be secondary to the fact that these are about students getting real work experience, students getting exposure to these technologies and techniques, students being better educated. That's exactly what this whole committee and this channel is about. We don't want to lose track of that and go off on a rat hole on all the political considerations. So as it comes forward, I think it's important that that flavor stays there as well as possible when the Board considers it.

Jeff Poehnert

I guess I believe probably the political aspects could be taken care of and the replay process through the server.

Alderman Teeboom

Again, the PTO is a forum – a group of people getting together all 5, 6, 7 candidates that you have on the Board of Education. They'll all be there I presume all at the same time.

Stacy Hynes

All six.

Alderman Teeboom

That's a no brainer. That's done. The other one Marshall McLuen (sp?) wrote a famous book Mr. Barker called the Medium is the Message. You do not separate the message from the medium. Therefore, the political message is what comes through not the fact that it's tutorial for students. You have to think about this carefully. A political debate is a political debate. What comes through as a candidate, a candidate debating is not talking about all I'm doing for the students, let me just ease my language as an example. He may or may not. He's out there presenting his case because he wants to be president of the United States. That's why he's there not because he's being educational. He's got plenty of things to do to become president of the United States. I understand what you said, but I don't agree with you. You cannot separate the message from the medium.

John Barker

I don't want to get into an extended debate here. But so many of the things that the educational channel does will at times reflect (inaudible) educational community opinion not. If we say that the focus of the educational channel is about the presentation of opinion rather than the presentation of educational information, I think we once again lose focus on why communities do that. They do it as an educational mechanism. They do it for the benefit of those parties who are participating as well in both viewership and those creating it. I agree that we'll disagree on the focus of that.

Paul Johnson

One other suggestion in terms of getting the content in front of people sooner rather than later while some policy is being worked on is that it might be appropriate to put on channel 99 slides, a bulleting board that all of the broadcasts are available on the Nashua Telegraph's website on-line free of charge on demand. I don't think it's being promoted currently on the 99 bulletin board. That kind of finesses the issue if it never does get ratified, but also lets people see them sooner rather than later.

Dennis Ryder

Just 2 small points. I'm reading this request from the education department here. Number one it's talking about upholding no critical advertising or promotion of a candidacy, similar bouts by supporting group or lobbying organizations. It then refers to the Telegraph's editorial board. We've had one broadcast already that had a commercial clearly displayed on the back wall. I presume that this is saying that they're going to have the Telegraph clearly displayed on the back wall?

Ed Lecius

I can answer that Mr. Chairman. No. It's the editorial board of the Telegraph sitting around the table with the candidate. There are not banners, no advertising...

Dennis Ryder

Thank you. That's the point I wanted to make. Secondly this says it's going to take place during class. I presume there's going to be no question of pay for the student videographers? They're having a class experience.

Ed Lecius

Yes. Part of the...

Dennis Ryder

I support this 100 percent then.

Paul Johnson

So it's not student interviewing, it's students actually behind the scenes on this?

Stacy Hynes

For the production yes, and they've been involved with the design, working with the editorial board, and how it's produced.

Paul Johnson

No students actually appear on camera at any time during this?

Stacy Hynes

Correct.

Alderman Teeboom

I'd like to see a vote by this board. This has to be approved by the Board of Aldermen. It's not in control of this board. I would like it like we did in the past. Now understand in the past this board turned it down and the Board of Aldermen ignored that and did what they wanted to do, which is approve that resolution with all of its language in it of conditions. I'd like to make a motion to see if this board – I'd like to see a vote on this board. In fact, I'd like to see a roll call vote on this board to see if we approve it or not approve the presidential presentation. Basically what I think the approval would be to see that the Telegraph productions will be presented on channel 99. These are Telegraph productions correct?

Stacy Hynes

These are produced by the senior TV and production students.

Alderman Teeboom

The students run the cameras and the students run the show.

Stacy Hynes

They've designed a program.

Alderman Teeboom

It's done in the Telegraph office, and whatever is on the computer when we dial up telegraph.com, that same program you want to see on channel 99?

Stacy Hynes

Correct.

Alderman Teeboom

I'd like to see a roll call vote whether this board supports that.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN TEEBOOM TO APPROVE THE PRESIDENTIAL

PRESENTATION

ON THE QUESTION

Paul Johnson

Of the motion and not of the merits?

Andrew Cernota

Of the motion. I'm sure the merits will probably spill into that.

Paul Johnson

I'd just like to say that I'm really conflicted on this particular one. This was as I understand it that the Telegraph came up with, and they came up with a mechanism whereby they could provide not only their print content but video content that drove people to the Telegraph website. A great business model for them, no cost production, and all. I applaud them for their creativity in coming up with this in the primary season. I was somewhat under the misconception that students were involved in actually interviewing the candidates, and on camera, and had some presence, and see things from a student's perspective in terms of candidates talking to young people. Apparently that is not the case. So what we have here is really a commercial venture by the Telegraph interviewing candidates sequentially with no students visible, no student input. I do understand that the students are behind the scenes. They are proud of their work, and I respect – and the conflicting part is I think they deserve to have their work shown. I'm sure it's fine work and they're proud of it and this is a one every four year occurrence. It's a difficult choice for me. I'm not sure yet how I'll vote.

Stacy Hynes

I just wanted to reiterate again that this is something that the students are being assessed on by their teacher. So it is something that's a great deal of thought and the fact that they are being placed on potentially 99 and they're on the website certainly does add weight to that. They have a great investment and the design involved a lot of conversation with all these editors. The online editors as well as the editors taking part on the editorial board in what they were expecting to see. Although they are not actually asking the questions, they've been very involved with the whole design of the program.

Paul Johnson

What I think I'd be a lot more comfortable with in thinking this through is to have a making of show that edited things down and showed students producing these rather than showing just the talking heads of the politicians' talks with the Telegraph editors.

Stacy Hynes

There eventually is a production of that. You mean behind the scenes?

Paul Johnson

Yes.

Stacy Hynes

There is actually one the Telegraph produced themselves. I don't think it was intended to be part of their online presentation. It's really for the students.

Paul Johnson

That almost seems like that's more in keeping with what should be on 99 and what the Telegraph's content on the Telegraph.

Stacy Hynes

Well maybe that's something maybe the committee can talk to the Telegraph about.

John Barker

I just wanted to once again reiterate that when I do vote on this it will be on the spirit of the educational components of this and intention and no commentary whatsoever on the Telegraph or any of those matters. That the decisions – I don't want to make it appear as though we are making any kind of favored decisions for anybody or that we are promoting these kinds of things or setting some particular precedent for these organizations or these events in general. In the spirit of the educational opportunities these afford and the values it provides to students. Based on the recommendation and the diligence, and the thought given by the Educational Channel Committee on this, my vote will be based on that.

ROLL CALL

Yea: Ed Lecius, Dennis Ryder, John Barker, Charlie Matthews, Mariam Swanson 5

Nay: Alderman Teeboom, Paul Johnson, Dorothy Clarke, Brian Morrissey 4

Andrew Cernota abstained from voting as his law firm represents the Telegraph in some matters.

MOTION CARRIED

Alderman Teeboom

Point of clarity. We still need it passed. I'm still looking for a write up from I guess either Mr. Lecius or Ms. Hynes that I can send to the Board of Aldermen – a communication and ask without going to resolution to see if I can get that.

Ed Lecius

Well it would come from the Chair of the committee.

Andrew Cernota

Probably in this instance maybe from the vice chair.

Ed Lecius

No. The chair of the Educational Committee.

Andrew Cernota

Okay. Yes.

Alderman Teeboom

So it would be Ms. Hynes.

Stacy Hynes

So I'll write it up for the Board of Aldermen.

Alderman Teeboom

And particular explain the...

- Authorization to purchase new production equipment

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

COMMITTEE MEMBER REMARKS

Alderman Teeboom

There's a resolution in committee that's coming up Thursday I believe. I think Mr. Barker is going to be there. I hope he's going to be there. It's about the Court Street. It's due. As you know we

have a tentative agreement authorization with the Mayor to occupy Court Street but its only temporary advice of counsel. It certainly has to be approved by the Board of Aldermen and that resolution is now before the Board of Aldermen. It will be debated this Thursday I think?

John Barker

Thursday the 16th.

Alderman Teeboom

So you'll see it on TV if you don't go down. You'll see Mr. Barker answer the questions. I'll be there too. Hopefully the committee will favorably approve that and go back to the full Board for concurrence. If it didn't pass the committee, it probably will have a hard time with the Board. I don't see a big problem and the Mayor supports it.

The other one I wanted to mention is there was a proposal made to make a separate PEG department in the IT Division proposed by Mr. Barker. That ultimately even though it went through legal review, it got introduced, it did not – in general the series of questions including counting questions that we talked about earlier (inaudible) and it was noted that the Mayor had not endorsed that. In asking the Mayor to endorse it, he did not endorse it. He basically felt they have a new department formed in IT Division called "PEG Department, the Nashua CTV Department" and that should be up to the next Mayor to decide. So I've withdrawn that legislation. It's now basically you're still reporting, obviously, just like you are Mr. Poehnert. You're not in a separate department and won't be for this year.

John Barker

Just a couple points. One is that I think it's clear that the Mayor felt that the decision belonged to the next Mayor, but also that there were a number of accounting ramifications (inaudible) that needed to be thought about ahead of time. So he felt it was judicious to weigh those in before moving forward. He did not – I just want to make it clear the implication is not that the PEG goes anywhere else. The IT Division will continue to have those staff members and continue to hopefully bring the progress that you've come to enjoy here moving forward.

The second thing is that really the genius of this whole thing began simply enough on whether Nashua CTV was a term we could use in a job description if it was not a formal department of the IT Division. So I would like to ask if our legal department could let us know if there is any impediment to using the term "Nashua CTV" for these efforts going forward whether it's on the announcements where we currently use it or on documents with contracts and the like and within the City whether it's a PDF, position description form, or another mechanism.

Dorothy Clarke

I think it depends. Of course a lawyer answer. Nashua CTV can't enter into any contracts certainly, but that's the same for any department or division. It's always the City of Nashua as the contracting party. In terms of having it on a job description, like the PDFs I think clearly it's

still going to say the IT Division. I guess I would just at this point say maybe leave department blank at this point. In terms of the name Nashua CTV, my only reluctance there is I don't think it's ever been sort of officially so designated by the Mayor and/or the Board of Aldermen if that's what we were going to call the PEG channels. It's sort of been a name that this committee voted on and used. I guess I'd just want maybe some sort of more official naming protocol before it got used in a lot more documents.

John Barker

Such as a resolution proposed by the Mayor perhaps?

Dorothy Clarke

Exactly.

Charlie Matthews

Yes I had a quick question for Mr. Poehnert. I wanted to know if you could update us on the scheduling for the broadcasts and the replays. Is there a schedule now on the website or is there another source that we can find out what's coming as far programming is concerned.

Jeff Poehnert

I put the schedule on every week on Channel 16 and it plays. On the slides each day that goes by those slides come off. Every Friday I update them and the crawl.

Charlie Matthews

Is there a static schedule that we can look at on the web so if we wanted to plan...

Jeff Poehnert

I have to update that. 99 has their schedule as well but on Channel 99. I'm sorry I take that back. They have the schedule on 99, but I also put it on Channel 16. So that each day is 99 Monday, Channel 16 Monday. But the website I do have to update.

Charlie Matthews

Okay because people do ask when programs are going to be aired. Sometimes it's difficult to watch the channel to find out that information. Thank you.

**MOTION BY ED LECIUS TO ADJOURN
MOTION CARRIED**

MEETING ADJOURNED

Cable Television Advisory Board – 10/12/07
Page 35

The meeting was declared closed at 10:56 a.m.

Committee Clerk