

**GREATER AUSTIN AREA TELECOMMUNICATIONS
NETWORK (GAATN)
INTERLOCAL AGENCY**

**625 East 10th Street, 6th Floor
Austin, Texas 78701**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING HELD January 9, 2006
Lower Colorado River Authority
Hancock Building, Board Room
3701 Lake Austin Blvd**

Agenda Item No. 1:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Patrick Jordan at 1:32 p.m.

The following Board members announced as present at the start of the meeting:

Tom Lott, on behalf of the Lower Colorado River Authority
Brian Kunz, on behalf of the Lower Colorado River Authority
John Kohlmorgan, on behalf of Austin Independent School District
Gray Salada, on behalf of Austin Independent School District
Patrick Jordan, on behalf of the City of Austin
Gary Weseman, on behalf of Austin Community College
John House, on behalf of the University of Texas
Wayne Wedemeyer, on behalf of the University of Texas
Dave Kelly, on behalf of the State of Texas

GAATN Personnel present at the start of the meeting:

Ronald Roberts, Jr, Project Coordinator
Syd Falk, GAATN Attorney
Heidi Cottingham, Maintenance Contractor
Martha Krishke, Acting Network Manager

Agenda Item No. 2:

Citizen Communication

Dr. Ken Matwiczak from the University of Texas was present and would present during the Board update. Patrick moved onto the next agenda item.

Agenda Item No. 3:

Approval of December 5, 2005 Board Minutes.

There were no changes to the minutes and Wayne made the motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Gray. The vote to approve was unanimous.

Agenda Item No. 4:

Discussion and possible action regarding the Board Chairperson Update.

Patrick noted for the record that Ashley Caron had resigned as Network Manager. He added that her position would be posted soon and welcomed any input from entities on candidates or qualifications that they would like to see.

A. GAATN Study/Audit by University of Texas

Dr. Ken Mitwiczak introduced himself and briefly discussed his background on his lecturing and teaching at the LBJ School of Public Affairs. He then suggested approaches to a study by first year grad students that would start in August of 2006 and be in draft form by May of 2007 with a final and polished study that same July. His expenses covered and included the following: A month's salary for him, supplies, 50% time for a graduate assistant for approximately one month, tuition reimbursement for said graduate assistant, and indirect costs to the University of Texas (equal to 50% of the total value of the contract), which, he explained, could be negotiated since there was a benefit to the University through its use of GAATN. He went on to explain, in general terms due to it being proprietary information, a model that he used to generate reviews for various agencies and organizations. He shared with the Board the methodology of how the students would approach a study of GAATN, how the project would be designed by the students themselves, how much time that all participants would be expected to participate and the mutual benefits the study would have for GAATN and the students. Dr. Matwiczak also volunteered information on a variety of past reports that he has overseen of similar nature and offered these and references to the Board should they choose to review them. Questions to Dr. Matwiczak by board members flushed out two separate approaches that could be studied. The first – and what Dr. Matwiczak was proposing – a review of GAATN and its internal practices, communications, and overall management, while the second would be an assessment about whether GAATN had ‘value added’ worth to the public or the participant-customers which it serves. Patrick mentioned the confidentiality of certain GAATN infrastructure information and also the state law protecting that information. Dr. Matwiczak understood this and added that the report could be provided at any public or private level that the Board was comfortable with, but did caution them about ‘intellectual property’ (because the study and report would be created by a UT class, UT might have claims to the study and report, e.g., copyrights), to which he added had not previously been an issue since UT had not asserted such rights as to previous studies such classes had performed. It was a very thorough and well-discussed presentation by Dr. Matwiczak and the Board thanked him for his appearance. Before departing he asked that the Board commit verbally one way or the other sometime in mid to late March and thanked them for the opportunity as well before departing.

Wayne shared that he felt it was time for such an audit after 11 years of existence but Ron and Martha noted that a study had been done by a student named Quinn Stewart and Patrick noted that it was still on the internet for review, a link for which is provided; <http://www.gslis.utexas.edu/~quinn/GAATN.html>.

Patrick further noted that functional models and behaviors to which GAATN was bound were largely defined in the Interlocal Agreement and GAATN policies. John K considered a study a good idea, be it a value-added focus or Board operations focus. Wayne stated that the latter would probably have to be done prior to a value-added focus. His opinion was that the parameters around GAATN needed to be understood first. Gray felt that the GAATN was fairly narrowly focused and agreed with Patrick on that point. He further added concern about the public credibility of a study by the University of Texas when the University itself had present participation as an entity – it might not be perceived as a truly “independent” audit. Wayne asked if the Board wished to solicit others for a study. John K suggested creating a scope for study and Gray concurred that a guideline would be good. Wayne stated that it would be important to let Dr. Matwiczak know either way as soon as possible.

Further discussion of the possible audit centered around its function as either a ‘report card’ or opportunity to improve, continuation or outsourcing. The final decision was to include the topic for the Board meeting in February under the agenda topic of ‘GAATN Program Evaluation’.

Agenda Item No. 5:

Executive Session:

Adjourn for closed session, under one or more of Tex. Gov't Code sections 551.071, 551.072, 551.074, and/or 551.076, to seek legal advise about pending, anticipated or contemplated litigation concerning:

- A. Construction, equipment, and product warranty claims;
- B. Damage to GAATN fiber optic cables, equipment, hardware, and other property; or
- C. Contractual or tort claims by or against GAATN; or
- D. the procedures and operations of the Board or the organization; and/or

to consider matters concerning

- E. real property purchase, exchange, lease or value;
- F. personnel matters; or
- G. security devices or security personnel.

Reconvene for discussion and actions, if any, on matters considered in closed session.

Patrick removed the Board to Executive Session at 2:28 pm and back to regular session at 2:58 pm. Gray moved to approve the settlement with Dar-Gen for the amount of \$9,900 including that the Chairman be authorized to sign all documents consummating the agreement. This motion was seconded by Wayne and passed unanimously. Gray then made the motion to approve the settlement with Davey Tree for the amount of \$26,243.40 including that the Chairman be authorized to sign all documents consummating the agreement. This motion was also seconded by Wayne and passed unanimously.

Agenda Item No. 6:

Discussion and possible action regarding the financial report and budget issues.

John K noted that the payment from the City had arrived but was not in the report yet. Wayne asked about the \$207,000 for consulting but Martha corrected this by noting that the SLA was included in that particular category. There was no further discussion at this point as the new budget with updated and current numbers was set to be discussed later in the meeting.

Agenda Item No. 7:

Discussion and Possible Action regarding the SLA renewal.

Ron explained that the renewal for the SLA had been agreed by the Board to take place in conjunction with the budget every year. John K noted that an amendment that stated this specifically needed to be added to the SLA. Ron added that he had sent out electronic copies of the SLA for possible other additions and changes per John Kohlmorgan's request. Martha added that a 3.8% increase was being suggested to the SLA which would bring it from \$172,431 to \$179,000. Wayne asked about the shortage of staff at present for GAATN and John House shared that the Technical Subcommittee had been informed at the December meeting that Martha would be acting as the interim Network Manager. Patrick added that it was the City that was

shorthanded and not GAATN at present and thanked the staff for taking up the slack so well. Patrick moved to approve and support the SLA for August 2006 through August 2007 at the stated cost. This motion was seconded by Gray and passed unanimously.

Agenda Item No. 8:

Discussion of and possible action regarding the Technical Subcommittee Update.

Tom began by asking Ron about the AutoCAD 2006 purchase. Ron shared that the software was in at the City and would be loaded on the GAATN server this afternoon or first thing in the morning. This expense was being borne by the City and included licenses for both City employees involved with working on GAATN. He added that the Maintenance Contractor would be upgrading to AutoCAD 2006 as well on the GAATN server there. Ron further noted that he and Tim Cottingham had discussed this on several occasions and added that the funding was in the budget for the improvement of the GAATN workstation at the maintenance contractor's offices. John Kohlmorgan inquired about the ability to link spreadsheets to the drawings and Ron answered that he had been told there were a couple of ways to do so, and that one cheap way was to hyperlink the data. But he expressed desire to get it installed and then look at the options once he was more familiar with AutoCAD. John Kohlmorgan directed Heidi to get three quotes from vendors for both the AutoCAD 2006 and additional software solutions that would allow the desired link ability to the prints. Once the quotes are in, he stated that he would assist with the process through AISD purchasing.

Agenda Item No. 9:

Discussion and possible action regarding the Network Manager's Update (COA, 10 minutes).

A. Site List Draft

B. Network Rights Draft

Martha presented both the documents to the Board. Patrick added that the city had added a site on Cameron Road that would be utilized in the upcoming budget year, so it was included in both documents. After some minor changes for UT and ACC, Wayne moved to approve the Site List. This motion was seconded by Gray and passed unanimously. Wayne requested that an electronic copy of the network rights based on the approved Site List be sent out before the meeting at which it would be approved so that he and others would have some extra time to double check the list. Approval at the Technical Subcommittee a week from Wednesday was suggested as a way to push up approval of the network rights in preparation for budget approval at the February Board meeting. Ron stated he would add that item to the tech agenda.

Martha went on to explain that she had two budgets to present, based on a minimum and a (higher) recommended capital improvements amount. She added that the holding account contained, above the \$700,000 for emergency agreed upon in GAATN policy, \$72,000 for a TxDot project and \$149,000 that would remain. These amounts were referenced as a funding source, along with a savings in insurance renewal compared to budget and budgeted consulting, for the C2S expansion for AISD and the City. The running total budget that Martha presented was more up to date than the AISD budget because she had added in invoices that had been processed through the City for GAATN from the end of where the AISD budget left off. This updated budget indicated, to her, a need by AISD to transfer those monies relatively soon. John Kohlmorgan noted that some of the fiber orders were in account 6319 GA as opposed to 6244. He clarified a few other items as being in 6319 GA and added that there had been an additional and unapproved fiber order by the previous Network Manager that was unexpected, but the ability to transfer the funds from the holding account would assist with these issues.

Patrick explained the two proposals, the minimum and recommended, to the Board. John K noted that there was a BIS project for AISD this year. Gray asked about the \$250,000 in Capital Improvements in the minimum budget, was told it was to complete D1N and also to start A1N. Martha added that D1N needed to be completed and that A1N was in need of redesign and rebuild soon. Patrick noted that these two projects were important. Martha added that she had assigned priorities to the projects column and Patrick noted that the recommended budget would allow GAATN to pick up a priority project or two, such as completing A1N, as soon as D1N is done. John K doubted the ability of the GAATN budget to do a whole ring at a time. The importance of A1N to participants and the condition of the fiber was discussed. Patrick also questioned how much should be in Capital Improvements and suggested that the Technical Subcommittee come back with a recommendation for that number.

There was a desire to keep the budget "flat" (*i.e.*, to have it at an approximately constant dollar level) by several Board members and a request was made to show the prospective budget out a couple of extra years. John Kohlmorgan suggested a 5 year plan. Gray asked about the projects and their priorities and Martha stated that she had listed them but the Technical Subcommittee had not discussed the projects or approved any priority so they were open for discussion. Gary asked about the ring report that the previous Network Manager was to have completed in September but was told by Patrick that he possessed what had been done but that it was largely incomplete. John Kohlmorgan stated that he was more confident in the fiber and added that he runs an OC-48 on everything without problems, he further added that it takes 3-4 years to rebuild a ring within the GAATN budget. Patrick reiterated a need for a recommendation from the Technical Subcommittee on a figure for Capital Improvement.

Agenda Item No. 10:

Confirm date, time and location for the next regular Board meeting as February 6, 2006 at 1:30 p.m. in Board Room of the Hancock Building at LCRA on Lake Austin Blvd.

A. Add agenda items for next month.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:54 p.m.