



**CITY OF FULLERTON  
TECHNOLOGY WORKING GROUP  
MEETING MINUTES  
October 29, 2009  
9:00 A.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER**      Chair Burtner called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present

Roger Burtner, Chair	Madusha Palliyage
Fred Canfield	Sam Ricchio
Mike Carter	Carl Samantello
Helen Hall	Thad Sandford
Larry Iboshi	Ed Smith
Harry Lamberth	Paul Stover, Vice Chair

Members Absent

Sujay Shah

Staff

Al Zelinka, Planning Manager

Chair Burtner introduced newly appointed member Sam Ricchio, and announced the reappointment of Fred Canfield.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Burtner asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the August 27 meeting. Vice Chair Stover indicated that the word "attended" on page 4 of the minutes (third paragraph) should be changed to "unintended." With the one correction noted, Larry Iboshi moved approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Stover, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Chair Burtner asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the October 8 meeting. Mr. Iboshi requested that his statement at the October 8 meeting: "The winner of the proposal will be announced." be added to the fourth paragraph under Discussion Item 1. With the one correction noted, Mike Carter moved approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Larry Iboshi, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

Considering Mr. Zelinka had only a few minutes to spend with the TWG, Chair Burtner began the meeting with Discussion Item #2.

### **2. General Plan and TWG contribution – Zelinka**

Each TWG member was given a copy of the Council-approved "City of Fullerton General Plan Update Outline." Planning Manager Zelinka reported that the City was in its third year of a community-based process to update Fullerton's General Plan, noting that historically the intent of the General Plan was to be a citywide tool, but in actuality few departments, if any, have used it. Mr. Zelinka commented that one of the inherent problems with the existing General Plan is there are so many goals that it means everything to everyone and nothing to no one. There is nothing to focus the City on achieving things.

The General Plan Update Outline is based on a Council-approved vision statement and guiding principles. The Community Development Department is now in the process of developing goals, policies, and action plans. In general, each of the elements listed in the outline has a few goals; and depending on the topic of each goal, there could be anywhere from a few to several policies for each element. Those policies will direct and frame the decision making in the City so that when City staff are considering an issue, or when City Council or a commission or committee working group is considering something, they will have something to refer to in order to align everyone in the process.

In addition to the policies, staff is working on action plans (work program items), identifying what needs to get done within certain time frames, e.g., five years, ten years, and that can include anything from a physical capital improvement project to developing code for standard specs for installation of telecommunications infrastructure.

Mr. Zelinka explained that his objective is to engage all City staff, including committees and commissions, to help the City craft the policies and actions so that the General Plan becomes a tool to help the City, its committees and commissions, accomplish their goals. Mr. Zelinka noted there is not a lot of support in the existing General Plan for what the TWG is trying to accomplish.

Mr. Zelinka apologized for having only a few minutes to spend with the TWG this date, indicated he would be available for a second meeting with the group, and requested the TWG members, in the interim, assist him with the General Plan and the next discussion by reviewing the different elements of the plan and identifying which ones apply to what the TWG wants to accomplish, i.e., what are the TWG's goals, and what are the topic areas that will need policies written to support the TWG's objectives, for example, if the TWG wants standard specs for installation of telecommunications infrastructure, it needs to be included in the action plan. Another piece of information the TWG members could provide would be identifying resources, e.g., the City of Ontario's code regarding telecommunications. Mr. Zelinka explained that he wants to make sure the

resources are there to help staff, committees, commission, working groups, etc., get done what they want to get done.

Mr. Zelinka reported that all of this information will be vetted through a public process once all of the drafts are complete. The City's objective is for the General Plan to be a sustainable document, and the way to accomplish that is to make sure that all of the policies and actions in the General Plan support each other, thereby minimizing conflicts and maximizing support and reinforcement. Mr. Zelinka explained that the TWG's role is critical because telecommunications is an increasingly vital part of the City's infrastructure, economy, educational and emergency preparedness systems, and the City's efforts to make a more sustainable community so people can travel less and do more locally. All of these values, which are embodied in the vision statement, support what the TWG is about, and Mr. Zelinka requested that the TWG identify those topics that the TWG wants included in the plan in order for City staff to help the TWG develop policies for those topics.

Ms. Hall commented that she believes technology is a key component of any general plan, and perhaps it is lacking from Fullerton's General Plan because Information Technology is under Finance and it gets buried. She noted that in cities where technology is not a department, IT does tend to get buried, but many cities have recognized technology's importance and made it a separate department. She further commented that she believes technology needs to be an integrated part of the General Plan, not just a stand-alone segment, because technology is going to play a part in each of the different elements of the plan.

Chair Burtner asked Mr. Zelinka if the intention is to have technology as a separate element of the General Plan or will it be merged with all of the other elements to the point that no one really sees it.

Mr. Zelinka offered two perspectives: the "silo option" or the "integrated option." The "silo option" would create a stand-alone element, which is treated separately, disconnected from everything else. The "integrated option" would integrate technology into as many elements as possible. He noted that telecommunications is such an integral part of our environment, and very important to our economy, social fabric, and our build environment, there is a strong argument to have technology not buried but integrated into as many elements as possible to support the cost.

Chair Burtner stated that some of the TWG members had been questioning recently whether there was any reason for the TWG to continue to exist because they have not seen within the City anyone willing to champion what the TWG has been trying to do over the last seven to eight years. Mr. Zelinka assured Chair Burtner that from his perspective the TWG needs to continue, noting that technology needs to be a backbone part of the City's future plan.

Mr. Sandford asked if there was a strong "sponsor" in an individual on the Council or in the City Manager's staff, noting that in his experience a successful plan is one that receives involvement of senior leadership. Mr. Zelinka agreed and reported that the City Manager is definitely supportive of technology being at an equal level as any other

infrastructure in the City, such as water infrastructure, wastewater infrastructure, etc., and there are at least two "champions" on the City Council.

Chair Burtner thanked Mr. Zelinka for the time spent with the TWG, and indicated the next meeting would be November 19. Mr. Zelinka agreed to be in attendance.

**1. Creation of an educational/municipal (institutional) fiber/wireless network, FullertonNet – RFP for I-Net**

Chair Burtner noted that at the previous meeting the TWG had requested that Assistant to the City Manager Rob Ferrier investigate why the City did not receive any responses to the RFP. Mr. Burtner reported that Mr. Ferrier was not able to attend today's meeting, but had emailed his findings. A copy of the email was distributed to TWG members. Mr. Ferrier reported that the responses were varied, and some, as suspected, indicated they did not respond due to a lack of any payment referenced in the cover letter.

Mr. Iboshi reported that he had contacted James Hettrick, CEO of ISMS, as to why ISMS had not responded to the RFP. Mr. Hettrick indicated one of the reasons they did not respond was because they did not believe that Fullerton would qualify for any stimulus money.

Ms. Hall reported that she had received a call from TelePacific Communications' and they indicated they never received the RFP, and asked if it was still available.

Mr. Sandford commented that the RFP created by the TWG included an incentive to respond by indicating the consultant would be awarded the contact if the funding was received. Mr. Sandford noted that City staff modified the RFP before releasing it, and by modifying it they essentially said the City would resolicit if they received funding. Mr. Sandford commented that if he were a contractor, he would not have responded to the RFP either. Mr. Sandford stated that, essentially, the RFP cover instructions sent by the City Manager's office were at odds with the wording of the RFP itself, and this is another problem the TWG needs to recognize – a "disconnect" between the TWG and the administrators who put out the notice. Chair Burtner noted that he has not seen a copy of the RFP cover letter.

Chair Burtner asked Ms. Hall to brief the TWG on her discussions with AT&T (the City's incumbent provider of services).

Ms. Hall stated that she had been contacted by AT&T reps to discuss the City's telecommunications needs. The meeting was not regarding TWG's project, but Ms. Hall did inform AT&T of the TWG project and what the TWG was trying to accomplish. The AT&T rep provided Ms. Hall with a contact name at AT&T who specializes in the broadband initiative stimulus funding. Ms. Hall contacted him and he indicated he is willing to meet with the TWG at a future meeting. Chair Burtner indicated he wants to devote the next TWG meeting to the General Plan and Planning Manager Al Zelinka; therefore, a decision would be made in the future regarding the TWG meeting with AT&T.

Mr. Sandford commented that it is unclear whether the City desires to go after the stimulus money or not, especially after comments made by Mr. Ferrier at the last meeting regarding a matching funds requirement and the City's current budget situation. Mr. Sandford indicated that if the City is not interested, then the TWG needs to recognize that and stand down because there is not much the TWG can do on that particular subject. If, however, the City is still interested, then the TWG needs to help figure out how to put together enough of a package that would be competitive for the stimulus money. Mr. Sandford indicated that either way the City needs to let the TWG know their position.

Chair Burtner suggested that the TWG check with Rob Ferrier to find out where the City stands on pursuing stimulus money. He indicated his personal feeling is that the probability of receiving stimulus money is so remote that he is not certain the TWG should spend time on that aspect of it or assume that stimulus funding will be received.

Mr. Lamberth commented that it has been more than eight months since the City Council asked the TWG to come up with a cost estimate for the I-Net, and that is not going to be possible until the needs of the users are identified, i.e., input from each department. Mr. Lamberth suggested that perhaps the TWG could work with each department to collect the information needed, which would be an aid to developing the General Plan. Mr. Lamberth also noted that his work to identify the path of the I-Net also needs to be completed because of the impact on cost.

Chair Burtner indicated the TWG still needs to respond to Council, but suggested that he meet with Mayor Bankhead to find out Council's position as to whether they still want an estimate, even if the chance of receiving stimulus money is very remote; and if Council still wants an estimate, request that Council provide the necessary support from City staff to assist Mr. Lamberth and the TWG in completing the work needed.

Vice Chair Stover expressed that the issue goes back to what Mr. Sandford mentioned earlier, and that is, does the TWG in fact have a champion? Mr. Stover stated that he does not believe that the TWG has ever had a champion, and if the TWG cannot identify that person, then the TWG is null and void. Mr. Stover suggested that the City Manager needs to be that champion. He needs to be identifying firsthand to the TWG what it is he wants to do as City Manager.

Ms. Hall agreed, noting that right now the TWG is just spinning its wheels, going around in circles. The TWG needs direction from the City Manager as to what the City expects the TWG to do. Ms. Hall suggested that Chair Burtner meet with Assistant to the City Manager Rob Ferrier, identify the concerns of the TWG, and request clear direction from the City Manager as to what the charter of the TWG is going to be, what he expects this committee to do as far as moving forward, because right now the TWG is at a complete standstill.

Chair Burtner indicated that he believes the TWG has gone as far as it can go – there are no obvious next steps, except perhaps to work with Al Zelinka, but he is not sure what that would achieve down the road. He stated that he is not willing to hold meetings without further direction – it is a waste of the TWG members' time and totally unproductive.

Chair Burtner agreed to meet with Mr. Ferrier and hopefully the City Manager, and requested that Vice Chair Stover attend also. Mr. Stover agreed. Chair Burtner indicated he would also meet with Mayor Bankhead, and would email the TWG with results of the meetings.

### **ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING**

To be determined.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. Lamberth commented that he believed the findings of the telecommunications services audit by Liedtke & Associates, initiated by Fullerton Maintenance Services Department, were based on a false assumption. The report concluded voice over IP would be too expensive to implement from an acquisition standpoint, yet Mr. Lamberth is familiar with companies that have converted to VOIP because it is cheaper, better, and faster. Mr. Lamberth suggested the issue be reopened. Ms. Hall and Mr. Iboshi both commented that the primary focus of the study was related to billing.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, Chair Burtner asked for a motion to adjourn. Thad Sandford so moved. Carl Samantello seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 10:24.

Next meeting scheduled for November 19, 2009.