Butte-Silver Bow Information Technology Advisory Committee
Minutes for May 29, 2015 at 12:00 PM
BSB Business Development Center, Education Room, 305 Mercury Street

Present:  Ed Metesh (Highlands), Keith Seyffarth (Pay Dirt Designs), Alyson Harvey-Williams (Retired BSB MIS), Toni Wood (SCLHS)
Absent:   Courtney McKee (Headframe Spirits), John Morgan (Pioneer Technical), Cory Woolverton (Highlands)
Also present:  Danette Gleason (BSB), Linda Sajor-Joyce (BSB), Phillip Curtiss (WOH), Helena Joyce (MSE-TA), Robert Scully (FatBeam), Bob Garner (FatBeam)

Announcements

Welcome to Invited Guests
PHIL C.: Welcomes guests from FatBeam and from MSE-TA to the meeting. Both of whom were present to address the Committee regarding the reconsideration of the ITCOM Action 2015-01.

Anthony Cochenour leaving the Committee
PHIL C.: Announced that Anthony Cochenour has stepped down from participation in the IT Advisory Committee due to a lack of time presently being spent on getting his own business moving forward. Also, there was a request made to the Committee members present to provide candidates who would be a good fit to serve on the network architecture working group.

Update on Department Head Meeting
PHIL C.: Announced that the BSB Department Head meeting held on May 5 with a success with may departments represented and engaged in the process. Also indicated that the Departments were tasked with identifying IT goals/objectives for their department and strategies for how these could be achieved and provide this to the IT Advisory Committee.
LINDA S.: Indicated that of the 17 or 18 departments present at the meeting, one two (2) had submitted the requested information.
DANETTE G.: Commented that she thought a lot of valuable information was collected from the May 5th meeting.

Update on Office 365 Pilot Project
LINDA S.: Updated the group on this pilot project stating there are presently 21 people participating and the focus on its use is to allow inside/outside collaboration. The first use-case is the BRES database project. Hope to roll out the pilot in 3-weeks. Contractor for Office 265 is LiftOff. Contracts have been submitted to Microsoft.

Public Communications

There were no members of the public or the press attending this IT Advisory Committee Meeting.
Topics for Discussion

Discussion and Approval of the Minutes from the Previous Meeting

There was no discussion on the minutes from the last meeting and all IT Advisory Committee Members approved the minutes from the last meeting.

Project Updates:

Reconsideration of ITCOM Action 2015-01 - Dark Fiber IRU Solution for BSB —

DANETTE G.: Introduced this topic by firstly apologizing to the committee that this topic is being asked to be reconsidered, and (secondly) such a reconsideration is not a reflection on the ability of the committee’s previous decision, rather (thirdly) that Danette G. provided an unclear response at the last meeting when the topic was discussed related to BSB’s ability to capitalize Solution-3: Lit Fiber through FatBeam.

Danette G. went on to say that she was under an incorrect perception that the Lit Fiber solution would not allow BSB to capitalize the fiber network as it would not be provided as an IRU, but rather as a service. From her meeting with Linda S. and representatives from FatBeam on May 21st, this perception was corrected, and that was the primary motivation for the reconsideration. Danette G. further wanted to include the staffing impact to BSB MIS operations of selecting the dark versus the lit fiber.

ROB S.: Indicated that the two proposals - Lit and Dark - are equivalent, with both resulting in an IRU for the fiber network for BSB, with the addition in the Lit proposal of having the extra service side to initially provide the equipment to light the fiber for BSB. The idea being it would ease the turn-up of the service for BSB.

LINDA S.: Indicated she has changed her mind and is now for the Lit proposal given her understanding that this will result in less impact on the MIS staff. She also indicated they are down another person and this should remove some of the up-front staffing burden to get move forward with the fiber.

DANETTE G.: Indicated she also changed her mind and is now for the Lit proposal.

PHIL C.: Asked of the FatBeam representatives, how quickly could the proposed fiber network be operational for BSB?

ROB S. BOB G.: Spoke of the time consuming process of having to get every pole approved by Northwestern Energy and other factors required to implement the network. Assuming no delays or other issues incurred from the weather or the like, the quickest the network could be operational might be six (6) months from placement of order.

HELEN J.: Raised questions and concerns with leveraging BSB’s newly constructed EOC as a secondary site for network in addition to using MERDI. She advocated not using EOC for any kind of second site for the network, and instead simply using the single site MERDI as it has a tremendous amount of capacity and has been “over built”. So much so, that she indicated she spoke with Cisco Networking personnel regarding their over building of the MERDI data center.

BOB G.: Described how other networks they have put into service at other locations typically have two (2) sites on them for redundancy.

LINDA S.: Raised the issue of the second lateral build for the EOC and there was some discussion as to making sure that is included in the revised proposal from Fatbeam, as was called for in the ITCOM Action 2015-01.

ROB S.: Spoke at some length about how BSB would be able to begin down the direction of lit fiber services, possibly without a second site (the EOC) on the network, and then later, these could be added.

PHIL C.: Cautioned the committee members that we have been talking since the committee was formed of going after one-time money for the build and to make sure what we want to build is the end state as Danette G. had indicated in previous meetings it would be difficult to go back and ask for additional money at a later time.
KEITH S.: Asserted that for him, the question came down to “Where is the value in spending the additional money to have Fatbeam light the fiber?” and for him, the discussion on helping the MIS Staff transition to the fiber network justifies the additional cost.

ED M.: Wanted to understand how a transition from the Lit service to the dark would take place.

ROB S. BOB G.: Indicated that FatBeam would simply remove their equipment at the site location and BSB would place its own equipment there.

PHIL C.: Corrected FatBeam and informed that group that BSB would also have to provide its own central location equipment as well, even to transition a single site away. So, if BSB wanted to transition a site location onto the dark fiber, it would need to purchase something equivalent to the ME3800 pair (assuming best practices and the EOC as a redundant location on the network) and a single ME1200 (or equiv) for the site location. Then, at that point in time, BSB would have the bulk of its sites on their equipment, BSB would have a single site on its own equipment, and the cross connects between the two sets of equipment would need to dump into the BSB core switching layer to be brought together. This introduces complexity later, during the transition (should that ever come) in favor of easing adoption at the front-end by having the fiber lit by Fatbeam.

KEITH S.: Asserted that having FatBeam light the fiber might allow for a quicker implementation of the fiber network as it will allow them to get started with permitting and move forward.

LIND S.: Brought up the staffing issues again, making the case that the MIS staff at present does not have the skills or number of people to take on the work associated with turning up the fiber network in a dark fiber setting. She emotionally pleaded with the committee to adopt the lit proposal and allow the fiber project to advance with as minimal an impact on the MIS staff as possible.

PHIL C.: Commented that there is also impact on the MIS staff with the adoption of the distribution layer that was put in place earlier this year. The same skill sets to operate that infrastructure are, in fact, the same skills required to operate the ME3800 and ME1200s.

HELEN J.: Asserted that MSE-TA would be happy to help MIS staff with any networking needs they require. They currently support BCHC and HRDC-12.

ALYSON W.: Asked on Helena J. “How many IT Staff does MSE-TA presently have?”

HELEN J.: Indicated MSE-TA present has four (4) FTE IT Staff as well as a trouble ticket system.

MATT V.: Offered the suggestion that maybe this year’s budget be spent on securing additional labor and skills within the MIS Staff and next year’s budget focus more on obtaining the equipment to allow BSB to light the fiber.

DANETTE G.: Called for a vote - following some discussion as to whether there was a quorum.

Vote for Lit Fiber Ed Metesh
Vote for Lit Fiber Keith Seyyfarth
Vote for Lit Fiber Toni Wood
Vote for Lit Fiber Alyson Harvey-Williams

LIND S.: Suggested that maybe a time limit, or some other condition, be placed on FatBeam lighting the fiber to force BSB to eventually budget and switch for lighting its own fiber.

KEITH S.: Suggested that whenever BSB does transition site locations away from FatBeam lighting the fiber to BSB lighting its own fiber, the site locations with the lower utilization should be transitioned first.

Border Architecture/Distribution Core Project —

PHIL C.: Asked Linda S. if she had heard back from the State of Montana on BSB’s request to make modifications to the routing.

LINDA S.: Stated she has heard back from BSB’s customer service representative at the State and they were reviewing the request, were going to have a meeting to determine actions needed to implement the request, then would be getting back with BSB afterwards.
Council Chambers Project —

DANETTE G.: Asked if Phil C. could provide a brief update as to the progress of this component.

PHIL C.: Indicated that final pricing for the initial design and configuration should be available early next week.

LINDA S.: Wants to obtain other quotes for similar solution.

ED M.: Inquired as to how the initial desire to stream the council chamber meetings has evolved into a renovation project of the entire council chambers IT.

DANETTE G.: Answered Ed M. by informing the group that, over the weeks since the Council has been considering streaming their meetings, many of the technology components - such as the vote taking system, the sound recording system, etc. - have been failing. The project evolved to meet the entire needs of the council chamber meeting space, including the ability to stream the meetings.

Agenda Items Tabled to Next Meeting

Project Updates:
Review IT Budget (WIP) —
Review IT Project Time Line (WIP) —

Discussion from the Working Groups - Status of Activities, Scope of Work, Timeline, Budget
Required IT Staff Capabilities and Alignment of Job Duties —
Best Practices and Standard Infrastructure —
Reference Compute Architecture —
Network Infrastructure (Internet Access, Wide-Area and Local-Area Networks) —

Any Other Business (AOB)

Change when the IT Advisory Committee of the Whole next Meets

DANETTE G.: Requested of the committee members to next meet on June 12, 2015 to mostly focus on the budget of items.

PHIL C.: All members present were in agreement.

Action Items

• Phil C. to author an IT Advisory Committee Action to the Chief Executive on the selection of Solution-1 of the IRU options.
• Phil C. to author an IT Advisory Committee Action to the Chief Executive on the development of an RFI to present to Internet Service Providers
• Phil C. to continue to work with BSB and ISP vendors to develop pricing model and recommend to IT advisory committee working groups and the committee as a whole.
• Phil C. to work with BSB and State of Montana to implement changes in the BSB Cisco 3800 series router in preparation for integration of the distribution layer.
• Working group members are to continue their efforts in working together toward the specific identified goals and objectives.
• Phil C. will work toward developing a project plan and circulate to the group.
• Working groups are to develop major tasks/milestones to be completed to realize the groups’ goals and objectives.

• Where possible, the working groups are to develop tentative budgetary figures for the recommended work to be performed to accomplish the groups’ goals and objectives.

Next Meeting: (Of the Whole) June 12, 2015 at 12:00PM