

CABLE TELEVISION ADVISORY BOARD

SPECIAL MEETING RFP FOR STUDIO CONTRACTOR

04/01/2022

A meeting of the Cable Television Advisory Board was held April 1, 2022 at 8:00 a.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber and via Zoom.

Members of Committee present: Andrew Cernota, Chairman

Steve Buxton, Nashua Fire Chief

Lauren Byers, Public Works Designee

Joe Fay, Police Designee

Alderman Ernest Jette

Kimberly Kleiner, Director of Administrative Services

Jennifer McCormack, Library Director

Nick Miseivitch, IT

Also present: Jeff Poehnert, PEG Program Manager

Pete Johnson, Education Channel Access Administrator

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC: Andrea Sebastian, Access Nashua

Andrew Cernota:

So welcome, everyone, to a special meeting of the Cable Television Advisory Board. We'll begin with a roll call. Steve Buxton.

Chief Steve Buxton:

Present.

Andrew Cernota:

Lauren Byers is joining via Zoom.

Lauren Byers:

Here

Andrew Cernota:

Andrew Cernota is here. Justin Chapman is not. Joe Fay.

Joe Fay:

Present.

Andrew Cernota:

Alderman Ernest Jette.

Alderman Ernest Jette:

Here.

Andrew Cernota:

Kimberly Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Here.

Andrew Cernota:

Cheryl Lindner is not. Jennifer McCormack.

Jennifer McCormack:

Here.

Andrew Cernota:

Nick Miseirvitch has not joined us yet. Cole Morgan is also not here. All right. There is a quorum. So we'll proceed. First item, comments from members of the public, if there's any.

Andrea Sebastian:

Good morning. And thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of Access Nashua. I'm Andrea Sebastian. I live in Litchfield and work for the Nashua School District. I am one of many public access producers.

I first got to know the team at Access Nashua when a couple of my girlfriends and I decided to host a talk show about everything and anything. It was called The Loft. In every episode, we would focus on a person who is part of the Nashua community. Some of the topics we covered included the mayoral candidates, personal fitness, drug addiction, and local events including Christmas at The Hunt.

I became part of a Care for a Cause committee that was for St. Joseph Hospital. We were doing a fundraiser for a new mobile health van. I reached out to the Access Nashua team to see if they could help us with some promotion. We ended up producing a couple of videos that highlighted the old vehicle and the need for a new one. I know that the videos that the Access Nashua team created was a major contributor to a successful project.

Another project I worked on with the team at Access Nashua was to promote the art hub. We created a 30-second PSA highlighting Nashua's art scene. That brings me to today. I recently approached the team with another show idea. It is a little different than most shows on television. It is called Guided Crossings. And every episode discusses various aspects of death and dying.

I was extremely nervous to bring up an idea like this. But again, Dick Gagnon did not disappoint. I then worked with Dan Young, the creative director to bring my vision of a deaf cafe background to reality. I am one of many producers who share similar experiences. I would like to read a couple of excerpts from others and provide you with the letters in full.

From the perspective of a board member with the Nashua International Sculpture Symposium, I've had the fortune to view up close your projects with NISS particularly around children's events. The video that have been created are fresh and innovating, engaging, and fun. You and your team are professional, accessible, community-focused, and easy to work with. It is obvious that you care about the community that you live and work in, and that your programming reflects and enhances it, Tanya Prather.

For over 10 years, Access Nashua has provided air time to the Unitarian Universalist Church of Nashua. This has been of great value to some of our members who cannot attend church in person as well as to acquaint other residents of Nashua with our church and the activities. As the personnel responsible for preparing the videos to Access Nashua, I would say the process has been easy and professional, Dan Murphy.

Access Nashua Community Television has been an integral part of our community. They have provided business and non-profit organizations a venue for their voices to be heard. Additionally, minority and immigrant populations that are acclimating to their new homes count Access Nashua as a vital resource, Senator Kevin Avard.

A common theme among the many letters can be summed up by the following words, professional, productive, impressive, trustworthy, positive attitude, inviting, inspiring, friendly, encouraging, creative, enthusiastic, technically skilled. Throughout the past 10 years, many people have used Nashua's public access channel to tell their stories. Access Nashua has made that process easy for both producer and guests to get their message out to residents. And we would like to see the city continue to contract community media services group in the operation of the city's public access channel. Thank you.

Andrew Cernota:

Thank you. All right. Any other comments? All right. If not, we'll move to the first item of new business, the DPW building request. Miss Byers, would you like to present the request?

Lauren Byers:

Yes. Thank you. So the cameras are very important for the building for many reasons. First of all, the city doesn't have enough space to hold Zoom meetings with cameras available. Additionally, beyond the use of the DPW, the Fire Department will also be using... utilizing that space and could also make use of those cameras as well, and the Mine Falls advisory committee. So there are many groups that would be using the cameras at that location.

There will be times occasionally when that location can't be used due to snow emergencies where that space is taken or whether there's such, meetings such as that, or need for the staff. But, otherwise, I think would it's very important to get those cameras in there so we have additional space in the city.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Thank you. Is there a motion with regard to the request? I believe you all received a handout with the breakdown as far as the cost. It totals, \$90,300. Miss Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

So if I could just, build a little off of, what Lauren said for people that may not know what this building is about, they are consolidating a lot of the DPW functions into this new facility. Because of that, they're going to have the unique opportunity to be able to have meetings and have the Board of Public Works meetings, the Mine Falls Advisory and various others. It's a good location for us to have another studio because of just the opportunity of where it is. It may be convenient, you have a place, you know, with Nashua High School North way up, on that end of town. It will give another location here.

It is true that we commonly don't have enough space. So, you know, whether it's the city auditorium with planning and zoning and, Room 208 now has some access, and then, of course, the Aldermen especially lately have been busy in the chamber almost every night. So I think it is great to have another location to be able to broadcast from. And I think...I mean it is 90,000. At least, that's the estimate looking at what we did here in the chamber. We don't know if that will be a little lower or a little higher. That's just an estimate. And we're looking at this fall.

So it- it's not too far away which is why we needed to put it on the agenda today because we will go and forecast it in the FY23 budget if the committee is amendable. I think it's a great opportunity especially with that building being able to have so many staff and so many departments, for public books within it.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Any other discussion? Anyone have any observations, questions, concerns? Alderman Jette?

Alderman Ernest Jette:

Forgive me. You were looking for a motion. Was the motion made?

Andrew Cernota:

Yeah. I don't believe it has been. So we should start with the motion, I suppose, before we get into the discussion. Yes.

Alderman Ernest Jette:

Okay. So just, just to get things started, I, move that we approve the request for \$90,300 for the DPW conference room coverage provided in the estimate.

Andrew Cernota:

There's a motion. Now, we'll go to the discussion. Alderman Jette.

Alderman Ernest Jette:

So, this \$90,000, would this be coming from the from our budget or is this coming from the city budget?

Andrew Cernota:

My understanding is that this is coming from our special revenue fund, which is specifically for Public Education and Government Access Television.

Alderman Ernest Jette:

Could you remind me how much money do we have in that fund?

Mr. Poehnert:

You have somewhere close to about 500,000. Oh, sorry. I have my finger on the mute button. You have somewhere in the neighborhood of 500,000 in our Capital Improvement Fund.

Alderman Ernest Jette:

Okay. And I get, not to beat a dead horse, but currently the Board of Public Works uses the Auditorium here in City Hall. Is it expected that DPW would be making more use of the broadcast facilities of the ability to broadcast then, and they currently need, I think they only meet like once a month, right?

Lauren Byers:

Hi, Alderman Jette. Yes. So... Lauren Byers, DPW. We would be using it for our meetings on the monthly basis also to the Mine Falls Park Committee meetings. And also, the Fire First Responders would also most likely be using it for meetings that they need to hold as well.

Alderman Ernest Jette:

Then, it would be my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, that this would open other venues, within the city government to have their meetings there as well, just as we have the auditorium open and 208 open? That's my understanding of it, that it won't be... You know, just the Public Works.

Andrew Cernota:

I have to say I had the same concern that, I think, Alderman Jette had that we actually in previous cycles, we've, provided some technology for the DPW conference room on, on the understanding that it would be used for, broadcasting their meetings and others. And it was used about, twice. And then, the meetings ceased to be held there and were moved to the Auditorium. And the conference room wasn't used for broadcast after that.

Alderman Ernest Jette:

That's correct.

Pete Johnson:

I also had a question of Miss Byers. Pete Johnson here. I just... I'm curious, typically your facilities close at five o'clock. If somebody were wanting to have a city meeting there after hours is that something that's possible or is this only going to be open, during business hours?

Lauren Byers:

Lauren Byers, DPW. To answer both questions that were raised, the first one about only utilizing our conference room a couple of times, we could not hold our meetings there because one of the

commissioners, did not feel safe in the building to come to those meetings. So we had to move them out of our conference room.

And then, as far as access after 5:00 PM as long as there was a responsible city personnel, to let people in there to go to that meeting and then close up afterwards, that would be something that would definitely be possible.

Pete Johnson:

And I'm assuming that the safety concern is addressed by the new building.

Lauren Byers:

Yes. That is correct. It was our HVAC system that was dysfunctional and still is, which did not allow for airflow in our building and still does not. So the new building won't have any of those issues.

Andrew Cernota:

Any other questions, Chief Buxton?

Chief Steve Buxton:

Steve Buxton, Nashua Fire. To Lauren Byers's point, we've been working closely with them as their construction project of their new building is very close to our training facility at the landfill. And it'll allow us the ability to hold classes in that conference room area when we're holding classes at the Millyard currently, we hold those out in open air. So we have to bring all of our companies out there if we want to train on a specific topic.

Now, sometimes, that works out because we're using the training facility. But currently, the Fire Department doesn't necessarily have the ability to communicate between our eight facilities. We do have a training classroom at 177 Lake Street. But we've quickly outgrown that. And the 20-plus years of that building has existed. And this would just add to our ability to hold classes and communicate through the technology that now exists. I guess kind of thanks to COVID, we all discovered a bunch of these things.

But it's, it's kind of the new way that we do business. It is a more efficient model for us. And I think any time we're building a conference room or a building such as this, the better we can equip it to move into the future, the better off we can be. Thank you.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Miseivitch.

Nick Miseivitch:

Nick Miseivitch, City IT. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I apologize for being late today. My big question... Well, first of all, I'd like to state that I'm pleased to hear that this room will be open to other departments wishing to utilize the equipment. However, my question is just right off of Chief Buxton's statement of this is really for broadcasting equipment, not video conferencing. So I guess I would like some, additional information from Mr. Poehnert or Mr. Johnson on how this will facilitate Chief Buxton's needs.

Pete Johnson:

I believe, Pete Johnson, that the estimate that Mr. Poehnert provided today was just based on what we had spent up in the auditorium doing something a similar sized room. It does not take into account any, you know, sort of Zoom capabilities, video conferencing capabilities. I was going to suggest that, you know, if this goes through that, you know, that \$90,000 is really a, a very basic estimate. And, I believe the public works has come up with \$100,000 that they were requesting. Correct? I believe that I've seen that at some place before.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Kim Kleiner. I'm sorry I don't understand the question as far as they've come up with-

Pete Johnson:

That was their initial estimate on their side. They said they were looking for \$100,000. I believe you asked us to say is that something that would be correct. We went out and looked at what we had done up in the auditorium. And that's been several years. So there may be changes in pricing. Obviously it's more expensive for labor and such these days to install it. So I don't think that the, motion that Alderman Jette made, I don't believe that \$90,000 is going to be enough potentially to cover it if we go that route. That was all I was saying.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Kim Kleiner. So in the estimate for the construction of the building, there had been a placeholder of 100,000 put that was originally for this request that is before you now. We asked, Mr. Poehnert to go out and come up with a, a better estimate. And that is the 90,000. And, yes. As, as I stated, we're not sure to that number. There's other costs to the project and to the equipment that's needed in that room. But that is not a request before you. The request before you was for the video conferencing equipment broadcast equipment.

Andrew Cernota:

I see Mr. Poehnerts hand up. But I did have a quick question for Chief Buxton. Would your training be, cable cast?

Chief Steve Buxton:

Steve Buxton, Nashua Fire. So our training when we're going in between stations would be more of a video conferencing, issue, like Nick pointed out. We are working towards trying to do some public education, type things. But we're not there quite yet.

Currently, the classroom at 177 Lake Street, we're working to upfit. So we can do some video conferencing out of there. It's not at that point right now.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Thank you. Mr. Poehnert.

Mr. Poehnert:

All right. I just wanna clarify a couple of things. I did have put a Zoom hybrid add-on, and that was based on, the \$1700 we spent up in the, up in the auditorium to switch that to a hybrid version. And so, I put in \$2000 for that.

Mr. Poehnert:

Also, um, it was my understanding in, in the, in the plans that this conference room can be partitioned into three separate rooms. And so, that's why, I've got eight cameras there. I mean if it was not to be partitioned, it would be full you know, two in either end, one in the middle, probably, you know, on either side. But if you've got a partition on each one and you wanna do a, broadcast of that meeting in that partition, you'd need to have six allotted you know, three on the wall on either side and then, two on either end which would come out to eight.

So that's why the eight cameras. The same thing with the wireless microphones. We have 14 microphones up in the auditorium. But it's an open room. If this was a partition, they would probably... need more microphones, depending on what was going on in the rooms at the time. So I mean actually, this could come down in "price. But I'm not sure that's possible these days. So that's how I base this.

This room was to be partitioned, and there could be the situation where you've got a couple of things going on in there. Now, I don't... You know, we also only have one switcher. So we may not be able to do that. But, you know, say somebody in partition three wanted and, you know, wanted to do a broadcast so we will know it. Then, we would have to have cameras in that partition to do it, you know. So that was my thinking there because in an open room like the auditorium, it would be just four cameras, you know, two on the walls.

Pete Johnson:

Let me know if I'm correct. But at this point, there's only equipment enough to do one thing out of those three rooms-

Mr. Poehnert:

At a time. Yeah.

Pete Johnson:

At a time. So you could not have, you know, in meeting partition A, a Zoom meeting going on with, you know, people from, X, Y construction company talking about something for Public Works and then a meeting that's being televised in Room C.

Mr. Poehnert:

Well, no. My thinking was that you could, theoretically have in partition one a meeting. And then, we're in partition three broadcasting a second meeting.

Pete Johnson:

But the first meeting utilizes all that same equipment. The audio system.

Mr. Poehnert:

Oh, no, no. They're not utilizing anything in that first one.

Pete Johnson ([00:22:18](#)):

They're having a Zoom meeting.

Mr. Poehnert:

Yeah. I mean in other words, I'm just trying to make sure there's enough cameras there, if there's a situation where you've got in partition one a meeting going on that has no technology to it. I mean it's just the meeting. And we're in partition three that we've... in that partition, we have cameras.

Pete Johnson:

So what I'm saying is, is you can only do one meeting that's being... using-

Mr. Poehnert:

Broadcast. Yes.

Pete Johnson:

Electronics and being broadcast at a time.

Mr. Poehnert:

Yes. I'm just trying to make it. So it doesn't matter what partition that we do that. We have the ability. That was my thinking here.

Andrew Cernota:

I see. Ms. Byers has her hand up.

Lauren Byers:

All right. So we would only have one of the three areas set up for this type of thing. We don't need it for the entire thing. Our thought was the third bay which is closest to the outside door, so people could come in the side and not have to walk throughout the building would be the only place we would have this equipment. So I think the cost will come down quite a bit based on that.

Mr. Poehnert:

Yeah that would probably cut the cost of the cameras in half probably in that case.

Andrew Cernota:

Yeah. Mr. Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Nick Miseirvitch, City IT. If I'm understanding correctly, then, only the first partition would be set up for broadcasting.

Andrew Cernota:

Yes.

Nick Miseirvitch:

But the room can be broken up for other type of meetings, but non-broadcasting. Is that correct?

Mr. Poehnert:

I mean if I heard that correctly, that's what that is.

Nick Miseirvitch:

That was my understanding.

Mr. Poehnert:

I think you're correct. Yeah.

Lauren Byers:

Lauren Byers, DPW. That is correct. The meeting room could be partitioned off from the other two. And other meetings or events could be held in the other rooms during the time of this meeting that was broadcast.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Okay. All right. And then, one more. I don't think that my original question was answered, will there be, you know, video conferencing capabilities?

Mr. Poehnert:

Well, there will be Zoom capabilities of it just like we have in in the auditorium. And we have done that up there.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Okay. All right. So it would be done via Zoom-

Mr. Poehnert:

Yeah.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Not through like a video conferencing

Mr. Poehnert:

No. It would be Zoom.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Any conferencing phone type.

Mr. Poehnert:

It'd be a version of Zoom, like, as in here.

Nick Miseirvitch:

All right. Thank you.

Pete Johnson:

I would suggest on that, this estimate, like we said, is pretty raw that to do what they wanna do, we really need to meet with, or put out an RFP saying this is what we would like to see out of the room and get some actual costs as opposed to just an estimate based on what we did in the auditorium.

And then, my other question would be since this room would be utilized for just, general meeting space for DPW, are they willing to share any cost, you know? It, shouldn't necessarily be CTAB's responsibility to pay for the general, capability of that room to have audio which you would need anyways, you know. I think our mission is to broadcast, correct? So, is there any sharing possibility that, you know, if this comes out at \$100,000, maybe it's 50,000 each, if this board decides that?

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Poehnert.

Mr. Poehnert:

I'm just gonna say following up on that, I mean my litmus test normally, in ours is that, if we weren't there, what would you need, like, you know, in a meeting? So if you need microphones that really shouldn't be our expense or at least a split of expenses because we need microphones to be able to broadcast. But like in this room you would have microphones whether we existed or not, you know, for you to hear in this room. It has nothing to do with the broadcast, right?

Mr. Poehnert:

In order for anybody to see a meeting, you need cameras. That would definitely be our responsibility. But monitors in the room, not necessarily. We don't need them to broadcast a meeting. The people in the room need them, you know. So that would... I look at that as not our expense. It probably shouldn't be.

Nick Miseirvitch:

All right. Thank you. Yeah.

Andrew Cernota:

Just to put a question for Miss Kleiner, the timeline on when a decision on this needs to be made. I know it's related to the budget process for the city. Can you give us some guidance as far as-

Kimberly Kleiner:

Yes. Kim Kleiner, Director of Administrative Services. So we were looking not only because of the budget that we're putting together for CTAB for the city, but also for the budget on the construction project itself. So there are things that certainly they are not asking the committee to fund, the monitors, for example. There is an amplification system that's, you know, within the contract... the construction contract that they're not asking us for that. So I just wanna be clear that, you know, they were only asking for the equipment that would require us to broadcast. But good point on the microphones.

Andrew Cernota:

Yeah. To cover the meetings.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Yeah. So the project's moving pretty quickly. And they expect to, be ready by October. So a lot of these costs, need to be put together and finalized as well as any orders because some of these things have a longer lead time. I think we saw that.

Andrew Cernota:

You know, as you can see we ordered equipment for this room in December that, you know, now they're saying April. So, yeah.

Kimberly Kleiner:

So that's some of the concern.

Andrew Cernota:

And, I guess another question related to the delays and supplies, has the supply chain issues related to some of the equipment? Has that impacted price substantially? I know it has impacted price and it's also impacted installation costs. So, all right. Any other discussion? Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

So, I'm not sure exactly what we're being asked to do. I think we're being asked to authorize this, you know, the configuration of this room with the equipment necessary to broadcast meetings from there. But we don't seem to know. Maybe, I'm wrong. But we don't seem to know exactly what that's gonna cost. And so, picking up on Mr. Johnson's suggestion, that we do the homework necessary to come up with hard harder numbers. And so, I guess that would, you know, delay things for a month. Is that, is that something that you can live with or

Andrew Cernota:

Or we could have another special meeting.

Alderman Jette:

Yeah.

Andrew Cernota:

So we wouldn't necessarily need to delay it a month. But until-

Alderman Jette:

Yeah.

Andrew Cernota:

We had the numbers and, have another meeting. Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

Representative of the school district. Is there a supply chain issue for equipment for this that would delay the project?

Andrew Cernota:

Yes. There are supply chain issues currently with a lot of the AV equipment that's out there.

Greg Rodriguez:

So when does this room wanna be stood up by?

Andrew Cernota:

I believe she was saying, this fall. And you wanna outfit it when it's in studs as opposed to, you know, having to go in after the walls are up and put in boxes to mount the cameras and wiring and such. So, Mr. Poehnert.

Mr. Poehnert:

I was just gonna say just in this conversation today we'd be at a little over \$19,000 less because of the requirements that I thought I was over required, you know, making an overestimate of the requirements. And, they aren't as large as I thought. So it would be probably \$19,000 less than the estimate.

Greg Rodriguez:

And those are based on, you know, numbers from several years ago-

Mr. Poehnert:

Yeah.

Greg Rodriguez:

Obviously. So.

Alderman Jette:

Yes. So could I ask if we pass this as is, where does it go from here? And how do those numbers get good, you know?

Andrew Cernota:

I believe it's still held through the regular city process. It's just because it's coming out of our special revenue fund that it requires our approval as well as the city's usual process for the expenditure of this amount of money. So I believe it still goes to

Kimberly Kleiner:

Finance.

Andrew Cernota:

A Finance Committee and, as I said, the typical process for city purchasing or something like this. Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

Do you have an installer in mind? A company.

Andrew Cernota:

I'm sorry.

Greg Rodriguez:

Do you have an installer or company in mind?

Mr. Poehnert:

I mean I think we, we probably launched the RFP, right?

Pete Johnson:

And right I think given the price, it would have to go out for bid.

Mr. Poehnert:

Yeah. We have favorite vendors that

Andrew Cernota:

Any other questions? Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

So, I'm sorry if I'm, you know, having difficulty grasping this. So, we can go ahead and authorize this. And then, the, numbers get harder as, as we go along, you know, the proper bidding takes place. And this is just launching the process, so to speak.

Andrew Cernota:

Well I have to say I'm a little nervous about the, the squishy numbers myself. But, we aren't the...We're, the first approval that's required not the last. So yes, I'm sure the board of Aldermen will be more strict as far as their requirements for the numbers.

Pete Johnson:

Might I suggest, if the board here is interested in looking at this, maybe we look at a not to exceed number and put a price on what we're willing to give up for out of our budget for this program so, you know, maybe it's 50,000 or 75,000. But rather than pulling up a number that's specific, look at a number that we would contribute to the project. Does that make sense?

Andrew Cernota:

Sounds attractive to me. Miss Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

So Kim Kleiner, one of our concerns was to ensure that the committee was amendable to this type of project, right? So it does require us to go out for an RFP and come up with some hard numbers which will go to the Finance Committee. But in order... before we started that process, we wanted to make sure that this was even an avenue the committee was amendable to us pursuing.

There is some concern about getting the equipment in time for the us to meet the ongoing construction which will be happening, you know, this summer and early fall. So we would have to work with city

purchasing to get an RFP out very shortly and then go through the normal contract process and bring it to Finance. And we'd update this board. And I think the not to exceed is a great idea because it gives us some room that the committee is comfortable with, if they are.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Johnson.

Pete Johnson:

I would tend to think that given what we do it's not gonna be cost beneficial for us if it's only doing one meeting a month for Board of Public Works. It has to be open and available at times when people need meeting rooms for it to be, I think, cost effective for us to go in there and say, "We wanna outfit this or help out fit this room for television." We could easily send a camera operator with a tripod and a microphone to put on the table just to do one meeting a month. So I think that's where it stands making sure that this is open and available for others to utilize, and that it gets utilized.

Andrew Cernota:

Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

So, where does the, the Board of Public Works stand on this? Have this issue gone before them? Are they looking to contribute money to it? It sounds like a, a joint process. And now, I'm hearing the Fire Department would also use it of the Fire Commissioners. So they looked at this. Are they willing to participate? It sounds like it could be a joint project. But I don't know if Board of Public Works. I'm assuming they're on board. But I don't know, and the Fire Commissioners. So maybe, we could hear from those entities.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Byers.

Lauren Byers:

Lauren Byers, DPW. We'll have to go back to the office with this one and find out which direction they'd like to take. I think the best case scenario coming out of this meeting would have been a not-to-exceed, situation, and then looking into it further as far as RFPs maybe in the future withdrawing it if we find out it isn't a viable option. So, I think if the committee could see clear to do the not-to-exceed and then give us some time to determine whether or not we should proceed. But that at least will get the ball rolling should we need to decide to move forward and give us time to order the equipment. But as far as making a definitive statement on the DPW's support or the administration support, I'd have to get back to you on that.

Andrew Cernota:

Yes. Oh, I'm sorry. Chief Buxton.

Chief Buxton:

Steve Buxton, Nashua Fire. We currently are undertaking a project that would give us broadcast capabilities from 177 Lake Street. Nick pointed out our capabilities that we'd be looking for when we use this conference room, would be more in lines with the video conferencing need.

Pete Johnson:

Part of your RFP was also that they could televise from that room as well and get it back to us. So I had a chance to look over two of the lower cost proposals and sent my recommendations. But what I could do, to one of your chiefs yesterday. So-

Chief Buxton:

Yes. Thank you.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Any other comments, questions? Mr. Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

All right. So, Nick Miseirvitch, City IT. So are we at a point where we should maybe have Alderman Jette amend his motion? And then, I guess, we need to determine how much of a not-to-exceed amount. Is that correct?

Andrew Cernota:

I think that's correct. Mr. Poehnert.

Mr. Poehnert:

I'm not a member. But I would... I mean I myself would say somewhere around 70,000 not to exceed that. It just sounds based on even the numbers that I've got that are older.

Andrew Cernota:

Yeah. Alderman Jette, would you like to amend your motion?

Alderman Jette:

Yes, I would authorize the request to a not to exceed \$70,000.

Andrew Cernota:

Okay. So there's amendment to the motion. Any discussion of the amendment? All right. I guess, we'll go to a vote. And because Miss Byers is on Zoom, we have to do it by roll call. Chief Buxton.

Chief Buxton:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Andrew Cernota's yes. Deputy Chief Fay.

Joe Fay:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Ms. Lindner's not here. Miss McCormack.

Jennifer McCormack:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Morgan's not here. Mr. Rodriguez was left off the city website. Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Motion passes. All right. We'll move to the next item on the agenda, the recommendation for the CTV management provider. Miss Kleiner would you like to start us off?

Kimberly Kleiner:

Happy to. Kim Kleiner, Director of Administrative Services. So as many of you know, there was an RFP put out for this project. There were two respondents. I believe the entire committee has had a chance to review the proposals. There was a smaller group that met and interviewed both of the individual groups that responded. And so, those notes have been shared. And you should have received those last Friday.

Kimberly Kleine:

So going forward from where we are, is there needs to be a recommendation on who this committee recommends that the administration moves forward with. From there still a lot to the process. So there would have to be some sort of contract on negotiation. There'd be a finalization of the contract. The contract has to go through the city... normal city processes, in this case, to include the Finance Committee and the Board of Alderman. So this is a recommendation that the administration moves forward with and understands the committee's choice.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Is there a motion regarding a recommendation to the city to choose one or the other of the respondents?

Alderman Jette:

Can I ask a question?

Andrew Cernota:

Yes, Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

So, this smaller committee, I thought I was gonna be on it. But I don't know if, I didn't get... I don't remember getting an invitation. So maybe, I missed it.

Andrew Cernota:

It might have been an oversight. I think.

Alderman Jette:

Did the smaller committee have a recommendation?

Andrew Cernota:

The smaller committee didn't meet, and as far as to make a recommendations. They were asking basically just interview questions to respondents on separate days and that they didn't caucus afterwards to discuss them. I think that several members of the committee are here and could probably share their thoughts. And that might be the best way to do that. As I said, I don't know. There wasn't a vote as such for a recommendation from that committee as far as the two. But, Miss Kleiner, would you?

Kimberly Kleine:

Kim Kleiner. I would say that's correct. I think the committee saw that they were... or the smaller group saw that they were more of a fact-finding. We tried to ask very similar questions of the two groups and provided those in very short answer to the entire committee here. But most of our questions, things of that sort, were provided to us by purchasing. So it's normally a process that purchasing or one of the city departments would go through, and we have an RFP. And we're choosing a vendor. And we've provided that information.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. So Miss McCormack.

Jennifer McCormack:

I was on that small group. And are you looking for motion?

Andrew Cernota:

Yes.

Jennifer McCormack:

So I would move that we recommend CMSG as the next operator for our public-access television station.

Andrew Cernota:

Okay.

Alderman Jette:

Can I second that?

Andrew Cernota:

Well, we don't need a second always work. And we'll go into discussions. And also, you're not a member of CTAB.

Alderman Jette:

Oh, yeah. Oh yeah.

Andrew Cernota:

So,

Alderman Jette:

I still remember that.

Andrew Cernota:

I appreciate the enthusiasm. But, all right. We'll have discussion of the motion. Would anyone like to, start off?

Alderman Jette:

Well, could we hear from the members of the smaller committee as to, can we hear from Miss McCormack why she's recommending them?

Jennifer McCormack:

I'll add my comments. So I participated in the two interviews. And I read both of the proposals. And I... in my opinion, CMSG demonstrated a more thorough understanding of a public-access television station

and a stronger commitment to community participation in programming. I think both teams had the technical expertise. But for Public Access, I think CMSG is the right choice.

Andrew Cernota:

I'd have to say I agree with both those points. I thought both proposals were technically competent. And there were certainly aspects of both proposals that were appealing. But I think as far as having.. Well, certainly, with... given the CMSG's experience with cable access of both running it here in, in Nashua and, prior experience of the, their employees they seem to have a better grasp as far as the underlying philosophy of Public Access as a public forum.

Andrew Cernota:

And they'd addressed some of their proposal was tailored more towards serving that as opposed to the other proposal with some of the other... Chief Buxton.

Chief Buxton:

Thank you. Steve Buxton, Nashua Fire. While both proposals, I do agree and I apologize I had to leave the second meeting short early, but I did review the notes. While both proposals, I felt, were, technically proficient, one, obviously, had more experience. They're established in the area. But I felt the first, BRB TV brought more energy and is willing to go into looking to grow the product. And I think kind of what we have in front of us is we're gonna continue with the current model and being a not just the Fire Chief, but also the citizen of the community, very rarely do I utilize local access television.

And I think that's just a product of the model that exists in front of us. BRB TV, I think, is looking to grow and reach out into the community and make it more known. So I would be in support of BRB TV. So I won't be supporting the current function.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Kleiner you were there. Would you like to share your thoughts?

Kimberly Kleiner:

Sure. Kim Kleiner. So I have to somewhat agree. I have some particular concerns. I think it was brought up with the... in the second interview that there may have been some contract problems because there may not have been a contract liaison on the city. I don't think that's true.

I think Director Cottingham was contract liaison. And I think that whenever Director Cottingham was, reached out to I found he always did a very professional and thorough job. So having said that, I think the city does need to be involved here. And I think we need to be involved only to the point that the contract with us is being upheld. And I don't necessarily think that as we look over the course that, that has entirely happened. That's my concern.

Off the Chief Buxton's comments, I do agree that there was some energy. There's certainly a familiar error. I can't say it with BRB. They're familiar with our city. They've been doing a lot of shows and gathering of information and reaching out to people.

And so, I think through the radio, at least they have a really good comprehension of where the city is, both our population, our and where we're intending to move. Do they have as much experience with Public Access TV? Absolutely not. And I think that's why they brought that other gentleman in who does have thorough knowledge over 30 years with Public Access. And they've also brought in the shows who certainly have a lot of experience in public television.

Kimberly Kleiner:

So I think they've wrapped a good team around them. Do they have as much experience as CMSG? I mean no. But I think at some point, we have to decide if we continue down the same road, or if we engage someone, give someone the chance to try something else.

Andrew Cernota:

I'd say that the concern I had with BRB was that it seemed like they had expectations as far as what they could do with Public Access TV that I don't think it would be intentional at all. But I think that the positive and in some ways, it might be positive to have some cross-pollination between the radio and the television.

Andrew Cernota:

But I'd be concerned a bit about that there'd be a temptation to promote a for-profit radio station through its affiliation with the management of the Public Access TV. That was... and, as I say, that there probably would be benefits to Public Access TV for that because they certainly have brought energy and vitality to WSMN which didn't necessarily have that in the past. But anyway.

Pete Johnson:

I was also at both meetings and something that hasn't been discussed here is the cost estimates that were provided by both, CMSG and BRB TV. And I don't know if they have them out. They came out in our... What was it?

Andrew Cernota:

Well, there was a compar- Well, both, we received copies of the RFP responses. But there was also comparison provided by city purchasing.

Pete Johnson:

In that comparison. But the CMSG proposal was less I believe if I read that correctly. And there were a couple of different cost estimates. One based on having news an additional news broadcast. And the other was if the city provided a studio operator or CMSG would provide that. So there were four cost proposals there. And I believe there were two for BRB TV that were higher estimates. Somebody has that and wants to bring the numbers out.

Andrew Cernota:

The BRB proposal was 175,000 in the first year, 163,800 in the second year, 168,000 in the third year. CMSG, there... They had different proposals based on four different proposals for different scopes of work prices ranging on a per annual basis of 145 to a high of 165,000. That was the one that included the development of a news program with a projected five 5% minimum increase for years two and three. So-

Pete Johnson:

Okay. And then one of the other things in the BRB proposal was a list of items in an appendix one that were sort of add-ons, but did not list pricing so that should those also be discussed potentially today. But there could be additional costs depending on what direction the city would want to go. So-

Andrew Cernota:

An their cost was already substantially more than most of the proposals for CMSG. Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

Just pointing out some things from BRB TV is it looks like they can reach a larger audience with the- even the device capabilities because people aren't really... Oh, well, I don't wanna speak for everybody. But I'm cutting the court as a thing. And this can... And BRB TV can reach across Roku, Apple, internet streaming, Fire Stick, Amazon. And they also mention a bilingual community too, so in their BRB proposal.

Andrew Cernota:

I would add that was one of the things that again gave me pause about their proposal because I believe they didn't seem to realize that we already had um-

Greg Rodriguez:

Okay.

Andrew Cernota:

Some of those... most of that.

Greg Rodriguez:

Yeah

Andrew Cernota:

Most of those are already provided.

Greg Rodriguez:

Okay.

Andrew Cernota:

So any other discussion?

Nick Miseirvitch:

All right.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Nick Miseirvitch, City IT. So, CMSG has four proposals versus BRB's single proposal by interpreting these, results accurately. So what is in... what's the difference between CMSG's four proposals?

Andrew Cernota:

Okay.

Nick Miseirvitch:

So-

Andrew Cernota:

So I, you know, I did mention that a little bit if you allow me to do that.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Sure.

Andrew Cernota:

So at one point, we were discussing at CTAB whether or not to have a city employee manage the studio. So two of their proposals. And one has a studio manager provided by the city. The other has a studio manager provided by CMSG. And in the other two proposals, they're basically the same, but add potentially or add doing a new show doing through local news.

Andrew Cernota:

And that was the added cost on the other two proposals. The first proposal was 145,000 for the first year. And that was basically continuation of the current scope of work.

Andrew Cernota:

The second proposal was a 100,200. And that was the one where the city employee would be taking over for a portion of what they're currently doing now. Proposal C was the...It was 165,000. And that, I believe, was the one that included the television news program being developed. And then, the proposal D-

Pete Johnson:

Was with the news, but with the cities still-

Andrew Cernota:

Oh, okay and 920,000. So both of the really low value ones there include an additional cost to the city. And that would have another employee. There'd be a cost shift to the city of the employee. But the second and the third proposal, the difference is that the first proposal was basically the current scope of work but more strictly controlled by our contracts that we'd be working on. And then, proposal C was the one that included the news program. Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

Thank you. Greg Rodriguez, Nashua School District. Would it be worth this committee voting on which proposal we wanna move forward to if we were gonna put a motion for CMSG?

Andrew Cernota:

I think it probably would be,

Greg Rodriguez:

Because, there's a vast price difference between each proposal. Even proposal C and, and B are... is \$65,000.

Andrew Cernota:

Right. Mr. Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

One other thing to consider using these numbers, they're anticipating that the salary of this individual would be 45,000. That's not entirely correct. That's just direct cost that does not include the indirect costs. So the cost of the city is gonna be much higher than that 45,000.

Pete Johnson:

Correct. And I think we discussed that back at the time that they were willing to give up some because the studio person would also be working for the government and education channels. So the city was gonna take a portion of that if we were to go that direction. So those numbers had already been made up last year by the city. I don't remember the exact salary it was based on. But those numbers were brought up by Janet Graziano.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Kim Kleiner. So there was some initial discussion back last fall. I don't think that the administration made a decision either way on whether the city would be amendable to adding another staff person on the city payroll. And the answer to that point, it would be much more than just their salary because you have to factor pension benefits like that many all that. So I mean generally on an average we at least stay at the salary. But still, that adds another employee to the city's payroll.

I mean that... and even whether or not the employee would be paid at out of the fund, that's another employee in our budgets where the proposal was clearly... The RFP itself was clearly for a contractor to manage the studio. That was the RFP that was set forth. To the other point of the differences in the cost, if you take the BRB and you look at it in year three, there are 168,000. C- CMSG, if you go with the news and 5% each year, they're over 168,000.

So I wanna be careful to say that BRB is so much higher because there's other costs to consider. You have to consider what option you are interested in. You know, BRB includes the news show at cost. So, I think there's, you know, we tried to be as careful as we could with the, the notes we put out and asking a lot of the similar questions.

But I think that we really have to... You have to really look at Purchasing Manager Parkinson's synopsis to understand because it's not apples to oranges, right? Apples to apples.

Pete Johnson:

And I think there's also something to be thought. I think this community needs to decide whether we want to get into the news business at all. Having a government contractor running a news program seems a little problematic to me. But as I said, that's a discussion, I think, that we probably need to have as part of this.

Jennifer McCormack:

So I

Andrew Cernota:

Miss McCormack.

Jennifer McCormack:

I think I'm off track. So I think the latest question, I think, it was you, Mr. Rodriguez said should we be choosing which of CMSG's proposals prices we'd be selecting, I would prefer... or I think it makes sense to me for the committee to choose which firm is more qualified, which firm we want to award the contract to.

I think that next bit which package or if, if we chose CMSG. That seems like a different discussion. And I'm not sure all of that is for this committee to decide. Adding another city employee or not is really probably outside of our purview.

Pete Johnson:

That could all be discussed in the contract negotiations after you select a provider.

Andrew Cernota:

Well, I would also add that, this is where the advisory in our advisory board comes into play. We are making a recommendation to the city both the administration and the Aldermen. So I know over the years our mandate has grown where we actually have some actual binding authority on some things, our previous discussion being one of them. But, in this particular case, we are advisory. So, Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

Would it be appropriate to discuss CMSG's proposal which one I'm gonna choose, and then compare, to?

Andrew Cernota:

I think as far as discussion I'm willing to entertain whatever discussion we have. So if you want to start a discussion about that, then-

Pete Johnson:

Isn't the discussion right now on the motion as to selecting CMSG, correct?

Andrew Cernota:

Correct, although if members of this board are trying to decide which recommendation to make, it might play into that recommendation as far as whether even as far as qualifications. If we're looking at, at one of the proposals that might incorporate something that BRB might be more qualified because they've had experience running their radio station as far as developing programming themselves, that might play into the, the discussion.

Andrew Cernota:

So as I say, I'm willing to be pretty broad about the discussion. But we also have, I'm sure, other things we need to get to eventually too. So I... Mr. Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Well I'll offer my... Nick Miseirvitch, City IT. I'll offer my opinion on this to my fellow members. It seems to be that to compare the two entities and more lines of apples to apples, we would be better off looking at proposal C from CMSG and compare that to BRB. And since, you know, someone mentioned cost, the costs are going to be approximately the same since BRB projected their three-year pricing. And CMSG is requesting a 5% increase year over year. So therefore, the two are fairly identical in cost. So that should not be, or that will not be my determining factor.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Since we started to bring in the question about which proposals among the CMSG-1, I think I just state my preference would be proposal A. As I say, I have concerns about a government contractor getting into news and reporting and having the government contractor be the one speaking on the Public Access TV. I think it should be the public that should be the content providing component to that.

Andrew Cernota:

And so, that's... I'm resistant to the idea of adding another city employee because of the burden on the city. But, at least, that aspect of it is more a matter of opinion for me. But again, if other people wanted to... Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

I'm just looking at quick math if we're looking at a class proposal C alone. Year one is 165. Year two would be 173,250. And year three would be 181,912 for proposal C. So just to put that in perspective.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Johnson.

Pete Johnson:

Yeah, I did bring up the appendix one for BRB TV. And that was their additional items that they didn't provide costs for as they repropoed several additional initiatives which aim to dramatically increase P-channel audience. So those aren't included in the cost estimate that was provided. Options are not to, included in the basic proposal but are proposed in response to Q&A and that they provide addendum one.

Pete Johnson:

So some of the initiatives they're looking at are initiatives to promote viewership by rebranding the channel and having a BRB TV app. That's one thing I had questions of in their proposal, was should the government sponsored channel be labeled as a private entity and supporting artist Russell broadcasting as opposed to it being the city Public Access channel. We're looking for somebody to operate the Public-Access channel and to work with the public here not to necessarily promote and create their own programming, correct? So some of those things is part of the rebranding were things that Mr. Rodriguez brought up. Let's see.

Pete Johnson:

Okay. I'll just read a couple of paragraphs that, that started here. We propose to rebrand the channel and edify the community with local people, local stories, and local content. It would be watched locally and worldwide on BRB TV app. We will teach the community what Public Access is and how to use it and how the citizens can embrace it within their community.

Part of our rebranding effort will be to include fresh, vibrant, and new content, rebrand the concept of Public Access to lose the stigma of an archaic boring content channel with little viewership to become a legitimate TV station with a new concept, BRB TV, where you want to be.

Viewers will be able to watch on local cable channel, the internet, and on the BRB app. So this is something that's not included in their basic proposal. And there's no cost estimate provided as to you know what these additional services, and they're calling them additional services would cost the city. So it's difficult to say that it's 170 whatever thousand dollars you that's my point that there's a lot of unknowns here and what costs could be additional. So, and they're also looking at doing government programming, educational programming, and all of that would be additional costs in there. There was a long appendix one.

So, just in the second one, it was streaming content closed captioning. Four was Nashua Performing Arts Center coverage and studio inside of the Performing Arts Center. That was the last one that they had in their five bulleted points.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Kim Kleiner. So I was in the interview. And I do remember the question and the answer that I heard and maybe perhaps I'm wrong. Some other members that were there could verify was that they didn't put a cost to that. And there's many things that they have done over the number of years in regards to the radio station that they were able to work through other channels not necessarily money being exchanged that there... they had other means, and that they have been very creative working within a budget which was basically nothing for the upstart of WSMN.

And so, I believe, you know, I don't wanna quote his exact words, but something along the lines of they have expertise in building something from nothing, was the, the line that I remember unless someone else remembers differently.

Andrew Cernota:

I think it was pretty fair assessment of his confidence and his ability to achieve the near impossible. All right. Any other comments, discussion? All right. Then, I guess, we go to a vote. All right. Chief Buxton.

Chief Buxton:

Mr. Chair, can you do me a favor? Can you just read the motion again so refresh everybody's memory or-

Andrew Cernota:

Okay. The motion was to recommend, uh, CMSG as these respondents to be recommended to the city, for the award of contract. And it didn't include as far as which of these proposals,

Chief Buxton:

That was my question.

Andrew Cernota:

Yeah. Yeah.

Chief Buxton:

Very good. Thank you.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Chief Buxton.

Chief Buxton:

No.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Andrew Cernota's... Oh, I'm sorry. Lauren Byer. You still there? Looks like she might have left us. All right. Andrew Cernota's yes. Deputy Chief Fay.

Joe Fay:

No.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

No.

Andrew Cernota:

Jennifer McCormack.

Jennifer McCormack:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Nick Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

No.

Andrew Cernota:

And Mr. Morgan's not here. All right. So-

Kimberly Kleiner:

Mr. Rodriguez.

Andrew Cernota:

Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

I also vote no.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. So the motion fails. All right. So I guess, we need a new motion to approve BRB as the recommended respondent. All right, Chief Buxton.

Chief Buxton:

I'd like to make that motion to recommend BRB TV, uh, can be awarded the bid.

Andrew Cernota:

Okay. There's a motion. Discussion of the motion. Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

So one of the concerns I had about the, the BRB proposal is that... and I don't know if this is, you know, if this is done in other places. But, the, the marriage of a commercial radio station with a Public Access TV station concerns me. Part of the Public Access TV station will be financed by the rate payers but kind of supervised by the city government.

That I'm trying to compare it to public television or public radio. They're different but public television public radio it's all contribution or funded by contributions grants and people subscribe. But it's the public that donates the money. And we've talked about cable access TV station trying to do some fundraising to help support it. And so, that mixture of a commercial radio station running a Public Access TV and possibly seeking donations and stuff I'm not sure there's anything wrong with that and maybe that's done in other places.

I'm just not familiar with it. And it makes me uncomfortable. And I wonder if during the interviews the people who participated in those that subject was brought up and what answer they had to that.

Andrew Cernota:

I did raise the question about the degree to which their for-profit business would be involved in the content generation and especially with the rebranding so that the cable access we- would share a brand in some respects with the radio station.

Andrew Cernota:

And they were fairly emphatic that they would be using the radio station to support the television and to drive viewership for the television. But, the... And as far as the fundraising side of things even the current arrangement, the fundraising to the extent that it has occurred has happened through a friends of organization. And it was for specific projects.

Andrew Cernota:

So conceivably, that could still be operated in that same sort of way so that if they needed a particular piece of equipment or something, the friends of could supply it through fundraising, and could be operated as a non-profit. So donations would be tax exempt. But, that obviously would be something they'd have to look into. I didn't get the impression that they had it particularly well fleshed out in their minds. But that was merely an impression. Miss Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Kim Kleiner. So very early on that was my concern as well, Alderman Jette. They did let us know at one of the... I believe it was the RFP pre-bid meeting that they had started a separate entity. So the entity that they would be operating under for the management of Public Access is not the entity that the radio station is, and that they viewed any mention of Public Access TV on the radio station as nothing more than a public service announcement that they would do for the United Way or any other, you know, not- nonprofit organization.

So that, yes, they would use that, you know, the radio station in a way to promote. But they use it to promote a lot of different things. But it is, in fact, that the entity that they are using, and it's more Mr. Bartis's, Attorney Bartis, I think it is, would be running the new entity for the Public Access. And they are aware that they would need a non-profit arm to do any donations, and that as far as the can the city is concerned, and I would stress this of anybody where the city is concerned in any relationship between the city and any non-profit that it's using, we would require by some financial oversight of the third party.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Johnson.

Pete Johnson:

One of my concerns that I brought up during the questioning was the creation of programming by simulcasting some of their radio shows. They indicated that they would be interested in using the live feed that they already have on the internet to broadcast some of those radio shows that they have which are paid for by the hosts. So host pays them for time to be on the radio show, and then saying potentially, "Well, we, you know... You can do the hour on the radio. And then, we'll throw in a free TV show for you because that's on the, the Public Access channel that's being paid for by the city." So that was a concern that I had in marriage between the two organizations.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Any other comments? If not, we'll move to a vote. So the vote is on a motion to recommend, BRB TV as the provider. Chief Buxton.

Chief Buxton:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Andrew Cernota vote yes. Deputy Chief Fay.

Joe Fay:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Lindner's still not here. Miss McCormack.

Jennifer McCormack:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Morgan's still not here. Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Promotion passes. Okay. Comments from the public. All right. Seeing none. Remarks by members. All right. If there aren't any is there a final motion?

Alderman Jette:

I move we adjourn.

Andrew Cernota:

This motion to adjourn. And I guess, because of Miss Byers being on Zoom earlier, we still have to do that roll call. So Chief Buxton.

Chief Buxton:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Byers has left the meeting. Andrew Cernota vote yes. Mr. Chapman is still not present. Deputy Chief Fay.

Joe Fay:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Miss Kleiner.

Kimberly Kleiner:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Ms. Lindner's is still not present. Miss McCormack.

Jennifer McCormack:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Miseirvitch.

Nick Miseirvitch:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

Mr. Morgan is still not present. And Mr. Rodriguez.

Greg Rodriguez:

Yes.

Andrew Cernota:

All right. Thank you very much. Meeting is adjourned.