



**CABLE TELEVISION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 4, 2022 @ 7:00PM
DPW&P BUILDING 50 FAMILIA WAY, FORMERLY KNOWN AS SKYLINE DR
WORCESTER, MA
Approved June 1, 2022**

Call meeting to order
7:00pm

1. Roll Call

Present: Jeff Levering, Steve Quist, Sergio Bacelis, John Keough; Judith Warren, Director Cable Services

2. Approval of minutes from March 2, 2022

Moved by Levering; Seconded by Bacelis; Roll Call (Yes 4; No 0)

3. Membership update, PSA Update, new member(s) introduction (Warren)

Warren: Introduced new member, John Keough, and announced that CAC has appointed another new member who has not yet been sworn in.

Keough: Provided his background and outlined his initial feelings regarding the importance of this upcoming contract negotiation.

4. WCCA-TV Preliminary Needs Report (DePasquale)

DePasquale: Summarized key points of WCCA needs report, and stated that WCCA provides an essential service, yet is experiencing funding decreases. Primary concerns included funding for facility maintenance/safety compliance, operating costs for community productions, content distribution, IT needs, maintaining appropriate staffing levels, training and materials, and organizational promotion. Enumerated membership and programming-hour growth rate, and highlighted significant programs WCCA has created or shared.

Also highlighted need for better access to Charter representatives and periodic inspections of cable lines

Public Comment: Michael Coogan: A key point is that the people who need WCCA's services most cannot access those services elsewhere

5. Plan of Action for Ascertainment

a. Review Survey Consultant RFP Responses (Group)

Levering: RFP has been approved and put out; three responses were received; CTAC must now rate responses and submit preference to Purchasing Dept.

i. Create consolidated Evaluation

Levering discussed his method for analysis and his ratings of respondents with CTAC members; Members concurred with his method/assessment.

Levering asked what top languages spoken in Worcester are; Warren can discuss with Human Rights Office; will not need to address until survey is actually in process.

ii. Motion to recommend

Moved by Levering; Seconded by Quist; Roll Call (4 Yes; 0 No)

b. Review / Approve Ascertainment Consultant RFP (Levering)

Levering: Requirements document has been drafted and distributed among CTAC members; highlighted that consultant shall work for CTAC to evaluate and report on the tech design/operations of Spectrums cable system and capabilities relative to federal and other regulatory requirements, and outlined details of this evaluation. Levering requested CTAC's input for any adjustments to these expectations.

Keough: Requested that Spectrum to provide information on other contracts in Massachusetts which have "open clauses" regarding inclusion of new technology in municipal contracts; this clause is not currently present in Worcester contract. Levering agreed that this can be added.

Quist: Expressed concerns regarding high speed internet access across areas of Worcester.

Public Comment: DePasquale asked if Charter/Spectrum has been audited. Warren: Language is there for franchise audit.

Motion: Submit RFP as discussed to Purchasing Department, allowing edits to be made by Levering/Purchasing Dept to improve clarity. Moved by Levering; Seconded by Quist; Roll Call (Yes 4; No 0)

c. Status/Review/Modify Updated Timeline (Quist, Levering)

Levering: Public Hearing will be held June 1st, allowing public comment on Spectrum's performance, with business portion of meeting to follow.

6. Next Meeting – June 8, 7:00pm, 50 Skyline Drive, Meeting Room A, Worcester includes Public Hearing. June 1st proposed, and agreed upon, for next meeting, with a 6pm start time. An additional meeting for June 15th was also proposed, pending progress on RFP contract.

7. Adjournment

Public Comment: Michael Coogan, advised direct mail and phone for survey distribution.

Motion: Adjournment; Moved by Levering; Seconded by Quist; Roll Call (4 Yes; 0 No)

Attachments

- Draft Ascertainment Study Consultant RFP
- CAC Meeting Planner

City Of Worcester

Cable Ascertainment Study Consultant – (DRAFT) Requirements

Request for Proposals for Professional Consulting Services:

Cable Services Study in Support of Cable License

General Information

The City of Worcester, Massachusetts (“City”), with a population of 200,000+ in 70,000+ households, is seeking the services of a consulting firm to provide assistance in a variety of areas in support of its “ascertainment” of cable services. The City’s “ascertainment” period is part of its renewal of its licensing contract with Spectrum Communications, and the services Spectrum provides to our citizens and three public TV stations.

Consultant shall work with the City’s “Cable Advisory Committee” (“Committee”) to help evaluate the following items through the consultant’s final report:

- The technical design and operation of Spectrum’s cable system, and capabilities relative to federal or other regulatory requirements. This may include active testing of such capabilities.
- The current public (PEG) channels facilities, equipment, services and projected needs. Similarly, this may include testing such capabilities.
- Contractual gaps in Spectrum’s performance under the current contract, along with recommendations to improve a new contract considering:
 - Shortfalls in the technical capabilities of Spectrum as it relates to its current services to the subscribers, our public buildings, or our public stations.
 - Current or expected technical advancements over the next 10 years that should be considered for inclusion in a new agreement.
 - Features and contractual terms other municipalities have which would benefit Worcester, noting whether these features or terms were offered by Spectrum or a competitor.
 - Variances in any contractual responsibility of Spectrum versus services provided.

- Review Spectrum franchise payments for no less than the last three years for accuracy and timeliness.

(It should be noted the City has separately initiated a RFP for a marketing firm to assist in evaluating, through one or more survey's, public sentiment regarding the City's TV services.)

Qualified firm shall be able to demonstrate they have the resources, experience, and qualifications to provide consulting services for this project from concept to final report.

Consultant should provide a complete list of references, information about the project team, examples of prior related work products, and other components listed more fully in the "Comparative Evaluation Criteria" section.

Finalist or finalist consultants will meet with the committee to review their proposal and should have the associated team available during their proposal presentation.

Scope of Services

The Consultant will serve as project leader for the services they propose. Working with the Committee, the Consultant will determine information needs and potential methods for gathering this information. Consultant should expect to attend the, generally, monthly meetings of the Committee, in-person or remotely. Interactions with the staff of Spectrum Communications and the City's PEG Channels will be coordinated with the City's Director of Cable Services.

The consultant's **Worcester Massachusetts 2022 Cable Services Study** must be in professional, print-ready form. An oral presentation of the Study by the consultant will also be scheduled. The Committee hopes to select Consultant for this role in June, with work beginning in July, and a final report submitted to the Committee in November with an oral presentation in December.

MINIMUM EVALUATION CRITERIA:

All proposals must satisfy all the minimum criteria below for further evaluation. Proposals shall include information demonstrating compliance with each of these criteria. Proposals that do not meet the minimum criteria will not be further evaluated.

A. Executive Summary:

Provide an overall description of your firm including years established, size, location, etc.

B. Qualifications and Experience:

Provide a detailed description of your firm's qualifications and experiences relative to the scope of work including, but not limited to, the following:

- a. 5 or more years' material involvement in working with municipal committees in the development of Ascertainment Studies. Preference will be given to firms showing significant (10+ years) experience assisting multiple municipalities based on varying needs.
- b. Demonstratable expertise in the evaluation of Cable License Contracts for gaps in performance, services offered elsewhere, regulatory requirements, and the like. For example, identify meaningful differences between a city's contract, and contracts negotiated by other municipalities with the same or other cable providers.
- c. Demonstratable expertise in technical cable system evaluation, able to identify and report on gaps or improvements which should be considered during the upcoming license negotiations. Such evaluations should occur with Spectrum Communications and the three City channels (Public Access, Education, and Government) and might include system performance, compliance with relevant FCC or other regulations, and picture quality.
- d. Demonstratable expertise in auditing cable franchise payments, determining contractual payment terms, rates, fees reimbursed to the City, and associated variance. Committee is looking to go back 3, and possibly 5, years in payments.

- e. Ability to complete projects on-time and on-budget. Committee's goal is to have the survey results in final report form by November 1, 2022 with oral presentation on or about December 7, 2022.

C. Examples of Previous Work:

Respondents shall cite examples of previous work as outlined in Section B above. Multiple examples are recommended, cross referencing the qualifications to the relevant sections.

D. Project Team Qualifications:

Respondents shall submit the qualifications and experience of the Project Lead and all members of the proposed project team including resumes for each member.

E. Project Approach:

Respondents shall submit their proposed approach and methodology for the project. How will the firm gather requirements, guide the committee's decision-making process, gain approval for the proposal including timeline, and interact with city employees, the Committee, Spectrum communications, and the like.

F. Proposed Services:

- Provide an overview of the firm's understanding of the Scope of Services tasks to be provided
- Submit a proposed project work plan with timelines to accomplish all tasks listed in the Scope of Services and the project deliverables
- Submit associated costs.

G. References

Respondent must submit a minimum of five (5) references from Ascertainment Study projects performed within the past five (5) years for local government organizations and include organization name, contact person, current phone number, email address and description of work performed.

COMPARATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA:

Comparative Evaluation Criteria: Each proposal meeting the Minimum Evaluation Criteria shall be further evaluated and rated according to the Comparative Evaluation Criteria to determine the relative merits of each proposal. The review will cover the objectives listed below. Within each category, the degree to which the proposal satisfies the stated objective shall be reviewed and rated on a system of “Highly Advantageous,” “Advantageous,” and “Not Advantageous.”

Capacity and capability of the firm to meet the proposal expectations

Proposals should demonstrate project understanding as well as capacity and capability to meet the proposal requirements. Evidence of this should include a clear description of how the consultant would approach a project of this scope.

Highly Advantageous - Proposal provides a clear and well thought out approach to meeting the project scope of services. The firm has demonstrated a thorough and detailed understanding of the project and is providing staff and resources highly capable of meeting all the City’s requirements.

Advantageous - Proposal provides a thorough approach to implementing a project of this scope and. The firm has demonstrated a good understanding of the project and is providing staff and resources that can meet the City’s requirements.

Not Advantageous - Proposal provides an unclear approach to meeting the project scope of services and the firm has demonstrated a limited understanding of the project. Staff and resources may not be adequate in meeting the City’s requirements

Qualifications

Highly Advantageous – The respondent team possesses superior qualifications demonstrated by ten (10) or more years of experience in successfully performing Ascertainment Studies for use during cable television ascertainment periods.

Advantageous – The respondent possesses adequate qualifications demonstrated by five (5) to nine (9) years of experience in successfully performing Ascertainment Studies.

Not Advantageous – The respondent possesses the minimum of five (5) years of experience in successfully performing Ascertainment Studies.

Past performance

Proposals should demonstrate past performance by including descriptions and examples of completed projects, letters of reference for specific Ascertainment Studies projects and references with contact information.

Highly Advantageous - Respondent demonstrates extensive experience and positive past performance in the management of Ascertainment Studies projects. References are included and support claims to high quality work. More than three examples are from different municipalities with varying needs, show an attention to detail, clarity in writing and presentation.

Advantageous - Respondent demonstrates adequate experience and some positive past performance in the management of Ascertainment Studies projects. References are included and support claims to adequate work. One or two examples are provided from municipalities, show an attention to detail, clarity in writing and presentation.

Not Advantageous - Respondent does not demonstrate sufficient experience or positive past performance in the management of Ascertainment Studies projects. References are included and do not support claims to work being completed. Examples show less than adequate clarity, detail, or professionalism.

References

Highly Advantageous – The proposal includes ten (10) or more favorable references from previous Ascertainment Studies consulting projects performed within the past five (5) years and includes company name, contact person, current phone number, email address and description of work performed.

Advantageous – The proposal includes five (5 - 9) favorable references from previous Ascertainment Studies consulting projects performed within the past five (5) years and includes company name, contact person, current phone number, email address and description of work performed.

Not Advantageous – The proposal includes the minimum of five (5) favorable references from Ascertainment Studies consulting projects performed within the past five (5) years) and provide incomplete information regarding company name, contact person, current phone number, email address and description of work performed.

Interview / Oral Presentation of Services

Highly Advantageous – The respondent's proposal presentation is supported by the individuals who will perform the services and include thorough, highly detailed information regarding how the firm will complete the scope of services. The proposal presentation included multiple relatable examples and dialog from services performed for other similar municipalities.

Advantageous – The respondent's proposal presentation is supported by some of the individuals who will perform the services and included adequately detailed information regarding how the firm will complete the scope of services. The proposal presentation included 3 or less relatable examples and dialog from services performed for other similar municipalities.

Not Advantageous – The respondent's presentation was conducted by the firm's sales team and not the individuals who will perform the services. It includes some information regarding how the firm will complete the scope of services but was not clear as to the firm's ability to comply with the stated scope of services. The proposal presentation included limited examples and dialog from services performed for other similar municipalities.

COST / PRICE PROPOSAL RFP #: _____

(To be completed by proposer)

Consulting fee must be submitted as a flat, lump sum fee for all tasks/deliverables in the attached scope of services and required under the contract. Please include any and all costs associated in the lump sum fee. No additional fees will be considered. Proposers may not add additional items.

Lump Sum Consulting Fee / Total Cost: \$ _____ *

**low proposal price will be based on the total fee amount*

Signature of person submitting proposal _____
Date:

Printed Name _____ Title _____

Company _____

Address _____

Phone _____

Fax _____

E-Mail _____



Cable Advisory Comm. 2022 Meeting Planner

As of: May 4, 2022

All dates and subject matter priorities subject to change, updates provided according to meeting schedule (currently monthly)

CAC Meeting Planner – 2022

As of: May 4, 2022

March	April	May	June	July
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey Consultant RFP, Review and Approve • CAC Meeting Planner Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NO MEETING DUE TO LACK OF QUOROM • Public Hearing re: Spectrum Television Services • Ascertainment Consultant RFP, Review and Approve • CAC Meeting Planner Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey Consultant Meeting, Approval to Proceed • Ascertainment Consultant RFP, Review and Approve • CCATV Preliminary Needs Report review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Hearing re: Spectrum Television Services • Ascertainment Consultant Meeting, Approval to Proceed • Survey Consultant First meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ascertainment Consultant First Meeting • Survey Update • Government Channel Preliminary Needs Report review
August	September	October	November	December
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summer Recess (Preliminary) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant Updates • Draft Spectrum Contract Shortfall Review • Schools Channel Preliminary Needs Report review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant Updates • Survey Result Due • Spectrum Rep Attends - Contract Shortfall Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Hearing re: Spectrum Television Services • Consultant: Survey Results Review • Ascertainment Consultant Update • Ascertainment Report Due • PEG Channels Final Report Due 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant: Ascertainment Results Review

All dates and subject matter priorities subject to change

CAC Meeting Planner – 2023

As of: May 4, 2022

January	February	March	April	May
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Develop, Review key Ascertainment Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Draft Ascertainment Report Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Final Ascertainment Report Review and Approve	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD
June	July	August	September	October
<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD	<ul style="list-style-type: none">TBD

All dates and subject matter priorities subject to change