



**Cable Television Advisory Committee Agenda**  
**March 2, 2022 @ 7:00p.m.**  
**VIRTUAL ONLY via Webex**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**Approved May 4, 2022**

To join meeting online using WebEx platform:

- ❖ go to [www.webex.com](http://www.webex.com)
- ❖ click the "join" button on the top right side of the screen
- ❖ enter the meeting ID, 160 794 8474

To attend via phone:

- ❖ call 1-415-655-0001
- ❖ enter the access code: 160 794 8474

1. Call meeting to order

7:00pm

2. Roll Call

Present: Jeff Levering, Steve Quist, Sergio Bacelis, Marie DiCardy. Judith Warren (Director of Cable Services, City of Worcester).

3. Approval of minutes from 2/2/2021

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

4. Membership update, PSA Update/Review (Warren)

a Citizens Advisory Staff Liaison update

Warren outlined Citizen Advisory Council progress on acquiring new applicants for the CTAC, including a scheduled interview for a potential new member. Requested Jeannie Michaelson explain to CTAC how board openings can be appropriately publicized.

Jeannie Michaelson provided background on CAC efforts for board recruitment, and informed board of two potential new members. Michaelson also explained protocol for CTAC to pursue press opportunities, and informed board of a flyer that can be shared provided information on board opportunities.

Quist provided several examples of radio-based opportunities to advocate for board participation (WCRN, WTAG, WCUW). Warren will follow up with City's communications staff to set up radio appearances as appropriate.



Levering reminded CTAC that it is critical for this process to move quickly due to impending deadlines.

Mauro DePasquale (WCCA, Worcester) requested clarification on who interviews and approves potential members, and asked if PEG volunteers/members are permitted to serve on CTAC. Michaelson explained that, per the City's Law Department, CTAC participation would be considered a conflict of interest in these cases, and that the final approval for membership comes from the City Manager.

## 5. Plan of Action for Ascertainment

[Note, items taken out of order.]

### a. Status/Review/Modify Draft Timeline (Quist, All)

Quist presented projected timeline for CTAC actions, including public hearings and report deadlines, for 2022 and 2023. Committee discussed protocol for publicizing public hearings, and agreed on April 6, 2022 for next public hearing.

Discussed deadlines for reports from individual PEG entities in Worcester. Quist and Levering requested brief, simplified, reports from PEG entities in the interest of expediency, and advised that longer, official reports incorporating survey information, etc, could be done by PEG entities later in the process.

### b. Survey Development, RFP Consultant Requirements review (Levering, all)

Levering outlined progress so far on drafting an RFP for a consultant to develop, produce, administer, and tabulate public opinion survey for CTAC to use in ascertainment report. Per Levering, he, Warren, and City Purchasing Department have drafted majority of the RFP, pending minor adjustments as necessary, and it will be released soon with the hope that a consultant will be selected by May. There is also a second RFP being drafted for additional consulting needs that will arise throughout the ascertainment process.

**Motion:** CTAC approves RFP for survey consultant, as discussed, with remaining edits as required by City or committee members, for clarity; Moved by Levering; Seconded by Quist; Roll Call (4 Yes, 0 No)

**Public Comments:** Michael Coogan (Worcester) requested clarification on structure/wording of RFP. Tetrah Clark (Worcester) suggested CTAC pursue member recruitment efforts at Clark, other local universities.

## 6. Next Meeting – April 6, 7:00pm location to be announced

Confirmed by board. Location still pending.



7. Adjournment

7:42pm

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

8. Attachments: DRAFT Survey Development Consultant & DRAFT Timeline Plan

City Of Worcester  
Community Survey Consultant – (DRAFT) Requirements  
Request for Proposals for Professional Consulting Services:  
Survey City Residents and Report on Public Opinions Regarding Cable Services

### **General Information**

The City of Worcester, Massachusetts (“City”), with a population of 200,000+ in 70,000+ households, is seeking the services of a market research firm to provide a survey of the city’s residents regarding cable services. The City is in the “ascertainment” period of renewing its contract with Spectrum. The survey, and the contract, are specific to the cable television services provided by Spectrum.

Consultant shall work with the City’s “Cable Advisory Committee” (“Committee”) to determine the type of questions to be included. Consultant will assist the Committee in determining the best methods for ensuring adequate response rates, clarity of likely responses, and other topics Consultants deem important to consider. Consultant will design, gain approval for, execute, and report on results of the survey (or surveys). The Survey Results Report must be in professional, print-ready form. Consultant should also expect to attend meetings of the Committee, a remote fashion is acceptable, as requested (Committee meets monthly).

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 of information gathered related to the Cable Television renewal.

### **Scope of Services**

The Consultant shall serve as the overall project leader for the survey project and will meet with the Committee as needed.

Working with Committee, determine information needs and potential methods of survey generation. Guide committee in considering various approaches and methods to survey distribution and reporting. Draft and gain approval for survey questions, project timeline, and distribution methods. Implement survey(s) and report back to the Committee with oral results and related professional, print ready report based on deadlines approved by the Committee. Also, the underlying data representing the survey results should be delivered at that time in a previously agreed to format.

## **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. Minimum of 5 years experience in developing and successfully gaining material response levels for surveys of public opinion around complex topics.
- b. Expertise in the use of various survey methods, the relative advantages and disadvantages of each, and an ability to consultatively guide a process to finding the best method or methods to gain meaningful response levels
- c. Expertise in use of survey technologies, from paper to web, and knowledgeable of the advantages and disadvantages of each.
- d. Experience in working with municipal committees in the development and deployment of public opinion surveys will be given preference. Experience in development of public opinion surveys for other purposes will be considered if the response received meets or exceeds other requirements.
- e. Experience in developing supporting budgets, for example for mailed surveys, if such costs are separate from your proposed fee
- f. Ability to complete projects on-time and on-budget. Committee's goal is to have the survey results in final report form by October 1, 2022.

### **C. Examples of Previous Work:**

Respondents shall cite examples of previous work as outlined in Section B above. Samples of survey methods and results should be included.

### **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, define and propose survey related costs, and implement and report on the results.

**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

**G. References**

Respondent must submit a minimum of two (2) references from previous opinion survey 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 in order 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 approach to meeting the project scope of services. The firm has demonstrated a thorough understanding of the project and is providing staff and resources highly capable of meeting the City's requirements.

**Advantageous** - Proposal provides an adequate approach to implementing a project of this scope. 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 possesses superior qualifications demonstrated by ten (10) or more years of experience in successfully performing public opinion surveys 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 public opinion surveys. Preference to firms with if some or all these surveys were done in support of cable television ascertainment periods.

**Not Advantageous** – The respondent possesses less than FIVE (5) years of experience in successfully performing public opinion surveys.

### **Past performance**

Proposals should demonstrate past performance by including descriptions of completed projects, letters of reference for specific public opinion survey projects and references with contact information.

**Highly Advantageous** - Respondent demonstrates extensive experience and positive past performance in the management of public opinion survey projects. References are included and support claims to high quality work.

**Advantageous** - Respondent demonstrates adequate experience and some positive past performance in the management of public opinion survey projects. References are included and support claims to high quality work.

**Not Advantageous** - Respondent does not demonstrate sufficient experience or positive past performance in the management of public opinion survey projects. References are included and support claims to work being completed.

### **References**

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

**Advantageous** – The proposal includes three (3) or four (4) favorable references from previous public opinion survey 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 two (2) favorable references from public opinion survey 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.

### **Interview / Oral Presentation of Services**

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

**Advantageous** – The respondent's presentation was conducted 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 presentation included one relatable example 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 presentation included no examples and dialog from services performed for other similar municipalities.



# Cable Advisory Comm. 2022 Meeting Planner



As of: March 2, 2022

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

# CAC Meeting Planner – 2022

As of March 2, 2022

March	April	May	June	July
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey Consultant RFP, Review and Approve</li> <li>• CAC Meeting Planner Review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Comment re: Spectrum Television Services</li> <li>• Ascertainment Consultant RFP, Review and Approve</li> <li>• CAC Meeting Planner Review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey Consultant Meeting, Approval to Proceed</li> <li>• CCATV Preliminary Needs Report review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Comment re: Spectrum Television Services</li> <li>• Ascertainment Consultant Meeting, Approval to Proceed</li> <li>• Survey Consultant First meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ascertainment Consultant First Meeting</li> <li>• Survey Update</li> <li>• Government Channel Preliminary Needs Report review</li> </ul>
August	September	October	November	December
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summer Recess (Preliminary)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant Updates</li> <li>• Draft Spectrum Contract Shortfall Review</li> <li>• Schools Channel Preliminary Needs Report review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant Updates</li> <li>• Survey Result Due</li> <li>• Spectrum Rep Attends - Contract Shortfall Review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Comment re: Spectrum Television Services</li> <li>• Consultant: Survey Results Review</li> <li>• Ascertainment Consultant Update</li> <li>• Ascertainment Report Due</li> <li>• PEG Channels Final Report Due</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant: Ascertainment Results Review</li> </ul>

All dates and subject matter priorities subject to change

# CAC Meeting Planner – 2023

As of March 2, 2022

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

All dates and subject matter priorities subject to change