

- ii. Some ties with 2nd & 3rd
- d. City ISP numerical came in #2 – but 5 members choose working with the local ISPs
- e. Ranking was done by factors – not just financial related
- f. Rod – This decision could use further work to truly assess the viability of working with Allo.
 - i. Need to do due diligence
- g. Trent – had to make decision based on assumptions
 - i. Need to view the deal before a final decision can be made
- h. Lavonna – can we provide recommendations on what the contract should be based on?
 - i. Lori - We are looking at just providing an overview recommendations
- i. Rod – I would think that 2,3,4 would be worth reviewing more
- j. Trent – Would like a discussion on level of importance of the decision factor
- k. Bret – We want to rule items out and what is worth pursuing
- l. Rod – Ruled out 1 and 5
- m. Rod - #3 for example, we had some input from Comcast
- n. Rod – Comcast sent an email to Bret/Rod about wanting to work with the committee.
- o. Lavonna – Doesn't want to work with current providers
- p. Bret – reads Comcast email – will add to minutes:
- q. Jason – Sounds like a defensive answer
 - i. Perception problem with Comcaset
- r. Rod – Comcast does have an offer in the email and we should hold them to it
- s. Trent – best way to push them is to bring in competition
- t. Lori – Allo would be the new competition
- u. Bianca – Can we take the next steps of reviewing the recommendation
 - i. Lori – we would like to present the recommendation and offer to dig into that further
- v. Paul – Group would continue as advisory position as we move into city negotiations with potential P3 options
- w. Trent – recommendations
 - i. Can we make a recommendation with areas to keep in mind
 - ii. What details are we most concerned with as it relates to P3 partners
- x. Lavonna – My concern for them or the deal, is it a low financial risk for the city
 - i. Comcast – can they provide it equally across the City of Greeley
- y. Trent – Fears
 - i. I do not believe the citizens will happy with their ISP – don't want City of Greeley's name tied to ISP
 - ii. Cost for the program
- z. Rod – City could come in without capital
 - i. Risks become amplified if we put in capital
- aa. Jason – No reward without risk
 - i. City could own the middle mile
- bb. Rod – Are doing it because it's a good investment or for another reason
 - i. What are we getting paid for it and is there a return?
- cc. Jason – We should make sure the ownership of the core part of the network should be part of the partnership

- dd. Rod – Is there a final end to the middle mile
- ee. Michelle – Can't we lease off fiber for the middle mile?
 - i. Lori - Yes
- ff. Bret – P3 would require an RFP
- gg. Jason – It is not Allo per se – it is the recommendation option that makes the most sense
- hh. Lori – Very rare that a new provider would provide a letter like that to a community
- ii. Trent – Greeley has been asked by Allo, but are there other companies that would provide other options?
- jj. Lori – Other companies may be interested but their option may be a higher cost
- kk. Bianca – Is the city required to put this out to RFP?
 - i. Lori – It is a good idea for the City to put their preferred requirements
 - 1. This is what we'd like to accomplish and see what comes back from the market
 - 2. Communities sometimes put out a loose RFI – doesn't go well
- ll. Bianca – Hard to evaluate when you don't know what else is out there
- mm. Paul – Best practice would be for an open RFP
- nn. Scott – Nothing stopping Allo from coming tomorrow to be a service provider
 - i. Allo is looking for partnerships
- oo. Rod – Risk to city brand –
 - i. Business initiative for the middle mile
 - ii. Give Allo the opportunity to buy into the middle mile – but this should be separate programs so that there isn't branding overlay
- pp. Lavonna – We would need to define the contract to define how and what the city is risking. How are those mitigated.
 - i. Partnership – should provide some power to the City of Greeley
- qq. Lori – You can't eliminate the risk
 - i. But do you step so far back that you don't show the benefits that the city made the right decision
- rr. Jason – Inaction can have just as much risk for the community
- ss. Lavonna – The general public is asking for competition
 - i. City will be a hero if we are able to bring in competition
- tt. Jason – Do we have objective data to show that this is the right decision?
- uu. Trent – Don't want to divest City of Greeley
- vv. Michelle – caveat points – mitigate risk
 - i. Capital investment should have value
 - ii. Do we provide them 'what is the problem'
- ww. Paul –
 - i. City staff kick off
 - ii. Consultant
 - iii. Citizen recommendation
- xx. Trent – Tax presentation
 - i. Staff will provide decision matrix
- yy. Scott –
 - i. Scientific citizen survey has number one as lower price

- ii. Number two, would like to see a service from the City of Greeley
- zz. Amy – Speaks to the fact that Greeley has a great reputation
- aaa. Jason – How to address the pricing issue
 - i. Does the injection of competition address this issue – potentially.
- bbb. Rod – Allo did mention that incumbent prices usually drop 10-15% when they come in.
- ccc. Lavonna – Speaking to friends about how her vision has changed on what she expected when she started.
 - i. Just have to explain to the citizens about what they really do want
- ddd. Renee
 - i. Sales tax increase would be spread over 10yrs and not over 1 year
- eee. Bret – We don't want the city to take on the financial obligation to build and run this utility
- fff. Bianca – We don't think this is beneficial to all the citizens and we need to compare all the other tax needs coming on soon. Thanks to Paul for showing those items that we need to understand
- ggg. Lori – do you have the information to put together remarks
- hhh. Bret –
 - i. Discussion about what we have ruled out
 - ii. Show the decision matrix and discuss
 - iii. And is there a role for the committee moving forward?
- iii. Rod – We have a role based on specific model moving forward
 - i. P3
 - ii. Grant
 - iii. Digital divide
 - iv. How to deal with some of the issues can be work that this committee can focus on
- jjj. Jason
 - i. Can some of these be associated with the P3 plan?
 - ii. Part of the negotiations can focus on some of these areas
- kkk. Trent –
 - i. Can we provide and 'If / Then' statement
- lll. Paul – Council will not provide action at the worksession
 - i. Not going to respond to letter other than telling them we are going to RFP
- mmm. Lavonna – Are we recommending the p3
- nnn. Bianca – should be a little softer language
- ooo. Lavonna – Don't want Comcast get involved in the processes that could impact the results
- ppp. Rod – We should narrow down to the 1 recommendation
- qqq. Jason – we have to deal with people that we don't want all the time
 - i. Comcast could step up to provide what the community needs
 - ii. We have a responsibility to listen to what Comcast could provide
- rrr. Lavonna – Based on the survey the current providers have not stepped up in the past to address issues
 - i. Has a problem providing number 2
- sss. Trent – Council members who are up for re-election will listen and make a decision
 - i. P3 is our recommendation

February 14, 2020

- ii. Mindful of key facts – and happy to advise
- ttt. Rod – Based on the information we have recommendation on where they should move toward
- uuu. Set meeting on March 4th at 4:30
- vvv. Scott – define vote to recommendation
- www. Rod – motion to develop presentation on recommendation that reflects purpose
 - i. Data inputs
 - ii. Work done
 - iii. Final recommendation for P3 steps
 - iv. Present at March 4th
- 5. Next Meeting
- 6. Meeting Adjourn – Bret , Chair

Reference: Email from Comcast that Rod read from during the meeting:

From: Lehmann, Jon
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 3:39 PM
To:
Subject: [External]RE: Thank You - Conversation at Last Greeley Broadband Citizens Committee Meeting
Importance: High

Dear Mr. Naber and Mr. Esch,

First, congratulations on being appointed Chair and Deputy Chair of the Broadband Citizens Committee.

Second, this email is a follow-up to my email below thanking the Committee and encouraging the Committee to reach out to me directly with any specific address(es) of a resident or business who isn't able to receive our services and/or is getting unreliable service. Unfortunately, I have yet to receive a response or inquiry to that email so I am trying again.

As we discussed at the December 19th Committee meeting, Comcast would love to work with the City, the Committee and/or any Greeley resident on understanding exactly where there is a perception that we do not serve either a business or resident and any instance of unreliable service. In addition, Comcast is more than happy to continue discussions on any issue that any Greeley resident may have with us.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to present and discuss our products, services and serviceability (including, but not limited to, our Internet Essentials product – high-speed broadband to lower income residents – www.internetessentials.com).

Finally, congratulations again and I look forward to working with you in the near future.

Sincerely,

Jon Lehmann
Senior Director, Government and Regulatory Affairs
Comcast | Mountain West Region
1899 Wynkoop St, 5th Floor, Denver, CO 80202
E: jon_lehmann@comcast.com

February 14, 2020

O: 303.603.2062

M: 303.880.7032

Connect with us on Social: [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#) | [Blog](#)

GIG-SPEED INTERNET | Comcast has **launched Gigabit-per-second internet speeds** across our Colorado service territory! We've also launched our new **xFi platform**, which enables Xfinity subscribers to better manage their home wifi networks. For more information, visit **xfinity.com/gig** and **xfinity.com/xfi**.