

NEK Community Broadband

Governing Board Special Meeting Minutes

June 23, 2021 5:00-6:30pm

Attendees: (see list)

Role Call & Agenda Review - 2 Min

Public Comment - 5 Min

New Business

5:00-NRTC Design & Engineering- Concord/Waterford- Review & Vote

- The CUD is on a tight timeline and needs to have as many plans in place in order to move through the projects with efficiency.
- Evan sent an overview from NRTC with the breakdown of the deliverables.
 - Fiber layout design, splicing plans, bills and materials, stacking sheets, fiber construction maps, fiber management system report, fiber calculation sheets, hosted final layout design, online fiber design management support, some field validation work
 - NRTC can begin immediately
 - Need to be ready to move when the make-ready work is done
- Question (Paul Fixx): Do you have an estimate for the budgeted expenses for the TBD item?
 - NRTC budgeted was \$6000 within field validation work which includes personnel and overhead. It would not include anything out of scope, which would need approval. The CUD is in control of hiring the field validation, may not need travelling expenses.
- Question (Paul Fixx): why is field validation in the contract?
 - If there are any significant costs the Executive Committee will come back to the board. Discussion of the amount of expense that would be a concern.
- It will be put into the motion for a cap to be put on the TBD items.
- Contract says “incurred expense” The CUD needs to have an agreement with contractors about TBD items.
- Question (Robert Simms): What is field validation?

- Validating the assumptions made by state databases and utilities, the purpose is to ensure that there are not drastic changes or potential expenses incurred.
- General consensus for the language of the motion to allow caps for additional expenses.

Motion to accept the proposal with additional expenses not to exceed \$2000

Motioned: Paul Fixx, Seconded: Rudy Chase, Carried:(23-0)

- Discussion: the price for engineering and design will be the same through the network?
 - NRTC estimates 8 cents per foot on engineering and design work
 - Tilson 860 mile project at 4600 per mile with WEC. NRTC was 2200 per mile with detailed engineering. The more miles you do, the less it costs per mile.
 - The CUD is working to get the best price possible.

5:30-NRTC Executable Project Plan- Phase 1- Review & Vote

- Defining expectations for outside plant infrastructure, head end location, make-ready assessment, resiliency standards, public safety, open access requirements, etc.
- Needs to be completed quickly to place orders for materials that we can use for the future.
- Optimistically, to kick off construction in spring 2022.
- Question (Sarah Lyons): Can we see the referenced sample (Schedule 1 to Exhibit B).
 - The CUD did not receive the sample from NRTC yet. The Executive Committee agrees that the content that is currently in the document is all that is necessary for the vote, but it would be helpful to have the sample.
 - Subject to confirmation, we have enough cable to complete the Concord project.
 - The project plan lines up who is accountable, responsible and informed for project management. The exhibit that was provided was vetted and will deliver to you a sample.
- Evan showed an example of the splice chart to give an example of the work that goes into the detail designs, high level design looks at infrastructure
- NRTC needs to change the signatories on the contract
- Question (Paul Fixx): Will the detailed work be done for the entire backbone?
 - No, the high level design will show the cabinets and infrastructure, etc. The process is to validate information and perhaps redefine borders or information

- Question (Morgan Wade): Could we consider pending corrections to member and signatories for the 60K, and in sharing the example??

Motion to approve this contract pending the changes to signatories that will be necessary to execute it with a careful review of the names to ensure that all the names within the document are correct. Motioned: Kristen, Seconded: William, Carried: (23-0).

- Concern was voiced about the details that are incorrect in the contract.
- The engineering details and project management details are solid. Thoroughly reviewed from a technical standpoint.
- The Executive Committee will be more vigilant about reviewing documents before giving them to the board.

Other Business

- Had the close of the RFP process, received 8 proposals with a good mix of large national organizations and small community organizations.
- Looking for a subcommittee go through the RFPs in detail and give recommendations to the Executive Committee that the Executive Committee will review, then bring to the Governing Board
 - 1 Executive Committee member, 1 Tech Committee member, and 2 Governing Board members
 - Governing Board seats are available, email Evan ASAP
- Question (Sarah Lyons): what are the proposals for?
 - The ISP/operator network
- Question (Sarah Lyons): Are the criteria pre-established?
 - There were criteria initially in the RFP, then further criteria based on the CUD needs, but they will be extensively refined by this committee.
- Evan will send an email out to the GB pertaining to the subcommittee.
- Question (Wendy Matthews): are we considering 1 ISP or multiple?
 - 1 would be ideal. Comes down to what the CUD decides for an operating model in July.
- Questions (Rob Simms): What did the candidates respond with?
 - This is the full proposals (30-80 pages)
- The committee will also consider the possible models available to the NEK CUD based on the RFPs given.
- Question (Paul Fixx): Do we expect to negotiate the proposals?
 - It will be very iterative. The CUD is looking in the direction of the operator model, which may not fit within the proposals, but the CUD will try to negotiate the best possible deal for the communities with the ISPs.

- Agreement ought to be reached by August or September.
- Question (Paul Fixx): A year of design and pre-work for a year before phase 1, and wouldn't need for the ISP till later?
 - To have the best possible relationship with the partner, they will want to have input on the engineering and may have inhouse teams that could save time or money in that process. The biggest priority is delivering on our commitment to get the Concord/ Waterford completed. The operator needs to be in place by the end of the year and we hope to maintain a good relationship with them.
- Question (John Kellogg): What are the thresholds for the Executive Committee vs the Governing Board? To expedite the communication and agility of the Board and Committees?
 - With the ARPA funding there are strict guidelines for how funds are to be spent. We must have a procurement policy that will outline expenditure thresholds (approval in the GB in July) in the process of drafting a bylaw change for the EC as well to help with these sorts of scenarios, ought to be in your email to review before the GB meeting. Those 2 documents will help answer this question.

Adjourn

Motion to adjourn. Motioned: Dale Urie, Seconded: Jennifer Barone, Carried (23-0)

*Respectfully Submitted,
Jami Jones, NEK Broadband, Clerk*



