



Public Notice
Technical Committee Agenda
Public Notice for the Policy Committee

Regular Meeting
July 10, 2012 – 3:30 PM - City of Champaign Council Chambers

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes
5. Policy Committee Updates
6. Action & Discussion Items:
 - a. Construction Update
 - b. Subcommittee Reports and Actions
 - i. OSS/BSS RFP
 - ii. Marketing and Outreach
 - iii. FTTP Procurement Process/Status Update (Mike Smeltzer/Teri Legner)
 - c. Officer Elections
7. Discussion items:
 - a. Tasks or Items for the next meeting
 - b. Next Meetings:
 - July 24, 2012 City of Champaign Council Chambers, 3:30 PM
 - August 14, 2012 City of Champaign Council Chambers, 3:30 PM
8. Audience Participation – 5 minute limit per person
9. Committee Member Comments and Announcement
10. Adjourn



Sign-in Sheet

UC2B Technical Committee
 Time: 3:30 PM

Date: May 8, 2012
 Room: Champaign Council Chambers

VOTING MEMBERS	ORGANIZATION	Present
Fred Halenar	City of Champaign	✓
Tony Vandeventer	City of Champaign	
Tracy Smith (Chairperson)	University of Illinois	✓
Connie Dillard Myers	University of Illinois	
Bill DeJarnette (Vice-Chair)	City of Urbana	✓
William Gray	City of Urbana	
VOTING ALTERNATES		
Craig Shonkwiler	City of Urbana	
	University of Illinois	
Mark Toalson (for Tony)	City of Champaign	✓
NON-VOTING MEMBERS		
John Brighton	University of Illinois	
Chris Hamb	University of Illinois	
Omar Sobh	City of Champaign	
David Young	City of Urbana	✓
Ross Veach	City of Urbana	✓
OTHER ATTENDEES:		
Mike Vrem	Champaign Telephone Company	✓
Mike Smeltzer	U of I	✓
Teri Legner	City of Champaign	✓
David Glynn	Pavlov	✓
Mike Hosier	Champaign Telephone Company	✓
Peter Folk	Volo	✓
Patrick East	City of Champaign	✓
Ray Mitchell	Volo	✓

UC2B

MINUTES

5-8-2012

3:30 P.M.

CHAMPAIGN COUNCIL CHAMBERS

MEETING CALLED BY	Tracy Smith, Chair
TYPE OF MEETING	UC2B Technical Committee
GENERAL ITEMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracy Smith, Chair called the meeting to order. • Quorum was verified – Verbal Roll call was taken (see Roll Call sheet). • Approval of Agenda. Fred Halenar made motion. Bill DeJarnette 2nd. Approved. • Approval of 5/1/12 Meeting Minutes. Mark Toalson made motion. David Young 2nd. Minutes approved.

#5.

POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT UPDATES

TRACY SMITH

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tracy Smith reminded the committee that this is their one shot to weigh in on the technical issues related to the private network expansion that is on the Policy Boards agenda for tomorrow's meeting.
------------	---

#6A.

CONSTRUCTION UPDATE

MIKE SMELTZER

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mike Smeltzer reported that construction continues, the Urbana contractor is pulling some fiber, the Champaign contractor is getting close to finishing off all of their conduits. Urbana is close to that as well. The RFP for the 2nd phase of construction, the deadline was extended until a week from tomorrow. The first addendum came out last night; the second addendum will come out tomorrow morning that has updated maps. Bid opening would be 2 p.m. on May 16th in Champaign Council Chambers and bids are due by 12 noon at the City Clerk's office. The evaluation team will jump into service as soon as the bids are opened and probably work on it non-stop until we have a winner.
------------	---

#6B.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS & ACTIONS

DISCUSSION	<p>OSS/BSS RFP (Mike Smeltzer)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mike Smeltzer reported that the canvassing team has desired to have a more sophisticated customer relationship management system to aid them in their canvassing and tracking/outreach. This Thursday they are deciding on what that will be. In the near future, all potential customers and people who wanted to sign up, in a CRM system (not sure of which one yet); looking for good work flow management and tracking. We may be backdooring our way into a customer database management system, there are modules for these systems that include billing and these are inexpensive. None of these would necessarily interface with an automatic provisioning system, but we're not anticipating that need yet. • Mark Toalson confirmed said we're backdooring our way into something; but the something we're backing into is creation of a database that could put into the OSS, is that right. • Mike Smeltzer said no, this would actually be a CRM system, like salesforce.com. • Mark Toalson asked that's not going to replace the OSS/BSS we're talking about. • Mike Smeltzer said that people have different definitions of what is an OSS/BSS, the BSS part is really customer relations, and this could be that part. Yes, this could be long term what we go with. One thing that is still uncertain, and there is differences of opinion, when we bid the operational part of the call center, whether we tell people this is our CRM system and we'd like you to use it or your already in this business, you have some sort of CRM system, just put our customers into your system. No decisions been made, but at least we'll have an option of we will own or have rented a CRM system that will have all of our customer data in it and we could put out that RFP for call center work requiring they use our system. • Bill DeJarnette said the reality is that somebody who wins that bid, our little dab of users is very small compared to their larger user; and they'd tend to want to use their system, and we would get the best prices but it does on the backend give us a repository to maintain and download, and make sure that we have ownership of the most current copy of that data in a methodology that maybe usable for us for any number of analysis. We're not losing anything by going through this process.
------------	--

	<p>Marketing & Outreach (Teri Legner)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teri Legner announced Safiya Noble has been hired for the City as a temporary employee to coordinate the Outreach & Customer Acquisition part of the project; she is working with the canvassers Dr. Ghant and LaEisha Meaderds, she is also managing a contract with Chris Hamb, Chris Media to do some grass roots outreach for UC2B. We will probably need some technical assistance from an agency to help with production of messages, particularly audio & video messages, but that will be something that will happen down the road. It's really beefing up in anticipation of getting that push out this summer so that we do have our 2500 subscribers like we hope. <p>FTTP Procurement Process/Status Update (Mike Smeltzer)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mike Smeltzer said they hope to have multiple bidders show up at our doorstep next Wednesday, part of the second half of that process is the materials, once the second addendum is out Shive Hattery will concentrate on getting the Materials RFP out. One of our current vendors has located some reasonably priced fiber cables in sizes that we're probably going to need for some of the phase 2 work, and we may just buy it now.
--	--

#6C.	TECHNICAL ISSUES RELATING TO PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN NETWORK EXPANSION	COMMITTEE
DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tracy Smith stated if we are going to weigh in on this recommendation for the Policy Committee this is our shot. We discussed a lot last week. Feedback from last week, Mike Smeltzer tweaked the proposal put forth last week that's included in our new packet. Tracy reiterated this is our one shot if we're going to make any recommendations, as you're listening, think of the technical components. Tracy confirmed that everyone is in agreement when talking about laterals, having a common definition, and then once we have that from a technical and operational standpoint, what makes sense. Does it make sense having multiple entities owning varies laterals or does it make more sense from a technical and operational standpoint for one entity to own that. We need to discuss that. Tracy asked Mike Smeltzer to step the committee through the updated version. Mike Smeltzer said the updated version of the policy is fairly similar to before although more specific in use of language when talking about a lateral cable or a drop cable; and not referring to things generically as laterals which sometimes that includes both of them. If the word cable is in there, we're talking about a specific segment of the cable. In terms of the policy, it doesn't make much difference because I'm advocating the same thing for both lateral cables and drop cables. Drop cables are typically on private property, laterals will be typically on public property. The Policy Board is looking to this group not only for technical but for operational advice. They are looking for this group to give them some advice; some things are not particularly technical or operational but pure policy but none-the-less some of these things will come before them tomorrow and you may want to weigh in now. Mike Smeltzer outlined four or five things that will discussed tomorrow in differences of opinions. Tracy Smith asked if anybody had questions about the information that was provided in the packet. Bill DeJarnette said he thought it would be best just to step through it. Mike Smeltzer started discussion on page 2 letter A, all lateral fiber in the cities ROW that connects to UC2B network shall be operated as an open access network by UC2B. Mike stated he did not believe everyone in the room believes that. Mark Toalson asked if he felt that is required by the grant. Mike Smeltzer said no, and it was discussed on Friday with this proposed policy with our attorneys, and they concurred that we are venturing where no one has gone before because there are no models for us to look at (because nobody has ever tried to run a fiber network all the way to the buildings as open access on a dark fiber basis). But to give both dark fiber access to an endpoint there's not a lot of precedence for that. This is our own attempt at creating a policy that maintains the concept of open access that makes sense for other providers and also makes sense for customers; and as simple and straightforward as possible both for other providers to be able to provide services and for customer to be able to order services from different providers once they already have fiber in there. That's why it's important for UC2B to operate all of that fiber, so that it's a one call; easier and faster for switching providers, and also for providers to get services streamlined quicker. If we end up having to negotiate with other people that own bits and pieces of the fiber there, that can be time consuming. Ross Veach said it can be time consuming, but not impossible. Mike Smeltzer said it is certainly not impossible. But there is no guarantee that another provider who builds their own lateral, they are under no obligation to ever make any of that available to UC2B unless we have a policy that looks like this or something like this. If you build a fiber lateral you'd be under no obligation to ever share that with anybody. In which case, the only answer we have (even though there's fiber that connects to the UC2B network that goes to your building) if somebody else wanted to provide services to that, their only choice at that point would be to build their own fiber or a second lateral; because you don't have to share unless 	

somehow we force to share.

- Ross Veach again asked for distinction between the lateral running down the ROW and the fiber coming into the building.
- Mike Smeltzer said sure, maybe your recommendation could be that maybe the laterals are shared, the drop cables aren't. There is a small distinction there. Say the ring is six blocks away from you and we have to build six blocks of lateral to get to the front of your building and then go in; it's certainly less expense to have to build that last part going into your building, but it's still an obstacle if whoever currently controls that lateral isn't interested in letting anybody else ever use it.
- Ross Veach said he understands that but what if he doesn't want to let you use it.
- Mike Smeltzer said if you're the ISP building into Huber's, 3 blocks of fiber in the City ROW, and 50 ft. to go from a handhold out to Huber's. If Ross's Internet Company builds that, pays for it, maintains it and Huber's doesn't want to use Ross's Internet Company anymore, and Ross says he doesn't want anyone to use it; now we're stuck with a situation where we would have to duplicate that infrastructure. That seems to be counter-productive to craft a policy that allows that to happen. If we create a system where people have to duplicate infrastructure and put more stuff in the ground; there is a lot of infrastructure down there. That's bad if we end up with a situation that a provider does not, or is not somehow required to make that infrastructure available. Because we can make our own rules for connecting to the UC2B fiber that we could mandate that, we have the ability to mandate that legally if we want to. He thinks we will regret the day that we didn't do that at some point in the future.
- Bill DeJarnette suggested that with the limited amount of time, we would be better off pushing through all these topics, go over them generally and come back & put the pieces together.
- Mike Smeltzer when through the policy (provided in the packet) Item B is merely what the Cities would prefer; both Public Works have expressed a strong preference for not having 96 different companies in the right-of-way. Item C is basically a restatement of Item A. Item D is common sense, that if we're going to assume responsibility for donated fiber that we can't allow that to drive us into bankruptcy. Item E merely says we're talking about stuff in Champaign, Urbana and Savoy. We are not interested in getting fiber into Tolono, Rantoul, etc...And fiber that went to these places would not be considered a lateral; it would be considered some sort of backbone.
- Teri Legner said that the City of Champaign has an agreement with the Village of Savoy about working in their right of way for this project.
- Mike Smeltzer said we had to really contract where we had originally hoped to build fiber specifically for this interest because the City of Urbana did not have rights-of-way in a lot of those areas to the north.
- Mike Smeltzer said those are the core principles. If we were a private entity, we would be approaching this in a very different way.
- Bill DeJarnette said if our goal is to own the laterals which makes perfect sense, and I want to reduce load and increase simplicity, but if there are mandatory standards that's one thing for things being built in current but things that are already existing that we may want to connect or somebody already has infrastructure in the ground, if my standards are very specific or different, does that force them to run their own laterals and then to connect to someone else in the right-of-way so now the donation rules don't matter because it will be done their own way and duplicating infrastructure because they have to find a way to get to an ISP because they cannot connect to us because they cannot meet our standards and/or they have a large number of assets and they don't want to donate. How do things fit in that already exist?
- Mike Smeltzer said we're always drawing a line at a lateral. If someone had conduit that went through Champaign Urbana or went great distances, that's not a lateral that's a backbone fiber. Does not think that anybody today has an existing lateral that connects to UC2B. So we are talking about new things. Volo for example has fiber that comes down University and Springfield, they already have fiber there and if they want to connect to somebody on that route, they'll probably just connect into their own fiber, and not use UC2B. Doesn't think this will apply to any existing construction because it really talks about laterals, and there aren't any existing laterals to UC2B rings at this point.
- Bill DeJarnette said that if I turn half the fibers back over to Champaign Telephone, I have an organization that may not want to buy a 20 year IRU, may not want to front building costs, may really want to try something for 3-5 years; we don't have an in-between solution. The vendor is the in-between solution; he's the one that they could lease from. There's language that attempts to preclude that a little bit or control how that fibers used. Say Champaign Telephone does all my phone stuff, maybe I don't want to have (maybe my network admin guy just quit), and I let them run my network, and I have extra capacity on my fiber so how about I trade you the extra capacity on my fiber and it's a net sum zero transaction where I feel good, they get more capacity because they are on my fibers, and believes the language is trying to control that too. That's a real slippery slope, what are the goals of this document in dealing with those two issues.
- Mike Smeltzer said at the end of the day, UC2B wants to have a direct business relationship with anybody that's using our dark fiber. And if you sublease or sub-rent it, that would violate that because then if something goes wrong with them, they call you, you call us, and we don't even know who they are. They're not our customer. It's not uncommon for IRU agreements to

- specifically prohibit that kind of subleasing because the owner of the fiber wants to have that direct relationship with the people that are using it.
- Bill DeJarnette said do we want to look at some potential language for that; there is some potential benefit in organizations being able to test the waters and not have to commit to a 20 year commitment to get to a place, that they may or may not be able to develop that business model; but on the other hand it may be feasible for them to say, subcontract a couple of fibers with Champaign Telephone for 3-5 years and work through that process. We really don't have anything in-between.
 - Mike Smeltzer said we will, or we will soon.
 - Bill DeJarnette said the document says if you get two other vendors to buy into capital purchase then UC2B can back door their way in and provide another layer of service. But that assumes I have to get two more people to buy capital into an environment; where's my saturation, where's my value.
 - Mike Smeltzer said that one of the things the Policy Board will be talking about (on the 24th) is dark fiber leases. If Champaign Telephone paid for a lateral & put that in, and even if UC2B wanted to offer some of that fiber as a lease, UC2B would have to compensate Champaign Telephone which seems fair, but there would be a shorter lease, a one-year lease if you wanted to test the waters. What would probably make more sense would be to ask Champaign Telephone to provide a lambda service which looks like a dark fiber service, and doesn't put them quite so much in the middle of controlling the connection.
 - Bill DeJarnette said most of this looks like I'm in the business of making people do what I want them to do whether they want to do it or not. How do I make Champaign Telephone offer a lambda service to somebody?
 - Mike Smeltzer said Mike Hosier from Champaign Telephone is actually here, but I can anticipate what he's going to say that if somebody shows up at his door step with money and says they want service and it's something he can provide, he'll do it.
 - Bill DeJarnette said if they own fiber, and I'm looking to build a scenario by which they cannot go ahead and sublease that fiber out, but now I'm turning around and well there's some other technical termed relationship they could have that would be ok to do; I'm not sure I see a lot of difference, it's still service to somebody for a reason, and part of my reason is if I can get more people interested in providing levels of service and close some of those windows down, get something in that 3 year or 5 year, we're more competitive.
 - Mike Smeltzer said it's conceivable that some company (ISP) from Peoria shows up in town and they want to lease services from Champaign Telephone, Champaign Telephone may decide it's not in their best interest competitively to provide services to a potential competitor and that's certainly within their ability to chose who they want to do business with; in that case that provider would have the option under this policy of having access to some of those exact strands, or strands on that same cable.
 - Bill DeJarnette said the beauty of the policy is that if I want in, if I can put up some money, I'm in. The issue I am looking for, I think I want to be in, there's always the mark-up capability of a 3 year deal, well its X-plus but you can try that, and it looks like we've tried to close that door; even if we don't address it in this language, I suspect that needs going to be out there at some point. And the other piece would be, is my ability to (like when the U of I got in the business of selling computers) but what keeps us in the government as we continue to expand the services we provide, where do we draw the line as what we call governmental services and actually selling off our extra capacity; notwithstanding the fact that the U of I won't provide the Internet to back that, but none-the-less it does keep somebody else from buying a couple fibers (IRUing a couple fibers on our ring), which is money out of our pocket.
 - Mike Smeltzer said yes, and to some degree and this pains me to say, UC2B has to act a little like AT&T, now AT&T has decided corporately, that's usually in their best interest to never sell dark fiber. I don't know of anyone who's ever bought dark fiber from AT&T. They just don't do it. They'd much rather sell you a service at a monthly rate rather than let you have total access to something they've put in the ground and do that. By the fact that we are providing access to dark fiber, we're being very different that AT&T, but the fact that we're trying to make it available to whomever wants to have access to it, but at the end of the day, we still need to be economically sustainable. So there has to be some attention paid to the bottom line in everything we do, just to keep the doors open, to keep the community benefit fund funded to make this experiment continue. So part of this has to be fairly mercenary capitalistic and parts of it is going to be open access and trying to encourage things that do good things for our society and it's always going to be a balancing act between those two.
 - Fred Halenar said sometimes we're trying to drive this down too far, and if there were a million such customers that wanted to buy dark fiber or lease, that you could potentially have a million different contracts, but I think what A-E is trying to present to us is some basic structure and framework from which to operate from, and that is some guiding factors. Sometimes I have a problem dealing with each individual specific case, because we've hired attorneys to look at IRU's to help structure that, and I'm sure they are going to look at lease agreements as well. And each one could have its own individual uniqueness put to them.
 - Bill DeJarnette said and with each uniqueness comes a different valuation.
 - Fred Halenar said right so, the point I'm trying to make is maybe the intent here is to have wording that each needs to be looked at on a case-by-case basis after you set some general

criteria.

- Bill DeJarnette agreed whole heartedly. Back to the general premise of our goals, it sets the tone, and the methodology on how you evaluate on a case-by-case basis, is how you get there, what I'm looking at in the couple issues, is the piggybacking of services, and who owns the strands, is just setting the tone of what's our expectation of how we do business. Do we tell people it's yours, you control your own destiny – you connected to us, or is it, here are the rules, there's going to be some very specific usage rules, Urbana – you use yours for the business of doing Urbana business, we assume that is public service, police, fire, the core services; we don't think you're going to get into anything that is not normal City business. The other issue is creating the perception of whether we're simplifying or creating barriers, and an evaluation on a case-by-case basis I think gets us more to the issue of eliminating barriers; people have the assumption there's some access to the information and how we would get there.
- Mike Smeltzer said one of the things we need to be aware of, if we were a totally private entity we would have no necessary obligation to be consistent, but because of our roots and our funding sources that we need to treat people as equally as we possibly can, and that's why having a far reaching policy that kind of explains how we're going to do and if we apply that uniformly, we're probably in good shape. But if we negotiate one deal with you and a very different deal with you, and you both talk, sooner or later one of you is going to be unhappy, and that's going to show up at City Council meetings. So we want to try and be as consistent across the customer base and consumer base, offering a consistent set of pricing and policies.
- Bill DeJarnette to clarify this again, I've got a lateral, I pay for a lateral, I build my lateral, 2nd person in doesn't exist, there's no one that wants to add to that lateral, but we're having people come to UC2B that would like to provide some service to that facility. But they don't want to commit to a 20 year and buy in; so unless UC2B is willing to buy in as that 1st organization in, that's what's going to have to happen to create that free flow into that facility.
- Mike Smeltzer agreed yes. Obviously UC2B would need some capital fund to make that happen. If you built the lateral, its \$18,000, UC2B would have to pay you \$9000 if we were the 1st organization in; in order to get access to some strands to be able to provide services to other people. Now depending upon how much we're charging those other people and how long a contract they sign for, maybe that \$9000 is a good investment. That's under any circumstance; the people who are building the fiber in the first place, have the right to recapture some of that if they've in fact, donated it to the system.
- Bill DeJarnette said it's one thing for the laterals that we're building now because those are under very controlled cost, the reality is there's a couple people that, and short lateral can be very expensive, but are we looking at some sort of capping mechanism to say that the handshake agreement that Mike & I've got because Mike does boring on weekends, and that's ok, so instead of costing \$6 a foot, I'm going to charge him \$15 a foot so that he can capitalize it as \$15 a foot; while UC2B's back here on the other end wanting to buy in, well that price is inflated; do we care? What's our sense of fairness, because we're the steward for that next guy in, 2 years, 3 years, and 5 years down the road to say that the price is not so exorbitant that it is inappropriate and cheaper for you to just bore your own?
- Mike Smeltzer said this references a donation agreement and in that donation agreement you the donator would say I would how much fiber and where, and documents what you paid for it; and UC2B will say if it's reasonable or not. There is a check and balance there with donating fiber.
- Bill DeJarnette said that goes back to what Fred Halenar said about each thing has to be evaluated on its own merits.
- Mike Smeltzer agreed; each lateral could be wildly different in cost. We have some laterals that will be dirt cheap to do, and others will be expensive on a per foot basis just due to the complexity of where they are going and all the existing infrastructure & so forth. And that will probably change over time.
- Ross Veach asked to move away from policy, money and ideology and talk about some physical things. If you own a run of fiber and I own a run of fiber and we want to interconnect, how do we do that physically? I know how you do it when you own it all. But how do you make that cross connect when two people own fiber in the ground.
- Mike Smeltzer explained and used an example, say Ross builds fiber into Huber's; your fiber would get spliced into a UC2B ring fiber in a UC2B splice case in a UC2B manhole, you would have to extend your fiber or conduit into that manhole bring your cable in and it would get spliced in.
- Tracy Smith asked by whom?
- Mike Smeltzer said that anybody who touches a UC2B cable, its UC2B staff or contractors. All the stuff that happens upstream to that, your building the fiber and responsible for that, but when it comes time to touch the ring, where you have the ability to disable services for other people, we want UC2B contractors or employees doing that part of the splicing.
- Ross Veach said now that I built that 8 block run, and UC2B wants to use some of those strands, how do you make that connection.
- Mike Smeltzer said if you made that 8 block run and donated it to UC2B; it's just UC2B infrastructure and we treat it like any other infrastructure.
- Ross Veach said he doesn't think you're always going to get there. I'm trying to get someone to

address the issue of how does it work if two different people own the runs of fiber and they mutually wish to make a cross connect between those two runs of fiber.

- Mike Smeltzer said it's going to happen in one or the other organizations manholes.
- Ross Veach said or there's going to be a run of fiber between two manholes.
- Mike Smeltzer said sure.
- Peter Folk, Volo said that's the fairly standard way of doing it.
- Bill DeJarnette said if we look at Item 7 – talk about the donated fiber – what I'm looking at here, and this ties back to the rings potentially; how do we support this density?
- Mike Smeltzer said that was the point Bob Miles made last week, is that we could end up with an upside down Christmas tree, our rings are probably limited to 216 strands a piece so it doesn't make a whole lot of difference if take as many 144 strand cables and try to splice them in, there's no place for them to go, but at the same time, in the fullness of time, let's say Huber's there's an antique shop next door, there's a couple other things down the street, in the fullness of time, those strands don't have to go back to the ring because in the fullness of time we'll put a cabinet in there and we'll take those strands into a local neighborhood cabinet. So we want to be sure we have enough strands to eventually service the businesses those go by, and sooner or later we would splice maybe it's a 48 count cable, that would go back to a neighborhood cabinet where it could go into electronics, because we don't to have one strand of fiber on the ring for every single customer we have.
- Bill DeJarnette said that's what I'm looking at.
- Mike Smeltzer said if at some point we have so many customers in downtown Urbana that the ring that's running through downtown Urbana has no more strands on it, that would probably suggest that it's time to put in some sort of local electronics, use two strands to drive those electronics and home all those customers to those electronics, the neighborhood electronics. There's no guarantee that we'll ever get there, but even if we don't come up with a grandiose plan for expanding the fiber, if we get a tremendous density in some area that may suggest that it would be smarter.
- Bill DeJarnette said obviously any funding model we design or build over time has got to have that as part of its ultimate goal to be able to fund, install & replace over time.
- Mike Smeltzer said that the cable that's designed to go into Lincoln Square now, I think it's a 48; we don't have 48 strands available on the ring fiber that goes by that for that to hook into; but hopefully someday we'll be able to take that 48 and extend it down to a cabinet where would be able to take advantage of it. And again, using Lincoln Square, if I were a provider, I doubt that I would try to use separate strands or separate two strands of fiber for every single company that's in Lincoln Square that I had services to; I'd probably use a couple put electronics in the building somewhere and then run either copper or fiber infrastructure off of that, so even those there's 48 potential customers in Lincoln Square, we could probably service Lincoln Square with 12 strands.
- Mark Toalson asked Mike about page 2, Item D, could you describe a situation where a donated fiber would put a financial strain on UC2B.
- Mike Smeltzer said if donated fiber did not also come with a maintenance agreement, the donated fiber, we take JULIE responsibilities for it, and there's a recurring cost for JULIE locates, so that would be a financial responsibility, if that fiber were damaged and it wasn't located properly, we would hopefully have enough maintenance funds coming in from all of our collective customers to support that.
- Mark Toalson said so you mean actually currently damaged, as donated.
- Mike Smeltzer said no no, not donated damaged, it's in the ground its working fine and is then damaged by someone with a backhoe or something. After it's donated.
- Mike Smeltzer said Item D is supporting in the transaction there are couple times where the companies buying in put in 55%, the first provider get 50% and UC2B keeps 5% just for general overhead, and also for the maintenance charges we want, even though you're donating the fiber, we want you to pay us to maintain it.
- Bill DeJarnette said one of the pieces I could see that might be expensive for us to maintain would be a really long lateral to a low volume user. So there's not much income really coming through. If we're charging by the fiber on those laterals, what would the maintenance agreement look like?
- Mike Smeltzer said what we set up in the NTIA application, and what was agreed to, was just a flat rate for laterals. There was a rate for having fiber on the ring that was based on the length of the ring, but laterals regardless of whether they were long or short, they're the most vulnerable part of what we do probably, because that's where people are planting trees etc...we did those at a flat rate of \$600 per year, \$50/month.
- Bill DeJarnette said so that's what would kill us, is a really long lateral that I'm getting \$600 for and that's 8 blocks in a residential area.
- Mike Smeltzer said you might have a \$2000 repairs on that over a couple years, and that would be bad, but you're also going to have a lot of laterals that are 50 ft. that maybe never get cut that you're also \$600 for, and hopefully those all average out. There's no way of proving that short of experience.
- Ross Veach asked why he is going to have a 50 ft. lateral.
- Mike Smeltzer said because there will probably be a drop cable because you happen to live on a street where the ring ran right in front of.

- Ross Veach said that's a drop cable then.
- Mike Smeltzer said yes it is. He was using the term lateral in the generic sense.
- Mark Toalson said he was wondering what that cause might be set up to deny. If the network is open, and there someone has conduit in the ground, 8 blocks that goes to one house, and they want to donate it, and make it open, how can we deny that if we're going to call it open. It sounds like we're denying it because we don't anticipate it being profitable.
- Mike Smeltzer said there was no intent on my part to ever deny an otherwise valid donation with Item D being the reason for that. Item D is to establish the validity of there will be some charges in terms of maintenance, there will be charges in terms of when the sales happen, UC2B will take a little cut of those sales.
- Fred Halenar said then should that be reworded a little bit.
- Mike Smeltzer said if it's not clear to Mark it should be reworded.
- Mark Toalson said he understands what you're saying, but just wanted to make sure that it wasn't being used to...
- Mike Smeltzer said no and again, using an example of a house which is probably not a good example because we're not really talking about houses yet, but it could be to a business that's in the middle of nowhere and we have plenty of those; the other alternative would be just the same way we price IRUs is to measure the distance of a lateral and just add that to the per foot charge or the per mile charge we do and that way people who have really long laterals would pay more and people who have short laterals would pay less. That would certainly be fairer, at the time or more consistent perhaps; at the time we did the grant proposal we did not know how long any of the laterals were going to be so we just put a number at and said that applies to all laterals regardless of length. We knew roughly that the longest a lateral could be would be about a half a mile, because the rings were always within a half a mile of something. But if going forward, maybe we just want to do it on a per foot basis and be done with it and that's one of the things the Policy Board will be discussing on the 24th. Is how we price lateral and drops from a maintenance standpoint?
- Mark Toalson confirmed this is not laid out to provide means for denial.
- Mike Smelter said no, it never occurred to me to deny.
- Bill DeJarnette said that our means to deny is more of a quality issue and for lack of a better term, than quantity issue. And going back to what Fred said, evaluating these things on an item by item basis, I think the standards may have a little flexibility over time because what we think is appropriate now or whether there's a 1 inch as opposed to an 1.5 inch as opposed to 2 inch because if I remember right a year and a half ago, 2 two inches were the basic minimum expectation for our ring and we put in the ground one inch and a half. So these things slide as to what's acceptable and what we have to have, because expediency and trying to find a level of service dictates that we have; the term we hear a lot is the key we're trying to sell conceptually is that, it's easier to get to UC2B than to do it on your own. We're here, we're funded, it should be, the federal government put 90% of the money in it to make it easier, and we would like to make that happen.
- Tracy Smith said (jumping in) that we have 20 minutes left and we have a hard stop at 5 p.m. We've had some really great discussion, some technical, some not so much, are we at a place where we feel comfortable building a motion or a recommendation. We need to allow time for the audience as well.
- Bill DeJarnette said we should be because I've just got a couple of simple questions here. Looking at the donated laterals, can UC2B just string another cable through there, at some point in time, let's say purchaser 2 is in, purchaser 3 is in, whatever issues there are, we ended up running a 48 but whatever's happened, that 48 really isn't taking care of it, it would be just as easy to run another cable in, and then once I'm in the lateral, what's that give me on the drop side, from an ownership perspective, how well can UC2B reach out and support it's end users.
- Mike Smeltzer said his goal was that this applied to both lateral cables and drop cables, and in terms of those, at some point in the future, if we just didn't have enough infrastructure in place one way or another, somebody builds a new building or they subdivide an existing building or we're just out of strands, if it's all UC2B infrastructure we always have the option of pulling out the old cable and pulling in a bigger cable, there are service outages that are going to be associated with that and you can do some things to minimize that, none-the-less those have to be done very carefully and tenderly.
- Bill DeJarnette said but in these scenarios I guess I should clarify this, these customers really aren't UC2B customers right, using Lincoln Square as an example, Lincoln Square is not going to call UC2B if they have a problem, they would call I expect Champaign Telephone, so that relationship while we've talked about us providing that relationship in outreach, in this dark fiber scenario, we're just holding the infrastructure, we're not the actual provider of the service from a transparency basis all the way out to end user.
- Mike Smeltzer said our customer is the leaser of the service and when you have to take a planned outage on a fiber cable that has multiple people providing services over it, it can take weeks & months just to coordinate it that finds a time that works for everybody where they can have technicians available and so forth. It can be a very awkward and time consuming process which is why it is better to err on the side of bigger cables going in perhaps than you think you may need. The other thing that's happening, and he is guilty of it and others as well, is that

we're all still thinking in terms of traditional fiber where you need strands per customer; or you need strands per any given amount of wavelength. With modern electronics and wave division multiplexing and all of that, we could of built our ring out of one strand, that would have been silly but we could have built the entire UC2B rings with just a single string of fiber and we could have done all the things we're currently planning on doing, we would have sunk more money into electronics to make that happen, but there's always an electronics solution to give you extra bandwidth over your existing fiber. And somewhere in here it says that UC2B will never lease the last 2 strands of fiber, if there's a 12 strand count, the first company gets six, the next 2 get two, those final two will always be in reserve for UC2B to provide lambda services over so if somebody else comes along and says I need my own dedicated link to there, well we could turn up a lambda for them and make that happen.

- o Tracy Smith asked Bill what was his next question.
- o Bill DeJarnette said that was it.
- o Tracy Smith asked if the committee had any other questions.
- o Mark Toalson said in summing this up, we've always talked about it being an open network, and that's just how I've always perceived it, beyond that we're asked to view technical issues. And we really haven't talked much to technical issues; you alluded to it briefly early. It sounds like that management would be simplified in an open network versus one that's not all the way open. And it's kind of alluded to in Item B.
- o Mike Smeltzer said in the event to something really bad happening in the infrastructure, somebody doesn't do a JULIE and they tear up all kinds of stuff, the fewer people you have that own infrastructure down there, the easier it is to deal with, but that doesn't happen all the time, it's not a really big deal, but the Cities cannot limit, legally limit, how many people own infrastructure in the Cities right-of-way once they have filled out all the right forms and paid the right fees. But the City through this policy could encourage that number to be smaller rather than larger. Both Public Works Departments have indicated that having fewer organizations in the right-of-way is better than having more; it's just a matter of degree.
- o Mark Toalson said in efficiency of management.
- o Mike Smeltzer said in efficiency of management, of recordkeeping, and tracking all of that stuff.
- o Mark Toalson said now that's a technical recommendation.
- o Mike Smeltzer said to make the GIS management easier.
- o Mark Toalson said yes, I'm looking for a technical recommendation here.
- o Peter Folk, Volo, said it is simply not the case that for UC2B, having UC2B own more laterals is simpler to manage. It would be dramatically simpler if UC2B doesn't build anymore. It's already got its GIS layout of the existing rings, everything you add to that adds complexity. When you add in a lateral that I built, it even adds more complexity because now you have to track my specific standards as opposed to UC2B's general standards. That's a little bit less of a problem if UC2B builds it on its own because presumably UC2B will have some kind of standards, but as Bill said, it changes over time. The simplest from a management standpoint that you can have for this network, is to have, you have a backbone and anybody connecting to that backbone, well that's them; they're responsible for everything from that handoff onward. Now that's what the phone company does in your house, you have a NID. So that's my weigh on that one technical recommendation.
- o Mike Vrem, Champaign Telephone, said he will elaborate a little more too. The one thing we have in common no matter who the carrier is - is the ROW. And how many different fibers are going to be tracked in the ROW is going to depend on usage, no matter whose they are. But whose fibers are going to be documented and whose fibers are going to be put into the locate system and whose fibers are going to be able to be tracked and located so that they aren't cut. I can't speak for Peter but I can for Champaign Telephone that if we have fiber out that, we want it to be able to be located, we want it to be listed in a system that is available to everyone and that's the basics of this.
- o Tracy Smith stated we're at a 10 minute warning so if we're going to make a recommendation here, this is it folks because we have to allow for audience participation and discussion if we are going to have a motion. What is the pleasure of the committee.
- o Bill DeJarnette asked Fred Halenar if he had any language he could put in on the premise of a little more evaluation process on individual basis.
- o Fred Halenar said he did not, and as he looked through some of this, for example, if you look at the top of page 2 if you put that in there before all A-E as kind of an overlying statement. Do you include it in the individual ones that involve adding somebody else's laterals? Here again, I still think it needs to be on a case-by-case basis.
- o Mike Smeltzer said this anticipates that every donation would be handled separately because they're all going to be unique in some way.
- o Fred Halenar said in addition to that maybe Item D should be reworded a little bit differently as well. Remember you said you had problems with that one as being denying a process but we don't want it to reflect that.
- o Bill DeJarnette asked Mike if he took anything from what was said so far that would change any of what you've written here from a clarification or from a slightly different twist of bend to it. Because I envision the Policy is going to have some of the same questions we've asked here so if we could address those in the language on the front end, we'll allow them to get more to the core issues as opposed to treading the same ground that we've just gone through.

- Mike Smeltzer said something about the individual evaluation of the donations, would certainly make sense just to get that said so it's not implicit because we won't be here in 10 years to imply anything.
- Mike Smeltzer said also some clarity on Item D that – that's not intended to be exclusionary in anyway, its merely a principle that if we're going to take on additional responsibility and potential expense, we need additional revenue to support that and that comes through a percentage of the sales, as well as the additional maintenance fees.
- Bill DeJarnette said then on Number 5, on the second line, we say fiber for its own business purposes only – is there some language that would tighten up or clarify that a little bit.
- Mike Smeltzer said the attorneys would have a field day with his language.
- Bill DeJarnette said then maybe we should just say through the attorney's process of leases, as Fred has mentioned in the IRUs, that this language will become more apparent as to its goal.
- Mike Smeltzer said he is sure they can massage that appropriately to achieve that intent but with more precise language.
- Bill DeJarnette said then I think the question that might come up is this issue of conduit that flows through our community that we would consider that to be more backbone oriented as opposed to falling under our lateral language; so that we wouldn't really expect a donation from that perspective, what we might look at is how that costing would come into effect if we tied handhold to handhold – that was Item 3.
- Tracy Smith said at this time we don't have a motion on the table.
- Bill DeJarnette asked if she wanted a motion before we do audience participation.
- Tracy Smith said yes, that's typically how we do it.
- Mark Toalson said a motion that this committee is in support of an open network, believes that an open network is more efficient to manage, and this document as amended per comments here, we support that as a means of obtaining that open network.
- Mark Toalson said he is a little concerned about making a motion based on something we just said let's change.
- Mike Smeltzer said one could probably argue that an open network is less efficient than a closed network. So I'm not sure if you want that to be the basis of your motion.
- Bill DeJarnette said wasn't the open network concept kind of driven through this whole grant process anyway. It was the underpinnings of what we talked about from the grant perspective was the expectation from day one was that the network would be open, clearly anything I can dictate every rule to, is much more efficient for me, but it doesn't necessarily be - is what the community has an expectation of and I think based on our last couple years of rhetoric, the word open has been there just because that's been the perception of our grant expectations, but how we mutate to what that means from an open perspective I don't know – I don't think saying its more efficient or more desirable once become we this entity that has to run this thing on a daily basis. But none-the-less I think that's the community expectation.
- Mark Toalson said to throw out the word efficient; I am just looking for some component of technical recommendation.
- Fred Halenar said therein lies the problem; because I think no matter what you want to do anything would be technically feasible. I am not saying it wouldn't be cost effective, but you could do that either through fiber, fiber counts, through equipment, protocols, I am not sure that the Policy Committee wasn't also looking to the Technical Committee for some blessing on the recommendation set herein.
- Mark Toalson said as far as that goes, open, I support, I cannot speak for the three of you today, but I support that, technically yes, we've established that just about anything could be possible so I am looking at some advantage technically to go with this.
- Tracy Smith reminded the committee that we can put forth as little or as much as we want to, whatever we can have a consensus on and if our consensus is around open access as a concept, that's fine, just give me something to take.
- Bill DeJarnette said then let me back up, are we agreeing that this document says open access to us?
- Fred Halenar said I think it says several things, I think it says open access with ownership by UC2B, I would like it to say also, with in terms of expanding the network, of looking at things on a case-by-case basis to make smart decisions in terms of expanding the network. I am just not really sure what the Policy Committee wants from this group.
- David Young agreed, he is not exactly sure what the Policy Board expects and is really concerned that their interpretation of our recommendation or our vote on this matter is going to be read as thumbs up or thumbs down and the level of communication between the Technical Committee and the Policy Board is very low. He would estimate it at 2 bits per 2 weeks. And frankly the Policy Board is making decisions before he has even read the minutes. He is a member of this committee and before he read the minutes of the Technical Committee meeting so he thinks we're working on these really short timelines and this kind of, parliamentary sort of process, and a lot of recommendations and decisions are just crossing in the mail, and so when he thinks of saying yes we believe in open access, he is afraid of what the telephone game is going to change that into; that's going to change that into yes we like this policy or we can support this policy. He does not support this policy and is just beginning to understand it and get his head around it. He does not want to send those particular 2 bits to the Policy Board for it to arrive 2 weeks later or whenever the minutes come out. I hope we can come up with a

- narrower sort of recommendation than 'we are for open access'.
- Tracy Smith asked David if he had a suggestion to put forth.
 - David Young said no, as I said I'm just beginning to understand this. I think the timeline is way too short for understanding some of these proposals and for producing really good recommendations for the Policy Board. And there's another thing that concerns me, and it kind of supports my concern that we're making recommendations that are not well understood or even received by the Policy Board in the right context. Some of the remarks in the prior meeting, "Mike Smeltzer said his original suggestion was that this was a Policy Committee issue period and that there weren't really any technical aspects to this that were in debate, there are members of the Policy Committee that feels that this committee gives them some spiritual and psychological support in their decision making, even on things that aren't technical." I don't think that we should be giving spiritual and psychological support to the Policy Board. And I think that we are giving spiritual and psychological support to the Policy Board when we're sending these 2 bits per 2 weeks, 1 bit a week messages to them. And then several weeks later, we've all got the minutes and then we can form some understanding of what's really transpired and the nuances of sort of discussions that are occurring in both of the committees.
 - Tracy Smith said we do not control this timeline. And I have emphasized that we need to focus our discussions on technical issues although we haven't, we need to bring forth our technical thoughts on this, whether we say we support this or not, they're asking for our technical thoughts on a proposal, and if we can't get it together to give them something in the time frame they gave us, then we have to live with what they come up with because they will make a decision in absence of our input. That's where we are. We're already past 5 p.m. Are we going to put something forth or not?
 - Ross Veach said I don't read this policy as being technical at all. I think we're being asked to pass judgment on policy and other items, it's not technical, there's nothing technical in there.
 - Mike Smeltzer said at noon tomorrow the Policy Board is going to ask Tracy what did you guys discuss and what was the outcome of your discussion, and if there's a motion, they'll listen to that if not they'll listen to Tracy's synopsis of all the things we talked about today. That may be perfectly fine to have her on behalf of this committee or group tell what she's heard, and there are about 5-6 different things that people have pointed out that need to be more clear, this needs to be changed here & there and she'll provide all that information. There doesn't necessarily have to be a motion that comes from here.
 - Peter Folk, Volo said I think there is a motion that probably everyone could agree on and would like to put it forward. The Technical Committee believes that one of the core values of the UC2B network is open access. The Technical Committee also believes that it has not been adequately defined for fiber at this time. The Technical Committee furthermore can support the later donation mechanism outlined in the recommendation as an option that UC2B should allow donations under that scheme, but the Technical Committee cannot at this time support it as a requirement for all inter-connectivity.
 - Fred Halenar asked Mike if there is any way that (I know you've made some changes in this document since the last time based upon the drops, laterals & language and we now have some other recommendations) is there any way to come up with a complete strikeout version of that and say this is what the Technical Committee addressed in terms of issues that they saw in here.
 - Mike Smeltzer said I could certainly give them a strikeout version tomorrow that we passed out as you know the Policy Board takes a dim view of getting things right before a meeting. And they've actually asked that things go out on Friday before so they have a whole weekend to review things. But they could look at the red and they can say, this is what I read & these are the six changes. Yes that could certainly happen.
 - Bill DeJarnette said I can support the document in general, there are some changes that I think are important that we talked about, mostly those are clarifications, those are better understandings, I do believe we have to have a methodology for people to donate conduit, we need to understand where stuffs at, there's a lot of benefits for us tying this network together so that everybody is protected and there are few surprises because we've had enough surprises with un-locatable infrastructure in the ground as we've done this large project as it is. When Ameren has no idea where a large gas main in, that's a tad worrisome, we would like think on a new environment we could do better than that if we had a chance to actually figure out where stuff is but I did like Peter's item that I'm not sure this is the only solution. And I think we need to explore that and I think that ties very clearly with Fred's issues of the evaluation because this is not how we're going to do business for 10,000 connections. This is something that we're going to see item by item and we do need guidelines, but none-the-less, everything needs to stand on its own merit. These IRUs are going to be unique, they'll be some boiler plate, but everything's going to have a little bit of its own flavor to it and I think adding the language that says that this would not be the only methodology by which we would accept connections, would be of some benefit.
 - David Glynn, Pavlov, said Item 5 – any entity leasing fiber from UC2B either through an IRU or a monthly lease will be contractually restricted to using that fiber for its own business purposes only, UC2B dark fiber cannot be subleased or sub assigned. UC2B will have direct business relationships with all users of its dark fiber. Some people will be in possession of dark fiber that will actually have other people manage that for them. You need to establish some sort of proxy

relationship in those aspects. There are people who have possession of dark fiber that are going to need resources to go ahead and manage that and take care of that for them. The relationships between the managers of the dark fiber and the possessors of the lease or ownership of the owner of the IRU. Item 5 is leaving out something's that might actually restrain people from gaining the most benefit that they could from their own access that they have available to them.

- Bill DeJarnette said I don't think you're paragraph precludes a management function, I think you're looking more of a (what I talked about earlier) – no piggybacking of other functions.
- Mike Smeltzer said if you would hire Pavlov to manage your fiber for you, I don't think #5 would certainly preclude that. If in the process of managing your fiber, they decided to hook up 6 apartment buildings to your fiber that would be not good, according to #5.
- David Glynn, Pavlov asked why.
- Mike Smeltzer said because we would just as soon Pavlov lease dark fiber direct from UC2B so that UC2B reaps the financial benefits of that.
- David Glynn, Pavlov, said and if Pavlov was able to enter into a proxy relationship that allowed UC2B to go ahead and realize that.
- Mike Smeltzer said you lost me.
- David Glynn, Pavlov, you have people that are going to be in possession of fiber that have, that might be desirous of going ahead and trading that for services, UC2B wants to go ahead and be compensated for that, lots of people have no problems paying compensation for that. Do you want to go ahead and funnel all relationships explicitly only to UC2B?
- Mike Smeltzer said this is the AT&T in me coming out – yes.
- David Glynn, Pavlov, said ok. Thank you.
- Peter Folk, Volo, said on Item 5, I view that as the antithesis of an open network.
- Tracy Smith said last call.
- Mark Toalson said we had a motion, but there was never a second.
- Bill DeJarnette said he would offer a friendly amendment to Mark's motion. Not that he remembers Mark's motion exactly. It did die from lack of a second.
- Tracy Smith said yes.
- Mike Smeltzer said good luck to Tracy.
- Ross Veach said if I were in a voting position I would put forward Peter's motion, but I'm not.
- Bill DeJarnette said I think my motion is in support of this document, with the changes we've discussed, that we look towards an open network, we can support the lateral donations methodologies as placed in this document, but add that I don't believe that is the only methodology we should look at to support connectivity and these issues will need to be evaluated because of their individuality.
- Bill DeJarnette said it's just not financial, the point is because of their uniqueness, and it drives the financial.
- Ross Veach asked if there was a motion on the table.
- Bill DeJarnette said that's my motion.
- Tracy Smith said she wants to be sure she's captured the motion and then we'll see if someone wants to second it and we'll open up for discussion. I have that in support of this document, plus recommended changes, we support the donation methodology outlined in this document, but it shouldn't be the only methodology to allow connections, these individual connections need to be evaluated separately. Does that capture you're emotion Bill?
- Fred Halenar said the only problem is these motions are getting to read like a book. In an effort to keep it simple like, supporting the document with changes, because that says open access and other things in there.
- Bill DeJarnette said I still believe and we're stuck with the term open access whatever it means. I think what we can't do is back down from that. I'm not sure what it means, but it's what we've got.
- Fred Halenar said from the technical side, I'm not sure we had anything to add from the technical side whether it be issues or otherwise.
- Bill DeJarnette said the only technical side is whether the merits are is it worth trying to control everything, does that enhance our ability to run this network & environment, or make a more viable profitable organization or whether we're better off backing off and saying what we're really into is ring infrastructure and the little dab we were forced to build out and then for lack of a better term, will a lease connections to us, and then its every man for himself.
- Mark Toalson asked if there was a second.
- Fred Halenar seconded the motion.
- Mike Hosier, Champaign Telephone, had two questions, and he agreed with Bill, what does open access mean; does that mean that anybody who wants can connect to any part of the network for their own use, and I guess that has to be defined. And on the laterals, and the laterals that we might build, or anybody might build, if its case-by-case, if we can decide to donate of if we can decide to hold onto that lateral and if somebody wants to go along side that lateral into that building or some other location, they've got to rebuild it parallel to me. I need to know that, and it has to be consistent. I don't think you can say I can build into this building but if somebody else buys fiber on the ring and then they connect & go into another building, they've got access to my fiber but I don't have access to their fiber, because they decided not to donate it. So I think that has to be consistent. I don't think you can say it'll be case-by-case

and you've got this network that's an open access network but Champaign Telephone decided not to donate their lateral into 115 North Neil and now nobody else can get in there unless they come and build it along side it, that doesn't make sense.

- Bill DeJarnette said if you came in from the ring, you paid for it, you built it, the next guy in on the other has some conduit that happens to be running down the other boundary and for him to get into that facility (Marketplace) is much cheaper from where he's at than it would be to pay the half to get into Marketplace. Do I tell him that's not feasible?
- Mike Smeltzer said no he could do that, there's nothing that prohibits somebody from doing another lateral, if we required both of them to donate it, then we'd have two lateral connections into Marketplace.
- Mike Hosier, Champaign Telephone, said back to the City policy and right-of-way and installing fiber, anybody can get a permit and run fiber in the City and pay the fee. So that doesn't, that has nothing to do with UC2B. So if somebody else wants to run fiber, between their existing conduits into Marketplace, they pay the fee and do it.
- Bill DeJarnette asked what you are looking for in what we just said that would clarify or help you as a company doing business now.
- Mike Hosier, Champaign Telephone, said that it stays consistent. And that if other people are building laterals and attaching to UC2B, then I have access to them just like they would have access to mine; or say the opposite and Mike asked me what I thought about building a lateral and having to donate half of it, and my first reaction is that's no good because I want to build a lateral and have nobody else have access to it. He said no, it's an open access network, I think everybody should have access to it; I said ok, I guess that makes sense and I'm fine with that.
- Bill DeJarnette said so what you're saying is, that if a laterals going to be connected to UC2B then they have to donate it.
- Mike Hosier, Champaign Telephone, said everybody should have access to it. If somebody else wants to go from one of their locations to another location on their own fiber, I mean they can do that today. That doesn't have anything to do with UC2B. I just think you have to be consistent and I got nervous when you started saying we'll look at these case-by-case and it'll be this hodge-podge of well this one is and this one isn't, if it's really an open access network whatever that is, I think these laterals that connect UC2B have to be treated the same way for everybody.
- Mark Toalson agreed with what he was saying, and commented, but to take this and say we're in support of this, but each situation has to be handled individually, is really striping this document of any value what-so-ever, and we may as well go to the Policy with no recommendation.
- Bill DeJarnette said let me back up a tiny bit, and what drove most of that issue was the evaluation aspect of it.
- Mike Smeltzer said I thought you're intent was the evaluation had to be treated independently; I didn't think whether it was in or out was going to be treated individually.
- Tracy Smith said she wanted to be sure she captured this accurately. You say that we are in support of an open network, that we are in support of the donation methodology as described in this document, but that it should not be the only methodology used to allow connections, and these individual connections need to be evaluated separately.
- Bill DeJarnette said to strike out the piece before that which talks about the other methods of connection, the reason I don't have a problem with that is if I'm looking at laterals, the must tighter definition of what we're looking at laterals now, and treating other longer runs as backbone issues, then I don't have a problem because I don't have an expectation that somehow somebody with a run that's running through Champaign-Urbana just because they touch UC2B to get to ICN is now all of a sudden having to donate that as a lateral. So within that constraint I am fine, I can do this, so you strike out the 2nd to the last thing. Because the last thing still exists which are these things will have to be valued individually because each one is going to stand alone.
- Mike Smeltzer said I don't know if you just struck the language, that it's not the only way we'll do it, we don't have other methods, but if it's either we do this and it's mandatory or we do this and it's not mandatory.
- Bill DeJarnette said we struck it – it's mandatory. If we're going to do this methodology, then this is the methodology, whether we find 18 months out or 24 months out that we can't get there from here, and then we're going to change it anyway. It's a business model that has to flux and flow depending on what society does to us.
- Mike Smeltzer said this would be our process going forward for everybody and if we come up with a better idea in 18 months, then we implement our idea but that doesn't have to be in your motion.
- Bill DeJarnette said no, not at all. Reality says we have to have something to move forward with and business practices say that if you're models terrible you change; the reality is I don't expect us to be doing business 2 years from now if we're successful based on what we thought was a good idea two months ago.
- **Tracy Smith said Fred Halenar had the second.**
- **Fred Halenar said yes and before he agrees to the change, please paraphrase it back to him.**
- **Tracy Smith said we support the document plus the changes, we support the**

donation methodology in this document and these individual donations need to be valued independently.

- Mike Vrem, Champaign Telephone, said to comment on evaluation, in order to built it, somehow there's going to have to be construction charges pulled together for that, the construction charges, the actual cost of building should be the value document, it's going to vary by every contractor that's involved, the premiere thing that should be underlining that, is that it follows the construction methods approved by UC2B. If it's done that way, it should have a value that should hold true.
- Fred Halenar said exclusive those comments I'll second.
- Ray Mitchell, Volo, said this might be going a little bit of a different direction so bear with me, but I think that the Policy Committee is mostly looking for, from a operational and managerial standpoint, does this donation method make UC2B harder to manage or easier to manage, and if you can send them that information whether or not you support this method or another method is not as important as what does this imply from an operations and technical standpoint.
- Tracy Smith said we have a motion and a second on the table, are there other discussion items, and are we ready?
- Peter Folk, Volo, said once more that what you have on the table, does not promote UC2B as an open access network, it promotes UC2B as a fungus that grows out and the only way that you can connect to it is by being absorbed by it; that is not open access. Open access means I can access the network and you can access the network without becoming the network. I can send traffic over the network that I chose without you telling me I can't chose that traffic. So that Item 5 is saying the opposite of open access and the fact that you have taken away my ability to connect my assets to the network without giving them to UC2B makes UC2B not an open access network.
- Ross Veach said I largely agree with what Peter's saying, but I want to point out that we have as a Technical Committee have failed to define what is an open access dark fiber network. We don't know what it means, how can we be voting on it? It's a nebulous concept. Pie in the sky right now as far as we're concerned.
- Mark Toalson said I guess we're working from our individual interpretations of that and I just have to say fundamentally I don't see connecting a closed system to an open network as maintaining an open network.
- Ross Veach said but I don't think we're defining an open network. I tend to agree with Peter that we're defining a closed network and calling it open.
- Mike Hosier, Champaign Telephone, said if it's an open network and you don't really need to pay to have access to it then I don't know why I'm investing in strands on all 7 rings if it's open, if I can just use it, why am I paying for it.
- Fred Halenar said he wrote some notes down for himself and there are a couple words such as sustainability and open that doesn't go with free. And I think by saying an open access network doesn't necessarily mean it's free.
- Ross Veach said absolutely not.
- Fred Halenar said I wonder too if we're not just having difficulty trying to describe the physical absorption of a network versus the electronic connection to access, and that's where I think we're having the difficulty because we're building physical infrastructure but once you do that you get electronic access and that's the open part.
- Mike Vrem, Champaign Telephone, said I have to agree with Fred that there's got to be some definition around this and the easiest definition is that by being up its virtual, anyone can attach to it, but there's a cost to attaching too, there still has to be a centralized point of attachment, now that could be at the fiber or it could be at one of the nodes or somewhere along the way, but at that point traffic for whoever it is, is going to stay on their fibers per say, but at that central point it becomes open for anyone to enter and exit the network. There's got to be some definition around that, and this is not a good example but typically in all the other carriers in the world have pops, they have meet points, they have places where they join networks, they do it through agreements, the agreements determine what they can do and what they can't do over that network, that's how they connect. It's been done that way for a hundred years.
- Ross Veach said bilateral agreements between two parties.
- Bill DeJarnette said I do recognize as we finish this up that this does not solve Pavlov's issue at all.
- **Tracy Smith said we have a motion and a second on the table are we ready to vote. Alright, all in favor of the motion on the table please say 'I' all opposed same sign, the motion carries. I will take my notes with me tomorrow and I will do my best to represent all of the discussion and paraphrase the discussion around the motion and recommendation that we are putting forth to the Policy Committee, I encourage you if you are able to attend, please do so.**
- **Tracy Smith asked if there are any other audience comments. None.**
- **Tracy Smith asked for any committee comments or announcements. None.**
- **Tracy Smith asked for a motion to adjourn.**
- **Mark Toalson motioned for adjournment.**
- **Fred Halenar second.**
- **Meeting Adjourned.**

7.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

<p>DISCUSSION</p>	<p>Tasks or Items for the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ No new items <p>Next Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ May 22, 2012 City of Champaign Council Chambers, 3:30 PM○ June 12, 2012 City of Champaign Council Chambers, 3:30 PM <p>Audience Participation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ None <p>Committee Member Comments or Announcements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ None <p>Adjournment – 5:30 P.M.</p>
-------------------	---