|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Committee Name | | | | | |
| 9.20.2017 | | 6:30 pm | | HCOG | |
| Facilitator | Jim Drawe | | | | |
| Minute Keeper | MaryEllen Kennedy | | | | |
| Committee Attendees | Jim Drawe David Dvore Craig Martin  Bob Labrie Jeremy Dunn  Charley Rose MaryEllen Kennedy | | | | |
| Guest Attendees | Steve Nelson, Gayle Huntress | | | | |
| Approve Minutes from 9/6/2017 Yes NO Not Applicable | | | | | |
| Called to order at 6:31 | | | | | |
| Review Shutesbury RFI | | | | | |
| Discussion Notes |  | | | | |
| Jim – Cummington BB committee saw Shuresbury’s RFI spreadsheet & felt the difference was small. They still favor WW. Gayle brought the spreadsheet.  WG+E stated that subscriber-based charges apply to total number subscribers outside of Westfield (from any town).  Shutesbury did not try to rationalize the maintenance costs, providers quoted in different ways. Costs seemed higher that quoted to WW. WG+E said there would be no cost for ONT calls for WW.  Shutesbury BB committee liked the certainty of OTT ‘all inclusive’ plan.  Craig discussed spreadsheets he created to compare the results to encourage the towns to really consider costs of operating independently.  The higher rate charged by WW includes most admin expenses and accumulating revenue which can be returned to the town to pay debt service.  Craig – towns should do all they can to increase take rate.  Mt. Washington has over 70% subscribers, $300 connection fee during build. Jim feels that towns will either do a full build or not at all. He doesn’t feel that towns will charge a connection fee (Shutesbury considering $100).  Jim – we are only guaranteeing initial price. It may change based on our experience. WW can’t take a loss. Jim suggests we take a vote on guaranteed price; discussion will highlight why this is not a good idea.  Jeremy – it’s not small vs. big towns, it is early adopters vs. those who are coming later – we should stress that early adopters may feel they need to choose another provider, WW will no longer be an option later.  Gayle – we should develop spreadsheet to highlight the difference between going with WiredWest and standalone.  Jim & Craig will work on a comparison spreadsheet based on the RFI results. | | | | | |
| Decisions/Outcomes |  | | | | |
|  | | | | | |
| Action Items | | | Person Responsible | | Deadline |
| Develop comparison spreadsheet for WW vs. standalone operations | | | Jim & Craig | |  |
|  | | |  | |  |
|  | | |  | |  |
|  | | |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Regional Broadband Solution | | | |
|  | | | |
| Discussion Notes |  | | |
| MOU  Steve – we have removed all objections to the MOU. Need to highlight the other benefits of going with WW.  Thinks the website should be clearer and simpler to find our message. Steve passed out a paper highlighting the benefits of working as WW.  Jim met with Ed & Dan in Becket (both objected to 50% rule); they feel they can be profitable at 40% take rate. But we want towns to be working to achieve a good take rate. Steve feels towns should be reimbursed based on top line revenue – the original plan and towns should work to encourage folks to take higher priced packages. Becket thinks rule should be 50% of seasonally adjusted premises. Jim stated he would agree to use seasonally adjusted premise, but asked them to supply the definitions and asked how assessors can identify which are seasonal.  Craig – one option – when town brings a new customer on, the town should cover all the costs of acquiring the customers. Jeremy – towns will be motivated to increase the take rate due to the need to repay the construction costs. Jim – it will also be in WG+Es interest to have a high take rate.  Jim - we can present something like Craig’s spreadsheet to show the towns how it is more beneficial to work together than independently. Gayle – we should focus on getting towns to sign the MOU, using the spreadsheet and other literature.  Jim – will offer to visit WG+E to move contract forward. He will start writing a contract based on the term sheet in the MOU. WG+E contract stated they would start marketing 3-4 months before towns are turned up; Rowe & Shutesbury may be live summer 2018. Jim wants contract ready by March 2018.  Plainfield, Ashfield, Cummington, Windsor have significant edge issues, working together. Jim had asked Diedre to develop agreements for edge issues.  Plainfield asking us to cover how to handle losses in MOU. Jim – if actions defined in the contract, DOR will enforce. Jim mentioned possible actions if losing money.  Jeremy – there should be statement that the BoD will periodically evaluate the financial condition and decide on actions to resolve any issues. | | | |
| Decisions/Outcomes |  | | |
| Jim – motion to eliminate the take rate threshold & remove the premise definitions from the MOU.  David – second. Passed unanimously. This will be presented to the BoD at Oct. 13 meeting.  Item 6 on term sheet striking last sentence + item 9 & 10. | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MLP Support | | | |
| Discussion Notes |  | | |
| Workshop  Heath – Friday. We no longer need to pay Diedre’s expenses, she will not travel the night before. | | | |
| Decisions/Outcomes |  | | |
|  | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|  | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| September 13 BoD meeting review | | | |
| Discussion Notes |  | | |
| Not discussed under this heading. | | | |
| Decisions/Outcomes |  | | |
|  | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| WG+E | | | |
| Discussion Notes |  | | |
| Not discussed under this heading. | | | |
| Decisions/Outcomes |  | | |
|  | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Committee Updates | | | |
| Discussion Notes |  | | |
| Bob absent, no Finance committee update  Outreach – will have document to send with spreadsheets.  Steve – we should communicate our benefits to ensure towns have good background, to help acceptance of MOU.  Jim - Pittsfield meeting – Chris Mitchell of MN – muni fiber expert. Chair of Williamstown SB & WG+E general manager.  [Cummington asked for grant from Community Compact? To connect the town offices via fiber and install a central server. Got a grant to study.] HCOG contracts with Paragus for IT support – any town can join. | | | |
| Decisions/Outcomes |  | | |
|  | | | |
| Action Items | | Person Responsible | Deadline |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |
|  | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MEETING WRAP UP | | | |
| Set Next Meeting | | | |
| October 4, 2017 | | 6:00pm | HCOG |
| Agenda Items |  | | |
| Adjourn at 9:13 pm | | | |
|  | | | |