

AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
AUGUST 20, 2019
WORK SESSION, SPECIAL SESSION MINUTES

Members Present:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Kevin Barnes	Council Member
Staci Carroll	Council Member
Barbara Christiansen	Council Member
Rob Shelton	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Community Services Director
Wendelin Knobloch	Associate Planner
Terilyn Lurker	City Recorder
Aaron Brems	Fire Chief
Kyle Maurer	Finance Officer
George Schade	IT Director
Cherylyn Egner	Legal Counsel
Adam Olsen	Senior Planner
Darren Falslev	Police Chief
Derric Rykert	Parks and Recreation Director

Also present: John Woffinden, Preston Kirk, Matt Dugdale, Greg Lowe, Brett Thomas, Ryan Johnsen, Kathy Shaw, Todd Marriot, Camille Buhman, Glen Ricart, and one additional person.

The American Fork City Council met in a special session and work session on Tuesday, August 20, 2019 in the City Administration Office Conference Room, located at 51 East Main Street, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

WORK SESSION

The purpose of City Work Sessions is to prepare the City Council for upcoming agenda items on future City Council Meetings. The Work Session is not an action item meeting. No one attending the meeting should rely on any discussion or any perceived consensus as action or authorization. These come only from the City Council Meeting.

1. Review and action on a resolution providing for the holding of a local special bond election in American Fork City for the purpose of submitting to the qualified electors of the city the question of the issuance and sale of up to \$8,500,000 of General Obligation Bonds for new Fire Station.

Preston Kirk explained that the State Legislature allows for municipalities to call for a special bond election, and the first step in that process was to pass a resolution. This resolution would be provided to the County Clerk/Auditor and the Lieutenant Governor's Office. The resolution needed to be given appropriate notice, and a public hearing must be held. Staff had scheduled that public hearing for September 10, 2019. It was noted that election information would be sent out with the public notices. He presented a draft of the broad parameters for the bond, which contained

the bond amount, the length of the bond, and the impact it would have on the average primary residence and commercial business. The election would be held on November 5th, and it would be canvassed on November 19th. During the canvassing, the Council could pass a parameters resolution to move forward with the second phase of the process. Mr. Kirk stated that there was a lot of work going into preparing the City for fiberoptic, but that wasn't included in this resolution because they were waiting on the voice of the electorate. The City was trying to be as frugal as possible to gain the citizens' support.

Council Member Carroll asked how the proposed fee increase compared to the other bonds that the City had. City Administrator David Bunker explained that the amount of the proposed bond was less than the Police and Courts bond, which was scheduled to fall off in June 2020. He noted that the Fire Station bond would also be paid off the following year. Because those two bonds would be gone, there would be no need for a tax increase to cover the proposed bond.

Council Member Shelton asked if there would be an additional interest payment on the Police and Courts bond after June 2020. Mr. Bunker said that this would depend upon when they secured the bonds. Council Member Shelton then asked what they anticipate for a call period, and Mr. Kirk said that they are typically seeing a nine-year call period. It's nice to have that kind of flexibility so the City can refinance the bond if it's in the best interest of the City.

There was a brief discussion about the term of the bond, and Mr. Bunker noted that this wouldn't be determined until after the election. Mr. Kirk stated that they were looking at 20 years of annual payments with a small interest the following year.

Council Member Shelton said that it would be helpful if they had an outline of what the payments of this bond would be compared to the other bonds they had. He asked if there would be a tax adjustment to accommodate the bond. Mr. Bunker stated that they wouldn't know the exact details of the bond payment amounts until they get the bond. Finance Officer Kyle Maurer said that they could put together an estimate based on the current market.

In response to a question from Council Member Taylor, Mr. Bunker explained that the payments for the new bond would be equal to or less than the current payments on the Police and Courts bond. He noted that the Fire Station bond for Station 51 would drop off the following year.

Council Member Christiansen moved to approve Resolution No. 2019-08-34R providing for the holding of a local special bond election in American Fork City, Utah, for the purpose of submitting to the qualified electors of the City the question of the issuance and sale of up to \$8,500,000 of general obligation bonds; providing for the holding of a public hearing and the publication of a notice of public hearing and providing for related matters. Council Member Taylor seconded the motion.

Council Member Carroll expressed appreciation for the information provided by staff. She believed that this was an important issue and needed to be voted on this year.

Mayor Frost called for a vote on the motion. Voting was as follows:

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Barbara Christiansen, Council Member
SECONDER:	Clark Taylor, Council Member
AYES:	Council Member Barnes, Carroll, Christiansen, Shelton, Taylor

2. Adjourn to a work session

Council Member Taylor moved to adjourn to the special session at 4:18 p.m. Council Member Christiansen seconded the motion. All were in favor.

SPECIAL SESSION

1. Discussion with Jibe Media on the concept for City re-branding

Greg Lowe briefly reminded the Council of the process they had already gone through in the re-branding process. They had already done their brand assessment, where they spoke with staff, elected officials, and citizens about American Fork City. Then they created a mood board to help figure out which direction they wanted to go, stylistically. Now they had fifteen logos to show the Council and get their feedback. He noted that the logos were in black and which because they wanted to focus on the design of the logo first. The next step in the process would be color exploration. He encouraged the Council to set aside personal preference as they discussed the logos, and instead to focus on what would align with the purpose and vision of American Fork. They should choose a logo that was distinct and memorable.

Brett Thomas presented and explained each of the fifteen logos.

When discussing the third logo, Council Member Carroll asked why this one was in black and gray. Mr. Thomas explained that they used black and gray to show how the logo could have additional depth without putting in color at this time.

Mr. Thomas continued to present the logo options. It was noted that the logos could still be altered, such as font changes.

Mr. Lowe said that taking on a new brand can take some time. A new logo may not have any real meaning to people until that logo was used consistently. He gave the example of the Nike Swoosh or the Apple logo. Mr. Thomas added that simple and unique shapes tend to be more memorable. Mr. Lowe said that they were not asking the Council to decide today. He would send them the slide presentation for the Council Members to consider further, and he would be back in touch with them to either move forward with one logo or explore more options.

Council Member Barnes said that he was thinking of sports logos that are popular, and the ones that are the most memorable are simple.

Council Member Taylor reminded the group that this was a logo, not the entire brand. He felt that simplicity was key, but there had to be a story behind the logo they chose. Mr. Lowe stated that they had a full branding book for the City by the end of this process. The logo was just one part of branding.

The Council went through each logo again. After some discussion, the Council decided to review the logos further before giving any direction.

2. Discussion on policy considerations, financial projections, and interlocal cooperative opportunities for the proposed broadband project.

City Administrator David Bunker stated that Sid Boswell, with Design 9, would be talking the Council through the different models for the broadband project. Mr. Boswell would be giving the presentation via telephone. Mr. Bunker explained that one of the things Mr. Boswell researched was municipal broadband projects in other cities. He found that the national average take-rate was 54%, which occurred by the third year. The take-rate range he found was from 30% to 80%.

Council Member Shelton believed that West Valley's take-rate was 15%. It was noted that Spanish Fork's take-rate was 80%.

Council Member Barnes asked if they found another municipality that included broadband as a utility, and Mr. Bunker said that they did not.

Mr. Boswell presented three models using three different take-rates. Each of the options presented included a \$9.95 charge to each home. There would also be a \$60 service fee. The first model did not include a connection fee if they chose to sign up at the time it was made available. For business revenue, there was a modest take-rate of 15%, with a growth of 5% each year and topping out at 50%. Businesses would have higher quality fiberoptic with more options, and they would be assessed an activation fee as they make an upgrade. Businesses would also have a monthly utility fee, whether or not they upgrade service.

Council Member Shelton asked if the model included paying in the bond they were currently paying into. There was a \$2 million deficit in the broadband, and he asked if they would be paying that back over time. Mr. Boswell said that the only thing included in the bond was the capital costs and loan closing costs.

Mr. Boswell said that the estimates were conservative and based on current trends in construction costs. The projections showed only \$26 million for bonding in the model, but the City estimated the cost at \$35 million. The more conservative number did not account for construction overages. Mr. Boswell said that he could change that number to \$30 million, but it would increase the interest. Council Member Shelton said that he was looking at the worst-case scenario. He wanted to make sure they could go to the citizens and tell them that they could anticipate a certain amount each month.

Mr. Boswell stated that page eighteen of the long form document included a list of five employees needed for operations, support and equipment replacement fees, two vehicles and maintenance for those vehicles. Also listed were the ISP fees that would be charged to the City based on the number of customers in the network. There was a list of retail costs, but some of that would be sent to service providers.

Mr. Boswell then went over the costs for services, including leasing of poles and conduits, facility maintenance, customer service and billing, etc. He also addressed costs for staffing and overhead.

Mayor Frost noted that the plan falls off on year four regarding the management portion. Todd Marriott explained that they anticipated that by year four, they would have less to do from the marketing/sales approach. He anticipated that those costs would be mitigated by other potential cities that would become involved.

Mr. Boswell continued by listing the external expenses and describing debt payment.

In response to a question from the Council, Finance Official Kyle Maurer explained that they must decrease the deficit by 5% each year to avoid an audit finding.

Mr. Boswell continued his presentation by discussing liability insurance, which also included other external expenses. There would be a net loss the first year, but they would be receiving positive revenue the second year in the 70% model. They needed to make sure that they don't have a negative cash balance for the length of the project. The next set of numbers shown by Mr. Boswell were closing costs and interest.

Mr. Bunker asked what would happen if an ISP came in and said that they could provide internet for a lower amount. He asked if these projected numbers would decrease. Mr. Boswell said that there would be more revenue retained that wouldn't go to the ISPs. He noted that this model showed building out in three years, which was aggressive.

Mr. Boswell said that the next three pages were the proformas. They also created summary pages to make it easier for people to understand. These summaries included balance sheets and statement of cash flows. They would have a negative net income the first year. The next series of pages in the document were hypotheticals based on the bond amount.

Council Member Shelton noticed that they were calculating the rate at 1.5%. Mr. Boswell said that this was interest income. The cost of the bond was 3.25%, and they would have quite a bit of interest the first year because they will obtain a large amount of money that year.

Mayor Frost said that the bondable amount in this model was \$26 million. He asked if they could plug any number into the spreadsheet and it would calculate the rest. Mr. Boswell said that it would, for the most part. They would have to validate some of the information. Mayor Frost was sure that the bond amount would be more than \$30 million, so they needed to drill down those numbers. Council Member Shelton said that he would rather plan for the worst-case scenario.

Council Member Shelton said that they needed to increase and go with the higher bond amount. He was also sure that expenses would be more than what was shown here. He thought it would be best to go up to 5% on the interest cost. The low take-rate and high expense model was the best way to go.

Council Member Shelton asked if there was an opt-out built into the model. Mr. Boswell said that they did not have that option, but it would drop down the cost. They could investigate adding that in, but it gets tricky because they would be reducing revenue every month. Mr. Boswell anticipated about \$2,700 per home. A lot of money goes into the last part of connecting fiber to a home. Council Member Shelton asked about the assumption on the number of people taking a waiver each year. Mr. Boswell said that was not included. They would have to account for that in the reduction of revenue or an off-ex charge.

Mr. Boswell then presented the other two models, so that the Council could see the affect if they had fewer people sign up. The expenses were the same in the 50% take-rate model, but this model had less revenue with fewer hookups. They would have to add \$1 million to cover operating losses. In this model, they would have two years of net loss.

Mr. Boswell addressed the last model which had a 25% take-rate. This was the worst-case scenario. In this model, they started with 15% and added 5% per year. They took most of that in the lower service tier. There was substantially less revenue in this model.

Mr. Marriott said that during the last public hearing, a citizen stated that if they were charged \$9.95 then they wouldn't participate. This worst-case scenario reflected that mentality. He stated that they took several assumptions, and those assumptions were explained in the memorandum that was sent to the Council. This last model took \$26 million with a 3.8% bond rate. With 8,600 residents paying \$9.95 and commercial paying the minimum amount. It was important to note that this model didn't include any gig upgrades because they wanted to test the lower limits. In the first year, they only assume 1% in upgrades. Those upgrade percentages increase in the following years.

Mr. Boswell continued to explain the details of the 25% model, noting that they would still have two years of negative net income with substantially more loss in the second year. They would have to borrow additional funds to cover the losses in those first two years. To cover for the slower growth, they had to reduce expenses in many areas. Mr. Boswell gave examples of decreased equipment and personnel expenses.

Council Member Carroll asked if these cuts were something they could do, realistically. Mr. Boswell answered affirmatively. They would have to act as a business and figure out how to cut costs if the revenue wasn't coming in.

Mr. Marriott indicated that he could sit down with Mr. Boswell and compare these models to UTOPIA. He stated that they had quantified these numbers and believe them to be realistic.

Mayor Frost noted that they would get a better projection on the bonding and update the model. They would report to the Council when they get that information.

Mr. Marriott introduced Glenn Ricart, who had done a lot in the progression on internet accessibility. Mr. Marriott listed some of Dr. Ricart's achievements.

Dr. Ricart stated that after he was the CEO of a major network company eight years ago, he was considering how he could give back to the community. He joined US Ignite, which was a non-profit project that tried to map out the future of the internet, applications and services that advance networking, including making fiber more widely available. The organization accepted donations, had generous corporate sponsors, and they were recipients of some federal grants. Dr. Ricart spoke about gigabit fiber areas around the country and how advanced networking was changing healthcare, transportation, public safety, and education. There were also great economic development opportunities with gigabit fiber. He presented a short video describing the organization.

Dr. Ricart stated that fiber was foundational. There were no speed limits to fiber, and it was necessary to support wireless and future 5G wireless. The downside to fiber is that it could become

damaged in an earthquake. He answered key questions about fiber, including who provides and gains revenue from fiber, what was the service model going to be, and what the take rate was going to be. He also described the relationship between the municipality and the service provider.

Council Member Taylor asked what US Ignite could do for American Fork from a business standpoint. Dr. Ricart said that US Ignite was working with advanced wireless and had a lot of industry partners in that area. There were also funding opportunities. They had already worked with eight communities to put together an economic development tool to help them investigate fiber options.

Council Member Barnes asked if they could get reimbursement from government grants or if they needed to get the grant before spending money. Dr. Ricart stated that he hadn't seen a reimbursement, but there are some who would invest in certain areas.

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT - LIGHTHUB

Kathy Shaw presented a chart showing the proposed organization of the Fiber Board, and noted every member would have one vote. There would be an executive director and operations officer. American Fork would control their own NOC. The financing would be done by each community.

Council Member Carroll asked if the other communities would only be paying for their use of the NOC. Ms. Shaw said that they would pay for their own operations. Council Member Taylor said that the other communities would pay their fee to be in the NOC.

Council Member Carroll asked how they would assess how much other cities would pay to be in the NOC. Mr. Marriott said that they would create a policy to determine that amount. They would also decide on the contract term. Council Member Taylor wondered if the fee should be based on the number of subscribers.

Council Member Carroll said that there would be employees of Lighthouse, and the cities would have to pay to cover those costs. She asked how that was determined. Mr. Marriott said that it would depend on the model they used. Each city would need to consider their own model.

Camille Buhman stated that the City would be creating their own contract with each municipality that was brought in. They could determine the cost or buy-in when the time comes. She had drafted an interlocal agreement that sets the terms for Lighthouse participation, but they could always create a new contract. American Fork has a great asset that other cities would want to use, and it would be a major benefit to the City to start the organization and have other municipalities buy into it.

Council Member Clark asked if the \$30 million figure would be in the interlocal agreement. Mr. Bunker said that they could use the interlocal agreement to get the \$30 million bond, but they could also bond for it on their own. This second option was how the project was being proposed so far.

Ms. Buhman said they needed to think of the interlocal as a corporation, and there was an option to bond.

Mr. Marriott said that they would need to contract with another city, because they couldn't make an interlocal agreement alone. If two cities bond under the interlocal agreement, it would be their own debt.

Council Member Taylor commented that the NOC was their network, and they should remain the primary owners of it. He didn't want other entities making decisions about it. Ms. Buhman gave the analogy of a cabin that someone owns but chooses to rent out for a fee. American Fork City would maintain control of the fiber and the NOC, and others would pay to use it. Ms. Shaw reminded the Council that the Lighthouse Fiber Board would have one vote per city. The NOC and fiber will not be owned by Lighthouse.

Council Member Clark asked if the City would remain in control if they run the bonding through the interlocal, and Ms. Buhman answered affirmatively. He then asked if there were benefits to bonding under the interlocal. Mr. Bunker stated that one advantage was that the debt wouldn't be on the City's books. The City would still have to pay the bond amount and secure the funding. Mr. Maurer explained that they would have to pledge some of their revenues for this bond, and that would be taken into consideration. Mr. Bunker said that the path they were currently pursuing was not to use the interlocal to bond. Other entities could use the interlocal for the bonding, and that would be positive. Ms. Buhman noted that if another city wanted to bond under the interlocal, the board would have to vote on it.

Ms. Shaw there were pros and cons to an interlocal agreement. It would give them more customers and a larger variety of service providers. They would also have the ability to bond through it and pay on a subscriber basis. Each city would pay into Lighthouse, but American Fork would charge for the use of the NOC. American Fork could choose to contract with each city individually for the use of their NOC.

Council Member Christiansen asked if having the interlocal would restrict the City from contracting with another city individually, and Mr. Marriott said that it would not. American Fork could still do outside contracts.

Ms. Shaw said that some of the cons of the interlocal agreement were that they would have to cooperate with other cities, and they may not get everything they want because it would be voted upon by the board. Any board meetings would be subject to the Open Meetings Act at GRAMA.

Council Member Barnes said that they should determine the fee to use the NOC beforehand. Ms. Buhman noted that they could change the terms of the agreement if they wanted to change the fee in the future. They discussed why they would choose to charge different amounts to different cities.

Council Member Shelton was concerned about other entities having a say in what American Fork does with their fiber and NOC. Council Member Clark argued that the interlocal didn't take away their control, because the City owned the fiber and NOC. Council Member Shelton said that 911 used to use county assets, but a few years ago, everyone in the interlocal was charged an assessment and the county doesn't have control over them anymore. He was concerned that 15 or 20 years down the road, the board would vote to change control of the NOC. Mr. Marriott said that if the City loses control of the interlocal, they would still have control over the City's assets, which were the fiber and NOC.

Council Member Shelton did not see the benefit of an interlocal agreement other than providing a way for other cities to keep debt off their books.

Ms. Buhman assured the Council that they could draft the terms of the interlocal any way they wanted. They could clearly define the government structure, American Fork's assets, and fees to be charged. They wanted to create an entity that would be financially attractive to other municipalities. If they had two or three municipalities buying into the interlocal, it would look even more attractive for more cities. It would also bring in more revenue for American Fork. It would be more expensive to do separate contracts with each municipality.

Council Member Shelton disagreed. He gave the example of a business giving away stock, which also gives away some control. There is phantom stock, which carries the same benefits aside from a vote. He thought that an interlocal agreement would be less attractive to other cities. Cities would still go where they could get the best cost. Mr. Marriott disagreed and said that cities could still go through the same competitive process after joining the interlocal.

The discussion turned to UTOPIA, and Council Member Shelton said this was a good argument against the interlocal. He wanted to make sure American Fork keeps the revenue as long as possible. In the future, Lighthub could choose to create their own NOC and the City would lose out on that revenue. Ms. Buhman said that the language of the contract could control a lot of those concerns. Council Member Shelton was familiar with other interlocal agreements, and in many cases the governing board had the right to change the bylaws.

Council Member Taylor said that they could make more revenue if they could get four or five municipalities to buy into the interlocal than if they chose to do individual contracts. He didn't see a negative to having an interlocal agreement.

Council Member Shelton said it would be a good idea to contract with Cedar Hills, but if they opt out after the first year, the City would suffer. Ms. Buhman said that they could include a minimum term in the contract.

Mayor Frost said that they were still at the beginning stages of this process. They could craft the agreement in a way that would benefit and protect the City. He could see the benefit of an interlocal agreement, and he believed it was the right thing to do.

Mr. Marriott said that if American Fork goes it alone, they would have to take on all the operating expenses. If there were an interlocal, they had the benefit of sharing those costs. There was also the risk of other cities creating their NOC if there was not interlocal.

Council Member Carroll felt it would be a better option for cities to come into an interlocal agreement. Council Member Clark agreed and said that it would also be easier to get other municipalities to join an interlocal agreement than an individual contract. They would also gain a lot of revenue this way, which would help them pay off their bonds.

Mr. Bunker stated that the task force had a series of recommendations that the Council should review.

Mr. Marriott stated that Council Member Shelton had brought up the Universal Service Fund, so they did some research. Those funds were pulled out from good areas to help with rural development areas. However, American Fork wasn't eligible for this grant because they weren't paying into the Universal Service Fund. If they were paying into it, they would have to meet the

requirement of having 135% less than the poverty line to be considered. They would have to prove that they were eligible for assistance.

Council Member Shelton asked if the City would offer phone service through fiber, and Mr. Marriot said they would not.

Mr. Bunker went over the effective date outline. The system would be installed in different areas of the city and residents would not have to pay until its fiber was available in their area. The residential and business fees would be set by the Council.

Council Member Shelton asked if there was a separate fee for home occupations. Mr. Bunker said that the current model does not specify home occupations, but the ISP could charge them more. Council Member Shelton requested that they outline the determination of home occupations.

Ms. Shaw said that if they aren't a business entity, they would provide three mgs down and one mg up. This would give people enough to check email and maybe stream a little bit. They wouldn't be able to do intense gaming or stream videos. If they want to do more, they would have to upgrade. Mr. Bunker added that if they provide too much of a basic service, people wouldn't be motivated to upgrade.

There was a discussion regarding speed and data, and whether it was appropriate to limit usage. They discussed including a backstop measure. Council Member Taylor said that they needed to be clear in whatever decision they made. They didn't want residents to be surprised by anything.

Council Member Barnes said that he had received information that low-income families could get 15 megabytes from Comcast for \$9.95. Mr. Marriott confirmed that that was essentially the same as the 3-1 mgs they were proposing. It was stressed that citizens needed to be educated on the difference. The Council thought it would be wise to provide something similar for low-income families.

Ms. Shaw said that they estimated 250 mgs up and down would be \$35 per month, and 1 gigabyte up and down would be between \$45 and \$65 per month.

The group then discussed how the ISP relates to their fiber network, and how the fees would be charged. They also discussed the difference between charging the service as a utility versus wholesale. Council Member Shelton wanted to be sure that the \$9.95 fee was not counted twice in the models that had been provided. Mr. Bunker stated that this fee was for the cost of installation, and the \$30+ would be for operations.

Council Member Taylor felt that they needed to increase the cost and encourage residents to upgrade. Mr. Bunker added that they needed to be aware of the market value as well.

The comment was made that in Ammon, ID, they were paying \$10 per month for one gig, but they paid \$3,000 for the initial connection.

The discussion turned to the cost of the bond, and Mr. Bunker said that they would get with Laura Lewis to make sure that they had the correct amount and then plug that number into the model.

Council Member Shelton thought it would be good to have an executive summary because there were different levels of understanding. Mr. Bunker agreed.

Mr. Bunker initiated a discussion about the timeline. Their goal was to get the bond closed by Thanksgiving, which means that they needed to price bonds by October 15th. It'll take 30 days to get the bond sold and all the documents ready for closing before Thanksgiving.

Council Member Shelton asked if there was a concern with waiting until January. Mr. Bunker explained that if there were any hiccups, then they would be delayed and subject to any changes the legislation makes next year. Waiting would add a level of uncertainty.

Mr. Bunker said that they would have to go out to San Francisco or New York to get bond ratings. The Mayor would have to go there and sell the City. To be ready for a bond rating trip in October, they would need to have the utility fee public hearing and parameters public hearing on September 24th. The Council could hold more special work session, if needed.

Council Member Christiansen said that she was willing to have as many work sessions as necessary to ensure that the Council was comfortable.

Council Member Shelton thought they were moving so quickly that the numbers on the spreadsheets weren't matching up. They needed accurate numbers to take to the public. They also should take another look at the opt-out and low-income options. Currently, those who opt-out are those that refuse to let the City hook them up. The \$9.95 utility fee is something that everyone would be paying, even if they aren't hooked up. He questioned why these individuals were required to apply for the waiver every year. The group discussed how this would affect subsequent homeowners.

Council Member Taylor asked what the opt-out was good for if they were still paying the fee. Mr. Marriott stated that all premises within the City would be charged a minimum fee unless they obtain a hardship exception. The qualifications for that exception would be clearly defined.

Council Member Shelton recommended only allowing a certain amount of money to cover those who need waivers.

Council Member Carroll said that the current language requires people to opt out or apply for a hardship by the time fiber is installed in their area. She suggested making it a set date for everyone, regardless of where they live.

3. Adjournment

The work session ended at 9:14 p.m.



Terilyn Lurker, City Recorder