

DOCUMENTS IN THIS PACKET INCLUDE:

LETTERS FROM CITIZENS TO THE
UTILITIES ADVISORY COMMISSION

From: [Sherry Listgarten](#)
To: [UAC](#); [Batchelor, Dean](#); [Abendschein, Jonathan](#)
Cc: [Evert, Catherine](#)
Subject: 37 KVA transformer => 15 homes @ 10 amps each
Date: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 10:19:54 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Hello again. I want to be sure that I understood Assistant Director Tomm Marshall correctly when he gave, as an example of inadequate grid capacity, a pole with a 37 KVA transformer supporting 15 homes.

My understanding is that a 37 KVA transformer [is rated for](#) 156 amps at 240 volts. So that is an average of ~10 amps (or 2400 watts) per house. Do I understand that point correctly? Assistant Director Marshall also mentioned more generally that the city-wide system is designed for about 2 KVA per home or again about 8-10 amps, implying that this configuration is fairly standard.

Is my understanding correct? As I mentioned before, it would be useful to know if that kind of configuration is common, and more generally how the city's transformers map to homes, and if the situation differs for SFH and MFH.

Again, very happy to talk if that's easier.

Thank you,

-- Sherry.

--

Sherry Listgarten
Climate blogger for Embarcadero Media
[A New Shade of Green](#)
Online at [Palo Alto Online](#), [Mountain View Voice](#), and [The Almanac](#).
650-646-4644

From: [Sherry Listgarten](#)
To: [UAC](#); [Batchelor, Dean](#); [Abendschein, Jonathan](#); tmarshall@cityofpaloalto.org
Cc: [Evert, Catherine](#)
Subject: Re: Palo Alto's grid capacity and capabilities
Date: Wednesday, February 2, 2022 10:39:37 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

FWIW, this [September 2020 report](#) from the utility is the most recent data that I have. Assistant Director Marshall seemed to discount that report ("written by an intern"), so I would be interested in hearing more specific critiques or problems with that writeup, which is quite recent. Or perhaps the report is fine but the timeframe is the question?

Thank you,

-- Sherry.

On Wed, Feb 2, 2022 at 7:15 PM Sherry Listgarten <sherry@newshadeofgreen.com> wrote:

Hi. I write a blog on climate-related topics for the Palo Alto online paper (and others), and was interested in tonight's UAC discussion about our city's limited grid capacity and capabilities potentially precluding our ability to hit our SCAP goals.

I would be interested in seeing the data underlying our concerns. Do we have that available, either in reports or in spreadsheets? I would like to understand more quantitatively the extent to which the grid is near capacity, and how it has evolved over the last few years.

I'd also be interested in your higher-level sense of the constraint. For example, EV adoption is accelerating and the state has its foot firmly on the accelerator. Can Palo Alto keep up? Or does our data show that we will likely need to limit L2 chargers, assuming the typical EV will draw 7-10 kW and need four hours per week? (I am making this requirement up, so feel free to share your own assumptions.) The EVs do not require new capabilities to charge, so this is solely about capacity. I had heard previously that our grid was in fine shape wrt EV charging, so this was new information for me.

More generally, EV chargers, induction stoves, and heat pumps have very different load patterns. Have we got a sense of which are likely to be most problematic? (My bet would be the stoves, due to high kW and inflexible load. But ymmv.)

I was a little disappointed that the claims were not backed up with data or quantified in any way during tonight's meeting. I don't doubt that the data exists, so I look forward to seeing what you can share. Alternatively, or in addition, I'd also be very happy to talk with someone at the utility who has worked on this.

Thank you,

-- Sherry Listgarten

P.S. I am guessing Tom Marshall's email, apologies if I got it wrong...

--

Sherry Listgarten

Climate blogger for Embarcadero Media

[A New Shade of Green](#)

Online at [Palo Alto Online](#), [Mountain View Voice](#), and [The Almanac](#).

650-646-4644

--

Sherry Listgarten

Climate blogger for Embarcadero Media

[A New Shade of Green](#)

Online at [Palo Alto Online](#), [Mountain View Voice](#), and [The Almanac](#).

650-646-4644

From: [Daniel Dulitz](#)
To: [UAC](#)
Subject: electric distribution infrastructure modernization
Date: Friday, February 4, 2022 11:21:58 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from dulitz@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Chair Forssell, Vice-Chair Segal, Commissioners, and Staff,

I found Assistant Director Marshall's presentation, and the subsequent colloquies with Commissioners, to be thought provoking and valuable. Thanks to Assistant Director Marshall and all staff who helped to prepare the report, and to the Commission for its thoughtful consideration.

When Vice-Chair Segal offhandedly suggested "then maybe we need more distributed energy storage," or something to that effect, I realized that Assistant Director Marshall's presentation and argument largely focused on expanding the capacity of the distribution system. I would like to see another presentation on how "smart grid" technologies can reduce the need to expand distribution capacity in the first place.

Let me start by wholeheartedly agreeing with Assistant Director Marshall that, as transformers near the end of their useful life and must be replaced, they should be replaced with somewhat higher capacity transformers.

The question is, *how much* additional capacity is needed, and how much related infrastructure (poles with inadequate load ratings) must be upgraded as a consequence.

Answering that question is not simply a matter of noting the increased peak loads from heat pumps, EVs, and rooftop solar.

If option 1 in Assistant Director Marshall's presentation is to be purely reactive, and option 2 is to be proactive in expanding the capacity of the grid, I would like to see consideration of option 3, which is to proactively mandate the use of distributed energy storage systems, and to invest in ways to control those systems (such as Fiber to the Premises) to enhance grid resiliency and to reduce the need for costly transformer upgrades.

EV charging only burdens the grid because CPAU does not limit charging at times of highest grid stress. Modern Energy Star heat pump water heaters have a Demand Response (DR) facility that allows the utility to force them to turn off during periods of grid stress, but CPAU does not use that facility. Many heat pumps and air conditioners (including mine) have a "curtailment" input that is meant to connect to a utility-provided trigger, but CPAU does not provide such triggers. Distributed ESS such as Tesla Powerwall provide reactive power control services, and they can be made to support the grid when requested by the utility during periods of capacity stress. As far as I know, CPAU does not use those DR features.

The entire purpose of DR features is so we can all spend less on transformers and distribution system upgrades. UAC has an important role in managing this upgrade process to ensure that

the costs of upgrades are borne by residents only when necessary. UAC should ensure that CPAU's peak demand estimates are modeled both with and without the use of DR features and other curtailment methods. UAC should encourage CPAU to invest in systems to control DR features to support the grid on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood and transformer-by-transformer basis where needed. And UAC should investigate whether battery ESS should be a mandatory component of larger solar, EV charging, or heat pump installations that would otherwise overburden grid capacity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Daniel Dulitz
3995 Page Mill Road
Resident since 2009

From: [Lawrence Garwin](#)
To: [UAC Public Meetings](#); [Batchelor, Dean](#); [UAC](#)
Subject: Re: Grid Modernization discussed at Wednesday's UAC Meeting
Date: Friday, February 4, 2022 4:46:29 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from lawrencegarwin@yahoo.com.
[Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

(Please forward to Alison Cormack and Tomm Marshall, as I was not able to find their email addresses through the Palo Alto website. Thank you.)

Honorable Utilities Advisory Commission Members, Council Liaison Alison Cormack, Utilities Director Dean Batchelor, and Assistant Director Tomm Marshall,

I had hoped to share some more comments during Wednesday February 2nd's Utilities Advisory Commission meeting, but despite having my virtual Zoom hand up for some time, the meeting went to break without me being called upon. I was disappointed, as family responsibilities prevented me from attending the rest of the meeting.

Therefore I take this opportunity to suggest we consider an alternative way to move forward with Palo Alto's building and transportation electrification with substantially reduced grid modernization costs.

Imagine that most people who live in Palo Alto who have electric vehicles (EVs) are able to plug them in to charge slowly throughout the day, when surplus renewable energy is usually available on the grid. For many, this would be at work. There, EVs would be plugged into normal 120 VAC outlets for the most part, but those with longer commutes would plug into 240 VAC outlets or Level 2 chargers. The target would be for the EVs to be driven home with an 80%+ charge.

These cars are then plugged into residences via bidirectional chargers, with the mostly full batteries covering the evening loads associated with people returning home that currently tax the electrical grid and often require gas turbine peaker plants to operate. The EVs, if needed, charge slowly overnight at whatever is the best time and rate to use the grid's surplus renewable energy, with the target of having enough charge by morning for the commute to work, where the cycle starts once again.

With the evening peak grid loads flattened via bidirectional chargers and EVs, many more of which we can safely expect in the coming years, especially given that by 2035, all new cars and passenger trucks sold in California will be required to be zero-emission vehicles, I believe that Palo Alto's grid modernization costs to cover building and vehicle electrification can be substantially reduced by adopting this slow daytime and bidirectional evening charging of EVs.

If some aspect of this approach is unworkable, I ask that all of the involved parties maintain open minds and a willingness to brainstorm, develop, and explore solutions radically different than what have been employed in the past. We have amazing technologies and resources at our disposal that did not exist a few years ago; if we embrace them, perhaps we can

inexpensively, and with a minimum of unneeded natural resource use, reach our climate goals and be good stewards for our descendants.

Thank you in advance for your enthusiastic and in-depth consideration of this proposal, and any others that may come before you, to move us forward to full electrification of our energy-related needs.

I look forward to your questions and thoughts on this proposal and would be happy to help in whatever way I can in developing innovative solutions to our climate issues.

(A different, yet related, pre-meeting proposal is reprinted below.)

Lawrence Garwin
Community Center
Palo Alto, California

On Feb 2, 2022, at 12:28 PM, Lawrence Garwin wrote:

Honorable Utilities Advisory Commission Members,

It's imperative for Palo Alto to implement and incentivize the use of electric vehicle (EV) bidirectional charging and demand/response load shedding to remove fossil fuels from our electricity supply.

Whereas traditional utilities might prefer stationary battery storage, because most battery manufacturing is currently focused on EVs, there are battery raw material constraints, EVs sit unused 90+% of the time, and some studies show EV batteries plugged in most of the time to provide grid services actually degrade less than ones charged occasionally on an as-needed basis, EV based grid storage is the clear choice to decarbonize our electricity supply.

As well, recent developments in electrolyte additives (partially funded by Tesla) have yielded lithium ion batteries with a 4 to 8 times increase in battery cycle life, depending on temperature. This promises an EV battery pack useful for a million miles and perhaps a century, which is well over the 20+ years generally required for investing in grid infrastructure for storage applications (in this case, bidirectional chargers, communications systems, City fleet vehicles, and incentives for residents and commuters to plug in their own vehicles).

In 2021 the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) updated their Combined Charging System (CCS) Direct Current Fast Charging (DCFC) protocols to allow bidirectional charging. This was the last piece needed for wide scale adoption of Vehicle to Grid (V2G) and demand/response EV charging in the US.

The Interstate Renewable Energy Council (IREC) has published **Paving the Way: Vehicle-to-Grid Standards for Electric Vehicles**, <https://irecusa.org/resources/paving-the-way-vehicle-to-grid-standards-for-electric-vehicles/> which describes how municipalities, public utilities commissions, and manufacturers now have all the standards necessary to implement Vehicle to Grid (V2G) and demand/response EV charging in the US.

I ask that Palo Alto Utilities engage with the Palo Alto city Council and other City departments to immediately review this document and swiftly implement and incentivize Vehicle to Grid (V2G) and demand/response EV charging in Palo Alto.

Thank you for giving this issue the priority and immediate attention it deserves.

Lawrence Garwin
Community Center
Palo Alto

From: [Sherry Listgarten](#)
To: [UAC](#); [Batchelor, Dean](#); [Abendschein, Jonathan](#); [Elvert, Catherine](#)
Subject: Draft blog post about Feb 2 UAC meeting (grid update needed for 80x30)
Date: Saturday, February 5, 2022 5:18:15 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Utility staff and UAC Commissioners:

I did not receive a response from you to my invitation to discuss this topic, but it is important so I want to share [this draft blog post](#) with you in case you have any feedback or comment. This post will go live tomorrow morning.

Dean, please feel free to forward to Tomm if you wish. (I don't have his contact information.)

I understand this is late notice, so if you want to respond but cannot get back to me today, no worries, I can also take feedback and make changes as needed once it is published. Or of course you can add your comments to the blog post.

Best regards,

-- Sherry.

--

Sherry Listgarten

Climate blogger for Embarcadero Media

[A New Shade of Green](#)

Online at [Palo Alto Online](#), [Mountain View Voice](#), and [The Almanac](#).

650-646-4644

From: [Jeff Hoel](#)
To: [UAC](#)
Cc: [Hoel, Jeff \(external\)](#); [Palo Alto Fiber](#); [Council, City](#)
Subject: TRANSCRIPT -- 02-08-22 UAC meeting -- FTTP
Date: Sunday, February 20, 2022 3:32:28 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Commissioners,

Re:

02-08-22 UAC agenda:

<https://www.cityofpalalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/agendas-minutes/utilities-advisory-commission/archived-agenda-and-minutes/agendas-and-minutes-2022/02-08-2022/uac-agenda-february-08-2022.pdf>

02-08-22 staff report (10 pages, including 8 pages of presentation slides)

<https://www.cityofpalalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/agendas-minutes/utilities-advisory-commission/archived-agenda-and-minutes/agendas-and-minutes-2022/02-08-2022/02-08-2022-id-13939-item-1.pdf>

02-08-22 video:

<https://midpenmedia.org/utilities-advisory-commission-31-282022/>

Please see a TRANSCRIPT of this meeting, below the "#####" line. With my comments (paragraphs in red beginning with "###").

First, some high-level comments:

1. I worry that the word isn't getting out.

1a. I agree with Vice Chair Segal (0:35:47) that the communications team doesn't have a way of measuring what fraction of the public even knows about the FTTP project.

1b. I agree with Commissioner Johnston (0:41:31) that an article in the Palo Alto Weekly would help.

1c. I agree with Chair Forssell (1:01:10) that there's a lot of overlap between what's asked on the Get Involved Map and what will be asked in market surveys, and hope that it's easy to merge the two datasets.

2. I'd like to hear from Commissioner Scharff. When he was mayor in 2013, he said in his State of the City speech that the time for FTTP was "now."

<https://www.cityofpalalto.org/files/assets/public/city-council-and-mayor/state-of-the-city-address/scharff2013-state-of-the-city-speech.pdf>

Thanks.

Jeff

Jeff Hoel
731 Colorado Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94303

#####

TRANSCRIPT:

0:00:00:

Chair Forssell: Hello, everybody. Welcome to the February 8th special meeting of the Utilities Advisory Commission. We are meeting today to discuss an item that we wanted to make sure was well-noticed to the public, as a hold-over from our regular meeting last week.

On UAC's 02-02-22 agenda, Item VII.2's description didn't say "fiber."

<https://www.cityofpalalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/agendas-minutes/utilities-advisory-commission/archived-agenda-and-minutes/agendas-and-minutes-2022/02-02-2022/02-02-2022-uac-agenda.pdf>

And so, why don't we get right to it. We'll start with roll call. I'll call out commissioner names, in the order in which I first saw you come onto Zoom. Commissioner Bowie.

0:00:35:

Commissioner Bowie: Present.

0:00:37:

Chair Forssell: Vice Chair Segal.

0:00:39:

Vice Chair Segal: Present.

0:00:40:

Chair Forssell: Commissioner Johnston.

0:00:41:

Commissioner Johnston: Present.

0:00:43:

Chair Forssell: Commissioner Scharff.

0:00:45:

Commissioner Scharff: Present.

0:00:47:

Chair Forssell: Commissioner Metz.

0:00:48:

Commissioner Metz: Present.

0:00:50:

Chair Forssell: All right. And, so far, Commissioner Smith isn't here. If he's able to come later, we'll make a note of it. And I'm here as well. And, Council Member Cormack. I don't know if you count for roll call, but ...

0:01:01:

Council Member Cormack: I do not count for roll call, but I am here.

0:01:03:

Chair Forssell: All right. I'll remember that for next time. OK. So, let's see. [II.] Agenda Review and Revisions. We've only got one item, so I don't think there are any revisions. Which brings us to [III.] Oral Communications. Are there any members of the public who want to address the UAC on some item that is NOT on the agenda?

0:01:35:

Dave Yuan: Oh, OK. So, it seems one hand raised. So, Ms. Joye, please unmute your mike.

0:01:45;

Lindsay Joye: Oh, hi. This is Lindsay Joye. And I just wanted announce that the link on your agenda does not lead you to the Zoom meeting. You have to hand-enter in the numbers. So -- It just says the Zoom account hasn't been paid, or something like that. So, just an FYI about today's agenda.

0:02:04:

Chair Forssell: OK. Thank you for that. So, if anybody's watching via some other mechanism than straight on the Zoom, can you just repeat the instructions one more time? What they need to do?

0:02:16:

Lindsay Joye: Look at the top of the agenda. Open Zoom. And copy the actual numbers of the Meeting ID.

0:02:24:

Chair Forssell: Got it.

0:02:25:

Lindsay Joye: Because the hyperlink didn't work for me.

0:02:29:

Chair Forssell: Gotcha.

0:02:30:

Tabatha Boatwright: Chair Forssell?

0:02:32:

Chair Forssell: Yes.

0:02:33:

Tabatha Boatwright: This is Tabatha Boatwright. And I'm administrating the meeting. That error has been corrected.

0:02:40:

Chair Forssell: OK. So, if they've got a -- If somebody's got a fresh copy of the agenda, they can use the link. But if they're having trouble, they should just enter the Meeting ID.

0:02:49:

Dave Yuan: OK. If anyone else from the public would like to speak on an item not on tonight's agenda, please raise your hand. No other hands are raised.

0:03:00:

Chair Forssell: Thank you. Um, let's see, we don't have any [IV.] Minutes to approve, from a prior meeting, nor do we have any [V.] Unfinished Business. Director Batchelor, do you have a ([VI.] Utilities Director Report) report for us?

0:03:11:

Director Batchelor: I do not.

But a kind of Director's Report occurred at 1:16:43.

0:03:12:

Chair Forssell: OK. Which means we can go straight to our [VII.1] New Business. "Discussion of the Palo Alto Fiber Project and Updates on the Communications and Community Engagement Efforts to Date and Upcoming Opportunities Planned." So, before we dive into it, let me -- or, maybe as the start of diving into it -- are there any members of the public wishing to speak on this topic?

0:03:40:

Dave Yuan: If anyone from the public would like to speak on this item, please raise your hand. No hands are raised.

0:03:50:

Chair Forssell: All right. Great. Then is there a staff presentation?

0:03:54:

Director Batchelor: There is, Chair Forssell. Good evening, commissioners, Council Member Cormack. All great to see you again. Thank you very much for your flexibility, for being available today, as we were not able to -- as Chair Forssell mentioned earlier-- that we were not able to put this on the agenda. Tonight we have with us Amanda de Jesus, our Communications Manager, and Meghan Horrigan-Taylor, who is our Chief Communications Officer. That we'll be running through a presentation, to talk a little bit about some updates on the communication and engagements, as well as some upcoming opportunities. That was the main reason why we needed to hold this meeting earlier than later, and not push it to next month's meeting. There are some workshops that will be coming open here. And we'll talk a little bit more about that. So, with that, I will turn it over to Amanda.

0:04:47:

Slide 1 (PDF page 3) -- Palo Alto Fiber -- Communications and Community Engagement Update

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: I'll kick it of, to start.

0:04:50:

Director Batchelor: OK.

0:04:50:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: And Amanda and I will tag-team the presentation tonight. And also help with facilitating any input, or also any questions that the commission may have. Good evening, Meghan Horrigan-Taylor. Thank you for having us. We're really excited to provide you with a status report today about the communications and community engagement efforts planned, and also progress made so far, **.

0:05:20:

Slide 2 -- Goals and Milestones

And so, if we can go -- this slide -- perfect -- I wanted to just provide a snapshot of where we are, and also where we're headed, around this overall effort, from a communications and community awareness standpoint. So, kind of kicking this off in the fall, in September timeframe, this current kind of -- we'll talk about these in phases, just to give everyone a snapshot of our goals and milestones here, but from when we started this project, the opportunity in front of us was to a few things. One is, maximize community awareness about this project -- what it is, ways the community could get involved and provide input. And it really builds community excitement about fiber. And so, we kicked off that effort by doing a lot of different things, both communicating with the public about the project, setting up a project web page, also kicking off a new fiber hub,

To me, it's potentially confusing to be using the word "hub" in two different senses: 1) a website place for communicating about FTTP, and 2) a physical shed for housing FTTP electronics.

that we'll talk a little bit about, as a way to build excitement, but also, to really engage the community in different ways on this project. And, really, the overall goal here is to build momentum, leading up to a conversation with the UAC and the Council in the May/June timeframe. And at that point, the hope is that the Council and the UAC will make some decisions about the project.

Traditionally, UAC decides (by voting) what to recommend to Council, and lets both Council and the public know (via minutes, video). And then, later, Council decides (by voting), after receiving input from the public.

Traditionally, joint meetings between Council and UAC have been study sessions for the purpose of discussing how Council and UAC can accomplish these functions separately. The last such meeting was 11-27-17.

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/agendas-minutes/city-council-agendas-minutes/00-archive/2017/11-27-17-ccm.pdf>

As I understand it, the proposed joint meeting between Council and UAC will be a study session, so nobody will decide anything (by voting).

And then, at that point, we'll continue to build momentum, and continue to build excitement, and continue to inform about the project. And then we'll have additional phases, as part of the effort. And so, this is really our initial snapshot for you tonight. To talk about things that we've accomplished, but also look ahead a little bit in the next 3-4 month period. What's planned. Opportunities for the UAC to assist us with sharing information with your community networks, potentially have focus group conversations, and really try to continue to communicate with the public about these opportunities to be engaged. But also answer questions that the community may have about the project. So, Amanda will be helping us talk about some of the tactical work that we did up until this point, and some items that are planned. But did just want to give you the sort of snapshot in time, with a few of these phases, to talk through that a little bit, as a way to capture the goals of what we're attempting. And also just talk through the expectations from a community standpoint, in terms of community conversations that are happening and ongoing. So, with that, our next slide, ...

0:08:14:

Slide 3 -- Community Education

... I'll turn it over to Amanda, to talk a little bit about our community education, that's started, as well some community engagement. Amanda.

0:08:24:

Amanda de Jesus: Thank you, Meghan. And I apologize. I may lose the screen-share. I need to grab my notes from the other screen. So, I'm going to try and switch over. If I do this, you can't see the presentation anymore, right? Or can you?

0:08:43:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: We can still see it.

0:08:44:

Amanda de Jesus: You can. OK. Great. 'Cause it says your screen-sharing is paused on my screen. So, if you can see that page, great. So, thank you, Meghan. Obviously, communication education encompasses a variety of different approaches, both digitally

and in print. So this slide captures the many different approaches currently underway and planned. The community education engagement phase on Palo Alto Fiber is continuing, as Meghan mentioned, through May. As you'll hear later, there is great excitement for this project. And all of these approaches seek to build awareness. Build excitement. And ensure that the community is aware of the conversations taking place. So, I'm not going to go through each of these in detail. But I wanted to capture all the ways we are reaching community members and businesses. We are also leveraging Utilities existing customer communications channels to increase awareness and engagement opportunities. Staff are also supporting the Utilities customer service team, who will be receiving direct phone calls about the fiber project. This particular aspect of correspondence actually kicked off late last week. So, that one is fairly new.

0:10:00:

Slide 4 -- Community Education (cont.) -- including the Fiber Hub (and Get-Involved Map)

I'm going to jump to this next slide. So, we are working to build community awareness as we go. So, this slide shares the Fiber Hub. This particular slide is the Get-Involved Map that we developed as part of this Hub, as a means to engage the community, get people talking to each other, pin their support for the project.

How does the map get people talking to each other? Contact information is not provided.

I don't understand what the heart buttons are all about. A Chrome browser search reveals that there are 174 "0" hearts, 39 "1" hearts, and 5 "2" hearts. But 4 of the 5 "2" instances are at the Arthur Keller entry. What's up with that?

It's one of the ways that community members also can engage with staff. Through this hub site, they can also learn about the fiber project, including its benefits, and gain resources, like frequently asked questions, fact sheet, and the ambassador toolkit. To date, the fiber hub has actually had over 4,000 views.

I confess that I have viewed the site dozens of times, just to track progress.

Does the City have data on how many times each visitor clicked on other buttons at the website?

By the way, when you go to this page, a pop-up says, "fiber-palo-alto.hub.arcgis.com wants to know your location," and gives you the opportunity to click "ALLOW," "BLOCK," or "X." I have always clicked "X," because things like this usually mean you're willing to get ads for pizzas close to your current physical location. Does the City have data on what people have been clicking? Why is the City asking this question?

And 210 residents and businesses have pinned their support on this map.

How many of these are businesses? (This data is collected but not made public.)

Has staff reviewed the data for plausibility? One person entered the same data twice (accidentally, I assume).

This shows excitement and support of the project, because the community are actively going in, saying that they're interested, adding their name and their address to the map, and signing up to receive regular updates.

0:11:08:

The project webpage is more of a technical webpage, that provides information like previous staff reports, and presentations, helpful documents, calendar listings of upcoming events, and a ref project timeline.

0:11:23:

The blog is a series of educational and engagement information, with the first being about, "Five Ways That the Community Can Learn and Be Engaged With Palo Alto Fiber." Each month -- Each month's blog will focus on a new topic area that gives a little bit more in-depth information, and is shared through a social media websites and newsletters. As of today, February 8th, 880 people have viewed our latest blog. Which is exciting and great. Because, again, it just shows that people are excited about this project. They want to know more. They want to sign up for updates. They're willing to invest their time into learning more and getting involved.

0:12:04:

Going to social media, again, this is an ongoing, ever-evolving strategy. Currently, our reach and engagement has steadily been increasing over past few months, with thousands of views and engagement on each of our posts. The FIBERLink newsletter was launched a couple weeks ago. And, to date, over 550 people have subscribed to received that monthly eblast. Within the first two weeks after it -- of its launch. About 400 people signed up to receive the newsletter. And it also had a strong open rate. Once again, reinforcing that the community is excited about this project, and want to learn more.

0:12:46:

back to Slide 3.

So, I want to go back to this slide. Um. So, as I mentioned, the social presence will continue to grow. We're not only focusing on

mainstream channels like Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, but also LinkedIn, to better reach our business community. And NextDoor, to reach our residents. We've been seeing, again, steady growth in the number of people we reach. And people are responding to the City's outreach and education, which can be seen in the number of blog views, the hubsite views and pins, and, of course, the sign-ups for the open rates of the newsletter. Through social media, we're also doing weekly posts, using the hashtag #FiberFriday tag. These, again, provide more information about the project, and can easily be shared with your neighbors and community networks. Through all of these social media platforms, the community can also share the City's posts, to help their networks learn about fiber and engage other Palo Altans, which, again, I have been seeing that consistently. People are sharing our posts more. Which means more people are seeing them, that we aren't necessarily able to reach as easily as your community networks. Creating community driven social media conversations about Palo Alto Fiber is a great start to connecting and joining the conversation on this effort.

0:14:08:

I'm going to touch on the Fiber Ambassador Toolkit real quick. So, this ...

0:14:11:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Actually, Amanda, can I jump in really quick?

0:14:12:

Amanda de Jesus: Yeah.

0:14:12:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: The one thing I also wanted to mention on this slide is, there is an opportunity for community members to email us directly.

The slide itself doesn't have any email addresses. This "Contact Us" page <https://fiber-palo-alto.hub.arcgis.com/pages/contact-us> provides fiber@cityofpaloalto.org as an email address.

On 12-18-21 I sent a message to meghan.horrigan-taylor@cityofpaloalto.org and jay.sivarajah@cityofpaloalto.org about the "Get Involved" map, and didn't hear back.

To ask questions, to get more information. We've seen a steady increase in email communication as well. That actually does help us to build out our frequently asked questions. I know Amanda will get to that in a little bit. But I just wanted to mention that as well.

0:14:39:

Amanda de Jesus: Yeah, thank you.

0:14:40:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Thank you.

0:14:41:

Amanda de Jesus: Um. So, yeah, the Fiber Ambassador Toolkit is another resource that shares tools and resources about ways to host a neighborhood meet-up on fiber. It contains adjusted topics of discussion, sample agendas, Powerpoint slides, etc. It's a way to provide the community with some added resources, to build their own networks, help their people. Really, it's a way for neighbors to meet up together. It provides the resources to connect with staff for more support on hosting these conversations. It furthers the work that the City is doing to support the community, hosting these types of conversations. It's a great launching point for the community. And we've already received some great feedback about the -- about different resources that we can include in the Toolkit. And it is a living document. We will update it as we receive feedback and information that the community sees as helpful to host these types of conversations amongst each other. One of the things that will be added to the Toolkit are to help the social media conversations -- like, the actual drafted social media posts, with graphics, that people can easily copy and paste, and share with their own -- or, on their own social media platforms. Excuse me.

0:16:10:

Slide 5 -- Common Community Questions

Um. So, as Meghan mentioned, we have definitely been receiving -- people asking questions about fiber, through the fiber email address, which myself and another staff monitor.

OK, so this is the preferred email address? (fiber@cityofpaloalto.org)

These are the most common questions. Part of the community interest and input received are questions about the project. Part of the opportunity to have these FAQs online is to evolve them over time in response to specific questions from the community. The FAQs are on the fiber hub page. They're not on the project site yet. They're on the hub page. And as we receive questions from the

community, we will be updating them, working with our consultant, to get the technical questions answered as best we can. This list of questions, and their corresponding answers will be provided to you. They are actually on the hub already. So you can go on there to check them out. If you receive questions -- you, as UAC commissioners receive questions, or similar questions -- It's a great resource. And you can also reach our staff if you have other questions. Um. Let me ...

0:17:30:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: And also, for -- if there's questions missing, we'd love to hear feedback about that. We can definitely build these out further.

0:17:36:

Amanda de Jesus: Yes. If there are missing questions. And this -- these are not the only ones that are on the website. This is just a snapshot of the ones that we've been receiving recently from the community.

0:17:46:

Slide 6 -- Community Engagement

So, going on to our community engagement opportunities, like I mentioned, the hub was launched in October 2021. That's, again, a great way to connect with other community members, and -- in a way that we can see, visually, that the excitement continues to grow. More people are pinning their support every day. The Fiber Community Information Session is coming up on Thursday, February 24th, from 5:30 to 6:30 pm. There will be time for an informational presentation, as well as a Q&A session with staff and our consultant, Magellan.

0:18:27:

At the end for February, beginning of March, we are supporting a Fiber Neighborhood -- Neighbor Meet-Up Week. We are dedicating this week to supporting community members to host their own conversations around fiber, utilizing the Fiber Ambassador Toolkit and other resources provided by the City. Ambassadors and other community members are encouraged to set up some time to invite neighbors for a conversation about fiber, whether that's in person, in a park, or virtually. It's an opportunity for the community to come to staff and ask us to support these types of meetings, ask us to participate as guests. Really, we want the community to take ownership over this project, as well. Which is part of the reason -- and the whole point of doing engagement and education -- is to get people excited and involved, in taking -- starting to take ownership of this project. Hosting neighborhood meet-ups and community conversations really ensures that your neighbors know about the project. It ensures that they're given relevant -- and important and accurate -- information, that comes from a source of -- a good source of information. Excuse me.

0:19:46:

Um. And, in addition, of course, encouraging neighborhood competition. It's something that we think will kind of happen organically through this process. But also, the City is -- City staff -- we are brainstorming ways right now ways that we help to encourage some friendly competition between neighborhoods.

What does staff have in mind as the stakes of such a competition? What would neighborhoods compete for?

Getting more people in certain areas to show support, get involved. And this is one of the ways that we can help that along.

0:20:20:

The UAC and the City Council will hold a Joint Study Session, tentatively scheduled for May. And then -- going back in time a little bit -- the Market Research Survey will be launched in the coming months.

0:20:42:

I think -- I think that's it. Meghan.

0:20:50:

Slide 7 -- Next Steps & Q&A

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Thank you. And so, we did want to provide an opportunity for questions from -- and input from the Utility [sic] Advisory Commission. Just in closing, I did want to reinforce that we are hearing a lot of really good feedback about the fiber project, and the effort underway. The excitement we're hoping to build upon. And continue to build community awareness about the project, through all these different ways, as well as other opportunities. Some opportunities will also kind of continue over time, between now and the Study Session with the UAC and the City Council, and beyond. Some of these include focus groups to talk about the project, answer questions, gain feedback. But the hope is, the market survey, the input received so far, will all be an opportunity to help inform the conversation that the UAC and the Council will have in May. And then, we'll, of course, build on that, moving forward. So, with that, we'll close, and offer any -- an opportunity for questions and additional input. Thank you.

0:22:04:

Chair Forssell: Thank you very much. Let's see. I want to make a note that Commissioner Smith was able to join us. So, he's on now as well. And with that, why don't we turn to commissioners. Any questions or comments? It's helpful if you raise your Zoom hand. Commissioner Smith.

0:22:26:

Commissioner Smith: Thank you, Chair. I've also had an opportunity to meet with Meghan, previous -- and Amanda previously, and an opportunity to dig deep into the Toolkit. And, again, I want to highlight the progress we've made so far. I do think it's good progress. That said, I -- One of the -- One of the preeminent requirements, when we passed, or pushed for, bringing Magellan on board was education and engagement with the public.

I wonder if Commissioner Smith is referring to what UAC voted for at its 04-21-21 meeting?

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/agendas-minutes/utilities-advisory-commission/archived-agenda-and-minutes/agendas-and-minutes-2021/04-21-2021-special/04-21-2021-uac-minutes.pdf>

At that meeting, Andy Poggio emphasized that the outreach should precede the surveys, so that survey participants would be educated about the issue. (See my transcript, on page 34 here, starting at 0:04:42.)

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/public-letters-to-council/2021/06-01-21-ccm-public-letters-set-5.pdf>

No doubt, there are other reasons to engage the public, but this one was important.

(Magellan was originally hired on 06-01-20.)

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/reports/city-manager-reports-cmrs/year-archive/2020-2/id-11580.pdf?t=59010.48>

It was one of the five tenets, if you will, of our entire proposal and motion, that was passed. One of the things that I am very concerned about is the education of the public. And I think relying on ambassadors who are not sponsored by the City, or even identified as community members sponsored by the City, where the City owns the organization -- which they do -- I think that reduces the credibility of the Ambassador program. And, more importantly, I think it also reduces the opportunity to deliver a shared message across the entire City of Palo Alto. I'm very concerned about having, you know, 20 to 30 different ambassadors delivering a different message on different neighborhood, with no understanding, specifically, of what Joe, Mary, and Bill are saying on any one particular day, and one particular meeting.

0:24:01:

Another concern that I have is that it seems that, as much as we have "engaged" Magellan, from a City Department of Utilities perspective, for the fiber, and literally awarded \$2.5 million -- in excess of \$2.5 million -- for the engineering associated with this, we are now turning to the City of Palo Alto population to actually own the job. I don't think that's necessarily the case. The City of Palo Alto engages with the City -- and, quite frankly, pays taxes to the City -- to own this process. Together, we own the fiber. Together, we own the UAC. Together, we own the City Council. And we direct the City Council through our own voting. But, to turn around and say, we went ahead and hired Magellan to do the design, now I need you to go through and figure out everything else that's necessary to get the business up and running I think is a little unfair. And, quite frankly, drops the ball.

Great point.

I would encourage the City to take more of an ownership role. More importantly, a sponsorship, or a leadership role, in coordinating and organizing these ambassadors, rather than leaving it as a rough outline of an ambassador program. To my mind, an ambassador program, I think, can be very, very effective, provided it is very structured. Monthly meetings would be best, if they can be managed. We have 26,000 residents. Roughly.

Estimates vary. This 08-20-21 article says Palo Alto's population is 68,572.

<https://paloaltoonline.com/news/2021/08/20/census-data-highlights-shifting-demographics-in-palo-alto-neighborhoods>

This 09-28-13 staff report assumed that a citywide FTTP network would pass 22,709 residential premises (not counting 5,226 residences in MDUs of 20 or more units, which staff at that time assumed wouldn't be served by FTTP) and 3,192 business premises (not counting 734, which staff at that time assumed were too large to be served by FTTP).

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/reports/city-manager-reports-cmrs/year-archive/2015/id-6104-ftp.pdf>

These days, which premises are we assuming would be passed? And how many are there?

Maybe it would be a good idea to report, every quarter, what the premises counts are. Say, in Utilities Quarterly Reports. Which, by the way, should be quarterly.

We -- Based upon our business plan from Magellan, even rough case, we need 7,800 -- or 30 percent -- of those residents to sign up. And we're a long ways from. And if we launched the website, and if we launched the interest -- statement of interest -- map in October, we're 5 months into a process that should be generating north of 600 -- 650 -- per month, for the next 12 months, if we're going to be successful in rolling out fiber to the home.

Many municipalities that have successfully implemented municipal FTTP networks grew their take rates over several years.

So, I would encourage just, perhaps, a little more stress on organization and structure to the program. But I do like what I've seen so far. Thanks very much.

0:26:21:

[pause]

0:26:30:

Chair Forssell: Sorry. Does staff want to respond to Commissioner Smith?

0:26:33:

[pause]

0:26:41:

Director Batchelor: Yes. I do. So, Commissioner Smith, I totally understand where -- what you're coming from on this. I guess the thing is is that, I'm thinking that -- um -- maybe, we're -- in my mind, we're not as far as where you're wanting to be at. From this outreach -- core of outreach -- to customers, and back out to the community. And that we are more in maybe one -- one and a half -- phases behind where you're at, at this point. Because, you know, I think the thing is is that this project has been on the books for 20-plus years.

Not exactly. When Council voted to do the dark fiber network in 1996, they hoped that FTTP would somehow emerge later, but, so far, it hasn't. That didn't put FTTP "on the books."

We've had, you know, early adopters getting really excited, and then the City doesn't do anything, and we let it go.

I think it's a mischaracterization to call the municipal FTTP advocates in Palo Alto from the turn of the century "early adopters." They wanted the whole City to be an early adopter. Does the City still have the names and addresses of the 67 customers of Palo Alto's FTTH Trial network in the Community Center neighborhood. It might be interesting to ask them if they were "early adopters" in the sense of having needs beyond that of the masses. They agreed to pay \$85 per month for internet-only service. The original electronics supported only about 5/5 Mbps per premises. (As a further experiment, staff replaced the original electronics with BPON, which has 622/155 Mbps to share, and it was shared by 4 premises. I don't know if speed was further limited by the ISP.)

It's been kind of a history. And so, now, it's actually -- we're getting excitement from the community itself, from showing that we are really 100 percent behind this, and we're moving forward. And I think that, from what we've seen so far, from Amanda's work and Meghan's work, that the community has really been uplifted about this next move. However, the thing is that, I think that, you know, we are -- we don't even know if we are going to go to the ballot,

On this particular point, Director Batchelor is getting ahead of his skis. In 2004, Council knew that a FTTP-specific ballot measure would have to pass by two-thirds, and that that would be tough to do, so it looked at lots of alternatives. This time around, one of staff's tasks is to consider financing options again, so that Council can pick one.

or what we're going to do, or how funding is going to come about. Or what we're going to do with this. So, I think the thing is is that - You know, I think we need to really go to the Council. And I think we need to actually talk to the Council about this. And then, we take the active role afterwards, about this whole ambassador piece that you were just explaining. And I think that that's where we need to then kind of find what those ambassadors, and what kind of tools we set them up for, as we move forward at that point. Because I think the thing is is that we don't want to get out in front of what the Council's direction might be. And once we have this joint venture meeting with Council,

Is this perhaps a Freudian slip? The next meeting between UAC and Council will NOT be a "joint venture" meeting. It will be a "joint" meeting. Under NO circumstances should anyone in City government be communicating with Joint Venture Silicon Valley, which advocates the interests of the telecom incumbents.

I think we'll get a little bit more understanding from where the Council wants to be, and where they want to go with this. I know that, you know, the Council has adopted, and, basically, is talking to the UAC as the leads on this project. And I think the thing is is that we still need to get some direction from them. And then how we're going about moving it. So, I understand exactly what you're saying. But we just might be just a little further -- YOU might be just a little bit further ahead than where staff is.

0:29:29:

Commissioner Smith: Thank you very much, Dean. I appreciate the response. And I really do appreciate the consideration. And I'm not discounting that at all. I, in my head, have this grandiose idea that the City of Palo Alto can do anything. And I recognize that that is a beautiful space to be. And I recognize that it takes a lot of people to get there. There's no doubt about it. I think what I'm a little concerned about is that if we -- if we do the dates, or the scheduling, associated with this -- and this is what I do on a regular basis -- is, I look at the end goal. I look at the end goal. And then, I count back the number of days it's going to take me to get to that end goal. And if I do that in my head, even in a cursory level -- If I do that in my head, we are, at some point, going to have to ask SOMEBODY for money. Because we don't -- we acknowledge this. Even when we engaged Magellan, we knew we did not have enough money. So, if we look at it from a best-case scenario perspective, the best-case scenario is that we are in a position to ask for money -- ask for money when Magellan is done with the design. So, if we look at THAT date, we're roughly 12 months from today. And that's the earliest possible that we could actually even have the NOTION of asking for it. So, does that mean 6 months or 9 months beyond that for a ballot measure? And raising the money appropriate? I don't know. But that is definitely a conversation that I think, to your point, that we should be having with Council, and the Mayor, and the City Manager, to understand

specifically what -- Do we have a timeline for this? And do we have a date -- To your point, have we already decided to go/no-go? In my head, we've just spent \$2.5 million, and we've just -- we've said "go." Now, maybe there's another go/no-go that wasn't communicated -- or, WAS communicated, and I just didn't hear it, because I'm hearing things with -- well, to be frank, hearing things the best possible. But if there is ANOTHER go/no-go decision that needs to be made, then let's go ahead and identify that, and have that conversation NOW. Let's not wait until May. Right? We've already engaged \$2.5 million. Let's get that going.

0:31:32:

Director Batchelor: Right. No, I totally understand and agree with you, is that -- You know, I think the thing is is that, I guess I was viewing it as -- The first go portion of it was that we were going to hire a consultant. We were going to do this business study. And it was going to cost us something. And then, if you remember, we phased this out for Magellan, and we kind of sped it up, because we really wanted to know what that full design -- and maybe what that full detailed costs might look like. 'Cause I think that that's important, that we need to have that conversation with Council, to give them the best estimates that we might have, as we move forward. You know, as the commission talked the last time we met, was that it was decided by the commission that we should NOT go phase by phase as we build. We should build 100 percent out within the next 5-6 years, or whatever the timeline of that construction might be.

On 05-24-21, Council said 5 years (not 5-6 years). At the time, I pointed out that other municipalities have been able to do citywide FTTP in less time.

Because, at the end, it may be cheaper for us if we built the entire City out. So, I think that that -- you know, we need to talk about what that cost is. And that's why I think we looked at what Magellan was going to do on the design phase. So that we could get the best cost estimate to Council to make some decisions.

0:32:54:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: And, Dean, just to confirm that -- that your point there is that the next point of time with the Council and the UAC is in May. Correct?

0:33:05:

Director Batchelor: That's correct.

0:33:06:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Right. So that in the overall phases, that document -- or that visual that I showed in the beginning of our engagement and communication plan, with the goal of building awareness and ensuring that the community is educated about the project really is this snapshot of time between now -- from October through to May/June, when that conversation takes place. And then, from that time, when there is more fuller conversation around what's next, we will then develop additional conversations with the community. Fuller engagement around what's next. Right? So, I just want to make sure that there's kind of these snapshots in time. The engagement, the communication will ebb and flow with these milestones. You know, this is a very big project, and there are a lot of milestones to get to. And to goal. But that initial standpoint is the May timeframe. So, I just want to reinforce that overall planning.

0:34:07:

Vice Chair Segal: Can I ask you one question on that, Meghan? Sort of to Commissioner Smith's point. But with the community-engaging piece, what is our goal? Or, what are our milestones there? And -- Yes, we can start with that.

0:34:21:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Sure. So, one goal is to build excitement, and build awareness, and keep building on that. I think we've done that. To date, there's a lot of excitement around the project. There's a lot of engagement with City staff. Asking questions. There's engagement between neighbors. On social media, people are sharing the information, and responding back to us, and sharing excitement about the project. And then, overall, the pinning of your home and/or your business on the map is pretty key. Because that's literally saying, "I want fiber at my house." Or "I want fiber at my business." And sign me up.

Not exactly. It says, "I'm interested." For example, "LR" (pinner number 212 by my count) says, "Already use AT&T fiber for internet and home phone." LR might be hoping to be able to switch to municipal FTTP when it becomes available, or he/she might just be hoping AT&T will have to lower its price to be competitive.

So that's happening. That's real-time information that we're receiving. All of that, plus the market survey that will be launched in mid-March. Those results, and that information, will be gathered and shared directly with the Council, and with the UAC, all in one snapshot.

And shared with the public at that time?

So, that provides an opportunity for us to say, here's what we've heard so far. And then, now, let's talk about these next milestones, that Dean just outlined. Hope that makes sense.

0:35:36:

Vice Chair Segal: Well, I was hoping to get some kind of more quantitative milestones.

0:35:34:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: In terms of actual number?

0:35:47:

Vice Chair Segal: Whatever is -- So, I don't know -- You know, to measure the success so far, To me, there has to be some kind of quantitative idea, to be able to measure if we're meeting it, exceeding it, or not. And so, saying that there's engagement, and that there's 200+ pins, or whatever, is great. But, I don't know, is that meeting our expectation? Is it exceeding it? Are we behind?

For example, how many "premises representatives" even know there is a "Get Involved" Map? Or, for that matter, how many know there's a FTTP project?

0:36:13:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Gotcha. So, from a -- The market survey will be one real quantitative outlook. Our hope is to get at least, you know, 1,000 responses.

The January 2022 utilities bill insert on FTTP

https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/utilities/bill-inserts/paloaltofiber_utility-bill-insert_jan22_web-final.pdf seems to say -- at least I think so -- that EVERY premises will be invited to participate in the survey. (Because EVERY premises will get this bill insert, or equivalent.) Is that the case? If the City gets only 1,000 responses to 30,000-ish invitations, won't that be a problem? Will the 1,000 responses be "representative" of the population? Who on the team understands the math of statistics?

We're hopeful for more. The -- From a just-engagement standpoint through our communications efforts, I -- Actually, from a numbers standpoint, the blog is very surprising -- in a good way -- to us. Just within the two weeks, to have over 800 views of people. That they've received it in a lot of different ways. Both people sending it to them, but also receiving it through our channels. That, in itself, is a pretty high number. Because of the short timeframe that it's been out there. And so, there's a lot of different pieces like that, that are pretty powerful. I would say we're building, from zero, a newsletter, to receive input, and updates along the way, through this project. So, at this moment, with a week and a half of us launching that, having over 550 people sign up, that's actually, to me, a really great opportunity, great progress, and shows excitement, as well. Because somebody's saying, "I want to hear updates. I want more information." So, those are kind of key milestones. I'm hoping by the May timeframe, with the meet-ups, I'm hoping we could at least have ten small neighbor-to-neighbor conversations, at a minimum. With some focus groups that could be -- some larger groups. We're in a pandemic, so we're trying to get -- manage through that.

0:37:57:

The other opportunity, of course, is this information session. I'm hoping that we have at least 100 people who are interested in hearing more. And that could mean that we host another opportunity like that before the May timeframe. Right now, there's about 75 people signed up to receive information through that information session. So, that's actually fairly good for the community to demonstrate interest, as well.

0:38:28:

Vice Chair Segal: I spoke a little out of turn. So I'll stop. But I think having actual numbers that we're striving toward, that we could measure, would be a really helpful.

0:38:38:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Sounds good. Thank you. For the feedback.

0:38:42:

Chair Forssell: Commissioner Johnston has been waiting patiently. Go ahead.

0:38:45:

Commissioner Johnston: Thank you. So, I -- just to kind of build on the discussion that we were just having with Vice Chair Segal, I mean, I appreciate that it -- We've gotten a good start. But it sounds to me like we've still got a long way to go between now and May. We've got 210 people who've pinned on the map. Just listening to the numbers we've talked about before, we've got some 26,000 households in Palo Alto. So, we have kind of less than 1 percent at this point who've expressed an interest. And, to me, as we've discussed in the past, it's really critical that we get broad community support for this project. Just along that line, I mean, the meeting in -- on February 24th -- Did I understand we have 75 people who are already signed up for that?

0:39:49:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor AND Amanda de Jesus: [nod]

0:39:49:

Commissioner Johnston: That's good. That's great.

0:39:51:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Yes. Um hum.

0:39:51:

Commissioner Johnston: How are we inviting people to that? How are we building that group?

0:40:00:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: That's a great question. So, a lot of different opportunities there. We have a website calendar. People can do a [search](#) on "fiber" and that automatically pops up as an opportunity.

Is this using a Google search (Google "site:cityofpaloalto.org fiber") or the City website's built-in search facility? Is there a difference? Note that information that's not on the City's website wouldn't be found.

We have our social media calendars, that are also -- it shows up as a its own distinct event, through Facebook, through NextDoor. NextDoor is its own unique opportunity, of course. That's a very targeted group of households in Palo Alto only. And so, we've sent information -- through all our channels, but that's just one example. We also have a business newsletter, and that reaches our business community. And so, we have shared information through that opportunity. We've also advertised that opportunity at specific event[s] and opportunities through our Utilities bill inserts.

There are two inserts so far:

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/Departments/Utilities/Customer-Service/Utilities-Bill-Pay/Bill-Inserts>

December 2021: the link says, "Connecting the Community Through Local Broadband."

https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/utilities/bill-inserts/paloaltofiber_utility-bill-insert-nocropmarks_final.pdf

The link doesn't say "fiber," but the insert itself does.

January 2022: the link says, "Fiber to the Home Survey."

https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/utilities/bill-inserts/paloaltofiber_utility-bill-insert_jan22_web-final.pdf

It says Magellan will send you an email later this month.

As well as through the online portal when you go in to pay your bill. And also, direct emails to Utility customers. So those are just a few different ways, in terms of actual print flyers. We're printing them to be provided to all of our City facilities. Obviously, the pandemic has limited people walking in. But recently, coming up this next week, our libraries are going to back to their normal open dates. So, that'll be additional traffic to, obviously, a different set of our community.

On 02-17-22, I asked three different librarians at Mitchell Park about the flyers, and they hadn't heard of them. In fact, they hadn't heard anything about the whole FTTP project. One librarian had no trouble finding the Utilities bill Inserts page

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/Departments/Utilities/Customer-Service/Utilities-Bill-Pay/Bill-Inserts>

so I could show her what the inserts look like.

0:41:31:

Commissioner Johnston: And have we been able to get anybody to, say, write an article for the Weekly, or paloaltoonline[.com] to talk about the project, or talk about the workshop?

Both are great ideas. The Weekly has a calendar for noticing events, which readers might not notice unless they're looking for events. It also provides an opportunity to write op-eds, which are more conspicuous to readers.

0:41:41:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Not about the workshop yet.

Google "site:paloaltoonline.com fiber <past-month>" 6 hits

1) 02-18-22: "Power restored to more than 4,500 customers impacted by outage" -- a snarky comment from "Online Name" -- "Can balloons disable the \$23,000,000 fiber-to-the-home system?"

<https://www.paloaltoonline.com/square/2022/02/18/power-restored-to-more-than-4500-customers-impacted-by-outage>

2) Essentially the same as 1)

<https://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2022/02/18/more-than-4500-customers-lose-power-in-palo-alto>

3) 1-28-22: "Where do your recyclables go? Palo Alto struggles to track their destination as material heads abroad" -- The company OGO Fibers deals with trash.

<https://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2022/01/28/where-do-your-recyclables-go-palo-alto-struggles-to-track-their-destination-as-material-heads-abroad>

4) 02-11-22: A CityView calendar item about the 02-08-22 UAC meeting, and a correction about when it was previously reported to be.

https://www.paloaltoonline.com/morguepdf/2022/2022_02_11.paw.section1.pdf

5) 02-04-22: A CityView calendar item about the 02-02-22 UAC meeting, plus the "OGO Fibers" item (item 3), plus something about a fabric and fiber artist.

https://www.paloaltoonline.com/morguepdf/2022/2022_02_04.paw.section1.pdf

6) 01-21-22: " Billionaire donor for new city gym revealed — and his money comes with strings attached" -- another snarky comment from "Online Name" about spending \$23,000,000 on fiber.

<https://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/2022/01/21/billionaire-donor-for-new-city-gym-revealed--and-his-money-comes-with-strings-attached>

In other words, there's nothing in the Weekly in the past month that would let the casual reader know there even is a FTTP project -- except for the "Online Name" cheap shots.

But definitely an opportunity.

0:41:45:

Commissioner Johnston: I mean, I -- As always, you're going to start with a community of people who are particularly interested in this. The early adopters. And, again, that's fine. That's good. But ultimately, if the project's going to be successful, we have to get a lot broader support in the community than just the people who are already interested. So, to me, the critical thing here is, we've got to demonstrate to people how Palo Alto having its own fiber system will change their lives. Why having Palo Alto have this system, as opposed to relying on AT&T and Verizon, Comcast, whatever. Why it makes a difference that we run our own system.

If Palo Alto owns the FTTP network, then it can be run in the interest of residents and business, rather than to maximize profits, whether it's run by staff or subcontracted.

And, secondly, they're going to have to know what it's going to cost them, not only in terms of the initial outlay -- as taxpayers --

Previous citywide municipal FTTP proposals in Palo Alto have said the goal is for the network to pay for itself, just like our other utilities. So "taxpayers" wouldn't have to pay anything. In the 2004 proposal, the City was going to back bonds by the revenues of the electric utility, in case the fiber utility was having trouble paying for itself. That would have affected electric ratepayers (not taxpayers). Ultimately, Council chose not to take that path.

but also, what it's going to cost them to be subscribers. And I just -- And maybe I haven't been looking in the right places, but I haven't seen kind of answers to those questions yet, that would -- that make an impact on me, as a fairly non-technical person. In other words, not an early adopter in this area. Just a member of the community, who -- sounds like a good idea to have a fiber network, but I don't really know what advantage I'm going to get from it. So, I would encourage you to a) broaden, as much as you can, the community that will participate in the -- in the meeting in February, but also realize how much we have to do between now and May, if that's going to be the go/no-go.

0:43:42:

One last question, which is, is there something that we can do to help the February 24th session be successful?

0:43:53:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Yes. Thank you for that question. [laughs] We would love to be able to send the event flyer to everyone, and see if the commissioners have time to send that on to your own networks. That in itself is -- You are ambassadors of this project, by default, because you're commission members. And I know you're all excited about this, in different ways, about the project. So, that would be one way. We're also interested in hosting smaller focus group opportunities. And so, as a commissioner, if you have interest in hosting a focus group, we would love to do that, as part of the next phase of engagement before the May timeframe. Those are just a couple of ideas. But definitely, there are a lot of ways that we could use your help. So, yeah.

0:44:48:

Commissioner Johnston: And I assume many of us may choose to participate on February 24th,

In my message to UAC of 01-30-22 (point 6) (see pages 5-6 here)

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/agendas-minutes/utilities-advisory-commission/archived-agenda-and-minutes/agendas-and-minutes-2022/02-02-2022/public-letters-to-uac.pdf>

I suggested that the 02-24-22 meeting be a special meeting of the UAC. I wish this possibility had been discussed on 02-08-22. I think staff could still choose to do so. The meeting would have to be noticed in the usual place. There would have to be an agenda. There would have to be minutes. Ideally, the meeting would be videotaped. It would require that a quorum (4) of commissioners attend. Would a quorum of commissioners be willing to attend? If the meeting is NOT a UAC meeting, then the Brown Act might limit the number of commissioners who are allowed to attend to less than a quorum.

<https://www.bbklaw.com/bbk/media/library/pdf/major-provisions-and-requirements-of-the-brown-act.pdf>

but what -- kind of what's the format going to be? Is it mainly presentations by Magellan? Or --

0:45:03:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Yes. So, we were hoping to have a presentation by staff and Magellan, talking about the project. Giving

some, you know, detailed information about the project, answering some of those frequently asked questions, but leaving time for community questions -- and an ans- -- question-and-answer session, as the bulk of the opportunity. 'Cause that really is the opportunity to engage, ask questions, gain input. And all of that then will be shared with the Council, and with the UAC as well.

Will it be shared with the public, as required by the Brown Act?

If you're not able to join us on **.

0:45:39:

Commissioner Johnston: OK. Thank you.

0:45:39:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Thank you.

0:45:40:

[pause -- mute problem?]

0:45:45:

Chair Forssell: ... Commissioner Johnston. Commissioner Metz. Go ahead, Commissioner Metz.

0:45:57:

Commissioner Metz: OK. Thank you. I didn't see my Zoom hand. Yes. Well, first of all, thank you very much, Amanda and Meghan, for your presentations. It sounds like the outbound marketing is, you know, well underway. And, you know, sounds like it's moving forward pretty well. You mentioned that there will be inbound marketing research, starting in March. And also requesting an hour **. But my thought would be that the most important things -- there probably are others -- to address in their research are the key market risks associated with the project, namely, you know, what is the take rate, what is the pricing that people will pay, and what specific features are they expecting in the service? So, I guess I have two questions. Which are: are those things included in the market research? Because I think those are, at a minimum, essential. And then, what have you learned so far, from the questions and feedback that you've gotten from people, that would, you know, illuminate those questions?

0:47:08:

[pause]

0:47:13:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Dean, I could probably answer a few of those, but also wondering, do you -- would you want to take this first? Or do you want me to --

0:47:22:

Director Batchelor: No, I can go kind of first. So, Commissioner Metz, I think that -- You know, one of the things that we'll be talking about with the joint meeting is the take rates. We've kind of talked a little bit about the take rates now. I believe it's right around -- from what Magellan was talking about before -- was around 74[00] -- 7500 customers. Would be needed.

Probably Commissioner Metz was asking about how many premises would actually sign up.

But, again, that might have changed. And so, there will be some updates on that. We also haven't really talked about the business plan. One of the other items that would be discussed in that would be the whole business plan, which will be part of this take rate, as well as looking at -- we'll have a better idea around the cost. Knowing that we'll have a full-blown design.

Will the "full-blown design" nail down details such as how many hubs there are, where the hubs are, and whether the architecture is AE or PON?

And what that cost -- knowing that Magellan has a good track record of working with contractors. Contractors, in the past, have given us some cost breakdowns. There was three or four of them that gave us breakdowns of that. So, I think, as we get closer to the joint meeting, we'll be able to answer some of these questions that you have. In that presentation. Because I think the thing is is that I think those are some of the biggest questions that we're hearing from the public right now is is that, you know, what IS the monthly cost going to be? Is it going to be at or less than our competitors, that we have today? We have two of them in the market. So, how are we going to price ourselves, compared to AT&T and Comcast?

Note that the incumbents often have discounted introductory prices, but what really counts are the prices after that.

0:49:03:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: I also wanted to mentioned -- specific to the question around the survey. We are asking several market

questions. I did want to ask that Amanda to specifically address your question about pricing and costs.

0:49:17:

Amanda de Jesus: Yeah. So, the market research survey really will help inform the City and Magellan as to where community members are at, as far as how much they're willing to pay, whether they would choose Palo Alto Fiber over any of our -- any of the competitors. So, all -- Those questions actually will be helped answered through the market research survey. So, yes, those -- It's not specific asked. It's designed in a way to really get at the heart of the matter for this research survey -- which is, what should the monthly costs be, and what's the potential take rate?

0:49:57:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: And the current features that they have with their current -- yeah -- service. I think that answers your question, Commissioner.

0:50:06:

Commissioner Metz: I'm not sure. I didn't even really understand what you said. You said we're not directly asking what price people would pay, but -- Could you just clarify what information we WILL receive, and -- in terms of, you know, pricing?

0:50:23:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Amanda, correct me if I'm wrong, but it does ask specifically what their current service is, what their features are, what they're paying, and those overall market questions. Is what I understand, but just want to reconfirm.

0:50:39:

Commissioner Metz: So, it's not asking people what they WOULD pay for a Palo Alto Fiber service.

0:50:47:

Amanda de Jesus: The market research survey kind of use -- it uses information that people provide about their current service, about their current costs, and about their general ideas of what they could and would pay for. So, it doesn't explicitly ask, "Would you pay \$50 a month for this service?" It asks about tendencies. And Magellan, I think, can provide an even better answer to your question. And so, we can get back to you on that. But, it -- really, it's set up in a way that it'll help inform how much it would cost.

0:51:27:

Commissioner Metz: It would be good if you did that. Because, you know, I'd really like to understand, you know -- 'Cause eventually we're going to make a big bet. Right? On pricing. Prices that people will really pay, when they have to, you know, reach into their wallets. So, we need to be pretty comfortable, before we do a bond issue. Or before the UAC recommends to the City Council to go forward with this, that, you know, we have an idea what the revenue will be.

0:51:58:

Chair Forssell: Commissioner Bowie.

0:52:01:

Commissioner Bowie: Thank you for the presentations. And, again, I really enjoyed the dashboard piece -- the geographic dashboard.

A.k.a. the Get Involved map?

So, in addition to what Commissioner Metz was just mentioning about the cost comparisons in the market survey, one of the benefits, here, of local control is not just about deciding speeds and costs. It's also about how we -- or, the internet policy that we are then able to enact. And I'm just curious if that is being articulated? That there are those merits to sort of whether we are treating different types of traffic certain ways. There's the ability to, you know, to zero-rate certain projects. There's the ability to kind of treat things -- You know, we even have like a local net neutrality option here. Right? That there are things within local control. Are they being articulated? Or is it just sort of a service quality metric that people are being surveyed on?

0:53:07:

Amanda de Jesus: It does include questions about speeds. Dean, do you want to take the technical part of that? [laughs] It doesn't ask specific technical questions about the type of -- It's really trying to get a sense of the consumer market.

0:53:27:

[pause]

0:53:29:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Correct. It could be a secondary component of additional survey, that we do at a later point. Um.

0:53:43:

Director Batchelor: We could ...

0:53:43:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: And/or, we could -- There could be opportunity to add some additional technical questions as part of the survey. We haven't -- obviously -- launched that yet. So, there could be an opportunity to talk further with Magellan about the opportunities there.

0:54:00:

Commissioner Bowie: Thank you. I think that it might be a differentiator. Because while that is in the policy weeds of internet policy, you know, we have a sophisticated population, where that might be a differentiator. How data is being handled by an ISP.

0:54:15:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Gotcha. And I do know, obviously, security is a feature in that.

0:54:20:

Commissioner Bowie: Right.

0:54:20:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: I think it's likely to be part of a question. So, there may be opportunities to do more of a deep dive in those areas.

0:54:29:

Amanda de Jesus: Yeah. And there are FAQs on the website right now that talk about data caps and net neutrality. So, there is information out there. It's not going to necessarily be on the survey though.

0:54:43:

Dean Batchelor: And I think, from a technical standpoint, from the building of the network, you know, we're going to have capacities much greater than our competitors do. Since it is going to be 100 percent on a fiber portion of it. Now, AT&T has put more fiber in, too. But Comcast is still running coax over fiber.

Not exactly. It's fiber to nodes and then coax from nodes to premises.

So, I think the thing is is that when we talk to Magellan, you know, there was some flexibility -- is that we could go anywhere from 1 to 10 megs on -- speedwise.

He's probably trying to say that the electronics could support speeds up to either 1 Gbps (symmetric) or 10 Gbps (symmetric). I think Council should insist on the latter, because it will last longer.

And it has the capacity to move even further than that. So, I think that, the technical side of it -- there's definitely a plus for us.

0:55:36:

Chair Forssell: Vice Chair Segal. Go ahead.

0:55:39:

Vice Chair Segal: Real quickly, I just wanted to compliment. There's a lot of content on these different websites. But I would echo Commissioner Johnston's concern that maybe they're not -- that some information isn't focused on the right audience. So, for example, -- and I can do this offline, too --

Doing it at a UAC meeting lets Council and the public in on it.

but, for example, when I was first trying to find the fiber hub, I came across, before that, utility pole surveying website. And I just think that that priority is a little bit distorted -- that that may make sense to have it up there, I don't know. But it's -- I don't think it's what residents are first thinking about when they're trying to find information.

It's very difficult to construct a website so that a Google search will list the found items in what the webmaster thinks is priority order.

0:56:24:

And I found the fiber hub also not very private. I know that was a big selling point on the front end.

Yes, at UAC's 10-06-21 meeting, staffer Jay Sivarajah said that the big yellow dot would keep the pinner's address somewhat private. (See my transcript, page 20, at about 0:39:30.)

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/agendas-minutes/utilities-advisory-commission/archived-agenda-and-minutes/agendas-and-minutes-2021/11-03-2021-regular/november-03-2021-public-letters-to-uac.pdf>

But when I logged in, and I saw my area, and -- I mean, I just saw first name, and, based on whatever it is -- 200 meters or whatever -- I knew exactly who it was. So, I don't know -- You know, I don't know that I need to see the names of folks, honestly. But if privacy is part of what we're hoping for, I didn't find it to be that private.

Personally, I wish the map had given the pinner the opportunity to select, field by field, what information was public and what information private.

When I send emails to UAC and Council, I have the opportunity to provide my full name, where I live, etc., just in case the public wants to know who's advocating what I choose to advocate.

I'm kind of annoyed at paloaltoonline for giving people the opportunity to comment, specifying only a handle, not their real name. I think it invites impolite, rash, and misleading comments. In the past, there have been examples where a single person uses several handles, so he can fake back-and-forth conversations. I think paloaltoonline thinks that it can detect when that happens and remove the posts. But even so.

But -- And then some other things, which -- maybe just reach out to me offline. We can go through.

0:56:58:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Thank you for the feedback. Just specific on the search, was that just through Google? Or was that on the City's website?

Again, what's the difference?

0:57:06:

Vice Chair Segal: Um. So, I tried a few different ways. I got an email that I'd link. It was, like, Five Things You Can Do. And I was trying to find the hub through that. And I ended up on this utility pole. And so, it's -- And if you do a Google search, the first thing -- Well, the first thing that comes up is fiber ads from AT&T. And, you know, the -- below the ads. It doesn't get you there directly. And I just think we want to remove all the friction. I think there should be a page that explains to people what we're thinking about, what we hope to do, why they care, and, you know, why they should -- might want to get involved.

Well said.

The City could think about putting hashtag-like content on web pages that, if users knew about it, could make information easier to find. For example, if there were one web page about the FTTP project from which you could click to wherever else you wanted to go to find out about the project, you could put "FiberHome" on that page. You could also put "NOTHome" on any page that was not a home page but that wanted to talk about a home page. (So Google "FiberHome -NOTHome" wouldn't find those pages.)

In 2009, a Website Advisory Committee was appointed by staff, mainly to advise on how to make the City's website more beautiful, after an outraged public complained about how ugly a new incarnation had become.

https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/files/assets/public/agendas-minutes-reports/reports/city-manager-reports-cmrs/year-archive/2009/cm-246_09.pdf

But one of the long-term goals was to talk about adding metadata to make it easier to find things. Somehow the Committee didn't get around to that before it was disbanded in 2012.

0:57:44:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Thank you. That was really helpful.

0:57:46:

[pause]

0:57:51:

Chair Forssell: All right. I'm looking for any additional commissioner hands up. Um. Just a couple of small things from my end. I appreciate the presentation, the questions, and conversation. Obviously, we all wish we had a crystal ball, and could predict like, if we build this, who will [laughs] -- who will adopt it. And just in thinking about -- I mean, obv- -- it looks like everybody is doing their best, to sort of come at this question from lots of different angles, and try to find out -- And as far as the survey goes, I'm really glad -- I was going to -- before you mentioned, in response to a different question, that you were going to gather the information on what service people have, and what they're paying for it. 'Cause I think, for me, a huge part of it is just understanding what's out there.

And what people are doing now. And whether they're happy with it. And then, you know, if we find that most residents are -- you know, have something that's like similar download speeds, and probably fiber would get them better upload speeds, and they're paying about the same, you know, that's a very different story than if we find large neighborhoods that are just getting horrible speeds in both directions at a very expensive price point, which we anecdotal evidence of, but I've never been able to understand -- like, AT&T, I'm sure, will not give us a map. Of, like, neighborhoods. Service levels.

This AT&T web page

<https://www.att.com/availability/>

purports to tell you what you can get if you type in an address. It used to tell me that I could get internet with downloads up to 768 kbps. When I tried it today, it just said, "Looks like high-speed internet isn't available at your address." I don't know how accurate the data is.

I feel like such an opportunity to create such a map, a little bit, ourselves. So, I guess I was going to say, will the survey have neighborhood or address information such that we could try to get some sense of whether there's, you know, geographic cohesion to different service levels, with different -- the incumbent providers.

0:59:58:

And my other question is, with the pins, could we prompt people -- Right now, the question is, like, what would you use this for? And some people are, like, Zoom. And some people are, you know, I would watch Netflix. Could we prompt them to say, "Who is your provider?" And what is your service level? And what do you pay? Since that's already organized by geography. I think that would be very helpful information.

1:00:24:

Amanda de Jesus: That is, actually, one of the fields in -- when a person goes onto the hub to pin their support, or type in their -- one of the fields is, "Which internet service provider do you currently have?" So that is captured there.

At the community map page,

<https://fiber-palo-alto.hub.arcgis.com/pages/get-involved>

if you click on "+Submit a Report," the page gives the user the opportunity to fill in 1) First Name, 2) Are you a ... (select resident or business), 3) Current Internet Provider (select Comcast, MegaPath, EarthLink, AT&T, Sonic, or Other), 4) Tell us your thoughts on Palo Alto providing fiber to your home, 5) How would you use Fiber, 6) Email (required), 7) Last Name, and 8) Enter an address to search (and put a pin on the map at that address). Of these, the public can find out how others have filled out fields 1 and 4, and can see a dot on the map at the specified address (field 7). Note that field 3 does NOT let the user specify service level or what the user is paying.

1:00:37:

Chair Forsell: OK. But do we find out, like, what speeds they have and what they pay? Like, what package they're on?

1:00:47:

Amanda de Jesus: No. That ...

1:00:48:

Chair Forsell: Because otherwise we just know whether they have AT&T or Comcast. Which is not that deep. You know. Which is not helpful to figuring out whether potential Palo Alto Fiber would be a superior provider.

1:01:05:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Yeah. That will be a part of the market survey though. So, part of that survey will ...

1:01:10:

Chair Forsell: Right. So, I guess, can the market survey get their addresses? Can the thing that gets the ** -- sorry, get their neighborhoods? Can the neighborhood thing the other pieces of the information. So, we've got sort of two datastreams, to try to create this map.

1:01:24:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Yes.

Chair Forsell: And get a sense of whether the potential offering, you know, is just a little bit better, way better, -- You know, better along the axis of price? Along the axis of speed? Whether that's download or upload? And I just want to echo Commissioner Bowie's insight, that there are other sort of properties of municipal fiber that are potentially really interesting. And I hadn't really thought about, you know, privacy or net neutrality. But if there -- Yeah. I don't know. I'm not quite sure how to pull on that thread. If it's, like, asked in the survey, whether people even think about that. Or in the outbound efforts to educate the public about these things. But -- just -- I think that's an interesting point.

1:02:22:

And you mentioned, in response to Commissioner Johnston, UAC commissioners could host a focus group, I'm happy to. [laughs]
We can follow up offline.

1:02:34:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Thank you.

1:02:35:

Chair Forssell: And then, my final question is just -- Commissioner Smith was referring to the \$2.5 million that we spent on Magellan. That's also for the whole AMI -- Like, building out fiber, both just to maintain our existing fiber ring, and to have it support AMI. Right? So, it's not \$2.5 million just spent on pursuing fiber to the premises. Am I correct?

1:03:00:

Dave Yuan: That is -- Yes. This is Dave Yuan. Yes. I think about \$700,000 is for the backbone. Another -- Or maybe it's \$500,000 for the backbone. And another \$2 million -- up to -- for fiber to the home. Is the split.

1:03:14:

Chair Forssell: OK.

1:03:14:

Dave Yuan: Hopefully.

1:03:15:

Chair Forssell: OK. So, it is a big chunk of that that has been on all this design, and other things around fiber to the premises. Not just ...

1:03:28:

Dave Yuan: That's correct.

1:03:29:

Chair Forssell: And that is for -- includes AMI, or does not include for AMI?

1:03:34:

Dave Yuan: The network will be supporting AMI as well. But the backbone is just to support the City facilities mainly. Just a footprint for fiber to the home ** ...

1:03:43:

Chair Forssell: Let -- Let -- Yeah. Let -- I mean, let me ask the question I'm really thinking instead of trying to come at it in a cagey way. If we DON'T proceed with fiber to the premises, but we DO, you know, upgrade the backbone and deploy AMI, how much of the \$2.5 million was -- was -- went toward something that got built, versus something that did not get built?

1:04:09:

Dave Yuan: Probably the half million. The same half million.

1:04:12:

Chair Forssell: OK. All right. So, we're \$2 million in, on something that we may not do.

1:04:18:

Dave Yuan: Correct.

Here's my opinion:

* Palo Alto's AMI was designed to work even if neither FTTP nor the enhanced "backbone" were built. It required 7 or fewer wireless aggregation nodes, backhauled by dark fiber. The existing dark fiber network could have provided that backhaul.

* I think that citywide FTTP could have been deployed without building the enhanced "backbone." The FTTP design in progress discussed on 10-06-21 would require only 2 or 3 huts. And the existing dark fiber network could have provided backhaul for them.

* All, or nearly all, of the functions staff says enhanced "backbone" is for could have been provided by FTTP at lower cost.

So, we're \$500,000 (or \$700,000) into building an enhanced "backbone" that we don't really need, plus \$2 million into building a FTTP network that we very much need.

1:04:18:

Chair Forssell: And that decision is coming up in May. May/June time frame. For Council.

1:04:24:

Dave Yuan: Yes. We should have a better estimate by then of the construction costs. And they should have the network design. Hopefully, by then, 90 percent done by then. There are some delays right now with the pole surveys that you guys mentioned. It is hard for the surveyors to access a lot of the backyard poles. So, we're trying to come out with a better way of getting that data. And that will determine whether poles will be replaced for the project.

1:04:49:

Chair Forssell: Got it. All right. That's it for me. Council Member Cormack.

1:04:57:

Council Member Cormack: Thank you, Chair Forssell. And let me just test my understanding. What I recall from when Council did this is, what we're really looking for is for a business case to come back. Is that --

1:05:07:

Director Batchelor: [nods]

A verbal confirmation would have been better.

1:05:08:

Council Member Cormack: OK. Great. So, that's what I'm expecting to see, when it comes. All right. And all of this is in service of that. Great. Appreciate all the detail on **. That's wonderful. I have one overarching question. As one of the other non-engineers on the call. You know, all of us who took Marketing 101, or worked in Sales, were taught that you never describe the features. You describe the benefits. So, I still feel like when we talk about fiber, some people really understand what we're talking about, and other people don't. And I worry that they're more in the latter group. So, even the whole thing, calling this a fiber hub. And that lovely icon, which looks fantastic, is about, you know, -- the -- you know, the mechanism, as opposed to the benefits. So, you know, Meghan, are you the right person to talk about this a little bit? I just -- We're spending so much time on something. And I have to be honest. When I see it come through, I happen to know what it is. But otherwise, I would just archive it. In the same way I try to encourage the S/CAP people not to call it electrification but to call it getting gas out. So, thoughts on just the overall title.

One of the advantages of mentioning "fiber" up-front is that we can benefit from all the advertising that Google Fiber did. I assume their marketers chose to mention "fiber" up-front to make it hard for the incumbents to say their alternative technologies were just as good.

Another advantage is reminding staff, UAC, Council, and the public that other technologies are not as good. Over the years, we've wasted a lot of time wondering about wireless. Let's not waste any more.

Of course, we should mention the many benefits of fiber, including:

- * It's faster for downloads, and way faster for uploads. It has the potential to remain faster for generations.
 - It won't drop your Zoom calls.
 - You can access BIG files, which your work might require.
 - You get good performance even during times when lots of people are accessing the network at the same time.
- * It's more reliable. So maintenance costs are lower, and outages are fewer.
 - You don't have to worry about interference.

Of course, we should also mention the benefits of municipal, including:

- * The City won't spy on you or sell your use data.
- * The City will price services according to what they cost, rather than what the market will bear (as we do with our other utilities).
- * The City has a great track record for good customer service.

1:06:23:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: We debated -- what to call it. [laughs] But we do have a benefit sheet that we lead with. A lot of FAQs are also tied to the overall benefits. So, the -- While the -- One reason why we have the hub -- It really is a way to connect people around this project. And share information. At a very high level. But then, if they really want the detail, we have the project page, which gives them timeline, technical information, you know, staff reports. Really detailed, meaty info.

1:07:08:

[small child noises in the background]

1:07:08:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: The hub is really an opportunity to educate members of the public that really have no concept about what the project is.

1:09:17:

Council Member Cormack: Including some of the younger members of our community.

1:07:22:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Like this one. [gestures to small child off-screen] [laughs]

1:07:24:

Council Member Cormack: That's fine. We've already seen my dog on this one. Listen, this is what happens when we work at home. OK. So, I'd just encourage us to maybe have a tag line. Like, "Bringing you higher speed internet." Or whatever it is. So people who, you know, are just busy during their day, and not following the ins and outs of our work. OK.

1:07:46:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: I should mention, also, we have infographics. So, a lot of the marketing materials -- like, in the utility insert, and things like that -- are visually showing what fiber is. It's about logging into your computer, streaming, doing yoga from your computer. Because we're all, you know, still stuck at home doing those things. So, there is an aspect of that that we try to tie visually to explain it. But we -- I definitely hear you. And we can take a look at additional opportunities there.

1:08:20:

Council Member Cormack: I was struck by the conversations that you're encouraging the community to have. I feel like this is a version of what we did with the race conversations that the HRC did. And I'm thinking a lot about the S/CAP, as I watch the really frankly amazing thing about the time you're spending on something. Which is important and yet not even one of our, you know, Council priorities for this year.

As I understand it, there is general agreement that staff will spend time on things that are not one of Council's official priorities.

At Council's 2000 retreat, City Manager Benest introduced the idea of Council's picking priorities. He called it a parlor game. "Humor me," he said.

Can I think of some of the work you're doing here as a dress rehearsal for what we might do with climate action?

1:08:54:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: [nods]

A verbal confirmation would have been better.

1:08:54:

Council Member Cormack: OK. Goody.

1:08:56:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Yes.

1:08:56:

Council Member Cormack: I'm going to go ahead and send this presentation off to the S/CAP. Because I think it's this level of deep engagement across everything, and having, you know, the experts -- people like you -- in the City, who understand our channels, and understand our objectives, and know how to communicate. That would be helpful.

1:09:14:

And then, just two small things on the program. I'm glad you mentioned libraries. Are the **libraries** hosting some of these workshops? Are you just displaying the flyer there?

When I checked, Mitchell Park wasn't displaying flyers. (See just before 0:41:31)

It seems like we should use our captive channel to educate people. [laughs]

1:09:29:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: That's a great opportunity. We haven't thought about hosting at the libraries. But we definitely could. And, potentially, a focus group or two could be at the different branches. So, great idea. Thank you.

1:09:42:

Council Member Cormack: Always thinking about libraries. And then -- this one's not going to be a surprise to Dean either -- What about the ESVs? What about the Emergency Service Volunteers? Have you reached out to them to communicate this?

1:09:57:

Director Batchelor: Not yet.

1:09:58:

Council Member Cormack: OK.

1:09:59:

Director Batchelor: We have not ...

1:09:59:

Council Member Cormack: I didn't think so, 'cause I AM an ESV, and I DO scan those emails. But I think that -- those would be other groups who would be naturally interested in anything that makes our City more resilient. So, I would just add those two potential channels to the list.

If ESVs were willing to spread the word about FTTP, fine. But now is not the time to ask, "What about wireless?"

Great. Well, thanks so much for the update. And I really appreciate the attention that's being paid to it.

1:10:24:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Thank you.

1:10:28:

Chair Forssell: All right. Um. Moving, on, we have an item [VIII.] for Commissioner Comments and Reports from Meetings and Events. It's only been less than a week. Very good. [IX] Future Topics for Upcoming Meetings. We also dealt with that last week. So, I think this -- Oh. Commissioner Smith.

1:11:00:

Commissioner Smith: Thank you, Chair. Does it make sense for us to -- First of all, I appreciate this special session. It allowed us to focus on something that a number of us are very passionate about, and we fought hard over the last year to 1) get everyone excited -- 1) -- passed our measure -- 2) -- get it to Council -- 3) -- and then, more importantly, get Magellan involved. Does it make sense for us to program regular updates? With Meghan and Amanda? Between now and May? Does that make sense? Because it's abundantly clear, as you highlighted in your questioning, it's abundantly clear that May's and important day. The meeting in May, that is.

Was Item IX is an action item? (The agenda doesn't say.) If so, a motion would be in order. Right?

1:11:51:

Chair Forssell: Commissioner Scharff. You're on mute. If you were addressing Commissioner Smith's question.

1:11:59:

Commissioner Scharff: No, I wasn't. I was all good.

1:12:01:

Chair Forssell: OK.

1:12:07:

Dave Yuan: This is Dave. I can maybe address Commissioner Smith's comment. Yeah, I think the plan is to bring back Magellan back in. In April. With a business plan update. But I think we're also going to invite the subcommittee UAC.

Does a FTTP subcommittee of the UAC exist at this point? If so, when was it appointed? And is there information about it on

the City's website?

Which I think Commissioner Smith is a part of. To kind of talk more about the business model. And then, maybe, at that time, we can give them an update of the communications plan as well. But if we want to present all of that to the full UAC, we're happy to do so. It might just -- won't have all the information vetted out by March, unfortunately.

1:12:40:

Chair Forssell: You know what. What I think would be -- You know, we're always trying to balance, like, not creating a bunch of work for staff. I'm searching through the presentation that was sent out. I would just love to know updates on the number of pins,

Could the Map page be enhanced to display the number of pins?

the number of views, the number of blogs, -- You know. Like, if that is something that's very easy to look up -- And it could as simple as an email, or a report at the end of the meeting. You know, like a half page at the end of the packet. Or something like that. Just to get -- Just to give us a sense. Of, like, you know, attendance at the workshop, --

1:13:19:

Dave Yuan: Yeah, I think we could ...

1:13:19:

Chair Forssell: Just like how some of the numbers are ending up.

1:13:23:

Meghan Horrigan-Taylor: Yeah, we could definitely do that. No problem.

1:13:27:

Chair Forssell: Thank you. Commissioner Metz.

1:13:30:

Commissioner Metz: Yeah. I would welcome updates before April. I think, you know, if we're going to get into anything deep, like the business model and stuff like that, you know, April is kind of a fait accompli. If we really want to, you know -- it's going to be difficult to make any changes or course corrections at that point. So, I really would love to see, you know, a month -- it doesn't have to be a whole meeting, but at least monthly updates, to -- for this program. I would say the S/CAP is kind of in the same category. A really big thing that is on our plate.

1:14:10:

Chair Forssell: So, you're asking to see --

1:14:13:

Commissioner Metz: I'm agreeing with the idea there. That updates sooner than April would be a good idea. Particularly things address -- you know, that could be, you know, really big impediments to the overall program. I think we need to be -- the big -- the major risks that this initiative faces -- I think, you know, we need to see as soon as possible.

1:14:40:

Director Batchelor: So, if I could, Chair Forssell ...

1:14:40:

Dave Yuan: **

1:14:42:

Director Batchelor: Go ahead, Dave ...

1:14:42:

Dave Yuan: Go ahead ...

1:14:44:

Dave Yuan: As I say, we'll check in with Magellan, to see what's available by the March meeting. And then we'll present whatever we -- what's available.

1:14:52:

Director Batchelor: Yeah. I was going to say, we could probably do an info item in the March -- If there's some significant changes. And we can -- I was going to say, we'll also talk to Magellan at the same time.

1:14:54:

Chair Forssell: Thank you. All right. Well, I think that brings -- Oh. Commissioner Smith.

1:15:15:

Commissioner Smith: So, Commissioner Metz's comments just made me think of one other thing. Out of our meeting last week, I must -- Perhaps I just didn't ask this question, but I was a little shell-shocked by what was delivered by Assistant -- Deputy Director of Utilities. That our infrastructure may not be appropriate to support our S/CAP goals. That left my head spinning. I'll be frank. And, are we ...

1:15:50:

Commissioner Scharff: You know, I think we're violating the Brown Act, frankly. I think we're now having discussions about what our LAST meeting was.

1:15:56:

Commissioner Smith: No, I -- I would agree, Greg. Sorry, Commissioner Scharff. But there was a comment about what should we be discussing in the future. And that's what I'm trying to address. And I think that's something that we need to address. So I'll leave it there. I think that's something that we need to address.

1:16:13:

Chair Forssell: And continue the conversation about ...

1:16:17:

Commissioner Smith: Correct.

1:16:19:

Chair Forssell: Yup. I would agree. I think there's plenty left to talk about there, ...

1:16:28:

Director Batchelor: I totally agree. Yes.

1:16:32:

Chair Forssell: Excellent. Thank you for that. All right. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

1:16:40:

Director Batchelor: Could I interrupt for just one second, Chair?

1:16:42:

Chair Forssell: Yeah, of course.

1:16:43:

Director Batchelor: I should have asked -- I should have given this quick update real quick. If you remember, in the last meeting, I mentioned that there was going to be some large outages that were going to take place over this last Saturday. So, there was 700 customers that were affected. And we had a 4-hour window, from 8:00 until 12:00 noon. We were able to fix a piece of cable, put it back into service. We got some customers back up -- back in service within about an hour and 15 minutes. It was a pretty easy fix after the crew got out there. And was able to get the customers -- And there was also as secondary. About 22-24 customers on Walnut Street. The plan was to work on this large outage first, and then do the work that needed to be done in the back yards on Walnut Street. We had estimated customers to be out of service until 5:00. We were able to get service back up to about 3:10. All the customers on that day. So, very productive day. Things went really well for us. And we were able to get customers back up and in service much quicker than what we estimated. Thank you.

1:17:53:

Chair Forssell: Thanks for letting us know. We'll consider that an extension of the Director's Report. [laughs]

1:17:59:

Director Batchelor: No, exactly. I apologize. Just throwing that in there.

1:18:03:

Chair Forssell: No. Thanks. I WAS curious, so it was good to know. All right. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

1:18:15:

Commissioner Metz: Move to adjourn.

1:18:17:

Commissioner Johnston: I'll second.

1:18:18:

Chair Forssell: All right. Thank you. Wave you agree. Thanks for everybody. I appreciate you making time for this special meeting. Thank you, staff. Thank you, commissioners. Thank you to Council Member Cormack. Thank you, members of the public who have been listening. And we will see you for our regular meeting in March. Take care.

1:18:39:

Director Batchelor: Thank you.

From: [E Nigenda](#)
To: [UAC](#)
Cc: [Dailey, Karla](#); [Batchelor, Dean](#); [Keith Bennett](#)
Subject: LA Times: As drought lingers, larger and more destructive wildfires pose new threats to water supply
Date: Wednesday, February 23, 2022 7:17:36 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Be cautious of opening attachments and clicking on links.

Dear Commissioners,

ICYMI, from the LA Times: [As drought lingers, larger and more destructive wildfires pose new threats to water supply](#).

I found the following statements particularly interesting (emphasis is mine):

- Now, as the state moves into a new era of heat, flames and dryness driven by climate change, **the conversation around water in the West must increasingly account for fire.**
- Much of the state’s infrastructure and water management system were designed around the climate and forests of the previous century, and are less suited to the realities of the current era.
- . . . forest fires are now becoming large enough that “we think it should actually be making a difference in the water budget of entire regions.”
- **“Water managers, water supply distributors should be evaluating their own treatment systems and assessing whether they can effectively treat water that has been impacted through these fires** — whether it be sediment or the byproducts of ash or burned houses.”

Drought, fires, storms, sea level rise, malicious attacks, etc. can impact our electric grid, water, wastewater and gas infrastructure. Although you are not explicitly covering emergency preparedness this year, I hope you will keep these in mind as you discuss the resiliency of our utilities.

Thank you for your service to our community,
Esther Nigenda, Ph.D.