ATTACHMENT A

Summary of High-Speed Fiber Funding Options

The fiber planning team, working with Finance Division staff, have identified five categories of potential funding sources: City of Eugene, Urban Renewal Agency, State of Oregon, federal agencies, and private contributions. It is possible to use a mix of the sources, described in the table below. The table shows our preliminary assessment of each funding source's advantages and disadvantages. The information will change as we refine the funding plan.

Funding Type	Description	Summary of Advantages/Disadvantages
City of Eugene		
General Fund	The General Fund is the largest fund used to account for discretionary expenditures and revenues. Public safety represents 55% of total General Fund spending, followed by culture and leisure, central business functions, and infrastructure and planning.	Fund is flexible and relies upon stable revenue sources, primarily property taxes. Use of General Funds is at the discretion of City Council. While the fund has stabilized post-recession, there are still insufficient resources to sustainably fund existing services.
Telecom Registration/Licensing Fund	The Telecom Fund accounts for revenues and expenditures associated with the City's 2% registration fee/business privilege tax imposed on providers of telecommunications services in Eugene.	Allowable under the legal limitations set forth in the 1997 Ordinance 20083. The Telecom Fund has sources of ongoing revenue and beginning working capital. Use of Telecom Fund resources would require Executive approval.
General Obligation Bond	A debt instrument that allows the City to raise additional revenues for specific purposes by getting voter approval to raise property taxes to repay debt.	This would require voter approval of a new tax levy. There are significant federal and state law restrictions on using bond funds for a public-private partnership.
Local Option Property Tax Levy	Time-limited new revenue source. Can be used for capital projects with a maximum levy life of 10 years.	This is another familiar funding mechanism. Requires voter approval. Falls under the Measure 5 tax rate cap.
Full Faith & Credit (FF&C) Bonds	FF&C bonds are not a way to pay for a project; rather, they are one of several ways that can be employed to ensure that funds to be used to pay for a project are available when needed to pay for project expenses. FF&C are bonds that are backed by the City's promise to repay the debt from any available sources. Typically, this is done for revenue streams that do not have a strong history or that have a high level of uncertainty around the ability to repay the debt over time. In order for the lender to feel comfortable with the likelihood of getting repaid, the City's General Fund has to provide backing for the bonds.	By themselves, FF&C bonds are not a way to pay for a project. They are a way to take a dedicated stream of dollars and turn that stream into an upfront payment for a larger project. The key to a successful FF&C bond is to identify a reliable payment stream. FF&C bonds do not require a public vote.

Funding Type	Description	Summary of Advantages/Disadvantages
Urban Renewal Agency		
Extend Existing Downtown Urban Renewal Plan and District	The Downtown Urban Renewal District currently receives a portion of property taxes collected by various taxing jurisdictions. The only remaining capital project currently authorized in the Plan is for improvements to the Park Blocks for the Farmers' Market. Existing tax increment funding is expected to end in winter of 2016.	An urban renewal project must be located in the boundary of the district and be included as a project in the plan. The Downtown Urban Renewal District covers a portion of the planned service area. The current Downtown Urban Renewal plan would need to be amended by council to extend this funding source. A plan amendment requires significant public process and a lengthy timeline. There is risk that the plan amendment ordinance would not be supported by overlapping taxing districts or would be referred by voters. For larger funding efforts, this could provide significant funding without raising taxes.
Terminate Existing Urban Renewal Plan and District	Termination of the Downtown District would result in tax increment dollars being returned to overlapping taxing districts, including the City's General Fund. There could be both a one-time deposit of existing funds remaining in the Downtown District accounts, as well as ongoing tax revenues at termination.	Current estimates of the amount to be returned to the City of Eugene annually would be approximately $1 million. This would be consistent with the council's intent in 2010 to terminate the district at the end of the projects identified at that time. This would reduce the funds available to the City for downtown projects by approximately $1 million per year (half).
Riverfront Urban Renewal Capital Fund	The Riverfront Urban Renewal District currently receives a portion of property taxes collected by various taxing jurisdictions. The Riverfront Urban Renewal Capital Fund accounts for capital revenues and expenditures in the District.	An urban renewal project must be located in the boundary of the district and be included as a project in the plan. The Riverfront Urban Renewal District covers a portion of the planned service area.
State of Oregon		
Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA) Loan	IFA offers low-interest loans for purposes that meet qualifying criteria. Telecommunications facilities are eligible to receive a loan through IFA's Special Public Works Fund.	This is not a way to pay for the project. It is a way to change the timing of when funds are available. City would need to identify resources to repay the loan.
IFA Grant	Grants are available through the Special Public Works Fund for construction projects that create or retain traded-sector jobs. The grants are limited to $500,000 or 85% of the project cost, whichever is less, and are based on up to $5,000 per eligible job created or retained.	Must collect letters from employers stating expected job growth and document 100 new jobs within 5 years of receiving grant, based on a $500,000 assumed grant. City must repay any grant funds that are not offset by job creation and retention.
Federal Agencies		
U.S. Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration (EDA)	Federal grants provided through EDA generally fund up to 50% of project costs. The grantee must provide the matching funds and meet economic distress criteria including unemployment rates above the national average and have a demonstrated special need for the grant.	This represents an opportunity to leverage federal grant dollars for the Fiber Project. The City would still need to commit the 50% matching funds for the project. The City currently does not meet the eligibility criteria for economic distress, but we may be able to show we have special needs that make the City eligible.
Private Funds		
Internal building infrastructure	Require building owners to fund connections inside building.	The internal wiring could be owned by the building owner or by the public network, and the ownership will determine funding source. Staff have not yet fully assessed advantages and disadvantages of different ownership models.

Funding Type	Description	Summary of Advantages/Disadvantages
Required payment to connect to network	Require building owners contribute funds to connect to the network.	This will reduce the overall cost to the City, but it may limit participation in the network, so the network will not be ubiquitous in the service area. The limited coverage would reduce the overall success of project.
Optional payment to move to the front of the line	Create an option where a property owner can be connected to the network earlier if the property owner pays for the connection.	This will create an incentive for building owners to contribute funds to the construction project, but not require a financial contribution. The network will eventually achieve full coverage.
Voluntary contributions	Ask building owners to contribute to project as they wish.	It is unlikely that property owners would voluntarily contribute funds to a public infrastructure project if there is no clear incentive for them to do so.

ATTACHMENT B

Summary of Park Blocks Improvements Funding Options

Funding Type	Description	Summary of Advantages/Disadvantages
City of Eugene		
General Obligation Bond	A debt instrument that allows the City to raise additional revenues for specific purposes by getting voter approval to raise property taxes to repay debt.	This is a familiar funding mechanism that could be coupled with other park projects. Would require voter approval of new taxes; requires significant lead time. Could be incorporated into a larger GO Bond proposal for parks and recreation facilities across the City.
Local Option Property Tax Levy	Time-limited new revenue source.	This is another familiar funding mechanism that could be coupled with other parks needs. Requires voter approval. Falls under the Measure 5 tax rate cap.
Full Faith & Credit (FF&C) Bonds	FF&C bonds are not a way to pay for a project; rather, they are one of several ways that can be employed to ensure that funds to be used to pay for a project are available when needed to pay for project expenses. FF&C are bonds that are backed by the City's promise to repay the debt from any available sources. Typically, this is done for revenue streams that do not have a strong history or that have a high level of uncertainty around the ability to repay the debt over time. In order for the lender to feel comfortable with the likelihood of getting repaid, the City's General Fund has to provide backing for the bonds.	By themselves, FF&C bonds are not a way to pay for a project. They are a way to take a dedicated stream of dollars and turn that stream into an upfront payment for a larger project. The key to a successful FF&C bond is to identify a reliable payment stream. FF&C bonds do not require a public vote.
General Fund	The General Fund is the largest fund used to account for discretionary expenditures and revenues. Public safety represents 55% of total General Fund spending, followed by culture and leisure, central business functions, and infrastructure and planning.	Fund is flexible and relies upon stable revenue sources, primarily property taxes. Use of General Funds is at the discretion of City Council. While the fund has stabilized post-recession, there are still insufficient resources to sustainably fund existing services, so this source is unlikely to be able provide funding for the Park Blocks improvements.
Increased Transient Room Tax Rate	The Transient Room Tax (TRT) is a 4.5% tax charged on all overnight stays in the city, including hotels and motels, campgrounds, retreat centers, RV parks, bed and breakfasts, and vacation rentals. These tax dollars are collected under the authority of the City's Transient Room Tax Ordinance, to be used for the promotion and development of tourism and visitor programs for Eugene.	Current TRT dollars are fully programmed, so an increase in the rate would be required to add services. This tax is largely paid by visitors, rather than City residents. Any increase would have to comply with state law restrictions on spending. Higher lodging costs could impact other downtown revitalization goals. The State is considering an increase to TRT for the Track and Field World Championships. Historically, the City tries to move increases in concert with Springfield to maintain competitive balance.

Funding Type	Description	Summary of Advantages/Disadvantages
Parks SDCs	Parks System Development Charges (SDCs) are collected on all new development in the City and used to fund park construction and rehabilitation required to support new development. Park SDC fees are set based upon an approved project list.	Paid by new development for park improvements. For eligibility, the project work needs to be listed on the approved SDC project list. Included in the current project list is land acquisition to expand the park blocks and development of a children's playground in the downtown. The project list would need to be amended to include additional projects, or projects could be included in the next project list, which is a step in the current park and recreation system plan update process.
Road Capital Fund	The Road Capital Fund is funded by state and federal grants for specific projects competitively awarded to the City.	If successful, awarded funds could be used for changes to streets that surround the Park Blocks.
Urban Renewal Agency		
Existing Urban Renewal Funds	The only remaining capital project currently authorized in the Plan is for $500,000 of improvements to the Park Blocks for the Farmers' Market.	The funds are ready and intended to benefit the Park Blocks and have been since 2010. The Farmers' Market maintains interest in creating a permanent, year-round home for the market in downtown, and is continuing to work with both the City and County to identify the key next steps toward that goal. The $500,000 set-aside for improvements was determined prior to the land swap concept, and may need an increased investment.
Extend Existing Urban Renewal Plan and District	The Downtown Urban Renewal District currently receives a portion of property taxes collected by various taxing jurisdictions. Existing tax increment funding is expected to end in winter of 2016.	The current Downtown Urban Renewal plan would need to be amended by council to extend this funding source. A plan amendment requires significant public process and a lengthy timeline. There is risk that the plan amendment ordinance would not be supported by overlapping taxing districts or would be referred by voters. For larger funding efforts, this could provide significant funding without raising taxes.
Terminate Existing Downtown Urban Renewal Plan and District	Termination of the Downtown District would result in tax increment dollars being returned to overlapping taxing districts, including the City's General Fund. There could be both a one-time deposit of existing funds remaining in the Downtown District accounts, as well as ongoing tax revenues at termination.	Current estimates of the amount to be returned to the City of Eugene annually would be approximately $1 million. This would be consistent with the council's intent in 2010 to terminate the district at the end of the projects identified at that time. This would reduce the funds available to the City for downtown projects by approximately $1 million per year (half).
Riverfront Urban Renewal Plan and District	The Riverfront Urban Renewal District currently receives a portion of property taxes collected by various taxing jurisdictions.	An urban renewal project must be located in the boundary of the district.
State or Federal Sources		
State or Federal Grants	Possible funding source for improvements, depending on what is part of implementation.	Grants can be uncertain in terms of timing and amount.

Funding Type	Description	Summary of Advantages/Disadvantages
Private Funds		
Downtown Service District Adjustments	Fees paid by downtown property owners to provide special services within the district.	Existing program; property owners share in the cost. Would increase costs for downtown businesses, which could slow the downtown revitalization momentum. Could be perceived as unfair because a small population would be paying for improvements to be used by the entire community.
Private Donations	Community members contribute to a capital campaign to fund particular features in the improvement project.	Could build community enthusiasm for the project. Would take significant effort to develop the campaign; uncertainty about ability to raise the funds could delay project.

ATTACHMENT C

Follow-Up Information from the January 27 Work Session & Answers to Councilor Emails Received Since Then

What is the impact of the Downtown Urban Renewal District on the overlapping taxing districts?

School District 4J would be the most impacted, experiencing an annual net loss of about $340,000 in its revenue after discounts, delinquencies, and the State school funding formula as a result of terminating tax increment collections in the Downtown District.

Taxing bodies that overlap with the Downtown Urban Renewal District (the Downtown District) are affected by the use of tax increment funds to implement the Urban Renewal Plan. When a district is first created, the assessed value within the plan area is established as the "frozen base." This is a way of keeping the overlapping taxing districts "whole" as of the date the urban renewal district is created. The overlapping jurisdictions (City, County, schools) continue to receive property tax revenue based on the frozen base value. In theory, if urban renewal efforts are successful, the value of the district will grow above the base. That increase is called the "incremental value" or "excess value." The Downtown District receives taxes based on the incremental value. This has an impact on the amount of revenue that the overlapping jurisdictions receive, versus what they would have received if there were no urban renewal districts in effect.

The Lane County Assessor's Office has prepared an analysis of the impact of the Downtown District on the overlapping jurisdictions for the current tax year (FY16). Based on that analysis, if the Downtown District had not been in effect, net revenues for the overlapping taxing districts in total would have been about $1,040,000 less than they were with the Downtown District in place. This is because of compression in the schools' tax rates and after the State school funding formula is taken into account for 4J. Additional detail beyond the following table is provided on page 3.

Taxing District	Estimated Annual Change in Revenue w/out DT District AFTER Discounts, Delinquencies, & School Funding Formula
Eugene School District 4J – *permanent rate*	20,000
Eugene School District 4J – *local option*	(360,000)
Lane Community College	70,000
Lane Education Service District	25,000
Total Education	**($245,000)**
City of Eugene	1,000,000
Lane County – *permanent rate*	180,000
Lane County – *local option*	-
Eugene Urban Renewal Downtown	(2,015,000)
Eugene Urban Renewal Riverfront	-
Total General Government	**($835,000)**
City of Eugene – *Bonds*	40,000
Eugene School District 4J – *Bonds*	-
Lane Community College – *Bonds*	-
Total Bonds	**$40,000**
TOTAL TAXES	**($1,040,000)**

What is the impact on Eugene School District 4J?
The impact on schools from the division of tax calculation for urban renewal districts is largely an impact on the State's budget because schools are mainly funded on a per-pupil funding formula (rather than by the level of property tax dollars generated within their boundaries). The State determines how much money must be allocated for the education of each pupil across the state. If the money is not available from local property taxes, the State will make up the difference. If more funds are available through local school property taxes, the State would have additional dollars to allocate as it chooses. In other words, the State can choose to allocate any extra money to education or to some other budgetary priority. If the State chooses to keep the money in education, some of that money would return to Eugene schools based on the applicable State-wide school funding formula. For the Downtown District, the overlapping schools are 4J, Lane Community College, and Lane ESD.

The Lane County Assessors Office's analysis of the impact of the Downtown District on overlapping taxing districts is shown in the chart (on page 3 of this attachment). In order to understand the analysis, there are three factors to consider:

1. Revenue from 4J's permanent levy would increase by approximately $586,000, for a net gain of approximately $20,000 after applying the State school funding formula. (4J receives about 2.8% of the total State-wide funding.) This is the best-case scenario that assumes all else is equal, and the State decides to provide more funding for schools as a result of having more property tax revenue available. The rest of the property tax benefit would accrue to other school districts in the State in this case.

2. 4J will lose about $360,000 of local option levy proceeds (after discounts and delinquencies) if the Downtown District no longer collects tax increment funds. This occurs because the urban renewal portion of school taxes are currently counted under the "general government" category for Measure 5 tax rate limitations, and those taxes would move back into the "education" category with termination of tax increment collections. When that happens, the education category of taxes must be reduced for about 821 additional properties within the City because they are already at the limit for education taxes under Measure 5. In order to reduce the education taxes to the Measure 5 limit, State law says that local option levy proceeds are the first to be reduced. The State school funding formula does not apply to local option levies, so the full impact of this reduction would be felt in 4J's budget. Both of these estimates are based on FY16 tax roll information and would vary in future years with changes in market conditions. The estimates are also based on net taxes, which take into account discounts for early payment and delinquencies.

3. There is also a one-time impact. If tax increment collections are terminated, there would be a return of any excess tax increment funds collected by the Downtown District to the overlapping taxing districts. The amount returned will depend on how much tax increment is on-hand at the time of the calculation, which cannot be estimated at this time. However, the State confirmed that this would not represent additional money to be spent on education in 4J; rather, it would go through the State school funding formula, and 4J would receive about 2.8% of the total on a one-time basis.

In summary, 4J would experience an ongoing net loss in its revenue of about $340,000 annually as a result of terminating tax increment collections in the Downtown District and a one-time impact of less than 3% of any one-time funds provided to the State.

Estimated Impact of Downtown District Tax Increment Collections on Overlapping Jurisdictions[1]
FY16 Tax Data

Taxing District	Levy	With Downtown Tax Increment[2]	Without Downtown Tax Increment[2]	Difference	Estimated Revenue After Discounts, Delinquencies, & School Funding Formula[3]
EDUCATION					
Eugene School District 4J	Permanent	52,436,917	53,023,217	586,300	20,000[4]
Eugene School District 4J	Local Option	11,760,371	11,382,386	(377,985)	(360,000)
Lane Community College	Permanent	8,371,200	8,445,856	74,656	70,000
Lane Education Service District	Permanent	3,017,925	3,045,123	27,198	25,000
Total Education		**$75,586,413**	**$75,896,582**	**$310,169**	**($245,000)**
GENERAL GOVERNMENT					
City of Eugene	Permanent	95,803,317	96,854,328	1,051,011	1,000,000
Lane County	Permanent	17,509,307	17,700,169	190,862	180,000
Lane County	Local Option	16,570,854	16,570,854	-	-
Eugene Urban Renewal Downtown	Urban Renewal	2,122,696	-	(2,122,696)	(2,015,000)
Eugene Urban Renewal Riverfront	Urban Renewal	1,597,478	1,597,478	-	-
Total General Government		**$133,603,652**	**$132,722,829**	**($880,823)**	**($835,000)**
BONDS					
City of Eugene	Bond I	3,712,786	3,753,187	40,401	40,000
City of Eugene	Bond II	11,386,348	11,386,348	-	-
Eugene School District 4J	Bond I	196,187	198,468	2,281	-
Eugene School District 4J	Bond II	17,452,656	17,452,656	-	-
Lane Community College	Bond II	2,775,096	2,775,096	-	-
Total Bonds[5]		**$35,523,073**	**$35,565,755**	**$42,682**	**$40,000**
TOTAL TAXES		**$244,713,138**	**$244,185,166**	**($527,972)**	**($1,040,000)**

Notes:

1. Numbers vary from the FY16 Adopted Budget document due to the use of current year's tax data and the inclusion of compression.
2. Data provided by Lane County Assessment & Taxation, tax year 2015-16.
3. The assumed collection rate is 95%.
4. Assumes that legislature allocates the additional property taxes to schools throughout the State and 4J receives its 2.8% share of the total.
5. Bonded debt tax rates would be slightly reduced if tax increment collections were ceased. An estimate based on $43,000 of bonded debt taxes is a tax rate decrease of approximately $0.003 per $1,000 of assessed value, or about $0.57 per year for the typical home.

Examples of other cities that have built fiber optic systems and how they funded them:

- The City of Bozeman, MT adopted a Fiber Master Plan in January 2015. The City will build an 'open-access' fiber network (similar to the Eugene network) using funds from two Tax Increment Finance areas to build the first of three phases. The Master Plan recommends the City pursue state and federal grants, charitable contributions, network revenue, and connection fees to fund the remainder of the network.
- The City of Chattanooga, TN formed the Electric Power Board (EPD), a public utility company, to build and operate the fiber network. EPD built the community-wide fiber network in tandem with its 'smart grid' that allows the electric meters to feed electricity consumption data back to the utility. EPD is also the service provider. The City funded the construction with approximately $220 million in revenue bonds and $111 million from a federal stimulus grant. The revenue bonds are backed by revenues from providing internet service and the smart grid network. A recent article in State Tech Magazine highlighted the work of Chattanooga and other cities: How and Why Chattanooga, Tenn., and Other Cities Have Embraced Municipal Broadband.
- The City of the Dalles partnered with the county and the local public utility district on a plan for a $1.8 million, 17-mile fiber-optic loop through the community that would connect anchor institutions and offer a 'backbone' for private providers to connect to. State and federal grants covered half of the costs; the City contributed $10,000 and entered into loans backed by revenue to cover the remainder.
- The Lake Oswego City Council voted to pursue a public-private partnership to build a community-wide fiber network in January 2016. Under the proposed arrangement, a private firm will construct and operate the fiber network, and the City will guarantee a minimum revenue amount. The private firm will own the system and be the service provider for 30 years; at the end of that period the system can transfer to the City. The City is guaranteeing a minimum level of subscription revenue for the project.
- The City of Sandy funded the construction of the community-wide network with revenue bonds backed by service subscribers. The City is the service provider.

Answers to Additional Questions Received Since the Work Session

1. What would the yearly principal and interest payments look like for a $4 million 5-year Full Faith and Credit Bond for the fiber optic project? What would be the impact on taxpayers for a 5-year levy to raise $4 million for the fiber project?
A rough estimate of the annual cost for a Full Faith & Credit Bond is $1 million per year. A rough estimate for the impact on the typical taxpayer for a 5-year levy to raise $4 million (plus borrowing costs and interest) is about $15 per year.

2. What is the feasibility of the following funding sources?
A. Anticipated EWEB FY17 CILT payments to the General Fund
The General Fund forecast includes projected EWEB CILT payments over the forecast period. The forecast will be updated and presented to the Budget Committee in the spring. The forecast assumes that these revenues are available to support the existing service system. To the extent that some of these dollars are dedicated to one particular service, it could cause a funding gap for other General Fund services.

B. State grants
The Infrastructure Finance Authority (IFA) offers grants through the Special Public Works Fund. The grants are limited to $500,000 and are based on up to $5,000 per eligible-job created or retained. The applicant must collect letters from employers stating expected job growth and

document 100 new jobs within 5 years of receiving grant, based on a $500,000 assumed grant. The City must repay any grant funds that are not offset by job creation and retention.

C. Federal grants

U.S. Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration (EDA) offers grants that fund up to 50% of project costs. Based on conversations with EDA staff, the City is more likely to receive approximately $1.25 million. The grantee must meet economic distress criteria including unemployment rates above the national average and have a demonstrated special need for the grant. To date, staff have not identified other federal funding sources.

D. A portion of the $1 million that will go to the General Fund when the Downtown Urban Renewal District sunsets at the end of this year

This is included in the chart in Attachment A as a feasible funding source, along with advantages and disadvantages.

E. A portion of the Telecommunications Fund

This is included in the chart in Attachment A as a feasible funding source, along with advantages and disadvantages.

F. Riverfront Urban Renewal District funds for that part of the study area within district boundaries.

This is included in the chart in Attachment A as a feasible funding source, along with advantages and disadvantages.

G. A portion of the increased property tax revenues that will likely go to the General Fund this calendar year

There was about $1.2 million of property tax revenue above what was budgeted in the current fiscal year. Those funds were appropriated by City Council on SB#1 in December 2015.

The General Fund forecast includes projected property tax increases over the forecast period. Those projections assume additional construction occurs throughout the City in each of the next six years. The forecast will be updated and presented to the Budget Committee in the spring. The forecast assumes that these revenues are available to support the existing service system. To the extent that some of these dollars are dedicated to one particular service, it could cause a funding gap for other General Fund services.

H. Recipients of the service should be required to pay something at the time of service delivery. What could the fee look like?

Staff are working to identify how to maximize private contributions. That could include determining if the City should offer property owners an earlier connection to the fiber network if the property owner contributes funds for the construction of the infrastructure.

Occupants of the connected buildings will have to pay a private Internet Service Provider (ISP) for any internet service delivered over the fiber lines. EWEB will charge the ISP a fee to lease the fiber. EWEB's fee is designed to cover maintenance and long-term replacement costs for the fiber lines. The ISP will incorporate EWEB's fee into any fees that they charge the occupants of connected buildings. The City is not anticipated to receive any ongoing fees for the use of the fiber.

I. The VA Clinic will start paying taxes soon. Can those be used for this purpose?

On May 27, 2014, Council directed the City Manager to execute a document that provided for the City's payment of the VA Clinic's System Development Charges (SDCs) from future property tax revenue from the Clinic. It is expected that the VA Clinic's new property tax payments will be dedicated for about 10 years for this purpose, so these revenues would not be available for the fiber project. (Other new property tax revenue is addressed in response to G above.)

3. An extensive chunk of the study area lies outside of both of the urban renewal district boundaries. What are the funding sources for service extension to these areas, since Urban Renewal dollars cannot be used in these parcels?
The remaining area of the Fiber Service Area may be funded by the federal and state grants and the other City funds discussed above and in Attachment A.

4. Provide a list of buildings that are slated for connection, and, equally important, a list of the buildings that won't receive the service.
At this time, we are working to allow all the buildings in the Fiber Service Area to connect to the fiber network. We may encounter physical impediments to some structures that limit connectivity to individual buildings and this may mean that those buildings would be included in a later phase of the project. We will not know which buildings until we start the work.

5. Please provide a printout of the full-color map of the study area that was sent to Council electronically a few days ago.
A color map will be provided at your places at the work session.