


# ctc technology & energy

engineering & business consulting



## **Fiber Optic Master Plan**

**Prepared for the City of Hayward, California**

**January 2017**

## Contents

1	Executive Summary.....	1
1.1	Project Background and Objectives .....	1
1.1.1	Fiber Optic Master Plan Objectives.....	2
1.2	Methodology .....	3
1.3	The City of Hayward’s Industrial Corridor Is Unique.....	3
1.4	The City’s U.S. Economic Development Administration Grant Decreases FTTP Construction Costs.....	4
1.5	The City Can Consider Three Potential Business Models With Varying Degrees of Risk	6
1.5.1	A Dark Fiber Model Will Enable the City to Partner with the Private Sector and Balance Risk .....	7
1.5.2	A Wholesale Service Model Can Enable Multiple ISPs to Serve Customers .....	8
1.5.3	A Retail Service Model Is High Risk.....	9
1.6	Estimated Fiber Costs and Phased Deployment .....	9
1.6.1	Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor .....	10
1.7	Recommendations and Next Steps .....	11
1.7.1	The City Can Take Small Steps with Potentially Big Rewards Toward Achieving Its Goals	12
1.8	Expanding FTTP to Residential Customers Adds Considerable Cost.....	17
2	Broadband Needs and Trends .....	20
2.1	The City Is Served Similarly to Other Markets, but There Are Still Gaps in Service	21
3	Needs Assessment .....	23
3.1	Business Survey Results.....	23
3.2	Comparison of Services in Hayward to Gigabit Communities.....	23
4	Operational and Business Model Options .....	26
4.1.1	Staffing Considerations for Various Business Models.....	27
4.2	Fiber Management Requirements .....	28
4.3	Dig Once Considerations .....	29

4.3.1	The Case for Dig Once Policies .....	29
4.3.2	Coordinating Conduit Construction with Other Utility Projects Reduces Costs	31
4.3.3	Standard Specification .....	31
5	Proposed Fiber Design .....	34
5.1	Construction Methodology .....	34
5.2	Overview of Existing Assets .....	35
5.2.1	City Conduit and Fiber .....	35
5.3	Leverage Existing Assets .....	38
5.4	Conceptual Design and Specifications – Industrial Technology & Innovation Corridor	40
5.4.1	Network Design .....	43
5.4.2	Network Core and Hub Site .....	44
5.4.3	Distribution and Access Network Design .....	45
6	Cost Estimate – Industrial Technology & Innovation Corridor .....	49
6.1	FTTP Cost Estimate Summary .....	49
6.1.1	FTTP Cost Estimate (Fiber and Electronics) – Wholesale and Retail Models ....	49
6.1.2	FTTP Only Cost Estimate (No Electronics, Drops, or CPEs) – Dark Fiber Model	51
6.2	Cost Estimate Breakdown.....	52
6.2.1	Existing City Network Infrastructure Decreases FTTP Construction Costs.....	53
6.3	Field Survey Methodology for Network Design and Cost Estimate .....	54
6.4	FTTP Cost Estimate .....	55
6.4.1	OSP Cost Estimation Methodology .....	56
6.4.2	OSP.....	57
6.4.3	Central Network Electronics.....	58
6.4.4	Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) and Service Drop Installation (Per- subscriber Costs).....	59
6.5	Operating Cost Considerations.....	60
6.5.1	Technical Operational Expenditures .....	60
6.5.2	Technical Staffing Requirements.....	62

- 7 Business and Financial Model ..... 64
  - 7.1 Overview ..... 64
  - 7.2 Retail Model Financial Projections ..... 65
    - 7.2.1 Financing Costs and Operating Expenses ..... 66
    - 7.2.2 Operating and Maintenance Expenses..... 72
    - 7.2.3 Summary of Operating and Maintenance Assumptions ..... 73
    - 7.2.4 Take-Rate Sensitivity ..... 74
  - 7.3 Wholesale Model Financial Projections ..... 76
    - 7.3.1 Financing Costs and Operating Expenses ..... 78
    - 7.3.2 Operating and Maintenance Expenses..... 83
    - 7.3.3 Summary of Operating and Maintenance Expenses ..... 84
    - 7.3.4 Take-Rate Sensitivity ..... 85
  - 7.4 Dark Fiber Model Financial Analysis..... 87
    - 7.4.1 Cost Implications of the Dark Fiber Model..... 89
    - 7.4.2 Financing Costs and Operating Expenses ..... 90
    - 7.4.3 Operating and Maintenance Expenses..... 97
    - 7.4.4 Revenue ..... 99
    - 7.4.5 Dark Fiber Fee Sensitivity ..... 100
- Appendix A: Glossary of Terms ..... 102
- Appendix B: Assessment of Local Broadband Market..... 104
- Appendix C: Retail Financial Model (spreadsheet)..... 105
- Appendix D: Wholesale Financial Model (spreadsheet)..... 106
- Appendix E: Dark Fiber Financial Model (spreadsheet)..... 107
- Appendix F: Online Business Survey Questions..... 108
- Appendix G: Online Business Survey Results ..... 109
  - Survey Methodology..... 109
  - Online Survey Results ..... 110
    - The Majority of Responses Were from Small-to-Medium Size Businesses..... 110
    - Nearly Half of Respondents Are Satisfied with Current Internet Speeds..... 113

Pricing Sensitivity and Willingness to Switch Service Providers ..... 116

The City’s Role..... 119

Follow-Up Interviews with Select Businesses..... 120

**Figures**

Figure 1: Demarcation Between City and Partner Network Elements ..... 8

Figure 2: Comparison of Per-Passing Costs in Various U.S. Markets..... 19

Figure 3: Existing and Proposed City-Constructed Infrastructure ..... 37

Figure 4: Existing and Proposed City-Constructed Fiber by Strand Count ..... 38

Figure 5: High-Level FTTP Architecture..... 42

Figure 6: Detail Showing FTTP Access Layer Design ..... 44

Figure 7: Total Estimated Cost versus Take Rate..... 50

Figure 8: Demarcation Between City and Partner Network Elements..... 52

Figure 9: Map Showing Existing Conduit and Fiber Resources..... 54

Figure 10: High-Level FTTP Sample Design Overview..... 56

Figure 11: Demarcation Between City and Partner Network Elements..... 89

Figure 12: Respondents’ Number of Employees (Based on 255 Responses) ..... 111

Figure 13: Respondents’ Annual Sales Volume (Based on 227 Responses) ..... 112

Figure 14: Business Respondents’ Primary Internet Connection (Based on 201 Responses) .... 113

Figure 15: Importance of Price, Reliability, and Speed (Based on 191 Responses) ..... 114

Figure 16: Respondents’ Satisfaction With Current Internet Speeds (Based on 197 Responses)  
..... 115

Figure 17: Satisfaction with Current Internet Service Attributes (Based on 192 Responses) .... 116

Figure 18: Monthly Cost for Internet Services (Based on 183 Responses) ..... 117

Figure 19: Respondents’ Willingness to Switch to 100 Mbps Service at Various Price Points (Based on 142 Responses) ..... 118

Figure 20: Respondents’ Willingness to Switch to 1 Gbps Service at Various Price Points (Based on 137 Responses) ..... 119

Figure 21: Main Role for the City With Respect to Broadband Access (Based on 160 Responses)  
..... 120

**Tables**

Table 1: Three Potential Business Models..... 7

Table 2: Breakdown of Estimated Dark FTTP Cost..... 10

Table 3: Staffing for Dark Fiber Business Model..... 27

Table 4: Staffing for Wholesale Service Model.....	28
Table 5: Staffing for Retail Service Model.....	28
Table 6: Breakdown of Estimated Total Cost.....	50
Table 7: Breakdown of Estimated Dark Fiber Model Cost.....	51
Table 8: Breakdown of Estimated Total Capital Cost – Retail and Wholesale Model.....	55
Table 9: Estimated OSP Costs for FTTP.....	57
Table 10: Estimated Central Network Electronics Costs.....	58
Table 11: Per-subscriber Cost Estimates.....	60
Table 12: Responsibility Matrix for Potential Business Models.....	64
Table 13: Base Case Retail Model Financial Analysis with 60 Percent Take Rate.....	66
Table 14: Operating Expenses in Years 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20 – Retail Model.....	68
Table 15: Income Statement – Retail Model.....	69
Table 16: Cash Flow Statement – Retail Model.....	70
Table 17: Capital Additions – Retail Model.....	72
Table 18: Labor Expenses – Retail Model.....	73
Table 19: Take Rate Reduced to 50 Percent – Retail Model.....	75
Table 20: Take Rate Reduced to 40 Percent – Retail Model.....	76
Table 21: Take Rate Reduced to 30 Percent – Retail Model.....	76
Table 22: Wholesale Model Financial Analysis with 60 Percent Take Rate (Base Case).....	77
Table 23: Operating Expenses in Years 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20 – Wholesale Model.....	79
Table 24: Income Statement – Wholesale Model.....	80
Table 25: Cash Flow Statement – Wholesale Model.....	81
Table 26: Capital Additions – Wholesale Model.....	83
Table 27: Labor Expenses – Wholesale Model.....	84
Table 28: Take Rate Reduced to 50 Percent – Wholesale Model.....	86
Table 29: Take Rate Reduced to 40 Percent – Wholesale Model.....	86
Table 30: Take Rate Reduced to 30 Percent – Wholesale Model.....	87
Table 31: Base Case Financial Analysis – Dark Fiber Model.....	88
Table 32: Breakdown of Estimated Dark Fiber Model Cost (aerial and underground construction) .....	89
Table 33: Income Statement – Dark Fiber Model.....	92
Table 34: Cash Flow Statement – Dark Fiber Model.....	94
Table 35 – Capital Additions – Dark Fiber Model.....	97
Table 36: Operating Expenses Dark Fiber Model.....	99
Table 37: Dark Fiber Model Financial Analysis - \$35 Per Month Passing Fee.....	100
Table 38: Dark Fiber Model Financial Analysis - \$30 Per Month Passing Fee.....	101
Table 39: Dark Fiber Model Financial Analysis - \$25 Per Month Passing Fee.....	101

## 1 Executive Summary

There is a growing desire for robust, fiber-based broadband throughout the U.S., particularly among businesses of all sizes as their needs evolve, and connectivity becomes increasingly integral to business operations. Given this, localities are eager to find ways to fill gaps in available service to help their communities attract and retain businesses. Cities that want to advance economic development and attract a talented workforce are seeking ways to deploy fiber-to-the-premises (FTTP) in their communities, or to partner with private providers that are willing and able to help meet connectivity needs.

The City of Hayward is committed to enabling greater fiber-based connectivity for its numerous businesses, and to eventually expanding services to its residential neighborhoods. The City is focused on a phased municipal broadband deployment, and exploring a potential public–private partnership to achieve these goals.

### 1.1 Project Background and Objectives

The City intends to leverage any available conduit and fiber infrastructure to support a municipal FTTP deployment to advance the availability, affordability, and reliability of connectivity services for its business sector, which hosts thousands of businesses in a broad range of industries. To this end, the City has received funding from the U.S. Department of Commerce to install a preliminary fiber optic and conduit network. CTC’s engineers developed a proposed fiber design (see Section 5) based on the assumption that this infrastructure would be foundational to any future City efforts to deploy an FTTP network.

To supplement the City’s direct efforts to deploy FTTP and to potentially support its long-term vision, the City also seeks to understand emerging public–private partnerships in the broadband industry, how to balance risk and reward, and whether a partnership makes sense in Hayward. In short, the City aims to take any steps it can to enable greater connectivity in the community, while not taking on undue risk.

*The Fiber Optic Master Plan’s primary objective is to analyze and outline the best potential path and business model to deploy a fiber optic network that can meet the community’s needs, with an initial emphasis on serving businesses located in Hayward’s Industrial Corridor.*

### 1.1.1 Fiber Optic Master Plan Objectives

To achieve the City's vision as outlined in its General Plan 2020,<sup>1</sup> the Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor (Industrial Corridor)—an approximately nine-square-mile section of industrial-zoned land with more than 5,100 businesses—needs infrastructure to attract investment and support business growth. Today, fiber infrastructure that supports access to broadband Internet service is as vital as streets, water, and sewer infrastructure. Broadband connectivity enhances a community's economic development potential by attracting new advanced businesses and providing existing businesses the tools they need to expand. Accordingly, the City engaged CTC Technology & Energy (CTC) to prepare a Fiber Optic Master Plan to assist in the planning, budgeting, and implementation of a landmark fiber optic network infrastructure project.

The Fiber Optic Master Plan's primary objective is to analyze and outline the best potential path and business model to deploy a fiber optic network that can meet the community's needs, with an initial emphasis on serving businesses located in Hayward's Industrial Corridor. Additional information on this targeted area and the types of business activities within it can be found in the Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor Baseline Profile,<sup>2</sup> published by the City's Economic Development Division in March 2015.

Specifically, this plan outlines strategies for improved consumer choice for data connection services (including Internet), and economic development and job creation within the community. This plan:

- Provides the City with information and data to set its goals and objectives to facilitate the design and deployment of a fiber optic network in Hayward;
- Presents and evaluates the current supply of broadband communications assets, products, and services in the City;
- Provides an inventory and assessment of existing City-owned assets and infrastructure required to support deployment of a fiber optic network;
- Defines and evaluates potential fiber optic network routes and requirements;
- Identifies potential impacts of a fiber optic network, including impacts on City right-of-way (ROW), City-owned conduit, streetlight poles, traffic lights, existing fiber systems, and other real property;
- Defines services and technologies to be offered on the fiber optic network;
- Presents an engineering study, network design, and deployment cost model;

---

<sup>1</sup> The General Plan 2040 is available on the City's website at <http://cityofhayward-ca.gov/GENERALPLAN/>

<sup>2</sup> The Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor Baseline Profile is available on the City's website at <http://cityofhayward-ca.gov/CITY-GOVERNMENT/BOARDS-COMMISSIONS-COMMITTEES/PLANNING-COMMISSION/pc/2015/pca040915-P01.pdf>



- Outlines a potential phased approach to deliver the network; and
- Evaluates potential business models to build, operate, and make “last-mile” connections to a fiber optic network.

## **1.2 Methodology**

This report was researched and prepared in the summer and autumn of 2016 by CTC, with ongoing input from City staff. In addition to drawing on our extensive industry experience, our analysis is guided by our conversations and interviews with City staff about the City’s objectives and desired outcomes.

Over the course of the engagement, CTC performed the following general tasks:

1. Reviewed the City’s key physical infrastructure;
2. Developed and administered an online survey of Hayward businesses;
3. Conducted follow-up interviews with a select group of Hayward businesses to further gauge interest in City FTTP efforts;
4. Researched the region’s available broadband services and costs;
5. Conducted onsite and desk surveys of City infrastructure;
6. Evaluated potential public–private partnership business models based on current developments in the broadband industry; and
7. Developed pro forma financial statements for the City, including a governance model for a fiber enterprise.

In addition to those tasks, CTC prepared a proposed fiber design (Section 5), which provides data relevant to assessing the financial viability of network deployment, and offers guidance to develop business models for a potential City construction effort (including the full range of models for public–private partnerships). This estimate also provides key inputs to financial modeling (see Section 7) to determine the approximate revenue levels necessary for the City to service any debt incurred in building the network.

## **1.3 The City of Hayward’s Industrial Corridor Is Unique**

Hayward is an economically and ethnically diverse city of approximately 150,000 residents within 45.32 square miles on the eastern edge of the San Francisco Bay. As a regional center of retail, industrial, and public activities, Hayward combines a hometown atmosphere, ideal climate, cultural attractions, parks, and recreational facilities with easy access to suppliers and customers throughout the Bay Area and beyond.

The City is known as the “Heart of the Bay” because of its central location in Alameda County—25 miles southeast of San Francisco, 14 miles south of Oakland, 26 miles north of San Jose, and 10 miles west of Pleasanton and surrounding valley communities. Hayward has two Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) stations, an Amtrak station, its own executive airport, and an extensive network of freeways and bus lines that provide easy access to the San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose international airports. The City also boasts easy access to the Port of Oakland, the fourth-busiest container port in the U.S.

The City leveraged its strategic location and natural assets to become a regional hub for commerce and trade. Today, Hayward is home to more than 7,000 businesses, ranging from family-owned retail shops and restaurants, to globally recognized manufacturers, distributors, and retailers. The City’s key industries include:

- Advanced and specialized manufacturing;
- Clean and green technology;
- Food and beverage manufacturing;
- Life science and biotechnology; and
- Transportation and logistics.

The City’s Industrial Corridor is a large crescent-shaped area of industrial-zoned land located along the City’s western and southwestern boundaries. This roughly nine square miles of land is home to more than 5,100 businesses that employ nearly 47,500 workers. According to the City’s General Plan, this corridor is expected to grow as an economic and employment center and evolve to achieve a healthy balance of traditional manufacturing and information- and technology-based uses.

Given the importance of the Industrial Corridor, we recommend focusing on providing service to businesses there as part of a phased implementation approach to deploying FTTP in Hayward. Rather than a pilot project, we believe that finding a way to serve the Industrial Corridor—or a subset of businesses there—and maintain service long term will serve the City’s interests. This may be possible through a public–private partnership under one of the business plans outlined in Section 1.5. Specifically, the City can target infrastructure deployment to lower barriers for one or more private providers that aim to serve these locations, and it can enable a mid-range FTTP-based retail product.

#### **1.4 The City’s U.S. Economic Development Administration Grant Decreases FTTP Construction Costs**

The U.S. Department of Commerce’s Economic Development Administration (EDA) announced in 2016 that it had awarded just over \$2.74 million in grant funds to the City to support fiber optic

infrastructure development.<sup>3</sup> This grant funding will enable the City to install conduit and fiber optic cables, which will support an FTTP deployment in the Industrial Corridor.

The cost estimates in Section 6 anticipate an additional approximately \$5.4 million to deploy the the proposed fiber design in Section 5.<sup>4</sup> The design and associated costs take the EDA grant into consideration and anticipate that any infrastructure the City develops with the \$2.74 million grant will become part of a broader FTTP deployment. The fiber optic infrastructure that the City deploys with grant funds will serve as a backbone for a middle-mile and FTTP deployment.

Our analysis assumes that the grant funds will be used to install both conduit and fiber, and that the conduit will be fully deployed with City fiber infrastructure. Given this, it is unlikely that the City will have excess conduit to make available for other entities to use. In our experience, unless an entity already has excessive unused conduit or has a need to install innerduct,<sup>5</sup> leasing conduit can hamper expansion of fiber as the entity's needs evolve. Further, there is not significant

*The City's approximately \$2.74 million in Economic Development Administration (EDA) grant funds serve as the basis for CTC's engineering design and cost estimates, and enable cost savings for the City's FTTP deployment. The projected cost to deploy the proposed fiber design in Section 5 is approximately \$5.4 million, in addition to the \$2.74 million grant.*

revenue to be realized from leasing empty conduit. Instead, if the City seeks to monetize its infrastructure, it can offer excess fiber strands for dark fiber licensing.

One key network infrastructure component is known as a "hub site," which is a location in the community, typically in the City's ROW, where network backbone fiber terminates in a shelter or enclosure. From this point, middle-mile network fiber is distributed deeper into the community to support eventual FTTP connections to customers.<sup>6</sup> Another important part of network deployment is to connect the network to an Internet point of presence (POP) where the City can access services offered at the POP. Services could include hosting servers and network electronics in a datacenter environment and "peering," which involves direct access to application providers<sup>7</sup> that reside at the

---

<sup>3</sup> "U.S. Department of Commerce Invests Nearly \$4 Million in Northern California to Help Build Infrastructure and Support Job Creation," *U.S. Economic Development Administration*, last modified September 9, 2016, <https://www.eda.gov/news/press-releases/2016/09/14/northern-ca.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> Note that this cost is associated with a "dark fiber model," in which the City would directly deploy an FTTP network and provide a private partner with a license to use the City-owned fiber. This estimate is for outside plant (OSP) infrastructure only and does not include the cost for network electronics, fiber drop cables, or customer premises equipment. See Section 1.5.1.

<sup>5</sup> Innerduct is smaller conduit (or tube) used to subdivide a larger conduit or duct for the placement of optical fiber cables.

<sup>6</sup> This is also commonly referred to as "distribution fiber," given its purpose.

<sup>7</sup> Examples include Netflix, Vonage, Yahoo, Dropbox, etc.

POP. In addition to serving as a backbone, the City's grant-funded infrastructure will help connect the network hub to the POP, which can help the City gain access to Internet service providers (ISPs) that may be interested in procuring dark fiber from the City to serve businesses in the Industrial Corridor or along the fiber routes.

Perhaps the simplest benefit the EDA grant offers is approximately \$2.74 million in avoided costs to the City. While this does not cover the entire cost to serve the City's target area, it gives the City a notable head start toward achieving its connectivity goals.

## 1.5 The City Can Consider Three Potential Business Models With Varying Degrees of Risk

We evaluated three core business models for the City to consider, two of which assume the City will seek a private partner. Each model assumes the City will invest in FTTP and take some financial and operating risk, even if the City pursues a public-private partnership based on one of these models. While a private company could come into the City and invest directly without requiring the City to take financial risk of its own, this private investment approach is not a true partnership, and the private sector has not signaled to the City a willingness to take this approach.

*We recommend considering a **dark fiber model** in which the City deploys, owns, and operates an FTTP network and seeks a private partner to invest in electronics to "light" the network, and offers services to end users.*

In a **dark fiber model**, the City directly deploys an FTTP network, and provides a private partner with a license to use the City-owned fiber; the partner "lights" the fiber, and offers services to end users. In this model, the partner would pay a per-passing cost to the City to help offset the public-sector costs for fiber deployment. In this model, the City is responsible for all construction and maintenance of the fiber, but does not manage network electronics, customer premises equipment (CPEs), or any customer contracts.

In a **wholesale service model**, the City deploys an FTTP network and "lights" the fiber, and then offers lit services to one or more private providers to offer service to end users. The City is responsible for fiber construction and maintenance as well as all network electronics, including replenishments and vendor contracts.

In a **retail service model**, the City deploys an FTTP network, "lights" the network, and directly offers services to end users. In this model, the City will construct and maintain an FTTP network, "light" the fiber and maintain all network electronics, and market and sell services to retail customers. The City is responsible for customer service at every level in this model, and enters the local market as a direct competitor to existing providers.

Table 12 describes the City’s and a partner’s responsibilities in each of the models. It is important to note that certain aspects of a partnership may be negotiable, but that we recommend a division of responsibilities as outlined below. A partnership should help manage the City’s risk, and substantially modifying this division of responsibilities could place undue risk on the City. For example, we would view with skepticism a dark fiber partnership that required the City to invest in both the fiber network and network electronics because it shifts much of the risk onto the City.

The three models we evaluated can be categorized from lowest to highest risk to the City: a dark fiber model entails the least risk, a wholesale service model is riskier than the dark fiber model, and a retail service model involves a great deal of risk to the City.

Table 1 shows a visual representation of the responsibilities that would fall to the City under each of the potential business models, and thus the potential degree of risk.

**Table 1: Three Potential Business Models**

City Responsibility	Model		
	Dark Fiber	Wholesale Service	Retail Service
Invest in and own outside plant (OSP)	X	X	X
Fund and perform fiber maintenance	X	X	X
Invest in own network electronics		X	X
Replenish network electronics		X	X
Manage electronics vendor contracts		X	X
Purchase and maintain CPEs			X
Marketing and customer acquisition			X
Conduct customer service			X

### 1.5.1 A Dark Fiber Model Will Enable the City to Partner with the Private Sector and Balance Risk

We believe the dark fiber model represents the best balance of shared risk and reward between the City and a potential partner. In this model, the City is responsible for a substantial capital investment to deploy fiber to the Industrial Corridor (and, perhaps, eventually the entire community), but its risk is offset in part by retaining ownership of an asset. Further, this model assumes the private partner will make a substantial investment of its own in network electronics, and the marketing, advertising, and support responsibilities associated with providing service to end users.


The City is already versed in making infrastructure investments on various public works projects, and will not have to employ a broad range of new staff to learn unfamiliar skill sets such as providing technical support over the phone to customers who call for help with issues related to the equipment in their businesses or homes. Some of the responsibilities for maintaining the dark

fiber network will require additional staff, but we anticipate less than four full-time positions will be necessary to support the City’s dark fiber deployment (see Section 7).

Further, as we noted, the City’s approximately \$2.74 in grant funding to support conduit and fiber installation is a meaningful step toward infrastructure investment, which will help lower the City’s risk even further. Unlike other communities that may not have access to grant funding, the City already has a head start on making an investment in fiber and conduit. If the City can supplement this investment to strategically deploy a dark fiber network to its preferred target area in the Industrial Corridor, it may become an attractive partner for the private sector.

An example of the demarcation points between the City dark fiber and the partners’ electronics is shown in Figure 1. The Figure also shows the potential demarcation points for lit services (wholesale model).

**Figure 1: Demarcation Between City and Partner Network Elements**



### 1.5.2 A Wholesale Service Model Can Enable Multiple ISPs to Serve Customers

A wholesale service model is a lower-risk option than the City choosing to directly provide retail service, but it still represents a significant financial and operational risk for the City. Because the financial and operational risk for the fiber *and* the network electronics falls to the City, any private partner(s) with which the City contracts will automatically shoulder less of the partnership’s risk. That is, there will be an imbalance in the shared risk and reward between the parties, which puts the City at a disadvantage from the outset.

This model may still be attractive, however, if the City wishes to retain control of the fiber and the network electronics while shifting responsibilities such as operations, customer support, and marketing to the private sector. If the City is willing and able to take on additional financial and operational risk associated with network electronics—for example, maintaining vendor licenses, upgrading firmware, and periodically replacing network electronics—a wholesale service

approach may be a viable option. This model can enable multiple ISPs to use the City's network to offer services by lowering costly barriers to entry.

### 1.5.3 A Retail Service Model Is High Risk

The only model that does not anticipate some level of partnership is the retail service model, where the City would construct, own, and operate a fiber network over which it would directly provide services to end users. While this model gives the City complete control, it also represents the greatest possible risk to the City. In this model, the City would be responsible for all aspects of network construction and administration, as well as marketing and advertising services to potential customers, providing services, and offering customer support. This is a high-risk model, because all financial and operational responsibility for every aspect of the network and service falls to the City; the City must compete with existing providers that have an established presence in the market and can make use of economies of scale; and the City would be entering the market as a new provider.

There are numerous steps the City must take to implement a retail service model that provides service to end users. Even then, there is no guarantee that the City can successfully manage an inherently unpredictable for-choice business that requires an ability to compete in the

*Our analysis indicates that it would cost approximately **\$5.4 million** for the City to deploy a dark fiber network to the Industrial Corridor. This cost is in addition to the \$2.74 million the U.S. Economic Development Administration awarded the City in 2016.*

marketplace against established providers. If the City opts to pursue this model, it will likely need to create new positions for additional staff; determine whether the fiber optic enterprise will be housed in an existing City department or will be a separate entity; develop a range of policies related to use, including compliance with digital millennium copyright act (DMCA) requirements and other state and federal regulations; and launch a marketing campaign. These are merely the steps necessary to get started. While these considerations are substantial, the complexities associated with ongoing operations are

especially significant.

## 1.6 Estimated Fiber Costs and Phased Deployment

To ensure our design cost estimates reflected City goals and the reality of the infrastructure and market in Hayward, our engineers conducted extensive desk surveys and an onsite field survey, and engaged City staff in discussions throughout the course of this project. Our analysis examined potential costs associated with bringing FTTP to the Industrial Corridor, and a possible phased deployment.

### 1.6.1 Industrial Technology and Innovation Corridor

Based on a conceptual, high-level design prepared by our engineers, we developed cost examples for the City to consider. While we believe that a dark fiber model will best meet the City’s needs, we conducted analysis for a retail service model as well (see Section 6). This helps illustrate the difference in costs that the City might incur if it opts to pursue a retail service model—if, for example, the City is unable to find a partner to lease dark fiber and still wishes to ensure service to select portions of the community.

Here, we look at the cost to deploy *only* the FTTP outside plant (OSP)<sup>8</sup> infrastructure. This is the total capital cost for the City to build a dark fiber network for lease to a private partner, which will then provide retail service over the FTTP infrastructure. In other words, this portion of our analysis is consistent with the dark fiber business model we outlined in Section 1.5.1.

We estimate that a dark fiber model, in which the City deploys a dark fiber network to the Industrial Corridor, will cost approximately \$5.4 million. As we noted, such a model does not include costs for network electronics, subscriber equipment, or fiber drop cables.

In this model, the partner would take on the costs for the network electronics, which represents approximately a \$3 million upfront investment, based on our analysis. Further, the partner would also be responsible for network electronic replenishments and annual fees associated with network electronics, such as vendor licenses.

Table 2, below, outlines the projected costs for this model, and Section 6 provides additional details about this approach.

**Table 2: Breakdown of Estimated Dark FTTP Cost**

Cost Component	Total Estimated Cost
OSP Engineering	\$0.5 million
Quality Control/Quality Assurance	0.2 million
General OSP Construction Cost	3.2 million
Special Crossings	0.7 million
Backbone and Distribution Plant Splicing	0.1 million
Backbone Hub, Termination, and Testing	0.5 million
FTTP Lateral Installations	0.2 million
<b>Total Estimated Cost:</b>	<b>\$5.4 million</b>

<sup>8</sup> OSP, known as “layer 1” or the “physical layer” of the network, is both the most expensive part of the network and the longest lasting.



## 1.7 Recommendations and Next Steps

Section 2.1 indicates that the City is served similarly to comparable markets. While there are some gaps in available service, many of the City’s businesses currently have access to fiber-based connectivity or alternative technologies that offer sufficient speeds for their business needs. We note that, based on our experience and analysis, Hayward is ahead of similar cities—even by simply commissioning this Master Plan, the City has set itself apart from many of its peers. Although there is not great urgency for the City to fill gaps, this section describes potential steps the City can take increase broadband availability—especially to businesses—and thereby potentially advance its standing in a global economy.

One of the most important decisions the City must make, which will inform next steps, is which business model to pursue. We believe the City will achieve the most favorable outcome by pursuing a dark fiber model, in which it expands its existing dark fiber and conduit, and grants access to its network to private entities that will offer services. We believe this approach represents shared investment and risk for the public and private sector, and may help offset the City’s financial obligations.

### ***We recommend that the City:***

- *Consider a dark fiber model*
- *Adopt a dig-once policy*
- *Audit its infrastructure and records*
- *Implement a records management system*
- *Construct a fiber segment to connect an Internet POP*
- *Expand FTTP to select Industrial Corridor areas*
- *Signal to the private sector through a procurement process*
- *Lease dark fiber strands to select Industrial Corridor customers*

In this approach, the City constructs and owns the fiber network and the private partner “lights” the fiber with electronics and directly serves end users. This model is currently underway on a large scale in the City of Westminster, Maryland, with its private partner Ting Internet,<sup>9</sup> and in the City of Huntsville, Alabama, with its private partner, Google Fiber.<sup>10</sup>

Retaining ownership of the fiber OSP assets is important to mitigate risk; owning assets is a way for the City to retain some control of the network, and to have some say in when, where, and how it is built. This approach includes a scenario in which a community pursues a partnership with a private provider; a good way to balance risk and

reward is for the City to maintain ownership and control of the assets while it assigns operational responsibilities, including the capital investment for network and consumer electronics, to a

<sup>9</sup> Wiley Hayes, “Westminster, Md. Partners with Private Sector to Broaden Fiber-Optic Network,” *GovTech*, last modified October 26, 2015, <http://www.govtech.com/dc/articles/Westminster-Md-Partners-with-Private-Sector-to-Broaden-Fiber-Optic-Network.html>.

<sup>10</sup> Frederic Lardinois, “Google Fiber Is Coming To Huntsville, Alabama,” *Tech Crunch*, last modified February 22, 2016, <http://techcrunch.com/2016/02/22/google-fiber-is-coming-to-huntsville-alabama/>.

private partner. This enables both parties to perform functions that highlight their strengths while not having to expend resources and energy attempting to carry out tasks for which they are ill-equipped.

There is risk to the City in this model because it requires a substantial capital investment to build (or expand) and maintain the fiber network, but it also gives the City a degree of control because the City owns the network. In the event the partnership fails for any reason the City owns its assets and can take over control of the network directly or engage a different partner. This partnership model where the City retains ownership of the fiber assets will likely enable the City to make use of its existing fiber assets, and retain more control than simply relying on the private sector, while tempering risk in a way that a retail model cannot.

We note that recent developments with Google Fiber—particularly its apparent scaling back of infrastructure deployment—do not change any of CTC’s recommendations in this report.<sup>11</sup> The City is focused on finding ways to serve business customers, while Google Fiber has historically focused on providing residential service.

### **1.7.1 The City Can Take Small Steps with Potentially Big Rewards Toward Achieving Its Goals**

There are opportunities for the City to improve telecommunications services in the community with minimal capital investment. A phased fiber construction approach would allow the City to invest in infrastructure over time that facilitates the goal of eventually providing FTTP to all residents and businesses in the City.

At a high level, we believe the City can take on the following projects to help advance toward its goals without requiring a multi-million-dollar investment in the near term:

- We recommend that, in the coming months, the City consider modifying its ROW ordinance to provide the City with the option of obtaining conduit on routes where utilities are performing excavation. This type of “Dig Once” policy would require any excavation plans fitting specified criteria to include municipal use conduit or fiber, unless the City opts out of the excavation project.
- Conduct an in-depth audit of existing fiber infrastructure and corresponding records, and implement a thorough records management program. This will support the City’s current efforts, and will enable a stronger enterprise going forward.
- Spend approximately \$60,000 to construct a roughly 0.3-mile segment of fiber to the Internet POP at 25070 O’Neil Avenue. If the City expands fiber and conduit through the

---

<sup>11</sup> Jon Brodtkin, “Google fiber division cuts staff by 9%, “pauses” fiber plans in 11 cities,” *Ars Technica*, last modified October 25, 2016, <http://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2016/10/google-fiber-laying-off-9-of-staff-will-pause-plans-for-10-cities/>.

Industrial Corridor as planned, and begins offering dark fiber services to high-end customers, this will add value to that offering.

- Begin expanding FTTP to select portions of the Industrial Corridor, and signal to the private sector through a procurement process that the City seeks one or more partners to offer services over a City-owned fiber network.
- Offer dark fiber services to some locations to support key customers in the Industrial Corridor.

#### ***1.7.1.1 Consider Modifying the City's ROW Ordinance to Include a Dig-Once Policy***

Future public works projects should also be leveraged to expand the City's conduit and fiber network. Projects such as utility replacements, road widenings, and other major capital improvement efforts may provide the opportunity to install conduit and fiber optics without the need for surface restoration. A coordinated Dig Once ordinance, which typically requires the installation of City-owned communications infrastructure in excavation projects where the City has determined that it is both financially feasible and consistent with the City's long-term goals, is recommended to leverage these types of public and private excavation projects. Section 4.3 further discusses our Dig Once recommendations.

Similar to Dig Once is a concept called "One-Touch Make-Ready," which applies to infrastructure that will be placed on electric or communication poles. Enacting a One-Touch Make-Ready ordinance is similar to implementing a Dig Once policy in that both aim to simplify the process of deploying infrastructure through coordinated efforts among entities and agencies. The goal is to streamline the process of deploying future-generation communications infrastructure throughout as much of a locality as possible, while minimizing cost and disruption to the ROW.

This analysis does not include a recommendation that the City enact a One-Touch Make-Ready ordinance at this time because our design anticipates a fully underground network. If the City expects to deploy additional infrastructure on poles in the future, or partner with a private entity that may deploy an aerial network, it may be prudent to explore a One-Touch Make-Ready policy.

It is important to note that Dig Once policies typically govern ROW spaces that a locality owns and over which it has control, whereas a One-Touch Make-Ready ordinance generally applies to poles that the locality may not own, or to which it may not have rights. While these poles are often located in the locality's public ROW, it is unclear to what degree a locality can direct pole owners to provide access to their poles. While CTC cannot provide legal guidance, we note that

Louisville Metro Government in Kentucky<sup>12</sup> and Metro Government of Nashville and Davidson County in Tennessee<sup>13</sup> are currently involved in litigation over One-Touch Make-Ready policies.

### ***1.7.1.2 Conduct Asset Audit and Carefully Manage any Existing and Expanded Fiber and Conduit Assets***

One of the most important steps the City can take is to ensure that it is carefully managing its assets, including conduit and fiber. Whether the City opts to expand its assets or maintain the status quo, fiber strand management on the front end can have enormous benefits over the life of the fiber network, and can save potential confusion and cost in the long run.

One initial step toward this end is to conduct a thorough evaluation of any and all fiber management documentation the City currently has in place. There may exist documentation in the form of spreadsheets, correspondence, or simple text documents. A full fiber management system may be a necessary long-term investment, but the City cannot evaluate its needs until it understands what it already has available. An audit of existing documentation will enable the City to identify gaps in its fiber strand management—and if any documentation already exists, this can be used to develop an initial fiber map, which can then be built onto as the City expands its network.

We encourage the City to maintain detailed records of all its fiber strands and their locations. The importance of keeping meticulous records does not cease once the network is fully constructed. On the contrary, it is critically important for all ongoing and additional connections made on the network to be documented. Updates should be made to “as-built” and strand management documentation in real time to avoid making mistakes later, misremembering strand allocations, or simply forgetting important items altogether.

Documenting the network’s fibers and strand usage is crucial, and making sure that City staff has unrestricted access to its strand management tools is equally important. Even if the City works with an outside firm to manage this process, we believe that it is a worthwhile investment to appoint a staff person who will become knowledgeable about and maintain documentation regarding the location of strands on the City’s network. Further, using an intuitive and straightforward system and/or software is also key; this will help guard against such critical knowledge being inaccessible to future iterations of City staff and leadership.

---

<sup>12</sup> Brodtkin, Jon, "Charter, like AT&T, sues Louisville to stall Google Fiber," *ArsTechnica*, last modified October 5, 2016, accessed January 5, 2017, <http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2016/10/charter-like-att-sues-louisville-to-stall-google-fiber/>.

<sup>13</sup> Fingas, Jon, "Comcast sues Nashville over law that helps Google Fiber," *Engadget*, last modified October 26, 2016, accessed January 5, 2017, <https://www.engadget.com/2016/10/26/comcast-sues-nashville-over-google-fiber-law/>.

Another key aspect of taking care of its infrastructure is to ensure that the City has access to an on-call fiber maintenance contractor that can perform network repairs on an emergency basis. This contractor should be empowered and required to access the City's fiber management system—even if it is simply a shared spreadsheet—to record any network changes as close to real time as possible. The City will benefit tremendously from taking an inventory of its records and ensuring that anyone involved with the network going forward is accountable for this as well.

As we note in Section 7.4.3, the City can choose to hire new staff, engage existing staff, or contract out for various responsibilities related to managing the network. Generally, the degree to which a locality elects to maintain certain responsibilities internally or contract them out is specific to the unique needs of the locality. That is, each locality has its own structure, hierarchy, and collection of staff with various skill sets, and only the locality can determine which functions it may be capable of managing internally versus which responsibilities are best delegated to highly skilled contracted vendors. However, although the City may end up contracting out most responsibilities, we encourage keeping documentation creation and management as an internal function for either existing or new City staff. While there are many competent firms that can perform GIS and other network documentation functions for the City, we believe that because the City has a vested interest in the documentation's integrity, fiber documentation and records management is best performed internally.

#### ***1.7.1.3 Construct 0.3 Miles of Fiber To Connect To Internet Point of Presence***

We recommend the City construct fiber to the Internet POP at 25070 O'Neil Avenue. This requires approximately 0.3 miles of fiber construction at a cost of approximately \$60,000. Establishing a presence at the Internet POP allows dark fiber customers to access the services offered at the POP. Services could include hosting servers and network electronics in a datacenter environment, accessing multiple ISPs at rates lower than can be achieved at the customer's premises, and direct access to applications providers that may reside at the POP (such as voice over Internet protocol, or VoIP, services providers).

With the connection to the Internet POP, ISPs may be interested in procuring dark fiber from the City to serve businesses in the Industrial Corridor or along the fiber routes. The dark fiber services may also be used by wireless ISPs to provide connectivity to telecommunications towers and distributed antenna systems to provide backhaul for wireless service. Expanded wireless service may be a way to meet some of the network services needs for businesses in the Industrial Corridor.

#### ***1.7.1.4 Deploy FTTP In a Concentrated Area in the Industrial Corridor***

The City may want to deploy dark fiber to select areas of the Industrial Corridor. The City should select a targeted area for deployment where it can reach the maximum number of customers

with the least amount of fiber construction. The City should take into consideration the following factors when choosing such an area:

- Density of businesses along specific routes;
- Types of businesses within the area (i.e. technology firms typically require more network services than manufacturers);
- Feedback from businesses in the area on their existing needs;
- Presence of multi-tenant office buildings; and
- Feasibility of fiber construction (i.e. minimal railway and interstate crossings, minimal environmental impact, and presence of existing conduit and fiber).

Once the City has selected a target area, the FTTP network should be constructed to support a full FTTP deployment in the future, which may require additional conduit and larger handholes than currently necessary. To complete an FTTP network that will serve approximately 15 percent of businesses, we estimate a cost of approximately \$2.3 million.

Note that because our projection in Section 1.6.1 shows that it would cost approximately \$5.4 million to deploy FTTP to the entire Industrial Corridor, the projected cost to serve only 15 percent of businesses may seem high. However, whether the City deploys FTTP to 15 percent or 100 percent of businesses in the Industrial Corridor, the backbone must be built out and fiber routed to an aggregation point to support network core development.

It is also important to note that this targeted FTTP network will require the City to establish many of the policies and procedures required to support a larger scale FTTP deployment. This approach can help the City capture the cost to build and operate the network, and helps project the potential cost to expand the network to the full Industrial Corridor and other areas.

#### ***1.7.1.5 Initiate a Procurement Process to Communicate the City's Plans to the Private Sector***

If the City pursues a dark fiber or a wholesale service model, it may be prudent to issue a request for information (RFI) or request for proposal (RFP) to signal to the private sector that the City is willing to invest in infrastructure and is seeking a partner. The process can also provide feedback on price point a potential partner might consider (see Section 7.4).

*Our analysis indicates that it would cost approximately **\$2.3 million** to serve approximately 15 percent of businesses in the Industrial Corridor.*

An RFI process allows the City to cast a wide net and ask the private sector for input on potential business models and partnership configurations. An RFP is not as broad as an RFI, but allows the City to set the parameters of the business model it hopes to pursue in a partnership, and define specific requirements it will have of its partner(s). If the

City can identify its preferred business model and can develop a framework of what it hopes to accomplish through a partnership, the terms defined in an RFP and a potential partner's response can serve as the foundation for an eventual partnership contract.

If the City opts to pursue a dark fiber model, the procurement process can describe the type of investment the City is seeking from a private provider, the exact service area the City's dark fiber deployment will target, and thoroughly describe the City's vision. This can lay out very clearly the City's expectations of a partner, and enable potential partners to evaluate the feasibility of partnering with the City.

For a wholesale service model approach, the City may want to start with a brief questionnaire aimed at known ISPs in the region before it moves forward with a full procurement process. This may identify providers that would be willing to purchase wholesale service from the City, and give the City a sense of what type of potential revenue it may be able to expect from a partnership.

#### ***1.7.1.6 Offer Dark Fiber Strands for Lease to Select High-End Customers***

One of our key recommendations is that the City continue to expand its fiber and conduit network as planned, specifically through the Industrial Corridor. The expanded fiber and conduit system will allow the City to begin offering dark fiber services to high-end customers. As customers purchase dark fiber services, the City will construct additional fiber and conduit to the customers—thus expanding the footprint of the existing network.

Dark fiber services include the City offering fiber optic strands between locations without active electronics. The customer would be responsible for the electronics to activate, or "light," the fiber. In this scenario, the City would only be responsible for maintaining and repairing the fiber. This approach minimizes the City staffing required, as the City would be responsible *only* for the network electronics for the City network. Fiber maintenance and repair can be contracted to a third party, and most of the costs associated with maintaining and repairing the fiber would already be required to run the City's network.

### **1.8 Expanding FTTP to Residential Customers Adds Considerable Cost**

The City aims to eventually consider deploying residential FTTP in addition to serving the Industrial Corridor, and potentially other business customer locations in Hayward. Considering this desire to serve residential users, it is important to understand the potential costs associated with FTTP deployment, and particularly with providing retail service to residential users.

We conducted a high-level analysis of the cost per passing in various states in the U.S., including California, Colorado, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Washington, and Wisconsin. The "per passing cost" is the approximate cost to pass a premises with fiber optics. This cost does not include the cost of the drop cable or the CPEs; it is simply the cost to run fiber in front of a location. Our


analysis showed an average per-passing cost of just under \$1,400, based on the per-passing costs in the several communities we evaluated.

It is important to note the per-passing costs ranged from \$1,100 to over \$1,600; as such, we encourage localities to use caution when examining costs estimates from other communities. It is important to note the per-passing costs ranged from \$1,100 to over \$1,600; as such, we encourage localities to use caution when examining cost estimates from other communities. Using this cost range and assuming there are 46,000 residential passings in Hayward results in a fiber per-passing cost estimate of \$50.6 million to \$73.6 million. Actual costs will depend on housing densities, construction types, traffic control requirements, make-ready, and other factors.

Still, even with this caveat, the City can begin to understand through other communities' experience the kinds of costs it may incur in an FTTP deployment that includes residential customers. Figure 2, below, shows the range of costs that we considered from various markets throughout the U.S. Note that these examples point to a scenario that considers *only* the FTTP outside plant (OSP), or the fiber and conduit associated with the network. These costs do not consider the cost of network electronics necessary to "light" the network. Additionally, these do not include the cost for installing the customer drop cable, which is the fiber extension that connects a customer's premises to the fiber network.



**Figure 2: Comparison of Per-Passing Costs in Various U.S. Markets**



## 2 Broadband Needs and Trends

The need for high-speed broadband is increasingly evident as consumers become more educated on the merits of ultra-fast connectivity. Businesses of all sizes in every industry are finding that their ability to compete successfully depends more than ever on their access to a broadband connection. From manufacturing organizations that rely on high-speed connectivity for automation,<sup>14</sup> to small business owners that need broadband to complete customer transactions and provide WiFi to patrons, businesses' demand is steadily growing.

Further, the workforce is becoming increasingly mobile, and businesses that wish to effectively compete must be aware and accommodating of this reality. Cloud computing and reliable wireless broadband services are two potential areas of significant need for business customers, and examples of accommodating a mobile workforce. Having employees who are mobile and can work from anywhere potentially reduces overhead costs and enables companies to be nimble. As reliable wireless service becomes an integral component of effectively doing business, companies find this is an area where they need significant improvement in dependable connectivity.

Cloud computing—which refers to information technology services, such as software, virtualized computing environments, and storage, available “in the cloud” over a user’s Internet connection—is also changing the way businesses operate. The business drivers behind cloud computing are ease of use and, in theory, lower operating costs. For example, business owners understand that adding a new employee to their growing business requires ample resources. This includes purchasing a computer, installing necessary software, and ongoing software license management. Also, local server and application administration requires either dedicated staff or contracted support.

As an alternative, cloud services eliminate the need to maintain local server infrastructure and software, and instead allow the user to log into a subscription-based cloud service through a web-browser or software client. The cloud is essentially a shift of workload from local computers in the network to servers managed by a provider that make up the cloud. This, in turn, decreases the end user’s administrative burden for information technology (IT) services.

Even where businesses’ needs may be mostly met, many communities have areas that lack reasonably priced, high-speed options for residential customers. Because of this, a pervasive challenge that impacts local businesses is the area's ability to attract and recruit top professional talent. The availability of broadband service varies widely throughout the U.S., and the small- to

---

<sup>14</sup> Chopra, Aneesh, “Insourcing American Jobs: The Importance of “Smart” Manufacturing, Broadband, and IT,” *The White House*, last modified January 14, 2012, accessed September 15, 2016, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2012/01/14/insourcing-american-jobs-importance-smart-manufacturing-broadband-and-it>.

medium-size business market tends to lack a range of options to meet these users' needs. Cable and digital subscriber line (DSL) service is typically available to businesses, and options for higher-end services like Metro Ethernet are often available in urban areas. But many communities lack a mid-level service that offers more capacity and reliability than residential-grade cable or DSL, but is less costly than Metro Ethernet and similar dedicated services targeted at large organizations.

This gap represents a market niche that we believe the City may be able to fill by deploying FTTP that can support fiber-based business connectivity. Even if the City does not directly offer services, it can fill broadband availability gaps by enabling one or more private providers to offer services over a robust fiber optic network.

## **2.1 The City Is Served Similarly to Other Markets, but There Are Still Gaps in Service**

Many of the City's services—especially the lowest-priced offerings—provide download speeds far below the Federal Communications Commission (FCC)'s updated definition of broadband of at least 25 Mbps download speed.<sup>15</sup> Further, these tiers may even be “up to,” services, which means that the actual speed a customer experiences is less than the advertised amount. For example, if a customer subscribes to an “up to” 5 Mbps service, they may experience speeds as low as 1 Mbps or even less. Given the FCC's updated definition, these services cannot technically be classified as broadband.

In some cases, the available service tiers that would meet the minimum definition of broadband are priced much higher than many of the City's consumers may be able to afford. Unfortunately, this is not unique to the City. On the contrary, our analysis shows that the available speed tiers and price points in the City are comparable to other markets throughout the U.S. In fact, some of the City's existing available service offerings are priced lower for higher service tiers than in other markets. Further, some businesses in the Industrial Corridor are limited to only DSL service.

As the City considers how to pursue a fiber deployment, it may want to focus on gaps in affordable mid-range service offerings. Some subscribers may opt to purchase low-tier service because it meets their needs, but the current market does not adequately meet the needs of subscribers that desire affordable mid-range service. This often applies to small- and medium-sized businesses that have limited funds to allocate to telecommunications spending, but that require fast, reliable service to conduct their day-to-day business.

---

<sup>15</sup> “2015 Broadband Progress Report,” *Federal Communications Commission*, last modified February 4, 2015, accessed September 1, 2016, <https://www.fcc.gov/reports-research/reports/broadband-progress-reports/2015-broadband-progress-report>.

These users, and potentially others, likely desire more robust and affordable service, as well as better upload speeds. The upload speeds available in the City today are either minimal (as low as 1.5 Mbps in some cases), or are priced very high (\$249.95 per month for 20 Mbps upload for Comcast's small business service). Though upload speeds may not be as important in some markets, the need for improved upload speeds in a city like Hayward is especially prominent, given its location and large business sector.

If the City can directly or in a partnership focus on filling the gap for mid-range services, it may find that this eases the process of introducing a new broadband offering into the market. Competing directly with existing providers to offer roughly the same service that is available today will not set the City or its partner(s) apart in any way. Our analysis shows that the City and the other markets we evaluated seem "well-served," in that there are several providers offering service in the existing market. However, a new offering that is sensitive to availability and supply challenges can address service gaps.

### 3 Needs Assessment

The City has a range of broadband user groups and stakeholders, and is especially interested in understanding local businesses' connectivity needs. An important part of understanding the potential success of a municipal FTTP deployment is to determine the perceived need for better connectivity options within the community, and willingness to switch to a different service.

To assist in understanding the demand for fiber connectivity and related services, CTC conducted an online survey of Hayward businesses on behalf of the City. Additionally, we compared available services in Hayward to those in select communities, particularly those that identify as "Gigabit Cities." The analysis in this section helps illustrate with broad strokes the potential desire for fiber-based connectivity in the City.

#### 3.1 Business Survey Results

The business survey was designed to collect a range of data to understand current use of Internet and data services, satisfaction with current service providers, and interest in higher-speed Internet and data service offerings. While the survey should not be considered a truly representative sample of all Hayward businesses, it offers some insight into a potential customer base and market in the City, and provides the City with a starting point to understand the service attributes where it may need to focus its efforts.

In general, the survey shows that:

- Most of the respondents represent small- to medium-size businesses;
- Most respondents are not significantly unhappy with most attributes of their current service;
- More than 40 percent of respondents believe the City should have some role in enhancing broadband connectivity options for businesses in Hayward; and
- Approximately 75 percent of respondents would be very or somewhat willing to switch to a 1 Gbps service for \$75 per month, and the willingness steadily drops as the service prices increases.

The full survey results are described in Appendix G: Online Business Survey Results, attached to this Report.

#### 3.2 Comparison of Services in Hayward to Gigabit Communities

As is typical of most cities of similar size in the U.S., the City of Hayward has more than a dozen carriers offering residential, small business, enterprise-grade, and carrier services.

We identified 13 service providers in the Hayward area that offer fiber-based enterprise services, from dark fiber connectivity to data transport services, with speeds that range from 1 Megabits

per second (Mbps) to 100 Gigabits per second (Gbps). The carriers that provide enterprise-grade lit services in the Hayward area are:

- Access One
- AT&T
- Comcast
- EarthLink
- Integra
- Level 3
- Line Systems
- MegaPath
- Sonic
- TelePacific
- Windstream
- XO Communications
- Zayo

Four service providers in the City have dark fiber availability:

- Integra
- Level 3
- Line Systems
- Zayo

With respect to the availability and pricing of enterprise-grade services, we have seen that the offerings in Hayward are on par with services in regions of similar size and urbanity. The City has a good mix of facilities-based and non-facilities-based providers, with all the major carriers having an established presence in the City. Prices for services are dependent on bandwidth, location, and network configuration; whether the service is protected or unprotected; whether the service is managed; and whether the customer has a service-level agreement (SLA).<sup>16</sup> The pricing for enterprise grade services have continued to drop over the last several years across the country and we expect that trend to continue in Hayward.

Residential and small business customers in the Hayward area have access to a range of services, though individual service options are dependent on location. The main ISPs in Hayward are AT&T, Comcast, and Sonic. Of these providers, Comcast offers fiber-based internet services up to 2 Gbps. There are also wireless ISPs (WISPs), such as Etheric Networks and Cruzio, and satellite-based services available in the City.

---

<sup>16</sup> An agreement between a provider and a customer that outlines certain parameters about the service an end user can expect; for example, an SLA may indicate that, in the event of an outage, the provider has a limited amount of time to restore service.

The key difference that we see between the residential and small business services in the City in comparison to other communities that have municipal broadband or fiber-to-the-home (FTTH) by a provider like Google Fiber is the ubiquity of service. Though Comcast offers gigabit services in Hayward, the availability of the service would vary based on location and most likely only if there was a strong business case to warrant an expansion of service to a particular location.

With regard to pricing, we have seen communities with a municipality backed service offering price gigabit services from \$50 (in Longmont, Colorado), to \$100 (in Westminster, Maryland) per month, with low installation costs.<sup>17</sup> Google Fiber offers its residential 1 Gbps services at \$70 per month with waived installation costs with a 1-year contract (typically \$100).<sup>18</sup> In comparison, the service provided by Comcast in Hayward is for the 2 Gbps speed at \$299.95 per month and requires a two-year contract, plus \$1,000 in upfront installation and activation fees.

We have provided an assessment of the broadband service available in the City in Appendix B.

---

<sup>17</sup> In such cases, the municipality has made a substantial capital and/or operating investment in the network, which potentially enables lower service prices than scenarios of purely private investment.

<sup>18</sup> <https://fiber.google.com/cities/kansascity/plans/>, accessed June 2016

## 4 Operational and Business Model Options

There are several business models that the City can consider for its fiber deployment. Overall, we believe that the City's key focus should be to deploy fiber in at least select areas of the community, such as the Industrial Corridor. We believe that the City is most likely to be successful if it focuses on infrastructure, and works to lower barriers to market entry for the private sector. By doing this, the City can encourage competition and increase the range of service options available to consumers, but it does not have to take the enormous risk of becoming a service provider and competing with established providers.

The dark fiber model will have the least risk for the City because it does not entail operational unknowns like a retail service model. Managing agreements with and providing service to end users is generally expensive and unpredictable, and—unlike the dark fiber model—is not an approach for which the City is already at least partially equipped. Even a wholesale service model carries more risk than a dark fiber model because there are additional costs and uncertainties associated with maintaining network electronics.

A dark fiber model is essentially a public works model, in that fiber is simply infrastructure, which the City is already accustomed to managing. This approach allows the City to play to its strengths, and carefully navigate around its potential vulnerabilities (e.g., not having the expertise to successfully market retail service).

If the City determines that a dark fiber model does not appropriately achieve its goals in the short term, it can opt to pursue a retail service model, where the City becomes the provider and offers services directly to end users. This model carries greater risk for the City because of the marketing, advertising, competition, and customer service components. While it is challenging for a municipality to become a retail service provider, it is not impossible, and the City can choose this path. We recommend this model only if the City finds that it is for some reason unable to pursue a dark fiber model, or if it is unable to attract a partner to offer services over a City-owned network.

A wholesale service offering is a “middle ground” between a dark fiber approach and the City becoming a retail service provider. In a wholesale service offering, the City would deploy the FTTP network, and would add network electronics to “light” the fiber. It would then offer “lit services” over the network to one or more ISPs. This model is attractive in that it potentially enables numerous ISPs to offer services. In a dark fiber model, on the other hand, one provider may control the strands to a location and may or may not offer lit services to a competing provider. The wholesale service offering could potentially help the City achieve open access goals it may have.



### 4.1.1 Staffing Considerations for Various Business Models

Each of the potential business models we outlined in Section 1.5 requires some additional staffing. Consistent with our assertion that the dark fiber model entails the least risk for the City, this model requires the lowest investment in additional staff. Similarly, the retail service model requires the greatest investment in additional staff, while the wholesale service model is between these.

For a dark fiber model, we anticipate that the City will likely need to add 1.5 full time employees (FTEs) in year one, and 2.75 FTEs in year two and beyond. This model requires primarily fiber infrastructure and management staff, with some minimal sales requirements. The “marketing” necessary for this model is restricted to working directly with providers to encourage them to lease access to the City’s dark fiber network.

**Table 3: Staffing for Dark Fiber Business Model**

<b>New Employees</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5+</b>
Business Manager	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
GIS	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Communications - Sales	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Customer Service Representative	-	-	-	-	-
Service Technicians/Installers & IT Support	-	-	-	-	-
Fiber Plant O&M Technicians	0.25	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Total New Staff</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>2.75</b>

Projections for necessary staff increase slightly for a wholesale service model. We anticipate that the City will need to increase staffing by approximately 2.5 FTEs for this model in year one; 4.25 FTEs in years two and three; and 5.25 FTEs in year four and beyond. Because this model requires the City to “light” the fiber by adding network electronics, IT support staff and additional GIS support is added in this model. The sales requirements for this model will be similar to a dark fiber model: convince private providers to purchase services on the City’s network, though in this case providers will purchase “lit” services from the City.

**Table 4: Staffing for Wholesale Service Model**

<b>New Employees</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5+</b>
Business Manager	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
GIS	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Communications - Sales	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
Customer Service Representative	-	-	-	-	-
Service Technicians/Installers & IT Support	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00
Fiber Plant O&M Technicians	0.25	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Total New Staff</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>5.25</b>	<b>5.25</b>

For the retail service model, these numbers increase again because of the addition of a customer service representative. This function is necessary in a retail model, whereas in other models the City will not directly manage or interact with end users. The retail model anticipates a total of 4.75 FTEs in year one, 8 FTEs in years two and three, and 9 FTEs in year four and beyond.

**Table 5: Staffing for Retail Service Model**

<b>New Employees</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5+</b>
Business Manager	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
GIS	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Communications - Sales	0.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Customer Service Representative	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
Service Technicians/Installers & IT Support	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00
Fiber Plant O&M Technicians	0.25	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
<b>Total New Staff</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>

## 4.2 Fiber Management Requirements

One of the most important steps the City can take is to ensure that it is carefully managing its assets, including conduit and fiber. Whether the City opts to become a retail service provider or simply provide access to its dark fiber network, fiber strand management on the front end can have enormous benefits over the life of the fiber network, and can save potential confusion and cost in the long run.

Even—or, perhaps, *especially*—if the City contracts out the construction of fiber network, we encourage the City to maintain detailed records of all its fiber strands and their locations. This process is extremely important during the construction phase of the network, and is easiest to carry out during this phase. As construction is underway to build or expand fiber, the City can allocate a staff member or work with a firm to keep track of its fiber usage, which will lay the foundation for ensuring the network’s long-term usability and growth.

However, the importance of keeping meticulous records does not cease once the network is fully constructed. On the contrary, it is critically important for all ongoing and additional connections

made on the network to be documented. Updates should be made to “as-built” and strand management documentation in real time to avoid making mistakes later, misremembering strand allocations, or simply forgetting important items altogether.

Documenting the network’s fibers and strand usage is crucial, and making sure that City staff has unrestricted access to its strand management tools is equally important. Even if the City works with an outside firm to manage this process, we believe that it is a worthwhile investment to appoint at least one staff person who will become knowledgeable about the location of strands on the City’s network. Further, using an intuitive and straightforward system and/or software is also key; this will help guard against such critical knowledge being inaccessible to future iterations of City staff and leadership.

### **4.3 Dig Once Considerations**

We recommend that in the coming months, the City consider modifying its ROW ordinance to provide the City with the option of obtaining conduit on routes where utilities are performing excavation. This type of “Dig Once” policy would require any excavation plans fitting specified criteria to include municipal use conduit or fiber, unless the City opts out of the excavation project. This would require the installation of City communications infrastructure in excavation projects where the City determines that it is both financially feasible and consistent with the municipality’s long-term goals to develop the communications infrastructure.

Such a policy can reduce the cost of the conduit to the City by 25 percent to 75 percent relative to the cost of a standalone construction project if it installs or has conduit installed in coordination with other excavation. A Dig Once approach can also reduce the impact on ROW and inconvenience to the public.

#### **4.3.1 The Case for Dig Once Policies**

The construction of fiber optic communications cables is a costly, complex, and time-consuming process. The high cost of construction is a barrier to entry for potential broadband communications providers. In addition, available space is diminishing in the public ROW. Moreover, cutting roads and sidewalks substantially reduces the lifetime and performance of those surfaces.

Accordingly, encouraging or requiring simultaneous construction and co-location of facilities in the public ROW will reduce the long-term cost of building communications facilities. This is because there are significant economies of scale through:

1. Coordination of construction with road construction and other disruptive activities in the public ROW.
2. Construction of spare conduit capacity where multiple service providers or entities may require infrastructure.

The reason that these economies are available is primarily because fiber optic cables and installation materials alone are relatively inexpensive, often contributing to less than one-quarter of the total cost of new construction. While material costs typically fall well below \$40,000 per mile (even for large cables containing hundreds of fiber strands), labor, permitting, and engineering costs commonly drive the total price toward \$200,000 per mile if conducted as a stand-alone project.

Moreover, as the ROW becomes more crowded with communications infrastructure and other utilities, the cost of new construction can grow rapidly. In general, however, it is in the best interests of both public and private entities for the public sector to identify construction collaboration opportunities that share the burden of expensive and duplicative labor-related costs and efficiently use physical space in the ROW.

If fiber construction is coordinated with a major road or utility project that is already disrupting the ROW in a rural area, the cost of constructing the fiber, communications conduit, and other materials can range from \$10,000 per mile up. However, if fiber construction is completed as part of a separate stand-alone project, the cost of constructing fiber and communications conduit can range from \$95,000 to \$200,000 per mile and even higher in complex urban environments.

There are numerous methods for constructing fiber optic infrastructure. Underground construction using protective conduits generally provides the most scalable, flexible, and durable method for developing long-term communications infrastructure, but is also typically more expensive than aerial construction methods requiring attachments to utility poles. Underground construction can be preferable despite the cost because of the limit in the quantity of cables and attachments that can be placed on existing utility poles in more crowded areas, and because aerial construction is more exposed and vulnerable to outside conditions.

Banks of conduits constructed simultaneously or large conduits segmented with innerduct, provide multiple pathways for the installation of multiple fiber optic cables located in close proximity, with the ability to remove, add, or replace fiber optic cables without disturbing neighboring cables.

Conversely, multiple conduits installed at different times must be physically spaced, often by several feet, to prevent damage to one while installing the next. Once the ROW becomes crowded, often the choices of construction methods are reduced, leaving only less desirable methods and more costly locations for construction of additional infrastructure.

Some of the key savings achieved through coordinated construction efforts include:

- Incremental labor and material costs, through reduced crew mobilization expenses and larger bulk material purchases
- Trenching or boring costs, particularly when coordination enables lower-cost methods (e.g., trenching as opposed to boring) or allows multiple entities to share a common trench or bore for their independent purposes
- Traffic control and safety personnel costs, particularly when constructing along roadways requiring lane closures
- Engineering and survey costs associated with locating existing utilities and specifying the placement of new facilities
- Engineering and survey costs associated with environmental impact studies and approvals
- Lease fees for access to private easements, such as those owned by electric utilities
- Railroad crossing permit fees and engineering
- Restoration to the ROW or roadway, particularly in conjunction with roadway improvements
- Bridge crossing permit fees and engineering

#### **4.3.2 Coordinating Conduit Construction with Other Utility Projects Reduces Costs**

Where other types of construction are occurring within or along the ROW, such as road construction or resurfacing, roadway widening, sidewalk repairs, bridge construction, and water or gas main installation, there is an opportunity to place telecommunications infrastructure at an overall reduced cost and with reduced disruption to public ROW.

#### **4.3.3 Standard Specification**

The challenge in developing a standard specification for a Dig Once project is to incorporate the requirements of known and unknown users, and to provide sufficient capacity and capability without excessive costs.

We considered the following factors in developing a conduit specification:

1. Capacity—sufficient conduit needs to be installed, and that conduit needs to have sufficient internal diameter, to accommodate future users' cables and to be segmented to enable conduit to be shared or cables added at a future date

2. Segmentation—users need to have the appropriate level of separation from each other for commercial, security, or operational reasons
3. Access—vaults and handholes need to be placed to provide access to conduit and the ability to pull fiber. Vaults need to be spaced to minimize the cost of extending conduit to buildings and other facilities that may be served by fiber
4. Costs—materials beyond those that are likely to be needed will add cost, as will the incremental labor to construct them. Beyond a certain point, trenches need to be widened or deepened to accommodate conduit
5. Robustness—the materials, construction standards, and placement need to reasonably protect the users’ fiber, and not unduly complicate maintenance and repairs
6. Architecture—sweeps, bend radius, and vault sizes need to be appropriate for all potential sizes of fiber

We recommend further discussions with private carriers to better develop a specification. It may be appropriate to have a different specification for different projects. Based on our knowledge of similar efforts in other cities, and our analysis, we believe the following standardized approach is suitable for major corridors and can be modified as discussions continue with excavators in the rights-of-way:

- Four two-inch conduit, minimum SDR 11 High-density polyethylene (HDPE), each of a separate color or unique striping to simplify identification of conduits within vaults and between vaults, in the event conduit must be accessed or repaired at intermediate points. Conduit count can be reduced if the Industrial Corridor is assessed not to justify the capacity.
- Composite anti-theft vaults having dimensions of 30” x 48” x 36” (W x L x D), placed in the sidewalk or available green space within the city or municipality ROW, as close to the curb or gutter as possible.
- Vaults spaced at intervals of 600 feet or less, typically at the intersection of a city or municipality block.
- Sweeping conduit bends with a minimum radius of 36 inches to allow cable to be pulled without exceeding pull-tension thresholds when placing high-count fiber cables (e.g., 864-count).
- Conduit placed in the same trench directly above the excavator’s infrastructure or, where this is not possible, placed with minimum horizontal offset, to minimize cost.

It is important to note that the proposed approach is designed to create consistency and predictability in costs and deployment and is a necessary compromise among the potential users. If an excavation project has a long-time horizon and sufficient budget, it is possible to customize

the Dig Once build, potentially adding conduit or adding vaults at particular locations. This plan provides a baseline approach.

The approach is a compromise among different types of users of conduit constructed under *dig once*. Some users might prefer larger conduit for consistency with earlier builds. Others sought a larger count of smaller conduit, to provide more flexibility and the capability for more providers to participate with smaller cable counts.

Two-inch conduit has become a standard size for a wide range of construction projects, and can support the widest range of use cases. A single two-inch conduit can accommodate a range of multi-cable configurations, while retaining recommended fill ratios, allowing a single user to serve its backbone and “lateral”/access cable requirements with a single, dedicated conduit. A few example cable configurations supported by a single two-inch conduit, which are not supported by smaller conduit, include:

- Two medium backbone cables (e.g., 144-strand to 288-strand cables) and one smaller “feeder” cable (e.g., 24-strand cable);
- Large backbone cable (e.g., 864-strand) and two or more smaller feeder cables; or
- Three medium backbone cables.

Compared to placing fewer, larger conduits segmented with innerduct, this approach provides greater opportunity for individual conduit to be intercepted and routed for future vault installation by a particular user. Additionally, two-inch conduit is substantially cheaper to install and physically more flexible than larger varieties, offering more options to route around existing utilities and other obstructions. Placing four conduit will provide a standard allotment of one or two conduit for State or municipality use and provide capacity for other use and for spares.

We recommend SDR 11 HDPE in all cases except where conduit is exposed to the elements (for example, as a riser to building entry), or under extreme levels of pressure (such as under a train or trolley track). SDR 11 HDPE designs will generally support standard highway and railway loads with less than 1 percent deflection when buried with two feet of cover.

## 5 Proposed Fiber Design

### 5.1 Construction Methodology

Our analysis assumes underground construction will consist primarily of horizontal, directional drilling to minimize ROW impact and to provide greater flexibility to navigate around other utilities. There are a variety of methods for underground construction, including plowing, trenching, directional boring, and microtrenching.

Plowing is generally the cheapest construction method, and is performed in unpaved areas where little subsurface rock is present, and the fiber route maintains a straight path (e.g., along a highway). The plowing machine pushes away dirt, inserts conduit and covers the conduit with the backfill.

Trenching is similar to plowing in that a narrow hole is dug and conduit is laid and the bottom of the trench, and is then covered with backfill. Unlike plowing, trenching can be performed in most situations but may not be cost-effective when expensive restoration is required to return the streets or rights-of-way to their original (i.e., pre-installation) condition.

Directional Boring is a process in which conduit is placed by drilling horizontally underground without disturbing the surface. The boring machine pushes a long drill that displaces the dirt underground so that a conduit can be installed. The direction and depth of the directional bore can be altered to navigate around other existing utilities. Directional boring is ideal in situations where trenching is not feasible, such as stream and railroad crossings.

Microtrenching uses a specialized saw blade to cut a small trench about a foot deep into the road or sidewalk subsurface. Very tiny conduit is inserted and covered with backfill, and the cut or “microtrench” is then sealed. Specialized fiber is then blown through the conduit system. Microtrenching is best suited for areas where the cost to perform surface restoration is high and roadway construction is not anticipated.

Underground construction costs are subject to uncertainty related to utilities congestion in the public rights-of-way, and the prevalence of subsurface hard rock—neither of which can be fully mitigated without physical excavation and/or testing. Surface restoration requirements can also greatly impact the cost of underground construction. For, example unpaved land is far less expensive to restore than cobblestone streets.

This analysis estimated costs for underground infrastructure placement using available unit-cost data for materials and estimates on the labor costs for placing, pulling, and boring fiber based on construction in comparable markets.



## 5.2 Overview of Existing Assets

We compiled an inventory of Hayward's current and planned broadband assets, data, and related information. During the process, the City provided documentation of its fiber and conduit. At the City's request, we focused on how the City's assets could be leveraged for future plans, relying on existing documentation rather than performing new surveys and condition assessments. To complete our assessment, we requested several pieces of GIS data from the City, including:

1. Political boundaries
2. Hydro layers (rivers, wetlands, etc.)
3. Rights-of-way/property Lines
4. Street centerlines
5. Street polygons
6. Sidewalk/parking lot polygons
7. Address points
8. Building polygons
9. City facilities
10. Parks and green spaces
11. Existing conduit and fiber
12. Existing assets
13. Huts
14. Water towers
15. Special development areas
16. Any other utility information

We discussed with the City any known plans for constructing fiber and conduit in the future, including:

1. Planned public works projects
2. Current and planned construction by private contractors, utilities, and others

We note that this type of investigation aligns with our longstanding guidance to municipal clients to take advantage of public or private sector construction that creates an opportunity to install City-owned conduit or fiber.

### 5.2.1 City Conduit and Fiber

Based on the City's GIS data, the City constructed and operates 14.1 miles of fiber and 13.6 miles of conduit. Approximately nine miles of the infrastructure is a U-shaped core fiber path made up of 60-strand cables, which run along Hesperian Boulevard, Mission Boulevard, and Winton Avenue. In addition, a 48-count cable extends north of Winton Avenue on Hesperian Boulevard, and 24-strand cables extend along Harder Road from Mission Boulevard to Tarman. 24-strand

cables extend the Winton Avenue fiber west of Hesperian Boulevard and down Clawiter Road. There is fiber on Enterprise Avenue from Clawiter Road to a water treatment plant. The City also expects to install fiber as part of a project related to California State Route 238, south of Industrial and north of A Street, along Mission Boulevard.

The City's conduit follows much of the same path, including lateral extensions into City Hall, Fire Stations 1 and 4, Hayward Executive Airport, and the Water Pollution Control Facility. Based on conversations with City engineers, most of the existing conduit is 2 inches in diameter with notable exceptions of the conduit along Hesperian Boulevard between Panama Street and Industrial Boulevard, which is 1.5 inches in diameter, and the newer conduit along Mission Boulevard, which is 2.5 inches in diameter.

Vaults, or pull boxes, are generally located every 500 to 600 feet along the fiber path. City engineers indicated that, with some exceptions, pull boxes along Hesperian Boulevard, Harder Road, Clawiter Road, and Mission Boulevard are generally in good condition. Pull boxes along Winton Avenue require some repair work, and fiber along Hesperian Boulevard from Fire Station 4 to Winton Avenue should be further evaluated. Most of the conduit only contains one cable, which means there is room for future additions. City staff reports that the fiber is primarily used for traffic and fire station communications.

Based on our discussions with the City, there is not innerduct or pull cables in this conduit. Standards for fiber and conduit construction have largely been determined by individual contractors hired by the City. It is our understanding that the City is developing a construction standard for future projects.

An additional 27 miles of planned fiber and conduit construction will expand the City's fiber backbone and allow for future expansion in new areas, including multiple paths through the City's Industrial Corridor. In addition to expanding the reach of the City's core loop, the additional fiber will create several loop structures that will allow for redundant connections over diverse physical paths. The proposed fiber also includes connections to Fire Station 3, Weekes Branch Library, and the Hayward Area Recreation & Park District office as well as a loop through the California State University (CSU) East Bay campus. The new fiber would also pass several other community institutions, including schools, parks, and hospitals. The existing conduit and fiber routes are shown alongside proposed future routes in Figure 3 and Figure 4.

Figure 3: Existing and Proposed City-Constructed Infrastructure





Figure 4: Existing and Proposed City-Constructed Fiber by Strand Count



During our review of the City’s records, City staff reported that the City does not currently maintain records of fiber assignment, fiber use, and splice matrices, and that available GIS data does not necessarily include all the City’s assets. We recommend that, going forward, the City include fiber assignment and splice matrices in its documentation efforts as this will aid in troubleshooting, future construction, and allocation of fiber strands.

### 5.3 Leverage Existing Assets

The existing conduit and fiber assets provide a starting point from which the City can expand. The proposed fiber builds will increase the resiliency of the network and allow the City to reach new key areas and institutions such as the Industrial Corridor. The existing strand counts, however, may not be sufficient for future needs.

If the City desires to significantly expand its fiber service, it should examine its current and future fiber needs and use strand counts that accommodate those needs plus those of potential external fiber users in new construction. Where higher strand counts are not available, new

cables can be pulled into the existing conduit if sufficient space is available. Where space is not available, new cables can replace the smaller cable to provide enhanced fiber counts along routes.

Future public works projects should also be leveraged to expand the City's conduit and fiber network. Projects such as utility replacements, road widenings, and other major capital improvements may provide the opportunity to install conduit and fiber optics without the need for surface restoration. A coordinated Dig Once ordinance, which typically requires the installation of City-owned communications infrastructure in excavation projects where the City has determined that it is both financially feasible and consistent with the City's long-term goals, is recommended to leverage these types of public and private excavation projects.

There may also be opportunities for the City to engage further with private partners to serve the Industrial Corridor. The City could, for example, provide transport for service providers that need to reach existing and potential customers as well as strategic peering points such as Internet POPs or data centers in another part of the City. The City may offer conduit to reduce construction costs to the Industrial Corridor—however, as we noted above, we do not recommend this approach.

We have identified three potential connection points within the City:

1. 25070 O'Neil Avenue
2. 21350 Cabot Boulevard<sup>19</sup>
3. 1880 Depot Road

The O'Neil Avenue location is an Internet POP where the City may be able to interconnect with other national and regional networks including Zayo. This POP is close to Route 238 where the City is planning to construct new fiber. The City may be able to arrange for connectivity at this site and include it in the Route 238 project construction so that it may offer transport or use the connectivity for its own purposes.

The Cabot Boulevard location is a Verizon data center approximately 1 mile west of the City's conduit along Clawiter Road.

The Depot Road location is an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) central office, located next to the City's fiber and conduit along Hesperian Boulevard. If it is determined that interconnection services are available at this location, the City may want to take advantage of its proximity to existing fiber.

---

<sup>19</sup> <https://fiberlocator.com>, accessed June 2016.

## 5.4 Conceptual Design and Specifications – Industrial Technology & Innovation Corridor

OSP (layer 1, also referred to as the physical layer) is both the most expensive part of the network and the longest lasting. The architecture of the physical plant determines the network's scalability for future uses and how the plant will need to be operated and maintained; the architecture is also the main determinant of the total cost of the deployment.

Figure 5 (below) shows a logical representation of the high-level FTTP network architecture we recommend for deployment to the Industrial Corridor. This design is open to a variety of architecture options. The figure illustrates the primary functional components in the FTTP network, their relative position to one another, and the flexibility of the architecture to support multiple subscriber models and classes of service.


The recommended architecture is a hierarchical data network that provides critical scalability and flexibility, both in terms of initial network deployment and its ability to accommodate the increased demands of future applications and technologies. The characteristics of this hierarchical FTTP data network are:

- Capacity – ability to provide efficient transport for subscriber data, even at peak levels
- Availability – high levels of redundancy, reliability, and resiliency; ability to quickly detect faults and re-route traffic
- Diversity – physical path diversity to minimize operational impact resulting from fiber or equipment failure
- Efficiency – no traffic bottlenecks; efficient use of resources
- Scalability – ability to grow in terms of physical service area and increased data capacity, and to integrate newer technologies
- Manageability – simplified provisioning and management of subscribers and services
- Flexibility – ability to provide different levels and classes of service to different customer environments; can support an open access network or a single-provider network; can provide separation between service providers on the physical layer (separate fibers) or logical layer (separate virtual local area network (VLAN or VPN)
- Security – controlled physical access to all equipment and facilities, plus network access control to devices

This architecture offers scalability to meet long-term needs. It is consistent with best practices for an open access network model that might potentially be required to support multiple network operators, or at least multiple retail service providers requiring dedicated connections to certain customers. This design would support a combination of Gigabit passive optical network (GPON) and direct Active Ethernet (AE) services (with the addition of electronics at the Fiber Distribution Cabinets (FDCs)), which would enable the network to scale by migrating to direct connections to each customer, or reducing splitter ratios, on an as-needed basis.

The design assumes placement of manufacturer-terminated fiber tap enclosures within the ROW or easements, providing water-tight fiber connectors for customer service drop cables and eliminating the need for service installers to perform splices in the field. This is an industry-standard approach to reducing both customer activation times and the potential for damage to distribution cables and splices. The model also assumes the termination of standard lateral fiber connections within larger multi-tenant business locations.

Figure 5: High-Level FTTP Architecture





### 5.4.1 Network Design

The network design and cost estimates assume the City will:

- Use existing fiber and conduit to connect to an Internet POP in the City;
- Procure space at the POP to host network electronics and provide backhaul to the Internet;
- Use existing City land or ROW space in the Industrial Corridor to locate the core and distribution hub facility with adequate environmental and backup power systems to house network electronics;
- Construct fiber to connect the hub to the FDCs;
- Construct fiber optics from the FDCs to each business (i.e., from termination panels in the FDC to tap locations in the ROW or on City easements); and
- Construct fiber laterals into large, multi-tenant business facilities.

Leveraging the City's existing conduit and fiber resources could decrease the costs associated with both constructing a backbone and identifying locations to house electronics that are near the City's existing resources.

The FTTP network and service areas were defined based on the following criteria:

- Targeting 512 passings per FDC;
- FDCs suitable to support hardened network electronics, providing backup power and an active heat exchange;<sup>20</sup> and
- Avoiding the need for distribution plant to cross major roadways and railways.

Coupled with an appropriate network electronics configuration, this fiber design serves to greatly increase the reliability of services provided to customers as compared to that of more traditional cable and telephone networks.

The access layer of the network, which encompasses the fiber plant from the FDCs to the customers, dedicates a single fiber strand from the FDC to each passing (i.e., potential customer

---

<sup>20</sup> These hardened FDCs reflect an assumption that the City's operational and business model will require the installation of provider electronics in the FDCs that can support open access among multiple providers. We note that the overall FTTP cost estimate would decrease if the hardened FDCs were replaced with passive FDCs (which would house only optical splitters) and the providers' electronics were housed only at hub locations.

address). This traditional FTTP design allows either network electronics or optical splitters in the FDCs. See Figure 6 below for a sample design.

**Figure 6: Detail Showing FTTP Access Layer Design**



This architecture offers scalability to meet long-term needs. It is consistent with best practices for an open access network model that might potentially be required to support multiple network operators, or at least multiple retail service providers requiring dedicated connections to certain customers.

#### 5.4.2 Network Core and Hub Site

The core site is the bridge that links the FTTP network to the public Internet and deliver all services to end users. The proposed network design includes a single core location given the size of the network. However, if consumer demand dictates it, a second Internet POP could be added to increase redundancy to the network.

For the cost estimate, we assumed that the core site electronics would be collocated with the distribution electronics in the Industrial Corridor hub with connectivity to the Internet POP at 25070 O'Neil Avenue.

The core will also house the providers' Operational Support Systems (OSS) such as provisioning platforms, fault and performance management systems, remote access, and other operational support systems for FTTP operations. The core location is also where any business partner or content / service providers will gain access to the subscriber network with their own POP. This may be via remote connection, but collocation is recommended.

The core network electronics run in a High Availability (HA) configuration, with fully meshed and redundant uplinks to the public Internet and/or all other content and service providers. It is imperative that core network locations are physically secure and allow unencumbered access 24x7x365 to authorized engineering and operational staff.

The operational environment of the network core and hub locations is similar to that of a data center. This includes clean power sources, UPS batteries, and diesel power generation for survival through sustained commercial outages. The facility must provide strong physical security, limited/controlled access, and environmental controls for humidity and temperature. Fire suppression is highly recommended.

Equipment is to be mounted securely in racks and cabinets, in compliance with national, state, and local codes. Equipment power requirements and specification may include -48 volt DC and/or 120/240 volts AC. All equipment is to be connected to conditioned / protected clean power with uninterrupted cutover to battery and generation.

For the cost estimate, we assumed that the core and distribution hub will be located on existing City land within the Industrial Corridor.

### **5.4.3 Distribution and Access Network Design**

The distribution network is the layer between the hub and the FDCs, which provide the access links to the taps. The distribution network aggregates traffic from the FDCs to the core. Fiber cuts and equipment failures have progressively greater operational impact as they happen closer to the network core, so it is critical to build in redundancies and physical path diversities in the distribution network, and to seamlessly re-route traffic when necessary.

The distribution and access network design proposed in this report is flexible and scalable enough to support two different architectures:

1. Housing both the distribution and access network electronics at the hub, and using only passive devices (optical splitters and patches) at the FDCs; or
2. Housing the distribution network electronics at the hub and pushing the access network electronics further into the network by housing them at the FDCs.

By housing all electronics at the hub, the network will not require power at the FDCs. Choosing a network design that only supports this architecture may reduce costs by allowing smaller, passive FDCs in the field. However, this architecture will limit the redundancy capability from the FDCs to the hub.

By pushing the network electronics further into the field, the network gains added redundancy by allowing the access electronics to connect to two distribution switches. In the event one distribution switch has an outage the subscribers connected to the FDC would still have network access via the other distribution switch. Choosing a network design that only supports this architecture may reduce costs by reducing the size of the hub.

Selecting a design that supports both models would allow the City to accommodate many different service operators and their network designs. This design would also allow service providers to start with a small deployment (i.e., placing electronics only at the hub site) and grow by pushing electronics closer to their subscribers.

#### ***5.4.3.1 Access Network Technologies***

FDCs can sit on a curb, be mounted on a pole, or reside in a building. Our model recommends installing sufficient FDCs to support higher than anticipated levels of subscriber penetration. This approach will accommodate future subscriber growth with minimal re-engineering. Passive optical splitters are modular and can be added to an existing FDC as required to support subscriber growth, or to accommodate unanticipated changes to the fiber distribution network with potential future technologies.

Our FTTP design also includes the placement of indoor FDCs and splitters to support large-tenant businesses. This would require obtaining the right to access the equipment for repairs and installation in whatever timeframe is required by the service agreements with the customers. Lack of access would potentially limit the ability to perform repairs after normal business hours, which could be problematic for commercial services.

In this model, we assume the use of GPON electronics for most subscribers and Active Ethernet for a small percentage of subscribers (typically large business customers) that request a premium

service or require greater bandwidth. GPON is the most commonly provisioned FTTP service—used, for example, by Verizon (in its FiOS systems), Google Fiber, and Chattanooga EPB.

Furthermore, providers of gigabit services typically provide these services on GPON platforms. Even though the GPON platform is limited to 1.2 Gbps upstream and 2.4 Gbps downstream for the subscribers connected to a single PON, operators have found that the variations in actual subscriber usage generally means that all subscribers can obtain 1 Gbps on demand (without provisioned rate-limiting), even if the capacity is aggregated at the PON. Furthermore, many GPON manufacturers have a development roadmap to 10 Gbps and faster speeds as user demand increases.

GPON supports high-speed broadband data, and is easily leveraged by triple-play carriers for voice, video, and data services. The GPON OLT uses single-fiber (bi-directional) SFP modules to support multiple (most commonly less than 32) subscribers.

GPON uses passive optical splitting, which is performed inside FDC, to connect fiber from the OLTs to the customer premises. The FDCs house multiple optical splitters, each of which splits the fiber link to the OLT between 16 to 32 customers (in the case of GPON service).

AE provides a symmetrical (up/down) service that is commonly referred to as Symmetrical Gigabit Ethernet. AE can be provisioned to run at sub-gigabit speeds, and like GPON easily supports legacy voice, voice over IP, and video. AE is typically deployed for customers who require specific service level agreements that are easier to manage and maintain on a dedicated service.

For subscribers receiving Active Ethernet service, a single dedicated fiber goes directly to the subscriber premises with no splitting. Because AE requires dedicated fiber (home run) from the OLT to the CPE, and because each subscriber uses a dedicated SFP on the OLT, there is significant cost differential in provisioning an AE subscriber versus a GPON subscriber.

Our fiber plant is designed to provide Active Ethernet service or PON service to all passings. The network operator selects electronics based on the mix of services it plans to offer and can modify or upgrade electronics to change the mix of services.

#### ***5.4.3.2 Expanding the Access Network Bandwidth***

GPON is currently the most commonly provisioned FTTP technology, due to inherent economies when compared with technologies delivered over home-run fiber<sup>21</sup> such as Active Ethernet. The cost differential between constructing an entire network using GPON and Active Ethernet is 40

---

<sup>21</sup> Home run fiber is a fiber optic architecture where individual fiber strands are extended from the distribution sites to the premises. Home run fiber does not use any intermediary aggregation points in the field.

percent to 50 percent.<sup>22</sup> GPON is used to provide services up to 1 Gbps per subscriber and is part of an evolution path to higher-speed technologies that use higher-speed optics and wave-division multiplexing.

This model provides many options for scaling capacity, which can be done separately or in parallel:

1. Reducing the number of premises in a PON segment by modifying the splitter assignment and adding optics. For example, by reducing the split from 16:1 to 4:1, the per-user capacity in the access portion of the network is quadrupled.
2. Adding higher speed PON protocols can be accomplished by adding electronics at the FDC or hub locations. Since these use different frequencies than the GPON electronics, none of the other CPE would need to be replaced.
3. Adding WDM-PON electronics as they become widely available. This will enable each user to have the same capacity as an entire PON. Again, these use different frequencies than GPON and are not expected to require replacement of legacy CPE equipment.
4. Option 1 could be taken to the maximum, and PON replaced by a 1:1 connection to electronics—an Active Ethernet configuration.

These upgrades would all require complementary upgrades in the backbone and distribution Ethernet electronics, as well as in the upstream Internet connections and peering—but they would not require increased fiber construction.

#### ***5.4.3.3 Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) and Subscriber Services***

In the final segment of the FTTP network, fiber runs from the FDC to customers' buildings, where it terminates at the subscriber tap—a fiber optic housing located in the ROW closest to the premises. The service installer uses a pre-connectorized drop cable to connect the tap to the subscriber premises without the need for fiber optic splicing.

The drop cable extends from the subscriber tap (in a handhole underground) to the building, enters the building, and connects to CPEs.

---

<sup>22</sup> "Enhanced Communications in San Francisco: Phase II Feasibility Study," CTC report, October 2009, at p. 205.

## 6 Cost Estimate – Industrial Technology & Innovation Corridor

The City recognizes the importance of deploying a robust, scalable FTTP network infrastructure that can support a wide range of applications and services. At the City’s request, CTC prepared a high-level network design and cost estimate for deploying a gigabit FTTP network in the City’s Industrial Corridor. The FTTP network will promote economic development in the Industrial Corridor where businesses traditionally have limited options for telecommunication services.

The CTC cost estimate provides data relevant to assessing the financial viability of network deployment, and to developing a business model for a potential City construction effort (including the full range of models for public–private partnerships). This estimate will also enable financial modeling to determine the approximate revenue levels necessary for the City to service any debt incurred in building the network.

The CTC design and cost estimate are underpinned by data and insight gathered by CTC engineers through several related steps, including discussions with City stakeholders and an extensive field and desk survey of candidate fiber routes.

The descriptions in this document are highly technical and make use of acronyms. We have included a glossary as Appendix A.

### 6.1 FTTP Cost Estimate Summary

Based on these inputs and other guidance from the City, we developed a conceptual, high-level FTTP design that reflects the City’s goals and is open to a variety of architecture options. From this design, we present two cost examples.

The first is the cost to deploy FTTP infrastructure, all electronics, service drops to the consumer, and CPEs. This estimate shows the total capital costs—which would be incurred by the City, or the City and its partner(s)—to build an FTTP network to support a ubiquitous 1 Gbps data-only service. This is the capital cost the City would incur if it pursued a wholesale or retail model.

The second cost estimate example is the cost to deploy *only* the FTTP OSP infrastructure—consistent with the dark fiber model, as described in Section 1.5.1. This is the total capital cost for the City to build a dark fiber network for lease to a private partner.

#### 6.1.1 FTTP Cost Estimate (Fiber and Electronics) – Wholesale and Retail Models

This Industrial Corridor FTTP network deployment will cost approximately \$8.5 million, inclusive of OSP construction labor, materials, engineering, permitting, network electronics, drop installation, CPEs, and testing.<sup>23</sup>

---


<sup>23</sup> The estimated total cost breakdown assumes a percentage of businesses that subscribe to the service, otherwise known as the penetration rate or the “take rate,” of 35 percent.

**Table 6: Breakdown of Estimated Total Cost**

Cost Component	Total Estimated Cost
OSP	\$5.2 million
Central Network Electronics	0.6 million
FTTP Service Drop and Lateral Installations	2.1 million
CPE	0.6 million
<b>Total Estimated Cost:</b>	<b>\$8.5 million</b>

Figure 7 shows the change in total estimated cost by varying the expected take rate.

**Figure 7: Total Estimated Cost versus Take Rate**



The cost is roughly linear by take rate as the per-subscriber cost of adding additional subscribers is constant.

Actual costs may vary due to unknown factors, including: 1) costs of private easements, 2) congestion in the public ROW, 3) variations in labor and material costs, 4) subsurface hard rock, and 5) the City’s operational and business model (including the percentage of businesses who subscribe to the service, otherwise known as the penetration rate or the “take rate”). We have incorporated suitable assumptions to address these items based on our experiences in similar markets.



The total estimated technical operating costs for this model are outlined in Section 6.5 (not including non-technical operating costs such as marketing, legal services, and financing costs). The total cost of operations will vary with the business model chosen and the level of existing resources that can be leveraged by the City and any potential business partners.

### 6.1.2 FTTP Only Cost Estimate (No Electronics, Drops, or CPEs) – Dark Fiber Model


This Industrial Corridor dark FTTP network deployment will cost more than \$5.4 million, inclusive of OSP construction labor, materials, engineering, and permitting. This estimate does not include any electronics, subscriber equipment, or drops.

**Table 7: Breakdown of Estimated Dark Fiber Model Cost**

Cost Component	Total Estimated Cost
OSP Engineering	\$0.5 million
Quality Control/Quality Assurance	0.2 million
General OSP Construction Cost	3.2 million
Special Crossings	0.7 million
Backbone and Distribution Plant Splicing	0.1 million
Backbone Hub, Termination, and Testing	0.5 million
FTTP Lateral Installations	0.2 million
<b>Total Estimated Cost:</b>	<b>\$5.4 million</b>

This estimate assumes that the City constructs and owns the FTTP infrastructure up to a demarcation point at the optical tap near each business, and leases the dark fiber backbone and distribution fiber to a private partner. The private partner would be responsible for all network electronics, fiber drops to subscribers, and CPEs—as well as network sales, marketing, and operations.

**Figure 8: Demarcation Between City and Partner Network Elements**



## 6.2 Cost Estimate Breakdown

The cost components for OSP construction include the following tasks:

- **Engineering** – includes system level architecture planning, preliminary designs and field walk-outs to determine candidate fiber routing; development of detailed engineering prints and preparation of permit applications; and post-construction “as-built” revisions to engineering design materials.
- **Quality Control / Quality Assurance** – includes expert quality assurance field review of final construction for acceptance.
- **General Outside Plant Construction** – consists of all labor and materials related to “typical” underground outside plant construction, including conduit placement, fiber installation, and surface restoration; includes all work area protection and traffic control measures inherent to all roadway construction activities.
- **Special Crossings** – consists of specialized engineering, permitting, and incremental construction (material and labor) costs associated with crossings of railroads, bridges, and interstate / controlled access highways.
- **Backbone and Distribution Plant Splicing** – includes all labor related to fiber splicing of outdoor fiber optic cables.
- **Backbone Hub, Termination, and Testing** – consists of the material and labor costs of placing hub shelters and enclosures, terminating backbone fiber cables within the hubs, and testing backbone cables.


- **FTTP Service Drop and Lateral Installations** – consists of all costs related to fiber service drop installation, including outside plant construction on private property, building penetration, and inside plant construction to a typical backbone network service “demarcation” point; also includes all materials and labor related to the termination of fiber cables at the demarcation point. A take-rate of 35 percent was assumed for standard fiber service drops.

### 6.2.1 Existing City Network Infrastructure Decreases FTTP Construction Costs

The cost estimate assumes the use of the City’s conduit and fiber optic network to provide fiber optic connectivity along most the route between the Industrial Corridor and Internet POPs for network connectivity.

The use of the City’s conduit and fiber optic resources as a backbone could reduce the cost and complexity of deploying an FTTP network because the network can reduce the amount of construction needed to provide backbone connectivity in the City (Figure 9).

**Figure 9: Map Showing Existing Conduit and Fiber Resources**



A detailed engineering design will determine the exact level of savings that the conduit and fiber resources can provide to the Industrial Corridor FTTP network, but we estimate the savings to be between \$500,000 and \$1 million.

### 6.3 Field Survey Methodology for Network Design and Cost Estimate

A CTC OSP engineer performed a preliminary survey of the Industrial Corridor via Google Earth Street View to develop estimates of per-mile cost for underground construction in the existing ROW. A CTC engineer then conducted a brief onsite field study of the City’s existing conduit and the Industrial Corridor to determine the costs with underground construction in the area. The engineer reviewed available green space, ROW widths, building setbacks, and existing underground utility placements—all of which have been factored in to our design and cost estimate.

The ROW in the Industrial Corridor tends to be wide and many of the areas have additional ROW under sidewalks where existing utilities are not located. Some areas are served by aerial utilities while most the service drops and other areas of the Industrial Corridor have all underground

utilities. Given the width of the ROW we do not anticipate any issues with constructing City fiber optics in the ROW.

One obstacle for construction is the rail lines that crisscross the Industrial Corridor. Railroad crossings require permitting and special construction, which can increase the costs and time required to construct fiber optics. The owner of the rail bed must provide a permit or easement to cross the tracks, which is typically a straightforward process with the larger railroads such as Union Pacific. Crossings may be more difficult if someone else owns the rail bed, and/or it is abandoned.

The review of the existing conduit showed that the conduit and fiber optic system appeared to be in good shape. The older of the existing conduit system was designed to support traffic systems using either twisted copper pair or small count fiber optic cables. Traffic conduit tends to have closer handholes (every 250 feet) than fiber optic telecommunications conduit (every 500+ feet). We also noted that the handholes in the older conduit are smaller than what would be recommended today for a fiber optic network. Higher-count fiber optic cables require larger handholes to properly store slack cable and house the fiber optic splice enclosures. If higher fiber optic cable counts were needed in the future, approximately every other handhole would need to be replaced to accommodate the cable. It is important to note that even with potentially having to replace handholes, the fiber optic and conduit system provide tremendous value to the City.

#### 6.4 FTTP Cost Estimate

This section provides a summary of cost estimates for construction of the FTTP network to all businesses in the Industrial Corridor. With the wholesale and retail models, assuming a 35 percent take rate, this deployment will cost approximately \$8.5 million—inclusive of OSP construction labor, materials, engineering, permitting, network electronics, drop installation, CPEs, and testing. Table 8 shows the breakdown of estimated total costs for each network component.

**Table 8: Breakdown of Estimated Total Capital Cost – Retail and Wholesale Model**


Cost Component	Total Estimated Cost
OSP	\$5.2 million
Central Network Electronics	0.6 million
FTTP Service Drop and Lateral Installations	2.1 million
CPE	0.6 million
<b>Total Estimated Cost:</b>	<b>\$8.5 million</b>

### 6.4.1 OSP Cost Estimation Methodology

As with any utility, the design and associated costs for construction vary with the unique physical layout of the service area—no two streets are likely to have the exact same configuration of fiber optic cables, communications conduit, and underground vaults. Costs are further varied by soil conditions, such as the prevalence of subsurface hard rock; location and number of existing utilities; and crossings of bridges, railways, and highways.

To estimate costs for the Industrial Corridor network, we developed a high level FTTP sample design on the basis of street mileage and passings. Since much of the Industrial Corridor has underground utilities, we assumed that the entire FTTP network would be constructed underground.

**Figure 10: High-Level FTTP Sample Design Overview**



The assumptions, sample design, and cost estimates were used to estimate a cost per passing for the OSP. This number was then multiplied by the number of businesses based on the City’s GIS data. The actual cost to construct FTTP to every premises in the Industrial Corridor could differ

from the estimate due to changes in the assumptions underlying the model. Further and more extensive analysis would be required to develop a more accurate cost estimate.

## 6.4.2 OSP

### 6.4.2.1 Cost to Construct the Network

In terms of OSP, the estimated cost to construct the proposed FTTP network is approximately \$5.2 million, or \$2,030 per passing.<sup>24</sup> As we discussed above, our model assumes all underground fiber construction. Table 9 provides a breakdown of the estimated OSP costs. (Note, the costs have been rounded.)

**Table 9: Estimated OSP Costs for FTTP**

Area	Distribution Plant Mileage	Total Cost	Passings	Cost per Passing	Cost Per Plant Mile
Corridor	33.9	\$5,200,000	2,560	\$2,030	\$150,000

We estimated costs for underground placement using available unit cost data for materials and estimates on the labor costs for placing, pulling, and boring fiber based on construction in comparable markets.

Material costs were generally known, aside from unknown economies of scale and inflation rates, and barring any sort of phenomenon restricting material availability and costs. The labor costs associated with the placement of fiber were estimated based on similar construction projects.

While generally allowing for greater control over timelines and more predictable costs, underground construction is subject to uncertainty related to congestion of utilities in the public rights-of-way and the prevalence of subsurface hard rock—neither of which can be fully mitigated without physical excavation and/or testing. While anomalies and unique challenges will arise regardless of the design or construction methodology, the relatively large scale of this project is likely to provide ample opportunity for variations in construction difficulty to yield relatively predictable results on average.

We assume underground construction will consist primarily of horizontal, directional drilling to minimize ROW impact and to provide greater flexibility to navigate around other utilities. The design model assumes a single two-inch, High-Density Polyethylene (HDPE) flexible conduit over

<sup>24</sup> The passing count includes individual single-unit buildings and units in small multi-business buildings as single passings. It treats larger multi-tenant businesses as single passings.

underground distribution paths, and dual two-inch conduits over underground backbone paths to provide scalability for future network growth.

### 6.4.3 Central Network Electronics

Central network electronics will cost an estimated \$580,000, or \$225 per passing, based on an assumed take rate of 35 percent.<sup>25</sup> (These costs may increase or decrease depending on take rate, and the costs may be phased in as subscribers are added to the network.) The central network electronics consists of the electronics to connect subscribers to the FTTP network at the core, hub, and cabinets. Table 10 below lists the estimated costs for each segment.

**Table 10: Estimated Central Network Electronics Costs**

Network Segment	Subtotal	Passings	Cost per Passing
Core and Distribution Electronics	\$360,000	2,560	\$140
FTTP Access Electronics	220,000	2,560	85
<b>Central Network Electronics Total</b>	<b>\$580,000</b>	<b>2,560</b>	<b>\$225</b>

#### 6.4.3.1 Core Electronics

The core electronics connect the FTTP network to the Internet. The core electronics consist of high performance routers, which handle all the routing on both the FTTP network and to the Internet. The core routers should have modular chassis to provide high availability in terms of redundant components and “hot swappable”<sup>26</sup> modular line cards in the event of an outage. Modular routers also provide the ability to expand the routers as demand for additional bandwidth increases.

The cost estimate design envisions redundant rings between the core sites running networking protocols such as hot standby routing protocol (HSRP) to ensure redundancy in the event of a core failure. Additional rings can be added as bandwidth on the network increases. The core sites would also tie to the distribution electronics 10 Gbps links. The links to the hubs can also be increased with additional 10 Gbps and 40 Gbps line cards and optics as demand grows on the network. The core routers will also have 10 Gbps links to ISPs that connect the FTTP network to the Internet.

The cost of the core routing equipment is \$260,000. These costs do not include the service provider’s OSS—such as provisioning platforms, fault and performance management systems,

<sup>25</sup> The take rate affects the electronics and drop costs, but also may affect other parts of the network, as the city may make different design choices based on the expected take rate. A 35 percent take rate is typical of environments where a new provider joins the telephone and cable provider in a city.

<sup>26</sup> Hot swappable means that the line cards or modular can be removed and reinserted without the entire device being powered down or rebooted. The control cards in the router should maintain all configurations and push them to a replaced line card without the need for reconfirmation.



remote access, and other OSS for FTTP operations. The service providers and/or their content providers may already have these systems in place.

#### **6.4.3.2 Distribution Electronics**

The distribution network electronics aggregate the traffic from the FDCs and send it to the core to access the Internet. The distribution electronics consist of high performance aggregation switches, which consolidate the traffic from the many access electronics and send it to the core for route processing. The distribution switches typically are modular switch chassis that can accommodate many line cards for aggregation. The switches should also be modular to provide redundancy in the same manner as the core switches.

The cost estimate assumes that the aggregation switches connect to the access network electronics with 10 Gbps links to each distribution switch. The aggregation switches would then connect to the core switches over single or multiple 10 Gbps links as needed to meet the demand of the FTTP users in each service area.

The cost of the distribution switching equipment is \$100,000. These costs do not include any of the service provider's OSS or other management equipment.

#### **6.4.3.3 Access Electronics**

The access network electronics at the FDCs connect the subscribers' CPEs to the FTTP network. We recommend deploying access network electronics that can support both GPON and Active Ethernet subscribers to provide flexibility within the FDC service area. We also recommend deploying modular access network electronics for reliability and the ability to add line cards as more subscribers join in the service area. Modularity also helps reduce initial capital costs while the network is under construction or during the roll out of the network.

The cost of the access network electronics for the network is \$220,000. These costs are based on a take rate of 35 percent and include optical splitters at the FDCs for that take rate.

#### **6.4.4 Customer Premises Equipment (CPE) and Service Drop Installation (Per-subscriber Costs)**

CPEs are the subscriber's interface to the FTTP network. For this cost estimate, we selected CPEs that provide only Ethernet data services (however, there are a wide variety of CPEs offering other data, voice, and video services). Using the estimated take rate of 35 percent, we estimated the CPE for business customers will be \$630,000.

Each activated subscriber would also require a fiber drop installation and related electronics, which would cost roughly \$2,860 per subscriber, or \$2.7 million total (assuming a 35 percent take rate).

The drop installation cost is the biggest variable in the total cost of adding a subscriber. A short aerial drop can cost as little as \$250 to install, whereas a long underground drop installation can cost upward of \$3,000. (We estimate an average of \$2,160 per drop installation within the Industrial Corridor.)

The other per-subscriber expenses include the cost of the optical network terminal (ONT) at the premises, a portion of the optical line termination (OLT) costs at the hub, the labor to install and configure the electronics, and the incidental materials needed to perform the installation. The numbers provided in the table below are averages and will vary depending on the type of premises and the internal wiring available at each premises.

**Table 11: Per-subscriber Cost Estimates**

<b>Construction and Electronics Required to Activate a Subscriber</b>	<b>Estimated Average Cost</b>
Drop Installation and Materials	\$2,160
Subscriber Electronics (ONT and OLT)	400
Electronics Installation	200
Installation Materials	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$2,860</b>

## 6.5 Operating Cost Considerations

This section outlines some of the key technical operating expenditures the Industrial Corridor FTTP network would incur. Costs for FTTP network technical operations include staffing (technicians, program manager), OSP maintenance, electronics maintenance, and customer support.

The costs discussed in this section are not meant to be inclusive of all operating costs such as marketing, legal, and financial costs. Further, the magnitude of total cost of operations will vary with the business model chosen, balance of added new staff versus using contractors, the level of existing resources that can be leveraged by the City, and any potential business partners. Staffing requirements and operation costs will vary based on the selected business model. We provide additional staffing and operational cost details in Section 7.

### 6.5.1 Technical Operational Expenditures

If the City chooses to offer a retail data service, we estimate that the City would likely initially purchase 2 Gbps of Internet capacity. This is an estimated number for the beginning of the

network deployment and can be expected to grow as video streaming and other cloud applications grow in importance. Depending upon the contract terms Internet bandwidth we would estimate costs in the \$0.75 per Mbps per month to \$1.50 per Mbps per month range in Hayward. We recommend that the Internet access be purchased from multiple Internet providers and be load balanced to ensure continuity during an outage.

The operating costs also include maintenance contracts on the core network electronics. These contracts ensure that the City has access to software support and replacement of critical network electronics that would be cost-prohibitive to store as spares. Where cost effective such as the distribution aggregation switches and the FTTP electronics, we recommend storing spares to reduce the total costs of maintenance contracts. We estimate hardware maintenance contracts and sparing at 15 percent of the total electronics cost.

In addition, we recommend planning for an annual payment into a depreciation operating reserve account based on the equipment replacement cost to help limit risk. This reserve fund should never go negative; the balance that accrues in this account will fund the capital needs for ongoing capital replenishments.

#### **6.5.1.1 Fiber Maintenance Costs**

The City would need to augment its current fiber staff or contractors with the necessary expertise and equipment available to maintain the fiber optic cable in an Industrial Corridor FTTP network. Typical maintenance costs can exceed 1 percent of the total fiber OSP construction cost per year and includes a mix of contracted services.

Fiber optic cable is resilient compared to copper telephone lines and cable TV coaxial cable. The fiber itself does not corrode, and fiber cable installed over 20 years ago is still in good condition. However, fiber can be vulnerable to accidental cuts by other construction, traffic accidents, and severe weather. In other networks of this size, we have seen approximately 80 outages per 1,000 miles of plant per year.

The fiber optic redundancy from the hubs to the FDCs in the backbone network will facilitate restoring network outages while repair of the fiber optic plant is taking place.

Depending on the operational and business models established between the City and service providers, the City may be responsible for adds, moves, and changes associated with the network as well as standard plant maintenance. These items may include:

- Adding and/or changing patching and optical splitter configurations at FDCs and hubs;
- Extending optical taps and laterals to new buildings or developments;
- Extending access to the FTTP network to other service providers; and

- Relocating fiber paths due to changes such as the widening of roadways.

The City would need to obtain contracts with fiber optic contractors that have the necessary expertise and equipment available to maintain an Industrial Corridor FTTP network. These contracts should specify the service level agreements the City needs from the fiber optic contractors to ensure that the City can meet the service level agreements it has with the network service providers. The City should also ensure that it has access to multiple fiber optic contractors if one contractor is unable to meet the City's needs. The fiber optic contractors should be available 24x7 and have a process in place for activating emergency service requests.

#### **6.5.1.2 Fiber Locating**

The City will be responsible for locating and marking all underground conduit for excavation projects per California's DigAlert System statutes. Locating involves receiving and reviewing excavation tickets to determine whether the area of excavation may impact the City's underground FTTP infrastructure. If the system is impacted, the City must mark its utilities in the manner and within the allotted timeframe provided by the statute.

Locating is either done in-house or by contractors who specialize in utility locating. The City may be able to leverage its existing utility locating personnel, processes, or contractors to reduce the cost of utility locating for the FTTP network.

### **6.5.2 Technical Staffing Requirements**

Additional staffing will be required to perform the maintenance and operation responsibilities of an Industrial Corridor FTTP network. The staffing levels and the responsibility for that staffing will vary greatly with the various potential business models. The following sections outline the technical groups that will be required to maintain and operate the network.

#### **6.5.2.1 Outside Plant**

The OSP group will be responsible for the maintenance, operations, and expansion of the City's telecommunications infrastructure including conduit, fiber, and splice enclosures. During construction, the OSP group will be responsible for tracking and overseeing the construction of new infrastructure. Once the network is constructed, the OSP group will oversee any future adds, moves, or changes to the network.

The OSP group may use contractors to perform activities such as construction, repair, and locating. Management of contractors will be a responsibility of an OSP manager with OSP technicians assisting with project oversight and quality assurance and quality control. The OSP manager will also assist with engineering and design of any adds, moves, and changes that occur on the network.

The OSP group will have responsibility for general field operations. This group will include OSP technicians to perform locates, and contracted support to provide repair services. Tasks will include management of the One Call process, fiber locates, response and troubleshooting of Layer 1 troubleshooting, and fleet management. Additionally, it is critical that while many of OSP jobs may be outsourced, that the OSP group be equipped with the proper locate and testing equipment.

#### **6.5.2.2 Network Engineering**

The network engineering group develops and maintains the network architecture, responds to high-level troubleshooting requests, manages network electronics and makes sure the network delivers to the end user a reliable service.

The network engineering group is responsible for making architecture decisions that will determine how the network can deliver services to users. The network engineering group will also be responsible for change management and architectural review to ensure that network continuity is ensured after changes.

The network engineering group will also be responsible for vendor selections when new hardware, technologies, or contractor support is needed to support the network. The network engineering team will perform regular maintenance of the network as well as provision, deploy, test, and accept any electronics to support new sites or services.

Network technicians will be responsible for troubleshooting issues with network electronics and responding to customer complaints.

To operate network electronics (if required by the business model) we estimate a staffing requirement of one network manager, up to one network engineer, and up to two network technicians that could be a combination of personnel as well as contracted support. Network staffing levels may vary depending on the take rate of the FTTP network.

#### **6.5.2.3 Network Operations Center and Customer Service**

The network will require individuals to perform monitoring and oversight of the network electronics. The group will be responsible for handling technical calls from users, actively monitoring the health of the network, and escalating issues to the proper operations groups. The group is also required to develop and monitor network performance parameters to ensure that the network is meeting its obligations to its users as defined in the network service level agreements (SLAs).

Often network operations require a 24x7 customer service helpdesk and tools for network monitoring, alerting, and provisioning.

## 7 Business and Financial Model

This section presents a financial analysis based on the candidate business models we outline in Section 1.5, above. Our modeling is based on an FTTP deployment to the Industrial Corridor, and assumes that the City will take some financial risk by investing at least in dark fiber infrastructure. The models are briefly summarized again in Table 12, with an emphasis on the division of responsibilities between the City and a partner.

**Table 12: Responsibility Matrix for Potential Business Models**

Activity	Model		
	Dark Fiber	Wholesale Service	Retail Service
Who invests in and owns the outside plant (OSP), like fiber?	City	City	City
Who invests in and owns the network electronics?	Partner(s)	City	City
Who is responsible for customer service to end users?	Partner(s)	Partner(s)	City

### 7.1 Overview

Potential business models for an FTTP deployment range from:

- A **retail service model** in which the City directly provides fiber service;
- To a **wholesale service model** in which the City builds an open access network and invites private partners to deliver services over the network;
- To a **dark fiber model** in which the City builds the fiber and enters a partnership with an anchor service provider, similar to the business model the City of Westminster, Maryland adopted when it partnered with Ting Fiber.<sup>27</sup>

As we noted in Section 1.5, we believe a dark fiber model will best fit the City’s needs, because it leverages the City’s abilities and offsets some of the risk associated with implementing a new broadband enterprise, as the City would be required to do in a retail service model.

We conducted financial modeling based on the three potential business models to illustrate the kind of costs and revenues the City might see under each model. This section presents an overview of the FTTP financial model, based on the cost estimates in Section 6. We have provided the City with a complete financial model in Excel format; because the Excel spreadsheet can be

<sup>27</sup> “Westminster Fiber Network,” *City of Westminster*, accessed November 8, 2016, <http://www.westminstermd.gov/419/Westminster-Fiber-Network>.

modified to show the impact of changing assumptions, it will be an important tool for the City to use if it negotiates with a private partner.

These financial projections do not include any economic development or other indirect benefits, which are often not easily quantifiable. The projections also do not include potential revenues from small cell or distributed antenna system (DAS) providers, which may represent a modest revenue source the City can tap into if it can find interested providers.

## **7.2 Retail Model Financial Projections**

The financial analysis in this section assumes the City of Hayward owns and operates the FTTP infrastructure and provides retail service to businesses in the identified service area. As we described above, the City will be the service provider in a retail service model and will be responsible for all aspects of network deployment and maintenance, network and customer electronics, service delivery, and customer service and support. This financial analysis is based on several assumptions, outlined below.

In the analysis, we assume the City offers four base services, at prices that compare favorably to similar services in other cities:

- A 250 Mbps commercial service at \$100 per month,
- A 1 Gbps small commercial service at \$200 per month,
- A 1 Gbps medium commercial service at \$400 per month (including service-level agreement), and
- A 1 Gbps Metro Ethernet transport service at \$1,000 per month (including service-level agreement).

We assumed that 68 percent of subscribers will purchase the 250 Mbps service; 15 percent will purchase the 1 Gbps small commercial service; 15 percent will purchase the 1 Gbps medium commercial service; and 2 percent will purchase the 1 Gbps Metro Ethernet service.

Given the assumptions outlined in this section, a 60 percent take rate (the percentage of customers that subscribe to the service) is required to maintain a positive cash flow. Note that this analysis does not indicate or review whether obtaining this required take rate is realistic; rather, it reflects the take rate necessary to maintain a positive cash flow, considering all other assumptions in the model. The complete model is provided in Appendix C.

Please note that, based on other competitive overbuilds, obtaining a 60 percent take rate is considered aggressive, and will likely be difficult to obtain and maintain. Realistically, we would expect a 35 percent to 45 percent take rate.

The financial analysis for this base case scenario is as follows:

**Table 13: Base Case Retail Model Financial Analysis with 60 Percent Take Rate**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$341,000	\$3,280,000	\$3,280,000	\$3,280,000	\$3,280,000
Total Cash Expenses	(911,000)	(1,419,000)	(1,419,000)	(1,419,000)	(1,419,000)
Depreciation	(234,000)	(1,254,000)	(625,000)	(617,000)	(617,000)
Interest Expense	(185,000)	(617,000)	(485,000)	(321,000)	(111,000)
Taxes	=	=	=	=	=
Net Income	\$(989,000)	\$(10,000)	\$751,000	\$923,000	\$1,133,000

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$(50,000)	\$491,000	\$2,770,000	\$5,548,000	\$8,319,000
Depreciation Reserve	-	1,132,000	1,150,000	354,000	(138,000)
Interest Reserve	185,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	<u>185,000</u>	<u>660,000</u>	<u>660,000</u>	<u>660,000</u>	<u>660,000</u>
Total Cash Balance	\$320,000	\$2,283,000	\$4,580,000	\$6,562,000	\$8,841,000

The income statement demonstrates an overall health of the enterprise on a year-by-year basis. The above cash flow statement shows the cumulative cash balance of the enterprise. It shows unrestricted and restricted (depreciation, interest, and debt service reserves) cumulative cash balances. The cash flow statement is the most important measure for a public entity. It is important for the enterprise to maintain a positive unrestricted cash balance at the end of each year.

Please note that we used a “flat model” in the analysis. With a “flat model,” inflation and salary cost increases are not used in the analysis because it is assumed that operating cost increases will be offset and passed on to subscribers in the form of increased prices. Models that add an inflation factor to both revenues and expenses can greatly overstate net revenues in the out-years since net revenues would then also increase by the same inflation factor.

### 7.2.1 Financing Costs and Operating Expenses

This financial analysis assumes a combination of bonds and loans will be necessary to deploy the FTTP network. We expect that the City will seek 20-year bonds with principal repayments starting the year after the bond issuance.

We project that the bond issuance costs will be equal to 1.0 percent of the principal borrowed. For the bond, a debt service reserve account is maintained at 5.0 percent of the total issuance amount. An interest reserve account equal to years one and two interest expense is maintained for the first two years.



Our analysis estimates total bonding requirements to be \$13.2 million, and we assume that bonds are issued at a 5 percent interest rate.

The model assumes a straight-line depreciation of assets, and that the OSP and materials will have a 20-year life span while network equipment will need to be replaced after 10 years. Last mile fiber and CPEs, as well as other miscellaneous implementation costs, will need to be accounted for after five years. Network equipment will be replaced or upgraded at 80 percent of its original cost, miscellaneous implementation costs will be at 100 percent, and last mile and CPEs will be at 100 percent. The model plans for a depreciation reserve account starting in year three—these monies are set aside to fund future electronics replacements and upgrades.

Table 14 shows operating expenses for years one, five, 10, 15, and 20. As the table indicates, some expenses will remain constant while others will increase as the network matures and the customer base increases.

**Table 14: Operating Expenses in Years 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20 – Retail Model**

<b>Operating Expenses</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Support Services	\$52,000	\$28,000	\$28,000	\$28,000	\$28,000
Insurance	25,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Utilities	-	-	-	-	-
Office Expenses	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Facility Lease	-	-	-	-	-
Locates & Ticket Processing	8,000	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Peering	-	-	-	-	-
Contingency	10,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Billing Maintenance Contract	10,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Fiber & Network Maintenance	16,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Vendor Maintenance Contracts	-	83,000	83,000	83,000	83,000
Legal and Lobby Fees	50,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Planning	-	-	-	-	-
Consulting	50,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Marketing	100,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Education and Training	11,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
Customer Handholding	-	-	-	-	-
Customer Billing (Unit)	-	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Allowance for Bad Debts	3,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000
Churn (acquisition costs)	1,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Pole Attachment Expense	-	-	-	-	-
Internet	<u>30,000</u>	<u>41,000</u>	<u>41,000</u>	<u>41,000</u>	<u>41,000</u>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$372,000</b>	<b>\$481,000</b>	<b>\$481,000</b>	<b>\$481,000</b>	<b>\$481,000</b>
Labor Expenses	<u>\$539,000</u>	<u>\$938,000</u>	<u>\$938,000</u>	<u>\$938,000</u>	<u>\$938,000</u>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$539,000</b>	<b>\$938,000</b>	<b>\$938,000</b>	<b>\$938,000</b>	<b>\$938,000</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$911,000</b>	<b>\$1,419,000</b>	<b>\$1,419,000</b>	<b>\$1,419,000</b>	<b>\$1,419,000</b>

Table 15 shows the income statement for years one, five, 10, 15, and 20.

Table 15: Income Statement – Retail Model

Income Statement	Year 1	Year 5	Year 10	Year 15	Year 20
<b>a. Revenues</b>					
Internet - Business	\$277,000	\$3,280,000	\$3,280,000	\$3,280,000	\$3,280,000
Connection Fee (net)	64,000	-	-	-	-
Per Passing	-	-	-	-	-
Per Customer	-	-	-	-	-
Provider Fee	-	-	-	-	-
Assessments	-	-	-	-	-
Ancillary Revenues	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$341,000</b>	<b>\$3,280,000</b>	<b>\$3,280,000</b>	<b>\$3,280,000</b>	<b>\$3,280,000</b>
<b>b. Content Fees</b>					
Internet	\$30,000	\$41,000	\$41,000	\$41,000	\$41,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>
<b>c. Operating Costs</b>					
Operation Costs	\$342,000	\$440,000	\$440,000	\$440,000	\$440,000
Labor Costs	539,000	938,000	938,000	938,000	938,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$881,000</b>	<b>\$1,378,000</b>	<b>\$1,378,000</b>	<b>\$1,378,000</b>	<b>\$1,378,000</b>
<b>d. EBITDA</b>	<b>\$(570,000)</b>	<b>\$1,861,000</b>	<b>\$1,861,000</b>	<b>\$1,861,000</b>	<b>\$1,861,000</b>
<b>e. Depreciation</b>	<b>234,000</b>	<b>1,254,000</b>	<b>625,000</b>	<b>617,000</b>	<b>617,000</b>
<b>f. Operating Income (EBITDA less Depreciation)</b>	<b>\$(804,000)</b>	<b>\$607,000</b>	<b>\$1,236,000</b>	<b>\$1,244,000</b>	<b>\$1,244,000</b>
<b>g. Non-Operating Income</b>					
Interest Income	\$ -	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$3,000	\$1,000
Interest Expense (10 Year Bond)	-	-	-	-	-
Interest Expense (20 Year Bond)	(185,000)	(621,000)	(490,000)	(324,000)	(112,000)
Interest Expense (Loan)	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$(185,000)</b>	<b>\$(485,000)</b>	<b>\$(485,000)</b>	<b>\$(321,000)</b>	<b>\$(111,000)</b>
<b>h. Net Income (before taxes)</b>	<b>\$(989,000)</b>	<b>\$(10,000)</b>	<b>\$751,000</b>	<b>\$923,000</b>	<b>\$1,133,000</b>
<b>i. Facility Taxes</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>j. Net Income</b>	<b>\$(989,000)</b>	<b>\$(10,000)</b>	<b>\$751,000</b>	<b>\$923,000</b>	<b>\$1,133,000</b>

Table 16: Cash Flow Statement – Retail Model

Cash Flow Statement	Year 1	Year 5	Year 10	Year 15	Year 20
<b>a. Net Income</b>	\$(989,000)	\$(10,000)	\$751,000	\$923,000	\$ 1,133,000
<b>b. Cash Outflows</b>					
Debt Service Reserve	\$(185,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Interest Reserve	(370,000)	-	-	-	-
Depreciation Reserve	-	(439,000)	(219,000)	(216,000)	(216,000)
Financing	(37,000)	-	-	-	-
Capital Expenditures	<u>(2,588,000)</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ (3,180,000)</b>	<b>\$ (439,000)</b>	<b>\$ (219,000)</b>	<b>\$ (216,000)</b>	<b>\$ (216,000)</b>
<b>c. Cash Inflows</b>					
Interest Reserve	\$ 185,000	\$ 95,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Depreciation Reserve	-	-	-	-	-
Investment Capital	-	-	-	-	-
Start Up Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Grants (infrastructure)	-	-	-	-	-
Grants (customer premises)	-	-	-	-	-
10-Year Bond/Loan Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-
20-Year Bond Proceeds	3,700,000	-	-	-	-
Loan Proceeds	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,885,000</b>	<b>\$ 95,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>d. Total Cash Outflows and Inflows</b>	<b>\$ 705,000</b>	<b>\$ (344,000)</b>	<b>\$ (219,000)</b>	<b>\$ (216,000)</b>	<b>\$ (216,000)</b>
<b>e. Non-Cash Expenses - Depreciation</b>	<b>\$ 234,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,254,000</b>	<b>\$ 625,000</b>	<b>\$ 617,000</b>	<b>\$ 617,000</b>
<b>f. Adjustments</b>					
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (10 Year Bond)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (20 Year Bond)	\$(3,700,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (Loan)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>g. Adjusted Available Net Revenue</b>	<b>\$ (3,750,000)</b>	<b>\$ 900,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,157,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,324,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,534,000</b>
<b>h. Principal Payments on Debt</b>					
10 Year Bond Principal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
20 Year Bond Principal	-	472,000	602,000	768,000	981,000
Loan Principal	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 472,000</b>	<b>\$ 602,000</b>	<b>\$ 768,000</b>	<b>\$ 981,000</b>

Significant network expenses—known as “capital additions”—are incurred in the first few years during the construction phase of the network. These represent the equipment and labor expenses associated with building, implementing, and lighting a fiber network. Table 17 shows the capital additions costs in years one, two, and three, and the total for years one through three.

This analysis projects that the capital additions in year one will total approximately \$2.6 million. These costs will total approximately \$3.5 million in year two, \$1.8 million in year three, and \$2.6 million in year four. This totals just over \$10.5 million for total capital additions costs for years one through four.

**Table 17: Capital Additions – Retail Model**

Capital Additions	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<b>Network Equipment</b>				
Core Network Equipment	\$380,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TBD	-	-	-	-
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 380,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Outside Plant and Facilities</b>				
Total Backbone and FTTP	\$1,635,000	\$2,726,000	\$1,090,000	\$ -
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,635,000</b>	<b>\$2,726,000</b>	<b>\$1,090,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Last Mile and Customer Premises Equipment</b>				
CPE (residential and small commercial)	\$91,000	\$182,000	\$182,000	\$638,000
CPE (medium commercial)	18,000	36,000	35,000	124,000
CPE (enterprise)	6,000	10,000	10,000	36,000
Average Drop Cost	263,000	525,000	523,000	1,836,000
Additional Annual Replacement Capital	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$378,000</b>	<b>\$753,000</b>	<b>\$750,000</b>	<b>\$2,634,000</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Implementation Costs</b>				
Splicing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Vehicles	50,000	-	-	-
Emergency Restoration Kit	50,000	-	-	-
Work Station, Computers, and Software	10,000	7,000	-	2,000
Fiber OTDR and Other Tools	85,000	-	-	-
Generators & UPS	-	-	-	-
OSS	-	-	-	-
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$195,000</b>	<b>\$7,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>
<b>Replacement Costs for Depreciation</b>				
Network Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Customer Premises Equipment	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Implementation Costs	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Total Capital Additions</b>	<b>\$2,588,000</b>	<b>\$3,486,000</b>	<b>\$1,840,000</b>	<b>\$2,636,000</b>

### 7.2.2 Operating and Maintenance Expenses

The cost to deploy an FTTP network goes far beyond fiber implementation. Network deployment requires additional staffing for sales and marketing, network operations, and other functions. The addition of new staff and inventory requirements will require office and warehousing space:

- Expand office facilities for management, technical and clerical staff

- Expand retail “storefront” to facilitate customer contact and enhance their experience doing business with the FTTP enterprise
- Provide warehousing for receipt and storage of cable and hardware for the installation and on-going maintenance of the broadband infrastructure
- Establish location to house servers, switches, routers, and other core-network equipment

Training new and existing staff is important to fully realize the economies of starting the FTTP network. The training will be particularly important in the short-term as the new enterprise establishes itself as a unique entity providing services distinct from services provided by the City today.

The expanded business and increased responsibilities will require the addition of new staff. Marketing and sales are critical. It is important to be proactive in setting customer expectations, addressing security concerns, and educating the customers on how to initiate services.

The initial additional positions, staffing levels, and base salaries are shown in Table 18. Please note that the table only lists estimated salaries and in the analysis, we added a 40 percent overhead to these salaries.

**Table 18: Labor Expenses – Retail Model**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5+	Labor Cost
<b>New Employees</b>						
Business Manager	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	\$130,000
GIS	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	\$80,000
Communications - Sales	0.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	\$75,000
Customer Service Representative	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	\$65,000
Service Technicians/Installers & IT Support	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	\$90,000
Fiber Plant O&M Technicians	<u>0.25</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>1.00</u>	<u>1.00</u>	\$90,000
<b>Total New Staff</b>	<b>4.75</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	

### 7.2.3 Summary of Operating and Maintenance Assumptions

Additional key operating and maintenance assumptions include:

- Salaries and benefits are based on estimated market wages. See Table 18 for a list of staffing requirements for the retail service model. Benefits are estimated at 40 percent of base salary.
- Use of a help desk service, which includes a \$50,000 startup cost and \$1.50 per month per customer service fee.
- Insurance is estimated to be \$25,000 in year one and \$50,000 from year two on.
- Office expense allocations are estimated to be \$6,000 per year.
- Locates and ticket processing are estimated to start in year one at \$8,000, increase to \$15,000 in year two, and increase to \$31,000 from year three on.

- Contingency is estimated to be \$10,000 in year one and \$25,000 from year two on.
- Billing and maintenance contract fees are estimated at \$10,000 in year one, and \$20,000 from year two on.
- Legal fees are estimated to be \$50,000 in year one, and \$10,000 from year two on.
- Consulting fees are estimated at \$50,000 in year one, and \$10,000 from year three on.
- Marketing and promotional expenses are estimated to be \$100,000 in year one, and \$50,000 from year two on.

Vendor maintenance contract fees are expected to start at \$43,000 in year two, increase to \$52,000 in year three, and increase again to \$83,000 in year four; these fees are expected to remain steady at \$83,000 per year beyond year four. Annual variable and operating expenses not including direct Internet access include:

- Education and training are calculated as 2 percent of direct payroll expense.
- Customer billing is estimated to be \$0.25 per bill per month.
- Allowance for bad debts is computed as 1 percent of revenues.
- Churn is anticipated to be 5 percent annually.

Fiber network maintenance costs are calculated at 1 percent of the total construction cost, per year. This is estimated based on a typical rate of occurrence in an urban environment, and the cost of individual repairs. This is in addition to staffing costs to maintain fiber.

Internet and peering is estimated at \$1.25 per Mbps per month for the first 2 Gbps, and \$1.00 per Mbps per month thereafter.

#### **7.2.4 Take-Rate Sensitivity**

This section shows the large impact that fluctuations in take rate can have on financial modeling. In the following tables, we show the financial projections for take rates of 50 percent, 40 percent, and 30 percent.

Please note that, based on other competitive overbuilds, obtaining a 60 percent take rate is considered aggressive, and will likely be difficult to obtain and maintain. Realistically, we would expect a 35 percent to 45 percent take rate.

Note that the total unrestricted cash balance in year one with a 50 percent take rate is projected as a loss of \$50,000, as shown in Table 19, below. This number is the same as the projections for a 60 percent take rate (see Table 13, above), but by the time we reach year five, the numbers diverge significantly.



The projected unrestricted cash balance with a 60 percent take rate is projected to be approximately \$491,000 in year five. With a 50 percent take rate, the unrestricted cash balance in year five is projected as a loss of approximately \$451,000.

This is nearly a \$1 million difference in unrestricted cash balances based on the difference between a 60 percent and a 50 percent take rate. As the take rate declines, this gap widens, as the tables below show.

**Table 19: Take Rate Reduced to 50 Percent – Retail Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$341,000	\$2,738,000	\$2,738,000	\$2,738,000	\$2,738,000
Total Cash Expenses	(911,000)	(1,390,000)	(1,390,000)	(1,390,000)	(1,390,000)
Depreciation	(234,000)	(1,104,000)	(579,000)	(572,000)	(572,000)
Interest Expense	(185,000)	(577,000)	(453,000)	(297,000)	(98,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (989,000)	\$ (333,000)	\$316,000	\$479,000	\$678,000

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ (50,000)	\$ (451,000)	\$ (220,000)	\$404,000	\$1,023,000
Depreciation Reserve	-	1,026,000	1,082,000	434,000	90,000
Interest Reserve	185,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	<u>185,000</u>	<u>620,000</u>	<u>620,000</u>	<u>620,000</u>	<u>620,000</u>
Total Cash Balance	\$320,000	\$1,195,000	\$1,482,000	\$1,458,000	\$1,733,000

As Table 20 shows, the total projected revenues in year five with a 40 percent take rate are approximately \$2,176,000. The base case analysis with a 60 percent take rate projected year five revenues at approximately \$3,280,000. This is greater than a \$1.1 million difference in projected revenues based on take rate.

Similarly, the unrestricted cash balance in year five for the base case analysis—with a 60 percent take rate—is projected at approximately \$491,000 per year in year five. With a 40 percent take rate (see Table 20, below), the unrestricted cash balance is projected as a loss of approximately \$1.5 million per year in year five.

**Table 20: Take Rate Reduced to 40 Percent – Retail Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$341,000	\$2,176,000	\$2,176,000	\$2,176,000	\$2,176,000
Total Cash Expenses	(911,000)	(1,362,000)	(1,362,000)	(1,362,000)	(1,362,000)
Depreciation	(234,000)	(953,000)	(533,000)	(526,000)	(526,000)
Interest Expense	(185,000)	(532,000)	(417,000)	(271,000)	(85,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (989,000)	\$ (671,000)	\$ (136,000)	\$ 17,000	\$203,000

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ (50,000)	\$(1,514,000)	\$ (3,394,000)	\$ (4,988,000)	\$ (6,586,000)
Depreciation Reserve	-	922,000	1,018,000	520,000	326,000
Interest Reserve	185,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	185,000	575,000	575,000	575,000	575,000
Total Cash Balance	\$320,000	\$ (17,000)	\$ (1,801,000)	\$ (3,893,000)	\$ (5,685,000)

Again, the unrestricted cash balance in the base case analysis (Table 13) for a retail model is projected as approximately \$491,000 in year five. As Table 21 shows below, the projected unrestricted cash balance with a 30 percent take rate is a loss of approximately \$2.5 million in year five.

**Table 21: Take Rate Reduced to 30 Percent – Retail Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$341,000	\$1,634,000	\$1,634,000	\$1,634,000	\$ 1,634,000
Total Cash Expenses	(911,000)	(1,340,000)	(1,340,000)	(1,340,000)	(1,340,000)
Depreciation	(234,000)	(803,000)	(488,000)	(480,000)	(480,000)
Interest Expense	(185,000)	(493,000)	(384,000)	(247,000)	(72,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (989,000)	\$ (1,002,000)	\$ (578,000)	\$ (433,000)	\$ (258,000)

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ (50,000)	\$ (2,469,000)	\$ (6,431,000)	\$ (10,216,000)	\$ (14,002,000)
Depreciation Reserve	-	816,000	950,000	600,000	554,000
Interest Reserve	185,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	185,000	535,000	535,000	535,000	535,000
Total Cash Balance	\$ 320,000	\$ (1,118,000)	\$ (4,946,000)	\$ (9,081,000)	\$ (12,913,000)

### 7.3 Wholesale Model Financial Projections

The financial analysis in this section assumes the City of Hayward owns and operates the FTTP infrastructure and provides wholesale service to ISPs. The ISPs in turn offer retail service businesses in the identified service area. This financial analysis is based on several assumptions, outlined below.

In the analysis, we assume the City offers four wholesale base services, based on a 25 percent discount from the retail model.

- A 250 Mbps commercial service at \$75 per month;
- A 1 Gbps small commercial service at \$150 per month;
- A 1 Gbps medium commercial service at \$300 per month (including service-level agreement); and
- A 1 Gbps Metro Ethernet transport service at \$750 per month (including service-level agreement).

We assumed that 68 percent of subscribers will purchase the 250 Mbps service; 15 percent will purchase the 1 Gbps small commercial service; 15 percent will purchase the 1 Gbps medium commercial service; and 2 percent will purchase the 1 Gbps Metro Ethernet service.

As in the case of the retail model, a 60 percent take rate is required to maintain a positive cash flow.

The financial analysis for this base case scenario is as follows:

**Table 22: Wholesale Model Financial Analysis with 60 Percent Take Rate (Base Case)**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$271,000	\$2,460,000	\$2,460,000	\$2,460,000	\$2,460,000
Total Cash Expenses	(572,750)	(934,250)	(934,250)	(934,250)	(934,250)
Depreciation	(233,000)	(1,253,000)	(623,000)	(616,000)	(616,000)
Interest Expense	(175,000)	(589,000)	(465,000)	(308,000)	(107,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (709,750)	\$ (316,250)	\$437,750	\$601,750	\$802,750

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$55,250	\$57,250	\$909,000	\$2,257,750	\$3,601,500
Depreciation Reserve	-	1,132,000	1,154,000	366,000	(118,000)
Interest Reserve	175,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	<u>175,000</u>	<u>630,000</u>	<u>630,000</u>	<u>630,000</u>	<u>630,000</u>
Total Cash Balance	\$405,250	\$1,819,250	\$2,693,000	\$3,253,750	\$4,113,500

This analysis does not indicate or review whether obtaining this required take rate is realistic; rather, it reflects the take rate necessary to maintain a positive cash flow, considering all other assumptions in the model. The complete model is provided in Appendix D.

Please note that we used a “flat model” in the analysis. With a “flat model,” inflation and salary cost increases are not used in the analysis because it is assumed that operating cost increases will be offset and passed on to subscribers in the form of increased prices. Models that add an inflation factor to both revenues and expenses can greatly overstate net revenues in the out-years since net revenues would then also increase by the same inflation factor.

### **7.3.1 Financing Costs and Operating Expenses**

This financial analysis assumes a combination of bonds and loans will be necessary. We expect that the City will seek 20-year bonds with principal repayments starting the year after issuance.

We project that the bond issuance costs will be equal to 1.0 percent of the principal borrowed. For the bond, a debt service reserve account is maintained at 5.0 percent of the total issuance amount. An interest reserve account equal to years one and two interest expense is maintained for the first two years.

Our analysis estimates total bonding requirements to be \$12.6 million and are issued at a 5 percent interest rate.

The model assumes a straight-line depreciation of assets, and that the OSP and materials will have a 20-year life span while network equipment will need to be replaced after 10 years. Last mile and CPEs as well as other miscellaneous implementation costs will need to be accounted for after five years. Network equipment will be replaced or upgraded at 80 percent of its original cost, miscellaneous implementation costs will be at 100 percent, and last mile and CPEs will be at 100 percent. The model plans for a depreciation reserve account starting in year three - this funds future electronics replacements and upgrades.

Table 23 shows operating expenses for years one, five, 10, 15, and 20. As seen, some expenses will remain constant while others will increase as the network matures and the customer base increases.

**Table 23: Operating Expenses in Years 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20 – Wholesale Model**

<b>Operating Expenses</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Support Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Insurance	25,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Utilities	-	-	-	-	-
Office Expenses	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Facility Lease	-	-	-	-	-
Locates & Ticket Processing	8,000	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Peering	-	-	-	-	-
Contingency	10,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Billing Maintenance Contract	10,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Fiber & Network Maintenance	16,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Vendor Maintenance Contracts	-	83,000	83,000	83,000	83,000
Legal and Lobby Fees	50,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Planning	-	-	-	-	-
Consulting	50,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Marketing	30,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Education and Training	7,000	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
Customer Handholding	-	-	-	-	-
Customer Billing (Unit)	-	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Allowance for Bad Debts	-	-	-	-	-
Churn (acquisition costs)	-	-	-	-	-
Pole Attachment Expense	-	-	-	-	-
Internet	<u>30,000</u>	<u>41,000</u>	<u>41,000</u>	<u>41,000</u>	<u>41,000</u>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$242,000</b>	<b>\$362,000</b>	<b>\$362,000</b>	<b>\$362,000</b>	<b>\$362,000</b>
Labor Expenses	<u>\$330,750</u>	<u>\$572,250</u>	<u>\$572,250</u>	<u>\$572,250</u>	<u>\$572,250</u>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$330,750</b>	<b>\$572,250</b>	<b>\$572,250</b>	<b>\$572,250</b>	<b>\$572,250</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$572,750</b>	<b>\$934,250</b>	<b>\$934,250</b>	<b>\$934,250</b>	<b>\$934,250</b>

Table 24 shows the income statement for years one, five, 10, 15, and 20.

**Table 24: Income Statement – Wholesale Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
<b>a. Revenues</b>					
Internet - Business	\$207,000	\$2,460,000	\$2,460,000	\$2,460,000	\$2,460,000
Connection Fee (net)	64,000	-	-	-	-
Per Passing	-	-	-	-	-
Per Customer	-	-	-	-	-
Provider Fee	-	-	-	-	-
Assessments	-	-	-	-	-
Ancillary Revenues	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$271,000</b>	<b>\$2,460,000</b>	<b>\$2,460,000</b>	<b>\$2,460,000</b>	<b>\$2,460,000</b>
<b>b. Content Fees</b>					
Internet	\$30,000	\$41,000	\$41,000	\$41,000	\$41,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>	<b>\$41,000</b>
<b>c. Operating Costs</b>					
Operation Costs	\$212,000	\$321,000	\$321,000	\$321,000	\$321,000
Labor Costs	330,750	572,250	572,250	572,250	572,250
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$542,750</b>	<b>\$893,250</b>	<b>\$893,250</b>	<b>\$893,250</b>	<b>\$893,250</b>
<b>d. EBITDA</b>	<b>\$(301,750)</b>	<b>\$1,525,750</b>	<b>\$1,525,750</b>	<b>\$1,525,750</b>	<b>\$1,525,750</b>
<b>e. Depreciation</b>	<b>233,000</b>	<b>1,253,000</b>	<b>623,000</b>	<b>616,000</b>	<b>616,000</b>
<b>f. Operating Income (EBITDA less Depreciation)</b>	<b>\$(534,750)</b>	<b>\$272,750</b>	<b>\$902,750</b>	<b>\$909,750</b>	<b>\$909,750</b>
<b>g. Non-Operating Income</b>					
Interest Income	\$ -	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$2,000	\$1,000
Interest Expense (10 Year Bond)	-	-	-	-	-
Interest Expense (20 Year Bond)	(175,000)	(593,000)	(469,000)	(310,000)	(108,000)
Interest Expense (Loan)	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$(175,000)</b>	<b>\$(465,000)</b>	<b>\$(465,000)</b>	<b>\$(308,000)</b>	<b>\$(107,000)</b>
<b>h. Net Income (before taxes)</b>	<b>\$(709,750)</b>	<b>\$(316,250)</b>	<b>\$437,750</b>	<b>\$601,750</b>	<b>\$802,750</b>
<b>i. Facility Taxes</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>j. Net Income</b>	<b>\$(709,750)</b>	<b>\$(316,250)</b>	<b>\$437,750</b>	<b>\$601,750</b>	<b>\$802,750</b>

Table 25 shows the cash flow statement for years one, five, 10, 15, and 20.

Table 25: Cash Flow Statement – Wholesale Model

Cash Flow Statement	Year 1	Year 5	Year 10	Year 15	Year 20
<b>a. Net Income</b>	\$ (709,750)	\$ (316,250)	\$437,750	\$601,750	\$802,750
<b>b. Cash Outflows</b>					
Debt Service Reserve	\$ (175,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Interest Reserve	(350,000)	-	-	-	-
Depreciation Reserve	-	(439,000)	(218,000)	(216,000)	(216,000)
Financing	(35,000)	-	-	-	-
Capital Expenditures	<u>(2,583,000)</u>	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ (3,143,000)	\$ (439,000)	\$ (218,000)	\$ (216,000)	\$ (216,000)
<b>c. Cash Inflows</b>					
Interest Reserve	\$175,000	\$105,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Depreciation Reserve	-	-	-	-	-
Investment Capital	-	-	-	-	-
Start Up Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Grants (infrastructure)	-	-	-	-	-
Grants (customer premises)	-	-	-	-	-
10-Year Bond/Loan Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-
20-Year Bond Proceeds	3,500,000	-	-	-	-
Loan Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$3,675,000	\$105,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>d. Total Cash Outflows and Inflows</b>	\$532,000	\$ (334,000)	\$ (218,000)	\$ (216,000)	\$ (216,000)
<b>e. Non-Cash Expenses - Depreciation</b>	\$233,000	\$1,253,000	\$623,000	\$616,000	\$616,000
<b>f. Adjustments</b>					
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (10 Year Bond)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (20 Year Bond)	\$ (3,500,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (Loan)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>g. Adjusted Available Net Revenue</b>	\$ (3,444,750)	\$602,750	\$842,750	\$1,001,750	\$1,202,750
<b>h. Principal Payments on Debt</b>					
10 Year Bond Principal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
20 Year Bond Principal	-	450,000	574,000	732,000	935,000
Loan Principal	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$450,000	\$574,000	\$732,000	\$935,000
<b>j. Cash Balance</b>					
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$55,250	\$57,250	\$909,000	\$2,257,750	\$3,601,500
Depreciation Reserve	-	1,132,000	1,154,000	366,000	(118,000)
Interest Reserve	175,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	<u>175,000</u>	<u>630,000</u>	<u>630,000</u>	<u>630,000</u>	<u>630,000</u>
Total Cash Balance	\$405,250	\$1,819,250	\$2,693,000	\$3,253,750	\$4,113,500

Significant network expenses—known as “capital additions”—are incurred in the first few years during the construction phase of the network. These represent the equipment and labor expenses associated with building, implementing, and lighting a fiber network. Table 26 shows the capital additions costs in years one, two, and three, and the total for years one through three.

This analysis projects that the capital additions in year one will total approximately \$2.6 million. These costs will total approximately \$3.5 million in year two, \$1.8 million in year three, and \$2.6 million in year four. This totals just over \$10.5 million for total capital additions costs for years one through four.



**Table 26: Capital Additions – Wholesale Model**

Capital Additions	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
<b>Network Equipment</b>				
Core Network Equipment	\$380,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TBD	-	-	-	-
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$380,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Outside Plant and Facilities</b>				
Total Backbone and FTTP	\$1,635,000	\$2,726,000	\$1,090,000	\$ -
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,635,000</b>	<b>\$2,726,000</b>	<b>\$1,090,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Last Mile and Customer Premises Equipment</b>				
CPE (residential and small commercial)	\$91,000	\$182,000	\$182,000	\$638,000
CPE (medium commercial)	18,000	36,000	35,000	124,000
CPE (enterprise)	6,000	10,000	10,000	36,000
Average Drop Cost	263,000	525,000	523,000	1,836,000
Additional Annual Replacement Capital	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$378,000</b>	<b>\$753,000</b>	<b>\$750,000</b>	<b>\$2,634,000</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Implementation Costs</b>				
Splicing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Vehicles	50,000	-	-	-
Emergency Restoration Kit	50,000	-	-	-
Work Station, Computers, and Software	5,000	4,000	-	2,000
Fiber OTDR and Other Tools	85,000	-	-	-
Generators & UPS	-	-	-	-
OSS	-	-	-	-
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$190,000</b>	<b>\$4,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>
<b>Replacement Costs for Depreciation</b>				
Network Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Customer Premises Equipment	-	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Implementation Costs	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Total Capital Additions</b>	<b>\$2,583,000</b>	<b>\$3,483,000</b>	<b>\$1,840,000</b>	<b>\$2,636,000</b>

### 7.3.2 Operating and Maintenance Expenses

The cost to deploy an FTTP network goes far beyond fiber implementation. Network deployment requires additional staffing for sales and marketing, network operations, and other functions. The addition of new staff and inventory requirements will require office and warehousing space:

- Expand office facilities for management, technical and clerical staff

- Provide warehousing for receipt and storage of cable and hardware for the installation and on-going maintenance of the broadband infrastructure
- Establish location to house servers, switches, routers, and other core-network equipment

Training new and existing staff is important to fully realize the economies of starting the FTTP network. The training will be particularly important in the short-term as the new enterprise establishes itself as a unique entity providing services distinct from services provided by the City today.

The expanded business and increased responsibilities will require the addition of new staff. Even in the wholesale service model - marketing and sales are critical. It is important to be proactive in setting expectations, addressing security concerns, and educating the ISPs on how to initiate services.

The initial additional positions, staffing levels, and base salaries are shown in Table 27. Please note that, in the financial model, a 40 percent overhead is added to the salaries listed below.

**Table 27: Labor Expenses – Wholesale Model**

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5+	Labor Cost
<b>New Employees</b>						
Business Manager	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	130,000
GIS	0.50	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	80,000
Communications - Sales	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	75,000
Customer Service Representative	-	-	-	-	-	65,000
Service Technicians/Installers & IT Support	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	90,000
Fiber Plant O&M Technicians	0.25	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	90,000
<b>Total New Staff</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>4.25</b>	<b>5.25</b>	<b>5.25</b>	

### 7.3.3 Summary of Operating and Maintenance Expenses

Additional key operating and maintenance assumptions include:

- Salaries and benefits are based on estimated market wages. See Table 27 for a list of staffing requirements. Benefits are estimated at 40 percent of base salary.
- Insurance is estimated to be \$25,000 in year one and \$50,000 from year two on.
- Office expense allocations are estimated to be \$6,000 per year
- Locates and ticket processing are estimated to start in year one at \$8,000, increase to \$15,000 in year two, and increase to \$31,000 from year three on.
- Contingency is estimated to be \$10,000 in year one and \$25,000 from year two on.
- Billing and maintenance contract fees are estimated at \$10,000 in year one, and \$20,000 from year two on.
- Legal fees are estimated to be \$50,000 in year one, and \$10,000 from year two on.

- Consulting fees are estimated at \$50,000 in year one, and \$10,000 from year three on.
- Marketing and promotional expenses are estimated to be \$30,000 in year one, and \$15,000 from year two on.

Vendor maintenance contract fees are expected to start at \$43,000 in year two, \$52,000 in year three, and \$83,000 year four on. Annual variable and operating expenses not including direct Internet access include:

- Education and training are calculated as 2 percent of direct payroll expense.
- Customer billing is estimated to be \$0.25 per bill per month.

Fiber network maintenance costs are calculated at 1 percent of the total construction cost, per year. This is estimated based on a typical rate of occurrence in an urban environment, and the cost of individual repairs. This is in addition to staffing costs to maintain fiber.

Internet and peering is estimated at \$1.25 per Mbps per month for the first 2 Gbps and \$1.00 per Mbps per month thereafter.

#### **7.3.4 Take-Rate Sensitivity**

This section shows the large impact that fluctuations in take rate can have on financial modeling. In the following tables, we show the financial projections for take rates of 50 percent, 40 percent, and 30 percent.

As discussed in the retail model, obtaining a 60 percent take rate is considered aggressive, and will likely be difficult to obtain and maintain. Realistically, we would expect a 35 percent to 45 percent take rate.

Table 28, below, shows financial projections for a 50 percent take rate. While projections for year one are identical to our base case scenario of 60 percent (seen in Table 22, above), the City's unrestricted cash balance shows a loss of approximately \$641,000 by year five, and this continues to increase. By year 20, the unrestricted cash balance shows a loss of approximately \$1.6 million. This is a \$5.2 million difference between the base case scenario with a 60 percent take rate and a scenario with a 50 percent take rate.

**Table 28: Take Rate Reduced to 50 Percent – Wholesale Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$271,000	\$2,053,000	\$2,053,000	\$2,053,000	\$2,053,000
Total Cash Expenses	(572,750)	(918,250)	(918,250)	(918,250)	(918,250)
Depreciation	(233,000)	(1,102,000)	(578,000)	(570,000)	(570,000)
Interest Expense	(175,000)	(549,000)	(432,000)	(284,000)	(94,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (709,750)	\$ (516,250)	\$124,750	\$280,750	\$470,750

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$55,250	\$ (640,750)	\$ (1,226,000)	\$ (1,422,250)	\$ (1,621,500)
Depreciation Reserve	-	1,026,000	1,087,000	447,000	111,000
Interest Reserve	175,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	175,000	590,000	590,000	590,000	590,000
Total Cash Balance	\$405,250	\$975,250	\$451,000	\$ (385,250)	\$ (920,500)

As take rate continues to decrease, financial projections follow suit. As shown in Table 29, below, unrestricted cash balance for a take rate of 40 percent falls to a deficit of nearly \$1.5 million by year five. This negative balance continues to grow to over \$7 million by year 20. Further, with a take rate of 40 percent, the City would not generate a positive net income until year 20.

Compared to the base model, a 40 percent take rate will dramatically affect unrestricted cash balance, result in a nearly \$1.5 million difference by year five, and an over \$10.5 million difference by year 20.

**Table 29: Take Rate Reduced to 40 Percent – Wholesale Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$271,000	\$1,632,000	\$1,632,000	\$1,632,000	\$1,632,000
Total Cash Expenses	(572,750)	(903,250)	(903,250)	(903,250)	(903,250)
Depreciation	(233,000)	(952,000)	(532,000)	(524,000)	(524,000)
Interest Expense	(175,000)	(504,000)	(395,000)	(257,000)	(81,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (709,750)	\$ (727,250)	\$ (198,250)	\$ (52,250)	\$ 123,750

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$55,250	\$ (1,447,750)	\$ (3,501,000)	\$ (5,268,250)	\$ (7,039,500)
Depreciation Reserve	-	920,000	1,020,000	525,000	334,000
Interest Reserve	175,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	175,000	545,000	545,000	545,000	545,000
Total Cash Balance	\$405,250	\$17,250	\$ (1,936,000)	\$ (4,198,250)	\$ (6,160,500)

Table 30 shows our lowest projected take rate of 30 percent. In this model, the unrestricted cash balance is a deficit of over \$2 million by year five, and the deficit continues to grow to over \$12

million by year twenty. In this model, the City is unable to generate a positive net income over the course of 20 years.

In comparison to our base model of a 60 percent take rate, the difference in unrestricted cash balance by year five is over \$2.2 million, and nearly \$16 million by year 20.

**Table 30: Take Rate Reduced to 30 Percent – Wholesale Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$271,000	\$1,226,000	\$1,226,000	\$1,226,000	\$1,226,000
Total Cash Expenses	(572,750)	(893,250)	(893,250)	(893,250)	(893,250)
Depreciation	(233,000)	(801,000)	(486,000)	(479,000)	(479,000)
Interest Expense	(175,000)	(465,000)	(362,000)	(234,000)	(68,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (709,750)	\$ (933,250)	\$ (515,250)	\$ (380,250)	\$ (214,250)

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$55,250	\$ (2,155,750)	\$ (5,671,000)	\$ (9,014,250)	\$ (12,358,500)
Depreciation Reserve	-	814,000	952,000	610,000	572,000
Interest Reserve	175,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	175,000	505,000	505,000	505,000	505,000
Total Cash Balance	\$405,250	\$ (836,750)	\$ (4,214,000)	\$ (7,899,250)	\$ (11,281,500)

#### 7.4 Dark Fiber Model Financial Analysis

The financial analysis for all scenarios presented here represents a minimum requirement for the City to break even each year, excluding any potential revenue from other dark fiber lease opportunities that may be available to the City.

The base case scenario assumes that the City’s private partner will pay a fee of \$40 per passing per month, with no upfront or balloon payments. Based on an assumption that the City will deploy an FTTP network in the identified business area, the financial model applies the fee to all business premises in the identified service area. The current model keeps constant the \$40 per passing fee, though the City and its partner could negotiate periodic increases.

Please note there is no market data or examples of the dark fiber model with a business focus. For example, in its agreement with Huntsville Utilities in Huntsville, Alabama, Google Fiber pays under \$10 per month per passing, but this is for residences only—no businesses are included. The per-passing fee is the largest “risk” in the model and could be tested with the recommended RFI.

Further, the \$40 fee is based on a full recovery of capital and expenses. The FTTP deployment is likely to have additional economic development and other benefits that are not easily measured.

In recognition of these benefits, the City could choose to provide funding to the proposed enterprise that would lower the required per passing fee.

The financial analysis for the base case scenario is as follows:

**Table 31: Base Case Financial Analysis – Dark Fiber Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$6,140	\$1,226,880	\$1,226,880	\$1,226,880	\$1,226,880
Total Cash Expenses	(373,750)	(549,250)	(549,250)	(549,250)	(549,250)
Depreciation	(119,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)
Interest Expense	(130,000)	(351,000)	(275,000)	(176,000)	(51,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (616,610)	\$15,630	\$91,630	\$190,630	\$315,630

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ (6,610)	\$10,340	\$25,490	\$40,640	\$56,790
Depreciation Reserve	-	141,000	185,000	229,000	273,000
Interest Reserve	130,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	<u>130,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>
Total Cash Balance	\$253,390	\$531,340	\$590,490	\$649,640	\$709,790

Please note that we used a “flat model” in the analysis, which means that inflation and operating cost increases (including salaries) are not used because it is assumed that operating cost increases will be offset by increases in operator lease payments over time (and likely passed on to subscribers in the form of increased prices). We anticipate that the City will apply an inflation factor, typically based on a Consumer Price Index (CPI), to the portion of the per-subscriber fee that covers projected operating expenses during negotiations with a private partner. Please note that it is not appropriate to apply a CPI to the entire passing fee because most of the fee is to support the principal and interest on the debt service.


This document presents an overview of the financial model; we have provided the City with a complete financial model in Excel format. Because the Excel spreadsheets can be manipulated to show the impact of changing assumptions it will be an important tool for the City to use as it negotiates with a private partner.

This analysis does not contain any potential revenue from wireless ISPs that are looking for connectivity to wireless access points. A wireless ISP could leverage the FTTP infrastructure and avoid drop costs and investment in the electronics for the FTTP network. The use of the fiber is dependent upon the wireless technologies implemented by the wireless ISP.

### 7.4.1 Cost Implications of the Dark Fiber Model

The financial analysis in this section assumes that the City constructs and owns the FTTP infrastructure up to a demarcation point at the optical tap near each residence and business, and leases the dark fiber backbone and distribution fiber to a private partner. The private partner would be responsible for all network electronics, fiber drops to subscribers, and CPEs—as well as network sales, marketing, and operations.

**Figure 11: Demarcation Between City and Partner Network Elements**



Using 100 percent underground construction, the dark FTTP network deployment for the business park will cost approximately \$5.5 million, including OSP construction labor, materials, engineering, permitting, and pole attachment licensing. This estimate does not include and electronics, subscriber equipment, or drops.

**Table 32: Breakdown of Estimated Dark Fiber Model Cost (aerial and underground construction)**

Cost Component	Total Estimated Cost
OSP Engineering	\$519,000
Quality Control/Quality Assurance	192,000
General OSP Construction Cost	3,158,000
Special Crossings	703,000
Backbone and Distribution Plant Splicing	139,000
Backbone Hub, Termination, and Testing	475,000
FTTP Lateral Installations	265,000
<b>Total Estimated Cost:</b>	<b>\$5,451,000</b>

The above estimates assume that the City constructs and owns the FTTP infrastructure up to a demarcation point at the optical tap near each business, and leases the dark fiber backbone and distribution fiber to a private partner. The private partner would be responsible for all network electronics, fiber drops to subscribers, and CPEs—as well as network sales, marketing, and operations.

The ownership of the drops is an assumption that could be changed through negotiation with a private partner—as, indeed, could many of the assumptions underpinning this analysis. We have chosen this key parameter for the base case scenario because we believe this approach presents a reasonable balance of costs, control, and risk for the City. (City ownership of the drops, for example, would increase the City's control, but also significantly increase the City's costs.)

In a related vein, we note that some network operators suggest that the network's optical splitters should be a part of the Layer 1 or dark fiber assets. We caution against this approach. The network operator (i.e., the City's partner) should maintain the splitters because, as operator of the electronics, it must determine and control the GPON network split ratio to meet the network's performance standards. This may involve moving power users to GPON ports with lower split ratios, or moving users to different splitters to manage the capacity of the GPON ports. The City should not be involved in this level of network management. Also, the City should not have to inventory various sized splitters or swap them as the network operator makes changes. Even if the City were to decide to purchase some of the optical splitters for the network, we believe it should be the network operator's responsibility to manage and maintain the splitters.

#### **7.4.2 Financing Costs and Operating Expenses**

For the base financial analysis, we used the OSP costs for a combination aerial and underground construction. In the scenarios, we show the impact of the increased costs for an all-underground deployment.

This financial analysis assumes that the City will cover all its capital requirements with general obligation (GO) bonds. We assumed that the City's bond rate would be 5 percent.

We expect that the City will take three 20-year bonds—one each in years one, two, and three—for a total of \$7.6 million in financing. (The difference between the financed amount and the total capital costs represents the amount needed to maintain positive cash flow in the early years of network deployment.) The resulting principal and interest (P&I) payments will be the major factor in determining the City's long-term financial requirements; P&I accounts for about 53 percent of the City's annual costs in our base case model after the construction period.

We project that the bond issuance costs will be equal to 1.0 percent of the principal borrowed. For the bond, a debt service reserve account is maintained at 5.0 percent of the total issuance



amount. An interest reserve account will be maintained for the first two years. Principal repayment on the bonds will start in year two.

The model assumes a straight-line depreciation of assets, and that the OSP and materials will have a 20-year life span. Because we assume the City's partner will be responsible for network electronics and CPE, we have not included depreciation or replacement costs for that equipment (although we note that, typically, network equipment would be replaced after 10 years, while CPE and last-mile infrastructure would be depreciated over five years). The model plans for a depreciation reserve account starting in year three to fund future replacements and upgrades.

Table 33 shows the income statement for years one, five, 10, 15, and 20.

**Table 33: Income Statement – Dark Fiber Model**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
<b>a. Revenues</b>					
Internet - Business	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Connection Fee (net)	-	-	-	-	-
Per Passing	6,140	1,226,880	1,226,880	1,226,880	1,226,880
Per Customer	-	-	-	-	-
Provider Fee	-	-	-	-	-
Assessments	-	-	-	-	-
Ancillary Revenues	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 6,140</b>	<b>\$ 1,226,880</b>	<b>\$ 1,226,880</b>	<b>\$ 1,226,880</b>	<b>\$ 1,226,880</b>
<b>b. Content Fees</b>					
Internet	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>c. Operating Costs</b>					
Operation Costs	\$169,000	\$194,000	\$194,000	\$194,000	\$194,000
Labor Costs	204,750	355,250	355,250	355,250	355,250
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$373,750</b>	<b>\$549,250</b>	<b>\$549,250</b>	<b>\$549,250</b>	<b>\$549,250</b>
<b>d. EBITDA</b>	<b>\$ (367,610)</b>	<b>\$ 677,630</b>	<b>\$ 677,630</b>	<b>\$ 677,630</b>	<b>\$ 677,630</b>
<b>e. Depreciation</b>	<b>119,000</b>	<b>311,000</b>	<b>311,000</b>	<b>311,000</b>	<b>311,000</b>
<b>f. Operating Income (EBITDA less Depreciation)</b>	<b>\$ (486,610)</b>	<b>\$366,630</b>	<b>\$366,630</b>	<b>\$366,630</b>	<b>\$366,630</b>
<b>g. Non-Operating Income</b>					
Interest Income	\$ -	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Interest Expense (10 Year Bond)	-	-	-	-	-
Interest Expense (20 Year Bond)	(130,000)	(352,000)	(276,000)	(178,000)	(53,000)
Interest Expense (Loan)	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ (130,000)</b>	<b>\$ (275,000)</b>	<b>\$ (275,000)</b>	<b>\$ (176,000)</b>	<b>\$ (51,000)</b>
<b>h. Net Income (before taxes)</b>	<b>\$ (616,610)</b>	<b>\$15,630</b>	<b>\$91,630</b>	<b>\$190,630</b>	<b>\$315,630</b>
<b>i. Facility Taxes</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>j. Net Income</b>	<b>\$ (616,610)</b>	<b>\$15,630</b>	<b>\$91,630</b>	<b>\$190,630</b>	<b>\$315,630</b>

Table 34 shows the cash flow statement for years one, five, 10, 15, and 20.

**Table 34: Cash Flow Statement – Dark Fiber Model**

Cash Flow Statement	Year 1	Year 5	Year 10	Year 15	Year 20
<b>a. Net Income</b>	\$ (616,610)	\$15,630	\$91,630	\$190,630	\$315,630
<b>b. Cash Outflows</b>					
Debt Service Reserve	\$ (130,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Interest Reserve	(260,000)	-	-	-	-
Depreciation Reserve	-	(47,000)	(47,000)	(47,000)	(47,000)
Financing	(26,000)	-	-	-	-
Capital Expenditures	(1,823,000)	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ (2,239,000)	\$ (47,000)	\$ (47,000)	\$ (47,000)	\$ (47,000)
<b>c. Cash Inflows</b>					
Interest Reserve	\$130,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Depreciation Reserve	-	-	-	-	-
Investment Capital	-	-	-	-	-
Start Up Funds	-	-	-	-	-
Grants (infrastructure)	-	-	-	-	-
Grants (customer premises)	-	-	-	-	-
10-Year Bond/Loan Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-
20-Year Bond Proceeds	2,600,000	-	-	-	-
Loan Proceeds	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ 2,730,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>d. Total Cash Outflows and Inflows</b>	\$491,000	\$ (47,000)	\$ (47,000)	\$ (47,000)	\$ (47,000)
<b>e. Non-Cash Expenses - Depreciation</b>	\$119,000	\$311,000	\$311,000	\$311,000	\$311,000
<b>f. Adjustments</b>					
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (10 Year Bond)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (20 Year Bond)	\$ (2,600,000)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Proceeds from Additional Cash Flows (Loan)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>g. Adjusted Available Net Revenue</b>	\$ (2,606,610)	\$279,630	\$355,630	\$454,630	\$579,630
<b>h. Principal Payments on Debt</b>					
10 Year Bond Principal	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
20 Year Bond Principal	-	277,000	353,000	451,000	576,000
Loan Principal	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	\$ -	\$277,000	\$353,000	\$451,000	\$576,000

**j. Cash Balance**

Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ (6,610)	\$10,340	\$25,490	\$40,640	\$56,790
Depreciation Reserve	-	141,000	185,000	229,000	273,000
Interest Reserve	130,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	<u>130,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>
Total Cash Balance	\$253,390	\$531,340	\$590,490	\$649,640	\$709,790

Significant network expenses—known as “capital additions”—are incurred in the first few years during the construction phase of the network. These represent the equipment and labor expenses associated with building a fiber network. (Again, because the City’s responsibility will be limited to OSP, we have not included any costs for core network equipment, drops, or CPE.) This analysis projects that the capital additions (including vehicles and test equipment) in year one will total approximately \$1.8 million. These costs will total approximately \$2.7 million in year two, and \$1.1 million in year three. This totals just over \$5.6 million in capital additions for years one through three.

**Table 35 – Capital Additions – Dark Fiber Model**

<b>Capital Additions</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>
<b>Network Equipment</b>			
Core Network Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TBD	-	-	-
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Outside Plant and Facilities</b>			
Total Backbone and FTTP	\$1,635,000	\$2,726,000	\$1,090,000
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,635,000</b>	<b>\$2,726,000</b>	<b>\$1,090,000</b>
<b>Last Mile and Customer Premises Equipment</b>			
CPE (residential and small commercial)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
CPE (medium commercial)	-	-	-
CPE (enterprise)	-	-	-
Average Drop Cost	-	-	-
Additional Annual Replacement Capital	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Miscellaneous Implementation Costs</b>			
Splicing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Vehicles	50,000	-	-
Emergency Restoration Kit	50,000	-	-
Work Station, Computers, and Software	3,000	3,000	-
Fiber OTDR and Other Tools	85,000	-	-
Generators & UPS	-	-	-
OSS	-	-	-
Additional Annual Capital	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$188,000</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Replacement Costs for Depreciation</b>			
Network Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Customer Premises Equipment	-	-	-
Miscellaneous Implementation Costs	-	-	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>Total Capital Additions</b>	<b>\$1,823,000</b>	<b>\$2,729,000</b>	<b>\$1,090,000</b>

### 7.4.3 Operating and Maintenance Expenses

The cost to deploy an FTTP network goes far beyond fiber implementation. Network deployment requires network maintenance and technical operations, and other functions. In this model, we assume that the City's partner will be responsible for lighting the fiber and selling services, so the City's financial requirements are limited to expenses related to OSP infrastructure and network administration.

These expanded responsibilities will require the addition of new staff. We assume the City will add a total of three and three-quarters full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions within the first three years, and will then maintain that level of staffing. Our assumptions include one-half FTE for management, one FTE for GIS, one-quarter FTE for communication support, and one FTE for fiber plant maintenance and operations. Salaries and benefits are based on estimated market wages, and benefits are estimated at 40 percent of base salary.

Some of these responsibilities can be contracted out, while some can be absorbed into existing positions within the City. Each City's circumstances is unique, and the skill sets that exist within an organization will inform to what degree responsibilities must be contracted out. We encourage the City to train internal staff for all record-keeping responsibilities—particularly network details such as fiber strand usage and locations. We cannot overstate the importance of keeping meticulous records on the fiber to maintain the long-term integrity of the network, and keeping this function in-house gives the City the greatest degree of control over these records' accuracy.

Locates and ticket processing will be significant ongoing operational expenses for the City. Based on our experience in other cities, we estimate that a contract for locates will cost \$8,000 in year one, increase to \$15,000 in year two, and increase to \$31,000 from year three on. (If the City decides to perform this work in-house, the contract expense would be eliminated—but staffing expenses would increase.)

Additional key operating and maintenance assumptions include the following:

- Insurance is estimated to be \$25,000 in year one and \$50,000 from year two on.
- Office expenses are estimated to be \$2,400 annually.
- Contingency expenses are estimated at \$10,000 in year one and \$25,000 in subsequent years.
- Legal fees are estimated to be \$50,000 in year one and \$10,000 from year two on.
- Consulting fees are estimated at \$50,000 in year one and \$10,000 from year two on.

Fiber network maintenance costs are calculated at one percent of the total construction cost, per year. This is estimated based on a typical rate of occurrence in an urban environment, and the cost of individual repairs. This is in addition to staffing costs to maintain the fiber.

Table 36 lists the City's projected operating expenses for years one, five, 10, 15, and 20.



**Table 36: Operating Expenses Dark Fiber Model**

Operating Expenses	Year 1	Year 5	Year 10	Year 15	Year 20
Support Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Insurance	25,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Utilities	-	-	-	-	-
Office Expenses	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Facility Lease	-	-	-	-	-
Locates & Ticket Processing	8,000	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000
Peering	-	-	-	-	-
Contingency	10,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Billing Maintenance Contract	-	-	-	-	-
Fiber & Network Maintenance	16,000	55,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Vendor Maintenance Contracts	-	-	-	-	-
Legal and Lobby Fees	50,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Planning	-	-	-	-	-
Consulting	50,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Marketing	-	-	-	-	-
Education and Training	4,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
Customer Handholding	-	-	-	-	-
Customer Billing (Unit)	-	-	-	-	-
Allowance for Bad Debts	-	-	-	-	-
Churn (acquisition costs)	-	-	-	-	-
Pole Attachment Expense	-	-	-	-	-
Internet	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$169,000</b>	<b>\$194,000</b>	<b>\$194,000</b>	<b>\$194,000</b>	<b>\$194,000</b>
Labor Expenses	<u>\$204,750</u>	<u>\$355,250</u>	<u>\$355,250</u>	<u>\$355,250</u>	<u>\$355,250</u>
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b><u>\$204,750</u></b>	<b><u>\$355,250</u></b>	<b><u>\$355,250</u></b>	<b><u>\$355,250</u></b>	<b><u>\$355,250</u></b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b><u>\$373,750</u></b>	<b><u>\$549,250</u></b>	<b><u>\$549,250</u></b>	<b><u>\$549,250</u></b>	<b><u>\$549,250</u></b>

#### 7.4.4 Revenue

The base case scenario assumes that the City's private partner will pay a fee of \$40 per passing per month, with no upfront or balloon payments. Based on an assumption that the City will deploy a ubiquitous FTTP network in the business park. The financial model applies the fee to all business premises in the business park. The current model keeps that \$40 per passing fee constant, although the City and its partner could negotiate periodic increases.

Operating and maintenance expenses account for approximately 47 percent of the City's total annual costs. (P&I payment on debt is the remaining amount.) At a minimum, 47-percent of the per-passing fee should be increased by a CPI each year.

In the scenarios below, we show the sensitivity of the monthly fee.

#### 7.4.5 Dark Fiber Fee Sensitivity

This section demonstrates the sensitivity of the financial projections to changes in per passing fee. We show the financial projects for fees at \$35, \$30, and \$25 per passing per month.

Table 37, below, shows financial analysis for a \$35 per month passing fee. In this model, the unrestricted cash balance shows a loss of approximately \$435,000 by year five, and more than \$2.6 million by year 20.

Compared to our base model of a \$40 per-month passing fee, the decreased fee results in an unrestricted cash balance difference of \$760 at year one, growing to an approximately \$445,000 difference by year 5, and ultimately a difference of over \$2.7 million by year 20.

**Table 37: Dark Fiber Model Financial Analysis - \$35 Per Month Passing Fee**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$5,380	\$1,073,520	\$1,073,520	\$1,073,520	\$1,073,520
Total Cash Expenses	(373,750)	(549,250)	(549,250)	(549,250)	(549,250)
Depreciation	(119,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)
Interest Expense	(130,000)	(351,000)	(275,000)	(176,000)	(51,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (617,370)	\$ (137,730)	\$ (61,730)	\$37,270	\$162,270

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ (7,370)	\$ (435,160)	\$ (1,186,810)	\$ (1,938,460)	\$ (2,689,110)
Depreciation Reserve	-	141,000	185,000	229,000	273,000
Interest Reserve	130,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	<u>130,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>	<u>380,000</u>
Total Cash Balance	\$252,630	\$85,840	\$ (621,810)	\$ (1,329,460)	\$ (2,036,110)

As the per-passing fee decreases, unrestricted cash balance and net income also decrease.

Table 38, below, shows financial projections for a \$30 per month passing fee. Were the City to charge this fee, we project an unrestricted cash balance deficit of \$8,140 at year one, and that deficit increasing to over \$5 million by year 20.

In comparison to our base model of a \$40 per month passing fee, a \$30 fee results in an unrestricted cash balance difference of \$1,530 at year 1, growing to a difference of nearly \$5.5 million by year 20.

**Table 38: Dark Fiber Model Financial Analysis - \$30 Per Month Passing Fee**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$4,610	\$920,160	\$920,160	\$920,160	\$920,160
Total Cash Expenses	(373,750)	(549,250)	(549,250)	(549,250)	(549,250)
Depreciation	(119,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)
Interest Expense	(130,000)	(351,000)	(275,000)	(176,000)	(51,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (618,140)	\$ (291,090)	\$ (215,090)	\$ (116,090)	\$ 8,910

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ (8,140)	\$ (880,680)	\$ (2,399,130)	\$ (3,917,580)	\$ (5,435,030)
Depreciation Reserve	-	141,000	185,000	229,000	273,000
Interest Reserve	130,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	130,000	380,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
Total Cash Balance	\$251,860	\$ (359,680)	\$ (1,834,130)	\$ (3,308,580)	\$ (4,782,030)

Table 39, below, shows our projections for the lowest passing fee of \$25 per month. In this projection, the unrestricted cash balance begins as a deficit of \$8,910, with that deficit growing to \$8.1 million by year twenty. Further, this per-passing fee is unable to generate positive net income over the twenty-year projection.

In comparison to our base model, a \$25 per month passing fee results in a difference of \$2,300 at year one, \$1.3 million difference by year five, and ultimately an \$8.2 million difference by year 20.

**Table 39: Dark Fiber Model Financial Analysis - \$25 Per Month Passing Fee**

<b>Income Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Total Revenues	\$3,840	\$766,800	\$766,800	\$766,800	\$766,800
Total Cash Expenses	(373,750)	(549,250)	(549,250)	(549,250)	(549,250)
Depreciation	(119,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)	(311,000)
Interest Expense	(130,000)	(351,000)	(275,000)	(176,000)	(51,000)
Taxes	-	-	-	-	-
Net Income	\$ (618,910)	\$ (444,450)	\$ (368,450)	\$ (269,450)	\$ (144,450)

<b>Cash Flow Statement</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 10</b>	<b>Year 15</b>	<b>Year 20</b>
Unrestricted Cash Balance	\$ (8,910)	\$ (1,326,190)	\$ (3,611,440)	\$ (5,896,690)	\$ (8,180,940)
Depreciation Reserve	-	141,000	185,000	229,000	273,000
Interest Reserve	130,000	-	-	-	-
Debt Service Reserve	130,000	380,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
Total Cash Balance	\$251,090	\$ (805,190)	\$ (3,046,440)	\$ (5,287,690)	\$ (7,527,940)

## Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

The descriptions in our FTTP design and cost estimate analysis are highly technical and make use of several acronyms that can be confusing, especially to a non-technical audience. While we try to define each acronym the first time it appears in the text, we also believe that a glossary can be a useful tool to navigate this document. This section outlines most of the acronyms that appear in this analysis.

**AE** – Active Ethernet; a technology that provides a symmetrical (upload/download) Ethernet service and does not share optical wavelengths with other users. For subscribers that receive Active Ethernet service—typically business customers that request a premium service or require greater bandwidth—a single dedicated fiber goes directly to the subscriber premises with no optical splitting.

**CPE** – Customer premises equipment; the electronic equipment installed at a subscriber’s home or business.

**Distribution Fiber** – The fiber in an FTTP network that connects the hub sites to the fiber distribution cabinets (see below).

**Drop** – The fiber connection from an optical tap in the ROW to the customer premises.

**FDC** – Fiber distribution cabinet; houses the fiber connections between the distribution fiber and the access fiber. FDCs, which can also house network electronics and optical splitters, can sit on a curb, be mounted on a pole, or reside in a building.

**Access Fiber** – The fiber in an FTTP network that goes from the FDCs to the optical taps that are located outside of homes and businesses in the rights-of-way.

**FTTP** – Fiber-to-the-premises; a network architecture in which fiber optics are used to provide broadband services all the way to each subscriber’s premises.

**GPON** – Gigabit passive optical network; the most commonly provisioned FTTP service—used, for example, by Verizon (in its FiOS systems), Google Fiber, and Chattanooga Electric Power Board (EPB). GPON uses passive optical splitting, which is performed inside FDCs, to connect fiber from the Optical Line Terminals (OLTs) to multiple customer premises over a single GPON port.

**Hub** – At the hub, optical splitting is used to distribute network services deeper into the community, enabling eventual FTTP connections.

**IP** – Internet Protocol; the method by which computers share data on the Internet.

**LEC** – Local Exchange Carrier; a public telephone company that provides service to a local or regional area.

**MDU** – Multi-dwelling unit (i.e., an apartment or office building).

**OLT** – Optical Line Terminal; the upstream connection point (to the provider core network) for subscribers. The choice of an optical interface installed in the OLT determines whether the network provisions shared access (one fiber split among multiple subscribers in a GPON architecture) or dedicated Active Ethernet access (one port for one subscriber).

**OSP** – Outside plant; the physical portion of a network (also called “layer 1”) that is constructed on utility poles (aerial) or in conduit (underground).

**OSS** – Operational Support Systems (OSS); includes a provider’s provisioning platforms, fault and performance management systems, remote access, and other operational support systems for FTTP operations. OSS is housed in a network’s core locations.

**OTT** – Over-the-top; content, such as voice or video service, that is delivered over a data connection.

**Passing** – A potential customer address (e.g., an individual home or business).

**Peering** – An interconnection between two service providers, or a service provider and an application provider (Netflix, Dropbox, etc.) to facilitate faster, less-expensive connections.

**PON** – Passive optical network; uses passive optical splitting, which is performed inside FDCs, to connect fiber from the OLTs to multiple customer premises over a single PON port.

**POP** – Point of presence; a physical location where network switches, routers, and servers are housed. POPs frequently offer appropriate power, cooling, and security resources for network equipment, peering (see above) and at times enable connections to multiple ISPs.

**POTS** – “Plain old telephone service;” delivered over the PSTN.

**PSTN** – Public switched telephone network; the copper-wire telephone networks that connect landline phones.

**QoS** – Quality of service; a network’s performance as measured on a number of attributes.

**ROW** – Right-of-way; land reserved for the public good such as utility construction. ROW typically abuts public roadways.

**VoIP** – Voice over Internet Protocol; telephone service that is delivered over a data connection.

## **Appendix B: Assessment of Local Broadband Market**

This Appendix is attached as a separate PDF file.

## **Appendix C: Retail Financial Model (spreadsheet)**

This Appendix is attached as a separate Microsoft Excel file.

## **Appendix D: Wholesale Financial Model (spreadsheet)**

This Appendix is attached as a separate Microsoft Excel file.



## **Appendix E: Dark Fiber Financial Model (spreadsheet)**

This Appendix is attached as a separate Microsoft Excel file.

## **Appendix F: Online Business Survey Questions**

This appendix is attached as a separate PDF file.

## Appendix G: Online Business Survey Results

To understand the potential market demand for fiber connectivity and related services among Hayward businesses, CTC conducted an online survey in summer 2016. At a high level, the survey showed that the respondents that completed the questionnaire are not overwhelmingly unhappy with their current speeds, and that there is a modest willingness to switch to a higher-speed service—but only if the price point is \$75 per month or less.

Most of the businesses indicated that price, reliability, and speed are important factors for them to consider as their connectivity needs evolve and they become increasingly dependent on cloud-based business solutions to support their operations.

### Survey Methodology

The survey was sent out via e-mail on behalf of the City to approximately 2,600 businesses in July 2016. An online survey mechanism enabled completion of the survey questionnaires over the Internet. The survey was designed to collect a range of data to understand businesses' current use of data and Internet services; satisfaction with current service providers; and interest in new, higher-speed data and Internet service offerings.

The survey's e-mail distribution list was culled from data purchased from InfoUSA on approximately 900 businesses located in Hayward, in conjunction with email lists provided by the City and Chamber of Commerce. CTC worked with City staff to develop a set of questions for Hayward businesses, which were then entered into a survey instrument on SurveyMonkey, an online tool that allows for customization, and provides granular output of responses in various formats for analysis. The survey questionnaire is attached to this report as Appendix C.

50 recipients opted out of the survey; 18 emails were returned as undeliverable; and 1,545 emails were unopened. Of the 1,006 potential respondents that opened the email, 183 clicked through. There were 156 total responses through the email collector, which included the original email we sent through SurveyMonkey.

In the weeks following the initial SurveyMonkey email notification, the City sent a follow-up email outside the SurveyMonkey system, which contained a web link for potential respondents to access the survey. There were 103 responses collected through the web link, for a total of 259 responses all together. Of the approximately 2,600 email recipients, there were 259 respondents that filled out at least some portion of the survey.

While there were 259 responses to the survey, not every respondent completed the full survey, as respondents were able to skip questions and answer questions only partially. We designed the survey in this way to encourage respondents to answer questions for which they had a response, while not forcing them to attempt to answer questions they do not believe are applicable to their

business. Although this does not produce statistically valid results, it can provide insight into the business community's connectivity needs, their willingness to switch to a new provider, and what role they believe the City should play in an FTTP deployment.

Further, a secondary purpose of the survey was to identify potential businesses that would be willing to further discuss their connectivity needs, and their potential willingness to purchase services from the City. The final questions in the survey prompted willing respondents to provide specific information about their contact information and their willingness to speak in greater detail with City representatives about their connectivity needs. While 77 respondents listed their business' specific address, only 41 respondents indicated a willingness to be contacted further. CTC was able to reach 24 businesses for follow-up discussions.


### **Online Survey Results**

As we noted, the survey had some inherent limitations, and the respondents are not truly representative of a random selection of the population. Still, the City can potentially glean some valuable information from the businesses that chose to respond, caveats aside.

#### **The Majority of Responses Were from Small-to-Medium Size Businesses**


91 percent of the responses were from businesses with only one location. Nearly half the respondents to the business survey represented businesses with 1 to 4 employees, and more than three-quarters (approximately 77.25 percent) came from businesses with less than 20 employees. About 14.5 percent of responses were from businesses with 20 to 99 employees, and about 6.7 percent of responses were from businesses with 100 to 499 employees. Only about 1.5 percent of responses were from business with 500 or more employees. There were no responses from businesses with more than 5,000 employees. See Figure 12, below.

**Figure 12: Respondents' Number of Employees (Based on 255 Responses)**




Nearly half of the responses were from businesses with a sales volume of less than \$500,000 per year. A majority of businesses (approximately 83.3 percent) represented had an annual sales volume of \$5 million or less. Only approximately 3.5 percent of respondents represented businesses with an annual sales volume of \$50 million or greater.

**Figure 13: Respondents' Annual Sales Volume (Based on 227 Responses)**



More than half of the respondents (approximately 57.2 percent) currently subscribe to either cable or DSL; nearly 12 percent of respondents are connected via fiber; and slightly less than 7 percent are connected to a fractional or full T1. See Figure 14, below.


**Figure 14: Business Respondents' Primary Internet Connection (Based on 201 Responses)**



**Nearly Half of Respondents Are Satisfied with Current Internet Speeds**

Price, Reliability, and Speed tend to be the most important factors that businesses consider when evaluating their connectivity options, and when considering the possibility of switching providers. Based on the 191 full responses to the question that prompted respondents to indicate the importance of various aspects of their business Internet service, it appears that reliability is most important, followed by price, and speed. Approximately 78 percent of respondents indicated that reliability was somewhat or very important; approximately 76 percent indicated price was somewhat or very important; and approximately 74 percent of respondents indicated that speed was somewhat or very important. See Figure 15, below.


**Figure 15: Importance of Price, Reliability, and Speed (Based on 191 Responses)**



While speed appears to be an important attribute to the respondents, nearly half of the 197 respondents that fully answered the question indicated that their current Internet speed was fast enough for their needs. Approximately 29 percent of respondents indicated that their current speed was not bad, but not quite fast enough for their needs. Only a little over 10 percent of respondents indicated that their current Internet speed was very slow, and approximately 13.7 percent indicated it was fairly slow. That group—approximately 23.9 percent of respondents to the question—indicated that they would like to be connected at higher speeds.




**Figure 16: Respondents' Satisfaction With Current Internet Speeds (Based on 197 Responses)**



It appears that most respondents are not particularly unhappy with various attributes of their current service (see Figure 17, below). This does not mean that respondents would not consider alternative service from a different provider, but it does indicate that the City would have to find ways to differentiate itself to stand out among its competitors—particularly as a retail service provider.


**Figure 17: Satisfaction with Current Internet Service Attributes (Based on 192 Responses)**



### Pricing Sensitivity and Willingness to Switch Service Providers

Almost 60 percent of respondents indicated that they currently pay \$100 or more per month for their business Internet connection. Just over 10 percent of respondents indicated that they currently pay \$49 or less per month for their business Internet connection. Nearly 32 percent of respondents indicated that they currently pay \$50 to \$99 per month. See Figure 18, below.


**Figure 18: Monthly Cost for Internet Services (Based on 183 Responses)**



Although most respondents appear to pay more than \$75 per month, or somewhere near that price point, there did not appear to be a significant willingness to switch to much higher speeds. Nearly half of respondents (approximately 45 percent) indicated that they were somewhat or very satisfied with the price of their current services—based on the 192 respondents that fully answered the question. Still, only approximately 35 percent indicated that they were very or somewhat *dissatisfied* with the price of their current services.


Just under 60 percent of respondents indicated that they would be “very willing” to switch to a 100 Mbps service for \$75 per month, and only 10 percent indicated they would be “very unwilling” to switch to 100 Mbps service for \$75 per month. The respondents appear to be particularly sensitive to price

**Figure 19: Respondents' Willingness to Switch to 100 Mbps Service at Various Price Points (Based on 142 Responses)**



Approximately 63 percent of respondents to the survey indicated they would be “very willing” to switch to 1 Gbps service for \$75 per month, which is a slightly higher willingness than those respondents that indicated they would switch to 100 Mbps service at the same price point. Respondents seem slightly more likely to switch service for higher speeds.


**Figure 20: Respondents' Willingness to Switch to 1 Gbps Service at Various Price Points (Based on 137 Responses)**



### The City's Role

One of the questions the survey asked all respondents was what role they believe the City should play in facilitating broadband access in Hayward. Only approximately 15.6 percent of the 160 responses indicate a belief that the City should have no role. Just over 40 percent of respondents indicate that the City should either install a network and offer services to the public or install a network and lease it to competing private companies to offer services. Approximately 29.4 percent of respondents believe the City should encourage a private firm to build a fiber network in Hayward. Approximately 14.4 percent of respondents do not know what role the City should play. See Figure 21, Below.

**Figure 21: Main Role for the City With Respect to Broadband Access (Based on 160 Responses)**



### Follow-Up Interviews with Select Businesses

As we noted, approximately 40 businesses indicated that they could be contacted further for additional discussions. We managed to reach 24 unique businesses for follow-up conversations to gather these businesses’ insights. Most of these respondents believe that the City has some role in at least providing infrastructure to help manage the connectivity challenges in the market today, and especially in the future. Only one respondent indicated the City should become a provider, while only three respondents were on the opposite end of the spectrum and claimed the City’s only role should be to expedite permits.

In general, the respondents that we reached indicated that they believe connectivity is critical for their business operations, and their dependency on it is growing. This is especially true as their business operations grow increasingly dependent on cloud computing. Most respondents indicated that the current market does not meet their needs, and that the speed and reliability of currently-available services is especially unlikely to meet their future needs as their businesses grow and evolve.

As is the case with many small- to medium-size businesses in other markets, connectivity options are limited to only DSL or cable for many of the respondents to the business survey. There is a shared perception that competition is lacking in the Hayward business market, and that it must be increased in order to drive better choice for businesses. Further, choices are limited for alternative services, or for back-up options to help offset the speed and reliability challenges these businesses face with their primary providers.

While some of the respondents could purchase cable modem service through Comcast, it tends to be much more expensive than AT&T's DSL service, and the speeds and reliability do not necessarily justify the increased cost. Still, satisfaction related to reliability and speed seems to be marginally higher with Comcast than with AT&T. Most of these respondents claimed that the customer service they receive from their current providers is not good, and they would prefer more positive experiences when seeking support.