



## Monthly Meeting, Friday August 3, 2012

Anasazi Room, La Plata County Courthouse

1:30 pm to 3:30 pm

(To participate via teleconference, please call 661-673-8600  
and then enter participant code 850589#)

### AGENDA

(packet item 1)

**1:30 pm Meeting Called to Order & Introductions:** Tom Yennerell Chair

#### **Additions/Changes to the Agenda**

#### **Consent Agenda**

- A. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes for Friday, July 13, 2012 (item 2)
- B. Financial Report for June (3a and b)

#### **Telecommunications Report**

- A. General Manager Services Report (part of 4a)
- B. Community Updates (part of 4a)
- C. Responsible Administrator Report (part of 4a)
- D. Telecommunications Committee Minutes for July 18, 2012 (4b)
- E. Telecommunications Committee Chair Report (will be made at mtg)
- F. July 23 Joint Executive & Administration Committee meeting minutes (4c)

#### **Discussion**

- A. Telecommunications Excavation Policy (5a and b)
- B. Letter received from Pueblo Community College (6)

#### **Decision**

- A. **General Manager Services contract recommendation (Resolution 12-10)**  
(7a-d)

#### **Management Report**

- A. Audit documents signed & filed with state (part of 4a)
- B. Government Budgeting Class (Region 9 staff attended, relevant to their fiscal support of the COG) (part of 4a)
- C. Next CARO meeting (part of 4a)
- D. Update on Governor's August 20 visit (part of 4a)
- E. COG policy review & update (part of 4a)
- F. COG sustainability and staffing plan (part of 4a)

#### **Decision**

- Set 2013 COG member dues (Resolution 12-11)** (8a-c)

#### **Announcements**

Next regular Board meeting will be September 7, 2012 from 1:30 – 3:30 pm at the La Plata Courthouse.

**3:30 pm Adjourn**

**Packet Item 1**

C:\Users\John\Desktop\JE\COGdrive\Meetings\8-12\August meeting agenda.docx

**Minutes for July 13, 2012 SWGCOG Board meeting**  
**Anasazi Room, La Plata County Courthouse**  
**1:30 pm to 3:30 pm**

**Members Present:**

Tom Yennerell, Town of Mancos  
Michael Lee, Town of Ignacio  
Shale Hale, City of Cortez  
Ron LeBlanc, City of Durango  
Ernie Williams, Dolores County  
Dick White, City of Durango  
Rachel Davenport, Town of Bayfield  
Greg Schulte, Archuleta County  
Willy Tookey, San Juan County  
David Mitchem, Town of Pagosa Springs  
Bobby Lieb, La Plata County  
Ryan Mahoney, Town of Dolores  
Rachel Simbeck, Town of Mancos  
Bryce Capron, Town of Dove Creek  
Jason Wells, Town of Silverton  
Joanne Spina, La Plata County

**Guests:**

Ken Charles, DoLA  
Gary Shaw, Ute Mountain Ute  
Todd Beckstead, Beckstead & Co.LLC

**Staff/Consultants:**

Susan Hakanson  
Laura Lewis Marchino  
Ed Morlan  
Shirley Jones  
Dr. Rick Smith  
John Ehmann  
Sam Starr

**Call to Order & Introductions:** The meeting was called to order at approximately 1:30 p.m. by Tom Yennerell, Chair. A quorum was present. Introductions were made by those present and those on the phone were also recognized.

**Additions or Changes to the Agenda:** Tom noted that the agenda order had been adjusted from the standard format to cluster related decisions with other agenda items on the same general topic. Ed Morlan asked to defer the FastTrack decision item because a response to our draft agreement has not been received yet. He would like to also discuss a planned visit by the Governor. Tom suggested making that Discussion Item E. He further suggested that the scheduling of a joint Executive / Administration Committee meeting would be Discussion Item F.

**Presentation: Audit Report – Todd Beckstead, Beckstead & Co., LLC**

Todd Beckstead thanked the Board for the opportunity to serve as Auditor and thanked the staff for their cooperation and transparency. Although the job of the auditor is to find errors, he indicated that a good job is being done and the financial statements fairly present the COG's operations for 2011. He explained the nature of his review and presented his findings and main recommendations.

He tested the reimbursements for the telecom grant. One check was submitted for reimbursement twice. A similar error was discovered last audit. Procedures and reports to help avoid further recurrence of this issue were recommended and discussed with Laura Lewis Marchino and Shirley Jones.

He was discussed the handling of member match on the telecom grant. He indicated that this revenue should be deferred until it is actually used as match for that community's project expenses. He recommended that the deferred revenue issue be reviewed at least quarterly. (A policy on this topic was prepared for Board vote at this meeting.)

He also noted that for a large disbursement of grant funds to one community, the support document for the grant expenditure was not on file. The member government indicated they were sending it in but it was not received. The invoices were re-requested, compiled and found to provide adequate documentation in this case but he recommended that the COG consistently

**Packet Item 2**

require support documentation prior to making payments. (A policy to address this recommendation has also been prepared for consideration later at this meeting.)

He noted that a much higher percentage of the project administration budget had been spent to date than for project construction. He recognized that this was expected, logical and not unusual for a construction project but recommended that administrative expenses be monitored to make sure there is enough remaining administrative budget to finish the grant work.

He re-iterated that the financial statements are fairly presented and offered to respond to questions. Ed Morlan asked for Todd's opinion about the appropriateness of using an enterprise fund for on-going SCAN operations and how to do it. Todd indicated there are several situations where use of an enterprise is required. If the revenues of an enterprise fully cover the expenses of that activity including capital expenditures, use of an enterprise fund is required. He indicated that the SCAN project doesn't meet the threshold of this requirement if it does not anticipate full recovery of the incurred capital costs from on-going revenues and he doesn't believe it is anticipated to do so. However whenever user fees are charged, you are allowed to use enterprise accounting and there can be advantages for management reporting and program assessment. It can be done informally by staff internally without Board action. If the Board directs an enterprise fund be established, it could increase future audit costs. Jason Wells asked if the decision whether to set up an enterprise needs to be made now as the business model is being refined and finalized. Dr. Rick Smith said no, but they would like the opportunity to make a recommendation later. He said there were political factors outside of the realm of accounting that the Board will need to bear in mind when it makes its decision. Ed noted that the budget that will be presented later does not at this time include SCAN operating budget information outside the grant work.

Tom Yennerell thanked Todd for his presentation and work.

**Decision- Approval of the 2011 Audit (Resolution 12-08)**

Ron LeBlanc asked if the Board needed to approve the Audit or "accept" it. Tom agree that accepting it is probably the more accurate term. **Willy Tookey recommended we pass the resolution 12-08 to accept the audit. The motion was seconded and passed with all those voting in favor.**

**Decision- Accounting policies recommended by auditor (Resolution 12-09)**

**Shane Hale recommended we pass the resolution 12-09 to approve two accounting policies. The motion was seconded Willy Tookey and passed with all those voting in favor.**

After the votes John Ehmann realized that while the agenda listed Resolutions for these decisions, it was later decided by staff that the attachments for these decisions would be the audit materials themselves and the policy statement itself and there would not need to be separate resolutions for them. He apologized that agenda listed Resolution numbers that were relied upon to offer motions when the attached materials did not include separate resolutions. Upon hearing this Joanne Spina recognized that the Board should re-vote to make it clear was voted on and approved and Tom & others agreed.

**The votes were re-made by the same moving parties on the actual audit and accounting policy documents presented and both passed with all those voting in favor.**

**Consent Agenda:** The Consent Agenda consisted of the minutes for the June 1, 2012 Board meeting and the financial report for May 2012. Ernie Williams asked if there were any sales revenues in May. Laura Lewis Marchino said there was for dark fiber. Ernie asked if this was the expected monthly amount. It may not be, as there may have been some catch-up for past months. Rachel Davenport asked that the minutes be amended to reflect that she was not at the June 1 meeting. **Willy Tookey made the motion to approve the consent agenda with the requested correction to the minutes and it was seconded by Ryan Mahoney. The motion passed, with all those voting in favor.**

#### **Public Hearing on proposed amended SWCOG budget**

Tom Yennerell opened the public hearing at 2:02 pm and asked if anyone from the public wished to speak on the proposed amended SWCOG budget. Seeing and hearing no such request, the public hearing was closed at 2:03 pm.

#### **Decision- 2012 SWCCOG Budget revisions (Resolution 12-10)**

Shane asked why the Board was being asked to a mid-year budget revision instead of at the end of year. Laura responded that it was intended to help with preparing a 2013 sustainability plan and budget and to recognize that some line items that have seen significant changes and help us get a better handle of where we are at and expect to go. She indicated we would still need to do an end of year adjustment. Susan Hakanson added that the costs of legal counsel was one area where expenses were under-budgeted compared to actual experience. She also indicated that while the AmeriCorps position ends in October (and there may not be an opportunity to get a similar position in the future due to SUCAP not being awarded the contract to offer such positions for 2013), there are remaining available funds (from Region 9 for 2012 transition staffing and the transit grant) that can cover extending the service of John Ehmann past the official end date of his current funding and through the end of the year.

Bobby Lieb asked about the General Manager Services contract amount and if it had already changed. Laura clarified that it was proposed that the budget amount increase by \$20,000 recognizing both a need for service and more money available for it due to savings elsewhere. Bobby asked if the approval of the budget revision presumed the addition and extension of the General Manager Services contract. Ed and Laura both indicated there is no linkage and that the budget revision is just a budget revision and that the decision about what to actually do with the General Manager Services contract will be re-visited later.

Shane asked about a discrepancy between revenue and expenditure amounts in the original budget for DoLA construction. Ed indicated the imbalance in the original budget may not have been correct. Bobby Lieb noted discrepancies in in-kind revenue and expenditures in both the original budget and revisions and asked if they should balance out. Shirley Jones agreed that they should offset. Ed indicated that he was already planning on making additional changes in the future to add the SCAN operating budget and update sales revenues and recommended that this version not be adopted at this time and the opportunity be provided to make additional changes later. Tom noted the potential value of the revised budget but asked the preference of the Board. Ron suggested taking this budget material under advisement as information only and that when the numbers that are not moving it could be re-introduced at a later meeting. Shane suggested continuing to receive information and tabling the budget revision until the end of the year and then making the final adjustments. Bobby noted the advantage of amending the budget and having all the funds budgeted to afford planned expenses. Ron noted that the

Responsible Administrator is accountable for maintaining a balanced budget. Ernie agreed with the importance of having solid numbers. Greg Schulte said that mid-year budget revisions were the practice of some governments and not others. If we wait, at minimum, we need some process for the Board to be informed about the progress with expenses to date and provided updated best projections. Tom said it was more common in local government to wait until the end of the year and got the sense that had more supported by Board members. He asked if we could amend our monthly budget reporting to show revised projections in addition to the original budget and the actual to date. Joanne noted that if you are increasing the total budget, that needs to be recognized and you are required to make a budget adjustment. Ron hasn't sure from the information provided what the bottom-line was. (Note: The proposed budget revision reduces the total budget.) Rachel Davenport asked if projections have been prepared for the rest of the year in addition to looking actual costs to date and Laura responded that they were projected for the remaining of the year (based on experience to date and judgment). Rachel did also note though that the profit & loss statement already provides the Board information about revenues & expenditures to date. Laura indicated the budget was amended 5 times last year. Bobby supported preparing projections for future months by month and then looking at actual & projected spending for all 12 months. Rachel agreed that would be useful. Tom summarized the discussion saying there was consensus support for preparing monthly projections and using that information in the budget management report. We asked if staff understood the Board's preference. Laura said yes. Ed indicated he still wanted to amend the budget when the numbers are checked and revised. Ken Charles suggested the option of further consulting with our Auditor on these policies and practices. Tom ended this discussion and said the item is tabled for the moment.

Tom did add that the invoices for the additional 10% of telecom project management match are out and important to pay promptly.

## **Reports:**

### **A. Telecommunications Report**

Ernie had a few comments and questions related to the community update. He asked Shirley to separate the match for Dolores County and Dove Creek. Their projects may be the same, they may not. He asked why discussion of Eagle-Net build was scheduled with Dolores County Development Corporation on a date when the Dolores County Commissioners were not available when it is the County Commission who will put up the match. He asked for better communications and more detail. Ed offered to respond. Tom observed that detailed community conversation is best done outside the Board meeting and that he and others do that to pursue their specific concerns with community projects. Ernie asked if discussion of how things were going with the project was acceptable? Tom said it was but there were time constraints and raising them during the Board meeting takes time from lots of other people who are not directly interested parties in that particular conversation. Ernie indicated that he was interested in hearing how things were going in other communities; but that if further discussion wasn't to be afforded now, then someone should call him. Rick said he would call Ernie.

Ron LeBlanc asked for more information about the accounting issue with the Durango project raised in the report. Laura indicated that the matter has been resolved with Eric Pierson. Cortez had a similar issue but also believes it has been since handled.

General Manager Services Report- Dr. Rick Smith was on vacation for 3 ½ weeks in June. Paul Recanzone submitted information for this report in his place. Rick is looking forward to further discussion with the Executive / Administration Committees about SCAN, the operating budget and how SCAN can be a useful tool without it being very time-consuming. Greg asked if there was any update on Eagle-Net progress. Rick indicated they are going to Mancos next week for permitting and then headed west. In the discussion it was noted that Eagle-Net had previously been vague about construction dates, only saying what they expected to do this year. The line over Wolf Creek Pass has not yet been laid. Rick will try to get more specific information on exactly when they will be in communities at the Eagle-Net Board meeting he will attend next week.

Responsible Administrator Report- Ed asked for questions but none were immediately offered. He indicated several communities have still not signed the telecom IGA- Rico, Dolores County, the Town of Dolores and Ignacio. Michael Lee said he is aware of the status of the document with respect to his community. Ernie indicated that they were previously advised by their lawyer to not sign it but he is willing to discuss it further by phone. Ryan indicated while there were previous hesitation related to Eagle-Net, he is willing to put it before his Board.

Telecommunications Committee Chair Report- Jason Wells asked if the General Manager Services contract was going to be discussed at this meeting, as anticipated in the TeleCom Committee minutes. It is not on this meeting's agenda and there is no longer a special Board meeting planned later in July so it will have to be handled later. Ed indicated that it was a COG Board decision when & how to handle it but he thought there should be an evaluation process. He thought the budget could be increased by as much as \$30,000 to extend the contract if the Board wishes.

Jason gave a brief reminder about the Club 20 telecom discussion event in Telluride on July 18.

## **B. Management Report**

Greg Schulte reported that the TPR voted to keep the administrative support contract with Region 9 until end of June 2013. Shane said the topic should come earlier next year. He asked Susan the extent to which she had gotten to communicate with the TPR before the vote. Susan said she shared some information to try to reassure them at that meeting about how little would change and what might be gained. She will be attending their meetings going forward to establish better communication and highlight new opportunities. Shane shared that in his view the COG is not seeking to be the overseer or over-rider on transportation policy. Susan agreed. Ernie indicated he was opposed to the change at this time based on the TPR's success working together and the difficulties he has had on telecom issues with the COG to date. If he thought the transition would be smooth, he would be willing to support it. Greg observed that several jurisdictions did not participate in the vote and that it would be important to hear their voice next time.

On the pursuit of a grant on regional mapping, Tom asked if there was a cash local match? Susan clarified that only preliminary information has been submitted so far that might lead to an opportunity to make a grant request. SW Connect would be the primary organization to do the mapping which would include transportation and other services. The COG might provide some staff support and use existing, currently unallocated transit grant funds for the match. They also have secured an offer of a \$5,000 private donation if the proposal is invited. The COG could receive about \$4,000 in new revenue to help administrate the grant.

The new COG office is in the old Durango Public Library. Volunteers for Committees are still wanted and will be formally appointed in September. Ed discussed an issue with regional housing data discrepancies and asked if the COG wanted Region 9 to continue to work on it at some expense. Shane said yes, agreeing that was an important topic to address. Ed said that Region 9 would continue to work to correct the issue. Tom thanked Region 9 for handling it and indicated that at some point in the future the COG might get more involved, but not immediately.

## **Discussion:**

- A. Region wide guidelines for conditional permitting for telecommunication utility installation  
Rick indicated that Eagle-Net is mainly focused on federal rules and are not very interested in what local government thinks. He described our desire for Eagle-Net (or others) to put or allow communities to put empty conduit in the trench for the community to use now or later. Space for trenches and lines is limited. Ryan observed that Eagle-Net plans to use a shaker tool to put the conduit in rather than dig a trench and lay it in. He is not sure if they can double up the conduit for the insertion. Ed noted that there is compartmentalized conduit with 2, 4 or 8 chambers. There are federal legal concerns for Eagle-Net about sharing a stick of conduit. Rick said if an actual trench is dug there is the option of using the same contractor and trying to get a good price for simultaneous work and have two sticks of conduit put in with one paid for by SCAN. Ed said that Eagle-Net has raised objections to doing even simultaneous work and trench sharing, saying that other conduit must be 5 feet away from theirs. We are trying to gain some power and get them to change their stance to some degree. Bobby asked how many miles we might have to lay conduit or fiber side by side to theirs. A definite answer was not provided (in part because it has not been firmly determined yet, though it could be large). Ron added that the City of Durango has laid telecom lines in abandoned gas and water lines and realized cost and time savings. Shane was impressed with the good idea implemented by the city of Durango.

Jason took the opportunity to ask about the E-Tic contract and whether there was an automatic process for new communities to get trained on and billed for E-Tic. Rick indicated that there isn't an automatic system in place. Shane said it was good software but kind of complicated to use & train people on. Rick said that there may be the possibility that information could be moved from GIS to E-Tic or vice versa

- B. COG sustainability and staffing plan update  
Susan is pursuing outreach meetings include related to GIS, the Office of Community Services, AAA, etc. She is looking at new programs, existing and new policies, the relationship between the SCAN project and the sustainability plan for the COG as whole, the budget more. It is a big elephant. An analysis grid is included in the management report that gives a preliminary look at program options in each COG priority area..
- C. DoLA funding opportunities  
Ken Charles was recognized by Tom and volunteered some information related to the energy impact assistance money. Support for COG may be available in mid to late 2013 in amounts of \$25,000 or maybe more). It is not firm yet whether it can be used for general support or must be for programs. The match will be dollar for dollar. He said that might be something to think about when the COG decides what level of dues to raise. Laura noted that there was a lot of discussion about this topic at the CARO meeting and disappointment about what was being offered and the timeline. Ken noted that that is the opportunity to

advocate for change, but if they did more for the COGs it would take from what is otherwise going to the local governments.

D. Guidance on 2013 dues

A spreadsheet was included in the management report about the what the 2013 dues would be by community for different levels of total revenue raised. This is just information at this time. A decision on dues is planned for the next Board meeting

E. Governor's visit

Ed was contacted by Tony Hernandez of DoLA recently, suggesting there may be an opportunity to meet with Governor when he comes to Durango to start the U.S. Pro bike race. DoLA thought it could be a chance to showcase & discuss the SCAN project. Ed filled out a placeholder meeting request but is seeking Board input on the prospect. A meeting with Mayors was also suggested. Greg said he preferred to wait to talk more about the SCAN project until we have more to show off and Ron agreed. The Governor's time availability was unclear. We will wait to get some further feedback from the Governor's office then Ed and Charles will confer further and notify the group when plans come together.

F. Joint Executive / Administration Committee

The members of these committees and staff will be meeting on July 23, mainly about the SCAN project .

**Announcements-**

The next Board meeting will be held Friday August 3, 2012 from 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm at the La Plata Courthouse.

**Adjourn- The Chair adjourned the meeting by consensus shortly after 3:30 p.m.**

- Announcement/Proclamation
- Special Presentation
- Report

- Consent
- Decision

**AGENDA SUBMISSION FORM**  
**Southwest Colorado Council of Governments**

Date of Board Meeting: August 3, 2012		<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff: Laura Lewis Marchino	Presentation Time: 2 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Subject: April Financials	Discussion Time: 5 minutes	
Reviewed by Attorney? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes   Attorney: _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> No fiscal impact Committee Approval _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A		

**Background:**

In your packet are financial reports produced through Quick books for the SWCCOG. The first is the Combined Balance Sheet by Class through June 2012. This shows Total Assets of \$66,819.54 with negative assets in the general COG fund of \$316,800.29. This is primarily because the money in the general bank account are telecom funds. Please note the high numbers in Telecom accounts receivable and also that the deferred revenue numbers will change now that the audit is finalized.

The second item is the Profit/Loss through June 2012. These pages show actual expenses compared to the six month budget (annual budget divided in half).

The final report is the Profit/Loss Annual budget versus actual numbers. Under the general COG, most of the income has already been received and is at 83.8% of budget and expenses are at 43.8% of budget. For Telecom, income is at 30.8% and expenses at 34.2% of budget. Net income is a negative \$21,034.99 after a positive net income of \$39,914.03 for the month of May. Net income numbers have been dependent on the receipt of DoLA funds. The Financials have been sent to the SWCCOG Treasurer.

**Fiscal Impact:**

As referred to above.

**Recommended Action:**

The recommended action is to approve the June Financial Report

**Accompanying Documents:**

- Combined Balance Sheet by Class through June 2012
- Profit/Loss by Class Budget to actual through June 2012
- Profit/Loss by Class Annual Budget to actual

---

ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS

None

**Packet Item 3a**

**Southwest Colorado Council of Governments**  
**Combined Balance Sheet by Class**  
 January through June 2012

	<u>100-General</u>	<u>830-Telecom</u>	<u>Unclassified</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<b>ASSETS</b>				
Current Assets				
Checking/Savings				
1001 · 1st Southwest Bank	-308,245.87	0.00	0.00	-308,245.87
Total Checking/Savings	-308,245.87	0.00	0.00	-308,245.87
Accounts Receivable				
1200 · Accounts Receivable	1,181.76	373,883.65	0.00	375,065.41
Total Accounts Receivable	1,181.76	373,883.65	0.00	375,065.41
Other Current Assets				
1090 · Due To/ Due From	-9,736.18	9,736.18	0.00	0.00
1210 · miscellaneous receivable	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1499 · Undeposited Funds	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
1550 · Prepaid expense	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Other Current Assets	-9,736.18	9,736.18	0.00	0.00
Total Current Assets	-316,800.29	383,619.83	0.00	66,819.54
<b>TOTAL ASSETS</b>	<b>-316,800.29</b>	<b>383,619.83</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>66,819.54</b>
<b>LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>				
Liabilities				
Current Liabilities				
Accounts Payable				
20000 · Accounts Payable	0.00	960.00	0.00	960.00
Total Accounts Payable	0.00	960.00	0.00	960.00
Other Current Liabilities				
2200 · Deferred Revenue	0.00	11,375.00	0.00	11,375.00
2210 · Deferred Member Contributions	0.00	29,462.00	0.00	29,462.00
2500 · Suspense	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Other Current Liabilities	0.00	40,837.00	0.00	40,837.00
Total Current Liabilities	0.00	41,797.00	0.00	41,797.00
Total Liabilities	0.00	41,797.00	0.00	41,797.00
Equity				
32000 · Retained Earnings	15,491.74	30,565.79	0.00	46,057.53
Net Income	17,408.99	-38,443.98	0.00	-21,034.99
Total Equity	32,900.73	-7,878.19	0.00	25,022.54
<b>TOTAL LIABILITIES &amp; EQUITY</b>	<b>32,900.73</b>	<b>33,918.81</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>66,819.54</b>

**Southwest Colorado Council of Governments**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual**  
 January through June 2012

	100-General			
	Jan - Jun 12	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>Income</b>				
4000 · Sales	0.00			
4005 · Other Income	0.00			
4010 · Grant-DOLA Admin	0.00			
4020 · Grant DOLA-Construction	0.00			
4040 · Grant-Transit	7,074.34	7,500.00	-425.66	94.3%
4950 · Match-GOV Admin	13,999.00	6,999.98	6,999.02	200.0%
4951 · Match-GOV Construction	0.00			
4952 · Region 9-Matching Funds	20,000.00	9,999.98	10,000.02	200.0%
4955 · In Kind Project Match	0.00			
4956 · Matching Funds-Other	0.00			
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>41,073.34</b>	<b>24,499.96</b>	<b>16,573.38</b>	<b>167.6%</b>
<b>Cost of Goods Sold</b>				
5000 · Cost of Goods Sold	0.00			
<b>Total COGS</b>	<b>0.00</b>			
<b>Gross Profit</b>	<b>41,073.34</b>	<b>24,499.96</b>	<b>16,573.38</b>	<b>167.6%</b>
<b>Expense</b>				
5510 · Travel & Ent	368.33	500.02	-131.69	73.7%
5512 · Meeting Exp	503.14	399.98	103.16	125.8%
5515 · Legal Fees	3,146.00	1,500.00	1,646.00	209.7%
5520 · Advertising	261.33	500.02	-238.69	52.3%
5525 · Audit	6,185.00	9,000.00	-2,815.00	68.7%
5527 · Internet & software	0.00			
5532 · Postage	99.02	63.98	35.04	154.8%
5535 · Printing/Reproduction	457.50			
5540 · Membership/Sub	250.00	250.00	0.00	100.0%
5550 · Supplies	31.98			
5555 · Liability Insurance	3,897.00	3,900.00	-3.00	99.9%
5637 · SCAN GM	0.00			
5638 · Region 9 EDD	0.00			
5639 · Infor Services-Project Mgmt	0.00			
5640 · Consulting	0.00	9,999.98	-9,999.98	0.0%
5641 · MSC-Regional Project Mgmt	0.00			
5642 · MSC-Project Engineering & Mgmt	0.00			
5643 · CDOT LLC	6,395.52	4,749.98	1,645.54	134.6%
5644 · AmeriCorp Member	2,069.53	2,750.02	-680.49	75.3%
5645 · Project Construction	0.00			
5955 · In Kind Project expense	0.00			
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>23,664.35</b>	<b>33,613.98</b>	<b>-9,949.63</b>	<b>70.4%</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>17,408.99</b>	<b>-9,114.02</b>	<b>26,523.01</b>	<b>-191.0%</b>

**Southwest Colorado Council of Governments**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual**  
 January through June 2012

	830-Telecom			
	Jan - Jun 12	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>Income</b>				
4000 · Sales	4,200.00	20,000.02	-15,800.02	21.0%
4005 · Other Income	8,400.00	24,999.98	-16,599.98	33.6%
4010 · Grant-DOLA Admin	107,776.01	60,000.00	47,776.01	179.6%
4020 · Grant DOLA-Construction	393,759.16	699,999.98	-306,240.82	56.3%
4040 · Grant-Transit	0.00			
4950 · Match-GOV Admin	0.00	27,500.02	-27,500.02	0.0%
4951 · Match-GOV Construction	866.63			
4952 · Region 9-Matching Funds	5,011.65	8,000.02	-2,988.37	62.6%
4955 · In Kind Project Match	133,077.05	222,999.98	-89,922.93	59.7%
4956 · Matching Funds-Other	3,049.10			
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>656,139.60</b>	<b>1,063,500.00</b>	<b>-407,360.40</b>	<b>61.7%</b>
<b>Cost of Goods Sold</b>				
5000 · Cost of Goods Sold	0.00	5,000.02	-5,000.02	0.0%
<b>Total COGS</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5,000.02</b>	<b>-5,000.02</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Gross Profit</b>	<b>656,139.60</b>	<b>1,058,499.98</b>	<b>-402,360.38</b>	<b>62.0%</b>
<b>Expense</b>				
5510 · Travel & Ent	1,889.97	750.00	1,139.97	252.0%
5512 · Meeting Exp	151.55	500.02	-348.47	30.3%
5515 · Legal Fees	7,516.80	2,100.00	5,416.80	357.9%
5520 · Advertising	0.00	200.02	-200.02	0.0%
5525 · Audit	0.00			
5527 · Internet & software	112.50	65.02	47.48	173.0%
5532 · Postage	10.60	9.98	0.62	106.2%
5535 · Printing/Reproduction	0.00	174.98	-174.98	0.0%
5540 · Membership/Sub	0.00			
5550 · Supplies	0.00			
5555 · Liability Insurance	0.00			
5637 · SCAN GM	29,750.00	27,500.02	2,249.98	108.2%
5638 · Region 9 EDD	27,692.59	15,000.00	12,692.59	184.6%
5639 · Infor Services-Project Mgmt	1,575.00	999.98	575.02	157.5%
5640 · Consulting	337.50	300.00	37.50	112.5%
5641 · MSC-Regional Project Mgmt	33,445.40	20,000.02	13,445.38	167.2%
5642 · MSC-Project Engineering & Mgmt	58,916.99	176,499.98	-117,582.99	33.4%
5643 · CDOT LLC	0.00			
5644 · AmeriCorp Member	0.00			
5645 · Project Construction	400,107.63	572,784.98	-172,677.35	69.9%
5955 · In Kind Project expense	133,077.05	200,000.02	-66,922.97	66.5%
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>694,583.58</b>	<b>1,016,885.02</b>	<b>-322,301.44</b>	<b>68.3%</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>-38,443.98</b>	<b>41,614.96</b>	<b>-80,058.94</b>	<b>-92.4%</b>

## Southwest Colorado Council of Governments

## Profit &amp; Loss Budget vs. Actual

January through June 2012

07/19/12

Accrual Basis

## TOTAL

	Jan - Jun 12	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>Income</b>				
4000 · Sales	4,200.00	20,000.02	-15,800.02	21.0%
4005 · Other Income	8,400.00	24,999.98	-16,599.98	33.6%
4010 · Grant-DOLA Admin	107,776.01	60,000.00	47,776.01	179.6%
4020 · Grant DOLA-Construction	393,759.16	699,999.98	-306,240.82	56.3%
4040 · Grant-Transit	7,074.34	7,500.00	-425.66	94.3%
4950 · Match-GOV Admin	13,999.00	34,500.00	-20,501.00	40.6%
4951 · Match-GOV Construction	866.63	0.00	866.63	100.0%
4952 · Region 9-Matching Funds	25,011.65	18,000.00	7,011.65	139.0%
4955 · In Kind Project Match	133,077.05	222,999.98	-89,922.93	59.7%
4956 · Matching Funds-Other	3,049.10	0.00	3,049.10	100.0%
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>697,212.94</b>	<b>1,087,999.96</b>	<b>-390,787.02</b>	<b>64.1%</b>
<b>Cost of Goods Sold</b>				
5000 · Cost of Goods Sold	0.00	5,000.02	-5,000.02	0.0%
<b>Total COGS</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5,000.02</b>	<b>-5,000.02</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Gross Profit</b>	<b>697,212.94</b>	<b>1,082,999.94</b>	<b>-385,787.00</b>	<b>64.4%</b>
<b>Expense</b>				
5510 · Travel & Ent	2,258.30	1,250.02	1,008.28	180.7%
5512 · Meeting Exp	654.69	900.00	-245.31	72.7%
5515 · Legal Fees	10,662.80	3,600.00	7,062.80	296.2%
5520 · Advertising	261.33	700.04	-438.71	37.3%
5525 · Audit	6,185.00	9,000.00	-2,815.00	68.7%
5527 · Internet & software	112.50	65.02	47.48	173.0%
5532 · Postage	109.62	73.96	35.66	148.2%
5535 · Printing/Reproduction	457.50	174.98	282.52	261.5%
5540 · Membership/Sub	250.00	250.00	0.00	100.0%
5550 · Supplies	31.98	0.00	31.98	100.0%
5555 · Liability Insurance	3,897.00	3,900.00	-3.00	99.9%
5637 · SCAN GM	29,750.00	27,500.02	2,249.98	108.2%
5638 · Region 9 EDD	27,692.59	15,000.00	12,692.59	184.6%
5639 · Infor Services-Project Mgmt	1,575.00	999.98	575.02	157.5%
5640 · Consulting	337.50	10,299.98	-9,962.48	3.3%
5641 · MSC-Regional Project Mgmt	33,445.40	20,000.02	13,445.38	167.2%
5642 · MSC-Project Engineering & Mgmt	58,916.99	176,499.98	-117,582.99	33.4%
5643 · CDOT LLC	6,395.52	4,749.98	1,645.54	134.6%
5644 · AmeriCorp Member	2,069.53	2,750.02	-680.49	75.3%
5645 · Project Construction	400,107.63	572,784.98	-172,677.35	69.9%
5955 · In Kind Project expense	133,077.05	200,000.02	-66,922.97	66.5%
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>718,247.93</b>	<b>1,050,499.00</b>	<b>-332,251.07</b>	<b>68.4%</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>-21,034.99</b>	<b>32,500.94</b>	<b>-53,535.93</b>	<b>-64.7%</b>

3:10 PM

## Southwest Colorado Council of Governments

## Profit &amp; Loss Budget vs. Actual

January through December 2012

07/19/12

Accrual Basis

*Annual*

100-General

	Jan - Dec 12	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>Income</b>				
4000 · Sales	0.00			
4005 · Other Income	0.00			
4010 · Grant-DOLA Admin	0.00			
4020 · Grant DOLA-Construction	0.00			
4040 · Grant-Transit	7,074.34	15,000.00	-7,925.66	47.2%
4950 · Match-GOV Admin	13,999.00	14,000.00	-1.00	100.0%
4951 · Match-GOV Construction	0.00			
4952 · Region 9-Matching Funds	20,000.00	20,000.00	0.00	100.0%
4955 · In Kind Project Match	0.00			
4956 · Matching Funds-Other	0.00			
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>41,073.34</b>	<b>49,000.00</b>	<b>-7,926.66</b>	<b>83.8%</b>
<b>Cost of Goods Sold</b>				
5000 · Cost of Goods Sold	0.00			
<b>Total COGS</b>	<b>0.00</b>			
<b>Gross Profit</b>	<b>41,073.34</b>	<b>49,000.00</b>	<b>-7,926.66</b>	<b>83.8%</b>
<b>Expense</b>				
5510 · Travel & Ent	368.33	1,000.00	-631.67	36.8%
5512 · Meeting Exp	503.14	800.00	-296.86	62.9%
5515 · Legal Fees	3,146.00	3,000.00	146.00	104.9%
5520 · Advertising	261.33	1,000.00	-738.67	26.1%
5525 · Audit	6,185.00	9,000.00	-2,815.00	68.7%
5527 · Internet & software	0.00			
5532 · Postage	99.02	128.00	-28.98	77.4%
5535 · Printing/Reproduction	457.50			
5540 · Membership/Sub	250.00	250.00	0.00	100.0%
5550 · Supplies	31.98			
5555 · Liability Insurance	3,897.00	3,900.00	-3.00	99.9%
5637 · SCAN GM	0.00			
5638 · Region 9 EDD	0.00			
5639 · Infor Services-Project Mgmt	0.00			
5640 · Consulting	0.00	20,000.00	-20,000.00	0.0%
5641 · MSC-Regional Project Mgmt	0.00			
5642 · MSC-Project Engineering & Mgmt	0.00			
5643 · CDOT LLC	6,395.52	9,500.00	-3,104.48	67.3%
5644 · AmeriCorp Member	2,069.53	5,500.00	-3,430.47	37.6%
5645 · Project Construction	0.00			
5955 · In Kind Project expense	0.00			
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>23,664.35</b>	<b>54,078.00</b>	<b>-30,413.65</b>	<b>43.8%</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>17,408.99</b>	<b>-5,078.00</b>	<b>22,486.99</b>	<b>-342.8%</b>

**Southwest Colorado Council of Governments**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual**  
 January through December 2012

830-Telecom

	Jan - Dec 12	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>Income</b>				
4000 · Sales	4,200.00	40,000.00	-35,800.00	10.5%
4005 · Other Income	8,400.00	50,000.00	-41,600.00	16.8%
4010 · Grant-DOLA Admin	107,776.01	120,000.00	-12,223.99	89.8%
4020 · Grant DOLA-Construction	393,759.16	1,400,000.00	-1,006,240.84	28.1%
4040 · Grant-Transit	0.00			
4950 · Match-GOV Admin	0.00	55,000.00	-55,000.00	0.0%
4951 · Match-GOV Construction	866.63			
4952 · Region 9-Matching Funds	5,011.65	16,000.00	-10,988.35	31.3%
4955 · In Kind Project Match	133,077.05	446,000.00	-312,922.95	29.8%
4956 · Matching Funds-Other	3,049.10			
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>656,139.60</b>	<b>2,127,000.00</b>	<b>-1,470,860.40</b>	<b>30.8%</b>
<b>Cost of Goods Sold</b>				
5000 · Cost of Goods Sold	0.00	10,000.00	-10,000.00	0.0%
<b>Total COGS</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>-10,000.00</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Gross Profit</b>	<b>656,139.60</b>	<b>2,117,000.00</b>	<b>-1,460,860.40</b>	<b>31.0%</b>
<b>Expense</b>				
5510 · Travel & Ent	1,889.97	1,500.00	389.97	126.0%
5512 · Meeting Exp	151.55	1,000.00	-848.45	15.2%
5515 · Legal Fees	7,516.80	4,200.00	3,316.80	179.0%
5520 · Advertising	0.00	400.00	-400.00	0.0%
5525 · Audit	0.00			
5527 · Internet & software	112.50	130.00	-17.50	86.5%
5532 · Postage	10.60	20.00	-9.40	53.0%
5535 · Printing/Reproduction	0.00	350.00	-350.00	0.0%
5540 · Membership/Sub	0.00			
5550 · Supplies	0.00			
5555 · Liability Insurance	0.00			
5637 · SCAN GM	29,750.00	55,000.00	-25,250.00	54.1%
5638 · Region 9 EDD	27,692.59	30,000.00	-2,307.41	92.3%
5639 · Infor Services-Project Mgmt	1,575.00	2,000.00	-425.00	78.8%
5640 · Consulting	337.50	600.00	-262.50	56.3%
5641 · MSC-Regional Project Mgmt	33,445.40	40,000.00	-6,554.60	83.6%
5642 · MSC-Project Engineering & Mgmt	58,916.99	353,000.00	-294,083.01	16.7%
5643 · CDOT LLC	0.00			
5644 · AmeriCorp Member	0.00			
5645 · Project Construction	400,107.63	1,145,570.00	-745,462.37	34.9%
5955 · In Kind Project expense	133,077.05	400,000.00	-266,922.95	33.3%
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>694,583.58</b>	<b>2,033,770.00</b>	<b>-1,339,186.42</b>	<b>34.2%</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>-38,443.98</b>	<b>83,230.00</b>	<b>-121,673.98</b>	<b>-46.2%</b>

**Southwest Colorado Council of Governments**  
**Profit & Loss Budget vs. Actual**  
 January through December 2012

	TOTAL			
	Jan - Dec 12	Budget	\$ Over Budget	% of Budget
<b>Income</b>				
4000 · Sales	4,200.00	40,000.00	-35,800.00	10.5%
4005 · Other Income	8,400.00	50,000.00	-41,600.00	16.8%
4010 · Grant-DOLA Admin	107,776.01	120,000.00	-12,223.99	89.8%
4020 · Grant DOLA-Construction	393,759.16	1,400,000.00	-1,006,240.84	28.1%
4040 · Grant-Transit	7,074.34	15,000.00	-7,925.66	47.2%
4950 · Match-GOV Admin	13,999.00	69,000.00	-55,001.00	20.3%
4951 · Match-GOV Construction	866.63	0.00	866.63	100.0%
4952 · Region 9-Matching Funds	25,011.65	36,000.00	-10,988.35	69.5%
4955 · In Kind Project Match	133,077.05	446,000.00	-312,922.95	29.8%
4956 · Matching Funds-Other	3,049.10	0.00	3,049.10	100.0%
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>697,212.94</b>	<b>2,176,000.00</b>	<b>-1,478,787.06</b>	<b>32.0%</b>
<b>Cost of Goods Sold</b>				
5000 · Cost of Goods Sold	0.00	10,000.00	-10,000.00	0.0%
<b>Total COGS</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>-10,000.00</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Gross Profit</b>	<b>697,212.94</b>	<b>2,166,000.00</b>	<b>-1,468,787.06</b>	<b>32.2%</b>
<b>Expense</b>				
5510 · Travel & Ent	2,258.30	2,500.00	-241.70	90.3%
5512 · Meeting Exp	654.69	1,800.00	-1,145.31	36.4%
5515 · Legal Fees	10,662.80	7,200.00	3,462.80	148.1%
5520 · Advertising	261.33	1,400.00	-1,138.67	18.7%
5525 · Audit	6,185.00	9,000.00	-2,815.00	68.7%
5527 · Internet & software	112.50	130.00	-17.50	86.5%
5532 · Postage	109.62	148.00	-38.38	74.1%
5535 · Printing/Reproduction	457.50	350.00	107.50	130.7%
5540 · Membership/Sub	250.00	250.00	0.00	100.0%
5550 · Supplies	31.98	0.00	31.98	100.0%
5555 · Liability Insurance	3,897.00	3,900.00	-3.00	99.9%
5637 · SCAN GM	29,750.00	55,000.00	-25,250.00	54.1%
5638 · Region 9 EDD	27,692.59	30,000.00	-2,307.41	92.3%
5639 · Infor Services-Project Mgmt	1,575.00	2,000.00	-425.00	78.8%
5640 · Consulting	337.50	20,600.00	-20,262.50	1.6%
5641 · MSC-Regional Project Mgmt	33,445.40	40,000.00	-6,554.60	83.6%
5642 · MSC-Project Engineering & Mgmt	58,916.99	353,000.00	-294,083.01	16.7%
5643 · CDOT LLC	6,395.52	9,500.00	-3,104.48	67.3%
5644 · AmeriCorp Member	2,069.53	5,500.00	-3,430.47	37.6%
5645 · Project Construction	400,107.63	1,145,570.00	-745,462.37	34.9%
5955 · In Kind Project expense	133,077.05	400,000.00	-266,922.95	33.3%
<b>Total Expense</b>	<b>718,247.93</b>	<b>2,087,848.00</b>	<b>-1,369,600.07</b>	<b>34.4%</b>
<b>Net Income</b>	<b>-21,034.99</b>	<b>78,152.00</b>	<b>-99,186.99</b>	<b>-26.9%</b>

## COG Board Reports for 8-3-12

This section of the agenda is to provide updates on activities since the last SWCCOG meeting. Any item can be moved to decision or discussion if needed.

### Telecommunications Report

#### General Manager Services Report- Dr. Rick Smith

It was good to get back in to the swing of things after the lengthy absence during the month of June. Thank you for your patience! Most of the month was split attempting to get a handle on where the different projects are in construction and working with Susan to get operations into a place where it can be sustainable. I will be traveling next Friday so I will call in to the meeting.

#### I. COG

a. Utilized the expertise of Susan to define the difference between COG services and benefits of the SCAN project.

b. Facilitated Telecom sub-committee meeting.

c. Met with the COG Administrative and COG Executive Board members and Staff (Susan, Ed, John and myself) to discuss roles and responsibilities. We did not finish but another meeting was contemplated.

d. Met with the committee that hired me to perform the GM duties. I offered them a short term contract until the end of the year to get them to a point where they can be more self-sufficient and not a drain on the budget. The committee felt that getting the COG to end of the year was important until new budgets could get arranged to undertake the duties within the COG. They also asked if I would provide an operations budget that included two options (1) no General Manager or Tech position and (2) a General Manager and a Tech position. The committee told me they were OK with continuing the relationship.

e. Vendor meetings: i. Attended the EAGLE-Net Board meeting in person. 1. Reaffirmed the routes and emphasized the need for single trenching in the municipalities of our region. Specifically, I requested that extra conduit be placed in the trench at COG expense.

2. Met with Chip White and discussed our port charges. We also discussed questions vendors are asking about EAGLE-Net in terms of the fees for utilizing their assets in the region.

3. Met with Gretchen Dirks (PR for EAGLE-Net) to discuss EAGLE-Net and SCAN doing some kind of splash announcement about the southwest. This is an attempt to place a bit of urgency in EAGLE-Net to get things completed.

f. The second quarter SCAN newsletter was completed and sent out by Region 9. I have had positive responses from vendors on receiving some publicity. **Packet Item 4A**

g. Met with a technology vendor to ascertain a methodology whereby COG members who do not have VOIP services currently can acquire them through the Internet and still achieve 5-digit dialing for COG members.

h. Attended a 1 day seminar on CISCO products and their use in the SCAN network.

**II. Mancos** - a. EAGLE-Net is to be in contact with Tom to begin the permitting process. I will circle around to ascertain if this has occurred.

**III. Ignacio** - a. Assisted Mike with COG billing questions. Laura brought Shirley from Region 9 to the meeting to address billing questions.

**IV. Dolores** – a. Tetra Tech (EAGLE-Net contractor) is to be in Dolores installing fiber. I will circle around with Ryan to find out the progress.

**V. Pagosa Springs** - a. USA Communications is in final negotiations with the city on the joint build agreement. Paul and David are meeting with USA Communications on August 2nd.

b. Greg is working hard to coordinate with the area sanitation provider to place conduit in the trench with their new pipeline.

**VI. Bayfield** - The ditch crossing permits are complete and paid. Bayfield is still searching for a vendor to install the fiber.

#### **VII. Dolores County –**

a. Ernie and I visited by phone about the issues he was concerned. We addressed his concern with the billing, the IGA, and joint work with Dove Creek.

b. We agreed that Sonny, Bryce and I would meet with the County Commissioners next Tuesday and iron out any issues.

#### **VIII. Dove Creek –**

a. Met with Sonny in Dove Creek and discussed their position on the SCAN project. They are willing to support the project but are grappling with the fiber cost/value ratio given what they do today.

b. Sonny and I agreed that we will work with EAGLE-Net to get fiber to the library and schools.

#### **IX. August FOCUS**

a. Follow-up with the different communities to verify the builds are moving forward.

b. Work with Susan on the sustainability plan and provide those numbers to the COG formally in September.

c. Per discussion with the hiring committee, I will provide to options to the Board, (1) an option containing GM and Tech services under the COG membership and (2) A GM and Tech position

## SCAN Community Updates

### Generally

- **Logical design of the network continues.** We have applied for E-mail addressing scheme but, to my knowledge, not yet received a response yet.
- **All participating towns and counties should be considering the telecommunications service assets they currently have available and currently use. We have received a few responses to the usage survey update but it is very few.** It is very important to get this information to make the business plan better reflect reality. We may need an advocate in each community to reach out to the various potential community anchor institution customers and conduct an in person survey.

### Bayfield

Paul has reached out to a handful of vendors and asked for quotes. Some have already eliminated themselves but others are still working to provide unit pricing. To help them provide unit pricing, he created a worksheet, copy is available at <http://www.ohivey.com/documents/Pricing.xlsx>. We would like to have pricing before the first of August. Paul has also reached out to Kelly Hebbard of FastTrack Agreement earlier this week. Their attorney has been on vacation. Kelly is hoping to have something for us before the meeting on the third.

Cortez – No Change

Dolores – No Change

Dove Creek - Dr. Rick met with the Town to review the plans.

Durango – No Change

Ignacio –Received the executed IGA

Mancos– No Change

Rico– No Change

### Pagosa Springs

USA Communications and the Town have agreed in principle to a joint build arrangement and about to sign a contract. We are putting together a meeting for the 2<sup>nd</sup> to finish this piece of work. Staking is now complete and in to drafting.

Silverton– No Change

## Responsible Administrator Report- Ed Morlan

Contracts are pending between the COG/Bayfield and FastTrack as well as a contract between the Town of Pagosa Springs/Archuleta County and USA Communications.

Paul and Dr. Rick have been trying to coordinate design and construction between EAGLE-Net and their design and engineering contractor, G4S; and construction sub-contractor, Tetra Tech in several communities. The initial position of EAGLE-Net that they cannot share trenching and/or conduit with SCAN fiber has been a setback and will result in the loss of significant cost savings. We have been working to overcome this, partially using the position that local jurisdictions will require sharing of trenching in local permitting conditions.

Since there were no responders to the first bid on the Bayfield work, Paul has been working with individual vendors to obtain unit pricing on the essential aspects of the network. This should help identify vendors likely to do work in other communities.

We are working on revisions of the DoLA grant budget for 2012 AND 2013 to include both an Implementation chart of accounts and a new Operations chart of accounts. The recent change in the nature of the proposal on the GM position would result in a different budgeting approach. We are working to produce a version projecting that scenario.

It was previously reported that Dr. Rick had visited with the City of Cortez about providing joint E-Rate services for other COG members but Cortez had concerns about the risk involved. The City has offered to help coordinate but the COG needs to apply for its own SPIN number for E-Rate.

**Telecommunication Committee Minutes for the July 18 meeting.** (See attached.)

**Telecommunications Committee Chair Report** – Jason Wells will provide at the meeting.

July 23 Joint Executive & Administration Committee meeting minutes (See attached.)

### **Discussion**

**Telecommunications Excavation Policy- See attached agenda form and draft resolution.**

#### **Letter received from Pueblo Community College**

Attached is a letter we received for PCC in response to previous correspondence on PCC's continued involvement in the DoLA grant. The previous letter to PCC established September 1<sup>st</sup> as the date they needed to commit by, which would entail PPC committing some matching funds. The draft revised budget currently assumes that the remaining budget amount for PCC, about \$150K is moved to a contingency line item. Direction is requested from the COG Board on how to proceed.

### **Management Report**

A. The COGs audit documents have been signed and filed with the state.  
Government Budget Class attended by fiscal agent / Region 9 staff

B. Government Budgeting Class

Shirley, Ed and Laura from Region 9 attended a Government budgeting class presented by DoLA on July 24<sup>th</sup>. The program overviewed what should be in a budget, revenue limitations, passing a budget and making budget changes. We did receive clarification on several items. Items of the most relevance to the SWCCOG are listed below. Laura will be at the meeting if more specific information is needed.

- Need to make sure our 2013 budget has a 3% emergency line item anticipating our low revenue.
- Expenditures must be less than or equal to revenues plus fund balances.
- Recommend having three years of comparative data in the budget, a budget message and beginning and ending fund balances.
- Dates of importance to the SWCCOG include: presenting the budget to the board by October 15th; adopting the budget by December 31<sup>st</sup> and submitting the budget to DoLA by January 31<sup>st</sup> of each year. Budgets must now be submitted via an e-filing portal.  
[www.dola.colorado.gov/e-filing](http://www.dola.colorado.gov/e-filing).

**Amending the Budget**

- 1) Budget amendment is a transfer between two funds (general and telecom) and a public hearing and notice is required. An amendment only looks at total fund expenses going above the approved budget numbers, not individual line items within funds.
- 2) A Supplemental budget is to expend unexpected revenue received in excess of budgeted revenue and a public hearing and notice is required. In other words, if the SWCCOG is increasing the total revenue, then must do a supplemental budget.
- 3) A Budget revision is a reduction in appropriations (expenses) to reflect reduced revenues. No public hearing is required.

**At this point in time, the SWCCOG is only looking to need a budget revision at the end of the year and does not expect to have either the General COG or the Telecom total expenses go over budget.**

#### C. CARO Report

The Colorado Association of Regional Organizations (CARO) will next be meeting in Alamosa on Friday, August 17<sup>th</sup> from 10 am to 3pm. This meeting will coincide with the State Business Loan Fund Administrator meeting on Wednesday and Thursday. Currently, Laura Lewis Marchino and Ryan Mahoney are the SWCCOG representatives. More information can be distributed if board members are interested.

#### D. Update on Governor's August 20 visit – Ed Morlan

I spoke to Tony Hernandez again about the Governor's visit in Durango on August 20<sup>th</sup>, the Pro-Bike Challenge. I told Tony that everyone I talked to about this was concerned about logistics and with other things going on that to arrange a separate event with the Governor was not advisable. Tony suggested maybe a briefing with the Governor about the project. I could do something along those lines if the COG wants me to pursue it.

#### E. COG policy review & update

### **SWCCOG Policy Review (Formal policies that received affirmative Board action)**

#### **Institutional documents**

**By Laws – Revised 2012**

**Articles of Association – Revised 2012**

**MOU's between member organizations and SWCCOG – TBR, fall 2012**

#### **Fiscal Policy**

**Procurement Policy – adopted Sept. 10, 2012 – Revised Feb. 4., 2011**

**Signature Policy – adopted April 2, 2010 – revised Jan. 13, 2012**

**Contract between Region 9 as fiscal agent – SWCCOG revised, June 2012**

**CIRSA participation May 2010**

**Ownership of Assets – vote in 2011 systems build by SCAN**

**giving the ownership of systems within the boundary of the jurisdiction to that member organization.**

**Accounting policies:** "Invoices are paid on the 15<sup>th</sup> and the end of the month. All telecom and COG invoices will be reviewed and approved by Region 9, and a list of invoices will be presented to the COG Treasurer for review before any checks are paid. Checks in the amount of \$5K or more, and any checks payable to Region 9, will require a second signature." From 7-15-2010

**Accounting policies with regard to support documentation and quarter review of deferred revenue adopted July 13, 2012**

**Approval of invoicing & payment collection for the City of Durango's Dark Fiber Lease Agreements/IGA 11-4-2011**

**Approve Sole Source Procurement Process 12-02-2011**

**SWCCOG dues plan with a base rate of \$150, plus a population multiplier to generate the remaining amount. From 9-10-2010**

## **Proposed**

**Leasing of Shared Asset**

**Common Purchase of software and / or services**

## **Committees**

**Forming a Nominating Committee. From 11-5-2010**

**Expansion of the role of the Legislative Committee to include [external] policy matters. From 3-4-2011**

## **Other**

**(Review is continuing.)**

F. COG sustainability report (see attached.)

c:\users\john\desktop\je\cogdrive\meetings\8-12\august 3 reports.docx

## SWCOG Telecommunications Committee

July 18, 2012 12:30—2:00 p.m.

Phone Conference Summary

### **Committee Members Present**

Ernie Williams, Dolores County  
Jason Wells, Town of Silverton  
Rick Smith, City of Cortez  
Eric Pierson, City of Durango  
Shane Hale, City of Cortez  
David Mitchem, Town of Pagosa Springs

### **Staff/Consultants**

Paul Recanzone, OHivey  
Ed Morlan, Region 9 EDD  
Rob Montgomery, State of Colorado  
Dr. Rick Smith, Consultant  
John Ehmann, SWCCOG  
Sam Starr, Region 9 EDD

**The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by Dr. Rick Smith**

I. **June 13, 2012 meeting summary:** Approved

II. **GM Contract Discussion:**

Dr. Rick Smith's contract will terminate around the 15<sup>th</sup> of August. Discussions were ongoing to determine how the COG should go forward with renewing the contract. Since the Committee does not have the authority to appropriate money for the contract, an agreement to convene the Temporary Hiring Committee was reached in order to determine what the recommendation to the board should be. The hiring committee will also confer on what the priorities are for extension, and what the timetable for approval should be. Jason, Ed, and John will be having this meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> for the hiring committee in the Anasazi in the Courthouse at 2:00 p.m. Dr. Rick will be using the time in between to write a proposal for an extension of the current contract.

III. **Updates:**

A. Vendor Meetings—Paul

- USA Communications is on track, just at a "slow and steady pace". Paul, Dave Mitchem, and Greg Schulte briefly reviewed the contract for Archuleta County before the appropriate documentation was submitted for approval. Paul is expecting to hear back from them tomorrow, and Mr. Gilbertson (who works on behalf of USA Comm.) is excited to be moving forward with the project, provided that no significant changes to the contract were made.
- A Master Mutual Services Agreement is in the works with FastTrack. The document will be ready to be presented to the FastTrack board in the first week of August, and Paul will wait to receive feedback from their board before taking the information before the SWCCOG.
- Thought we had an agreement with Eagle-Net, but there were two different interpretations of the contract in regards to how the plowing

**Packet Item 4b**

needs to be done. Paul states that while their view of contract will still save a little money, their method is “ultimately dysfunctional.” Paul will be headed to Denver next week to discuss whether the NTIA grant guidelines have preemption over local permitting requirements, and generally sort everything out. Legally, Eagle-Net can’t sell telecom assets to SCAN and can only lease and those leased assets would not be eligible for SCAN grant reimbursement.

- Paul received an email from CenturyTel—apparently they are under new regional leadership again. Mr. Bodet (from CenturyTel) is willing to work with SCAN in a number of ways, but his hands *will* be tied if the new regional leader dislikes the project.
- Procurement methods for bidding on Bayfield construction crew have been largely unsuccessful; the project will use a selection method instead to move things along. 5 companies have been targeted, but two have already pulled out. Switching methods for acquiring bids requires that all communities grant approval, and so far only Mancos, Dolores, and Bayfield have done so.

#### B. Community Updates

- Paul is working with Pagosa Area Water Sanitation District (PAWSD), who is struggling to identify the real values of their commitments.
- The staging and drafting has been completed in Silverton.
- Paul strongly urges members from Cortez and Durango to submit forms for reimbursement to the match pool, for dollars up to the amount allocated in the grant.
- An engineer is currently in Mancos to assist in working on the appropriate route.
- Dolores’s route issue has been solved, and all the loops have been closed
- Dolores County is currently discussing the possibilities of extending the network beyond the schools and county building (i.e. to the firehouse, and healthcare clinic). The BOCC, Bryce, and town will get together on the 31<sup>st</sup> of this month to discuss SCAN options.

#### C. Upstream Connectivity

- We have applied for a block of IP addresses for SCAN. We should hear back in a week or two as to whether or not we’ll get them
- The Committee remains confident that we will have IPB6 when the timing is relevant

#### IV. **E-Rate Decision:**

Cortez is more comfortable with having the SWCCOG acquire its own spin #, and Rick pledged to discover what the process and costs for this procedure will be. Shane Hale commented that it had everything to do with risks and the dependency on other communities. Ed Morlan asked if the E-Rates could ever be affected by sequestration,

but since there is a surplus, the general consensus was that it would be “highly unlikely” for the rates to be affected by such a thing.

**V. Agenda Items for August COG meeting:**

- Discuss options for the GM contract extension (see item II).
- Discuss the ways in which SWCCOG wants to deal with making recommendations on telecommunications legislation. Dr. Rick plans to advocate that Chris La May be added to the CML policy committee.
- Continue to have discussions about SCAN products and services.
- Ed plans to bring forward an operations budget draft

**VI. Other Business**

Consensus was that it was necessary to carry a uniform message to our respective governments in regards to proposed language for permitting conditions. Discussions were had about the possibilities of passing city/county ordinances and Paul suggested seeking a resolution from the COG urging member governments to pass formal resolutions to have this requirement but no formal action was taken.

The head of DoLA will be in Cortez on August 2<sup>nd</sup>. Ken Charles has invited Ed Morlan to discuss the SCAN project as a whole with him. That evening there will be a less-formal “rubbing of elbows” taking place at the Conquistador Golf Course clubhouse. All are invited.

There was discussion that Telecom Committee members did not receive the June Telecom Minutes. John Ehmann sent them out, and Dr Rick will make sure to forward them in the future.

**VII. Next Meeting**

The next Telecom Committee meeting will be on August 22.  
The meeting was adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

Meeting Summary submitted by Sam Starr

July 23, 2012 Joint Executive / Administration Committee Meeting

La Plata County Courthouse 9-11 am

In attendance

Tom Yennerell Chair  
Ron LeBlanc  
Joanne Spina  
Susan Hakanson  
Ed Morlan  
Dr. Rick Smith  
John Ehmann

By phone

Clifford Lucero  
Greg Schulte  
Paul Recanzone

Tom Yennerell called the meeting to order shortly after 9 am and noted all those listed above in attendance in person and by phone. He said that the SCAN project is a unique project that is being watched closely by DoLA and needs to be done right and completed successfully. He observed that we are going through some growing pains but do have an array of staff and consulting resources to meet the challenges. He stated that we need to integrate efforts and make sure we fulfill the original intent for the project.

SCAN Grant – Review of Original Intent. Susan Hakanson indicated her desire to review the original intent of the grant to aid development of the COG sustainability plan, recognizing that she was not involved with the COG when the SCAN project was proposed and awarded. She said she wanted to hear discussion about whether we are on track and give Board members an opportunity to raise any concerns.

Dr. Rick Smith noted his role in presenting the proposal for SCAN to DoLA. He stated his understanding that the original intent of the grant was to build community networks in order to aggregate demand for local governments and for them to work together to cut costs. As an added benefit, it was anticipated that private vendors (such as ISPs) could potentially also use those telecom assets to further serve the general community and stimulate economic growth.

Ed Morlan noted that the community networks were originally envisioned to include schools, libraries and other community anchor institutions. Ron LeBlanc disagreed that they were part of the original intent. Ed responded that he felt they were always part of the original plan as they would be needed as part of the network to make it sustainable. Joanne Spina asked if the community anchor institutions were named in the application, scope of work or noted in the grant presentation. Susan Hakanson said they were prominently discussed in the presentation but the application / scope of work focused mainly on the participating governments. Rick observed that the governments are the ones who worked together to prepare the grant and would be the ones providing the local match. It was at the discretion of the COG to what extent to reach out and include community anchor institutions. In connecting up the governments, the network would try though to go by areas where the fiber might assist business. Paul Recanzone noted that most libraries in the region are special districts (and treated as local governments by the state and specifically DoLA) or part of the city and that is generally also true for other types of community services such as fire protection. Paul agreed that we don't have the authority to serve non-profits directly (but Ed later noted that it can be done indirectly). Rick added that he is

**Packet Item 4c**

getting some pushback from outside forces with regarding to “servicing the community”. He has tried to emphasize that SCAN is not servicing the community but rather aggregating the demand.

Ron read a passage from the contract that states that “the regional project is comprised of individual build-outs in 13 separate communities in the 5 counties” also known as the Region 9 planning region. Telecommunications infrastructure equipment will be installed to provide high speed internet services “within government and public buildings & facilities and between participating communities as the budget allows. The recipients of the telecommunications include the cities and counties of (insert all the names of the member jurisdictions of the COG)”. Ed indicated that he interpreted “public buildings” to include schools, libraries and other community anchor institutions.

Greg Schulte offered his perspective from Archuleta County. He said he felt the project was generally on track. He noted that in challenging, multi-year projects you usually learn things along the way and that has been the case with this project. Archuleta County wants the community anchor institutions involved there because it makes for a better aggregation of demand. He recognized that there could be differences of perspectives amongst the communities on this question. He didn’t feel that organizing and including the provision of service to special districts within the grant funded plan was so far outside the scope of the original intent as to require amendment of the scope; but he indicated that if enough felt otherwise, then maybe we do.

Susan asked whether there is an expected need to seek additional funding for the project or if the project can eventually provide revenue to the COG. Joanne indicated a need for additional detail in the action plan on the structure of operations and how the revenues flow to the COG and especially from the community anchor institutions. Rick explained that the COG would gather the service requests and buy the total amount of “pipe” needed. Ed agreed that is the basic process but noted in response to a question from Joanne that the price charged for the services will vary from the purchase price of the pipe in order to pay for overhead (i.e. maintenance, running of the network and its administration). Rick also explained how the network could lease assets to private providers to produce another revenue stream and provide additional service to the general community. Tom asked for further clarification whether community anchor institutions would pay the local government or the COG directly. Ed noted the experience in Ignacio, where it was determined that the school would pay the COG separately and directly. Ed agrees that how this will be done in other communities is still an open question.

Ron asked if a preferred rate system for services would be applied to those who built the system in distinction to other non-contributing entities. He also expressed concern that if everyone receiving service got a seat at the governance table it would dilute the influence of the building partners and could favor communities that use a lot of special districts to deliver service over those who provide most or all of those services in-house. He said if the governing model of the network is the COG Board he is happy; if it broadens out, he is not. Ed reiterated the value of inclusion of other customers in the customer base but agreed that the future governing model down the road for the network was a valid matter to further discuss and address.

Ron reminded that the COG is the recipient of the grant. Joanne added that the special districts have not made any investment, do not bear any responsibilities for the network and have no role other than as a customer, if they are offered service and decide to accept it. They are not an owner. She asked for further clarification of the role of Eagle-Net in servicing the schools.

She noted support that our governments provided to Eagle-Net in their pursuit of federal funds, even though it was in competition with other local proposals. Ron noted that Eagle-Net did not exist when the SCAN started, but when it emerged it was anticipated that shared access to built infrastructure could save each organization from having to do it all themselves. Rick indicated that Eagle-Net's original purpose was to provide a network connection for schools and some libraries but that Eagle-Net has since expanded their business plan to also offering internet to those customers. Rick shared information from the most recent Eagle-Net Board meeting that if the COG selects Eagle-Net as its internet service provider then they'd prefer we gather up the schools and include them in our buy of internet services from Eagle-Net. If we do not select them as our internet service provider, they intend to offer their services to the schools (and thus there may be competition with SCAN for their internet business).

Ed noted that budget limitations affect the ability of the COG to link up community networks and the hope has been that we can arrange to make substantial use of Eagle-Net's middle mile infrastructure to meet this need. Joanne asked if Eagle-Net will be charging for this access and Ed acknowledged that they would and this cost is not included in the grant budget. Rick shared that Eagle-Net has recently calculated that the cost of "porting" our intercommunity traffic to their middle-mile infrastructure will be \$3,875 per month or \$46,500 per year. This basically is the cost of one "on-ramp" in each community. Paul noted that for the system to work you need both a ramp interface with the network and "surface roads to and from the customers". The SCAN network will provide and enhance these surface roads. Some communities already have well developed surface road systems while others need to build them from scratch or make substantial additions. Ed also explained the concept of a carrier-neutral location to help facilitate interconnect and infrastructure sharing. Susan asked who would make the agreements with Eagle-Net, build the interconnects and who would be responsible for maintenance. Ed indicated that we would need to develop customer service agreements first and then build on them and meet middle-mile service requirements with Eagle-Net or other providers.

Ron checked to make sure that a list of needed policies would be developed from this meeting. Susan assured the meeting was being recorded, would be transcribed and that all identified policies would be noted, worked on and brought to the Board for further discussion and action as required. Ron reiterated that government investment though the grant & match and from their own funds (such as in the case of Park Elementary) needs to be recognized in service pricing & benefit. In his view a special district that has not invested should not receive equal price treatment and should not have provision of access to the network subsidized by those who did invest in the network. Joanne asked for clarification if there are facilities not contemplated in the original grant that have gotten hooked up without investment? Ron indicated that is what he is hearing. Greg indicated that in Archuleta County they wanted to use part of their government's budget allocation to hook-up their schools and other community anchor institutions in part because of an opportunity to partner with USA Communications and share the infrastructure costs. At least some their partners (such as the hospital) will provide part of the local match. Paul noted that while the entire local match is a participating government's responsibility, it can be passed along to community partners in any community if it wishes or not and Rick agreed. Ed emphasized that the budget divided the available grant funding out amongst the communities and it sets a limit on the community's share of grant funding.

Paul added that there is the prospect that "excess spending" (local grant eligible telecom spending beyond the local match requirement) on qualified items in some communities (i.e., Cortez and Durango) could be use as available match in other communities for their match requirement. His understanding it that from DoLA's perspective the project has a total match requirement and that it doesn't have to come proportionally from all communities and Ed

agreed. Joanne stated that could be perceived as a problem by some citizens of communities that are facilitating / "subsidizing" the build match in another community. Ed asked Paul to confirm this interpretation of what he said and Paul agreed with the interpretation. He added that he was raising an option that the Board could consider. Rick emphasized that this indeed was a Board decision and not a staff or consultant decision. Tom questioned where we could or should deviate from the existing schedule for financial participation in the budget and in the grant agreement.

Greg noted the possible situation whereby a planned partner in the grant might not build (such as is potentially the case with the community college). That creates "excess or available budget". "Excess match" may be out there as well; but the question remains of how the excess budget will be used. If there is equipment that benefits everyone and the owner of that equipment has excess match to use, that might be an agreeable plan; but he indicated that there still should be conversation and consideration of options. If there is extra construction money available, there should be some fair way for parties to advocate for its use. Ron noted how the TPR re-evaluates unused funds (allowing new competitive proposals and then a vote) and said that such a process was used in the previous re-allocation of \$150k from the community college to the Durango hub. Ed observed that what Paul described about using excess budget and excess match earlier was used in this case- the city of Durango provided the excess match for the excess re-purposed budget from the community college, though in this case the funds were used on equipment (a hub) that will benefit the entire network and all its partners. Ron felt that while the city of Durango was willing to handle the finance of the hub in this manner to get it on board and working; when other communities actually come online and use the hub, he feels they should catch-up and also contribute match to proportionally share in the cost of that hub. He also noted that other communities will need to share in the cost of the e-Tic software when they come online and start using it. Ed noted that the grant actually bought the software and the currently online communities using it just share in the annual licensing. Ron offered the view that other communities must commit to using this same software (and not something else) to give the network a consistent planning software platform and share the costs as intended.

Paul suggested that there are several ways to allocate costs- either based on estimated usage of several services or through a set internal service charge (and subsequent compensation back to the community providing access to the asset or the service). Rick said that there could be service deals amongst subsets of participating governments as well as generally provided services. Ed asked if this would be within or outside of the SCAN operation and cautioned against the scattering of separate deals and administration of deals. If several or more governments want to participate in a service offer, it may be more efficient to deal with it through the general SCAN operation. Susan shared the concern about tracking separate deals. (The SCAN grant helps finance many of the assets being used / leveraged to provide services offered for purchase.) Paul noted that that the aggregation and sale of these services creates a cost savings and an opportunity to both generate revenue to the communities that own the assets and in part to the COG itself in order to finance things that benefit the network as a whole. Ed agreed that community to community service deals were a policy option but it is not fully consistent with an all for one – one for all philosophy.

Joanne felt it important to note that while the SCAN project is often described as its own entity, it is a function of the COG and its governing body is the COG. Ed agreed. Joanne has also wished for time to nail down the ownership of assets. Ed and Paul indicated that the ownership of assets is based on which government jurisdiction they are located in (not who provided the match) and they believe it is in policy (by Board action in the middle of 2011). A city owns the

assets within city limits and a county owns those located in the unincorporated part of the county. Joanne asked if the COG didn't exist who would be responsible for the maintenance of SCAN telecom assets? Paul indicated it would be the government jurisdiction where it is located, unless, if it is needed, some other coordinating instrument is developed to maintain the operational advantages of pooled assets.

Ron indicated he wanted the Board to discuss the prospect of member jurisdictions developing deals amongst themselves using telecom assets and formulate a policy and operational protocols for them. He also wanted the Board to consider various global member services beyond telecom services that the COG itself could develop & market and which could perhaps be delivered via the SCAN network and its operational capacity. These could include GIS, shared software and many other services. He thought that developing these possible services should be actively encouraged. Rick noted that these would be COG member jurisdiction only benefits and should, in his view, be considered member services rather than revenue opportunities for the COG. Ed expressed the desire that the value added of the service be recognized in the accounting.

Joanne observed that some smaller jurisdictions (who have not yet implemented their telecom build) may not yet have seen substantial value added of membership in the COG and may not give much weight to the potential value added from future spin-off uses of the SCAN network and operations. She emphasized that we need to try to offer other near-term benefits beyond SCAN to respond to the question of value added by the COG if you are a member vs. not being a member. Others agreed with the importance of addressing this concern.

Susan noted that there needs to be further clarification of roles & responsibilities. Ed mentioned another issue with regard to possible provision of revenue sharing with the COG for revenues generated through their lit fiber services which utilized grant funded infrastructure. Ed noted that there still needs to be several adjustments to the telecommunication budget for certain revenues and for MSC "assistance to owner" expenses. Whereas it was originally assigned to the administration (also called overall "project management"), he would prefer to shift them into construction budget. This could be helpful, especially if there is unspent construction budget available. There was discussion and concern about what these expenditures actually were, i.e. whether it was more of the nature of administration support or construction engineering. Ed indicated that he didn't know if we might eventually exceed the admin. / project management budget by the end of the project (we haven't yet, expenditure to date is at about \$250k of the \$400k budgeted) but he was trying to be pro-active to avoid a potential problem. Hypothetically he could go to Ken Charles and asked for a formal amendment to the grant budget to increase the admin. / project management portion of the budget if it turns out that we need to do this but it may look better to shift more of the spending into the construction side of the budget. Ed further noted that the admin. / project management budget broadly speaking actually encompasses project management for the shared telecom infrastructure & its overall system design as well a separate set of expenses for the grant administrative services provided by Region 9. Region 9 provides 100% of the match for this second set of administrative expenses.

Greg noted that that the time remaining for the meeting was limited and asked what still needed to be discussed. Ed noted that he needed further conversation with Rick to properly and fully update the budget. Joanne observed that grant administration and ongoing operations are recognized as separate things requiring concurrent work, but there may need to be further delineation and separation. Rick indicated that he feels Ed's role in fulfilling the DoLA grant and meeting its requirement is pretty clear and proceeding appropriately. His piece is less defined. He is establishing the necessary relationships with customers and providers and offering advice

to the Board about how to define future operations. He foresees a COG Director coordinating activity related to SCAN but having the technical work done by staff resources from within member jurisdictions rather than purchasing outside contract service, from him or others. He cited the experience of the Southern Ute tribe and the high expense of using outside contract services. He noted that there could still be a need for a bridge of another few months of GM support to get the project to the point where the work can be assigned to appropriate and available member technical staff. Ed agreed that use of member staff was worth exploring. Ed also indicated that we still need further development of the operating budget whatever way the project activity is organized. Susan asked if we have adequate process in place to address operation planning. Ed indicated that Paul is a valuable resource for that. Joanne indicated that there is still concern for the costs of such support. Paul noted that he does everything he can to minimize his costs to the project. Joanne thanked him for that practice and his work. Rick agreed to be available to talk further with Ed to determine the necessary operating budget numbers.

Rick expressed a desire to minimize the extent of Board meeting time devoted to specific community or network operational details. Ed then received a call from Ken Charles relevant to the SCAN project, asked if he could put the call on speakerphone and the request was granted. Ken Charles asked for some information about a particular issue but he quickly decided to handle the issue later with Ed and Rick and ended the call. Joanne re-emphasized the importance of the Responsible Administrator and General Manager working cooperatively during this bridge time even though there are separate roles & responsibilities. Susan Hakanson highlighted the need for SCAN staff and the Board to bring forward to her any further items that the COG needs to address as an institution to be successful with the SCAN project and overall. She re-stated the need to understand whether she needs to find other revenue to complete the SCAN project or can eventually expect SCAN revenue to support general COG operations.

Ron, Greg & Clifford had to leave within a few minutes of each other.

Ed asked about the timeline for preparing August COG Board meeting materials, John Ehmann responded (but initially misstated the timeline to Ed, before stating the correct one to Tom). The meeting is August 3. Materials though would need to be available Wednesday July 25 so that can be reviewed and approved by Tom and go out to the Board on Friday July 27.

There was support for a follow-up meeting. Susan Hakanson will coordinate the timing and agenda of that.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11 am.

SWCCOG Sustainability Plan

Program		Partners	Services	Cost	Benefits
SWCCOG	General Administration	Membership Region 9 DOLA	Ensure SWCCOG is fully and legally operational. Support the board and programs of the board. Explore gaps in regional service or programs that could be encourage or developed by the SWCCOG. Explore what is most valuable to member organizations through belonging to a cooperative regional governmental organization.	Staff Legal	Structure
SWCCOG	Staffing	Membership Region 9 Americore		Salaries  Benefits  Overhead	Professional organization Consistency of service
Telecommunication	SCAN	SWCCOG Membership, Region 9, Anchor Entities Eagle Net Private Providers	consult with Dr. Rick or Paul  connectivity	Staffing Legal Fees Additional Construction  Enterprise Zone Set Up Cost	Lower cost per mg Increased Bandwidth availability Ownership of system Platform for additional services  Ongoing revenue generation
Transportation	TPR Transit Council Mapping	All regional governmental entities Public Providers Private Providers AAA SWConnect Region 9	Information, scheduling, service coordination, mapping, cooperative grants	Staff time	Shared Staff. training, regional community mobility, access to public health, access to employment, economic development. <b>Packet Item 4d</b>
Program		Partners	Services	Cost	Benefits

SWCCOG Sustainability Plan

Senior Issues	AAA County HS Programs Transportation	Christina Knoell Executive Director (970) 264-0501 AAA County HS programs	Regional Senior Services	Staff	Coordination of Efforts
Housing	Regional Housing Groups	Regional Housing Groups	Affordable housing senior housing Loan programs	Staff	Coordination of efforts Shared administrative staff
Environmental		4CORE, SJBRA SJRC&D, SJCA Regional water agencies Private enterprise		Staff	
Tourism		DATO, Chambers,			Coordinated efforts
Shared Expertise / Services	GIS Training Grants	Member organizations		Staff	Shared staff Coordinated effort Economies of scale Training efforts

SWCCOG Sustainability Plan

Program	Actions	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges
SWCCOG	<p>Meeting with Admin. - Exec Committees for direction, July 23, 2012.</p> <p>Region 9 / SWCCOG relationship</p> <p>By Laws</p> <p>Articles</p> <p>MOU</p> <p>Accounting Policy &amp; Practices</p> <p>Formal Agreement with Tribes</p> <p>Committee Structure / Scope of Authority</p> <p>Policy Handbook</p> <p>Update Web content</p> <p>Enterprise Fund Documents</p> <p>SCAN - Ownership of Assets</p>	<p>Regional Planning and Coordination</p> <p>One meeting</p> <p>Regional grant possibilities</p> <p>Economies of scale</p> <p>Administrative efficiencies</p>			
SWCCOG	<p>1.0 FTE Support</p> <p>1.5 FTE Support + Full time Admin</p> <p>2.0 FTE Full time support + Admin</p> <p>or .5 FTE Support .5 Accounting 1. Admin</p> <p>2.5 Full Support, Full Admin .5 Accounting</p>				
Telecommunication	<p>Enterprise Fund</p> <p>Attract / Inform Anchor Entities</p> <p>Meet with School Districts</p> <p>Maintenance Plan for network</p> <p>Framework Enterprise Fund Works Under</p> <p>Extend GM Service Contract (2012, 13 or if we envision ongoing to direct EZ)</p> <p>Service agreements with EagleNet</p>	<p>Bargaining Power</p> <p>Experts in SCAN community</p> <p>combined physical assets</p> <p>combined staffing and expertise</p>	<p>On-going maintenance</p>		<p>Ongoing Maintenance</p>
Transportation	<p>Maintain &amp; strengthen council as a forum for joint action.</p> <p>Further the SWConnect mapping project.</p> <p>Revisit goals and objectives identified in the regional transportation plan.</p>	<p>Regional Planning and Coordination</p> <p>One meeting</p> <p>Regional grant opportunities</p>	<p>Formal Leadership</p>		
Program	Actions	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Challenges

SWCCOG Sustainability Plan

Senior Issues	Met with Director - July 25, 2012. Will participate in AAA and ARCH strategic planning discussions. Will continue to coordinate with AAA director on concept of shared services. Only 2 other AAA's in state are not under COGs. Will coordinated with AAA director to visit with board at fall meeting. Further discussions with AAA and regional County HS agencies. Further senior transportation conversation	Shared administrative costs Economies of scale coordinated efforts regional grant opportunities			
Housing	Coordinate Regional Conversation				
Environmental	Potential role in 2014 CAFR summit.(200 + participants, local agencies would not have to travel for training) Coordinate Regional Conversation				
Tourism					
Shared Expertise / Services	GIS initial discussion, July 19, 2012. Identified areas of collaboration. Contacted state GIS office for clarification. Research area of need within member agencies. Further GIS discussion				

## AGENDA SUBMISSION FORM

### Southwest Colorado Council of Governments

Date of Board Meeting: August 3, 2012	Type of Agenda Item: Decision
Staff: Ed Morlan	Presentation Time: 3 minutes
Subject: <b>Template for telecom excavation policy</b>	Discussion Time: 5+ minutes

Reviewed by Attorney? No Attorney:

Committee Approval: Discussed in July 18 Tele-Com committee with no formal action. (Topic also previously presented at July COG Board meeting.)

Background: Public right-of-way is a limited and regulated commodity that can easily be fully consumed by multiple utility needs. The Tele-Com Committee and SCAN staff have discussed the option of sharing a template for telecom excavation policy with member jurisdictions to consider formally adopting to help create a consistent standard for managing this resource and achieving cost savings for the SCAN telecommunications project.

The current draft of what that recommendation could look like is as follows:

“All grantees of telecommunications right of way & construction permits shall afford other telecommunications carriers, public utilities, and local governments an opportunity to share in the use of their excavations within public right-of-way. In the event that a local government, a telecommunications carrier, or a public utility desires to share in a grantee’s excavation, it shall provide a written request to do so. Joint use of excavations shall be subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Such Joint use shall not unreasonably delay the work of the party causing the excavation to be made;
- (2) Any party desiring to share in an excavation may be required to pay the fair and reasonable pro rata cost of said excavation. Such joint use shall be arranged and accomplished on terms and conditions satisfactory to both parties; and
- (3) Either party may deny such request for safety reasons.”

---

Fiscal Impact: No direct costs for the policy recommendation. Could result in substantial cost savings for SCAN project implementation.

---

Recommended Action: Further Board discussion about whether to create and share a template for telecom excavation policy with member jurisdictions. A draft resolution is available if the Board wishes to make such a recommendation.

---

Accompanying Documents: Draft Resolution 12-12 Recommendation to local governments on telecom excavation policy.

**Packet Item 5a**



## Resolution 12-12

### Recommendation from the Southwest Colorado Council of Governments to local governments on Tele-com Excavation Policy.

WHEREAS, public right-of-way is a limited commodity that can easily be fully consumed by multiple utility needs and further recognizing that trenching, boring, and excavation (hereinafter referred to as “excavation” or “excavations”) within public right-of-way can significantly degrade the quality and longevity of street surfacing and seriously inconvenience the public and;

WHEREAS, there can be significant cost savings to the SCAN project of the SWCCOG and its participating member jurisdictions from implementation and application of a uniform tele-com excavation policy, and;

WHEREAS, it is desirable for member jurisdictions to have a consistent, formal policy on this topic;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY the Board of Directors of the SWCCOG, Colorado:

That staff is directed to ask its member jurisdictions to consider and adopt this formal tele-com excavation policy:

All grantees of telecommunications right of way & construction permits shall afford other telecommunications carriers, public utilities, and local governments an opportunity to share in the use of their excavations within public right-of-way. In the event that a local government, a telecommunications carrier, or a public utility desires to share in a grantee’s excavation, it shall provide a written request to do so. Joint use of excavations shall be subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Such Joint use shall not unreasonably delay the work of the party causing the excavation to be made;
- (2) Any party desiring to share in an excavation may be required to pay the fair and reasonable pro rata cost of said excavation. Such joint use shall be arranged and accomplished on terms and conditions satisfactory to both parties; and
- (3) Either party may deny such request for safety reasons.

ADOPTED, this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2012

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

Tom Yennerell, Chairman of SWCCOG

# Pueblo

---

## Community College

June 22, 2012

Ed Morlan  
SCAN Responsible Administrator

Dear Mr. Morlan

President Erjavec has asked that I respond to your letter regarding the Telecommunications network for Southwest Colorado West Campus. In this letter SWCCOG has stated the concern that Pueblo Community College (PCC) has not contributed any portion of the matching funds for connectivity into the regional network. It was also indicated that SWCCOG will be sending an invoice for 10% of the match amount.

I would like to reiterate PCC's position relative to our involvement in the Southern Colorado Access Network (SCAN).

The mission of the SCAN network to provide the capability to connect and enhance the access to broadband connectivity within the communities who are participating in the grant is a worthy cause and is important to us. The need for extra broadband capacity for the Southwest Colorado West Campus to extend into the communities for the support of educational requirements is important.

The issues providing the matching funds at this time are twofold.

First, the funds that our matching contribution will secure will potentially provide the hardware and local loop for network connectivity. However, at the current time we have no accurate written or projected design, implementation, or reoccurring costs on the connectivity from the SCCC campus into Cortez for the middle mile connectivity to join the SCAN network.

Although Century Link discussed potential numbers that were in excess of five thousand dollars a month and other companies have discussed connectivity options, to date we have no cost effective connectivity option.

Second, SCCC West is spending significant dollars every month to connect the campus with the rest of the community college system for delivery of classes and to provide our students with all of the college services. Until the point in time that the SCAN network is fully interconnected with public networks that provide full private network capabilities, we are unable to defer any network traffic / costs from our existing infrastructure to supplement middle mile connectivity into the SCAN.

The only option to pay for connectivity at this time is to secure the commitment of increased enrollment numbers from the communities to ensure that the investment can be substantiated. It is our hope that this will materialize.

**Pueblo Campus**  
900 W. Orman Ave.  
Pueblo, CO 81004  
719.549.3200

**Southwest Colorado Community College**  
701 Camino del Rio | Durango, CO 81301  
970.247.2929  
33057 Hwy. 160 | Mancos, CO 81328  
970.565.7496

**Fremont Campus**  
51320 W. Hwy. 50  
Cañon City, CO 81212  
719.296.6100

It is our desire to see the SCAN network move forward to completion and we do desire to remain and be a partner. However the above issues need to be solved before monetary commitments can be reached.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bryan O Crawford". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'B'.

Bryan Crawford  
Director, Information Technology  
Pueblo Community College

cc: President Patty Erjavec, Pueblo Community College  
Jon Brude, Business Officer, Pueblo Community College

---

## AGENDA SUBMISSION FORM

### Southwest Colorado Council of Governments

Date of Board Meeting: August 3, 2012	Type of Agenda Item: Decision
Staff: Ed Morlan	Presentation Time: 3-5 minutes
Subject: Extension of GM services contract	Discussion Time: 5-10 minutes

Reviewed by Attorney? No, not yet. Attorney:

Committee Approval: No, not by full Committee; but Jason Wells, Tele-Com Committee Chair, indicates it is recommended by the Tele-Com Committee members who were charged with and attended the contract review.

Background: A review meeting was held July 25 with Dr. Rick Smith in regards to the General Manager Services contract for the SCAN project. Attending were Jason Wells, Rick Smith of the City of Cortez, David Bygiel and Ed Morlan. Eric Pierson also provided input but was not able to attend. These 5 had previously served as the review committee in making the initial proposal award to Dr. Smith and Arona Enterprises. The report of this review group is attached.

It is recommended that the COG Board approve a 4 month extension at \$5,000 per month. The contract extension or letter agreeing to the contract extension will be prepared by staff, reviewed by the COG's attorney and made available to the SWCCOG Chair for review and signature if the review group's recommendation to offer the extension is approved by the Board. The extension document will maintain all of the terms of the existing contract except for the time period and the rate of compensation but will add conditions that: 1) Dr. Rick agree to develop and clearly present to the Board in the near future, some clear options for Network management in 2013 and provide assurances that before this extension ends, and 2) that he will fully engage with all community anchor institutions of interest to the Network while working closely with COG staff and/or legal counsel to clear any remaining legal hurdles relative to marketing services to these entities.

---

Fiscal Impact: \$20,000, if approved. Cost would be covered by utilizing savings in other areas of the SCAN budget.

---

Recommended Action: Approval of the recommendation that a contract extension be finalized and signed by the Chair as described above.

---

Accompanying Documents: Arona Enterprises Proposal; SCAN General Manager Contract Evaluation & Recommendation

**Packet Item 7a**

---

#### ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS

Prepare extension document and have reviewed by COG attorney. Present to COG Chair for review, approval & signature.



**Southwest Colorado Council of Governments  
(SCAN)  
General Management**

Prepared for  
**Southwest Colorado Council of Governments**

Prepared by  
**Dr. Rick K. Smith  
Arona Enterprises**



## **Project to Date:**

The SCAN project is a difficult project from a management perspective due to its complexity and ownership of the assets upon completion. The Southwest Colorado Council of Governments (SWCCOG) owns the project and received the Department of Local Affairs (DoLA) grant. However, each community is unique in its requirements and relationships with vendors. Arona Enterprises recognized these circumstances and attempted to balance the political and technical aspects of the SCAN project.

The SWCCOG and its membership are held bound by state legislation. The success of SCAN is dependent on it following the original grant parameters. Building and maintaining vendor relationships within those restrictions is paramount as those are the providers of service to the SWCCOG membership. To date, the SWCCOG has begun to foster positive relations with local vendors.

The SCAN project is in its second year of a three year construction cycle. The build is progressing as expected considering the different procurement processes that must be followed by the SWCCOG and the individual communities. When building a sustainability plan that generates sufficient funds to sustain the endeavor, Arona Enterprises recognized that funds generated from SWCCOG members' use of the SCAN will not be fully appreciated until the completion of the project in 2013.

## **Proposal:**

In order for the SCAN project to be sustainable an operational plan that accounts for SWCCOG members' utilization of SCAN assets is essential. This plan should be founded in SWCCOG policy and should take into consideration SWCCOG membership ramp fees, and usage fees as revenue streams to assist in the maintenance cost of the fiber infrastructure. An additional consideration can be given to leasing out excess capacity to vendors.

Technical and managerial tasks of the SCAN should be a function of the SWCCOG membership. A procedural process needs to be developed based upon SWCCOG policy to achieve these ends.



Arona Enterprises is willing to continue working to these ends with the following specific deliverables:

- 1) Enhance the draft plan previously submitted to include an operations budget that follows SWCCOG Board policy.
- 2) Develop a set of procedures that will guide the operations of the SCAN network based upon SWCCOG Board policy.
- 3) Responsible for the Technical Committee meeting (agenda, meeting announcement and conducting the meeting).
- 4) Provide the SWCCOG Board with a monthly report and be available during the SWCCOG monthly meeting to address Board concerns.
- 5) Serve as a resource to SWCCOG members during their construction phase.

### **Timeline:**

Arona Enterprises contemplates a short term contract of four months commencing on August 10 and concluding on November 10<sup>th</sup>.

### **Remuneration:**

Arona Enterprises proposes a flat fee of \$5000 a month including all expenses associated with the project engagement. Invoices will be submitted monthly to the SWCCOG Board.

### **SCAN General Manager Contract Evaluation & Recommendation**

Per the direction of the COG Board, a committee meeting was arranged with the group comprised of Jason Wells, Chair of the Telecom Committee and persons from the GM selection committee; Rick Smith from Cortez; David Bygel from La Plata County; and Eric Pierson from the City of Durango, although he was not able to attend the meeting, he provided some input. Ed Morlan and Paul Recanzone also provided some input. Ed had prepared an evaluation form based on the GM Contract Scope of Work but the group felt it was too detailed and they did not know the details of how that work was progressing. Jason brought a copy of the original proposal from Arona Enterprises and the group reviewed some of the objectives and time frames of that proposal. It was noted that some areas were significantly behind the proposed timelines and achievements.

There was discussion among the group to distinguish between the evaluations of the contract itself and the performance of the individual. The committee did not feel it was appropriate for them to evaluate the performance of the individual. The consensus of the group was that there was a need for a General Manager of the network to implement the systems and beginning to sign up customers.

Dr. Rick Smith provided the group a proposal at the meeting, Wednesday, July 25<sup>th</sup>. Copy attached. The proposal calls for an extension of Dr. Rick's managerial obligations to the COG through November 10<sup>th</sup> of this year, after which time he recommends that he yield to a modified approach to managing the Network. According to Dr. Rick, the current model is not financially sustainable for the SWCCOG, particularly within the coming year when operational revenues are not yet expected to have reached their full potential. Dr. Rick's proposal also calls for a reduced monthly fee for the extension period -- \$5,000 a month, whereas the current agreement's fee is established at \$7,000/month.

Essentially, the foundation of Dr. Rick's proposal is that the COG cannot afford to hire a General Manager as a separate contract position and proposes that the larger members of the COG (City of Cortez & Durango/La Plata County) increase their staff capacity to include management of the network, at least during an interim period prior to the SCAN's ability to maximize its earning potential. The group collectively noted that it would be up to those COG members whether or not they would agree to do this. Also it was noted that it would take time (at least a year or two) after the physical completion of the network to develop products and service and build a customer/user base that could sustain a contract employee.

Based on the change of direction advanced in the proposal and the need for full Board input on such a decision, the committee did not have a recommendation in response to Dr. Rick's suggested managerial approach beyond the current calendar year. However, the committee did recommend continuing to retain Dr. Rick's services not only through the November 10<sup>th</sup> proposed date, but through the end of 2012. This recommendation was conditional on Dr. Rick developing and clearly presenting to the Board in the near future, some clear options for Network management in 2013. The recommendation was further conditional on assurances from Dr. Rick that before his term runs, he would fully engage with all community anchor institutions of interest to the Network while working closely with COG staff and/or legal counsel to clear any remaining legal hurdles relative to marketing services to these entities.

Should the Board accept this proposal; staff will need time to develop a different budget implied in this approach. It is suggested that the COG Board discuss this among the group and the entities this would impact.





**Resolution 12-10**  
**Authorizing the Southwest Colorado Council of Governments**  
**To Execute A Contract Extension with Arona Enterprises**

WHEREAS, Jason Wells, Tele-Communications Committee Chair, several other members of the Tele-Communications Committee of the SWCCOG and Ed Morlan, Responsible Administrator, met with Dr. Rick Smith, owner of Arona Enterprises on July 18, 2012 to review the General Manager Service contract as was discussed at the July 13 meeting of the SWCCOG Board, and;

WHEREAS, Dr. Smith made a proposal for a 4 month extension of that contract at a reduced rate of compensation, and;

WHEREAS, the Tele-Com Committee members participating in this review agreed to recommend to the SWCCOG Board that such an extension with several conditions be prepared and presented to the SWCCOG Chair for review and signature and have provided a report of their evaluation & recommendation to the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY the Board of Directors of the SWCCOG, Colorado:

That a 4 month extension of the General Manager Services contract with Arona Enterprises at \$5,000 per month be prepared by staff, reviewed by the COG's attorney and made available to the SWCCOG Chair for review, approval and signature. The extension document will maintain all of the terms of the existing contract except for the time period and the rate of compensation but will add conditions that: 1) Dr. Rick agree to develop and clearly present to the Board in the near future, some clear options for Network management in 2013 and provide assurances that before this extension ends, and 2) that he will fully engage with all community anchor institutions of interest to the Network while working closely with COG staff and/or legal counsel to clear any remaining legal hurdles relative to marketing services to these entities.

ADOPTED, this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of August, 2012

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

Tom Yennerell, Chairman of SWCCOG

## AGENDA SUBMISSION FORM

### Southwest Colorado Council of Governments

Date of Board Meeting: August 3, 2012	Type of Agenda Item: Decision
Staff: Susan Hakanson	Presentation Time: 3 minutes
Subject: 2013 SWCCOG Member Dues	Discussion Time: 5-10 minutes
Reviewed by Attorney? N/A. Attorney:	
Committee Approval: N/A	

Background: Staff is asking for a decision on 2013 SWCCOG member dues. The timing of the request is aimed at allowing adequate lead notice to member jurisdictions about what to include in their 2013 budgets and to help guide the sustainability plan by clarifying what level of core administrative funds will be available to support and operate the SWCCOG.

---

Fiscal Impact: The dues will help determine the core administrative funding of the SWCCOG and will inform the 2013 budget which will be prepared and approved in Oct. of 2012. The dues are a main potential source of local match for any possible new grant funding.

---

Recommended Action: Approve the recommended level of dues and schedule of amounts from member jurisdictions.

---

Accompanying Documents: Set 2013 COG member dues (Resolution 12-11);  
Proposed 2013 SWCCOG dues schedule.

---

ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS

**Packet Item 8a**



**RESOLUTION 2012-11 TO ADOPT 2013 SWCCOG MEMBER DUES**

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING MEMBER DUES FOR THE **SOUTHWEST COLORADO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (SWCCOG)** COLORADO, FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR BEGINNING ON THE FIRST DAY OF JANUARY, 2013, AND ENDING ON THE LAST DAY OF DECEMBER, 2013.

**WHEREAS**, the SWCCOG will be considering a sustainability plan to ensure long-term viability of the SWCCOG; and

**WHEREAS**, financial support by the membership is crucial to assure the minimal staffing of the SWCCOG through 2013 to allow for other programs or projects identified as goals by the SWCCOG board to be developed and put into place to sustain the long term viability of the SWCCOG; and

**WHEREAS**, financial support by the membership is crucial to receiving grants and additional funding for other identified future programs or projects; and

**WHEREAS**, the SWCCOG staff has submitted options regarding dues schedules to this governing body for its August 3, 2012 meeting for consideration to assure the minimal staffing the SWCCOG through 2013; and

**WHEREAS**, this schedule is attached and has been considered and finalized by the Board.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Directors of the Southwest Colorado Council of Governments, Colorado that:

1. The attached schedule of 2013 member dues as submitted and amended by Board discussion and raising a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_, is hereby approved and adopted as the schedule of 2013 member dues for the SWCCOG.
2. Staff is hereby directed to issue the invoices to the member jurisdictions according to this schedule with a due date of January 23, 2013.

DONE AND ADOPTED IN DURANGO, LA PLATA COUNTY, COLORADO, this 3rd day of July, 2012.

SOUTHWEST COLORADO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

---

Tom Yennerell, Chairman

## 2013 SWCCOG Dues options worksheet for 3 revenue levels

Jan -December 2013

Total Amount to be Distributed    \$ 14,000 Current Level

Total Generated by Base Amt: 200    \$ 2,800

Remainder to be Distributed by %  
of Population                            \$ 11,200

	Data for calculation				Revenue options		
	Pop. 2010 Census	% of Total Pop.	% of Pop. Times Remainder	Base Dues Amount: 200	FY 13 Dues At Current Rate	FY 13 Dues To Raise 2X revenues	FY 13 Dues To Raise 4X revenues
<b>ARCHULETA</b>							
Pagosa Springs	1,727	2.3%	\$ 255	\$ 200	455	910	1,819
Unincorporated	<u>10,357</u>	<u>13.6%</u>	<u>\$ 1,528</u>	<u>\$ 200</u>	<u>1,728</u>	<u>3,457</u>	<u>6,913</u>
<b>DOLORES</b>							
Dove Creek	735	1.0%	\$ 108	\$ 200	308	617	1,234
Rico	265	0.3%	\$ 39	\$ 200	239	478	956
Unincorporated	<u>1064</u>	<u>1.4%</u>	<u>\$ 157</u>	<u>\$ 200</u>	<u>357</u>	<u>714</u>	<u>1,428</u>
<b>LA PLATA</b>							
Bayfield	2,333	3.1%	\$ 344	\$ 200	544	1,089	2,177
Durango	16,887	22.2%	\$ 2,492	\$ 200	2,692	5,384	10,768
Ignacio	697	0.9%	\$ 103	\$ 200	303	606	1,211
Unincorporated	<u>30,379</u>	<u>40.0%</u>	<u>\$ 4,483</u>	<u>\$ 200</u>	<u>4,683</u>	<u>9,366</u>	<u>18,732</u>
<b>MONTEZUMA</b>							
Cortez	8,482	11.2%	\$ 1,252	\$ 200	1,452	2,903	5,807
Dolores	936	1.2%	\$ 138	\$ 200	338	676	1,352
Mancos	1,336	1.8%	\$ 197	\$ 200	397	794	1,589
<b>SAN JUAN</b>							
Silverton	637	0.8%	\$ 94	\$ 200	294	588	1,176
Unincorporated	<u>62</u>	<u>0.1%</u>	<u>\$ 9</u>	<u>\$ 200</u>	<u>209</u>	<u>418</u>	<u>837</u>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>75,897</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 11,200</b>	<b>\$ 2,800</b>	<b>\$ 14,000</b>	<b>\$ 28,000</b>	<b>\$ 56,000</b>