

IN-PERSON SURVEY COMMENTS (November 1, 2012 – November 10, 2012)

1. Why not?
2. Anything to advance services, facilities etc in town should be done!
3. Go for it!
4. Depends on cost
5. Comcast sucks!
6. Why would you build a network without the Internet?
7. Why is this being considered? Isn't this Los Alamos County competing with commercial business? Don't understand
8. Yes, let's move forward. A great amenity to attract young people
9. This broadband study/project has been going on for years - way too long. Please - get to work and implement a solutions! I currently pay \$400 per months for T1 services
10. Los Alamos should lead the information age, not follow. Let's do this!
11. Seems very expensive
12. Internet is not a "right" but a private business/industry service. Gov't should stay out of our lives
13. I've heard the county had an opportunity to have this done some years ago for much less than \$50M and turned it down.
14. cost sounds too high. Why do we need ultra high speed? Why not internet service instead?
15. Would only enhance Los Alamos
16. Invest in Wi-Fi
17. Broadband internet is a fundamental need of public infrastructure, like electric and water
18. It seems that comcast and centurylink aren't interested in upgrading their infrastructure. Let's do it if we can keep it profitable and consumer friendly and cost effective.
19. I believe this is key to economic development and other opportunitites in education. It can help define los alamos as ready for future
20. the prices would be reasonable if it an actual internet service not just a local community network! Nonsense!
21. the county blows enough money. They need to focus on the locals that need jobs and \$ the town needs to spend less on crap and more of the people benefit. Tax cuts!
22. I want to keep my landline phone number
23. yes if the service is considered utility service and cost is competitive with comcast and centurylink
24. only interested in high speed internet at reasonable price
25. the cost is too damn high
26. my family already pays triple this forms lowest rate for the same if not worse service. Strong support
27. without a plan and description its hard to answer. I suspect this would be more broadly used in the county than swimming pool, golf course or ice rink improvements
28. cbn could be useful to some, but the infrastructure investment should be done by comcast or centurylink. They offer this in santa fe and abq. Why not here? The county should not do what should be done by comcast.

29. as a computing business owner, this would help us grow our local business
30. upload speed is important too
31. too expensive by 10x
32. these rates (like our sewer rates) will skyrocket. These services are already available. No more taxpayer funding
33. Costs are everything/so taxes - increase = no no cost or very little = maybe
34. the county must weigh costs and participation rates. People who won't use it shouldn't have to pay for it.
35. high speed internet is already available, just not at the 50Mbps rate. \$50M to duplicate already existing services?
36. The extraordinarily high cost of current IP connectivity is strongly dependent on TelCo using essentially unregulated IP?Internet charges to build out their cellular networks. The county should be well below their price point.
37. Must be cost-competitve with comcast. Many users want just an IP address, not full-service, ISP, VoIP
38. Make it part of utility bill. Small enough bandwidth to be competitive with DSL and cable and extras if people need it
39. currently paying \$30 for 10mb
40. The availability of a county sanctioned internet service could be helpful to those who could afford it however it may also pose a threat to the citizens privacy due to possible access to any form of personal record transmitted via this connection
41. great option for those who distain cable
42. as above, I only pay \$50 to comcast for 28Mbps. So though I'd like faster, don't provide it at such a massive premium
43. almost everything depends on the price that it would take to build/pay for
44. depends on cost and how many would subscribe - should be consumer funded not county supported
45. this is not a county utility

ONLINE COMMENTS (November 13, 2012 – November 25, 2012)

1. By the time this is up and running something new will have come along to replace it.
2. I'd really like to see the schools get this so students can benefit. Right now the internet is slow and there are many things that we cannot take advantage of.
3. Los Alamos is way behind in this sevice. Time to catch up.
4. Broad band is badly needed in our community. It is time to join the 21st Century.
5. I heard on the radio that the "county" could not afford such a purchase for the community. Our utilities alone already run \$300 to \$400 a month. I also know that we can't afford an additional \$80-\$150 a month just for internet. It would have to be budgeted. I can see how it would benefit the lab. Maybe the schools. I thought this project was funded by a grant?. Maybe more information out to the community would be helpful.

6. With all the money the county gets from gross receipts from LANL, this is the type of infrastructure improvements the money should be paying for, NOT a white rock visitor center, nature center, or other useless county buildings going up all around LA.
7. \$50million divided by 9,000 points of use is \$5500 per household/business. The technology will be obsolete within 10 years and we'll still be stuck paying for it, like Bill Richardson's Rail Runner.
8. Please use a reputable Contractor, with a dedicated Council subcommittee oversight, to design and build the system.
9. "I have now a DSL medium, is good enough for my internet needs, because the basic time is not the download but reading and understanding time. I have no real time application to develop over internet, and no interest that kids to waste more time on TV on movies..
10. I good to have broadband but unpleasant to pay for it...Finally if the community needs it I will stay with the community - we missing more fundamental things than broad band that may be achieved first with this money - the only thing that LANL employees can not do with the broadband there is to watch porn and do stocks transactions or politics so for them will be that so valuable to do it from home?"
11. Build cost is \$10,000 per household. Add bond interest and its ??? \$15k??
12. Really think the lab needs to participate in the cost of development/subsidy
13. Nothing on ISP,TV,and other associated cost. Do not want it to be like the costly Railrunner. Make sure a majority of LA homeowners can and will use it. Thanks for asking
14. Nothing on ISP,TV,and other associated cost. Do not want it to be like the costly Railrunner. Make sure a majority of LA homeowners can and will use it. Thanks for asking
15. Seems excessively expensive at (effectively) \$2800/person in the county and an internet access cost higher than I pay now.
16. Broadband is vital to the future of Los Alamos as a science and technology center.
17. I do not think we should have to pay for the construction to lay the lines down.
18. I have 2GB with Century Link for \$35 a month. Would I pay \$50 a month? I am not sure. I do not do games or download movies, but I am sure I am in the minority.
19. internet for me is like water
20. We are low-income which affects some of our opinions.
21. You need to be competitive in price with DSL for home service. This means the cost for homes should be about \$20/month.
22. Yes, as someone who makes \$50,00 in household of 4, I recommend that the county own and supply the service
23. I cannot support this project based on increased tax rates or government subsidy. The resulting infrastructure and services must be shown to be self-sustaining by income from private businesses and households.
24. It's antiquated before the project has begun. No solid cost information, hook up, maintenance, etc. County has GRT monies; use that instead of taxing.
25. I would rather the County sponsor minor league baseball team, including a new stadium. This community broadband idea is just about the dumbest idea to come along in some time. It is a complete waste of money - MY MONEY.

26. The current broadband situation in parts of Los Alamos are abysmal due to outdated infrastructure. Nothing near a 10 Megabit maximum is available in my area because of old copper wiring that will not be updated. There are enough negatives about working at the Lab/living in Los Alamos without adding slow internet access to the list for possible residents and lab recruits to consider. Ultra fast internet connections (with an emphasis on ultra) are a must and because of the small size of our community will require some investment of public funds. Normally I am against raising taxes but this is an expenditure that will benefit everyone in the community and set us on a path for the future.
27. I think plans at 5 megabits per second would be a good idea as well.
28. The current cable provider should have already offered this service. We should look at getting a different cable provider willing to invest in the county.
29. prices seem a bit high for a tax funded infrastructure. If we have to pay an ISP on top of that, it becomes prohibitive.
30. The service is necessary; the cost is not. Do not gold-plate it like all other major county projects.
31. "Don't we already have fiber service at these prices?
<http://losalamosnetwork.com/internet.html>"
32. Government, at any level, has no right or reason to tax all citizens to provide a service already adequately provided by purely commercial enterprises.
33. "This is a ridiculous waste of tax money that will compete with (and likely cost more than) commercial offerings that are already in place and operating profitably. You are not offering any advantage to use this new system over the existing systems. I can get to all county and local businesses on the internet already. The average home owner now pays somewhere on the order of \$30 for 10mbit internet. How IN THE WORLD do you expect they will pay \$20 more per month for the same service? The general public can get access at the libraries and numerous businesses who offer free internet who would love to have their business. This is a patently absurd waste of government resources intruding where it has no place.
34. Raising GRT to support such a thing is hardly pro business, nor is implementing something with the government that directly competes with private entities. I have insufficient words to express how stupid this is. I am a county small business who is a Software Development company. My entire existence depends on the internet. And yet I think this is a terrible idea. That should be a good litmus test."
35. Increasing taxes to pay for creating a new county utility that competes DIRECTLY with for-profit, tax-paying companies already employing people in Los Alamos County will NOT improve the county's economy, or aid low income families, or in any way improve life in the county. It will drive employers out of town, and increase the tax burden on companies operating in the county and residents.
36. There are some areas in Los Alamos that suffer because only one company is available in that area. Often times, their service is the worst possible because the company does not want to improve the connectivity. While I thought \$150 may be a bit expensive for 50mb/s I would probably fork it out to receive that service - as long as there options to opt out and slow down, i.e., no long binding contracts, etc.
37. If you cannot beat Comcast, which has a monopoly, why bother?

38. "Municipality should provide broadband if it is not otherwise available.
39. The high speeds would be beneficial to businesses but probably not to us. We use antenna tv and are currently happy with our internet speed and cost from CenturyLink"
40. what are the citizens saying? Majority rules?
41. This is an unnecessary project - please use my tax dollars for more worthwhile expenditures like modernizing CRITICAL infrastructure. It seems that the answer to every initiative in Los Alamos is YES and the means to achieve it is RAISE taxes. Get in step with the rest of us and do more with what you have.
42. The longer you put it off, the more it is going to cost. We are too small a population center to expect a commercial operator to install it up here.
43. Providing this service will allow Los Alamos to optimize its role in science and technology. It will result in more economic development as more science and technology businesses will want to locate in Los Alamos and it will allow the public school system to leapfrog ahead of other communities in this country in terms of educational opportunities offered to students.
44. The costs proposed above are way above national averages for these speeds. If the costs were even slightly less, I'd be more willing to get behind this issue.
45. I would think the vast majority of LA residents are casual internet users. I pay 19.95 a month for the next 5 years, at which time I will be 70. I do not know if I will still be on the net or not. The cost you are listing seem to be very high.
46. I would support an increase in GRT to pay for this but what are you doing with all of the extra GRT you got from taxing the Lab? This is something worth spending the money on. Can't say the same for most of the other things you are doing with the money.
47. I very much support the basic concept. The only concern that I have is on access and cost. I already use a cable modem and would like even faster service. How much it would really cost is the question.
48. The proposed costs seem excessive. In Los Angeles for instance 100 Mbps service is offered for \$30/month. The county probably shouldn't get involved unless commercial companies can not be enticed to build out the service via the grant of a monopoly or ?? A build out cost of almost \$3K per county resident is excessive.
49. Wireless is gaining speed at such a fast pace investing in OLD technology would be a waste.
50. I believe another objective of the envisioned Network should be to provide WiFi access in key County locations to Network subscribers who are away from their residence but around the County.
51. Please move forward with this project.
52. "I currently have Comcast Triple Play phone/Internet/TV service. The phone and Internet service are adequate for my needs. The TV service would be greatly improved if Comcast or some other TV provider were to use the CBN. However, if they don't, I can't see spending \$50 million dollars of taxpayer money to build out such a CBN.
53. There seem to be too many uncertainties about how the CBN would be used to support such a project at this time. It would make more sense to me for the supporters of this project to shop around to see what businesses would be willing to commit to using the CBN, and how much they would pay to the County to have the CBN available. Don't developers now pay to extend

utility lines? Why should we treat the CBN differently and use taxpayer money to pay the whole cost to install up front? What happens if a 1-gigabyte fiber cable is not adequate to handle future needs? A gigabyte sounds like a lot, but if lots of people start to download movies via that pipe, it could jam up in a hurry.

54. Before making a decision on how to answer this survey, it would have been nice to have seen some kind of a budget analysis, i.e., how many users would it take to make this project fiscally manageable, and at what cost to the resident, are we just opting for an indefinite tax increase?"
55. Perhaps using the grant received from the lab to pay for this instead of it being used for things not needed in this community would be the way to go
56. Fiber at the right price: yes. Not at any price. ISP using county network should subsidize county network.
57. Will the charges for use ever diminish?
58. The CBN project is very important in providing an essential service to homes and businesses.
59. Provide it but cut existing services to pay for it. Cutting police department would be a good start.
60. If supported by county taxes monthly rates for service should be lower than your questions suggest -- not leveraged by the service providers.
61. This is a vital utility for the county residents.
62. the rates proposed are much higher than existing services
63. Why are you calling it giga-bit service, then offering the highest speed of 50 megabit, 20x slower?? Why would we have to pay 50 million to install it, then pay so much to use it? Why can't we get gigabit service then only pay a minimal maintenance fee?
64. The county cannot afford this and I am not willing to pay anything for it. We can use what we already have.
65. There is not nearly enough detail here for any answer other than depends for most of the questions. I am obviously not going to support paying more than I am now through CenturyLink/Qwest, nor am I going to support a tax increase for a service that costs more than I am currently paying. However, if this project will actually bring down the cost per Mb, then I might support it.
66. Internet speeds being provided today are excellent and getting better all the time. Fully trained and staffed for-profit companies are providing the infrastructure, service and support for this service. This is as it should be. The cost to the County for development is outrageously large and does not even address residential service or support. Most local businesses do not and cannot begin to use the top speeds available to them today. Please review the most data-intensive business we have in town today and then look at the newly available high-speed internet business service packages from Comcast. More bandwidth than most companies could utilize by far. I am a hi-tech person and support nearly all forms of infrastructure improvement along these lines, but this is something we don't need to provide at the County's expense. I do consider broadband an attractive feature for recruiting and retaining hi-tech companies in Los Alamos, but other than a supercomputing center or Google-scale server operation, this project is completely over the top and not at all reasonable to be provided at our County's expense. Furthermore, under the County "utility" model it does not make sense. Unlike water or power,

you're asking residents to pay for broadband they will not have access to in their own homes. Regarding this survey in general - what is the difference in answering DON'T KNOW and DEPENDS? In some cases I "don't know" how to respond because it "depends" on many additional project details that are yet unknown.

67. We are WAY over-due for Broadband services in this community. Please, no more delays.
68. Having a dependable internet service would be very nice. Current service providers are overloaded, as evident by slow internet speeds on nights, weekends, and holidays. Furthermore, it is very frustrating to deal with companies who charge premiums for less than premium, undependable service. Our household would most definitely switch to a County provided service.
69. The pricing is very high, especially if most of the infrastructure is being paid for by taxes.
70. I think this is a great idea and I hope you can move forward on it soon. Thanks for bringing this as a possibility.
71. I work on the internet. For higher speed home connection through comcast I'm paying around \$45 a month as part of a bundle with cable tv. I can get 20-23 mb/sec with this. I'm interested in faster upload.
72. This should be a high priority project. It's ridiculous that in such a high tech area we have seriously deficient broadband.
73. I've used both DSL and cable in Los Alamos, and both have had their share of problems (low speed and inconsistent service). I'm very much in favor of reliable and affordable high-speed internet access throughout the whole county.
74. Working for the LAPS, I cannot afford to pay higher rates than what I pay now. A small gross receipts tax might be more doable.
75. This proposed project is way too expensive and should be terminated immediately!
76. The broadband is in today's world a standard utility provision. The prices identified in this survey are much too high. It appears it is being compared to the current Comcast, Verizon, and Century Link prices, which are extremely elevated.
77. DO IT!
78. I think the community broadband is a good idea, if we can get better prices and speeds for internet services. If prices are just on par with current pricing there is no advantage for the county to pay taxes for infrastructure only to pay the same amount for internet services. (which should be part of the monthly fee). In addition my area in White Rock (Pajarito Acres) can not get DSL and I am stuck with Comcast (or Satellite), if the phone company is not willing to upgrade the lines to my area I would be concerned that the broadband also would not extend to all homes in the county (Even though the project says it will be).
79. Monthly cost of county broadband service would be a critical decision factor. The cost per Mbps would need to be lower than what is currently offered commercially (I currently pay \$45/mo for 5Mbps download) and I would not want to pay more than \$50/month. I would view community broadband more favorably if the upload speeds are greater than 1Mbps (to support VPN connections to LANL).

80. I'm for considering Internet service a utility like electricity. I'm not sure how much control is appropriate for the County specifically to manage utilities. But I also know Comcast has very little incentive to provide reliable service, so I'm generally in support of this initiative.
81. "If it's included as a utility it cannot be set to ~\$150/month...not even \$80/month.
82. If you raise tax would the monthly fee be less? It can't be more than 50/month in my opinion"
83. I would rather have the county own the last mile fiber than Comcast or Qwest, but my support for building it now depends on the cost. I would pay for internet access and phone service over fiber, but would probably pass on TV/cable.
84. How likely is it that existing ISPs provide similar service on their own? How quickly will this technology become a dinosaur?
85. Comcast provides poor service quality (download rates etc) to my area on Arizona. We also can't get Quest (whatever they are called now) because they don't service our street with their dsl service. The only other service I know of is a wireless local provider and I do not want wireless connection stuff. That means the community broadband thing is a very positive thing for me. I'd be very happy to jump onto it if it were available at a reasonable cost.
86. "I don't understand why it has to be so expensive. In other parts of the world there is broadband available up to 1Gbit/s for \$130 per month, 60Mbit/s for \$58 10Mbit/s \$35. It's a big investment to build the actual broadband and the money has to come from somewhere but the service to the households shouldn't be that high.
87. There is more investigation that can be done to look into how other cities have financed their fiber optics to see how it can be more interesting money wise for the average household."
88. We already have 7MB for \$43 from our internet provider. I think spending millions of dollars to run fiber to every home is a terrible use of county funds.
89. It should move forward if the survey shows that it is economically feasible.
90. went to do the survey in WR at TimeOut Pizza as advertised last week in the Monitor, but no one was there!!!! Very poor organization.
91. I would support county broadband because the commercial options (DSL from Century Link and cable internet from Infinity) don't provide what I would like.
92. build this and make it truly affordable.
93. "I feel the county should proceed with the project on 2 conditions:
94. the county must build and OWN the infrastructure. Any type of system where we, the inhabitants of the county, don't own the infrastructure we pay to build is unacceptable to me.
95. I would want to see a system where the county also operates the system. Maybe other companies are permitted to LEASE some bandwidth to offer services, but I don't want to see a system where the only providers available are private companies. I could be onboard with the project if only private companies offer service at first, but the infrastructure must be LEASED, or the contract to operate the infrastructure must have a short duration (at most 5 years in my opinion) and there must be a path for the county to operate broadband as a non-profit utility for the benefit of the county."
96. Currently subscribe to 40m broadband for ~\$75.00 per month. The per month access to broadband only is too high.

97. This project would benefit 99% of LAC residents. Screw the millions spent on the Nature Center - we all have nature out our back door or hasn't the council looked lately. Once again, the older retiree residents get what they want at the expense of everyone else. The council get their mega million \$ office bldg but families don't get a pool. Same old story when the old folks run the town...Aspen Ridge support, Betty Ehart Center, what's next? No wonder families are leaving town and I'd encourage all newcomers to live elsewhere since the values of this town are upside down. Let the old UC retirees get what they want... remember the referendum a few yrs back where those over 70 were going to avoid property taxes? Nice try you rich seniors! Those over 70 are the richest segment of the country and our county if you haven't noticed. I will never vote for a tax increase ever - only a moron would since the Feds and county already take way more than they should.
98. I would like a higher speed internet service but the price must be competitive with what I am getting now and the County and/or taxpayers should not subsidize this. Also, I strongly oppose this as a Utilities function. They have done a very poor job of providing basic services like reliable electricity, and should not be entrusted with additional service responsibilities!
99. Leave this to commercial entities for those that want it, but stop wasting my tax \$\$ to fund it.
100. The cost that I would be will to pay depend on the benefits that I would get. If my phone, TV and internet access is included, I would be interested in paying a much high amount.
101. I am a school employee and, unlike LANL or for that matter county employees, I cannot afford the above quoted prices. Please, structure a county run service that recognizes that this county has a variety of income groups that should have access to basic services, such as internet. Times are changing. LA includes poor people, service workers and some public servants that haven't seen much income growth in years. Additionally, having so called "competitive pricing" by private companies is a joke. Just drive around town and look at gas prices, food, etc. Please have the county run the system. Their services are excellent and not profit driven.
102. This will be huge for the community. make it happen!
103. I can get FREE wireless internet at the library. Why would I pay \$150/month for it? Costs to the consumer would need to be MUCH more competitive for this to sell. It should be provided by the county.
104. This is an interesting issue. I'm supporting it because I have high confidence in the LA County Utilities Dept, and almost none in Qwest/CenturyLink/Comcast (I use a Santa Fe ISP, but they use CenturyLink copper). I would trust our county to provide infrastructure that could in turn make for a competitive market.
105. For how long would the .0032 sales tax last? I am strongly opposed to an Indefinite tax
106. Having network access as a utility would be a strong factor in keeping our family up here in Los Alamos, as opposed to moving to Santa Fe.
107. Using a utility bond issue with property tax increase would be more fair than using a sales tax increase to cover costs. At least a comparison would help.
108. Although I don't support paying more than \$50 for broadband right now, I would pay more in the future and I believe this would be an investment in the future.
109. As a business owner, I feel that this is a very important step for our community.

110. We live in an Internet era. We need to become internet service/product producers instead of only consumers if we are to survive this huge economic disruptor. Amazon will grow and prosper & Los Alamos will die if we don't get moving on this transition.
111. I need more details and more nuance to be able to answer most of these questions. The questions important to me are not in this survey.
112. I feel very strongly that this is a vital service for the county if we want to diversify our business opportunities. This is the sort of infrastructure, which will allow web based businesses to open in Los Alamos and capitalize on the talent that already lives here.

ONLINE COMMENTS (January 31, 2013 – February 15, 2013)

1. I think CBN should be implemented, because I am tired of being held hostage to bad broadband access from Comcast and Centurylink (i.e. high price for slow speed, and poor reliability).
2. Has the county considered talking to one of the providers such as Qwest about working with the county to provide broadband at a discount and help with the investment of the infrastructure.
3. We have a lot of costs right now. I am not sure this is the best way to spend our resources, we have to weigh the costs versus other projects.
4. I already have good telephone and internet service that provide access to many of the services mentioned and don't need television. DPU has not done a good job of providing reliable services and should not be responsible for broadband. And lastly, there are more important issues than broadband that need funding, especially with budgets getting tighter.
5. It would be nice, and is recommended, the County take extra time in planning this, with the community input. We would like to see more of the smaller companies in the County be involved. This can be an opportunity for advancement, or a burden on citizens. Take the opportunity for advancement, and get the community involved; offer classes for business entrepreneurship, offer business case scenarios, offer planning and scheduling reviews with businesses; get businesses signed up to offer services before it is built - and we don't mean with a large sum of money - what we are pointing towards is that the County take leadership, and offer business counseling, business development, and support from the County in the beginning. Take charge of the opportunity, and get the community involved - do not let the larger companies, take our money, and then over charge for services. For example, the Hive is sponsored by local businesses, as a way of "looking good" for the supporting local businesses. The Hive is growing to be political in its nature, and is taking some of the money from the County, to operate. Not enough citizens know about the Hive, and what it does (could do if run correctly) for our community, its potential to be a base start for a lot of business, and its potential to help the County. The Hive should be run by the County, as an incubator, and take the political nature that has started to implode the Hive, and throw it out. Input the CBN, and the incubator companies that use the CBN as a central service starting point, then train, train, train, and grow these companies to support the community, with community input. Look at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/InnovationFellows> as a model.

6. I currently have less than 1Mbit service via DSL and cannot get faster up/downloads (Pajarito Acres). Comcast offers better "service" but it is shared service with other users on their cable. All I really want is an IP address and typically maybe 5Mbit service, but I am not willing to pay an excessive amount for this, say more than \$20 per month. Higher cost is prohibitive for retired folks here.
7. cost is key. Right now the costs suggested on this survey look high.
8. I have called and inquired about internet of ANY kind being available to East Gate business owners for over three years. I have been a business owner here for over 20 years. Your CBN project has become a standing joke now for East Gate Park business owners. LA County does NOT provide good customer service. LA County makes me feel like my vote counts for nothing, and my opinion counts for nothing. I find it interesting that the first thing noted in Item #3 at the top of this useless survey, is what is NOT included in the "Basic Service". . "Internet Service". Not Priceless. . . but rather PAR for the Course. Tom Rock _ Business owner.
9. The community broadband service would be a great addition to the county's infrastructure and for local businesses. While we will already have gotten service from RediNet being a core institution, we strongly support the CBS as we believe it would enhance businesses in the county.
10. The rest of the industrialized world has ultra high speed internet at low prices, which is considered a basic necessity. To be in a science driven town, and not have universal access to ultra high speed internet is inexcusable.
11. Download speed is important, but upload speed is equally important. Answers to download speed depend on what the upload speed is also. 2. As a business, the ability to change ISP settings is crucial. Fast download speed is important, but so is a knowledgeable support staff that can work with our team to avoid problems with latency, packet loss, etc. 3. If the county were to provide the service as a utility, business customers may need 99% service uptime and a high level of customer service to support their needs at all times. To date, I have not seen any information from the county regarding such requirements. 4. Much of our work is done through virtual private network connections to support our remote projects and deployed staff. The internet backbone is a crucial aspect to our future successes. We utilize large files, remote access to databases, cloud services, multi stream video conferencing (weekly to daily), hosted process tools, and VOIP. Solid internet access is a CORE concern. 5. Reliance on NMGR as a support mechanism assumes that Los Alamos County provides ample business opportunities and a robust enough economy that the NMGR revenues are available. Reliance on LANS/LANL to provide all the purchasing power for NMGR in LA County is a uncertain proposition as evidenced by the current projected NMGR/County shortfall. 6. The current projected cost of this project is very steep. While our company may benefit from enhanced internet options, the current approach may need to be reevaluated.
12. A good broadband infrastructure throughout the county is absolutely critical to our local economic development and to compete both nationally and globally.
13. Our purchase of Internet services is dependent on the relationship between CBN and the REDI Net project that we are currently working with to connect all of our schools and district facilities.

14. not enough info to be able to answer these questions. Need to know about reliability, service quality, contract terms, install costs, how it affects current contracts I have in place, etc. in order to really answer these kinds of questions. Would this big of a project be needed just to get service to commercial areas? How much of this is about subsidizing home service versus commercial service? How much can we get private companies to pay for the existence of the service through their use of it to provide end-user service?
15. I am not a business but rather a heavy home user of internet service.
16. Any increase in Gross Receipt Taxes should be used to support the schools. The county council could save money by making a decision and not study every option and proposal put forth by every individual.
17. we have internet now and i am looking for a cheaper solution, not a faster solution. I definitely do not want increased taxes since internet service is a business problem not a government problem.
18. I would be willing to do absolutely anything to get rid of Comcast.
19. After the latest LAC budget news of deferred capital projects, decreasing get revenues, and increasing property taxes, this project seems like just another way to spend money that shouldn't be done.
20. This is far too expensive unless one has a need to keep up with colleagues around the world.
21. There are other alternatives for financing as well.
22. County does not the experience and specialists not to keep it outdated, and will create another monopoly slipping in high prices low quality, eliminating all other alternatives and when it will not work, will simply not work - Now I have good internet for only \$20...and is more than I can use.
23. The options available now for internet service are awful. Something needs to be done. We are forced to use companies that provide terrible service b/c we don't have any other options.
24. Too expensive with no clear benefit over currently existing providers. Plus adding tax burden to existing businesses to fund overly expensive internet access is ridiculous. Recent revenue drops should adequately demonstrate the lab is not an infinite money well accessible through GRT hikes.
25. I currently pay \$71.84 (including taxes) for internet-only Comcast Business Class service. This provides high-reliability service, 20Mbps down, 4Mbps down, with full ISP features. The suggestion that I should pay the county \$10 more for incremental improvement in service over existing privately available options is absurd. \$50 is not an entry-level service. If the county wished to offer a free, or very low cost (\$10/mo), service which could guarantee every household could receive a basic service (0.5-1Mbps down, always on) regardless of income levels, I would not only support it, but offer to assist.
26. I currently pay 19.95 for 7mbps, so 50 for 10 is more than a little ridiculous. I was able to get 1 TBps in Toronto for \$50/month, so your pricing scheme is way out of bounds above. I doubt you will find anyone willing to pay 150 for 50mbps, it's simply not worth it.
27. Broadband has to be done now and done well to fit the needs of my companies or we have to move to a place that has done it well.