

QCIC Governance Agreement Comments

Scott County:

- Staff comments are made with the underlying principle that less is more in a 28E agreement. While there are several reasons that we are recommending that the agreement be amended a prevailing reason is that we were too specific in areas of control and governance. The board of twelve members needs to understand that this governmental entity is in place to determine the use of the public safety fiber as a whole and as partners in use in each state. Scott County believes a quorum of 4 from each state is still important to assure that the best decisions are reached. Scott County comments are limited to the agreement and not to the future actions of the Board as to use or management of the network.
- **B 2** Remove establishing a Technical Advisory Committee; add Contract for services that benefit the network.
- **B 3** Strike entire section.
- **B 4** Strike entire section.
- **B 5** Strike entire section.
- **C 2** If Trinity Fiber references are no longer relevant remove now.
- **C 3f** Remove reference to Economic Development Committee.
- **F** Take out network management and leave it as an authority in **B 2**.
- **G** Should Limited Agent representative be Fiscal Agent? There should be two of them. SECC would be Iowa and the ETSB Board the other one. These two bodies can take money account for it, pay bills, and if fiber is owned by them depreciate it.
- Scott County thinks that technical committees or task forces to develop RFP and review should be the authority of the board but not in the agreement. These committees once determined by the Board will either be subject to open meeting laws and records or not as constituted.
- By laws should be done by the Board and not part of the governance agreement so they can be modified by a majority of the Board.

Milan:

- Retain the services of a consultant familiar with fiber and with our system to help prepare RFPs, and to help evaluate (and value) responses.
- With the aid of a consultant, implement a system to more formally track fiber optic assets and strand allocation & usage.
- Draft the IGA to use SECC and ETSB as custodians of system-wide revenues.
- Avoid putting hard fiber counts in the IGA for each of the 3 categories (Public Safety, Agency & Economic Development).
- Retain a Technical Committee structure. This group would continue to help manage the Public Safety strands as well as make other recommendations to the Governance Committee.
- Solicit input from other interests during the RFP process (and other times as appropriate) instead of creating a standing Economic Development Committee.

Moline:

- Eliminate the two Economic Development Committees and maintain the Technical Committee
- Form an ad hoc committee if needed to review and issue an RFP for commercialization of the dark fibers categorized for private use.
- Do not put the number of lines to be allocated into the three designated categories in the Intergovernmental Agreement, but rather delegate the responsibility for allocating lines among the three categories to the QCIC Board.
- Hire a Consultant to manage the system and represent the QCIC Board in commercialization of the dark lines allocated to private use.

Davenport:

- The one clear positive of the draft is it separates economic development use from public safety use. However, the proposed structure seems more unwieldy than the present structure, and directed toward an on-going role for CGC. Davenport would prefer to use existing structures / committees (QCIC, SECC, ETSB, QCFirst, etc.) to leverage the opportunities, rather than create new committees.
- Davenport also thinks it appropriate for monetary return to be roughly equivalent to initial investment among the partners.
- Within these guiding principles, Davenport is open to any progress, by consensus.

Rock Island ETSB – Ralph Beswick:

- Overall liked the proposal.
- Feels no QCIC NET Board member wishes to be on another committee. Using the diagram on page 3 of Mr. Hill's proposal as a reference point, it is suggested the "Economic Development Group" simply be called "Partnership Development" and that the Network Manager be in charge of this with assistance/advice as needed and/or requested from various groups such as: the technical group, QC Chamber, SECC, RICO ETSB, etc. "Partnership Development" can do all the background and legwork necessary to provide the the QCIC NET Board with specific request and/or opportunities for public/private partnerships. This set up may make it necessary for the QCIC NET Board to meet more often -perhaps every other month - but the meetings could focus on approving or denying partnership development request along with normal 'day-to-day' network maintenance issues.
- Is in favor of any legal by-law changes that would ultimately streamline the process of the Board approving partnership development while maintaining the networks integrity.