

6-14-2007

# ConnectME Authority Advisory Council Meeting Notes - June 14, 2007

ConnectME Authority

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalmaine.com/connectme\\_meetings](http://digitalmaine.com/connectme_meetings)

---

## Recommended Citation

ConnectME Authority, "ConnectME Authority Advisory Council Meeting Notes - June 14, 2007" (2007). *ConnectME Authority Meetings*. Paper 34.  
[http://digitalmaine.com/connectme\\_meetings/34](http://digitalmaine.com/connectme_meetings/34)

This Text is brought to you for free and open access by the ConnectME Authority at Maine State Documents. It has been accepted for inclusion in ConnectME Authority Meetings by an authorized administrator of Maine State Documents. For more information, please contact [statedocs@maine.gov](mailto:statedocs@maine.gov).

ConnectME Authority  
Advisory Council Meeting  
June 14, 2007

Meeting Notes

Administrative items:

- In Attendance (**Bold**, Advisory Council members)  
**Fletcher Kittredge**  
**Keith Burkley**  
Peter Petersen  
Ben Sanborn  
Chris Hodgdon  
**Reggie Palmer**  
**Pat Scully**  
John Liantonio  
**Linda Lord for Gary Nichols**  
**Jeff Letourneau for Ralph Caruso**
- Reggie Palmer nominated Fletcher Kittredge for Chair. The nomination was unanimously approved
- Fletcher Kittredge nominated Reggie to Deputy Chair. The nomination was unanimously approved.
- It was agreed that decisions will be made by majority vote if necessary. The AC will strive for consensus but recognizes that will not always be possible – the possibility of a “divided report” was discussed.
- It was agreed by all that all “interested persons” should be added to the e-mail list.
- The charge of the Advisory Council was reviewed:
  - Select a Chair
  - Welcome new members: Wayne Jortner and Pat Scully
  - Provide Authority with a draft application and evaluation process
  - The need to define “unserved” and “area”
  - The Secretary of State version of the rule was distributed – it has an effective date of June 29, 2007

Pre-Application/Application

- Phil Lindley (PL) distributed a draft pre-application letter for discussion and copies of Georgia and Nebraska letters.
- There was a discussion about the concern that the pre-application may not provide enough information to evaluate the viability of projects – this must be balanced with the possible deterrent that a long application would be for a small provider (the type that is most likely to apply for the

- funding). Because incumbents have the “right of first refusal” it is important for the projects that receive funding to be viable so that the incumbents can make the most economic decision
- It must be clear to applicants that their application may be seen by the incumbent and members of the Advisory Council.
  - There was a discussion about when in the process the incumbents be allowed to exercise the rights of first refusal – before the applications are reviewed or after the “winners” are chosen? One possible solution was to post the areas from which applications have been received/those areas the applications would cover on the web site after applications come in but before the evaluation process. Ben Sanborn pointed out that the rule provides the incumbents with 14 days after the application process to preempt ConnectME investment – but perhaps incumbents could provide an “initial indication” on pre-applications.
  - There was a discussion about how small and “area” would be considered unserved. As large as a town or as small as one address? – It was decided to table this discussion until the next meeting.
  - The Authority must determine the unserved areas so that the certificate of qualification for tax purposes can be awarded.
  - There was a discussion about the definition of unserved/underserved and how to measure the allowable “20% overlap”. It was decided to table this discussion until the next meeting.
  - Reggie requested that Phil research what other states are doing on applications and review processes
  - Edits were discussed to the pre-application letter. Phil agreed to edit the draft and send it around again for discussion.
  - There was a discussion about whether or not to allow a new business to apply for funding – technically only entities that submit the assessment are eligible. It was decided to table this discussion until the next meeting.

Items for the next Authority meeting, July 5, 2007

- Proposed pre-application letter
- Recognize 2 new members
- Mechanism for Fund Administrator
- Job description for Exec Director

Items for next Advisory Council meeting week of July 9

- Evaluation process
- Full Application
- “Area” definition
- Unserved/underserved definition