



Chap Rec	State Performance Audit Recommendation	Response	Action Planned and/or taken	Date Completed	Leads & P.O.C.s
II Gen	<p>The Mid-Columbia PUDs should form a task force to fully evaluate the shared service opportunities identified in this report and in other functional areas. The tasks required to implement these recommendations should be handled through collaborative discussions among the three PUDs. We recommend a two-level approach for these discussions:</p> <p>Form a senior management steering committee with a representative from each PUD. The steering committee would establish the objectives and ground rules for the work groups and make ultimate decisions regarding the implementation and design of shared services opportunities as well as serve as the escalation point for issues that the working groups are unable to resolve. Depending on the governance options chosen, the three PUD Commissions may ultimately have to act on shared services proposals.</p> <p>Establish work groups for each function (IT, fleet) made up of a small number of subject matter experts from each PUD. The work groups would do the detailed analysis required to fully assess each shared services opportunity in this report from a quantitative and qualitative standpoint. They would then provide alternatives and recommendations, with supporting documentation, to the senior management steering committee.</p>	<p>Grant, Chelan and Douglas County PUDs have a long history of cooperative alliances. The general managers of the three utilities meet on a monthly basis to review issues facing all three districts. The boards of each utility meet on a quarterly basis. Individuals and departments within the three utilities regularly collaborate.</p> <p>At present, Grant County PUD is working with Chelan and Douglas County PUDs to collaborate on projects required by our operations, as well as with various federal, state and local agencies and private organizations. The results of these collaborative efforts, has and will save the utility millions of dollars. A sampling of these efforts include: Grant County PUD has a contract with Douglas County PUD to use their unused hatchery capacity. This allows Douglas County PUD to utilize their entire facility until their own needs increase. It allows Grant County PUD the ability to avoid building a facility at this time, a savings of millions of dollars.</p> <p>Grant County PUD and Chelan County PUD are currently negotiating a contract to fund the construction of a hatchery that will satisfy both PUDs' requirements for a specific fisheries program. The joint project will result in savings of millions of dollars for the initial construction and operating costs for the life of the facility.</p> <p>Grant County PUD has significant obligations to fund recreation facilities under the terms of the utility's new federal license. Utility staff is presently considering options for partnerships with other agencies and private companies to meet these requirements while maximizing dollars expended. The pursuit of these ventures could result in millions of dollars of cost savings.</p> <p>Grant County PUD appreciates the recommendations of the state and will pursue additional efficiencies to be gained from further cooperative shared services between the Mid-Columbia PUDs.</p> <p>Grant County PUD will continue to work with any interested partner in looking for opportunities to reduce costs in these and other areas.</p>	<p>The General Managers from the three PUDs (Grant, Chelan, and Douglas) discussed how they wanted to tackle the recommendations of the State Performance Audit. An agreement was reached between Chelan and Grant that two senior leaders would be selected to work the follow-up efforts. Douglas PUD wanted to be copy furnished on what was being explored and would join in should various efforts make sense to them. On October 23, 2010, Michael Woywod, Director of Support Services for Grant, and Wayne Wright, Executive Manager – District Services Group for Chelan, met to kick off the review process. Since then, the General Managers have met as well as some of the Commissioners to discuss challenges and opportunities to partner. In addition, employees from Grant and Chelan in the following departments have coordinated meetings: Human Resources, Information Technology, Communications (Public Affairs), Procurement, Finance, Transportation, Facilities, Power Management, Natural Resources, Hydro, Customer Services, Legal, and Audit.</p> <p>Where appropriate, work groups have been established and will continue to be evaluated. New ones may be established on an ongoing basis as needed.</p>	Feb, 2011	<p>Leads: Board, GM</p> <p>POC: Michael Woywod</p>
II Ins 1	Compare costs of insurance coverage regularly with other PUDs.	Traditionally, Grant PUD's debt covenants required an independent engineer to evaluate our insurance coverage every year. This requirement ended a few years ago when the original debt was retired. We will continue to obtain and compare costs of insurance and levels of coverage with	The PUD's currently compare insurance costs, including insurance program limits, deductibles retentions and premiums. We will continue to conduct side by side comparisons between all three mid-Columbia PUD insurance programs on an annual basis.	Dec 21, 2011 (continuing annually)	<p>Lead: Jim Bunch</p> <p>POC: Julie Yount</p>



		the other PUDs.			
II Ins 2	Consider sharing insurance administration functions to provide administrative cost savings.	Grant County PUD will review opportunities to save on insurance administrative costs with the other PUDs.	Grant PUD staff participated in phone calls and a meeting with Ron Gibbs, Chelan PUD's Risk Manager. We discussed administration functions, claims administration and other insurance & risk department related functions. We agree that no consolidation is feasible at this time but will continue to review and discuss options.	August, 2009; February 23, 2010; March 11, 2010; Dec 21, 2010	Lead: Jim Bunch POC: Julie Yount
II Ins 3	Consider a shared approach to negotiating and contracting including combining brokers and insurance providers to reduce premium expenses when appropriate.	Grant County PUD will consider shared opportunities to reduce premium expenses where appropriate.	Grant PUD consulted our broker at Marsh USA who, in 2009, provided broker services to both Grant PUD and Douglas PUD. No additional savings potential was made available considering the "shared" broker relationship. Both insurance programs were marketed to the same or similar insurers. Individual policies were priced according to the risks and exposures of each PUD. Grant PUD completed a RFP for broker services in 2010 and contracted with a different brokerage firm at significant cost savings. Douglas and Chelan PUDs' brokers were among the respondents at the highest and second highest bids. No cost savings were offered for "group" services.	July 7, 2009; March, 2010	Lead: Jim Bunch POC: Julie Yount
II IT 4	The three Mid-Columbia PUDs should collaboratively investigate a plan to achieve enterprise IT systems standardization and the centralization of system hardware and support staff.	Grant County PUD has explored various options with other Central Washington utilities for sharing information services. These services ranged from shared support to providing back up facilities for each other. The last effort occurred in the early 2000s and was abandoned for various reasons. We will renew these discussions.	Grant and Chelan IT managers met to discuss potential partnering efforts regarding: Enterprise Software/Hardware Management and Support, Data Centers and Disaster Recovery. We concluded that our larger applications systems are too disparate to collaborate. It is not financially feasible because one of the utilities would have to abandon a large investment. We did, however, agree that it may be beneficial to combine license purchases for Microsoft and other applications common to both utilities. We have agreed to meet quarterly to discuss potential standardization, joint-training and cost savings.	Jan. 7, 2011	Lead: Michael Woywod POC: Gordon Graham
II IT 5	The three Mid-Columbia PUDs should consider sharing both primary and back-up data centers.	Grant County PUD will consider shared IT facilities as discussed above.	The possibility of one utility hosting a data center/disaster recovery site for the other was discussed but is not currently possible. A robust communications link between the two utilities would be required, and at present, does not exist.		Lead: Michael Woywod POC: Gordon Graham



II Fac 6	<p>The PUDs should consider a two step approach to cooperatively provide Facilities, Real Estate and Parks services:</p> <p>Consolidate the management of Facilities, Real Estate and Parks from five managers to two managers for all three PUDs.</p> <p>Combine the complete Facilities, Real Estate and Parks functions into one aggregate group for all three PUDs. This assessment should establish the correct mix of out-source and internal resources for these three functions.</p>	<p>Grant County will consider shared and or consolidation of services for facilities, real estate and parks.</p>	<p>A number of meetings have been held with Chelan and Grant's Natural Resources and Facilities employees. The State Performance Audit recommendations were thoroughly reviewed. It is important to note that there are a number of factors the auditors did not consider when making their recommendations, including:</p> <p>The new license requirements that Grant will be working over the next five to ten years. A significant amount of additional work/responsibilities will fall on the shoulders of Lands and Facilities.</p> <p>Geographic boundaries that directly impact sharing of resources.</p> <p>The ability to communicate significant challenges between three governing boards and management of groups.</p> <p>Contractual limitations with bargaining unions.</p> <p>The audit completely disregarded the dynamic challenges that both Grant and Chelan face managing both their current park system and the future requirements negotiated with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Once Grant PUD, for example, completes expanding its park and recreation system to meet requirements, there will be facilities located over 92 miles apart in Washington's fourth largest county. A strong supervisory presence is required to deal with the current and upcoming challenges making it completely unfeasible to share management personnel, facilities, and park employees.</p>		<p>Leads: Michael Woywod, Jeff Grizzel</p> <p>POC: Tim Fleisher</p>
II Fac 7	<p>Regardless of the outcome of recommendation 6, before the Grant County PUD determines resources to manage its new "Parks" responsibilities, its management should work with Chelan County PUD to determine how Grant might benefit from Chelan's current processes, resources and experiences for the operation of parks facilities.</p>	<p>Grant County PUD will review the process in place at Chelan County PUD and discuss with Chelan PUD other options considered, and based on their history, other options which they would consider now.</p>	<p>Lands and Facilities staff met with Chelan PUD Parks on May 28th to learn more about their department functions and staffing at Chelan PUD.</p> <p>In July they met with Chelan PUD and Douglas real estate managers to discuss lands management issues. They met separately with their parks and recreation managers to discuss Crescent Bar Island recreation planning. Grant staff has been and will continue to meet with these individuals and utilize gained information.</p>	<p>May 28, 2010; July 22, 2010</p>	<p>Leads: Michael Woywod, Jeff Grizzel</p> <p>POC: Tim Fleisher</p>
II Pro 8	<p>The three PUDs should collaborate to obtain better volume purchase arrangements by standardizing the terms, conditions and pricing with common vendors. As part of this collaboration the PUDs should establish common makes and models for the same types of materials (e.g., poles, fiber cable, and large vehicles) which do not impact the technology of the distribution systems and hydro facilities.</p>	<p>Grant County PUD has discussed common purchases for some items. We are willing to enter into discussions with the other PUDs and expand this are of cooperation.</p>	<p>Grant and Chelan will be conducting combined vehicle and equipment auctions and collaborating in 2012 fuel bids to investigate potential fuel margin savings. We will also be working together researching potential future purchases of alternative fuel vehicles and joint training opportunities for fleet technicians.</p> <p>We are also pursuing a joint contract with Chelan for elevator maintenance.</p>		<p>Lead: Michael Woywod</p> <p>POC: Craig Weddle</p>
II Pro 9	<p>The PUDs should consider consolidating procurement functions under one manager to eliminate redundant administrative costs and consider establishing common practices for</p>	<p>As part of the process mentioned above, Grant County PUD will discuss consolidation of the procurement function between the three PUDs.</p>	<p>More meetings will be occurring between the PUD procurement and operations staffs to brainstorm future opportunities for joint contracting.</p>		<p>Lead: Michael Woywod</p>



	gathering bids, negotiating contracts, issue purchase orders and managing vendors for the same types of materials with the same vendors.				POC: Craig Weddle
IV A Gov 1	<p>The Grant County PUD Commission should develop governance policies and practices to provide appropriate leadership and oversight by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establishing the strategic direction for the PUD. 2. Clearly defining Commissioners' roles and responsibilities, including the Commission's role in providing policy direction and oversight and management's role in executing that direction. 3. Establishing performance goals and evaluating performance for the employees who report directly to the Commission. 4. Develop and adopt specific conflict-of-interest policy for the Commission and specifically address perceived potential conflicts for Commissioners. 5. Developing and adopting rules of conduct for public and private interactions among Commissioners. 6. Developing rules of conduct for public and private interactions among Commissioners. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grant County PUD Commissioners agree that governance policies are helpful tools in providing leadership and oversight to the utility. The board adopted a governance policy by Resolution No. 8402 on August 31, 2009. The commission uses this document as a guide for their interactions with each other, with staff and with the public. Grant County PUD established a strategic plan in September 2007. Commissioners have committed to a practice of reviewing and evaluating the plan on an annual basis to establish the strategic direction for the utility. 2. The Grant County PUD Commission adopted a governance policy by Resolution 8402 on August 31, 2009. Roles and responsibilities for the Commissioners are defined in this document. 3. Governance policies related to establishing performance goals and evaluating performance for employees that report directly to the Commission are included in the Commission's Governance Policy. Appointee evaluations are currently being performed. Part of this process includes setting goals for 2010. 4. Section 20B of the Governance Policy address conflict-of-interest. This section provides specific processes for Commoners in addition to RCW 42.23. In addition, the utility's Code of Ethics policy pertains to all employees and Commissioners. 5. Rules of conduct for public and private interactions among Commissioners are detailed in the Governance Policy. 6. Rules of conduct for public input and interaction with the Commission are included in the Governance Policy. 	See response column	Aug 2009	Board



<p>IV A SP</p>	<p>The Grant County PUD Commission and District management should expand the role of the strategic plan in providing actual policy direction and management of the PUD. Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Commission should play a lead role in developing, overseeing deployment and reviewing progress of the strategic plan. 2. Management should identify, develop and discuss alternative approaches and strategies to address key strategic issues in developing the strategic plan. 3. Management should incorporate analysis of key trends, customer issues and concerns, internal issues and concerns into strategic decision-making or the strategic plan. 4. Management should develop and implement an effective performance measurement, management and reporting system to monitor progress over time consistent with the PUD vision, mission, and strategic objectives. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commissioners were involved in the creation of the utility's Strategic Plan. The commission will annually lead discussion on further development, review and revision of the document. 2. Grant county PUD agrees with this recommendation and will look for opportunities to enhance strategic discussions. 3. Grant County PUD agrees with this recommendation. The utility currently tracks many of these trends and plans to incorporate them into the document. 4. Grant County PUD agrees with this recommendation. The utility will work to include meaningful metrics in the document by which to measure the organization's progress over time. 	<p>See response column</p>	<p>Dec. 2010</p>	<p>Board, GM, Mgt. Team</p>
<p>IV A Org</p>	<p>Grant County PUD should consider aligning its organizational structure with its key functions and combining financial, administrative and support services. It should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create separate organization units; Power Generation and Distribution with each having complete organizational responsibility for its activities. 2. Combine support services into an Administrative and Support Services organizational unit. 3. Consider creating a separate strategic planning function reporting directly to the General Manager and focusing on the long-term strategic issues of the PUD, including long-term power management issues. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grant County PUD will consider these recommendations moving forward as part of our current reorganization efforts. The utility is already operating to this capacity to some extent. Power Generation and Distribution operate as their own, separate organizations, lead by separate division directors. 2. Reorganization is a consideration when the utility experiences a change in management level personnel. Management continues to seek opportunities to find ways to manage more effectively. 3. Grant County PUD will consider this recommendation as the utility discusses reorganization opportunities. 	<p>1. & 2. Currently examining various organizational possibilities/combinations with final recommendations by May 30, 2011.</p> <p>3. Created a Financial Management Oversight Committee that will specifically review all long term capital expenditures.</p> <p>Updated the District's Strategic Plan with increased/improved measurables.</p> <p>Restructured the weekly Commission and Management Team meetings to spend more time focusing on long-term strategic challenges.</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Leads: Tim Culbertson, Chuck Berrie, Jim Bunch</p>



IV B Labor	<p>To reduce costs and improve operational effectiveness, Grant County PUD should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restructure the composition of its line crews from four linemen to three linemen when the nature of the work allows. 2. Work with the state Legislature to increase the threshold for Chapter 54.01.070 RCW. (See corresponding recommendations to the Legislature in Appendix B.) 3. Increase the number of District crews and replace contractor crews and District crews 4. Evaluate the use of overtime and take steps to reduce linemen overtime hours 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grant County PUD has various crew sizes based on the nature of the work and will further evaluate the composition of line crews and seek additional efficiencies. 2. Grant county PUD agrees that dollars could be saved if a legislative change to the threshold of Chapter 54.04.070 RCW was implemented. A change to state law would allow the utility to review best available options to complete work instead of relying on the hiring of contractor crews. 3. Grant County PUD will re-examine this area to be assured the utility optimizes its use of District crews within the limitation of state law. 4. Grant County PUD will continue to evaluate and reduce overtime hours when possible. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line crew composition has been and will continue to be assessed for efficiency in production and cost effectiveness. We use four men, three men, and even two men crews depending on the scope of the work. Adjustments are made when new equipment becomes available or safe work practices change. 3. We are only using dock crews on jobs that are required by Chapter 54.04.070RCW. All other work is being done by our own District crews. 4. Line Department has reduced almost all scheduled overtime, (excluding reimbursable overtime). Examples: changed work shifts to reduce overtime exposure, attempting to make temporary repairs until permanent repairs can be made on regular time, and evaluating overtime justification case by case. 	n/a	<p>Leads: Tony Webb, Andrew Munro</p> <p>POC: Gene Huberdeau</p>
IV B Labor	<p>Grant County PUD management should pursue increasing spans of control through organizational consolidation as management attrition occurs. Consideration should also be given to interdivisional and/or interdepartmental realignments to increase spans of control.</p>	<p>Grant County PUD appreciates the state's note that the utility is operating in line with span of control best practices. Grant County PUD will continue to include span of control when evaluating opportunities for organizational changes. Whenever there is a change in staff, the Management Team considers other options to have the work performed and opportunities to find ways to accomplish the work more effectively.</p>	<p>The organization has cut positions, avoided backfilling where possible, combined functions and focused on right-sizing.</p>	n/a	<p>Leads: Tim Culbertson, Chuck Berrie, Jim Bunch</p> <p>POCs: Directors</p>
IV B AM	<p>Grant County PUD should continue to aggressively pursue the development of a comprehensive, enterprise-wide asset management program. This would include all the asset management program elements described above.</p>	<p>Electric system staff is currently in the process of implementing a new asset management system that will meet the needs of the utility's transmission and distribution systems. Extensive reviews of various asset management systems were completed prior to the selection. The utility's current asset management solution for hydro system was not the recommended solution for transmission and distribution due to high costs and lack of fit for the needs of the electric system. The utility's Information Technology Steering Committee weighed the cost of having to support two systems and agreed that because of the differing needs of the electric system and hydro system, two asset management packages provided the best solution for the utility.</p>	<p>The construction management module and work management software from Cogsdale, along with the GIS project, will pave the way for system wide asset management. There is a lot of work yet ahead, but the foundation has been laid to get there. In addition, changes in warehousing procedures have provided more control and better accounting of materials.</p>	n/a	<p>Leads: Chuck Berrie, Jim Bunch, Michael Woywod</p> <p>POC: Craig Weddle</p>



IV C	<p>To assist with cost reviews, Grant County PUD should adopt policies to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change its request-for-proposals process to require that architectural and engineering firms' proposals include financial data on the actual pay rates of propose staff as well as accounting information supporting the overhead calculation. With this financial information, the District could then independently calculate and determine whether the fees proposed are reasonable (generally, a 10 percent profit is allowed). 2. After selecting the most highly qualified firm in accordance with state law (RCW 39.80.40), the District should review the fees proposed by the firm before negotiating or signing the contract. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grant County PUD recognizes this to be an area for improvement. The utility has been working to improve procurement, contracting and project management practices since 2008. The utility is currently reviewing and replacing all boilerplate contract forms and will consider this during that process. 2. Grant county PUD agrees with this recommendation. In 2010, all project managers will participate in negotiation training and project management training which has been tailored to the utility's needs. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The District is now requiring contractor proposed rates with all proposals. Rates are used in evaluation where allowed (not in engineering, architectural, surveying work per RCW), and are used as information to leverage negotiation of more competitive rates with firms for engineering work after selection of the most qualified firm. We are not requiring contractor's financial data on actual staff pay levels, but are taking an aggressive approach to negotiation of rates which is producing cost savings for the District. 2. We have implemented this suggestion fully and are aggressively negotiating rates before approving a contract. Negotiation training was held spring, 2010. The Project Management training program has been launched with the first beta class completed and future classes being scheduled for all Project Managers between now and may 31, 2011. 	Fall 2010	<p>Leads: Chuck Berrie, Mitch Delabarre, Kim Justice, Directors</p> <p>POCs: Craig Weddle, project/program managers</p>
IV C	<p>Grant County PUD should take the following actions to improve its contract change order practices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revise contract change order procedures to require an independent estimate of change order costs be prepared for contract change orders 2. Require detailed contractor proposals for both lump sum and time and material change order 3. Revise contract general conditions to allow labor costs for only employees who work directly on the change orders 4. Revise contract general conditions to exclude incidental charges to proposed wage rates 5. Revise contract general conditions to require detailed contractor proposals for change orders to be negotiated on a lump sum basis with details on proposed labor hours and labor categories, material and quantities, equipment and equipment hours 6. Establish procedures to ensure proposed labor rates are based on the contractor's actual cost for unemployment insurance 7. Perform a cost analysis of the contractor's 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grant County PUD agrees and this change has been made to our process. 2. Grant County PUD agrees and is modifying the contract language to require this additional information. 3. Grant County PUD agrees and is presently revising our contract forms 4. Grant County PUD agrees and is close to implementing this recommendation into our contract language. 5. Grant County PUD agrees and is implementing this recommendation. 6. Grant County PUD agrees and is including language to limit these costs as recommended in changes that are in process to our contract forms. 7. Grant County PUD agrees and will modify procedures 	<p>See response column</p> <p>Revised/updated responses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Engineering has made this change to their procedures. 7. Engineering has made this change to their procedures. 	Fall 2010	<p>Leads: Mitch Delebarre, Kim Justice, Michael Woywod</p> <p>POC: Craig Weddle</p>



	<p>purposed costs for both lump sum and time & material change orders</p> <p>8. Document the results of negotiation and the basis for determining the reasonableness of negotiated prices in a record of negotiation</p>	<p>to require this analysis once available when contract change orders are necessary</p> <p>8. Grant County PUD agrees and has already implemented this recommendation</p>			
IV D	<p>Grant county PUD should increase its inventory turnover by reducing of inventory levels and evaluating economic order quantities.</p>	<p>Grant County PUD will continue to evaluate and revise inventory levels. Based on this recommendation, the utility plans to reassess the need for two warehouses and will look at centralization of materials. We anticipate that we will find areas where economization is possible and we will work to implement new practices.</p>	See response column		<p>Lead: Michael Woywod</p> <p>POC: Craig Weddle</p>
	<p>Grant County PUD should institute a systematic approach to analyze all of its purchases not subject to competitive bids to identify opportunities for additional agreements or volume discounts, regardless of whether a purchase card was used.</p>	<p>Grant County PUD agrees with this recommendation but takes exception to the analysis of this issue. As noted in the report, the utility presently works with several vendors to obtain volume discounts, regardless of formal strategic alliances. The dollars included in this analysis reflect all items bid and quoted, as appropriate, within the utility's procedures and state law.</p>	See response column		<p>Leads: Jim Bunch, Michael Woywod</p> <p>POC: Craig Weddle</p>
IV E	<p>Grant County PUD should:</p> <p>1. Prepare an updated and complete financial forecast for its wholesale fiber optic program using the most current revenue and cost information available.</p> <p>2. Take steps to improve the economics of its wholesale fiber optic network program by:</p> <p>a. Pursuing all opportunities to secure stimulus funding, including opportunities that require legislative changes that would affect all PUDs in Washington</p> <p>b. Continually monitoring areas where fiber has been extended but the saturation is below Grant County PUD's desired target of 40 percent</p> <p>c. Improve communications to increase customer awareness of the availability and benefits of high speed Internet in those areas</p> <p>3. Re-evaluate District policy for extending the fiber optic network given the modified financial projections presented in this report.</p>	<p>1. Grant County PUD Commissioners will continue regular review and evaluation of the financial forecast for the fiber network.</p> <p>2a. The utility is currently working on an application to pursue stimulus funds and will review options for outside funding as appropriate/available.</p> <p>2b. Grant Count PUD agrees and staff has been providing regular updates to the board. Commissioners and staff will review fiber saturation rates by individual local area on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>2c. Grant County PUD agrees. The Board of Commissioners has previously expressed this concern and is reviewing the current communication strategy for the fiber optic network.</p> <p>3. In 2008, Grant County PUD established guidelines for further development of the fiber system. The plan requires the system to satisfy the Commission's goal that revenues should meet or exceed the operation and</p>	<p>Staff continues to provide quarterly updates to the Commission.</p> <p>2a Application for stimulus funds was unsuccessful.</p> <p>2b See response column</p> <p>2c See response column</p> <p>3. Staff is researching the possible deployment of Wireless Internet Service Offering in areas of Grant County where Fiber to the Home costs are very expensive. We are also reviewing the possibility of reading Irrigation Metering "Circles" as an additional use of the Wireless Internet Infrastructure. Staff continues to provide quarterly Commission updates</p>	<p>n/a</p> <p>Mar 2010</p> <p>n/a</p> <p>n/a</p> <p>n/a</p>	<p>Lead: Tony Webb</p> <p>POC: Warren Miller</p> <p>Leads: Tony Webb, Michael Woywod</p> <p>POCs: Warren Miller, Sarah Morford</p>



		<p>maintenance expenses plus depreciation of newly installed fiber and electronics. Commissioners review network financials on a quarterly basis and approve further build-out on an annual basis, as they have in the past three years.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--