Which statement best reflects your current thinking?	Use this space if you wish to expand on your answer choice:	Want FTTH Internet for same or less $?	Current Internet Satisfaction
Sole ISP	You guy's have a great track record for quality customer centric services. The more you take charge of the the better off I'll be	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	wish there was a choice that read: i want the city of palo alto to have the system they know they can maintain as well as they maintain all the systems they currently have in place. and i want them to be able to do so in the manner they feel is best. not some manner they think will some how appease the common citizen. if the city managers think they can handle providing service AND handle the relationship of other providers in the city and ALL the nuances associated with having to deal with other providers than i would change my answer to #2. My concern is that when cities and more importantly citizens think up and insist on employing ever 'optimal idea' (like capturing 'extra' income from other providers) the result is disappointment and failure. Bottom Line: just charge us what we have to pay inorder for the system to work and work well, or don't do it at all. Thanks	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	This option works as long as you're a full service ISP. Palo Alto has some very technical people in it and they'll likely want choices about parts of their service is done by the ISP and what they do themselves. Here are some of the services I'm referring to: 1) ISP email server or Customer email server 2) ISP web sites or Customer web sites 3) ISP Domain Name Serivce 4) Customers with fixed IP addresses 5) Customers with more than one IP address 6) Customers with routers with NAT and Firewalls The case I want to avoid is Palo Alto choosing to be the ISP but only provice a simple service.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	there may be come cost and revenue issues which could dictate a different option such as #2 or #3. I would be happy with any of the 3 options. I am not expert enough to know which of the 3 options would be financially the most viable. I do think that financial viability should be an important consideration.	Very interested	2
Sole ISP	The loss of our home-grown cable company with the concomitant degradation in service has convinced me that a public utility can do a better job in this kind of situation than private providers.	Very Excited	4
Sole ISP	The City of PA has in my view an excellent record of providing services to its customers and even though I prefer private companies to compete in providing such services usually the City has proved to be it is more than capable of providing services at competitive prices - keep it up!	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	The City has shown it can be very efficient and repsonsible with other services, like electric power. I believe this is a technology the city could expand on in the future, and will need control to be able to do so. Adding other suppliers is always a decision that can be made later.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	That way there is problem, there is one source of contact. Now if I have a problem, my ISP contacts the DSL provider, who contacts pacbell and so on. This is A MAJOR hassle.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	Remember electricity deregulation? That didn't work. Next they tried telecom deregulation and look how that turned out for companies like Worldcom.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	Really, either choice 1 or 2 is fine. Commercial ISPs are unreliable. Palo Alto Utilities are terrific; I'm sure they can do an excellent job.	Very Excited	5
Sole ISP	Previous experience with a bankrupt SP believe the issue was ownership & accountability.	Very Excited	4
Sole ISP	Palo Alto Utilities have managed other utilities very well, and I feel they can do this.	Very interested	2
Sole ISP	palo alto power professionals will do it better, and in the long run cheaper than outsourcing this	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	Palo Alto City is best positioned to act in the interests of the community. With focus on service rather than business profits I believe that the City of Palo Alto Utilities will have greatest success as the sole ISP with discretion to sub-contracts services as necessary.	Very Excited	1

Sole ISP	Own the service. Make it work, well. Too many service providers are here today, gone tomorrow, and the grief it causes customers is large. The City will be here tomorrow and stability is much sought after by business, home business, and casual browser.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	Our utility rates are lower than PG&E because PA operates its own service. I was much happier with the cable coop than I am with AT&T. I'm assuming that the FTTH service provided by PA would be superior to and less expensive than that provided by commercials entities.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	Number 2 is also acceptable to me. Number 3 is not appealing to me	Very interested	3
Sole ISP	No more mediacity, ispchannel fiascos, please. If the city paid to construct the FTTH network, why should private firms profit from its use by charging PA residents?'	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	My current ISP is Prodigy Internet. I only use it for accessing the network. I do not use any of their 'frills', such as chat rooms. I only use a 56K modem; my connection speed is always at 49.2kb. I have no complaints with their service; they have never gone down. BUT, it is not high-speed. With Palo Alto as the sole provider, the cost to the users should be lower, with simplified billing, no extra access-fees, and no fancy portal hopefully. Just a way-station, not a destination. Keep it simple.	Very Excited	4
Sole ISP	In my view, the most fundamental reason for the City to act as the only service provider is that its goals would be as closely aligned as possible with the interests of Palo Alto residents. Commercial providers would be serving diverse constituencies instead, such as Wall Street, speculators, Sacramento politicians, etc., etc. Although an argument could be made that the absence of competition would result in higher service prices, my belief is that the most important issue is the quality of service, especially after horrendous experiences with 'established' providers such as Pac Bell phone and DSL, ATT Cable, and Sprint wireless. Since their business does not depend on our community they have easily afforded to ignore our dissatisfaction, and I would hope we remove ourselves from such situations by being self managed. In practice, their size has done nothing to bring administrative efficiencies that have resulted in better service or lower prices. The case of cable TV is a clear example of pricing running way ahead of value. Isn't Palo Alto's experience with running its own	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	In an ideal world this would be the option I would prefer. However after seeing all the problems that this approach caused with the cable TV service, I would be happy as long as the service was fast, reliable, and well priced.	Very interested	2
Sole ISP	In a way I don't care which way the FTTH is operated. The important things are that the network is cost competive, properly maintained and reliable, and billing is straight forward. My choice is based on the believe of having a single responsible party for all the network to avoid business complications.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	I'm sure you're having fun with this one... :) My 2c: I think in the long run (although I'm usually for free enterprise) that this could provide people with the most reliable, stable system with the lowest monthly rates. This also has higher up front costs and risks but removes the finger pointing problems. I'm sure over the last couple of years you have gained a great deal of experience in this area and it would be interesting to see a poll of customer satisfaction so far over time (hopefully increasing and high). I also believe the slow approach is correct because of the experience gained. P.S. As an interesting note to this in responding to your question my PBI dsl line went down again.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	I'm only interested in this approach as an alternative to the existing low-quality solutions. If the City is merely going to act as a layer of management to push through the existing solutions, I'd rather deal directly with PacBell.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	I'm no expert, but this may be difficult to start up since the customer base may initially be small. Therefore, I would assume that at the beginning, the city would be allowed to sub-contract out certain ISP functions or all functions until critical mass was there to do it all in-house.	Sounds interesting	2
Sole ISP	I'm afraid that otherwise ATT or some other company will take over leaving us with an intractible mess like we now have with cable TV	Sounds interesting	3

Sole ISP	Ignoring the legal issues, it is clear that if the City starts by offering other options it would be difficult to later withdraw them, while if the City starts by being the exclusive ISP and that turns out to be undesirable, it would be fairly easy (politically) to change to allow others. So why not see if people would be happy with the City offering the whole service? It would be desirable to have a dialup alternate included in the basic rate that could be used when outside the City (like when on a business trip).	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	If we can afford this, it is the best option.	Very Excited	5
Sole ISP	I'd prefer one reliable ISP for years to come. No 'out of business', no switching.	Very interested	3
Sole ISP	I would prefer this option, as it would give one central place for users to go for service and service questions/problems. If this were to be the option chosen though, I would expect the City to provide a total ISP infrastructure that would include not only access, but complete NewsNet service and other service provided by traditional ISPs.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	I would prefer option 1, but 2 would be ok also.	Sounds interesting	2
Sole ISP	I would make it a universal charge, like the monthly sewer charge - whether people use it or not. That way it would be accessible to everyone and cost the least. Big pipe needed, though....	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	I would like the city to provide IP 'dial tone'. Perhaps having some vetted full service ISP's to point folks to (sort of like choice 2 but with less direct involvment) would make sense but basically a no frills service is my preference.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	I want to buy ISP service from the City because the City is a stable, dependable provider which is already in the business of providing essential services. Commercial ISPs are not in the business of providing essential services, they are in the business of milking their customers for short-term gain. Last year only one of my friends had the same ISP at the end of the year as at the beginning. They had been traded like baseball cards, the ISPs had gone bankrupt, the terms of service had changed in unnacceptable ways. This all wastes incredible amounts of time and money. ISP service is as essential to me as power and phone. No commerical ISP is prepared to provide that kind of service to residential or small business customers. I'd prefer to have the City as the sole ISP. I'd be OK with them selling capacity to other ISPs. If the City was not one of the ISPs my level of interest in the fiber connection would go down significantly.	Very Excited	1
Sole ISP	i want a one stop solution. if i have a billing or performance issue, i don't want any other vendor to point fingers.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	I trust the city to provide quality service at a good price, whereas a for-profit company may be more concerned about its executive compensation and shareholders than its customers.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	I think Palo Alto should add Internet/TV and even possibly phone services as a municpal service. I don't underestimate the difficulty of this task and it would take a city referendum to know if you have the support of the residents. Cable Co-op partially failed because it thought it would have a greater penetration of the residents. You need to build resident support because in a few years you will compete with AT&T who will try to offer the same services - but NOT with fiber.	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	I make my choice with little knowledge of what the chioces entail. I would prefer to have some control as a citizen over the process and that is why I made the choice I did. I also made some criticism to the survey (but maybe it was another one) that I never got a response to.	Sounds interesting	2
Sole ISP	I have had it with one ISP going under after another. Also, I don't trust them with their 'agreements' with 'partners'. MOVE ON DOING THIS FAST......	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	I don't have all the information to be 100% convinced of this, however, the model of the services supplied by Palo Alto Utilities has been a good one.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	I am really concerned about quality and consistency of service. If the City is the only provider, it stands a better chance of having the financial incentives and returns to make the kind of investments that will bring us such quality.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	I am assuming that the service would not be very much more costly than the other options but I would be willing to pay a reasonable premium for my choice.	Very Excited	3

Sole ISP	However I realize that it might be cost prohibitive to have the city do it all. The other option that appeals to me is #4, but it seems to me that it is extremely hard to find a company that will hold true keeping costs down and providing a reliable service.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	Having the city act as the sole ISP on its network probably makes the best sense. This allows control over tradeoffs between price and service(speed/quality). This allows Palo Alto to differentiate itself-- and control its future in a volatile market with lots of failed competitive ISPs-- in this smaller captive city-wide market with limited near term revenue potential.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	Does #1 mean Palo Alto would not allow other fiber optic service providers? #2 seems to infer there would be other providers using the same network. I would choose either #1 or #2 depending on the cost. I currently have DSL with Pacific Bell; I would hope the fiber optic service run by the city of Palo Alto would be much preferred; but look at what happened by not supporting the Cable Co-op and reverting now to AT&T which is the pits - I quit them to go to Direct TV. But next year I plan to purchase a new aerial for my roof and watch only what that brings to my house. Thanks,	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	Definitely not No. 3	Very Excited	3
Sole ISP	Can control service better and be directly responsible to residents-unlike ATT cable broadband that I hope hope you replace. I hope I will be one of the first.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	As a senior on a fixed income, cost is always a concern. However, PAMU has always provide us with good service and been resonsive to our needs, so why not make it a part of PAMU, on a as needed basis.	Very interested	2
Sole ISP	A single service provider would help to acheive economies of scale. If this single provider were a commercial provider, these economies might not be passed on to the subscriber.	Very Excited	2
Sole ISP	The City's first responsibility should be to maintain the physical fiber network and charge ISPs (be them City owned or outside) access fees suitable to pay for the physical network's maintenance and to pay off the network's installation costs over a suitable time frame (ten years?). The City should only offer ISP services if it can secure an affordable access deal with a Teir 2 or 3 service provider and offer reasonable priceing to FTTH customers. If it is determined that paying for the highspeed connectivity to a tier 2 or 3 network requires a significant portion of the availible FTTH customer base then the City should be the sole ISP. Ofcourse the service should be reasonably priced otherwise few will adopt it. An ISP is not necessary and would add both financial costs and technical complications. Most ISP don't have the bandwidth to service a high-speed fibernet anyway. The City should treat the purchase of bandwidth from a Tier 2 or Tier3 provider the same way it treats it's power and water purchases from the providers of those utilities. Residents who choose to use FTTH will most likely be techno savy anyway so they won't need much mo	Very interested	3
One of many ISPs	With the CPAU offering ISP services alongside other ISPs, consumers have the greatest choice, and competition among providers will bring low prices and better service to consumers. Besides, I have a hunch that the CPAU would eventually do a better job than most commercial providers, and make money at it too.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	what matters most is that the service be	Very interested	
One of many ISPs	Were the city to provide the service, I would opt for it rather than other providers. However, I suppose not everyone would be so inclined. My many years of experience as a homeowner with the city-owned utilities suggest that the city can either match or do a better job than external providers.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	We have had too much bad experience with AT&T and other ISP's to no have the city as a backup. I would not mind if you subcontracted out the ISP service, but I don't ever want to hear that we can't get the service we want because the FCC and the ISP etc. are not responsible to us, as City users.	Very Excited	4
One of many ISPs	to maintain competitions that might lead to better service and lower fees. good for the consumers.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	This will give flexibility, provide healthy competition, and assure at least one straightforward option	Very interested	3

One of many ISPs	There are a couple of things at issue here. First, I am a firm believer in municipally owned and operated services, rather than being at the mercy of a distant profit-oriented organization that Just Doesn't Care (e.g., PG&E, Pac Bell, AT&T Broadband,...). So having the City own and run the service should make it both more reliable and cheaper. At least I hope so. But there are transition issues. My corporate/personal web site is hosted by Verio. My wife's (shared) DSL comes from Earthlink, and her email is at Earthlink/Mindspring. Changing addresses or web/domain hosting might be a hassle, so being able to do things step by step is useful. Less important is the issue of traveling and access to accounts. With Earthlink, there are dial in POPs throughout the US & Canada, so, if one does not have someone else's connection to go through (for telnet access, for example), relying on FTTH as the _only_ way to get into the Net can be problematical. Fortunately, we don't travel that much, so this is a lower order concern at this time.	Very interested	3
One of many ISPs	The other options 1 and 3 would be acceptable as well.	Very interested	3
One of many ISPs	The key thing is: 4. to get good, reliable, well-priced service soon. I need time to reflect before I form a strong opinion on the best way of doing this. Probably option 2, maybe option 1.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	The important issue for me is choice. Beyond the direct fiber service, I want to have some choices, in case some ISP is unreliable or oo expensive, or doesn't have the options I want, or...	Very interested	3
One of many ISPs	The city should work with outside providers,but keep control of the product. Outs side providers can supply the most current technology, and use this as a good PR for their company. Palo Alto would be a 'Feather' in the hat of any company to offer such a service	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	The city should not compete with the other internet service providers by offering any sort of complex ISP services. The city should only offer VERY BASIC service: it connects users to the internet. The user then uses existing internet resources for mail, web site hosting, news feeds, etc. If someone wants more service, then they go to other internet service providers. The other ISP's may pay to be listed as an alternative to the basic city services, with the consumer paying for the line, or the ISP could collect the line fees to make a single billing; I don't care which.	Very Excited	
One of many ISPs	The City has shown it can operate a public utility in an efficient, economical fashion. I would be interested in a service managed by the City that combined data, phone, and cable tv. But the City can't be all things to all people. Even though it would increase the complexity of managing the network, I think other service providers should have the opportunity to offer their plans along with the City. It might be illegal to exclude other vendors.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	The city could use the income from other companies, and I believe in giving people choice. I would most likely buy my ISP service from the city, because I've been happy with the service I get from Palo Alto Utilities. In contrast, I've been pretty unhappy with private ISPs!	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	The charge to other ISP's to access the PA network should establish and maintain a reserve fund to continually upgrade the network and keep costs down to the Palo Alto end users.	Very interested	
One of many ISPs	The Cable Co-Op was poorly run and had the worst market share of any cable company in the US, and has left a legacy of poor cable modem internet access in Palo Alto! Market forces are a powerful way to assure that the product being delivered has good value, and should be allowed to work. However, the internet access offered by cable companies and ILEC telephoe companies in other parts of the country (and even the county, for that matter) are skewed towards 'couch potato' information consumers, with low uplink bandwidth, which is terrible for telecommuting, video conferencing, operation of servers at home, and innovation in general. Furthermore, their restrictive terms of service, prohibiting use of non-Microsoft systems (Qwest after Microsoft became a partner in their DSL service), prohibiting the use of more than one computer in the home (one cable industry magazine even called people with home NAT routers such as those made by Linksys, SMC, D-Link, NetGear, etc. 'pirates' for having more than one computer) serve to stifle innovation and again to turn those who would otherwise be prod	Very Excited	5

One of many ISPs	Thank you for asking my opinion. Of course, it depends on economics. I think the City provides good service (utilities) and I assume it would provide good service for this also. I was never a Palo Alto cable subscriber so I don't know what on there... Maybe some lessons have been learnt from that experience. I would not mind the City being the sole provider if it were economically feasible. Otherwise, opening unused capacity to other providers as well might provide additional revenue and make the service cheaper for everybody.	Sounds interesting	
One of many ISPs	Option 3 would be just as acceptable to me. I think it is very important that the city not establish a monopoly over thic service channel. If the City chooses to go into service provision as distinct from providing capacity it is essential that there be a competitive offering to be sure that the city is constantly tuned in to the changing technologies and economics in this dynamic market.	Very interested	2
One of many ISPs	Option 2 gives me competitive services incase the City is unable to fulfill its promises. Option 3 isn't any better than I have now. Option 1 could work, if the City really proves to be cheaper and more reliable. I have more difficulty in reconnecting to a competitor, if Option 1 doesn't work out.	Very interested	4
One of many ISPs	My feelings are a bit mixed on this issue. I have a strong feeling toward mode 1. I would like to hope that Palo Alto would deliver internet service in the same strong mode as they deliver other utilities. If I were absolutely certain of that, there would be no question. The reason I have a little doubt is the cable-coop experience. I am not sure that the city of Palo Alto had full and direct responsibility for Cable-coop, but in the end it went under. I selected option 2 because I felt that it left room to have option 1 anyway, but left room for others to contribute if they had anything worthwhile. I kind of felt that in the end we might get option 1 by default.	Very interested	4
One of many ISPs	My answer is my opinion based on the limited information I have. If there is a strong reason why the City should be the sole provider, or the City should not be a provider at all, that could change my response.	Very interested	2
One of many ISPs	Maximum choice makes sense to me as a consumer. I want the city involved because it has a different set of constraints that we as citizens can influence.	Very Excited	4
One of many ISPs	Like the DSL model and not like the cable company model...	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	It would be good for the City to provide basic services (like email), but still give people a choice. The problem I see with many companies that provide Internet service is that they tend to go out of business. :-(Also, it would be nice to have only a single billing. I'm using PacBell to provide DSL and as my ISP and all charges are part of my phone bill which is convenient.	Sounds interesting	4
One of many ISPs	It would be constructive if the city was involved to maintain a competitive balance with third party providers. However, I suspect it may not prove economic for the city to support the infrastructure necessary for its own service (too small a customer base), meaning that utilizing all third party providers could be the ultimate answer.	Very Excited	4
One of many ISPs	It seems to me that having other companies access the FTTH network could provide a back-up if the city's network were to go down. If my assumption is incorrect, then I would choose option #1. I see no benefit either to the city or to residents in option #3.	Very Excited	4
One of many ISPs	It is very important that the city own an ISP, so that the people (in the form of the city) will own the 'company' that serves them. If the city were not to operate an ISP, we would be at the mercy of profit-driven companies like AT&T, etc., who would be unresponsive to the citizen's needs if profit were at stake. In addition, I would much rather pay money to the city than some greedy corporation, even if it cost more. Also, it is great to have these corporations pay to offer services through our network (which they will, as soon as it is widespread), because it provides the fiber utility with another source of revenue and gives the city some leverage with these companies. (Converseley, it would be foolish to sell the fiber network to a company, as I hope we have all learned from the sale of our own cable co-op to AT&T.) However, though the city should act as an ISP, I think it would be a mistake to have only a city owned ISP on the network, as there are other people who prefer the brand name providers, and they might decide not to hook up to the FTTH network if they could not choose their favorite brand-name ISP.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	It is never best to have a monopoly if it is feasible to do otherwise.	Very Excited	1

One of many ISPs	It is important to have choices for service providers. I wish there was a choice for providers for services like utilities and garbage collection.	Very interested	3
One of many ISPs	It is important that there be an alternative to a poorly run Internet service provider having a monopoly on service via the fiber. Experience suggests that competition in the only way to stand a chance that good service will be available.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	It is important that the City act as a service provider (options 1 or 2). I would support any option, but think it prudent that other companies also be allowed to provide services.	Very Excited	1
One of many ISPs	I'm tempted to answer '4', but I suspect '2' is the best way to answer '4', so that's my selection.	Very interested	2
One of many ISPs	If the cost charged of the other internet providers is used to help pay for the costs of the system. It is understood the system would be fast and reliable.	Very interested	2
One of many ISPs	If the City is not a service provider, eventually there will be only one service provider. As experience with similar technologies (telephone, cable TV) demonstrates, that company will be large and indifferent to individual customers. Using the City of Palo Alto Utilities as a model, I would expect a service operation provided by the City to recognize that customers are its business.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	If more than just internet access is planned then I'd want one place to go for billing, support, service. That implies that I could choose to do everything through CPAU. Allowing other ISPs to access the network would be a nice bonus for those that have a preference.	Very Excited	4
One of many ISPs	I would use this option to ensure competitive rates to users. Once these have been established, the City could 'get out of the business' if it wanted to. The fiber has enough bandwidth to support any number of providers that want to compete for customers.	Very interested	4
One of many ISPs	i would rank order the choices, in order of most favorite to least: 2, 1, 3	Sounds interesting	3
One of many ISPs	I would like to see the city succeed in providing the service and would give them a chance, but would like to have other options if I am not satisfied with the service.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	I would like to have an alternative to the giant companies and trust the CPAU, but a choice of service providers is always better.	Sounds interesting	4
One of many ISPs	I would like to get my service from the city. However, it would be nice to be able to get other ISPs in case the city doesn't figure out how to provide the relevant services. My requirements would be: - Get a fixed IP address - Have the city provide backup DNS service - Do reverse mapping from my fixed address to my domain.	Sounds interesting	5
One of many ISPs	I would like the city to provide basic reliable high-speed cost-effective Internet connectivity. No need to also offer email boxes, web pages, etc. Yahoo or MSN and others do that fine. Access to the service by other providers is acceptable, but I do not trust their staying power. We can do without another PG&E or NorthPoint fiasco.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	I would have answered #4, except that our experience with ATT had been so miserable. I think providing options is the key, but I do have concerns that other providers cut fees below costs, drive the City to conclude that the service is unprofitable, then go out of business. By the way - cost is not my primary concern. Reliability is. CPA does a great job on it's other utilities - both from a cost and service viewpoint - so I have confidence this will work out as well.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	I would expect the City to provide no-frills reliable, competitively priced internet access - maybe not even providing email services (not sure about that). If other ISP's could make a business offering more services and charging more (or the same) then great.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	I would expect that the City of Palo Alto would have very good service and would probably be better than any other. But, I would not like to be limited to one choice just in case Palo Alto's system was not the best.	Very Excited	2

One of many ISPs	I think this whole idea is interesting, but I'm not positive the city should be involved in an area where the technology is changing so fast. I'll bet that wireless will be the best method for high speed internet connection in the future, especially for people and businesses like me that use only notebook or handheld computers. I don't use broadband or DSL now and have no plans to do so in the future (unless Palo Alto offers a far cheaper and more reliable plan than the ones currently available).	Sounds interesting	3
One of many ISPs	I think this way people with limited funds would still have the access to the network, and those who can afford higher price, would get better service and additional services provided by private companies. Also, if for some reason those companies will fail on Palo Alto market, the residents would still have a backup plan in the face of the Utilities.	Very Excited	1
One of many ISPs	I think that more options mean happier customers.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	I think that allowing other service providers on the network would help Palo Alto amortize the costs quicker, and make it more appealing to users. I am assuming that other ISPs pay some charge to Palo Alto	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	I think most people would like to flexibility of staying with or selecting their on ISP. The city could do what PacBell and others do, offer a discount to those who use the cities ISP.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	I think most of the arguments about corporations being more efficient in terms of cost no longer apply if we assume the city is building and maintaining the hardware, therefor 3 doesn't make sense because it would allow non-city ISP's to make money with almost no capital investment or risk. Choice 1 might be all right (especially when viewed through the lens of Cable Co-op vs. AT&T), but choice 2 seems to offer the most choice with the best gaurantee of a basic quality service.	Very Excited	4
One of many ISPs	I propose alternative choices in the event that the cities offering is not as good as that provided by third parties. my first choice, however, would be to try the cities' service and to support the city if it had a competitive or superior product.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	I prefer #2, but #4 is ok also. The key is to allow multiple choices, if possible. Maybe having a well run local ISP company like sonic.net as one of the choices.	Very Excited	4
One of many ISPs	I like having the City as one of the players, as it was with Cable Coop before the ATT takeover. CC was much more responsive to customers than ATT.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	I had difficulty choosing this choice and #4. I think if the city is involved, it will help provide a stronger voice in assuring reliable and quality and community oriented service. I'm uncomfortable with poor quality of service from the telecom giants.	Very Excited	
One of many ISPs	I don't want to be locked into a single service provider, as was the case when Cable Co-op sold out to AT&T.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	i don't think the city needs to be in this business other than to help launch it and eventually leave it to the 'experts'	Sounds interesting	3
One of many ISPs	I don't know if I like the idea of a government ISP, and I think that if CPAU entered into the business, I'd like some choice of other ISPs for competitive reasons.	Sounds interesting	4
One of many ISPs	I don't know how complex the ISP task is and whether some users may want special services from an ISP. The city should provide at least basic ISP services, if not all.ISP services.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	I currently have DSL with SBC (PacBell). The cost is $49.95 per month. Service is excellent. For me to switch, I'd need some motivation such as a cost of less than $40. Also, I presume I would loose my email address, which is a negative. On another issue, I question whether it make sense for the City to venture into a project like this with high capital costs in a field where the technolgy is changing rapidly. This is not like owning the local electrical system.	Very interested	4
One of many ISPs	I believe that this option would be the most flexible. I have been very satisfied with city owning its own utilities and running them in a very effective manner for the residents. The problems with cable TV in Palo Alto illustrates why I believe that a 'citizen managed' facility is best. (i.e., we can vote out the elected officials that oversee the FTTH or utilities, if we are unhappy with how they are providing service.) I would vote to continue this trend in the FTTH network. However, if it financially sound, the allowing access to other providers would insure flexibility to all citizens as well as ensure that the city provider is providing competive service.	Very Excited	3

One of many ISPs	I answer in this way because it will hopefully keep a competitive environment for the best possible service at the lowest cost.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	I am not sure that I am qualified to answer the question on the basis of what I know. I would prefer to have CoPA manage or oversee it in some manner. I am not too happy with what AT&T is doing on the cable network.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	I am not a technical expert on FTTH. Thus I do not have enough knowledge on judging the difference of the three options. From the point of an user, I do not think that option 3 is really a good idea. Only a charging agent won't make any difference. Option 1 might be hardware costly and hard to maintenance because the user group is limited. Option 2 might be the best choice if the city can make a good deal with a reliable company.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	Fundamentally, the base service for the CPAU's Information Utility should comprise: a) Local network access, 2) Internet Access and 3) A city based email address. This is similar to operating a corporate network (and the local roads model). I believe that our electricity model works well and could be applied to Internet access. The CPAU could aggregate the bandwidth needs for most people while allowing (perhaps more commercial or motivated) people to find/use a private ISP for access. In this case the CPAU would provide a competitive base for service and pricing that would set the standard for alternate providers. The CPAU could also contract with several ISPs for access traffic and allow any resident a preference or random choice of ISP, much the way that long distance phone service is provisioned. I do *not* think that the city should simply ask everyone to find their own ISP and get access - that does not sufficiently provide the convenience of a utility. I am willing to help extensively to get this right for us - so please continue to call upon me whenever I can be of service.	Very Excited	5
One of many ISPs	Due to the present surplus of broadband capacity (in general, not necessarily the same as availability of connection)I expect to see provider consolidation and rate increases. Most broadband services have yet to deliver really mature consistency in performance and quality. Dealing with any comms provider these days is a circus. If the City can manage to create a scenario in which it ensures at least two providers (one being the City, which one hopes would be accountable, good at communication with customers, and proffer state-of-the art service at competitive to advantageous prices), it would I think significantly benefit Palo Alto customers. More people will subscribe when the hassles and disappointments are improved upon.	Very interested	3
One of many ISPs	Different providers offer different options so I'd hate to see a monopoly, even by the city. However, I suspect that the city would do a better job than most providers (:-)	Sounds interesting	4
One of many ISPs	Compition is always good.	Very Excited	5
One of many ISPs	Competition and versatility is good.	Sounds interesting	3
One of many ISPs	City of PA services have been good in the past, but this is anew area so I am concerned that the service level be high. If it is then I would perfer to use PA.	Very Excited	1
One of many ISPs	Choice and competition are always desirable, but more importantly different providers may develop different plans for different types of users, and that would be the best scenario.	Very interested	4
One of many ISPs	CHOICE #1 IS ALSO ACCEPTABLE	Very interested	1
One of many ISPs	Cable servie declined as soon as the city (through cable co-op) sold cable to AT&T. For this reason I think the city should be a provider	Very interested	2
One of many ISPs	Based on the experience of Cable Co-op, I do not recommend city to get in the business of providing service exclusively. However, City should keep the option of using the network for channeling other services to the residents through the pipes in the future. Remember, it is just the begining of the information age.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	As the country moved into the electric age a hundred years ago, the Palo Alto City fathers took the risk to implement city-owned and managed utilities. This has been a huge success financially and service-wise. Palo Alto should be thinking about the next big utility break thorough which will probably be soemthing like FTTH. Palo Alto should get on board now and make a market for these services. We need this forward looking thinking to keep Palo Alto in the forefront of cities in the next century.	Very Excited	2
One of many ISPs	Any option is fine with me.	Very Excited	4

One of many ISPs	A variety of options seems like it would be healthy. All else being equal, I would choose to use the service provided by the City.	Very interested	2
One of many ISPs	A little competition can't hurt, and might inspire other ISPs to come up with ideas. Also, some people are hooked on AOL and MSN, and would not easily switch. However, 1. would be acceptable. I would not want 3.	Very Excited	3
One of many ISPs	2 is preferred as long as it does not cost too much for the city to manage.	Very Excited	4
One of many ISPs	#2 will allow subscribers maximum choice, and create incentives for lower cost and improved customer service. Final point: if this program goes forward, spend the money to hire an expert from the telecom industry to run the FTTH. Lots of companies have tried and failed at this, it's worth spending the money to have an experienced hand.	Very interested	
One of many ISPs	I would like P.A. to build the infrastructure and to provide a service. If you wish to open the cables up to other service providers for a fee to subsidize the P.A. City owned service then that is reasonable as long as the access and overhead these other service providers consume does not take any precedence over the city owned and operated services. And the city operations must commit to maintaining state of the art cutting edge services. We also must commit to a serious personal privacy policy that keeps big brother out of our network. Also if the city is to do all this work I want some long term commitment in terms of LAWS which will prevent future administrations and committees from selling the tax payer built infrastructure and services to a private corporation such as the damn Cable-coop sale to AT&T fiasco.	Sounds interesting	4
ISP access only	would prefer competition	Very interested	3
ISP access only	Urge PA cut medium length (3-5 yrs) contract for service.	Very interested	2
ISP access only	There are lots of internet service providers with well established infrastructures. It would be a profound waste of time and energy for the city to reproduce this.	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	There are a number of companies in a much better position than the City of PA to deliver this service to residential end users on a timely basis. The City of PA has spent at least 3 years evaluating how to approach FTTH. In that same amount of time RCN has wired a number of communities in the Bay Area from scratch and is now offering two phone lines, expanded digital Cable TV, and 3 mbps internet in a bundled package for about $150/month with no installation fee and no long term contracts. Other cable companies, including AT&T, are upgrading old systems to offer similar services. Since last December I have been an RCN customer at my small office in San Francisco and the service has been outstanding and reliable. I have friends in San Mateo who have similar experience with RCN. I am sure RCN is not the only firm ready to step in to compete with AT&T and Pac Bell. By the time the City of PA got this thing going on a large scale I am 100% certain that they will be faced with extreme pricing pressure from other broadband options including wireless neighborhood networks. The City should only	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	The service should be fast, reliable and competitively priced. Competition is good.	Very Excited	2
ISP access only	The reason that the City should own the infrastructure (fiber plant) is that that is a natural monopoly, which would suffer, rather than benefit from competition. I do not trust a commercial entity with that monopoly, and I am confident that the City can do a fine job. But the service offerings are naturally competitive. The barrier to entry is very much lower than the for the physical plant, and the role of innovation much greater. The City does not have a special attractiveness in terms of the quality it could offer in terms of services, but it would likely be in a position of unfair advantage over other players. Also, this is a very risky business and seems like an over-extension of the City's involvement. So it would be best to leave this area to others. It would be advantageous for all, however, if some arrangement could be made for all of the ISP participants to pool their bandwidth requirements. Perhaps the City could act as a consolidator of bandwidth, as a sort of non-content-oriented extension of the infrastructure role.	Very Excited	5
ISP access only	The problem with the city running something, the politicians get into the act and fund social programs that make these recipians life time dependents. For example the utilities were very reasonable, now the monthly utility bill is very expensive.	Very interested	2

ISP access only	The PA Cable Coop experience would indicate that municipal governments may or may not be equipped to compete in providing services prone to technology discontinuties and rapidly changing demands. By focusing on providing the infrastructure only, the City will be able to focus on what it does well and allow other, commercial, partners to focus on what they do well.	Very Excited	5
ISP access only	The margins in communication are so slim, and need for higher speed so unending, i do not see how the city can make choices 1 or 2 be profitable on the long term. Choice 3 is the only one that i can envision providing the city with positive income. It will be small, but at least positive. The others are bottomless investment pits.	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	The complexity of both building out the network and providing internet service seem high. To be successful, the city should focus on simply building out the network and leave the headache of providing service to someone else	Very Excited	5
ISP access only	The city should stay out of the ISP space. This is a tough business and should be avoided. I would give a single vendor a monopoly on the PA market and make them pay hefty fees for the privilege.	Very interested	3
ISP access only	The City should not be in the ISP business, which consumes a large amount of resources and training of personnel, etc. However, it should broker between residents and outside ISPs to guarantee a choice of high quality services.	Very interested	4
ISP access only	The City should never get engaged in technology management business. City is nothing more than the representative of its population and the manager of several low-level functions which may be developed and maintained by local expertise. With technology it's different, the CIty may run a risk of becoming a bottleneck in providing for its population the access to the ever-evolving technology innovations. kenA	Sounds interesting	3
ISP access only	The city should get the highest return on investment, and I would assume that can best be done in option 3. My concern in options 1 and 2 would simply be that PA does not have the scale to provide this service as efficiently as other ISPs, nor do I think it should be the city's business.	Very interested	4
ISP access only	The City should capitalize the infrastructure costs and recover it via access fees from ISP's. Running an ISP is dramatically different from running a municipality and we don't need any more highly-compensated employees on the City Payroll. You should look into SkyPilot's offerings. SkyPilot can provide broadband capacity via wireless receivers (mounted on the rooftops of City buildings, homes, etc.). This is a much cheaper solution to implement than laying fiber cables to every home. It also has the benefit of NOT inconveniencing all the residents and businesses with torn-up roads, etc. If you'd like more info, let me know and I can arrange a meeting with the CEO of SkyPilot for you to explore this alternative. Thanks, PS. These email comm channels are excellent for those of us who cannot make the Town Hall meetings, etc.	Very Excited	2
ISP access only	The basic, and most important, reason is to avoid having to change long established email addresses and web sites associated with one's current ISP, in my case Earthlink.net. However, I recognize the need to make this a profitable service, so some form of surcharge or other income generating means needs to be established. I for one would be willing to pay a reasonable fee to keep my current email and web page addresses.	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	See ref. Andy Poggio's 1999 article on www.PA-FiberNet.	Very Excited	5
ISP access only	Providing access to other ISPs might be the best way to keeping up with technology improvements made by ISPs and also provide a full menu of choices for users. This might provide more users for the FTTH network. The cities role would be to build, maintain and update the FTTH network.	Sounds interesting	2
ISP access only	Our city has got enough problems without getting into the (very competitive) Internet service provider business. The TV cable coop debacle provides a good lesson on how NOT to do it!	Sounds interesting	2
ISP access only	Option 3 helps is preferrable because: 1) Helps to ensure lower prices through competition; 2) Offloads the City of PA from acting as a service provider; 3) Allows the City of PA to focus on its core competencies and responsibilities of servicing the community; 4) Prevents dependence on a single service provider.	Very Excited	2

ISP access only	Operating an Internet service provider is a capital and effort-intensive endeavor in an already saturated market. I doubt that the city could attract, retain and compensate the talent required without spending an inordinate amount of money to start from scratch, and then spending even more on providing acceptable post-build customer care. Consider: running an ISP is more complex than running a cable television service. Could the city run its own cable service? (I'm sure it would like to, given AT&T's stunningly miserable performance in this arena, but realistically speaking, TV service is not in the core competencies of municipal government.) Even providing decent customer care takes a significant investment in 24x7 call center capability, problem tracking, customer communications and tremendous patience. Even in an educated community such as Palo Alto, most people aren't experts in computer configuration, so technical support is a constant albatross. I doubt that the city would be able to amortize the costs of providing this support over the size of the customer base. An outside provider would be able to better absorb the cost by spreading it over the rest of it	Very Excited	2
ISP access only	My ISP has been reliable and I'd like to retain them (Earthlink). I also don't want to change my e-mail address, since it's been widely distributed. Thanks!	Very interested	3
ISP access only	Most important is that the services be provided competitively. Profits to the city should be refunded to users, not go to the general fund!	Very Excited	4
ISP access only	I've chosen option #3, because I don't want to change my e-mail address. Another reason is dial-up access service. I want to use nation-wide dial-up access service when I go business trip. In such a case, I have to contract nation-wide ISP anyway.	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	Internet access is a rapidly changing technology making it difficult for a small player (the City) to remain up to date and competitive in services.	Very Excited	4
ISP access only	Increase competion to drive down the prices.	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	I would only accept item (1.) if it was clear that there was some type of economy of scale that would make (1.) a great deal for residents. I'm afraid the lack of choice in this solution might inhibit competitive offerings. A choice of one is never comfortable. Two is probably unworkable, as the City would be competing with its own customers and other ISP's would be at a serious disadvantage in terms of pricing and flexibility. There would be no end of complaints about the 'City Monopoly' favoring its own customers first for repair service, installs, etc. Seems like (3.) is the most neutral stance the City could take. Supply the raw plumbing and let ISP's duke it out for our business, from Mom & Pop operations offering budget deals to big guns offering a full array of services.	Very Excited	4
ISP access only	I think the City should not spread itself too thin. if there are multiple providers that will tend to keep costs low and service higher than the current monopoly situation we have with AT&T Broadband.	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	I think it's too much to ask of the city to become an ISP. The city should become an ISP only as a last resort.	Very Excited	5
ISP access only	I guess I could have picked #4. I picked #3 as my best guess of how to acheive #4. I assume that #1 would actually amount to the city picking an ISP to subcontract the work. I can imagine that would work better if the Palo Alto FTTH market is not big enough to attract multiple ISPs.	Very interested	2
ISP access only	I frankly don't trust the city to reliably provide the ISP services required, including online support, etc... Opening it up to other providers should provide some level of competition to help control the price. In addition, if the city offered ISP services along with other providers it would seem to create an unfair competitive edge for the city. And, in fact, while the city has a unique opportunity to provide the links, I don't think the city should be in competition with private providers in this area.	Very interested	4
ISP access only	I don't think the city should become an ISP. However, charging access fees to other ISP's is appropriate and would help finance the cost of the FTTH network over time.	Very Excited	2
ISP access only	I don't have a problem if the city provides internet access service. What I want most is the choice of any internet service without having it dictated by the infrastructure provider like the cable companies do. I think the FTTH should be focussed first on providing infrastructure that is open to all users and providers. If services are added that is fine if it makes economic sense to both users and the CPAU. I like the analogy of the electric utility.	Very interested	4

ISP access only	I am of the very strong opinion that Palo Alto Utilities does not, nor ever will have, the expertise to manage a completely new, high-tech infrastructure like FTTH. First of all the learning curve is to great. Second, PA Utilities cannot keep sewers in repair. How can citizens expect a high level of reliable service of a complex technical infrastructure with such an obvious history? Third, a high tech infrastructure, like is being proposed, will demand skilled specialized workers who will either demand high salaries or simply will not come to work for the standard salary scales. It will simply bloat city staff more, and who will pay for that?	Sounds interesting	3
ISP access only	I am not in favor of monopoly situations. So I would favor putting as much competition into the process as possible (I assume the City still builds the network, in order to reduce duplicative cost and construction disruption).	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	Fibre based high bandwidth access will surely bring with it potential IP liabilities (music & video downloading & copying, for example) that the city should not have to contend with.	Very Excited	3
ISP access only	Fast, reliable & priced well are the most important things, and I think option 3 is the most realistic way to achieve them. With #1 there's no competition, and with #2 there's a conflict of interest. Thanks for asking!	Very interested	3
ISP access only	Assuming the network infrastructure will be city-owned, the City will give periodically renewable contracts to one or more ISPs based on their competitive bidding. Since contract will be up for renewal once every few (2-4) years, it will keep service providers competitive and customer focused. City should not get into ISP business.	Very Excited	2
ISP access only	An ISP must have a large, competent staff. Could you really compete with Earthlink or AOL? I think the city would be prudent not to try to compete.	Very Excited	2
ISP access only	3. or possibly some combination of 2. and 3. might be best.	Sounds interesting	3
ISP access only	(1) the City does not -- and should not -- have the expertise to effectively exploit the extensive potential of FTTH. (2) better than (1) but still requires the City to develop additional expertise, staff, and facilities at a cost that is not likely to be covered by outside, paying services. And even if the cost is covered, the benefit to the City is minimal. (3) Best revenues, least internal burden on the City's operations. Sell access to more than one provider to encourage competition in service quality. No cost for City Web site.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	With limited computer literacy all of the #4 statement benefits appeal to me. I worry though about being led down the primrose path only to be disappointed later with the system not being fast, not reliable, and expensive. See cable TV after a 10 year study. Is the fiber network still in top notch condition or will we be surprised later on? I find the C of PA history of studies lacking.	Very interested	2
Does not matter	Though having choices on who provides service might foster good prices, as everyone has probably thought of	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	There is not enough information to answer this question since there is probably a significant difference in cost. Provide the cost comparison and I will respond	Sounds interesting	
Does not matter	The service must also be financially self sufficient and must not drain the city's general funds.	Very Excited	2
Does not matter	The only other thing I'd want is roaming dial-up or Wi-Fi (802.11) access to the internet. (Practically, that means partnering with nationwide ISPs., so option #2.)	Very interested	4
Does not matter	The keyword is 'reliable'. I would worry whether the City has the expertise to act as a reliable forward-looking ISP.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	The key is internet access. Service provider such as AOL is no value.	Very Excited	1
Does not matter	The key here is that whomever the ISP is, will have access to all of the web site information and other activity going on from each home on the internet. I'm not certain that I am comfortable with the city having that information, as a governmental organization. When a private company has that information, I can more easily remedy any harm that I have by taking the company to court (its harder to take the city to court). I like the utility aspect of the infrastructure, but I think the ISP services go a bit too far. However, if the city can only afford the infrastructure by acting as the ISP, then I'd still chose that over no FTTH.	Very Excited	5

Does not matter	The city should not sign any exclusive agreements with 3rd party providers, as this would negate effective price competition among 3rd party providers. I would be very interested in becoming involved in this program, as I happen to be professionally employed in the network infrastructure arena.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	The City has proven it can do a good job in running the FTTH as a utility. Being an ISP requires a different skill set as well as a larger customer base, so the City should do its due diligence before becoming an ISP.	Very Excited	2
Does not matter	The city has enough experience in the utilities business that choice 1 is probably OK. If choices 2 and 3 maintains enough revenue for the city and keeps costs to consumers low, that is OK. I would rather see my money go to CPA for the services rather than to an outside service provider if CPA can provide good service.	Very Excited	
Does not matter	The City has a marvelous track record as a utility, e.g. in contracting for and supplying water, gas, and electricity. It seems less wise to take the costly and risky path of being the builder and innovator.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	The cable system did not work out , I think the city should set up the network and lease it to service providers. Companies have to make a profit, I can not watvh the city loose anymore money.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	The above statement represent my view entirely, whichever method can provide fast, reliable connections at the best possible price should be employed.	Sounds interesting	3
Does not matter	Sole provider was my initial thought because I think PA does a great job managing its utilities, but as long as 4. above is met, should be fine.	Very Excited	1
Does not matter	Seems like a strange question to ask users as there is not enough info to tell us the costs/benefits of each option. All those could work depending on the parties participating so choosing one over another I cant make the choice at this time	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	Providing competent, timely technical support will be the main hurdle. I'm not sure if the city is up to the task or can afford it. Alternately, a city monopoly would funnel more revenue to the city entity to pay for such things.	Very Excited	2
Does not matter	Price is King. I pay 49.95 for DSL from DirectTV DSL. Service and speed are adaquite, but I would like to support a program from the city of Palo Alto	Very Excited	4
Does not matter	Price and reliability are more important to me than speed.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	One issue for me is maintaining my current internet address (high cost of changing a long-term address). That would point to answer #3, but it is only one of many issues.	Very interested	
Does not matter	once customers and businesses go onto the FTTH network, it would be really disruptive if the provider became insolvent - so we have a slight preference for picking solutions which have 'staying power'	Very Excited	5
Does not matter	Note that I work for Covad Communications and have a great deal of knowledge about wholesaling broadband access. Feel free to contact me if you would like to talk about your options here. Personally, as long as it does NOT go the route of the Cable Co-op, I think it would be best if Palo Alto solely act as its own ISP, for access only. I would NOT get the city into e-mail, web hosting, etc. That said, many ISPs offer bring-your-own access solutions today, and allow e-mail to be checked remotely, etc. If you allow re-sell to ISPs, be very careful about credit checks, etc. There is much turmoil in the ISP industry, and you need look no further than Covad's own recent experiences. Also, I assume that Palo Alto would run the physical fiber network, but handoff the routing, DNS, etc. to a backbone provider, etc. That would limit the city's need to hire specialized IP engineers. If you want to follow up regarding my/Covad's experiences, or potentially want to explore the possibility of Covad providing your routing/DNS/Internet connectivity, please contact me.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	my main concern would be whether the city could offer competitive pricing, and service. If the city was able to truly offer the best deal, and not lose money in the process, I would definitely purchase internet services locally	Very interested	2
Does not matter	My main concern with choice (1) above is the lack of competition among ISPs, allowing price and service quality to become problematic. If the city could convince me that it could outperform other ISPs in quality and price, then (1) would be my choice.	Very interested	3
Does not matter	My bias is always toward a free market, so all things being equal, other service providers should also be allowed access to increase competition.	Very interested	3

Does not matter	My answer (above) reflects my opinion only as an end user, but not as a citizen of Palo Alto. I would like Palo Alto to succeed in the project, but I can only offer goals and not the corresponding business approach. I believe that to be successful, the network (including infrastructure and services) should eventually become financially self sustaining (for the most part), that is, not become an excessive burden to taxpayers in the long term. If this goal requires revenues from ISP subscriptions, then perhaps PA should become the sole ISP provider. This approach, however, would require residents to switch from their current ISP to PA ISP, which might require substantial incentives (if increased performance was not enough). It would also require PA to remain competitive with other ISPs in terms of services, performance and price. A transition plan might mitigate some of the risks by first phasing residents onto the PA network (with their current ISPs) then phasing them to the PA ISP, which would eventually become the sole provider. This approach would suggest that PA also provide services for those who are r	Very interested	5
Does not matter	j	Very interested	2
Does not matter	It would be a nice bonus if the city could make an operating profit on this endeavor, so as to not alienate those residents who are not interested in this service.	Very Excited	2
Does not matter	It seems to me that the service has to be fast and reliable. Then, whichever option is cheaper is the way to go. What does an internet service provider do for me anyway? I think email accounts and their web access of emails are probably the only things I use from AT&T Broadband right now. But then, I can pay Yahoo or Hotmail to get similar email services. Maybe you can offer different level of services and let the customers decide whether the internet service provision is worthwhile the money.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	It seems to be important to have tiered pricing, so that basic 24/7 connection is possible for anyone, with low prices for low bandwidth requirements, and higher prices for high bandwidth use. If the entry level cost is right, you can get very high participation levels. As a Palo Alto resident, I would think that our city residents would benefit more from $45 million spent on FTTH in the urban area (not the hills, necessarily, if it drove the cost up too much) than on the currently proposed library expansion!	Very interested	4
Does not matter	It really depends upon how you define ISP. All I want is a fast, reliable, reasonably priced connection to the internet, with use of one or more static IP addresses. I run my own web/e-mail servers from home now with a PacBell DSL line (drury.com, among others). I would not be all that interested in e-mail or other services provided by a full-service ISP. But I'm sure most of your potential customers would be interested in those services (most people don't wish to trouble with configuring and maintaining their own e-mail server, I'm sure). Given that, I would probably vote for number 2, above, as choice is always good.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	In general, as a consumer, I prefer choice, and the more choices, the better.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	In addition, the service needs to allow NAT, small home web sites and e-mail servers, plus provide a static IP address. If Palo Alto utilities wouldn't support this than I would change my answer to 'multiple ISPs.' ATT Cable doesn't allow either servers or static IP's and it makes their service unusable for power users. On the other hand, DirectTV DSL and many other DSL providers to allow home servers and static IPs.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	I'm not hung up on this issue one way or the other. I'm not interested in email, web, etc. All I'm looking for is extremely fast IP dialtone.	Very interested	4
Does not matter	I'm don't know enough about the pros and cons of each option to make an informed opinion	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	If well priced, fast, reliable access is available, I dont' see why anyone would need a different ISP.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	I would encourage the city to use the most cost-effective option. Palo Alto already charges way too much for utilities.	Very interested	2
Does not matter	I would be looking for service that makes the most economic sense to all involved. The city doesn't need to get into the business unless they can do it for cheaper than outside providers.	Very Excited	4

Does not matter	I would be concerned if the city decided to be the sole ISP because of the cost to stay current and be competitive. Let other ISPs fight for the most current technology and let the city pick and choose for the best service for residents	Very Excited	
Does not matter	I wonder if the city would be able to put together the skill set to manage an ISP. It seems to require an economy of scale. However, I don't feel like the current ISPs do such a great job, so if the city thinks it could give competent service, I would have confidence in that decision.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	I think the Cuty has done a good job managing utilities, so I was inclined to go with Option 1, but the bottom line for me is that I want something that is well priced, reliable and fast. People with more knowledge about this than I have can better assess the pros and cons of each option. My main goal is to get out of the ATT web.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	I think the city can charge a premium as the service is premium.	Very Excited	4
Does not matter	I think the bottom line is that the service is fast and reliable. I think the City could do a very good job managing service itself, on the other hand, it may be more flexible to allow multiple companies to offer service over the network (eg option #3) and it would surely reduce the administrative burden for the city, as well as be more competitive.	Very Excited	4
Does not matter	I think it would be difficult for tthe City to function as an I think it would be difficult for the City to function as an ISP. I would support it if it happened, but it is not a big issue.	Very Excited	5
Does not matter	I prefer the city as a service provider, as most telecomm companies have proven to provide poor service and be unresponsive to customers. I believe a municipal utility is more likely to act in the best interests of its users. However, there are many aspects of an ISP that the city may not be well equipped to take on, such as technical support, so I like option 2 if it is workable. The city might provide only basic services, in order to make it attractive for commercial ISPs to enter this market. (The only service I need is packet transport. I run my own mail, dns, etc. servers, and will continue to do so.)	Very Excited	2
Does not matter	I prefer lower cost with few restrictions. I don't want anything but a static ip and a fast reliable pipe. I don't care who runs the pipe. I don't care about services like webhosting, email, etc. Those can come from companies like yahoo, hotmail or whom ever.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	I managed to send my previous survey before I had finished it. On the whole I have been very pleased with Palo Alto Utilities. Therefore, I certainly have no problem with having the city be the provider. (In fact, I would tend to lean in that direction.) However, I suspect that is not a good long term business for the city to be involved in. I would suggest a staged approach where the city is the initial service provider, but it makes the network available to other providers as well. As other providers prove that they can provide the service at a reasonable cost, the city can get out of the business.	Very Excited	
Does not matter	I like the idea of having a choice as to who my Internet Service Provider would be, with the City being one of those choices (as in statement #2), but ultimately, the quality and price of the service are my main concerns.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	I have my own domain name and use email address re-direction so it doesn't really matter as long as I can get email. I would like a static IP address as I operate a (verl low usage) server out of my home. It is basically only used by my family and a few friends.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	I have a slight preference for maximizing control by the city because I do NOT see a competitive market as the best choice for utilities, which this will surely become. Small differences in price are unimportant to me in relation to customer service, where I would hope the city would always have an edge.	Very interested	2
Does not matter	I don't have any expertise relative to this subject to make an informed choice so I chose option 4.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	I believe that the objective is to provide fast & reliable service; pricing should support maintenance of the infrastructure. The city can play an important role in providing infrastructure and maintaining it, but I'm not sure the city should be in the ISP business.	Very interested	3

Does not matter	I believe that the City does things well, generally, so I am not opposed to the City acting as a service provider. However, generally speaking, I think that it's best for companies to focus on what they do best (e.g., City provide basic infrastructure, and ISP's provide Internet service).	Very interested	4
Does not matter	I am really not knowledgable about how this all works. I am interested in the service, but need to learn a lot more about it in order to have my opinion be of any real value.	Very interested	5
Does not matter	i actually doubt the City knows much about being a Tier 1 service provider. why not leave that to the experts who do this for a living and can leverage their skills?	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	For me, the cost is a primary issue. The city should use whatever system provides the lowest cost, but be reliable.	Sounds interesting	2
Does not matter	Even if it was priced a little higher reliablity is #1. I am not sure but it might be best to own and maintain the lines and lease to another company.	Very Excited	
Does not matter	Basically, I'm fed up with Pac Bell's DSL service, which is unreliable and whose cost recently rose. As far as CPA versus other providers, I'd pick CPA if all else is equal.	Very interested	2
Does not matter	Based upon previous experience with government at all levels (including the city), my sense is that the response rate is too slow to actully be competitive in a market environment. For example, just getting this project going is taking a very long time. However, sometimes only governments can function at the scale which is needed, such as this project. So while I don't have a problem with the city being the ISP, if they allow any competition (and they should, for optimal development of the system), I doubt they'll be able to compete for long - but they should be allowed to try, and soon! We couldn't wait any longer, and just signed up for a DSL line, although we had tried that a couple of years ago, and it was an awful experience.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	As long as I received value, quality and a good price, I would be happy. If opening this up to other providers gives me that option, then great. Otherwise, I'd be happy with the City solely providing it. I do think that opening this up to others would be better 'received' in general though...otherwise it looks like a captive market. :)	Very Excited	1
Does not matter	As a voter I have some small influence over the City and could complain and (hopefully) get poor service issues resolved (I have always gotten good service from the City Utilities). For 3rd parties I can switch providers but the worst situation is a single 3rd party provider like our ATT cable where they can do what they please and I have no other choices. I'd like to see the City make money off of this while offering great service at a lower price than available anywhere else (like electricity) but I'm not sure how possible that is. Good luck anyway.	Very Excited	3
Does not matter	As a utility user (electricity, water, garbage), I never cared about who is providing the service as long as it meets the quality level I'm expecting (and paying for). Internet Access is a commodity just like other utilities.	Very interested	3
Does not matter	And there is little significant cost to the city of Palo Alto	Very Excited	2
Does not matter	After the Cable Coop debacle, I'm somewhat sceptical of municipal/government-owned entities providing these types of services. Best to leave business to the professionals.	Very interested	3