
Request for Council Assistance Regarding Community Broadband Coordination in Quemazon and Hawk's Landing

Allan Saenz <asaenz@losalamosnetwork.com>

Wed, Feb 18, 2026 at 4:35 PM

To: "Laurent, Anne" <anne.laurent@losalamosnm.gov>

Cc: "Ryti, Randall" <randall.ryti@losalamosnm.gov>, "Reagor, David" <david.reagor@losalamosnm.gov>, "Herrmann, Ryn" <ryn.herrmann@losalamosnm.gov>, "Hand, Melanee" <melanee.hand@losalamosnm.gov>, "Havemann, Suzie" <suzie.havemann@losalamosnm.gov>, "Neal-Clinton, Beverly" <beverly.nealclinton@losalamosnm.gov>, "Cull, Theresa" <theresa.cull@losalamosnm.gov>, "Rael, Juan" <juan.rael@losalamosnm.gov>, "Smith, Jerry" <jerry.smith@losalamosnm.gov>, ~Attorney <~Attorney@losalamosnm.gov>

Hi Anne,

Thank you for your update and for the County's February 17, 2026 letter regarding LANet's offer and the County's renewed request for "clear and marketable title" for infrastructure serving Quemazon and Hawks Landing.

I want to restate my position, provide a straightforward cost comparison, and propose a path forward that avoids additional delay, unnecessary cost, and resident disruption.

1. Concern about process and good-faith negotiation

LANet supports transparency and strong documentation. However, the posture described in the County's letter reads less like a path to negotiation and more like a search for reasons to delay or say "no"—despite the fact that these questions have been raised, documented, and addressed multiple times over the last decade.

This is not a new issue. Similar questions were raised as far back as 2016. LANet retained counsel and produced permits, maps, written responses, and Bates-numbered materials reflecting County-authorized work and a County/LANet framework acknowledging LANet-owned facilities located in public ways.

As context, Los Alamos Network is a certified Competitive Local Exchange Carrier (CLEC), and we operate as a regulated telecommunications provider serving Los Alamos customers for 26 years.

We are a local and locally-owned business that has demonstrated strong commitment to our community for many years.

LANet raised the idea of how this infrastructure would be valuable to the Broadband Project idea and sought to engage with the County on how it could work about 3 years ago and we are disappointed to only be having this discussion now. It feels like the clock has almost run out on attempting to get this done, with no negotiation even proposed until now.

LANet cannot continue to incur escalating legal fees and time responding to repetitive requests that revisit the same questions without a defined decision point.

If the County's intent is to negotiate and move forward, the solution is to acknowledge the historical record and adopt a clear timeline with clear milestones.

2. Counteroffer: Valuation / Purchase Price

My counteroffer for the acquisition of LANet conduit and associated infrastructure in Quemazon, Hawk's Landing, and the small section near 15th & Canyon (plus the related Central segment for immediate possession) is: \$1.2 million.

This valuation should be considered in the context of avoided construction cost, avoided restoration, avoided duplication, reduced disruption to community members, quicker implementation in the areas of existing infrastructure, and reduced risk—especially in difficult terrain.

3. Cost comparison: Build new vs. acquire existing

Using the County's unit pricing assumptions under discussion (microtrenching + restoration) and known quantities for Quemazon mainline (26,740 LF), plus a conservative placeholder for Hawk's Landing + 15th & Canyon (~5,000 LF, subject to joint verification), the estimated cost to build new infrastructure is approximately:

- Best-case (low lateral scenario): ~\$2.03M
- Mid-case: ~\$2.45M
- High-case: ~\$3.01M

At a \$1.2M acquisition price, the County's estimated savings are approximately:

- Best-case savings: ~\$833K
- Mid-case savings: ~\$1.25M
- High-case savings: ~\$1.81M

These figures are conservative because they do not fully capture common drivers of overruns in Quemazon and Hawk's Landing—rocky conditions, curved alignments, steep driveways, tight right-of-way, traffic control frequency, restoration quality exposure, and change orders. If complications increase costs by even 25–50%, total build costs could reasonably land in the ~\$2.54M to ~\$4.51M range.

Beyond cost, new microtrenching increases resident disruption, introduces additional restoration exposure, and adds schedule uncertainty—all of which can delay customer connectivity and slow overall project deployment.

4. Transition structure (Paid in full; transition use payments)

If the County proceeds with acquisition and takes possession, my position is:

1. The County pays the purchase price in full at closing.
2. Once the County owns the conduit, LANet will pay the County \$15 per active customer per month to use the County-owned conduit during the transition period while customers are migrated and the legacy network is decommissioned in an orderly way.

This creates immediate, predictable project revenue while reducing customer disruption and avoiding delays.

5. Possession / implementation approach

- Central segment: possession can transfer immediately upon execution.
- Hawk's Landing: possession can follow as decommissioning is completed and the area is cleared for County use.
- Quemazon: transition can occur by phases to maintain continuity and prevent outages.

6. Timeline and funding path

To move quickly, I would suggest this acquisition be approved either by:

1. Utilizing funds already approved through the existing amendment tied to the Low-Level Design, or
2. Bringing a new, targeted amendment to Council if reallocation is needed.

Either approach establishes a clear timeline and allows the project to proceed without duplicative construction.

7. Documentation and "title clarity" — use the existing record, stop re-litigating

As noted, these questions were raised in the past (including 2016) and LANet provided records and documentation in prior reviews and productions. This should not become an excuse to slow the process, increase costs, or make the transaction harder. The County has previously requested—and LANet provided—documentation distinguishing conduit installed/owned by LANet but located in the County public way.

If the County is now applying a heightened evidentiary standard to provider-owned conduit in shared public ways in Quemazon, LANet requests that the County apply the same standard consistently across similarly situated out-of-town providers operating in those same corridors (including Xfinity and Lumen).

8. Willingness to negotiate and request for a defined decision path

I am willing to negotiate certain terms (transition sequencing, scheduling, documentation, and operational coordination). My hope is that the County will reconsider the valuation based on the savings and risk reduction outlined above, and that we can move this forward promptly.

Please respond with the County's proposed next step and timeline.

When does a transfer need to be completed by in order not to disrupt Broadband Project timelines?

This should drive our timeline for completing the transfer. My hope is that the County's approach is not an attempt to "run out the clock" on the proposed transfer.

Given the history and time sensitivity, LANet is not in a position to enter another open-ended legal process to re-prove the same underlying facts.

If the County is not willing to proceed on a defined timeline, LANet will focus its efforts on continuing operations and competing against the County in the market as a local small business.

Thanks
Allan Saenz

