



First Responder Network Authority (FirstNet) | Office of Communications | www.firstnet.gov

Transcript

FirstNet Board of Directors Webcast, Reston, Virginia, September 16-17, 2014

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

>> Sue Swenson: Please take your seats, everyone.

Good morning, everyone, good morning. If everyone could please take their seats, we're about to get started. Thank you.

>>Sue Swenson: Good morning. How is everybody today? Welcome to Reston headquarters. FirstNet moved here about three months ago. This room looks really well-appointed. I will assure you our quarters are less well-appointed, like a start-up situation, which is probably very appropriate for where we are. But I'm delighted you are all here today. Welcome to our September 17th board meeting. Thank you for being here in person. I would also like to thank the audience here with us at this open meeting and those joining on the web cast.

The great thing about being here is it really allows a lot of collaboration. I don't know how many of you know about the Commerce building downtown. We were spread all over, like seeds in the wind, which really made it hard to actually go and talk to one of your colleagues if you had an idea. So being here in our open space will hopefully foster a more collaborative environment. So that's terrific.

We're delighted to be here and we really appreciate the U.S. Geological Survey's letting us host in the auditorium today. I'd like to take a minute before we get into the meat of the meeting to welcome our new board members. We're delighted with the nomination of Henson county sheriff, Richard Stanek. Richard couldn't be with us because of a prior commitment. We look forward to his participation. Former governor, Jim Douglas we are happy to have you here, and I understand you have some very good driving skills from what I hear about last night.

>> Sue Swenson: Annise Parker, a delight to have you here. And also Salt Lake City Chief Chris Burbank. We had the opportunity last night to talk about the joys of air travel these days. I'm sure you are all experiencing that. Frank Plastina, I knew Frank years ago actually and haven't seen him in 25 years or something, but you look exactly the same. I just want to congratulate Ed Reynolds for being reappointed to the board. Ed, I am glad to have you continuing in your service on the board.

I'd like to take a moment to thank our outgoing board members. They were here during a very challenging time. I particularly want to thank Sam (Ginn) in the chair and for getting us up and going. He established the governance structure under which we operate today. Wellington Webb, of course the former mayor of Denver. Of course, a terrific guy. The good news for Wellington's consulting business, is that he couldn't continue on with us, but I have a feeling we're going to hear from him. In fact I think some folks saw him in Washington this week. He has spent a lot of time in D.C. with his consulting business. The retired assistant police chief from New York, (Charles Dowd), Paul Fitzgerald, sheriff of Storey county, and Craig Farrill, are also no longer on the board. I talk to all of them and they are extremely committed to this effort. I think we'll see them in various forms and iterations going forward.

I and FirstNet are delighted for their support.

Also in the audience with us today we have some special guests from the Public Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC). We have, as I think you all know, a Public Safety Advisory Committee which represents many disciplines, tribal, local government, and state disciplines and services. It is a great organization and provides great advice for FirstNet. I'd like to introduce and ask you to raise your hand or stand up if you could, as I call your name: the Chair of the PSAC, Harlin McEwen, Bill McCammon, vice chair, Paul Patrick, Paul, there you are, Tom MacLellan, thanks for coming today and Tom Sorley. I appreciate you all being here and also for the continued advice and insight that you give us on this project.

So with those introductions, I'd like to turn the meeting over to the Board Secretary to explain how things are going to work today. I think you know that our meetings are all open. In fact, somebody asked me this morning if our meetings were open yesterday. I think it is important to acknowledge and repeat that all of our meetings are open. The only meeting that we closed for a little bit yesterday was the Governance committee meeting to talk about personnel issues. We're endeavoring to have meetings open and have them in a setting where visitors can actually participate with us in the room. So Mr. Secretary, would you call the roll.

>> Uzoma Onyeije: Good morning, everyone. First, before I call roll, I wanted to remind everyone this is a public forum and if you could take out your mobile devices and hit that off or silent switch or button, we would appreciate that at this time.

And with that, let's get started with the roll. Chair Sue Swenson.

>> Here

>> Barry Boniface

>> Here

>> Chief Chris Burbank

>> Here

>> Tim Bryan

>> Here

>> Ron Davis

>> Here

>> Brian Deese

>> Here

>> Governor James Douglas

>> Here

>> Chief Jeff Johnson. Kevin McGinnis. Mayor Annise Parker. Frank Plastina. Ed Reynolds. Suzanne

Spaulding. As we mentioned, Sheriff Stanek couldn't be with us. And Teri Takai. We have a quorum.

>> Sue Swenson: Thank you very much. I believe the board members have the minutes from the last, two meetings correct? You should have two sets of minutes. I'd like to entertain a motion to approve those or address any comments, additions, solutions or corrections. Thank you, Tim. Second?. There -- thank you, Barry. All those in favor of approving the two sets of minutes, please say aye.

>> All: Aye.

>> Sue Swenson: All opposed signify same sign. Any abstentions? I'm sure there are a few. We'll record the abstentions appropriately. Thank you very much.

We had our committee meetings yesterday, starting at 2:00 and finishing up at about 7:30. It was a very long day, but obviously we covered very important topics. We'll obviously hit on many of them again today. A lot of substance we'll talk about today was covered in the meetings yesterday.

I'll start with a review of the Governance Committee. We had a visit from Art Warren who is from the (DOC) Office of the General Counsel ethics team. We reviewed conflict of interest and clearance processes. I think in light of where we are, relative to the project, we're moving into a significant phase of the project, I think the timing on that meeting was very appropriate. With the issuance of the draft RFP coming up, Mr. Warren provided a good refresher of those procedures and processes, giving a good briefing for the new board members.

Then we went into closed session where we only talked about a couple of things. We're in performance review time now, so we talked about appropriate performance reviews of the FirstNet team and also our executive search which is going very, very well.

Barry, I'll turn to you to update us on the technology committee.

>> Barry Boniface: Thanks, Sue. We had a very productive session in the Technology Committee. First thing we did was pass the minutes from the prior meeting, a very important item. And then we had a good discussion from Ali and Jeff about the activities of the CTO organization. They talked about the things they are focused on right now and also gave us some sense of where they thought their energies would be spent going into 2015. We talked a little bit about the challenges they have in terms of hiring people, but net-net, they are making good progress and we had a good report.

Then the next order of business was the review the technology components of the public notice and comment process, as well as RFI process, and we passed resolutions suggesting that the board approve those sections of those elements. So that was pretty much the activities of the Technology Committee yesterday.

>> Sue Swenson: Could I ask a question since I didn't attend the meeting. I heard that there was a discussion about preemption and priority testing. Could you just bring me up to date on that particular topic?

>> Barry Boniface: Maybe Jeff, I don't know if he's in the room here, he gave us -- (laughter)

>> Sue Swenson: Back in the audience.

>> Barry Boniface: He gave us an update on those --

>> Sue Swenson: Because the reason I raise this is because this is such a critical issue and it is something I've been particularly interested in for quite some time in fact. This work has been under way for a while

and it's really critical as we enter the phase about our excess capacity. Plus, having the ability to do this is critical to the project. I think it is worthy of just a couple minutes Jeff, if you don't mind.

>> Jeff Bratcher: Sure. We are seeing excellent progress out at the research lab. As you know, we have funding there to do testing for the key features, which are all under the quality of service umbrella. But more specifically we are conducting priority and preemption testing for our users, which we'll have on the FirstNet network. The basic functionalities are in some of the systems they have in the labs now, and we are actually proving that out. It's still on the definite bleeding edge of the technology, even with the test manufacturing vendors. They're putting new capabilities into the actual test equipment now to verify this functionality. They have proven the basic concept. We can do preemption, and prioritize users on LTE. The technology gives us a great flexibility with how we can actually implement the system and provides the key priorities to firemen, law enforcement officers and EMS. Chief Johnson was there Friday in Boulder. We had a much more in-depth discussion about the efforts, and have a good understanding of how that will move forward. So, we are looking forward to continued progress with the vendors they have in the labs now, and again I'm very encouraged by the vendors' participation and actually building this into their products now.

>> Sue Swenson: Fantastic. Have you been able to do testing on congested network or is that coming later?

>>Jeff Bratcher: Yes, they are actually using what's called a load generator on a system. They can actually load up a sector of a cell site so that it triggers the overload and kicks in the priority and preemption capabilities. They are actually doing that in the lab now.

>> Sue Swenson: Excellent. Chief Johnson, any observation? When you and I talked about it, you were excited about this news and this update.

>>Jeff Johnson: Yes, I have a number of them, thank you. I think you were right over year ago to say this is the most important thing we need to prove out. It is fundamental to the network. And I was so impressed with PSCR's technical and research approach to making sure that this works. It was very impressive. As you know, Dereck Orr runs a tight ship and their research is so clean and well-intentioned that I left that four-hour session saying, okay, we're on the path. This does work. It can be better. And they're chasing down those parts that can be better, but proved this can work. So it is as you say, under load they have proved it. So it is a great place to be to put that behind us now.

>> Sue Swenson: Jeff, do me a favor and thank the folks working on this for continuing to press on it, and for the work they're doing. To me it is pivotal.

>>Jeff Johnson: Sure, absolutely. Yes, thank you.

>> Sue Swenson: Thank you. Barry.

>>Barry Boniface: There you have it, Sue. (Laughter)

You know, I know when to bring the experts in and when to keep my mouth shut, so at any rate, that was pretty much the activity of the committee.

>> Sue Swenson: Thank you. Any questions for Barry about the – Go ahead Suzanne.

>>Suzanne Spaulding: Thank you. I really just want to express my appreciation to Ali and his team for the emphasis that they're placing on the notion of hardening. That is, making sure this network is hardened and across all hazards, physical and cyber. From the Department of Homeland Security, we're

particularly concerned we bake in cyber security from the get go. It is clear the team is committed to that, and I really appreciate it.

>> Sue Swenson: It's interesting you raise that. We were over talking to a couple of folks on Monday and that is actually one of the issues that came up. There is a common concern about cyber security. If you think about a public safety network today, it is disaggregation really make its difficult because of the disaggregation. As we aggregate the capability it becomes more of a target. I think it will be an elevated issue for us beyond what we have today. It is on the minds of people on the Hill, so obviously the work Ali and team are doing is critical. More to come on that, I presume Barry. Very good.

Jeff, I think you were next on the Outreach Committee. Did you have a good discussion on that committee?

>>Jeff Johnson: Thank you Madam Chair, members of the board. I think first, I think it is an important distinction to talk about outreach to set the tone. There's a reason we don't call this marketing. That is because the outreach and communications teams are out there, to, number one, to tell you what we're doing on this important network and our development on this path to that. Number two is to listen. Listening, as you saw yesterday, is such an important part of how we're going to think about the RFP; what elements are built into that RFP; and then eventually how we move to finding who our partner is. Listening is important, as we get out and tell the story and make sure the interested parties know about it and have a portal that is clear to them in terms of how they talk to us. This is an important part of our outreach.

On that path, mid-summer, we were invited by the Adjutant General in Hawaii who had assembled American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands and Alaska together. They call themselves the discontinuous states and talk about how unique their needs are. For example, the fact that water surrounds the islands is so important and they need coverage there, and their back haul is different. They may have a different need for a core, etcetera, and etcetera. That was such a productive meeting and we came out of that with the recommendation that maybe on our team we reach out to them and put them in one separate bucket in terms of how we address their issues. We talk about the outreach meetings and they embraced that approach.

We have started state consultations, first with Maryland. Then Chairman, you and I met with Governor O'Malley days ago, to discuss what it's like after consultation, which was very helpful and insightful for me.

And now we roll on to Oregon, Washington, Montana, and -- is it Minnesota, that's right. So we roll into those meetings now. I think we are on a path to possibly knock out between six and eight states in the remainder of this year. We have 56 separate entities that we need to consult with. So that's very important. We continue our outreach and exchange of information with public safety associations. That is no small task. And we're engaged with them routinely. And then yesterday on the committee, we passed a resolution supporting the RFI and asking the board to support the RFI, asking the board to support the public notice and comment.

And then you get down to the individual level, to my left, your right, is the esteemed Kevin McGinnis, who, has been travelling this country, working with our tribal nations. He has even found the far reaches of Alaska. You know our travel department didn't know how to buy him a ticket for a dog sled. I think he had to improvise, but he ended up in really remote corners of Alaska. I mention that only because, number one, Alaska is unique. We actually wouldn't understand that completely unless we were out there and talking to them and listening and understanding the difficulties in Alaska's case. For example the satellite angles are different; the number of satellites that are available is different; the ability or inability to place terrestrial tower infrastructure is different. While in Hawaii, they certainly have a

challenge with their islands. They don't have near the number of islands that Alaska does in the Aleutian chain. You start walking through these uniquenesses and whether it's that or Burning Man in Nevada. The fact is we don't understand states and their needs and their users' needs until we talk to them. Kevin, I want to thank you for your outreach to the tribal nations and for putting yourself on the road to the extent you have. It has made a big difference. Thank you.

>>Kevin McGinnis: My pleasure.

>>Jeff Johnson: Then lastly, at the public safety level, we continue our conversations with everybody from the volunteers to the labor unions, to the individual public safety entities who have a lot of questions. Now we're about to start our conversations with Governors. And I just want to thank this board of directors and you Chairwoman, for your support for outreach. This is an important time for us and it's a big load.

>> Sue Swenson: I think TJ and the team will probably talk about it, but I think it's been insightful for us in terms of just the level of understanding that people have in the state and local communities about the facts. So it's really important that we get out and actually communicate that because I think as you indicated yesterday, there has been some real ah-ha moments in a couple of these meetings. I appreciate the work the outreach team is doing and frankly the whole board for the meetings they're having just to talk about the facts of the projects. Thanks for that. And Kevin, you talked about some airlines that I had actually never heard of, so I can tell that you're going to remote areas because I've never heard of them. So I too appreciate your being the on the road. And I know it is not just a matter of getting there and getting back, because for those who do a lot of travel these days, it is not unusual to have delays, cancellations and what not. Sometimes Kevin was getting home at 2 or 3 in the morning. So I know that's had a personal impact on you.

>>Kevin McGinnis: Thank you, Chairman. Yes, and I just want to point out to everyone, especially our new board members, and those in the public who haven't followed us that closely, we do have a very strict consultation format, process, etcetera, as Jeff has described, but also a lot of what we do is getting out there and seeing where the rubber meets the road and whether the rubber meets a dirt road, or permafrost or sand or whatever, the roads are what we have to cover. The other piece of outreach is getting out and staying in touch with our public safety colleagues. Jeff and I and others have spent a lot of time going out and touching the various disciplines within public safety and we have to keep doing that.

>>Jeff Johnson: Madam Chair, I think my final comment is, I would like to offer a couple of thank yous on behalf of outreach. Thank you to Suzanne Spaulding who is a board member here at FirstNet, amongst her other responsibilities. The resources you have been able to leverage for our coverage workshops at the state level have been invaluable. I left my first review of the coverage workshop provided by Chris Essid and others and I honestly was blown away. I was impressed with the capabilities and the analytics demonstrated there. I appreciate that this is a choice for you and your team and I want to thank you for making that choice. It's really making an efficient use of our money and our capabilities. We hit the street ready to go when we get there. Admiral Hewitt goes out of his way to help us be effective. I want to pass along our thanks to you and your team, Admiral Hewitt and Chris Essid and others. Really it has been helpful.

>>Suzanne Spaulding: Jeff, thank you for that. They bring such a passion and commitment to this that I would have a hard time holding them back. But the department is very pleased to support this very important effort, so thank you for your recognition for the team. I know it means a lot.

>>Sue Swenson: So last, but not least the Chair of the Finance Committee Mr. Tim Bryan.

>>Tim Bryan: Okay, Sue. Thank you. We actually went through four items yesterday in the Finance Committee. Three of which are going to be covered to some degree of detail today. The first one, however, was a presentation by one of Stuart's lieutenants on the compliance regime, and the compliance efforts we're making inside of FirstNet. We have the distinct pleasure of satisfying all federal regulations, plus all of the kind of compliance items we put together for a more commercial company. So we get a two-for out of that. Jason described that to us, and it was a good presentation to bring us up to speed on that. We passed two resolutions, as did the other committees. We looked at the RFI, we looked at public notice and comment and passed some resolutions, recommending that the board approve those. We went through those in some detail, in some detail, realizing that pretty much all of the parts of those documents affect the finance committee inasmuch as it relates to these public-private partnerships that we're endeavoring to undertake.

The fourth thing we did was we looked at some budget materials. We're a little bit early in the process, but we went over some targets and some estimates that we have in place. We went over the process we're going to go through to get to continue to refine the spend plan for fiscal year 2015. I don't want to give away too much since we have a presentation on that in the full board meeting, but those are the four items we covered in the finance committee, Sue.

>> Sue Swenson: Great. Thank you, Tim. Do any board members have questions for the committee chairs regarding the reports that were provided? Okay, great, I think we can continue on with the matters before us. We actually have three key matters before the board today for consideration. We'll get an update on the strategic road map which will obviously consider the issues in the road map which are the public notice and comment, the draft request for information, and the 2015 budget. I would just like to say that I think all of the audience probably remembers that we shared the strategic road map in New York at our March board meeting. That was the result of several months of work to really lay out the plan for FirstNet over the next couple of years to get to the point where we have the answers that we need to actually start to deploy this network. And I'm here today and happy to tell you that we are on track. You know, every time I tell somebody that, they are a little shocked and surprised that we're actually on track because it is difficult. I mean this is hard work; not a matter of going back for a couple of hours and slapping something together on a PowerPoint. This is a very complex set of issues and I really want to commend and thank the team for the effort they put into this, not only individually, but the engagement they have had with the key constituencies for this effort.

So what this represents today is not just FirstNet's thinking, it is really the thinking of a lot of people. I also would like to say it is not final. This is not a decision. This is, you know, particularly in the public notice and comment, the Act describes some things that we think need some interpretation. As a result, we are offering up a view of that, making it clearly an opportunity, frankly, for all of you in the audience and the viewing audience on the webcast to actually provide input to it. So this is a very open transparent process and I just want to make sure everybody understands these are not decisions, these are frameworks of things to think about and react to. So I just want to put that into context a little bit because I'm not sure that maybe that didn't come across as clearly as it could have yesterday, and I just want to start the discussion today with that context in mind.

So TJ, I think you and your team are going to go through the materials quickly because we went through a lot of this yesterday. So please do this in summary form today. The board obviously needs to consider whether or not we want to proceed because assuming we vote on this, then this information will be actually published today I presume. It's really important I think for the listening audience and people here to know this is happening today. I had a question this morning from somebody saying, so, when will the draft RFI be out? Well, it's today. We're talking about real-time stuff here. TJ Kennedy, do you want to start the discussion with your team?

>>TJ Kennedy: Sure. I would be happy to. Thank you. One quick administrative note, it sounds like they

were having some video issues. They were having video issues, and the team is working on resolving that. Audio is up and so we're moving forward. There was great feedback from the committee meeting yesterday on the webinar and a lot of folks tuned in. Hopefully they'll correct that shortly. We'll continue to move forward.

Just like you said, I think it is really important we go back to the March board meeting and strategic road map. What we want to go through today are three big items we'll talk about today, with the RFI and draft statement of objectives, and the public notice and comment are exactly what we said we were going to go work on in March and been executing through this summer. A lot of really hard strategic work on that has been done, along with the state consultation efforts, and that was another key part of our strategic road map, to begin state consultation. That started with a check list going out in April and good phone calls and webinars and feed back with states, and now we're actually kicking off the actual state consultation effort. Amanda Hilliard our Director of Outreach and Dave Buchanan our Director of State Consultations are going to walk the board through details this morning and then we'll jump into a very high level summary of what we talked about yesterday on the public notice and comment as well as the RFI. Go ahead, David.

>>David Buchanan: Great. Thanks, TJ and thanks, madam Chair, I will take a few minutes today to update the board on the state consultation program. I'm going to go over what we did with the Maryland meeting, the first consultation meeting, talk about the process, lessons learned from the consultation process, some important items we learned from Maryland and talk to you about the next steps. When FirstNet management briefed the board in June we talked about beta testing the first consultation meetings and we will talk to you about things we learned from them. The beta tests are for making improvements to efficiently and effectively deliver consultation to the remaining 55 states and territories. We were in Annapolis Maryland on July 29, hosted by Ray Lehr the SPOC for MD and his broadband team. They brought together a great group of representatives from across the state of Maryland who were able to share their experiences with broadband technology and communications and public safety operations and activities, not the least of which was the governor. Governor O'Malley participated in the consultation along with a number of his component heads, including the superintendent of the state police, state agency, CIO office, office of cyber security and communications systems executives, as well as and probably most importantly, local representatives from local public safety to illustrate again their experiences with delivering public safety and communication challenges they are facing in Maryland.

The FirstNet team included myself, TJ Kennedy, and representatives from the rest of the user advocacy team. And you can see on the next slide, maybe not, some topics we were able to cover in the initial meeting. There was a good exchange with the Maryland representatives and the FirstNet team around the FirstNet update, as well as roles and responsibilities for the state and FirstNet. There was another good exchange of information, and we were able to obtain key information from the state about their public safety operations in Maryland, particularly around who is a user in Maryland and who responds. Who is a first responder in Maryland. We also discussed coverage priorities and had a coverage dialogue about coverage priority in the State of Maryland, and finally we had a discussion around outreach. You'll hear from Amanda about the outreach activity and how the outreach team can complement the outreach team in Maryland to amplify and collaborate together to reach the various stakeholders who are critical to this endeavor in the State of Maryland.

One of the key takeaways you heard me describe is the first four consultations are a beta test of the process. We want to make sure we're effectively using the dollars and resources we have to conduct these consultations and that we're efficiently using the state's time with them. One key takeaways from this beta test process with Maryland is how important it was to have local public safety officials in the room. We will be working with states going forward to make sure there is a diversity, a range of disciplines that participate in the meetings, such as fire, EMS, law enforcement. We also seek geographic

diversity representation in rural areas, urban areas, all four corners of the state and that there is jurisdictional diversity. We see representatives from public safety, from the state, from locals and where appropriate from tribes. That dialogue and the eight hours we spent with Maryland was most fruitful. In going forward we're going to make sure to extract as much of that as we can from future states.

We learned a lot of critical information about Maryland which we think will help inform our business plan, our acquisition plan, and our systems planning. You can see here in the slide a number of topics we covered under coverage priority, special events, again around users and operations. Unique aspects of the states; what is unique about Maryland. In particular the dialogue again was most fruitful when the local public safety officials illustrate the challenges and opportunities they see with FirstNet around a special event. We used the Preakness horserace case as a backdrop to look at public safety operations now without FirstNet, and what that event might look like in the future with FirstNet. This was very fruitful, very productive, and it gave us a lot of good information to take back to FirstNet to help with RFP planning, with the system planning and with our business planning.

Going forward, we have just heard Chief Johnson describe that we have seven more consultation meetings planned for this calendar year in Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Utah, Iowa, and Florida. All of these occur between next week and the middle of December. We've received initial consultation readiness checklists from 25 states. We are digesting that information and gathering information, so we can prepare for additional meetings. To the remaining states we continue to provide technical assistance and outreach to them, to help them get ready for the consultation process and provide them with information from FirstNet to be prepared.

So with that, I'll turn over to Amanda to talk about outreach.

>>TJ Kennedy.: Amanda, one moment before you start. I want to thank Ray Lehr and the Maryland team who are all in the room with us today. And I want to thank them for going first and helping us work through the first state consultation effort. Your team did a terrific job, so thank you, Ray.

>>Amanda Hilliard: Thanks for the opportunity to brief and update you on our outreach and communications activities over the last couple of months. I'm going to talk briefly about hiring updates that continue to be a major focus for me and for the outreach team, as well as some of the engagements that we've had the last couple of months, and plans for the next couple of months.

I'll start just briefly touching on an organizational update. I'm pleased that over the last three months we brought on three additional staff to lead up our state and local branch, our tribal branch and our federal outreach branch. That would be Carl Rebstock, Jeremy Zollo, and Chris Algiere. All three come with great background in terms of working with their respected stakeholders on communications issues. They each bring a great network of stakeholders, so they have been able to hit the ground running their first week here. That has been really great and we'll be working over the next months to staff up the team, and of course I want to mention both Vicki Lee and Christy Wilde who hit their one year anniversaries with FirstNet a few months ago, and continue to be key members of outreach team. They are doing a lot of travel and engagement. I'm pleased with the staff we have on board and I am looking forward to bringing more folks on board.

Let me talk for a minute about state and local outreach support. The team has been working closely with Jeremy the last couple of months to hone in and develop an even more detailed staffing plan. We've been doing some analysis looking to hone in on staffing needs. We still plan to hire a lead in each of the 10 regions and I'm pleased that just Tuesday we posted for regions 5, 9 and 10, and we plan to post for the remaining seven regional leads in the next couple of weeks. We just have to trickle it so that we have adequate time to go through the resumes and do the interviews and what not. Our focus right now on hiring is those 10 regional outreach leads and then once we bring those folks on board, they will each

hire their teams. We're looking at about one to four folks in each of the regions depending on the makeup of the states and the needs. We have developed a detailed plan about that. This team's primary responsibility will be to be on the road, to be at agency meetings, state association meetings, and all of the outreach events many of the state points of contacts will conduct, working on co-presenting with them. We will be sharing the latest news about FirstNet as well as supporting the state consultation process. So we're excited about that. We're also working on the internal processes and procedures to make sure that we have systems in place so that all the information and data, they're hearing when they are in the meetings are feeding back to our headquarters here in Reston and the technical team in Boulder.

Similarly, Carl and I have been working closely on a plan for tribal outreach and our staffing there, and again he's done some analysis. The map here on the slide will show you that the majority of the nation's 566 federally recognized tribes are actually located in the 11 states in regions 9 and 10. So we are planning right now for a modest size team. We are looking to hire one individual to focus in regions 9 and 10. Another part-time employee would focus solely on Alaska, given the number of tribes there, and then a third staff to focus with the tribes in regions one through eight. So Carl and I are working with HR looking at some different hiring options for how we can bring the best folks onboard to support us with that.

I want to talk for a couple minutes about our work with the Public Safety Advisory Committee. We have been working closely with Harlin and the executive committee to set up a couple of working groups. The tribal working group is in the process of being stood up. It is going to be chaired by Richard Broncheau, our PSAC representative for the National Congress of American Indians. We have extended invitations to 17 tribal association and public safety organizations to join the group to essentially provide advice and recommendations on outreach and consultation strategies with tribes. We've gotten some good responses. There is interest in participating. Many of them just have to go through formal processes or procedures within their organization to formally identify representatives. We expect that group will have their first meeting in late October or early November. We are looking forward to getting that group up and running and to the advice and suggestions they'll be able to help us with as we move forward with tribal outreach.

We're also in the process of establishing an early builder working group, which I think Darryl Ackley will be chairing. He is our Association of State Chief Information Officers representative on the PSAC, and Todd Early from Texas will vice chair that group. We just met with Harlin, held a meeting with the two of them a few weeks ago and we are scheduling a kick-off meeting for the early builders very soon. Again, they're going to be meeting as a group and providing us with advice and lessons learned from the experience they have had over the last couple of years, so we're looking forward to getting that more formalized.

The PSAC submitted two key documents in July that we've been working through. The first document was use cases for the network. It is a pretty lengthy document that provides a lot of different use cases, applications, and different capabilities, expected of the network. The technical team has been going through that and from an outreach perspective, we plan to use that and turn it into our presentation material, and into our fact sheets to talk about specific use cases we envision.

In addition PSAC submitted a report on potential users of the network, which has been helpful as Stuart and his team pull together the public comment and notice. We're also leveraging that report for our state consultation activities as we plan for data collection on users. That has been really helpful and at a very high level, they started to get into the priority discussion in that document. We are looking forward to honing in on a new assignment with the PSAC very soon on that issue.

Lastly, the PSAC submitted to FirstNet the National Public Safety Telecommunication Council published

report on defining public safety grade, in May. The PSAC members reviewed that report and endorsed the findings, and passed to FirstNet. As you heard, if you participated in the technical meeting yesterday, Ali talked about how he's been talking with the executive committee members about suggestions on implementing that report.

So really good engagement, we're excited to have the PSAC executive committee here today and tomorrow, and we have a couple of different meetings scheduled with them across different staff here at FirstNet, as well as board members and our leadership team. The full PSAC has its next meeting on December 2. I also want to mention that tomorrow afternoon we're holding an association briefing where all the PSAC member organizations and a few other associations are invited. It is for the DC-based staff to just hear the latest and greatest on FirstNet, so just another outreach opportunity for the associations in particular folks that are located nearby here.

This slide here highlights a sampling of some of the stakeholder events that we've been attending and speaking at these last couple of months. You heard Chief Johnson talk about the meeting in Alaska. Many states are starting to ramp up their outreach efforts. California and Oklahoma which stick out in my mind are just starting to do some town hall and FirstNet related outreach meetings. We've been invited and able to go and support them and give FirstNet updates at those. We've been speaking at a number of PSAC member organization meetings, and at the National Governor's Association. We had a large presence at the APCO conference, the National Association of State CIOs, as well as participation at the National Congress of American Indian's convention. So this is really great engagement with the PSAC organizations and those who are speaking at their conferences get a really great opportunities to extend our outreach.

In terms of federal outreach, I've been continuing to participate in the Emergency Communications Preparedness Center meetings. There were focus group meetings on FirstNet consultation, as well as research and development in grants, so the DHS team has been great to work with, and I have been keeping folks at that level informed of activities. Now that we have Chris Algieri on board he is working away at a more detailed plan for how we can start doing more one-on-one engagement with federal agencies.

Ed Parkinson and some of you and TJ I know have been busy on the Hill, as well. I think Ed has tallied up 42 meetings since early June. Ed has some new staff starting next week, which we're looking forward to. We are starting to have some conversations about as we see some changes in governors and potentially some state single points of contact how we plan for that. So there will be a collaborative effort between Ed's team and my team.

So in the last few slides I just want to touch on a couple of communications updates. Our communications team that Corey and Ryan are leading is continuing to be very active on social media, posting three to five blogs a week. They have done a lot of guest blogs with our state single points of contact and other stakeholders which I think folks really like. Our web page or website continues to see increased traffic. We're putting new content on that site every week. I get a lot of good feedback when I go out and talk to stakeholders about the website. Related to that, just last week we released a multi-media presence page on our website indicating we're able to put videos on our website. We also launched our YouTube channel where we placed a number of videos you may have seen at APCO. These are the result of a lot of hard work by the folks on the communications team, we now have the ability to share content on the web. This is really great.

We're also very active on Twitter, where have over 750 followers there. I've seen many of the state single points of contact starting to use that as an outreach forum, as well, so that's been great. We recently launched a LinkedIn page, as well.

So in closing, this map here highlights the states that we've visited. We've actually flown to or traveled to 35 states since October of 2013, reaching about 20,000 stakeholders. I would note of course that while we haven't gotten to every state in the past year, we do continue to engage with all the states' single points of contact and continue to hold monthly calls with the SPOCs and quarterly webinars, giving them the latest on FirstNet update and the monthly SPOC calls provide an opportunity for the states to talk amongst themselves to discuss the outreach they are doing. Chairman, I think they have been valuable for us and them, as well, in terms of socializing with their peers.

Of course in the coming year, we will be hitting all 56 states and territories with consultation meetings, and as we see our outreach staff ramp up as I mentioned, their primary job will be on the road, you know, participating in the meetings. So I have come to the end of my remarks. I guess Dave and I will take any questions if there are any.

>>Teri Takai: Well, Amanda and Dave, I really appreciate the update and thank you for all the hard work. I know it is a lot of travel and getting out to see folks and I'm sure everyone appreciates it.

I have two questions. I guess, and maybe they're questions in the form of a bit of a concern. The states have been terrific about naming the single points of contact, as hard as that is, to do across the state and local jurisdictions, and I think it is important that FirstNet adopt the same approach, that is, that there is a single point of contact here as well. We don't want confusion over do I call Amanda or do I call Dave and what is the difference between the two teams and if I have a concern, how do I know that that is getting fully communicated? So I guess I'd ask you as you think about going through the rest of this year to make sure that for the state single point of contact there is a FirstNet single point of contact, so that if somebody doesn't know who to call they can go on the website and they get one person. And then I think the other piece of that is to make sure they get one answer, because as we're evolving here, things are going to be moving quickly and it is easy to get the answer of the day and it depends on who you talk to.

I guess those would be the items. Again, I'm not asking you to answer the questions right away, but I want to respect what the states have done in terms of organizing, which is, you know an exciting and difficult proposition for them. I want to make sure that, you know we're being as clear for them in terms of how they get information and also how they give us that feedback in a way that we're going to record it, and going to get them answers to those questions.

>>David Buchanan: Thank you for that. I think that is a good observation. We're well aware of that same risk and we think about that and talk about that. Currently our staff is collocated in the same suite and the rest of the team. Amanda and I and the rest of the advocacy team have a close working relationship. We meet every day and I think today we've been able to avoid those risks, but we'll continue to be aware of them and work to make sure that doesn't happen.

>>Teri Takai: Yes, I think that is great, but the challenge is if you are sitting in 'name your state', they don't know that. And they need to have, again, one person that you can activate in the background to do the dialogue.

>>Sue Swenson: Yes, Amanda and Dave, thanks, along with Teri's comments for everything you are doing. The question that I have, Amanda, is you talked about the states and the organizational structure around outreach. What kind of skill are you looking for? I think it would be helpful to the listening audience to understand this and they would perhaps be interested in these opportunities. I think it is important we define the skillsets and could you describe maybe some of the challenges that we're having getting the right people in those jobs? I think these are critical positions with particular skills we're looking for, so how are we doing on the hiring for that?

>>Amanda Hilliard: Sure.

>>Sue Swenson: If you could.

>>Amanda Hilliard: I think you know as I mentioned the folks that I have hired to date have been able to come in and hit the ground running right away, which I think is important and critical. I would hope, one, that I would expect they have been working within their state or within their region, their agency, on broadband related issues and in the past probably LMR projects. I would hope or would like for the folks to have participated on committee meetings, governance structures within their organizations, related to the communications efforts. You know, obviously we're looking for strong interpersonal skills, presentation skills, the folks will be up in front of the room presenting often and in small meetings, just having dialogue and exchange. So that's critical piece, too, communications skills.

You know, we're looking for folks that have relationships within the state, within the region. Again, so they can hit the ground running right away. So in terms of some of the challenges that I faced, we did advertise for some public safety subject matter expert positions back in June. I have had some lessons learned through the HR process, and for the positions I just advertised, we've made the vacancy postings much more detailed. The things I learned from some of the things we weren't seeing in a number of potential candidates that I interviewed previously, we made sure those are documented and required as the minimum qualifications we're looking for in the new positions. Many folks that I interviewed for the public safety SME positions were just getting familiar with FirstNet or hadn't heard about us until they applied for the vacancy announcement. For those positions where that is our national law enforcement representative for example, I thought it was critical that they have been involved in working on this effort to be able to be successful in the role.

>>Sue Swenson: I have one additional comment. We talk about the coordination between the two of you, but I think we have another prong on that chair, a three-legged chair and the other is the Government affairs chair and --

>>Amanda Hilliard: It's like a five legged chair with state plans.

>>Sue Swenson: I think it is important there be not only coordination between the two of you, but Ed Parkinson, as well. As you indicated, in this effort you will be involved in from a government affairs perspective, as well. If there is five prongs or 10 prongs, whatever the prongs are, but I want to mention, Ed is active and adding resources and the work he does is critically important.

>>Amanda Hilliard: Yes

>>Jeff Johnson: Madam Chair, one thing I would add to Amanda's report about hiring is this is the federal hiring process and we're subject to the idiosyncrasies, strengths, and weaknesses of the federal hiring system. It is all about the art of properly defining the role, properly defining the work and in doing our best to get a deep and wide pool of candidates that meet our needs because one thing is for sure, we can't settle for not having the right people. It is too important work. As Amanda said, we've learned lessons about how to make sure we get that pool and how we make sure we comply with the hiring process on our path to get the right people. But nonetheless, it is what it is.

>>Amanda Hilliard: Yes.

I also want to add because I know there may be some folks probably listening in who that might be interested in those regional positions we just advertised. I want you to know those are permanent telework positions. It says that in the vacancy posting but it may not necessarily be 100% clear. That reminded me of a challenge we had with some of the candidates that were pretty highly qualified for the

regional or national SME positions. But those were advertised for Reston, and folks thought they could get that changed to telework. When I posted those, I was looking for folks that would be headquarters based. I'm reconsidering that now, but there was a little bit of confusion there, as well, for the couple of candidates we were considering, there that was issue that came up.

>> Tim Bryan: Amanda, I will give you one small piece of advice. We have in my day job an organization that is flung across the nation that serves a lot of the rural communities and it's really hard to touch all those bases. We have about a dozen people that do that, as you go about the hiring process, not only sort of keep them informed through internal webinars and things like that, but find a good ERM/CRM system that can help you track contacts and help you develop your message and have a single place within your organization where you can get that information. If you don't do that from the beginning and try to do it a couple years from now....

>>Amanda Hilliard: Yes.

>> Tim Bryan: Because we did that. And it is no fun.

>>Amanda Hilliard: You should see a line item in the budget memo for that. Randy is nodding his head. (Laughter) So yes.

>> Tim Bryan: I set myself up for that, Amanda.

>>TJ Kennedy: I want to thank Amanda and Dave for a great update on what has been happening in both consultation and outreach.

What we'd like to do now is to move into an update on the public notice and comment, and then I'll cover the RFI and the draft statement of objectives. Stuart?

>>Stuart Kupinsky: Thanks, TJ. So we had three committee meetings yesterday as you know that went through both the underlying slides on the background to the public notice and comment, and hit upon each of the sort of material interpretations that were contained in the documents. You have the documents and have been able to review them ahead of the meeting. So what I would propose is to race through the slides very quickly to leave time for questions and discussion, because I think the vast majority of board members were present for at least one or two of the meetings.

So in March 2014, as both Sue and TJ pointed out, we announced that over the next 12 months we wanted to achieve four primary goals. And today we're checking the box on two of them. We've initiated this public notice that I'm going to describe. We've started formal state consultations as Dave talked about, and we're also initiating this RFI . And it is not just an RFI, it is an RFI with parts of a draft RFP. So I would say we're checking the box on 2-1/2 of these bullets.

The pieces fit together in a pretty straightforward manner. Our consultation efforts are feeding into the RFI that we're hopefully launching today, and that will obviously feed the draft RFP. Then the topic for discussion right now, the notice and comment process, is also a feeder into the draft RFP. And the notice and comment document itself is somewhat legalistic. It is a Word document that goes through and analyzes the text of the enabling legislation. It's really a legal analysis of the legislation, hopefully an objective analysis, with the policies in mind that FirstNet would follow. But it's important to point out that this is a legal interpretation of the outer boundaries, if you will, of the provisions in our enabling legislation. These are not policy pronouncements within those boundaries and so we discussed that at length yesterday, but I'm going to touch on that a couple times as we go through this.

We're not actually legally required to put out a notice and comment document. We are not subject to the Administrative Procedure Act. Even if we were, some of the interpretations that are in the document are more along the lines of interpretive rules, and so we may not have been subject to it anyway. But there were several good reasons for doing this, among them include the emphasis that Congress placed on an open and transparent process in our enabling legislation, and so we wanted to make sure and get input on some of the key interpretations that will feed into the RFP process.

This RFP process is a little unusual and a one-shot deal under the rubric set out in our enabling legislation and as a result this is our one opportunity to get feedback on these interpretations and the combination of the notice and the RFI should hopefully serve that end. Lastly, the RFI and the RFP process, while technically open to the public for comment, tends to draw the crowd of vendors and potential suppliers to FirstNet. And while we encourage everyone to respond to the RFI that we are talking about today, the notice and comment document that we're going to launch is going to be launched on a wider basis, if you will, using the Federal Register. And we want to make sure that we get participation if we can.

>> Sue Swenson: Let me just comment. We have background noise. I'm not sure why. We will try to take care of that. Do you want to wait a moment please?

>>Stuart Kupinsky: Sure.

>> Sue Swenson: (background noise) --

>> Sue Swenson: So let me make a comment to those on the line. There is somebody talking that has background noise, I don't know if you can hear me, I would suggest you go on mute while we try to fix the line here. I hope you don't say anything you don't want us to hear.

>>Stuart Kupinsky: Well if they are talking about the notice, I'm happy to listen.

>> Sue Swenson: You are happy.

>>Stuart Kupinsky: Didn't sound like it, though. Sounds like we're --

>> Sue Swenson: OK Great.

>>Stuart Kupinsky: We talked about the fact this is a wide participation effort, so we're hoping to get comments from a pretty diverse group as shown on the slide. The interpretations in the notice are legalistic interpretations of legislation, but just because you're not an attorney doesn't mean you can't participate in the process.

The item that I emphasized at the outset is the outer boundary of our legal interpretation. This is important to understand. I'll use an example that we'll talk about probably more in depth in a moment. But one of the interpretations that we're setting forth is our preliminary view of what the term "public safety entity" means. This is a legal analysis under the provisions of the act; this is not a policy pronouncement of which users we believe should be on the network. This is a legalistic interpretation of the words in the legislation. So there are additional steps that occur after we establish this outside legal boundary for our interpretation of public safety entity. We could, for example, decide as a policy matter, after consultation with the PSAC and other public safety entities, for example, that we want to narrow the scope of eligible users on our network. And then once we define the eligible users on our network, there will be technical and operational parameters that dictate the priority and preemption scheme that we use and that an incident commander on the ground, for example, could implement to prioritize users even within that second basket, the narrower basket. So this document, this notice and comment document, is really only seeking comment on the outside legal boundaries, that first ring, if you will, in

the Venn diagram. I want to emphasize that.

So we went through a series of topics and different committees had somewhat overlapping jurisdiction over various of the topics. What I would propose to do is highlight just a few of these and leave room for discussion and questions. So we talked in the Technology Committee in particular about the delineation between the core network and the RAN network. The most important point from this discussion in the notice and comment document is that FirstNet is required to build a nationwide core network and our interpretation from both the straightforward language in the legislation and the interoperability goals of the act, is that an opt-out state, that is, a state that builds its own RAN, would use the FirstNet core to serve public safety entities. That would ensure the interoperability goals in the act and again from the straightforward language in the legislation we believe this is a correct interpretation. We're obviously seeking comment on this interpretation; it is not the final interpretation.

With respect to users, we just talked a little bit about the definition of public safety entity, and I'd like to go through that in just a slight bit more detail. There are two prongs to the definition of public safety entity under the act. One prong is based on, actually, a Communications Act provision, and the other prong is based on a Homeland Security Act provision. Focusing in on the first prong, the FCC has provided us with an interpretation of that prong of the Communications Act provision. With regard to government entities, entities such as a transportation department that plays a role in protecting the safety of motorists, etcetera, has been interpreted as potential providers of public safety services and thus under our enabling legislation would be deemed public safety entities. We in the notice and comment document go through and give deference to the FCC's interpretation of this provision, which is one of the prongs of our public safety entity definition. We extend that interpretation to nongovernmental entities, using the FCC's interpretation of the same words for purposes of governmental entities.

And then we go on to look at the Homeland Security Act prong of our definition. The HSA provision has not been publicly interpreted by the Department of Homeland Security. It contains two aspects that are of interest. One is that it specifies that in addition to organizations, it includes in its wording, personnel, and so we have interpreted that provision to mean that a public safety entity for purposes of FirstNet could include an individual, a human, if you will. We've used the example of a volunteer firefighter, independent of the firefighting organization that that individual is volunteering for. In addition, the HSA prong of the definition uses the term 'related personnel and organizations' and so we have tried to interpret the term 'related' and our preliminary analysis is that that term results in those individuals and organizations that are directly supporting what would be considered more traditional first responders, should be included in the larger circle of public safety entity in terms of our enabling legislation. It's critical to understand the distinction between being included in the legal definition of public safety entity, and the performance of the network with regard to those entities. Let me take a moment to explain this.

It was the subject of questions in a couple of committee meetings. I want to make it clear for the full board.

The designation of being a public safety entity under the act, if our preliminary conclusions held at the end of the day, does not mean that those entities or individuals would in essence clog or rob network capacity from more traditional public safety entities.

What it means is that our core network would be the one serving those entities to the extent they are our subscribers and that they count as public safety entities.

Our core would implement whatever priority and preemption schema would be put in place with regard to all entities on Band 14. So as an example, an incident commander would be able to, under this interpretation, either elevate or deprioritize, let's say workers from a utility in the middle of a response

to a hurricane, so if power needed to be restored an incident commander could theoretically use the FirstNet network to elevate the priority of that utility worker for purposes of restoring power and then return that utility worker to the same prioritization level that a commercial customer of one of our covered leasing agreement partners would have. And so, in effect, we allow the incident commander to have more power over, you know, individuals and organizations to the extent that they are deemed public safety entities. It is actually not the reverse. So I wanted to try and add clarity to that and we can grab Jeff to come back up again for more technical analyses if there are further questions. Well. Both Jeffs. Chief Johnson is able to answer these questions, too.

>>Jeff Johnson: Madam Chair, if I may comment. Stuart, I'd like to thank you your office for listening to public safety's request to listen very broadly on this topic. As any incident commander will tell you, and I spent 15 years of my life as a fire chief of a metropolitan entity, many of the biggest emergencies we dealt with involved non-traditional public safety resources. They involved buses to evacuate neighborhoods, buses to evacuate apartment complexes. It takes public transportation to evacuate neighborhoods ahead of a wildfire. Many of the ice events, wind events, storm events, that had major power outage consequences, that rolls into senior resident care facilities that are without power and electricity, people's oxygen machines don't work, and literally getting the electricity back on changed that incident from 'I have utility problems' or 'I have a mass casualty incident'. The fact is, whether it is transportation, whether it is mass transit, whether utilities, there are all sorts of secondary resources that are public resources that the incident commander needs access to. I think it is very insightful and of public safety to ask and insightful of you to listen, to ask and listen to this issue very broadly, because the fact is when the incident commander needs to talk to somebody, we have to have the ability to do it. Thank you for doing that, Stuart.

>>Stuart Kupinsky: Certainly. Thank you. Our focus is obviously the network is going to be designed. Our interpretations are geared toward an operational philosophy centered around the traditional public safety official, right? So these are legal interpretations to try and fit that mindset into the legal rubric we're working with and to enable that kind of operational philosophy.

So --

I'm flipping through slides you have already seen. I wanted to touch on a couple of other points and open up to further questions and discussion.

The network is not a green field design. We have the guidance of a report from what was a technical advisory board called the Interoperability Board and in this report, the Board recited a number of industry standards, 3GPP, as the industry group they primarily concentrated on, and detailed out a lot of the industry standards that we're to follow in constructing the network. If we follow the industry standards we will hopefully lower the cost ultimately to public safety because we're able to access a wider equipment market, etcetera.

But it's important to note that this is not a static network and our interpretation of the enabling legislation is in a straightforward manner in that we are to keep the network advanced and technically advancing as FirstNet matures. We're fortunate that there is language built into the Interoperability Board report that foresees this issue. There is a tension between identifying network standards today, and some of the edicts in the legislation that say we're supposed to keep the network modern, if you will. So this language in the Interoperability Board report allows us some flexibility in adopting these industry standards that have been identified today, as they themselves mature over time.

In addition to that, the legislation allows us to make nonmaterial changes to the standards that are set out in the Interoperability Board report, and we seek comment in the notice and comment documents about what that means and when and under what circumstances those changes should be effectuated. I

wanted to highlight that, because we're actually seeking comment about the appropriate circumstances for deviating from that report.

And then I wanted to note very quickly that for those that weren't with us yesterday, we've adopted preliminarily, pending comment, a definition of rural and the significance of adopting a definition for that term which is not provided in the act, is that we are obligated to build in substantial rural milestones in our deployment plans at each phase of our deployment. So we don't come out with a preliminary conclusion as to what those substantial rural milestones should be. We seek comment on how we should come to that conclusion and the factors that we should consider. I think it is a critical question for us, and I wanted to highlight it for the board.

And then, probably one more item would be the incorporation of existing infrastructure. The act provides a number of types of infrastructure that we're supposed to consider incorporating into the FirstNet network, and in at least two contexts. One directly into the RFP process that we're engaging in, and then two, just in general. That we are over the entire life of our existence, we are supposed to enter into agreements to leverage infrastructure.

The test for when the legislation requires us to enter into these types of agreements to leverage infrastructure is an economic desirability test, so another one of the key items in our notice and comment document is the factors to consider in an economic desirability assessment, and how, for example, the transaction costs of potentially evaluating millions of pieces of infrastructure across the country should be included in that economic desirability assessment. Our goal obviously is to create a situation where we have optimized the cost curve for FirstNet and thus the public safety community by lowering our costs to build the network and provide the services that public safety needs. And so we don't want to make uneconomic decision in incorporating infrastructure that would actually increase our costs.

So these get into more complicated assessments, particularly where we are balancing costs with speed of deployment. It is a significant area for us and so we sought guidance in the notice and comment document. With that, I will propose to stop there and allow questions and any discussion.

>> Sue Swenson: All right, does the board, we spent quite a bit of time on this yesterday in the committee meeting, is there anything top of mind? One question I have that maybe is just worth repeating is the availability of these comments. To what degree, if I was interested seeing what other people's point of view is, where would I find those?

>>Stuart Kupinsky: It will be a two-stage publication if you will. First stage is we're going to put up on our website an unofficial version of the notice document so that everybody has access to it immediately. The second stage is the official publication in the Federal Registrar and then once that publication takes place, there is a mechanism online that allows people to file their comments in response to our document and all those comments will be available to the public. Everybody will be able to see everybody else's comments.

>> Sue Swenson: Does the board have any comments or questions? I know some of you may not have been as involved as others; I want to make sure everybody is comfortable with the topics and the process and sounds like I'm seeing nods around the table. So, Stuart we might be able to proceed. Teri do you have something?

>>Teri Takai: Just a comment just for the broader group. When will the comment period close?

>>Stuart Kupinsky: Thank you. It's a 30-day comment period. We decided to match up the RFI comment period to the notice and comment period. OK. Thank you very much.

>> Sue Swenson: Do you want to go with the resolution at this point?

>>Stuart Kupinsky: Please.

>> Sue Swenson: Mr. Secretary, would you read the motion or resolution?

>>Uzoma Onyeije: Madam Chair, now therefor be it resolved the board authorizes management to take such reasonable actions as are necessary to publish the proposed public notice in substantially the form presented to the board and take public comment on management's preliminary interpretations of FirstNet's enabling legislation contained therein.

>> Sue Swenson: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

>>All: Aye.

>> Sue Swenson: Those opposed, same sign? Any abstentions? Resolution is passed. Thank you, Stuart. TJ, I think you will take us through the draft RFI; correct? Comprehensive draft RFI?

>> TJ Kennedy: In similar fashion as Stuart just did, I will cover at a high level a lot of the discussion that occurred in the committee meetings yesterday. You heard a bit in the read out earlier today about all the discussion on the RFI and the draft statement of objectives. One key for us, we want to make sure we're getting all the possible input through market research prior to getting into an RFP where we can no longer have key discussions. One key for us is to make sure that this is a way for us to put out as much thinking as possible on the statement of objectives and to get as much feedback as possible. You will also see that in the past we had done a number of detailed or specific RFIs; now we're getting down to asking some of the key questions that relate to business strategy as well as technical operation and our key objectives are going to become part of the draft RFP and eventually the final RFP

To be able to pull in market research, one thing in spite of trying to make sure to keep the urgency of moving forward as quickly as practical, make sure that we are getting input in a very defined way and folks are responding to each objective as part of the comment on the draft statement of objectives. Also on the really difficult questions that the team has been pondering we also want to share the key questions with everybody for feedback. And so we want to make sure great minds in industry and smart minds who have been thinking about how to make FirstNet a success so that public safety gets system they need. They can comment and give us additional ideas in case we missed something we should have considered. So this process over the next 30 days has the ability to come in and respond to this draft statement of objectives. I think it will be very important.

One of the big things we've done, is we have taken a performance-based approach by choosing statement of objectives versus statement of work. The goal of the statement of objectives is to allow industry and to allow the technology community to respond in different ways but meet the same objectives. We thought this was very important so we were open to different ways of solving the problem and getting the best solution at the best cost for public safety because we have unique element where there is an element to have covered leasing agreement. We want to make sure to allow the best way to have covered leasing agreements and cost low to build the network which will result in lower user fees for public safety at the end of the day. By taking a statement of objectives approach, this will really leave us open to many different possibilities when it comes to the partnerships or approaches to the solution, but we now want to get those discreet comments coming in. One thing with RFI responses we need to make sure RFI responses will be confidential so that companies can come forward with responses to their approach to our needs. By doing this, they should be able to come forward with very specific ideas they would propose to meet all of the objectives that we're putting forward. And so we

think this is the best way and quickest way possible for us to be very open and transparent and also to get the ideas into the team and get those analyzed and get a draft RFP out on the street.

One of the other things we're doing is trying to make sure we push forward with this RFI, and this is a last chance before the communications may end up changing in the future as we get into the writing phase and have teams that are sequestered away to get into the RFP. From a timing perspective, a high level time line is to issue the RFI for 30-days and then have the RFI information come back in. This will be analyzed by the team, then work together on market research report and move that into an industry day and go out to industry and talk about the draft RFP that is going to be released and then actually issue the draft RFP.

That draft RFP will have a comment period and then we'll move to final RFP phase. That comment period on draft RFP will be an important piece for folks weighing in on the near final RFP we'll be going out with. Another key element as we move forward. If you think about this as a funnel, each step of the way will get more refined, it will be very close to the final RFP. One of the differences with an RFI and draft statement of objectives, all of the attachments that may be part of the final RFP evaluation criteria and those things, we are not there yet. They will come later with the draft RFP and the final RFP. That is what the team will be working on getting responses digested, which is very important.

As far as the outline of the RFI, pretty standard kind of information on the background, what is being requested and what are the program objectives. Two attachments will be with the RFI are the draft statement of objectives themselves and a glossary of key terms, a lot of acronym and terminology we use both in the technology community as well as public safety community. We want to be very clear on what those are as we move stop here forward.

As far as the kinds of issues we're approaching in the RFI, there is some very detailed questions that go into deploying and operating and maintaining the network. Key elements of the RFI are related around pricing and sustainability. One thing that was discussed in the Finance Committee yesterday is that one key element, what we're trying to do with the RFP process is prove the sustainability of the business model and that sustainability is so key FirstNet going forward with the way the legislation was set up to make this work. We want to make sure we're teasing out the elements that will help make sure we have a sustainable approach to this, as well as getting key responses that will help us build a network that is sustainable going forward.

Suzanne Spaulding mentioned about system hardening and how important that is to the network. One thing we have in here are some key questions around that reliability and even restoration of the network after key disasters or other issues. Priority and preemption. One thing we want to do is to push industry to make sure they come forward with specific ways they would expect to handle that. We heard from the Technology Committee and the technical team and how the testing in the lab is going and we want industry to come forward and tell us how they will implement that. It will be important as we move forward.

We have a bit in there about opt-out with RAN integration as well as life-cycle innovation. One of the keys to the network that is different for public safety, is we have to have a network that is recapitalized and have to have a business model that has the ability to go to advanced LTE 5G, 6G generations in the future. That is a different model than we in the public safety industry have lived under in the past in some cases. As part of the way we want to look at this, innovation the way industry has and how they think about building that into RFI responses will be very important.

As far as the outcomes, we know there is a chance that there will be some things we have not thought of. We have left a bit of open-ended questions for people to bring forward any ideas we may have missed. We know that industry is working very hard on bringing forward important solutions and even

though the team has worked hard to pull this together, there is always a chance for key issues we've missed. I hope they would bubble up now if we haven't heard them already. We also want to make sure that we're open to ideas that we haven't heard, and this is a great chance for everybody across industry to really weigh in and get their information in front of FirstNet if they haven't done that.

So with that, I think I've covered it at a high level. There was a lot more detailed discussions with the different committees yesterday broken up by key element in the objectives, and I'm open to questions before we move on.

>> Teri Takai: TJ Kennedy, not so much a question, but to first of all, I think the approach that you are taking to put out the RFI, as well as the items that Stuart just mentioned are critically important. I want to emphasize that to industry folks on the line, but also the state and local customers. The input that we're going to get from this process, while it might seem somewhat bureaucratic, and fairly laborious as government documents can tend to be, are just really so critically important to getting the input, before we commit ourselves to something as final as an RFP. And I just want to make sure that the audience takes this seriously and we're emphasizing that we're really serious about wanting that input, because it is going to shape not only what the RFP is going to be, but what the network is going to look like going forward. Again, I just want to emphasize what you're saying from a board perspective that this is really such a critical next step in our strategic road map, that I just couldn't let it go by without taking an opportunity really to emphasize that, and to just really encourage everyone to think about it. And you don't necessarily have to respond on all of it. There may be parts of it that are really important to get the feedback on, but I really encourage the maximum amount of participation that we can get.

>>TJ Kennedy: I appreciate that, Teri too, as well as your guidance and the board's guidance as we move through this, as well as the seriousness of getting this input has been there every step of the way and I think this is really important.

>>Brian Deese: Just to follow-up to reinforce. You mentioned TJ, the nature of the communications changes. It may actually be helpful for you to give us a little bit more on how that works, particularly for those who are less close to it. I think it goes to the point Teri was making.

>>TJ Kennedy: Yes, technology right now is changing quickly and we hear a lot about LTE and most of us are dealing with LTE day-to-day and voice over LTE is coming to some of the commercial networks already. As we move forward, there are a lot of key elements that will continue to change and we want to make sure we understand from different proposers, who will be responding to our RFI and eventually their RFP approaches. We want the technology committee, when it comes to the sustainability side, to understand that we're not just trying to build an initial capital network; we need a network that is sustainable and must look at the operating cost and maintenance of what we propose to go forward and how to build that into the business model.

It is not just about technology that changes very quickly, but we need to be agile to deal with it as the sustainability that comes into it.

>>Brian Deese: That is, I think you may be answering a different question. I was more focused on the nature of FirstNet's capacity to communicate with external stakeholders as we move from the RFI process into the RFP process.

>>TJ Kennedy: Great point. Brian, going forward, the key for us, getting into the RFI process, we will now be having a contract officer as the central point of contact related to the key communication around the RFI. After this market research phase ends, there will not be the time to have additional market research where we can have open dialogue with industry. So what is so important about an RFI like this, is we can take that open dialogue today and take the inputs, but when we get into the RFP, we are

locked down during the RFP process and communication with vendors related to the RFP. There are specific points when we will have to turn off the communication to keep the integrity of the RFP process. We're headed there.

>>Teri Takai: I think just follow-on to Brian's point. I think we are tag teaming here. I think the other points that Brian, you were after, making critical decisions based on this information and I think that is an important point to take, as well. Some of which are going to be popular, some of which may not be quite so popular. They are decisions in trying to get to the specifics of what FirstNet will really look like. So I think it's the formal communication, but also the fact that it is going to really start to get down to some critical things we've all been talking about. We have to make the decisions or we'll not be able to move forward.

>>Sue Swenson: TJ, can you comment on the confidentiality of the information? I think if I was responding, I would want to know how my information was being protected, obviously, this is a competitive process, and I think this is critically important that people understand how we're going to do this.

>>TJ Kennedy: Sure. I think two things: one with our contracting officer, work closely to make sure as inputs come in, they are kept company confidential and that the restrictions on releasing that are made very clear. We will protect that with utmost integrity so these responses are looked at from the key business capabilities that folks wouldn't necessarily put out in the public domain because of their secret sauce or what they do differently from somebody else is so different. Because this is nearing the end of the market research process, we want to get down to specifics like Teri said a moment ago. We need to make key technology decisions, make key business decisions and this input will help drive that. We're looking for real input. Those decisions are not made. This is a real request for input, but also we want that input not to be holding back on key information that companies can provide now to make sure we go forward with the best solutions.

>>Sue Swenson: I think we know, if you think about the longer process and issuance of the RFP, we know that the conversations about where we end up will happen at a later stage within the source selection process. I think that is what it is called, Stuart? I think what we're saying suggests to the degree possible is to really indicate where people are today because we will be making some decisions in the RFP based on that. I think we need to encourage not just boiler plate responses and try to get into as much detail as possible. We know the real negotiations in which none of us will be involved, will happen later. Correct?

>>TJ Kennedy: Correct.

>> Sue Swenson: Okay.

>>Annise Parker: Sue, a quick question for the new folks over on this side of the table. You have already been through a number of rounds of RFIs. How many --

>>TJ Kennedy: We've had 12 RFIs before.

>> Annise Parker: And this last shot RFI, what they'll see is what we anticipate being the RFP document, but still a last chance to weigh in, but it is not a last chance to weigh in. There will be another draft RFP. So they have 30-days to weigh in, how long do you anticipate to produce the final -- not final, the draft RFP and then go to a full RFP?

>>TJ Kennedy: Good question. What happens now is we go out for 30 days with the request for information and draft statement objectives which you appropriately said, are the core of what becomes

the draft RFP in the future. Comments that come back on the RFI questions and the draft statement of objectives will be analyzed and put into the draft RFP, while will have a number of key attachments and details traditional in federal procurement. We expect that to take a few months to occur. Part of the reason being we don't lock into an exact date depends on the number of responses, and if there is anything new or different that comes in, will take more time to adjust the approach. Once that happens over a few months, we will come out with industry day and a draft RFP. You have comments of the draft RFP, but when you get to the stage when it is near finished RFP, what we don't want to do is go in with the wrong approach.

What we're doing now is exposing as much of the approach as we can and we are trying to get a lot of input right now so that if we need to change direction it will be now.

>> Annise Parker: Obviously we are working in an area where change is happening at a tremendous speed and there can be game changing technological breakthroughs. However, because we've had such a long period of input from industry, the anticipation is that everybody knows where we are going and there shouldn't be any surprises. This is one last chance to see.

>>TJ Kennedy: Correct. And I think this is a big opportunity. People aren't just responding to the art of the possible. Now they are responding to a draft statement of objectives and our approach to the objectives. I think what we're looking for is for industry-specific approach to those key objectives and how they would have us do that if they were in charge of doing this. We want to look at the business and technology together.

>>Stuart Kupinsky: One quick addition to that. The difference between the draft statement of objectives that we have embodied in our RFI and the final draft RFP is the subject of a number of the questions in the RFI. So let me give you an example. The statement of objectives talks about how the network should be constructed and operated and the features provided by the network, etcetera. What is missing from a draft RFP perspective, is how we are going to evaluate proposals to achieve those objectives as well as the process of the acquisition so to speak, in arriving at a winner or winners, and so some of the pointed questions in the RFI go to those processes and those evaluation criteria that will be critical in our ability to arrive at the right result. That is the best way to describe it. Sue yesterday asked some pointed questions about, you know, the built-in risks of having states opt-out and how that affects the process of the procurement itself. Those are some questions we're asking in the RFI: how best to approach the procurement process and the competition, if you will, to arrive at the right result. That is the difference between the draft statement of objectives and the ultimate draft RFP. The draft RFP will contain our final view pending comments to how we approach the acquisition, the evaluation criteria and the statement of objectives. Hopefully that helps.

>> Teri Takai., I want to make sure we are answering the mayor's question in one regard. Our strategic roadmap today says that we will put the RFP out in the first --

>> TJ Kennedy: Correct.

>>Teri Takai: Now perhaps some variability in terms of responses, but I wouldn't want to leave it open ended if we get a bunch of stuff back that it is just going to go on. We have a target date for the first quarter.

>>Stuart Kupinsky: And we're moving as fast as possible in that direction. I will point out our program road map does caveat that.

>>TJ Kennedy: My chief counsel tried to protect us on those the key things. We understand and we are moving with a lot of urgency. One reason we're going forward with a 30-day turnaround is we want

people to be focused on getting information in, and we want to digest it and then move forward. We have urgency to move forward doing it right and being very methodical about it.

>> Sue Swenson: Any other comments or questions from the board? Looks like we're ready to have our Secretary read the operative portion of the resolution.

>>Uzoma Onyeije: Now therefore be it resolved that the board authorizes management to take such reasonable actions as are necessary to publish the proposed public notice in substantially the same form as was presented to the board and seek public comment on management's preliminary interpretation. I'm sorry, I think I'm reading the wrong one.

>> Sue Swenson: Yes, go to the next one.

>>Uzoma Onyeije: Let's try it again. Now therefore be it resolved the board of the First Responder Network Authority hereby authorizes management to seek public comment on management's proposed comprehensive network solution request for information and statement of objectives substantially in the form presented to the board. I think that is the right one.

>> Sue Swenson: Sounds like the right one. Is there a motion? Thank you, Barry. Second? Thank you, Ed. All those in favor? Any further comment? All those in favor signify with aye.

>> All: Aye.

>> Sue Swenson: All those opposed, same sign. Any abstentions? Resolution passes. Thank you very much. Thank you, TJ. I think we're ready to move on for a brisk, crisp discussion of the budget.

>>Tim Bryan: Why are you turning on my microphone now? I'm the crisp part. Well, as we did yesterday, Randy and I will tag team a quick discussion of the 2015 fiscal year '15 budget. As we discussed yesterday and I'll take two minutes to reprise the short talk I did yesterday, if anybody was here yesterday, lamentably you will hear it all again. Most good finance committees don't just look forward, they also look backwards. I think one of the things we wanted to do is look backwards in a public setting and talk a little bit about what we said here over the past year and what actually transpired, and then really provide commentary around two things: what do the numbers mean, and what is the process that we're following.

I think as you can see in the center of this page, that is on the screen, just as we were getting organized after we had established the board, I'm not sure we had an employee yet in March of 2013, we may have had one or two. We were asked to provide a quick figure for the President's 2014 budget, which we did at \$257 million of obligations. When we had a board authorization in August of 2013, the board actually authorized \$194 million, but delegated to the Finance Committee a spend plan that would focus on spending and the associated milestones, which we did a few months actually a month later and the Finance Committee authorized \$98 million of obligations. We took another look at that in April (2014) when the management team came up with revised road map, we looked at the priorities of that road map and directed spending to support the priorities that were in the road map, that is \$72 million obligation budget that was approved in April and here we are in September and it looks like we'll end up at around \$64 million. Those are all on the obligation side and on the expense side we'll actually spend \$29 million.

So there is a number of ways a person could look at this depending which lens they look at it through. One is we did a great job by expending considerably less than we had originally anticipated. Others might look at it as we did not such a great job, because we didn't make the progress we had anticipated and therefore didn't spend as much as we had calculated, and then others could just say we're not that

good at budgeting just yet because the numbers are pretty far apart.

I think the paint job we'd like to put on this, is this is an organization, both the board and a management team, that really wants to move this process forward and move it forward as quickly as possible. You heard it from Randy, you heard it from Stuart, and we certainly provided the financial capacity to do that. However, I think we want to establish that we have to go through gates in order to reach milestones, in order to really both spend money wisely and achieve the results we're looking for. So as consequence, I think this presentation of numbers actually paints a really good picture of both a management team and a board focused on the most critical priorities and objectives of developing a sustainable business plan for FirstNet and directing spending in a calm, rational and reasonable way to achieve those objectives.

So that's a sort of backward look. Also a backward look and a forward look is the process which we're going to use this year. You'll see that we're going to establish a target or an estimate for our budget for fiscal year 2015 and if you liked the Finance Committee yesterday you'll love it again, because in a few weeks we'll meet again and talk about a spend plan and go through a budget memo. We will look at those priorities, look at the road map and we're going to direct spending in the way to make sure we can achieve our priorities. As a consequence, you'll see that in a bit of the presentation today and you'll get another crack at us a few weeks from now. So Sue, that's a very brief summary of the process of the numbers and I know Randy will give a more detailed view of what is before the board today.

>> Sue Swenson: Great. Thank you.

>>Randy Lyon: Sure. Thank you, Tim. I'm happy to be here today to present an outline of what we're proposing in the budget and I am especially happy to be doing it given what we've heard over the last hour or so. I think the budget is very responsive to the types of priorities and activities that we've just been walking through. I'll touch on some of that as we walk through it. Overall, what we're recommending is a budget of \$120 million of obligation with expenses of \$115 million as well as access to obligational authority that was not used in 2014 to catch some of the year-end things we've got underway.

So in terms of the broad set of activities we're looking at, the really key focus of this work is on the Comprehensive RFP. We realize that it is a necessity to move forward to develop the kind of partnerships and network structure that is essential to going forward with FirstNet. The other very large piece is the state consultation, which we heard great presentations on today. And finally, we have some network development activities which are activities to facilitate effective and timely roll out of the network and to keep us on a critical path. Consistent with what Tim has said, a lot of emphasis here is on putting things in place to stay on the critical path and what we're having discussions about is about making sure we do things in the right sequence and get the results and deliverables that we need.

And finally, there are some administrative support activities that support the organization across the whole, as well as some that specifically support programmatic activities. So going into those in more detail next, I went through them yesterday with the committee.

So the first big piece is the Comprehensive RFP. This is a capstone set of activities which includes several components. Within that capstone activity, the actual hands-on work on the Comprehensive Network RFP is half of this whole capstone area and there are some smaller pieces that contribute to it. The Comprehensive RFP work includes work with procurement experts, both internal government and external experts that includes technical consultants to help with the RFP, program managers in that type of work. We also have financial advisors that are assisting with our business strategy work and an internal team doing that work and that is a relatively small component, but very valuable and validating what we're doing and thinking strategically as we move ahead. The public notice and comment process

Stuart laid out fits into the broad category but is actually relatively small expense for some internal attorneys and possibly some help with outside counsel if there is a large volume of response.

With respect to standards development I am very happy to point out this ties in directly with what Jeff Bratcher was talking about earlier today, exciting key technology work that we're doing in cooperation with the Public Safety Communications Research program which is also located in Boulder and it will also potentially support cyber security work which was also touched on today, and finally technology development is some cross-cutting expertise that helps us technologically across these areas.

The state consultation is the other really important rail of what we're working on. This is to reach out to the states so they are prepared to respond. Once we get RFP responses it will help provide input to the RFP planning process. There is a lot of outreach to the user community as well as technical support that is going to be complementing the disciplinary and the state experts that are out in the field. I'd also include a relatively small set of communications and government affairs which includes some state and local government affairs technical capability and also counsel support because we are dealing with state laws across the 56 states and territories, to make sure in these interactions that we have things just right if that need arises.

Finally, a smaller area, a kind of cluster of network development issues, we're doing a NEPA study. We discussed in detail at the June board meeting to help facilitate timely rollout once the federal government needs to do a basic studies to ensure it is properly considering environmental issues. Spectrum relocation is to establish the framework for a grant program, but the actual grant funding is not built into the budget figures you have seen just a moment ago. It is to establish a grant program so that we can work with some jurisdictions and agencies that are currently on our spectrum band and help them relocate so we have a free and clear band to use nationally. BTOP projects is so that we have effective leveraging of the investment NTIA is making to several public safety projects as well as the project that is getting under way in Harris County through another set of funding. Finally, there is a small amount of funding to promote the idea of an 'experience center' or to do initial planning on an 'experience center' so public safety will have the opportunity to see some hands-on demonstrations of the capabilities that we, that FirstNet will be able to offer. Finally, we have supportive administrative activity and these include things like running the accounting system so we're paying the bills, doing the acquisition services, some of which are intimately related with the setting up of IT systems for our internal commodity in IT, laptops for people, that type of thing. Facilities management is a very very slim a very slim staff we have to pay rent that falls into the administrative bucket. My financial management staff, also relatively small and HR staff and some of these people also have roles in sporting the programs directly. We have HR folks hiring engineers to work on the technical side or hiring outreach and public safety specialists to work on the consultation and planning side, those are considered programmatic activities. We also have outside audits and things funded through various buckets.

So that concludes my presentation, happy to take any questions.

>> Sue Swenson: Any comments or questions? Barry.

>>Barry Boniface: Just for clarity's sake, I'm a little confused, so I know you are not surprised by that, but when you get the band back together in two weeks or so are we going to go back through it, are we going to get a further refinement of the \$120 million budget number or is it more detailed behind the \$120 million number? Just so we have our expectations right.

>>Tim Bryan: I think what you're going to get is a little bit of both, but I think more importantly you're going to get a staging of what milestones do we want to achieve in order to spend funds in various areas. On the RFP and the RFI, you might stage it on the technology side you might stage funds based upon when you get out an RFP or when you get out an RFI. NEPA might be staged in a way we think the date

we're going to begin construction. I think the goal is to really make the spending based upon the milestones achieved for the priorities we've laid out. I think you will see both more detail and a staging, Barry. Randy.

>> Randy Lyon: Yeah, More detail and closer linkage to the time periods, too, we have that, but it is going to be really tied closely to deliverables and dates, probably focus on the first quarter of the year, I would think. But --

>>Barry Boniface: Great. Thanks.

>>Annise Parker: Thank you. You know, I, sorry, you elided past spectrum relocation really, really fast. And I don't know there was a discussion here yesterday. That is a huge unknown. Is that anticipated it would come out of the existing FirstNet allocations or would that have to be some form of separate appropriation?

>> Stuart Kupinsky: Her question was what are the funds for spectrum relocation coming out of FirstNet funding or other allocations?

>>Randy Lyon: Sure. That is a very good question. We do expect that we will fund the grant program and we actually have that as an option that we could do in 2015, or it could be just depending on the time, we might actually establish the grant program in '15 and actually start funding the relocations in 2016. It's not a huge amount of money, but it's -- you're right, it's a subtle issue about whether it should be FirstNet's responsibility or whether it should be the incumbents' who are using it. We have reached a conclusion that the most efficient way to do this is have FirstNet cover the cost and --

>>Annise Parker: When you say not a huge liability, how do we establish that? I assume we -- well, we know how many agencies are in the spectrum. Do we have an idea of how much they have invested? They are going to...Speaking for local government I can tell you they are going to want to recoup the cost.

>>Randy Lyon: My sense, we have a very good idea of the cost of moving these folks and it's -- I think have detail in the detailed budget.

>>TJ Kennedy: One thing to make really clear, what we're talking about is those incumbents on the block where we're operating. We know the number of them, we know at some level what systems they have today, and what they would need to do to retrofit or make the capabilities happen to move to other spectrum and be effective. We have a number of estimates we'd be happy to share with the board.

>>Randy Lyon: Some of the jurisdictions are very, very small.

>> Sue Swenson: Just a comment, mayor. Because I was actually involved in this early on in FirstNet actually in anticipation of this coming, actually working with NTIA. We actually had a person working on this to identify who the incumbents were, and he actually visited the locations and talked with the incumbents so we have quite a bit of information. We knew that there would be a timing issue in terms of we wanted to understand the scope of it so that we could do the planning. So we actually used someone from NTIA to help us do the work for us on a detailed basis.

>>Sue Swenson: Just a comment about the budget and this is an unusual situation for me and I think for others. You know, usually when you have a project, you kind of know the definitive outcome. We have an unusual situation here in that we have legislation, which gives us a number of steps that we have to go through to get to a final answer. So it is not like we're, you know, building a web project where we know exactly what the outcome is going to be. Instead, we have a number of steps we have to take to

get an answer. I think that is why we are trying to be prudent about the expenditures to make sure they are matched to milestones and so we don't overspend.

>> The conference is now in silent mode

>> Sue Swenson: That's great. I hope someone will fix that.

>> The conference is now in silent mode.

>> Sue Swenson: I guess not, I guess not. But I just wanted to comment about that. It is a bit of an unusual situation in that we have steps that we have to take, we also want to be very prudent about the expenditure and timing of that so we --

>> The conference is now in talk mode.

>> Sue Swenson: Great. OK. Good. I'm glad that happened. So I want to comment about that, it is a bit of unusual situation and I think that --

>> The conference is now in silent mode.

>> Sue Swenson: Being particularly, I will ignore the person talking. I want the audience to understand that because I'm not sure it is quite as evident to people on the outside looking in, as we look at this budget. We want to spend the right amount of money to accomplish to move as quickly as we can, but also be prudent about the expenditures as we get to the final answer. Hopefully we will get to the answer that we hope can, frankly, the goal is to have a sustainable business plan to build and operate the national nationwide network for public safety and do it in a way that prudently uses the funds available. I just think that is really important to understand. I've never seen a project like this before. I want to comment about that, Randy and Tim. I know you see it the same way. So are we ready to entertain a motion for the -- read the operative portion, ready to have the --

>>Uzoma Onyeije: I want to make one mention to the board that the management team looked at the resolution that was sent in your board packets and what you should have in front of each of you is a red line of the management's proposals for changes to that .And it is changing in two ways. We wanted to make sure we have clarifying language in there to indicate that 2014 obligated funds are going to carry over in this budget.

And the second thing we wanted to clarify is how this is related to a prior board resolution. Those are the two changes you will see. They are pretty straightforward, I'll be reading from the red line version.

>>Tim Bryan: Uzoma, I'm sorry, before you read that, I want to make this group aware as I did yesterday, the full board will get the budget memo, will consider it. We'd urge the board to cycle feedback to the Finance Committee or to the management team. While this resolution reads that the Finance Committee can approve this final spend plan, I want to make sure everybody understands it is a work product of the management team and the full board. We're happy to be gatekeepers to some extent, but we're really interested in making sure that everybody participates fully in that process.

>> Brian Deese: Uzoma, and to the point of the red line, could somebody, you or Stuart or somebody give the short version of what board resolution 14 is? I don't have that encyclopedic a memory of what that was.

>>Uzoma Onyeije: So in board resolution 14, the board came up with a sort of table of authorizations in terms of how funds can be obligated by FirstNet and the board resolution 14 was done prior to the

committee structure. So if you look at that board resolution, it doesn't contemplate actions of the Finance Committee. With that, I'll read the operative language.

Now therefore be it resolved that the board hereby adopts management's fiscal year 2015 budget of \$120 million, plus an additional amount to fund remaining fiscal year 2014 authorized obligations in substantially the form presented to the board and hereby delegates to the Finance Committee oversight of specific budget expenditures within guidelines to be developed and approved by the Finance Committee. For purposes of clarity, specific budget expenditures approved by the Finance Committee are deemed authorized expenditures notwithstanding board resolution 14 which concerns a delegation of financial responsibilities.

>> Sue Swenson: All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

>> All: Aye.

>> Sue Swenson: All those opposed, same sign? Any abstentions?
Resolution carries, thank you very much.

I think we've concluded the matters before us today. I think this is a fairly significant meeting that's occurred and a huge milestone on the strategic road map. I want to thank again the FirstNet management team. A lot has happened since the last board meeting and I think this is a real milestone. I also want to thank the people who coordinated this meeting. These are never easy if you have ever done this sort of thing. I want to say the technical difficulties we experienced today is not a further indication of how the network will be run. I can assure you of that.

So thanks again for a couple of successful days here in Reston and I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

>> Sue Swenson: So moved. Thank you, second. All in favor?

>> All: Aye.

>> Sue Swenson: Opposed? Meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.