

Public Safety Broadband Network (PSBN) Commission
Department of Public Safety, Headquarters, Lab Classroom
Meeting Minutes
October 1, 2014

- The meeting was called to order by Chair, Paco Aumand at 1:30 pm with the following present: Robert T. White, Kiersten Bourgeois, James Porter, Lt. Michael Manning, Terry LaValley, Dave Tucker, Chris Campbell, Sara Small and Suellen Royea. Copies of the RFI and the Request for Public Comment were distributed.
- **Update on Hiring Process:** Paco reported that Kiersten Bourgeois, Terry LaValley, Dean Hamel, and Kim Prior were scheduled to interview four (4) candidates, but two (2) candidates backed out. The two (2) candidates they did interview were not acceptable. Kiersten noted that one of the candidates that backed out called ahead of time and was deterred due to the position being a limited service position. Paco noted that Kiersten has offered to re-write the job specifications. The applicants that applied were engineers and may not have the people skills required of the position. Paco received a call from a contractor from Kentucky, who was interested in what opportunities may be available in Vermont. A question was asked regarding how the position was recruited. Paco responded that we went through the State system the first time, and the second time we used the State system and advertised in the Free Press and online. Kiersten noted the position was written strictly from an IT point. Another question was asked if PMP was a requirement. Paco answered that Public Safety was trying to hire a qualified project manager with the hopes they could also work on other projects with different funding. Paco suggested reviewing the job description and then re-advertising.
- **FirstNet RFI and Public Comment and Request for SPOC Comment:** Paco Aumand gave a review of FirstNet's Request for Information and request for public comment. Comments on the RFI are due on October 17, 2014 and comments regarding the request for public comments are due on October 24, 2014. Paco called FirstNet for some clarification and found out they are looking for comments about policy statements contained in the public notice to see if they are on the right path. Appendix B, Section III of the RFI was reviewed and Paco felt the program objectives were appropriate. Chris Campbell noted there are some really important questions in Section E of the RFI. He felt the answers could have a big impact on Vermont; mainly on how they structure the licensing agreements for 1, 4, 6, 11, and 18. Chris wondered how much new coverage will be achieved and how spectrum will be used. He demonstrated his concern on the white board and explained that if they use the FCC blocks, Vermont would be divided into three (3) areas. He was concerned that the build out may not reach the whole area and some of the chronic dead spots would still be without service. He thought local public safety agencies may be able to build those areas as long as there is still some spectrum available. There was some discussion about building out areas and funding. Paco Aumand asked Chris Campbell to write up the answers to the questions he spoke about. He agreed.

The pricing section on Page 5 was reviewed. Paco Aumand suggested that the optimal prices would be that it cannot be any more than what we are paying now unless we wanted additional features. It was noted that we currently are paying for two (2) programs. The combination of what we are paying now would be the high end. As we evolve, the dependency and our needs grow and what we are willing to pay for will change.

Priority and preemption on Page 6, #15, was reviewed. Terry LaValley and Lt. Manning described the current system. Terry described a situation where if a member of the public happens to get into the network before a Public Safety caller, the Public Safety caller may have to wait. During an emergency, it was thought that geographic regions would have priority over other public safety community, but it will have to be flexible and scalable. Anyone in that region will have access. It was suggested to think about other communication issues, consider some of the "what if" situations, whether a local area can handle the demand, and who gets priority even within Public Safety. It was noted that some of those decisions take place today through a Command Center. Paco Aumand noted the RFI is looking for responses from the business community, but felt it would be in our best interest to respond.

The bigger issue is feedback on their policy considerations in regards to the Notice to Request Public Comment on certain proposed interpretations of its enabling legislation. Elements of the network on Page 3, second paragraph was reviewed. It was noted that we have spent a lot of money for our current push to talk network. A question asked was how we would interoperate with the National model so people can move in and out of the system. It was noted that the land mobile radio system is a separate piece. A suggestion for high traffic sites to pay a higher system maintenance fee could help. The group was not in opposition to the Elements of the Network.

Public Safety Entities, Secondary Users and Other Users was reviewed. Paco Aumand felt that we should not be opposed to the other definition of public safety and would concur with their preliminary conclusions. He was not opposed to the suggested non-public safety entities but felt that first responders should be higher on the list. A question was asked about who makes the determination of public safety services. It was noted that it starts at the federal level. A suggestion was made that at the local level, some common sense should be applied during a situation.

Paco Aumand noted that FirstNet wanted Vermont to weigh in on the definition of rural, Part B, #3. Kiersten gave some history about the term and offered to make some contact to verify the definition and draft language.

Paco will draft a letter and distribute to the board for review with our comments.

Kiersten Bourgeois inquired about our new FirstNet board member. Paco Aumand volunteered to reach out to him.

- **E911 Study Update:** Kiersten Bourgeois gave an update on the E911 study. A draft report is being created with the disclaimer that all the committee members do not agree with all of it. In addition, the study requires them to draft legislation. Dave Tucker added that this is a required report and is a recommendation. It was noted that this study and draft legislation was a legislative reaction; no problems were identified to solve except the saving of \$300,000.
- **Next Meeting:** The next meeting is scheduled for November 5, 2014. Meeting adjourned at 2:50 pm.