



Telecommunications & Connectivity Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes

January 10th, 2020 Meeting

1:00 pm – 2:30 pm Pavilion Auditorium, Montpelier, VT

Attendees:

1. David Snedeker – Chair of the Board, Northeastern Vermont Development Association
2. Robert T. White- AOT
3. June Tierney – Commissioner, Department of Public Service
4. Michael Clasen – Deputy State Treasurer
5. Evan Carlson – Do North Coworking
6. Clay Purvis – Director, Connectivity Division, Dept. of Public Service
7. Michael DeHart- Telecommunications & Connectivity Staff, Dept. of Public Service
8. Ken Jones – ACCD

Members of public:

Stephen Whitaker

Item	Item Description	Action By
1.0	Call to Order at 1:03pm	Chair Snedeker
2.0	Meeting Minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Corrections• Motion to Approve	Moved Michael C, seconded Ken J, approved unanimous
3.0	New Business: <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Review updated Connectivity Annual Report• Provided draft copy to board including information for FY2019.• No new data due to server migration which started in summer 2019• No money in FY 2019 connectivity fund• One time allocation from general fund to Connectivity Fund• USF rate increase	Clay Purvis

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expecting \$500k-800k/yr in Conn. Fund• Carried over language from last year's report re: bb availability for remote workers <p>Michael Classen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Want language about monitoring and reporting requirements from the dept• Explain "actual amount" vs "awarded amount"• Pg 6 fy2019, USF increase and anticipated increase> use word "annually" to be clear <p>Ken Jones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Want to know about CAF II projects• What it contributed in terms of level of investment and the kinds of improvements <p>Clay P:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• That can be found better through USAC but can provide to you <p>Evan C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What kind of granularity for new data? <p>Clay P:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bandwidth and physical address location data received have been more precise so far <p>Michael C:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Typo on pg 12, bottom pgh <p>Ken Jones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BAP point 4 is presented twice with different names <p>Clay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Act 79 gave us a rural broadband technical assistance specialist: Rob <p>Evan:</p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the future, can the CAB review the BIG applications? <p>Clay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It's not in the board's enabling statute, but it's possible• I have concerns, and would need to be cautious because we have members who are part of organizations who have and may in the future receive grants. <p>Evan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Same question, but for the electric utility round <p>Clay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• May be less of a concern there, so it's worth thinking about and bringing back to the board <p>David:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any additional comments should be forwarded to the department and the board within a week (due date for report is Jan 15) <p>Clay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We also have more drive test data from Washington and Lamoille county and a few other towns, but it isn't yet synthesized <p>David:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Just to be clear, the phones were made available to us and we did a drive test of our own <p>Ken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the status of the FCC's mobility fund and its data? <p>Clay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The FCC just ended the program because they	
--	--	--

	<p>couldn't trust the carriers' maps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program has been replaced by a 5G program. No plan to address how they'll administer that fund, how they'll manage invalid data, or how they'll address the original problem meant to be addressed by the Mobility Fund. <p>Ken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the 5g fund still go to rural areas? <p>June:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FCC announcement allows us time to comment on the implementation of the 5g fund • US house and senate should be aware of this, because this issue doesn't touch just Vermont <p>Evan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will data synthesis be complete? <p>Clay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presidents day weekend hopefully. 	
4	<p>Annual Public Meeting pursuant to 30 V.S.A. 202(j)</p> <p>Stephen W: This meeting is being neither transcribed nor recorded, yes?</p> <p>Michael D: No</p> <p>Stephen W: I'd like to question the process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I didn't get an agenda as requested • This won't meet requirements of the statute for the annual public meeting 	David Snedeker

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Four years the department has failed the requirements of the annual public meeting• You should plan on holding this meeting a month of two from now, properly notice it, and actively seek public participation• There hasn't been a duly adopted plan since 2004, and the Department's failures are to blame• To call this a public meeting without anyone knowing is farcical• CI grants are to be distributed consistent with the plan• In the absence of the plan, it's a black box• Rulemaking hearing at LCAR didn't include Dept• Fiber and microcell make-ready rules in 248a are concerning• Dept should have advocated on behalf of the public, but rules were made without dept speaking up• CAF II fiber builds: we should be requiring maps of where the fiber is being built. This is a settlement from a service quality investigation, and there should be a public benefit calculation. That middle mile fiber is essential to our CUD strategy.• The Dept didn't speak up when the proposals from Consolidated re: Chesterfield• That runs against statutory goals in 202(c) for open access	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where is the dept on these critical issues?• Public Safety Radio Planning:• ~Division shall inventory RF and evaluate the potential to serve bb~(202e b 3)• Meeting in Burlington didn't have four votes to approve grants• This advisory board should hold Dept accountable on these issues• CAF II funding: putting in digital line carries so providers can deploy DSL, those fiber strands should be mapped• Wireless drive testing is grossly deficient because it doesn't measure signal strength, which is essential for placing a call• Dept is refusing to do drive test again or have it done by a competent contractor. Two datasets necessary are an accurate map fo wireless coverage (including signal strength), and an accurate map of all available fiber• Something else: this board should advise on what should be explicitly open for public access and what can be held behind NDA- you shouldn't be able to claim competitive secrecy for things that are readily visible on the poles• It seems the dept is ignoring the 100/100 goal. We are approving grants to provide obsolete technologies that aren't capable of providing 100/100. The only tech is	
--	---	--

	<p>fiber, and we shouldn't be investing a single public dollar in anything but fiber.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Data from Comcast and Consolidated is not verified. We're taking their word, and that's a big caveat that should be in the Annual Report.• FCC auditors drove Vermont and many other states, but did not measure AT&T- likely because they are the FirstNet provider. This is probably because it would expose the fraud in FirstNet's drawdown of FCC money.• Everywhere FirstNet puts small cells, they are single-carrier small cells.• This advisory board should strongly recommend that commissioner fights in Legislation to integrate E-911, broadband, FirstNet, and all telecom issues for an actual comprehensive approach to telecom planning.• VTA grants awarded to SoverNet to build fiber network- only when firstlight was sold to Anton was I able to get access to the contracts. They prohibit sale of dark fiber.• We should be fighting back on that because the "business case" argument has changed now that they are owned by a foreign capital corp.• Magellan Advisors: Report on Electric Utility Feasibility Report:	
--	---	--

	<p>One of the committee members asked about middle mile assumptions. Magellan assumed market-rate middle mile fiber, but the absence of that in the State of Vermont debunks the entire report. Until we get a poles database...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• GMP's poles are in the database, double poles need to be located- consolidated is blocking expedited make-ready by not updating infrastructure.• Dept and PUC have been derelict in resolving double pole issue since the sale happened. Number of double poles has increased and no progress is being made. These are priorities that need to be the focus of the plan.• Dept issued an RFI Act 79 provision allows dept to issue an RFI to determine level of resources necessary. An RFP for an engineering firm should be out immediately to get a 10-yr telecom plan under consultation with ADS and ACCD.• The two responses to RFI I saw- it doesn't appear that they are interpreting the 202d requirements for geographically-specific service coverage (wireless coverage mapping). The numbers in the responses to the RFI don't seem to include that. I expect it to be about a million dollars. <p>David S: Do you have any of this in writing?</p> <p>Stephen: no.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>June: I will not comment on these things at this time, given the broad number of issues at hand.</p> <p>Ken: On public engagement, what should we expect this year regarding the telecom plan?</p> <p>Clay: legislature changed the telecom plan statute, but did not change this board's role. We will be working closely with you as a member of ACCD and as a member of this board.</p> <p>June: did we have this conversation already?</p> <p>Stephen: I just called to the attention of the board members that this board needs to be more involved.</p> <p>David: Thanks for your comments and we will take this under advisement. If there are no other comments I would entertain a motion to adjourn.</p>	
5	Adjournment	Motion: White Second: Clasen

Minutes Subject to Approval