

**OREGON TELECOMMUNICATIONS COORDINATING COUNCIL
2001-2003 EXIT REPORT**



Mission statement:

Provide all Oregonians with affordable access to broadband digital applications that will improve the Oregon economy, improve the quality of life in Oregon communities and reduce the economic gap between well-served and underserved Oregon communities for present and future generations.

Prepared on behalf of the Council by:

Cathy Britain
John Irwin
Ann Steeves

18 December 2003

**OREGON TELECOMMUNICATIONS COORDINATING COUNCIL
2001-2003 EXIT REPORT**

Table of Contents

Review of the 2001 – 2003 Council Sessions.....	1
Process Recommendations for Next Steps.....	6
Attachment 1 - Stakeholders and Issues.....	10
Table 1 - Council Members.....	14
Table 2 - Committees.....	15
Table 3 - Topics/Issues Before the Council.....	17
Table 4 - Issues Planning and Prioritization Matrix	26

**OREGON TELECOMMUNICATIONS COORDINATING COUNCIL
2001-2003 EXIT REPORT**

Review of the 2001 – 2003 Council Sessions

Subsequent to the passage of SB 765 in 2001, the first meeting of the Oregon Telecommunications Council (hereinafter referred to as Council or OTCC) occurred in December of 2001. The full Council met 20 times, added to its membership (see Table 1), heard testimony from many, formed committees (see Table 2) to work on issues raised, and prepared and delivered a report to the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management and Technology detailing a number of policy and legislative recommendations. The Council processed and acted on a considerable body of information as listed in the Report To the Legislature (see <http://www.ortcc.org/report.html>). Yet many issues remain to be addressed. This report contains a summarization of key points raised, addressed, and remaining to be addressed (see Table 3). The best source for reviewing Council materials such as all minutes, white papers and reports can be found on the Council's Website located at www.ortcc.org.

Committees formed around key topic areas that were key to the development of background and recommendations for the legislature. With the issuance of "Stakeholders and Issues" (see Attachment 1 by Ed Parker) we found an initial straw man for formation of the Council's agenda. Building on that paper, and with additional input from Council members, the "Issues Matrix" (see Table 4) was developed and served as a framework for prioritizing topics for consideration.

In its study of Oregon broadband infrastructure and utilization, the Council found that many areas of Oregon are now well served, as there has been substantial progress on the supply side of the equation. Yet there are still communities where this is not the case and the Council advocated legislative and policy approaches to remedy this gap.

The Council found that the greatest opportunity for Oregonians resides in building the demand side of the equation through education, planning assistance and ready availability of best practices knowledge. Quite a few Oregonians out there still are unaware of the opportunities that broadband brings. Many of the Council's recommendation were directed at this demand side opportunity. Oregon has a distinct advantage among the states and needs to learn how to take advantage of it.

Legislative gains

Legislative successes included the passage of HJR 4, HB 2304 and HB 2577B.

House Joint Resolution 4 – establishes policy for telemedicine reimbursement

HJR 4 is a resolution stating in part:

“Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) That we, the members of the Seventy-second Legislative Assembly, encourage and support the following policies for telemedicine reimbursement in the State of Oregon:

(a) Medical providers who are reimbursed for services provided in person should be reimbursed for the same services when provided via telecommunications.

(b) Any clinical service or diagnosis that is reimbursed when provided in person and that can be delivered appropriately via telecommunications should be eligible for reimbursement.

(c) With the exception of medically appropriate 'store and forward' technology to deliver clinical services or diagnoses, reimbursable services should include clinician-to-patient services and not clinician-to-clinician services.

(d) A patient informed consent document should be used for telemedicine services. This document should contain the components outlined in a model informed consent document.

(e) A patient should have the right to choose either telemedicine or in-person services when both are available.

(f) Payers should consider transmission costs when reimbursing for telemedicine services.

(2) That as used in this resolution, 'telemedicine' means using telecommunications technology to deliver healthcare, including but not limited to clinical diagnosis, clinical services and patient consultation.”

<http://www.leg.state.or.us/03reg/measures/hjr1.dir/hjr0004.a.html>

The Telehealth Committee lead by Cathy Britain went on to form the Telehealth Association of Oregon (TAO) and is now underway with negotiations to implement HJR 4.

House Bill 2304 – Establishes policy on public safety networks

HB 2304 establishes a broadband policy addressing public safety needs of the state.

“It is the policy of the State of Oregon to encourage and support the rapid deployment of broadband telecommunications services in areas of the state where such services do not exist, to support redundancy of critical telecommunications assets in order to ensure homeland security protections in the state and to ensure that a secure conduit is available for emergency communications and public safety networks in all Oregon communities.”

<http://www.leg.state.or.us/03reg/measures/hb2300.dir/hb2304.a.html>

House Bill 2577B - Establishes policy on access to broadband services

HB 2577-B establishes policy on access to broadband services. Directs the Public Utility Commission to include number of public bodies providing basic telecommunications infrastructure in annual report. Modifies name, membership and duties of Oregon Telecommunication Coordinating Council. Directs council to collaborate with education, healthcare education providers and members of healthcare industry to develop and implement plan relating to distance learning (amended in using language from HB 3574). It requires council to report on plans to interim committees and Legislative Assembly.

With the passage of HB 2577B Oregon now has a state policy on broadband!

The Legislative Assembly finds and declares:

(1) It is the goal of this state to promote access to broadband services for all Oregonians in order to improve the economy in Oregon, improve the quality of life in Oregon communities and reduce the economic gap between Oregon communities that have access to broadband digital applications and services and

- those that do not, for both present and future generations; and
- (2) That the goal set forth in subsection (1) of this section may be achieved by:
 - (a) Expanding broadband and other telecommunications services;
 - (b) Creating incentives to establish and expand broadband and other telecommunications services;
 - (c) Undertaking telecommunications planning at the local, regional and state levels that includes participants from both the public and the private sectors;
 - (d) Removing barriers to the full deployment of broadband digital applications and services and providing incentives for the removal of those barriers; and
 - (e) Removing barriers to public-private partnerships in areas where the private sector cannot justify investments.

There's more to the measure. Read it in its entirety at <http://www.leg.state.or.us/03reg/asures/hb2500.dir/hb2577.b.html>

Legislative recommendations requiring additional work

The Omnibus Telecommunications Act included a number of recommendations that were withdrawn. Items below follow the order of topics listed of the Omnibus Telecommunications Act.

1. Economic Development - planning and education

Work remains incomplete on the critical role Oregon Community and Economic Development (OECD) could play across the state with telecommunications and economic development and, as such, deserves further Council consideration and support.

Use of OECD resources met resistance from both the legislature and industry. The legislators' position reflected the budget uncertainties of the times. Industry representatives expressed concern that state funds would be used to develop competition from the public sector. We could have done a much better job building to a consensus on this matter. Many on the Council supported the use of OECD staff and resources to help guide strategic planning processes in unserved communities. Planning would have been economic development driven, resulting in increased demand for services through greater use of the resources. To this day we still have many communities who have broadband but in a substantially underused capacity. Given the economic status of Oregon it seems shortsighted not to avail ourselves of this resource in the many areas where it exists today. The investment would be returned many times over as a win-win for both industry and the public in the form of increased revenues and jobs.

2. Advanced telecommunications facilities incentives - tax credit

The tax credit incentive remains broken and deserves further consideration by the Council.

Our initial version of HB 2577B, The Omnibus Telecommunications Bill, contained provisions to repair the tax credit previously enacted under SB 229. The legislative climate indicated this provision would fail, so we withdrew it.

3. *Funding*

Additional discovery and recommendations on the implications of the use of state funds for critical public works infrastructure seems appropriate.

The Council recommended funding selected telecommunications development projects as a means for creating jobs and furthering economic development in Oregon. A sound telecommunications infrastructure, accessible broadband services and advanced telecommunications services are necessary to ensure that Oregon remains competitive in retaining existing businesses and attracting new businesses. This also seems consistent with the declaration by the previous legislature that telecommunications infrastructure is counted as public works infrastructure. Therefore, issuance of lottery bonds to finance these business development projects would seem an appropriate use of state lottery funds. Industry opposition combined with the economic environment (i.e., budgetary) served to remove this segment from the proposed legislation.

Policy and administrative rules surely could be crafted to ensure that this was not a mechanism solely to create competition with the private sector by the public sector (an oft reiterated view from industry). Many smaller telecommunications business entities might benefit from this use of funds, especially to serve underserved areas or to foster a more competitive environment. This also could be a vehicle for financing public-private partnership ventures.

4. *Utility regulation*

Changes to utility regulation to encourage and authorize support for public-private partnerships and other cooperative and negotiated agreements should be a high-priority topic for the Council.

The proposed legislation contained language in support of a role for the Public Utility Commission (PUC) to encourage and authorize support for public-private partnerships and other cooperative and negotiated agreements under which public bodies, as defined by ORS 174.109, provide basic telecommunications infrastructure and private entities use that infrastructure to provide advanced information and communications services. Here we met resistance from former PUC commissioners who took the position that they were strictly a regulator and that this was outside the scope of their activities. We see that in other states PUC's have indeed taken it upon themselves to render decisions that include an assessment of economic impact (e.g., Michigan). The state of Oregon through its commissioners does make determinations along these lines already (e.g., whether or not an Extended Area of Service (EAS) is in the best interest of the communities initiating a request for such). This topic needs to be again brought to the forefront of Council discussion, especially in light of the three new commissioners now on board.

5. *Cooperation*

A progress report to the Council from Department of Administrative Services (DAS) would be advisable to re-evaluate whether or not to recommend future legislation dealing with cooperation among state entities.

DAS was instructed in the proposed legislation to work cooperatively with other state agencies. We removed this section at the request of DAS as there are already ample directives in place for this purpose.

6. *Electronic commerce enterprise zones*

The Council would be well advised to re-look at the use of electronic commerce zones for stimulating the economy.

Budgetary concerns weighed on the legislators and this section was seen as cutting revenues at a critical moment. Out of the 5 already designated zones apparently only 2 have been used (we need to recheck facts on this assertion). The Medford zone is the most successful with a net result of an increase in tax revenues after a couple of years.

7. *Electronic learning*

Under HB 2577B the Council is responsible for creating a plan to share networks between education and healthcare providers for electronic learning.

Language inserted by legislative council put DAS in the role of creating a network plan for Oregon Department of Education (ODE). This was an unfortunate and incorrect reading of the Council's recommendations and so we removed it.

8. *Electronic government*

It would be highly appropriate for the Council to get an update on the progress of the DAS eGovernment project.

Language was removed from the proposed legislation after additional discussion with DAS. DAS already has a mandate underway for this.

9. *Benchmarks*

The Council should continue to work toward establishment of benchmarks to measure progress and impact of broadband deployments.

Oregon does not have a reliable way to measure progress of broadband deployments, economic impact, or quality of life improvements. The Council recommended establishment of benchmarks for such a purpose. While they were dropped from legislation, many believe it is still important to have a set of metrics for this purpose. Oregon does it for roads, water systems and other public works infrastructure; we need to do it for telecommunications (named as a critical public works infrastructure in legislation from the previous session).

10. *Public-private partnerships*

The Council should continue efforts to pursue the use of public-private partnerships across the spectrum of telecommunications opportunities and treat it as a high-priority matter.

Public-private partnerships became one of the key recommendations of the Council for building infrastructure and increasing usage of broadband. A Roundtable in January of 2003

brought a variety of input to the discussion (posted on the reports page of the ORTCC Website). In December the Oregon Business Plan invited new policy proposals. We introduced the concept of public-private partnerships for telecommunications at the December Summit (posted on the reports page of the ORTCC Website). That proposal along with others is now under review. Follow up with the OBP folks is in order. Some states have found it necessary to establish policy and rules through legislation.

Process Recommendations for Next Steps

A first task for the incoming Council would be the creation of a work plan and/or strategic plan for the OTCC through 2005 and possibly beyond. The following are suggested “next steps” for inclusion in the plan.

OTCC

1. The Council will meet bi-monthly or quarterly. Meetings should include:
 - a. Public input – continued invited presentations as well as other input
 - b. Government input – invited presentations and discussions from state agencies, the Governor’s office, the legislature, Association of Counties (AOC) and League of Cities (LOC), Congress and federal agencies
 - c. Industry input – invite discussions from specific sectors and/or companies
 - d. Discussion of committee reports
2. Dissemination to the public, Governor’s office and Legislature should be a high priority with defined and measurable objectives
3. The Council should establish a legislative strategy group to begin work in January 2004 with defined and measurable outcomes.
4. The Council will develop a business plan for its future including long and short-term goals, funding, and relationships.
5. The Council will prioritize the outstanding issues (see “Legislative recommendations requiring additional work” in this document) and assign them to committees for review and action

Committees

1. In order to increase efficiency, maximize work efforts and include more Oregonians in OTCC processes, the major work of the OTCC should be delegated to Committees.
2. Committees should be established and operational at the first meeting of the OTCC in 2004.
3. Committees could include: Public/Private Partnerships; Government; Education; Healthcare; Healthcare/Education; Public Safety/Homeland Security
4. All OTCC members will participate in at least one committee.
5. Each committee will be made up of at least two Council members and will include other interested members from throughout the state.
6. Committees will establish work plans that can be completed by June 2005 and that have measurable outcomes.
7. Committees will provide monthly written reports to the Council via email.

Staffing and Logistics

1. In cooperation with the State agencies, the Council will determine:
 - a. who will provide support to the Council including press releases, minutes, listserv and website management

- b. meeting venues, broadcasting
- c. legislative support
- d. document preparation

Agenda for First 2004 Council Session

Draft

- | | | |
|------|---|------------------------|
| I. | Welcome | John Irwin, past chair |
| | - Introductions | Group |
| | - Review of the authorizing legislation | John Irwin |
| | - Approval of December 2003 minutes | Group |
| | - Public input | Public |
| II. | New business | |
| | - Election of chair and vice-chair | John Irwin |
| | - Overview of administrative processes | Chair/Group |
| | - Committees | Chair/Group |
| | - Meeting frequency and schedule | Chair/Group |
| | - Business plan/Funding options | Chair Group |
| | - Staffing | Chair/Group |
| | - Council study and work priorities
(see attachment) | Chair/Group |
| III. | Old Business | |
| | - Committee updates | Committee Chairs |
| IV. | Council Tasks | Chair |
| V. | Adjourn | |

Council Study Areas 2004 - 2005
D-R-A-F-T

<i>Topic</i>	<i>Committee</i>
Planning and education (OECD role)	Economic Development
Electronic commerce enterprise zones	
Public Utility regulation	
Public-private partnerships	Public Private Partnerships
Advanced telecommunications facilities	
Public Safety, Alert Networks, and Interoperability	Public Safety
Cooperation among state departments	Government
Electronic learning	Education
Electronic government	
Benchmarks	
Council Funding	

Attachment 1 - Stakeholders and Issues
For Possible Oregon Telecommunications Legislation
Edwin B. Parker
January 18, 2002

Desired Outcomes

Before discussing possible legislative recommendations it might be helpful if the Oregon Telecommunications Coordinating Council (OTCC) attempted to reach a consensus on desired outcomes. Agreement on desired outcomes would give us a criterion against which to select and prioritize our issues and legislative recommendations.

For example, one outcome I hope we will consider: Provide all Oregonians with affordable access to broadband digital applications that will improve the Oregon economy, improve the quality of life in Oregon communities and reduce the economic gap between rural and urban Oregon.

Process

Both private sector telecommunications providers and local governments have a major stake in the process. Most of the telecommunications infrastructure in the state has been provided and will continue to be provided as a result of private sector investment. We cannot achieve the desired outcome without cooperation with the investor owned businesses whose infrastructure needs to be expanded and extended to meet the needs of Oregon communities in the broadband digital age.

However, we also need to recognize that some of the needed telecommunications infrastructure and applications will not provide sufficient returns to justify private sector investment at this time, particularly in rural Oregon. Therefore, local governments attempting to provide essential infrastructure and services for their communities must look for public-private partnership arrangements and other incentives to achieve the desired infrastructure investment and applications development. Partnership and incentive arrangements cannot be unilaterally mandated. They must be developed in constructive dialog with the various stakeholders.

The following list of stakeholders and issues is intended as a list of topics for discussion and dialog, not as proposed answers for anything. We might wish to instruct staff to conduct preliminary investigations on each of these potential issues (and others suggested by other members of the council) and report back to us so we can then have a more informed discussion in which we decide which ones to work on further and how to prioritize them.

Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers

Issue 1. Mini-SB 622 for other carriers. As a result of Senate Bill 622 from the 1999 legislature most Oregon communities served by Qwest will soon have self-healing fiber optic rings providing redundant digital broadband connections from their community to other communities in Oregon. They will also have local broadband access through Digital Subscriber Lines (DSL), at least for homes and businesses not too far from the telephone company central office. Communities served by other carriers are not so fortunate. We should have intensive discussions with representatives of other Oregon incumbent carriers, particularly Verizon and Sprint, to determine what variation of the original SB622 legislation will provide sufficient incentive for them to provide self-healing fiber optic rings and DSL services for the communities they serve. Communities served by Verizon in southern Oregon and by Sprint in the Gorge and on the central coast would be primary beneficiaries.

Issue 2. Tax credit fix. Oregon legislation in 2001 was intended to provide tax incentives for private sector telecommunications infrastructure investment. Amendments to that legislation

may be required to fix problems with the narrow scope of the language in the current statute. We should work with industry representatives to find mutually acceptable language to fix the problem.

Issue 3. Public-private partnership arrangements. Industry representatives have expressed concerns about public sector competition. Local governments are determined not to give up their present rights to be providers of last resort when private sector carriers fail to provide advanced broadband services to their communities. Government interests were successful in blocking industry-sponsored legislation in the 2001 session that would have limited their legal right to provide telecommunications services. Constructive dialog is required to find mutually acceptable means for public-private partnerships to provide advanced telecommunications infrastructure and services in locations where investor-owned businesses have not made the needed investment. OTCC can provide a useful forum for that needed dialog. Open access to public sector infrastructure may be a better solution than legislation blocking public sector investment.

Public Utility Commission

The Oregon Public Utility Commission (PUC), through its regulatory decisions, has a major influence on the availability, quality and price of telecommunications services in Oregon. Some critics of the Commission have argued that they could and should do more to help bring advanced telecommunications services to rural Oregon. We should have a dialog with PUC staff to determine what legislation would permit them to help make broadband digital telecommunications services available throughout the state.

Issue 4. Economic Development as a Regulatory Criterion. The legislative mandate of the PUC dates back to a time when the objective of the PUC was to regulate monopoly public utility providers “in the public interest.” In the case of telecommunications that has usually been interpreted as trying to mitigate potentially bad effects of monopoly pricing by keeping prices low for local analog voice telephone services. Perhaps it is time for legislative direction to the PUC to permit them to take into account the effects of telecommunications regulation on the Oregon economy. New legislation could at least permit the PUC to take into account the harmful economic consequences for communities lacking advanced broadband services. More positively, the “public interest” could be defined to include achieving the goal of providing broadband digital telecommunications services for all Oregon communities.

Issue 5. LADS Circuits. On January 1, 2002 Qwest prices for Local Area Data Services (LADS) in rural Oregon became so prohibitively expensive that many rural Oregonians who previously had access to the Internet through such circuits have been effectively deprived of access to the Internet. Qwest referred all inquiries to the PUC. The PUC said that because of legislation there is nothing they can do. That may be true in the short run, but should not absolve the PUC from responsibility. We should have a dialog with the PUC to determine what legislative changes would be appropriate to fix the problem. Local digital services need not be defined as an unregulated “luxury.” In this digital age, local digital services should be considered as basic as analog voice services and subject to similar price caps.

Issue 6. Universal Service Fund. The PUC currently administers a state Universal Service Fund that provides explicit subsidies for the provision of narrow-band analog voice service in high cost locations, of which there are many in rural Oregon. Expanding that Universal Service Fund to help support the provision of broadband digital services in high cost locations may be the most effective way to achieve that goal in locations where private sector investment would not otherwise make such services available at affordable prices. A dialog with PUC staff and telecommunications carriers will be required to achieve mutually acceptable legislative language permitting the PUC to expand the Universal Service Fund to broadband services. The goal should be to make broadband services accessible in each community for those who want it, not bringing broadband to every household whether they want it or not.

Cable Industry

Issue 7. Remove Barriers to Expansion of Cable Broadband Services. Cable television companies provide more broadband digital service through cable modem access than telephone carriers provide through DSL services. A dialog with cable industry representatives would be useful to determine whether or not there are any barriers to the expansion of their broadband service offerings that could be removed through legislation. It is possible that no legislation is needed or desired, but we should have the conversations to find out.

Competitive Telecommunications Providers

Issue 8. Remove Barriers to Competitive Provision of Broadband Services. Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs), Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and regional consortia are potential providers of broadband services and applications delivered over broadband digital infrastructure. We should have a dialog with representatives of all potential competitive providers of both infrastructure and services to determine whether there are any barriers to the expansion of services that could be removed by legislation.

State Government

Issue 9. Direct DAS to Assist Rural Communities. The state of Oregon spends a lot of money on telecommunications networks, much of it coordinated through by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS). Advanced digital networks procured and managed by DAS extend throughout rural Oregon. The procurement power of state government is a powerful positive incentive that can be used to give incentives to the commercial providers of government network services to make comparable services available to rural businesses and residents at comparable prices. Failure to use that procurement power to make advanced services generally available will have a serious negative consequence. When government traffic is segregated on a separate government-only network, there may not be enough remaining traffic in rural areas of the state to make a general purpose advanced digital network available to other users. Legislation could direct DAS to take this issue into account in its network procurements.

Issue 10. Fund OECDD to Provide Technical Assistance, Training and Support. As a result of SB 622 the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department has a small telecommunications staff that provides some technical assistance and support to Oregon communities. That funding is insufficient to meet the needs of Oregon communities for technical assistance, applications development, training and support. Furthermore, that staff is funded entirely with money from Qwest as a result of SB 622. The next budget for OECDD could provide expanded funding for a telecommunications support group that can continue after the SB 622 tasks are completed.

Issue 11. Extend the Life of OTCC. Our council will sunset once we have given our recommendations and advice to the next legislature. We might wish to consider a recommendation to either extend the term of our council or otherwise serve the purpose our council is serving. The problems are not all going to be solved in one legislative session.

Provision of Broadband Applications

Infrastructure alone will not bring about economic development or improved quality of life. That can happen only through the applications that utilize the broadband infrastructure. Investment in infrastructure will be stranded or wasted (or not occur in the first place) if we do not at the same time stimulate the necessary applications.

Issue 12. Health Care. Telemedicine applications require broadband service and have been proven medically effective in innumerable trials and demonstrations. The primary reason such applications are not generally available throughout the United States is that third-party

insurance payers have generally not been willing to reimburse doctors for medical consults via videoconferencing and other distance-bridging technologies. If providers cannot get paid telemedicine applications will not happen on any meaningful scale. Things started to change in 2001 when Medicare announced that, effective October 1, 2001, Medicare will reimburse for medical videoconsults when patients are located in non-metropolitan counties. That's a start. A small number of states, including California, have passed state legislation requiring third-party insurance payers to reimburse physicians for remote medical consults. We (or our staff) should work with representatives of the medical profession and the medical insurance companies to develop a consensus on how to craft Oregon legislation to ensure that providers of medical services can receive medical insurance payments for telemedicine consults.

Issue 13. E-commerce. The Oregon Internet Commission, which developed a number of recommendations for expanding e-commerce applications in Oregon, among other things, went out of existence at the end of 2000, prior to the 2001 legislative session. We should ask our staff to contact Jim Johnson and other former members of that Commission to see what legislative recommendations they have at this time.

Issue 14. Education. As a result of SB 622, videoconferencing facilities have been installed in a number of schools throughout the state. We (or our staff) should talk with people from all levels of educational institutions to find out what remaining barriers and future opportunities there are for a major expansion of distance learning services by videoconference and broadband Internet access. At a time of budget crisis in education, the promise of broadband technology could be affordable access to life-long learning by Oregon residents of all ages. What can we do to help make it happen?

Issue 15. E-government. State and local government applications can provide powerful examples of how effective use of broadband technology can make information and services available to people in all parts of the state in a cost-effective way. The legislature could make all public hearings accessible by video-conferencing throughout the state. They could direct state agencies to make all public information accessible on the Internet while carefully protecting all proprietary or confidential information from any public access. They could direct state agencies to make all government forms and applications Internet-enabled. They could direct state agencies to make it possible to conduct most transactions with the state via the Internet. It may not be reasonable for the Department of Motor Vehicles to conduct driving tests on-line, but many other transactions with the state could be done without requiring people to go in person to wait in line in a government office. Just as large businesses are automating their supply chain through Internet-enabled applications, so can the state government take advantage of broadband Internet opportunities to make its procurement and supply-chain transactions more efficient. The state could make technical support services available to county, municipal and other governmental entities throughout the state to help them make more effective use of broadband Internet services. These are some of the ways state government can be a leader in using broadband applications to improve the quality of life for all Oregonians and set a good example for private sector providers of information and services.

Table 1 - Council Members

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Current Representative</i>	<i>2004-05 Nomination Request</i>
Education		
Education	Camille Cole (ex officio)	---
Education - K-12	---	?
Education - Community Colleges	---	?
Education - Universities	---	Curt Pederson
Telecommunication consortia or citizen groups		
Central Oregon Telecommunications Task Force	Andrew Spreadborough	Andrew Spreadborough
CoastNet	---	Ed Parker
Eastern Oregon Telecommunications Consortium	Cathy Britain	Cathy Britain ?
Fiber South Consortium	Cindy Weeldreyer	Cindy Weeldreyer ?
Frontier Telenet	Rob Myers	Rob Myers ?
Gorge Teleconsortium	Lee Curtis	Erick Larson?
Klamath Falls Telecommunications Task Force	Agnes Box	Agnes Box ?
North Coast Telecommunications Consortium	Lylla Gaebel	Lylla Gaebel
Regional Fiber Consortium (Lane and Klamath Counties)	Betty Dickson	Betty Dickson
South Coast Telecommunications Task force	Ann Steeves	Ann Steeves
Southern Oregon Telecommunications and Technology Council	John Irwin	John Irwin
Government		
Connecting Oregon Communities Advisory Board 1	Ed Parker	---
Connecting Oregon Communities Advisory Board 2	Wes Hare	---
County 1	Steve McClure	Steve McClure ?
County 2	Marlyn Schafer	Marlyn Schafer
City 1	Dan Bartlett	Dan Bartlett
City 2	---	?
Tribes	Sal Sahme	Sal Sahme ?
Healthcare		
Oregon Health & Sciences University	Kim Hoffman (ex officio)	Kim Hoffman (ex officio)
Industry		
Telecommunication Industry & ISP's 1	Brant Wolf	Brant Wolf ?
Telecommunication Industry & ISP's 2	---	?

--- = in Current Representative column this means that position does not exist

--- = in 2004-05 Nomination Request column this means that position does not exist under HB 2577

? = in 2004-05 Nomination Request column this means uncertainty as to whether a request for nomination in fact exists (as of Dec 9 2003)

Table 2 - Committees

<i>Committee(s)</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Members (* = Chair)</i>
Economic Development	Current status: inactive White paper: “Analysis of the Importance of Telecommunications to Oregon Economic Development”, September 16, 2002	Cindy Weeldreyer* John Irwin Milo Mecham (staff – in limbo) Dan Stark (staff – resigned) Ann Steeves
Guidelines	Current status: inactive Guidelines incorporated into HB 2577	Ed Parker * Cathy Britain John Irwin Dan Stark (staff- resigned) Cindy Weeldreyer
Government Services	Current status: inactive	Brant Wolf * Dan Barttlet Pat McLarney (staff – resigned) Ann Steeves
HB 2577 Amending Committee	Current status: inactive HB 2577 now is Oregon law	Cathy Britain * Bill Penhollow (staff – AOC) Ann Steeves Link Shadley (NoaNet) Brant Wolf
Healthcare-Education	Status: active Two full meetings to date with other organizing work underway by the committee chair.	Rob Myers * Cathy Britain Camille Cole Kim Hoffman John Irwin Ed Parker Link Shadley (NoaNet)
Public Outreach-Community Education	Current status: inactive White paper: “Public Outreach Committee Policy Recommendations”, September 13, 2002	Wes Hare * (resigned) Lee Curtis Kyle Engen (resigned) Kim Hoffman John Irwin Cindy Weeldreyer

<i>Committee(s)</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Members (* = Chair)</i>
Public-private Partnerships	Current status: active Roundtable: January 23, 2003, White papers: “Public-private Partnerships for Telecommunications in Oregon”, September 30, 2003 (includes Roundtable comments) “Public-Private Telecommunications Partnerships”, Remarks of Edwin B. Parker At Oregon Connections Conference, Bend, OR, October 2003 WIP: Development of a Policy Proposal for the Oregon Business Plan	John Irwin * Charlie Brunetti (BrunettiDEC) Lee Curtis Milo Mecham (staff – in limbo) Stephen Macartney (DAS) Shayne Maxwell (Rogue River) Ed Parker Sal Sahme Link Shadley (NoaNet) Rich Ryan (Hunter Communications) Andrew Spreadborough Ann Steeves Chris Tamarin (OECDD) Cindy Weeldreyer Brant Wolf
Public Safety	Current status: active HB 2304 now Oregon law	Ann Steeves * John Irwin Betty Dixon Cathy Britain Rob Myers
Telehealth	Current status: active + creation of TAO White paper: “Telemedicine Committee Report to the Council”, October 25, 2002 HJR4 passed as a resolution	Cathy Britain * Kim Hoffman Ed Parker John Irwin

Table 3 - Topics/Issues Before the Council
2002-2003

This table shows the topics/issues that came up during Council sessions. Many were addressed but many more are worth reviewing for inclusion into the Council’s work plan for the next 2 years.

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
1. Mission statement	Guidelines Committee/Council discussions/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Mission statement adopted under HB2577B. Provides a mission statement for the state of Oregon broadband. “Provide all Oregonians with affordable access to broadband digital applications that will improve the Oregon economy, improve the quality of life in Oregon communities and reduce the economic gap between well-served and underserved Oregon communities for present and future generations.”
2. Legislative Guidelines	Guidelines Committee/Council discussions/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Adopted under HB2577B. Use these guidelines to formulate legislation and policy for the state. 1. expansion of and incentives for affordable broadband and other telecommunications services, 2. telecommunications planning at the local, regional, and state level that includes participants from both public and private sectors, 3. removal of barriers to and provision of incentives for the full deployment of applications (examples: telemedicine reimbursement, distance learning incentives and public safety networks), 4. removal of barriers to public-private partnerships and public actions in areas where the private sector cannot justify investments, 5. use of economic development resources to help fund programs to train telecommunications support personnel, 6. use of economic development resources to help fund educational programs to assist communities to maximize their use of telecommunications technology, and 7. availability and use of State and Federal programs to plan and finance the expansion of advanced telecommunications services.

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
<p>3. Technical Assistance - Planning and Support: The State, through the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD), should continue to provide funds to support community telecommunications strategic planning assistance, particularly in underserved low-income areas. In support of this mission the State should compile and maintain a telecommunications resource database, maps of telecommunications infrastructure and a state telecommunications resource website. Review the OECDD Strategic Plan to ensure telecommunications remains a focus for the department. Conduct feasibility study of each county, its resources, gaps, partners, demand, etc. Identify penetration data per county. Study alternative approaches to providing coordinated statewide, regional, and local telecommunications services. Identify “killer applications” that can drive the business case and aggregate demand. Review Distressed Communities Index and areas with limited or no coverage. Prepare a ten-year outlook for telecomm in Oregon. Evaluate software for tracking infrastructure.</p>	<p>OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Economic Development Committee/Public Outreach-Community Education Committee/Council Discussions/Reviewed Needs and Issues list that reflects gaps in the network statewide. Recommendations in Report to the Legislature. Reviewed Michigan state telecommunications legislation, UTAH model and North Carolina’s state investment into rural areas (how urban areas subsidized rural areas).</p>	<p>Develop public education piece on how broadband deployment supports community issues. Recommendations in the Report were removed from proposed legislation. Continue efforts to involve OECDD in assisting communities with resources and guidance for strategic planning efforts. Evaluate engaging Rural Development Initiatives (RDI) to help create public awareness materials. Define capacity in each community (OECDD – Chris Tamarin’s efforts may have accomplished some of this – see OECDD Website). Acquire and post a list of regional activities/best practices. Council to provide a list of communities who still had unmet needs. Lots more to do under this topic.</p>

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
<p>4. Infrastructure - Identify Agency: The Council supports and repeats a previous recommendation of the Oregon Internet Commission to: "... aggressively promote the existence, maintenance and constant updating of the generally accessible, route-diverse, statewide, reliable broadband telecommunications services, which are essential to E-business. A specific state agency should immediately be identified and charged with pursuing this goal."</p>	<p>Council discussions/ Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.</p>	<p>No change. Continue efforts to get a focal point identified within state government for broadband related advocacy. Encourage Governor to appoint a staff person on telecommunications policy. Ray Naff of the governor's staff is now in the communication loop. Do we need an ex officio Council member from the governor's office?</p>
<p>5. Infrastructure – Incentives: The Council recommends that existing tax incentive (credit established under SB 229) legislation be revised to increase its usefulness to providers of telecommunications infrastructure.</p>	<p>OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Economic Development Committee/Public Outreach-Community Education Committee/Council Discussions/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.</p>	<p>Removed from proposed legislation. This tax credit remains "broken" and deserves to be repaired. Continue efforts to get this tax credit fixed.</p>
<p>6. Infrastructure – Funding: The State should continue and enhance funding programs for telecommunications infrastructure including the development and enhancement of backbone "middle-mile" and local distribution "last-mile" networks to improve access.</p>	<p>OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Economic Development Committee/Public Outreach-Community Education Committee/Council Discussions/OECDD report on SB292 ("private activity" bonds for Special Public Works Infrastructure). Reviewed OECDD's effort to raise the 5% cap of the Special Public Works Fund. Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.</p>	<p>Removed from proposed legislation. Use of the state's bonding authority to finance public works infrastructure is already a matter of law. Procedures need to be streamlined and consideration for growing the ceiling on bonding limits needs to be evaluated.</p>

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
7. Infrastructure – Cooperation: The Legislature should direct the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) to continue to work with other state agencies, K-12 education, community colleges and universities, and to create new opportunities with local communities and with the private sector to ensure that any public funds spent on telecommunications infrastructure will contribute to and not hinder the goal of shared broadband infrastructure accessible to all.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Council discussions/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Legislation and executive orders already exist to enable elements of this approach. Planning for implementation needs to be considered.
8. Infrastructure - Remove Barriers: Constitutional amendment that would remove constitutional barriers to public entities sharing in the costs and benefits of telecommunications infrastructure constructed by public-private partnerships.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Public/Private Partnership Committee/Council discussion/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Removed from proposed legislation. Determined not to be necessary at this time for telecom public-private partnerships as envisioned by the Council.
9. Utilization - Telemedicine Reimbursement: The Council recommends that the following policy be approved by a joint resolution of the Legislature and implemented by the Governor with an Executive Order: “It is the policy of the State of Oregon that healthcare payers providing service in the state should reimburse for telemedicine according to the definition and premises presented in the Council Report.”	Telehealth Committee/Council discussion/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature. Adopted under HJR 4. The Telemedicine Association (TAO) of Oregon formed.	Adopted under HJR 4. The Telemedicine Association (TAO) of Oregon formed. Continue support for the TAO and its efforts to negotiate payments with payers.
10. Utilization - E-commerce Zones: The Legislature should facilitate and promote E-commerce through the expansion of E-commerce Zones to more communities.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Economic Development Committee/Public Outreach-Community Education Committee/Council Discussions/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature. Removed from proposed legislation.	Removed from proposed legislation. This proposal deserves another look as where it has been used, the communities have benefited.

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
11. Utilization – Education: The Legislature should order the creation and publication of an integrated statewide plan for the K-12 educational community, community colleges, and universities to share telecommunications infrastructure and plan for its use to improve the delivery of e-learning opportunities throughout the state. The goal for such a plan should be to provide all Oregon students with equal access to existing and emerging educational opportunities through telecommunications.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Education Committee/Council discussion/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Adopted in HB2577B. The Council’s Healthcare-Education Committee is charged with the responsibility to produce a report with recommendations. Create a sub or separate listserve for the Healthcare-Education Committee.
12. Utilization – Libraries: The Legislature should direct the State to provide financial assistance for library resource sharing activities to public, school and academic libraries from funds specifically appropriated for a statewide network of all types of libraries.	Education committee/Council discussion/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Removed from the proposed legislation as it was addressed under another measure. Continue to support libraries in their use of broadband.
14. Utilization - E-government: The Council recommends adoption of measures to position Oregon as a national leader in the use of e-government for its residents.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Council discussion/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature. Removed after further discussion with DAS. E-Gov initiative underway.	The Council needs to get an update on the progress of the e-Gov initiative. Progress seems slow when viewed from outside.
15. Utilization - Public Safety: The Council recommends that the State should support rapid deployment in areas where broadband does not exist, support redundancy of these critical assets in order to ensure the best homeland security protections within the state, and ensure that a secure conduit for emergency communications and public safety networks is available to all communities both rural and urban. Seek synergies between Qwest, other telcos & the Public Safety communities to explore deployment/redundancy.	Public Safety Committee/Council discussion/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature. Research grant opportunities from Department of Homeland Security	Adopted under HB 2304. Oregon needs to build on this policy. A possibility for use of public-private partnerships seems a reasonable path to pursue for implementations. Review the State of Colorado’s plan to utilize Homeland Security to fund additional deployment.

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
16. Monitoring – Benchmarks: The Legislature should direct the appropriate agencies to use benchmarks to measure how well the state meets its telecommunications goals and to report the resulting measurement annually to the Legislature and the Governor. Compare where we are now vs. where we were before the Council was formed as far as deployment at the varying levels.	Guidelines Committee/Council Discussion/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Removed from proposed legislation. The Council needs to review and resubmit this recommendation. Without metrics, how can you determine progress?
17. Council Continuation and expansion: The Legislature should extend the term of the Council through the next biennium and direct it to report progress toward State telecommunications goals and to make further recommendations to the Legislature and to the Governor.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Council discussion/Guidelines Committee/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Adopted under HB2577B. The Council was continued for another 2 years and expanded in terms of membership. Pursue reappointment and appointment of members. Follow up on OPAN and potentially appoint an ex-officio member of the Council.
18. Consortia: The State should continue to support the work of regional telecommunications consortia that have emerged throughout the state.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Council discussion/Guidelines Committee/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Adopted under HB2577B. The state recognized the value of the consortia by once again explicitly naming them in the measure.
19. Generate Awareness: State agencies should generate awareness of new telecommunications infrastructure and disseminate knowledge of how business, government and individuals can put it to productive use. Create a media campaign to get the word out about telecommunications. Host a seminar to educate the legislature on the importance of telecommunications. Define mechanism to communicate work of the Council to others, LOC, AOC, Educations, Health Care, etc. Prepare a list of accomplishments of the Council and post to the website. Encourage Qwest to use ad space to show how people are using SB622. Prepare “exit” report for 2001-2003 Council.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Council discussion/Guidelines Committee/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature. Policy paper submitted to Oregon Business Plan in December 03.	The Report recommendation needs to be reviewed and possibly resubmitted. A policy proposal to the Oregon Business Plan for use and advocacy of telecom was submitted in December of 2003. OECDD funded SOTTC advisory spots on broadband. Telemedicine demos were effective. Key Council documents are posted at www.ortcc.org . Chris Tamarin’s work through OECDD is getting the word out. Exit report will be available in December 2003. Other opportunities? Follow up on Oregon Business Plan and Oregon’s Advantage through telecommunications

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
20. Workforce Development: The State should support efforts to provide cost-effective, quality workforce development training using telecommunications infrastructure to access distance learning opportunities.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Guidelines Committee/Education Committee/Economic Development Committee/Council discussion/Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	This recommendation needs to be reviewed and resubmitted. A policy proposal to the Oregon Business Plan for use and advocacy of telecom was submitted in December of 2003. Follow up on OCKED's progress.
21. Sharing and Partnerships: The State should allow schools, educational service districts, and local education agencies in underserved and unserved areas to provide broadband access for the surrounding community. Encourage public and private entities to seek opportunities for partnership with educational institutions that will stimulate the use of broadband technologies through community projects and public education. Review SOEN contract. Evaluate how to "share" traffic on the same network and encourage/	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Guidelines Committee/Education Committee/Economic Development Committee/Council discussion/Received status report on OSUN. Evaluate synergies between OPAN and OSUN. Recommendations in Report to the Legislature.	Re-evaluate and refine this proposal for re-submission to the legislature. It may not require legislation to implement these ideas. Explore implementation through use of public-private partnerships. Promote intelligent sharing of networks.
22. E-learning: The State should support innovative efforts that build effective and cost-efficient delivery of e-learning, that is, distance education and training supported by telecommunications.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Guidelines Committee/Education Committee/Council discussion/Contacted Distance Education Council and other education representatives. Recommendations in Report to the Legislature. Elements amended into HB 2577 and adopted.	Healthcare-Education Committee formed. Elements amended into HB 2577 and adopted. The Council's Healthcare-Education Committee is charged with the responsibility to produce a report with recommendations.
23. Oregon Telehealth Alliance: The Oregon Telehealth Alliance should be created to continue the work of the Council's Telehealth Committee.	Telehealth Association of Oregon formed.	Adopted under HJR 4. The Telemedicine Association (TAO) of Oregon formed. Continue support for the TAO and its efforts to negotiate payments with payers.

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
24. Public-Private Partnerships: Public and private organizations should work together in partnership to promote the use of telecommunications infrastructure and new technology. Study the manner in which telecommunication investments can be coordinated to facilitate partnerships between the public and private sectors.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Public-private Partnership Committee//Public-private partnerships Roundtable in January 2003/Council discussions. Evaluate LLC's in the course of creating public-private partnerships. Recommendations in report to the legislature. Policy paper submitted to Oregon Business Plan in December 03.	ORTCC Public-private partnership Committee formed. Policy paper submitted to Oregon Business Plan in December 03. This concept deserves evaluation and strong support from the Council. An examination of legal foundations is in order. Is further legislation needed? What other measures can be taken to foster an improved understanding of this opportunity?
25. CLECs: What additional incentives might help CLECs achieve access to ILEC facilities? Identify and address barriers to CLECs and other competitors providing broadband services.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Identified as an issue. No action taken.	FCC decisions have relegated certain decisions to the state PUC's. What role should the state of Oregon's PUC take in these matters, if any?
26. Franchise issues: To what extent are franchise agreements a barrier or incentive to extension of broadband services? Evaluate franchise fees and their impact on making deployment affordable.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Identified as an issue. Tabled with the opportunity to re-surface..	This is a "hot" topic and will likely remain as such..
27. ROW issues: Can State lands and rights-of-way be used to encourage infrastructure build-out? Work with ODOT regarding rights of way issues, large inventory of land, and high permitting costs.	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Identified as an issue. Reviewed ODOT's Schedule A & B. Some work accomplished here to create a more streamlined process with ODOT.	ROW issues continue to come up and merits a re-evaluation for possible recommendations. This is a very complicated set of issues under one heading. Work remains

<i>Topic/Issue</i>	<i>Source/Action(s)</i>	<i>Status & Recommendation(s)</i>
28. PUC issues: The mandated focus of the PUC regulations may prevent taking into account the harmful economic [and quality of life] consequences for communities lacking broadband services. The limitation on using the universal service fund for anything beyond POTS. Definition of affordability. What changes need to be made to allow the PUC to provide more support for rural deployment (economic development as a criteria, modifications to the universal service fund, etc.)? Work with the PUC to reduce final costs to customers (affordability).	OTCC Issues Matrix of 4 February 02/Council discussions on these matters. Action deferred.	The PUC does take into consideration what's best for communities when evaluating EAS routes. Included is consideration for economic impact. If this can be applied to EAS routes (telephony), why not broadband? As to the USF an evaluation of the appropriateness of using these funds for broadband in rural locations needs to be evaluated. How about a USF in support broadband for rural and underserved areas? Define broadband capacity in each community – share with PUC as an instrument in their decision-making. Revisiting telecom regulatory policy in the light of technology and competition changes could be important.
29. Public sector ownership: The ownership role for municipalities and other government entities. Is this unfair competition by governmental entities with the private sector?	This issue was raised on the appearance of HB 2442 and HB 2443.	Council determined that this particular issue was to be tabled and addressed at a later time, if the need so arose. The Council's general consensus on this topic is embodied in the Guidelines. The Council strongly supported the use of public-private partnerships as a way to resolve this issue.
30. Council funding: The OTCC is an unfunded legislative council. Members volunteer their time and pay their own expenses. Staff support was reduced due to funding shortfalls. Garner support for the Council from AOC, LOC, etc. Evaluate EDA funds that could be passed through OECDD.	Staff budget report/ Seek Public and Private Grants to augment the work of the Council.	Pursued multi-region grants. More work to go on this one.
40. Support for non-Council initiatives: Identify and Support other groups' legislation around telecommunications. The OTCC has a defined role in coordinating telecommunications legislation and policy recommendations.	Council discussion/Legislation for libraries and other initiatives were supported. Letters of support for HR1582 to US Congressional Delegation.	Ongoing activity. The OTCC should also ensure that it is tracking federal legislation and providing support as appropriate.
41. Universal Service Fund: Identify the benefits of the federal FCC USF for health clinics and hospitals and get the word out.	Council discussion/	More work to do on this topic.

Table 4 - Issues Planning and Prioritization Matrix

February 5, 2002

For an approach or issue to be considered by the OTCC, it must be addressed under column A AND either column B or C

Column A: Outcome/Mission - Provide all Oregonians with affordable access to broadband digital applications that will improve the Oregon economy, improve the quality of life in Oregon communities and reduce the economic gap between rural and urban Oregon for present and future generations.

Column B: Study alternative approaches to providing coordinated statewide, regional and local telecommunications services, including providing services to unserved or underserved areas of the state

Column C: Study the manner in which telecommunications investments can be coordinated to facilitate partnerships between the public sector and the private sector and between state and local governments

	PRIORITY	STAKEHOLDERS	A	B	C
SUPPLY					
<u>SB 229 (tax credits):</u> Tax credit fix Other issues raised in the public hearing on the rules What legislative changes need to be made to strengthen and enlarge the tax incentives? Bonds Are bonds an appropriate funding mechanism? What are the constraints of using this financing mechanism? What are the financial impacts? What legislative recommendations emerge?	1	ILECs CLECs Residents Businesses State Government Counties Cities	X	X	
<u>SB 622 (Telecommunications Infrastructure Account, etc.):</u> Was SB622 worth doing, and if so, can we do it over? Legislative changes to allow the PUC and Qwest to reduce the price of LADS circuits? Mini-SB 622 for other carriers What suggestions can other ILECs make to create a system similar to that achieved by SB622?	2	ILECs Residents Businesses State Government Counties Cities	X	X	
<u>Rural deployment:</u> Why is rural deployment going slowly? What methods might be used to encourage broader distribution of broadband? (Limited broadband access – large areas not covered, Uneconomical characteristics of broadband deployment in rural areas.) Empty spaces in cell coverage. What additional incentives might help CLECs achieve access to ILEC facilities? Identify and address barriers to CLECs and other competitors providing broadband	3	Residents Businesses Educational Institutions Healthcare Not for profits CLECs ILECs Cities	X	X	X

<p>services.</p> <p>How does government affect deployment?</p> <p>Use purchasing power of state (DAS) to leverage services for customer in rural areas.</p> <p>To what extent are franchise agreements a barrier to extension of services?</p> <p>Focusing on commercial and industrial customers may redline residential customers.</p> <p>What synergies exist between state and federal programs?</p> <p>Does a lack of open access inhibit competition and affordability?</p> <p>Remove barriers to expansion of cable broadband services (Cable Industry).</p> <p>Remove Barriers to Competitive Provision of Broadband Services (CLECs)</p> <p>Can State lands and rights-of-way be used to encourage infrastructure build-out?</p>		<p>Counties</p> <p>State Government</p> <p>Federal Government</p> <p>Cable Industry</p> <p>Cooperatives</p> <p>190 entities</p> <p>Rural Consortia</p>			
<p><u>Public-private:</u></p> <p>What are the ranges of public/private options?</p> <p>How can P/P arrangements overcome questions of ownership, profitability and revenue division?</p> <p>Public competition with private investment – taxpayer subsidization.</p> <p>Public competition with private investment – control of permitting process.</p>	4	<p>ILECs</p> <p>CLECs</p> <p>Residents</p> <p>Businesses</p> <p>Local governmental entities</p>	X		X
<p><u>PUC:</u></p> <p>The mandated focus of the PUC regulations may prevent taking into account the harmful economic [and quality of life] consequences for communities lacking broadband services.</p> <p>The limitation on using the universal service fund for anything beyond POTS.</p> <p>Definition of affordability</p> <p>What changes need to be made to allow the PUC to provide more support for rural deployment (economic development as a criteria, modifications to the universal service fund, etc.)?</p> <p>Address LATA cost barrier</p>	5	<p>State government</p> <p>Residents</p> <p>ILECs</p> <p>CLECs</p>	X	X	
DEMAND					
<p>What educational steps might achieve a better understanding of the potential of broadband and thus encourage expanded use of broadband services?</p>	6	<p>Residents</p> <p>Businesses</p> <p>Providers</p>	X	X	
<p>Work with medical community to identify legislation to support use of telemedicine.</p>	6	<p>Residents</p> <p>Healthcare Institutions</p>	X	X	
<p>Identify legislative actions to encourage and support expansion of e-government services.</p>	6	<p>Residents</p> <p>Businesses</p> <p>Government</p>	X	X	
<p>Identify legislative actions to eliminate/reduce the barriers to more distance learning</p>	6	<p>Residents</p>	X	X	

opportunities in high school and community colleges.		Businesses Educational Institutions			
Fund OECDD to Provide Technical Assistance, Training and Support	7	State Government Residents Businesses Providers	X	X	
OTHER					
Extend the Life of OTCC	8	State Government Rural Consortia	X	X	X