Oregon Telecommunications Coordinating Council
Minutes
July 24, 2008

Attendees:
Council Members: John Irwin, Pam Berrian, Agnes Box, Cathy Britain, Rob Myers, Ed Parker, John Greydanus representing Curt Pederson, Phil Barker representing Marlyn Schafer, Michael Weidman, Art Hill, Onno Husing, and Kim Hoffman.

Staff: Chris Tamarin of the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department

Others:

Shelley Jones, Oregon Public Utility Commission
Nate Arbogast, WindWave Communications
Pat Mooney, WindWave Communications
Fred Ziari, EZ Wireless
Keith Grunberg, Charter Communications
Larry Bundy, Blue Mountain Community College
Marsha Spellman, Converge Communications
Chris Seubert, Qwest
Phil Barker, IT Director, Curry County
Mary Beth Henry, Deputy Director, Portland Office of Cable Communications and Franchise Management
Jon Nicholson, tw telecom inc.
Mike Dewey, Oregon Cable Association
Stephen Macartney, LS Networks
Eric Schmidt, Association of Oregon Counties
Milo Mecham Lane Council of Governments
Eric Anderson, BendBroadband
Andrea Fogue, League of Oregon Cities
Martha Pelligrino, City of Portland
Petra Redchuk, Charter Communications
Dave King, Oregon State University
Derek Abrams, Oregon State University

Old Business:
Ed Parker moved that the June 26, 2008 minutes be approved with corrections as discussed. Art Hill seconded the motion. The Council approved the minutes.

Broadband Policy Roundtable:
John Irwin welcomed everyone to the meeting.

John Greydanus, Director of Media Services and Outreach, Oregon State University welcomed the group to OSU and indicated that the topic of today's discussion is

important to OSU and its future. He noted that OSU has a presence in every county, and has a mission to address research, education delivery and outreach statewide. As educators increasingly look to on-line methods to address these issues, statewide planning for broadband is critical. John observed that not only the network infrastructure, but the content and applications that ride the network are important and we should parallel their development. OSU is working to apply technology across its curriculum moving courses from the blackboard to on-line environments. John observed that ORTCC has been one of the most persistent and dedicated groups working for the development of broadband in Oregon and its contributions are appreciated.

John Irwin expressed his hope that this would be an "open and hearty" discussion on the merits and content of a broadband policy for Oregon. He expressed his opinion that Oregon would benefit from a broadband policy to provide guidance and broad direction to keep pace with the continually growing needs of our state and to remain competitive in the growing global economy. Many of the building blocks are already in place. Gaining consensus on how to move into the future does not necessarily require more legislation. But it does mean reaching consensus among a wide number of participants on how we might meet the future with broadband in Oregon.

John noted that Oregon's broadband infrastructure is a great asset and that broadband infrastructure is one of the economic development advantages Oregon needs to be competitive with other states and other countries. Oregon business, health care, education, government, public safety, and residents depend on it. John observed that Oregon's current strong position largely is the result of private sector investments and proactive public policy with some notable public sector and public-private partnership activity. He reported that he frequently speaks with residents of other states that admire Oregon's achievements to date. He recently spoke with a member of a "very large state's" broadband task force that told him, "I like the way you do things in Oregon."

John noted that despite Oregon's relatively strong status, opportunities and challenges remain to be met to address and meet the continually growing needs for broadband infrastructure and services. He observed that equally and perhaps even more important to having good infrastructure, are motivation and knowledge of how to use broadband to enable and support commerce, education, workforce development, healthcare, access to government, public safety, and individual citizen access to knowledge; the demand side of the equation. Unmet and growing demand for broadband will draw investment in infrastructure and services creating a win-win for providers and users.

John observed that societal externalities do not always immediately fit with corporate business models. We should consider deriving business models that can take advantage of public-private partnerships to address these needs and support investments. Finding the balance is the trick. He added that public policy development in this arena must be subject to significant analysis, honest debate, and serious consideration.

John said that the task before us is to agree to craft, adopt, and implement a broadband policy for Oregon. This is critical if Oregon is to continue to be competitive and to continue to grow its economic and quality of life factors.

John asked for brief opening statements from the panelists to be followed by open discussion.

Ed Parker

Ed proposed that Oregon needs a broadband policy because broadband is an engine of economic growth and a creator of price lowering economic efficiencies that will help counter the inflationary effects of high energy prices. Oregon needs broadband for economic growth and productivity gains in its economy. He added that a national broadband policy is needed to regain this country's competitive edge against countries in Europe and Asia and we need an Oregon broadband policy to keep us competitive with other states. Municipal broadband policy is also needed because municipalities, particularly rural communities, would be foolish to depend entirely on the federal and state government to ensure that their needs are met. Rural communities without competitive broadband will be at risk of becoming ghost towns.

Ed said that his topic today is infrastructure. Infrastructure is about the supply of essential facilities and broadband infrastructure is as essential to communities as water, sewer and transportation systems. There is a distinction, however, in that broadband requires private investment. Demand must also be stimulated to provide adequate incentives and returns for private investment to meet our collective needs.

Ed recommended that a broadband infrastructure policy for Oregon should have four elements:

1. Establish goals - we need infrastructure that can support synchronous services for videoconferencing, telepresence applications, and medical applications. A minimum goal would be symmetric ten megabits per second for households and symmetric one hundred megabits per second for businesses. Whatever the speed goals may be, however, the network must be scalable because the demand for greater capacity and faster speeds will continue to grow in the future.
2. Establish measurements - we must be able to monitor and measure how well we are doing against our goals to manage and adjust policy over time.
3. Maintain competition – a monopoly or duopoly will not be sufficient. Robust competition is needed between telephone companies, cable companies, competitive access providers, wireless companies, and municipal providers (as providers of last resort when private investment is not available). We also need to maintain open competition for applications and terminal devices to stimulate demand and utilization of network services. Customers don't buy infrastructure, they buy the services that the infrastructure can provide.
4. Create incentives and remove disincentives for digital broadband networks. The current Universal Service Fund should be shifted from subsidizing analog telephone service to broadband digital service. Voice is now just one application riding on multi-purpose digital networks. Government can provide incentives by

being anchor tenants for multi-purpose broadband digital services as a matter of policy. Additionally, government funding needs to be provided when there is a gap in the return on investment needed to drive private sector funding.

Dave King

Dave introduced himself as the Associate Provost at Oregon State University responsible for extended campus on-line education programs. Prior to coming to Oregon, Dave was the Executive Director of the Indiana Higher Education Telecommunication System and one of the architects of the I-Light system that provides fiber access to forty private and public colleges and universities in Indiana. He also served as Chair of an association representing regional fiber optic networks in states across the country.

Dave indicated that his focus is on education, meaning that sector of society that provides access to information and learning in a broad sense including schools, libraries, colleges and universities. Dave shared a quote of a Sun Microsystems chief technologist who asserted that, "A network increases in value exponentially with every individual node that is added to it." This is critical from an educational point of view. We can easily become islands as individual educational institutions, but where the value can come for society and for the state as a whole is when we link institutions together. This beneficial effect is not limited to educational institutions. Some of the greatest opportunities for benefit are in the K-12 schools. When broadband is brought to a community, it not only enhances education, but also healthcare, security and other areas of community interest. There are many reasons for individual organizations and institutions to have broadband, but we need to maintain a focus on interconnecting various institutions to gain the full benefit. Dave would like to see, for example, a scenario where the network would support an interactive working relationship between a High School history teacher and a University history professor. Supporting collaboration and cooperation between those engaged in research and grant funding is another example. Distance education is yet another. OSU's "Open Campus" approach is being used for outreach to communities to provide educational resources around the state and broadband connectivity is essential to this effort.

Dave thought that Universal Service Fund programs could be made easier, more direct, and more understandable for schools using its programs.

Dave made several comments regarding policy. He noted that OSU conducted a statewide survey last year that indicated that 2.4 million out of 3.7 million people in the state access the Internet at least twice a week. He sees this as an indicator of demand and the mode of delivery that education needs to employ. He asserted that the success of Oregon will depend on more people having more access and becoming more educated. State policy should seek to maintain growth in available access and increased utilization of broadband, particularly in times when that growth is threatened by economic downturns.

Fred Ziari

Fred introduced himself as CEO of EZ Wireless, a provider of point-to-point high bandwidth wireless communication systems. He also has an agricultural engineering consulting company in Eastern Oregon and believes that the "silver bullet" for American agriculture is technology and particularly information technology. Fred also chairs the Engineering Technology Industry Council www.oregonetic.org, which provides funding to all eight Oregon universities to increase the number of engineering graduates and degrees in support of Oregon's industries.

Fred suggested that the prognosis for Oregon is not very good. The funding level for universities is falling way behind. The total funding provided to the eight Oregon universities to support engineering, computer science and information technology is less than 50% of the funding provided to the University of Washington. Fred added that the number of kids from Eastern Oregon going on to college is currently at a low point. Previously 15% of students in Eastern Oregon would go on to college; we are now down to levels of 13 and 14%.

Fred sees broadband as an engine of economic development and innovation. Fred is concerned that our county has lost its competitive edge in manufacturing. The only thing that is giving us a competitive advantage in America today is our innovation. He said that the food processing industry is a good example. The majority of innovation is happening in America. Fred is concerned that there is a shortage of engineers, scientists, and PhDs in Oregon needed to push innovation, create jobs and support economic growth over the next decade.

Fred observed that there was a rush toward free universal broadband that was pushed by a number of municipalities including Philadelphia, San Francisco, Houston, San Jose and Portland. He observed that every one of them has failed and he sees a backlash from these ill-conceived approaches to providing universal broadband.

Fred supports the concept of multi-purpose broadband networks. We need to increase our expectations. "We talk the talk, but don't walk the walk." Fred also suggested that we need champions to move the concept forward. Providing essential broadband infrastructure to communities, expanding programs at Oregon's universities, and teaching science and technology in our high schools to create a pipeline of students are needed to support innovation and economic growth and should be part of our strategy and policy.

Kim Hoffman

Kim introduced herself as the Chair of the Telehealth Alliance of Oregon, a not for profit organization dedicated to advancing telehealth throughout Oregon. Oregon is a very diverse state geographically and demographically. We are the tenth largest state in land size and we have ten counties that are considered to be "frontier" counties meaning that they have less than six people per square mile. Kim added that, in fact, some of our counties have less than three people per square mile. One of our biggest challenges is to provide all areas of the Oregon with adequate health care. In some cases this means basic health care and in others it means access to specialists.

Kim described several healthcare scenarios faced by people living in different parts of the state and the challenges of physically traveling long distances to receive care. Kim then described several scenarios using telecommunications technology to deliver healthcare services and the resulting improved levels of care, convenience and reduced costs. Kim also described the opportunities and benefits of being able to deliver medical training and educational programs remotely to areas around the state.

Kim emphasized that our ability to deliver clinical health care services remotely and to deliver healthcare education programs and training remotely depend up the statewide availability of broadband networks.

Mary Beth Henry

Mary Beth is Deputy Director, Portland Office of Cable Communications and Franchise Management and the President of the National Association of Telecommunications Officers & Advisors (NATOA). Mary Beth shared one of her favorite statistics, the United States is number one in the number of studies that say how far behind we are in broadband.

Mary Beth asked, "How much bandwidth do we need?" She reported that NATOA www.natoa.org just recently released a set of Broadband Principles regarding the critical need for widespread deployment of next-generation broadband networks and necessary steps to achieve this goal:

1. NATOA calls for the immediate nationwide deployment of advanced broadband networks.
2. True broadband requires high capacity bandwidth in both directions.
3. Fiber to the premises is the preferred broadband option. She noted that we are becoming "prosumers" not only consuming content on the Internet, but also producing it.
4. High capacity broadband connectivity must be affordable and widely accessible.
5. High capacity broadband requires open access networks.
6. Network neutrality is vital to the future of the Internet.
7. All networks and users have the right and obligation to non–discriminatory interconnection.
8. Local governments must be involved to ensure that local needs and interests are met.
9. Local governments must be allowed to build and operate broadband networks.
10. A variety of options must be considered to cover deployment costs.

Mary Beth said that we cannot leave the task of building broadband networks to the private sector alone, because we will continue to fall behind. This approach has not resulted in the level of investment that we need. Broadband is critical infrastructure. Just as communities in the past needed to provide electricity for their citizens as critical infrastructure, many need to provide broadband today when private sector providers are not stepping up. Government has always played a role in either helping to facilitate or

provide critical infrastructure. Local government should be viewed as a key partner by industry as well as by state and federal government.

Mary Beth reported that in Portland, the largest urban area in Oregon, there is no near term prospect for fiber to the home (FTTH), yet in the suburban communities all around Portland, FTTH is being deployed leaving Portland as the hole in the middle of the "fiber doughnut."

Mary Beth summarized that we should think big, adopt high goals, and act boldly. She advised that Oregon should not just consider what it takes to compete with California or Washington, but what level of broadband capacity is necessary to compete globally.

Open Discussion

John Irwin observed that with the tremendous growth of the Internet and expansion of applications, we are going to have to be *visionary* in how we craft public policy going into the future. There have been references to the coming "Exa-flood." We need to be looking even beyond the Exa-flood to the Zetta and "Yotta-flood."

John asked, "Should a broadband policy, if we develop one, include infrastructure, or are we done with infrastructure?"

Ed Parker responded that he would like to answer Mary Beth's question, "How much bandwidth do we need?" He said there is a simple one-word answer – more! And so Oregon needs a scalable infrastructure. No matter how much capacity we have, or get, in the future we will need more and it will need to be bi-directional. Ed recommended that any specific goal whether it is measured in Megabits or Gigabits should be set to a specific time horizon and not viewed as an endpoint. Ed added that it is also important that we pay attention to synchronous vs. asynchronous and symmetrical vs. asymmetrical broadband service capability.

Michael Weidman responded that when he heard Mary Beth's question, he wanted to add "to where?" Michael observed that we are using the term broadband synonymously with Internet access. He noted that the Internet is a "best effort" network made up of multiple networks. When you think about Internet Protocol, you have a source of information and a user of that information. You get queries and you are moving data. Michael suggested that we should not just think in terms of the World Wide Web, but also think in terms of the Oregon Wide Web. We need to keep as much traffic routed within the state as possible, moving routers and switches as close to the edge of the network as possible. We are concerned with time sensitive applications like high definition videoconferencing and telepresence. We should be concerned with issues of latency, jitter, and survivability of the network. Michael recommended that peering within the state should be encouraged. He made an analogy to the legacy telephone network, that when you call someone in your office – you dial a four digit extension number, when you call someone in your town – you make a local call, you don't dial 1+ ten digits to make every call, you route your calls and establish the connection through the closest switch to the edge of the

network. IP provider networks should be peered and should exchange traffic within the state whenever possible for improved network performance.

Art Hill shared that the Oregon Health Network project reflects that model. He said that we should be concerned with quality of service and assurance of service. We need to have specified levels of service, not "up to" levels of service. We don't buy cars with "up to" four wheels. Ed Parker agreed that for real time applications like telemedicine, guaranteed and reliable levels of service are critical.

Marsha Spellman observed that in her work with tribes in Oregon, the issue for some communities is even more basic – voice telephone service. Marsha said that though there has been significant progress in connecting rural communities, there are still communities without any service. Hopefully, when infrastructure is finally built out, it will leapfrog analog voice, so that we don't build legacy systems capable of just voice. It is important, that as we consider policy and state strategy, we remember that there are still communities that have no access.

John Irwin asked about broadband policy concerns with regard to education.

Larry Bundy responded that with regard to education at all levels; the key issue is not network capacity, but individual network access. In rural parts of the state, this continues to be a real issue.

Dave King added that from an education point of view, it is the school, the community college, or learning center at the farthest ends of the network that we need to be concerned about. He noted that OSU can bring all the bandwidth it needs to the campus, but we also need connectivity to the communities, schools, and students at remote locations.

Art Hill responded that when he came to Blue Mountain Community College in 2001, videoconferencing was being used to deliver distance education programs. Art shared that he had just completed a term teaching a group of US students and a group of students in Croatia, together, in the same class using telecommunications. We have seen exponential growth in the demand for and use of distance education. Yet, there are still Community Colleges in rural areas of Oregon where Art is unable to arrange a videoconference in order to avoid travel. Art reported that the demand for distance education is almost infinite and distance education programs are effective. Art observed that many urban schools have the same problem with broadband access as rural schools because there have not been any unified plans or policy to provide universal access to broadband for schools. This impacts economic development in the state. Education drives innovation, which drives job creation, which drives asset growth, which drives community development and economic growth.

Onno Husing recommended that any approach, that is undertaken, be flexible. There are many different service scenarios and we need flexible programs that allow for creative

solutions in individual communities. Onno is persuaded that subsidies should be made available as gap financing to make projects viable.

Stephen Macartney shared that he conducted a telecommunications connectivity survey of K-12 schools in Oregon. He noted that there are rural communities in the state that have fiber network facilities connecting schools within the districts, but they have trouble getting to the world. He added that there is also quite a bit of fiber in the state connecting public buildings within counties or cities, but again high bandwidth connectivity to the world is limited. Mac observed that there is not a policy for connectivity to K-12 schools. School districts and ESDs have varying levels of network connectivity, and there is no uniformity. We need connectivity to schools throughout the state, but often there is no business case for the investment. We need a policy with goals applying to the entire state to determine how this need can be met.

Milo Mecham commented from the perspective of government that ORTCC needs to recognize that it is "preaching to the choir." Broadband must be made a real issue for the rest of the state. It must be discussed in terms of services for K-12 schools, in terms of services for higher education, services for medical care, and in terms of economic development. He observed that governments have multiple issues and constituencies and demands to deal with. To succeed, a broadband policy must be flexible enough to fit with and support the other goals and issues that governments have. You could take the Oregon Universal Service fund which today supports basic dial tone service and use that fund to support broadband. The way we will deliver voice service or "dial tone" in the twenty-first century is through broadband. But to accomplish this type of policy change, it must be tied in to the rest of the state's concerns as well. The current users of the USF will need to be included and the benefits for them identified. Large telecommunications service customers need to be included and the benefits for them identified. The recommended broadband policy must fit within the context of all the demands being placed on government and industry.

Eric Anderson commented that the Universal Service Fund system is a difficult one to deal with as a new carrier trying to access the funds. Eric said that the USF system needs some "tweaks" to ensure equal accountability for all the carriers that receive funds and that it could be used as a resource to improve broadband access.

Phil Barker added that he has no doubt that incumbent carriers using the USF would hesitate to redirect these funds. He said that there is a danger that analog voice landline services might be lost for rural users, so we should consider this cautiously.

Marsha Spellman said that the USF was created in the Communications Act of 1934 to support the deployment of telephone service in rural communities and this is still the basis of it. There are two funds to consider, the federal USF and the Oregon USF. Telephone companies are designated as either a high-cost company or low-cost company. A high-cost company delivers services in expensive, high-cost to serve, rural areas and receives funds primarily from the federal USF. Marsha reiterated that there are communities in the state that do not have dial tone and would be happy to have just voice

service. We need to recognize how important USF is to rural communities, as it currently exists today. John Irwin noted that the Federal Communications Commission is reviewing the USF, and that the state of Oregon has already adopted legislation that will "synch-up" the Oregon USF with any changes made to the federal USF.

John Irwin asked for thoughts on broadband and economic development.

Fred Ziari commented that even people in technology industries recognize that Oregon needs to have a diverse economy and that a strategy focusing only on the high-tech sector will not be enough. Fred suggested that agriculture is one of the most important sectors of our economy. The state of Oregon leads the nation in hunger. Twenty-five percent of people under age twenty-five have food insecurity. Globally, we are adding a net gain of one hundred million people a year to the world population while we are taking about one and a half million acres out of agricultural production each year. Agricultural efficiency and productivity are important issues. US agriculture is very important to the world's population because we are a country that has the ability to increase its agricultural output. Oregon agriculture, in particular, is important and is already making use of high technology. Consequently the need for high-bandwidth connectivity for agriculture is growing rapidly. Fred shared that large farms in Eastern Oregon are using wireless broadband networks and sophisticated information technologies to manage their operations. The increasing high costs of food and fuel are the two major concerns of Americans today. He said that broadband can provide solutions to address both those concerns. Marsha Spellman advised to look at Universal Service Funds: "the money is there."

John Irwin asked for thoughts on broadband and healthcare.

Kim Hoffman observed, regarding economic development and the recruitment of new businesses, that one of the first questions to be answered by prospects is what kind of health care is available in the community. If adequate health care services are not available in a community, companies will locate somewhere else. Kim said that we are in a "Catch 22" in Oregon. We have healthcare shortages in our rural communities, but also have healthcare shortages in urban communities. For example, OHSU has two pediatric radiologists, the only two in the state. New imaging technologies can produce 650-700 MB files. There is a need for the services of these radiologists in rural areas and across the state, but we don't have the resources to deliver them. Our challenge is to provide access to healthcare education in order to create more healthcare specialists, keep them in our communities, and provide healthcare delivery systems that can serve all areas of the state. Marsha Spellman added that healthcare telemetry monitoring for older patients in their homes is a valuable application.

Dave King noted that all these applications need to be combined when considering broadband policy issues. It will take recognition of economic development, telemedicine, public safety, education, and other applications together as the combined demand needed to create a private sector business case, perhaps with a government subsidy, to drive the deployment of broadband infrastructure. None of us alone can articulate the demand in a

way that will be attractive enough to produce the desired results. But if we can work together to aggregate all this, the benefit can be huge.

Onno Husing agreed that it is vital to build communities of interest, aggregate demand and identify infrastructure and service needs. We need to build a uniform and common message. Onno reported that he is participating in the organization of an Oregon Rural Congress that will be meeting in Cascade Locks on August 21 and 22 to develop an independent rural policy voice in the state. He said that telecommunications will be one of the key "planks" considered and addressed.

Chris Tamarin observed that many of these comments have alluded to a "Push-Pull" policy strategy for the expansion of broadband. Much of the approach up to now has been a Push strategy to build infrastructure and broadband availability. Many of the comments this morning indicate that we should be shifting to a Pull strategy that focuses on applications and how we can use broadband and promote the benefits of using broadband. He suggested that we should be shifting to a Pull strategy that creates and stimulates demand for broadband services for e-commerce, e-government, telemedicine, distance education, agriculture, public safety telework and other applications.

Jon Nicholson commented that one of the things that can be done to provide incentives to the private sector to invest in new infrastructure is to remove barriers to entry. Jon noted that an ongoing challenge for competitive access providers is to gain access to buildings in order to deliver services to customers. Competitive providers are often at a disadvantage relative to incumbent providers in that they must pay extra rent, negotiate special terms, and franchise fees for right of way that don't exist in other parts of the country. These are additional costs that end up being passed on to customers. These are some barriers that could be removed or "eased" through policy to help the private sector expand broadband networks.

Pam Berrian responded with concern over the term "barrier to entry." She associates that particular term with specific language in the Telecommunications Act. Pam noted that Oregon has had a long history of franchises, and there has been no court decision yet where any city in Oregon has been shown to be a barrier to entry. Pam recognized that there are issues, however, and she has been aware of litigation between competitive and incumbent providers, between telephone companies and cable companies, and between providers and governments.

Nate Arbogast commented that though franchises may not be "barriers to entry," the different franchise terms in cities will impact the attractiveness and ease of doing business in any particular city. Pam Berrian noted that in many cities and counties in Oregon, especially Eastern Oregon, there is little or no use of franchises, little construction permit oversight, and little or no rights of way use fees and still, few providers are locating there. City or county rules are not the issue. Eric Anderson said that he saw that effect in the wireless industry. For example, he had experiences with some cities in California where it cost him more to get through the zoning process than it did to build the infrastructure.

Art Hill brought up the application of telecommuting or telework and reported that a speaker at last month's ORTCC meeting telecommutes 100% of the time from Pendleton and is employed by an insurance company with offices located in Portland. He noted that this insurance company currently has 20% of its employees telecommuting and has a goal of increasing that number to 80%. Art suggested that he would like to see a policy recommendation for an incentive to help companies in the private sector explore and utilize telecommuting in their organizations. Marsha Spellman added that Oregon is a state essentially of small businesses and that access to broadband is essential for the development and growth of small businesses.

Stephen Macartney observed that of all the different applications that have been discussed, no one application is enough to drive private sector to make investments. He recommended that policy recommendations seek to unite and consolidate these various sectors of the market so that we have enough aggregate demand to drive investment. And it should offer, and identify incentives from all available sources to spur private sector investment. For example, Mac noted that in the state of Oregon there is about $30 million of unspent E-Rate money for libraries and schools. We need a policy to help aggregate both demand as well as available incentive resources to move us toward expanded broadband.

John Irwin asked for thoughts on broadband and public safety.

Fred Ziari responded that there is an opportunity to combine public safety with economic development. Public safety applications can make use of information technologies to improve their operations, data collection, reporting, and information processing. In Hermiston, the police department has reduced voice communications by 60% and is saving over 2000 man-hours through the effective use of broadband. Furthermore, the police department is sharing the network with the fire department, healthcare, businesses and other users. Ed Parker added that we should encourage mobile broadband, not just fixed broadband, and public safety is the most promising anchor tenant. Ed also observed that the "first responder" in emergency situations isn't really the police officer or fire fighter, it is the citizen with a cell phone. Whenever we build radio towers for public safety communications systems, commercial wireless transceivers should be placed there as well. Public-private partnerships in developing broadband infrastructure for mutual benefit should be recommended. Phil Barker commented that this model is being used in Curry County in their public safety network.

John Irwin asked for thoughts on broadband and government.

Pam Berrian responded that municipal governments want their communities to excel in 'livability' for existing residents and businesses and to recruit more businesses. Eugene seems to be insatiable in that regard and wants its citizens to have easy access to services and can use broadband to improve access to services and amenities.

John Irwin noted that another consideration for broadband policy is mapping an inventory of existing broadband infrastructure. Mary Beth Henry responded that Washington State is ahead of Oregon in this area, but also said that a key issue regarding the mapping of infrastructure for public policy development is the need of the private sector service providers' protection of proprietary information. Stephen Macartney suggested that this sort of mapping would not be that valuable. The goal is to get services to areas that need it regardless of where specific telecommunications facilities may be located. Mary Beth reported that www.broadbandcensus.com is an organization that NATOA is working with that it gathering data on broadband service availability. She added that she would like to see a 'buddy system' approach between governments and providers. Jon Nicholson noted that service providers in the City of Portland provide maps to the city of all their fiber network facilities within the city on an annual basis.

John Irwin asked for thoughts on broadband policy and leadership. He pointed out that the ORTCC sunsets in January 2010 and asked, "Who should lead this effort going forward?"

Onno Husing suggested that there is an important education function to be performed to improve the awareness of legislators of the value of and applications for broadband. It's not about lines on a map, but about telemedicine, e-commerce, agriculture and the other applications and their resulting benefits. He added that local champions are needed to provide their support; real people talking about real applications and needs before the legislature. Onno said that the Oregon Innovation Council should be looked at as a model. Art Hill advocated extending the existence of ORTCC beyond January 2010 as a leadership group. Agnes Box commented that she sees the ORTCC "morphing" into something new. The broadband policy recommendations submitted in the 2009 legislative session could also be used to define that new entity. Agnes suggested that the new entity would have different representation. It should include higher education, healthcare, economic development, cities, counties, k-12 schools, public safety, public health, agriculture and telecommunications industry representatives.

Pam Berrian added that Oregon Senator David Nelson has already demonstrated his leadership and the ORTCC might also consider approaching Oregon Representative Nancy Nathanson, former chair of the National League of Cities' Information, Technology and Communications Committee, and former member of an FCC Advisory Committee.

Mary Beth Henry pointed out that the State of Washington has adopted legislation to produce a state broadband map and suggested it would be prudent for the ORTCC to review that legislation and check the progress of that project.

Next Steps

John Irwin brought the conversation to conclusion and discussed the next steps in the process.

- Roundtable minutes will be prepared and distributed to ORTCC members by August 1st

- Draft recommendations will be prepared and distributed to ORTCC members for comment by August 8th
- A revised draft based on comments will be prepared and distributed to ORTCC members and roundtable attendees by August 19th
- Council review and discussion at its August 28 meeting
- Council will develop its proposals by October 15
- Council will submit its policy recommendations and legislative concepts to the 2009 Legislative Assembly and the Office of the Governor

John added that the ORTCC will be meeting in Newport on October 15th, the day prior to the Oregon Connections Telecommunications Conference www.oregonconnections.info and invited people to attend that meeting.

John Irwin thanked everyone for coming to Corvallis and participating in the Roundtable in the middle of the summer and adjourned the meeting.

Meeting Schedule:
The council will meet next on Thursday, August 28, 2008 in the Mt. Neahkahnie Conference Room, 1225 Ferry Street SE, Salem, Oregon 97301. Meeting information will be updated and posted on the Council website at www.ortcc.org.

* * *