



AGENDA

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, January 30, 2013 – 10:00 a.m.

LA-RICS Headquarters, Large Conference Room

2525 Corporate Pl., Suite 200, Monterey Park, CA 91754

AGENDA POSTED: January 22, 2013

Complete agendas are made available for review on the Authority's website at <http://www.la-rics.org>.

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call
3. APPROVAL OF Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes for June 11, 2011, and January 9, 2012.
4. NEW BUSINESS – DISCUSSION ITEM
 - 4.1 FirstNet Path Forward
5. PUBLIC COMMENT
6. ADJOURNMENT



LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING INFORMATION

Members of the public are invited to address the LA-RICS LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE on any item on the agenda prior to action by the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE on that specific item. Members of the public may also address the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE. The LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE will entertain such comments during the Public Comment period. Public Comment will be limited to three (3) minutes per individual for each item addressed, unless there are more than ten (10) comment cards for each item, in which case the Public Comment will be limited to one (1) minute per individual. The aforementioned limitation may be waived by the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE's Chair.

(NOTE: Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3(b) the legislative body of a local agency may adopt reasonable regulations, including, but not limited to, regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on particular issues and for each individual speaker.)

Members of the public who wish to address the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE are urged to complete a Speaker Card and submit it to the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE Secretary prior to commencement of the public meeting. The cards are available in the meeting room. However, should a member of the public feel the need to address a matter while the meeting is in progress, a card may be submitted to the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE Secretary prior to final consideration of the matter.

It is requested that individuals who require the services of a translator contact the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE Secretary no later than the day preceding the meeting. Whenever possible, a translator will be provided. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting you wish to attend.

(323) 881-8291 or (323) 881-8295

SI REQUIERE SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION, FAVOR DE NOTIFICAR LA OFICINA CON
24 HORAS POR ANTICIPADO.



MEETING MINUTES

LOS ANGELES
REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

June 16, 2011

LA-RICS Corporate Office
2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200, Monterey Park, California 91754

Official Voting Members Present:

Daryl Osby, Chair, representative for the County of Los Angeles Fire Department
Gerardo Pinedo, representative for the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services
Chris Hansen, representative for the City of Los Angeles Police Department
Mark Wilkins, representative for the County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department
Stephen Sotomayor, representative for the City of Los Angeles Mayor's Office (CAO)
Andy Fox, representative for the City of Los Angeles Fire Department
Mitch Tavera, representative for the City of Culver City, At Large Seat #2
Joe Payne, representative for the City of Pasadena, At Large Seat #4

Representatives For Official Voting Members Present:

Olyvia Rodriguez, representing Manuel Rivas, Jr., representative for the County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office

Official Voting Members Absent:

Mark Davis, representative for the City of Los Angeles Chief Administrative Office
Nancy Ramirez, representative for the Los Angeles School Police Department
Alex Rodriguez, representative for the Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association
Scott Pickwith, representative for the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association
Howard Chambers, representative for the California Contract Cities Association
Greg Simay, representative for the City of Burbank, At Large Seat #3
Kim Raney, representative for the City of Covina, At Large Seat #4
June Gibson, representative for the City of Los Angeles, Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
Mike Garcia, representative for the City of Long Beach
Mary Giordano, representative for the City of Torrance, At Large Seat #1



1. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the LA-RICS Legislative Committee was called to order on June 16, 2011 at 3:40 p.m. by Chair Daryl Osby.

2. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call

Daryl Osby conducted a formal roll call and determined not a Quorum was not reached. Staff informed a member was in route and would be arriving shortly. The committee moved forward, with reporting, holding off action until a Quorum was reached.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Approved

4. OLD BUSINESS – (None)

5. REPORTS –

5.1 Grant Performance Period Modification

Susy Orellana-Curtiss said that as discussed at the last Legislative Committee Meeting, once negotiations have concluded and we have a detailed project plan in place, we hope to share that information with the granting agencies in order to demonstrate project progress and hopefully restructure the performance period to match the project plan. We do not have the project plan details at this time, but will update the committee as soon as it is received.

Stephen Sotomayor stated that there might be some grant extension for some people that may not have heard about. There were some recent updates to our grant funding.

Susy Orellana-Curtiss said that actually all of 2008 grants are all now extended, which is great news. June 30, 2012, UASI and SHSGP through May 31, 2011, and PSIC through June 30, 2011.

Daryl Osby: any questions or comments?

6. NEW BUSINESS – DISCUSSION ITEM

6.1 S.911 – Public Safety Spectrum and Wireless Innovation Act (see attachments)

Daryl Osby directs the floor to Ron Wong who has an overview.

Ron Wong started with S.911 and said that this bill creates the "Public Safety Broadband Corporation" to oversee and to be the license holder for the spectrum as allocated to public safety. The bill primarily sets up the framework for this corporation, establishes the requirements for the Board. It also established the technical requirement for interoperability, it looks to ensure that there's competitive bidding and that the equipment that is procured is compatible and interoperable throughout the nation. It also provides and creates policies for events National Telecommunication Information Authority (NTIA) to make loans to the corporation, US dollars that will be taken out of the US Treasury as a loan to the corporation for construction and maintenance. Two billion dollars



is what is going to be borrowed from the Treasury and that will be set up to construct and operate the nationwide broadband system. It also established a public safety trust fund and what that does is that it allows for grants, operations grants, and also provides for some R & D work, because the LTE system is still new and it funds the lab in Bolder Colorado to continue to certify equipment to be operating on this system. It also looks at the technology for the Evolved Packet Core (EPC), which is basically the brain of the LTD system. The idea is to have a nationwide network. That is still under development for what that core does. There's an auction component in here for them to auction the 1.7, 1.9 and 2 GHz bands and the money that derived from that to be deposited in this trust, is divided in the operations and maintenance and anything that is obtained over 11 billion dollars that will go back into the treasury for deficit deduction.

Although not specifically mentioned, one of the issues that we're focusing on is the talk in Washington about the reallocation of our UHF frequencies; the majority of the channels for public safety are in the UHF region. The bill doesn't specifically identify the frequency but it talks about incentive auctioning & voluntary charity auctioning. Voluntarily allow your frequencies to be auctioned and they would determine the worth and you'd be reimbursed for it. That's my fear; I think that the authority response to this should be strong language to oppose any auction of our UHF channels. Any of those actions would devastate what we're trying to do here in LA-RICS. Although it doesn't mention it I think that we need to put a strong statement in there that we are against any reallocation auctioning of our frequency; that's law, fire, and paramedics.

The rest of the bill discussed spectrum efficiency on the Federal side, it doesn't directly affect us. There are trying to do the same thing that they are doing on the regulatory side of the FCC, for spectrum efficiency. As I read through this it looks like what they are trying to do is perhaps push the federal operators into the same spectrum (700 – 800 MHz) or look at public/private partnerships. But that part of the bill doesn't have any impact to LA-RICS. I almost forgot the most important part; the bill will allocate the Block-D to public safety. All the bills have done that and that's a good thing for us.

6.2 S 1040 – Broadband for First Responders Act (see attachments)

Ron Wong talked about S.1040 (attachment) and asked to recall that at the last legislative meeting we talked about HR 607, there are a lot of similarities to that in this bill; it allocates the Block-D, it discussed the auctioning of the 1.7, 1.9, and the 2 GHz to generate revenue for the corporation. What is new is that we made recommendation to oppose in (HR) 607 and any reallocation of our UHF frequency. It came in back in this bill even though it's not a mandate. What they wanted the FCC to do is to not renew any FCC licenses to public safety and encourage movement to a 700 – 800 MHz spectrum. In the case of LA-RICS, we just don't have the frequencies that they expect at that particular spectrum. The frequencies that we are looking at are below 512 MHz and Above 170 MHz. That would take all of our channels. We can stay on those frequencies, but we have to make a showing to the FCC for the public good, economic hardship, a lack of spectrum. I think if this is ever enacted, I think that LA-RICS does have a good position to stay on our channels, but it's going to be challenging because it looks like the commission is pushing for all public safety to go to 700 – 800 MHz. The bottom line is that if there is a recommendation from this committee to make to the Board, is a very strong statement that the UHF frequencies are critical for operations here and we just can't afford to give them up.

Daryl Osby: Directs the floor to Chief Scott Poster. Chief Poster said that he had a question on the summary of 1040 (attachment 6.2a, under Title I, page 1) were it says "Authorize the shared use, sublicensing or leasing of the public safety or leasing of the public safety broadband spectrum and network infrastructure by entities that are not defined as public safety services, subject to the requirements that public safety services retain priority access to the spectrum, pursuant to



procedures adopted by the Commission" with the provisions that "Any revenue derived from such shared use should be deposited in the Public Safety Interoperable Broadband Network Maintenance and Operation fund." That would mean that if we decided as LA-RICS, as a region, to share our 20 MHz with D-Block or the Block that we have with the commercial carrier there could be no revenue generated back to the JPA?

Ron Wong was not clear on; again it's a secondary usage issue. I think a lot of that would have to be part of policies that generate by the corporation, as I read that, in my mind I wasn't clear as what they were trying to say.

Chief Poster said that he thought that it would be important for in these economic times, in the region/public safety to formally send a recommendation that we accept this bill in its entirety. I think that we need to obtain any possible revenue that we can possibly derive from this bill to offset the cost of public safety and offset the cost of the system. That would be my take on that.

Chair Osby asked if there were any other questions, comments. Sara Henry referred to the last page of your summary sheet (attachment 6.1a, under Title V, page 6) for Senate Bill 911 there is a list of proposed amendments. This bill was introduced at the Senate Commerce Committee Meeting on June 8th and there were amendments proposed by the Committee members. To date, that Committee hasn't published a final updated version of the bill; however, all the amendments are listed here so you know how it will affect the current bill that's in front of you. None of which negatively impacts LA-RICS. I just wanted to point that page out. It's the last page of 6.1, the summary of 6.1.

Gerardo Pinedo referred back to Chief Poster's comments are you suggesting that we support, if amended, or what are we doing exactly on this?

Chief Poster's impression of what Ron Wong's recommendation for the committee on 1040 would be to support the bill if it's amended particularly in regards to the frequencies. However, I think that it would be prudent on us, as a region, to find any source of revenue if we can. So looking at the way that this is written, I would push back to the JPA to bring part to this Committee to review and digest this information and find out what exactly is and opportunities are for us to derive some revenue. In other words, we may want to address two amendments. One would be the frequencies and one may be to seek revenue. That a prudent decision on the Committee's part.

Chair Osby asked if there were any other questions, comments. Lieutenant Mark Wilkins referred back to Chief Poster's comment recognizing that this is ultimately going to be a national broadband spectrum and as it's governed if there's authorization to least part of the spectrum or some of the spectrum to private entities with revenue funds associated. The question would be how is that going to be divvied up? Is it something that can be done regionally or is this something that can only be done at the national level. If we have one national committee governing this spectrum and the use of it, there'd need to be some delineation or an explanation as to how those monies would be divvied up, because it seems that it would be difficult to do on a regional level. I guess this is something that we are going to need to take under consideration if we are going to look at that option.

Chief Poster said that this is basically a cellular service and if a carrier requests us to share their band, we would know that. They would be requesting permission to use spectrum, if they do request permission there could be a value to that and the value may be able to be split with the Federal Government, it may be able to be split between the JPA and the Federal Government, which would be beneficial to us. But in order to use the spectrum there has to be some type of application or effort to do that.



Lieutenant Mark Wilkins stated having a question and concern, for example, if a private carrier is allowed to roam in some of the space that LA-RICS is utilizing the question is since it's a national spectrum can that money be directly sent to LA-RICS for example or is it going to a national entity and then that's split. Stephen Sotomayor stated that it's like some revenue sharing between the local and the federal. Lieutenant Mark Wilkins agreed.

Stephen Sotomayor stated that if a corporation is formed that's going to be their rules of business because they have that leasing ability. There's another good question in that, is the spectrum in Los Angeles going to be worth a lot more than the spectrum in different parts of the country. There's also the question of how is that going to be split up, how is it going to one general maintenance pot that's going to be split. When that corporation gets that leasing authority that's going to be the point where we are going to have to have them put in writing how that money is being shared across the entire broadband network.

Chief Poster said that LA-RICS is paying for licenses, we have paid to be participants in the system, because LA-RICS is paying for the licenses, the D-Block is not intended to be up for sale or be moved out. It would be a rare occasion where that would be a public safety need to have that spectrum for all the uses that public safety wants it for. However, should the opportunity arise for a commercial carrier to utilize the spectrum that is a point where we have license frequencies in this area that may have such substantial value that it would be prudent for us to explore other possibilities of sharing some type of revenue source. It would be prudent on us because of our maintenance cost and infrastructure in this region to look at a possible revenue source.

Mark Wilkins: I think that's it's absolutely crucial that the language talking about reallocating the spectrum between 170 and 512 is completely removed. I know that it indicates in there that there's an exception if we could show a need to have the frequencies, by taking it away it will jeopardize public safety. It also talks about revisiting it again in five years. I think that if there's any semblance of the in the bill at all I don't think that it's something that we should entertain, I think that we should make sure that that it's removed from the bill. Ron Wong stated expunged. Stephen Sotomayor agreed.

Chair Osby stated that just for a point of order I want to make note for the minutes that we have a quorum now so, thank you.

Ron Wong said that getting back to the revenue issue, we need to understand that these bills are focused primarily on a regional system, that we have received a waiver that would make us kind of an island, and that the idea behind the bill is to have the corporation generate those policies, I think it's important that when you look at the corporation that there are 15 members on the board and a number of those belong to state and local government. I think it's important for the JPA to get the Board to influence the policies. Even though LA-RICS is very visible we're also a competitor for the rest of the system. I would strongly urge that the JPA consider getting a member or getting person on that Board, again to influence the policies.

Stephen Sotomayor commented that it seems like we had three standing things for most of these bills 1) don't auction off what we're already using; 2) allocate the D-Block; 3) enterprise. Sara Henry did such a great job of drafting up a D-Block letter that has language that we discussed before, but it seems that we've stuck to those common themes across all those bills that we're in pretty safe territory. Maybe the next one is saying if there is revenue generated and it's collected in a national level that a portion needs to be allocated to the maintenance and operation and local jurisdictions. Lieutenant Mark Wilkins agreed and said to stick with those four points. Chief Poster also is supporting a committee member.



Chair Osby asked if from the body incorporating those comments to the two bills, do you think this is something that we can move to the JPA for support?

Andrew Fox said that he thinks we can move both bills and 1040 as amended, as outlined by Ron. The others weren't amendments. Stephen Sotomayor said that the others were more general points that we're trying to make, but they can each be applied to the individual bills as there're written.

Ron Wong also wanted to mention that we looked at the frequency spectrum, not only public safety, but also the commercial market, the utilities market. I think that maybe we need to reach out to other agencies or other frequency lobbying groups to see what their positions are. I'm sure that as far as the reallocation of the frequency they're very similar to ours and I think we should reach out to them and maybe a lead coordinated effort.

Chair Osby that more specifically, as it relays to these two bills, any verbiage that talks about reallocation or any compromise to UHF we want to make sure that is eliminated or addressed. It sounds like we have two different conversations right now. So specifically as it relays to S.911 and S.1040 with proposed recommended changes and additions, can we have a motion...

Andrew Fox agreed and moved that they recommend to the JPA Board to support both pieces of legislation as amended by the committee. **MOTION APPROVED**

Chair Osby asked if there were any comments or questions. Chief Poster added one more thing to do, at the last JPA meeting Sheriff Baca was very vocal about sending a letter to Rockefeller and Hutchinson. Basically his concepts of network sharing was something that he was very adamant that he supported and the JPA has sent, I will read this out of a letter to Rockefeller and Hutchinson, "Moreover, to address possible concerns of congressional representatives regarding the interests of the private sector, the LA-RICS Authority has shown a willingness to work towards public-private enterprise sharing based on opportunities that do not compromise the security of the D Block." That's a quote from the letter that was sent to Hutchinson and Rockefeller. This committee may want to add something similar depending on the conversation of recommendation of S.911 in regards to network sharing which is also supported by the White House. Andre Fox stated that he would incorporate the language into both letters.

Olyvia Rodriguez said that the letter that went to the Senate Commerce Committee, I believe they also went both of our California Senators. I would agree to have that language included as well.

Andrew Fox included his motion.

Chair Osby stated that it will be duly noted. Any other comments or questions? Vote for approval. **MOTION APPROVED**

If we could go back to item number three, approval of our May 11, 2011 minutes, now that we have a quorum. **MOTION APPROVED.**

7. FUTURE MEETING DATES, TIMES, and LOCATIONS

Future meetings will be held based on information requested or required by the Board of Directors.

The next meeting date/time – TBD



8. PUBLIC COMMENT –

We request this item be added to the next meeting agenda: Select a Vice Chair and a Secretary for the next meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.



MEETING MINUTES
LOS ANGELES REGIONAL
INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday, January 9, 2012 • 3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Los Angeles County Fire Department – Headquarters, Training Room 26
1320 N. Eastern Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90063

Official Voting Members Present:

Daryl Osby, Chair, representative for the County of Los Angeles Fire Department
Greg Doyle, representative for the City of Los Angeles Police Department
Mary Giordano, representative for the City of Torrance, At Large Seat #1
Joseph Payne, representative for the City of Pasadena, At Large Seat #4
Nancy Ramirez, representative for the Los Angeles School Police Department
Olyvia Rodriguez, representative for the County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office
Stephen Sotomayor, representative for the City of Los Angeles, Mayor's Office
Mark S. Wilkins, representative for the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

Representatives For Official Voting Members Present:

Suzie Abdou, representing Gerardo Pinedo, representative for the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services

Official Voting Members Absent:

Howard Chambers, representative for the California Contract Cities Association
Mark Davis, representative for the City of Los Angeles Chief Administrative Office
Mike Garcia, representative for the City of Long Beach
June Gibson, representative for the City of Los Angeles, Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst
Scott Pickwith, representative for the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association
Alex Rodriguez, representative for the Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association
Greg Simay, representative for the City of Burbank, At Large Seat #3
Mitch Tavera, representative for the City of Culver City, At Large Seat #2



1. CALL TO ORDER
 2. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call
 3. NEW BUSINESS – DISCUSSION ITEM
- 3.1 S. 911 - Allocates D-Block to public safety - LA-RICS supports

Chair Daryl Osby asked Olyvia Rodriguez to give an overview of S. 911.

Committee Member Olyvia Rodriguez stated that the LA-RICS Board of Directors took a support position on the D-Block legislation by sending letters to Congressional members. This legislation allocates the D-Block to public safety; and in the past few months, “Super Committee” meetings were about spectrum allocation. Bill S. 911 was one of the pieces of legislation that was really being looked at in terms of the revenue that it generates and that is why it is being considered at the Deficient Commission’s discussions. There are a lot of factors that took place although the Super Committee did not produce a report. The public safety community really came forward in those discussions and indicated to congress how important the allocation of the D-Block is to public safety. There is more of a census now than there was before, and now we have Bill H.R. 3630 which does allocate the D-Block to public safety. However, there are other concerns with it, but in particular with both bills H.R. 3630 and H.R. 3430, since everything is very fluid in terms of which specific bill is going to be considered. The chances that either of these bills will be considered a stand-alone, in the sense that it would be considered on its own and voted individually, that is very unlikely to happen. It is more likely that any spectrum legislation would be considered as part of a larger legislative package. That is why Committee Member Rodriguez suggests that this Committee consider recommending to the Board of Directors to prepare and send letters to the Congressional members as appropriate to support the D-Block.

Comment [msw1]: I'm not sure this is the right word.

Committee Member Stephen Sotomayor stated the other aspects that differ from all of these bills are the governing structure on how the national broadband network is going to be rolled out. For example, the republican bill had it more state centric, were S. 911 had it more at a federal level. It is a common theme to support the D-Block and the safety spectrum is part of that option revenue raising source, in the sense that maybe at this point LA-RICS does not want to support any governance structure that has its differences with each one. What kind of governance structure would LA-RICS want to see, once a public safety broadband network is rolled out. The different amount of grant funds that is associated with each one of the bills and where LA-RICS would want that authority to be vested, statewide or at the federal level.

Committee Member Wilkins stated that what has been discussed is the 700 MHz spectrum, which certainly is critical. The Committee should not just focus on that particular spectrum because other bills suggest something different. He suggested the Committee stay open to all possibilities.

Chair Osby summarized the topics by saying that for the S. 911, the Committee gets the D-Block to remain allocated for public safety. For broadband spectrum UHF/VHF,



MEETING MINUTES
Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System Authority
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

the Committee wants to make sure they maintain that. Also, as for the last bill H.R. 3430, he was not sure if the Sheriff's Department was working on an extension on this. Committee Member Wilkins responded that LA-RICS was requesting an extension on behalf of all the LA-RICS' member agencies. The request has yet to be submitted per the advise of LA-RICS FCC attorney, Bob Gurss. Mr. Gurss suggested it would not be prudent to put in an extension request until there is a contract in place with definitive deliverables and proof of a funding source. Chair Osby asked if the information is of any relevance to the meeting, Committee Member Wilkins stated it is only relevant if the Legislative Committee were to recommend the JPA Board support this particular piece of legislation. He feels it would be prudent to support the 2-year narrowband extension because it ultimately benefits LA-RICS.

Committee Member Mary Giordano asked if Committee Member Rodriguez is suggesting to in general not support any of the bills, per say, but rather support the themes and speak to each of their congress people in a conference committee. Committee Member Rodriguez suggested not to lean on any specific bill, and she has already taken a position on S. 911, obviously there are other provisions in this bill as she would like to see in other bills as well. Her comments were more specifically directed to H.R. 3630 because this is the bill that may or may not ultimately be negotiated. Maybe ask the Board to send a more general letter on this item with the specific themes, but not limit LA-RICS to H.R. 3630. On H.R. 3430, she stated there is no major action anticipated on this particular bill. The focus is more on the provisions that are in the H.R. 3630. Sara Henry, Grant Specialist, summarized it by saying that LA-RICS should send a letter discussing the broad things that are there. H.R. 3630 addresses some of these, H.R. 3430 addresses some of these and maybe at congress they work it out and address change for all of our issues. Committee Member Rodriguez concurred.

Chair Osby commented that in relation to narrowbanding, it was a topic that was in play at LA-RICS who takes the responsibility the JPA or the entities that have not come in compliance, and should take it upon themselves to ask for an extension. Committee Member Wilkins stated the JPA did reach out to member agencies within the JPA asking for their support and concurrence to request a waiver on behalf of all member agencies within LA County. He commented there is no real need for the Board to take any particular action on it, but at some point and time if it does become more relevant, he believes it would make sense that the Board would likely be in favor of it, since the member agencies have already been reached out to.

Committee Member Ramirez recalls there was a certain number that would not be meeting the January 1, 2012~~3~~, deadline and as a result had the representatives go and talk about this bill. ~~Although, it was urged that those that could go forward on January 1, 2012, do so.~~ Committee Member Wilkins stated the key issue is the cost savings. If narrowbanding those frequencies is part of the LA-RICS build-out, which it will be, then it makes sense for agencies not to spend the money now ahead of time because they may have to spend again when LA-RICS is built-out. Therefore, the money they would have spent on narrowbanding could be used on other projects within their city or public safety. In the future LA-RICS may need to take a position, maybe the issue should be discussed further.



Technical Committee Chair Kevin Nida stated that when the Technical Committee was meeting prior to negotiations in the prep procurement they found there is no coordinating body within the County that does both law and fire, there are no LA County Fire Chiefs and the LA County Police Chiefs are not really involved in communications as much, so they have found that LA-RICS has been the **enactor** coordinator for technology and building out the system. His recommendation is to support the 2-year extension because if the FCC rules and says they are going to play hardball, they are going to make sure that LA-RICS is narrowbanded by 2013 and if not, there will be other people within their legal teams lobbying for LA-RICS' frequencies. Those channels are worth \$1 million apiece in the LA market and someone who has a lot of money and wants to play by the rules; they have the right to petition the FCC for it. Two years buys you a lot time. People are looking at LA-RICS as the leader for the County and region for all aspects, whether it is technical, operational, legislative, finance, they are looking at LA-RICS as the primary coordinating body for LA County.

Chair Osby stated that this body does not want to wait until the last minute and then try to lever our position. As it relates to cost, which he agreed with, in this economic environment he is sure that they are not the only entity or agency in the County that are faced with this dilemma.

- 3.2 H.R. 3630 - Jumpstarting Opportunity with Broadband Spectrum (JOBS) Act - Allocates D-Block to Public Safety but takes away narrow band 700 MHz channels LA-RICS needs for narrow band data service (MDT/MDC). LA-RICS opposes the Auction of NB 700 MHz frequencies. There is also a "Voluntary" relinquishing of television band frequencies that we currently use for voice. The danger is the eventual loss of the word "Voluntary" and the potential interference cause by new licensees.

The Committee recommends the Board of Directors to prepare and send letters to the Congressional members as appropriate to oppose relinquishing spectrum already in use or planned for use any Authority member agency for the LA-RICS System.

Chair Osby asked for motion to approve. **MOTION APPROVED**

- 3.3 H.R. 3430 - FCC to allow a 2-year extension to Narrow Band.

It is recommended that the Board of Directors authorize the Executive Director to prepare and send letters to the Congressional delegation as appropriate in support of the extension to the narrowband requirement, should this issue come to the forefront.

Chair Osby asked for motion to approve. **MOTION APPROVED**

4. PUBLIC COMMENT – None



MEETING MINUTES
Los Angeles Regional Interoperable Communications System Authority
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

John Lenihan, LA County Fire Battalion Chief, suggested that at the next meeting there should be a presentation on virtues of State Control vs. Federal Control, so that the Committee can make a decision on a stance. Committee Member Sotomayor stated that it would important to know where the Committee stands as bills move rapidly. The Committee probably wants to see the governance of the national broadband network, public safety network, and how they would like to see it as LA-RICS. Would they want to see it at a state level, federal level; may be on a common theme.

Chair Osby confirmed that this would be an agenda item at the next meeting and as well as a presentation on state and federal governance.

Sara Henry said there may be legislation in front of the LA-RICS Board on CEQA and the CEQA process. There may be a special meeting to consider CEQA legislation on behalf of LA-RICS, and if it happens it will be in the next 2 – 3 weeks.

5. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

Chair Osby adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m. The next meeting is to be determined.