



Illinois Department of Commerce & Economic Opportunity

Broadband Advisory Council - Infrastructure and Technology Working Group Meeting Minutes of Meeting Held on Friday, September 13, 2019 11:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.

Preparer: Mesfin Lenth

Introductory Remarks

Broadband Council Chair Sorenson – Good Morning! It’s 11 o’clock. Thanks everybody for joining us for Round II of our working group. Let’s go around and do introductions so we can capture everybody for records and minutes.

Roll Call

Lori Sorenson, Department of Innovation and Technology (DoIT, Chair); Travis March, Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO); Tom Chi, Springfield Police Department; Britney Carls, Governor’s Office of Management and Budget; Rick Holzmacher, Illinois Rural Broadband Association; Joe Mambretti, Northwestern University; Paul Wright, Illinois Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW); Marc Thorson, Northern Illinois University; Sean Middleton, Illinois Electric Cooperative; Bruce Montgomery, Montgomery & Company; Representative John Connor; Ryan Gruenfelder American Association of Retired Persons (AARP); Stephanie Cassioppi, US Cellular; Jim Zolnierek, Illinois Commerce Commission; Dale Walters, DoIT; LeeAnn Herrera, Charter; Randy Nehrt, Illinois Telecommunications Association; Matt Schmit, Illinois Broadband Office; Karen Boswell, Frontier; Steve Hill, Satellite Broadcasting and Communications Association; Bob Barry (AT&T); Dori Mania and Molly Dunn, Illinois Governor’s Office.

Introduction of State Broadband Director, Matt Schmit

Chair Sorenson – Before we start with the minutes, let’s have Matt Schmit introduce himself. Matt is the new Director of the Illinois Office of Broadband. Matt tell us about your background and share anything you would like with the group.

Matt Schmit– Thanks Lori. As I mentioned in my intro, this is my first week here and I am excited by the level of investment in broadband here in Illinois. My work is to engage in this group and translate what we are talking about investment practices and recommendations and standing up this grant program. I am interested in feedback and getting to know folks and if you have any questions or would like to set up a call, I welcome the opportunity.

Matt Schmit - In terms of my background, I have broadband experience from 3 different perspectives covering the last 15 years:

- I ran a telecommunications academic policy forum at University of Public Affairs in Minnesota and learned the economics of telecom policy. And some federal grant opportunity 10 years ago and how to administer that well. I ran for Minnesota legislature in 2012; I am going to pull those three experiences and try to bring the best practices and approach in broadband. I really look forward to getting to know you and work with each other.

Chair Sorenson – wonderful! we are excited to have Matt and his background pedigree joining the Connect Illinois program. We are thrilled to have you and the timing is perfect here. Welcome Matt and thank you for joining us!

Matt Schmit – Thanks again.

Review of the Minutes

Chair Sorenson – Ok, we will move on to the review of the minutes. I know we have some edits so let's see what we have.

Rick Holzmacher – Yes, let me make some accuracy changes. If you go to page 2 of the mobility of broadband, last speaker, Rick Holzmacher, the first sentence there, the word is inserted in error and does not make sense and beginning with “You will not be able to”, I propose striking that sentence. On the same page, under speed goals, second speaker Rick Holzmacher, this was in the context of Lori asking me what minimum speeds our members would likely invest in. I would propose before the word copper, insert the word augmented, and skipping forward to the third and 4th sentences, those sentences were relative to the broader point that does not appear in the minutes. I would propose striking, beginning with “we have done fixed.. through the word yes. Finally, in that same section, the last sentence that begins with one hundred, that should have been minimum 100 symmetrical, but you can just make it easy and say fiber is what or could read as minimum 100 symmetrical or fiber is; either is fine. That's all I have.

Chair Sorenson: ok, that first one is deleting that first sentence?

Rick Holzmacher – yes, I am not sure what that is referencing.

Chair Sorenson - well, you know how hard it is to keep minutes. We tried to consolidate down and not catch everything. Ok, terrific, any other edits? Ok, with that do we have a motion to move with the minutes as presented?

Jim Zolnierek – Move to approve the minutes.

Chair Sorenson – do we have a second?

Rick Holzmacher – seconded.

Chair Sorenson - All in favor?

All – Aye.

Chair Sorenson - Opposed? Alright, we have our minutes. Thank you.

Topic Discussions

Chair Sorenson - So continuing to Topic Discussions includes:

- Program Speed Goals
- Leveraging Federal Funding
- Vision Document
- Broadband Access and Education Programs
- Broadband Mapping and Digitized Maps
- Best practices from Other States
- Challenge Process

Chair Sorenson – Do we want to make any recommendations and what should be the target the State trying to achieve from overall overarching policy? Are there recommendations that we want to make that indicate for these grants using the \$400 million that the investments should have a minimum speed, addressing symmetrical or other issues? Just throwing it out there because we are not obligated but just want to offer that opportunity. These will just be recommendations and maybe thoughts from the working group.

Nebraska Study

Stephanie Cassioppi– Can I bring up a document in relation to the speed issue that was sent out today?

Chair Sorenson – sure.

Stephanie Cassioppi – I am Stephanie Cassioppi from US Cellular. I was able to listen in on most of last week’s meeting. What I heard was really in relation or directed to the fiber side. I want to address the wireless side as well. With the speed issue in mind, no rural area is fully and economically developed without a wireless broadband program as well as a fiber program. We should look at also including wireless as either a separate component or augment to the overall grant program. When it comes to speed, if you put in requirements for certain high-speed levels for the grant program, there is a possibility that you might box out wireless. From a fixed wireless perspective, we might be to make that switch which is like a WIFI. From the mobile broadband perspective, it might not be possible, at least not in the near future or for the whole coverage area which is stronger the closer you are to the cell tower.

Stephanie Cassioppi - The cell tower is needed as you get out in rural areas. U.S. Cellular has created a proposal that we at U.S. cellular have submitted to the Department of Agriculture. It recommends the State of Illinois look at a wireless broadband program as part of the overall program. It is modeled after the state of Nebraska. Before we get too detailed, I wanted to bring it up, because it is a limitation for wireless as if you set a very high speed as a requirement, you can box out what these rural areas really need.

Rick Holzmacher – Lori, just to make an observation on Stephanie’s point as you have said, there is no argument in this room that wireless and 5G are extremely important to broadband for the State. There is a distinction between Nebraska’s proposal and other states with broadband

programs, to my knowledge no other jurisdiction besides Nebraska has a wireless program. Other state programs focused on fixed solutions - fiber and/or fiber-fixed wireless, making a distinction between fixed wireless and handset wireless.

Rick Holzmacher – To your point about not hamstringing what speed can be provided, I believe that Nebraska, just glancing at the memo, Nebraska had a combined program in the beginning, and decided that the combined program was problematic and so they made two separate programs. At a minimum, they should be separated. This is not to say they are not both laudable goals they are just distinctly different goals. The last observation I would make is to the degree a program deals with fixed solutions it will in part, push out more fiber. That means more towers can be built.

Stephanie Cassioppi - That's right.

Rick Holzmacher - So, don't mistake anything I said for not recognizing the proliferation of wireless as important it is a just a separate issue.

Stephanie Cassioppi – No, I appreciate that. We have participated in the Nebraska Wireless Grant Program for at least ten years and I regularly testify to our applications and make sure those towers are built. The program is combined but separate from the wire line's program. Because it's like comparing apples and oranges, I just brought it up to keep in mind. We would like to bring something similar to Illinois and we have been able to build 50 towers in Nebraska rural areas, bringing not only wireless voice but wireless broadband to where it is needed the most. That includes agricultural areas where maybe fiber cannot get to. When you think about economic development and trying to attract businesses and residents to an area, they take out their cellphones and see if there is coverage. We want to make sure we can develop that.

Separate programs for Fixed, Wireless/Satellite

Jim Zolnierek – I would suggest that maybe a threshold question whether there should be programs for fixed services or mobile services. That will help prevent the speed thresholds question which is important to know.

Steve Hill - I apologize my video is not working very well. I would concur on from the wireless. I would like satellite to also fall in that same category as wireless. We have worked with wireless and other technologies. We should make sure that all technology is included, with satellite being part of the program as well.

Stephanie Cassioppi – When you look at the speed from the wireless side, there are a lot of variables and it depends on the spectrum you have and the tower. Nebraska's goal is what kind of technology is deployable; is it 5G or 4G? Something like that.

Jim Zolnierek – I have a question for the satellite gentleman. So, is the distinction between mobility and fixed service or something else? Should satellite be treated as a fixed service? Or is it the mobile?

Steve Hill – It is truly a wireless service. Focusing on infrastructure is great, but we already have our infrastructure up there (for satellite). We worked in New York and there is a program that is based on the consumer. New York is funding the consumers' equipment underwriting on cost

and service and allowing acquisitions. So unlike other services, we have already put our infrastructure up there, which is trying to give the best service to the consumer in a user program.

Paul Wright – I have to question the idea of separating the two topics regarding broadband expansion. For every type of service, is it going to take fiber to get it, if it's 5G, fixed wireless, or small cellular. Again, you still need the fiber out there. In spending \$400M expanding access and service speeds, I believe we should consider placement of fiber so regardless if it's a wireless provider or a land-based provider the benefit realized instead of considering splitting it now. When we are looking at spending taxpayer dollars including our own, the infrastructure should be in place. If any of the eligible providers want to expand their services beyond the fiber maybe those costs should be at the provider's expense. I feel we should continue to look at fiber placement and to start dividing it up might be premature.

End Goals – Service Speed, Innovation, Additional Coverage

Tom Chi – instead of thinking about an arbitrary number that we are wanting to get to for a minimum, why don't we look at the approach of our end goal? Is the end goal for underserved kids for school work and projects and items like that? If we want to be creators of the future, what kind of speed do we need now and 5 years from now to achieve the end goal? We should think of that instead of doing a minimum of 10 Mbps because honestly 5 years from now do we know if 10 is enough to achieve our goal? We don't know that. Let's discuss that.

Ryan Gruenenfelder – I would add that as we are thinking about the technologies we need to support this initiative, I know one of Governor Pritzker's priorities is Telehealth. Talking about speed goals, what is the minimum speed necessary to achieve that expansion of technology that's important, especially for specially doctors and for pharmacist and stuff like that. We need to consider that.

Stephanie Cassioppi – We tend to think, is the goal more coverage or highest speed? And what's the trade off?

Sean Middleton – I want to echo that point as we are trying to drive innovation and would want to look like a leader. Our organization has done a lot. We started with wireless and have done that for decades, but we must have support. If we want to drive innovation, we want to make sure we are sending the right signals. For instance, there are new fixed technologies that we can do in 2020, but we know CDRS gets you to those levels. We don't want to inadvertently incentivize enough for only 2019 levels. That would be my perspective.

Sean Middleton - We want to be in the position where the leadership falls within this funding mechanism. If we put in a fiber, we all know people will be happy with 50-megabit fiber. We offer gigabit speeds and people are happy to take 50 because that is what is in our system because that's all we have for cost. But there is potential for upfront investment and we don't want to be in a position where we spend on good 25 meg wireless and incentivize unwanted service. We need to be careful incentivizing equipment and infrastructure that has life.

Karen Boswell – I realize this is a very fine line that we are talking about. I want to point out that we are down to census blocks that lack coverage because part of the census block had providers in it, but there is portion of the census block that doesn't. For example, in Southern Illinois, the

solution might not work because there are so many trees. So, a goal should to push service out to those areas where people may not be able to get fast speed to provide internet for kids who may not be able to reach it.

LeeAnn Herrera – In response to Karen, other states have provided us with the ability to challenge when there are grant applications. This gives us the ability to challenge where we already have service. I know there has been some talk about how the challenge process is going to work itself out. We think that if the state truly wants to serve people that are unserved or underserved and don't want to overbuild areas where private investment has been made, we have to ensure a strong challenge process.

Chair Sorenson – Is there anything else?

Matching Funds – Federal and Private

Chair Sorenson – I also want to capture what we need to help insure federal FCC and USDA funding.

Dale Walters- Also private investment and anything involving that within this program.

Karen Boswell – I echo seeking a public private approach.

Stephanie Cassioppi – There will be mobility funding at the federal level in the next three years and the FCC says that it is eligible.

Randy Nehrt – It is important to take into account that the components in the state broadband program meet the requirements in any federal grant and loan programs to ensure Illinois companies have a fair chance for federal loans and grants. We should not miss those opportunities when establishing the Illinois program.

Chair Sorenson – What do we want to be as the State? The full council needs to set a vision. What is the long-term fixed wireless solution? Is there anything else - anything related to infrastructure and technology and what we want to be and where we want to be?

Travis March – I have a question on that. I'm learning this as I go and am not a Broadband expert. I understand the federal programs do give bonus points for states that have broadband plan. Is there guidance and what that entails right now? I would expect it to be a living document that would grow and be developed as we go forward. Is it just good having an outline now or do we need something more robust than that to start?

Marc Thorsen – I think that's what Randy was specifically referring to. I think it's a generic requirement that the state has a plan in place. We can check that box and make sure we follow through as members seek our support on federal programs to benefit the public.

Joe Mambretti – my comment would be that we should not focus on speed and feed. Because it is highly variable as noted and there are some areas where they would like to get thin streams. But there are others. For example, a company in Chicago probably needs 100 gigabit which is old fashioned and about 12-year-old technology. We don't want to get overly fixated on just needs and feeds. The performance should be meeting the requirements of the wide ranges of

researching institutions and single places in certain areas and not single numbers in certain places. I also want to comment on the state plan as there are were state plans in the past. Some have been developed and I have some shells that can be used. Some are quite good.

Educational Programs/Digital Literacy

Chair Sorenson – How about broadband educational programs and thoughts on if those programs are needed or should be tabled? Some states have that as a requirement and other applications and I am curious; is it a good thing or bad?

Stephanie Cassioppi – What exactly is that; can you provide an example?

Chair Sorenson – Some other states have had scoring where you get extra points if you set up a broadband adoption program such as training or education in the community. An example is working with a library and helping folks adopt broadband. The state has independently done broadband adoption programs, but we have never combined them as components of a broadband access grant program.

Jim Zolnierek – It strikes me that that it depends on some of the choices you make. Obviously for a middle mile project, I am not sure how applicable that would be and seems more of a last mile of type of thing.

Rick Holzmacher – I agree with Deno’s characterization from the last meeting. If you are a service provider, you are always trying to maximize your take rate. Whether you have a strategy, involve your technicians, and provide other programs, I think all of these things that companies are doing help. As far as making them something you get points for in the scoring criteria, I am aware that that has been done in other states and I see no reason why we wouldn’t incorporate that as an applicant or part of the application process. As Stephanie points out, I am not familiar with the different plans and if there have been other adoption programs. If there have been adoption programs we are not aware of, maybe that is something we need to educate ourselves on.

Jim Zolnierek – Another factor on that issue is not only with education but supplying higher points for providing customers with computers and other technology items.

Installation Timeframes

Steve Hill - In certain markets, it’s going to be very difficult to deliver fiber. In rural markets and ag markets, satellite might be the better solution. Maybe consider incentivizing markets in cases like that. You can’t put in a one size fits all, and while I would like to run fiber in a lot of places, in a lot of cases it is not realistic. Maybe we can provide 25/3 service in a market that doesn’t have anything and can be done quickly. What is the frame to deliver service? And in some states, they can take up to 10 years. That’s just not right and residents can’t wait that long. Timing should also be considered.

Mapping and the Challenge Process

Chair Sorenson – Last time we talked about broadband mapping and toward the end of discussion we discussed whether the state should focus on mapping and investing. What is

happening at the federal level? Do you need to do mapping first or do you do it in parallel? Let's circle back on that.

Stephanie Cassioppi – Congress held a hearing on mapping just this past Wednesday. There are 4 or 5 or maybe 6 even bills, bi-partisan efforts that would to fix the issues that currently exist with mapping. I know on the wireless side there are a lot of activities and it will probably move, but again, I don't know what your time frame is and how that would fit in with the goals of the State.

Rick Holzmacher – I mentioned this in the last meeting. Someone mentioned the challenge process, and if you look at what other states have done, the incumbent challenge and a refusal process serves two purposes. One is to prevent duplication in services where there are already robust services to prevent overbuilding, and the other benefit to that process is that it allows the application process to become a de-facto mapping tool to identify areas that need to be served. I'm not exactly sure how it will work, but the applicant will come in and circle the area, notices will go out and the incumbent might say, wait a minute, we have 25+ service in this neighborhood and grant administrators might say what about the surrounding area? The incumbent might say, we don't have that. So, the administrator directs the applicant to resubmit to that surrounding area. Or in that same hypothetical, the incumbent might say they have an investment in the pipe and in 2 years, they might say we are going to have it covered, and the administrator would then rule that area is no longer eligible. So, in terms of mapping, it will show you where areas that are already served and areas that are unserved on a more granular level.

Stephanie Cassioppi– I agree with that. The challenge process is needed if you are going to use maps that exists today. The feds passed bills because of that process. From our perspective, from the wireless side within Illinois, the initial federal fund mobility wireless map shows we are covered. We know we are not because we get calls all the time about some of the areas. We just need to be careful -- the challenge process is key.

Jim Zolnierek – I don't know if there is complimentary process whereby the providers can identify the areas. Maybe allow consumers and communities to come forward and say I don't know what the map is showing, but we can't get service. It's just another tool for us to identify unserved or underserved areas. Previously, with the Illinois broadband program, we had customers not getting service and we had them let us know.

Marc Thorsen – Echoing Zolnierek as a long-time local government guy, working with the local governments is a better approach to find out more information. Regional economic development commissions or planning commissions are excellent resources. From an NIU Fiber perspective, that's our pulse in the communities they serve. They know a lot and are worthwhile source of information

Chair Sorenson – We might skip the order of the topics because the challenge process appears to be a key issue. A question I would like to ask Rick: When you were talking about experience in other states, you put an applicant who wants service with an existing provider. At our state level, there is one side saying this and another saying that. A community might say different things. how do you get to determine the source of truth in that challenge process? And what level of

information will providers will be willing to share with the state to document that service is there?

Tom Chi – I believe what you're referring to is the Broadband Data Improvement Act of 2019, which is in the House and the Senate right now as SR1522 and HR3162. The bill has a three-step validation process. The first step is to collect the public feedback. The 2nd step is to look at the dataset from carriers and the 3rd step is to target on the ground and field validations. They would actually go to the field for validating where there are discrepancies. I don't see why we would deviate from something like that and that would be a good approach.

Jim Zolnierek – One of the concerns with that is the field validation can cost a lot. So, who pays for validation?

Stephanie Cassioppi – I agree with that. We tried to challenge, and we are rural carriers in 23 different states. When the FCC mobility map came out, we spent \$2m and was only able to cover 6% of the areas we wanted to cover. Due to cost, it isn't feasible.

Tom Chi – that answers my question.

Stephanie Cassioppi – I agree there are different approaches that can be done; we will tell where and how we will cover the areas.

Karen Boswell – I am not aware if there is push back in our 29 states regarding the challenge process in terms of the legitimacy of the offer.

Jim Zolnierek – I know there was some push back on the mobility funding. When there was talk that Illinois would receive very little funding, our response was that it wasn't accurate. The challenge was that the Illinois Commerce Commission did not have the resources to cover that.

Stephanie Cassioppi – That's right. And part of the problem was how mapping was done. It measured and covered a small portion of the census blocks. Given that the census blocks are large, you're just doomed to fail.

Karen Boswell – I think that is where Illinois' unserved customers are. You have one provider and the whole census block is exempt from capital funding and it fails. So, I think that's where a lot of the opportunities are.

Chair Sorenson – In other states in the challenge process, what level of details did the providers come back with and were there variations? Is it household by household? What are you digging for and what are you using to map and decide?

Rick Holzmacher – Not an expert on this, so hopefully someone else can speak on this. As I understand it, there has to be testimony to understand what's happening out there. In addition to the federal mapping changes, the states that have done this have taken on their own simultaneous mapping exercises on these issues.

Chair Sorenson – Has anyone participated in the Indiana challenge process and mapping? Because I don't think they have mapping.

Karen Boswell – I can check on that and bring details to the next meeting. I can also check on Minnesota.

Chair Sorenson – Ok.

Jim Zolnierek – The carriers have the burden and should work together with local and governments and communities to come up with where we can work together. But don't want to stress their budgets.

Travis March – I presented on the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) process last week. Since that time, I talked with GOMB and it appears that the merit review process will allow for a challenge process. The final version of it will depend on GATA requirements and the final criteria utilized in the solicitation.

Matching Funds

Chair Sorenson – Are there any other best practices from other states? Any recommendations to incorporate or avoid from other states?

Rick Holzmacher – At a high level, there must be a matching component and you must have a stake in the game to be an applicant. A large part of this program is to leverage private and federal investment dollars and an important way to make sure that happens is to ensure the players who are doing this have a stake in the game.

Karen Boswell – More states can match what the companies can provide and that's one way to look at that.

LeeAnn Herrera – I have participated in both the Indiana and Minnesota process. Indiana is fairly new to Broadband investment and they just had their initial round of applications. Minnesota's broadband Office are excellent to work with on the whole. They always followed up with questions and were transparent and making sure the dollars are not going to overbuild existing investment, so that's key. I also agree with whoever is doing the building must have a stake in the investment.

Service Commitment

Stephanie Cassioppi – They supply the capital expense to build the initial infrastructure and it is reimbursed. The companies are required to provide service for at least five years and to cover their own operating expenses. But we are only reimbursed for capital expense which is different than the wireline program in Nebraska.

Jim Zolnierek – How do they insure the 5-year service requirement?

Stephanie Cassioppi – They don't hold it back. We apply every year so there is this process that runs through the Commission. They have other ways of getting back.

Level of Match Funding

Karen Boswell – When it comes to the match, you might want to consider a sliding scale with points where companies contribute. There are instances with census blocks where the FCC sets a high cost requirement where you must contribute at 80% or more.

Chair Sorenson – I have seen the different state programs and ranges from 15 to 80 percent. Do we need to be careful? Is there a floor that might leave out high cost areas or is it really a sliding scale?

Rick Holzmacher – Both. Most of the programs have match requirements and match preferences. With the sliding scale, you need to be careful where you set it. Generally, 50% is the match requirement but requirements and preferences can differ depending on the state program.

Stephanie Cassioppi – When you are talking about the matching requirement, are you considering the match on the capital outlay or is it also on ongoing operating cost?

Service Requirements/Claw back Provision

Chair Sorenson – Stephanie mentioned the 5-year service requirement. There fair expectations that the state is making an investment on some outcomes. How long should the expectation be to provide service and prices and is this a contractual obligation of the grant?

Randy Nehrt – I am not sure I am addressing your question or not. On a claw back provision, if a provider did not meet its obligation and what they applied for in a grant, some states address that by prohibiting future grants and applicants.

ICC Regulation

Jim Zolnierek – Following up on items running through the ICC, most telecom is not relegated by the commission. The participants in this program may not be subjected to the authority of the Commission.

Chair Sorenson – Are there other topics we have not covered? We have the third meeting on the 19th of September, so we may try to combine the notes from our two meetings and see what comes up. We can frame that for our next meeting. Is there something else or topics we should really consider?

Communities/Symmetrical Upload Speeds

Bruce Montgomery – One of the things mentioned last week and I would reiterate is when we think of Broadband long-term, we need to think about new apps and new uses. It shouldn't be feeds and speeds, it should be about the Illinois communities. We need to engage with the needs of the communities. Historically, many of the networks have been popular and were created in Illinois. We should bring communities together, democratizing with tech communities and workforce development and education is essential. I would hope that for applications there would be some resources that can go to community and citizens involved to research and development. We can apply innovations and leverage broadband and the idea of simply installing networks.

Bruce Montgomery - At the last meeting, with respect to symmetrical services and the need for consumers and what is pushed and can not only download but can produce, that has been the frustration and limitation. Symmetrical upload and again, requesting perhaps a thoughtfulness and opportunities for collaborative work and test beds, self-direction and developing what might

become the next generation. That can have a tremendous impact on a community and make a difference in the lives of Illinois residents.

Unserved/Underserved

Chair Sorenson – Other thoughts? Other topics?

Karen Boswell -What should be unserved and underserved?

Chair Sorenson – Any suggestions?

Karen Boswell – There can be more points for unserved than underserved areas, but we would need to determine that.

LeeAnn Herrera – I think the Federal definition of unserved is 10/1 and underserved is 25/3. Indiana's first program was committed to unserved areas to make sure they had the chance to get served first. That meant 10/1. The second program was for underserved which was 25/3. To be served was truly considered to be a broadband program.

Jim Zolnierek – Unfortunately, a lot of this is circular. Depending on what you want to do, if you want the community to have telehealth, service on the cities' center and every consumer should have access to mobile etc., it's just difficult to pinpoint.

LeeAnn Herrera – Defining the unserved vs underserved is only for definition purposes, not for limitations to the type of services with 10/1 and 25/3.

Karen Boswell – The grantmaking process might incentivize investment into unserved vs unserved areas. The Indiana program provides a match of up to 90% in round one that is directed at unserved areas but drops to a recommended 50% in the following round that is for underserved areas.

Stephanie Cassioppi – Unserved areas might have a lower match which results in more incentive to cover unserved areas.

Jim Zolnierek – That is one possible idea.

Public Comment

Chair Sorenson –Any other considerations? Any comments from the public?

Next Meeting

Chair Sorenson – Hearing none, September 19th will be our next meeting. We will use WebEx and have the same rooms available. We will develop the agenda and work to summarize the thoughts and recommendations. We'll seek to get the thoughts/recommendations to you by next Wednesday. These meetings should have weeks in between and I don't feel like and I don't know if we all have to agree.

Chair Sorenson - Travis, under Open Meetings Act rules, can we convene - or can it be agreed - that an additional meeting might be completely WebEx or phone before we have to submit?

Travis March – I will check with our DCEO legal team on that and can report back.

Adjournment

Chair Sorenson - We will let you know. Thanks everybody! Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Jim Zolnierek – First motion to adjourn.

Tom Chi – I second.

Chair Sorenson - Meeting adjourned!