## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

+ + + + +

COMMERCE SPECTRUM MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CSMAC)

+ + + + +

## MEETING

+ + + + + TUESDAY, JULY 24, 2012 + + + + +

The Advisory Committee met in Conference Room 1107, Building 1, at the Institute for Telecommunications Sciences, 325 Broadway, Boulder, CO, at 1:30 p.m. Brian Fontes and Gregory Rosston, Co-Chairs, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT

- DR. BRIAN FONTES, Chief Executive Officer, National Emergency Number Association, Co-Chair
- DR. GREGORY ROSSTON, Deputy Director of the Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research and Deputy Director of the Public Policy program at Stanford

University, Co-Chair
LARRY ALDER, Google, Business Operations
Project Manager

DR. DAVID E. BORTH, Independent Consultant\*
MICHAEL C. CALABRESE, Vice President and
Director, Wireless Future Program, The
New America Foundation

MARTIN COOPER, Chairman and Co-Founder of DYNA, LLC, and Co-Founder of ArrayComm, LLC

- MARK E. CROSBY, President/CEO of the Enterprise Wireless Alliance (EWA)\*
- THOMAS S. DOMBROWSKY, JR., Engineering Consultant, Wiley Rein, LLP
- DAVID L. DONOVAN, President, Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc.\*
- MARGARET (MOLLY) FELDMAN, Vice President of Business Development, Verizon Wireless
- DR. HAROLD FURCHTGOTT-ROTH, President Furchtgott-Roth Enterprises\*
- H. MARK GIBSON, Director, Business Development, Comsearch
- DALE N. HATFIELD, Executive Director, Center for Law Technology and Entrepreneurship, University of Colorado
- DR. KEVIN C. KAHN, Technology Policy Consultant, Intel
- DOUG McGINNIS, IT Manager of Communication Infrastructure Strategy, Exelon Corporation
- DR. MARK A. McHENRY, President, Shared Spectrum Company
- JANICE OBUCHOWSKI, Founder and President, Freedom Technologies, Inc.
- DR. ROBERT PEPPER, Senior Managing Director of Global Advanced Technology Policy

at Cisco Systems Inc.

- CARL POVELITES, Assistant Vice President of Public Policy, AT&T
- RICHARD (RICK) REASER, JR., Head, Spectrum Management Department, Raytheon Space & Airborne Systems
- DENNIS A. ROBERSON, Illinois Institute of

Technology

- DR. DANIEL DEAN STANCIL, Head, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, North Carolina State University\*
- BRYAN TRAMONT, ESQ., Managing Partner, Wilkinson Barker Knauer, LLP
- JENNIFER WARREN, Vice President, Technology

Policy & Regulation, Lockheed Martin Corporation\*

ALSO PRESENT

KARL NEBBIA, Associate Administrator for the Office of Spectrum Management

TOM POWER, White House Office of Science

and Technology Policy

LAWRENCE (LARRY) STRICKLING, Assistant

Secretary of Commerce for Communications

and Information

PETER TENHULA, Vice President and General Counsel for Shared Spectrum Company

BRUCE M. WASHINGTON, Designated Federal

Officer

\* Present via telephone

	Page	4
C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S		
Welcome and Opening Remarks	5	
Opening Comments from Co-Chairs	6	
Spectrum Management Improvements	. 12	
Subcommittee's Report		
Unlicensed Spectrum Subcommittee's Report .	. 48	
Spectrum Sharing Subcommittee's Report	.113	
Progress Report - CSMAC Working Groups	.134	
NTIA Evaluation of CSMAC Recommendations	.149	
Regarding Interference and Dynamic		
Access Subcommittee		
Office of Spectrum Management Hot Topics	.157	
Committee Questions and Discussion	.167	
Opportunity for Public Comment	.172	
Schedule of Next Meetings;		
Miscellaneous Items	.179	

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(1:30 p.m.)

ASST. SEC. STRICKLING: Good afternoon. Welcome to Boulder for those who are just getting here. Once again, just a few admin notes, we have a few visitors and that's always good, but a few things, if you have a cell phone, please silence your cell phone. We're currently webcasting and we're on a telephone bridge. For those who are on the bridge, please be reminded the bridge is for the CSMAC members who are not present. So you do not need to acknowledge that you're on the bridge unless you're a CSMAC member.

We do have Wi-Fi passwords we use on these are for the members. Anyone who needs one, please raise your hand and we'll make our way to you. Okay. We're going to attempt to get one of the documents we believe that is missing. I think we've covered most. So we're up on the webcast and we're up on the bridge.

I have one more announcement in the push-top mics, so you push to talk, state your name and talk, and then once you finish, please take the mic off. Once again, we'd like you to speak loud. We have the house mic phone at this time and there is a lot of engineering going on.

TOM POWER: Good afternoon. I am not Larry Strickling. I am Tom Power from the Office of Science and Technology Policy in the White House sitting in to do, I guess, the welcoming for Larry.

And I am not going to say much other than to thank you all for -- for being here and for your continued work. It is a really interesting time to be involved in spectrum issues. Just in the last few days, we've had the release of the PCAST report.

I understand yesterday the DoD presented their list of facilities that could be subject to testing under the STA request that T-Mobile filed on behalf of the FCC which

all ties into the -- the working group -- working groups that -- that you folks have been overseeing.

This morning, I've met some of you. I attended the meeting of the NITRD WSRD folks who are doing some good work. I know you've got 5 GHz under your belt as well and a bunch of issues on the agenda today.

So there is a lot to be done and a lot of opportunities in front of us as well as a lot of challenges, but I just want to say welcome and thanks for your good efforts.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Great. For those of you on the phone, this is Greg Rosston and welcome to Boulder and to the CSMAC meeting.

One of the things that I think
we'd like to do first is to have the people
who are members of the committee on the phone
just to check in and say who's here so that we
have an accurate record of that. Maybe what
I'll do is I'll go through the names of the

1 CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Harold 2 Furchtgott-Roth?

Dan Stancil?

Jennifer Warren?

Okay. So if you all could figure out -- well, maybe just have people e-mail you at the end if they were on the phone or not.

So, anyway, welcome, and we are looking forward to doing two things in this meeting is going through our different subcommittee reports that we have, and we have some issues on which we will vote today, and then also to talk about our work going forward in the -- that is the -- not only -- not only the entire evaluations of some of our recommendations but how we're going to move forward to work on the technical --

CO-CHAIR FONTES: For those who are on the call, I think it'd be helpful as we speak around the table here to say your name, folks, for the record here, and in the event there is anyone on the call that would be

	Page 10
1	helpful. And this is Brian Fontes who is
2	speaking.
3	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Thank you.
4	MR. NEBBIA: Karl Nebbia from
5	NTIA.
6	MR. POWER: Tom Power from OSTP.
7	MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Tom
8	Dombrowsky, Wiley Rein.
9	MEMBER POVELITES: Carl Povelites,
10	AT&T.
11	MEMBER MCHENRY: Mark McHenry with
12	Shared Spectrum.
13	MR. ALDER: Larry Alder with
14	Google.
15	MEMBER CALABRESE: Michael
16	Calabrese, New America Foundation.
17	MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Janice
18	Obuchowski at FTI.
19	MEMBER TRAMONT: Bryan Tramont,
20	Wilkinson Barker.
21	MEMBER GIBSON: Mark Gibson,
22	Comsearch.

	Page 11
1	MEMBER FELDMAN: Molly Feldman,
2	Verizon Wireless.
3	MEMBER ROBERSON: Dennis Roberson,
4	Illinois Institute of Technology.
5	MEMBER MCGINNIS: Doug McGinnis,
6	Exelon.
7	MEMBER KAHN: Kevin Kahn, Intel.
8	MEMBER PEPPER: Robert Pepper,
9	Cisco.
10	MEMBER HATFIELD: Dale Hatfield,
11	University of Colorado.
12	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. So now
13	we've now that we've done the roll, why
14	don't we we're ahead of schedule which is
15	nice to start at least.
16	So we want to move onto the
17	Subcommittee Enforcement unless there was
18	anything you wanted to add, Brian.
19	CO-CHAIR FONTES: I don't. Karl,
20	do you have any opening comments?
21	MR. NEBBIA: Just to thank
22	everybody for coming all the way out here.

1 Dale, you especially.

(Laughter.)

MR. NEBBIA: And we're -- we're glad to be in Boulder and looking forward to working today.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Thanks, Karl.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Great. So

Bryan and Mark, you guys are up first with the Spectrum Management Improvement Subcommittee Report.

MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. Thanks,

Greg. This is the report on the

recommendation -- this is Mark Gibson by the

way. This is the report on the

recommendations that -- NTIA's comments on the

recommendations that the subcommittee made to

make that clear. It's -- it's in the title.

And so what the subcommittee did was based on the comments and the recommendations that Karl talked about at the last meeting in Stanford, the working group went back and tried to address the questions

working group had made was that the NTIA

22

should do a one-time system-wide activity

check on the GMF, and the response from the

NTIA was they agreed but they wanted a greater

understanding -- a greater clarity to

understand what we meant, and given that

there's lots of records in the GMF and it

would take a lot of time for an individual at

the NTIA to go through it.

So what we did is we broke that down and suggested that the effort could begin on the bands that are the interest.

Primarily, obviously, the bands
that were part of the -- of the fast track
report which were the 1675 to 1710, 1755 to
1850, and so on and so forth. So those are
the bands that are really in a sweet spot of
the interest and in -- and efforts could be
focused on those bands initially, get them
cleaned up, and then move on to whatever other
low-hanging fruit are identified, maybe at a
PCAST report or whatever.

And also we recommended that there

-- there is a fair amount of effort that can be undertaken to automate that process using scripts, smart approaches, and whatnot, and also concentrate only on the records -- or on the fields that we reported on are necessary to build a database for doing Spectrum

Management according to the administration.

So there's a lot of administrative records that may not need to be addressed.

And we referred in -- by
reference, I think, in the footnotes to the
list of variables that the working group felt
were necessary for doing Spectrum
Administration. So we suggested that that -that that was what you do.

As far as paying for it, we felt like there were monies in the CSEA Spectrum Release -- Spectrum Relocation Fund that we felt like the Office of Special Counsel might need to figure out how to get after.

Nonetheless, we suggested that there may be monies there to -- to address that.

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Am I missing anything?

2 MEMBER TRAMONT: What we suggested we do is essentially take the Office of 3 General Counsel's view -- what CSEA funds 4 could be used for this purpose, and we cited 5 some language that we thought suggested that 6 7 was possible. We wanted to -- but in the 8 spirit of getting NTIA something that they can 9 execute on, we simply said just seek the 10 opinion of the General Counsel's office. Thanks. 11 12 MEMBER GIBSON: On the next -- so

member GIBSON: On the next -- so are there any questions on that comment and recommendation? Yeah, Karl.

MR. NEBBIA: Just -- just so you know the Chief Counsel, the General Counsel, the Special Counsel are all three different people --

MEMBER GIBSON: Yeah, I know, I know. And --

MR. NEBBIA: -- and as long as I

never see a Special Counsel in my life, I'll

1 be very happy so --

MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. NEBBIA: One thing to note

4 here, right now, the 4200-4400 ranges that

5 you've cited, there is no data on that band.

There's no data to check. There's no

7 licensing --

2

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER GIBSON: Right.

MR. NEBBIA: -- that goes on in that band so that one -- that one's probably not one that will be -- that will be critical.

I think ultimately, at least from my experience, the decision about what will get paid and what will not get paid will probably come out of OMB. We're hoping under the new scheme to get updated guidance, and I know that they're working on that guidance that links to the new rules and so on. So it probably will not be a call that we can make inside of NTIA, but one certainly that they can give this guidance.

And I think also as we head toward

any future activity under the CSEA and the -the Spectrum Relocation Fund, there does come
a time in the process where the agencies have
to come back and update their information in
terms of transition plans and costs. And that
is the point at which on these it's just very
logical that that would be the point that
they're actually answering up for the systems
that are in this band a opposed to trying to
schedule a separate review in advance of that.

Now, you might say, well that -that may be a little way off and it would be
helpful in the work that we're doing now to
have better data, but I think certainly in the
process of ensuring that it gets paid for, I
think the likely time is in that period where
the agencies are actually providing specific
transition plans and information about their
systems.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Just -- yeah, I
think our -- overall, our recommendation,
obviously, is to have a comprehensive view of

all Spectrum holdings not just the priority
bands that have been identified for
relocation. So I think it's important and
discussions go on being if Mr. Priman\*\*\*

(00:14:01 ph) wants to weigh in now and allow
us to use the money, I think that would be
fine.

MR. NEBBIA: Because we have it to do up here, but if we --

MEMBER TRAMONT: It's important that it's not just focused on these particular bands but it is in the long-term interests -- it's this committee's belief that's in the long-term interests of NTIA to have a comprehensive record and so, hopefully, those funds can use -- can be used not just for these short-term issues, maybe three to five years, but even five to ten years out and get some other bands identified as well.

MEMBER GIBSON: Is that it, Karl?

MR. NEBBIA: Yes, sir.

MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. Good.

1 Thank you.

The next recommendation was to establish goals and metrics for data accuracy and milestones for achieving. And, essentially, what we did was you were asking for further guidance regarding, essentially, sampling techniques, what industry uses and what the commission uses.

So in our reply, we specify -- we identified several areas that come out of some of the committee members' experience with the commission, and their -- their company's experience with managing commercial data bases and/or licensing procedures, and so what you see here is things like specified license terms, performance and build-out requirements.

Some of this may or may not be applicable, but it's offered up more or less in terms of examples of the way that some commercial Spectrum Management techniques are used to deal with data issues: construction notification, secondary market rights, all the

1 stuff that's in there.

So you read through that and you find a litany of tools that would be available for spectrum relocators and spectrum managers to institute in the Spectrum Management and regulatory -- or licensing process that can help inform and make sure the data are accurate.

And I don't need to go through it.

Did you have anything you want to

Okay.

add?

MEMBER TRAMONT: Yeah, we're aware that FSMS is obviously a big part of this equation, and we hope at some point to be able to pick up this work after this iteration of - of CSMAC is concluded, that is the working groups 1755 to 1850, and pick back up on FSMS and what we'll work on going forward. So that's a little bit of an outstanding issue. You had asked for our evaluation of that and I think we need to probably sit down with the

staff and figure that out, but we haven't had
a chance to -- we weren't able to get that
done before --

MEMBER GIBSON: Right.

5 MEMBER TRAMONT: -- we submitted 6 this last meeting.

PARTICIPANT: And that's Bryan and Mark that were talking.

MEMBER GIBSON: Yes, yes.

10 MEMBER TRAMONT: We'll keep

11 identifying ourselves.

4

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

MEMBER GIBSON: I'm Mark and the other one's Bryan. And, yes, so Bryan's point of an FSMS, I will say that we did get some feedback from NTIA and the offer of having a briefing on FSMS. Well, that occurred right at the time CSMAC pivoted toward working on the five working groups, and we felt like we just didn't have the bandwidth to go there.

We did a scheme up that was fairly detailed as well as the data dictionary, and those of us that understand that are going

1 through trying to figure out what it means.

2 The rest of us are hoping that those that

3 understand it can tell them what it means. So

4 | we -- we will continue with that work and

5 follow back up with the powers that be at NTIA

6 to get the briefing on FSMS we've been looking

7 for it.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I don't think we're looking at that as a panacea, but we also know that the GAO report referred to that several times, it's come up in several discussions, and we're eager to find out to what extent that is going to address some of the things we've been raising.

MR. NEBBIA: Just a -- a few thoughts. I -- I'm not exactly sure of -- I'm sorry -- of the time requirements and staffing requirements to pull these kind of things off. I realize that the commission has them, for instance, on the billed out requirements that apply to some specific types of users, but I assume they don't apply across the board to

all FCC users. I also am not quite clear as to even where they exist, how they're or where they're applied in terms of, you know, build out of cell systems.

I think people are constantly asking questions about, well, where are people implemented where -- where they haven't? So one of our challenges, of course, is -- and certainly in the frequency of assignment area, I have eight people, and those eight people are spending day in, day out, reviewing incoming frequency assignment requests, trying to make sure the data is correct as possible. We do have some automated processes that back that up, and we will have more as part of -- as part of FSMS.

But I think it's certainly a challenge as we look at what it would require in terms of staffing to follow up on all this stuff because it's one thing to set up a process where people have build-out requirements, it's another thing to go hunt

them down when, you know, somebody, you know,
blows the dust off the book and says, oh,

yeah, these people were supposed to have done
this back in this and this date. And it's not

like we're talking about small numbers either.

There are a lot of people to chase down in --

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

in doing that.

Also, at least from my -- my perspective of -- of my time in Spectrum Management, it seems to me that there has been an emphasis probably for 20 or 30 years on minimizing the burden on most of the users of the spectrum and, in fact, as -- as we've talked about the increased data requirements under FSMS and had some conversations with the FCC about having those same data requirements so that we can actually do EMC calculations and so on, run them between us, their -- their feedback to us is, we could never go out and ask all of our users to provide all of that data.

So we continually seem to end up -

- even though we've got a line of requirements

2 here, we -- you know, we're -- we're concerned

3 about ending up in a place where a lot of

4 these things are expectations that come of the

5 government and not -- not -- not other people.

But as I was saying, it's

6

7 certainly been my experience that we have gone

8 out of our way in the past to provide maximum

9 | flexibility to minimum regulatory burden, and

so on, all along the way for both federal and

11 non-federal users. So we're talking about a

12 significant change in direction to require all

13 these things. But, you know, build-out

14 information, construction notification, these

15 types of things I think are fairly significant

in terms of the number of people -- and

17 capabilities that would be required. So I

18 think it's not that we -- we disagree with the

19 idea and that these things would be useful,

20 the challenge for me as somebody that's

21 managing a group of, you know, federal

22 employees is that these things do take

people's time and so on. So just figuring out how we would do that in a way that uses their resources well, I think, is a significant challenge for us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

The issue of data certification, of course, we have picked up. That was one of the items clearly stated in the GAO report, and we've now implemented rules requiring somebody from the agency that's actually going to put their name on the dotted line affirming that the data's correct, that the system is necessary, and that sort of thing. We're still working on actually the IT implementation of that because it requires changes to the software, and so on, to make a place in the data field. But, so, each of these things I think are good items to do. The question just gets to be the resource implications of getting into it. And, ultimately, I don't mean just the resource implications on -- on NTIA and our small assignment group but on the agencies to be

1 tracking and reporting, and so on.

Then we get on the last item was
going out and -- and audits which, I assume -would have assumed meant going out and
checking what they were doing, but then you
referred to the FCC's license audit software,
which I'm not quite familiar with what that
does so maybe you could give me a hint as to
how they perform their audits through software
just --

MEMBER GIBSON: Well, okay. Are

MR. NEBBIA: Yup.

MEMBER GIBSON: All points well taken. I -- you know, I think that the working group was studying this from the standpoint of what practices can be suggested to improve the value of the data that is contained in the GMF and associated related databases through, you know, standard practices, procedures, regulation, rules and whatnot.

1

The issue of -- of -- of the

number of FTE's or -- or work -- you know,

manpower is attended to the discussion, but I

2

3

4

-- I don't think a working group wanted to be

constrained by that. I think we wanted to

5

look at what -- what should be done, suggest 6

7

approaches to take, and then work through,

8

either collaboratively or you can work through off-line, what it would take to address these

9 10

so, all those points are well taken and in --

11

and, you know, we heard loud and clear the

12

first time that, you know, this is a -- a

13

resource issue, but nonetheless, at some

14

on -- on some of this, and so maybe there's a

point, resources are going to have to be put

16

15

point at which we discuss what type of

17

resources or something like that.

18

As far as the commission's audit software, their -- and Mark Crosby actually

19

20 provided some of this -- so, Mark, if you're

21

still on, I'll turn that to you in just a

22

second.

1

2

3

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

1213

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

But since this is a licensing system, licensees are responsible on a regular basis, depending upon the type of license they have for the service class they're using, to go in and update the license records to -- as a -- as a product of their license renewal, and most services are supposed to do it. It's kind of finding rules as it relates to the specific service so, for example, .95, it addresses, say, medical whatnot, they have to update it, and .101 that addresses microwave, they have to do it on a regular basis, and so on and so forth. So that's part of the process. And so that's part of the auditing you're talking about.

Mark, what other auditing software is out there that you were thinking about when you put this in?

MEMBER CROSBY: Mark. I'm at a -it's a little noisy in the background. I'm at
an airport in Reno. The commission has, you
know, the capability to draw up from ULS

certain groups or segments of licensees, 1 2 whether they are for construction, and there's notification sent to the construction 3 automatically. There's also -- we offer 4 5 capabilities to -- for renewals, construction permits, and those type of things, and that's 6 7 all done automatically, and the licensee's to 8 receive those directly from the commission.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER GIBSON: And I would add to that, there are commercial entities, such as Comsearch, that endeavor to inform licensees of their time -- of their -- the time frame for renewal was happening.

MEMBER CROSBY: That's certainly -

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER GIBSON: Yes. Well, many - many people out there do it as a service to
customers and clientele so, you know, there's
-- there's a process that goes on. And as we
were saying earlier, some of this might be
able to be overlaid into FSMS, maybe not in

the current release structure but in future release structures to the extent it resonates with the need. So, you know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

This is Rick Reaser from Raytheon, and I just want to add that one of the things that we've sort of suggested is, you know, many of these licenses in terms of -- of the federal licenses are actually defense or FAA contractor facilities, and we would be happy to be a part of that process for renewal, but there's like a wall between us. Because we know of a number of instances where there are licenses for our company locations and plants, and so forth, that may not be accurate one way or the other, in both directions by the way, and, you know, I think you could sort of tap into the industry as a -- as a -- as a part of this thing to help review that.

We'd be happy to do that, and then
I have some proposals that I'm going to make
to this and others about that because we'd
like to keep all of our stuff straight and

understand when things are expiring or not.

He's right, on the FCC stuff, we get notices, we -- we can keep on top of that very well, but we have lots of things with -- with some of the federal government contracts, and not just military but DHS and others, where things come due and people aren't really tracking it because there isn't a thing, and then there's other things like, well, maybe there's a new emissions designated so we don't need this or we're just doing CW antenna testing.

We can modify those particular licenses to be more appropriate to the activities that it's taking on whether than just renewal after renewal after renewal for something that we may not even need at a location.

Because the tendency is just to renew the damn thing because you don't know whether you really need it or not, so what happens is some bureaucrat will just renew it,

and that certainly was going on at our company on all the FCC licenses until we started going through them one by one because some central office just renewed every one whether it needed it or not.

I took the attitude on some of these things, I'm -- I don't know what this is for, I'm just going to not renew it and see if anybody calls me.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER REASER: and I -- I did

that on two -- two lady assistants by the way,

and I believe that they were long gone, but

they -- those licenses had been around since

the 90's at locations where the plant -- where

the company had no longer had facilities, and

they -- they were continuing to be renewed.

So I think that the analog of maybe looking at some of the good practices that the FCC has and try to maybe export those into the federal side might be a good thing, and let the guys -- it's an issue of who's

really the license for. Yes, it's for the military service or part of them, but at the end of the day, it's some, you know, contractor that's turned -- flipping the switch on the radio and testing it. It's not a -- not some federal guy in Washington who's processing the license, so maybe those people ought to have a little bit of a -- of a -- part of the process.

MEMBER CROSBY: Yeah, Karl, this is Mark again. I -- I -- I don't think it's - it was sophisticated so all that
administrative software that every person of every month, whatever, the people that are due for renewal or you haven't heard from them for awhile, the computer generates a nice letter saying, hey, what's going on with the system?

Are you still using it? Things like that. It not a technical software, more of an administrative practice software to keep track of licensees and their use of the spectrum.

That's all.

I did have

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

database.

Okay. just a couple other short questions here about right at the end of the text from this section, there's a part that says "establishing similar goals and metrics for data accuracy in other bands, " which I -- I understand, as Bryan was talking about, the fact that you're not looking for it to end with the four primary bands. And I'm not sure -- once again, originally, the two to four million estimate, I'm not quite sure what that was for because, once again, I -- it was doubtful, at least in my mind, that that cost was based on going through the entire

MR. NEBBIA:

As we looked at how many that would be monthly, just didn't seem possible that the two to four million was probably a realistic number for doing an entire, you know, database update. But, nonetheless, it says that we should look at the other bands.

And then it adds, "other than

1 perhaps those established for unlicensed 2 uses," which we don't actually have any bands established for unlicensed use, certainly not 3 on the federal side. I think it's 4 5 questionable whether they formally exist under 6 non-federal. So that may be an aspect you 7 just wanted to strike out on the last because I don't -- I don't know what it means. 8 9 guys may know what that was intended to refer 10 to.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

But, I think, ultimately, we -- we appreciate the -- the inputs and we realize that you're trying to give us inputs that go beyond the specific boundary of current date budgets, structures, and so on.

The one -- the biggest challenge for me in -- in dealing with those kinds of recommendations is that people tend to expect that they can be done once you put them on paper and, you know, we -- we know that we've had at least some CSMAC recommendations find their way into legislation. And so that's --

you know, people do respect the outcome of the thinking that's going on in this group. my challenge is finding myself, then, the expectation is that we will, in fact, fulfill everything that's on these lists, and that's -- that's one that I think may be a bridge too far, certainly for, you know, someone as young as me so --

(Laughter.)

MR. NEBBIA: Anyway, so, I just wanted to mention that. So I don't want to prevent people from making recommendations that they realize are probably beyond the -- the bounds of the current economy, but I think we have to also recognize the fact that they - the recommendations in that sense can create a -- an expectation without something that goes with it. They -- they have to --

MEMBER TRAMONT: I was just going to add that I think the useful part of this process that we're continuing today, issuing out recommendations, receiving questions from

you and then coming back, and then having the resource question explicitly teed up, hopefully, will prevent sort of the unfunded mandate problem going forward. But I think the key is to get -- if we could at least all agree on a general direction of what an idealized state looks like for the management of the federal spectrum resource from the database management perspective, then at least we have a common set of goals that we're working towards and then we can try and talk about what the resource demands are. But I don't think anybody realistically thinks that the current resources at NTIA or at the agencies are adequate to get us from where we are to where we need to be from a database 16 management perspective.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER GIBSON: That was Bryan. And this is Mark. And, again, your points are well taken.

First of all, with respect to the monies that we suggested, again, those are

realms and more maybe swags, maybe not even swags but wags, and whatever acronym you want to find out, but the point is that there was some, you know, spreadsheet analysis that went into trying to find those numbers, notwithstanding, you know, their accuracy. I would suggest that we -- we discussed in the paper that there are automated processes that can be undertaken that would streamline the effort, which we had thought would be used as part of that -- that monies.

The other thing is I don't think we're suggesting anything that isn't already in practice some place. Maybe not in the federal government, but within commercial work or within the FCC. So we're not trying to blaze new ground here. We may be trying to blaze new ground for NTIA, and we appreciate that, but we try to be considerate of the recommendations we're making as to their applicability and their implementation ability or "implement-ability" or whatever.

I hope whoever's putting this in paper can figure out what I just said.

But having said all that, I think that, you know, we want to charge ahead and come up with a list of recommendations that we can discuss and it -- you know, in the end, if you find that they are not appropriate, then -- then that's fine, but we didn't want to leave any stone unturned as it relates to the task at hand.

As far as the last recommendation which was, you know, go to Congress and get money, you agreed with that one, and I -- it's no accident I mention that on the heels of the 2.2 -- two million dollar -- two to four million dollars. We suggested that, you know, again, go back and look at the CSEA, talk to the Office of Counsel -- I forget which counsel it is -- and so, you know, find ways to possibly go out and -- and -- get, you know, get monies to address the task at hand.

I would add on a point you made

earlier was the 4200 to 4400 meg band. were looking at that band as it relates to issues associated with -- those were the radar altimeters and other things. That -- that work got put on the back burner for the new working group work we're doing so we'll try to pick that up, you know, whenever the type is right and address that. But if we do redo this, we'll pull that out of the discussion because we understand that there's not much in the database related to that. However, there may be stuff in equipment databases, and that's what we were finding out when we were doing the work that we're not talking about so

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. NEBBIA: Okay. One last point in your -- in your -- I'm sorry, this is Karl Nebbia again, sorry.

The last point in your final recommendation, at this point, we don't have the freedom to change the approach we have on agency fees, and that's -- I think some might

arque that we have the freedom to re-shift -or to shift some of the priorities or weightings, and so on. I'm not sure there's general legal agreement on that, but the one thing we don't have the ability to change is the fact that it is that the funds that we receive are an amount, at this point, 80 percent of basically offices, spectrum managements, cost to operate, so those costs to operate are actually determined within the budgetary process and work back down to us through -- NTIA's given a budget, NTIA then -so it's -- it's not as if we've got the ability to just change that budget amount and then recharge that to the agency. So there are some limitations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Excuse
me, sir, this is the conference coordinator.
Are you having some issues in your conference?
We were told that you were.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Yes, we are having issues. There are people who are

joining the call and, apparently, either they cannot hear us or, for whatever reasons, they're exiting the call, and so there are several attempts to join the call, exit the 4 call, and we just wanted to make sure that folks who do, in fact, call in are capable of 7 hearing the conference.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

PARTICIPANT: Let's see, there was an e-mail sent in from Marty saying that he and -- that he couldn't -- we couldn't hear them.

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. Ιf there's somebody on the conference that is having -- still having issues hearing what's being said, they can "star zero" and we'll pull their line.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Right. They're able to hear, they're just not able to speak back.

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. And they've verified that their line -- their line on their end is not muted?

	Page 45
1	CO-CHAIR FONTES: Well
2	CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. So
3	if they're having
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. So
6	everything is okay then?
7	(Simultaneous speaking.)
8	CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Do you
9	know what phone number he would be coming
10	from?
11	CO-CHAIR FONTES: Don't know.
12	CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay.
13	They'd have to *0 in order for us to pull his
14	line, but again, I believe line it's not
15	muted on our end so it might be self-muted,
16	and that might be why you're not hearing
17	anything from from their end.
18	PARTICIPANT: Okay. We have
19	Jennifer Warren, we have Mark Crosby, are
20	there any other members on the call?
21	CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay, you
22	have eight parties who have joined.

1 PARTICIPANT: That's fine. T'm 2 asking you specifically if there's any members of the Spectrum Management Advisory Committee 3 on the call. Jennifer and Mark Crosby. 4 5 That's it? Thank you. 6 CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. 7 do you need me any further then, sir, or --8 CO-CHAIR FONTES: I think we're --9 I think we'll go on. 10 CONFERENCE COORDINATOR: Okay. 11 I'll go ahead and leave your call then. 12 CO-CHAIR FONTES: Sorry. Madam 13 Chairman -- or madam -- sorry. 14 MEMBER TRAMONT: This is Bryan 15 So I believe we need to move for Tramont. 16 adoption of these recommendations with the 17 striking of the sentence of the clause --18 dependent clause on page 7 but other than 19 perhaps just establish for unlicensed uses, so 20 we'd strike that but then if we could have a 21 motion to adopt the recommendations of the 22 Spectrum Management improvements working

1 you very much.

2 CO-CHAIR FONTES: Did Marty just

3 join the call?

4 PARTICIPANT: Can you still hear

5 us?

6 CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Yes, we can.

7 Okay. Next on the agenda is the report from

8 the Unlicensed Spectrum Subcommittee, and so

9 I'll turn this over to Janice and Michael.

10 And why don't -- why don't you kind of walk us

11 through the documents because some were

12 circulated.

13 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Okay. Thank

14 you very much. And in terms of walking

through the documents, we have hard copies of

16 sort of an overview piece. Do we have that

17 | circulated now?

(Chorus of yeses.)

19 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I think

20 probably that will cover the heart of the

21 matter. I will be beginning, and Michael will

22 continue.

Part of what concludes this
authority is the unfinished business. So it
seems as though with PCAST and sharing work
underway, the unfinished business as it
pertains to unlicensed almost, you know, grows
as we try to knock off the specific issues
that -- that was, I think, addressed as best
we can.

So, basically, many of the issues before our committee pertain to enforcement.

And of course, the unlicensed environment, we have a technical non-status, enforcement becomes a political matter as well as a regulatory matter, because whereas people may not have status, they -- they certainly have expectations.

So there were four questions posed to us as -- as part of that: How should federal agencies deal with complaints of interference? How should they deal with interference, particularly when many of these unlicensed users and devices are in the hands

of servicemen who don't honestly understand
the rules? They've bought a product and they
have a set of expectations that normally
accompany the purchase of a product. How
should we prevent software modifications that
alter the compatibility characteristics of the
device and with widened distributor products?
What's the best approach to enforcing the
rules?

We made a set of enforcement recommendations in the preceding round of CSMAC, so one of -- one recommendation that will come at the conclusion of this report is to, again, incorporate by reference those enforcement recommendations. And then in addressing as creatively and productively as we could these questions, the committee reached a strong conclusion that in an environment where it's really very, very difficult to enforce, one must append to the extent maximum possible on technology solutions and, basically, in an environment

with smart devices are capable of contacting databases, being updated, being alerted, being turned off.

So we have made the very strong recommendation in the service throughout this report that, prospectively, the government must rely to the maximum extent possible on enforcement by technology; making sure that built into the device is the ability to be updated, cataloged, turned off, et cetera.

The tougher question -- well, not the tougher question, but the remaining question, however, if you have this whole category of cheap, dumb devices, most of which -- many of which are historic, or close, there aren't any perfect answers to those -- how to address interference from those devices, but we would strongly recommend that the band from which they operate be circumscribed, closed out, in essence, to historic bands, and that going forward, in those instances, we try to minimize the problem by minimizing the

1 existence of these devices.

In the past, I think there was a stronger argument to be made for the economics of these devices, but, in essence, even the more intelligent devices now are at a price point that we think enforcement through technology is the better course.

So I think that covers slides three and four.

Michael, do you have anything you'd like to add on those points?

MEMBER CALABRESE: No, except, you know, what -- I guess, you know, where it mentions then --

Oh, yeah, right. This is Michael Calabrese.

What it mentions at the bottom,

you know, you see that -- that distinction

just by way of example in comparing, for

example, the garage door opener -- the classic

garage door opener situation, a -- which we'd

call, I guess, an untethered or so-called dumb

device, compared to what we anticipate with the unlicensed devices that will operate in the TV white space subject to, you know, having GPS, knowing their location, checking the database for permission, to use channels which can be changed at any time and that can be even pushed further.

So -- so the place that the path is clear, although as Janice said, and we'll talk more about the -- what to do about what's the legacy of these garage door opener, perhaps baby monitor type devices that are already out there, is -- you know, we weren't able to add a whole lot to the -- to the repertoire.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: The reduced lines on post-hoch regulatory enforcement, it really kind of recognizes the inevitable, that it's very hard in an environment where you have myriad consumers with devices, the regulatory status of which they'll never reasonably be expected to fully understand,

post-hoch enforcement is just a bad idea. If at all possible, avoid it.

But we do have, and we've incorporated by reference — this is on page 7 — a set of past enforcement recommendations, and these are designed to put PC nodes that do exist. Part of this is pretty more than onerous on manufacturers. I mean, if there are devices that can be tampered with, and this was a problem in the 5 GHz band, some of the devices, per se, weren't interfering, but people could figure out pretty quickly how to create powered-up devices and then interfere with them.

If it's possible to avoid that, to lock those down better, we should expect that as manufacturers, we should expect manufacturers to do their best and probably be more specific about what their best is to advise consumers about what their limitations are. I think the oldest ones on the FCC, as it increasingly relies on unlicensed in

certain areas, put a shock clock in place.

It's absolutely useless to have a problem -- an interference problem and, you know, wait for weeks, if not months, to get that resolved if somebody kind of cranks through the process.

People have suggested a tool called the temporary restraint of interference. If there's a problem, and nobody can quite resolve that problem, perhaps those should just be required to shut down until the problem gets itself ironed out.

There's also, basically, almost uniform beliefs that the FCC is going to have to upgrade its monitoring capabilities. Some of these problems, no matter -- no matter how -- you know, how we try to address the desirability of pinging back to databases, or whatever, it's going to be an increasingly complicated electromagnetic environment.

At times, it's not going to be a simple fix or a simple understanding even of

where this is coming from. There is no amount of reporting, first off, that's even realistic, but second off is going to preclude this from happening. And, frankly, license users ought to be reasonably comforted that the FCC has taken upon itself where there is a problem at times to go out and do the sophisticated monitoring, come up with a recommendation, and then enforce it.

That -- that is -- you know, I
think going all the way back to my day at the
FCC, over 20 years ago, people almost, you
know, just shut down the possibility of, you
know, real -- real monitoring capability. And
it's hard to understand how to even deal with
an increasingly sophisticated electromagnetic
environment and not step up to that
expectation by licensed users in some context.

I think that would be my summary.

The basic objective here would be, number one, rely on smart devices rather than dumb devices, have the network monitor itself if

1 possible, and solve problems proactively.

Where there's a need to react, that reaction should be more efficiently applied.

Michael?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MEMBER CALABRESE: Yeah. Just I'd like to -- if I could just roll back one minute to recommendations one and two, so on slide five.

Because this really shows the distinction, I think, between the way we were thinking of the untethered and then going forward. So in recommendation number one, although we want to -- you know, we need to reduce the reliance on post-hoch regulatory enforcement, with respect to the legacy and untethered devices, what we end up concluding that really the best -- perhaps the only thing that really can be done, and we hope it could be more effective, is for NTIA with the FCC to more proactively educate policymakers concerning this secondary status of unlicensed devices in federal bands.

And that means that when the calls

-- you know, from the garage door opener

people, when they start coming in to

congressional offices, that shouldn't be the

first time that those telecom allays are

hearing that garage door openers actually work

on federal bands, right? They should be -
there should be some -- I think some proactive

education on that, and it's probably the best

thing we can do is just -- is hold a hard line

and make sure people are aware of it. It's

Whereas going forward, and this is the most important recommendation, is that the FCC should require then in all new unlicensed bands or on shared federal bands designated from licensed access, the devices should be connected devices that are required to -- I guess we use the phrase "call home", which could mean a variety of things which would be the -- the terms of access band by band depending on the federal system.

just simply the rules of the road.

So that could mean to -- such as with TV white space to renew the authorization to operate in the band, which TV white space happens every 24 hours maximum. That could be less or more. Obtain a firmware update to be remotely disabled in a particular frequency or to receive direction to switch frequencies.

So implicit in this recommendation also is that devices not only be connected but that they be multi-band so that they're not dependent on any one federal band so that that way consumer expectations are not, you know, defied to the point that manufacturers or consumers raise hell.

PARTICIPANT: Is that a technical term?

MEMBER CALABRESE: Janice covers

three very, very well, and then four -recommendation four -- this is on slide eight
-- again, it's to just try to push
specifically for manufacturers to increase
consumer education efforts about the nature of

unlicensed and their responsibilities as a -as an important counter port -- counterpart or
backstop to enforcement and avoidance through
technology. Because even with enforcement
through technology, it's important for
manufacturers to be on board as partners, that
their consumers have the right expectations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

That means perhaps the FCC would have labeling -- different labeling requirements than they do now. I know, personally, when I look at the wireless microphone packaging and instruction booklet in a TV band, if anything, it was almost the opposite of warning people that they had no Recommendations number 5, and this rights. is another one that is potentially controversial, that there should be further study of the regulatory framework for socalled cheap dumb devices or untethered devices. The committee recommends that in the future -- generally recommends that in the future, unconnected devices should be

restricted to legacy bands where they are already prevalent, which would be primarily 900 MHZ in 2.4, and policymakers should consider whether devices should even be further restricted in the future phasing out their access to very high quality bands over some appropriate time period. And that's just accepting that, you know, not everything should be assumed to -- to live forever.

So those are the -- I guess one last thing is just to call attention to because Janice didn't get any possible questions for further study, I believe -- I think we had agreed this subcommittee, like a couple others, would go on a bit of a hiatus for the remainder of this calendar year to focus on the five working groups for 1755, but what we think is important to continue on, perhaps early in the new year, and these are some of the questions, you know, that have been raised.

So, for example, one is how to pay

for -- how to reimburse federal agencies for the cost of facilitating shared access for unlicensees in particular, because, by definition, there wouldn't be clear -- where there's not clearly an option, there is not currently revenue under CSEA. And, you know, that was taken up a bit by the incentive committee. PCAST addressed that to some degree but probably more work needs to be done.

I know Karl encouraged us to figure out how, you know, in the context of an inventory, how could we get a better handle on where unlicensed devices are operating; for example, you know, perhaps the quantities in a particular band or their concentrations geographically which could affect the noise level overall. And we didn't really come up with anything satisfying on that yet, so that deserves further study.

There's also the question -- the last meeting we talked about several pros and

exclusively for unlicensed or whether
unlicensed should simply be the -- in a sense,
the fallback state for available capacity on
federal bands that are not being fully
utilized, which is more or less what the PCAST
recommended last week, so-called authorized
shared access to all the bands that are open
for sharing because they're under-utilized to
a considerable degree.

So that needs further study, as well as probably a -- if we want to look at authorized shared access across a much wider range of bands, what would be the nature of that of being authorized and being connected? Those would be good questions.

Also, and the final thing here is
the -- which was proposed, and we discussed a
bit, was the establishment of a voluntary
interference clearinghouse that could crowdsource experience with interference on federal
bands, whether it be federal users and/or

private parties could report -- self-report

and that could be aggregated and viewed and

may provide some -- some visibility into where

problems are developing, not only in terms of

band, but in terms of type and terms of

geography.

So those are all interesting future questions.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: So to summarize, Karl did give us a few follow-up questions, and we didn't fully answer them, and I have to say we probably concluded that perhaps there's not going to be a perfect answer, particularly on the topic of inventory.

I suppose when you get into an environment where people are going to be interacting with the database, that will yield a form of inventory. But the reality is unlicensed and sharing is going to be -- has become, is going to become a far more context and multi-faceted endeavor. And, you know, I,

for one, don't think it's almost possible to inventory in a classic way that -- how that happens.

You will get data back from
manufacturers, you'll get data again from
people contacting databases. I think some of
the responsibility will also fall on the
government, at least to do spot checks and
that sort of thing.

Dan Stencil did put forth a good crowd-sourcing paper which I hope is on the website. We'll make sure it's on the website. That kind of voluntary approach might be helpful in some bands of great interest. In other circumstances, I think the government is going to have to depend on the reality that information is going to be pretty limited in a sort of forthcoming way.

I'd like to close by saying that during this hiatus, this committee ought to be watching the FCC because this is an area where we've been asked to make recommendations about

government and sharing more with unlicensed, so I think there's an implicit understanding that is a thread here that that will be a growing phenomena, but it's a very interesting world where the -- you know, the interference will be becoming out of commercial regulated entities, and this is just a paper product so we can't really make a recommendation to the NTIA to enforce.

This is really a recommendation
that says if this is going to work, the FCC is
going to have to look at these more
complicated and probably far more promising
sharing of scenarios with unlicensed, but do
some hard work on conducting enforcement as
well as the sort of characteristics of
equipment that will be treated as unlicensed.

That completes our report. And,

Dan, you didn't hear the plug for your report

but we are going to double-check that it is

now on the website and that everybody studies

your concept of crowd surfing.

We have some very involved members of the committee on the table. I want to add, for example, Kevin. Kevin was sort of the godfather of the intelligent device recommendation which is really a very strong thread.

Does anybody from the committee want to report before I make a motion that these recommendations be adopted -- or Michael and I do?

Dr. Pepper?

MEMBER PEPPER: Robert Pepper,
Cisco.

Picking up on your last point, I think there's echo -- echo because both of your microphones, which are next to each other.

About the complexity going forward, if we go back to recommendation two and then also look at that in the context of the next report, which is the sharing report, one of the conclusions, which goes to, I

1 think, your point also about the complexity, 2 is on the sharing report, it says that -- it concludes that we shouldn't select one 3 particular technical approach to work through 4 the sharing issues because we don't yet know 5 6 what those are, right? 7 MEMBER KAHN: This report's not 8 about sharing. 9 MEMBER PEPPER: But it is. 10 MEMBER KAHN: Not this one. This one is not about sharing. This is simply 11 12 about how you get your hands around a device 13 that passes certification but it turned out to 14 have a post-book, things of that sort, which 15 are --16 MEMBER PEPPER: No, but -17 MEMBER KAHN: It's not about 18 sharing. I mean, the sharing rules are 19 independent of that is all I'm saying.

MEMBER KAHN: Oh, sorry, Kevin, go

MEMBER PEPPER: Well, except for

20

21

22

the --

1 on.

MEMBER PEPPER: Except for the fact, Kevin, that here there's a particular approach selected which is the database approach. There are multiple different approach -- technical approaches is the point, is that it doesn't have to be a single one -- MEMBER KAHN: No, no, no, listen --

MEMBER PEPPER: -- and
recommendation two appears to -- to focus on
one approach in particular which is the
database approach, which seems to be
inconsistent with some of the other
conversations we've had and, in fact, the
complexity of the issue. So --

MEMBER KAHN: We didn't take a position on the appropriate way to decide how a band should be shared. All I'm saying is this report does not take a position on an appropriate means for deciding if a band was open at any given moment in time.

MEMBER PEPPER: No, I understand

that but -- but the -- one of the conclusion 
- and what I'm looking at here is a different

report. This is -- this is the sharing

report, right? This is what's going to be

presented next.

MEMBER KAHN: Oh, I'm not part of that. I don't know.

(Laughter.)

MEMBER PEPPER: I know. So what

I'm saying is we're going to get a report from

the next subcommittee. One of the

recommendations from the next subcommittee is

not to select a certain spectrum sharing

approach at this time, because it's likely the

multiple spectrum sharing approaches will be

used in a band most economically to

accommodate the incumbent interest. So the

next committee's conclusion is that there are

multiple approaches. We're not yet ready to

pick one. Recommendation two appears to be

selecting --

mistakes; that people put a device out and the firmware in the device is faulty, and you can't get consumers to do an update.

So this is about solving that problem. It is not about -- so this works fine with -- for example, this would work with the existing 5 gig DFS. It has nothing to do with the DFS mechanism, it has to do with whether the mechanism works in a specific class of devices.

MEMBER CALABRESE: Can I answer the question? So, yeah, there was no one -- and, you know, if many others are reading it this way, we can try to tweak the language, but there was no intention to preclude any other -- any method of sharing -- of band sharing, but simply saying the devices that are operating on an unlicensed basis should be connected devices, whether they're using sensing, or not, or whether they're using DFS or any other -- any other method.

And, in effect, that's -- as it

turns out, that's actually completely

consistent with what, for example, the PCAST

report last Friday said that, you know, all of

the -- you know, all of the authorized shared

access devices should be connected even if

permission to transmit could be accomplished

strictly through sharing -- strictly through

sensing, that the devices should still be

connected devices in order to accomplish these

other enforcement functions. So we're only

concerned about the enforcement function.

MEMBER PEPPER: No, I understand that. And that actually -- this is Pepper again. Specifically going to number three which is receive direction from, you know -- receiving direction can also mean, and if it does, then I think we're just going to be, you know, putting -- making it explicit, that receiving direction also could be because of sensing and there -- thereby actually switching frequencies, but it's not sending, you know, direction from a third-party to the

1 device.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

There are multiple ways that you can do that so it's not clear what, number one, receive is or receive from whom --

MEMBER KAHN: Yeah, I think -- to answer that, I think what that -- I can tell you what that really was aimed at was much more -- yeah, I'm sorry, this is Kevin -- was much more -- if you had a band in which part of the band turned out that more study was needed, you know, interference was discovered post-hoch, you know, and people weren't quite sure how to -- you know, it was more a case of, gosh, we didn't think that kind of interference was going to be an issue, let's go off and study it for a few months and see if we can figure out how to tell people to do better firmware so that it won't be a problem.

In the meantime, we want to get people out of that part of the band while we work the problem. So it wasn't a -- it wasn't a DFS kind of call. Maybe it was still -- it

was still addressing, essentially, problems
discovered with classes of devices coached -so the worrying, perhaps, could be better in
that regard -- but this is not aimed at
dynamic assignment of frequency. That was
really not what this was about. This was
about this enforcement problem.

PARTICIPANT: Okay, now we're going to go to Mark McHenry and then to Dale Hatfield.

MEMBER MCHENRY: Bob, you said
this is inconsistent with the next panel, and
we agree with him that -- we call it
management in control, they call it
enforcement, but that should be database. And
for the frequency select -- just what Kevin
was saying, you can get any access that you
want, so I think the two groups are
consistent, and you were saying they were
inconsistent, I don't agree.

I see the recommendations as use any sharer approach that's appropriate, but

1 for the command and control, you need a 2 database and a connection. If you need to use 3 something, you're going to want a database to back that up. Even if it's in the licensed 4 5 band, you would want that. 6

PARTICIPANT: Thank you. Dale?

MEMBER HATFIELD: Sorry, I was going to change the subject just slightly, and

I didn't want to interrupt before. Karl?

10 MR. NEBBIA: Sorry, Dale. just calling rank. 11

(Laughter.)

13 MEMBER HATFIELD: I used to -- I used to be able to but I --14

15 (Laughter.)

7

8

9

12

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. NEBBIA: Yeah, well, I was a little worried earlier. We don't have the FCC people here but the language is starting to get a little bit risky around here, and I thought there might be some censorship that would happen.

(Laughter).

MR. NEBBIA: But, anyway, I do

2 think -- I do think there are some issues here

3 that we're not exactly connecting on, and it

4 seems to me that the heart of the

5 recommendation was to say, regardless of

6 whether you're sensing, you're doing database

7 type stuff, regardless of how you go about it,

if there's a problem, there needs to be some

9 way of connecting to the network to get new

10 instructions as to -- for instance, on the

11 DFS, it may be to change your receiver

12 bandwidth or it might be to change something

else about what you're doing, but the heart of

it was you've got to have some way of

15 connecting back.

Now, Mark then interjected the

database back into his last statement, and I

18 think that's not the heart of the

19 recommendation here. I think it may be

20 database is part of what's controlling it, but

I don't think that's necessarily the whole.

22 I just think that the key here is if we're

to change a little bit here. I wanted to associate myself with Janice's comments regarding the future where things are changing so dynamically and there's so many different emitter sources. There's so much opportunity for things like inner mod.

There is a -- you know, talking about signals coming from different directions, the signals that are increasingly noise-like and, therefore, more difficult to find out, and also the aggregate noise problem. We have not talked about unintended interference here, but there's all kinds of unintended interfering sources out there.

So when we talk about interference at any one place, it may be some combination of a bunch of intended emitters plus a bunch of unintended emitters and I -- I get worried that the end result of that is such a noisy-like structure in the aggregate that you can't -- even with a big budget and the best of intentions, you may not be very easily able to

figure out the person you want to go to and subject to a fine.

So I -- it just -- it -- it
bothers me but when Janice raised it, I -- in
fact, I -- I don't have to give my talk here.
I start at the end of Thursday because I've
just basically given it, but I am worried that
-- I am worried about that sort of aggregate
problem and noise-like situation that may be
difficult to track down the culprit.

PARTICIPANT: Karl -- or Bryan?

MEMBER TRAMONT: So I just want actually us to go back to Karl. So you flag this concern, which I share about whether or not we're being too -- is there a path to modifying the language that you feel like would preserve the flexibility you just flagged as an issue? Because I think it's sort of -- I think I said that it would help solve the problem and I do have the concern that we're somehow locking ourselves into a certain path. So I just want to go back to

1 that if we could.

MR. NEBBIA: Yeah, actually, I didn't think -- this is Karl. Yeah, that's right, with a "K".

I actually didn't think the recommendation was confusing. I think sometimes we -- we see things written and we view them from a perspective that we have but I think, for me, the emphasis is clear here. It has nothing to do with what technique you're using to -- to do the sharing but only that you're looking for an -- a connectedness in there. And I think there were other issues regarding that, that I'd like to talk about a little bit, but I do think the emphasis to me is quite clear.

MEMBER KAHN: Quick question.

This is Kevin. Would it help if you just deleted item three, because I don't think we actually lose anything by this business about drop -- by dropping the thing about change frequencies, because that's sort of implicit

anyway. And that avoids any notion that what we're doing is directing you to a frequency which kind of suggests the sharing.

If there's anything in here that, you know, I could see would make people think it was something it wasn't, it would be that little bullet three down there at the bottom.

Because it wasn't intended for that, but I understand how you could read it as that. You know, if that helps clarify it, I would have no problem with just deleting that one item because it doesn't --

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: This is Greg Rosston. Does that mean, basically, you're told to stop -- in number two, stop using a particular frequency, and then your -- your device has the knowledge to go to another frequency itself --

MEMBER KAHN: Yeah, I mean, conceivably, this device had ten frequencies to operate on and you told it to stop using that one, we would still have ten minus one

1 frequency to operate on but --

might avoid this -

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER KAHN: -- exactly. So that's why I don't think you would lose anything by deleting that item three and it

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: That's fine.

Why don't with go with that? You know,

frankly, I think that Bob, as always, is

raising an interesting issue because I always

want to have it both ways. I do think it's

sort of a subtle world in which we're

operating here.

I, for one, am not intending this set of recommendations be like an endorsement in a more sophisticated PCAST environment, but what I am -- but I think that we all agree however we feel about the pace of that, you know, future, that the entire committee really bought in strongly to the idea that you can't be allowing unlicensed devices, going forward, to sort of be in a very primitive self-help,

self-enforcement mode, and this was the minimum necessary to try to take us into a future state.

So I think that is a good edit that you promoted here, Bob, and I think that we can all agree and with that said, if you have other comments, I would like to --

MEMBER ALDER: This is Larry. All right. Janice had a comment on recommendation five which I agree with wholeheartedly in spirit, which we're basically saying is that cheap dumb devices have to be dealt with appropriately, and I like the fact that she used the word "generally", but I see also here that you're getting a little bit prescriptive by saying the solution is put them on a legacy band.

It just seems like we may
encounter situations in the future where
that's not the appropriate action. I think
the spirit is good. I'm wondering if there's
just a way to be less prescriptive on that.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I would 1 2 actually support such an edit. I think it's -- and, in fact, you know, one of -- one of the 3 views that I voiced during the committee's 4 5 work is, you know, the fact that the 9 is a 9 MHZ band and is an unlicensed band, and that 6 7 is a beautiful piece of spectrum. 8 totally trashed now with all sorts of stuff. 9 So, you know, saying that, you know, it should be legacy spectrum probably 10 wasn't the right choice of words, so if 11 12 anybody can suggest a better choice of words. I mean, basically, it's to find a select piece 13 of spectrum where that form of device would be 14 best suited and ensure that it would be 15 16 limited to that, you know, area. MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: If I can make 17 18 a -- to me -- This is Tom Dombrowsky. 19 To me, the first sentence is all 20 you need in recommendation five. Really, why 21 don't we study the regulatory treatment of

cheap, dumb devices and not get into all the

22

other things because, frankly, there's a lot of dumb devices, a lot of bands that aren't even covering their 49 MHZ. You know, there's a lot of stuff being used there for dumb devices and, frankly, being used well. I mean, people like their remote key entry for their car. They don't want to go and open that car if they don't have to.

So I think just leaving it just to that first sentence, let's study that and see if there's a way to get around it, and it might -- it might be the easiest way to get there.

MEMBER CALABRESE: We did study it and the recommendation we got was the second sentence. I mean, you know, essentially, that -- that unconnected devices should be restricted to, you know, some -- some limited number of bands so --

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Limited number of bands.

MEMBER CALABRESE: Yeah, so I --

Or just

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI:

they are already prevalent.

21

22

recommend study of. I don't have a problem.

I mean, I'd like the FCC to take up this topic

3 in a more disciplined fashion.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Yeah, I mean, my take is that the FCC hasn't done any coordination on this yet so, you know -- I'm sorry. Tom Dombrowsky again. And so I know the committee has looked at it and we have some thoughts about it, but at the end of the day, some of these may be a little bit too strong at this point just because there are so many dumb devices out there and to try and say you're now stuck here, we may be cutting you out, it's just a -- I think something that needs to be thought through a little bit more.

MEMBER KAHN: Kevin Kahn again. I think really all we were trying to get to there was that -- that if the big demand on additional spectrum which is -- I mean, if you didn't have demand for additional spectrum, none of this would be interesting, and the big demand for additional spectrum is not coming

from cheap dumb devices, it's coming from smart connected devices.

So the intent -- and, I mean, I think maybe we're too specific, but the intent was basically to say, for the devices that are not smart connected devices, let's try to keep them isolated to some limited set of bands that make sense to them rather than allowing them to proliferate all over the place and have, you know, interference problems with no recourse that we could have for the connected devices.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Could that be the second sentence? This is Bryan. Could that be -- could what Kevin just said be the second sentence in --

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: I mean --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: -- intend any

20 more discussions, right.

21 MEMBER TRAMONT: So more like --

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: This is Tom

2 at is just sort of getting the framework of 3 we've got a problem, let's not let it spread, 4 yeah, but then having that last sentence that 5 sort of says, not only do we not want it spread, we want to tamp it down, I think 6 7 that's where I have some concerns just because 8 a lot of the bands that they're in, we're not going to be moving other stuff in there. 9 10 There's not enough spectrum there. I mean, 49 MHz is not 11 not broadband. 12 broadband. We're not going to put smart connected devices in 49 MHz. So I think that 13 14 was my reaction. 15 MEMBER FELDMAN: This is Molly 16 Feldman. I mean, what Janice said earlier, what about just taking out legacy and just 17 18 limited or specific at the end? 19 CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Could

Dombrowsky. That's kind of what I was driving

1

20

21

22

somebody now give us a corrected -- are you going to try to give us a corrected -
(Laughter.)

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: The committee

recommends that future unconnected devices -
the -- the location of future unconnected

devices should be studied further by the FCC,

you know, and -
MEMBER CALABRESE: After the first

sentence, you could have, the committee rec -let's see -- the committee recommends -- and
just start off the third sentence, actually.

The committee recommends the policymakers
should consider whether such devices should be
restricted in the future phasing out their
access to very high quality bands over an
appropriate time period.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: I think I -- I share the concern of the last sentence that Tom has.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER TRAMONT: This is Bryan.

I'm sorry, but I don't want to -- we have a

lot of legacy devices and a lot of investment

in a lot of bands, and I don't know that I

would to put a cloud over them that we're going to pull it out from underneath them at this stage, so that last sentence makes me nervous.

I notice Kevin has language for his new sentence -- a different version of sentence two.

MEMBER KAHN: Yeah, if we get just get rid of some of the specificity, I think you can do it. I mean, you know, if the committee recommends that, you know, unconnected devices, you know, be, you know, assigned to, you know -- isolated sounds negative --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER KAHN: -- let me look for a better word, but --

MEMBER CALABRESE: A limited number of bands.

MEMBER KAHN: A limited number of bands where, you know, -- no, recognizing that, you know, once deployed, they will

always continue to exist, we recommend unconnected devices be assigned to a limited number of bands.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Let me give it a try. This is Tom Dombrowsky again. Maybe we can do it from a positive perspective which is, what are we trying to say: we want connected devices in the new spectrum bands and the broadbands. And so why don't we in the second sentence say, for new bands that could have broadband capability for unlicensed use, they should be connected to the extent that --

MEMBER KAHN: That was really what the origin of this.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: -- let's make it positive instead of restrictive. I mean, that, to me, seems like what you're trying to do and --

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: No, but that wasn't all that we were trying to do.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Okay. I'm

1 sorry.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I'm not -- I
don't know how we say this and maybe we should

CO-CHAIR FONTES: This is Brian here. I think what we may want to do is take a break, caucus end this so you can come out with specific language rather than trying to edit in a forum, and then after that break, come back and present that agreed-upon edit to recommendation five. Any thoughts?

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:53 p.m. and resumed at 3:02 p.m.)

So we'll take a 10-minute break.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. So they made progress during the break, and I'm going to turn it over to -- and I'll turn it back over to Janice and Michael to go through the edits, and they're being typed in now, as I believe, and then we'll read it for those folks that are on the call.

MEMBER CALABRESE: Right. 1 Okay. 2 So what we have -- this is -- I think we have 3 found an appropriate change for recommendation number five to strike the sentence two and 4 5 sentence three, and replace those two sentences with: "The committee recommends that 6 in the future", quote, "unconnected devices 7 8 generally should be restricted to a limited 9 number of appropriate bands" --10 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Okay, unconnected devices --11 12 MEMBER CALABRESE: -- actually, recommends that in the future -- so, yeah --13 14 I'm sorry --15 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Delete the 16 second that --17 MEMBER CALABRESE: Yeah, delete the second that, and sorry about that. Okay. 18 19 But in the future, unconnected devices 20 generally should be restricted to a limited 21 number of appropriate bands. 22 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Can everybody

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Now, I
think Karl had some comments.

3 MR. NEBBIA: Thank you. I've been

enjoying the fray. Janice uncensored is really, you know --

(Laughter.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. NEBBIA: Anyway, I had a few comments to make. First of all, we -- I noticed this committee was getting created, we had a lot of discussions internally about what kind of things we should have the group consider and whether the recommendations should all pertain to federal use of the spectrum or be more general. There was a lot of argument back and forth. And, in fact, the four questions here were constructed in a way where we were sort of limiting ourselves to what can the federal government do about these problems that we're experiencing, and as Janice said earlier, you know, the news today is that the problems still exist on the garage door side.

So -- and I understand the idea that ultimately the answers are in fixing the technology, and so on, but interestingly enough, it seems that more from the, what does the government do? How do we respond to these problems to an FCC problem?

And as we look ahead here, I think it's the recommendations, of course, are all stated, in essence, that NTIA should recommend to the commission that we alter something.

But I think one of the questions that's of interest to me here is when we see anywhere from industry a recommendation or a petition to the commission to make these kinds of changes, because that seems to me to be --certainly, if the unlicensed community steps up and says, this is how we would like it done in the future in order to keep ourselves out of these problems, it has a whole lot of weight if it's done that way, as opposed to the federal agencies, you know, complaining about an item -- which, to be honest, I was

talking earlier, I'm not sure I know of a single case where an unlicensed device is actively interfering with a non-federal user or, vice versa, that the non-federal user is interfering with an unlicensed device and, therefore, people are calling the Hill.

It seems like many of these untethered devices, and even the newer devices that are linked to the -- to the Net have, in fact, been placed in bands where the federal government operates. So it remains a significant issue for us.

And, certainly, I don't know based on the information here, I recognize that Wi-Fi has become like a focal point for many people, but I honestly don't know how many untethered devices are still out there.

Certainly, all the car key fobs are untethered. Many of the new car ignition systems have a radio linked in them. The --the tire reporting gauges are not tethered.

The garage door openers more and more, I

think, are getting tethered to people's cell phone connections, and so on; but I don't really have a good sense of how big a piece this is, and we didn't -- we didn't spend time necessarily on that, but I would certainly hope that if this is a significant item for us in the future, that we would see folks from the industry side step up and say, yes, this is really needed.

I mean, we can certainly, I think, maybe start the ball rolling by the fact that it has been interference in the federal systems that have really stood out -- or to or from federal systems. So we -- so we may able to take the ball on but, ultimately, this is an area that the non-feds -- in fact, the FCC does -- does regulate.

Now, one of the things I thought also was a key item in here is that the concept of requiring devices in the hands of all of our Americans with all of our rights and freedoms that their devices are all

calling back into somebody else's data system and reporting on themselves, I -- I found a little -- I mean, I understand the -- the concept of it and why it sounds like a really good idea to make this work, but I just found it a little bit surprising with all the kind of policy people we have around the table that nobody stood up and said, there are issues with requiring everybody's devices to report and especially those that carry location information, and so on. And so I just -- that seemed to me seeing them be two major items -- but, Kevin.

MEMBER KAHN: Just an observation.

This is Kevin. The devices should not have to report in, in this recommendation. It simply has to ask whether it is still authorized.

So, really, all it needs to do is query the database to ask, is the signature of its current former hardware still authorized? So the -- it's, for the most part, in one way -- I mean, you know, you can argue that there's

some privacy issues there, but, for the most

part, this is used as a one-way query of a

database. So it's not -- the device isn't

telling you anything particularly in this

case.

Just -- so that's just an observation on that last comment. But I would agree, if it were, then this gets a lot dicier.

MR. NEBBIA: I know -- this is
Karl again.

Certainly, in the 5 GHz issues
that we've had, part of what we wanted to do
was get them to make contact so that these
downloads could -- you know, could actually be
placed on their devices, but I think that's
interesting that the queries one direction.

I'm not sure --

Janice, do you have a comment?

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: I'm sorry. I

don't -- I agree that that's typically what

would happen, but I do think there were --

there was discussion about firmware, whatever, being, you know, upgraded in some instances

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Sure, but that's --MEMBER KAHN: that happens even now. If you go to your manufacturer's site with your device, they will, you know, download an upgrade to firmware. It's still a one-way -- I don't mean one-way because obviously these are -there's a protocol handshake, but the information content flow is from the database to the device. The device is not saying where it is, you know, it is not saying who owns it, you know, it's simply saying, you know, give me the keys that are valid for a device, you know, of this type and, you know, it will give back a set of information. If you have one of the following hash keys, you're still good to go, and if it doesn't, then it needs, you know, to get new firmware or do something else. Again, it goes to the manufacturer and says, you know, give me an update to my

1 firmware.

So it really is -- I mean, this one -- this one we did think about some, and it's not a -- I'm not saying you could not add, okay, big brother capabilities here, but that's not -- that is not required to meet the description of this.

MR. NEBBIA: This is Karl again.

Also, the recommendation statements up front
in the recommendation one about proactively
educating policymakers here. Certainly, from
our experience, I think the critical component
of that is, once again, the unlicensed
industry being willing to educate the folks up
on the Hill.

Because, first of all, I think
you've got to recognize there's a limited
number of folks on the Senate and House side
that are directly linked to telecom issues,
and most of the people getting the calls are
people just representing, you know, Joe Smith
at home that called them. They don't know

anything about telecom at all and to make a -you know, a major educational effort across the House and Senate, that's a pretty significant challenge when, in fact, when the problems happen, if the industry stood up right away and said, "these are the rules we live by, they make our industry work, we need everybody, including the folks on the Hill, to support the structure that we have in place, otherwise the whole system begins to erode, " that would have significantly altered the amount of time and resources that went into correcting at least the garage door problem, as temporarily as that may be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And the challenge there was we didn't have the door opener stepping up and saying, "you know, yes, Madam Congressperson, this is the correct way, we've got to stick by these rules."

So I think that certainly the educational aspect, I think, needs to be carried out to a great extent and certainly

encouraged by the industry. So I think as we look at that, we certainly would appreciate the industry's support in -- in looking at this.

Also, as we get into -- there's the recommendation three, which we really haven't talked about to a great deal, the streamlining of interference reporting tools. I'm not sure what that exactly means or what your understanding of the -- of the reporting requirements right now. If we have interference in the 5 GHz radars, we're getting calls immediately from the FAA. They've gone into -- into the FCC. They got people out in the field that are going after these folks.

So I'm not sure, some of those things about the reporting aspect, I just -- I didn't quite grasp what speeding up of the process people felt really did happen. We've certainly not sensed, certainly, a lack of response by the Commission enforcement bureau

people, so I'm not exactly sure, you know, where we go with that.

But looking to the future, I think one of the considerations that we had here is the cost aspect and, as most of you know, there were probably times during the drafting of the Middle Class Tax Relief Act where costs related to sharing spectrum with unlicensed was in the text. It, in the end, was removed from the text as a -- you know, as that discussion went forward.

So that still becomes a critical item right now. We're working on 5 GHz expansion that's going to take resources from the agencies to make that happen, and clearly there is not a mechanism in place now.

When we talk about the inventory,

I think what we were hoping was not an
inventory in the sense that we know where
everybody is, but could we -- could, in fact,
through the FCC's product certification
process, isn't there something there that

says, okay, all of the garage door openers are in three to four hundred MHz, the car key fobs that are 315, so that we had a sense as we were making plans that these folks are in certain locations.

I don't need to know where

everybody's car key fob is, but I would like

to know that the car key fob industry had

settled on 315, and if we start seeing issues,

that we know they're there. So I'm not

looking for an inventory as in a licensing

inventory. I'm just talking about where are

the products? Where are the baby monitors?

And so on, in the -- and so on.

The last interesting thing I've found as recently -- I don't know if many of you are aware -- but the Europeans, I think, have finally gotten frustrated with the unlicensed device routine, and their problem was they were pushing them into specific bands and the rest of the world wasn't buying it, particularly, the United States, and we were -

- equipment was floating around the world, and now they finally have adopted a much more -- or a new direction headed toward basically allowing unlicensed devices to go anywhere if they meet certain power requirements, and so on.

So it's interesting that we're suggesting a solution for the future is forcing the untethered guys into more focus spectrum when the Europeans have finally gotten frustrated with their own approach and now they're heading in the other direction, so.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Is that your last comment?

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Turn it back over to Janice and Michael. Wait, wait, microphone.

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: With all that said, and recognizing the very positive editorial work of the group here, we would

Page 111 like to put these recommendations to a vote. 1 2 CO-CHAIR FONTES: Is that a motion? 3 MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: That is -- I 4 5 make that motion. CO-CHAIR FONTES: Is there a 6 7 second to that motion? Okay. Is there any further discussion? 8 9 Hearing none, all those in favor, 10 say aye. 11 (Chorus of ayes.) 12 CO-CHAIR FONTES: Any opposed? 13 (No response.) 14 CO-CHAIR FONTES: Thank you. And I want to thank everybody for their 15 16 cooperation on the edits. 17 CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. 18 we're moving onto the structured spectrum 19 subcommittee report and this is -- we 20 discussed these -- this report and these 21 recommendations at the March meeting and have re-circulated in hard copy, although it's 22

available on the website from the previous meeting, the slide deck that Larry and Mark were going to prepare and going to discuss with the recommendations from that March meeting. So I'll turn it over to you guys.

MEMBER ALDER: All right. This is Larry. I'll kick it off. So, again, as Greg just said, these were discussed in the March meeting, and we just didn't have time to bring them for a vote for approval, so that's sort of what we're doing today.

To remind everyone of the background, the question we were working really on is how do we set up sharing arrangements when the primary service may continue or has the right to continue to evolve, and what kind of sharings are workable for the industry in the long term. We basically distilled the recommendations into two sets of technology set of recommendations, and a process set. So I'm going to turn it over to Mark.

1

2

3

5 6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 management and control

recommendation.

recommendations from the chart are not up There's three recommendations. there. first was that NTIA should develop a set of spectrum sharing requirements. I'm on the new working groups, and we were sent the planned exclusion zone but, really, spectrum sharing has more features, you know. Is there -what's your enforcement mechanism? changes can the incumbent make in the weight form or the entrance? So if the NTIA would make like a memo or a list of all these requirements, they might not put numbers against them but at least they would say that there is this issue that needs to be resolved. So we kind of become a template for making spectrum deals. So that's the first

MEMBER MCHENRY: So the technical

The second recommendation, which was already talked about, is even in licensed band and unlicensed band, you need a management and control approach to change the

software. And this has already been discussed, so I think our recommendation, I can't imagine a situation where you wouldn't want this, where the two parties are sharing and they could cause interference with each other, the incumbent's going to want some type of management control.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

And the third recommendation is -it's too early to pick winners and losers -we would look at different bands, like aircraft telemetry where the database works, where the sensing works, and sometimes both work and some other scenarios a different case works. So I recommend NTIA not pick a general approach and they kind of let it get worked out on a band by band approach. It could be even that within the band there might be two or three approaches depending on the incumbent and the entering systems. There are no clear winners or losers, and that would just leave it open. So those are the three technical recommendations.

And then if you turn forward a couple pages -- there's no page numbers for some reason on this one that I have, my printed copy -- that there's a process recommendation, titled recommendation four, which largely is one I think with the NTIA is already adopting, so this is kind of a softball for Karl and Mark. This is essentially a dialogue between the incumbents and the new entrants to develop specific sharing recommendations.

Generally, the feeling was that, without reading all the rules here -- maybe I will -- but the general idea was you need good cooperation between the incumbents and the new interests to really figure out the technical solutions. You can't do it in silos. It has to be cooperative. And I think that's the process that the NTIA is undertaking now with the 1755 band.

So just to read the recommendation, it says: In the interests

where sharing is necessary, NTIA should work 1 2 with the FCC, federal agencies, or potential new interests to develop specific 3 recommendations on the extent, impact and 4 5 method of sharing spectrum. Direct discussions between the experts result in the 6 7 most efficient and dynamic sharing method 8 based on detailed understanding of how systems 9 and technologies operate and are used. 10 Discussion should be open to any interested party but must be focused on a limited number 11 12 of issues or scenarios to develop actionable recommendations that would be codified in the 13 14 rulemaking procedure.

The discussions should be held as early in the process as possible to provide sufficient time and to allow open and direct discussion between the parties, including the federal agencies. They must have senior level oversight to ensure the discussions are based on official recommendations and with an expectation that proposals will be

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

1 implemented.

So that -- again, we presented these last time, there was some discussion last time, we wanted to bring them back, have a discussion, and then maybe entertain a motion to adopt these.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Is the discussion of these in addition to what we discussed last time?

Karl, do you want to --

MEMBER NEBBIA: My -- my only comment was, just to be clear on the technical recommendations, that these are for sharing the federal spectrum, because I don't think we want to say that we need to have as an interactive database if they're sharing between two commercial operators that decide to do it on their own, just to make sure that it's -- it doesn't say it anywhere in here, but with that understanding, at least in my perspective, it should be only for a federal perspective in this since it's NTIA.

1	CO-CHAIR FONTES: The question I -
2	- IBefore you do that, for those who are on
3	the call, if you can mute your phone, that
4	would be helpful. If somebody's moving papers
5	around or microphone around
6	MEMBER ALDER: Oh, I just want the
7	respond to Greg. So, Greg, I don't know if we
8	if you're suggesting an edit. The
9	recommendations do the NTIA share
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	MEMBER PEPPER: My question,
12	though, is you said something that maybe I
13	missed it, I didn't read it, that the
14	recommendation, which I agree we should get to
15	the federal spectrum, but that was to use an
16	interactive database. That's an example in
17	the text but not on the PowerPoint these
18	are still recommendations or am I missing
19	that?
20	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: I'm looking at
21	technical recommendation number two.
22	MEMBER PEPPER: Oh, okay, you're

right. Yes, but if you want to do that, an interactive database, but there are other names as well. If you want to put examples, you can put in other examples, whether it's sensing or peak, there are a number of different approaches that are not in the database --

MEMBER MCHENRY: Again, this is just an ad hoc control. Once the device is screwed up and it gets put in time-out, how do you -- you know, experiments are taking a time-out. While it's operating normally, it can be doing beaconing, any other thing you'd want. This is only after there's a problem, how do you fix it? That's management and control. This isn't -- maybe you're saying management means that moment-by-moment management, but this is kind of a month-by-month management.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: And that was Mark McHenry. And there's someone on the phone who keeps moving stuff around. Please

do a mute so we don't have to hear your papers
going around. Thanks.

MEMBER MCHENRY: Well, did you get the management, not a dynamic spectrum --

5 MEMBER ALDER: It's not

operational control, it's a management.

CO-CHAIR FONTE: Then I guess we can't mute from our end?

(Laughter.)

MEMBER MCHENRY: Maybe it's not somebody just moving papers, they're just walking around.

MEMBER PEPPER: Okay. So, anyway,
I guess the question, Mark, is I understand
the management controls -- it does not -- you
know, it does not necessarily define, but this
is an interactive database. I mean, we heard
some -- I mean, this is enforcement, right, so
we heard some of the other examples.

It's not necessarily, you know, querying an interactive database, but in the management control, it could also be turned

off to a specific frequency, or use of that frequency being turned off, and maybe it's just over-definition of interactive database.

MEMBER ALDER: What words do you want in there?

So the reason -- let me give a historical context before you respond to that. So, again, the question -- one of the questions that was proposed to the group to work on was the situation where you're having a sharing and the primary service may continue to evolve, and so the idea was, a solution to that was to have a management and control interface versus having some kind of magical one-size-fits-all sharing technology, that was the approach that we thought of as a group. So that's the background of the discussion and how the recommendations came out why.

There's kind of this management -you can do the spectrum sharing and the
incumbent user has the right to evolve each of
the management and control capabilities so you

can deal with things that might not be unanticipated in the future.

MEMBER MCHENRY: I think we kind of recommend just one side -- this is Mark.

Imagine if you had a million unlicensed devices and a radar complain, you just can't turn them million off to figure out what it is. You might go ask people questions, like what frequency are you on? Or you might have a process to figure out, what is this problem versus, just what Kevin said, call for permission to keep going, because it might be pretty painful if you have a million unlicensed devices just to turn them all off -

MEMBER PEPPER: But, again, it's in the previous discussion, right, it's a device -- if the device is operating across the range of frequencies, to tell, you know, a million devices not to use a particular frequency but there's still other frequencies that they can use.

MEMBER MCHENRY: But then what's the next step? Then what -- you still haven't fixed the problem. You just -- you know, you turned them all off in some parts of band.

You might want other features -- the committee didn't work out what these other features, and that would be worked out band by band.

MEMBER PEPPER: Yeah, but I guess the question is, is it interactive or is it interactive database? You know, maybe it's just the way I tend to think of database in a very narrow sense of, you know, the TV white space database --

MEMBER MCHENRY: No, I can imagine

MEMBER PEPPER: -- because this is different. I mean, it's, I think, broader than that in terms of --

MEMBER MCHENRY: You might force that license device to run a log file and keep it for a day and ask, send me your log files because I want to figure out what unlicensed

1 device caused the problem. That would be one 2 extreme of what this might be. It's going to be very hard to figure out what unlicensed 3 4 device or what was the problem, and just 5 turning things off, that's only --6 MEMBER PEPPER: No, no I 7 understand. I guess it's -- it's maybe it's -- it's the definition of database and thinking 8 9 about it more broadly. What you just 10 described, I don't think of as a database. 11 MEMBER MCHENRY: Okay. We could 12 put ergo database. We could list ten other things. Maybe we should take the example out 13 14 just so that --15 MEMBER PEPPER: Why don't we just 16 take the example out. I think that would be -17 18 MEMBER MCHENRY: I'm not 19 supportive of taking the example out. I think 20 the example helps clarify the intent. I'd be 21 more inclined to add other --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

22

	Page 125
1	MEMBER MCHENRY: other
2	examples.
3	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Do you
4	want to propose adding other things perhaps?
5	MEMBER ALDER: If there's a
6	suggested additional example.
7	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Do you just
8	want to have just one more example, beacons or
9	
10	MEMBER MCHENRY: Well, you could
11	request a log files from device. Please send
12	me a report.
13	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: We want
14	something that we can actually put in here
15	MEMBER MCHENRY: Yeah, on the
16	suggest log file be sent would be another
17	example feature you'd want the device to do.
18	Send in the frequencies that you transmit on
19	the last three hours so I help diagnosis the
20	problem.
21	MEMBER PEPPER: I mean yeah,
22	well I'm not sure how

1 of the group is --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MEMBER ALDER: So Mark is speculating here how to add other possible techniques. The recommendation of the group is to require a management and control feature using the spectrum sharing approaches, and we put an example so people understood what that meant, we said that interactive database would be one example. We didn't specify other examples. Mark's thinking about that right now.

MEMBER PEPPER: Right, but if you want to think of it broadly, a management and control technique would be, you know, using sensing and beacons.

MEMBER ALDER: Beacons, sensing, fine.

MEMBER MCHENRY: You might ask, did you get a beacon? What beacon strength? Let's try to diagnose why did this fault happen.

think at the moment of what to add as opposed to, you know -- deleting it makes it easy, but it's actually to some extent interactive features, not just a database. It's, you know, in an interactive database --

20

21

22

1	MEMBER MCHENRY: Who knows what
2	your iPhone is sending out and going on
3	between Apple and your phone and
4	MEMBER PEPPER: There are very
5	different reasons I mean, this very
6	different and that's, by the way, using
7	licensed bands. How about interactive
8	database or other system?
9	MEMBER ALDER: Or other system?
10	MEMBER MCHENRY: Or other, yeah,
11	just
12	MEMBER PEPPER: Fine.
13	MEMBER ALDER: Or other system.
14	MEMBER TRAMONT: This is Bryan. I
15	think, Greg, did you want to add your caveat
16	to top the NTIA should, in addressing I
17	thought you were saying in addressing sharing
18	with government bands, is that what the
19	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: The original
20	edit. I didn't know if I had to edit or
21	whether it was clear just because it's NTIA
22	that it's obviously dealing with.

	Page 130
1	MEMBER TRAMONT: What other
2	examples where NTIA is being asked to do
3	things that are related to commercial use, so
4	I think it's probably useful to go ahead and
5	do your edit here.
6	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: So what would
7	my edit say?
8	(Laughter.)
9	(Simultaneous speaking.)
10	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: NTIA should,
11	when adjusting from federal bands?
12	MEMBER TRAMONT: Yeah, consider
13	the following technical recommendations when
14	addressing shared federal system bands, I
15	guess. The NTIA should when addressing shared
16	federal shared federal spectrum?
17	MEMBER PEPPER: Shared federal
18	bands.
19	MEMBER ALDER: The following
20	tentative recommendations when addressing
21	yes.
22	MEMBER MCHENRY: So this is

	Page 131
1	Mark. After its auction, is it still a
2	federal band? So what's the point of this if
3	they turn around and auction it?
4	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Well, if it's
5	not shared with federal anymore shared with
6	federal users? When they auction bands,
7	right, they have federal users still in them
8	so it's not as if auction alone takes them out
9	but it's just depends
10	(Simultaneous speaking.)
11	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: but still
12	you could still auction the right to share it
13	with the federal bands, with federal users,
14	that's what I meant to say.
15	PARTICIPANT: So what is the
16	wording we came up with?
17	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Should consider
18	the following technical recommendations when
19	addressing sharing with federal users.
20	Okay. So are we at a do we
21	call

MR. NEBBIA: Couple short non-

22

1 controversial comments.

(Laughter.)

MR. NEBBIA: First of all, the issue of requirements, I think, certainly understanding what the requirements are as part of any interaction and trying to come up with best solutions, I think is important. I don't think it's really possible to specify out front what all those requirements are.

And also once -- once you get into this kind of discussion, I think, with an incumbent service, there has to be a certain since of limitation on their stating their requirements as they are, the idea you're going to open up all their requirements and re-discuss the wave forms and so on. I'm not sure that you can realistically pursue that but, certainly, the understanding that the requirements for the users involved in the sharing arrangement need to be known, I would certainly agree with that and can support that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

As we discussed the sharing arrangements, I know down at the WSRD earlier, they named the database side, the sensing side, and then of course the beacon side which has recently been mentioned here. One of the things that we're looking at in the 1755 to 1850 band is the whole question of interference acceptance or tolerance, which is not particularly a new -- it's not a technique, necessarily, but it may, in fact -particularly when we're talking with intermittent operations, may, in fact, become a critical part. So just so everybody recognizes when you're -- when you're thinking of those different approaches, that may become a really important one.

And then certainly on the fourth recommendation, I think this is pointing in a direction -- and I realize this recommendation has been developing over time, but certainly as it was developing, we are seeing this need to get the -- the sides of the issue together,

	Page 134
1	and as we look at the working group
2	discussions coming up, I think that's what we
3	are attempting to do there. And it seems like
4	in solving future problems, it's going to
5	become a critical component of what we do.
6	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. I think
7	I I think I lost track, but I'm not sure
8	we've had a motion on this.
9	(Simultaneous speaking.)
10	MEMBER ALDER: I will make a
11	motion to adopt these recommendations.
12	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Second. Okay.
13	Any further discussion?
14	Okay. All those in favor?
15	(Chorus of ayes.)
16	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Opposed?
17	(No response.)
18	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Great.
19	CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Now we're
20	in the next item in our agenda, and this is a
21	progress report in the CSMAC working groups.
22	And in this one, Karl, I don't

know if you want to start it out, but I think
we're really looking for the liaisons for each
of the five working groups to kind of give us
a quick update.

MR. NEBBIA: That's all. Yeah, we're just we're looking for that kind of report from folks who are in the groups.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: So for the 16951710 MHz meteorological satellite, Mark, if
you want to give us a quick update? Or
Dennis?

MEMBER MCHENRY: I'll give you the update. So there's been two face-to-face meetings. NTIA gave a nice briefing on the fast track analysis, went through all the technical details, and then NOAA provided an excellent overview of how all the satellite systems work and the frequencies. And there was a lot of technical discussions in the meetings and aggregation effects and they're starting to get down to the nuts and bolts. So there is a listing generated, we need to

know all these parameters, and the entrant and the incumbent will do the analysis. And Steve is circulating that around.

They set up a data repository and people were so friendly no head-knocking yet. So there's no problems. That's it.

MR. NEBBIA: Not like this group.

MEMBER MCHENRY: Not like this group. Very congenial.

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR FONTES: So the next group is the working group two, 1755 to 1850 MHz, law enforcement, surveillance, et cetera, et cetera. Tom?

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Yes, Tom

Dombrowsky. The group has had an initial call

just this week, in fact, yesterday, and

expects to have a face-to-face in about a

week-and-a-half on this issue. I think one of

the questions that's come up in that working

group, and there will be questions coming back

to NTIA on that, is a little bit on the scope

side, because there is some concern as to whether they should be looking at sharing or just looking at relocation schedules or not.

And I think more broadly another question, I think, Karl, you've heard from other groups, I think we're hosting several of these working groups and I think one of the questions is on the ethical side of providing foods and drinks for all the government folks that are coming to these meetings, so clarification there would be greatly appreciated, too, so we don't get into any trouble on that.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: This could be the Office of Special Counsel.

(Laughter.)

MR. NEBBIA: A couple quick comments. First, you're always safe at giving them nothing.

(Laughter.)

MR. NEBBIA: That's a good -- good

place to start. But with respect to the --

and we have sent this information back to our own staff who are participating -- certainly, we have done testing in the past that make it appear that traditional sharing between the existing incumbents and a wireless broadband system is not realistic, given the need for these agencies to go anywhere, and so on, at any time.

So from that standpoint, I don't think that sharing is a realistic aspect to pursue. The critical issue is what's the order of march for moving the systems out of the band.

However, there were some questions that came up that I think can be linked into that, and that is whether, ultimately, the law enforcement community can use the network, and in that sense share the industry's technology, and, in doing that, might be able to be on the network where the network is available, and in places where the network's signal is not strong enough for them to use, that they would

have some sort of agreement with the network operators that they would be free to put up their own stick there to do whatever they needed in that location.

2.0

So it might end up in some sort of broader cooperative sharing capability or arrangement but, certainly, the initial step has to be looking at the order of march for moving systems out.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: All right. Any other comments then, Tom?

MEMBER GIBSON: Yeah, this is

Mark. I want to make one comment. There was
a question from that working group as to what
you meant by other short distance links. We
thought what you meant was the -- essentially,
the repeaters that were put in place to
facilitate the connection with the law
enforcement efforts, but we weren't sure.

MR. NEBBIA: I would have to go back to our list, but I think that would probably also include like some of the

electronic ordinance disposal, maybe that type of thing. So there were some very short range, mostly, once again, linked to law enforcement.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. Any others?

meeting.

Rick, if you want to provide a comment or -
MEMBER REASER: We had our first

telecon last week, was primarily mostly about

getting to know each other, and it was fairly,

I think, friendly and so forth. Not a whole

lot of technical things were done at the

Okay, the working group three.

I think the plan -- there's a couple of action items, most of them dealt with federal government side providing information about technical characteristics regarding satellite uplinks, and so forth, for the ground stations. There's some continuing discussion about exactly how the electronic warfare stuff would be handled, and there's

going to be some things provided by the government next week.

The first face-to-face meeting
will be next week on August 1st, downtown, and
hope to accomplish a lot. It can be a long
meeting. It starts very early in the morning
and goes till late at night. So lots of
things to be discussed, but we are off and
running.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Great. Any
comments? Okay. Working group four? Mark?

MEMBER GIBSON: I'm going to have
to defer to either Tom or Mark because -- this
is Mark Gibson -- I wasn't able to make the
call, but I would add that I think our next
meeting's got yours beat because it's
scheduled from 12:00 a.m. till 12:00 a.m.

MEMBER GIBSON: So it's a 24-hour meeting, or a very short one, for the working group four. But I wasn't on the call so, Tom or Mark, you know, you have the details.

(Laughter).

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Sure. This is

Tom Dombrowsky. I was on the working group

four call, and as he said, we have an initial

call, we have a face-to-face meeting that I

hope the schedule's not midnight to midnight,

but that will be next week. I think that

group went very -- very cleanly.

I think there was a little bit of discussion about not everybody was involved in the last go around with the fixed microwave so there was concern about should we be doing sharing or should we not, and we said, no, you've fixed microwave, you're moving, everybody knows you're moving. We don't need to talk about sharing with fixed microwave.

And there was a lot more discussion of the tactical radio because that's where we really haven't done a lot of ground work. So the focus of the group's primarily going to be on the tactical radio, not on the fixed microwave, and I think everybody agreed with that.

1	CHARIR FONTE: Karl?
2	MR. NEBBIA: Just a note.
3	Certainly, with the experience of 1710 and
4	1755, there has been a lot of work done with
5	the tactical radio, at least in being able to
6	shrink the areas that you would have to
7	protect until you came up with some other
8	arrangement.
9	CO-CHAIR FONTES: Okay. No other
10	comment?
11	For working group five, I don't
12	know if Jennifer Warren is on the call to make
13	a presentation, or do you, Bryan?
14	MEMBER TRAMONT: I believe Ms.
15	Warren is going to take the lead here.
16	CO-CHAIR FONTES: Great.
17	Jennifer?
18	MEMBER TRAMONT: She was going to
19	take the lead per e-mail. If not, I can take
20	the lead.
21	(Simultaneous speaking.)
22	CO-CHAIR FONTES: Jennifer, if you

can hear us, just hold for a moment, please.

We were trying to mute the call based on the interference we were hearing at this end.

Jennifer, are you on the call?

You know what, Bryan, why don't

you go ahead and, Jennifer, when you're on the

call, why don't you give me a quick text or

send me a quick e-mail just so I know you're

on the call.

MEMBER TRAMONT: So the working group five had our initial conference call last week. It was very productive. Our task is fairly complex, like many of the other committees, so there is going to be some division of the group into multi-subgroups.

I think we had upwards of 80 people on the call, so we were very well attended. And we actually -- 85, I think was the number.

And our next meeting is scheduled for next week, August 2nd, I guess we're the slackers of the group, similar all-day affair.

We're going to start to dig in. There were some work items in terms of people volunteering for leadership roles in our subgroups as well as submitting questions that can help to frame the debate on the incumbent systems across five different vectors. So we are underway and, hopefully, the heavy lifting is starting now and will continue on the 2nd.

MEMBER DOMBROWSKY: Just one correction. It's a two-day meeting. It's Thursday and Friday.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: For the rest of the committee it's a two-day meeting, is that what you're saying, Tom? Thank you.

Okay, any other questions for Bryan?

Okay. Jennifer is on the call and, unfortunately, we're unable to hear her.

MR. NEBBIA: Just one comment.

I'd ask just that you keep us informed along
the process if, in fact, the 80-person, 100person participant list gets to be an issue,

1 we may have to figure out another approach.

We are trying to keep this as open as possible and yet -- but if you start getting 100 people trying to resolve issues, it will be even a

5 little bit more difficult than it's been

6 today.

2

3

4

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

CO-CHAIR FONTES: Janice?

MEMBER OBUCHOWSKI: Yeah, I wanted to highlight a topic that came up at this

meeting that I think is probably going to be

across the board. The question came up of,

12 you know, foreign participation, foreign

participation in person, foreign participation

by phone. That's sort of one subset of kind

of who becomes directly involved in this

16 process.

The second being kind of guidelines for protection of data, and while data may not be classified, one can envision that from a federal side, but also from a company side, if we're really going to get

into the nitty-gritty, something this -- this

open-ended probably will not yield the results everybody's hoping for.

So I simply raise those two kind of subsets of organizational questions to you, and so NTIA will have to be guiding us through this process, and there may well be a time when, you know, we're going to have to close down some degree of openness.

MR. NEBBIA: This is Karl. Well, I should indicate that I know the issue of the non-U.S. citizens came up at one point, and it just seemed like the simple solution, at least as the question was posed, was just not meet on restricted facilities. And it's not -- it's harder on everybody to meet in those facilities anyway, so even the people that are hosting the meetings. So I think we've kind of solved that one, and I hope the co-chairs of each of the groups feel they have the ability to resolve a lot of these types of issues.

With respect to the data itself,

at this point, we would certainly look for the agencies that have such data that they feel is vital to the discussion that, obviously, that they would bring that up and that they would let it be known what kind of limitations there are.

We're not -- we're not sure at this point whether there's going to be very much of that, as we've seen a lot of work go on in ITU work and other places where there's been a limited set of data that was all that was really necessary to get the formulating and outcome. So we're -- at this point, we're not putting out a general policy telling everybody how to do that.

We'd certainly like to get as much out on the table as possible, but if an agency feels they get to the point where a key factor in coming to a solution is something they can't release, then we'll -- we will certainly deal with that and may have to limit the group.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: 1 Thank you, 2 Janice, for raising questions on foreign participation in database. 3 4 Any other comments on the brief 5 reports? 6 Thank you. 7 CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay. Next, 8 we're going to move to the NTIA evaluation and 9 the CSMAC recommendation regarding 10 interference and dynamic access subcommittee. MR. NEBBIA: This is Karl. 11 12 put together a table going through all the 13 recommendations in that report and, 14 interesting enough, there's a report dating from November 10, 2010, so it pre-dates some 15 of your involvement here. 16 17 We have noted, however, that the unlicensed group, and others along the way, 18 19 have, in fact, referred to some of the 20 recommendations in this report. 21 We're running a little bit behind 22 schedule here today so I think, just

generally, I'd like to say that -- that we've tried to give a -- you know, a good explanation of what we think of the recommendations as they were, you know, laid out in this report. Most of them we think certainly are things that we will continue to do, things like guard bands, obviously a part of our tool chest with the new services.

Of course, I think there is a general expectation that the new service provides the guard band, but I'm not sure that we can enforce that in every case, particularly if somebody participates in an auction and they're paying for spectrum right up to the boundary. We would expect that creating a guard band may not be the right -- you know, expecting it to come out of their spectrum may not be the right thing.

We've also found in some of these cases that there are choices that can be made in that sharing environment where, instead of establishing a guard band, we take some other

approach, it may be down tilting antennas, it may be selecting a different frequency in those areas where we're having interference.

And some of you may have seen recently, we just have completed a report dealing with this adjacent band interference problem between the communications systems below 2690 and weather radar systems above 2700.

And, once again, there are cases where filtering the signal along that boundary was the only solution, but there are also lots of other approaches that could be taken and, certainly, fixed in a location-by-location basis not one that required a general rule that says everybody has to have guard bands and those sorts of things.

on what the virtual guard bands are, and we may need to spend a little bit more time looking at that. The same thing pertaining to this concept of data technology which, once again, it's not that easy for the feds to be

changing technology. They have but,
nonetheless, I think most of these
recommendations, I think, we can -- you know,
we can work with, and are certainly within the
frame work of what we're -- you know, what
we're doing.

We do -- as indicated, there's a recommendation that we should examine the application of DSA technologies for sharing and increase that use. Once again, we have certain, you know, limitations on the amount of resources we have for moving that forward.

On the other hand, there are other groups. The NITRD WSRD group this morning are looking at how to expand those test capabilities and opportunities so we may see more on that in the future. The PCAST report cited a concept they called "test cities" which is another new interesting idea.

We're going to continue the progress on our spectrum sharing testbed that's working in one particular band but,

once again, certainly some of the limitations there are due to the amount of resources that we can apply to it. Some of them are due to the fact that it's -- for some manufacturers, it's a new thing to come into an environment where all those characteristics are being tested of their devices.

So we've got a number of recommendations that you've made here where, unfortunately, we've had to cite the reality that doing this work has not been placed in our appropriations, so you'll see some of those there. And they're not in the budget for 2013. That's in front of Congress right now. So those things are -- you know, there's just some realistic aspects about it.

As the talk about the database issues, I think once again, realistically, NTIA controls the federal database. The challenge oftentimes is that even though we hold the database, the information belongs to the agencies; and, therefore, we can't make

the GMF data, even the non-classified data that is FOI exempt -- that's how it's marked at the current time -- we can't make that available without the agency's participation.

So as we get into all the recommendations related to a database, there at least seemed to us the assumption that the federal database could be made available, and that assumption, of course, doesn't play out in reality. So until something changes along that line, you know, we will be, I think, handcuffed in some of those areas.

And so I think at this point -oh, there's another section dealing with
harmonized spectrum, and I think that is
certainly an area that we're looking toward.

I think everybody has to recognize what
harmonization generally means. Certainly,
from my experience, the United States often
jumps out in front in terms of implementing
innovative concepts, new bands. We generally
are willing to step forward in doing that, and

we make frequency decisions as quickly as possible to get those systems implemented.

The challenge that creates is that then the rest of the world looks at what we've done. They obviously have other market motivations and other motivations, so what we frequently find is the thing that we've set out, and it can be the 700 MHz band plan, it can be decisions that we've made about where we're putting wireless broadband, both in the past and the future. We find them, I think, making an effort to check our advancements by coming up with a contrary solution and, therefore, putting into question the direction we've taken.

So then when you start talking in terms of harmonization, they're call is for us to change to become what they want to do, not the other way around, so we have to realize the issue of harmonization is kind of a two-edged sword.

Certainly, from the DoD

perspective, harmonization always means they
end up with less spectrum because nobody's
harmonizing military, they're only
harmonizing, you know, commercial uses, and so
on. So I think we need to, you know, consider
that. And I think that's probably all I feel
like I need to go into in detail.

I know most of you just probably saw this last week when it popped up. So I'm happy to give you more time, and if you want to come back at the next meeting with any questions about what we're implementing, that's certainly a satisfactory way for us.

CO-CHAIR FONTES: I think that will probably be the best approach. It is time to read this and review it carefully, and then where there are concerns based on your comments, then we can bring them up at the next meeting.

MEMBER TRAMONT: Actually, who are the co-chairs of that committee -- of the committee that made those recommendations?

items scheduled for 3:45 so we're just a

little bit behind, and I will talk fast. So,

first of all, I want to bring everybody up-todate that the FSMS phase one implementation

has begun, so we're actually starting that

process of moving to the FSMS on the

unclassified side, and this involves enabling

the agencies to implement the data through new

mechanisms. So the process is beginning of

this transition and that's good news for us to

finally get the system moving.

The phase two and three will be following along but, anyway, I think that's a major step for us and, once again, the new data coming in, the new data checks will be more substantial. We will have issues with some of the agencies in transferring over to the new system because there's security, IT security issues that we have to walk through there, but it is currently available to them to use.

Within that, we also noted earlier

1 that we have changed our own rules.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

system.

2 Everything's signed off. The only thing that hasn't quite happened yet is the updating of 3 what's called Spectrum 21, which is an 4 5 internal component of our current system that provides them the place for them to 6 7 electronically put in their name and 8 verification of what's going on. 9 certainly the agreement that they're going to 10 do that, that there's going to be a contact point in each agency who verifies that the 11 12 assignment was necessary and the data was accurate is going to be inserted into the 13

We also wanted to bring to your attention -- most of you probably seen it, at least through the trade press -- the letter that we received from the Hill requesting data on federal operations. It's broken out into a couple -- certainly, two major questions:

The one asking us through three different band ranges, 300 MHz, the 3 GHz, 1755 to 1850, and

So that, I think, is progress.

then the smaller band up to 1780, basically asking us for assignment counts and, you know, who they are linked to, whether they are space-based, air-based, or ground-based and then broken out by the frequency ranges. So that item is probably well within our grasp to do an assignment count.

The second item becomes a little bit more challenging and, certainly, it would be interesting if you had any thoughts on what that means and how we would go about doing that, maybe even on a non-federal perspective; but, once again, trying to come up with something that states the amount of spectrum.

Once again, spectrum is a multidimensional concept. We don't give agencies
whole bands or blocks of spectrum, we give
them locations, characteristics under their
authorization, and so on. So that one will
certainly be more challenging. If you have
any thoughts on how that can be reasonably
done, just any thoughts at the moment before -

MEMBER GIBSON: Well, yes, this is Mark Gibson. What about just telling them the number of assignments?

MR. NEBBIA: That's the first question. So we --

MEMBER GIBSON: Well, then tell them the side of the assignment.

MR. NEBBIA: So I think one of the possibilities is that you can, in fact, take the number of assignments, you can link their bandwidth to them. It doesn't necessarily, once again, convey the idea whether they're a nationwide assignment, whether they are a very geographically restricted assignment, it's just not something that lends itself to a good number.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Do you find that the number of ones that have a certain radius -- so one thing on the, you know, the commercial, the FCC side, they use MHz-pops but I'm not sure that that's a reasonable

thing to think about for -- for defense things
but --

MR. NEBBIA: Yes, the pops was very appropriate.

MEMBER GIBSON: Well, it would seem that it's left, you know, to your own interpretation but, I mean what Rick was saying is, you know, it seems to make sense, I think it's a challenge but I also think it's doable. You know, the commission has done it before, but I can't remember when, but I do remember them undergoing exercises at some point to try to do something similar to this, and I forget the bands.

It might have been -- I forget the bands, but we tried to look at forgiven carriers, how much spectrum they had, you know, for given areas. So, you know, it's not intractable, it just needs -- I think you need some boundary conditions and definition.

MR. NEBBIA: Okay. Any other thoughts before I move on -- yes, sir.

MEMBER ROBERSON: Yes, just actually a couple questions. One in the previous topic, do we have a time line for phase one complete, phase two start, phase three start?

MR. NEBBIA: There are. I don't have them with me but, yes, there are schedules laid out for all those -- you know, and we would probably provide those schedules -- there's overlap between them but, you know --

MEMBER ROBERSON: And then it's a question that's not really for you, it's really for Congress, but why would they use the 300 to 3 GHz and then cut out the band that is part of the 300 to 3 GHz, and then a part that's part of the 1755 to 1850, because it's really -- the latter two are redundant. They're actually covered by the first question. So I don't know why they would have used that structure.

MR. NEBBIA: I mean, certainly,

informational dumps is always easiest if you break things at clean band edges for one thing. That's always helpful. One thing we, I think, do recognize that within the 1755 to 1850 band, almost all of the uses are the same as those within the limited bands is that the system's operating across the entire spectrum, I think with the exception of the precision guided munitions don't operate down on that lower portion.

So if we're talking about times of systems operating, the reports will look very much alike. I would expect that the assignment counts of the 25 MHz will approximately be 20 to 25 percent of the total 95 MHz.

I think, certainly, that the difficulties in looking at the 300 to 3 GHz, that's much more difficult. If you're going across lots of different kind of spectrum, but we can certainly give assignment counts in

that range. One of the things that -- the odd things that comes up with those that deal with science services, we have been getting the radio astronomers and some of the other passive users to actually get assignments for or register their operations.

The problem in our database is they're all zero hertz. So you multiply the number of frequencies by the zero hertz and it still comes out to be zero when, in fact, they've got bands that they occupy.

MEMBER GIBSON: Okay. It's Mark again. One quick question. Your assumption is that this is spectrum used from transmitter side, not spectrum that the receivers can see?

MR. NEBBIA: That's another good question because we do have bands, maybe not in this range that are -- well, the passive ones are receive only, but even on the -- like I said, we get up in the 4 GHz with the radar altimeters, there are no records there. Or if we look at the weather satellite downlink

band, the key factor there wasn't so much the specific sites but at least a portion of the band, the fact that everybody's brother bought a satellite receiver to get the weather information, and whether it's police stations or local TV stations or universities, and so on.

And so those things play into it as a difficulty in trying to calculate this kind of number. But in line with this, just so everybody knows, and I know you have heard about the Energy and Commerce Committee folks working on these spectrum working groups and they are meeting, they are calling in representatives from the FCC and NTIA and Department of Defense, and we're making presentations to them so that's actively underway.

And the last thing I wanted to mention is ask Peter Tenhula briefly to let you know what's going on, on the NTIA's work on the technical panel and dispute resolution

board that we're required by the Middle Class
Tax Relief Act.

MR. TENHULA: Hi, this is Peter

Tenhula, NTIA, and just want to provide an update on actually some recommendations that came out of CSMAC a few years ago regarding the improving the process for identifying spectrum for future reallocation or sharing — and that made it into the law, the 2012 Tax

Relief Act — specifically provided significant improvements and modifications to the Commercial Spectrum Enhancement Act, also known as CSEA.

Some of the improvements involving authorizing transfers from the spectrum relocation fund for a much wider array of costs incurred by the federal agencies that have to relocate. It also added the concept of sharing costs and getting those reimbursed. It also included in the list of costs that are reimbursable are pre-auction planning, using alternative technologies, using state-of-the-

art systems, research, engineering studies,
economic analysis, and coordination with
auction winners. All of those are not covered
under the spectrum relocation fund.

Some processes were also put in place, I think, pursuant to the recommendations to improve transparency and accountability, specifically involving specifying contents for new agency transition plans. So a band that has been reallocated from federal to non-federal use, either on an exclusive or a shared basis, in order to get these reimbursements, they have to have a -- the agencies have to have a transition plan.

These transition plans are then reviewed by a technical panel. The technical panel is made up of three folks, one appointed by NTIA, one appointed by OMB, and one appointed by FCC. The first technical panel serves 18-month terms will be in place as of August 20th, and we're also developing the mechanisms for capturing the transitions

1 plans.

The Act requires us to come up with a common format, or templates, for the NCC use in preparing their transition plans and, you know, part of the template and the format is to ensure that classified and sensitive information is protected as well.

Part of the -- I mentioned the technical panel and other part of the improvements involve a dispute resolution board that would be established when, and if, there is a dispute between non-federal and federal entities in implementing those transition plans.

So a lot of thought went into preauction planning, the transition process
itself, and then even the implementation of
these transition plans. And our
implementation right now is kind of focusing
on those transition plans, the contents of
those, and that's going to be in the context
of where those rules take place -- or they're

contained in Annex "O" of the NTIA manual -and two other rules involve the workings of
the technical panel and the dispute resolution
board, and so we recently issued a notice of
proposed rulemaking on those two aspects of it
and comment on that. Those proposed rules are
due August 1st. That's it.

Any questions?

Thank you.

2.0

CO-CHAIR FONTES: I want to thank
Karl and Peter for an update. Are there any
questions based on their update?

Okay, the next one that we have on our agenda today is committee questions and discussion. So I've got questions coming from the committee. I thought that we had a few earlier, but go ahead.

MEMBER ALDER: Larry Alder again.

Just one more question is on the whole 1755 of the subcommittee. I ended up getting disconnected from the e-mail chains along the way. I don't know if that happened to other

members. I sent in my list of preferred
things, never heard anything from anybody and
didn't know what was going on. What is the
mechanism -- and that's actually fine. I'm
happy with that outcome.

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR FONTES: We'll get people over there to figure this out.

(Laughter.)

MR. NEBBIA: At this point, we've provided you the leadership structure for the groups, so if you want to be in one of those groups, the easiest thing, I think, is for you to contact them and say, I want to participate in your group as opposed to --

MEMBER ALDER: So I guess that what happened is if you weren't actually on the CSMAC mailing list, so some names got dropped, mine got dropped, and I just confirmed -- I wasn't getting those e-mails. So I don't know if you're going to use the mailing list to all CSMAC or just to

1 individuals, but I think that something 2 happened in there and just wasn't sure. So there will be just going forward just contact 3 the group chairs that have been named? 4 5 MR. NEBBIA: I think that would be 6 the easiest way and, in fact, one of the group 7 chairs, it almost seemed in working group 8 five, was it seemed like they're mailing out 9 the list to everybody. I was getting them 10 all, and I've never signed up for any of the groups, so I don't know, but that's -- that 11 12 would be the easiest route if you're missing--CO-CHAIR FONTES: 13 Did that answer 14 your question? 15 MEMBER ALDER: Yes, thank you. 16 CO-CHAIR FONTES: Are there other questions from the committee? 17 18 Okay. Great. Thank you. 19 CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Now we have an 20 opportunity for any public comment about -- as

we put out the procedures of public

participation. So the subject matter is

21

22

listed in the agenda, if there was any public comment in the room first? Is there anyone in the room that would like the speak? Okay. Is there anyone on the telephone who would like to speak?

MR. SNYDER: Yes, it's Jim Snyder.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Okay, Jim?

MR. SNYDER: So it's Jim Snyder from the Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics at Harvard University, and my comments relate to the CSMAC working group. I'd like to get some clarification about some information about the working groups.

Today's agenda included contact information about the working committees in quite a bit of detail, but it's not clear to me if all the industry members are listed there.

Are their meetings public? And are all the informal and formal industry members posted on that list?

It certainly listed quite a bit of

information, but I have to think that there are industry members that are not listed there. So if I could get some clarification about that, I would appreciate it.

And then I have a few other questions about the working groups.

MR. NEBBIA: The -- certainly, all of the participants are not on the list that you have. They are, in fact, contacting the co-chairs directly so that's -- they are not on the list that you have.

MR. SNYDER: Okay, I would suggest that that's a problem. And then are there meeting dates posted anywhere? They certainly had a number of meetings but I haven't seen any postings of their meetings. I would like to attend at least one of their meetings but, of course, I can't unless the information is publicly posted.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Again, I think as Karl suggested to Larry, contacting the group leaders to get the information about the

committee meetings will allow you to understand when they are, and I think that would be good for us to make sure that these are well-known as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SNYDER: Yes, I think that's impractical to contact them, so I think you have to either post them or assume that they are, as a practical matter, private.

Now I'd like to also note that if the industry wants re-licensees to the spectrum in the name of the public good, you need to convince the public you're acting in the public interest, which seems to be pretty reasonable. To build that trust, I would suggest you need to operate transparently and with accountability, and then I mean by this, not just as a public facade but for real, and that means complying with the laws and the ethics laws. It means not attacking those who speak to have those laws enforced or turning a blind eye while others engage in such behavior.

1

(Simultaneous speaking.)

2

3

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON:

that that's something that's not on the agenda

No, I think

Karl's point

4 for the day. The working group stuff and

5 getting the contact information for the

6 working groups is very appropriate, but then

7 throwing in other things like that, I think we

8 can have you take up at another time.

9

MR. SNYDER: Well, Karl, for

10

example, said, you are always safe by giving

11

them nothing, say, and, you know, Janice

12

raised issues about coming -- what time to

close down with degree of openers, so at least

13 14

procedural --

food.

15

about giving them nothing was in reference to

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON:

17

16

Okay. Well, working 18 MR. SNYDER:

19

group number two asked a procedural question,

20

and then Karl said, You're always safe by

21

giving them nothing. The attitude that I feel

22

that, you know, has --

1 (Simultaneous speaking.)

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Jim, let's --

3 let's stick to the agenda, please.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SNYDER: Yes, but let me just also note, finally, in conclusion on this subject is the last meeting, it was very clearly stated that the procedural issues are relevant and public comments, which is the norm at FACA proceedings, and this was a unilateral change of policy. And it's really been now since last May of 2011, it really has been for one reason -- for technical problems, last meeting, the meeting was closed -- there really hasn't been any opportunity, and there's no other vehicle to do it than at these meetings, and it's not as though you're overwhelmed with public participation.

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Jim, if you'd like to look at the very last bullet point on the participation policy, there is an opportunity for a public comment on this stuff, just not in the public comment period

at the meetings, but there is --1 2 (Simultaneous speaking.) 3 MR. SNYDER: -- comments are not posted online, for example, like the PCAST 4 5 comments, they are posted publicly and yours are not, so it's a different type of public 6 7 the way you've set it up, quite qualitatively would be different. 8 9 So, okay, I've had my piece and 10 I've -- you know, I suppose that if you're within your powers to restrict such comments, 11 12 but it clearly is implicit, the members of CSMAC have many procedural questions that came 13 14 up repeatedly today, and there's certainly, in 15 any type of democratic process --16 (Simultaneous speaking.) 17 Thank you very CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: 18 Is there anyone else who would like to much. 19 make a comment from the public on the phone? 20 I think we will not go till Okay. 21 4:40 a.m. before the next agenda item.

(Laughter.)

22

(Laughter.)

2.0

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: So I think this is just a notice of the schedule -- the next scheduled meeting so that you can get those on your calendar. And if there's any other -- not any other comments, I think we're --

MEMBER TRAMONT: Can I make a quick comment?

CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Bryan, yes.

MEMBER TRAMONT: This is Bryan

Tramont. I just want to welcome a number of students from CU who are part of our structure and policy course who, rather than going to class today, had the opportunity to sit around this table and listen to all of us.

So if students can raise your hands, excellent. And I encourage the members of CSMAC and the members of the public to visit with the students. This is their learning -- this is an opportunity to see

1	public policymaking up close and personal.
2	And so Dale and I were excited and our co-
3	teacher Jill Van Matre in the back. We were
4	excited to be able to bring the students in
5	and have them experience this firsthand. So
6	I'm sure it wasn't planned as we had forecast
7	but anyway. Just wanted to acknowledge their
8	presence.
9	And also David Donovan has agreed
10	to pick up the ball on the one thing that we
11	talked about.
12	CO-CHAIR ROSSTON: Fantastic.
13	Thank you. And we do welcome the students
14	here. Yes. Anything else?
15	I think we stand adjourned.
16	Thank you everyone.
17	(Whereupon, the above-entitled
18	matter went off the record at 4:23 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	

ability 40:21 43:5         ad 119:9         46:3         125:5 126:18,22         120:13 147:16           43:14 51:9 97:11         31:9 32:5 38:20         46:3         125:5 126:18,22         125:5 126:18,22         120:13 147:16           able 21:15 22:2         41:22 52:11 53:14         46:3         affect 62:17         130:19 134:10         apparently 44:1           31:22 44:18,18         67:2 105:5 124:21         afferming 27:10         170:18,18 171:16         appear 138:4           53:14 76:14 79:22         127:4 128:12,18         129:15 141:15         agencies 18:3,17         alerted 51:2         appear 138:4           101:14 138:19         added 167:18         adding 125:4         116:2,19 138:7         allays 58:5         Apple 129:3           180:4         addition 96:16         158:8,17 160:16         167:17 168:14         agency 27:9 42:22         allow 19:5 116:17         applicable 20:18         applicable 20:18         applicable 20:18         application 152:9         ap	A	activity 14:1 18:1	Advisory 1:4,11	118:6 120:5 121:4	77:1 82:1 98:7
43:14 51:9 97:11   147:20			•		
Additional R8:19.20	•			,	
abie 21:15 22:2   31:22 44:18,18   67:2 105:5 124:21   afternoon 5:4 6:8   agence 18:3.17   27:22 30:15 49:19   allerted 5::2   appears 69:11   appears 69:1				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
31:22 44:18,18 53:14 76:14 79:22 17:41 28:12,18 101:14 138:19 141:14 143:5 180:4 above-entitled 94:13 180:17 absolutely 55:2 71:5 acceptance 133:8 accepting 61:8 13:8 15:22 23:13 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5 accomplished 73:6 accomplished 73:6 accomplished 73:6 accomplish 73:9 141:5 accomplished 73:6 acco					
S3:14 76:14 79:22   127:4 128:12,18   129:15 141:15   129:15 141:15   143:5   140:14 143:5   140:14 143:5   140:14 143:5   180:17   140:16 143:6   140:16			C	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
101:14   138:19	,				
141:14 143:5   180:17   adding 125:4   162:19 138:7   Alliance 2:1   applicable 20:18					append 50:20
180:4   above-entitled   94:13 180:17   addition 96:16   17:18   17:15   17:15   additional 88:19,20   acceptance 133:8   accepting 61:8   a					
above-entitled 94:13 180:17 absolutely 55:2 71:5 acceptance 133:8 accepting 61:8		adding 125:4	116:2,19 138:7	•	
94:13 180:17 absolutely 55:2 acceptance 133:8 accepting 61:8 access 4:12 58:17 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5 75:17 91:13 149:10 accident 41:14 accommodate 70:18 accomplished 73:6 accomplished 73:6 accomplished 73:6 accomplished 73:6 accomplished 73:6 accountability 168:8 175:16 accurate 7:21 21:8 accomplished 73:6 accurate 7:21 21:8 accident 40:6 accident 40:16 accident 40:6 accident 40:16		C	148:2 153:22	<b>allow</b> 19:5 116:17	
117:8		addition 96:16	158:8,17 160:16	175:1	application 152:9
71:5 acceptance 133:8 13:8 15:22 23:13 acceptance 133:8 15:22 23:13 acceptance 13:8 15:22 13:4 17:5:11 acceptance 13:8 13:12 acceptance 13:8 13:12 acceptance 13:8 13:12 acceptance 13:8 13:12 acceptance 13:12		117:8	167:17 168:14	allowing 83:21	<b>applied</b> 24:3 57:3
acceptance 133:8 accepting 61:8 access 4:12 58:17         88:22 125:6 address 12:22 13:4 loses 4:12 58:17         43:15 71:19 loses 4:15 9:10 loses 4:12 58:17         43:15 71:19 loses 4:15 9:10 loses 4:12 23:13 loses 4:12 58:17 55:17         43:15 71:19 loses 4:15 9:10 loses 4:15 9:10 loses 4:15 9:10 loses 4:12 loses 4:12 loses 4:12 saccess 4:12 58:17 55:17         43:15 71:19 loses 4:15 9:10 loses 4:15 loses 4:	· ·	additional 88:19,20	agency 27:9 42:22	89:8 110:4	apply 23:21,22
accepting 61:8 access 4:12 58:17 58:21 61:6 62:2 58:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5         address 12:22 13:4 168:9 168:9 168:9 168:9 168:17 168:9 175:17 91:13 149:10 29:9 41:21 42:8 29:9 41:21 42:2 29:16:21 167:2 29:1	· · · · ·		43:15 71:19	<b>all-day</b> 144:22	
188   18   19   29   4   12   12   18   18   19   29   4   12   12   18   29   12   14   18   18   19   29   12   14   18   18   19   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   29   12   14   16   18   19   29   29   12   14   16   13   29   20   20   20   20   20   20   20		address 12:22 13:4	148:17 159:11	<b>alter</b> 50:6 99:10	appointed 168:17
S8:21 61:6 62:2 63:8,13 73:5	1 0	13:8 15:22 23:13	168:9	<b>altered</b> 106:11	168:18,19
53:8,13 73:5   75:17   addressed 15:9   149:10   49:7 62:8   173:1,14 176:3   165:21   49:10   addresses 30:10,11   addressing 50:16   70:18   accompany 50:4   accomplish 73:9   141:5   addequate 39:15   adjacent 151:6   adjourned 180:15   adjusting 130:11   adminstration achieving 20:4   acministration achieving 20:4   administrator 3:8 achieving 20:4   acknowledge 5:13   180:7   actionable 116:12   actionable 116:12   actionable 116:12   actionable 116:12   actionable 116:12   actionable 116:12   advanced 2:15   advanced actionable 116:12   advanced 2:15   advanced 2:15   advancements   166:17   addresses 30:10,11   134:20   170:3 178:21   173:1,14 176:3   177:3 178:21   173:1,14 176:3   177:3 178:21   173:1,14 176:3   177:3 178:21   10:16   American 1:1,23   approach 42:21   50:8 65:13 68:4   appreciated 137:12   approach 42:21   50:8 65:13 68:4   appreciach 13:23   10:16   American 1:1,23   approach 42:21   50:8 65:13 68:4   appreciach 137:12   approach 42:21   50:8 65:13 68:4   appreciach 13:23   approach 42:21   50:8 65:13 68:4   appreciach 137:12   approach 42:21   appreciach 13:22   10:13   approach 42:21   50:8 65:13 68:4   appreciach 13:23   approach 42:21   appreciach 13:23   10:16   American 13:12   appreciach 13:23   10:16   American 13:12   appreciach 13:22   160:13   appreciach 13:23   10:16   American 13:12   appreciach 13:22   160:14   appreciach 13:23   10:16   American 13:12   appreciach 13:22   160:14   appreciach 13:23   10:16   American 13:12   app		29:9 41:21 42:8	agency's 154:4	alternative 167:22	appreciate 37:12
T5:17 91:13   149:10		51:17 55:17	<b>agenda</b> 7:8 48:7	altimeters 42:4	40:18 107:2 174:4
149:10   accident 41:14   addresses 30:10,11   adgresate 79:11,20   Americans 101:21   amount 15:1 43:7   70:15 75:22   110:11 113:22   152:11 153:2   110:11 113:22   152:11 153:2   110:11 113:22   152:11 153:2   140:15,16 121:16   aggregated 64:2   aggregation 135:20   agg 56:12 167:6   aggregation 135:20   agg 56:12 167:6   aggregation 135:20   agg 65:12 167:6   aggregated 64:2   aggregation 135:20   agg 65:12 167:6   aggregated 64:2   analog 34:18   analog 34	,	addressed 15:9	134:20 170:14	165:21	appreciated 137:12
accident 41:14 accommodate 70:18         addressing 50:16 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 129:16,17 75:1 130:14,15,20 accomplish 73:9 141:5         accomplish 73:9 130:14,15,20 adds 36:22 adequate 39:15 adjourned 180:15 adjourned 180:15 adjourned 180:15 adjusting 130:11 administration 180:18 32:14 159:13 achieving 20:4 acknowledge 5:13 180:7 acronym 40:2 acting 175:12 action 84:20 140:16 actionable 116:12 actionable 116:12 actively 100:3 166:17         addresses 30:10,11 aggregate 79:11,20 adgregate 79:11,20 aggregated 64:2 aggregated 64:2 aggregated 64:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 64:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 64:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 4:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 64:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 4:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 4:2 aggregated 4:2 aggregated 4:2 aggregated 4:2 aggregated 4:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 4:2 aggregated 4:2 aggregated 4:2 aggregated 4:2 aggregated 4:2 aggrega		49:7 62:8	173:1,14 176:3	America 1:1,23	approach 42:21
70:18 accompany 50:4 accomplish 73:9 141:5 accomplished 73:6 accountability 168:8 175:16 accurate 7:21 21:8 32:14 159:13 achieving 20:4 acknowledge 5:13 180:7 acknowledge 5:13 acronym 40:2 acting 175:12 action 84:20 140:16 actionable 116:12 actively 100:3 166:17  75:1 129:16,17 130:14,15,20 130:14,15,20 131:19 adds 36:22 adgregation 135:20 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 64:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregation 135:20 aggregation 135:20 aggregation 135:20 aggregation 135:20 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 64:2 aggregation 135:20 aggregated 64:2 aggregation 135:20 agg		<b>addresses</b> 30:10,11	177:3 178:21	10:16	50:8 65:13 68:4
accompany 50:4       130:14,15,20       aggregated 64:2       43:14 56:1 106:12       110:11 113:22       110:11 1	accommodate	C	<b>aggregate</b> 79:11,20		
accomplish 73:9       131:19       aggregation 135:20       152:11 153:2       114:15,16 121:16         accomplished 73:6       accomplished 73:6       adequate 39:15       agree 39:6 75:13,20       analog 34:18       156:15         accourate 7:21 21:8       adjusting 130:11       admin 5:6       asil 7 84:6,10       135:15 136:2       29:7 69:6 70:16         accurate 7:21 21:8       accurate 7:21 21:8       accurate 7:21 21:8       achieving 20:4       administration       15:7,14       agreed 14:3 41:13       and/or 20:14 63:22       29:7 69:6 70:16       70:20 114:18         acknowledge 5:13       180:7       achieving 20:4       acknowledge 5:13       achieving 20:4       achinistrator 3:8       agreed-upon 94:10       agreed-upon 94:10       answer 64:11,14       41:7 61:7 69:18       appropriate 33:14         180:7       acting 175:12       adopt 46:21 117:6       adopt 46:21 117:6       adead 11:14 41:4       answer 64:11,14       72:11 74:6 172:13       97:15,18,21 162:4         action 84:20       140:16       adoption 46:16       adoption 46:16       Airborne 2:19       anterna 33:11       appropriately         actively 100:3       Advanced 2:15       advancements       air-based 160:4       Alder 1:21 10:13       appropriations         166:17       advancements       155:12	70:18				
adds 36:22   adequate 39:15   adgree 39:6 75:13,20   agree 39:6 75:13,20   allowed 39:15   adjusting 130:11   admin 5:6   adjusting 130:11   admin 5:6   administration   administration   15:7,14   administrative   achieving 20:4   action 39:15   adopt 46:21 117:6   adopt 46:16   actionable 116:12   actionable 116:12   actively 100:3   166:17   advanced 2:15   advancements   155:12   and sevents   and/or 20:14 63:22	accompany 50:4	, ,			
accomplished 73:6         accountability         adjacent 151:6         agree 39:6 75:13,20         analog 34:18         156:15           accountability         adjacent 151:6         adjourned 180:15         agree 39:6 75:13,20         analog 34:18         approaches 15:3           accuracy 20:3 36:6         adjusting 130:11         agreed 14:3 41:13         135:15 136:2         29:7 69:6 70:16           accurate 7:21 21:8         administration         15:7,14         agreed 14:3 41:13         and/or 20:14 63:22         19:20 114:18           achieving 20:4         administrative         15:8 35:13,20         Administrator 3:8         alead 11:14 41:4         answer 64:11,14         41:7 61:7 69:18           acting 175:12         adopted 67:9 110:2         adopting 115:7         adopting 115:7         adoption 46:16         advance 18:10         Advanced 2:15         advance 18:10         Advanced 2:15         advancements         Airborne 2:19         anticipate 53:1         appropriations           actively 100:3         166:17         Advancements         155:12         Alder 1:21 10:13         Alder 1:21 10:13         anymore 13:5         164:16	2 0				,
accountability         adjacent 151:6         83:17 84:6,10         analysis 40:4         approaches 15:3           accuracy 20:3 36:6         adjusting 130:11         103:8,21 118:14         135:15 136:2         29:7 69:6 70:16           40:6         admin 5:6         administration         15:7,14         administration         15:7,14         appropriate 33:14           achieving 20:4         administrative         15:8 35:13,20         Administrator 3:8         adopt 46:21 117:6         alopt 46:21 117:6         alopt 46:21 117:6         alopt 46:21 117:6         alopt 46:21 117:6         alopting 115:7         adopting 115:7         adopting 115:7         adopting 115:7         adopting 115:7         aircraft 114:11         antennas 15:11         appropriate 33:12         appropriate 33:14         41:7 66:17         41:4:7 61:7 69:18         69:21 75:22 84:20         69:21 75:2	141:5		O		
accuracy 20:3 36:6         adjourned 180:15         103:8,21 118:14         135:15 136:2         29:7 69:6 70:16           accuracy 20:3 36:6         adjusting 130:11         adjusting 130:12         administrative agreed-14:34         and 180:2         announcement 6:1         answer 64:11,14         41:7 61:7 69:18         answer 64:11,14 <th< td=""><td>accomplished 73:6</td><td>_</td><td></td><td>C</td><td></td></th<>	accomplished 73:6	_		C	
accuracy 20:3 36:6 40:6         adjusting 130:11 admin 5:6         132:21 agreed 14:3 41:13 admin 5:6         168:2 and/or 20:14 63:22 admin/s 12:7         70:20 114:18 119:6 127:7           accurate 7:21 21:8 32:14 159:13 achieving 20:4 acknowledge 5:13 180:7         administrative acronym 40:2 acronym 40:2 act 13:20 108:7 167:2,10,12 169:2 action 84:20 140:16 actionable 116:12 actively 100:3 166:17         132:21 administration administration administration 15:7 adwancements 166:17         132:21 administration 61:14 142:22 administration 180:9         168:2 and/or 20:14 63:22 admin/s 20:14 63:22 administration 180:9         70:20 114:18 119:6 127:7 and/or 20:14 63:22 appropriate 33:14 41:13 announcement 6:1 agreed-upon 94:10 agreed-upon 94:10 agreement 43:4 answer 64:11,14 70:17 answering 18:8 answers 51:16 99:2 at 139:1 159:9 at 139:1 159:9 administration 139:1 159:9 administration 139:1 159:7 administration 139:1 159:7 administration 15:12 advanced 2:15 advancements 16:12 atively 100:3 166:17         134:11 administration 180:9 Administration 180:9 are deduping 11:0 appropriate 33:14 announcement 6:1 an	accountability	•			
40:6       admin 5:6       agreed 14:3 41:13       and/or 20:14 63:22       119:6 127:7         accurate 7:21 21:8 32:14 159:13       administration 15:7,14       administrative 15:7,14       administrative 20:4       administrative 33:14         acknowledge 5:13 180:7       Administrator 3:8 acronym 40:2 act 13:20 108:7 167:2,10,12 169:2 acting 175:12 action 84:20 140:16 actionable 116:12 actively 100:3 166:17       adopted 67:9 110:2 advanced 2:15 actively 100:3 166:17       adoption 46:16 advancements 155:12       Airborne 2:19 air-based 160:4 Alder 1:21 10:13       anicolate 3:22 96:21 97:8 Annex 170:1 appropriate 33:14 41:7 61:7 69:18 appropriate 33:14 answer 64:11,14 72:11 74:6 172:13 answer 51:16 99:2 answers 51:16 99:2 antenna 33:11 appropriately appropriate 33:14 46:11 99:7 130:4 46:11 99:7 130:4 answer 64:11,14 answer 64:11,14 answer 51:16 99:2 antenna 33:11 appropriately appropriately appropriate 33:14 46:11 99:7 130:4 answer 51:16 99:2 antenna 33:11 appropriately appropriate 33:14 answer 64:11,14	168:8 175:16	•			
accurate 7:21 21:8 32:14 159:13         administration 15:7,14         61:14 142:22 180:9         96:21 97:8 Annex 170:1         133:15 151:12         appropriate 33:14 appropria	accuracy 20:3 36:6	•	- '	:	
32:14 159:13       15:7,14       180:9       Annex 170:1       appropriate 33:14         acknowledge 5:13       15:8 35:13,20       agreed-upon 94:10       announcement 6:1       41:7 61:7 69:18         180:7       Administrator 3:8       adopt 46:21 117:6       alead 11:14 41:4       answer 64:11,14       69:21 75:22 84:20         act 13:20 108:7       adopt 46:21 117:6       adopted 67:9 110:2       adopted 67:9 110:2       adopting 115:7       adopting 115:7       adopting 115:7       adoption 46:16       alead 11:14:11       answers 51:16 99:2       antenna 33:11       appropriate 33:14         action 84:20       adoption 46:16       adoption 46:16       Airborne 2:19       anticipate 53:1       appropriate 33:14         actionable 116:12       adoption 46:16       aircraft 114:11       anybody 34:9       153:12         actively 100:3       Advanced 2:15       advancements       air-based 160:4       171:2       approval 112:10         166:17       155:12       Alder 1:21 10:13       anymore 131:5       164:16	40:6		O		
achieving 20:4       administrative       agreed-upon 94:10       announcement 6:1       41:7 61:7 69:18         acknowledge 5:13       180:7       administrator 3:8       agreement 43:4       announcement 6:1       41:7 61:7 69:18         acronym 40:2       adopt 46:21 117:6       ahead 11:14 41:4       answering 18:8       97:15,18,21 162:4         acting 175:12       adopted 67:9 110:2       adoption 46:16       adoption 46:16       Airborne 2:19       antenna 33:11       appropriately         action 84:20       advance 18:10       Advanced 2:15       aircraft 114:11       anybody 34:9       39:13 67:7 85:12       appropriations         actively 100:3       166:17       Advancements       alcraft 12:1 10:13       17:2       anymore 131:5       164:16					
acknowledge 5:13 180:7 acronym 40:2 act 13:20 108:7 167:2,10,12 169:2 action 84:20 140:16 actionable 116:12 actively 100:3 166:17  15:8 35:13,20 Administrator 3:8 139:1 159:9 alopt 46:21 117:6 134:11 adopted 67:9 110:2 adopting 115:7 adopting 115:7 adopting 115:7 adopting 115:7 advanced 2:15 advanced 2:15 advancements 15:8 35:13,20 Administrator 3:8 139:1 159:9 ahead 11:14 41:4 46:11 99:7 130:4 144:6 170:17 aimed 74:7 75:4 alopting 115:7 adopting 115:1 144:6 170:17 aimed 74:7 75:4 antennas 151:1 anticipate 53:1 anybody 34:9 153:12 appropriations 153:12 approval 112:10 approximately 164:16		,			
180:7       Administrator 3:8       139:1 159:9       72:11 74:6 172:13       91:14 95:3,9,21         acronym 40:2       adopt 46:21 117:6       ahead 11:14 41:4       answering 18:8       97:15,18,21 162:4         act 13:20 108:7       134:11       46:11 99:7 130:4       answering 18:8       97:15,18,21 162:4         acting 175:12       adopted 67:9 110:2       adopting 115:7       aimed 74:7 75:4       antenna 33:11       appropriately         action 84:20       adoption 46:16       Airborne 2:19       anticipate 53:1       appropriations         actionable 116:12       Advanced 2:15       aircraft 114:11       anybody 34:9       39:13 67:7 85:12       approval 112:10         actively 100:3       155:12       Alder 1:21 10:13       Alder 1:21 10:13       anymore 131:5       164:16	C				
acronym 40:2       adopt 46:21 117:6       ahead 11:14 41:4       answering 18:8       97:15,18,21 162:4         act 13:20 108:7       167:2,10,12 169:2       adopted 67:9 110:2       144:6 170:17       antenna 33:11       appropriately         action 84:20       adoption 46:16       Airborne 2:19       anticipate 53:1       appropriations         140:16       actionable 116:12       Advanced 2:15       aircraft 114:11       anybody 34:9       153:12         actively 100:3       advancements       air-based 160:4       171:2       approximately         166:17       155:12       Alder 1:21 10:13       anymore 131:5       164:16	<u> </u>	,		· ·	
act 13:20 108:7 167:2,10,12 169:2 acting 175:12 action 84:20 140:16 actionable 116:12 actively 100:3 166:17  134:11  46:11 99:7 130:4 144:6 170:17 aimed 74:7 75:4 Airborne 2:19 aircraft 114:11 airport 30:21 airport 30:21 air-based 160:4 Alder 1:21 10:13  46:11 99:7 130:4 144:6 170:17 antenna 33:11 antennas 151:1 anybody 34:9 39:13 67:7 85:12 appropriately 39:13 67:7 85:12 approval 112:10 approximately 164:16					′ ′
act 13.20 106.7       167:2,10,12 169:2       adopted 67:9 110:2       144:6 170:17       antenna 33:11       appropriately         action 84:20       adopting 115:7       adoption 46:16       Airborne 2:19       anticipate 53:1       appropriations         140:16       actionable 116:12       advanced 2:15       aircraft 114:11       anybody 34:9       153:12         actively 100:3       advancements       air-based 160:4       171:2       appropriately         166:17       155:12       Alder 1:21 10:13       anybody 34:9       153:12         anymore 131:5       approximately         164:16	•	_		$oldsymbol{arphi}$	' '
acting 175:12       adopting 115:7       aimed 74:7 75:4       antennas 151:1       84:13         action 84:20       adoption 46:16       Airborne 2:19       anticipate 53:1       appropriations         140:16       actionable 116:12       Advanced 2:15       airport 30:21       39:13 67:7 85:12       approval 112:10         actively 100:3       advancements       air-based 160:4       171:2       approximately         166:17       Alder 1:21 10:13       anymore 131:5       164:16		_ :			
action 84:20       adoption 46:16       Airborne 2:19       anticipate 53:1       appropriations         140:16       actionable 116:12       actionable 116:12       advanced 2:15       aircraft 114:11       anybody 34:9       153:12         actively 100:3       advancements       air-based 160:4       171:2       approval 112:10         166:17       Alder 1:21 10:13       anymore 131:5       164:16	, ,	_			
140:16       advance 18:10       aircraft 114:11       anybody 34:9       153:12         actionable 116:12       advanced 2:15       airport 30:21       39:13 67:7 85:12       approval 112:10         actively 100:3       155:12       Alder 1:21 10:13       anymore 131:5       164:16	0	1 0			
actionable 116:12 actively 100:3       Advanced 2:15 advancements       airport 30:21 air-based 160:4       39:13 67:7 85:12 approval 112:10 approximately         166:17       155:12       Alder 1:21 10:13 anymore 131:5       164:16		_		_	
actively 100:3 166:17  advancements 155:12 Alder 1:21 10:13 Alder 1:21 10:13 anymore 131:5 164:16					
166:17			_		
100.17	•				
activities 33:15   auvise 34.20   10.13 64.6 112.0   anyway 9.6 36.10   area 24:9 65:21					
	activities 33:15	auvist 54.40	10.13 04.0 112.0	any way 5.0 30.10	a1 Ca 24.7 UJ.21
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

	I		I	I
85:16 101:16	154:9 165:13	<b>a.m</b> 141:17,17	51:20 57:22 58:7	<b>belief</b> 19:13
154:16	astronomers 165:4	178:21	58:16,16 61:1,6	beliefs 55:14
areas 20:10 55:1	attacking 175:19		63:5,8,14,22	<b>believe</b> 5:19 34:13
143:6 151:3	attempt 5:19	<u> </u>	65:14 86:2,19,21	45:14 46:15 61:13
154:12 162:18	attempting 134:3	<b>baby</b> 53:12 109:13	87:7,20 89:7 90:8	94:21 143:14
<b>argue</b> 43:1 102:22	attempts 44:4	<b>back</b> 12:22 18:4	91:13,22 92:19,21	<b>belongs</b> 153:21
argument 52:3	attend 174:17	21:18 23:5 24:14	93:3,8,10 95:9,21	<b>belt</b> 7:7
98:15	<b>attended</b> 7:5 29:3	25:4 39:1 41:17	97:15,21 100:10	<b>best</b> 49:7 50:8
arrangement	144:18	42:5 43:11 44:19	109:20 114:10	54:18,19 57:17
132:20 139:7	attention 13:12	55:18 56:11 57:6	129:7,18 130:11	58:9 79:21 85:15
143:8	61:11 159:16	65:4 67:19 76:4	130:14,18 131:6	132:7 156:15
arrangements	attitude 34:6	77:15,17 80:13,22	131:13 150:7	<b>better</b> 18:14 52:7
112:15 133:2	176:21	94:10,18 98:15	151:15,18 154:21	54:16 62:13 74:18
<b>array</b> 167:16	<b>AT&amp;T</b> 2:17 10:10	102:1 104:17	160:17 162:14,16	75:3 85:12 92:17
ArrayComm 1:25	<b>auction</b> 131:1,3,6,8	110:18 117:4	164:7 165:11,17	<b>beyond</b> 37:14
<b>art</b> 168:1	131:12 150:14	136:21 138:1	bandwidth 22:19	38:13
aside 63:1	168:3 169:16	139:21 156:11	77:12 161:12	<b>big</b> 21:14 79:21
asked 21:21 65:22	audit 28:6 29:18	157:16 180:3	<b>Barker</b> 2:23 10:20	88:18,21 101:3
130:2 157:7	<b>auditing</b> 30:14,16	background 30:20	<b>based</b> 12:19 36:14	105:5
176:19	<b>audits</b> 28:3,9	112:13 121:17	100:13 116:8,20	biggest 37:16
asking 20:5 24:6	August 141:4	backstop 60:3	144:2 156:17	<b>billed</b> 23:20
46:2 159:21 160:2	144:21 168:21	<b>bad</b> 54:1	170:12	<b>bit</b> 21:20 35:8
<b>aspect</b> 37:6 106:21	170:7	<b>ball</b> 101:11,15	bases 20:13	61:15 62:7 63:19
107:18 108:5	authority 49:2	180:10	<b>basic</b> 56:20	76:19 79:1 81:15
138:10	authorization 59:2	<b>ball's</b> 128:14	<b>basically</b> 43:8 49:9	84:15 88:10,15
aspects 153:16	160:19	<b>band</b> 17:5,10 18:9	50:22 55:13 80:7	102:6 136:22
170:5	authorized 63:7,13	42:1,2 51:18	82:14 84:11 85:13	142:8 146:5
assigned 92:13	63:15 73:4 102:17	54:11 58:21,21	89:5 110:3 112:19	149:21 151:19
93:2	102:20	59:3,11 60:13	160:1	158:2 160:9
assignment 24:9,12	authorizing 167:15	62:16 64:5 69:19	<b>basis</b> 30:3,12 72:18	173:16,22
27:22 75:5 159:12	automate 15:2	69:21 70:17 71:12	151:14 168:12	<b>blaze</b> 40:17,18
160:2,7 161:8,14	automated 24:14	71:14,18 72:16	beacon 127:20,20	<b>blind</b> 175:21
161:15 164:15,22	40:8	74:9,10,20 76:5	133:4	<b>blocks</b> 160:17
assignments 161:4	automatically 31:4	84:17 85:6,6	beaconing 119:13	blows 25:2
161:11 165:5	31:7	97:19 113:21,21	beacons 125:8	<b>board</b> 23:22 60:6
<b>Assistant</b> 2:17 3:13	<b>available</b> 21:3 63:4	114:16,16,17	127:16,17 128:5	146:11 167:1
assistants 34:12	112:1 138:20	115:20 123:4,7,7	Beacon's 128:8	169:11 170:4
associate 3:8 79:2	154:4,8 158:20	131:2 133:7	<b>beat</b> 141:16	<b>Bob</b> 75:11 83:9
associated 28:19	avoid 54:2,15 83:6	138:13 150:11,16	beautiful 85:7	84:5
42:3	avoidance 60:3	150:22 151:6	becoming 66:6	<b>bolts</b> 135:21
Association 1:17	avoids 82:1	152:22 155:8	87:12	book 25:2
2:3	aware 21:13 58:11	159:21 160:1	beginning 48:21	booklet 60:12
<b>ASST</b> 5:3	109:17	163:15 164:3,6	158:9	<b>BORTH</b> 1:22
assume 13:4 23:22	<b>awhile</b> 35:16	166:1,3 168:10	<b>begins</b> 106:10	bothers 80:4
28:3 175:7	aye 111:10	bands 14:11,12,16	<b>begun</b> 158:5	<b>bottom</b> 52:17 82:7
<b>assumed</b> 28:4 61:9	ayes 47:18 111:11	14:18 19:2,12,19	behalf 6:22	<b>bought</b> 50:2 83:20
assumption 154:7	134:15	36:6,9,21 37:2	behavior 175:22	166:3
L				

Douldon 1.12 5.4	hudgets 27.15	102.1 166.14	122.19 21 122.17	<b>chart</b> 113:2
<b>Boulder</b> 1:13 5:4	<b>budgets</b> 37:15 <b>build</b> 15:6 24:3	102:1 166:14 calls 34:9 58:1	132:18,21 133:17 133:20 138:2	chart 113:2 chase 25:6
7:15 12:4 13:16				
boundary 37:14	175:14	105:20 107:13	139:7 143:3 148:1	<b>cheap</b> 51:14 60:19
150:15 151:10	Building 1:12	capabilities 26:17	148:16,20 150:6	84:12 85:22 89:1
162:20	<b>build-out</b> 20:16	31:5 55:15 105:5	151:13 152:4	check 7:20 14:2
bounds 38:14	24:21 26:13	121:22 152:16	153:1 154:16,18	17:6 155:12
break 94:7,9,12,17	<b>built</b> 51:9	capability 30:22	155:22 156:13	<b>checking</b> 8:9 28:5
164:3	<b>bullet</b> 82:7 177:19	56:14 93:11 139:6	159:9,20 160:9,20	53:4
breaking 78:12	<b>bunch</b> 7:8 78:19	capable 44:6 51:1	163:22 164:18,22	checks 65:8 158:15
<b>Brian</b> 1:13,16 10:1	79:17,17	capacity 63:4	173:22 174:7,14	chest 150:8
11:18 94:5	<b>burden</b> 25:12 26:9	<b>capturing</b> 168:22	178:14	Chief 1:16 16:16
<b>bridge</b> 5:10,11,11	bureau 107:22	car 86:7,8 100:18	certification 27:5	<b>choice</b> 85:11,12
5:14,22 38:6	bureaucrat 33:22	100:19 109:2,7,8	68:13 108:21	<b>choices</b> 150:20
brief 149:4	burner 42:5	carefully 156:16	cetera 51:10	<b>Chorus</b> 47:18
<b>briefing</b> 22:16 23:6	business 1:21 2:5,6	Carl 2:17 10:9	136:13,14	48:18 111:11
135:14	47:2 49:2,4 81:20	Carolina 2:22	chains 170:21	134:15
<b>briefly</b> 166:20	<b>buying</b> 109:21	carried 106:22	Chairman 1:24	<b>Chris</b> 97:10
<b>bring</b> 112:9 117:4	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$	carriers 162:17	46:13	circulated 48:12,17
148:4 156:18	$\frac{\mathbf{C}}{\mathbf{C} \ 1:22 \ 2:10}$	carry 102:10	chairs 172:4,7	circulating 136:3
158:3 159:15		case 74:13 100:2	challenge 24:18	circumscribed
180:4	Calabrese 1:22	103:5 114:13	26:20 27:4 37:16	51:19
broadband 90:11	10:15,16 52:12,16	150:12	38:3 106:4,15	circumstances
90:12 93:11 138:5	57:5 59:17 72:11	cases 150:20 151:9	153:20 155:3	65:15
155:10	86:14,22 87:14,19	cataloged 51:10	162:9	<b>Cisco</b> 2:16 11:9
<b>broadbands</b> 93:9	91:6 92:18 95:1	category 51:14	challenges 7:11	67:13
broader 123:17	95:12,17 96:8,12	caucus 94:7	24:8	<b>cite</b> 153:10
139:6	96:14,17 97:8	cause 114:5	challenging 160:9	<b>cited</b> 16:5 17:5
broadly 124:9	calculate 166:9	caused 124:1	160:20	152:18
127:14 137:4	calculations 25:17	caveat 129:15	chance 22:2	<b>cities</b> 152:18
<b>Broadway</b> 1:13	calendar 61:16	cell 5:8,8 24:4	<b>change</b> 26:12 42:21	citizens 147:11
broke 14:9	179:7	101:1	43:5,14 76:8	clarification
<b>broken</b> 159:19	call 8:11 9:19,22	censorship 76:20	77:11,12 79:1	137:11 173:12
160:5	17:19 44:1,3,4,5,6		81:21 87:13 95:3	174:3
brother 105:5	45:20 46:4,11	central 34:3	113:22 155:18	clarify 82:10
166:3	47:16 48:3 52:22	<b>certain</b> 31:1 55:1	177:10	124:20
<b>BRUCE</b> 3:18	58:19 61:11 74:22	70:14 80:22 109:5	<b>changed</b> 53:6 159:1	clarity 14:4
<b>Bryan</b> 2:22 10:19	75:13,14 94:22	110:5 132:12	changes 27:15	<b>class</b> 30:4 72:10
12:8 13:6 22:7,13	118:3 122:11	152:11 157:8	99:15 113:10	108:7 167:1
36:7 39:18 46:14	131:21 136:16	161:19	154:10	179:16
80:11 89:14 91:19	141:15,21 142:3,4	certainly 17:20	changing 79:3	classes 75:2
129:14 143:13	143:12 144:2,4,7	18:14 24:9,17	97:20 152:1	classic 52:20 65:2
144:5 145:16	144:9,11,17	26:7 31:14 34:1	channels 53:5	classified 146:19
157:1 179:11,12	145:17 155:17	37:3 38:7 49:15	characteristics	169:6
Bryan's 22:13	called 55:8 60:19	99:16 100:13,18	50:6 66:16 140:18	<b>clause</b> 46:17,18
<b>budget</b> 43:12,14	105:22 152:18	101:5,10 103:12	153:6 160:18	<b>clean</b> 164:3
79:21 153:13	159:4	105:11 106:20,22	charge 41:4	cleaned 14:19
budgetary 43:11	<b>calling</b> 76:11 100:6	107:2,21,21 132:4	<b>CHARIR</b> 143:1	cleanly 142:7
	I	1	Ī	

	<u> </u>		l	l
clear 12:17 24:1	96:20 103:7,19	2:11	concerning 57:21	considerable 63:10
29:11 53:9 62:4	110:15 117:12	communications	concerns 90:7	considerate 40:19
71:5 74:3 81:9,16	139:13 140:8	3:14 151:7	156:17	considerations
114:19 117:12	143:10 145:19	community 99:16	concise 128:3	108:4
128:3 129:21	170:6 172:20	138:17	concluded 21:17	consistent 73:2
151:17 173:16	173:2 177:21,22	<b>company</b> 2:13 3:17	64:12 179:2	75:19
clearinghouse	178:19 179:10	32:13 34:1,16	concludes 49:1	constantly 24:5
63:20	comments 4:3	146:21	68:3	constrained 29:5
<b>clearly</b> 27:7 62:5	11:20 12:15,19	company's 20:12	concluding 57:16	constructed 98:16
108:15 177:7	13:18 47:14 79:2	compared 53:1	conclusion 50:13	construction 20:21
178:12	84:7 96:2 97:22	comparing 52:19	50:18 70:2,19	26:14 31:2,3,5
clientele 31:19	98:2,8 132:1	compatibility 50:6	177:5	Consultant 1:22
<b>clock</b> 55:1	137:18 139:11	complain 122:6	conclusions 67:22	2:2,10
<b>close</b> 51:15 65:19	141:11 149:4	complaining 99:21	conditions 162:20	<b>consumer</b> 59:12,22
147:7 176:13	156:18 173:10	complaints 49:19	conducting 66:15	consumers 53:20
180:1	177:8 178:3,5,11	complete 163:4	conference 1:12	54:20 59:14 60:7
<b>closed</b> 51:19	179:8	completed 151:5	43:17,18,19 44:7	72:3
177:13	Commerce 1:1,4	completely 73:1	44:12,13,20 45:2	<b>contact</b> 103:14
<b>cloud</b> 92:1	3:14 166:12	completes 66:18	45:5,8,12,21 46:6	159:10 171:14
coached 75:2	commercial 20:13	<b>complex</b> 144:13	46:10 144:11	172:3 173:14
codified 116:13	20:20 31:10 40:15	complexity 67:18	confirmed 171:20	175:6 176:5
collaboratively	66:6 117:17 130:3	68:1 69:16	confusing 81:6	contacting 51:1
29:8	156:4 161:21	complicated 55:20	congenial 136:9	65:6 174:9,21
<b>Colorado</b> 2:9 11:11	167:12	66:13	Congress 41:12	contained 28:19
combination 79:16	commission 20:8	complying 175:18	153:14 163:14	170:1
<b>come</b> 17:15 18:2,4	20:12 23:19 30:21	component 105:12	congressional 58:4	<b>content</b> 104:11
20:10 23:11 26:4	31:8 99:10,14	134:5 159:5	Congressperson	contents 168:9
33:7 41:5 50:13	107:22 162:10	comprehensive	106:17	169:20
56:8 62:18 94:7	commission's	18:22 19:15	connected 58:18	context 56:18
94:10 132:6	29:18	computer 2:21	59:9 63:15 72:19	62:12 64:21 67:20
136:20 150:17	committee 1:4,11	35:16	73:5,9 78:2 89:2,6	121:7 169:21
153:5 156:11	4:17 7:19 20:11	Comsearch 2:7	89:11 90:13 93:8	continually 25:22
160:13 169:2	46:3 49:10 50:17	10:22 31:11	93:12	continue 23:4
comes 165:2,10	60:20 62:8 65:20	conceivably 82:20	connectedness	48:22 61:18 93:1
comfortable 71:19	67:2,7 83:19 88:8	concentrate 15:4	81:12	112:16,16 121:11
comforted 56:5	91:1,7,8,10 92:11	concentrations	Connecticut 78:13	145:8 150:6
<b>coming</b> 11:22 39:1	95:6 98:9 123:5	62:16	78:20	152:20
45:9 56:1 58:3	145:13 156:21,22	concept 66:22	connecting 77:3,9	continued 6:15
79:8 88:22 89:1	166:12 170:14,16	101:20 102:4	77:15	continuing 34:17
134:2 136:21	172:17 175:1	151:21 152:18	connection 76:2	38:21 140:20
137:10 148:19	committees 144:14	160:16 167:18	139:18	contractor 32:9
155:13 158:15	173:15	concepts 154:21	connections 101:2	35:4
170:15 176:12	committee's 19:13	<b>concern</b> 80:14,20	<b>cons</b> 63:1	contracts 33:5
comma 128:5	70:19 85:4	91:16 137:1	consider 61:4	contrary 155:13
command 76:1	<b>common</b> 39:10	142:11 157:5	91:11 98:12	<b>control</b> 75:14 76:1
comment 4:19	169:3	concerned 26:2	130:12 131:17	113:22 114:7
16:13 78:6 84:9	Communication	73:11	156:5	119:9,16 120:6,22
	-	-	-	-

	I		1	
121:13,22 127:6	115:2 131:22	157:2,9,17 174:10	<b>D</b> 97:14	56:11 88:10
127:15	137:17 140:16	Co-Founder 1:24	<b>Daily</b> 78:13	123:21 176:4
controller 128:9	159:20 163:2	1:25	<b>Dale</b> 2:8 11:10 12:1	days 6:17
controlling 77:20	<b>course</b> 24:8 27:6	cranks 55:5	75:9 76:6,10 78:7	<b>deal</b> 20:21 49:19,20
controls 120:15	49:11 52:7 99:8	<b>create</b> 38:16 54:13	180:2	56:15 107:7 122:1
153:19	133:4 150:9 154:9	created 98:9	damn 33:20	148:21 165:2
controversial 60:17	174:18 179:15	creates 155:3	<b>Dan</b> 9:3 65:10	dealing 37:17
132:1	<b>court</b> 128:14	creating 150:16	66:19	129:22 151:5
conversations	<b>cover</b> 48:20	creatively 50:16	DANIEL 2:21	154:14
25:15 69:15	covered 5:20	critical 17:11	<b>data</b> 17:5,6 18:14	<b>deals</b> 113:17
<b>convey</b> 161:13	163:19 168:3	105:12 108:12	20:3,13,21 21:7	<b>dealt</b> 84:12 140:16
convince 175:12	covering 86:3	133:13 134:5	22:21 24:13 25:14	<b>DEAN</b> 2:21
<b>COOPER</b> 1:24	covers 52:8 59:17	138:11	25:16,21 27:5,16	debate 145:5
cooperation 111:16	<b>Co-Chair</b> 1:17,20	Crosby 2:1 8:3,17	28:18 36:6 65:4,5	<b>decide</b> 69:18 71:12
115:15	7:13 8:8,16 9:1,18	29:19 30:19 31:14	102:1 136:4	117:17
cooperative 115:18	10:3 11:12,19	35:10 45:19 46:4	146:18,19 147:22	deciding 69:21
139:6	12:6,7 13:11	47:9,10	148:2,11 151:21	decision 17:13
coordination 88:6	43:21 44:17 45:1	<b>crowd</b> 63:20 66:22	154:1,1 158:8,15	decisions 155:1,9
168:2	45:11 46:8,12	crowd-sourcing	158:15 159:12,18	deck 112:2
coordinator 43:17	47:3,7,11,19,22	65:11	database 15:6	<b>defense</b> 32:8 162:1
43:18 44:12,20	48:2,6 82:13 87:9	<b>CSEA</b> 15:17 16:4	36:15,20 39:9,16	166:16
45:2,5,8,12,21	87:16 90:19 91:15	18:1 41:17 62:6	42:11 53:5 64:18	<b>defer</b> 141:13
46:6,10	94:5,16 97:17	167:13	69:4,13 75:15	defied 59:13
<b>copies</b> 48:15	98:1 110:14,17	<b>CSMAC</b> 1:4 4:8,10	76:2,3 77:6,17,20	<b>define</b> 120:16
<b>copy</b> 111:22 115:4	111:2,6,12,14,17	5:12,14 7:16	102:19 103:3	definition 62:4
Corporation 2:12	117:7 118:1,20	21:17 22:17 37:21	104:11 114:11	124:8 162:20
2:25	119:20 120:7	50:12 134:21	117:16 118:16	<b>degree</b> 62:9 63:10
<b>correct</b> 24:13 27:11	125:3,7,13 126:1	149:9 157:17	119:2,7 120:17,21	147:8 176:13
106:18	128:1,6,10 129:19	167:6 171:18,22	121:3 123:10,11	<b>delete</b> 95:15,17
<b>corrected</b> 90:20,21	130:6,10 131:4,11	173:11 178:13	123:13 124:8,10	96:19
correcting 106:13	131:17 134:6,12	179:20	124:12 127:9	deleted 81:19
correction 145:10	134:16,18,19	<b>CU</b> 179:14	128:21,22 129:8	<b>deleting</b> 82:11 83:5
<b>cost</b> 36:13 43:9	135:8 136:11	culprit 80:10	133:3 149:3	128:19
62:2 108:5	137:14 139:10	<b>current</b> 32:1 37:14	153:17,19,21	<b>demand</b> 88:18,20
<b>costs</b> 18:5 43:9	140:5 141:10	38:14 39:14	154:6,8 165:7	88:22
108:7 167:17,19	143:9,16,22	102:20 154:3	databases 28:20	demands 39:12
167:20	145:12 146:7	159:5	42:12 51:2 55:18	democratic 178:15
<b>counsel</b> 3:16 15:19	149:1,7 156:14	currently 5:9 62:6	65:6	<b>Dennis</b> 2:19 11:3
16:16,16,17,22	157:16,21 161:18	158:20	data's 27:11	135:11
41:18,19 137:15	170:10 171:7	customers 31:19	date 25:4 37:14	Department 1:1
<b>Counsel's</b> 16:4,10	172:13,16,19	<b>cut</b> 163:15	158:4	2:18,21 166:16
<b>count</b> 160:7	173:7 174:20	cutting 88:13	dates 174:14	<b>depend</b> 65:16
counter 60:2	176:2,15 177:2,18	<b>CW</b> 33:11	<b>dating</b> 149:14	dependent 46:18
counterpart 60:2	178:17 179:4,11	C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S	<b>David</b> 1:22 2:3 8:4	59:11
counts 160:2	180:12	4:1	8:18 157:13,19	depending 30:3
164:15,22	<b>co-chairs</b> 1:13 4:3		180:9	58:22 114:18
<b>couple</b> 36:2 61:15	147:18 156:21	D	day 24:11,11 35:3	depends 131:9

danloyad 02:22	103:16 110:4	discovered 74:11	96.20 99.4 7	dynamically 70:4
<b>deployed</b> 92:22 <b>Deputy</b> 1:18,19	122:6,14,20 153:7	75:2	86:20 88:4,7 89:17,19,22 90:1	dynamically 79:4
described 124:10	<b>DFS</b> 71:15 72:7,8	discuss 29:16 41:6	93:4,5,16,22	E
description 105:7	72:20 74:22 77:11	112:3	136:15,16 142:1,2	E 1:22 2:1
deserves 62:20	DHS 33:6	discussed 40:7	145:9	eager 23:12
designated 3:18	diagnose 126:8	63:18 111:20	<b>Donovan</b> 2:3 8:4,18	earlier 31:21 42:1
33:10 58:16	127:21	112:8 114:2 117:9	180:9	76:17 90:16 98:20
<b>designed</b> 54:6	diagnosis 125:19	133:1 141:8	<b>Donovan's</b> 157:14	100:1 133:2
desirability 55:18	dialogue 115:9	<b>discussion</b> 4:17	door 52:20,21	158:22 170:17
<b>detail</b> 13:6 156:7	dicier 103:9	29:3 42:9 47:13	53:11 58:2,6	early 61:19 114:9
173:16	dictionary 22:21	104:1 108:11	71:17 98:22	116:16 141:6
<b>detailed</b> 22:21	different 9:10	111:8 116:10,18	100:22 106:13,16	easiest 86:12 164:2
116:8	16:17 60:9 69:5	117:3,5,8 121:17	100.22 100.13,10	171:13 172:6,12
details 135:16	70:3 79:4,8 92:6	122:17 132:11	doors 78:19	easily 79:22
141:22	114:10,13 119:6	134:13 140:21	dotted 27:10	easy 128:19 151:22
determined 43:10	123:17 129:5,6	142:9,17 148:3	double-check	echo 67:15,15
develop 113:4	133:15 145:6	170:15	66:20	economic 1:18
115:10 116:3,12	151:2 159:21	discussions 19:4	<b>doubtful</b> 36:13	168:2
<b>developing</b> 64:4	164:21 178:6,8	23:11 89:20 98:10	Doug 2:11 11:5	economically 70:17
133:20,21 168:21	difficult 50:20	116:6,15,20 134:2	downlink 165:22	economics 52:3
<b>Development</b> 2:5,7	79:10 80:10 146:5	135:19	download 104:7	economy 38:14
<b>device</b> 50:7 51:9	164:20	disposal 140:1	downloads 103:15	edged 155:21
53:1 67:4 68:12	difficulties 164:19	dispute 166:22	downtown 141:4	<b>edges</b> 164:3
72:1,2 74:1 82:17	difficulty 166:9	169:10,12 170:3	Dr 1:16,18,22 2:5	edit 84:4 85:2 94:9
82:20 85:14 100:2	dig 145:1	distance 139:15	2:10,13,15,21	94:10 118:8
100:5 103:3 104:6	dimensional	distilled 112:19	67:11	129:20,20 130:5,7
104:12,12,15	160:16	distinction 52:18	drafting 108:6	<b>editing</b> 97:10
109:19 119:9	direct 116:5,17	57:10	drama 96:6	editorial 110:22
122:18,18 123:20	directing 82:2	distributor 50:7	draw 30:22	edits 94:20 111:16
124:1,4 125:11,17	direction 26:12	division 144:15	drinks 137:9	<b>Edmond</b> 173:9
126:4	39:6 59:7 73:15	doable 162:10	driving 90:1	educate 57:20
devices 49:22 51:1	73:16,19,22	documents 5:19	drop 81:21	105:14
51:14,17 52:1,4,5	103:17 110:3,12	48:11,15	<b>dropped</b> 171:19,19	educating 105:11
53:2,12,20 54:9	133:19 155:14	<b>DoD</b> 6:19 155:22	dropping 81:21	education 58:9
54:11,14 56:21,22	directions 32:15	doing 7:6 9:9 15:6	<b>DSA</b> 152:9	59:22
57:16,22 58:17,18	79:9	15:13 18:13 25:7	due 33:7 35:14	educational 106:2
59:9 60:19,20,22	directly 31:8	28:5 33:11 36:19	153:2,3 170:7	106:21
61:4 62:14 72:10	105:19 146:15	42:6,14 77:6,13	<b>dumb</b> 51:14 52:22	effect 72:22
72:17,19 73:5,8,9	174:10	82:2 112:11	56:21 60:19 84:12	effective 57:19
75:2 83:21 84:12	<b>Director</b> 1:18,19,23	119:13 138:19	85:22 86:2,4	effects 135:20
85:22 86:2,5,17	2:6,8,15	142:11 152:6	88:12 89:1	efficient 116:7
88:12 89:1,2,5,6	disabled 59:6	153:11 154:22	dumps 164:2	efficiently 57:3
89:12 90:13 91:2	disabling 97:1	160:11	dust 25:2	<b>effort</b> 14:10 15:1
91:4,11,21 92:12	<b>disagree</b> 26:18 87:1	dollar 41:15	<b>DYNA</b> 1:25	40:10 106:2
93:2,8 95:7,11,19	disciplined 88:3	dollars 41:16	dynamic 4:11 75:5	155:12
100:8,8,17 101:20	disconnected	Dombrowsky 2:2	116:7 120:4	<b>efforts</b> 7:12 14:17
101:22 102:9,15	170:21	10:7,8 85:17,18	149:10	59:22 139:19
,		, · · · <b>, - ·</b>		
		Į	ı	

<b>eight</b> 24:10,10	6:7 168:1	150:22	<b>excess</b> 97:14	50:21 51:7 93:12
45:22 59:19	Enhancement	establishment	excited 96:3 180:2	106:22 116:4
either 25:5 29:8	167:12	63:19	180:4	128:20
44:1 141:13	enjoying 98:4	<b>estimate</b> 36:11	exclusion 113:7	extreme 124:2
168:11 175:7	enjoying 98.4 ensure 85:15	et 51:10 136:13,14	exclusion 113.7 exclusive 168:12	extreme 124.2 eye 175:21
179:1	116:20 169:6	ethical 137:8	exclusive 108.12 exclusively 63:2	<b>e-mail</b> 9:6 44:9
Electrical 2:21		ethics 173:9 175:19	Excuse 43:17 71:7	143:19 144:8
	ensuring 18:15		<b>execute</b> 16:9	170:21
electromagnetic	entering 114:19	<b>Europeans</b> 109:17 110:10		e-mails 171:20
55:20 56:16	Enterprise 2:1	<b>evaluation</b> 4:10	<b>Executive</b> 1:16 2:8	e-mans 1/1:20
electronic 140:1,21	Enterprises 2:6		Exelon 2:12 11:6	<b>F</b>
electronically	entertain 117:5	21:21 149:8	exempt 154:2	FAA 32:8 107:13
159:7	entire 9:15 36:14	evaluations 9:15	exercises 162:12	FACA 177:9
else's 102:1	36:19 83:19 164:8	event 9:21	exist 24:2 37:5 54:7	facade 175:17
EMC 25:17	entities 31:10 66:7	everybody 11:22	93:1 98:21	
Emergency 1:17	169:13	66:21 95:22 96:1	existence 52:1	face-to-face 135:13
emissions 33:10	entity 71:18	106:8 108:20	existing 72:7 138:5	136:18 141:3
emitter 79:5	entrance 113:11	111:15 133:13	exit 44:4	142:4
<b>emitters</b> 79:17,18	entrant 126:11,12	142:9,14,22	<b>exiting</b> 13:9 44:3	facilitate 139:18
emphasis 25:11	126:13 136:1	147:15 148:15	<b>expand</b> 152:15	facilitating 62:2
81:9,15	entrants 115:10	151:15 154:17	expansion 108:14	<b>facilities</b> 6:20 32:9
employees 26:22	Entrepreneurship	158:3 166:11	<b>expect</b> 37:18 54:16	34:16 147:14,16
enabling 158:7	2:9	172:9	54:17 150:15	fact 25:13 36:8
encounter 84:19	<b>entry</b> 86:6	everybody's 102:9	164:14	38:4,15 43:6 44:6
encourage 179:19	environment 49:11	109:7 147:2 166:3	expectation 38:4	69:3,15 80:5
encouraged 62:11	50:19,22 53:19	Everything's 159:2	38:17 56:18	84:13 85:3,5
107:1	55:20 56:17 64:17	<b>evolve</b> 112:17	116:22 150:10	98:15 100:10
endeavor 31:11	83:16 150:21	121:12,21	expectations 26:4	101:11,16 106:4
64:22	153:5	EWA 2:1	49:16 50:3 59:12	108:20 133:10,12
<b>ended</b> 170:20	envision 146:19	exactly 23:16 77:3	60:7	136:17 145:21
endorsement 83:15	equation 21:15	83:3 107:9 108:1	expected 53:22	149:19 153:4
<b>Energy</b> 166:12	equipment 42:12	140:21	expecting 150:17	161:10 165:10
<b>enforce</b> 50:20 56:9	66:17 110:1	examine 152:8	expects 136:18	166:3 172:6 174:9
66:9 150:12	ergo 124:12	<b>example</b> 30:9 52:19	experience 17:13	<b>factor</b> 148:18 166:1
enforced 175:20	<b>erode</b> 106:10	52:20 61:22 62:15	20:11,13 26:7	<b>fair</b> 15:1
enforcement 11:17	especially 12:1	67:3 71:13 72:6	63:21 105:12	<b>fairly</b> 22:20 26:15
49:10,12 50:10,15	102:10	73:2 118:16	143:3 154:19	140:11 144:13
51:8 52:6 53:17	<b>ESQ</b> 2:22	124:13,16,19,20	180:5	<b>fall</b> 65:7
54:1,5 57:15 60:3	essence 51:20 52:4	125:6,8,17 127:8	experiencing 98:19	fallback 63:4
60:4 66:15 73:10	99:9	127:10 176:10	experiments	familiar 28:7
73:11 75:7,15	essentially 16:3	178:4	119:11	Fantastic 180:12
107:22 113:9	20:5,6 75:1 86:16	examples 20:19	experts 116:6	far 15:16 29:18
120:18 136:13	115:9 139:16	119:3,4 120:19	expiring 33:1	38:7 41:11 64:21
138:17 139:19	establish 20:3	125:2 127:11	explanation 150:3	66:13
140:4	46:19	130:2	explicit 73:18	fashion 88:3
enforcing 50:8	established 37:1,3	excellent 135:17	explicitly 39:2	fast 14:13 135:15
engage 175:21	169:11	179:19	export 34:20	158:2
engineering 2:2,21	establishing 36:5	exception 164:9	extent 23:12 32:2	fault 127:21
	Complianing 50.5	cheepuon 104.)		
			<u> </u>	I

	ı	I	Ī	Ī
faulty 72:2	<b>Feldman</b> 2:4 11:1,1	132:3 137:18	143:1	108:11 115:1
<b>favor</b> 47:17 111:9	90:15,16	140:9 141:3 158:3	<b>Fontes</b> 1:13,16 9:18	152:12 154:22
134:14	<b>felt</b> 13:1 15:12,16	161:5 163:19	10:1 11:19 12:6	172:3
<b>FCC</b> 6:22 24:1	15:19 22:18	168:19 173:2	43:21 44:17 45:1	<b>found</b> 95:3 96:8
25:16 33:2 34:2	107:20	firsthand 180:5	45:11 46:8,12	102:2,5 109:16
34:20 40:16 54:21	<b>Fi</b> 100:15	<b>five</b> 19:17,18 22:18	48:2 90:19 91:15	150:19
55:14 56:6,12	<b>field</b> 27:16 96:6	57:8 61:17 84:10	94:5,16 97:17	Foundation 1:23
57:19 58:15 60:8	107:15	85:20 94:11 95:4	98:1 110:14,17	10:16
65:21 66:11 76:17	fields 15:5	97:11 135:3	111:2,6,12,14	Founder 2:14
88:2,5 91:4 99:6	<b>figure</b> 9:5 15:20	143:11 144:11	118:1 134:19	<b>four</b> 36:9,10,18
101:16 107:14	22:1 23:1 41:2	145:6 172:8	135:8 136:11	41:15 49:17 52:9
116:2 161:21	54:12 62:12 74:17	<b>fix</b> 55:22 78:1	139:10 140:5	59:18,19 98:16
166:15 168:19	80:1 115:16 122:7	119:15	141:10 143:9,16	109:2 115:5
<b>FCC's</b> 28:6 108:21	122:10 123:22	<b>fixed</b> 123:3 142:10	143:22 145:12	141:11,21 142:3
feature 125:17	124:3 126:15	142:13,15,21	146:7 149:1	<b>fourth</b> 133:17
127:6	146:1 171:8	151:13	156:14 157:21	frame 31:12 145:5
features 113:8	figuring 27:1	fixing 99:2	170:10 171:7	152:5
123:5,6 126:7	<b>file</b> 123:20 125:16	<b>flag</b> 80:13	172:13,16	framework 60:18
128:21	<b>filed</b> 6:22	<b>flagged</b> 80:18 96:9	<b>food</b> 176:17	90:2
<b>federal</b> 3:18 26:10	files 123:21 125:11	96:11	<b>foods</b> 137:9	frankly 56:4 83:9
26:21 32:8 33:5	filtering 151:10	flexibility 26:9	footnotes 15:11	86:1,5
34:21 35:6 37:4	<b>final</b> 42:19 63:17	80:17	<b>force</b> 123:19	fray 98:4
39:8 40:15 49:19	<b>finally</b> 109:18	flipping 35:4	forcing 110:9	free 139:2
57:22 58:7,16,22	110:2,10 158:11	floating 110:1	forecast 180:6	<b>freedom</b> 2:14 42:21
59:11 62:1 63:5	177:5	<b>flow</b> 104:11	foreign 146:12,12	43:1
63:21,22 71:19	<b>find</b> 21:3 23:12	<b>fob</b> 109:7,8	146:13 149:2	freedoms 101:22
98:13,18 99:21	37:21 40:3,5 41:7	<b>fobs</b> 100:18 109:2	forever 61:9	frequencies 59:7
100:10 101:12,14	41:19 79:11 85:13	<b>focal</b> 100:15	<b>forget</b> 41:18 162:14	73:21 81:22 82:20
116:2,19 117:14	155:7,11 161:18	<b>focus</b> 61:17 69:11	162:15	122:19,21 125:18
117:21 118:15	<b>finding</b> 30:8 38:3	110:9 142:19	forgiven 162:16	135:18 165:9
130:11,14,16,16	42:13	focused 14:18	<b>form</b> 64:19 85:14	frequency 24:9,12
130:17 131:2,5,6	<b>fine</b> 19:7 41:8 46:1	19:11 116:11	113:11	59:6 75:5,16 82:2
131:7,13,13,19	71:4,14 72:6 80:2	focusing 169:19	formal 173:20	82:16,18 83:1
140:17 146:20	83:7 127:18	<b>FOI</b> 154:2	formally 37:5	97:2 121:1,2
153:19 154:8	128:10,11 129:12	folks 7:2,6 9:21	<b>format</b> 169:3,6	122:9,21 151:2
159:19 167:17	171:4	44:6 94:22 101:7	former 102:20	155:1 160:5
168:11 169:13	finish 6:3	105:14,18 106:8	forms 132:16	frequently 155:7
feds 151:22	firm 96:22	107:16 109:4	formulating 148:12	Friday 73:3 145:11
feedback 22:15	<b>firmer</b> 96:20	135:7 137:9	<b>forth</b> 14:15 30:13	friendly 136:5
25:19 157:8	<b>firmware</b> 59:5 72:2	166:12 168:17	32:14 65:10 98:15	140:12
feel 80:16 83:18	74:18 104:1,8,20	<b>follow</b> 23:5 24:19	140:12,19	<b>front</b> 7:10 105:9
147:19 148:2	105:1	157:18	forthcoming 65:18	132:9 153:14
156:6 176:21	<b>first</b> 7:18 8:12 12:8	following 104:18	<b>forum</b> 94:9	154:20
feeling 87:13	29:12 39:21 56:2	130:13,19 131:18	<b>forward</b> 9:9,13,17	fruit 14:20
115:12	58:5 71:16 85:19	158:13	12:4 21:19 39:4	frustrated 109:18
feels 148:18	86:10 91:6 98:8	<b>follow-up</b> 64:10	51:21 57:12 58:13	110:11
fees 42:22	105:16 113:4,17	<b>FONTE</b> 120:7	67:19 83:21	<b>FSMS</b> 21:14,18
	-	-	-	-

22:14,16 23:6	150-1 154-19 21	154:1	132:15 134:4	group 7:1 12:21
24:16 25:15 31:22	150:1 154:18,21 generate 96:6	<b>go</b> 7:22 13:7 14:8	141:1,12 142:20	13:22 15:12 26:21
		O	,	
158:4,6	generated 135:22	19:4 21:9 22:19	143:15,18 144:14	27:22 28:16 29:4
FTE's 29:2	generates 35:16	24:22 25:19 30:5	145:1 146:10,21	38:2 42:6 47:1
FTI 10:18	geographically	37:13 41:12,17,20	147:7 148:8 149:8	98:11 110:22
fulfill 38:4	62:17 161:15	46:9,11 56:7	149:12 152:20	121:9,16 126:20
fully 53:22 63:5	geography 64:6	61:15 67:19 68:22	159:8,9,10,13	127:1,5 134:1
64:11	getting 5:5 16:8	74:16 75:9 77:7	164:20 166:21	136:7,9,12,12,16
function 73:11	27:19 84:15 90:2	78:7 80:1,13,22	169:21 171:3,21	136:21 139:14
functions 73:10	98:9 101:1 105:20	82:17 83:8 86:7	172:3 179:15	140:7 141:11,21
<b>fund</b> 15:18 18:2	107:13 140:11	94:19 96:21 104:5	<b>good</b> 5:3,7 6:8 7:6	142:2,7 143:11
167:16 168:4	146:3 165:3	104:19 108:2	7:12 13:10 19:22	144:11,15,22
<b>funds</b> 16:4 19:16	167:19 170:20	110:4 122:8 130:4	27:17 34:19,21	148:22 149:18
43:6	171:20 172:9	138:7 139:20	63:16 65:10 84:4	152:14 171:15
Furchtgott-Roth	176:5	142:10 144:6	84:21 101:3 102:5	172:4,6,7 173:11
2:5,6 8:5 9:2	<b>GHz</b> 7:7 54:11	148:9 156:7	104:18 115:14	174:22 176:4,19
<b>further</b> 20:6 46:7	103:12 107:12	157:16 160:11	137:21,21 150:2	<b>groups</b> 4:8 7:2
53:7 60:17 61:5	108:13 159:22	170:17 178:20	158:10 161:16	21:18 22:18 31:1
61:13 62:20 63:11	163:15,16 164:19	<b>goals</b> 20:3 36:5	165:16 175:3,11	61:17 75:18 113:6
91:4 111:8 134:13	165:20	39:10	Google 1:21 10:14	134:21 135:3,7
<b>future</b> 1:23 18:1	<b>Gibson</b> 2:6 10:21	godfather 67:4	gosh 74:14	137:6,7 147:19
32:1 60:21,22	10:21 12:11,13	goes 17:9 31:20	<b>gotten</b> 109:18	152:14 166:13
61:5 64:8 79:3	13:13,15,19 16:12	38:18 67:22	110:11	171:12,13 172:11
83:19 84:3,19	16:19 17:2,8	104:21 141:7	government 26:5	173:13 174:6
91:2,3,12 95:7,13	19:20,22 22:4,9	going 5:18 6:7,13	33:5 40:15 51:6	176:6
95:19 99:18 101:7	22:12 28:11,14	8:1 9:10,13,16	65:8,15 66:1	group's 142:19
108:3 110:8 122:2	31:9,17 39:18	13:5,6 21:19	98:18 99:5 100:11	growing 66:4
134:4 152:17	139:12 141:12,14	22:22 23:12 27:9	129:18 137:9	grows 49:5
155:11 167:8	141:19 161:2,3,7	28:3,4 29:14	140:17 141:2	<b>guard</b> 150:7,11,16
	162:5 165:12	32:20 34:1,2,8	<b>GPS</b> 53:4	150:22 151:15,18
G	<b>gig</b> 72:7	35:17 36:14 38:2	<b>grasp</b> 107:19 160:6	guess 6:11 47:16
<b>GAO</b> 23:10 27:7	give 17:21 28:8	38:19 39:4 47:3	great 7:13 12:7	52:13,22 58:19
garage 52:20,21	37:13 64:10 80:5	51:21 55:14,19,21	65:14 106:22	61:10 120:7,14
53:11 58:2,6	90:20,21 93:4	56:3,11 57:11	107:7 134:18	123:8 124:7
71:17 78:19 98:21	96:22 104:14,16	58:13 64:13,17,20	141:10 143:16	130:15 144:21
100:22 106:13	104:22 121:6	64:21 65:16,17	172:18	171:16
109:1	135:3,10,12 144:7	66:11,12,20 67:18	greater 14:3,4	<b>guidance</b> 17:16,17
gauges 100:21	150:2 156:10	70:5,11 71:20,21	greatly 137:11	17:21 20:6
general 3:16 16:4	160:16,17 164:22	73:14,17 74:15	Greg 7:14 8:10	<b>guided</b> 164:10
16:10,16 39:6	given 14:5 43:12	75:9 76:3,8 78:1	12:12 82:13 87:9	guidelines 146:18
43:4 98:14 114:14	69:22 80:7 138:6	78:22 83:21 90:9	112:7 118:7,7	guiding 147:5
115:14 148:14	162:18	90:12,21 92:2	129:15	guy 35:6
150:10 151:14	giving 137:18	94:17 97:14	Gregory 1:13,18	guys 12:8 34:22
generally 60:21	176:10,16,21	107:15 108:14	ground 40:17,18	37:9 110:9 112:5
84:14 87:11,11,12	glad 12:4	112:3,3,21 114:6	140:20 142:19	
87:17,18,20 95:8	Global 2:15	120:2 122:12	ground-based	H
95:20 115:12	GMF 14:2,6 28:19	120.2 122.12	160:4	H 2:6
70.20 110.12	<b>UNII</b> 14.2,0 20.19	127.2 120.4 127.2	100.4	

hand 5:17 41:10,21	heard 29:11 35:15	108:18 147:2	impractical 175:6	138:18
152:13	120:17,19 137:5	hosting 137:6	impractical 173.0	inevitable 53:18
handcuffed 154:12	166:11 171:2	147:17	168:7	inform 21:7 31:11
handle 62:13	hearing 44:7,14	Hot 4:15	Improvement 12:9	informal 173:20
handled 140:22	45:16 58:6 111:9	hours 59:4 125:19	improvements 4:4	information 3:15
hands 49:22 68:12	144:3 157:13	house 3:10 6:5,11	46:22 167:11,14	18:4,18 26:14
101:20 179:19	heart 48:20 77:4,13	105:18 106:3	169:10	65:17 100:14
handshake 104:10	77:18	hundred 109:2	improving 167:7	102:11 104:11,17
happen 76:21 97:4	heavy 145:7	hunt 24:22	incentive 62:7	126:5 138:1
103:22 106:5	heels 41:14	Hum 27.22	inclined 124:21	140:18 153:21
107:20 108:15	held 116:15	I	include 139:22	166:5 169:7
127:22	hell 59:14	idea 26:19 54:1	included 167:20	173:12,15 174:1
happened 159:3	Hello 8:21	83:20 99:1 102:5	173:14	174:18,22 176:5
170:22 171:17	help 21:7 32:18	115:14 121:12	including 106:8	informational
170.22 171.17	80:19 81:18	132:14 152:19	116:18	164:2
happening 31:13	125:19 145:5	161:13	incoming 24:12	informed 145:20
56:4	helped 126:14	idealized 39:7	incoming 24.12	Infrastructure
happens 33:22 59:4	<b>helpful</b> 9:19 10:1	identified 14:20	75:12,20	2:12
65:3 104:5	18:13 65:14 118:4	19:2,19 20:10	incorporate 50:14	initial 136:16 139:7
happy 17:1 32:9,19	164:4	identifying 22:11	incorporated 54:4	142:3 144:11
156:10 171:5	helps 82:10 124:20	167:7	increase 59:21	initially 14:18
hard 48:15 53:19	hertz 165:8,9	<b>ignition</b> 100:19	152:10	inner 79:6
56:15 58:10 66:15	hey 35:17	<b>Illinois</b> 2:19 11:4	increased 25:14	innovative 154:21
111:22 124:3	Hi 167:3	imagine 114:3	increasingly 54:22	inputs 37:12,13
harder 147:15	hiatus 61:15 65:20	122:5 123:14	55:19 56:16 79:9	inserted 159:13
hardware 102:20	high 61:6 91:13	immediately	incumbent 70:18	inside 17:20
harmonization	highlight 146:9	107:13	113:10 114:18	instance 23:20
154:18 155:17,20	Hill 100:6 105:15	<b>impact</b> 116:4	121:21 126:7,8,9	71:16 77:10
156:1	106:8 159:18	implement 158:8	126:14 132:12	instances 32:12
harmonized 154:15	hint 28:8	implementation	136:2 145:5	51:21 104:2
harmonizing 156:3	historic 51:15,20	27:14 40:21 158:4	incumbents 115:9	institute 1:12,18
156:4	historical 121:7	169:17,19	115:15 138:5	2:19 11:4 21:5
Harold 2:5 8:5 9:1	hoc 119:9	implemented 24:7		instruction 60:12
<b>Harvard</b> 173:10	hold 58:10 144:1	27:8 117:1 155:2	incurred 167:17	instructions 77:10
hash 104:18	153:21	implementing	independent 1:22	78:3
<b>Hatfield</b> 2:8 11:10	holdings 19:1	154:20 156:12	68:19	Intel 2:10 11:7
11:10 75:10 76:7	home 58:19 105:22	169:13	indicate 147:10	intelligent 52:5
76:13 78:22	honest 99:22	implement-ability	indicated 152:7	67:4
head 2:18,21 17:22	honestly 50:1	40:22	individual 14:7	<b>intend</b> 89:19
headed 110:3	100:16	implications 27:19	individuals 172:1	intended 37:9
heading 110:12	hope 21:15 41:1	27:21	industry 20:7	79:17 82:8
head-knocking	57:18 65:11 101:6	<b>implicit</b> 59:8 66:2	32:17 99:13 101:8	intending 83:14
136:5	141:5 142:5	81:22 178:12	105:14 106:5,7	intent 89:3,4
hear 8:20 44:2,10	147:18	<b>important</b> 19:3,10	107:1 109:8	124:20
44:18 48:4 66:19	hopefully 19:15	58:14 60:2,5	112:18 173:17,20	intention 72:15
120:1 144:1	39:3 145:7	61:18 132:7	174:2 175:10	intentions 79:22
145:18	hoping 17:15 23:2	133:16	industry's 107:3	interacting 64:18
	F8			
	I		l ————————————————————————————————————	I

interaction 132:6	170:2	<b>Janice</b> 2:14 10:17	32:22 33:3 35:20	52:13,13,18 53:3
interactive 117:16	involved 6:16 67:1	48:9 53:9 59:17	89:6 99:18 122:12	53:13 55:4,17
118:16 119:2		61:12 78:5 80:4		,
	132:19 142:9	84:9 90:16 94:19	123:20 145:20 146:2	56:10,13,14 57:13 58:2 59:12 60:10
120:17,21 121:3	146:15			
123:9,10 127:9	involvement	98:4,20 103:19	keeps 119:22	61:8,20 62:6,11
128:20,22 129:7	149:16	110:18 146:7	<b>Kevin</b> 2:10 11:7	62:12,15 64:22
interest 14:11,17	involves 158:7	149:2 176:11	67:3,3 68:22 69:3	66:5 68:5 70:8,10
65:14 70:18 99:12	<b>involving</b> 167:14	Janice's 79:2	71:10 74:8 75:16	72:13 73:3,4,15
175:13	168:8	<b>Jennifer</b> 2:23 9:4	81:18 88:16 89:15	73:18,22 74:11,12
interested 116:10	iPhone 129:2	45:19 46:4 143:12	92:5 96:9 102:13	74:13 79:7 82:5
interesting 6:16	ironed 55:12	143:17,22 144:4,6	102:15 122:11	82:10 83:8,19
64:7 66:4 83:10	isolated 89:7 92:13	145:17	126:1,1	85:3,5,9,10,16
88:21 103:17	issue 21:20 27:5	Jill 180:3	key 39:5 77:22 86:6	86:3,16,18 87:7,8
109:15 110:7	29:1,13 34:22	Jim 8:15,21 173:6	100:18 101:19	88:6,7 89:10 91:5
149:14 152:19	69:16 74:15 78:17	173:7,8 177:2,18	109:2,7,8 148:18	91:22 92:10,11,12
160:10	80:18 83:10	Joe 105:21	166:1	92:12,13,21,22
interestingly 99:3	100:12 113:15	join 44:4 48:3	keys 104:15,18	94:3 98:5,20
interests 19:12,14	132:4 133:22	<b>joined</b> 45:22	kick 112:7	99:21 100:1,13,16
115:16,22 116:3	136:19 138:11	joining 44:1	kind 23:18 30:8	102:22 103:10,15
interface 121:14	145:22 147:10	<b>JR</b> 2:2,18	48:10 53:18 55:5	104:2,7,13,14,14
interfere 54:14	155:20	<b>July</b> 1:9 78:13	65:13 74:14,22	104:16,16,20,22
interference 4:11	issued 170:4	<b>jumps</b> 154:20	82:3 90:1 98:11	105:21,22 106:2
49:20,21 51:17	issues 6:17 7:8 9:12		102:6 112:17	106:17 108:1,5,10
55:3,9 63:20,21	19:17 20:21 42:3	K K	113:16 114:15	108:19 109:6,8,10
66:5 74:11,15	43:19,22 44:14	K 81:4	115:7 119:18	109:16 113:8
79:13,15 89:10	49:6,9 68:5 77:2	<b>Kahn</b> 2:10 11:7,7	121:14,19 122:3	118:7 119:11
101:12 107:8,12	81:13 102:8 103:1	68:7,10,17,22	132:11 135:3,6	120:16,20 122:19
114:5 133:8 144:3	103:12 105:19	69:8,17 70:7 71:1	146:14,17 147:3	123:3,10,12
149:10 151:3,6	109:9 116:12	71:9 74:5 81:17	147:17 148:5	127:15 128:17,19
interfering 54:12	146:4 147:21	82:19 83:3 88:16	155:20 164:21	128:22 129:20
79:14 100:3,5	153:18 158:16,19	88:16 92:8,16,20	166:10 169:19	133:2 135:1 136:1
interjected 77:16	176:12 177:7	93:14 96:10,16	<b>kinds</b> 37:17 79:13	140:11 141:22
interlude 78:9	issuing 38:21	97:6 102:14 104:4	99:14	143:12 144:5,8
intermittent	item 28:2 81:19	126:3,9,12	Knauer 2:23	146:12 147:7,10
133:12	82:11 83:5 99:22	<b>Karl</b> 3:8 10:4 11:19	knock 49:6	150:2,4,17 152:3
internal 159:5	101:6,19 108:13	12:6,20 13:9	<b>know</b> 7:6 16:16,19	152:5,11 153:15
internally 98:10	134:20 160:6,8	16:14 19:20 35:10	16:20 17:17 23:9	154:11 156:4,5,8
interpretation	178:21	42:17 62:11 64:10	24:3 25:1,1 26:2	160:2 161:20
162:7	items 4:22 27:7,17	76:9 80:11,13	26:13,21 28:15,20	162:6,8,10,18,18
interrupt 76:9	102:12 140:16	81:3 98:2 103:11	29:2,11,12 30:22	163:8,10,20
intractable 162:19	145:2 158:1	105:8 115:8	31:19 32:3,6,12	166:11,21 169:5
inventory 62:13	iteration 21:16	117:10 134:22	32:16 33:20 34:7	170:22 171:3,21
64:15,19 65:2	<b>ITU</b> 148:10	137:5 143:1 147:9	35:3 36:20 37:8,9	172:11 176:11,22
108:17,19 109:11	<b>it'd</b> 9:19	149:11 170:11	37:20,20 38:1,7	178:10
109:12		174:21 176:9,20	40:4,6 41:4,6,12	knowing 53:4
investment 91:21	J	<b>Karl's</b> 176:15	41:16,19,21 42:7	knowledge 82:17
<b>involve</b> 169:10	<b>J</b> 173:9	keep 13:12 22:10	45:9,11 49:5	known 132:20
	•	•		•

148:5 167:13	legal 43:4	140:3 160:3	look 24:18 29:6	172:8
knows 129:1	legislation 37:22	links 17:18 139:15	36:21 41:17 60:11	major 102:12
142:14 166:11	lends 161:16	list 6:20 15:12 41:5	63:12 66:12 67:20	106:2 158:14
	letter 35:16 159:17	113:12 124:12	92:16 99:7 107:2	159:20
L	let's 44:8 74:15	139:21 145:22	114:10 134:1	<b>making</b> 38:12
L 2:3	86:10 89:6 90:3	157:8 167:20	148:1 162:16	40:20 47:4 51:8
labeling 60:9,9	91:8 93:16 127:21	171:1,18,22 172:9	164:13 165:22	73:18 109:4
lack 107:21	177:2,3	173:21 174:8,11	177:19	113:16 155:12
lady 34:12	level 62:18 116:19	listed 173:1,17,22	looked 36:16 88:8	166:16
laid 150:4 163:8	liaisons 135:2	174:2	looking 9:9 12:4	management 1:4
language 16:6	license 20:15 28:6	<b>listen</b> 69:8 179:17	23:6,8 34:19 36:8	2:18 3:9 4:4,15
72:14 76:18 80:16	30:3,5,6 35:1,7	<b>listing</b> 135:22	42:2 70:3 81:12	12:9 15:7 20:20
92:5 94:8	56:4 123:20	lists 38:5	107:3 108:3	21:5 25:10 39:7,9
largely 115:6	licensed 56:18	litany 21:3	109:11 118:20	39:17 46:3,22
<b>Larry</b> 1:21 3:13 6:9	58:17 76:4 113:20	little 18:12 21:20	133:6 135:2,6	75:14 113:22
6:12 10:13 84:8	129:7	30:20 35:8 76:17	137:2,3 139:8	114:7 119:15,17
112:2,7 170:18	licensees 30:2 31:1	76:19 79:1 81:15	151:20 152:15	119:18,19 120:4,6
174:21	31:11 35:21	82:7 84:15 88:10	154:16 164:19	120:15,22 121:13
late 78:11 141:7	licensee's 31:7	88:15 102:3,6	looks 39:7 96:9	121:19,22 127:6
<b>Laughter</b> 8:7 12:2	licenses 32:7,8,13	136:22 142:8	155:4	127:14
13:14 34:10 38:9	33:14 34:2,14	146:5 149:21	lose 81:20 83:4	managements 43:9
70:9 76:12,15,22	licensing 17:7	151:19 158:2	losers 114:9,20	<b>Manager</b> 1:21 2:11
78:10,21 90:22	20:14 21:6 30:1	160:8	<b>lost</b> 134:7	managers 21:4
96:4 97:12,16	109:11	<b>live</b> 61:9 96:1,1	<b>lot</b> 6:6 7:9,10,11	managing 2:15,22
98:6 110:16 120:9	life 16:22	106:7	14:7 15:8 25:6	20:13 26:21
128:15 130:8	lifting 145:7	LLC 1:25,25	26:3 53:14 86:1,2	mandate 39:4
132:2 136:10	<b>limit</b> 148:21	<b>LLP</b> 2:2,23	86:4 90:8 91:21	manpower 29:3
137:16,20 141:18	limitation 132:13	local 78:13 166:6	91:21,22 98:10,14	manual 170:1
171:6,9 178:22	limitations 43:16	<b>location</b> 33:18 53:4	99:19 103:8	manufacturer
179:3	54:20 148:5	91:3 102:10 139:4	135:19 140:13	104:21
law 2:8 136:13	152:11 153:1	locations 32:13	141:5 142:16,18	manufacturers
138:16 139:18	<b>limited</b> 65:17 85:16	34:15 109:5	143:4 147:20	54:8,17,18 59:13
140:3 167:9	86:18,20 89:7	160:18	148:9 169:15	59:21 60:6 65:5
LAWRENCE 3:13	90:18 92:18,20	location-by-locat	<b>lots</b> 14:6 33:4 141:7	153:4
laws 175:18,19,20	93:2 95:8,20	151:13	151:11 164:21	manufacturer's
<b>lead</b> 143:15,19,20	105:17 116:11	lock 54:16	loud 6:5 29:11	104:6
leaders 174:22	148:11 164:7	Lockheed 2:24	love 47:5	march 111:21
leadership 145:3	limiting 98:17	locking 80:21	low 87:8	112:4,8 138:12
171:11	line 26:1 27:10	log 123:20,21	<b>lower</b> 164:11	139:8
learning 179:22	44:16,21,22 45:14	125:11,16	low-hanging 14:20	MARGARET 2:4
leave 41:9 46:11	45:14 58:10	logical 18:7		Mark 2:1,6,13 8:3
114:20	154:11 163:3	<b>London</b> 78:12	<u> </u>	8:16 10:11,21
<b>leaving</b> 86:9 128:11	166:10	long 13:9 16:21	<b>M</b> 3:18	12:8,13 22:8,12
<b>left</b> 13:1 162:6	lines 53:17	34:13 112:18	madam 46:12,13	29:19,20 30:16,19
legacy 53:11 57:15	<b>link</b> 161:11	141:5	106:17	35:11 39:19 45:19
61:1 84:16 85:10	linked 100:9,20	<b>longer</b> 34:16	magical 121:14	46:4 47:8,9,9 75:9
87:20 90:17 91:21	105:19 138:15	long-term 19:12,14	<b>mailing</b> 171:18,22	77:16 96:10,12

	1		I	
97:10 112:2,22	means 23:1,3 37:8	59:17 64:9 67:12	171:16 172:15	<b>mine</b> 171:19
115:8 119:21	58:1 60:8 69:21	68:7,9,10,16,17	179:1,9,12	minimize 51:22
120:14 122:4	107:9 119:17	68:20,22 69:2,8	members 1:15 5:12	minimizing 25:12
126:19 127:3	154:18 156:1	69:10,17 70:1,7	5:16 7:19 20:11	51:22
131:1 135:9	160:11 175:18,19	70:10 71:1,3,7,9	45:20 46:2 67:1	minimum 26:9
139:13 141:11,13	meant 14:5 28:4	72:11 73:12 74:5	171:1 173:17,21	84:2
141:14,22 161:3	127:9 131:14	75:11 76:7,13	174:2 178:12	minus 82:22
165:12	139:15,16	78:8,11,16,22	179:19,20	minute 57:7
marked 154:2	mechanism 72:8,9	80:12 81:17 82:19	memo 113:12	Miscellaneous 4:22
market 20:22	108:16 113:9	83:3,7 84:8 85:1	mention 38:11	missed 118:13
155:5	171:4	85:17 86:14,20,22	41:14 166:20	missing 5:20 16:1
Mark's 127:11	mechanisms 158:9	87:5,14,19,22	mentioned 133:5	118:18 172:12
<b>Martin</b> 1:24 2:24	168:22	88:4,16 89:13,17	169:8	mistakes 72:1
<b>Marty</b> 44:9 48:2	medical 30:10	89:19,21,22 90:15	mentions 52:14,17	mitigation 97:3
<b>Matre</b> 180:3	meet 105:6 110:5	91:1,6,19 92:8,16	met 1:11 7:4	mod 79:6
matter 48:21 49:13	147:13,15	92:18,20 93:4,14	meteorological	<b>mode</b> 84:1
49:14 55:16,16	meeting 1:6 7:5,16	93:16,20,22 94:2	135:9	modifications 50:5
94:14 172:22	9:10 12:21 22:6	95:1,10,12,15,17	method 72:16,21	167:11
175:8 180:18	62:22 111:21	95:22 96:5,8,10	116:5,7	<b>modify</b> 33:13
<b>maximum</b> 2:4 26:8	112:2,5,9 140:14	96:12,14,16,17	metrics 20:3 36:5	modifying 80:16
50:21 51:7 59:4	141:3,6,20 142:4	97:6,8,13 102:14	<b>MHz</b> 61:3 85:6	<b>Molly</b> 2:4 11:1
McGINNIS 2:11	144:20 145:10,13	103:20 104:4	86:3 90:11,13	90:15
11:5,5 97:13	146:10 156:11,19	110:20 111:4	109:2 135:9	moment 69:22
McHENRY 2:13	166:14 174:14	112:6 113:1	136:13 155:8	128:18 144:1
10:11,11 75:9,11	177:6,13,13 179:6	117:11 118:6,11	159:22 164:15,17	160:22
113:1 119:8,21	meetings 4:21	118:22 119:8	<b>MHz-pops</b> 161:21	moment-by-mo
120:3,10 122:3	135:14,20 137:10	120:3,5,10,13	mic 6:4,5	119:17
123:1,14,19	147:17 173:19	121:4 122:3,16	<b>Michael</b> 1:22 10:15	money 19:6 41:13
124:11,18 125:1	174:15,16,17	123:1,8,14,16,19	48:9,21 52:10,15	monies 15:17,22
125:10,15 126:6	175:1 177:16	124:6,11,15,18	57:4 67:9 94:19	39:22 40:11 41:21
126:10,13 127:19	178:1	125:1,5,10,15,21	96:7 110:18	monitor 53:12
128:4,8,13 129:1	meeting's 141:16	126:3,6,9,10,12	microphone 13:18	56:22
129:10 130:22	meg 42:1	126:13,16,18,22	60:12 97:22	monitoring 55:15
135:12 136:8	member 5:14 10:7	127:3,13,17,19	110:19 118:5	56:8,14
mean 27:20 54:9	10:9,11,15,17,19	128:4,8,13,17	microphones 67:16	<b>monitors</b> 109:13
58:20 59:1 68:18	10:21 11:1,3,5,7,8	129:1,4,9,10,12	microwave 30:11	month 35:14
73:16 82:14,19	11:10 12:11 13:13	129:13,14 130:1	142:10,13,15,21	119:19
85:13 86:6,16	13:15,19 16:2,12	130:12,17,19,22	mics 6:2	<b>monthly</b> 36:17
87:7 88:2,4,19	16:19 17:2,8	134:10 135:12	<b>Middle</b> 108:7 167:1	months 55:4 74:16
89:3,17 90:11,16	18:20 19:10,20,22	136:8,15 139:12	<b>midnight</b> 142:5,5	month-by 119:18
92:10 93:17	21:13 22:4,5,9,10	140:9 141:12,19	milestones 20:4	<b>morning</b> 7:4 141:6
101:10 102:3,22	22:12 28:11,14	142:1 143:14,18	military 33:6 35:2	152:14
104:9 105:2	30:19 31:9,14,17	144:10 145:9	156:3	<b>motion</b> 46:21 47:4
120:17,18 123:17	34:11 35:10 38:19	146:8 156:20	<b>million</b> 36:11,18	47:6 67:8 111:3,5
125:21 129:5	39:18 46:14 47:5	157:5,18 161:2,7	41:15,16 122:5,7	111:7 117:6 134:8
162:7 163:22	47:9 48:13,19	162:5 163:1,12	122:13,20	134:11
175:16	52:12 53:16 57:5	165:12 170:18	mind 36:13	motivations 155:6
	•			

155:6	132:3 135:5 136:7	17:16,18 33:10	179:5	objective 56:20
move 9:16 11:16	137:17,21 139:20	40:17,18 42:5	noticed 98:9	observation 102:14
14:19 46:15 149:8	143:2 145:19	58:15 61:19 63:1	notices 33:3	103:7
162:22	143:2 143:19	77:9 78:3,12 92:6	notification 20:22	Obtain 59:5
	157:2,13,22 161:5		26:14 31:3	Obuchowski 2:14
moving 87:10,16	·	93:8,10 100:19		
90:9 111:18 118:4	161:9 162:3,21	104:20 110:3	notion 82:1	10:17,18 48:13,19
119:22 120:11	163:6,22 165:16	113:5 115:10,15	notwithstanding 40:6	53:16 64:9 78:8
138:12 139:9	171:10 172:5	116:3 133:9 150:8		78:11,16 83:7
142:13,14 152:12	174:7	150:10 152:19	November 149:15	85:1 87:5,22 91:1
158:6,11	necessarily 77:21	153:5 154:21	<b>NTIA</b> 4:10 10:5	93:20 94:2 95:10
multi 160:15	97:1 101:5 120:16	158:8,14,15,18	13:1,22 14:3,8	95:15,22 96:5
multiple 69:5 70:16	120:20 133:10	168:9	16:8 17:20 19:14	103:20 110:20
70:20 74:2	161:12	newer 100:8	22:15 23:5 27:21	111:4 146:8
multiply 165:8	necessary 15:5,13	news 78:12 98:20	39:14 40:18 43:12	<b>obviously</b> 14:12
multi-band 59:10	27:12 84:2 116:1	158:10	57:19 66:9 99:9	18:22 21:14 104:9
multi-faceted	148:12 159:12	nice 11:15 35:16	113:4,11 114:14	129:22 148:3
64:22	need 5:13 15:9,20	135:14	115:6,19 116:1	150:7 155:5
multi-subgroups	21:9,22 32:3	<b>night</b> 141:7	117:22 118:9	occupy 165:11
144:15	33:11,17,21 39:16	<b>NITRD</b> 7:5 152:14	129:16,21 130:2	occur 78:1
munitions 164:10	46:7,15 57:2,13	nitty-gritty 146:22	130:10,15 135:14	occurred 22:16
mute 118:3 120:1,8	71:4 76:1,2 85:20	<b>NOAA</b> 135:16	136:22 147:5	<b>odd</b> 165:1
144:2	106:7 109:6	<b>nobody's</b> 156:2	149:8 153:19	offer 22:15 31:4
muted 44:22 45:15	113:21 115:14	nodes 54:7	166:15 167:4	offered 20:18
myriad 53:20	117:15 126:2	<b>noise</b> 62:17 79:11	168:18 170:1	<b>office</b> 3:9,10 4:15
	132:20 133:21	noise-like 79:10	<b>NTIA's</b> 12:15	6:10 15:19 16:3
N N	135:22 138:6	80:9	43:12 166:21	16:10 34:4 41:18
N 2:8	142:14 151:19	noisy 30:20 79:19	<b>number</b> 1:17 26:16	137:15
name 6:3 9:20	156:5,7 157:11	non 131:22	29:2 32:12 36:19	<b>Officer</b> 1:16 3:20
27:10 157:14	162:19 175:12,15	non-classified	45:9 56:20 57:12	<b>offices</b> 43:8 58:4
159:7 175:11	<b>needed</b> 34:5 74:11	154:1	60:15 73:14 74:3	official 116:21
named 133:3 172:4	101:9 139:4	non-federal 26:11	82:15 86:19,20	off-line 29:9
names 7:22 119:3	needs 5:17 62:9	37:6 100:3,4	92:19,20 93:3	oftentimes 153:20
171:18	63:11 77:8 88:15	160:12 168:11	95:4,9,21 97:11	<b>oh</b> 25:2 52:15 68:22
narrow 123:12	102:18 104:19	169:12	105:18 116:11	70:7 96:12 118:6
National 1:17	106:21 113:15	<b>non-feds</b> 101:16	118:21 119:5	118:22 126:9
nationwide 161:14	162:19	non-status 49:12	144:19 153:8	154:14
nature 59:22 63:14	negative 92:14	non-U.S 147:11	161:4,11,17,19	okay 5:18 8:10,16
NCC 169:4	nervous 92:4	<b>norm</b> 177:9	165:9 166:10	9:1,5 11:12 12:11
<b>Nebbia</b> 3:8 10:4,4	Net 100:9	normally 50:3	174:15 176:19	13:13 17:2 19:22
11:21 12:3 16:15	<b>network</b> 56:22 77:9	119:12	179:13	21:12 28:11 36:1
16:21 17:3,9 19:8	138:17,20,20	<b>North</b> 2:22	<b>numbers</b> 25:5 40:5	42:16 44:12,20
19:21 23:15 28:13	139:1	<b>note</b> 17:3 143:2	113:13 115:2	45:2,5,6,12,18,21
36:1 38:10 42:16	network's 138:21	175:9 177:5	<b>nuts</b> 135:21	46:6,10 47:12,16
42:18 76:10,16	never 16:22 25:19	<b>noted</b> 149:17		47:22 48:7,13
77:1 81:2 98:3,7	53:21 171:2	158:22	0	75:8 90:19 93:22
103:10 105:8	172:10	notes 5:6	<b>O</b> 170:1	94:16 95:1,10,18
117:11 131:22	new 1:23 10:16	notice 92:5 170:4	object 87:6	96:7,12 97:9 98:1
	•	•	•	•

105:5 109:1	open-ended 147:1	overseeing 7.2	narticinates 150.12	102:7 105:20,21
1105:5 109:1	open-ended 147:1 operate 43:9,10	overseeing 7:3	participates 150:13	· /
′		oversight 116:20 overview 48:16	participating 138:2	107:15,20 108:1
117:7 118:22	51:19 53:2 59:3 82:21 83:1 116:9		participation	122:8 127:8 136:5 144:17 145:2
120:13 124:11 125:3 128:6	82:21 83:1 116:9 164:10 175:15	135:17 overwhelmed	146:12,13,13 149:3 154:4	144:17 145:2
		177:17		
131:20 134:6,12	operates 100:11		172:22 177:17,20	171:7
134:14,18,19 140:5,7 141:11	operating 62:14 72:18 83:13	over-definition 121:3	<b>particular</b> 19:11 33:13 59:6 62:3	<b>people's</b> 13:12 27:1 101:1
143:9 145:15,17	119:12 122:18	owns 71:18 104:13	62:16 68:4 69:3	Pepper 2:15 11:8,8
149:7 157:20	164:8,13	OWIIS / 1.10 104.13	69:12 82:16 97:2	67:11,12,12 68:9
162:21 165:12	,	P	122:20 152:22	68:16,20 69:2,10
170:13 172:18	operational 120:6 operations 1:21	pace 83:18	particularly 49:21	70:1,10 71:3,7
173:3,7 174:12	133:12 159:19	packaging 60:12	64:14 103:4	73:12,13 118:11
176:18 178:9,20	165:6	page 46:18 54:4	109:22 133:9,11	118:22 120:13
oldest 54:21		115:2	150:13	122:16 123:8,16
OMB 17:15 168:18	operators 117:17 139:2	pages 115:2	parties 45:22 64:1	124:6,15 125:21
once 5:5 6:3,4	opinion 16:10	paid 17:14,14	114:4 116:18	124:0,13 123:21
36:10,12 37:19	opportunities 7:10	18:15	Partner 2:22	128:14,17 129:4
78:17 92:22	152:16	painful 122:13	partners 60:6	128.14,17 129.4
105:13 119:9	opportunity 4:19	panacea 23:9	partiers 60.6 parts 123:4	percent 43:8
132:10,10 140:3	79:5 172:20	panel 75:12 166:22	party 71:20 116:11	164:16
151:9,21 152:10	177:14,21 179:16	168:16,17,19	passes 68:13	perfect 51:16 64:13
153:1,18 158:14	179:22	169:9 170:3	passive 165:5,18	perfectly 71:14
160:13,15 161:13	opposed 18:9 47:20	paper 37:20 40:8	passwords 5:15	perform 28:9
onerous 54:8	87:12 99:20	41:2 65:11 66:7	path 53:8 80:15,22	perform 28.9 performance 20:16
ones 54:21 161:19	111:12 128:18	papers 118:4 120:1	path 33.8 60.13,22 pay 61:22	period 18:16 61:7
165:19	134:16 171:15	120:11	pay 01.22 paying 15:16	91:14 177:22
one's 17:10 22:13	opposite 60:14	parameters 136:1	150:14	permission 53:5
one-size-fits-all	option 62:5	part 14:13 21:14	PC 54:7	73:6 122:12
121:15	order 45:13 73:9	24:15,16 30:13,14	PCAST 6:18 14:21	permits 31:6
one-time 14:1	99:18 138:12	32:10,17 35:2,9	49:3 62:8 63:6	person 35:13 80:1
one-way 103:2	139:8 168:12	36:4 38:20 40:11	73:2 83:16 152:17	145:22 146:13
104:8,9	ordinance 140:1	49:1,18 54:7 70:7	178:4	personal 180:1
online 178:4	organizational	74:9,20 77:20	peak 119:5	personally 60:11
open 13:2 63:8	147:4	78:19 102:21	people 7:18 8:1,11	perspective 25:9
69:22 86:7 114:21	origin 93:15	103:2,13 132:6	9:6 13:5 16:18	39:9,17 81:8 93:6
116:10,17 132:15	original 129:19	133:13 150:7	24:5,6,10,10,21	117:21,22 156:1
146:2	originally 36:10	163:16,17,17	25:3,6 26:5,16	160:12
opener 52:20,21	<b>OSTP</b> 10:6	169:5,8,9 179:14	31:18 33:7 35:7	pertain 49:10
53:11 58:2 71:17	ought 35:8 56:5	participant 22:7	35:14 37:18 38:1	98:13
106:16	65:20	44:8 45:18 46:1	38:12 43:22 47:13	pertaining 151:20
openers 58:6	outcome 38:1	48:4 59:15 75:8	49:14 54:12 55:7	pertains 49:5
100:22 109:1	148:13 171:5	76:6 78:5 80:11	56:12 58:3,11	<b>Peter</b> 3:16 166:20
176:13	outstanding 21:20	96:7 131:15	60:14 64:17 65:6	167:3 170:11
opening 4:2,3	overall 18:21 62:18	145:22	72:1 74:12,17,20	petition 99:14
11:20	overlaid 31:22	participants 174:8	76:18 78:2 82:5	<b>ph</b> 19:5
openness 147:8	<b>overlap</b> 163:10	participate 171:14	86:6 100:6,16	<b>phase</b> 158:4,12
	_			
	•	•	•	•

162.4.4.4	22.12.20.14.16	nost book 60:14	nmovolo=4.61:0	165,7 174,12
163:4,4,4	22:13 29:14,16	post-book 68:14	prevalent 61:2	165:7 174:13
phasing 61:5 91:12	40:3 41:22 42:16	post-hoch 53:17	87:21	<b>problems</b> 55:16
phenomena 66:4	42:19,20 43:7	54:1 57:14 74:12	prevent 38:12 39:3	57:1 64:4 75:1
<b>phone</b> 5:8,8 6:6	52:6 59:13 67:14	potential 116:2	50:5	78:1 89:10 98:19
7:14,19 8:2,6,12	68:1 69:6 88:11	potentially 60:16	previous 112:1	98:21 99:6,19
8:13,19 9:7 45:9	97:14 100:15	<b>Povelites</b> 2:17 10:9	122:17 163:3	106:5 134:4 136:6
47:15 101:2 118:3	131:2 147:11	10:9	pre-auction 167:21	177:12
119:22 129:3	148:1,8,13,18	power 3:10 6:8,9	pre-dates 149:15	<b>procedural</b> 176:14
146:14 178:19	154:13 159:11	10:6,6 110:5	price 52:5	176:19 177:7
phrase 58:19	162:13 171:10	powered-up 54:13	<b>Priman</b> 19:4	178:13
pick 21:16,18 42:7	176:15 177:19	PowerPoint 118:17	primarily 14:12	procedure 116:14
70:21 114:9,14	pointing 133:18	powers 23:5 178:11	61:2 140:10	procedures 20:14
180:10	points 28:14 29:10	practical 175:8	142:20	28:21 172:21
picked 27:6	39:19 52:11	practice 35:20	<b>primary</b> 36:9	proceedings 177:9
<b>Picking</b> 67:14	police 166:5	40:14	112:15 121:11	process 15:2 18:3
<b>piece</b> 48:16 85:7,13	policy 1:18,19 2:10	<b>practices</b> 28:17,21	primitive 83:22	18:15 21:6 24:21
101:3 178:9	2:15,17,24 3:12	34:19	printed 115:4	30:14 31:20 32:10
pinging 55:18	6:10 102:7 148:14	pre 169:15	priorities 43:2	35:9 38:21 43:11
pivoted 22:17	177:10,20 179:15	preceding 50:11	priority 19:1	55:6 107:20
<b>place</b> 26:3 27:16	policymakers	precision 164:9	privacy 103:1	108:22 112:21
40:14 53:8 55:1	57:20 61:3 91:10	preclude 56:3	<b>private</b> 64:1 175:8	115:4,19 116:16
79:16 89:9 106:9	105:11	72:15	proactive 58:8	122:10 145:21
108:16 137:22	policymaking	preferred 171:1	proactively 57:1,20	146:16 147:6
139:17 159:6	180:1	prepare 112:3	105:10	158:6,9 167:7
168:6,20 169:22	political 49:13	preparing 169:4	<b>probably</b> 17:10,15	169:16 178:15
<b>placed</b> 100:10	<b>popped</b> 156:9	prescriptive 84:15	17:19 21:22 25:11	processes 24:14
103:16 153:11	<b>pops</b> 162:3	84:22 87:2	36:18 38:13 48:20	40:8 97:3 168:5
<b>places</b> 138:21	port 60:2	presence 180:8	54:18 58:9 62:9	processing 35:7
148:10	<b>portion</b> 164:11	<b>present</b> 1:15 3:6,22	63:12 64:12 66:13	<b>product</b> 30:6 50:2
<b>plan</b> 140:15 155:8	166:2	5:12 94:10	85:10 96:18,20	50:4 66:7 108:21
168:14	<b>posed</b> 49:17 147:13	presentation	108:6 130:4	productive 144:12
planned 113:6	<b>position</b> 69:18,20	143:13	139:22 146:10	productively 50:16
180:6	<b>positive</b> 93:6,17	presentations		products 50:7
planning 167:21	110:21	166:17	159:16 160:6	109:13
169:16	possibilities 161:10	presented 6:20	163:9	<b>program</b> 1:19,23
plans 18:5,18 109:4	possibility 56:13	70:6 117:2	problem 39:4	<b>progress</b> 4:8 94:17
168:10,15 169:1,4	possible 16:7 24:13	preserve 80:17	51:22 54:10 55:3	134:21 152:21
169:14,18,20	36:17 50:21 51:7	President 1:22 2:3	55:3,9,10,12 56:7	159:14
<b>plant</b> 34:15	54:2,15 57:1	2:4,5,13,14,17,23	71:15,17 72:5	Project 1:21
<b>plants</b> 32:13	61:12 65:1 116:16	3:16	74:18,21 75:7	proliferate 89:9
<b>play</b> 154:9 166:8	127:4 132:8 146:2	President/CEO 2:1	77:8 79:12 80:9	promising 66:13
<b>please</b> 5:8,11,17	148:17 155:2	presiding 1:14	80:20 82:11 88:1	promoted 84:5
6:4 119:22 125:11	possibly 41:20	press 159:17	90:3 99:6 106:13	proposals 32:20
144:1 177:3	post 175:7	presume 47:4	109:19 119:14	116:22
<b>plug</b> 66:19	<b>posted</b> 173:21	<b>pretty</b> 54:8,13	122:10 123:3	propose 125:4
<b>plus</b> 79:17	174:14,19 178:4,5	65:17 106:3	124:1,4 125:20	proposed 63:18
<b>point</b> 18:6,7 21:15	postings 174:16	122:13 175:13	126:8,15 151:6	121:9 170:5,6

mmag 62.22	nutting 41.1 72.10	26.11 55.10 74.12	modlogotod 169,10	99.1 02.1 00.0
pros 62:22	<b>putting</b> 41:1 73:18	36:11 55:10 74:12	reallocated 168:10	88:1 93:1 99:9
prospectively 51:6	148:14 155:10,14	81:16 107:19	reallocation 167:8	114:14 122:4
protect 143:7	P-R-O-C-E-E-D	159:3 173:16,22	really 6:16 14:16	recommendation
protected 169:7	5:1	178:7	33:7,21 35:1	12:13 13:21 16:14
<b>protection</b> 146:18	<b>p.m</b> 1:13 5:2 94:14	quote 95:7	50:19 53:18 57:9	18:21 20:2 41:11
protocol 104:10	94:15 180:18	R	57:17,18 62:18	42:20 50:12 51:5
<b>provide</b> 25:20 26:8	0	radar 42:3 122:6	66:8,10 67:5 74:7	56:9 57:12 58:14
64:3 116:16 140:8	qualitatively 178:7	151:8 165:20	75:6 83:19 85:20	59:8,19 66:8,10
163:9 167:4	quality 61:6 91:13	radars 107:12	88:17 93:14 98:5	67:5,19 69:11
provided 29:20	quantities 62:15	radio 35:5 100:20	101:3,9,13 102:4	70:21 71:9,11,13
135:16 141:1	quarities 02.15 queries 103:17	142:17,20 143:5	102:18 105:2	71:15 77:5,19
167:10 171:11	query 102:18 103:2	165:4	107:6,20 112:14	81:6 84:9 85:20
<b>provides</b> 150:11	querying 120:21	radius 161:20	113:7 115:16	86:15 94:11 95:3
159:6	question 27:18	raise 5:17 59:14	132:8 133:16	96:14 99:13
<b>providing</b> 18:17 137:8 140:17	39:2 51:11,12,13	147:3 179:18	135:2 142:18	102:16 105:9,10
	62:21 72:12 81:17	raised 61:21 80:4	146:21 148:12	107:6 113:18,19
<b>public</b> 1:19 2:17	112:13 118:1,11	176:12	163:13,14,18	114:2,8 115:5,5
4:19 172:20,21	120:14 121:8	raising 23:14 83:10	177:10,11,14 realms 40:1	115:22 118:14,21 126:20,22 127:5
173:1,19 175:11	123:9 133:7 137:5	149:2		′
175:12,13,17	139:14 146:11	range 63:14 122:19	Reaser 2:18 32:4	133:18,19 149:9
177:8,17,21,22	147:13 155:14	140:3 165:1,18	34:11 140:9	152:8
178:6,19 179:20	161:6 163:13,20	ranges 17:4 159:22	reason 115:3 121:6	recommendations
180:1	165:13,17 170:19	160:5	177:12	4:10 9:16 12:15
<b>publicly</b> 174:19	172:14 176:19	rank 76:11	reasonable 161:22	12:16,20 37:18,21
178:5	questionable 37:5	Raytheon 2:18	175:14	38:12,16,22 40:20
<b>pull</b> 23:18 42:9	questions 4:17	32:4	reasonably 53:22	41:5 46:16,21
44:16 45:13 92:2	12:22 13:3,8	reached 50:18	56:5 160:21	50:11,15 54:6
purchase 50:4	16:13 24:6 36:2	react 57:2	reasons 44:2 129:5	57:7 60:15 65:22
purpose 16:5	38:22 49:17 50:17	reaction 57:2 90:14	rec 91:7 receive 31:8 43:7	67:9 70:13 75:21
pursuant 168:6	61:13,20 63:16	read 13:5,5 21:2		83:15 96:3 98:12
pursue 132:17	64:8,11 98:16	82:9 94:21 115:21	59:7 73:15 74:4,4	99:8 111:1,21
138:11 <b>push</b> 6:2 59:20	99:11 121:9 122:8		165:19 <b>received</b> 159:18	112:4,19,20 113:2 113:3 114:22
push 0.2 39.20	136:20,21 137:8	reading 72:13		
<b>pushed</b> 53:7	138:14 145:4,15	115:13	receiver 77:11	115:11 116:4,13 116:21 117:13
<b>pushing</b> 109:20 <b>push-top</b> 6:2	147:4 149:2	ready 70:20	166:4 receivers 165:15	118:9,18 121:18
put 27:10 29:14	156:12 159:20	real 56:14,14 78:17		130:13,20 131:18
1 -	163:2 170:8,12,14	151:17 175:17	receiving 38:22	· ·
30:18 37:19 42:5	170:15 172:17	realistic 36:19 56:3	73:16,19	134:11 149:13,20
54:6 55:1 65:10	170:13 172:17	138:6,10 153:16	recharge 43:15	150:4 152:3 153:9
72:1 84:16 90:12	quick 81:17 135:4	realistically 39:13	recognize 38:15	154:6 156:22
92:1 97:6 111:1	135:10 137:17	132:17 153:18	100:14 105:17	167:5 168:7
113:13 119:3,4,10	144:7,8 165:13	reality 64:19 65:16	154:17 164:5	recommended
124:12 125:14	179:10	153:10 154:10	recognizes 53:18	14:22 63:7
126:7 127:8 139:2	quickly 54:13	realize 23:19 37:12	133:14	recommends 60:20
139:17 149:12	155:1	38:13 133:19	recognizing 92:21	60:21 87:12 91:2
159:7 168:5	quite 24:1 28:7	155:19	110:21	91:8,10 92:11
172:21	quite 27.1 20.7	155.17	recommend 51:18	95:6,13
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

record 7:21 9:21	reliance 57:14	151:5 152:17	106:12 108:14	95:1 106:6 107:11
19:15 94:14	<b>Relief</b> 108:7 167:2	reported 15:5	152:12 153:2	108:13 112:6,16
180:18	167:10	<b>reporting</b> 28:1 56:2	respect 38:1 39:21	119:1 120:18
recording 126:14	relies 54:22	100:21 102:2	57:15 137:22	121:21 122:17
records 14:6 15:4,8	relocate 167:18	107:8,10,18	147:22	127:11,13 131:7
30:5 165:21	relocation 15:18	<b>reports</b> 9:11 149:5	<b>respond</b> 99:5 118:7	131:12 139:10
recourse 89:11	18:2 19:3 137:3	164:13	121:7	150:14,16,18
redo 42:8	167:16 168:4	report's 68:7	response 14:2	153:14 169:19
<b>reduce</b> 57:14	relocators 21:4	repository 136:4	47:21 107:22	<b>rights</b> 20:22 60:15
reduced 53:16	<b>rely</b> 51:7 56:21	representatives	111:13 134:17	101:21
redundant 163:18	remainder 61:16	166:15	responsibilities	<b>risky</b> 76:19
<b>refer</b> 37:9	remaining 51:12	representing	60:1	road 58:12
reference 15:11	<b>remains</b> 100:11	105:21	responsibility 65:7	Roberson 2:19
50:14 54:4 176:16	Remarks 4:2	request 6:21	157:6,12	11:3,3 163:1,12
referred 15:10	remember 157:9	125:11	responsible 30:2	<b>Robert</b> 2:15 11:8
23:10 28:6 149:19	162:11,12	requesting 159:18	rest 23:2 109:21	67:12
regard 75:4	remind 112:12	requests 24:12	145:12 155:4	roles 145:3
regarding 4:11	reminded 5:11	require 24:18	restraint 55:8	<b>roll</b> 8:11 11:13 57:6
20:6 79:3 81:14	remote 86:6	26:12 58:15 127:6	restrict 178:11	rolling 101:11
140:19 149:9	remotely 59:6	required 26:17	restricted 61:1,5	<b>room</b> 1:12 173:2,3
167:6	removed 108:9	55:11 58:18 105:6	86:18 87:11,18,20	<b>Rosston</b> 1:13,18
regardless 77:5,7	renew 33:20,22	151:14 167:1	91:12 95:8,20	7:13,15 8:8,11,16
register 165:6	34:8 59:2	requirements	147:14 161:15	9:1 10:3 11:12
regular 30:2,12	renewal 30:6 31:13	20:16 23:17,18,20	restrictive 93:17	12:7 13:11 47:3,7
regulate 101:17	32:10 33:16,16,16	24:22 25:14,16	<b>result</b> 79:19 116:6	47:11,19,22 48:6
regulated 66:6	35:15	26:1 60:10 107:11	results 147:1	82:13,14 87:9,10
regulation 2:24	renewals 31:5	110:5 113:5,13	resumed 94:15	87:16 111:17
28:21	renewed 34:4,17	132:4,5,9,14,15	revenue 62:6	117:7 118:20
regulatory 21:6	<b>Reno</b> 30:21	132:19	review 18:10 32:18	119:20 125:3,7,13
26:9 49:14 53:17	repeat 87:15	requires 27:14	156:16	126:1 128:1,6,10
53:21 57:14 60:18	repeatedly 178:14	169:2	reviewed 168:16	129:19 130:6,10
85:21	repeaters 139:17	requiring 27:8	reviewing 24:11	131:4,11,17 134:6
reimbursable	repertoire 53:15	101:20 102:9	re-circulated	134:12,16,18
167:21	replace 95:5	research 1:19	111:22	137:14 149:7
reimburse 62:1	<b>reply</b> 20:9	168:1	re-discuss 132:16	157:16 161:18
reimbursed 167:19	report 4:5,6,7,8	resident 78:13	re-licensees 175:10	172:19 173:7
reimbursements	6:18 12:10,12,14	resolution 166:22	re-shift 43:1	174:20 176:2,15
168:13	14:14,21 23:10	169:10 170:3	RICHARD 2:18	177:2,18 178:17
Rein 2:2 10:8	27:7 48:7 50:13	resolve 55:10 146:4	Rick 2:18 32:4	179:4,11 180:12
relate 173:10	51:6 64:1 66:18	147:20	140:8 162:7	round 50:11
related 28:19 42:11	66:19 67:8,21,21	resolved 55:5	rid 92:9	route 172:12
108:8 130:3 154:6	68:2 69:20 70:4,5	113:15	right 17:4,8 22:4	routine 109:19
relates 30:8 41:9	70:11 73:3 102:9	resonates 32:2	22:16 33:2 36:3	rule 151:14
42:2	102:16 111:19,20	resource 27:18,20	42:8 44:17 47:11	rulemaking 116:14
release 6:18 15:18	125:12 134:21	29:13 39:2,8,12	52:15 58:7 60:7	170:5
32:1,2 148:20	135:7 149:13,14	resources 27:3	68:6 70:5 81:4	rules 17:18 27:8
relevant 177:8	149:20 150:5	29:14,17 39:14	84:9 85:11 89:20	28:21 30:8 50:2,9

50.12 (0.10 71.22	2:10 6:10	144.0	-h	102.10
58:12 68:18 71:22	science 3:10 6:10	144:8	shared 2:13 3:17	signature 102:19
106:6,19 115:13	165:3	sending 73:21	10:12 58:16 62:2	signed 159:2
159:1 169:22	Sciences 1:12	129:2	63:8,13 69:19	172:10
170:2,6	scope 136:22	senior 2:15 116:19	73:4 130:14,15,16	significant 26:12
run 25:18 123:20	screwed 71:21	sense 38:16 63:3	130:17 131:5,5	26:15 27:3 100:12
running 141:9	119:10	89:8 101:3 108:19	168:12	101:6 106:4
149:21	scripts 15:3	109:3 123:12	sharer 75:22	167:11
S	se 54:11	138:18 157:19	<b>sharing</b> 4:7 49:3	significantly
$\frac{\mathbf{S}}{\mathbf{S}}$ 2:2	SEC 5:3	162:8	63:9 64:20 66:1	106:11
·= ·	second 29:22 47:8	sensed 107:21	66:14 67:21 68:2	silence 5:8
safe 137:18 176:10	47:10 56:3 86:15	sensing 72:20 73:8	68:5,8,11,18,18	silos 115:17
176:20	89:14,15 93:10	73:20 77:6 114:12	70:4,14,16 71:11	similar 36:5 144:22
<b>Safra</b> 173:9	95:16,18 111:7	119:5 127:16,17	71:20 72:16,17	162:13
sampling 20:7	113:19 134:12	133:3	73:7 81:11 82:3	simple 55:22,22
satellite 135:9,17	146:17 160:8	sensitive 169:7	108:8 112:14	71:22 147:12
140:19 165:22	secondary 20:22	sent 31:3 44:9	113:5,7 114:4	<b>simply</b> 16:9 58:12
166:4	57:21	113:6 125:16	115:11 116:1,5,7	63:3 68:11 71:12
satisfactory 156:13	Secretary 3:14	138:1 171:1	117:13,16 121:11	72:17 102:16
satisfying 62:19	<b>section</b> 36:4 154:14	sentence 46:17	121:15,20 127:7	104:14 147:3
saw 71:16 156:9	<b>security</b> 158:18,19	85:19 86:10,16	129:17 131:19	Simultaneous
saying 26:6 31:21	see 16:22 20:15	89:14,16 90:4	132:20 133:1	31:16 45:4,7 71:6
35:17 44:9 65:19	34:8 44:8 52:18	91:7,9,16 92:3,6,7	137:2 138:4,10	71:8 78:15 83:2
68:19 69:19 70:11	74:16 75:21 81:7	93:10 95:4,5	139:6 142:12,15	87:4 89:18 91:18
72:17 75:17,19	82:5 84:14 86:10	sentences 95:6	150:21 152:9,21	92:15 96:13 97:5
84:11,16 85:9	91:8 99:12 101:7	separate 18:10	167:8,19	118:10 124:22
104:12,13,14	152:16 153:12	97:3	sharings 112:17	126:21 127:2
105:4 106:17	165:15 179:22	serves 168:20	<b>shift</b> 43:2	128:16 130:9
119:16 129:17	seeing 102:12	<b>service</b> 2:4 30:4,9	shock 55:1	131:10 134:9
145:14 162:8	109:9 133:21	31:18 35:2 51:5	<b>short</b> 36:2 131:22	143:21 157:4,15
says 25:2 36:4,21	seek 16:9	112:15 121:11	139:15 140:2	176:1 177:1 178:2
66:11 68:2 90:5	seen 148:9 151:4	132:12 150:10	141:20	178:16
99:17 104:22	159:16 174:15	servicemen 50:1	short-term 19:17	single 69:7 100:2
109:1 115:22	segments 31:1	<b>services</b> 30:7 150:8	<b>shows</b> 57:9	sir 19:21 43:18
151:15	select 68:3 70:14	165:3	<b>shrink</b> 143:6	46:7 162:22
scenarios 66:14	75:16 85:13	set 24:20 39:10	<b>shut</b> 55:11 56:13	sit 21:22 179:16
114:13 116:12	selected 69:4	50:3,10 54:5	78:18	site 104:6
schedule 4:21	selecting 70:22	83:15 89:7 104:17	side 34:21 37:4	sites 166:2
11:14 18:10	151:2	112:14,20,21	98:22 101:8	sitting 6:11
149:22 179:5	self-enforcement	113:4 136:4	105:18 122:4	situation 52:21
scheduled 141:17	84:1	148:11 155:7	133:3,4,4 137:1,8	80:9 114:3 121:10
144:20 158:1	self-help 83:22	178:7	140:17 146:20,21	situations 84:19
179:6	self-muted 45:15	sets 112:20	158:7 161:8,21	slackers 144:22
schedules 137:3	self-report 64:1	setting 63:1	165:15	slide 57:8 59:19
163:8,9	<b>Senate</b> 105:18	settled 109:9	sides 133:22	112:2
schedule's 142:5	106:3	share 71:12 80:14	signal 138:21	slides 52:8
<b>scheme</b> 17:16	send 123:21 125:11	91:16 118:9	151:10	slightly 76:8
22:20	125:18 126:4	131:12 138:18	signals 79:8,9	small 25:5 27:21
	I	I	l .	I

smaller 160:1	sounds 92:13 102:4	39:8 43:8 46:3,22	started 34:2	83:20
smart 15:3 51:1	source 63:21	48:8 63:1 70:14	starting 76:18	structure 32:1
56:21 89:2,6	sources 79:5,14	70:16 85:7,10,14	135:21 145:8	79:20 106:9
90:12	so-called 52:22	88:19,20,22 90:10	158:5	163:21 171:11
Smith 105:21	63:7	93:8 98:14 108:8	starts 141:6	179:14
<b>Snyder</b> 8:15,15,21	space 2:18 53:3	110:10 111:18	state 2:22 6:2 39:7	structured 111:18
8:22 173:6,6,8,8	59:2,3 123:13	113:5,7,17 116:5	63:4 84:3	157:10
174:12 175:5	space-based 160:4	117:14 118:15	stated 27:7 99:9	structures 32:2
176:9,18 177:4	speak 6:5 8:13,19	120:4 121:20	177:7	37:15
178:3	9:20 44:18 173:3	127:7 130:16	statement 77:17	stuck 88:13
softball 115:8	173:5 175:20	150:14,18 152:21	statements 105:9	students 179:14,18
software 27:15	SPEAKER 78:5	154:15 156:2	states 1:1 109:22	179:21 180:4,13
28:6,9 29:19	speaking 10:2	159:4 160:14,15	154:19 160:14	studied 91:4
30:16 35:13,19,20	31:16 45:4,7 71:6	160:17 162:17	state-of-the 167:22	studies 66:21 168:1
50:5 114:1	71:8 78:15 83:2	164:8,21 165:14	stating 132:13	study 60:18 61:13
<b>solution</b> 84:16	87:4 89:18 91:18	165:15 166:13	stations 140:20	62:20 63:11 74:10
110:8 121:12	92:15 96:13 97:5	167:8,12,15 168:4	166:5,6	74:16 85:21 86:10
147:12 148:19	118:10 124:22	175:11	status 49:15 53:21	86:14 88:1
151:11 155:13	126:21 127:2	speculating 127:4	57:21	studying 28:16
solutions 50:22	128:16 130:9	speculative 126:19	<b>Stencil</b> 65:10	stuff 21:1 24:20
115:17 132:7	131:10 134:9	speeding 107:19	step 56:17 101:8	32:22 33:2 42:12
solve 57:1 80:20	143:21 157:4,15	spend 101:4 151:19	123:2 139:7	77:7 85:8 86:4
solved 147:18	176:1 177:1 178:2	spending 24:11	154:22 158:14	90:9 119:22
solving 72:4 134:4	178:16	spirit 16:8 84:11,21	stepping 106:16	126:19 140:22
somebody 8:8 25:1	<b>Special</b> 15:19 16:17	spoken 157:14	steps 99:16	176:4 177:22
26:20 27:9 44:13	16:22 137:15	spot 14:16 65:8	<b>Steve</b> 136:2	subcommittee 4:12
55:5 90:20 102:1	specific 18:17	<b>spread</b> 90:3,6	stick 106:18 139:3	9:11 11:17 12:9
120:11 150:13	23:21 30:9 37:14	spreadsheet 40:4	177:3	12:16,18 48:8
157:6,11	49:6 54:19 72:9	<b>STA</b> 6:21	stone 41:9	61:14 70:12,13
somebody's 118:4	89:4 90:18 94:8	staff 22:1 138:2	stood 101:13 102:8	111:19 149:10
sophisticated 35:12	109:20 115:10	staffing 23:17	106:5	170:20
56:8,16 83:16	116:3 121:1 166:2	24:19	stop 82:15,15,21	Subcommittee's
sorry 23:17 42:17	specifically 46:2	<b>stage</b> 92:3	straight 32:22	4:5,6,7
42:18 46:12,13	59:21 73:14	<b>Stancil</b> 2:21 9:3	Strategy 2:12	subgroups 145:4
68:22 74:8 76:7	167:10 168:8	stand 180:15	streamline 40:9	<b>subject</b> 6:21 53:3
76:10 88:7 91:20	specificity 92:9	standard 28:20	streamlining 107:8	76:8 80:2 172:22
94:1 95:14,18	specified 20:15	standpoint 28:17	strength 127:20	177:6
103:20 157:1	<b>specify</b> 20:9 127:10	138:9 164:1	Strickling 3:13 5:3	submitted 22:5
sort 27:12 32:6,16	132:8	<b>Stanford</b> 1:18,19	6:9	submitting 145:4
39:3 47:1 48:16	specifying 168:9	12:21	strictly 73:7,7	<b>subset</b> 146:14
65:9,18 66:16	<b>spectrum</b> 1:4 2:13	star 44:15	strike 37:7 46:20	subsets 147:4
67:3 68:14 80:8	2:18 3:9,17 4:4,6	start 11:15 58:3	95:4	substantial 158:16
80:19 81:22 83:12	4:7,15 6:17 10:12	80:6 91:9 101:11	striking 46:17	<b>subtle</b> 83:12
83:22 90:2,5	12:9 15:6,13,17	109:9 135:1	strong 50:18 51:4	<b>sub-base</b> 78:18
98:17 112:10	15:18 18:2 19:1	137:22 145:1	67:5 88:11 138:22	sufficient 116:17
139:1,5 146:14	20:20 21:4,4,5	146:3 155:16	stronger 52:3	<b>suggest</b> 29:6 40:7
sorts 85:8 151:16	25:9,13 35:21	163:4,5	strongly 51:18	85:12 87:10
	•	•	•	•

125:16 174:12
suggested 14:10       114:19 116:8       teacher 180:3       124:12       20:15 23:13,18         15:14,21 16:2,6       135:18 138:12       team 13:7       tend 37:18 123:11       26:4,13,15,19,2         28:17 32:6 39:22       139:9 145:6 151:7       technical 9:17       tendency 33:19       27:17 31:6 32:5         41:16 55:7 125:6       151:8 155:2       35:19 49:12 59:15       Tenhula 3:16       33:1,4,7,9 34:7         174:21       system's 164:8       114:21 115:16       tentative 130:20       68:14 71:16 79         suggesting 40:13       system-wide 14:1       117:12 118:21       term 59:16 112:18       79:6 81:7 86:1         suggests 82:3       T       130:13 131:18       terms 18:5 20:16       98:11 101:18         summarize 64:10       102:7 148:17       149:12 179:17       168:16,16,19       26:16 32:7 48:14       124:12         support 85:2 106:9       107:3 132:21       149:12 179:17       168:16,16,19       58:21 64:4,5,5       130:3 133:6         107:3 132:21       tactical 142:17,20       177:12       154:20 155:17       150:6,7 151:16
15:14,21 16:2,6 28:17 32:6 39:22 41:16 55:7 125:6 174:21 15:18 138:12 164:13 168:1 10:8 118:8 110:8 118:21 110:8 18:21 110:8 18
28:17 32:6 39:22
41:16 55:7 125:6       151:8 155:2       35:19 49:12 59:15       Tenhula 3:16       33:1,4,7,9 34:7         174:21       164:13 168:1       68:4 69:6 113:1       166:20 167:3,4       35:18 42:4 58:2         suggesting 40:13       system's 164:8       114:21 115:16       tentative 130:20       68:14 71:16 79         110:8 118:8       system-wide 14:1       117:12 118:21       term 59:16 112:18       79:6 81:7 86:1         suggests 82:3       Table 9:20 67:2       135:16,19 140:13       20:19 24:3,19       98:11 101:18         summary 56:19       102:7 148:17       149:12 179:17       168:16,16,19       58:21 64:4,5,5       130:3 133:6         support 85:2 106:9       107:3 132:21       149:12 17,20       177:12       154:20 155:17       150:6,7 151:16
174:21       164:13 168:1       68:4 69:6 113:1       166:20 167:3,4       35:18 42:4 58:2         suggesting 40:13       110:8 118:8       system's 164:8       114:21 115:16       tentative 130:20       68:14 71:16 79         suggests 82:3       110:8 118:21       117:12 118:21       term 59:16 112:18       79:6 81:7 86:1         suited 85:15       130:13 131:18       130:13 131:18       107:18 122:1         summarize 64:10       102:7 148:17       149:12 179:17       168:16,16,19       20:19 24:3,19       107:18 122:1         support 85:2 106:9       149:12 179:17       168:16,16,19       58:21 64:4,5,5       130:3 133:6         107:3 132:21       142:17,20       177:12       154:20 155:17       150:6,7 151:16
suggesting 40:13         system's 164:8         114:21 115:16         tentative 130:20         68:14 71:16 79           110:8 118:8         system-wide 14:1         117:12 118:21         term 59:16 112:18         79:6 81:7 86:1           suited 85:15         T         130:13 131:18         terms 18:5 20:16         98:11 101:18           summarize 64:10         table 9:20 67:2         140:18 166:22         26:16 32:7 48:14         124:5,13 125:4           summary 56:19         149:12 179:17         168:16,16,19         58:21 64:4,5,5         130:3 133:6           support 85:2 106:9         107:3 132:21         142:17,20         177:12         154:20 155:17         150:6,7 151:16
110:8 118:8       system-wide 14:1       117:12 118:21       term 59:16 112:18       79:6 81:7 86:1         suggests 82:3       T         suited 85:15       T       table 9:20 67:2       135:16,19 140:13       20:19 24:3,19       107:18 122:1         summary 56:19       table 9:20 67:2       102:7 148:17       168:16,16,19       58:21 64:4,5,5       130:3 133:6         support 85:2 106:9       149:12 179:17       169:9 170:3       123:18 145:2       140:13 141:1,8         107:3 132:21       tactical 142:17,20       177:12       154:20 155:17       150:6,7 151:16
suggests 82:3         suited 85:15       T       130:13 131:18       terms 18:5 20:16       98:11 101:18         summarize 64:10       table 9:20 67:2       140:18 166:22       26:16 32:7 48:14       124:5,13 125:4         summary 56:19       149:12 179:17       168:16,16,19       58:21 64:4,5,5       130:3 133:6         support 85:2 106:9       107:3 132:21       169:9 170:3       123:18 145:2       140:13 141:1,8         107:3 132:21       154:20 155:17       150:6,7 151:16
suited 85:15         summarize 64:10       table 9:20 67:2       135:16,19 140:13       20:19 24:3,19       107:18 122:1         summary 56:19       102:7 148:17       168:16,16,19       58:21 64:4,5,5       130:3 133:6         support 85:2 106:9       107:3 132:21       169:9 170:3       123:18 145:2       140:13 141:1,8         107:3 132:21       107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         108:16,16,19       123:18 145:2       140:13 141:1,8         107:18 122:1       124:5,13 125:4       124:5,13 125:4         108:16,16,19       123:18 145:2       140:13 141:1,8         109:9 17:12       154:20 155:17
summarize 64:10       table 9:20 67:2       140:18 166:22       26:16 32:7 48:14       124:5,13 125:4         summary 56:19       102:7 148:17       168:16,16,19       58:21 64:4,5,5       130:3 133:6         support 85:2 106:9       107:3 132:21       142:17,20       177:12       154:20 155:17       150:6,7 151:16
summary 56:19     102:7 148:17     168:16,16,19     58:21 64:4,5,5     130:3 133:6       support 85:2 106:9     149:12 179:17     169:9 170:3     123:18 145:2     140:13 141:1,8       107:3 132:21     tactical 142:17,20     177:12     154:20 155:17     150:6,7 151:16
support 85:2 106:9         149:12 179:17         169:9 170:3         123:18 145:2         140:13 141:1,8           107:3 132:21         tactical 142:17,20         177:12         154:20 155:17         150:6,7 151:16
107:3 132:21   tactical 142:17,20   177:12   154:20 155:17   150:6,7 151:16
10,10 102.21
supportive 124:19         143:5         technique 81:10         168:20         153:15 157:8
suppose 64:16         tag 13:7         127:15 133:10         test 152:15,18         162:1 164:3 16
178:10 <b>take</b> 6:4 14:7 16:3 <b>techniques</b> 20:7,20 <b>testbed</b> 152:21 165:2 166:8 17
supposed 25:3 30:7         26:22 29:7,9         127:5         tested 153:7         176:7
sure 8:14 21:7   69:17,20 84:2   technologies 2:14   testing 6:21 33:12   think 5:20 7:17 8
23:16 24:13 36:9   88:2,5 94:6,12   116:9 152:9   35:5 138:3   9:19 13:10 15:3
36:11 43:3 44:5   101:15 108:14   167:22   <b>tethered</b> 100:21   17:12,22 18:14
51:8 58:11 65:12   124:13,16 143:15   technology 2:8,10   101:1   18:21 19:3,6
74:13 100:1   143:19,19 150:22   2:15,20,23 3:12   <b>text</b> 36:3 108:9,10   21:22 23:8 24:5
103:18 104:4   157:11 161:10   6:10 11:4 50:21   118:17 144:7   24:17 26:15,18
107:9,17 108:1 169:22 176:8 51:8 52:7 60:4,5 <b>thank</b> 6:14 10:3 27:3,17 28:15
117:18 125:22   taken 28:15 29:10   99:3 112:20   11:21 17:2 20:1   29:4,5 32:16
132:17 134:7   39:20 56:6 62:7   121:15 138:18   46:5 47:22 48:13   34:18 35:11 37
139:19 142:1   151:12 155:15   151:21 152:1   76:6 97:9,10 98:3   37:11 38:6,14,2
148:7 150:11   takes 131:8   teed 39:2   111:14,15 145:14   39:4,13 40:12
161:22 172:2   talk 6:2,3 9:13   telecom 58:5   149:1,6 170:9,10   41:3 42:22 46:8
175:3 180:6     39:11 41:17 53:10     105:19 106:1     172:15,18 178:17     47:1 48:19 49:7
surfing 66:22 79:15 80:5 81:14 <b>Telecommunicat</b> 180:13,16 52:2,6,8 54:21
surprising 102:6   108:17 142:15   1:12   thanks 7:12 12:6   56:11,19 57:10
surveillance 136:13   153:17 158:2   telecon 140:10   12:11 16:11 120:2   58:8 61:14,18
swags 40:1,2   talked 12:20 25:14   telemetry 114:11   They'd 45:13   65:1,6,15 66:2
sweet 14:16   62:22 79:12 107:7   telephone 3:22   thing 17:3 24:20,22   67:15 68:1 71:4
switch 35:5 59:7   113:20 180:11   5:10 173:4   27:12 32:18 33:8   73:17 74:5,6,14
switching 73:21   talking 22:8 25:5   Television 2:4   33:20 34:21 40:12   75:18 77:2,2,18
sword 155:21 26:11 30:15 36:7 tell 23:3 74:6,17 43:5 57:17 58:10 77:19,21,22 80
system 27:11 30:2   42:14 79:7 100:1   122:19 161:7   61:11 63:17 65:9   80:19 81:3,5,6,
35:17 58:22 102:1 109:12 133:11 <b>telling</b> 103:4 81:21 109:15 81:13,15,19 82
106:10 129:8,9,13   155:16 164:12   148:14 161:3   119:13 140:2   83:4,9,11,17 84
130:14 138:6   tamp 90:6   template 113:16   150:18 151:20   84:5,20 85:2 86
158:11,18 159:5 <b>tampered</b> 54:10 169:5 153:5 155:7 159:2 88:14,17 89:4
159:14 <b>tap</b> 32:16 <b>templates</b> 169:3 161:20 162:1 90:6,13 91:15
systems 2:16,19   task 41:10,21   temporarily 106:14   164:4,4 166:19   92:9 94:6 95:2

07.0.00.2.00.7.11	160 21 22 162 22	<b>T</b>	1 1050	147.2.155.20
97:9 98:2 99:7,11	160:21,22 162:22	<b>Tom</b> 3:10 6:8,9	trashed 85:8	147:3 155:20
101:1,10 103:16	thread 66:3 67:6	10:6,7 85:18 87:5	treated 66:17	157:17 158:12
103:22 105:3,12	three 16:17 19:17	88:7 89:22 91:17	treatment 85:21	159:20 163:4,18
105:16 106:20,21	52:9 59:18 73:14	93:5 136:14,15	tried 12:22 13:4	170:2,5 176:19
107:1 108:3,18	81:19 82:7 83:5	139:11 141:13,21	150:2 162:16	two-day 145:10,13
109:17 114:2	95:5 96:19,21	142:2 145:14	trouble 137:13	type 29:16 30:3
115:6,18 117:14 122:3 123:11,17	97:6,8 107:6 109:2 113:3	tool 55:7 150:8 tools 21:3 107:8	trust 175:14	31:6 42:7 53:12 64:5 77:7 104:16
124:10,16,19	114:18,21 125:19	top 33:3 129:16	<b>try</b> 13:8 34:20 39:11 40:19 42:6	114:6 140:1 178:6
124.10,10,19	140:7 158:12	topic 64:14 88:2	49:6 51:21 55:17	178:15
129:15 130:4	159:21 163:5	146:9 163:3	59:20 72:14 84:2	typed 94:20
132:4,7,8,11	168:17	Topics 4:15	88:12 89:6 90:21	types 23:21 26:15
132:4,7,8,11	throwing 176:7	total 126:14 164:16	93:5 127:21	147:20
135:1 136:19	Thursday 80:6	totally 85:8	162:13	typically 103:21
137:4,5,6,7	145:11	tougher 51:11,12	trying 8:11 18:9	<b>T-Mobile</b> 6:22
138:10,15 139:21	tied 78:6	track 14:13 35:20	23:1 24:12 37:13	
140:12,15 141:15	ties 7:1	80:10 134:7	40:5,16,17 88:17	U
142:6,8,21 144:16	till 141:7,17 178:20	135:15	93:7,18,21 94:8	ULS 30:22
144:18 146:10	tilting 151:1	tracking 28:1 33:8	132:6 144:2 146:2	ultimately 17:12
147:17 149:22	time 6:6,16 14:7	trade 159:17	146:4 160:13	27:20 37:11 71:21
150:3,5,9 151:17	18:3,16 22:17	traditional 138:4	164:1 166:9	99:2 101:15
152:2,3 153:18	23:17 25:9 27:1	Tramont 2:22	TUESDAY 1:9	138:16
154:11,13,15,17	29:12 31:12,12	10:19,19 16:2	turn 29:21 48:9	<b>un</b> 13:1
155:11 156:5,6,14	53:6 58:5 61:7	18:20 19:10 21:13	94:18,18 110:17	<b>unable</b> 145:18
158:13 159:14	69:22 70:15 78:17	22:5,10 38:19	112:5,21 115:1	unaddressed 13:1
161:9 162:1,9,9	91:14 101:4	46:14,15 47:5	122:7,14 131:3	unanticipated
162:19 164:5,9,18	106:12 112:9	80:12 89:13,21	turned 35:4 51:3	122:2
168:6 171:13	116:17 117:3,4,9	91:19 129:14	51:10 68:13 74:10	uncensored 98:4
172:1,5 174:1,20	126:18 133:20	130:1,12 143:14	120:22 121:2	unclassified 158:7
175:2,5,6 176:2,7	138:8 147:6	143:18 144:10	123:4	unconnected 60:22
178:20 179:4,8	151:19 154:3	156:20 157:5,18	turning 124:5	86:17 91:2,3
180:15	156:10,16 163:3	179:1,9,12,13	175:20	92:12 93:2 95:7
thinking 30:17	176:8,12	transferring	turns 73:1	95:11,19
38:2 57:11 124:8	times 23:10 55:21	158:17	TV 53:3 59:2,3	undergoing 162:12
127:11 133:14	56:7 108:6 164:12	transfers 167:15	60:13 123:12	underneath 92:2 understand 6:19
thinks 39:13	time-out 119:10,12	<b>transition</b> 18:5,18	166:6	14:5 22:22 23:3
third 87:6,6 91:9	tire 100:21	158:10 168:9,14	tweak 72:14	33:1 36:7 42:10
114:8	title 12:17	168:15 169:4,14	two 9:9 34:12,12	50:1 53:22 56:15
third-party 73:22	titled 115:5	169:16,18,20	36:10,18 41:15,15	70:1 73:12 82:9
THOMAS 2:2	today 7:8 9:12 12:5 38:21 98:20	transitions 168:22	57:7 67:19 69:11	99:1 102:3 120:14
thought 16:6 40:10 76:20 88:15	38:21 98:20 112:11 146:6	transmit 73:6 125:18	70:21 71:9,11,13 71:15 75:18 82:15	124:7 175:2
101:18 121:16	149:22 170:14	transmitter 165:14	92:7 95:4,5 96:15	understanding
129:17 139:16	178:14 179:16	transmitter 103:14	97:2 102:12	14:4 55:22 66:2
169:15 170:16	Today's 173:14	168:7	112:20 114:4,17	107:10 116:8
thoughts 23:16	told 43:20 82:15,21	transparently	117:17 118:21	117:20 132:5,18
88:9 94:11 160:10	tolerance 133:8	175:15	135:13 136:12	understood 127:8
50.771.11 100.10	torci unice 133.0	173.13	133.13 130.12	
	I	I	I	ı

undertaken 15:2	upgrade 55:15	version 92:6	157:11 158:3	week 63:7 136:17
40:9	78:18 104:7	versus 121:14	167:4 170:10	140:10 141:2,4
undertaking	upgraded 104:2	122:11	171:12,14 179:13	140:10 141:2,4
115:19	uplinks 140:19	vice 1:22 2:4,17,23	wanted 11:18 14:3	156:9
underway 49:4	upwards 144:16	3:16 100:4	16:7 29:4,5 37:7	weeks 55:4
145:7 166:18	up-to 158:3	view 16:4 18:22	38:11 44:5 79:1	week-and-a-half
under-utilized 63:9	use 5:15 19:6,16	81:8	87:2 103:13 117:4	136:19
unfinished 49:2,4	35:21 37:3 53:5	viewed 64:2	146:8 159:15	weigh 19:5
unfortunately	58:19 75:21 76:2	views 85:4	166:19 180:7	weight 99:20
145:18 153:10	93:12 98:13	virtual 151:18	wants 19:5 175:10	113:10
unfunded 39:3	118:15 121:1	visibility 64:3	warfare 140:22	weightings 43:3
uniform 55:14	122:20,22 130:3	visit 179:21	warning 60:14	welcome 4:2 5:4
unilateral 177:10	138:17,22 152:10	visitors 5:6	<b>Warren</b> 2:23 9:4	7:12,15 9:8
unintended 79:12	158:21 161:21	visitors 3.0 vital 148:3	45:19 143:12,15	179:13 180:13
79:14,18	163:14 168:11	voiced 85:4	<b>Washington</b> 3:18	welcoming 6:12
United 1:1 109:22	169:4 171:21	volced 63.4 voluntary 63:19	35:6	well-known 175:4
154:19	useful 26:19 38:20	65:13	wasn't 74:21,21	went 12:22 13:2
universities 166:6	130:4	volunteering 145:3	82:6,8 85:11	40:4 94:14 106:12
University 1:20 2:9	useless 55:2	vote 9:12 47:16	93:21 109:21	108:11 135:15
2:22 11:11 173:10	user 100:3,4 121:21	111:1 112:10	141:14,21 166:1	142:7 169:15
unlicensed 4:6 37:1	users 23:21 24:1		171:20 172:2	180:18
37:3 46:19 48:8	25:12,20 26:11	$oldsymbol{ ext{W}}$	180:6	weren't 22:2 53:13
49:5,11,22 53:2	49:22 56:5,18	wags 40:2	watching 65:21	54:12 74:12
54:22 57:21 58:15	63:22 131:6,7,13	wait 55:4 110:18,18	wave 132:16	139:19 151:17
60:1 62:14 63:2,3	131:19 132:19	126:18,18	way 5:18 11:22	171:17
64:20 66:1,14,17	165:5	walk 48:10 126:17	12:14 18:12 20:19	we'll 5:17 13:7
72:18 83:21 85:6	user's 126:3	158:19	26:8,10 27:2	21:19 22:10 42:6
93:11 99:16 100:2	uses 20:7,8 27:2	walking 48:14	32:14,15 34:12	42:9 44:15 46:9
100:5 105:13	37:2 46:19 71:14	120:12	37:22 52:19 56:11	53:9 65:12 78:7
108:8 109:19	156:4 164:6	<b>wall</b> 32:11	57:10 59:12 65:2	94:12,21 148:20
110:4 113:21	utilized 63:6	<b>want</b> 7:11 11:16	65:18 69:18 72:14	157:18 171:7
122:5,14 123:22		21:10 32:5 38:11	77:9,14 78:2	we're 5:9,9,18,21
124:3 149:18	<b>V</b>	40:2 41:4,8 47:13	84:22 86:11,12	5:21 9:16 11:14
unlicensees 62:3	<b>vain</b> 157:14	57:13 63:12 67:2	98:16 99:20	12:3,3 13:10
untethered 52:22	<b>valid</b> 104:15	67:8 74:19 75:18	102:21 106:18	17:15 18:13 21:13
57:11,16 60:19	<b>value</b> 28:18	76:3,5,9 80:1,12	123:11 129:6	23:8,11 25:5 26:2
100:8,17,19 110:9	<b>Van</b> 180:3	80:22 83:11 86:7	149:18 155:19	26:2,11 27:12
unturned 41:9	variables 15:12	90:5,6 91:20 93:7	156:13 170:22	33:11 38:21 39:10
<b>update</b> 18:4 30:5	variety 58:20	94:6 111:15 114:4	172:6 178:7	40:13,16,20 42:6
30:11 36:20 59:5	various 13:3	114:6 117:10,15	ways 41:19 74:2	42:14 46:8 70:11
72:3 96:20,22	vectors 145:6	118:6 119:1,3,14	83:11	70:20 73:10,17
104:22 135:4,10	vehicle 177:15	121:5 123:5,22	weather 151:7	75:8 77:3,22
135:13 167:5	verification 159:8	125:4,8,13,17	165:22 166:4	80:15,21 82:2
170:11,12	verified 44:21	127:14 128:2,4,12	webcast 5:21	83:12 84:11 89:4
<b>updated</b> 17:16 51:2	verifies 159:11	129:15 135:1,10	webcasting 5:9	90:8,12 92:1
51:10	Verizon 2:5 11:2	139:13 140:8	website 65:12,12	97:20 98:19
updating 159:3	versa 100:4	155:18 156:10	66:21 112:1	107:12 108:13

	Ì	Ì	I	
110:7 111:18	wondering 84:21	worried 76:17	<b>101</b> 30:11	3
112:11 133:6,11	97:18	79:18 80:7,8	<b>1107</b> 1:12	<b>3</b> 159:22 163:15,16
134:19 135:2,6,6	word 84:14 87:17	worrying 75:3	<b>113</b> 4:7	164:19
137:6 144:21	92:17	wouldn't 62:4	<b>12</b> 4:4	<b>3:02</b> 94:15
145:1,18 146:21	<b>wording</b> 131:16	114:3	<b>12:00</b> 141:17,17	<b>3:45</b> 158:1
147:7 148:7,7,13	words 85:11,12	writing 157:7	<b>134</b> 4:8	<b>30</b> 25:11
148:13 149:8,21	121:4	written 81:7	<b>149</b> 4:10	<b>300</b> 159:22 163:15
151:3 152:5,6,20	work 6:15 7:6 9:13	<b>WSRD</b> 7:5 133:2	<b>157</b> 4:15	163:16 164:19
154:16 155:10	9:17 18:13 21:16	152:14	<b>167</b> 4:17	<b>315</b> 109:3,9
156:12 157:13,22	21:19 23:4 29:2,7	<b>T</b> 7	<b>1675</b> 14:14	<b>325</b> 1:12
158:1,5 164:12	29:8 40:15 42:5,6	<u>Y</u>	<b>1695</b> 135:8	
166:16 167:1	42:14 43:11 49:3	yeah 16:14,19	<b>1710</b> 14:14 135:9	4
168:21 179:8	58:6 62:9 66:11	18:20 21:13 25:3	143:3	<b>4</b> 165:20
we've 5:20 6:18	66:15 68:4 72:6	35:10 52:15 57:5	<b>172</b> 4:19	<b>4:23</b> 180:18
11:13,13 23:6,13	74:21 85:5 102:5	72:12 74:5,8	<b>1755</b> 14:14 21:18	<b>4:40</b> 178:21
25:13 26:1 27:8	106:7 110:22	76:16 81:2,3	61:17 115:20	<b>4200</b> 42:1
32:6 37:20 43:13	114:13 116:1	82:19 86:22 88:4	133:6 136:12	<b>4200-4400</b> 17:4
54:3 65:22 69:15	121:10 123:6	90:4 92:8 95:13	143:4 159:22	<b>4400</b> 42:1
90:3 103:13	135:18 142:19	95:17 96:17 123:8	163:17 164:5	<b>48</b> 4:6
106:18 107:20	143:4 145:2 148:9	125:15,21 129:10	170:19	<b>49</b> 86:3 90:11,13
134:8 147:17	148:10 152:4,5	130:12 135:5	<b>1780</b> 160:1	
148:9 150:1,19	153:11 166:21	139:12 146:8	<b>179</b> 4:22	5
153:8,10 155:4,7	workable 112:17	year 61:16,19	<b>18-month</b> 168:20	<b>5</b> 4:2 7:7 54:11
155:9,15 171:10	worked 114:15	years 19:18,18	<b>1850</b> 14:15 21:18	60:15 72:7 103:12
179:2	123:7	25:11 56:12 167:6	133:7 136:12	107:12 108:13
whatnot 15:3 28:22	<b>working</b> 4:8 7:1,2	yeses 48:18	159:22 163:17	
30:10	12:5,21 13:22	yesterday 6:19	164:6	6
<b>white</b> 3:10 6:11	15:12 17:17 21:17	136:17		<b>6</b> 4:3
53:3 59:2,3	22:17,18 27:13	yield 64:18 147:1	2	7
123:12	28:16 29:4 39:11	young 38:7	<b>2nd</b> 144:21 145:8	<b>7</b> 46:18 54:5
whoever's 41:1	42:6 46:22 61:17	<b>Yup</b> 28:13	<b>2.2</b> 41:15	<b>700</b> 155:8
wholeheartedly	108:13 112:13	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	<b>2.4</b> 61:3	700 133.8
84:10	113:6 134:1,21		<b>2:53</b> 94:14	8
<b>Wi</b> 100:14	135:3 136:12,20	<b>zero</b> 44:15 165:8,9	<b>20</b> 25:11 56:12	<b>80</b> 43:7 144:16
widened 50:7	137:7 139:14	165:10	164:16	<b>80-person</b> 145:21
wider 63:13 167:16	140:7 141:11,20	<b>zone</b> 113:7	<b>20th</b> 168:21	<b>85</b> 144:18
Wiley 2:2 10:8	142:2 143:11	0	<b>2010</b> 149:15	05 177.10
Wilkinson 2:23	144:10 152:22	$\frac{0}{0.45:13}$	<b>2011</b> 177:11	9
10:20	166:13,13 172:7	<b>00:14:01</b> 19:5	<b>2012</b> 1:9 167:9	9 85:5,5
<b>willing</b> 105:14	173:11,13,15	UU.17.U1 17.J	<b>2013</b> 153:14	<b>90's</b> 34:15
154:22	174:6 176:4,6,18	1	<b>21</b> 159:4	<b>900</b> 61:3
winners 114:9,20	workings 170:2	11:12	<b>23rd</b> 78:13	<b>95</b> 30:9 164:17
168:3	works 72:5,9	1st 141:4 170:7	<b>24</b> 1:9 59:4	
wireless 1:23 2:1,5	114:11,12,14	<b>1:30</b> 1:13 5:2 13:15	<b>24-hour</b> 141:19	
11:2 60:11 138:5	world 66:5 83:12	<b>10</b> 149:15	<b>25</b> 164:15,16	
155:10	109:21 110:1	<b>10-minute</b> 94:12	<b>2690</b> 151:7	
<b>Wi-Fi</b> 5:15	155:4	<b>100</b> 145:21 146:3	<b>2700</b> 151:8	
		10.0		
L				

## <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Commerce Spectrum Management

Advisory Committee

Before: US DOC

Date: 07-24-12

Place: Boulder, CO

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

Mac Nous &