

2013-01-11 to 13 Discussion on Broadband Coverage

Friday, March 28, 2014
10:08 AM

DHSMV: FloridaNet

Discussion on Broadband Coverage

Posted by Brett Boston on Jan 11 '13



From: Richard.Steiner@ocfl.net

Subject: Comment to the Broadband Committee (Meeting Jan 8th, 2013)

Broadband Planning Board,

I know this is early in the planning process but I wanted to add a comment to our Committee meeting on January 8th. When the funds are dispersed to the States to plan, engineer, and deploy a broadband solution throughout our state, we might want to consider deploying in certain geographical areas of the State to completely cover an entire area with a proven solution. The FCC mentions in one of the slides it will require possibly 5 times the number of currently deployed towers, monopoles, or roof tops currently in use for LMR systems to fully deploy a Broadband system. It was mentioned in our meeting the initial Broadband system may be for outside use only so an in-building solution will require even more. I know we will leverage and work with the carriers to deploy the appropriate number of sites for a system and even use their facilities since industry carriers have already done this.

If the funds from the \$7B allocated to Florida can only cover certain areas it might make sense to deploy a complete solution in certain areas rather than have an inferior product in the entire State that is not useable or completely "built out". First impressions to the users will be important and may improve the ultimate buy-in if we have a complete system solution available to a specific community first.

Thank you for allowing local participation on this committee, I know the Orlando/Orange County governments are committed to this.

Discuss this message



Brett Boston

Brett Boston posted for Rob Fortner:

Good idea Rich! Might I offer up Region 1 as a test-bed?

Region 1 is predominately rural and a large focus for FirstNet will be rural connectivity. The only thing I'd want to see is that whatever equipment or processes found to be inferior --as a result of Region 1's experience-- be corrected as the rest of the state gets developed. We wouldn't want to be left with an inferior product at the end-state,

ROB FORTNER

Posted on Jan 11 '13, updated 12 months later– Edit or Delete

<https://basecamp.com/2118498/projects/4636956-dhsmv-floridanet/messages/19837341-di...> 3/28/2014



Rob Fortner

I'd also like to make a comment on the potential organizational and system structure. Over time, Florida's LMR structure has become a "system of systems". I propose that a Public Safety Broadband network be configured similarly, thereby becoming a network of networks.

Insofar as there will be a National Public Safety Broadband Network, we'd then create a Florida Public Safety Broadband Network, then a Regional Public Safety Broadband Network, County, Municipal, Special District, etc.

I freely admit I have no idea about the technical requirements of making something like this happen, but it seems like the safest way to go. For example, the system should be configured so that a network problem in Tampa, for example, couldn't adversely affect the rest of the state. To the extent possible, problems would be localized.

Structuring ourselves—and Florida's PSBN—this way could also lower the development curve of our governance model. The SWG-ICC model, while not perfect, has served us well over the years. We could probably leverage that to Florida's advantage.

Thanks for everyone's consideration and the opportunity to participate.

ROB FORTNER

Posted on Jan 12 '13, updated 12 months later— Edit or Delete



Brett Boston

Thanks for sharing Rob. This is clearly the type of thinking we will be addressing as a group.

Posted on Jan 13 '13, updated 12 months later— Edit or Delete
