*** NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING ***

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

LOCATIONS:	Legislative Counsel Bureau 401 S. Carson Street Room 2134 Carson City, Nevada 89701	Grant Sawyer Building 555 E. Washington Avenue Room 4412 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

If you cannot attend the meeting, you can listen to it live over the internet. The address for the legislative websites is http://www.leg.state.nv.us. Click on the link "Live Meetings"- Listen or View.

DATE AND TIME: August 31, 2016, 1:00 p.m.

Below is an agenda of all items to be considered. Items on the agenda may be taken out of the order presented**,** items may be combined for consideration by the public body; and items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time at the discretion of the Chairperson.

DRAFT

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLE CALL

Chairman Diflo: So, for the record, my name is Paul Diflo, I'm the new chair of the ITAB Committee. At this time, I would like to call the August 31st, 2016 ITAB meeting into session. Kelly, if I could ask you to do a role call and then let me know if we have a quorum?

Kelly Kiesow: Okay. Assemblyman Anderson?

No response heard.

Kelly Kiesow: Senator Lipparelli?

No response heard.

Kelly Kiesow: Director Malfabon?

Director Malfabon: Present.

Kelly Kiesow: Director Cates?

Director Cates: Present.

Kelly Kiesow: Director Whitely?

Steve Fisher: Steve Fischer for Director Whitely.

Kelly Kiesow: Mr. Marcella?

Joe Marcella: Present.

Kelly Kiesow: Ms. Krause?

Catherine Krause: Present.

Kelly Kiesow: Mr. Betts?

Mr. Betts: Present.

Kelly Kiesow: Ms. McGee?

No response heard.

Kelly Kiesow: Chairman Diflo?

Chairman Diflo: Present.

Kelly Kiesow: Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS *(for discussion only)* –

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Kelly. So as this is a public meeting, I want to open up for public comments but I would like to keep this Agenda Item open so that we can take Agenda Item — we can take comments after Agenda Item 6, and again at the end of the meeting. So, at this time I would like to ask anybody in the North from the public that would like to speak. I would like to throw out the caveat.

If you would want to speak to Agenda Item No. 6, I'd ask that you wait until after we open for public comments after Agenda Item No. 6. Seeing none, I will ask if there is anybody from the South from the public that would like to speak?

Joe Marcella: Chairman Diflo, we had four representatives come in just about three minutes ago. Would you like me to have them identity themselves?

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Joe. That would be great.

Joe Marcella: Gentlemen? Ma'am?

DRAFT

John Lopez: Excuse me. Good afternoon. My name is John Lopez; I am Government Affairs Manager for Cox Communications here in Las Vegas. I think we are going to be speaking to Agenda Item No.6 that has to do with peering study, if I'm not mistaken?

Chairman Diflo: That is Agenda Item No. 6. That is correct.

John Lopez: Okay. Great. We will deliver our comments at that time then. Thank you.

Chairman Diflo: As stated, I would like to keep this agenda item open and I would like to proceed with the ITAB meeting at this time.

Joe Marcella: Chairman Diflo, we have another board member that just arrived.

Senator Lipparelli: I'm Mark Lipparelli.

Chairman Diflo: Welcome Mark. Kelly, can you log that Mark is here?

Kelly Kiesow: Yes. I will make note of that.

3. COMMENTS BY THE CHAIR *(for discussion only)*

Chairman Diflo: Okay. I would like to start. You've seen from the posted minutes that ITAB last met in October of 2014, which is not consistent with NRS242, which states that the board should meet once every three months, but may meet further times as deemed necessary by the tier. Based on some agenda items, specifically Agenda Item No. 6, we will be meeting once more before the legislature begins and that date will be October 27th, 2016. Kelly, I believe the time is going to be from 2:30 until 4:00, is that correct?

Kelly Kiesow: That is correct.

Chairman Diflo: Since the last meeting, we have a new State of Nevada CIO. So, I would like to formally welcome Shannon Rahming to her first ITAB meeting. Welcome Shannon. We also have a new ITAB Chair, and my disclaimer is, this new ITAB Chair is a novice at best when it comes to the onus's and rules for the meetings. So, having said that, I'm going to be leaning on the expertise of former chair, Mr. Joe Marcella, who is still a member of the Board, as well as Jeff Menicucci.

As it's been well over one and a half years since we've met, I want to take the time to remind the board that NRS 242 defines the creation, the members, the chair, the duties, the powers, and the compensation for ITAB, and it defines what The Board shall do — it would behoove us all if we all just went out and reread 242. I'm not going to read now, but it boils down to ITAB exists as a resource to help improve operational effectiveness and efficiency at the State of Nevada Information Technology Division and there is no funding or budget ownership by this group.

DRAFT

Kelly Kiesow: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman? I noticed Mr. Anderson — is Assemblyman Anderson here?

Chairman Diflo: Welcome Assemblyman Anderson.

Assemblyman Anderson: Thank you. Appreciate it. Sorry for being late.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 8, 2014 *(for possible action)*

Chairman Diflo: The next agenda item is the approval of the minutes from the October 13th, 2014 ITAB meeting which have been posted. Can I have a motion to accept the minutes?

Joe Marcella: I so move.

Chairman Diflo: And second?

Senator Lipparelli: I'll second that. Mark Lipparelli.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. And all those in favor?

Director Malfabon: Mr. Chairman, can I state since I was not present — what is the instructions to the people that were not on the Board at that time?

Chairman Diflo: Yes. If you were not present and haven't read the minutes, I think abstain would be the correct response.

Director Malfabon: Because I wasn't present, I prefer to abstain. Director Malfabon for the record.

Chairman Diflo: Very good.

Steve Fisher: Steve Fisher for the record, since I was not present at that meeting, I would abstain as well.

Catherine Krause: Catherine Krause for the record, I will echo that with the other members. I was not present nor a member of the board at the time.

Director Cates: Patrick Cates. Ditto, but I have a question for the AG on the point of order. If we all abstain, is there enough votes for a valid vote?

Jeff Menicucci: I believe the numbers are in our favor — if everyone votes in the affirmative — I believe the numbers are in our favor for a valid —

DRAFT

Director Cates: Well, you've got four people that aren't going to vote.

Jeff Menicucci: I believe we have — do we have nine?

Kelly Kiesow: Nine members total. We have today, yes, nine people.

Jeff Menicucci: Okay. I was right then.

Craig Betts: Just to follow suit, Craig Betts. I was not present either, so I will abstain.

Speaker: So, now we have a problem.

Chairman Diflo: So, now we only have four who actually have any knowledge of what transpired.

Catherine Krause: Mr. Chair? If this makes sense, just a suggestion, maybe those who were here, if they can affirmatively state that they think it's accurate. I mean, I don't know if that is reasonable for us to then feel more comfortable voting, that weren't here.

Chairman Diflo: That seems like a fair recommendation. I for one was here, I have read the minutes and they do seem accurate. Joe, I believe you were at that meeting as well?

Joe Marcella: They are accurate. Just one comment, I rather they weren't verbatim because my New York accent comes through.

Chairman Diflo: I noticed that when I was reading them, yeah.

Joe Marcella: I think it's a good idea to proceed.

Speaker: So, the recommendation I think is that we get a majority of those present voting even though they may not have actually been present for the meeting in question.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Are there any other members that were here at the last meeting and have read the minutes, and are willing to accept those minutes?

Assemblyman Anderson: This is Assemblyman Paul Anderson and I don't believe I was in attendance in the last meeting, however, I have read the minutes, watched the video, and am comfortable approving and sustaining the vote.

Chairman Diflo: So are we okay with that?

Speaker: Yes.

DRAFT

Chairman Diflo: Very good. At this point I would like to go — oh. I apologize. As I stated with my disclaimer, I need somebody to keep me honest at these public meetings. At this time, we would like to take a vote. All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Diflo: So, moved.

5. CIO UPDATE *(for discussion and possible action)* – Shannon Rahming, State CIO

Chairman Diflo: Heading on to Item No. 5 which is a CIO update and I would like to welcome Shannon.

Shannon Rahming: Good afternoon committee members. For the record, my name is Shannon Rahming and I'm the Chief Information Officer of Enterprise IT Services. First, I would like to take a moment and thank you for taking the time to attend the ITAB meeting, it is very much appreciated. In the interest of time as we have a very full agenda, I'm going to be giving a very brief overview. I was brought in [Inaudible 01:08:16] CIO in April 2015, in the middle of the '16, '17 legislative session. I was officially appointed to the position in October 2015.

During the session, EITs was granted three additional desktop employees to support placing tablets into the NHP vehicles, and for additional support needed for the Department of Administration and the Governor's office. The Tablet Project is a four-year project with 600 total tablets, of which we have deployed 185. We have another 150 on order right now, and the rest will be placed into vehicles in '18 and '19. So, we will have all 600 of them by year '19.

During the session, EITS was also granted a contractor to continue the disaster recovery efforts for the computing unit. We have had a contractor part time starting July 1, 2015 and she will be rolling out the project in October 2016. The Legislature granted us a full-time employee starting Fiscal year 2017. That position has been posted, we are getting a listing and we will be hiring that person very soon. That person will be working with our MSA contract person for some turnover, and then will continue on with all of the plans that we are working on for the computing unit, for disaster recovery.

The plans to be updated are the main frame, the unit systems, the VM System, AD, DNS, Convult Backup System, server, storage, and share drives. We also were given a small amount of money to do a cloud pilot project. We are working on Office 365 deployment with the Governor's office of Economic Development. This will allow EITS to get knowledge on how to manage this application for future deployments in the state.

The Legislative session also granted us an additional employee to manage the Endcap system. This is the proximity car system that allows access to buildings for appropriate people during

appropriate times. We currently are supporting 1,096 swipe stations, and 12,379 employees using those cards for access throughout the state. The CJIS Modernization Project for this phase was given six contract MSA programmers for the Fiscal year '16 and '17. That is the Criminal Justice Information System, when I say CJIS. They have been hired and are on schedule to complete the modernization of the criminal history offender tracking system on July 1, 2017. That is phase one of that project.

The next phase will hopefully be approved and funded by the '18, '19 Legislative Session. This is a ten-year project, as there are many public safety systems that need to be modernized due to non-supportive current systems. EITS is working in tandem with DPS to strategize and complete the project for all phases that will be funded.

In an effort to provide better customer service and continued infrastructure services to our agency partners, being Department of Public Safety, Department of Administration and the Governor's office, I am restructuring EITS to have an enterprise and agency group. The Enterprise group is comprised of the network, telecom, microwave, mainframe, Unix, and the server group. The Agency group will be help desk, desktop, programming, database and project management. We are currently in the process of hiring the chief position for the Agency group, allowing an IT type manager for those agencies to go to.

So, they will have one IT tech manager that they can go to, to get all of their issues taken care of. Again, that will be for our agency folks which is, again, DPS, DOA and Governor's office. It then allows for the Enterprise IT folks to continue to take care of all the enterprise issues for the whole state while allowing the agency group to be the go between our Agencies, and the other IT folks.

EITS is also working closely with the Nevada Department of Education for the remediation plan utilizing a new tool called Site and Proof, to find and modify the websites that need changes made for compliance. The Microwave Replacement RFP was awarded and the vendor has deployed personnel to the field to start the site surveys. The completion should be August 2018. This will allow the Microwave System to support the new IP based Nevada Shared Radio System, which is the public safety radio system used by highway patrol, sheriffs, police, fire, et cetera.

Nevada was awarded a Homeland Security Grant Funding for additional security tools during the last round. We also are working with the city of Henderson, who received funding to create a template for a cyber instant response plan that can be used anywhere within the State of Nevada. We also have used previous grant funds to work with other means of [Inaudible 01:13:03] such as North Las Vegas, for purchasing network monitoring capabilities.

Nevada was also one of only five states awarded the National Governors Association Cyber Policy Grant. The other states awarded this grant are Oregon, Connecticut, Louisiana and Illinois. We are working diligently for the next eight months on our incident response plans,

DRAFT

cyber center, and our Cyber Policies, to utilize all of the expertise and knowledge we can gain from this award. I have been working with CIOs of the various means of [Inaudible 01:13:35] to see where we can work together to get better pricing on IT software and services, and collaborate on planning for the future.

I meet regularly with the CIOs from Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, City of Henderson, Clark County, Clark County School District, Washoe County, Reno, Sparks, Carson City and Douglas. I have also been meeting with the IT managers from all State Agencies. This allows us to get an understanding of what each agency is doing and if we can get any synergy going for any of our projects. We also work together for solutions on common problems.

The Technology Investment Request Prioritizing Process — say that three times, which included directors for most Agencies in the State for the '18, '19 Legislative Session, looked at requesting made for more than $500K of which there were 18 requests for a total of $128M, with $60M of that being from general funds. The prioritized list was sent to the budget office.

We are continuing to work diligently with all of the Agency capacity needs for Silver net. We have been replacing network equipment to allow for more capacity, north to south, for a current total of 15-gigs north south. We currently have equipment in Switch in Las Vegas, and also will be moving equipment to ViaWest another facility in Las Vegas, which allows us to obtain an additional 10-gig circuit for our North, South run. That will give us a total of 25-gigs, north and south.

This is paramount for disaster recovery planning. It allows us the capacity to do the backups that we need to do, so that we can actually recover in a disaster. As everyone knows, backups are your cornerstone of disaster recovery. I realize I just said a lot and I'm sure you might have a couple of questions, but I wanted to give you a very high level overview of what's been happening with EITS. Thank you again for the opportunity to share this update with you.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Shannon. It sounds like you've been very busy since you started in the role.

Shannon Rahming: Yes. It's been great.

Chairman Diflo: Well, good. Are there any questions for Shannon?

Steve Fisher: For the record, Steve Fisher. I just have one question. How many staff do you have in EITS approximately? What is the size of your staff?

Shannon Rahming: The size of our — fully staffed is 184.

DRAFT

Steve Fisher: Thank you. I just have one other question. You mentioned — for the record, Steve Fisher. You mentioned Office 365, and the pilot project you're running. Can you talk to us a little bit about, maybe, some futuristic plans on Office 365? Just briefly?

Shannon Rahming: I can't talk a lot about it. I can tell you what we're doing with the pilot project. What we are doing with the pilot project is, we will be setting up the Ecowood group which is about 50 folks, putting them into a Cloud Office 365 environment, where they will be using Office 365 and they will also be using email. From that — they'll be using that Office 365 email client to be able to do their email.

As some of us are aware, the Ecowood group does travel all over the world, literally. So, it's very difficult for them to not be cloud based. So, they are a perfect group to do this project with. What our hope is that we will be able to build it so that other folks can come to us. As we all know, we don't have that funding yet at this point in time. So, we are trying to build for the future if possible, setting up our basic platform where others can come to it.

Steve Fisher: Thank you.

Shannon Rahming: Thank you.

Assemblyman Anderson: Mr. Chair, Paul Anderson down here in the south.

Chairman Diflo: Yes. Mr. Anderson, do you have a question for Shannon?

Assemblyman Anderson: Thank you. Shannon, can you talk to us a little bit about the backups between multiple data centers and what the benefit is, splitting between Switch and Vios down here in the south? If we're not doing — well, just kind of give me an update on why we're splitting that between data centers.

Shannon Rahming: Sure. For the record, Shannon Rahming. We are splitting data centers for a couple of reasons. A, that they're in different parts of the valley. So, if there is a disaster in one part of the valley, hopefully we won't be hit unless it wipes out the entire valley of Las Vegas. At that point in time, we will have bigger issues than that. So, that's part of why we're splitting it.

We also are — the data center that we're in now in Switch right now, is very limited in size. As far as when we have to do, specifically, welfare disaster recovery tests, we have nowhere for our folks to stand. So, they are literally kind of lined up. What we have at Viawest gives us a lot more room, and a much better situation for that to happen in. So, it's not only for disaster recovery but more for also — make it easier for us.

Joe Marcella: Chairman? Joe Marcella in the south.

Chairman Diflo: Yes, Mr. Marcella?

DRAFT

Joe Marcella: I had one question for Shannon. I was curious, not only have you made great strides this year, or actually since 2014, is when you first took office. I have seen some significant improvement, and the approach towards certainly more of an umbrella state, the question would be, is there a strategic objective as well as a formal plan going forward that the board can review?

Shannon Rahming: Great question. Shannon Rahming for the record. We are working on that strategic plan right now. That is something that we are working on this fall and will have ready — for a formalized plan, yes.

Joe Marcello: Thank you.

Shannon Rahming: Thank you.

Chairman Diflo: For the record, Paul Diflo. So, Shannon, that strategic plan, that would follow the budget terms, would be two years' strategic plan?

Shannon Rahming: It will probably go beyond that, but it will definitely will fall for the budget and will be available for that, in that point in time. But, I'm looking at more of a five-year plan.

Chairman Diflo: Great.

Shannon Rahming: To go beyond the two years, so we can continue on.

Chairman Diflo: Great. Thank you. Yes, sir? Mr. Cates?

Director Cates: If I could just add on to Shana's comments a little bit. The Governor issued a strategic frame work for his budget building and it includes goals as far out as five years, stretch goals. So, EITS and the other Agencies within the Department of Administration are updating their strategic plans to align with that right now. We intend to have that ready for the legislature.

Chairman Diflo: Perfect. Thank you, sir. Are there any other questions for Shana before we let her off the hot seat? Hearing none — oh, we do have one more.

Director Cates: I just want to give a plug for my employee. Shana worked for me as the Director of the Department and she's done great work in a very short period of time. She enumerated some of the many things that she has been doing. I would like to particularly commend her for her reorganization plan to separate the EATS functions between Agency and Enterprise Level Services. For those that don't know the history, EITS was combined with the IT Shop from public safety a couple of years ago.

DRAFT

That was a — and continues to be a difficult and challenging process. I think it took a while to figure out the best way to align our resources to improve customer service. I think she has a great plan that she's putting in place that I think is really going to help the Agency going forward.

Shannon Rahming: Thank you.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Thank you, Shannon. Appreciate it.

6. IMPLEMENTATION OF SB 289 (2015) *(for discussion and possible action)* – Jim Earl

Chairman Diflo: Now before we get to the meat of the meeting, which is Agenda Item No. 6 on the peering study, I was reminded to let everyone know that we have a hard stop today right at 4:15. So, the meeting is scheduled until 4:00, we would like to complete the meeting by 4:00. But we absolutely have to be out of the room by 4:15. Especially for public comments, if we could keep them between three and five minutes, that would be very helpful.

So, regarding Agenda Item No. 6, as you can see from the agenda, Senate Bill 289 was passed in 2015. It requires that the ITAB Board conduct a study of peering. That is including an analysis of potential benefits of peering arrangements to the State and its political subdivisions, and then submit a report of its findings and a recommendation. Now, the recommendation could be anything. It could be that we don't have a recommendation, but based on the fact that SB 289 passed, we are committed to do the study.

So, in today's meeting, we need to discuss what that study is going to look like. As far as I understand, we have [Inaudible 01:23:39] You can be as informal or as formal as we want. We need to decide how we are going to conduct such a study, and this is a decision that we need to make today; prior to the next meeting on October 27th, when we can review the findings and agree upon a recommendation that needs to be submitted prior to the start of the next Legislative Session in January.

I am particularly interested in hearing from Assemblyman Paul Anderson on how we can be most helpful to the legislature regarding SB 289. First, I thought it would be helpful to give a brief summary of what peering is and then I am going to turn it over to Jim Earl, and he is going to give us a more in-depth overview, and talk about our options as well.

Now, as far as I'm concerned, simply put, peering is an exchange of data between networks. There are multiple networks, some big, some small, peering is the connection point to exchange that data. For the State of Nevada, and EITS in particular, they contract for facilities and services with AT&T and Charter, and Cox, and perhaps others. The study is having us look at peering arrangements or providers like AT&T and Charter would have to peer with all of the other service providers in the State of Nevada, and that exchange point would take place in the state.

DRAFT

Jim, I would like to turn it over to you to go into more detail and if you want to elaborate, or correct anything about that definition of peering, that would be welcome.

Jim Earl: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'm Jim Earl and I don't think any correction is necessary on your explanation. I would like to take about ten minutes perhaps and outline essentially four things. One, how the Board got here. Second, what the Boards mission is under the applicable statute created by the passage of Senate Bill 289 in the last legislative session. What I see is the options for the Board Study, and what a report the legislature might consist of.

Now, let me make one disclaimer upfront, and then you'll hear me repeat it a couple of different times. That is that, anything that I talk about, and anything that I've written in terms of background documents, represents my personal opinion and my personal opinion only; as will become apparent when we look at the legislation. It's inappropriate for EITS, or for the Department of Administration, or any of the executive branch, to take a position on what the board ought to do. That's really for the board itself to determine. That's how the legislation was essentially established.

So, in terms of how the board got to where it is, as you correctly indicated, Senate Bill 289 was introduced early in session March 16th of 2015. Its co-sponsors were Senator Dennis, [ph 01:27:08] a former member of ITAB, and Assemblyman Paul Anderson, both a former member of ITAB, and a current member of ITAB.

The critical thing about SB289, is that the Bill as introduced, is very different from the bill that was passed and signed by the Governor. In its first iteration, and I'm going to read directly from the Legislative Summary of SB 289, this Bill require each provider of Internet Protocol Service, which serves an Agency or Political Subdivision of this State, to interconnect and maintain a peering arrangement within this state, with all other such providers of Internet Protocol Service.

That particular requirement was going to be enforced in terms of the original Bill by a prohibition that essentially prohibited a State Agency, or any Government Agency within the State of Nevada from obtaining Internet services from a carrier or provider that did not comply with the required instate peering arrangement that I've already outlined.

The Enforcement Provision reads like this, an Agency or political subdivision of this State may not obtain Internet Protocol Service from a provider of Internet Protocol Service if the provider has not complied with the provisions of subsection one. The provisions of sub session one are virtually identical to the summary I read just a moment earlier that requires instate peering among essentially all Internet Service Providers that would offer business to, the State, or Political Subdivisions, and Agencies thereof.

Now, during the legislative hearings, which occurred almost exclusively in terms of substance before committees related to Government Affairs, there were a number of interveners and testimony that was elucidated from other carriers and from Switch, and from the Committee

DRAFT

sponsors and indeed, other members of the public. The end result was that the original Bill was amended, and it was amended almost by complete substitution. The Bill which passed is the one that you refer to and — where a particular provision of that Bill are included in Agenda Item No. 6.

So, everybody has essentially the precise language of the Bill right upfront in the agenda. That particular section, two parts, the information technology advisory board, created by NRS 242.122 shall conduct a study of peering that includes without limitation, an analysis of potential benefits of peering arrangements to the State, and its political subdivisions.

Then, the requirement for the Board, which is essentially the second part of what I wanted to talk about, which is the Board Mission. The Board shall submit a report of its findings, including, without limitation, any recommendations for legislation to the Director of the Legislative Council Bureau for transmittal to the 79th session of the Nevada Legislature. And, frankly that is all. There is no reference to an instate peering requirement in the bill, as was passed. And, there is only limited guidance as to what the study is to consist of.

There is also only limited guidance on the report itself, which has to include some findings — including without limitation any recommendation for legislation because that direction is without limitation, it's open to the board to recommend other things. I'll talk a little bit about some of things that ultimately, you might want to consider when we get there.

In terms of the options for the study, as you correctly outlined in your introductory remarks, the guidance that the statute provides is not very specific. Just some of my observations about the position of the legislature, and passing SB 289. The legislature was aware that ITAB has no permanent staff, was also aware that ITAB is not a rule-making body nor is it an adjudicatory body such as the public services — Public Utility Commission state of Nevada, or at the federal level, the Federal Communication Commission, the FCC.

The legislature would also be aware that this body, ITAB, is subject to the open meeting law; therefore, has to take its decisions in congruity with the provisions of the Open Meeting Law, which makes us unlike a regulatory agency that exists at the state or federal level. Where, again, depending on what Public Meeting Laws are applicable at the state and federal level, operate in slightly different functions so that — in the case of the FCC for example, each individual FCC Commissioner can discuss issues not only with the staff that is doing the actual work within the FCC, but with the FCC Legal Staff, as well as his own staff.

The FCC Commissioner has between two or three regulatory attorneys on his personal staff, in addition to the General Counsel's Office of the FCC, which has about 100 regulatory attorneys in it. In addition to the staff of the FCC which has somewhere between 500 and 1,000 regulatory attorneys, in addition to supporting engineers and economists.

DRAFT

So, the picture that I want to paint is that ITAB is being asked to perform a study on peering that is — with many more limited — much more limited support than would occur at the federal level, or indeed at the state level in a Public Utility Commission. So, the question for you to really come to a conclusion about is, how to conduct the study?

If you'll notice in the agenda, there were two options of, indeed, many. One was that the board could, again the discretion is totally yours, simply have an agenda item in any number of meetings that it sees fit to hold, where the board would invite members of the public to come forward and give their opinions, and state their positions and rationales for what the Board should conclude in terms of its recommendations to the legislature.

Also, on the agenda is a Straw man, in terms of written questions that the board might use to guide a more in-depth inquiry in what would be another option that would solicit, and would request for information from members of the public to respond to these particular questions, or indeed, any questions that the board might have by a particular date, so that the Board would have those before them at the time that the board opened up later agenda items for public comment on either the study, the conclusions reached, or anything relating to instate peering and the precise words of the Boards requirements as indicated by the statute or the provisions of SB 289 as passed.

Now, quite frankly, I was the one who prepared the questions and there were essentially two inputs to that. One, I went back and I listened again, watched again, the video recording of all of the testimony during the legislative session that took place with regards to 289. One of the documents that was provided to both members of the public and to the board in terms of background, which is titled 78th Session SB 289 ITAB Related Testimony, that has the url's in it that will take someone who is interested to the committee testimony that was taken during the last legislative session.

The other thing that I was mindful of was, the FCC does not talk about peering very frequently. It's been a couple of decades since I was part of the General Councils Office at the FCC. So, I can't represent to you that I'm up to date, but to my personal knowledge, the most specific that the FCC has been in those 10 to 15 years, are contained in the background document extracts from the FCC 15-24 Report and Order.

That Report and Order is generally referred to as the Net Neutrality Decision and that particular document — which, if anybody wants to see it, I'll get up and get it out of my briefcase. That particular report and order is about 2-1/2 inches thick, and the particular extracts here — extracts from that order, were the FCC both describes what peering is, talks a little bit about what it's rationale is for not interjecting itself into the regulatory possibility surrounding peering, preferring to leave that to negotiations among carriers, and any other observations with regards to peering that the FCC made.

DRAFT

So this is essentially, as far as I am concerned personally, the latest word from the Federal Communications Commission, on national peering, what it is, and why the FCC at least has decided not to become involved in the commercial negotiations among carriers when they conclude peering arrangements.

So, when coming up with these questions, I was mindful of the questions that individual legislature on the — particularly the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, asked. And, drafted this particular Straw man with the idea in mind, if I were a member of the Senate Committee on Government Affairs, and I had been through the process in the last legislative session, what would I like to know about peering that would guide any decision that I wanted to make? Good or bad, pro or con, up or down, about peering in the upcoming legislative session.

Let me repeat, these are my thoughts and certainly nobody in the Executive Branch. The board is absolutely free to disregard any or all of the questions that I drafted as part of this Straw man. You're free to substitute anything that you want for it, and you're entirely free to say, no, we don't want to do written questions, we just as soon simply open the next board meeting for members of the concerned public to come in and talk to us about what our peering arrangements might be.

Now, this has some consequence also for the way in which carriers and other members of the public might want to both address you, and if you do choose to move forward with written questions, how they might want to respond. If you take both the FCC and Public Utility Commission, you really have one group of regulatory attorneys who are writing submissions for another group of regulatory attorneys.

So, if we're looking at an FCC proceeding, that is open and is of interest to major communications carriers, the FCC will have laid out the questions that it wants to have addressed, the responses will come essentially from the regulatory attorneys of those carriers, they will be addressed to the regulatory attorneys within the FCC, who will then come up with a draft Report and Order that goes through an internal process and involves [Inaudible 01:42:02] of the regulatory attorneys, once again, who sit on the staff of individual commissioners.

It's not really the situation that we have here in Nevada as a result of SB 289. What is requested is some meaningful guidance that the legislature hopes the Board can provide, channel, and refine, to be considered by the next legislature. So, what I tried to do was produce some draft questions and some backgrounds which is technically and legally correct, but is designed essentially to provide guidance to — and interested and concerned [Inaudible 01:42:55] legislator.

I was very mindful of the, sometimes very perspective questions that were asked by members of the Senate Committees that heard this particular Bill. My last topic is some suggestions as to, what a report to the legislature might contain. I do this to give — the thought being that if you know what the end product might be, or at least think about that a little bit, that affects the steps that the board might decide to take in order to get to that end product.

DRAFT

Again, these suggestions are my suggestions only and are not something that would necessarily — that the board might decide to do. Your guidance is the statutory guidance, which we've already been over. In my mind, what might constitute a report to the legislature could include the following.

First of all, the minutes of this ITAB meeting, and any other ITAB meeting that are relevant to peering. The background documents that the Board considered, and I would include in those, the three or four documents that are posted on the Board website and have been provided to members of the public. Just so the legislature and anybody that wants to take a look at it, knows what was available to the public and available to the board in terms of background, as a result of being one of the under pins of the study.

Should ITAB decide that its wants to go down a written questions route, then the written questions that the ITAB decides to request information formally on, would become part of the reports to the legislature. Company responses to those questions would be included, along with any recommendation the ITAB is to make. And, to pick up on a point that you made earlier on and I repeated at the beginning of my little presentation, that's pretty much in the discretion of the board, as a result of the descriptions that are contained in the statute.

So, you can make ITAB — depending on what it wanted to do, could make no recommendation for action, could recommend a specific legislation, could make a recommendation that no legislation is warranted, it would be open to you to recommend further study, perhaps by the Public Utility Commission or some other entity, if you see fit. This is really open to you and I would ask that what you've heard from me today only be a part of the guidance that you consider.

You should also consider the guidance of any member of the public, firm, or individual in terms of their suggestion to you, regarding Agenda Item No. 6, which was very specifically, to provide input to the Board as to how to the Board should exercise its discretion to conduct the study. So, Mr. Chairman, I would be more than willing to answer any questions now and I will certainly stand by if at any time you would find my personal opinions helpful to the guidance of the board.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Mr. Earl. I want to point out that you did a very thorough job with the homework on this topic. I have read the questions, reviewed the questions, and I think they're all pertinent. So, for myself and the board, we appreciate the thorough background work that you have provided us today.

Jim Earl: Thank you very much.

Chairman Diflo: At this point, I would like to open to the Board. Are there any questions for Mr. Earl in particular? Or as I mentioned earlier, Assemblyman Anderson and I would be anxious to hear how you believe the ITAB board can assist the legislature coming up.

DRAFT

Assemblyman Anderson: Sure. If there are no other questions, I would be happy to jump in. Jim, thank you very much for the details and certainly the effort in trying to figure out what we often look at as a lot of interpretation into what we're trying to accomplish in the legislature.

I think that there are probably some folks that want to enter into public comment on the issue, and I think I would wait to comment after that, however, I would just probably add to the basis that I am fairly clear on what peering is. I was a co-sponsor of the Bill, quite frankly because I could explain what peering was to the legislative body, and my background in IT and as an owner of a company that manages IT assets for other companies.

I am familiar with the cost and the infrastructure, and what it takes to do peering. I also recognize that peering is very concentrated in a very select few locations in the nation, and that while there can be some strategic benefit to having peering in other locations, also the cost of requiring that on a Governmental Bureaucracy level, may not be the best way to approach that subject matter.

So, I know that there are a lot of folks that would like to chime in on this. I would like to hear their opinions, and I'm happy to — at the end of that, express my desires of what direction — or at least my opinion of where we should go, in regards to the study itself.

Chairman Diflo: Appreciate it, Assemblyman Anderson. Are there any other comments from the board?

Director Cates: Mr. Chairman, I think that we would like to hear some of the public comment, and then kind of weigh in after that.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Thank you. So, since we have left Agenda Item No. 2 open, I would like to ask at this time if there are any public comments here in the north. Probably the best way to do that, is to come up here and be sure to state your name for the record.

Stephanie Tyler: Mr. Chairman, members of the community, for the record, my name is Stephanie Tyler. I am the State President of AT&T, Nevada. Appreciate, first of all, the incredible work of Mr. Earl. The Straw man represents, you know, obviously a lot of thought and a really thorough process. Quite frankly, a process that we are quite familiar with through the FCC. His discussion and, kind of, reminder of how the FCC is staffed, and how deeply they are staffed, and the processes they go through, is a very stark reminder to me of what we do at the federal level as well.

So, primarily, what I wanted to do is state for the record that we do not believe, from an AT&T standpoint, that this is necessarily something that is needed. Quite frankly, if State or local governments want to contract with providers that have only instate peering, that option is clearly open to them today. We believe it is a fundamental issue of choice.

DRAFT

We manage our network nationwide and worldwide, with obviously a constant eye towards security and some of the very things that Mr. Earl included in his Straw man questions. So, from that standpoint, I wanted the record to be clear on that. Also, I wanted to basically, again, listening to him describe some of the work before you, to be able to offer to be a resource. As I indicated, we are a worldwide telecommunications company, we have resources at a variety of different levels whether it's communications with NARUC which is the National Association of Regulatory Commissioners — Utility Commissioners. Or, the national Telecommunications Information Association. There are lots of regional groups as well.

So, if there's any information, anything that we can provide, especially understanding a little bit better about some of your staffing limitations, we would like to be helpful on that front too. Again, we will be part of this process, but mostly just wanted to state our desire to be a resource if that's helpful, and again secondarily, state that we believe that this is an issue that, kind of a, a solution search of a problem.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you for your input. Let me ask you a question regarding the format of a study. Do you have any suggestions on how you would do a study like that, being a global company, are you aware of any other states that have done something like this? What format might they have used?

Stephanie Tyler: Well, again, I believe there is the beginning — within the Straw man draft, of some of the answers to some of those questions. But, no, to the best of our knowledge, no other state has attempted to utilize something like this. This has been something, quite frankly, new. When this piece of legislation came up during session, we reviewed it at the national level and came back with no one else having really considered it, even in this fashion.

Chairman Diflo: Would you mind if I opened the questions up to the rest of the board?

Stephanie Tyler: Sure.

Director Malfabon: Director Malfabon for the record. So, I saw that there was a statement in the backup materials about — well, in the legislative discussion about it. If Nevada is at the forefront, this could be attractive to business? Could you comment on that? I hear a lot of concern about, kind of let the market play out, and let the Agencies that want to do this, procure those services. Any comment about that legislative discussion on attracting businesses through this requirement?

Stephanie Tyler: I'm very glad to respond to that, if I could Mr. Chairman? Absolutely. I believe that, again, the choice issue — I keep coming back to that very simplistic answer, because if a company is interested in looking at Nevada, and particularly perhaps Northern Nevada — in fact, I have to disclose, I sit on the Economic Development Authority of Western Nevada, which is EDAN, which is the primary recruiter of wonderful companies like Tesla. But, that option is clearly there to them.

DRAFT

If by choice, they like the idea of having all of the peering done in state for some particular reason, then they clearly have that option, and that is a great option for them to have. Or they have the option to do business with a company that would peer — like, for example, we do some of our peering in L.A. For security reasons, we believe that that is the best way for us to safeguard our network, is to not — you know, if there was some cataclysmic event in Nevada that took up a good portion of Nevada, then all of your peering is in Nevada, then your isolated just to that.

Again, sorry, I am going to do this at very high levels that I'm sure you all understand much more than I do from that standpoint, but, you know, we believe again, that our network is more secure by having these ultra secure locations in a couple of different spots. Again, that's how we feel it's best, but at the end of the day, it's about choice. Nevada is wonderfully positioned, and again, our economic development efforts I think are going great as a result of some of these different options. So, again, it's a choice issue.

Chairman Diflo: Are there any other questions from the board?

Assemblyman Anderson: Assemblyman Paul Anderson down here in the South. So, I think that, you know, just to clarify some of the intent. I think the goal of the Bill was certainly to address some security and reliability standpoint issues. We recognized that that, again, peering is concentrated in specific areas of the nation. When you have Washoe Boulevard, [ph 01:56:38] for example, that would, you know, could potentially go down, there are some catastrophic results of that that could have an impact, frankly for Nevada's infrastructure. Whether that be private or public infrastructure. I think the cost to vendors is clear.

What is unclear, at least — I think the purpose of the bill and the reason there was discussion, at least from our point of view is, whether or not government should be involved in those decisions. I think that was clear in the testimony here, you know, maybe the choices are something that we need to consider above the security and safeguarding of Nevada's data, and the speed of that data, and the point of origin and destination, whether that revolves around running through L.A to Reno, or a direct Las Vegas to Reno route.

That's really where we come into the details of this. We start getting to the zero's and the ones of what peering is and what needs to happen there. Again, I guess — I'm not sure if I have a question or am just making a statement here, but, I think the government involvement is certainly unclear and the point here, I think, is to have a clear discussion and I appreciate the points that have been made here and will probably be concurred with other folks. But, the speed, competiveness, and the reliability of network inside of Nevada, you know, Nevada in general has been behind the curve when it comes to those specific items. That comes business network, whether that's in urban or rural areas, if you look at other cities and other regions, they have developed out faster and stronger than we have. A lot of it is simply business demand and we recognize that.

DRAFT

Again, I think the redundancy or peering, the network infrastructure, those pieces are fairly clear as to, that's generally a free-market value of [Inaudible 01:58:54] businesses willing to invest and where they're getting the most return on investment. I think the question that really resolved into a study between this Bill and, again, my participation in this Bill as a co-sponsor, is really because I understood what peering was, and could explain that to the legislative body versus maybe some others who maybe didn't understand at the same level.

I think, again, the discussion is good. It's good to clarify where free-market should reign and where government should have a discussion about their reliability. Again, the point was made that we're maybe the first to have this discussion, it doesn't mean it's a bad discussion to have. Certainly, as we look forward to whether or not we want to — to how deep we want to get into the study, how prolific we want to get into discussion and the needs of a peering arrangement that's mandatory versus set in the free-market, I think those are key issues that we are trying to address here.

So, I appreciate the perspective and I think other folks will have similar perspectives. I just want to set the stage that the point of the study is really to be in perspective on where the government — the state government in this case, should intervene, should be involved, and where it shouldn't. I appreciate the clarification, this is certainly from AT&T perspective and I'm sure others will get us their perspectives, too.

Stephanie Tyler: Mr. Chairman, if I could? Mr. Anderson, thank you, I appreciate that. That is good perspective and again, I think this is a healthy discussion. Again, back to my original point, if there is a resource position that we can be helpful with, we are more than glad to do that, given our national perspective.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. We appreciate your input. Assembly Anderson, that was well said, and that helps me. Appreciate it. If there is anybody else from the public up north, please step up, state your name and company.

Shelly Caproe: Hi Chairman, and Board. I'm Shelly Caproe. I'm with [Inaudible 02:01:12] representing Charter Communications today. We would like to second Stephanie Tyler and AT&T's comments. We want to thank Mr. Earl for the obvious work he has done on this issue. Also, I want to thank Assemblyman Anderson for his comments on the government's role in peering.

We don't have any suggestions in how we feel you should conduct the study, which I know this is what the conversation is about, but we do want to make sure that it's known that Charter would like to play a role in the study, however you determine that's done. Whether it's invited guests giving their views, or the draft of questions and responding to those questions.

DRAFT

We do want to point out a couple of things. If the draft is approved, there are a couple of questions on there that we think are important. Number four goes into, like what was mentioned, the cost and the benefit that comes out of that, and does that have really an effect on the consumer and the cyber security? And, number eleven, goes into taking into account emerging technologies, and putting something in the legislation that may not keep up with the pace of emerging technologies. That's it. We would like a role, and we're here for any questions you have. That's it.

Chairman Diflo: Shelly, I would like to ask you the same question I asked Stephanie. You're a global company, are you aware of any other states that have done this, and what format they may have used for a study?

Shelly Caproe: I don't have any [Inaudible 02:01:18] on that. I would be very happy to ask Charter that question and get back to you on that. I don't know. I know that they don't feel it's necessary in state.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Then like we did with Stephanie at AT&T, I would like to invite the Board to ask you questions as well. Okay. It looks like we have no questions from the Board. Thank you, Shelly.

Shelly Caproe: Thank you.

Chairman Diflo: Is there anybody else up north that would like to public comment? Seeing none, is there anybody in the south that would like to make a public comment? If so, please step up, state your name and company.

John Lopez: Good afternoon. My name is John Lopez, for the record, Government Affairs Manager for Cox Communications here in Las Vegas. I brought my colleague with me.

Michael Acardi: Good afternoon. For the record, Michael Acardi, Director of Technology for Cox Communications.

John Lopez: Just wanted to start out and thank the Chairman and the Board for your service in doing this. Not having a permanent staff, I'm sure is quite a challenge. Also, wanted to thank Mr. Earl for his work on the questions. We thought they were very good and raised some very good topics regarding the subject of peering.

Just wanted to start out by saying that Cox Communications opposed Senate Bill 289 in its original form, when it was introduced. That isn't commentary on the fact that it raised some important issues. Assemblyman Anderson, we agree with your comments that having this conversation is very important. It's a subject a lot of people don't know about, and don't understand how networks move data around.

DRAFT

So, we really appreciate the opportunity to be a part of this discussion and offer our experts from Cox Communications to provide the Board with any information or have discussions as you deem appropriate. The problem with requiring a government mandate — to require peering within the State of Nevada, the biggest problem with it is that it is just not consistent with modern technology.

Internet traffic doesn't understand borders. If there were to be a situation where — at any location, if there is a disaster or failure or something like that, our network automatically reroutes that, and the customer doesn't even notice that that routing is going on. So, we think that a government requirement to contain that in the State of Nevada is just really not consistent with how the Internet works.

Cox is the largest ISP provider in the state of Nevada, and we do know a lot about how networks operate. Like I said, we maintain a number of redundancies in our network so that if there was a failure at one point, it would be quickly rerouted.

We're also concerned that mandating a route — if that's the single route that it has to go with in the state of Nevada, you're actually putting the system more at risk, instead of allowing these arrangements to travel with where technology dictates that they need to travel to. And, Mr. Earl brought up about the Federal Communications Commission, they have thousands of staff members. I worked in D.C for a long time and even in their [Inaudible 02:06:58] order, the FCC — with all of these attorneys onboard, they have looked at it. I just want to quote, they said — the FCC said, we do not believe that it is appropriate or necessary to subject arrangements for Internet traffic exchanges. We conclude that it would be premature to adopt prescriptive rules to address any problems that have arisen, or may arise.

From my company's perspective, I can tell you that this commission has not been shy about regulating Cox Communications and other companies like ours, and just the signal that the FCC doesn't even want to go here, I think is something that the Board should perhaps take a look at. That a federal regulatory body is just not willing to go there right now.

So, let's see. Nevada, to our knowledge, no other state has this type of peering arrangement, and we don't think Nevada should be the first to experiment with an instate mandated peering requirement. We, as a stakeholder, we just want to be at the table.

So, as far as any recommendations for the report, of course the company would like the recommendation or the report to be that Nevada Legislatures should actually exercise extreme caution before doing a mandate on instate peering. So, yes, it would definitely be our recommendation that there is a recommendation in the final report to legislatures to please emphasize caution.

DRAFT

So, with that, that is my statement. I am happy to answer any questions, and Michael Acardi is also here from the technical perspective if any members of the board would like to engage us. Thank you.

Assemblyman Anderson: John, do you have any recommendation for the format of this study?

John Lopez: I think it would be appropriate to include written comments which Cox would hope to be — to have the opportunity to provide to the board going through a number of these issues. You know, what the practical results are, what the costs is to companies like ours and also consumers, and to the State, as a matter of fact.

I mean, is there really going to be that much of an incremental benefit to state Agencies and local governments if they have to comply with a mandate? So, I would recommend including written comments if you choose to solicit those, to put in the report so that legislatures have an opportunity to go through it themselves and see what's provided.

Chairman Diflo: Appreciate that insight. I would like to open up for questions from the board.

Assemblyman Anderson: Mr. Chairman, if I could?

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir.

Assemblyman Anderson: I think having technical expertise at the table here would be beneficial to define peering, and if we could, in layman's perspective, and help understand, sort of, just the basics of how Internet traffic works which is essentially what we're talking about on the peering arrangements. So, we could maybe open that up if it would be okay with the Chairman?

Chairman Diflo: Yes. That sounds like a fantastic idea.

Michael Acardi: So, you did a good job of explaining it earlier. I just had a little more commentary to it, and use some real world examples. I'm sorry. Michael Acardi, Cox Communications.

An example would be a Charter customer in northern Nevada communicating with a Cox Communications customer in southern Nevada. If you let the Internet do its thing, it will automatically route traffic from the Charter customer in northern Nevada, to the Cox customer in southern Nevada. Well, if there is a lot of traffic being exchanged between those two company's customers, there could be benefit to having a direct connection between Charter and Cox Communications, for example. That arrangement would be defined as peering.

DRAFT

Another example would be video over the cloud providers that provide video services, companies like Netflix to a customer in southern or northern Nevada. If there is a lot of traffic between that video provider and the ISP, there could be benefit to the customer — to the two companies to have a direct connection. As AT&T stated earlier, all ISPs closely monitor their networks and monitor their bandwidth usage between not only their customers, but other ISPs throughout the country and the world, and we continually identify opportunity for making our networks more efficient.

So, that's how we look at our peering arrangements, to make it most efficient for our customers and at the same time, we still have our automatic rerouting of traffic in case a peering center goes down. I can tell you from Cox's perspective, we do, as others have mentioned, have peering at Wilshire in Los Angeles, but we have peering in many other locations including within the state.

Leaving Las Vegas, we have a lot of different routes, over seven, that traffic could take to go to northern Nevada. So, all of that traffic routing takes place in within 50 milliseconds. So, we are confident that our customers, in case of a catastrophe, their traffic could be rerouted automatically in a very quick fashion to reestablish communications.

Assemblyman Anderson: If I could jump in, if that's all right?

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir.

Assemblyman Anderson: So, I appreciate that explanation. I think that when you look at, sort of, the zeros and ones that are transported over the network, you have what's going BGP, right? Sort of your — it's not the definition the acronyms, but essentially, the best route.

So, how do we figure out the fastest way from point a to point b? That's generally what most networks revolve around. It's an autonomous or independent type protocol, that no matter what vendor you use or what your — whether you're AT&T or Cox for that matter, you can transport data across those networks in a peering arrangement using that protocol.

So, I think that one of the discussions that came up during session and before session was the advantage of saying, well, if it's state data, we would like for that to stay in the state. There is security and discussions that can be wrapped around that. It's not really the ideal thought process, or the definition of what the Internet was supposed to be — as an open architecture that we could transport data across wherever we needed it, and to the fastest points we needed it. But, as we talk about peering, the idea that we could take data from Vegas to Reno for example, as the fastest protocol because we have a peering arrangement that's mandated, was part of the discussion.

That's really what we're talking about here, whether we should be mandating those peering arrangements or not. That is essentially — and I appreciate the definition and I think that's a

DRAFT

great description of what peering is, is essentially how do we get data from point a to point b the fastest, and the most secure? Peering that is most local, or the fastest path is often the best route.

So, again, just to add to the conversation of, I think the open discussion is whether or not, again, the state government should be involved in this decision or not. I think that is very much a negotiable point, especially from my end, as a free-market guy. Again, I think the discussion itself, security, the path, the fastest route, the emphasis we could bring if we were Wilshire in Vegas or Reno. That's an economic development question built into that, right? As far as how much data resource could potentially be pushed into those areas.

Again, whether or not it's the right direction to go, I think that it's great that we're having this committee and the purpose of studying it versus forcing it through a legislative session. There is some thought there that — Las Vegas was one Wilshire, or if we had a first street or any data center that you want to look at in Nevada and Reno, and what that would do for economic developments inside of that. You can certainly look at one Wilshire and see the economic development happen inside of that tower or that building.

I appreciate the insight and I think it's critical that we understand at least the basics of how data flows across the Internet. Not very salacious or exciting, but at the same point, extremely critical to the flow of data and, quite frankly, the day to day activities that we have as consumers of that data.

So, I appreciate the insight from Cox and folks that have already spoken. I think it continues our mindset and thought process on how we should proceed. So, thank you.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you Assemblyman Anderson, appreciate it. Michael, I have a question for you as long as you're here I want to take advantage of your technical expertise. A couple of people have mentioned that new technology may change the way that peering is done in the future. I'm curious, with the adoption of software based networking, do you see that changing the look of how the peering or the exchange is done between networks?

Michael Acardi: Sure. Software Defined Networking is definitely coming in the future and many companies are already implementing it. That will make the efficiency of the Internet greater. It will make many connections dynamic, by that I mean — let's say you have a 1-gig connection from Las Vegas to Reno or Carson City with a traditional network, if you need to increase that there could be some manual labor and definitely physical connections, and a person looking at it. With Software Define Networking, one of the features and benefits could be that somebody just sits at a computer and within a few clicks, increases that bandwidth.

It takes that BGP, that protocol, that was spoken about earlier and enhances it. It just makes networking much more efficient. Doing things like forcing a specific route or a specific peering facility, could inhabit the ability of Software Defined Networking to utilize all of the features and benefits that are available within that technology.

DRAFT

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Michael. Appreciate it. Are there any other questions from the Board? Seeing none, thank you representatives from Cox. Is there anybody else down south that would like to make a public comment? You would state your name and your company.

Randy Robinson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Randy Robinson on behalf of Century Link. Most of what, I think, needs to be said has been said by the folks who proceeded me here at the microphone. We would associate our comments with those.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that you pitched it right. The bill requires a study so there will be a study that will be conducted. I also think that Assemblyman Anderson has rounded out what that is, and what the issue is. The question of what role, if any, the government should play is much different than, should the government have a mandate with respect to peering arrangements?

So, as the study proceeds in whatever fashion this body determines best, I think it's important to keep that clarity of separation between those two issues because it will certainly determine the direction of the study. I think that the background work that has already been done provided the committee is on target, a very comprehensive approach, I appreciate the work that has gone into that. It kind of flushes out that fundamental difference — excuse me, fundamental difference in the direction that this study might go. I'm not the technical guy, but I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Chairman Diflo: I would like to start with the same question that I asked everybody else. That is, is there a preferred format that Century Link would like to see? We heard Cox say that they would prefer the written questions.

Randy Robinson: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, Randy Robinson from Century Link. I think that's on target. I think if you put the questions out there, particularly again with this background information and let a variety of providers and other folks in the industry comment in written format. Then I would also welcome the opportunity to give public comment or presentation before this body based on that written comment. Let's have a robust discussion, let's have an open and transparent discussion. Let's have a robust discussion about the idea of peering.

Again, as Assemblyman Anderson pointed out, there may be some other benefits to this discussion for us here in Nevada and we — in a focused manner to expand our economic interest in the data industry. So, I think a robust discussion is helpful. I think written comments and giving everybody a base line, and a chance to thoughtfully lay out their cases also will be of benefit to this committee.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you. I would like to ask the board if they have any questions for the gentleman from Century Link? Seeing none, we thank you for your comments. Are there any other public comments at this time on Agenda Item No. 6? Okay. I see none.

DRAFT

The ITAB board has heard from Mr. Earl, we have heard from representatives of the various providers or stakeholders, and now it's up to us to decide on the format for the study. We have to decide on a format this afternoon. If I may, I guess I would like to just reiterate a couple of the ideas that we have heard today.

One option would be to invite the public to come talk at the October 27th meeting without any written questions. We could have what was described as a robust discussion. The second option would be to make public, a list of questions. If we were to do that, we would have to ask that the responses be sent back via email, and put on — I would imagine the website, at least ten days prior to the October 27th meeting. That would give us time to review those questions and analyze it, and make a decision on the 27th.

The third option that I heard was a combination of both. Let me answer the questions and then invite me back for some robust discussion. Maybe even a fourth option is, you know what, I've heard enough today, and maybe on the 27th we come up with a recommendation. That's what I have written down. Is there any — I would love to get input on any other options from the board. Joe, you are so quiet today, it's unlike you.

Joe Marcella: Yeah. It's very, very unusual. Mr. Chair, it seems obvious that the question is — or originally was, what was the legislator's intent, and the problem to solve, the resources and constructs of the study. What would be necessary to respond to, with the legislators — the legislatures have requested of ITAB. And, the last thing, and probably significant portion of all of this is, what is the government's role in managing what the outcome is going to be.

I agree with you, Chairman Diflo, that we have heard quite a bit about what peering is, how it's affected those from a positive and negative perspective. I think the only issue we have today is, how do we proceed to solidify the opinions? Do a comparative analysis — do some level of benefit analysis to find out if, in fact, we are solving a problem, and then present that back not only to the board, but to the public.

May I suggest, and I don't mean to cause work because our resources are less — or few. What we have done in the past is taken a group from the board that has volunteered to receive those emails, consolidate that information. With the assistance of Mr. Earl, put together some sort of a presentation or opinion for the next meeting that can be, at that point, a discussion. Those folks representing communications in Nevada north and south, could be present at that meeting.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Let me reiterate — let me make sure a point of clarity, that I understand what you're saying, Joe —

Joe Marcello: It's my New York accent.

Chairman Diflo: You're suggesting that we do not have a list of formal questions that we send out to the providers? That we're looking for input from the board now that we have heard this

information, we put together a presentation and invite the providers back on the 27th, have a robust discussion, and develop our recommendations at that time? Is that summarized correctly?

Joe Marcello: I think the formal questionnaire is still a necessary item.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. All right. I missed that. Very good.

Joe Marcello: And how it's analyzed, and how those questions are reviewed, is really the only question, or the only real task.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Any other input at this time? Mr. Earl?

Jim Earl: This is Jim Earl. Joe's suggestion as I understand it, would involve sending some group of questions out, and having responses ten days or so before the next board meeting. I would be perfectly willing to contribute time and effort to deal with a subset of the board, in terms of sorting out comments and coming up with one or more possible recommendations.

There is one very important caveat here, and that is I want to turn to the Boards Legal Advisor and — anytime that a body that falls within the scope of Application of a Nevada Open Meeting Law, convenes a subset of members to make decisions even though they need not necessarily be the final output of the entire body. That raises issues under the Nevada Open Meeting Law.

I'm not sure that I have the correct perspective of how that may play out in practice. My present understanding, and I stand to be corrected or modified by the Boards legal counsel, is that such a group — in order not to run afoul of the Nevada Open Meeting Law, needs to be considerably below the quorum of the body necessary to conduct business. Whether that is the only restriction of meetings of a subgroup of individuals — I diver to Jeff. But, that that is clearly a possible danger, if you will, of Joe's suggestion.

We only have such a large group, or do something that in any way, would violate the Nevada Open Meeting Law, if there is a small constituent group that meets outside of the hearing of the public.

Chairman Diflo: Let's get that answered first before we go any farther. I will diver to —

Jeff Menicucci: Jeff Menicucci for the record. In general, a subcommittee would also be subject to the Open Meeting Law. So, without knowing what the plan is on that, it's hard to give definite answer. We would have to give careful consideration to the Open Meeting Laws if a subset or a subcommittee of the Board were to be engaged in creating the questions or having discussion and then making recommendations back to the board.

It should not be a problem if the board decides today, here in open meeting, what questions to be submitted to the industry, soliciting their responses. Then the responses of course would be to the

DRAFT

full Board. If the Board considers those in a future meeting, those materials would of course be public information as well.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Thank you. So, we have the list of questions that were developed by Mr. Earl. If everyone has read those — I guess I would like to ask if you feel that they are sufficient, if there is any that you would like to modify or add to that. Maybe if we go down the road of getting the questions defined today so that we can publish them for response.

Assemblyman Anderson: Mr. Chair. Assemblyman Anderson, if I could?

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir.

Assemblyman Anderson: I think that as we have had the discussion here — well, I will start with the written questions. I don't think it's a bad idea to send those questions out and get some feedback and put some information on the record. I think that helps really well for legislative action or inaction, in the next session.

My concerns, my discussion, my desires of what this Bill is to achieve, have been satisfied at this point. I think that in the interim — and also from the legislative session and during the interim, the discussions I've had and, sort of, solidifying those discussions here on the record, for me, I think we understand best what peering is, how it may or may not benefit the state, and also what the government's role should or shouldn't be. Quite frankly, it's been clarified for me.

Again, not just in this meeting but in previous discussions and during legislative sessions as we've turned it from a bill to a study, and have had interactions beyond that. I think that I don't want to distract from other priorities, especially from our State CIO who has an abundance of priorities to try and figure out and balance.

So, my recommendation, while certainly may not be the Boards desire, but certainly would say, I would like to understand if there is an opportunity here to make the state a competitive entity when it comes to the IT infrastructure of the State and beyond. Whether that's the private industry or the public side of things, but I certainly don't want to chase our tails on the issue.

I'm not opposed to the idea of what may comprise of a subset — rather a subcommittee of a subset of this committee to research the issue a little bit more. But, I think my personal recommendation, and I think from the legislative intent, is to understand the issue better, recognize that maybe now is not the time to have any possible direction from the state side of things, and let the free-market go as it may and see what beneficial options may be as technology continues to progress.

I think our folks from Cox stated that pretty clearly, that this stuff changes quite frequently and there may be protocols that benefit us beyond what we could put in statute. That's, I guess, both a balance that I have as a Legislator and a private citizen, is what I want to put in the statute that is

DRAFT

very hard to change versus guidelines and discussions that a committee like this can have that gives guidance and direction versus solidifying something in statute.

So, I don't know if I clarified anything there, but I'm comfortable with the answers we have heard today. I'm comfortable with the testimony we've heard from the major players in the group that had a vested interest in this Bill and in this legislation and the technology itself. I'm also comfortable with where we're at today, and if we feel the need as a committee, to have further discussion, I would certainly urge that that goes into a subset of this committee so that we can focus on, obviously, advising the State CIO on more critical issues.

I'm happy to answer any questions as well, if there were questions on intent or desire from the legislative side. Mr. Liperalli stepped out at a key moment, so I guess I'm the only Legislator here to answer these questions.

Chairman Diflo: I appreciate your input. That was well said and I happen to agree with you. Mr. Earl?

Jim Earl: Jim Earl. Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that I've got this right, so please forgive me if I'm off by 180-degrees, or 90-degrees, or whatever. After having listening to, perhaps, the last ten minutes of discussion, a question was raised in my mind whether it would be sufficient at this meeting, for the board to adopt a recommendation now that might — given the last ten or fifteen minutes of discussion, read something like, the board recommends future consideration be given to the role of State Government in increasing he competitiveness of Nevada and its citizens, in an economic world where Internet communications are increasingly important.

And that be the recommendation of the board to the legislature, and that would mean that the report would essentially include everything that has been considered by the board up until this point.

Chairman Diflo: It seems a little vague, if you don't mind my saying, without making the actual statement that we're recommending no action from the Nevada State Legislation at this time. Then I would have to look at General Counsel to see if we can make a decision like that today because that really wasn't on the agenda, was it? Our Agenda Item was more of deciding on the format. Again, I'm just trying to avoid violating any Public Meeting Laws here.

Jeff Menicucci: Jeff Menicucci. The first part of the Agenda Item is pretty broad, but it does seem to be limited by the last sentence in terms of what the board may consider, and what it may do. It may consider the form this study is to take, including various items. I believe the way it's written, it appears that the intended item of Agenda Item No. 6, was to consider the form of the study and not to finalize the recommendation at this meeting.

Chairman Diflo: Right. Would it be appropriate — I think we can all agree that we would like to see the written responses, that we use the list of questions that Mr. Earl has developed for us,

we ask that those responses be sent back by the 17th. We then email those responses to the board for preparation and we'll give 15 minutes to the agenda on the 27th to develop a recommendation?

Assemblyman Anderson: Mr. Chair. Assemblyman Anderson down south again. I would certainly support that as a motion if you would like it, at this point. I think that is appropriate. We'll get things on the record that those are items that can be passed on to the legislative body. We can obviously choose to take no action, or have no recommendation from this side of things, but based on those written responses, I would be happy to make that motion as you described it.

Chairman Diflo: That would be great. Then I would ask for a second?

Catherine Krause: Second. Catherine Krause, for the record.

Chairman Diflo: Great. Thank you very much. Are there any other comments on that Agenda Item No 6, or have we beat it to death?

Director Malfabon: Mr. Chairman, it was mentioned that there were links from the legislative discussion and maybe we provide those links as well, along with the questions so that if someone is interested, can look at the history of the legislation with the link to the NRS and the commentary. There is an opportunity to look at some of the discussion during the legislative session too.

Chairman Diflo: Yeah. I think we can send that out. I'll get with Kelly and we'll make sure that that gets to everybody. I think that Mr. Earl, —

Assemblyman Anderson: Mr. Chair?

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir?

Assemblyman Anderson: Assemblyman Paul. I would be happy to mend the motion itself to include those links that are in today's agenda. I think those links are direct to both the testimony and any legislative intent that may be wrapped around those questions. I think we could wrap it into a motion if you're [Inaudible 02:42:45] to that?

Chairman Diflo: I am. That would be great. I'll ask for a second?

Catherine Krause: Second.

Chairman Diflo: Great. Thank you very much. Item No. 7 on the Agenda —

Speaker: Are we going to vote?

DRAFT

Chairman Diflo: Oh. I'm sorry. We've got that voting thing. All right, so we have the second. All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

Chairman Diflo: All right. All those opposed? All right. So be it.

7. INFORMATION SECURITY UPDATE *(for discussion and possible action)* – Brian Wilcox, State CISO.

Chairman Diflo: This takes us to Agenda Item 7, and Brian Wilcox the State CISO is going to give us the status on the State of Nevada security.

Brian Wilcox: Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, members of the board. For the record, my name is Brian Wilcox and I am the Chief Information Security Officer for the State of Nevada. I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to provide you a brief update on where we are with the Information Security Program.

To begin with, I wanted to just give a brief update from the last ITAB, again, as the CIO Shannon Rahming had indicated, the [Inaudible 02:44:09] position had been filled. I just wanted to also, for the record, say that I appreciate the Governors activity. He is very active in the Homeland Security area and continues to support Cyber as one his highest priorities. I would also like to say that Director Cates, and CIO Rahming also are very active in the cyber support and I am very appreciative of their efforts as well.

So, I became CISO in January of 2016 and at that time I commenced a 90-day review of the OIS Strategic and Tactical Capabilities. At that time, and after the review was finished, we ended up adopting a Governess and Risk Management framework in order to be able to manage the Office of Information Security based on the NASIO [ph 02:45:10] standards. Now those are nationally recognized standards for security.

So, based upon that, we then moved into looking at metrics and tracking. What we evaluated was a new set of key point performance indicators, along with staff utilizations. So, at the end of that 90-day evaluation, it gave us the positional capability to start setting our strategic and tactical initiatives for moving forward. We started off very early on with some grant applications, as previously eluded by Ms. Rahming, to the tune of slightly over $550,000. The applications have been successfully submitted and we're just expecting to hear from their successful conclusion very shortly.

Again, we were selected for the National Governors Association, the Policy Academy — which will help us steer us into a more structured governess framework. This might result in some changes to NRS. There is a possibility they are denying C242, and 603A.

DRAFT

Finally, we developed our wind drive grow strategy. Our wind strategy is to expand current customer and partner use of our enterprise security services that appropriately safeguard IT systems and proprietary information. This helps us with our vulnerability and threat management. We are scanning devices, we have a stable amount of scanning at this point but we do expect an expansion of scanning based upon some marketing efforts, and also some other state security activities that continue to drive moving with the device scanning.

Our next strategy is to develop programs to implement state-wide efficiencies of security systems, which in turn is the basis for our continuous improvement initiatives. We are looking at changing and improving our incident response. We have a new coordinator who is in charge of these process enhancements. Our incident responses from Agencies are back in the double-digit area which is very encouraging because we had seen a slight declination. Now we're getting a much more highly active response when it comes to answering incidents.

Finally, we're looking into grow strategy to develop programs and increase state-wide capabilities of our security services, which in turn is the basis for implementing new state security services and tools. We have currently five programs in development and I would like to give you more details of those, but I prefer to leave those as we continue to develop them. Not to give away any of our deficiencies, I would say, in our current infrastructure.

So, once again, I appreciate the opportunity to provide this update. If there are any questions, I would be happy to take them now.

Director Malfabon: Director Malfabon for the record. So, I know I received an email from Deter [ph 02:48:55] about false unemployment claims.

Brian Wilcox: Yes

Director Malfabon: I know that it was significant at our department, the Nevada Department of Transportation. There were over 170 employees and we really don't know at this time where the data breach was, but I know that they have Social Security number for myself. We've given information to our employees about what to do and provided some support there, but not a lot of information is — as I understand, it's an investigation that's ongoing.

Any comment on any timeline anticipated for that? I know that you probably don't want to go on the record on anything that's under investigation but just wanted to bring that up. It happened to me personally.

Brian Wilcox: Certainly. Brian Wilcox for the record. Yes, indeed, it is an active investigation. So, we would not be able to comment deeply on what is actually ongoing, however, it — I guess I would have to say at this point, this is not a new investigation. I actually ran into this a few years ago while I was at DMV.

DRAFT

So, this has been actively investigated at the federal level for some time. So, while there are evaluations going on to ensure whether there has or has not been any exfiltration of any information out of our areas, at this point there is nothing that is pointing to that. So, we are looking at all of the contingences and any options that we would have to continue to find out if there was any way, shape, or form part of our infrastructure that was the cause of it.

I, too, was a victim of this but mine came out of the federal side when I was working on some federal programs. So, a lot of this information is readily available on the dark web with many unfortunate consequences. Deeter has worked on this for a bit.

We are currently performing a vulnerability assessment, we just finished that vulnerability assessment and I'm waiting on the report for that to see what those results are. We also have one of us manage service partners doing some analysis at this point. I'm afraid that that is probably all I'll be able to comment on. I wouldn't be allowed to go any deeper.

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. Thank you, Brian, for that information. I would just add on to that, to really emphasize — as Deeter put out in her press release last week, it does not appear that any State of Nevada data has been compromised in this.

This is a nation-wide problem, it's not specific to State of Nevada employees. It's not even specific to the State of Nevada citizens. It is a multi-state issue of people using false identification to file claims. Out of an abundance of caution, Brian and his group are looking at the state systems to make sure that we don't have vulnerability that — the reports that I have received, we see no evidence that it in any way has resulted from compromised data that the State of Nevada is responsible for.

Steve Fisher: Mr. Chairman, I just had a question. For the record, Steve Fisher. We participated in an exercise called Cyber Storm 5, I think it was during the spring time. I know we learned a lot from an Agency perspective, participating in that exercise. I'm just curious, were there some lessons learned at the state level with regards to that exercise?

Brian Wilcox: Yes. Brian Wilcox for the record. Yes, indeed. EITS along with several Agencies participated in the Cyber Storm 5 exercise. I was just new in the position when it launched. Actually, I was transitioning out of DMV, so I had had prior experience with Cyber Storm 4. So, the answer to the question is, yes. There were lessons learned in regards to communications, incident response.

Several of those are being factored into the risk profile that will now actually promulgate through and tie into our strategies, of wherever those gaps were identified in that particular exercise. They will be put into the risk profile and then obviously we will respond in kind, to provide a strengthening if indeed there were various gaps identified in our operational processes.

Steve Fisher: Thank you.

DRAFT

Chairman Diflo: Brian. For the record, Paul Diflo. Quick question on your overall IT Security Program. Is user based training part of that? I mention it because we have had great, measurable success actually, at my company when we started training users about unhealthy behavior, especially when it comes to phishing attempts. You can really prevent a lot of breeches just by training the user base. I'm just wondering if that is part of your program?

Brian Wilcox: Brain Wilcox for the record. So, the answer is yes. We have a yearly requirement for training. We use a federal-based program. We are all required as state employees, no matter who, to take that training once a year.

We also participate actively in the October exercise for National Cyber Security Month, and as a matter of fact, we're just getting tuned up for that particular event now. That will be in conjunction with the Governor and various other entities. So, yes, indeed.

Chairman Diflo: Mr. Earl?

Jim Earl: Mr. Chairman, if I can augment that. I want to announce publicly that I completed my annual training yesterday on the particular web exercise to which Brian has eluded.

Brian Wilcox: Congratulations.

Jim Earl: And it was successful on the first try which is another plus. I will stick that feather in my own cap as well. To the specific questions that you answered, since it's fresh in my mind, there is a very specific questions that deal with spear phishing and phishing generally. There is a bit of a background discussion within the roughly hour, hour-and-a-half, online training about how circumstances have changed over the last couple of years.

One of the reasons that I took it and went through all of the training modules, as opposed to taking an option and just skipping to the end and seeing if I could pass the test, was I wanted to see how much information was contained, whether I thought it would be meaningful to a state employee. One of the things that struck me, which is essentially what I think your question was trying to get at, was I found that it was actually quite current.

There were a number of exercises in more than one module, that dealt with some of the problems associated with social networking, and how social networking could open the opportunity for phishing in ways which seem to be fairly innocuous. Some of the introduction to social networking were those things which many of us would not think twice about doing, like posting a picture of a family vacation onto a social networking site. Or, taking particular pride in the accomplishments of our children and putting their information and some photographs of them on a social networking site.

DRAFT

So, while my mind is fresh, and while your question was very timely, I thought I would contribute that. At least in my experience, the annual training that is available, is pretty good and pretty updated, and addresses some of the problems that are quite current as I see it.

Now, we do have a compliance issue. Brian and Brian's folks are quite good at reminding those of us at EITS that we darned well better do the annual training because — in the words of an ancient English poet, if gold will rust, what will iron do? Meaning that, we have to comply totally if we expect anybody else to comply at all.

The participation rate is pretty good in the Department of Administration as well, for much the same reason. But, I have to tell you, at least based on the discussion I had yesterday, with a person who works for Brian and who is responsible for setting all of this stuff up and managing it, that the compliance rate is not as high as we think it should be, in all Agencies across the state.

So, to the extent that this can be a reminder to see our decision makers and managers across the state, the training is available, but it doesn't do us any good if none of your employees take it.

Chairman Diflo: That's a great point. Thank you. Are there any other questions for Mr. Wilcox?

Catherine Krause: This is Catherine Krause for the record. This is more of a comment than a question in support of what you were just talking about with the trainings. So, at the Attorney General's Office, we do have an annual process, and I think we do have pretty good compliance.

Just to tell you as far as the effectiveness of the training, our employees do often contact either the helpdesk or they will call me, or one of our staff if they see something that they think either they shouldn't click on, or they might should have not clicked on. So, because of the training, they're pretty well-aware and I think it has been pretty effective. I just wanted to throw that support in there.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you. Are there any other questions for Brian?

Joe Marcella: Chairman Diflo, Joe Marcella for the record. I had one question for Brian. Brian, several years ago, understanding that all of the Agencies infrastructure tend to be proprietary and vertical in nature, there was a concerted effort to try and standardize security across the board and I think a lot of effort was made to do that. Understanding that that is infrastructure, and that's sort of the mechanics of keeping it safe, could you give us a briefing on how that project faired?

Brian Wilcox: Brain Wilcox for the record. So, I would have to say the overall effort has been satisfactory to good. We've had the opportunity now to deploy enterprise tools in order to be able to provide vulnerability scanning, to be able to look at virus signatures, to keep programs updated and much more of what you would consider an enterprise effort.

DRAFT

So, while I would say, and why I would say it's average at this point, is that the participation rate is not as great as we would like it to be. We are an advisory body, so while we do have the ability to do capabilities, we would like to, of course, always market our services and provide as much capability as possible. So, I hope that addressed your question.

Joe Marcella: Yes. Thank you.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you very much for your informative input, Mr. Wilcox.

Brian Wilcox: Thank you again, very much.

8. BOARD DISCUSSION *(for discussion and possible action)* – Chair, Paul Diflo, and Shannon Rahming, State CIO.

Chairman Diflo: That takes us to Agenda Item No. 8. It is titled Board Discussion, but really what this is about is something that Assemblyman Anderson said, we're all busy, we want to make the best use of everybody's time. What we want to do is ask your input for any specific agenda items for the next ITAB meeting. I'll open that up for any suggestions.

Director Malfabon: Director Malfabon for the record. We could consider getting the Office of Science Innovation and Technology to give a presentation to some of the work that they are doing on broadband and Nevada, and getting out to some of the last mile locations, the rural areas of the state.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. That sounds like a good idea. Appreciate that. Any other input? If not, we have already determined the date of the next Board Meeting

9. DETERMINATIOIN OF DATES FOR FUTURE BOARD-RELATED ACTIVITIES *(for discussion and possible action)* – Chair, Paul Diflo.

Chairman Diflo: Again, as a reminder, it's October 27th, from 2:30 until 4:00. And before I ask for a motion to adjourn, Item No. 2 is still open. At this time, I will ask if there are any additional public comments. Hearing none, we will close Agenda Item No. 2, and I will ask for a motion to adjourn.

Assemblyman Anderson: Mr. Chair, Assemblyman Anderson.

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir?

Assemblyman Anderson: Before I make a motion I would like to congratulate you on a meeting well done. Certainly, I know the experience of chairing for the first time, and it's always a bit of a challenge understanding the rules and the discussion, and the points of order. So, great job. I appreciate the efficiencies there.

DRAFT

10. ADJOURNMENT

Assemblyman Anderson: I would motion to adjourn.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you very much for the feedback. Second?

Director Malfabon: Director Malfabon. Second.

Chairman Diflo: All right. The meeting is adjourned.

DRAFT