

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115
Majority (202) 225-2927
Minority (202) 225-3641
November 20, 2017

Mr. Robert LeGrande, II
Founder
The Digital Decision, LLC
7579 Venture Drive
Alexandria, VA 22315

Dear Mr. LeGrande:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology on Wednesday, November 1, 2017, to testify at the hearing entitled "Oversight of FirstNet: State Perspectives."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Wednesday, December 6, 2017. Your responses should be mailed to Evan Viau, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed to Evan.Viau@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Marsha Blackburn
Chairman
Subcommittee on Communications and Technology

cc: The Honorable Michael F. Doyle, Ranking Member,
Subcommittee on Communications and Technology

Attachment

Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Peter Welch

1. Should all FirstNet subscribers have access to all FirstNet applications regardless of which FCC approved state RAN, core or national core network is used to reach those resources?
2. Explain why you believe that all carriers should be able to have access to the FirstNet core apps? How can that be accomplished and still provide a secure connection? Can that be done?
3. Has this process caused carriers to get more competitive with public safety? Better meet public safety needs?
4. Would an additional public safety carrier create more competition and result in better services for public safety?
5. As FirstNet struggles to ensure user adoption is a priority for NPSBN RAN operators, can you suggest a fair way to enforce that public safety user adoption goals are met, despite having different providers of public safety wireless broadband service competing for the end user business?
6. In a scenario where public safety broadband users in a specific state subscribe equally across three different service providers (e.g. 1/3 AT&T, 1/3 Verizon, and 1/3 Rivada), assuming interoperability is preserved, should the public safety community consider this a positive outcome?
7. How should FirstNet hold the designated NPSBN supplier accountable if their agreed adoption targets are not met, but overall all users are satisfied and interoperable with other networks?