MINUTES

INDEPENDENT PANEL REVIEWING THE IMPACT OF HURRICANE KATRINA ON COMMUNICATIONS NETWORKS

DATE OF MEETING: Friday, May 12, 2006 (Fourth Meeting)

LOCATION: Commission Meeting Room (TW-C305), Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, SW, Washington, DC.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT: Nancy Victory (Chair), Carson Agnew, Michael Anderson, Robert G. (Gil) Bailey, Gordon Barber, Sheriff Kevin Beary, Greg Bicket, Steve Davis, Steve Delahousey, Dave Flessas, Martin D. Hadfield, Jim O. Jacot, John Lyons, Tony Kent, Billy Pitts, Michael Rosenthal, Major Michael Sauter, Marion Scott, Kay Sears and Captain Patrick Yoes.

Lt. Colonel Joseph Booth, Robert Dawson, Fire Chief Stephen Dean, Kelly Kirwan, Jonathan Linkous, Adora Obi Nweze, Eduardo Pena, Sheriff Edmund "Ted" Sexton, Chief Edwin Smith and William Smith did not attend the meeting. Gordon Barber represented BellSouth in lieu of Mr. Smith, John Lyons represented Motorola in lieu of Mr. Kirwan and Michael Rosenthal represented SouthernLINC Wireless in lieu of Mr. Dawson.

ALSO PRESENT: Tom Fitzpatrick, Giuliani Partners, David Barron, BellSouth and Captain Timothy Cannon on behalf of Orange County, Florida Sheriff's Office.

FCC PERSONNEL PRESENT: Lisa Fowlkes (Designated Federal Officer) and Jean Ann Collins (Alternate Federal Designated Officer). Staff from the FCC's Office of Homeland Security also attended the meeting.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT: There were an estimated total of 20 members of the public present at the meeting. No member of the public addressed the Panel.

DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED TO PANELISTS AT MEETING: (1) Agenda; (2) Revised Agenda; (3) Draft Problems/Observations section; (4) Draft Recommendation section.

PURPOSE: The purpose of the meeting was to hear from additional experts and to review and discuss draft sections of the report.

CALL OF MEETING TO ORDER AND WELCOMING REMARKS

Nancy J. Victory called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission Meeting Room. She explained that the meeting would comprise two parts. First, the Panel will hear from speakers with follow-up questions and answers from Panel members. Second, the Panel will discuss various draft sections of the Panel's report. Ms. Victory reminded the Panel of its June 15, 2006 deadline for submission of its final report. She also reminded the Panel that at its last

meeting in June the Panel will consider and vote on the final draft of the report and recommendations.

PRESENTATION ON WORK OF MEDIA SECURITY & RELIABILITY COUNCIL

<u>Thomas Fitzpatrick</u>

Mr. Fitzpatrick represents Giuliani Partners, LLC and provided a briefing on the work of the Media Security and Reliability Council (MSRC). Mr. Fitzpartick gave an overview of why MSRC was formed and a brief history of recommendations and best practices by MSRC. As a case study, Mr. Fitzpatrick outlined the steps taken in the Milwaukee Plan, in which members of the local media in the Milwaukee area and the Wisconsin Department of Emergency Management formally agreed to apply MSRC's recommendations for the benefit of the public.

Mr. Fitzpatrick suggested that mass media, television, radio, cable and satellite radio broadcasters could be used as a national model for regional planning. He explained that any recommendations the Panel makes regarding model implementation plans should include the following five important principles developed by MSRC as the basis for their continued refinement. First, state and local governments are directly accountable to their constituents and are responsible for arranging the continuity of public communication and information services as they see necessary according to their needs and circumstances. Mr. Fitzpatrick stated that since broadcast media operate the vast majority of infrastructure, this kind of planning is best accomplished by establishing public/private partnerships to form local coordinating committees following nationally established recommendations and best practices as described in previous MSRC reports.

Second, there must be planning opportunities for appropriate local stakeholders. This process should continue on an ongoing basis and plans must be updated and tested and have the support and acceptance of local jurisdictions and constituents. Third, since local needs and circumstances widely vary, the measures required to address those needs should also vary. Fourth, local jurisdictions require flexibility to employ different strategies to achieve similar objectives. Regional and local committees should determine the extent to which their needs and circumstances will be addressed. Last, although federal entities play a role in the development and facilitation of national standards, to be useful and effective, day-to-day management of local plans should be a state and local responsibility.

<u>Questions from Panel Members</u>

Billy Pitts asked Mr. Fitzpatrick for his reaction to the Emergency Alert System (EAS) and how to best get a consistent message out to the public in an emergency situation. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded by summarizing how EAS was not used in New York during 9/11 and how the national public knew more about what was happening involving Hurricane Katrina than local officials in New Orleans. In light of these circumstances, Mr. Fitzpatrick urged the Panel to consider that regardless of the national dissemination of information, there is a public safety need for local officials to continue to broadcast on the most simple devices, like small portable

transistor radios, and to let their constituents know what is going on and what actions they should take to protect themselves.

Mr. Fitzpatrick further replied that he believes the difficulty the Panel, and the nation, will have to address is that the role of public communications in the new era of disasters and terrorist events has changed. He stated that to report what happened two hours after it happened is now unacceptable to the public and that the public's appetite for information has gone beyond what it was years ago. Mr. Fitzpatrick stated that he believes it is most important to develop the public communications tool as an operational aspect of emergency management.

Steve Davis asked if it is feasible in larger media facilities receiving the EAS message to have a reporter or spokesperson relay the EAS message in order to better assist the flow of information to the public. Mr. Fitzpatrick answered that it is feasible and stated that in certain areas of the country the local government and local broadcasters have worked out effective plans for doing so.

Sheriff Kevin Beary made a general suggestion that Panel members retrieve the National Geographic Katrina CD from the National Geographic website since it factually shows the large amount of misinformation that plagued local officials in New Orleans during the actual event. Mr. Fitzpatrick responded, elaborating on the impact of misinformation in New Orleans and following 9/11. He suggested that one way to address this problem is through the use of public/private partnerships in which the stakeholders can share information.

Kay Sears asked whether there are specific guidelines for the type of support that broadcasters must provide in a time of crisis. Mr. Davis answered in the negative. Mr. Fitzpatrick added that the concept of specific guidelines was discussed by MSRC. He explained that the better approach is to get the relevant information to local emergency managers at the scene and, in addition, before disasters strike, to forward information to local decision makers regarding the improved mobile communication capabilities of broadcasters.

PRESENTATION ON STATUS OF RECOMMENATIONS BY NATIONAL SECURITY TELECOMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

David Barron

Mr. Barron is Assistant Vice-President, Federal Regulations/National Security, BellSouth. Mr. Barron briefly summarized the progress of the National Security Telecommunications Advisory Council (NSTAC) since his presentation at the April 18, 2006 Katrina Panel meeting. He reported that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has created an emergency responder category that will be initially recognized under the National Response Plan. He also reported on various developments relating to access control credentialing. For example, he noted that private industry, along with DHS, has begun working on a credentialing program in Georgia and other southern states. They are planning to bring the process up the East Coast as quickly as possible.

Mr. Barron also stated that NSTAC plans to submit a recommendation that the capability of the National Coordinating Center for Telecommunications (NCC) needs to be expanded beyond

traditional communications providers to include information technology providers, possibly broadcasters and non-traditional providers such as cable telephony and Internet Service Providers. In addition, he stated that implementation had begun on NSTAC's recommendation that regional communication coordination capabilities be established. He indicated that these capabilities would be rolled out by June 1st with a plan to roll out the concept nationwide as quickly as possible.

Questions from Panel Members

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Barron if he thought broadcasters should be considered first responders. Mr. Barron stated that he thinks it is critical that broadcasters be included in that category. He also indicated that electric power, as well as other infrastructures, should be included.

Ms. Victory asked if the envisioned regional coordinating council is going to be an industry-only body. Mr. Barron answered in the affirmative, but stated that the body would have direct linkages to the Joint Field Office and to the NCC so that there are mechanisms in place when coordination with government is needed.

DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS/ISSUE SPOTTING SECTION OF DRAFT REPORT

Ms. Victory turned to the discussion of the Problems/Observations section of the draft Report. She explained that the focus of the discussion would be on the substance and that, to the extent Panel members have particular line edits or corrections that are not a major substantive change, they should email them to her.

Section I — Network Reliability and Resiliency

Ms. Victory opened discussion on the Network Reliability and Resiliency section by summarizing the observations and thereafter concluding, in general, that the networks were resilient during the storm with the major issue being more of power and flooding.

Following Ms. Victory's summary, Panel members suggested changes to the section. For example, Dave Flessas stated that security greatly contributed to restoration of service and, thus, language needs to be added emphasizing this. Ms. Victory agreed that it would be helpful to mention the issue in the resiliency discussion. Ms. Sears indicated that there was no mention of the lack of pre-positioned equipment. Ms. Victory suggested that relevant language could be added in Section II dealing with recovery.

Acknowledging that the draft's approach of discussing industry sectors works to a point, Ms. Victory suggested that the discussion should be more specific to make it clear that there was a difference in the weather impact in different areas and that may have affected resiliency. Captain Timothy Cannon suggested the mid-Mississippi area as a good model and stated he would secure and provide the relevant information.

Greg Bicket raised concerns that some of the language describing the impact on cable was misleading because: (1) it could be read as suggesting that cable's facilities are typically

4

underground when, in fact, underground facilities comprise a minority of cable's total plant miles; (2) the language does not recognize that flooding devastated cable's above ground facilities; and (3) the language implicitly suggests that cable was back up and operating at 100% of pre-storm homes in four days. Ms. Victory asked if Mr. Bicket could send clarifying edits and he agreed to do so.

Marty Hadfield stated that he did not think towers failed because of a lack of power. After further discussion among Panel members concerning antenna tower failures, Mr. Hadfield stated he would supply suggested remedial language. In addition, Ms. Sears volunteered to send some edits on the satellite section to distinguish between fixed and mobile satellites.

Section II — Recovery Process

Ms. Victory summarized the recovery process section. She specifically highlighted the significant factors and conditions that hampered recovery efforts during the disaster.

Steve Delahousey stated that military resources were brought to bear but civilian public safety representatives were not able to communicate with them thereby hindering the rescue effort. He suggested that language be inserted mentioning the existence of this problem. Ms. Victory agreed, stating that the discussion would be an appropriate addition to the section about Federal, State and Local Government Coordination. She requested that Mr. Delahousey supply her with specific remedial language. Mr. Pitts indicated that the MSRC best practices should be in the section. Ms. Victory stated she could strengthen the language.

Jim Jacot stated he was surprised that there was no mention of state emergency operations centers (EOCs). Discussion ensued among Mr. Jacot, Ms. Victory and Captain Cannon regarding the existence of communications between industry providers and state EOCs during the disaster. Ms. Victory indicated this was the first instance she has heard of such communications outside of an ad hoc line of communication between providers and the state EOC. She requested more information concerning these communications.

Ms. Sears brought up the issue of Federal, state and local coordination and wanted to clarify that the Panel was not misstating which branch was out of the loop. Ms. Victory wanted to clarify that the Panel was in agreement that the local entities had the information and were able to talk with the communications providers. Ms. Victory stated that this was not what she remembered from the discussion and requested more information. Mr. Delahousey stated that the biggest problem was not communicating locally but getting outside communications established. Mr. Davis agreed and asked Mr. Hadfield to elaborate on communications in Jefferson Parish. Mr. Hadfield summarized the effectiveness Jefferson Parish had in communicating during the disaster and indicated that additional upgrades have been made. He suggested the need for awareness of actual capabilities, cooperation between entities and continued dialogue on a local level. Mr. Delahousey also suggested that ESF-2 plans should include members of the media as part of the planning process.

Captain Cannon stated that the leading paragraph did not mention how the flooding affected recovery and coordination. Ms. Victory stated she would add to that paragraph.

5

<u>Section III — First Responder Communications and Section IV – Emergency Communications</u>

Ms. Victory summarized the section on first responder communications recommendations, noting specific subsections addressing operability versus interoperability, call forwarding and number portability, Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) routing and emergency medical communications. Ms. Victory also summarized Section IV regarding emergency communications to the public. Specifically, she discussed the EAS and other types of emergency communications to the public either through other notification means or through broadcast and cable media. She also summarized the discussion of the particular needs of people with disabilities and non-English speaking individuals.

Mr. Flessas suggested that the Panel not logically disconnect paragraphs discussing the lack of EAS activation of existing systems and paragraphs discussing the exploration of alternative methods. Ms. Victory agreed and stated she would attempt to keep them separate.

Ms. Victory stated that she would insert language noting that there appeared to be confusing information made available to the public because there were so many different sources with apparently no one official source or sources recognized.

DISCUSSION OF IWG-1 PROGRESS AND PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FULL PANEL CONSIDERATION

Mr. Flessas described IWG-1's recommendation regarding a readiness checklist. He noted that this checklist would include, among other things, industry best practices as set forth by the Network Reliability and Interoperability Council and the MSRC, business continuity plans, power reserves, and EOC coordination.

Ms. Scott described IWG-1's recommendation regarding education of public safety entities about back-up and non-traditional technologies. Ms. Scott explained IWG-1's view that this could be accomplished at various forums such as public safety conventions. Captain Patrick Yoes suggested that the National Fraternal Order of Police be added to the list of forums. Mr. Hadfield suggested that the Panel recommend that the FCC also introduce these back-up and non-traditional technologies at other communications forums.

Mr. Hadfield described IWG-1's recommendation regarding automatic waivers and special temporary authority (STA). In addition to the areas listed in the draft, Mr. Hadfield stated that this recommendation should include: (1) expanded opportunities for the electronic filing of STA requests on the CDBS online system; and (2) waivers for the activation and post-event reporting requirements related to point-to-point communications during an emergency by broadcasters.

Mr. Flessas described recommendations concerning the need for coordinated outage reporting requirements. He highlighted issues such as the need for a single repository of information and unified reporting structure during events, frequency of reporting, specific reporting requirements, proprietary information and the need to ensure the protection of carrier-specific data when sharing with other government agencies.

6

DISCUSSION OF IWG-2 PROGRESS AND PROPOSED RECOMMENATIONS FOR FULL PANEL CONSIDERATION

Mr. Davis explained the recommendation of a national credentialing system and guidelines. He stated that IWG-2 recommends that the FCC, using National Incident Management System training mechanisms, work with the appropriate Federal agencies to develop credentialing requirements. He also indicated that IWG-2 supports NSTAC's recommendation for a secondary level of access after first responder status for police, fire and medical professionals. Specifically, Mr. Davis stated that IWG-2 recommends, consistent with NSTAC's recommendation, that this status should be called emergency responder private sector. Ms. Victory suggested that IWG-2 revise the proposed language to make it clear that they support NSTAC's recommendation, but believe it should be augmented to include media companies as well.

Next, Mr. Davis summarized IWG-2's recommendation that a regional/state coordinating body be formed. Mr. Davis stated that IWG-2 hopes the regional/state coordinating body can facilitate communication and coordination between infrastructure providers, broadcast media, responders on the scene and the EOC representatives. He stated that the regiona/state coordinating body should work on, among other things: (1) identifying vulnerabilities in the telecommunications and media infrastructure and developing strategies to medicate those vulnerabilities, (2) administering the credentialing program and (3) identifying staging areas in the state's emergency preparedness plan. Finally, he stated that, after disasters, the regional/state coordinating body should assist with information sharing and the coordination of resources for the repair of key infrastructure components.

Ms. Victory proposed language recommending that entities should meet, both pre-disaster and post-disaster, on a periodic basis to develop channels of communications, to conduct joint preparedness and response plans, and to conduct joint exercises.

Mr. Flessas asked whether language regarding the state/regional coordinating recommendation should more pointedly indicate that the Panel supports the NSTAC recommendation for that coordination. Ms. Victory opined that she believes their recommendation was for an industry-only body. She suggested further discussion concerning whether the contemplated group in NSTAC's recommendation would support an industry-only subgroup. Ms. Victory reminded the Panel about discussions addressing the need for state and local representatives to be involved in coordination. Panel discussion ensued on this point and whether there should be linkage between a main group and a subgroup. Ms. Sears commented that the Panel would have to define any such linkage. Mr. Jacot stated that he understood NSTAC as recommending some form of interface with government entities. Although Mr. Jacot stated the need to make sure that the Panel's final recommendation is compatible with NSTAC's recommendation, he cautioned against the risk of having too many coordinating bodies. Mr. Davis stated that the Panel would be missing a major opportunity if it recommends industry coordination absent the presence of local or state governments. Ms. Victory ultimately suggested that IWG-2 work on language creating a coordinating body that meets on a regular basis with state and local representatives

and additional language creating an industry-only subgroup consistent with NSTAC's recommendation.

Mr. Jacot asked if IWG-2's recommendation specified a common staging area for all telecommunications providers. He questioned whether it is logistically feasible to have all providers staging out of the same area. Captain Cannon added that one of the issues that would need to be addressed is the difficulty providers would have communicating. Various Panel members commented on logistics and the increasing size of the staging area. Mr. Delahousey and Ms. Victory suggested that a possible solution would be to recommend a coordination area for all communication representatives and that the ESF-2 representative to communicate with this group. Ms. Victory requested that IWG-2 discuss potential changes to the language in the draft.

Mr. Davis continued summarizing IWG-2's recommendations including its recommendations that: (1) the FCC expeditiously implement the formation of the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau; (2) the FCC create a website listing the key state emergency management contacts as well as post disaster meeting areas; (3) the FCC create a website listing its "SWAT Team" contact information; and (4) that NCC expand its membership to include other technologies such as broadcast, cable and satellite.

Several Panel members discussed issues relating to the key state emergency management contacts website including the need for it to be manned on a 24 hour basis during an emergency, whether it should be a public website and whether it should be a two-way interactive site to allow industry to post available assets. Based on the Panel discussion, Ms. Victory asked that IWG-2 review the language again and revise it accordingly so that the language is clear and more specific about the information that should be included, that it should be password-protected and that it should be updated on a 24 hour basis during a disaster.

With respect to the proposed recommendation regarding NCC membership, Mr. Anderson suggested that the membership list be expanded to include ham radios and license exempt wireless.

Finally, Mr. Davis summarized IWG-2's recommendations regarding the priority communications programs, i.e., Wireless Priority Access (WPA), Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS) and Telecommunications Service Priority (TSP).

DISCUSSION OF IWG-3 PROGRESS AND PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FULL PANEL CONSIDERATION

Mr. Delahousey summarized the first responder communications recommendations, noting new language that had been added since the April 18th meeting. For example, he noted the addition of language recommending that the FCC encourage state and local jurisdictions to utilize the cache through training exercises on a regular basis. He also noted a new recommendation that the FCC urge state/regions to maintain a database of frequency usage by local emergency responders to allow for more efficient spectrum sharing and rapid on-site frequency coordination in the event of system failures. The language also recommended that the FCC work with the database

manager to ensure exchange of current information. With respect to the latter language, Ms. Victory suggested that IWG-3 obtain information on NCS's efforts in this area and figure out whether and how to tweak this language.

Mr. Delahousey noted that the recommendation regarding development of an inventory of available Federal government and military communications assets now includes a list of the types of equipment that should be included. In addition, he discussed a new recommendation that, following any large disaster, the FCC establish a website through which private sector companies can register communications assets that they can rapidly make available to first responders and relief organizations. Ms. Victory suggested that the list of Federal government and military assets might also include certain bridging or interoperability AC1000 type equipment.

With respect to the recommendation that the FCC work with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) to establish appropriate criteria for the distribution of $1 billion for 700 MHz interoperability, Mr. Delahousey noted the addition of language stating that, among other things, the criteria should mandate that any radios purchased with grant monies must be capable of operating on 700 MHz and 800 MHz channels established for mutual aid and interoperability voice communications. He also noted a new recommendation that the FCC work with NTIA to develop strategies and policies to allow Federal, state and local agencies to share spectrum for emergency response purposes, particularly the Federal incident response channels and channels established for mutual aid and interoperability. In addition, he noted a new recommendation that the FCC publicize interoperability successes and/or best practices by public safety entities to serve as models to further interoperability.

Ms. Victory, Mr. Pitts and Mr. Delahousey discussed adding references to the military in the recommendation regarding development of strategies and policies for Federal, state and local agencies to share spectrum for emergency response purposes.

Michael Rosenthal voiced concerns about providing specific language regarding the criteria for receiving grant money for bands that would have to be included in the radios and suggested that the language be more general so as not to be limited to 700 MHz. Various Panel members discussed the more limited use and operability of using only 700 MHz radios and how the grant to buy emergency safety communications equipment should at least make it capable of communicating with the majority of the equipment that exists today. The Panel members discussed the best way to move forward with this goal in a potential 700 and 800 MHz dual band environment. Mr. Delahousey indicated there exists new radio technologies that could adapt to the dual band environment. Ms. Victory stated that, if the Panel is going to recommend interoperability in a dual band environment, then the capabilities and requisite infrastructure of available radios should be researched. Ms. Victory asked Mr. Rosenthal to research these capabilities and the required infrastructure.

Mr. Delahousey presented the recommendation that the FCC should work to assist the emergency medical community to facilitate the resiliency and effectiveness of their emergency communications systems. Mr. Pitts raised the issue of a broader broadcast capability under the GETS, WPA and TSP programs. Ms. Victory suggested this issue is one that IWG-3 should

9

investigate. She stated that IWG-3 should also determine whether it is able to gather enough data on this issue in the time remaining and if a solution is something that the Panel will be prepared to recommend. She further indicated that there are questions relevant to this issue that the Panel needs to discuss.

Gil Bailey presented recommendations regarding resiliency and restoration of the 911 infrastructure and PSAPs. Mr. Bailey asked if there was any way PSAPs could be included as a local government entity or a 911 district in order to be eligible for funding. Ms. Victory suggested that IWG-3 should take a look at the idea of grants for PSAPs to complete 911 capabilities.

Ms. Victory discussed recommendations regarding emergency communications to the public. She discussed two revisions in the item discussing the EAS and indicated that IWG-3 eliminated a section and moved it to a discussion about specific recommendations to address communications to people with disabilities and non-English speaking Americans. Ms. Victory discussed the relocation of language recommending the prompt resolution of any technical hurdles in the current EAS to insure that non-English speaking people or persons with disabilities have equal access to public warnings. She further discussed how IWG-3 discussed suggesting that the FCC work with the various industry trade associations to create and publicize best practices for each industry sector serving these communities. Ms. Victory also stated that, for state and local government agencies that provide emergency information — whether through video, audio or online access — to take steps to make emergency information accessible to people with disabilities or non-English speaking Americans.

Mr. Davis suggested a recommendation that public safety offices coordinate with the Commerce Department to have certain transmissions go through the NOAA weather radios as a means of distribution. He explained that some individuals enable their weather radios to activate if there is a tornado warning. Mr. Pitts agreed that IWG-3 should analyze this more to confirm that implementing such a recommendation does not interrupt any current networking on the system. Mr. Davis and Mr. Pitts further agreed that the transmission only be streamed primarily on the NOAA all weather alert system and that retransmission should be at the discretion of the broadcaster. At Ms. Victory's request, Mr. Pitts stated he would explore how certain language or the general heading may be changed or delineated separately so that it characterizes people at-risk in a broader sense. Mr. Pitts suggested such an approach would be more inclusive of the elderly, children, people with disabilities, and non-English speaking individuals.

Mr. Pitts, Mr. Davis and Ms. Victory also discussed the issue of confusing information and inconsistent information and whether anything can be done to address the issue. Ms. Victory suggested that IWG-3 should explore this issue.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Victory stated that she would like to distribute to the Panel a redline draft of the changes agreed upon during this meeting with line edits. She requested line edits on the problem section from Panel members and requested that nonsubstantive changes to the recommendations be forwarded to her and her team by the following Tuesday morning. Ms. Victory stated that she

will then, on or around Wednesday, send out a redline draft of changes made to both the recommendation and the observation sections. She discussed how IWG-2 and IWG-3 still have issues to consider further and suggested that the final draft needs to be circulated to the Panel somewhere around the first of June for the Panel's review. Ms. Victory requested that, since she would like to know about any suggested changes or problems ahead of time, Panel members submit any changes to that final draft no later than June 7th. She indicated that the working groups need to complete their work and circulate any new recommendations prior to the Memorial Day weekend.

Ms. Victory stated that the next meeting was tentatively scheduled for June 9, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Victory adjourned the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify to the accuracy of these minutes of the May 12, 2006 Meeting of the FCC's Independent Panel Reviewing the Impact of Hurricane Katrina on Communications Networks ("Hurricane Katrina Panel").[1]

Nancy J. Victory
Chair
Independent Panel Reviewing the
Impact of Hurricane Katrina on
Communications Networks (defunct)

---

[1] The charter for the Hurricane Katrina Panel expired on June 15, 2006. Thus, the Panel is now defunct.