

**MINUTES**  
**NCC Region 43 700 MHz Regional Planning Committee**  
**June 25, 2003**  
**10:00 AM - 12:00 PM**  
**Wenatchee Convention Center during Washington APCO Conference**

**1. Roll Call and Introductions**

Following individuals participated in meeting.

Jim Anderson	Travis Boettcher
Fred Baker	Denny Casto
Dave Brush	Alan Hull
Guy Cranor	Gary Palmer
Kevin Kearns	
Terry Miller	
Bob Wentworth	
Jon (Wiz) Wiswell	

**2. Agenda Modifications – None**

**3. Approval of Minutes of May 28, 2003**

The Minutes of May 28<sup>th</sup> were approved.

**4. Information Updates**

Hai Phung went to Colorado for CAPRAD training. He reported to Kevin that it was good training and that he would be arranging to do some demonstrations at future Committee meetings, and training Kevin on what his roles will be in the database as the Chair. Kevin will also coordinate with Region 35 to see if we are approaching the duties in similar ways. We encountered a slight problem with our planning support funds but this is being resolved and then Hai's travel expenses will be reimbursed. Terry Miller will now be scheduling his training as well.

It was noted that the joint House and Senate bills did pass and that the SIEC will now be a formal subcommittee of the state's Information Services Board. A copy of the legislation is posted on the Region 43 web site at the following link.

<http://www.region43.org/docs/700mhz/HouseBill1271FormalizingtheSIEC.pdf>

It was noted that the legislation did not provide specific funding or staffing, but the understanding is that DIS will be picking up this role. The non-state-agency seats on the Committee will be filled by representatives of the various associations (cities, counties, police & fire chiefs, etc.)

It was also noted that if indeed DIS did the staffing of this process, since they don't have institutional knowledge or experience in radio systems, the participating state and non-state agencies will need to be heavily relied on for their knowledge and experience. It is expected that beyond the formally identified Committee, there will be one or more working groups that will be tasked with various functions. For purposes of the specific responsibilities delegated by the FCC for the administration of the 700 MHz interoperability spectrum, they will likely need support from the RPC. This is a role we have encouraged.

Kevin Kearns noted that he attended a recent joint meeting of the Western Washington Cooperative Interference Committee (WWCIC) and the Western Canada Telecommunications Council (WCTC) and gave a brief presentation on the 700 MHz regional planning process. This allowed us to get information about the planning process out to a broader audience and encourage further participation in the process. Wiz will also be working on getting our web site linked on the WWCIC web site.

Kevin Kearns also advised the group of a new Spectrum Coalition that is forming under the leadership of the District of Columbia. Due to their unique threat conditions, they have an exceptionally large number of technology initiatives that require connectivity (air monitoring devices, cameras, high-capacity mobile data, etc.) They have determined that the wide-band data channels in the 700 MHz band (even if aggregated to 150 kHz) will not be sufficient to meet their needs. In fact, they are interested in running something like 1.5 MHz channels and achieving near broad-band speeds in a wireless environment. They are trying to mobilize support for a change in Congressional direction and have an additional 10 MHz of the 700 MHz band allocated to public safety use (instead of auctioned for commercial use) for this need.

There was a general discussion of the current status of US and Canadian TV channels in the 60-69 band. While we are under no obligation to protect Canadian signals in US territory, we will likely take the political heat from the public if we disturb their reception. Further, even though the low-power translator licensees are secondary in this band by rule and must mitigate interference to us and suffer interference from us, the public/political repercussions from this might be significant. NPSTC is pushing for the FCC to do more to assist in delivering this message so it doesn't have to come from us as local jurisdictions when we try and license and build our systems.

Bob Wentworth attended a recent Region 12 (Idaho) meeting. Explained that they are not as far along as us. They are not too concerned with spending much time on it yet, until their neighboring plans are done. Bob will keep in tune on their process and keep us advised.

## **5. Draft Plan Review and Editing**

Draft Version 3 of the Plan was reviewed with Kevin starting off with a review of the changes from the last draft. It was noted that by our adding the new Section 3 on History and Background our document won't match the Guidebook. Kevin was asked to confirm with NPSTC or the FCC on whether this would present a problem or not when it came time for submittal and adoption.

There was significant discussion on Section 7 – Interoperability. It was noted that if the State builds a statewide infrastructure on their state licensed spectrum, they would likely implement a network of Interoperability repeaters as well, and if they did, the requirement on other licensees to implement additional repeaters may diminish or go away all together. This needs to be tracked as State planning efforts get underway in this band.

Most of the discussion focused on Section 7.3 – Requirement for Infrastructure to Support Interoperability Channels. The current language is written in terms of channel counts driving the number of required interoperability repeaters. But the question is, what is a “channel”? Is it the 25 kHz block being used for the initial CAPRAD county-by-county allocations, or is it a 12.5 kHz channel for a system using P25 CAI, or is it the 6.25 kHz channel equivalent if a system is using 4-slot TDMA? And does this apply to both narrowband and wideband channels or just narrowband channels?

After considerable discussion, a consensus was reached that we really should be talking in terms of bandwidth instead of channels. It was also agreed that 12.5 kHz should be the building block we use for counting. Finally, it was agreed that we are only talking about the consumption of the general category narrowband voice channels, not the wideband data channels. Given this, the amount of spectrum vs. number of I/O channels would be as follows:

Bandwidth Licensed	Required Number of Interoperability Repeaters
0 to 50 kHz	None
62.5 to 100 kHz	1 Call Channel
112.5 to 175 kHz	1 Call Channel 1 Law Enforcement Channel 1 Fire/EMS Channel
> 187.5 kHz	1 Call Channel 1 Law Enforcement Channel 1 Fire Channel 1 EMS Channel

When we submit our letter to the SIEC regarding recommended changes or updates to the Interoperability section, we will include this as well.

We then got into a discussion of Section 9 – Allocation of General Use Spectrum. Discussion focused on the pros and cons of each approach outlined. There

seems to be a building consensus around Option #2, but using the removal of interfering primary TV stations as the triggering point to start the clock, not Plan adoption. There was a feeling that we didn't need to wait for the LPTV and Translator stations to go away since they are secondary to our use.

By taking this approach, the clock would start running at different times in different parts of the Region. For example, in most of the Region there are no primary US or Canadian channels so the clock would start running at Plan adoption. But in the northwestern part of the Region where incumbent Canadian station(s?) are on the air, the clock wouldn't start until they went away. This would be fairer to agencies in those affected counties since they really wouldn't have full use of the band until the TV uses cleared.

**6. 4.9 GHz Regional Planning**

Kevin Kearns noted that most of the comments he hears so far on this indicate that we should conduct a regional planning process for this band. There will be more information coming out at the next NPSTC meeting so he will pass that on at the next meeting and we can sharpen our focus on this issue.

**7. Other Items/Good of the Order**

None

**8. Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be in Yakima on Wednesday, July 30, 2003.

**9. Adjourn**

Meeting was adjourned at 12:10