

MINUTES
Region 43 (Washington)
700 MHz and 4.9 GHz
Regional Planning Committee
May 26, 2004 - 1000 to 1300
Snohomish Public Utility Operations Center
Everett, Washington

1. Roll Call and Introductions

The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Kevin Kearns	Dave Brush
Cammie Enslow	Gary Amundson
Jon (Wiz) Wiswell	Hai Phung
Dean Heinen	Joe Bartlett
Babu Parayil	Ken Gustafson - phone
Kevin Moyes	Allan Josue - phone
Don Boyd	Keith Flewelling - phone
Walt Pierce	Mike Doble - phone

During introductions participants were asked to identify themselves and their agencies and provide information on any known or expected interest by their agency or agencies around them in either the 700 MHz or the 4.9 GHz band in the next couple of years. Since this has been done at past meetings (see previous minutes for details) only new information is noted in these Minutes.

Dean Heinen, Yakima County – 700 MHz, no change, but expanding plans for 4.9 GHz to include vehicular area networks.

Babu Parayil, Port of Seattle – Interested in 4.9 GHz for data applications.

Kevin Moyes & Don Boyd, Whatcom County – concerned about Canadian TV.

Walt Pierce, Snohomish County – no current plans for 700 MHz.

Mike Doble, 4.9 Ghz Research Center – on phone as a 4.9 GHz resource.

After introductions, Kevin reminded attendees to check the attendance list for correct information, and if they attended a meeting for which they were not credited, to contact Kevin with the information.

2. Agenda Modifications - None

PowerPoint slides were used to discuss agenda topics.

These may be viewed on the Region 43 web page at www.region43.org.

3. Approval of Minutes of April 28, 2004

Dean Heinen made a motion to approve the minutes. Wiz (Jon Wiswell) seconded the motion and the minutes were approved.

4. Treasurer's Report

Spencer Bahner was unavailable to give the treasurer's report. Kevin Kearns reported that the balance is unchanged. APCO has never billed for the RPC

meeting room so it is assumed that the room charge was included in the price for the APCO conference. Terry Miller has signed up for next month's CAPRAD training, so the group will be reimbursing him for his costs. Since Spencer has resigned from his position he will no longer be able to be the RPC treasurer. Kevin will be asking Ron Solemsaas if he can fill the Treasurer's position.

4. Information Updates – All

- **SIEC updates – Kevin Kearns reporting for Dennis Hausman**

The interim interoperability plan was completed by the 1st quarter deadline. The template for data collection of the local inventory has been developed and is almost ready to roll out. The DHS specified regions will be used for data collection. Staffing effort is a big undertaking, so the agency may apply for grants to allow them to bring a contractor on board to collect and tabulate data. The drafts are detailed, but not difficult to fill out. Tower coordinates and related data are requested. In densely populated areas with many agencies filling out surveys, this may give the impression that there are more towers than are really there, due to duplication. Therefore, the agency is trying to do some data scrubbing. Forms should be coming out this summer.

The SIEC approved and adopted the changes suggested by our RPC, with minor modifications. The interim Vice Chair, Jim Broman has now become Chair. The SAW groups are now meeting every two weeks. A lot of the scheduled activity has now been completed and is posted.

- **Actions in other RPCs – Kevin Kearns**

Region 35 (Oregon) is meeting on June 2nd at the Sunriver Lodge in Sunriver, Oregon. Region 5 (Southern California) has now been approved. Missouri is still working on regional coordination with eight other states. Missouri filed a Petition for Reconsideration following the rejection of their plan. They are asking the FCC to drop the coordination requirement because many of the surrounding regions are still unformed.

No other regions are imminent. It is assumed that they have been waiting to see the outcome for Region 5.

Reminder: to search on Proceeding 02-378 for filed comments, see http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi.

- **Outreach Workgroup Activities – Cammie Enslow for Kit Eldredge**

Kit requested suggestions regarding what we should be sending out to our notification list. Kevin suggested that we notify our group of the status of the regional planning effort and how close we are to completing our plan, and attach the meeting slides/minutes.

- **Vendor Demos - Group**

The issue of hosting 700 MHz and/or 4.9 GHz vendor equipment presentations came up for discussion. The group decided that this would be of general interest if the length of the presentations were limited, they were held following the regular meeting, and all interested vendors were given an opportunity to participate. Dean Heinen made a motion to add an hour or more for vendor presentations. Wiz seconded. The Outreach Committee will contact the

vendors. Motorola volunteered to present at the 6/30 meeting.

5. DRAFT Plan Review and Editing (see slides for details)

Draft Plan Version 8 is not complete, but is much closer to being done.

Details follow:

Section 3 - Description of the Region

A regional map is included in this section showing county boundaries.

Additionally, a tabulation of population by counties is included to demonstrate the fact that channel allocation is aligned with population counts (per 2002 census information).

Section 3.2 – Existing Interoperability and Mutual Aid Systems

Language regarding the LERN and NLEC frequencies was extracted from the SIEC Interim Plan and inserted into this section. While this section is not expected to address all interoperability problems, it contains paragraphs on all channels explaining how each may contribute to interoperability. The missing HEAR frequency, 155.280 MHz, was added to this draft revision.

Section 3.3 – Impacts on Existing Plans as a Result of Adding 700 MHz Interoperability Channels

In the previous Draft this section consisted of bullet points. Kevin took a 1st stab at language regarding the impact of adding new interoperability channels to existing plans. The first paragraph emphasized the fact that the addition of additional systems will increase interoperability needs. It is important that the new 700 MHz systems are planned with an awareness of existing legacy systems in the area. Kevin requested feedback on this section. Wiz asked for time to more thoroughly review the section. Gary will review the manner in which Region 5 handled this section.

Section 3.4.2 – State Agencies

Kevin noted that this section is still incomplete. Language is needed regarding the State 2.4 MHz of spectrum and administration strategy. Other entities will need to understand the state's plan.

Section 3.4.6 – Tribal Lands

Kevin suggested that we review this section and asked Cammie to add an additional paragraph regarding the role of the Governor's Office of Indian Affairs, including a link to the GOIA website. The map showing locations of tribal lands will be eliminated, since it is of poor quality and is available full-size on the website.

Section 4 – Information and Notification Process

This section is expected to continue to grow until the planning process is completed. Notification will be sent to all recipients on the roster. An update on the status of the planning process will be sent to recipients on the notification list and the approximate number of recipients will be documented.

Section 5 – Regional Plan Summary

New language has been added to this section showing consistency with the national CAPRAD pre-pack. If regions employ planning inconsistent with the pre-pack, coordination problems may occur with bordering states. Note: we have confirmed that Region 35 (Oregon) and Region 12 (Idaho) plan to use the CAPRAD pre-pack. The Plan sets guidelines for interoperability consistent with NCC guidelines and has been approved by the SIEC.

Section 6 – Interoperability

This section is unchanged and is awaiting action by the SIEC.

Section 7 – Additional Spectrum Set aside for Interoperability in the Region

The consensus on this issue is that additional spectrum is not needed to meet interoperability needs.

Section 8 – Allocation of General Use Spectrum

Two allocation options were discussed at the 4/28 planning meeting. The consensus of the group was that “Option 1” was preferable. Option 1 designates closure of the first filing window six months after FCC approval, followed by seven successive filing windows, each six months in duration. The Draft was revised to specify Option 1 but still needs work. Further language will be added regarding the event that triggers the clock and regional processing methodology. Discussion ensued on the following:

During the 1st 4 years should the RPC only consider CAPRAD compliant allocations with open season (all frequencies available) after closure at 4 years? Instead of a hard cutoff at the 8th cycle, should we reassess at the 7th cycle? At the 4/28 planning meeting the group agreed this would be a good idea. Wiz asked, can we include that language without a plan amendment? Kevin said that the FCC will require a full-blown assessment every time we revise our plan. Wiz then asked if we can amend our plan within that 6-month window? Kevin thinks we can. Consensus was reached on specifying seven successive filing windows, with the assumption that we can meet the window for amending the plan, if needed. It was emphasized that reassessment is good since the future is unknown. Dean suggested that we change the language of the last bullet from “granted” to “accepted for processing” or “considered”.

Section 9 – Explanation of How Needs Were Assigned Priorities in Areas Where Not All Eligibles Could Receive Licenses

This section is unchanged, as there have been no comments from previous meetings. At the last meeting we discussed whether we want to provide credit for shared systems. The consensus was that this issue would be addressed in points provided for other scoring categories.

Section 10 – An Explanation of How all the Region Eligibles’ Needs were Considered, and to the extent possible, met

This section still needs to be written.

Section 11 – Evidence that the plan has been successfully coordinated with adjacent regions

There has been no progress on this section yet, as Kevin still needs to look at the guidelines document. It appears that similar information to that contained in Section 5, regarding allocation with respect to the proportionality of spectrum count and population, is requested. Don Boyd asked if we need to formally coordinate our planning process with Canada. Wiz noted that they can look at our website for information on our progress. Kevin commented that any formal sharing of our plan is probably unnecessary.

Section 12 – Detailed Description of How the Plan Put Spectrum to the best possible use

This section still needs to be written after we coordinate our plan with Idaho and/or Oregon.

Section 13 – Detailed description of the future planning process, including, but not limited to the amendment process, meeting announcements and minutes, database maintenance and dispute resolution

This section has not changed and is awaiting further input. Kevin noted that channel allocations are included in the copies on the table in the back of the room. The CAPRAD plan considered population and geography and packed as many channels in as possible, based on population. More channels are available than shown by the pre-pack because it is based on AHAAT approximations. Progressing westward, counties increase in size and topography changes. The one-tower approximation works well, but tighter packing could be achieved by the use of specific information and complex engineering. Information from the 800 MHz plan was used to create a good model.

Schedule:

Kevin had hoped to bring a completed plan to the June meeting, but will not make that deadline. The plan document should be completed by the July meeting. The essential elements are there, and it will be sent to Region 35 for their meeting. Draft Version 9 should be ready for the June meeting and actionable versions should be ready for the July meeting. Wiz asked if someone should attend the upcoming Region 35 meeting. Kevin said he is unable to go, but if some of our people want to go, that would be good. A formal representative is not needed because a final plan is not ready. Wiz may try to go to be available to answer questions, as neither Kevin nor the Vice Chair can attend. Kevin asked Keith Flewelling if he has attended. He says he is keeping up on their activity but cannot attend the upcoming meeting.

Additional Discussion:

Babu wished to discuss Section 8, regarding the timeline. Kevin says we will avoid making assignments until users are ready to build (such as Metro Transit). Then they will be subject to the FCC timeline for completion of construction. The FCC does not appreciate the warehousing of spectrum. Regarding Section 9, Babu asked if the scoring criteria incorporate a minimum score. Kevin replied that in the 800 MHz process, the group only had to score one competing application, and the outcome was unsuccessful, as no one was happy with their allocations. It is sometimes an imperfect process. As for who does the scoring, Kevin may add more language to specify the details of the process. There are currently 20 voting members on the roster. Assuming the addition of more voting members, 35 people would be unable to review and do the scoring. Dean suggested we form a committee to review the applications and make a recommendation. This recommendation would then be reviewed and decided on by the voting members. Hai asked, if we have several agencies competing for 5 channels, will the channels be split up so that neither agency has enough channels? Sno-Co had this situation and no one was happy with the outcome. However if all channels are granted to one applicant, this denies the other applicant the possibility of building anything. Usually, the criteria decide the issue. Kevin does not anticipate many competing applications.

6. 4.9 GHz Regional Planning Workgroup – Kevin Kearns for Clark Palmer

Working Group Participants were announced (see slides).

The workgroup was formally convened at our March 4th meeting. This might put us at odds with the FCC, as we missed the deadline to start within 6 months of the ruling. The original goal was to bring a straw-man plan to the June 30th meeting of the RPC, ready to submit to the FCC. The plan is supposed to be completed within one year of the time the FCC adopted the rule. The NPSTC task force has been working hard with the manufacturing community regarding emission masks and other technical issues. Their guideline document has been published. In reading through the document, however, it is clear that it is not a cut and paste template. Much review work and authoring is needed for adaptation by an individual RPC. The WSDOT has a statewide license for the entire 50 MHz, which can be used as soon as type-accepted equipment is available. Dean can go county-wide (Yakima County) as soon as type-accepted equipment is available. Anyone that implements these frequencies must coordinate with everyone else using them to minimize interference. See part 90 for information on creating a regional plan. The most important elements are in section A: Regional Planning Committees MAY submit a plan, but can choose not to file a plan. If the RPC chooses to submit a plan, the plan MUST incorporate the elements contained in FCC Part 90, Subpart Y (see slides).

Discussion:

Kevin asked, considering the timeline, do we really want to try move aggressively to develop and adopt a plan by July 30th, including coordinating our plan with Oregon and Idaho? Perhaps we should we consider a two tier approach that initially considers the issue at a higher level and later files an amendment to submit a more thorough plan. The role of the RPC could initially be to act as a clearing-house for licensee information. Licenses could be posted along with a list of licensee contact numbers. We could choose to avoid entering into the allocation process and/or resolution of interference. Mike Doble noted that California is doing something similar. There is not enough information to formulate a plan since type-accepted equipment is not yet available. Motorola, LPN Wireless and other manufacturers are working on 4.9 GHz equipment. Their RPC has sent out a survey to all counties to assess interest in the band and has posted it on their website. We could adapt such a survey template for our use, to assess interest in our state. Wiz commented that 8 weeks is an impossible amount of time to complete a 4.9 GHz plan. He is leaning toward not having a 4.9 GHz plan, although he supports listing existing licensees on our website. Dean agrees with Wiz that, given the timeline, we cannot file a plan. He is hoping the Commission will extend the window. Gary suggested that perhaps the FCC could be persuaded to extend the window to 6/30/2005. The consensus was that meeting the 6/30/2004 timeline seems futile, but we want to do something.

Suggestions follow:

The 1st strategy will be to send the FCC a waiver petition to extend the deadline and attempt to get other RPCs to do the same. If unsuccessful, we could at least file a letter saying we could not meet the timeline. We could use the California survey (modified for our use) to collect interest information. We could circulate it

to our list, the 800 MHz list, and the Outreach Group notification list. Kevin asked for volunteers to adapt the survey and to compile information. Dean, Wiz and Cammie volunteered to assist with this effort. Dean will get a copy of the California survey and adapt it for our use, Wiz will aggregate the information returned and Cammie will assist them with these tasks. Survey results will be posted on our website by the end of July. Wiz suggested that we should begin posting existing licenses and licensee information on our website. Dean asked when we should have the extension letter ready and the timeline. Kevin suggested we limit the time to no longer than year-end and wondered if we want to tie the date to type acceptance of equipment. Dean says we should request a hard date extension. Kevin added that we can watch other states and observe how they handle their issues.

7. Other Items/Good of the Order

None

8. Future 2004 Meeting Dates

- June 30th meeting will be in Yakima in the Probation Services Training Room
 - July 28th meeting will be in Olympia at the State DIS Boardroom
 - All future meeting dates will be posted on the web site (www.region43.org)
- Note: The July meeting is particularly relevant as this is the opportunity for participants to make final comments on the plan.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1244 hours.