

MINUTES
Region 43 (Washington)
700 MHz & 4.9 GHz Regional Planning Committee
February 23, 2005 - 1000 to 1200
King County Regional Communications and Emergency Coordination Center
3511 NE 2nd Street, Renton

Meeting Summary:

The RPC met to discuss 700 MHz issues, SIEC updates, actions in other RPCs, NPSTC and NARPC, and to review FCC/industry documents of interest. The RPC Also reviewed, discussed and edited Draft Version 2 of the Regional Plan for 4.9 GHz.

Reminders/ Action Items:

Voting status – attendees are once again reminded to consider becoming voting members. A letter or an email sent to the Chair by anyone one level above you in your agency naming you as the agency designated voting member is all that is required to become a voting member.

1. Roll Call and Introductions

The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Kevin Kearns	Brooke Flynn
Dave Brush	Jeff Nightingale
Cammie Enslow	Tim McDowell
Capt Deborah Huntsinger	Harlan Ohlson
Dean Heinen	Andy Middlebrooks
Bob Bushey	Julian Braun
Valerie Eveland	Ivan Nepomuceno
Ron Solemsaas	Travis Boettcher
Ron Moyer	Bob Wentworth - phone
Tom Howell	Fred Radovich – phone
Steve Monsey	Dennis Hausman phone
Kit Eldredge	Mike Doble – phone
Walt Pierce	Hai Phung – phone

During introductions participants were asked to identify themselves and their agencies and provide information (in general terms) on any known or expected interest by their agency or agencies around them in either the 700 MHz and/or the 4.9 GHz band in 2005 and 2006. Since this has been done at past meetings (see previous minutes for details) only new information is noted herein.

Dean Heinen, Yakima - interested in 700 MHz for data.
Tim McDowell, WSDOT - looking at county wide wireless data at 2.4/4.9 GHz.
Bob Wentworth, Spokane - would like to see an open standard for 4.9 GHz.

Attendees are again reminded to verify their contact information on the sign-in sheet and to self-subscribe to the Listserv on the website, www.region43.org.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 26, 2005

Dean Heinen made a motion to approve the December minutes. Dave Brush seconded the motion and the minutes were approved.

Treasurer's Report:

The current balance is approximately \$165.00, which is expected to cover remaining expenses.

Vacant Vice-Chair Position:

Clark Palmer has been unable to fulfill the requirements of the Vice-Chair position due to work demands. The RPC was invited to submit nominations prior to the February meeting. One nomination was received. Dennis Hausman nominated Terry Miller from the WSDOT. There was a motion by Dave Brush, and a 2nd by Valerie Eveland and Terry was unanimously elected RPC Vice-Chair.

3. General Information Updates – All

• SIEC updates –Dennis Hausman

At the last SIEC meeting version 1 of the Interim Plan was adopted and the RFI is now on the street. There is a meeting today in Olympia and a formal SIEC meeting tomorrow. The Interim inventory is out for review. A pair of bills is currently in the Legislature to create a grant process to encourage the adoption of interoperability standards. The grants would favor applicants with a population of 400 thousand or greater that agree to implement the P25 standard. There is one 15 million dollar opportunity and an additional 5 million in matching funds.

• Actions in other RPCs, NPSTC and NARPC – Kevin Kearns

Other RPCs:

- Oregon - Region 35. The RPC Chair for the region has resigned and we are awaiting the designation of a new Chair to sign the draft letter of concurrence and Inter-regional dispute resolution agreement before filing our Plan.
- Idaho – Region 12. The Region 43 Review Team has reviewed the Region 12 Plan, found nothing that would be problematic for our Region and have recommended that we provide Idaho with a letter of consent. There was a motion by Dennis Hausman and a 2nd and the motion was approved.
- Reminder: to see any plans filed for the 700 MHz band search on Proceeding 02-378 at http://gulfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi

NPSTC:

January Board meeting material and Committee presentations are available on the NPSTC website, <http://www.npstc.org/meetings.htm>.

Spectrum Newsletters are available on the NPSTC website at <http://www.npstc.org/newsletter/v4issue2.pdf>.

The Chair noted that the CAPRAD system has been updated and will be reviewed prior to the next meeting.

NARPC:

Regional planning Chairs for NARPC and NPSTC will attend the March meeting in St. Louis, Missouri. Our Chair will participate via conference call.

Canadian 700 MHz Allocation Issues:

There have been no significant changes on this issue. The Chair noted that views can be different on these issues. Our Region encouraged Canada to use a packing scheme similar to ours to streamline cross-border allocation. However, the band is split in other areas and the plan did not work uniformly in all areas of the country. Differences of views across the tier reinforce the idea of using a similar plan. The outcome will be apparent at the release of the Rulemaking.

- **FCC Documents of Interest: 5th MO&O, 6th R&O and 7th NPRM – FCC 05-9:**
Note: not yet been published in the Federal Register; but was released by the FCC on January 7th (see meeting slides, page 11, for details)

Fifth Memorandum Opinion and Order:

This documents deals with significant issues, extending the date for a ban on marketing, manufacturing and importing voice equipment capable of operating only in 12.5 kHz channels from 12/31/2006 to 12/31 2014. This has engendered a lot of concern and response filings. However, the Commission did not extend the operational deadline for all systems and equipment to operate on 6.25 kHz channels. The date that new system applications will be accepted for 12.5 kHz systems has also been extended from 12/31/2006 to 12/31 2014 due to the fact that the Commission is not convinced that there is enough equipment available to meet the original 2006 deadline. Licensees will need to be attentive to this issue since they must meet the 2016 deadline even if they are granted a license to operate at 12.5 kHz. Since the 2016 window will occur in about 10 years agencies should be considering and planning for transition strategies for systems in this band.

Sixth Report and Order:

Terminology regarding Adjacent Channel Coupled Power (ACCP) was changed to refer to Adjacent Channel Power (ACP). Additionally, changes were adopted to ACP limits and rules regarding Public Safety and Guard Bands.

Seventh Notice of Proposed Rulemaking:

This NPRM proposed adoption of TIA recommendations regarding 50 and 100 kHz channels (in addition to existing 150 kHz channel configurations), and adoption of TIA recommendations relative to Guard Band operations. Additionally, the FCC proposed rejecting the TIA recommendations to relax ACP requirements for base stations as licensees would bear the cost of filtering, whereas they felt that protection should be integral to base station equipment. Next, they sought comments of TIA recommendations to apply the same rules for secondary fixed operation and digital base station identification as in the 800 MHz band (see meeting slides, page 14, for details of language in 90.627 and 90.647) and comments on proposals by Access Spectrum and Nortel/EADS regarding ACP requirements.

They proposed to accept the Scalable Adaptive Modulation (SAM) standard for wideband data interoperability and to adopt the NCC recommendation that equipment capable of utilizing the wideband data channels (except equipment meeting the "special purpose" definition) must be able to operate under the SAM Standard. It is expected that since the exception is not clearly defined comments will be filed asking for clarification.

Further, they proposed to accept NCC recommendations to revise ANSI/TIA/EIA 102 references to specify contemporary versions and AES encryption standards.

They declined to adopt the NCC recommendations to require nationwide standardized nomenclature for Interoperability channels and equipment (see meeting slides, page 17 for FCC comments). This request was engendered by the fact that some regions adhere to ICALL/ITAC standards some don't. When different agencies converge on the scene they often don't realize they can talk to each other because of differences in channel nomenclature. Many agencies wanted this in the FCC Rules and hoped to force manufacturers to adhere to a standard naming convention. The FCC does not want to approve unenforceable rules. It may be wise to encourage the DHS to do something in this arena. Comments will be filed on this issue but may be to no avail. Without a specific Rule we have limited capability about how we can enforce standardization. Perhaps the requirement can be rolled into grant requirements.

The FCC declined NCC recommendations to include 700 MHz design criteria in the Rules. The power differential of cellular systems is problematic. The NCC wanted specific recommendations for the edge of the operational area and for unfavorable environments and in-building coverage. The FCC is seeking comments on this issue regarding whether any "recommended" parameters should be in the Rules. It should be noted that if this recommendation were implemented many more sites might be required than if the agency determine its own acceptable QOS.

The FCC declined to accept the recommendation of the NCC and NPSTC to change the name of the SIECs from "State" to "Statewide" Interoperability Executive Committees. They also declined the recommendation to extend the authority of the SIEC to non-700 MHz Interoperability channels. The Commission noted that they expect the states to be in the role of approving applications for base stations operating on 700 MHz Interoperability channels. The FCC declined to make SIECs mandatory and noted that the group that fulfills the function of approving Interoperability for 700 MHz applications must include all public safety interests. They emphasized the fact that all states must have Interoperability plans coordinated with neighboring states.

The FCC declined to require the use of CAPRAD. They noted that, despite its apparent value as a pre-planning tool, none of the RPCs filed comments supporting mandatory use of CAPRAD. This occurred because NPST and the NCC had already filed such comments, which implies agreement. Although it may be useful to clarify the fact that the RPCs do in fact support the use of CAPRAD, since all the Frequency Coordinators and RPCs have committed to use CAPRAD, it may not need to be addressed in the Rules. Dennis Hausman mentioned that the eight state SIEC coalition can publicly comment that they support requiring use of CAPRAD.

The FCC declined to allow major and minor plan modifications as suggested by the NCC. They did clarify the fact that administrative issues such as changes in membership, leadership, or meeting schedules do not require regional coordination or FCC approval, but no changes to spectrum allocation are allowed.

Finally, the FCC proposed clarification of the language in the Rules regarding trunking requirements on General User channels and exemption of low power channels from trunking requirements.

Again, this has not yet been published in the Federal Register and is subject to a thirty-day comment cycle. The Chair requested discussion on these issues:

- Dennis Hausman – noted that we should file comments relative to CAPRAD issue.

- Kevin Kearns – asked, should we file comments on the Channel Nomenclature issue?
- Dennis Hausman – replied that he supports this idea. There was no opposition from the group. He asked if there is a due date for these comments.
- Kevin Kearns – replied that comments should be submitted within 30 days of publication in the Federal Register.

- **Pierce Transit:**

Pierce County Transit has requested eleven 12.5 kHz channels for their new system. The RPC tentatively approved allocation of these channels for their use, with the condition that they cannot be definitely allocated until our Plan is approved. The Pierce County RFP is expected to go out around March 15th and the request for specific channels will allow engineers and vendors to proceed on system design and proposals. Metro Transit was tentatively assigned channels in a similar situation, pending later approval. Discussion on this issue followed:

- Ron Moyer – noted that he has a channel separation plan in hand.
- Dennis Hausman – asked if this is the way we will be proceeding in the future.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that in the future they could go to CAPRAD with proposals for channels meeting their needs and the RPC will review their proposal.
- Dennis Hausman – commented that what we do now will set the tone for what we do in the future.
- Kevin Kearns – remarked that this is not a bad precedent,
- Dennis Hausman – responded that in that case we should go along with it
- Tom Howell – added that they are the ones that will suffer/take the risk.
- Dean Heinen – noted, if there is no preferential treatment we should be fine.
- Kevin Kearns – commented that those that are on the path already should score well in the future. There is a measure of risk that the applicants will have to be willing to accept. He then asked for a sense of the committee, specifically, can the RPC reach consensus on a predetermination to allow agencies to proceed with their designs (see meeting slides, page 24 for the Pierce County allotment)?

Dennis Hausman made a motion to move ahead as Kevin had suggested. There was a 2nd by Walt Pierce and group consensus.

- Tom Howell – suggested that we specify in the letter provided to agencies that this approval is preliminary and that there will be filing windows at the time of implementation.

Reminder: to see any plans filed for the 700 MHz band search on Proceeding 02-378 at http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi

4. 4.9 GHZ Regional Planning Subcommittee

- **4.9 GHZ Demonstration Event in California – Mike Doble**

The Event has been rescheduled to May 18th due to delays in acquiring the FCC experimental airborne license required to hold the event. The latest brochure is available at <http://publicsafetycommunications.org/Wi-Fi-1.php>.

The event is currently scheduled to be held at the Quiet Cannon Country Club in Montebello, California, with some of the exercises to be held at the LA County EOC and/or Laser Village. Mike Doble has been working with contacts in the broadcast community to negotiate free satellite time for live feeds to EOCs. Radio-telescope

groups are not yet online at 4.9 GHz so there is no equipment currently available for testing radio-telescope interference. Discussion followed:

Kevin Kearns – asked, “Do you have a sense that your relationship with the broadcasters is good?”

Mike Doble – responded that one group has already volunteered a satellite truck, although satellite time is not yet confirmed.

Kevin Kearns – noted that the extension of the date to May 18th allows for some planning for an appropriate room. He added that he will continue working on satellite downlink capability.

Valerie Eveland - asked if the date is likely to slip again.

Mike Doble – replied that they extended the date to acquire the airborne license, so the date should be good.

- **Discussion of Region 43 4.9 GHz Draft Plan Version 2 – Dean Heinen**

Version 2 of the 4.9 GHz plan was sent out yesterday. Previously suggested changes have been incorporated into Draft 2 of the document.

- Dennis Hausman – asked if the document will be sent out to groups? He offered to make his contact list available, and noted that the list closes on March 3rd.
- Dean Heinen – responded that he thought Dennis had offered this previously.
- Dennis Hausman – asked, weren’t we planning to first write a “story” about potential uses of this band (to make it more palatable for first responders)?
- Dean Heinen – asked, “Who will prepare the letter?” Cammie volunteered.
- Mike Doble – noted that New York City came up with an 4.9 GHz application list. He offered to send it to Dean.

Dean noted that the FCC provides four “must haves”, which are detailed in the NPSTC guidelines on page 7.

Section 1 Regional Committee Positions:

He noted that we should modify Section 1 to identify the Plan as a plan for sharing use of 4.9 GHz spectrum. He added that he already changed the description, pulling it right out of the RPCs 700 MHz Plan, and inserting it directly into the document.

Section 3 Description of the Region:

Information formerly contained in Section 3 has been moved to the Attachment section and can be completely removed, if necessary. He noted that he left the Federal Agency section in the list overview, as there will be further Interoperability opportunities. He suggested that comments regarding membership and attendance still need to be added at the end of Section 3.

Section 4 Notification:

The Notification Section has been trimmed to the bone. Dean requested the group to please review this section and comment on its adequacy. He added that the Outreach information on page 7 in Section 3 should be moved to Section 4.

Section 5.4 Adjacent Region Coordination:

There is a requirement to state how the plan has been coordinated with adjacent regions. The procedure as stated may be inadequate. Kevin offered to send a note to adjacent Regions, inquiring whether they are preparing a Plan. There had been discussion about coordination within 20 miles of population centers and the border. In areas such as Goldendale there would not be a problem, whereas Spokane, Kennewick, and Vancouver might be an issue. Discussion ensued:

- Val Eveland – noted that she wouldn’t consider Kennewick a population center

- Bob Wentworth – agreed that this language sounds OK.
- Harlan Ohlson – commented that interference might be a possibility for a point-to-point system staggered up the gorge and asked, “ How would you handle this”?
- Dean Heinen – asked, “Is 20 miles adequate, the gorge might be a good example”?
- Val Eveland – added that Benton County is looking at doing this for their chemical stockpile.
- Kevin Kearns – noted that his sense is that region 35 will not prepare a plan.
- Dean Heinen – commented that it had previously been suggested that we add a specific reference to “ad-hoc” networks. He prefers the terminology, “personal LAN”. Cammie prefers “ ad-hoc networking” and will send Dean some information to substantiate her preference. There has also been discussion regarding allowing users of horizontal polarization greater bandwidth since most mobile and portable technologies operate with vertical polarization.
- Harlan Ohlson – added that bandwidth will be key. Manufacturers want ten to twenty MHz and horizontal polarization makes sense due to the greater use of vertical polarizations
- Kevin Kearns – asked if there are any objections to use of this language. There were no objections.
- Dean Heinen – added that he has been going through the guidelines and changing the wording, “allocation” to “suggestion”, and “assignment” to “usage”.

Section 7.1 Permission to Use Frequency/Frequency Assignments:

- Kevin Kearns – noted that we will have to change the language in Section 7.1 so that it does not say we are coordinating or assigning channels
- Dean Heinen – responded that he will revise the section as suggested.
- Walt Pierce – asked if there is a format in CAPRAD that allows agencies to send in information or ease of entry.
- Kevin Kearns – asked, “Since 4.9 GHz coordination will not be mandatory, why couldn't agencies just post what they are doing”?
- Walt Pierce – suggested that if they could accept a spreadsheet format for entries it would save the frequency coordinator a lot of typing.
- Kevin Kearns – noted that he will inquire about these possibilities.

Section 7.5 System Implementation, and Section 7.6 Priority Matrix:

- Val Eveland – added that it is a good idea to expand on Section 7.5 and Section 7.6 to accommodate issues arising in the event that there are two Incident Commanders on scene, or border issues, etc.
- Dean Heinen – responded with concerns from a technical standpoint. Will an Incident Commander in the field understand this? Will issues be escalated to the Incident Commander or will the radio experts just fix any problems?
- Val Eveland – responded that she assumed this would be the responsibility of the Incident Commander.
- Kevin Kearns – suggested that we should be minimalist in the plan document and then subsequently publish best practices/guidelines document. Initially, we just need to provide guidance.
- Harlan Ohlson – asked if there are any Interoperability requirements.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that this was requested, but the FCC declined.

Section 8 Plan Summary:

- Dean Heinen – noted that we still need to write the Plan Summary. It does not state that a certification page was required but he chose to add it anyway.

Attachments:

- Kevin Kearns – commented on the attachments. He suggested that we leave in the regional, population distribution and county maps, but may not need the population table or list of cities and towns.
- Dean Heinen – asked if we should designate specific channels?
- Steve Monsey – responded that Pierce County considered 4.9 GHz for airborne use but are now planning on using 6 GHz.
- Kevin Kearns – reminded the group that it is not allowed as one hot spot in the sky can cause problems to many on the ground.

Draft Input:

- Dean Heinen – said that the next draft may be the final draft as we have to file in May. He asked the group to provide input.
- Val Eveland – asked about the deadline date for submission of suggested edits?
- Dean Heinen – that the sooner he receives them, the better, but by the next meeting at the latest as we will vote on the final version at that time.

5. 700 MHz/4.9 GHz Future Meeting Dates

The 700 MHz/4.9 GHz meetings will be scheduled from 1000 to 1200 hours, followed by the 800 MHz meeting from 1300 to 1500 hours. Vendor presentations will be scheduled to occur following the 800 MHz meeting, ending at 1630 or earlier.

- **March 30th meeting – Yakima Police Department**
- **April 27th meeting – King County ECC**
- **May 25th meeting – Benton County Emergency Services**
- **June 29th – Washington State DIS Boardroom**

Continuing on the last Wednesday of each month if needed, or switching back to the last Wednesday on the odd numbered months pursuant to the 700 MHz RPC Bylaws.

6. Other Items/Good of the order?

Dean Heinen noted that he was amazed to see 802.11g APs are available at Fry's for \$17.99 and you can have your choice of wireless cards for \$9.99.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1200 hours.