

**MINUTES**  
**Region 43 (Washington)**  
**700 MHz & 4.9 GHz Regional Planning Committee**  
**December 15, 2004 - 1000 to 1200**  
**Snohomish Public Utility Operations Center**  
**1802 75<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Everett**

**Meeting Summary:**

The RPC met to discuss 700 MHz & 4.9 GHz regional planning issues, SIEC updates, actions in other RPCs and NPSTC and the Canadian 700 MHz Band processes. The Regional Plan for the Public Safety 700 MHz Band in Region 43 was reviewed and discussed and a planning process timeline was outlined for coordination with neighboring regions, final Draft edits and publication. The need for 4.9 GHz planning and potential methodology was discussed.

**Reminders/ Action Items:**

Voting status – attendees are reminded that the Regional Planning Committee needs more voting members. Only a small percentage of current participants are voting members. The planning document is almost completed and ready to be sent to the FCC. Only voting members will be eligible to participate in the vote. 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 be a voting member. This should be done right away as the final vote is imminent.

Participation in the January Meeting – participation in these meetings is strongly encouraged as this is the final opportunity for input to the Plan document as well as the date to vote for transmittal of the Final Draft to Oregon and Idaho for comment and consent. Draft additions/edits should be sent to the Chair as soon as possible.

**1. Roll Call and Introductions**

The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Kevin Kearns	Tom Howell
Cammie Enslow	Jay Morrison
Capt. Deborah Huntsinger	Babu Parayil
Ken Rhodes	Jose Zuniga
Jon (Wiz) Wiswell	Walt Pierce
Dean Heinen	Travis Boettcher
Tom Samuelson	Keith Flewelling – phone
Ken Gustafson	Dave Brush – phone
Ron Moyer	Steve Monsey – phone
Ray Hawkins	Terry Miller – phone
Ron Solemsaas	Fred Radovich – phone
Steve Taylor	Dennis Hausman – phone
Mike Doble – 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.

- Ken Gustafson – his agency is in a holding pattern on growth, and is starting new wish lists around data needs, not sure if they need 50 or 25 KHz blocks.
- Ron Moyer- Pierce Transit, they are one month from finalizing their RFP. The Agency Executive Team wants 700 MHz to meet those needs.
- Babu Parayil - Port of Seattle, no change in their plans at this time.
- Dave Brush – phone, no change, “wants all the channels he can grab”.
- Steve Monsey – phone, in the coming year he wants to test 4.9 GHz with vendors (similar to the New York City RFP specs). Also, wants to investigate testing in the wideband 150 kHz channels like New York City.
- Terry Miller – phone, reiterated that, as always, they are mindful of WSDOT future uses and needs for spectrum, especially wideband data channels at 700 MHz, and potential 4.9 GHz use, and are looking to form partnerships to make use of spectrum. They are also looking at what DSRC brings to table.
- Dennis Hausman – phone, the SIEC learned yesterday that the Spectrum Coalition is trying to work in concert with the DHs to obtain an additional 30 MHz of spectrum. There was an FCC press release this morning that they will look at this issue. He noted that FCC interest is a good sign.
- Kevin Kearns – asked if there is interest in having some spectrum set aside for statewide wideband use and remarked that it may be formally discussed at the January NPSTC meeting.

Attendees were reminded to verify their contact information on the sign-in sheet and to self-subscribe to the Listserver on the website, [www.region43.org](http://www.region43.org).

## **2. Approval of Minutes of November 17, 2004**

Dean Heinen made a motion to approve the October minutes with an amendment to correct the remaining balance stated in the financial report to \$165.00 (rather than \$175.00). Ken Gustafson seconded the motion and the minutes were approved subject to the amendment.

## **3. Financial Report**

The current balance is approximately \$165.00, which is expected to cover remaining publication expenses and the final vote on the plan.

## **4. General Information Updates – All**

### **• SIEC updates –Dennis Hausman**

The final draft of the Statewide Public Safety Communications Interoperability Plan was expected to be approved by the SIEC at their December 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. Data was accepted through November 29<sup>th</sup>. The final draft can be accessed on the website at <http://isb.wa.gov/siec/InterimReport3.pdf>. The document is classified as confidential; details that could create a security risk will not be released. The final

version will be posted to the SIEC website by the end of December, with the detailed plan available in May 2005. A five to ten year interoperability plan is down the road. The Regional Forums proved to be phenomenally successful. It is interesting that this was the 1<sup>st</sup> time some agencies had sat down together and shared information. It makes sense to work within regions for interoperability. Regional forums will be continued into 2005. There is planning underway to hold a Statewide Interoperability Summit in mid 2005.

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

Other RPCs:

- Oregon - Region 35 met on December 1<sup>st</sup>. The Chair was unable to attend the meeting on behalf of Region 43 due to work responsibilities, but sent Regions 35 and 12 a copy of our Draft version 11 and slides reviewing timelines of our planning process with a request for feedback (see meeting slides for details).
- Idaho - Region 12 met on the 18th of November and will vote on their final draft for submission to our RPC for coordination. We will review their current plan at our meeting on the 17<sup>th</sup> and they will review ours.

The Chair requested volunteers to review the Region 12 Plan. The following RPC members agreed to review the document:

Dennis Hausman

Terry Miller

Jon (Wiz) Wiswell

Cammie Enslow

Note: electronic versions will be sent to Terry and Dennis.

It is expected that we will have a final document by the end of the month and a review ready by the first week of January for formal action at the January meeting.

- Both Oregon and Idaho have responded to our request for a “fatal flaw” review and have advised that they have found nothing problematic in our plan.
- 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](http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi)

NPSTC:

Meeting material from the November meetings in New York have not yet been posted but should soon be available at <http://www.npstc.org/meetings.htm>

The next meeting is scheduled for January 24<sup>th</sup> through the 26<sup>th</sup>. The Chair plans on attending through the 25<sup>th</sup>, returning for our meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup>.

## 5. **Canadian 700 MHz Band Allocation Decision – Kevin Kearns**

The Industry Canada proposed 700 MHz band rulemaking is available at

[http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/sp746e.pdf/\\$FILE/sp746e.pdf](http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/epic/internet/insmt-gst.nsf/vwapj/sp746e.pdf/$FILE/sp746e.pdf)

The proposed rulemaking asks what we would like to do about issues such as standards, interoperability, planning and authorization mechanisms, common service plans, harmonization with the US band plan, etc. (see below for RPC discussion).

On December 10<sup>th</sup> Region 43 Planning Committee members, Kevin Kearns, Spencer Bahner, Jay Morrison, Ken Rhodes, Cammie Enslow and Chris Fischer met with representatives of E-Comm and CREST to review current processes, discuss each issue and make recommendations (see slides for questions and recommendations).

Comments are due by January 15<sup>th</sup>. The final draft will be posted on the Region 43 listserver on January 10<sup>th</sup>, for discussion through the 14<sup>th</sup> prior to filing the document electronically with Industry Canada. The Chair invited discussion on these issues, noting that silence is assumed to be consent (questions are italicized):

*(a) What common/open standard could be encouraged, that would foster interoperable mobile systems for public safety operations? Should this be an APCO sanctioned standard? And if so, should this standard, with all its suites of technical criteria be applied in the bands 764-770 MHz and 794-600 MHz to only interoperability channels or to all public safety channels and if not, why and which technical criteria should be applied?*

- Kevin Kearns – noted that we will be recommending adoption of digital modulation with the goal of eventually transitioning from 12.5 to 6.25 kHz channels. He further added that the preferred open standard for interoperability should be the TIA/EIA 102 (P25).
- Dean Heinen – agreed with the recommendations as stated.

*(b) Should interoperability on a domestic and Canada/US basis be a prerequisite to licensing and if so, what criteria should be applied?*

- Wiz Wiswell – remarked that even if they use national funding, building in interoperability is very important, and should be built together.
- Terry Miller – offered an opposing view, remarking that we can't really offer up any glowing success story for interoperability funded in this manner.
- Kevin Kearns – asked if he would elaborate on this.
- Terry Miller – remarked that they are required to provide this much but he felt that when the DOT designed their 800 MHz system it was somewhat less than adequate due to the size of the footprint. He noted that we need interoperability and we need it to have the same coverage as the system but the interoperability does not come near the statewide coverage.
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell – remarked that he had struggled with that issue but the DOT was building many small sites and providing for all sites would be too costly. The DOT was a special case and had to be spread thin to cover adequately. This was felt to be the most reasonable approach. This will be true for Canada too. Equipment costs can be high with many sites.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that to the best of his knowledge, all of the required repeaters have not yet been deployed, but the plan did not really come close to a statewide interoperability footprint. He asked if a local level would be more acceptable?
- Dean Heinen – commented that the locals are much happier with a system of systems approach rather than one big statewide system.
- Jpn (Wiz) Wiswell – remarked that nothing says that an entity can't exceed the minimum requirements for interoperability.
- Dean Heinen – noted that the issue of having a single statewide system came up in the SIEC meeting. The reality is that it is a tough decision, due to the diversity of the equipment and technology.
- Cammie Enslow – remarked that the RABC comments indicated a reluctance to accept the requirement for interoperability as a precondition.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that we pushed interoperability as a precondition of spectrum allocation, based on bandwidth consumed, and that insured that the requirement was satisfied while funding and political support was still available.

*(c) What planning and authorization mechanism should be used to ensure that public safety users are successfully accommodated?*

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that it is appropriate to recommend pre-pack, at least in border areas, with the ultimate goal of sharing border area spectrum equally.

*(d) Should public safety users have to submit a spectrum and system plan that accommodates public safety users in defined areas in order to justify an authorization? What information and commitments should be required in an overall plan?*

- Kevin Kearns – noted that we will recommend that they consider doing regional planning and using scoring criteria that favors spectral efficiency and use by multiple agencies so that Interoperability is inherent in the system design.
- Dean Heinen - asked, isn't this treading on treaty issues? Is there a way to foster coordination?
- Kevin Kearns – responded that there might be a chance. He added that there is a separation between the thinking “back east” and “out west”. He sensed that there was interest in pre-planning and thought this might relieve the arbitrary way that Industry Canada makes decisions. In summary, he said there is consensus that the RPC recommend regional planning.

*(e) In order to foster a common communications system to accommodate public safety, should the Department insist on common service plans on a regional or national basis in various regions of Canada before licenses are granted anywhere else in Canada to any public safety user?*

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that to ease coordination we will recommend Canada follow the same band and channel plan as ours and include regional planning.

*(f) What level of harmonization with the U.S. band plan is appropriate i.e. should the Department define the same specific service applications such as low power, interoperability, wide-area systems etc.?*

- Kevin Kearns – noted that there is no direct analog from state to provincial spectrum but they may need to allocate some 700 MHz spectrum for national use. We will suggest that they mirror our Interoperability and low power spectrum in border areas so that we have common Interoperability solutions.

*(g) Does the current description of public safety services as previously referenced in footnote 2 cover all critical safety and services for public safety spectrum?*

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that their language does not distinguish between government and non-government entities (NGOs). He added that we will recommend that they look at our approach for preference to government vs. NGOs.
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell - answered that this approach makes sense. He noted that Canada has been close lipped around publishing frequencies and wondered if that will be an issue?
- Kevin Kearns – noted that comments are due by January 15<sup>th</sup>.

## **6. Review of 700 MHz Band Plan – Kevin Kearns**

Note: Details of the Band Plan and detailed charts available on meeting slides.

Note: Mobile transmit is high, base transmit is low to avoid 800 MHz interference. The television move “date certain” is uncertain, although LPTV is secondary by rule. In Washington State there are no primary stations. All are

secondary by rule and the Canadians did not deploy the Vancouver Island station so we are good to go on 700 MHz.

## **7. Region 43 700 MHz Plan Review & Editing**

- Draft Version 11 was posted to the listserver on December 11<sup>th</sup>. The current version incorporates edits/corrections of Spencer Bahner, Valerie Eveland and Cammie Enslow, who volunteered to review the Draft.
- Further edits/corrections to the Plan were requested:
  - Cammie Enslow – suggested adding section 4 to TOC, and mailing address edit.
  - Jon (Wiz) Wiswell – asked about whether changes to the Plan should require providing notice of appeals to all members? He remarked that the requirement seems onerous (see page 35 re: notice of appeal).
  - Kevin Kearns – noted that pushing the notice out to the list might not be enough because you're not sure that the right people will get it. It might be possible to modify the wording to specify that it should be filed with the Chair and the Secretary with the responsibility to distribute it to the membership within five working days. There would have to be a formal notice in writing, but it could be transmitted electronically to the membership. The listserver could be OK as long as 100% of the membership was signed up so all would receive it.
  - Dean Heinen – asked do we need to address the possibility that the Chair and the Secretary might go on vacation at the same time?
  - Dennis Hausman – asked, is there a requirement that these meetings have a quorum?
  - Kevin Kearns – responded that no count is required for a quorum.
  - Dennis Hausman - moved that we accept the timeline of January 26<sup>th</sup> described in page 23 of the meeting slides. Wiz seconded and the motion was passed.

## **8. 4.9 GHz Regional Planning Workgroup**

Because the FCC has chosen not to make 4.9 GHz regional planning mandatory or enforceable, the Chair invited discussion on how we wish to approach this issue.

Comments are summarized in the meeting slides. Detailed discussion follows:

- Dennis Hausman – commented that he believes that if we share a sense of the Rules we might be able to agree on certain standards. He has learned that it doesn't matter whether standards are created by the State or other entities. Local government will tend to follow guidance from any governing group as long as they are given opportunity for input. He added that the small counties are foundering due to lack of funding and staffing. Absent standards, codes of conduct will apply and these entities will do whatever their radio shops suggest. The SIEC heard this from local governments, "set your own standards and we will probably follow them".
- Mike Doble – added that Regions 5 and 6 are going ahead with a plan and it is very likely that other agencies will follow them. He thinks that the FCC will support them. The plan is based on "best practices", which they will push back up to NPSTC to come up with nationwide guidelines, hoping that basic issues will be implemented nationally, and lesser issues will be handled at the state level.
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell – suggested that we need some sort of database and a list of contacts to handle interference issues as they occur. He added that without this, if interference occurs he might be unable to support his incident response team.

- Mike Doble - responded that this has already been put in place. The CAPRAD system has been updated to support 4.9 GHz. It has been improved to include mapping software so you can view deployments and point-to-point links.
- Dean Heinen – noted that the area wide plan does not dictate any specific locations for Access Points. These could be registered with the RPC. If nothing else, that much should be coordinated at the regional level.
- Mike Doble – added that he has been working with Proxim, pushing NPSTC, etc. for a common channel plan with vendor cooperation. In the TIA standards group they are discussing the standards, trying to decide what technology to use. It is up to the vendors to work together to come up with an interim standard, and then to hammer out the details, working with TIA.
- Dean Heinen – asked if Regions 5 and 6 have developed a plan?
- Mike Doble – responded that Regions 5 & 6 have voted for a plan, and Region 6 has a plan draft. Southern California is interested in airborne video and will be testing for interference between airborne and ground systems.
- Dean Heinen – asked, at this point as an RPC, form of planning do we want to take on, classical frequency coordination or interference mitigation?
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell – remarked that as soon as you have a license you can use the band so classical frequency coordination will not work. It might be better to just inform new licensees about agencies using the band.
- Terry Miller – added that he is familiar with the Comsearch frequency coordinating groups that do microwave frequency coordination and we don't have the software for this. Perhaps we could register deployments through the RPC. That would provide the opportunity to input the info onto CAPRAD.
- Mike Doble - responded that at this frequency the transmission will short range, and ordinarily will not create a problem, but airborne video may.
- Terry Miller – remarked that the way it has traditionally been done in Washington State is that frequency coordinating committees have used best practices to create a set of minimum acceptable standards for deployment of systems.
- Dean Heinen – added that the issue causing concern is deployment in congested areas.
- Walt Pierce – responded that he hopes that radios will be smart enough to figure out the best frequency.
- Dean Heinen – noted that Cisco announced yesterday that 4.9 GHz product will be deliverable in July or August. It will not be Aironet with 4.9 GHz cards. He asked, at the incident level will the Incident Commander be allowed to determine who has priority?
- Walt Pierce – responded that best practices cannot be enforced, only encouraged. The Incident Commander will do what is necessary to respond positively to the incident.
- Steve Monsey – addressing interoperability, noted that authentication is usually not built into the radio. Most governments use the 802.1x spec. Whether equipment manufacturers will be able to talk through these issues is unknown. The Chair noted that we seem to have arrived at a consensus that we want to develop a plan for the 4.9 GHz band based on “best practices” and mutual coordination. Further discussion will be required to determine the exact form our plan will take.

Jon (Wiz) Wiswell made a Motion to keep the 4.9 GHz committee moving and draft a plan based on best-practice type of model and to ultimately use CAPRAD as a central repository for 4.9 GHz allocation information. The motion was seconded and passed.

- **4.9 GHz Demonstration Event in California**

See slides or website for details:

<http://publicsafetycommunications.org/Wi-Fi-1.php>

Mike Doble reported that he is considering reducing live coverage to one display. In LA they plan to have 3 displays (maybe 6 small displays). They may use one center display with multiple images. The date of the event has been changed to February 23<sup>rd</sup>. Since that is the date of a regularly scheduled RPC meeting, the Chair is trying to arrange a meeting location with a live feed so that we can incorporate the Event into our meeting.

## **9. 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 directly following the 800 MHz meeting, ending at 1630 or earlier.

- **January 26<sup>th</sup> meeting – Yakima Police Department, Yakima**
- **February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting – State DIS Boardroom, Forum Building, Olympia (This may change to the King County EOC so we can tap into the 4.9 GHz demonstration event in Los Angeles)**
- **March 30<sup>th</sup> meeting – location TBD (likely on the Eastside)**
- **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**

## **10. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn the 700 MHz/4.9 GHz portion of the meeting was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned.