

MINUTES
Region 43 800 MHz
Regional Review Committee
November 17, 2004 - 1300 to 1500
Snohomish Public Utility Operations Center
1802 75th Street SW, Everett

1. Roll Call and Introductions

The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Kevin Kearns	Ron Solemsaas
Jon (Wiz) Wiswell	Tom Howell
Spencer Bahner	Walt Pierce
Ken Rhodes	Jay Morrison
Capt. Deborah Huntsinger	Peter Hambuch
Cammie Enslow	Gary Amundson
Brad Barber	Dave Brush – phone
Bob Bushey	Keith Flewelling – phone

2. Approval of Minutes of October 27, 2004

Jon (Wiz) Wiswell made a motion to approve the October minutes. Spencer Bahner seconded the motion and the minutes were approved.

3. Recent FCC or Industry Documents of Interest Related to the 800 MHz Re-banding

- Nextel Ex Parte document dated 9/28 re: WT Docket No. 02-55 – suggesting a “Transition Period Interference Protection Standard” (see slides and link for details). http://gulfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516485514
Nextel proposed that the Commission clarify its new interference abatement standards to take into account the technical realities of interleaved public-safety/CMRS private wireless spectrum and the hardship of meeting the requirements of the Report & Order until band reconfiguration is accomplished. Nextel suggested that Public Safety be given full protection from interference where their system produces –85 dBm for portable or –88 dBm for mobile units. For levels between these levels and the –101/104 dBm specified in the R&O, the following would apply:
CMRS licensees would be required to provide interference mitigation on control and voice channels using best practices, providing Public Safety FM LMR systems a minimum C/I+N ratio of 17 dB pending the completion of the transition. CMRS licensees would be required to use their best efforts to mitigate interference in cases where the manufacturer’s C/I+N specification is greater than 17 dB.
- FCC Public Notice 04-253 dated 10/22 seeking comment on Ex Parte presentations and extending certain deadlines re: WT Docket No. 02-55 – issues raised in Ex Parte presentations including relocation processes, spectrum valuation and interference

issues caused the FCC to issue a notice seeking comments from public safety entities (within 10 days of the notice) and extend some deadlines by 45 days. The FCC is expected to file a clarification document in the future. Other Nextel issues were ignored as not pertinent to these issues (see slides and link for details).
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-04-253A1.pdf.

- Shulman, Rogers (et al) Comments dated 11/8 - recognizing that there may be interest in these negotiations, Alan Tilles filed comments requesting clarification from the Commission on several issues of interest including the interim interference protection standard, 900 MHz interference criteria, use of transition funding for RPC activities and unused spectrum issues (see slides and link for details).
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516793534

It was never anticipated that the interference standard would become effective immediately, rather that it would be applied post re-banding as suggested by Nextel. Additionally, per the original language of the Consensus Plan, Nextel was to have returned its 900 MHz spectrum to the FCC, rendering it available for use by B/ILT/SMR licensees operating in the 800 MHz band. Since the FCC chose not to adopt this portion of the plan, incumbent 900 MHz licensees were left as vulnerable to interference as 800 MHz licensees. Clarification was requested to specify that interference protection should apply to both frequency bands. This filing also urges the Commission to specify its expectations of the Transition Administrator's ability to authorize funding for RPCs to cover the cost of preparing the documentation required to estimate the cost of re-banding. How much of the up-front cost would be available for cost recovery is uncertain, as many agencies would have to pay consultants to prepare system wide equipment audits.

- Transition Administrator filing dated 11/12 Requesting an extension of 60 days - The end-to-end goal for re-banding is 36 to 48 months. There is already a need for the Transition Administrator to spend more time understanding the issues (see slides for document quotes and link for further details).
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516794028

The Transition Administrator has expressed an interest in obtaining informal input from interested stakeholders to avoid problems and expedite an optimal relocation schedule. Southern California has worked with Nextel to create a band plan for the Mexican Border area (see Region 5 Comments for Present & Proposed Mexican Border Plan).

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6516793872

- Region 5 (Southern California) Border Issues – Region 5 is still operating in an interleaved environment but has proposed an approach. We may do the same up here. The Chair has spoken to Nextel. In the next few weeks Nextel may want to sit down with us and set up a band plan.
- Other Resources - an abundance of resource material is available on 800 MHz subjects. Most of it is pretty good, but it is important to consider the source and evaluate the slant based on the originating organization. The APCO site offers informative “webinars” and relevant information, with a Public Safety slant. This can be accessed from a sidebar entitled “800 Alert news” (<http://www.apcointl.org/frequency/800hp.htm>). The NPSTC web site has

information on this topic (<http://www.npstc.org/>) and Shulman Rogers (<http://www.800mhzrebanding.com/>) and other law firms and trade shows offer information with a commercial client slant. ASHTO, CTIA etc. will have their own slant. The webinars generally last an hour. You log in, dial in on the telephone for the audio, and view the slideshow. Dave Buchanan is the radio manager for San Bernardino County and participates in these and the panels presented at various locations around the country. The slide deck for part 2 is already available. It has been rescheduled. See the "800 Alert news" on the right side of the page.

4. Other 800 MHz Re-banding Issues that Need to be Addressed

The Chair posed a series of questions/issues that still need to be addressed as we move forward with the re-banding process. A complete list is available on page 26 of the November 17th meeting slides (see <http://www.region43.org/800.htm>.)

Included are border related issues such as the method for negotiating a band plan for the border area, the impacts of re-banding in Oregon if Region 43 re-banding is delayed by border issues, and the related issue of coordinating re-banding timing between Region 35 and 43. Also of interest are the implications of our place in time in the re-banding process (early or late), the relationship between the RPC and licensees and their respective roles during negotiations with Nextel during re-banding, the role of the SIEC w.r.t I/O aspects of the 800 MHz band and their State management role. Remaining issues are listed in the slides. Discussion ensued:

- Spencer Bahner - does our committee want to do something like Region 5 (Southern California) in response to Nextel's findings?
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell - do we have the manpower and funds?
- Kevin Kearns - Nextel supports this, and may be willing to participate in the process.
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell - in conversations with Nextel they say they need the corporate OK to participate.
- Spencer Bahner – Kevin, are you concerned that we may end up at the end of the process? Our hopes previously were that we would be one of the early adopters.
- Kevin Kearns – It was important to be early when the funding was limited to 850 million. There was a lot of debate about whether 850 million was enough, and if the number of radios that had to be retuned was low enough to be covered by that amount. Now that Nextel must come up with 2.5 billion and bear the burden of retuning/replacing the radios, it is less of an issue.
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell - there is an advantage in letting someone else do the work first, but on the other hand, we should do our homework, have plans ready and make it work. One of the big issues in King County is "what is Public Safety?" There are multiple agencies in 3 counties that need to be addressed, i.e., City of Tacoma, Seattle, SERS system, King County, Boeing, etc. All have interoperability issues and interesting and varied challenges.
- Kevin Kearns – wants this body to focus on, "what is the role and responsibility of the Regional Planning Committee, vs. groups having to work together because of proximity?" Does the RPC have a role to play in this coordination?
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell - yes, in King County we could come up with a re-banding plan for our area, but in the larger plan it might not work unless we pay attention to all entities.

- Kevin Kearns – at the RPC level there is no need to coordinate because we already have a band plan.
- Jon (Wiz) Wiswell - if its strictly mathematical (for US primaries) and we are just moving entities down the band there is no issue.
- Kevin Kearns – it seems like the band plan is the appropriate place for the RPC to be most active.
- Brad barber - in the last meeting Nextel's plan to begin re-banding in Oregon came up.

5. Discussion of possible re-packing of Region 43 at time of re-banding

Kevin Kearns asked if there is interest in further discussion on this issue (with the dubious benefit of packing in more channels at our own cost). In previous discussions the group had agreed that although it would be beneficial, it is unlikely that incumbents would be able or willing to pay for it. The plan is to instead remove county-by-county allocations and accept applications for channels that become available. Because we are in a border area we have more time to reconsider the issue. Peter Hambuch remarked that he has been heavily involved in considering repacking in Region 5 (Southern California), and can have Katy Lebett contact Kevin regarding this issue, perhaps by conference call.

6. Proposed framework for 2005 and beyond Plan (see slides for complete text)

Do away with the Zones and Zone Representatives.

Allow any eligible licensee to designate a voting member (as in 700 MHz group).

Remove county-area channel allocations and begin accepting applications from any eligible licensee for appropriate channels.

Include the original county-area assignment tables as a guide to where channels were originally "packed" to assist in processing subsequent applications.

Continue to have the two filing windows each year to handle competitive applications (aligned with the 700 MHz windows when they are established).

Retain other key features such as scoring, I/O, etc.

7. Proposed timeline for 2005 and beyond Plan

January – first Draft of a new Plan presented to the Planning Group.

Next two months – review and edit the Draft in monthly meetings.

March – final Draft vetted at our monthly meeting.

April – Circulate to Oregon and Idaho for comments and consent.

May – hold formal Vote to approve for transmittal to FCC.

Volunteers for the plan drafting workgroup:

Steve Taylor

Jon (Wiz) Wiswell

8. Other Items/Good of the Order

- Potential for assistance from the Interoperable communications Technical Assistance Program (ICTAP) in an engineered approach to deployment of the ICALL and ITAC channels. See following link for info:

<http://www.ctc.org/DHSIF/LePage.pdf> .

- Vendor Presentations - One or two vendors will be allowed to make presentations of 45 minutes or less, with the first beginning at 1500 hours or earlier if the RPC business concludes early.

9. Future Meeting Dates

The 800 MHz Regional Review Committee will begin meeting on a monthly basis for the balance of 2004 and early 2005 to complete a plan re-write process and deal with issues surrounding the re-banding process. Meetings will be scheduled from 1300 to 1500 hours. Vendor presentations will occur directly following the 800 MHz meeting, ending at 1630 or earlier. Meetings will generally be held on the same dates as the 700 MHz/4.9 GHz meetings (usually the last Wednesday of each month) to reduce the need to travel to regional planning related meetings to once a month.

- **December 15th meeting - Snohomish County Public Utility**
- **January 26th meeting – location TBD (likely on the Eastside)**
- **February 23rd meeting – location TBD (likely on the Westside)**
- **March 30th 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**

- **The Agenda and meeting material will be posted to the web site, www.region43.org, and sent to the email list server prior to the meeting.**

10. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 1415 hours.