

REGION 43 NPSPAC REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF TELECONFERENCE MEETING
JULY 1, 1997

A special meeting of the Regional Review Committee was held via conference call to consider additional information provided by the City of Everett and Community Transit, and make a decision on how to handle their applications. The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 0900 with the following members and guests in attendance:

Kevin Kearns	Zone 2
Jon Wiswell	Zone 2
Jay Morrison	Zone 2
Alan Hull	Washington State Agencies
Pat Buller	Westside Frequency Advisor
Wayne Wantland	Eastside Frequency Advisor
Allan Zimmerly	Frank Thatcher & Associates
Don Ankeny	Community Transit
Tom Howell	SNOPAC
Bob Stiles	Everett Police
Al Upton	Everett Fire
Paul Papineau	?

Kevin Kearns reviewed the situation at hand based on the material provided by each applicant in their follow-up packages of information. Both applicants confirmed that the overview of the situation was accurate.

Discussion first focused on questions to Community Transit (CT). It was confirmed that they could find a workable solution with the assignment of only 1 NPSPAC channel. In this situation, they would implement their quasi-trunked voice/data system in a 4 channel configuration, and move the para-transit units to an alternate 2-way service.

It was also confirmed that their 5-year buildout would place 647 radios on the system, which is well above the 1/100 ratio for a total of 5 channels they would have if both NPSPAC channels were assigned. They re-confirmed their willingness and interest to work towards the development and use of a shared system in Snohomish County. They just don't want to be forced into this situation by not having enough channels to even operate in their alternative approach.

Discussion then turned to questions to the City of Everett. It was clarified that over the full 6 phases of their buildout they would place 2,543 radios on the air, which is well above the 1/100 ratio for the 17 channels requested. It was also confirmed that the first phase would place about 1,000 radios on the air. It was noted that a good turnback plan was offered with reasonable dates.

They were asked what the impact would be if they were assigned 16 channels instead of 17. They replied that it really would affect capacity at the remote sites. They noted that the revised data shows these sites as 5 channel simulcast sites, instead of the single channel configuration shown before. The simulcast configuration is much more realistic from a capacity standpoint. The only reason the previous package was done as single channels was to conserve on frequency coordination costs at this time. If only 16 channels were assigned, they believe they would need to reduce these remote sites to 4 channels, and this would have adverse impact on capacity on these sites. It was also noted by a Committee member that it seemed that capacity at these remote sites was really not needed until the later portions of the project.

Everett was asked if they had looked to bring in any other co-users with 800 MHz channels, such as the Housing Authority. They noted that to their knowledge there were no other public safety users of 800 MHz in Snohomish County, and that they had talked to the Housing Authority and that there was some interest, but cost issues needed further exploration.

After this discussion was concluded, the Chair reviewed the language of the Plan and Review Procedures. The Committee decided that they needed to apply the scoring criteria to both applications, compile the scores and then discuss further how to apply the results. The results of the scoring are as follows:

Q1=Immediate need to protect life and property - Maximum 6 points

Q2=The number and the ability to reassign the turn back channels - Maximum 5 points

Q3=Channel loading - Maximum 4 points

Q4=Effective system design - Maximum 3 points

Q5=Consolidation or the use of the channel by others - Maximum 2 points

Q6=Implementation schedule - Maximum 1 point

EVERETT

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	TOTALS
Kearns	4	4	3	3	2	1	17
Wiswell	3	4	4	3	2	1	17
Morrison	6	5	4	3	2	1	21
Hull	3	3	4	3	2	1	16
Buller	5	3	3	2	2	1	16
Wantland	5	4	4	3	2	1	19
TOTALS	26	23	22	17	12	6	106

COMMUNITY TRANSIT

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	TOTALS
Kearns	2	0	4	3	1	1	11
Wiswell	3	0	4	3	1	1	12
Morrison	0	0	4	2	0	1	7
Hull	2	0	4	3	2	1	12
Buller	4	0	3	2	2	1	12
Wantland	2	1	4	3	0	1	11
TOTALS	13	1	23	16	6	6	65

General discussion followed on how to interpret and apply the scoring. There was some discussion between the applicants about the degree of incentive CT would be under to participate in a regional system if they received one or two channels. CT reinforced that they were willing to joint venture, even if it came with a higher cost, and if they received no channels there was less motivation for Everett to work to find ways to pull CT into a shared system.

It was also clarified that even though CT is not a police, fire or EMS agency, they were eligible for NPSPAC channel assignments.

Wayne Wantland made a MOTION, 2nd by Jon Wiswell, to recommend assignment of 1 channel to Community Transit, and 16 channels to Everett. Discussion followed on how the channels would be selected and Jon Wiswell made a MOTION TO AMMEND the main Motion, 2nd by Wantland, to encourage the applicants to work it out between themselves, or to meet with the Chair to find a workable solution. The Motion to Amend PASSED on a 5 to 1 vote. The Amended Main Motion then passed on a 5 to 1 vote.

The Committee concluded discussion with both applicants by observing that this decision is in the spirit of encouraging cooperation between both of them, and that we strongly encouraged them to continue to work to find a way to implement a shared system environment so they both gained the best functionality and efficiency.

One other item of business was discussed. WSDOT has filed an application (that was for already approved statewide channels and has been approved administratively) for Granite Pass on the North Cascades Highway. This will be a solar site and WSDOT has asked if we would consider allowing the ICALL channel to be placed there as the only channel, and that they be allowed to use this repeater when needed for their operations. This would get ICALL coverage on this highway, which would not be possible on the solar power if a trunked site needed to be implemented.

There was discussion on the ability of our Committee to allow this kind of use of ICALL. It was suggested that given the low utilization, perhaps WSDOT could put up both ICALL and one of the ITAC channels. We concluded the discussion by advising WSDOT that we would consider a proposal for an ICALL or ICALL/ITAC configuration if they saw fit to put one together.

There was no further business to come before the Committee and the meeting was adjourned at 1115.