

Region 43 (Washington)  
800 MHz Regional Planning Committee

September 28, 2005 - 1200 to 1500  
Yakima Probation Services – 207 S. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
Yakima, Washington

**1. Sign-in and Introductions**

The following individuals participated in the meeting:

Kevin Kearns – RPC Chair (King County ITS)  
David Mendel – King County ITS  
Ken Rhodes – KCSO  
Cammie Enslow – KCSO  
Ken Rhodes – KCSO  
Dave Brush – City of Yakima  
Dean Heinen – Yakima County  
Steve Taylor – City of Tacoma  
Gary Baker – Grant County  
Jon “Wiz” Wiswell - City of Seattle  
Jay Morrison – SERS  
Rhein Etscheid – Motorola  
Jon Gallagher – Motorola  
Bob Bushey – Dataradio  
Peter Burnside - Futurecom  
Phone:  
Valerie Eveland – Benton County Emergency Services  
Fred Radovich – Motorola  
Doug Kerr - Consultant

Attendees were reminded to verify their contact information on the sign-in sheet and, if interested in staying abreast of Region 43 activities, to self-subscribe to the 800 MHz Committee Listserv on the website, [www.region43.org](http://www.region43.org).

**2. Approval of Minutes of August 31, 2005**

There was a motion by Jon “Wiz” Wiswell and a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Steve Taylor and the minutes were approved.

**3. General information updates – Kevin Kearns**

General Update on the Rebanding Issue

- Interference reporting - There was a brief overview of the history of how the original reporting of interference in the 800 band was documented and how that influenced the Transition Administrator’s determination of the order that regions would be addressed. It was noted that the Northwest did a good job of reporting interference and helping drive visibility on the issues, the only reason we aren’t in an earlier Wave of rebanding is due to Canadian border issues.

- Rebanding Waves and Timing The Chair reviewed the Rebanding Waves Prioritization map, noting that Oregon is in Wave 1, Idaho is in Wave 2 and Washington is in Wave 4, due to unresolved border issues. He noted that there is very little use of 1-120 channels in the Oregon voice systems. Oregon is currently in the negotiation phase (voluntary relocation negotiations for incumbents on Channels 1-120 in Wave 1 Regions commenced at the end of June this year). He added that the slides from the Transition Administrator are useful for presentations to management.
- Major Milestones in Wave 1 Schedule - Major milestones were reviewed for the benefit of the group. These dates are crucial as there is a cascading effect if they are not met.
  - May 27, 2005 – Freeze on new non-NPSPAC (851.0125 – 861.9875) 800 MHz applications in Wave 1 Regions and any site within 70 miles of the border of a Wave 1 Region. Modifications that do not add frequencies or change the footprint of existing systems will continue to be accepted. Applications filed to accomplish re-banding in the region will continue to be accepted.
  - June 27, 2005 – Start of voluntary relocation negotiations for incumbents on Channels 1-120 (851.0125 – 853.9875) in Wave 1 Regions.
  - September 26, 2005 – End of voluntary negotiations, start of mandatory negotiations for 1-120 incumbents.
  - December 26, 2005 – End of mandatory negotiations for Wave 1 Channel 1-120 incumbents.
  - February 8, 2006 – End of non-NPSPAC application freeze in Wave 1 Regions and sites within 70 miles of Wave 1 borders.
  - December 26, 2006 – 18 month benchmark. Nextel must have relocated all 1-120 incumbents in 20 NPSPAC Regions and initiated negotiations with all NPSPAC incumbents in those same regions.
- The Transition Administrator recognizes that there's confusion about forms, whom to contact, etc and they doing more and more to get the information out. He is encouraging public safety entities to take advantage of the information and materials available on the TA's expanded website: <http://www.800ta.org/default.asp>
- Forms, slide decks and webinars are available to assist licensees with the process. The webinars will be posted both as slide decks and presentations. Licensees are encouraged to contact the TA if they still have questions. To access this material, go to the website, select events, and then select recordings under webinars. These are actual recorded sessions. However, you will not get to ask questions or participate in polls. The first set covers the planning and negotiation process. Last week's sessions concerned how they are handling frequency proposals. You can object to the frequencies if you don't feel they are like-for-like or there are close-spaced or if there are adjacent channel uses that may conflict. It is prudent to review co/adjacent channel assignments to make sure they will work. There is a window in

which to object; current licensees need to pay attention. There are instructions available on how to interpret the rules.

- Expansion Band Channels from an RPC Standpoint - A Petition has been filed asking that RPCs be given some influence over how spectrum returned by Nextel in the Expansion Band is handled. While Public Safety has the first opportunity to utilize this spectrum before it goes to other commercial interests, the RPCs were not given a role in determining the best allocation of this spectrum. It is important to note that this will not be common channels nationwide, so the amount of spectrum in each market will vary. It would be first come 1<sup>st</sup> served, and there is concern that some entities may be standing in front of the frequency coordinator ready to grab spectrum. The recipients might not be the agencies with the greatest need. It is unlikely that the FCC will turn this over to the Regional Planning Committees. There is discussion on this issue between frequency coordinators, Nextel and the RPCs. There is a basic framework. When Nextel has an idea of what frequencies will be turned back, they will give the RPCs an opportunity to opt in or out within a 90 day window. The RPCs would be notified that an application from the Region has been submitted and the RPC will be able to comment on the application regarding who has higher needs, etc. This gives peer pressure time to germinate and supports an open process allowing for discussion. Four coordinators could live with this process (with scoring criteria applied to all who filed).

#### Pending Channel Requests

##### Washington State Homeland Security Region IV Interoperability Project

We have still not received the specific sites or channels they want to use, so this remains on hold.

##### Status of WSDOT Applications

Region 35 requested WSDOT to select an alternate to channel #784 at their Klickitat site. A replacement has yet to be proposed.

##### WSDOT ICALL Applications

WSDOT has implemented a single ICALL station on Mt. Spokane, and are proposing to implement 10 additional stations (previous meeting slides contain a complete list and coverage maps). There will be a total of 11 sites with ICALL working with entities to establish monitoring facilities. With the exception of Tumwater Hill, all are in non-urban locations. These were reviewed and discussed individually:

##### Mt. Spokane

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that this is already built, and is not in question.

##### King Mountain - in Whatcom County

- Kevin Kearns – commented that he sees no problem with this one.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – asked if we have heard anything from Bellingham.
- Kevin Kearns – replied that they are doing the monitoring.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – responded that there should be no problem.

##### Birch Mountain - in Kittitas Co.

- Kevin Kearns – asked if there were any objections/concerns about this site. The group expressed no concerns.

#### Haystack - in Klickitat County

- Valerie Eveland – remarked that she had requested to put an ICALL channel on Golgotha Butte in Klickitat Co. right on the Benton Co/Klickitat County border.
- Kevin Kearns – brought up the map and noted that if you look at the contour on Haystack, the red line is the co-channel contour line.
- Dave Brush – commented that there will be overlap, especially in Oregon. He also noted that directional antennas might also be considered.
- Kevin Kearns – asked Val when she expects to be on the air.
- Valerie Eveland – responded that she is currently ordering equipment and this should occur in a few months.
- Kevin Kearns – suggested that perhaps we should approve this in concept, but ask WSDOT to perform testing. Then parties could come to mutual agreement prior to approval.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – asked about the possibility of simulcasting.
- Kevin Kearns – asked the group how do they feel about approving in concept subject to testing? There was consensus that this would be OK. He will send a letter to both parties suggesting that they look at the simulcast option. The letter will be posted for the benefit of the RPC.

#### Magnuson Butte

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that he sees no other ICALL implementations or other issues. The RPC agreed.

#### Octopus Mountain

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that he sees no problem with this site. The RPC agreed.

#### Sky Meadows – covering the I-90 corridor.

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that he sees no problem here. The RPC agreed.

#### Skyline Lake – covering Highway 2 over Stevens Pass.

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that it is good to finally get coverage for the Pass. He asked if the group had any objections. The RPC had no objections.

#### Tumwater Hill

- Kevin Kearns – noted that work is underway in Pierce, King and Snohomish counties to define a tri-county ICALL simulcast system. This may create coverage overlaps with the Tumwater Hill site.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – mentioned that the DOT site would probably be built before the first simulcast. Once it’s up and operational, when the tri-county simulcast comes up, they may need to change their antenna pattern or power levels, or move to another site.
- Kevin Kearns – suggested that perhaps this could be part of the simulcast. If not, it might be best to defer final decision until the simulcast design is completed.

#### Manastash – just south of Ellensburg.

- Kevin Kearns – asked if the group foresees problems with this site.
- Dave Brush – asked, what about Sky Meadows?
- Kevin Kearns – responded that it is probably not a problem but anyone on a high site will key up both of them at the same time

- Dean Heinen – asked if there is anything on Indian John Hill that will bring up both repeaters.
- Dave Brush – remarked that there is a potential for problems with mobiles.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that he will send a memo stating that the site may create problems with mobile units, and simulcast should be considered. Although the calling party would be heard, someone on a mobile unit might not hear another mobile.

#### Alpowa Summit

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that he sees no issues and all agreed.

#### Standard Naming Conventions for Interoperability Channels

The Chair noted that Oregon has expressed interest in using the same channel sets as we do for the Regional interoperability channels. He invited group discussion on the issue.

- Steve Taylor – noted that in Clark County this becomes an issue, especially with respect to inter-state interoperability. If we don't use the same channels, we should use names that are more distinct between Oregon and Washington.
- Kevin Kearns – asked if it would matter in the event that they are the same frequency.
- Steve Taylor – responded that he wants the same nomenclature. He added that the bigger issue is common nomenclature.
- Kevin Kearns – noted that with only five mode selectors, they should have the same name.
- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – added that if it's the same frequency, it should be the same name. We could have WA, OR or ID ops if we could move into common frequencies.
- Kevin Kearns – responded the first issue of nomenclature is with regard to Oregon if we agree to 6 character nomenclature, e.g., WAOPS1 through 5? He asked if there was objection. There was none. He then suggested the second issue was to encourage standard frequencies as this improves the opportunity for interoperability. However, instead of 10 channels, you will only have 5 channels.
- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – replied, for highly populated areas this could be a problem.
- Kevin Kearns – noted, if they were the same frequencies it might free up some channels that could be used for other purposes. If channels out of the Region 35 plan are freed up, we could use some identified in Region 43 (if we assume that the Treaty will protect U.S. primary).
- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – replied that he thinks the preferred method is to look at the frequencies that are currently being used, the five used currently in region 43 and see if Oregon is using them, to try to identify two or three.
- Kevin Kearns – asked the group if they have any objection to that direction? He also asked if the group wanted to see the letter he will send out prior to sending it. The group was OK with Kevin sending it out and then posting it on the list.

## **4. Draft Re-write of Region 43 Plan**

### I. PLAN DEVELOPMENT

#### A. Introduction

- Kevin Kearns – asked the group if we want to say anything in the document introduction to the effect that we got to the life expectancy of the Plan and are moving away from the filing window and Zone concept, etc.
- Steve Taylor – responded that this makes it more like an Executive Summary.
- Valerie Eveland – responded that she likes this idea as some may not read the rest of the Plan.
- Kevin Kearns – asked if we should we call it an Executive Summary.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – replied that some of the material may not be appropriate for an Executive Summary.
- Kevin Kearns – suggested that we could just add an Executive Summary section.

#### B. Purpose

- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – suggested that this section needs to be consistent with the statement on page 7 in Section G regarding the Frequency Allocation Process.

#### C. Notification

- Kevin Kearns – suggested that we could condense this section with respect to the original plan and add details about this revision.
- Valerie Eveland – responded that this makes sense to her.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – asked how the section could be condensed.
- Kevin Kearns – replied that we could remove the portion about the original Plan adoption and add a section on how we notified for this revision.
- Dave Brush – asked if the thought was to make sure that notification of the revision encompassed the original entities and added the internet portion, etc.
- Kevin Kearns – noted that the consensus of the group was that we condense the history and focus on notification.

#### E. Plan Revisions

- Kevin Kearns – stated that he will add a section explaining the Plan revision process, with respect to ending the filing windows and the Zone concept and finally notification for the full Plan revision.

### II. REGIONAL DESCRIPTION AND DEMOGRAPHICS

- Kevin Kearns – noted that he reduced this information to the three items attached to the end of document. He asked if this seems like adequate documentation.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – asked if the FCC will accept this level of documentation.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that we won’t know until it is submitted.
- Dean Heinen – mentioned that nothing is said about this in the Purpose section.
- Kevin Kearns – asked for suggested changes/additional and detail.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – suggested that on the Washington State map the blank cell under population percentage should say Washington State = 100%. He also suggested specifying the date of the population statistics (2004).

### III. IMPLEMENTATION AND PROCEDURES

#### A. Regional Planning Committee

##### 1. Membership

- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – asked what represents a quorum as there might be a large number of committee members, but a small number showing up at meetings.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that in the 700 MHz Plan document we don’t specify what constitutes a quorum. That is handled in the bylaws. Therefore, all attending members constitute a quorum (even 2). He asked if there is

agreement that we want to go to the same arrangement as in the 700 MHz Plan document.

- Steve Taylor – remarked, “So this room would establish the quorum?”.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that we would need only a simple majority of the voting members. The quorum would be based on voting attendees, duly notified.
- Dean Heinen – suggested that the letter of authorization would need to be separate because they are separate committees.
- Dave Brush – asked if anyone wants to consider establishing a minimal number?
- Kevin Kearns – asked if there is anything else to discuss in membership section

## 2. Purpose

- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – asked to look at the last sentence on page 4 where it says, “The Regional Review Committee will establish at its first meeting its own operating procedures and by-laws.”
- Kevin Kearns – responded that that is just holdover text that was missed.

## B. General Procedures for Application

### 1. Timetable for System Implementation

- Dean Heinen – asked if we need to quote the Rules?
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – remarked that this might tend to open a door.
- Cammie Enslow – suggested rewriting the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence to remove “also applies”.

### 2. Frequency Recall

- Kevin Kearns – noted that we haven’t done anything regarding forcing us to monitor channel construction and use.
- Dean Heinen – suggested that the word “monitor” be removed from the Plan.
- Kevin Kearns – asked, what are we saying the Committee is going to do, especially if others are waiting, needing frequencies?
- Jon Gallagher – asked if there are two tracks.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that the Rules specify an expiration date on the license. At any point in time we could reserve the right to request that the FCC put them back into the pool. He asked, how does the group feel about a rewrite of this section? It occurs to him that since we do procedural review outside of the plan we might want to keep procedures out of the plan document. On frequency recalls he will try to come up with language specifying the mode of intervention but not specifying monitoring.

### 3. Reassignment of Frequencies

- Kevin Kearns – noted that this section has undergone a lot of edits and is pretty much where we want it to be.

## C. Requirements for License Application

- Kevin Kearns – noted that this section seems OK as is.

## D. Application Filing Windows and Criteria for Prioritization

- Kevin Kearns – remarked that this section has been reworked already.
- Dean Heinen – responded that it looks good to him.
- Kevin Kearns – noted the language re: open seasons, apply anytime, etc.
- Dean Heinen – asked, do we want to place the point scoring, etc. here or elsewhere?
- Kevin Kearns – responded that this language was here in the original document and he doesn’t want to change too much from the original document.

- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – suggested that we need to look more closely at the point values and weightings.
- Steve Taylor – asked, why is the implementation schedule weighted four times over channel loading, etc.?
- Dean Heinen – suggested adding language to the Maximum Allowable Point Value list to specify “first responders” receive priority in the event of a tie between applicants.
- Kevin Kearns – suggested adding language “human” to the first category, “Immediate need to protect *human* life and property”

#### E. Appeal Process

- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – remarked that this section is pretty straightforward.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that he is fine with leaving it “as is”.

#### F. Frequency Distribution

- Kevin Kearns – noted that this section needs to be rewritten. He added, Sections F and G can be merged and condensed.

#### G. Frequency Allocation Process

See above for comments on this section.

### IV. TECHNICAL DESIGN REQUIREMENTS

#### A. Introduction

#### B. System Design Standards

##### 2. Definition of System Coverage Area

- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – noted that in this section the document equates so many microvolts with dbu, “...the boundary where received signal strength falls to 40 dBu (decibels above 1 microvolt per meter...)”.
- Dean Heinen – suggested removing references to microvolts and leaving all references as dBu to be consistent.
- Kevin Kearns – suggested removing the parenthetical reference. All agreed.

##### 13. Transmitter Standards

- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – suggested removing the comments re: “new” spectrum.

##### 14. Coded Squelch

- Kevin Kearns – asked, do we want to address the use of P25 conventional signaling? He added, if you are moving into the guard band, P25 will create the same problems as CTCSS.
- Dean Heinen – responded that using the language, “subsequent technology”, takes care of the P25 issue.
- Kevin Kearns – asked if we need to change the language to specify that guard channel occupants need to use analog squelch to protect the channels the guard band is there to protect.

#### C. System Loading and Implementation Requirement

##### 1. Conventional Systems

No changes were proposed.

##### 2. Trunking Systems

No changes were proposed.

##### 3. Number of frequencies requested

No changes were proposed.

##### 4. Traffic Loading Study

- Kevin Kearns – suggested that this section poses an interesting question. It implies that we have the right to take frequencies away and we don't
- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – asked, why don't we remove the language regarding the number of mobiles/portables.

Note: Section D is missing so the Table of Contents and sections need editing.

- Kevin Kearns – noted that the highlighted sections in the document contain new language, offered for review and discussion.

#### E. Simplex Operations

- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – pointed out that the last sentence in the section, "A showing of air time usage, excluding telephone interconnect air time, during the peak busy hour greater than 70 percent per channel on three consecutive days will be required to justify additional or retain existing frequencies." implies that you need to show loading if you want exclusive use of the frequency for simplex operations.
- Dean Heinen – responded that you do have to show loading on your operating channels to justify additional channels.
- Kevin Kearns – remarked that this section is ambiguous and needs to be rewritten. He asked if we agreed that if an applicant is requesting a simplex channel in addition to a trunked channel they should have to show loading.
- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – responded that it should say simplex operation on a guard channel.
- Kevin Kearns – said that he will attempt to break the simplex paragraph into sections to distinguish simplex operation on State Ops vs. operation on a guard channel.
- Dave Brush – responded that some simplex frequencies were programmed in for agencies such as wastewater treatment facilities who work underground. They are doing talkaround.

#### F. Itinerant Operations

No changes were proposed.

#### G. Operation Aboard Aircraft

No changes were proposed.

#### H. Systems Designed to Serve Limited Areas of Operation

Kevin Kearns – suggested deleting language about requiring site specific licensing

#### I. Digital and Encrypted Operation

No changes were proposed.

#### J. Mobile Telephone Use

No changes were proposed.

### V. INTEROPERABILITY

#### A. Interoperability and Mutual Aid Channels

Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – suggested adding "primary" to the 2<sup>nd</sup> table.

#### B. Criteria for Interoperability Requirements

##### 1. Primary and Secondary Users

##### Primary User:

Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – suggested striking "will" from the sentence, "Primary Users will be required to.....".

##### Secondary User:

No changes were proposed.

## 2. Shared Trunking System:

No changes were proposed.

## 3. Channel Counting:

No changes were proposed.

## C. Channel Assignment

No changes were proposed.

## D. Channel Usage

No changes were proposed

## E. Requirement for Channel Capability

### Method One

### Method Two

- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – suggested that he would add a Method 3, Simulcast.
- Kevin Kearns – asked, do we want to embrace these other methods?
- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – responded that we could risk sending this to the FCC and getting it bounced or leave it as is.
- Kevin Kearns – asked, why don't we make Method One simulcast?
- Dave Brush – suggested that we modify the preceding paragraph to specify the three methods.

## **5. Good of the Order**

**None**

## **6. Future Meeting Dates**

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

- **October 26<sup>th</sup> – Meeting via Conference Call**
- **November 30<sup>th</sup> – Yakima Probation Services, Yakima**
- **December 28<sup>th</sup> – no meeting scheduled for December**

## **7. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 1400 hours.

## **8. Vendor Presentation by Future Com**

Summary: The recently announced MOBEXCOM DVR is the first mobile repeater to support P25. Available in VHF/UHF/700/800, it can be used either in-band or cross-band. This presentation will cover the features of both the MOBEXCOM DVR and the analog MOBEXCOM II. It will also discuss the variety of configurations used by customers to solve coverage and interoperability issues. Rebanding presents a number of challenges for the use of in-band 800 MHz mobile repeaters. The final section of this presentation will discuss the issues and potential solutions.