

## MINUTES

### Joint Meeting of the Region 43 (Washington) & Region 35 (Oregon) 800 MHz Regional Planning Committees

April 27, 2005 - 0900 to 1230  
Clark County "Elections" Building  
1408 Franklin Street, Room 226  
Vancouver, Washington

#### 1. Sign-in and Introductions

The following individuals participated in the meeting. Where appropriate, each attendee provided a brief description of their 800 MHz systems.

Kevin Kearns – RPC Chair	Joe Boyer – Transition Administrator
Kris McGowan – FCC	Shane Satterlund – Bearing Point
Kirstin Nelson – CRESA	Jim Cole – CRESA
John Talbot – CRESA	Jeremy Millman – CRESA
Ken Rhodes – KCSO	Cammie Enslow – KCSO
Dean Heinen – Yakima County	Joe Kuran - WCCCA
Valerie Eveland – BCES	Dennis Hausman - WA DIS/SIEC
Stan Bryan – DWLS	Allan Josue - EMD
Fred Baker – WSDOT	Alan Hull – WSDOT
Mark Richardson – WSDOT	Terry Miller - WSDOT
Harlan D. Ohlson – WSDOT	Jose Zuniga - WSDOC
Ron Solemsaas – SERS	Mark Morgan - Valley Comm
Steve Taylor - City of Tacoma	Jon "Wiz" Wiswell - City of Seattle
David Brush - City of Yakima	Spencer Bahner - Sparling
Zohreh Zandi - Community Transit	Tom Howell - Snopac
Tom O'Day - Port of Seattle	Babu Parayil - Port of Seattle
Jon C. Sholes - Deshutes County Sheriff	Andrea Moore - Beaverton PD
Bob Tardiff - Newberg PD	Johayne Fulmer - Medford Police & Fire
Jim Parsons - Clark County Sheriffs Office	James White
Joel Harrington - Adcomm Engineering	Tom Eckels - Hatfield & Dawson
Tim Derosier - Wireless Network Services	Steve Shelton - Day Wireless
Mike Ishida - Day Wireless	Rick Hinthorne - Day Wireless
Tom Grebner - Complete Wireless	Brad Johnson - Complete Wireless
Bruce Barlund – Motorola	Jim Switzer - Motorola
Larsen Grabenkort – Motorola	Bette Rinehart - Motorola
Duane Forman Motorola	Bob Bushey - DataRadio

Attendees are again 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. Joint Meeting of the Region 43 and Region 35 RPCs with the 800 MHz Transition Administrator

- **Follow-up and clarification of information from the APCO Symposium**

Charts of 800 MHz band allocations in border and non-border areas, pre and post-rebanding, were reviewed, as were maps showing Canadian border sharing regions showing the primary systems operating in those areas. There are three border sharing areas with Canada, but these can effectively be considered as two: A rectangle extending 140 kilometers from the Canadian border to the Cascade mountains, and an arc extending 140 km from the Canadian border through the Straits. There is a different band plan in the 140 km area for public safety channels in the 1-120 space and limitations on the NPSPAC channels to avoid interference. Predominant numbers of systems are in the Puget Sound have very little terrain protection from or to Canadian licensees. Across the rest of the region there are 800 MHz systems in use in the Vancouver/Portland area as well as in Benton County and in Yakima. Additionally, there is a WSDOT statewide system and there are WSDOC prison facilities located across the state.

Canadian border issues of great interest:

Present Canadian Border Allocation (see the G-3 chart in the meeting slides):

spectrum in the lower portion of band from 806 to 809 MHz is currently interleaved with SMR channels. The 60 channels of spectrum from 809 to 817 MHz are covered by provisions in the Canadian treaty allowing secondary via the waiver process.

Canadian Border Re-Allocation (see the G-4 chart in meeting slides): the band plan shown in the slides is the plan proposed in the original Consensus Plan. It is still possible that alternative band arrangements will be worked out as US/Canadian negotiations continue. One thing we hope to achieve is the same simple secondary use provisions in the non-NPSPAC channels that we have for the NPSPAC channels (basically just a technical showing that signals into Canada don't exceed  $-107$  dBw/m<sup>2</sup>)

- **Coordination issues in the Oregon/Washington border areas and strategies for interaction and coordination between RPCs**

Proposed Prioritization Waves (see US map in slides):

Although the state of Washington is assigned to Wave 4, portions of Washington may require coordination with Oregon which is assigned to Wave 1, for local and statewide systems. Therefore, there has been discussion regarding whether portions of Washington should proceed with Wave 1. Examples might include Clark, Washington and Benton Counties, the Cities of Portland and Vancouver, WSDOT, WSDOC, etc.

Discussion ensued:

- Joe Boyer – remarked that in terms of the RPCs, the FCC calls for the Transition Administrator (TA) to work with the RPCs, to achieve cross-regional coordination. The TA is committed to working with all the regions, and there will be flexibility in the process. The guidelines are just that. There are many systems with lots of sites due to coverage issues. In the larger public safety systems there will be a lot of unique characteristics. Channels (1-120) must be moved first to open up the space for the NPSPAC channel plan to move into. Regarding border issues,

we are far better than RPCs who share border areas with Mexico. We can expect the assistance of the TA assisting with WSDOT issues, understanding that Nextel will be a large part of the transition and all participants must be ready to work with Nextel. In the case of an impasse, the TA expects to intervene.

- Kevin Kearns – added that he focused on getting the TA to attend our meeting as they are the focal point of the process, the designated regulator and they understand our issues. However, it was clear from yesterday's APCO Symposium that Nextel is really the first point of contact on this work and he had failed to initially invite them to this meeting. He talked with them yesterday but their travel schedules prevented them from attending today. He discussed the cross border (Oregon) issues with Nextel and the prospect of the southern tier of Washington state rebanding with Oregon in Wave 1 and they said it shouldn't be a resource problem for them as long as the TA has the available resources to proceed.
- Joe Boyer – continued that the most efficient way to proceed is to let the two principals, public safety and Nextel, work things out and intervene when needed.
- Dennis Hausman – commented that the issue that has emerged is that there are agencies throughout the state that may bring a plan to Nextel and Nextel may say that it is too expensive. If the State disagrees with the dollar amount that Nextel is willing to put up, what would the position of the TA be if they are "guarding the trust".
- Joe Boyer – responded that regarding the timing, he recognized that doing little groups of regions together is highly problematic, and the R&O designated a six month negotiation period. The long configuration period is needed to accommodate large systems, weather (i.e. the Florida hurricane season, etc.), and available resources. If the negotiation fails, the TA will get involved in mediation. If that fails, the FCC will get involved. Although there is an obligation to be "reasonable and prudent" this is intended to maintain a "comparable facility", not to add enhancements. The TA wants to strike the right balance in this situation.
- Shane Satterlund – added that the TA wants to be active in pinpointing the areas where there may be these kinds of issues. The same is true for Nextel.
- Kevin Kearns – asked the TA to clarify whether both parties can go to the FCC if the resolution by Nextel and the TA are not satisfactory.
- Joe Boyer - responded that after the six month period the TA is automatically involved and will attempt to mediate negotiations between parties, if there is not an acceptable outcome the case is referred to the FCC and the FCC looks at it as a "de novo" (new) case.
- Kevin Kearns – noted that the documentation piece is very important (especially soft costs) so that there is a record to review in the event of referral.
- Joe Boyer – remarked that the FCC expects all parties to work together in good faith. People have worried that the money will run out, but Nextel has been forced to put up a letter of credit for \$2.5 billion. The value of spectrum that they will receive depends on them acting in good faith.
- Alan Hull – added that Nextel must sign a contract and he has to take it to the board. They are not technical people, and will ask "can you guarantee that everything will go as planned?". He is unable to do this.

- Joe Boyer – responded that Nextel has been very good at explaining the process. Regarding the payment flow, we need to recognize that there are numerous procurement processes. We could structure the contract so that payments go directly from Nextel through to the vendors.
- Joe Boyer – remarked that from an audit perspective, it is certainly cleaner to avoid using internal dollars, although a procurement package may be needed for municipalities. He suggested that for anything large, be sure to have a good scope of work (SOW) statement, as it may be necessary to certify that costs were kept as low as possible.
- Spencer Bahner – added that we need to have a method to shift to an alternate vendor if performance becomes problematic. Regarding the border area, is it possible that we may not need treaty modifications?
- Kevin Kearns – responded that he expects that there still may be a need for treaty modification due to differences on each side of the border. The treaty may need to be changed to add language about how to address post-rebanding differences.
- Joe Boyer – added that there have been extensive discussions with the state of New York on this issue. The good news is that where NPSPAC is coming from and going to is mostly aligned. The issue of concern is the interoperability channels, and whether there will be a problem when they move. Fortunately, there is not much cross border usage, and some channels are already programmed into their radios.
- Kevin Kearns – noted that there is currently no documented routine use of mutual aid channels in cross-border operations. There will be an interest in having cross-border mutual aid channels identified and programmed into user radios who normally operate in that area, but it could probably be accomplished in a different channel plan structure than the non-border area. The broader concern may hinge back to the map issue. If there is going to be one plan for the Puget Sound/Victoria area, different than the rest of the country, this may be problematic.
- Joe Boyer – responded that the TA has been pushing on Nextel to come up with a way to program repeaters to listen on both channels.
- Alan Hull – added that in the ongoing international effort for the Olympics in Whistler, B.C., there was a lot of movement of people across border. The Canadians use 800 MHz in the Vancouver area (shared system). Some had visions of a 700 MHz system that would fit both countries
- Tom Eckels – noted that many are used by Nextel's business partners in Vancouver and they are not rebanding.
- Joe Boyer – responded that Canada is progressing in these efforts. At least it's on the Canadian radar, unlike Mexico. Nextel US is talking to their Canadian counterparts. The goal is to cause minimum disruption to existing services during this transition.
- Kevin Kearns – noted that we want the TA to recognize that we use a lot of simulcast, big systems with six, eight or ten sites. Retuning these systems with minimal disruption is mind boggling. How will it be possible to make this seamless to the users? We may need to build a parallel infrastructure to keep

this seamless. He then asked the TA, "How well do you understand these kinds of designs? Are you ready for this?"

- Joe Boyer – responded that although the members of his team understand most all of the issues well, they expect to hire additional staff who are experienced in complex systems to assist with the process if the TA needs to intervene.
- Kevin Kearns – added that public safety has ongoing relationships with several consulting firms, so local resources will be available to public safety agencies.
- Joe Boyer – noted that prior to assigning priorities they studied the potential workload. The biggest and most complex markets were scheduled to be addressed first. In the southeast, Wave 3 was assigned their own band plan because of the large number of transactions that must be completed. The availability of engineering talent and technical resources needed to be addressed.
- Dennis Hausman – noted that Nextel has millions of units that can be borrowed, which might be acceptable for thirty to ninety days. He wondered if an agency would have to accept the loaners as comparable equipment.
- Joe Boyer – responded that some agencies will accept "Crystals" as comparable, and some won't. It is up to the agency.
- Dennis Hausman – mentioned that may not be any loaner equipment remaining for assignment in Wave 4. It is likely that we will be issued the stripped down versions of the current model. He asked if warranties will come with the equipment or be factored in. And what if the equipment fails after ninety days, what happens then?
- Joe Boyer – responded that Motorola is considering the warranty issue. The circumstances depend on the software/archaeology. The operating system of the radio may have to be rewritten. There will be a period of testing the program prior to re-flashing. The radios that are being issued will be comparable to what you have now.
- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – mentioned that he had an offline conversation on this subject with a vendor, and the response was, "We will not force you to accept used equipment."
- Kevin Kearns – commented on the subject of moving to 700 MHz systems. He said that the caveat is that this must be done within the 36 month time window.
- Joe Boyer – remarked that there can be no "gold-plating"; costs must be verifiable as "reasonable and prudent".
- Harlan Ohlson – added that this is an issue of trust. The contract issued is based on trust. Concerning the border issue, perhaps we could start vacating border channels early, but will the Nextel mid frequencies be available?
- Joe Boyer – responded that those are secondary. He added that there are other issues. We need to consider other equipment/systems that may have been designed to rely on 800 MHz channels, e.g. BDAs, SCADA, etc. The traffic lights in Denver, Colorado are controlled by 800 MHz channels.
- Kevin Kearns – added that sometimes BDAs support more than public safety, they may be managed by building systems.
- Joe Boyer – added that as the licensee of unlicensed but legitimate users of systems you will be responsible

- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – commented that for large, complex systems, he would strongly encourage that the TA supply a representative at these meetings. They could gain education and background on systems that could be useful later.
- Shane Satterlund – noted that ideally the TA would prefer to be present at the planning stage.
- Joe Boyer – added that the TA cannot be available for every session because they lack the resources. He added that he is hoping that most of the negotiations will go well. Given the number of entities, there will not be enough resources available.
- Kevin Kearns – added that to assist with this effort licensees in the Puget Sound area (King, Pierce & Snohomish Counties) are discussing forming a joint program management group to coordinate with Nextel and the TA. There is a general sense from the TA and Nextel that this is entirely appropriate, and costs should be covered where there are opportunities to coordinate with other agencies. He would encourage regional aggregations of cooperative efforts.
- Shane Satterlund – responded that they would support such an effort.
- Joe Boyer – asked if this would be a consulting effort?
- Kevin Kearns – responded that it would not. Several people would take on a program management role, coordinating aggregate bodies, making sure all timelines are met, agencies stay on track; get their paperwork in on time, etc.
- Shane Satterlund – responded that we need to formulate language regarding the role of group as a larger coordinated plan will better leverage resources.
- Spencer Bahner – raised the subject of media radios. He noted that he assumes that they will be treated the same as other radios, and upgraded or replaced. At the time their system went in scanners were unavailable, so the media requested radios with scan capabilities in them. Hard work resulted in radios that only transmitted with minimal capabilities and allowed the media to hear authorized talk groups such as fire and police. The press currently buys and maintains them.
- Joe Boyer – responded that he is not sure if these costs are reimbursable, but they may be if there is a demonstrable public benefit.
- Kevin Kearns – added that they are on our system.
- Jon “Wiz” Wiswell – added that we have agreements with the Boeing Company. He noted that we maintain mutual aid systems.
- Joe Kuran – asked if we can pick the vendor we prefer, or must we pick the cheapest?
- Joe Boyer – responded that as long as costs are reasonable and prudent you can pick the vendor who best knows your system.
- Baby Parayil – noted that his agency uses systems that have software sensors for trains, not just for public safety use.
- Cammie Enslow – asked if an agency can choose to upgrade to new equipment, instead of accepting old technology if they accept the cost difference?
- Joe Boyer – responded that it is necessary to clearly show that the reconfiguration costs are the same. This is covered on page 4 of the TA Guidelines document. You must show what the schedule is with and without the upgrade, and must stay on schedule and have the money in hand to cover the upgrade. If you choose to upgrade, it will be very difficult to prove comparable

facilities. If you have a problem later it will be difficult to establish your case. Some vendors have provided software that is designed to be upgraded. At the least equipment will be comparable to current models, without some of the enhanced features. He added that for 1 to 120 everything is fairly straightforward but for 851 to 854 Motorola lacks the right channelization.

- Harlan Ohlson – asked where cost reimbursements stop with respect to replacement radios.
- Kevin Kearns – responded that it is essential that agencies follow Glen Nash's advice to create a soft sign off, sliding the end date to deal with issues that emerge later on, or equipment that is missed. (See the Glen's presentation to the IWCE 2005 in Las Vegas and to APCO at:

<http://www.800mhzrebanding.com/IWCE2005%20Presentations.html>

The Chair thanked the TAs for participating in our meeting and excused them. He then moved to Agenda items that are shared by both Regions.

- The first topic of discussion was whether Regions 35 and 43 would be interested in future joint meetings. Both Regions concurred that they are interested. He asked about crossing the state border for bimonthly meetings. This was acceptable to the group.
- Next we addressed the issue of the southern tier of Region 43. Kevin noted that if a strategy is established to clear out 1 to 120, Nextel thinks they can move things around enough to move NPSPAC down. He asked if there is a lot of interaction across the border with Benton County, or is the main focus going to be the Portland/Vancouver area?
- Valerie Eveland – responded that there is little cross-border activity on 800 MHz in Benton County. It is OK to focus on the Portland/Vancouver area.
- Kevin Kearns – next asked if there is shared interest in doing some of the southern tier at the same time as Wave 1.
- Alan Hull – responded that three years is not a lot of time.
- Dennis Hausman – remarked that he sees a tremendous advantage to working together with Oregon. He sees it as a positive opportunity.
- Valerie Eveland – continued that on Benton County's behalf, a lot is dependent on what the WSDOT and WSDOC do, as they rely on them for mutual aid.
- Kevin Kearns – remarked that on the Washington WSDOT, WSDOC and Benton County are the systems of concern
- Dennis Hausman – added that if you are in a jurisdiction with multiple waves you will be able to move ahead with the earliest wave.
- Kevin Kearns – closed the discussion with the remark that he senses group consensus on the following:
  - (1) There is an interest in trying to do the southern tier at the same time.
  - (2) We should try to schedule a meeting with Nextel to discuss these issues.
  - (3) We should schedule bimonthly joint meetings with Region 35.

### **3. Joint Discussion of the future path of the National Association of Regional Planning Committees (NARPC)**

- **History review** (details available in meeting slides)  
Upon the completion of the work of the NCC the RPCs were designated to move ahead with 700 MHz planning. NPSTC arbitrarily divided the country up into several zones and provided funding to have a representative from each zone attend NPSTC meetings. Thus, at most all NPSTC meetings, two or more regional planning representatives had an opportunity to participate in the NPSTC proceedings. After several meetings questions arose in some areas regarding the manner in which these individuals were selected and whether they represented the views of the RPCs in their Zones. At this point interest was expressed in creating a formally constituted body to serve as an information clearing house and provide a common voice for RPC interests.
- **Review of proposed direction**  
Support letters requested that NARPC be recognized as a formal member of NPSTC and be awarded a seat on the governing board. However, due to the informal structure of NARPC and its inability to contribute to NPSTC operational costs this possibility is seen as limited. It has also been suggested that its inclusion might weaken the voice of public safety in NPSTC. Renewed efforts on this front have invited further discussion and debate.
- **Debate and adoption of a joint Region 43 and 35 position statement**
  - Kevin Kearns – remarked that in his opinion NPSTC is the appropriate aggregating body for public safety viewpoints on spectrum and regulatory issues and is increasingly recognized that way by the FCC and other bodies. Some say that adding NARPC to the mix is just raising the noise floor and creating one-to-many bodies trying to carry the same message. There are passionate views on both sides. NPSTC thinks that they provide an adequate voice for the regional planning interests of public safety, especially since they set up the zone system to be sure that RPC views would be heard. He noted that he doesn't think that even if NARPC is formalized it will be able to secure a seat on NPSTC.
  - Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – asked, if NARPC is not the formal organization, would the funding continue for regional representatives to attend NPSTC?
  - Kevin Kearns – remarked that he sees APCO as the "heavy lifter" on many of the NPSTC spectrum issues. He added that personally, it does not make sense to him to push to formalize a new RPC body, as NPSTC was already asking for RPC input prior to making policy decisions.
  - Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – asked that he is not sure we need another formalized organization. If the work is already being done and the input is already being collected, there may not be a reason to create another, although he is open to it.
  - Dennis Hausman – agreed that as long as we are getting the information, able to provide input, have representation, etc., why change things?
  - Kevin Kearns – remarked that for issues we were really passionate about, they would have more weight if they were filed as individual comments by individual RPCs. He noted that discussion today expresses a consensus that we recognize that there needs to be a way to provide RPC input into NPSTC activities, but we do not see the need for NARPC to become a formalized body. He will convey this message to the appropriate NPSTC and NARPC representatives on behalf of Region 43, and Joe Kuran or someone else from Region 35 will convey a similar message.

#### 4. Region 43 Spring Filing Window 800 MHz Application Processing

There was some discussion regarding processing during the rebanding process. Spencer Bahner suggested that all activity within a 75 mile strip into Washington be frozen; noting that areas like Benton County will be impacted by WSDOT. Kevin Kearns remarked that he does not want to have to deal with applications in the Puget Sound basin. He prefers to focus on the southern tier regions. There was a motion by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell to authorize the Chair to instigate monthly filing windows for the counties along the Oregon border. There was a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Steve Taylor. The motion was approved by committee vote.

- **WSDOT** (see meeting slides for details and a maps of sites)

##### Dusty in Whitman County

644 - already assigned as a WSDOT statewide channel, so no problem expected.

Chair recommends approval.

680 - assigned to WSDOC for statewide use, so confirmation will be required from the DOC that DOT may use this channel at the Whitman County location. The Chair recommends approval pending positive confirmation by DOC.

There was a motion by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell, and a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Allan Josue with no further discussion. The motion was approved.

##### Blagg Mountain in Chelan County

758 - already assigned as a WSDOT statewide channel, so no problem expected.

Chair recommends approval.

829 - Unassigned in the Plan. Already assigned several times to WSDOT, also used by EPSCA in North Seattle. Terrain blocked to King County so no problem expected. Adjacent channels also Unassigned in the Plan, have been assigned to WSDOT at lots of sites, so no apparent problem. Chair recommends approval.

784 - Unassigned in the Plan. Have already assigned it to several WSDOT sites.

Pierce and King have adjacent channels but terrain blocking makes this not a problem. Chair recommends approval.

There was a motion by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell, and a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Allan Josue to approve these allocations. The motion was approved.

##### Federal Way in King County

830 - Unassigned in the Plan, already given to WSDOT at several other sites. EPSCA uses 829 at the North Seattle site and this may create an adjacent-channel problem for either WSDOT or EPSCA.

Chair recommends requiring interference testing to rule out interference prior to approving this one and suggests a motion to approve if the tests pan out.

Wiz remarked that he would like to see the DOT agree in writing to be secondary.

There was a motion by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell to accept the proposal subject to testing and approval by both parties to the agreement above. There was a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Val Eveland and the motion was approved.

##### Pinus Lake in Whatcom County

758 - already assigned as a WSDOT statewide channel, no problems expected. Chair recommends approval.

829 - Unassigned in the Plan. Previously assigned several times to WSDOT, also used by EPSCA in North Seattle. Coverage prediction map indicates no co-channel signal problems outside of Whatcom County. Adjacent channels were also Unassigned in the Plan and have been assigned to WSDOT at lots of sites, no problems expected. Chair recommends approval.

784 - Unassigned in the Plan. Previously assigned to several WSDOT sites. Pierce and King have adjacent channels but terrain blocking makes this not a problem. Chair recommends approval

There was a motion by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell, and a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Valerie Eveland to approve the allocations and the motion was approved.

#### Ellis Mountain in Clallam County

626 – used in the Seattle area simulcast system. WSDOT has proposed using a directional antenna to avoid signal towards Seattle. No apparent co-channel issues into the King County area. Adjacent channels are Unassigned. Chair recommends approval. Jon "Wiz" Wiswell mentioned that he has a site at Apple Cove and is concerned about simulcast, although it is probably not a problem.

There was a motion by Valerie Eveland, and a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Allan Josue and the motion was approved.

#### Kamilche in Mason County

WSDOT is proposing this site as a substitute for the South Mountain site.

728 - assigned for use in Mason County in the Plan, previously approved for use at South Mountain by WSDOT.

810 - assigned for use in Mason County in the Plan, previously approved for use at South Mountain by WSDOT.

Note: when South Mountain was approved, WSDOT planned to use a directional antenna to minimize signal towards King and Snohomish counties to avoid adjacent-channel interference to 809 in the King County simulcast system and 811 in the SERS East simulcast system. A directional antenna is also now proposed for Kamilche. Kamilche has been considered as a way to avoid interference with Pierce and King counties. It represents an improvement over the previously authorized site. It appears that there will be no problem. Chair recommends a motion similar to the motion including the limitation on the Federal Way site. There was a motion by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell, and a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Allan Josue to approve subject to the previous stipulation and the motion was approved.

#### Queets in Jefferson County

683 - already a WSDOT statewide channel, so no problem there. Chair recommends approval.

759 – currently a Guard channel between two WSDOT statewide channels. Chair recommends approval.

There was a motion by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell, and a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Dave Brush and the motion was approved.

- **Clark County**

Clark County requested channel assignments to expand the coverage of their system to support the Interoperability plan adopted for Washington's Homeland Security Region IV Interoperability Project (see meeting slides for details and a map). Their goal was to add two 3 channel trunking sites and one 2 channel conventional site. These additional sites were expected to expand coverage up the Columbia River and along the I-5 corridor to support VHF to 800 MHz patching capability for interoperable communications. Since this work is currently in process the Chair is unable to make specific channel recommendations to the Committee. Coverage predictions will be forwarded to the Committee when available.

Discussion ensued:

- Jon "Wiz" Wiswell – asked how far north does this go?
- Kevin Kearns - showed on the map that it extends to boundary of Clark County, adding that they are outside of the regions as there is nothing further north than Kelso.
- Harlan Ohlson – regarding Rainier Hill, remarked, "We're already there" and in terms of the Nicolai site, there may be some close spaced sites to keep track of.
- Kevin Kearns – added that the selection of sites should be a joint process by both regional chairs. The Chair recommended approval.  
There was a motion by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell that the selection of sites should be a joint process undertaken by both regional chairs. There was a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Alan Hull and the motion was approved.

- **Benton County**

Benton County requests – ICALL and ICTAC-1 (see maps on meeting slides)  
They want to implement an ICALL system and a repeater on ICTAC-1 and a temporary repeater on the State Ops 3 channel.

There was a motion, by Jon "Wiz" Wiswell and a 2<sup>nd</sup> by Alan Hull and the motion was approved.

- **WSDOC at McNeil Island** (see meeting slides for details)

WSDOC had previously requested that the Committee identify up to three additional channels for system capacity expansion and coverage at their McNeil Island facility. A subcommittee composed of Zone 2 agencies developed a list of candidate channels, determining 828 as "best" for single-channel use. WSDOT is co-channel in Snohomish County. EPSCA is adjacent on 827 and 829 at their North Seattle site. The Chair recommended that testing be performed to ensure appropriate power levels and antenna configuration to avoid interference to WSDOT and EPSCA.

## 5. **Approval of February 23, 2005 800 MHz Minutes**

Valerie Eveland made a motion to approve the February meeting minutes. Jon "Wiz" Wiswell seconded the motion and the minutes were approved.

## 6. **Lunch Break – 1230 to 1330**

The 800 MHz portion of the meeting was adjourned.