

REGION 43 NPSPAC REGIONAL REVIEW COMMITTEE  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
NOVEMBER 22, 1996

The meeting was held at Kent Fire Station #73, 26512 Military Road South, and was called to order at 1000 with the following members and guests in attendance:

Kevin Kearns	Zone 2
Jon Wiswell	Zone 2
Jay Morrison	Zone 2
Dean Heistand	Zone 2 Alternate
Mark Buchholz	Zone 3
Alan Hull	Washington State Agencies
Alan Josue	Washington State Agencies Alternate
Pat Buller	Westside Frequency Advisor
Al Upton	Everett Fire Department
Spencer Bahner	King County Radio Communications Services
John Clauson	Kitsap Transit
Joe Blaschka	Adcomm Engineering
Lorri Ericson	City of Puyallup
Steve Taylor	Motorola
Skip Osteyee	Motorola
Fred Radovich	Motorola

OLD BUSINESS

None

APPLICATION REVIEWS

Washington State Department of Transportation

WSDOT has previously been assigned Channel #829 at a number of sites, and has applied to use it at Minot Peak in Grays Harbor County as well. The Committee has also assigned this channel to EPSCA for use at their North Seattle site. WSDOT is already assigned Channel #830 at Minot Peak.

The coverage maps previously supplied by WSDOT for Minot Peak indicate that the use of #829 at this site may provide co-channel interference to EPSCA's use at North Seattle. However, the previous coverage maps were not terrain modeled and it is believed that a terrain modeled map would indicate that this co-channel interference problem does not exist.

WSDOT (Alan Hull) was asked to provide a new coverage map for Minot Peak to show that co-channel interference to EPSCA will not be a problem. He was also asked to consider whether they could even use #829 at this site since #830 was already in use there.

Assuming that the above material is provided, and the co-channel interference concern is answered, a Motion was made and Passed to allow the Chair to sign off on the application.

### Clark County

The application from Clark County is to add a site to their existing trunked system and to add two conventional repeaters each at two sites to expand system coverage into some low use areas.

There did not appear to be any co-channel or adjacent channel interference concerns with the 2 frequencies at Marble Creek or the two at Bells Mountain. There also appeared to be no problems with the channels selected for Yacolt Mountain.

Other questions were asked and answered by the applicant (Mark Buchholz and Joe Blaschka):

Why were there two applications filed? - The FCC rules don't allow trunked and conventional channels to be mixed on the same application.

There is no indication of Clark County's willingness to implement interoperability repeaters or the International Calling Channel. Why? - This is a complex issue given that all the ICALL and ITAC channels have already been implemented in Portland and much of Clark County is already covered. Clark County did agree to implement ITAC repeater(s) in the future if locations can be found that add to overall coverage but don't interfere with Portland. They also expressed an intent to monitor the ICALL channel.

The offer of Turnback channels is highly non-committal. Will there be any Turnbacks? - Clark County is committed to turning back VHF channels to the pool of origin as soon as this can be accomplished. The reason for no definite commitment is the extended time it will take for all of their users to migrate to the new system.

The mobile counts need to be updated to reflect the reality of the system, and an extended implementation letter needs to be added.

A Motion was made and Passed to Approve this application. Mark Buchholz abstained from the vote.

### City of Puyallup

The City of Puyallup has applied for 5 channels from the Pierce County pool for use in a 3-site simulcast trunked system. There were no adjacent or co-channel interference problems noted with any of the channels. This would leave only 2 channels unassigned in the Pierce County pool since 15 are already assigned to the City of Tacoma.

There were a number of questions asked of and answered by the applicant (Lori Ericson):

You don't have funding yet for your system. What will you do if you can't find funding?  
- If we can't fund the system, we will surrender our licenses.

Your application does not guarantee any turnback channels. What channels will you turn back and when? - Puyallup is willing to vacate VHF channels as soon as conversion is complete, but no schedule has been developed yet.

Kevin Kearns read a letter from Pierce County advising that Pierce County is studying the opportunities for the implementation of an 800 MHz system in the county in cooperation with other cities in the county. The applicant was asked if a plan like this were to move forward, would they be willing to participate in it, and they said they would.

A Motion was made and Passed to Approve the application after the Chair received a letter from the applicant reaffirming their intent to turn back VHF channels as soon as possible and acknowledging that licenses would need to be surrendered if funding was not found and construction was not begun.

#### Kitsap County - CENCOM

Kitsap County - CENCOM has applied for 4 of the 8 channels from the Kitsap County pool for use in a mobile data system.

There was considerable discussion about the choice of channels and the wide area signal propagation from Buck Mountain and Gold Mountain. Channel #726 has already been assigned to Kitsap Public Works at Mt. Jupiter, and is co-channel in Whatcom County, as is #746. Given the large coverage footprint of Buck and Gold, and the scale of the maps provided, it is not possible to assess the co-channel interference potential.

It was also noted that since these channels would not be replacing any existing communications service (being used for data not voice) there would be no Turnbacks. Also, since this is not a voice channel application, there is some question if Kitsap County should be asked to put up ICALL or ITAC repeaters. This is a complex issue since ITAC repeaters are also required of King County, the City of Tacoma and WSDOC in this area. CENCOM expressed a willingness to at least monitor the ICALL channel, and implement an ITAC repeater if a location could be found that fit.

It was felt that the applicant needed to revisit their selection of channels and sites, and submit additional maps at larger scales to allow evaluation of co-channel interference potential. A Motion was made and Passed to request the additional data, circulate it for review, have the Chair poll the members, and then Approve the application if new data supports the application.

## Kitsap Transit

Kitsap Transit is applying for 4 of the 8 channels from the Kitsap County pool for expansion of their existing trunked system.

As with the CENCOM application, the wide area coverage off of Gold Mountain and the scale of the maps did not allow the evaluation of the potential for adjacent channel interference into Skagit and Clallam counties.

There was considerable discussion about a transit operation securing these public safety channels and whether this was the best use of public safety spectrum. It was noted by some of the committee members however that Kitsap Transit is an eligible applicant and that there are no competing applications within Kitsap County. The applicant did note that they do share their system with other users today, and are certainly willing to do more of this in the future.

There was some discussion on whether we should (or could) require them to implement and monitor the ICALL channel, or any ITAC repeaters. Since they are not a public safety agency, and do not currently provide 7X24 dispatch center coverage, ICALL monitoring did not seem appropriate. Additionally, CENCOM has expressed a willingness to monitor ICALL channel. Further, as explained in the CENCOM discussion, the large number of other 800 MHz implementers in the Puget Sound area make additional ITAC repeaters difficult to locate.

A Motion was made and Passed to request new coverage plots, circulate them for review, have the Chair poll the members, and then Approve the application if new data supports the application.

## Southeast Communications Center

Southeast Communication Center has applied for mobile licensing on all the interoperability channels. A Motion was made and Passed to approve this application.

## King County

King County has applied to use four channels on a secondary basis for mobile and portable simplex use only. The goal of this application is to gain additional simplex capability, noting that the 5 STATEOPS channels are not sufficient in heavily populated area. Further, there is a need for one or more simplex channels that can carry encrypted communications, and this is not allowed on the STATEOPS channels. The channels selected should not pose a co-channel or adjacent channel interference problem to any area assigned these channels on a primary basis.

There was considerable discussion by the group on this. It was clarified that simplex operations would only occur in King County and the immediate mutual aid areas, and since simplex communications would be on the repeater output frequencies, these mobiles and portables would not interfere with the inputs to these channels if they were implemented in other areas.

Pat Buller suggested using some of the unassigned pool frequencies for this use, but on examination it was felt that given where they had been assigned, there would be too much potential for adjacent channel interference. Alan Hull noted that WSDOT already uses mobile only licensing for simplex purposes on the guard channels in between their statewide channels and this works with no problems to the adjacent channels. The group agreed that this was a useful concept and was appropriate as long as careful selection of frequencies was practiced.

A Motion was made and Passed to approve channel 728 and 729 and conditionally approving 730 and 750 only if guard channels could not be found to substitute for these.

#### Washington State Department of Corrections

##### Walla Walla

WSDOC has applied to use channels previously approved for WSDOC at their Walla Walla facility. A Motion was made and Passed to approve this application.

##### Larch

WSDOC has applied to use channels previously approved for WSDOC at their Larch Corrections Center facility in Clark County. The original application was revised to move ITAC-3 down to the camp and place one of the WSDOC channels up on Larch. A Motion was made and Passed to approve this application.

##### Coyote Ridge

WSDOC has applied to use channels previously approved for WSDOC at their Coyote Ridge facility in Franklin County. A Motion was made and Passed to approve this application.

##### Cedar Creek

WSDOC has applied to use channels previously approved for WSDOC at their Cedar Creek facility in Thurston County. A Motion was made and Passed to approve this application.

##### Clallam Bay

WSDOC has applied to use channels previously approved for WSDOC at their Clallam Bay facility in Clallam County. Fred Radovich reviewed the design being used for this institution. It is very unique and uses several sites and control links to cover the large area that the Clallam Bay facility moves prisoners through. A Motion was made and Passed to approve this application.

## NEW BUSINESS

There was some general discussion on a number of other topics, including how long we plan on holding channels for counties that show no motion towards implementing the assigned channels, and how we would deal with requests from neighboring counties for this spectrum. It was decided that this should perhaps be a topic for the next regular meeting, or perhaps even a spring meeting prior to the next filing window. The Chair will try to schedule a meeting.

Being no other business to come before the group, the meeting was adjourned at 1630.