

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SAFETY NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

+ + + + +

IMPLEMENTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

THURSDAY
JANUARY 31, 2002

+ + + + +

The Implementation Subcommittee met in the Commission Meeting Room, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. at 11:55 a.m. Edward Dempsey, Subcommittee Chair, presiding.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

Opening Remarks 3
Report of DTV Work Group 3
Report on Regional Planning Committees 11
New Business 13
General Discussion 19

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 11:55 a.m.

3 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: Good morning. Okay, I
4 think we will get started.

5 We will be relatively brief today, as we
6 are kind of just moving along with our mission, and
7 our mission has been in the past year to follow the
8 transition -- well, the alleged transition -- of DTV
9 television, to free up some spectrum. Also, we have
10 been keeping track of the 700 megahertz RPC group
11 status.

12 So, as far as working groups go, the
13 working group that is the most active in our
14 Subcommittee is Dave Eierman's for DTV. We will get a
15 report from David, which will give us a pretty good
16 summary of where the DTV transition has gone so far.

17 David?

18 MR. EIERMAN: Over the last year -- I
19 think I have probably reported some of this before,
20 but over the last year there has been some attempts, I
21 guess, by the FCC to speed up the DTV transition
22 process. After September 11th, the FCC has an MO&O

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that came out that actually possibly slowed up some of
2 the transition.

3 I've got several pages of writing here. I
4 will try to summarize these rather than read them.

5 But going back to January of last year,
6 the third Report and Order allowed voluntary
7 negotiations for band-clearing or an incumbent TV
8 station could negotiate with an auction winner or a
9 wireless carrier and allow even three-way trades where
10 they could trade with another TV station in the core
11 spectrum.

12 There's been some other activity. As I
13 mentioned, the FCC came out with another Order in
14 September that allows the analog stations in 60
15 through 68 that have DTV allocations below, in the
16 core spectrum of 2 through 51, to relinquish their
17 operations on 60 through 69 and operate in the analog
18 mode on their core spectrum channel assignment until
19 2005 or until 70 percent of the local market is
20 penetrated -- or 70 percent penetration by digital
21 receivers in the local market.

22 So, basically, what it does is it gives

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these unique group of DTV stations, and it is about 80
2 analog stations out of about 140 stations in that
3 band, a delay of about 31 months where they can not
4 operate in DTV mode or not to have to simulcast. They
5 can just go to the other channel, operate analog, and
6 switch over to DTV at a later date.

7 I think the example that has been given is
8 Channel 65 in Kentucky. They have a Channel 7
9 assignment. They could abandon 65, move to 7, operate
10 there for two-and-a-half years, and then switch over
11 to digital later.

12 The National Association of Broadcasters
13 and the Association of Maximum Service Telecasters
14 petitioned the FCC with some concerns about that, that
15 these new analog stations that would be moving into
16 the core spectrum would have to be short-spaced based
17 on the existing analog TV spacing rules, and they
18 probably would not be able to operate at full power on
19 those new assignments unless -- well, they probably
20 would not be able to operate at full power because
21 they potentially could interfere with either new DTV
22 assignments or existing analog assignments.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So the FCC, you know, loosened their --
2 you know, tried to help speed up transition, and the
3 broadcasters have concerns about that.

4 In November the FCC issued an MO&O -- I
5 think it is 00-330 -- which was related to the
6 biennial review of the DTV transition, something I
7 guess they are going to do every two years, basically,
8 reviewing what the progress is and if there's any
9 tweaking of these transition rules required.

10 Their conclusion basically was that the
11 far-out goals of meeting market -- you know, 2006
12 deadline, and simulcasting requirements in 2004 and
13 2005 should stand, but there's possibility some
14 relaxation needed in meeting the requirements in 2002.

15 One of the things that is discussed there
16 is the early election of channel, where the
17 broadcasters are given a second assignment, and
18 sometime before 2007 they have to decide which channel
19 they're going to abandon and which channel they're
20 going to operate in the DTV mode on.

21 Earlier there had been a date proposed of
22 December 31st, 2003, for commercial stations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Basically, all these dates are a year later for public
2 television. But they had to decide which channel they
3 were going to keep and which channel they were going
4 to abandon by the end of 2003.

5 What the FCC decided is that they are
6 going to basically defer that deadline. They're not
7 going to have to declare by that date, and there's
8 been no date set. The date would probably be set in
9 the next review. Since it is a biennial review, I
10 would assume that that is sometime in 2003, is when
11 they would set the new deadline.

12 Service area replication, originally, the
13 broadcast service had to replicate the original analog
14 service area by December of 2004. That was to retain
15 interference protection against other users or new
16 users that wanted to come into the band. Basically,
17 if they didn't meet that date, they lost their
18 protection of whatever area they hadn't covered at
19 that time from interference protection.

20 Again, the FCC deferred this deadline and
21 has not set a new deadline; plus, they are also going
22 to allow the broadcasters to implement facilities at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lower power initially. As long as they cover the
2 smaller community of license, you know, the community
3 they are actually licensed to cover, they don't have
4 to construct facilities that cover the full Grade B
5 contour area. You know, you are dealing with
6 something that is 10 or 20 miles in radius -- I mean,
7 yes, radius -- versus something that is 50 or 60
8 miles in radius. So as long as they are on the air by
9 the initial construction date covering at least the
10 community of service, they will retain this
11 interference protection for the full service area, as
12 long as they meet the later construction dates.

13 Construction deadlines, supposedly all
14 approximately 1300 commercial stations -- I think it
15 is 1280-some -- were supposed to be constructed by May
16 1st of this year, May 1st, 2002, to cover at least
17 their community of license. So far, there's only
18 about 200 commercial stations and about 40 public
19 television stations that are constructed and fully on
20 the air and operational. So there's like 90 days left
21 to get those other over a thousand stations
22 constructed.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 A lot of those stations haven't received a
2 construction permit from FCC, for various reasons.
3 Some of them require border negotiations with Canada
4 and Mexico, and some of them have tower problems. I
5 think Chicago has one. I guess New York currently has
6 a tower issue.

7 So the FCC said that these stations could
8 ask for an STA, a temporary authorization, to actually
9 construct earlier, you know, start transmitting
10 earlier, even though they don't have their final
11 construction permit from the FCC. So, you know, it
12 was an attempt to speed up getting those stations on
13 the air.

14 Currently, it is a drop-dead deadline of
15 meeting that construction date of May 1st, but the FCC
16 said they would consider extension of that deadline on
17 a case-by-case basis, if the station can demonstrate
18 that there is some financial hardship. I guess the
19 issue has come up that, you know, we are in a
20 recession and the September 11th issue. So I guess if
21 the stations can now demonstrate that there's
22 financial reasons they can't meet the initial

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 construction date, they can get an extension.

2 However, they still need to meet the later
3 dates of being 50 percent on the air by the end of the
4 next year and 75 percent by the next and 100 percent
5 by the following year. So they are only waiving the
6 initial construction date.

7 Also of note is the legislation introduced
8 into the Congress by Jane Harmon. She's a
9 Congresswoman from California. Basically, this
10 Homeland Emergency Response Operations Act is to
11 basically close the 85 percent market penetration
12 loophole. Basically, they want to change it from
13 there being a market penetration loophole to a drop-
14 dead date of January 1st, 2007, when all these TV
15 stations on 60 through 69 have to be off the air and
16 the spectrum turned over to public safety services.

17 That's it. Keep monitoring what is going
18 on. Not much activity in Canada. They do have a
19 Notice of Inquiry out which many public safety
20 organizations responded to about opening up the 700
21 band to mobile services.

22 I have looked at Mexico's assignments, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think there's only like one or two potential
2 interferers in the San Diego area. The rest of the
3 border is fairly open.

4 That's it.

5 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: Thanks, David.

6 Bette Rinehart has been following the
7 progress of the Regional Planning Committees
8 throughout the country, and she is going to give us a
9 brief report on the status of the regions that are
10 formed and the regions that are considering forming.

11 MS. RINEHART: Okay. Of the 55 Regional
12 Planning Committees at 700 megahertz, 27 have held
13 their first meeting or else set a date for their first
14 meeting. This past month of January has been
15 extremely active. There were four Regional Planning
16 Committees that had their initial meeting this month.

17 I see there are four Regional Planning Committees
18 that have selected a convener, but have not yet
19 selected a meeting date. So that makes a total of 31
20 that are in the initial stages or further along.

21 There are three, of the ones that have
22 been convening, who have finished a draft plan. I am

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pretty sure that Michigan voted on theirs in either
2 January or the end of December, and Southern
3 California and Missouri have finished a draft plan and
4 they both intend to vote on those drafts at their next
5 meeting, which will be in March and in April.

6 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: Thank you, Bette.

7 For our Year 3 report, which we will be
8 submitting before the next meetings, Dave is going to
9 give us a summary report of the DTV activity and also
10 of the FCC activity relative to DTV transition.

11 We are also following the NLECTC, which is
12 still hard to say, database, and we are still watching
13 the other committees which are Interoperability and
14 Technology. As their document grow and change with
15 their further work, we will be folding that into our
16 document.

17 We are also monitoring the status of any
18 of the petitions for reconsideration or clarification
19 that are out there now presently regarding DTV or the
20 700 megahertz band. We hope to have that report
21 finished before the next meetings.

22 Just one comment on the RPCs: I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that after September 11th the significance of the RPCs
2 and their importance to the region for communications
3 has taken on, I guess, a new importance. In New York,
4 where the Regional Planning Commission Committee, was
5 essentially an organization that gave out frequencies
6 or tried to -- it is kind of hard to say without
7 embarrassing the New York metropolitan area and its
8 regard for interoperability.

9 But I could just say that the events of
10 September 11th have changed the way New York City
11 looks at the Regional Planning Committee now, and they
12 are looking more at using the new spectrum to build
13 some systems that will enhance interoperability within
14 the area. Unfortunately, an incident like that does
15 wake a lot of people up.

16 We have some new business we would like to
17 talk about. Fred Griffin has asked to talk about some
18 issues that he feels are important, especially now in
19 the wake of a greater need for spectrum and
20 interoperability for homeland security. So I will
21 turn the mike over to Fred.

22 MR. WILHELM: Ted, before you do, just a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 short announcement: We will have a get-together of
2 the sponsors, the Steering Committee, and the
3 Subcommittee Chairs tomorrow morning at 8:45 in the
4 hearing rooms immediately the Commission meeting room;
5 8:45 tomorrow morning, sponsors, Steering Committee,
6 Subcommittee Chairs, pastries, coffee, and
7 conversation.

8 (Laughter.)

9 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: Thank you, Michael.

10 Fred?

11 MR. GRIFFIN: Yes. I found the last
12 meeting in New York very educational, very helpful,
13 and I put out a general email on the list server.
14 Some of you may have seen it.

15 But the presentation that Steve Souder
16 gave of common resources or the definition of
17 interoperability and what was decided by the COG group
18 after Air Florida roughly 10 years ago to have some
19 form of common equipment, common resource, and how
20 that has percolated through about 10 years of how that
21 assumption of common resource really paid off for the
22 Pentagon disaster was very enlightening to me.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And the last three days to today was also
2 very enlightening to me on what is going on at PSWN,
3 where Steve elaborated on the next step, which
4 apparently there's -- and I don't know who or what,
5 but there is an agreement or policy that all equipment
6 from south of Washington to north of Baltimore will be
7 a common resource, and what that basically identifies,
8 it will all be Motorola Smart Net, because that's the
9 embedded investment there.

10 The other speeches that went on hinged on
11 the fact of, what is interoperability? Apparently,
12 what has been generally agreed to or understood in the
13 North/South Carolina region, and apparently it is
14 working its way through the whole Southeast, is going
15 to be interoperability is, when somebody calls you
16 like they have an incident down at Myrtle Beach and
17 you may be in Asheville, North Carolina, to help out
18 across a state line, you pick up your radio, along
19 with everything else you need, and you go and the
20 radio works while you're in transit, which is the
21 North Carolina Sun Network, down through South
22 Carolina, and when you get there, you find out your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 antenna is broke because you put it in your briefcase
2 and your battery is dead because you used it too much,
3 and you go into the local agency and they've got a
4 compatible set of accessories because it is all the
5 same equipment. Then you swap out the batteries and
6 go on about your business.

7 What that leads to, in my mind, and this I
8 guess is a challenge to the NCC Steering Committee and
9 above, is we may be in the realm of backward-thinking
10 when you need some new thinking. I was particularly
11 interested in the second page of the handout of the
12 speech by the Homeland Security man here, which is in
13 the back of the room, where he says, "We need to
14 implement seamless national strategies for a new
15 communication system."

16 I think, and we are not going to debate
17 this today, but I agree that we are setting the stage
18 for the next meeting as a major topic, is what the
19 real world requirements for interoperability is a
20 common carrier-based infrastructure and separating
21 infrastructure from the subscriber units. That is
22 kind of where the real world is going at this point in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time, and I don't think there is any criticism that
2 needs to be leveled at all at anything that is going
3 on, activity at this point, but I think the world is
4 changing; the requirements are changing. So maybe we
5 ought to have a relooking at what our goal is.

6 Now as a result of my Internet blast
7 across the list server, while I was busily working
8 hard in the middle of a vacation in the Caribbean on a
9 sailing cruise -- as I say, that was a joke; I had a
10 real good vacation -- we had an email in our office
11 from Jim Harping from the State of Alaska supporting
12 that kind of thinking and would like to discuss it
13 more. I haven't previously said this to Ted, and he
14 hasn't seen this, but I think that for the next
15 meeting he specifically ought to be invited to say
16 whatever he's got to say. I've got his name, address,
17 and email. He's the Information Service guy from the
18 State of Alaska.

19 Also, the other thing which has come into
20 office as a result of our work is that the APCO 25
21 impact has not decreased the cost of systems. There
22 is roughly a 15 percent increase when you specify APCO

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 25.

2 So, with all that said, what Ted and I
3 agreed is we are trying to set up on the agenda to be
4 discussed, debated, argued about, consensus reached,
5 or whatever, the subject of: What are our real goals
6 and where should NCC go, and what are the new
7 requirements regarding whatever Ted wants to call it,
8 interoperability, new system technology, or whatever?

9 I hope I have the done job of setting the background
10 for you today.

11 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: I think that what I
12 would like to do is, since it has become a hot topic,
13 at least on the list servers, open it up to some
14 discussion today as: Do we want to ask the Steering
15 Committee to look at this any further? I would like
16 to get a consensus. If anybody would like to discuss
17 this now, I think it is a good time to at least get it
18 started.

19 In my opinion, it is something that we
20 have discussed several times. I was one of the
21 speakers about a year ago discussing types of
22 standards and why public safety needs, I should say,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more stringent standards and more specific standards
2 that are based on their needs.

3 Fred has asked for this to be brought up
4 at the Subcommittee level. So I would just like to
5 open up the floor to some discussion on whether or not
6 we continue with this or not.

7 MR. POWELL: John Powell.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: John.

9 MR. POWELL: I think we have discussed
10 this over and over again. We use commercial services
11 for noncritical communications. All we have to do is
12 look at September 11th and look at what failed.
13 There's no way that the public safety services in New
14 York City or here could have carried out their mission
15 using commercial services, because they were
16 nonexistent or they were completely backlogged. That
17 existed for days. We heard that, I think, very
18 clearly at the last meeting. If we did not have our
19 own systems, redundant systems, fortunately I think in
20 the case of New York City, we would still be
21 recovering.

22 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: Yes, I agree with John.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 As I have said at previous meetings, it is on the
2 record that I am a firm believer in separation of
3 commercial versus public safety. I don't want to get
4 too into it, but as someone that was there on
5 September 11th whose wife immediately assumed that I
6 went down to the site and was killed, trying to get
7 through to her on my cell phone was useless. Trying
8 to get through to her on the public switch network was
9 essentially useless. And I can imagine that there
10 must have been thousands and thousands of people
11 besides the public safety people that were trying to
12 get a hold of others.

13 I will say that the police department did
14 put out requests for help from the commercial
15 carriers. They brought in for headquarters COWS,
16 cells on wheels, placed them all around headquarters,
17 giving the police department the ability to
18 communicate with their cell phones or IDNs, you know,
19 Nextel-types, because there was no telephone service
20 in police headquarters. That went on for two-and-a-
21 half to three weeks before they could get some lines
22 in.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There is a need -- and this is my opinion,
2 not the Subcommittee's opinion -- again, there is need
3 for a partnership with the commercial carrier people.

4 But speaking as a retired NYPD police officer, I just
5 do still believe that there's a significant importance
6 to redundancy, reliability, diversity that we will
7 never get from a commercial carrier.

8 MR. POWELL: And coverage.

9 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: And coverage.

10 MR. POWELL: In the areas where we don't
11 have a choice but to provide coverage, they often have
12 the choice not to provide coverage. The oft-
13 advertised nationwide service for these little things
14 right here, I guarantee you is not nationwide.

15 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: Something that I can
16 speak from, you know, the NYPD's radio network took a
17 major hit on September 11th. We lost radio tie lines.

18 We lost a couple of sites, not that many. And we
19 still, our system was still able to bring about
20 effective communications from the police officers at
21 the scene and the citywide units responding to the
22 scene, and the interoperability channels that were put

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in place a couple of years ago.

2 It was because of redundancy and coverage
3 that we had radio systems working: overlapping
4 coverage, additional receiver sites. The philosophy
5 in the NYPD was, if it takes you four receivers to
6 cover an area effectively, six would be better; eight
7 is the optimum. Because if you lose half the system,
8 it still works.

9 So, again, going back to Commissioner
10 Wax's statement at the last NCC meetings in Brooklyn,
11 which I guess is redundant in itself, is that you
12 can't stress the importance of redundancy,
13 reliability, and diversity in your networks.

14 You know, West Street, which was between 5
15 and 7, or diagonally between 5 and 7, was a major wire
16 center for Verizon. That center, although the
17 building withstood the impact of the buildings falling
18 on top of it, the vault which was underneath was
19 completely crushed and flooded with water. The entire
20 Financial District, as well as the majority of the
21 cellular carriers, had service through that wire
22 center.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. POWELL: That is not to say that we
2 don't need to look to the future and to encourage the
3 commercial services to provide the things that we
4 need, and we will use them more. I don't think we
5 will ever become fully dependent upon them for
6 mission-critical communications. It just won't
7 happen.

8 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: Right, and I agree that
9 we should pursue, public safety should pursue a better
10 partnership with the carriers for lots of reasons:
11 for the ability to prevent another communications
12 blackout in a New York City-type environment or a
13 September 11th-type environment. Priority access is
14 very important, something we should also be discussing
15 with the carriers more fervently now after the events
16 of September 11th.

17 I'll just finish this up and then I will
18 give it back to Fred.

19 I know, just from experience, the Police
20 Department, New York City Police Department, uses
21 Nextel extensively because it is a great way to take
22 the administrative traffic off of your real public

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 safety network. So I do believe that there is a
2 partnership. I, myself, participated in a partnership
3 using two-way, hand-held pagers. We issued them to
4 the Housing Bureau officers and to detectives, you
5 know, where they can communicate among themselves, and
6 as well as communications, they're allowed to run
7 plates. It has turned out to be a great project.

8 It is another public safety
9 carrier/private industry partnership that has worked
10 very well. But for mission-critical, again my
11 opinion, for mission-critical applications such as
12 your primary dispatch, citywide interoperability
13 channels, I don't think that that could ever be handed
14 off to a nongovernment entity.

15 MR. GRIFFIN: I didn't do my job, because
16 I agree with everything that has been said here. I
17 didn't convey the impression of the task or the
18 challenge. Let me try again.

19 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: I know you're going to
20 go ahead, but I don't think we got the impression that
21 you were advocating --

22 MR. GRIFFIN: But I agree with everything

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that has just been said here, but I don't think I
2 conveyed the new concept. You can dock my wages.
3 Will you?

4 (Laughter.)

5 As it was described in the PSWN meeting
6 here, and they used the example of, I believe it was,
7 Texas and New Mexico, or New Mexico and Arizona. But
8 you went across a state line, and you had one vendor's
9 proprietary hardware on one side and another vendor's
10 proprietary hardware on another side. What the
11 practical side of the industry is gravitating to, as I
12 see it, and this is Fred Griffin's thoughts only, is
13 you are developing something like what was in China
14 where you had spheres of influence where you have a
15 different set of things.

16 Take, for example, Virginia. You've got
17 central Virginia down there that happens to be an
18 Ericson system or M/A-COM, or whatever you want to
19 call it now, but just north of it you are going to
20 have a Motorola system in Charlottesville. So there
21 is not a commonality.

22 So if you have an incident in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Charlottesville and they call for support from
2 Lynchburg, you've got different equipment, and so
3 forth. So we are talking about a commercial carrier;
4 we are talking about in some form a common carrier
5 infrastructure so you do have a commonality and a
6 common resource. So we are not talking about
7 regenerating the old thoughts and the old discussion.

8 We are talking about something new. The fellow from
9 Alaska had a lot to say on this, and I am not even
10 going to try to repeat it. My point is it is a new
11 concept or a new idea and not the old stuff, no.

12 MR. SORLEY: Tom Sorley from Orange
13 County, Florida.

14 I think that a few short years ago people
15 would be shocked to know that they could sit in this
16 chamber and type on the Internet and all those sort of
17 things. We have to stop thinking like we have always
18 been thinking.

19 Commercial carriers don't currently
20 provide what we need. Maybe they never will. But the
21 fact remains we still need a nationwide seamless
22 system to talk. We all, most of us have coverage in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our own areas. A few short years ago in Orange
2 County, in my area, people would have rolled over and
3 played dead if you told them we could have all talked
4 to each other. Now we have one system; we all talk.

5 The State of Florida is building a system.

6 The State of Michigan has a system, the State of
7 Utah. I can go on and on, these statewide systems
8 that just a few short years ago people would have
9 thought you are crazy if you said that they could
10 actually pull that off, and now it is being pulled off
11 all over the country.

12 So I think we shouldn't dismiss the
13 concept of a nationwide seamless system simply because
14 we want to say the commercial carriers can't provide
15 it. Maybe that is not the answer. Maybe the answer
16 is we have to provide. Maybe we all come together
17 and, instead of being fragmented, we all get together
18 and say this is the way we have to do it.

19 In my area there's many cities that have
20 their own little systems and they pay a lot of money,
21 and I have a radio system that covers the complete
22 city, but yet they don't use it, because of political

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 reasons, or whatever. So I am just saying that there
2 can be a nationwide seamless system. It doesn't have
3 to be commercial. It can be provided by us, if we
4 just get together and come to terms with what we need
5 to do and make it happen. The Internet happened. It
6 can happen.

7 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: I just want to clarify
8 that the Subcommittee and my statements earlier I'm
9 sure were not against a nationwide network. This
10 Subcommittee supported the PSWN activities for a
11 public safety wireless network. I don't think that
12 any of us -- and I just want to make sure it is on the
13 record -- have ever taken the position of not
14 supporting a nationwide infrastructure.

15 In fact, years ago, prior to trunking and
16 prior to all the new technology, we essentially could
17 have had in the old FM, analog radio system mode,
18 essentially had a nationwide seamless network, if not
19 for the fact that we were all in different bands. I
20 mean, it is difficult when you have an embedded base
21 and you have spectrum across the broad region, but
22 nothing contiguous.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I mean, the simple answer, which we
2 discussed during PSWAC, which we all had great laughs
3 about, was: Why not put public safety everywhere into
4 one continuous band?

5 MR. GRIFFIN: Were you laughing at that?

6 CHAIRMAN DEMPSEY: Not I. I was not
7 laughing. I thought it was a great idea. I was one
8 of the proponents of it.

9 But there was a great cry from the public
10 safety users who from, let's say, the State of Montana
11 who would never give up their low-band system because
12 it allows them to put one antenna up, plug in the
13 middle of the State, and they could talk to all their
14 cars. They were happy. Bob was there with me.

15 I discussed that briefly at one meeting.
16 I couldn't decide who was going to kill me first, the
17 public safety users or the Commission.

18 I don't think any of us don't support a
19 public safety infrastructure that would be nationwide,
20 but in a country such as this where we don't mandate,
21 the FCC doesn't mandate standards, it is a free
22 enterprise nationwide, we've got an embedded base of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 spectrum that is everywhere from low-band now to soon
2 to be 4.9 gigahertz. So that is going to be something
3 that is difficult.

4 Then my closing statement is, that is a
5 great idea. Who's going to fund it? Here we go back
6 to, it is more important -- you know, I just read in
7 The New York Times that \$20 billion will be spent in
8 the next year-and-a-half to two years on research for
9 the delivery of medication in a new way that would not
10 require people from swallowing a pill anymore. Now I
11 think \$20 billion would be enough to build a
12 nationwide network, conservatively, yes, but the
13 priorities here are different because I guess of the
14 type of country that we are. Then, again, that is one
15 man's opinion.

16 MR. HOFMEISTER: Ernie Hofmeister, M/A-COM
17 Wireless.

18 In the spirit of real-world
19 interoperability, I would just like to share a couple
20 of comments that we shared with the Project 25
21 Steering Committee last summer, based on questions
22 asked to us. I think that is consistent with Fred's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 considerations here.

2 I think the real-world situation is,
3 within public safety we are going to have a variety of
4 systems deployed, a variety of modulations or
5 interfaces, and so on. Some are going to be standard.
6 Others are not going to be standard.

7 But I think with the emerging technology
8 there are some opportunities that we should get
9 together and talk about in terms of network
10 interoperability, with some powerful gateways, some
11 other kinds of things. I think, if we thought about
12 that, there are some opportunities to enhance the
13 interoperability. There are some challenges that come
14 with that, and then encryption and all kinds of things
15 like that. But I think there are some opportunities
16 that could be gained with looking at some of the
17 networks and gateways and other things.

18 One example is that the Department of
19 Commerce considers this system called the Digital
20 Network Management System. It is sort of floundering
21 right now, but I think the concept there and the
22 possibilities with technologies are worth considering

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in an environment. Certainly we would be happy to
2 participate, if you decided to have something at the
3 next meeting.

4 CHIEF McEWEN: I agree with what Ernie
5 said. I think that there are opportunities to do some
6 things. I think the idea of a nationwide
7 infrastructure is a wonderful idea that is a pie-in-
8 the-sky, cockamamie idea. It just ain't going to
9 happen.

10 We don't have -- it ain't going to be \$20
11 billion or \$40 billion. It is humongous, and there
12 isn't any commercial -- there is not the funding
13 support that you have from all of the millions of
14 customers that you have in the commercial world. So
15 there is no question but what it would be wonderful to
16 do that, but I have been around too long to expect
17 that we would ever see the kind of money that it would
18 take or the time. There wouldn't be anybody alive in
19 this room if we ever accomplished that. So it would
20 be probably our grandchildren's grandchildren.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Hey, that's not bad,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 though.

2 (Laughter.)

3 MS. WARD: Marilyn Ward. I'm not
4 representing anybody but myself at this moment.

5 I think that we talk about this all the
6 time, about how wonderful this nationwide network
7 would be. We saw the airlines go and get \$20 billion
8 in a week after September 11th. Twenty billion
9 dollars on the federal side is not \$20 billion to
10 Orange County, Florida, where I come from; let's face
11 it.

12 The question that I would pose to this
13 group is: Maybe this is our time to do that. Is this
14 not a recommendation that we should be making? I
15 mean, we can talk about it here. We preach to the
16 choir all the time. We are the same people who always
17 come to the room. We always say the same things, and
18 we talk about the pie-in-the-sky. Is this not the
19 opportunity for us to say -- I mean, is this report
20 going to be read by anybody that really cares? If it
21 is, then why would we not say what we really think
22 things should be, even if we know in our hearts of all

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701