

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

+ + + + +

NATIONAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

INTEROPERABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE

+ + + + +

THURSDAY

NOVEMBER 21, 2002

+ + + + +

The Subcommittee met in the Auditorium of the New York Fire Department Headquarters, 9 Metrotech Center, Brooklyn, New York, at 9:00 a.m., John Powell, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

| | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|
| JOHN POWELL | Chairman |
| STEVE DEVINE | Member |
| ROBERT SCHLIEMAN | Member |
| MICHAEL WILHELM | Designated Federal Officer to NCC |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

I N D E X

2

Page

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Introduction and Welcoming Remarks | 3 |
| Approval of Agenda | 8 |
| Subcommittee Action Items | 9 |
| Breakout into Working Groups | |
| Other Business | |

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

Time: 9:05 a.m.

MR. WILHELM: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's a little after nine o'clock, and we would like to get started with the Subcommittee meetings.

A couple of housekeeping matters: As you may have noticed from the signs on the door, there is no food or drink allowed in the auditorium, and I would very much appreciate it if you would honor our hosts' request in that regard.

As we have done in the past, the subcommittees will just meet in sequence, not according to any particular schedule, so that when we are through with the Interoperability Subcommittee matters, we will take a short break, and then go directly to the Technical Subcommittee.

There is no need to sign in today, but a reminder: When you come in tomorrow, to see Ginny -- to see Joy Alford at the table and sign in on the log that she has.

The FCC staff we will have here today is the Deputy for Public Safety in the Public Safety and Private Wireless Division, Ginny Kowalski. On my left

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 shaking hands is Greg Weintraub, and Joy Alford is
2 also at the table in back.

3 On the table you will find the letter that
4 went to the Chairman of the FCC from Kathy Wallman,
5 forwarding the recommendations from the NCC from the
6 last meeting. Appreciate it if you would take a look
7 at that letter to see if there are any necessary
8 additions or corrections to it.

9 With that, let me turn it over to John
10 Powell for the opening of the Interoperability
11 Subcommittee.

12 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Thank you, Michael.
13 Joy, could you let people know that we are getting
14 started, please. They can continue their discussions
15 outside.

16 Also on the table in the back of the room
17 is an agenda for this meeting, which is a single page.

18 There are two three-page documents. When we copied
19 them, the stapler was not working. So they are single
20 pages, but they are offset 90 degrees. So you should
21 have, in addition to the agenda, two other documents.

22 One of them is titled "NPSTC" or "Proposal
23 for NPSTC for Mobile Data Addressing," and the other
24 one is in bold print, and it simply starts at the top

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 of the page "Discussion," and that is another three-
2 page document.

3 I just want to make a couple of comments
4 in opening here. I am sure most of you saw
5 yesterday's USA Today which featured public safety
6 interoperability or lack thereof on the front page, an
7 article that originated out of the Denver area and had
8 input from, I believe, several people in this room as
9 well as a number of others who are very active with
10 the NCC. So interoperability certainly is in the
11 news.

12 Of course, as you read through that
13 article and others that are coming out recently, there
14 are, I think, certain solutions being highlighted. I
15 would just like to remind everyone that the
16 interoperability cat has many coats, many solutions,
17 and each of them needs to be carefully tailored to the
18 problem that is trying to be resolved.

19 Unfortunately, we see, I think, proposals
20 flying all over the place now for solutions that may
21 not be appropriate, and also price tags being floated
22 that may not be realistic by the time you get a system
23 installed to provide interoperability.

24 I don't think I probably need to remind

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 many of us in the room of that, because you are all in
2 that business already.

3 If we could turn to the agenda, I would
4 again ask Bob Schlieman if he is already set up to
5 handle the secretary duties for the meeting today.
6 Due to a crash of his computer -- or how many of them
7 now, Bob, three? Bob is being very hard on computers
8 recently.

9 We don't have the minutes available from
10 the last meeting, and I will get those -- Once he has
11 recovered to the point that he can provide the meeting
12 notes, we will get the minutes generated and
13 circulated from the last meeting, as well as this
14 meeting.

15 I also need to get that information in
16 before I can do a document update. We have had a
17 number of discussion threads going on since the last
18 meeting on the items that you will see under the
19 working group activities. You should have picked up
20 on those as they came across the listserv.

21 In particular, there has been discussion
22 on the channel nomenclature issue, which was, I
23 understand, a hot topic at the last meeting,
24 designating the interoperability channels with a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 special service designator. What was proposed was PI,
2 so that they do not inadvertently become assigned to
3 an agency for everyday use, which unfortunately
4 happens from time to time.

5 We need to look at a revision of one of
6 the recommendations that we made, Michael, after some
7 discussion. I think we put the wrong number in. So
8 that's on the agenda for today also.

9 Last, Dave Buchanan is not here today due
10 to pressing business back in California, and I have
11 asked Keith Devine -- Since Steve and Dave have been
12 working on a number of these issues that are within
13 the working group 6 area, I have asked Steve to just
14 continue leading that discussion when we get there.

15 If you have had a chance to look at the
16 agenda, I would ask if there are any corrections or
17 additions that need to be made to the agenda. Are
18 there items people would like to see added?

19 If not, we will start with working group
20 activities and Working Group 2. I wanted to highlight
21 the fact that the RTC guidebook published by NPSTC is
22 complete. I think those of us that have seen it are
23 very happy with the results.

24 When that group gets here, we will try to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 make a copy of that available for people to take a
2 look at. We also have copies for the Commission staff
3 and for the NCC Chair, Michael, once Dave gets here.

4 Do you guys have any additional comments
5 or activities regarding the standardized operational
6 plan? I know, Dave, you have been doing some work in
7 that area. Who else? Dave is busy reading up in the
8 front row. Do you have any additions to the
9 standardized operational plan at all to be offered?
10 None? Okay. I always want to give you that
11 opportunity.

12 Steve, it's all yours.

13 MR. DEVINE: Thank you, John. One of the
14 -- Several of the issues you will see in your agenda
15 with regard to the working group 3 of rules, policy
16 and spectrum planning -- several of the issues bleed
17 over, but there's a couple of high points that we
18 recommended at the last meeting.

19 We do have to make a correction to the
20 value of the NAC code, the recommended
21 interoperability channels. We had recommended the
22 nationwide interoperability CTTSS tone of 156.7 to
23 provide some continuity with the existing NCSPAC, the
24 87.112, and a network access code value.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 We would like to change that to dollar
2 sign 293, which is the default NAC code from the
3 dollar sign 61(f) that we had originally proposed. I
4 would like to bring that up as a correction to start
5 off to correct the document that Michael referred to
6 on the table in the back.

7 We felt that -- After some discussion, Bob
8 Schlieman recommended that we go to the default value
9 for the NAC code as compared to the value that was
10 designated. Any discussion, comments, on the shifting
11 of that NAC code to the default value out of the box?

12 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Let me just give a
13 little history on that. During the -- and when we are
14 talking NAC code, we are talking specifically the
15 project 25 digital series of documents.

16 At one point in the development of Project
17 25, an attempt was made to equate NAC codes to Pl
18 tones. For what reason, nobody could ever figure out,
19 because there really is no correlation between them.
20 But at one point a table was developed, and the 61(f)
21 NAC code happened to be the equivalent in that table
22 that came out from 156.7, which is the analog CTCSS
23 tone.

24 After further discussion, and since there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really is no correlation between those, we felt that
2 the manufacturer's default code of 293 was actually
3 much more appropriate to recommend, because that is
4 what would come standard off the shelf in a product
5 unless something else was loaded into the radio during
6 the programming.

7 So that is why we are recommending,
8 Michael, going to the default rather than the other
9 one, which really made no sense.

10 MR. WILHELM: Okay, I think that can be
11 done fairly informally. You can mention it to the
12 Steering Committee tomorrow and, if they approve,
13 which I'm sure they will, I will just issue an
14 addendum to the letter that went to Chairman Powell,
15 and that should take care of it.

16 MR. DEVINE: Okay.

17 MR. WILHELM: While I have the mike here,
18 I want to acknowledge the generosity of IXC
19 Corporation and Teddy Dempsey for providing the coffee
20 and rolls and bagels this morning. It was a great way
21 to start the meeting, and we really appreciate it.

22 MR. DEVINE: Thank you, John. Just to
23 clarify, the exiting 156.7 is still the recommendation
24 for analog operation. That remains the same on that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 letter.

2 Secondly, one of the other recommendations
3 from our last meeting was the expansion of the state
4 interoperability Executive Committee or the equivalent
5 authority below 512 with regard to interoperability
6 channels, in particular 00348, the VTEC and UTEC
7 designated FCC channels, as well as some coordination
8 at the state level, although not creating new rules
9 for established inter-system sharing channels in the
10 police, fire and emergency medical discipline.

11 Those recommendations -- The expansion of
12 the SIC to somehow provide somehow some direction with
13 regard to interoperability channels below 512,
14 including the VHF public host channels that are
15 utilized in some areas that are a recent Commission
16 addition to the interoperability resource, as well as
17 eventually the NTIA reg book channels that are
18 anticipated to be available for law enforcement
19 response in accordance with the Federal narrow band
20 mandate. So those are -- We are anticipating those.
21 They are not available at the moment, but we are
22 hoping that they will be.

23 Moving from that, the other issue that was
24 a significant discussion at the last meeting was the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 channel nomenclature for the interoperability
2 channels. There was much discussion. The original
3 convention was -- The first thought was an indicator
4 of the band and a four-letter designator indicating a
5 fire tactical or law enforcement tactical or emergency
6 medical tactical channel, and then a unique number at
7 the end of the -- trying to stay within the eight
8 character limit for most displays.

9 There was much controversy, indicating
10 that perhaps it was not consistent with what might be
11 expected by the users of these channels, the on-scene
12 first responder community. We have since reviewed
13 some of those, and it's certainly open for discussion
14 today. I'm sure it will be.

15 One of the recommendations was to leave
16 the band indicator as the first character of the
17 channel label and, instead of some kind of an FTAC or
18 LTAC, it would just be simply FIR, F-I-R, or LAW or
19 MED or any of the other designators. And if it was
20 not designated to a specific discipline, it would just
21 be TAC, and the last two characters would be -- I'm
22 sorry, the last three characters would be a unique
23 number, which we are anticipating, although there are
24 over 100 -- would be a unique number associated with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the specific channel.

2 The premise there is, if the number 78 was
3 the only thing heard, that could, by a particular
4 first responder, be associated with a particular
5 interoperability channel, and they would be able to
6 hear a portion of the last two characters and still be
7 able to use the resource.

8 So as an example, whereas previously we
9 had an FTAC or an LTAC convention, we would move
10 toward 1FIR39 or 4LAW78 or something along those
11 lines. I'd like to get some input and some discussion
12 on this.

13 We think it is important. In the last
14 week or so we were in San Diego for a software defined
15 radio convention, and there was a conference, and
16 there is going to be quite a bit of multi-band
17 portable and mobile equipment coming out. We feel it
18 is crucial that the first character indicate the band.

19 Right now, if we establish this convention
20 based on existing parameters, that might not reflect
21 where we are going to be in the next couple of years.

22 So I think it is important that we first establish
23 the band and use a nomenclature that is more in tune
24 with the users and what they are going to find

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 themselves using on scene in real life.

2 So we have acknowledged some of the
3 concerns about the previous convention, and they are
4 trying to find something that is more applicable on a
5 day to day basis, while still being able to get the
6 user to the right channel.

7 CHAIRMAN POWELL: We will put something
8 together. The idea again here is that the last three
9 characters, the number -- and we went to three,
10 because we think when we added all of the channels
11 together from all of the bands, that we are going to
12 be over 100 interoperability channels. So we went to
13 three characters for that.

14 That would be a unique number. So in
15 other words 001 would probably be, if we started in
16 the low band, would be low band, and 10-whatever, up
17 at the top then, would be up at the upper end of the
18 800 band, and those last three digits would be unique.

19 They would not be repeated in any of the bands.

20 There was another reason. Actually, in
21 theory, if we had a radio with a lesser number of
22 display characters, if they simply showed that three-
23 digit number, it would still make it a unique channel.

24 At the point we did the original research,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the manufacturers that we talked to all said on their
2 public safety radios that they would provide typically
3 a minimum of eight characters on the display. That's
4 why we based it on eight characters. However, should
5 someone come out with something lower than that, this
6 would also support that and still have an individual
7 ID that would be useful.

8 So it's open to discussion.

9 MR. DEVINE: And we would have one
10 character remaining. In VHF, for example, if it is
11 1FIR78, and we would use the designator D as in David
12 for the direct -- If it was in UHF, for example --
13 probably a better example -- the output talk-around
14 would be a D for direct designator.

15 So the input channel would be the number,
16 and the output channel talk-around would be the number
17 with the designator at the end. So that would be the
18 eighth character, especially in a band that was with a
19 number over 100. We would use all eight characters.

20 Any other discussion on channel
21 nomenclature? Seeing none, I assume consensus. It
22 was a hotly discussed topic at the last meeting.
23 There might be some comments on it. We certainly
24 welcome any input.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The other topic that was brought up was a
2 specific service code for interoperability channels,
3 The term PI for public safety interoperability after
4 the -- There are other service codes for different
5 visibility channels associated with each discipline,
6 but the term PI was brought up. We would like some
7 comment on that.

8 We have instances where through the cracks
9 we have designated intersystem sharing channels that
10 are used by other disciplines outside the system where
11 the discipline associated with the channel that it is
12 assigned to used as outputs, and there is no -- in
13 some instances, they are not being identified as being
14 interoperability channels. So that other disciplines
15 are using them as output channels and the like, and it
16 is causing a problem with regard to some of the
17 localities using these channels.

18 So we are inquiring whether or not a PI
19 service code would protect the channels and kind of
20 reclarify to the users that there is a unique special
21 intersystem sharing associated with some of these
22 channels. We would like some comment on that as well.

23 MR. SCHLIEMAN: And what does the PI stand
24 for, specifically?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. DEVINE: Public safety
2 interoperability.

3 CHAIRMAN POWELL: I guess my comment, to
4 start off with and direct this to -- primarily to the
5 Commission staff -- was that today, when a license is
6 issued, it only includes the channels for one service
7 on that license. We have many licenses out there
8 today, especially, for example, in the fire service,
9 where you will have all of your operational channels,
10 and then you will have 154, 265, 280, 295 on that same
11 license, and this wouldn't work that way.

12 It would require a separate license to be
13 issued for the interoperability channels unless the
14 Commission could issue a single license with more than
15 one service code on it, which would be, I think,
16 probably a major change in the licensing process.

17 MR. WILHELM: Yes, it certainly would be a
18 major change for ULS, and it is very, very difficult
19 to change ULS.

20 MR. DEVINE: Ron?

21 MR. HARASETH: Ron Haraseth, APCO. Yes, I
22 was going to basically talk about exactly what John
23 spoke to. Right now, public safety, there is only one
24 service code, being PW, other than the trunking and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 800 and some of those.

2 Right now, as Michael states, we cannot
3 put multiple service codes on an individual license,
4 and that would require a significant change within
5 ULS. Just a note.

6 MR. DEVINE: Is there the possibility
7 that, if we are going to corral the horses, for lack
8 of a better term, with interoperability to some
9 degree, and provide some consistency and some
10 standardization to a level that we haven't seen yet --
11 Is it possible that a channel that might contain -- or
12 a license that might contain interoperability channels
13 for multiple bands, that if there is a VHF user who's
14 got some 800 infrastructure that they are using in a
15 regional 800 system, is there the possibility that a
16 single license or an interoperable license an agency
17 can have that contains some of those channels?
18 Jeanne?

19 MS. KOWALSKI: Jeanne Kowalski, FCC. I'm
20 just going to return a question for purposes of
21 dialogue.

22 I think we are all struggling with the
23 question of what needs to be licensed in terms of
24 interoperability channels. Right now at 800 we do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 require licenses, but when you are looking at those
2 five VHF and four UHF trunked, it would be helpful to
3 hear from the Public Safety Committee and especially
4 the frequency coordinators about how do we look -- how
5 are we looking at this?

6 I mean, you really want all the mobiles to
7 talk. I don't know how much restriction we want to
8 make on these, and what's the value of licensing, if
9 these channels are designated in the rules for
10 interoperability. Can we have some dialogue on that?

11 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Robert Schlieman. On the
12 one hand, if the SCICs are agreed that the
13 responsibility for all public safety interoperability
14 channels and all of the SIECs were doing that, which
15 is not the case, then had they all been doing it, then
16 the SIECs could manage those channels, and that might
17 make the licensing issue less of an issue. But since
18 there is a lot of variability that can occur,
19 licensing of base stations, which has been the
20 standard for 800 -- mobiles are not required to be
21 licensed -- would be sufficient.

22 So I guess I would say that licensing base
23 stations is an important thing for control, if nothing
24 else.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. SPEIGHTS: On the Federal side, our
2 interoperability channels are going to be blanket
3 license. So we are not going to require each agency
4 to come in and say we are going to use channel XYZ in
5 this location, because the idea of an interoperability
6 channel is to be able to pick the channel when there
7 is an incident and use it, and not worry about whether
8 you have someone's signature on a license.

9 If I'm reading things right, you guys are
10 discussing us having these 100 or so interoperability
11 channels that range from low band all the way up to
12 700 -- I realize I'm talking about 700 predominantly
13 -- licensed to every single public safety entity in
14 this country. That's a nightmare.

15 You may want to explore some sort of a
16 blanket licensing agreement for this. Now it becomes
17 an enforcement issue. Obviously, it's going to be
18 difficult to enforce nationwide, whether local
19 entities will use these channels whenever they want.
20 I mean, you've got that problem anyhow, I think, but
21 that's something that you own.

22 Feds are not going to -- We don't plan on
23 licensing all of our 20 or so channels to every single
24 agency at every single location. It defeats the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 purpose of having channels set aside for incident and
2 command type of activities.

3 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Don, how are you going
4 to handle base stations? Are you going to license
5 base stations or not?

6 MR. SPEIGHTS: Well, typically, we do
7 license only base stations, but occasionally -- You
8 know, our database is not perfect, just like the FCC
9 database. Occasionally, what we do is we license the
10 base station, the repeater only, and then in the
11 record we will say how many mobiles is attached to it.

12 Now everywhere, does it show how many
13 mobiles? No. So that makes it difficult for us to do
14 analysis sometimes, but typically we only license base
15 stations, and each land-mobile assignment -- we call
16 it not a license; we call it an assignment. It's an
17 authorization -- will be authorized to use all of our
18 20 or so interoperability channels as a blanket
19 agreement.

20 MR. WILHELM: No, excuse me. Would you
21 identify yourself for the court reporter, please?

22 MR. SPEIGHTS: Yes. Harlin McEwen. No,
23 Don Speights from NTIA.

24 MR. WILHELM: Thank you, Don.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Don, so you do license
2 base stations for interoperability channels?

3 MR. SPEIGHTS: No, we don't. We license
4 base stations as a normal process of our frequency
5 authorization for the normal channels, but so far I
6 don't recollect -- and I'd have to check -- that we
7 actually require special or specific licenses for each
8 of those interoperability channels.

9 MR. SCHLIEMAN: And what type of control,
10 operational control procedure --

11 MR. SPEIGHTS: Well, we don't have exact
12 procedures. It's like we don't have an enforcement
13 branch. We don't go out -- We used to go out and
14 monitor and enforce. We don't do that. We don't have
15 the money to do that. Maybe Homeland Security will do
16 that. Who knows?

17 I don't think the FCC has the money.
18 Their enforcement -- Their field stations have been
19 closed down left and right over the past ten years,
20 and I don't know what the prognosis for the future
21 looks like. But does the fact that someone has a
22 license -- does that stop them from using a frequency,
23 you know, without authorization? I don't know.

24 I mean, there's a legal side of that, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 with Federal agencies we don't really have that
2 problem like you might with a state level agency or
3 even a private entity. I can understand the
4 difficulties in that, but if you are looking at making
5 interoperability channels easy to use -- Yeah, we have
6 abuse, too. We have people from FEMA that hand out
7 our -- I'm not going to say who -- hand out our
8 interoperability channels to state and locals and say
9 you guys can use them anytime you want, especially in
10 the 138 band.

11 It's difficult to stop that sometimes, but
12 the way we stop it is, when we find out that they are
13 using it, we stop it then. Our enforcement division
14 is actually the U.S. Marshal Service, and they are
15 busy doing other stuff. They are not going to go shut
16 -- You know, this is a very difficult issue.

17 So we look at it in the respect that, if
18 we tried to license all 34-plus -- actually, it's 50-
19 plus, but 34 predominant Federal agencies for all 20-
20 plus interoperability channels for multiple locations
21 throughout the United States, it becomes an
22 administrative nightmare.

23 Now if we did nationwide assignments,
24 which we do now for people like the FBI who have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 nationwide requirements, then that's just a paperwork
2 drill, because you can have no enforcement anyhow;
3 because you don't know where that person is at any
4 particular time.

5 So maybe that's -- I don't know. I'm just
6 saying maybe the states can have the license. But if
7 you look at 50,000-plus state and local entities
8 trying to license 100 interoperability channels, it
9 becomes a money issue, too, because that costs money
10 to apply for the license. Then it becomes an
11 administrative nightmare, and do you have any better
12 enforcement than you had if you had some sort of a
13 blanket agreement?

14 This is just a suggestion from Don, not
15 from NTIA.

16 MR. SCHLIEMAN: I think essentially the
17 parallel is between the Federal process and the state
18 interoperability executive committee related to the
19 statewide block of channels, where the state has free
20 rein to do whatever they want on those channels. If
21 the SIEC was in place, and it's not always the case,
22 then the SIEC could have blanket authority on the
23 interoperability channels.

24 MR. SPEIGHTS: That makes a lot more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 sense. But then -- and it's hard to hear sometimes
2 back there, but I think you had mentioned earlier that
3 you would like to expand the SIEC's authority to
4 channels below 512. If that were to happen, then that
5 would solve all those X number of channels below 512.

6 MR. SCHLIEMAN: How do you deal with those
7 states that did not invoke SIEC and defaulted to the
8 RPC? The RPC is not a legal entity in terms of
9 holding a license. Right?

10 MR. SPEIGHTS: I don't know. Ask Michael.

11 MR. WILHELM: Well, they are not
12 currently.

13 CHAIRMAN POWELL: I just want to make two
14 comments. Number one, I think most of us support the
15 idea that mobiles should not need to be licensed for
16 the interoperability channels. If you hold a license
17 in the band, then they should be available for you to
18 use.

19 On the other hand, base stations present a
20 particular problem, especially if you look at agencies
21 that could, in theory, without a license requirement
22 for base stations, on the higher bands where you have
23 repeaters, it becomes a real problem, because you
24 could key up from one location, you know, a dozen or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 two repeaters, and somebody has to be able to control
2 that.

3 Now if you have an SIEC that could do that
4 -- for example, and I'll use California, because I'm
5 very familiar with that, we have -- All of our
6 interoperability channels are licensed to the state of
7 California, and they very carefully control repeater
8 access and who can have repeaters and how they are
9 controlled, including setting, for example, on the one
10 UHF channel that we have, a different input tone, a
11 common output tone but a different input tone, across
12 the state. Repeaters have overlapping coverage. So
13 that you can select a single repeater, and that works
14 very well. But it's because it is controlled from one
15 location and because we today require a license for
16 base stations. That is giving a handle for some
17 enforcement, should that ever be necessary, which it
18 hasn't at this point.

19 MR. DEVINE: In response to Don Speights'
20 comment, I don't think we are looking at trying to
21 create a licensing process. I think we are trying to
22 clarify, and I think it is obvious that unlicensed
23 base stations with regard to interoperability can have
24 some serious impact to on-scene interoperable

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 capabilities.

2 So the current arrangement of licensing
3 the base stations and the mobile blanket license that
4 occurs in the VHF and UHF as well as 800 processes is
5 sufficient, I feel, for that.

6 When we discussed licensing, I didn't
7 necessarily infer that all 100 licenses, as Don would
8 say, all 100 frequencies, had to be licensed. What we
9 are referring to is that, if an agency had -- As it
10 stands now, you will find designated intersystem
11 sharing or interoperable channels on licenses in some
12 cases for base stations. In some cases you won't.

13 In some cases you won't see the mobiles,
14 and in some you do. But his premise that the states
15 need to be the contact point and develop the rules and
16 parameters -- areas in their state are going to use
17 different channels in different ways, and a lot of
18 that regional and local knowledge to allow them to
19 complete their mission, I think, is really the goal.

20 I think he is correct in saying I don't
21 think it's going to be beneficial to have each entity
22 license Federal channels. I don't think that is going
23 to happen, but I think to have those parameters
24 established at the state level is a viable

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 possibility. But we are not trying to create a
2 license debacle here.

3 CHAIRMAN POWELL: I think probably the
4 most important thing that we could do outside of
5 licensing things is to make sure that frequencies that
6 are reserved for interoperability use are clearly
7 footnoted in the rules for that purpose, and where we
8 have recommended that they be service specific -- and
9 the best example there is the VHF channels that have
10 been used for fire interservice, 154, 265, 280 and 295
11 for years need to be held for that use; because
12 nothing can mess up a major operation more than having
13 one agency with a base station on one of those
14 channels keying up right in the middle of an
15 operation, especially if you've got a bunch of
16 portables out there that are on fire ground trying to
17 talk, and somebody walks right over the top of them.

18 It's a safety issue for the officers that
19 are involved, and it's a coordination issue that, I
20 think, could easily be handled by the SIECs, if they
21 chose to do that in that state, as long as there was
22 something -- and I think the footnote would suffice --
23 clearly indicating that these channels are reserved
24 only for that use.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. DEVINE: The whole introduction of the
2 PI concept was protecting interoperability channels.
3 If that happens, we're okay with it. Fred?

4 MR. GRIFFIN: Fred Griffin, consulting
5 engineer. I would make one pleading directly to the
6 FCC through Jeanne in response to her question.

7 If you have any fixed facility, mutual
8 aid, interoperability or whatever, and the Commission
9 decides it's a blanket thing or unlicensed or
10 whatever, that's their prerogative. I'm not speaking
11 to that issue.

12 The issue I would like to bring to your
13 attention is you have a fixed facility that radiates
14 energy. It needs to be in the database someplace so
15 you can find it, so you can get around it or whatever
16 have you.

17 How this comes out, whether you have
18 licenses or not, people smarter than I can figure it.

19 But the thing you don't want is a bunch of facilities
20 out there radiating continuously and no database, so
21 you can't find them.

22 MR. HARASETH: Ron Haraseth, APCO. I'd
23 just like to reinforce what Fred said, that APCO being
24 the public safety MOU interference contact, it's very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 important that we have databases for interference
2 resolution that indicate where these base stations
3 are.

4 In addition, to expand on what Fred said,
5 we have some other situations. We have RF exposure
6 limits that -- and other design criteria that
7 consultants like Fred use to establish compatibility,
8 physical compatibility of frequencies and what-not at
9 given sites, and they need to know if a site includes
10 that type of frequency.

11 So base stations -- I would advocate very
12 strongly that any fixed site, permanent site, be
13 required to be licensed.

14 As an anecdotal thing, on the side of the
15 mobiles, in the state of Montana when we had mutual
16 aid frequencies that we designated, the state licensed
17 those and then produced authorizations. Well, in this
18 environment now nationwide in that same scenario, that
19 would be very, very cumbersome to have a state do
20 authorizations for every single individual entity.

21 The reason that we did that in Montana is
22 because there was nothing in the rules that indicated
23 these frequencies would be used for nothing but public
24 safety. If that were in the rules in the frequencies

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that we are advocating and the ones that are indicated
2 already for mutual aid and interoperability -- if that
3 was in the rules, then there would no longer be a
4 requirement for the states to maintain an
5 authorization and some sort of control.

6 It would be moving to a national level,
7 and then you could do a blanket license for the
8 mobiles in that scenario.

9 It is important to recall also, as far as
10 coordination goes on those frequencies, you do not
11 coordinate mutual aid interoperability frequencies.
12 You coordinate their use, and the use is done at a
13 regional, local level. So it is very important that
14 the SEICs or whoever is designated locally do that
15 operational coordination at the local level.

16 If they do not, that is a difficulty, and
17 I'm not sure that there shouldn't be some at least
18 basic guidelines for operation as a default and a
19 backup for those areas that do not formulate
20 interoperability rules, plus there is always the
21 possibility, if you don't have some very basic
22 interoperability operational guidelines for the
23 national level, you are going to have implementations
24 in different SIECs that may not exactly be compatible

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the way they are implemented.

2 So I would emphasize that that should be
3 addressed. As far as the cost for frequency
4 coordination, I think the coordinators can all give a
5 definite -- for base stations -- financial situation
6 where it's just strictly a pass-through or whatever it
7 costs to process the application.

8 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Ron, if I could ask you a
9 question on the database issue. I assume then that it
10 would be equally desirable that the state licensed,
11 single licensed, base stations should all be similarly
12 identified in a database that would be available for
13 interference analysis.

14 I wonder if perhaps -- I think your
15 suggestion has a lot of merit, and I suspect that
16 maybe, if the Commission is trying to reduce the data
17 log, if the SIECs or the states could maintain such a
18 database that would encompass both the state block and
19 the interoperability -- designated interoperability
20 channels for purposes of interference analysis.

21 MR. HARASETH: I heartily agree, and that
22 is no more evident than it is in the economic area
23 licensing that is causing a certain amount of problems
24 in the 800 band right now. There are some operations

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 out there that do not require having every frequency
2 licensed at a specific location for some of these
3 commercial carriers, and that's causing us a problem,
4 and that's a good thing to point to, particularly with
5 the 700 statewide out there.

6 It doesn't necessarily have to be with the
7 FCC. There is already the CAPRAD system out there,
8 and if the CAPRAD system is available to the
9 coordinators and to those people that are reviewing
10 interference situations, but as long -- you would
11 almost have to mandate it at that level. I'm not sure
12 the FCC would go to that point. But it could be
13 highly recommended perhaps.

14 MR. SCHLIEMAN; In the case of the CMRS --
15 and I guess I would observe that technically that same
16 problem could occur with the state block frequencies,
17 that the channels could be reassigned dynamically
18 during a day, according to the traffic load. Would
19 you have a suggestion on how that might be
20 accommodated in terms of the CAPRAD database?

21 I mean, I could see in a state database
22 that, when a change was made, the database was
23 modified accordingly in real time. But I don't know
24 how that works with the CAPRAD in terms of real time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. HARASETH: Difficult to say. I'm not
2 sure if I see the technology evolving in the 700 state
3 spectrum that would allow dynamic rebanding. I
4 suppose that it could happen. There is no reason why
5 they couldn't follow the same model that some of the
6 cellular people are following. Could be that they are
7 using the same equipment and the same switching
8 systems that cellular entities could be using.

9 So that is a scenario that is of concern.

10 MR. DEVINE: Just as a point, the original
11 intent wasn't for Fire mutual 154 or 280 to be -- We
12 weren't concerned about the fire discipline. It was a
13 nonuser who is not familiar with its interoperable
14 characteristics and some of the characteristics within
15 the footnote, a highway user, for example, who to them
16 it's just a number and the availability of it in
17 searches and the like for them to utilize that, and
18 for that to be licensed as an output in a different
19 discipline is really where the PI designator was
20 introduced, to somehow yell out that this is used as -
21 - has interoperable characteristics and is used in
22 many areas. So that was the original intent for it.

23 MR. HARASETH: True, but in the same
24 light, right now all the coordinators are very, very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 cognizant of all the footnotes for all the
2 frequencies, and they watch those very closely. I
3 think, creating an entirely different service category
4 for those and the changes that would be entailed in
5 ULS, along with the programs that the coordinators use
6 as well, would be very, very difficult.

7 I think that could really be addressed
8 through just clarifying the footnotes. The FCC has
9 asked in their most recent reevaluation of the rules
10 and regulations, and that is one area that could be
11 clarified.

12 The footnotes in general could be
13 clarified in a lot of situations. There is a lot of
14 carryover, archaic terminology in some of those
15 footnotes. There's some of them that need to be just
16 removed. There's some of them that need to be
17 clarified, and this would be a case that it could be
18 very clearly clarified.

19 MR. NASH: Glen Nash with the state of
20 California.

21 I, too, would support that the fixed
22 stations need to be licensed or captured on the
23 database someplace. We have -- We need to keep in
24 mind that, particularly on these interoperability

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 channels, that while we have been focused on the 700
2 megahertz here, that a lot of what we have been
3 suggesting we've been trying to move into the other
4 bands. Whereas, in the 700 megahertz band here, the
5 interoperability channels are set aside into a unique
6 block.

7 In the other bands, they are interleaved
8 in and amongst the other usable channels, and they are
9 immediately adjacent to channels that might be used by
10 other people for other purposes.

11 Therefore, to the extent that the
12 coordinators try to employ QST-88 to do an
13 interference analysis as they are doing coordination,
14 they need to know that those fixed stations are in
15 place. It does us little good to create an install an
16 interoperability system only to have it disabled by a
17 day to day use system being put in on top of it.

18 So we do need to know that information.
19 It is important as an engineering function and, you
20 know, from the standpoint of focus of coordination,
21 site analysis, interference analysis, all of that.
22 That is important information to know and, therefore,
23 I would suggest that we do need to license it.

24 Bob brought up -- To refocus a little bit

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here, you know, Bob brought up an interesting point on
2 the state licensed channels. Right now, there is no
3 process to capture that information. The states have
4 been given autonomy on how those channels are used and
5 everything.

6 You're right. You know, as part of all of
7 us, we have lost a bit of information that might be of
8 need and value in doing some engineering studies.
9 Again, you know, one thing that the FCC database has
10 always provided us was a method of finding out what is
11 licensed and in use in areas and, to the extent that
12 EA licensing has taken that information away from us,
13 state licensing is taking that information away from
14 us, the existing process for Federal licensing is --
15 you know, we've lost some of that information and
16 being able to do some of that analysis.

17 So we can't do all that we would like to
18 be able to do, just because the information isn't
19 available. So I think we do need to be careful about
20 making even less information available.

21 CHAIRMAN POWELL: I would think that, Ron,
22 in your role as mitigating disputes and interference,
23 would be really concerned with those state licenses,
24 because we all know that no state would ever come in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 conflict with its adjacent state in using channels.
2 That just has never happened, but certainly, this
3 would be ripe for that happening as these systems are
4 implemented, especially here along the East Coast with
5 the number of small states where in theory one base
6 station in some cases could go not only for that state
7 but impact states on two or three sides.

8 There needs to be a method to coordinate
9 that. Unless those fixed stations especially are
10 captured someplace, it is going to be extremely
11 difficult.

12 Everybody is whispering in my ear. Sean,
13 are you taking note of that?

14 MR. DEVINE: I think the overwhelming
15 consensus is that the current licensing of
16 interoperability base stations is crucial and needs to
17 continue, and I think we all concur with that as well.

18 So the benefits and -- Don Speights is in the room
19 now, and we had discussed the redbook channels
20 earlier.

21 If a relationship between NTIA and the
22 states were to develop parameters and usage parameters
23 for those channels and there would be no mechanism to
24 license those, then would it -- that might be a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 challenge as to if base stations were put up or would
2 they be mobile only blanket applications such as we've
3 seen at 800 and VHF and UHF.

4 Those are probably topics that we will
5 discuss once those channels are available at some
6 point, but that's probably another issue, if the
7 licensing of those would be a challenge, maybe a
8 blanket approach from the mobile perspective or fixed
9 base temporary if something like that could be
10 developed at the states as well. So --

11 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Do we have this issue
12 resolved then to people's satisfaction? Fred?

13 MR. GRIFFIN: Fred Griffin again. As part
14 of your consideration -- and I was not involved in
15 this. So I can't give you any details. But the city
16 of Richmond, Virginia, metropolitan area at the 800
17 NPSPAC mutual aid, they have been through a whole
18 series of gyrations regarding hosting the fixed
19 facilities and who does it and all the rest.

20 There might be something in that process
21 that you could learn from it or glean from it. The
22 man that -- not did it, but the man that forced it is
23 as a catalyst was the frequency coordinator. His name
24 is David Warner. At the present time he is not the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 frequency coordinator. At the present time he does
2 not work for Virginia State Police, but he does work
3 for the state of Virginia in the Department of
4 Information Technology.

5 I think somebody ought to talk to him.

6 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Okay, Fred, thank you.

7 A number of us know Mr. Warner well.

8 What we will do then, based on the
9 discussion that we have had so far, is tonight we will
10 try to get a list of these frequencies together. We
11 probably will not be able to designate those last
12 three characters, because we are going to have to sit
13 down with NTIA and others if we want to roll their
14 channels into that, and put that together. But
15 certainly, we can come up with the generalized
16 methodology that would be used, Michael, so we can
17 pull it out to the Steering Committee.

18 Then we will need to sit down with Don,
19 because I think it only makes sense to roll --
20 identify all the interoperability channels that might
21 be available. It would help, I think, not only state
22 and local agencies but also the Federal agencies,
23 because certainly in many areas they are also daily
24 players on the use of the state and local

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 interoperability channels through agreements that we
2 have with them.

3 Any further discussion on that item?

4 MR. DEVINE: Any other discussion on
5 channel nomenclature? I notice additional people in
6 the room. It was a fairly discussed topic. We will
7 provide the Steering Committee tomorrow with a copy of
8 some revised recommendations for convention for the
9 interoperability channels.

10 Dave Buchanan couldn't make this meeting.
11 He asked me to introduce a proposal through mobile
12 data addressing with regard to low speed data
13 interoperability channels.

14 Dave is recommending that the domain named
15 ps.gov be obtained. There was a discussion yesterday
16 in the NPSTC meeting. NPSTC is going to have an
17 initiative to go to NIJ and perhaps see if they could
18 acquire the ps.gov domain.

19 They are hoping to develop some kind of
20 coordination with the states, whether it's the SIECs
21 or not, to provide an opportunity to have a standard
22 addressing method nationwide with regard to this
23 ps.gov domain name and be able to dynamically assign
24 IP addresses for itinerant data interoperability

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 units.

2 We've got some documentation here on
3 Dave's recommendation. Right. There is a copy on the
4 back of the table, proposal to NPSTC for mobile data
5 addressing. Its original concept was considerable,
6 and there aren't too many people who want to be
7 responsible for it.

8 We would like to see an initiative begun
9 where the domain name is acquired, because we think
10 that eventually this is the way it's going to pan out,
11 but it's a fairly daunting task, at least from the
12 start.

13 MR. NASH: John, again Glen Nash with the
14 state of California.

15 I had a chance to read over that document
16 this morning. I would suggest one change to it is
17 that somewhere in that standardized addressing that
18 you add a state designator.

19 The reason for that is I noticed that the
20 concentration was on trying to come up with unique
21 identifiers for each city. There are many city names
22 that are repeated in states across the country, and I
23 think trying to get a unique three or four letter
24 identifier for each city when there's 14 of them

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 across the country could be difficult.

2 Therefore, there is a post office
3 regulation that says you can only have one name of a
4 city used in a state and, therefore, we could key off
5 of that to ensure that there is -- You know, that way
6 Columbus, Ohio, and Columbus, Utah, could both use
7 COL. It would be somewhat common.

8 So I would suggest that.

9 CHAIRMAN POWELL: We actually discussed
10 that yesterday. For those of you that have that
11 document in front of you, if you look at the front
12 page about the sixth line up, fifth line up from the
13 bottom, it gives an example for what would be Engine
14 291 for the Rialto Fire Department.

15 Our discussion was to add -- in this case,
16 we would add CA for California either before or after
17 that RIA.

18 I will also add to Glen's note that the
19 post office requirement is that you cannot have two
20 post offices with the same name. Nonetheless, we do
21 have cities -- For example, in California there are at
22 least two cities called Pinehurst, both of which have
23 fire departments. So we would need to -- or fire
24 departments associated with them that bear that name.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So it may not still be all that simple,
2 but I think at least adding a state designator to it
3 would be appropriate. It also turns out, I believe,
4 certainly the fire service has a three-letter code
5 across the country, and I can speak for a number of
6 the western states, noting that law enforcement
7 likewise has a three-letter designator.

8 The problem would be making sure that
9 those are unique, and it may be that we will have to
10 go beyond, in this case now, a five character
11 designator there.

12 I would also like to add that once that
13 five characters is assigned to an entity, that however
14 they use that would be left up to them to number their
15 units and so on. That's not something we wanted to
16 try to manage, although eventually, if you are going
17 to do address resolution through some database, we are
18 going to have to know who all those are to be able to
19 assign the appropriate IP back to them, just as the
20 Internet does with all of our unique identifiers
21 today.

22 MR. SCHLIEMAN; John, in terms of the
23 three-digit city code, I wonder if there might be a
24 more universal way to do it that maybe used a ZIP Code

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 or something. I'm thinking in terms of the fact that
2 you've got jurisdictions that have overlapping -- you
3 have agencies that have overlapping jurisdictions.
4 You could have multiple agencies with the same city in
5 the same service.

6 You could have a sheriff's department, a
7 local police department. You have state police, and
8 all have offices in the same city, such as Albany, New
9 York. So wouldn't that be a bit confusing? Wouldn't
10 it be perhaps better to have some coding stream that
11 used perhaps a numeric sequence with an agency
12 identifier before you came to the unit designator?

13 CHAIRMAN POWELL: What I would foresee
14 happening there -- first of all, you have multiple ZIP
15 Codes in an area, but you're going to have the same
16 issue. You know, take Denver, ZIP Code 80203. That
17 happens to be where the state offices are. That
18 happens to be where the Denver city offices are and
19 where Denver County offices are. So --

20 MR. SCHLIEMAN: How do you differentiate
21 these different agencies then?

22 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Well, you would go --
23 like we currently do, for example, in California on
24 our law enforcement teletype system, which is a three-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 letter mnemonic. You would have CAFBI and then a
2 number, which is 1234, which is their offices within
3 the state. You would have CASO for sheriff's office
4 or PD and/or a county designator for sheriff's office.

5 For example, SF for San Francisco.

6 MR. NASH: Glen Nash with the state of
7 California.

8 Bob, I would not suggest trying to use
9 names that are based upon the city in which an officer
10 is domiciled but rather to be using either an agency
11 name or a jurisdiction name or something like that.
12 So state agencies could be just, you know, S-T-A-T-E
13 to indicate it is a state agency as opposed to, you
14 know, being the New York City Police Department.

15 I think you start getting into too many
16 troubles if you try to identify a particular unit as
17 domiciled as its addressing code.

18 MR. SCHLIEMAN: I agree with that.
19 Probably, I didn't really approach it the right way,
20 because this really is the first time I have looked at
21 this. But I think the way it was just described,
22 using state codes such as ST or CI for city or CO for
23 county like is currently used, is useful.

24 I'm just wondering if the simplicity of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the unit designator as shown in this example here for
2 an engine isn't maybe too simplistic in terms of it
3 doesn't say it's fire. You know what I mean? In
4 other words, I think maybe you need a further agency
5 breakdown.

6 MR. NASH: I think I could go along with
7 that. There might be certain advantages for building
8 some mnemonics into that name so that you have some
9 information about who it is you are getting a message
10 from.

11 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Or sending to or whatever.

12 MR. NASH: So as you say, you know, even
13 though it is not a true national standard, I think the
14 Internet certainly seems to have been gravitating
15 toward the use of ST for state, CA -- or CI for city,
16 CO for county, and I think we could look at coming up
17 with PD, SO, FD, you know, and a short list of agency
18 type identifiers that perhaps do build in some
19 information into that e-mail address so that you know
20 a little bit about the person you are getting an e-
21 mail from.

22 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN POWELL: This whole issue was
24 almost brought up today as an informational topic to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 indicate that we are moving ahead with getting the
2 ps.gov domain name reserved, knowing that it is going
3 to take a lot of further discussion to resolve this.
4 So I think we can take the input that we've received
5 so far and build upon that.

6 NPSTC has asked a group of us to work
7 within that organization to try to hash this out, and
8 two of us are on that group and would certainly invite
9 anyone else. We will make sure that the subcommittee
10 e-mail reflector gets our discussions on the subject
11 and would invite all of your input as we try to
12 resolve this.

13 MR. DEVINE: I think Glen Nash's point is
14 important. It needs to be on a quick review. One
15 needs to be able to see whether it's a city, county or
16 state unit. If we are talking about a specific
17 device, I think it needs to be quickly reviewed and be
18 able to get a lot of information real quick, and I
19 think the Internet has provided that through some of
20 the addressing we see now.

21 So I think that's a good start, and I
22 think we need to look toward some of those established
23 ways of doing things when it comes to this domaining.

24 That's all that -- That was Dave's primary

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 input, and that's what he wanted to make sure we got
2 out today.

3 One of the other -- The other issue that
4 is on the table as well, I believe, was the
5 recommendation at the last meeting in September was
6 the aggregation of the data channels, the wide band
7 data channels that we had discussed, and made
8 recommendation for certain designations.

9 We removed the channel names, because that
10 topic was still under review. The notice on the
11 sheet, handout there, that's not listed. But we did
12 aggregate and provide the last six channels, 82
13 through 84 and 91 through 93, as with no 50 kilohertz
14 aggregation up to 150. We removed that, and we made
15 those recommendations and struck the names from that
16 recommendation originally.

17 Any comment on the 50 kilohertz data
18 channels and the aggregation allowable for the four
19 sets, and then the last two sets, no aggregation at
20 all. Any comment on that, based on the document?

21 CHAIRMAN POWELL: My understanding is this
22 is a revision based on discussion from the last
23 meeting. This is what is proposed now from that
24 discussion.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. WILHELM: Does this differ from the
2 item that the Steering Committee approved at the last
3 meeting?

4 MR. DEVINE: No.

5 MR. EIERMAN: Dave Eierman, Motorola.

6 The only comment I got is those last six
7 channels are in the same TV channel. So I know that,
8 when we broke up the narrow band channels, we made
9 sure that common channels were broken up between the
10 TV channels because of early adopter issues.

11 MR. DEVINE: The other issue that was
12 brought up at the last meeting was, with the 50
13 kilohertz interoperable standard, we addressed the
14 issue, and it will probably be additionally discussed
15 today, of if the incident commander or the OIC at the
16 time decided that the 150 kilohertz interoperability
17 structure was required and needed, it could remain.
18 But as a default value, they would all revert back to
19 50 kilohertz in a crisis.

20 In other words, the 150 kilohertz would be
21 secondary to the reduction back down to 50 kilohertz
22 unless it was ordered to remain by the incident
23 commander or the individual in charge at the scene.

24 That was discussed last time in a similar

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fashion to the secondary trunk channels that were
2 discussed and the immediate ability for remote removal
3 of them off the trunk system. So those topics as well
4 are certainly open to discussion, but the reduction
5 and the aggregation down to 50 kilohertz was indicated
6 to be a positive step. So we would certainly take any
7 comments on that as well, when needed at the scene.

8 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Based on Dave's note, I
9 think it would be appropriate and prudent for us to
10 redefine those -- to move one of those last groups so
11 that we have one in each pair of channels. That only
12 makes sense. It follows the procedures that the NCC
13 and the Commission have followed throughout this
14 proceeding in making sure that, if only one pair is
15 available, that you have a subset of the full channel
16 capacity that you would have elsewhere.

17 I would suggest, if we do that, also at
18 the very bottom of that second page where it notes
19 that 91, 92 and 93 are established as 50 kilohertz
20 nationwide common channels, that we should split those
21 up, perhaps maybe go from three to four and take two
22 of those in each of those pairs of channels.

23 Comment on that? If people are in
24 agreement, we can do that tonight, Michael, and have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that recommendation.

2 MR. DEVINE: I believe that's -- This was
3 a part of that recommendation. So if we are going to
4 change that, that would be a correction as well as the
5 NAC code that we discussed earlier. So we'll get both
6 of those clarified this evening.

7 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Okay. Is everyone in
8 agreement on that? Okay.

9 MR. DEVINE: Any suggestions as to which
10 channels of the other pair? Are we talking --

11 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Take the bottom one.

12 MR. DEVINE: Well, you want to make it --
13 instead of 82, 83 and 84, make it 46, 47 and 48?

14 MR. ROSS: Joe Ross, Washington, D.C.

15 I guess I'm confused. Why are these six
16 channels not permitted for aggregation? What's the
17 purpose? What are we trying to achieve?

18 MR. DEVINE: The real goal is, if they are
19 aggregated, there is a specific use or utilization;
20 and if they are not allowed for aggregation, there is
21 potential for three separate uses to operate
22 independently of each other. If a crisis were to
23 occur where 350 kilohertz channels could be better
24 used, then one 150 kilohertz set, then that's the --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 The concept is such that perhaps it would better serve
2 the scene or the incident.

3 MR. ROSS: Why not leave that up to the
4 states? Why not leave it up to the states to decide
5 whether they want that channel to be a 50 kilohertz
6 channel or a 150 kilohertz channel?

7 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Because we need some
8 national channels. As we have done across the board
9 with interoperability, we have reserved some channels
10 that will have a national characteristic, because we
11 need that so that we have interoperability and so that
12 people coming in from outside of the state in response
13 to an incident will be able to know, for example,
14 where to go.

15 This would be, I guess, the equivalent of
16 a calling channel, if we did that, right in this band,
17 and it has a national characteristic, not a state
18 controlled characteristic. Wayne?

19 MR. LELAND: Yes, Wayne Leland
20 representing TIA. Another reason is at this point in
21 time TIA is developing a 50 kilohertz data standard.
22 Okay? And there isn't any data standard for 100 or
23 150, at least at this point in time.

24 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Dave?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. EIERMAN: David Eierman, Motorola.

2 My only suggestion is you put these
3 channels near the center of the TV channel, not at the
4 edge where you might get into an adjacent channel. So
5 you know, butt them up against the narrow band
6 channels.

7 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Okay, we could take a
8 look at that and do that. We will reshuffle these
9 then, as it appears people are generally in agreement
10 with that, and --

11 MR. DEVINE: Of the six sets, we are
12 talking about two of the six sets being with no
13 aggregation, and you're saying, of those particular
14 sets, you would designate four of those six channels.

15 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Two in each one would be
16 designated for nationwide common, and noting that the
17 50 kilohertz -- and this is an issue that we do need
18 to address, Wayne, is if we are going -- These always
19 are for interoperability and, if we are going to
20 permit that going all the way up to 150, certainly the
21 technology that's been adopted would allow that to
22 happen as TIA has an ability to expand its standards
23 definition there, starting at 50 but eventually be
24 able to allow that -- hopefully, that same technology

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to be used up to 150, since it is capable of doing
2 that.

3 MR. LELAND: Wayne Leland in response.

4 Clearly, TIA is developing standards that
5 will encompass beyond 50 kilohertz and, in fact, two
6 different modulation schemes. So the direction we are
7 going will get us there, but the focus we have been
8 working on with the time constraints, etcetera, for
9 NCC has been on -- As you recall, we adopted the 50
10 kilohertz and that focus, and that just comes first.
11 But, yes, we will get there.

12 MR. DEVINE: Any other discussion on -- I
13 can imagine scenarios where two 150 kilohertz channels
14 would provide a certain level of functionality and be
15 appropriate for the scene, and I can also imagine a
16 scene where six channels could be appropriate for a
17 specific scene.

18 So is there any consensus regarding the
19 policy as to whether or not the deaggregation of
20 channels from 150 down to 50 is appropriate in the
21 rulemaking process or in any of our rules where, if
22 needed, that one would need to deaggregate those
23 channels? Is there any feeling on that, or do we
24 leave it to the discretion of the incident commander

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to decide what he feels appropriate based on the
2 scene? That's okay with me.

3 MR. WILHELM: Steve, could you elaborate
4 on that? I'm not sure I understand what you're
5 saying.

6 MR. DEVINE: If it was determined at the
7 scene that a limited number of data interoperability
8 channels were available and a 150 kilohertz
9 application is perhaps not as beneficial to the scene
10 as three 50 kilohertz applications would be, do we
11 want to address it in a similar way as secondary
12 trunking where those channels can be used secondary,
13 and then they have to be remotely accessed and made
14 available to the pool for the interoperability use?

15 MR. WILHELM: I think that was already
16 decided, that the 150 and 100 would be secondary.

17 CHAIRMAN POWELL: I would like to change
18 the minimum with regard to what we did with the
19 Steering Committee. I think just a reshuffling of the
20 channels, for obvious reasons, without any further
21 change, and the recommendations which they have
22 already adopted would be appropriate.

23 So if people are in agreement, we will
24 simply shuffle these, maintaining the same

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 requirements that now exist that the Steering
2 Committee actually already approved at the last
3 meeting. We are going to change where the 50s are
4 within the block.

5 Do we have any further business for this
6 subcommittee? Any other items people would like to
7 discuss? So for tomorrow, we will -- Mike will
8 provide to the Steering Committee a more detailed
9 recommendation, taking into account the discussion on
10 simplifying the nomenclature, number one, and then the
11 two corrections, the NAC code and the reshuffling of
12 these channels, the wide band channels.

13 MR. WILHELM: Thank you. I think it's
14 10:21 now. We'll take a break, and be back by 10:35.

15 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
16 the record at 10:21 a.m. and went back on the record
17 at 10:51 a.m.)

18 MR. NASH: If we could come to order,
19 please. John Powell asked for a couple of minutes to
20 finish up something that he forgot during his meeting.

21 CHAIRMAN POWELL: Not to finish up, but we
22 had a request that came in after we adjourned for the
23 day from the Fire Service on this channel
24 nomenclature, that rather than saying MED for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 medical channels, that we say EMS, to clearly
2 differentiate them from the MED channels at UHF and
3 also to show that they are EMS channels and not
4 available for public health or other people that might
5 fall under the wider MED terminology.

6 So if we have no objection to that, we
7 will make that change in the nomenclature. So it
8 would be -- For police, it would be LAW. For fire, it
9 would be F-I-R, and for the emergency medical
10 services, it would actually be EMS. Any objections to
11 that? Okay, thank you.

12 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
13 the record at 10:52 a.m.)

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1
2
3
4
5

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com