

UNITED STATES FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Full Membership Meeting
before the
Federal Communications Commission
of
The Public Safety National
Coordination Committee

Pages: 1 through 54

Place: New York, New York

Date: November 19, 1999

HERITAGE REPORTING CORPORATION

Official Reporters

1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20005-4018

(202) 628-4888

hrc@concentric.net

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

Full Membership Meeting
before the
Federal Communications Commission
of
The Public Safety National
Coordination Committee

Police Headquarters
Police Plaza, Lower Manhattan
1st Floor Auditorium
New York, NY 10038

Friday,
November 19, 1999

The parties met, pursuant to the notice of the
Commission, at 1:32 p.m.

BEFORE: KATHLEEN M.H. WALLMAN
Chair

PRESENTERS:

SERGEANT JOHN POWELL
GLEN NASH
LT. TED DEMPSEY
JULIO MURPHY
ED DROCELLA, National Telecommunications Agency
HOWARD SAFIR, NYPD Commissioner

NCC PANEL MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

JULIO MURPHY
STEVE PROCTOR
HARLIN MCEWEN

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4888

MARILYN WARD
ELLEN O'HARA
ERNEST HOFMEISTER
JAYNE LEE
MICHAEL WILHEIM
STEVEN MUELLER

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4888

I N D E X

1		
2		
3	Introduction, Chairman Wallman	2
4	Interoperability Subcommittee, Sgt. John Powell	5
5	Technology Subcommittee, Mr. Glen Nash	10
6	Implementation Subcommittee, Lt. Ted Dempsey	16
7	FLEWUG, Ed Drocella	21
8	New York Police Commissioner Howard Safir	37
9	General Discussion	42
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

1	Hearing Began: 1:32 p.m.	Hearing Ended: 3:15 p.m.
2	Recess Began: 2:28 p.m.	Recess Ended: 2:33 p.m.
3	Recess Began: 2:44 p.m.	Recess Ended: 2:55 p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1

2

(1:32 p.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Welcome to the New York meeting of the NCC. I'd like to begin by asking whether there is anyone who will be relying on the services of our sign language interpreter today. Would you please signify if you require these services. Okay, I see no one signifying that they are in need of interpretive services. So I think we will thank our interpreter. One more time, anybody?

8

9

10

11

All right, welcome. We are going to make this a productive afternoon. I have just brief remarks. First, thanking our hosts here in New York, particularly Ted Dempsey, for their generous hospitality, for all of the logistical coordination that they undertook to make us here and make us heard.

12

13

14

15

I'd also like to thank Neil, who has been in and out of the room during the course of the day, who has been extremely gracious in extending the department's and the city's hospitality. Thank you very much for making this beautiful auditorium available to us.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I'd also like to extend thanks to the Steering Committee, to the subcommittee leaders, and to everyone who has participated in the NCC process. What has impressed me about your participation in the process is not only the diligence and the dedication everyone has brought to this process but the determination that everybody has brought to work through old issues with new energy and to narrow differences that I think some people would have predicted six months ago couldn't be narrowed or bridged. So I appreciate all the energy and dedication that people have brought to that process.

1 I hope people will continue to remain committed to the process. We are in
2 some crucial stages now on some of the very core key issues that the FCC delegated to the
3 NCC.

4 I think it is important to remember why the NCC exists. We exist because
5 the FCC decided that it was important to have a stakeholder process to discuss and refine
6 and resolve these issues. So it is important, I think, for people to remain committed to the
7 process.

8 There will be a time, a moment, a stage in the process for the FCC to
9 consider recommendations from the NCC, but I think it is important for everybody who has
10 devoted any time at all to the NCC to remain committed to seeing through the
11 recommendations and to try to make those recommendations ones that are consensus-based
12 and that can be offered to the FCC as such.

13 We will continue to look for ways to ensure the broadest possible
14 participation in the NCC process. We've had some very good suggestions about expanding
15 the availability of conference call facilities and things like that that enable people who
16 don't have the funds or the time to travel to participate in all the working group and other
17 level meetings that have been so informative to the work of the NCC.

18 This will not be a perfect process. There will be points at which people
19 become frustrated with the way things are going. I hope that people will feel not only free
20 but feel it urgently important to let me know, to let Michael Wilhelm know, if there are
21 other people on the Steering Committee that you are more comfortable talking with
22 directly.

1 If there are process problems, I hope you will identify them promptly and
2 succinctly. Often it is a good idea to do so informally at first to see whether quick
3 solutions can be worked out.

4 I also commend the efforts of the frequency coordinators to continue to
5 work together. I understand there is going to be a meeting in early December where some
6 additional conversations will occur. We look forward to hearing the results of that
7 process.

8 I think there is some good opening there to work issues out informally,
9 rather than adding to the mountains of bytes of e-mail that we all already get on these
10 issues. So I commend the frequency coordinators and NPSTC for taking on the task of
11 facilitating those informal discussions.

12 With that, I would like to get right to the business of the day.

13 Michael, do you have any administrative matters that you'd like to raise?

14 Michael Wilhelm.

15 MR. WILHELM: Just mention the sign-in, please.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Oh, yes. I've been asked to remind all of you,
17 you need to sign in. In accordance with our open and democratic process here, we'd like to
18 know who has participated. In fact, we're required to keep track of that, so if you've not
19 signed in for today's afternoon meeting, we need to ask that you go back and sign in, please.

20 Anything else, Michael?

21 MR. WILHELM: No. Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: With that, I would like to go right to the report

1 from the Interoperability Subcommittee.

2 SGT. POWELL: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I am waiting for copies of
3 two of our reports to come in that I have for the Steering Committee. I will forward you
4 the official copies with a cover letter as to the action that we took yesterday.

5 As all of you are aware, in Lansing we passed forward to the Steering
6 Committee a recommendation regarding trunking of the interoperability channels. That had,
7 in that document, several items that were identified as requiring further work. The Steering
8 Committee subsequently requested that we flush out those items before they took action on
9 that initial request.

10 We will forward to you today two letters or two recommendations, one
11 regarding voice requirements, general voice requirements for interoperability that includes
12 such things as channel nomenclature, identifying the number of channels and specific
13 services that some of them are recommended to be used for, and related issues.

14 Second is another document that specifically addresses the open questions
15 on the trunked interoperability channel issue, specifically prioritization and a method of
16 notifying users when a higher priority is necessary to be implemented so that in reality,
17 trunking or conventional use at a lower priority can be stopped while a period of higher
18 priority is in use.

19 Those documents were completed and, I'm pleased to inform everyone here,
20 unanimously approved by the Interoperability Subcommittee.

21 We actually -- it took several other action items that I will include as
22 follow-up in the letter. One of those is a motion was again approved that we recommend

1 that no requirement for inclusion of voice interoperability channels should exist in
2 subscriber equipment that is designed for data only.

3 In other words, if a radio has no voice capability, we see no need to require
4 that it have the voice interoperability channels included in the radio. Our interpretation of
5 the current rules is that all radios are required to have that. So we will forward that to you
6 as a recommendation for your action.

7 Additionally, we addressed -- which is included in one of the documents --
8 the issue of encryption, stating that encryption is not permitted on the calling channels that
9 we have identified.

10 Those need to be open access channels and it is optional on the other
11 interoperability channels, with a recommendation that if it is implemented, that the
12 Technology Subcommittee identify a standard, such that if you have the appropriate key,
13 you would then be able to communicate with other users in an encrypted mode on those
14 channels.

15 Secondly, we spent a significant amount of time talking about data. We had
16 two presentations in the data area, one from FreeSpace, one from Data Radio, talking in
17 general about data requirements, potential data equipment or service offerings that are on
18 the horizon.

19 As a result of that, because of the work of Working Group 5, which was
20 addressing issues of trunking of interoperability channels we hope is now complete, the
21 chairman of that group, Dave Buchanan, offered to chair a new Working Group 6, which is
22 going to look at identifying specific user needs for both narrow band and wide band data.

1 That will be given a priority.

2 Dave's agency operates a very large data system so he is well-versed on the
3 subject. He also has recently been appointed to chair the Southern California Region 700
4 MHz Planning Committee, which has held their first meeting and actually now has a
5 window open.

6 Dave informed us that most of the requests that they are getting during this
7 open window for the 700 band is for data. So certainly in Southern California they have a
8 big interest in moving that forward.

9 I would anticipate that using some of the work that has already been done,
10 Dave and his working group will be able to quickly identify some user needs so we can
11 look at, in particular, the issue of requiring an interoperability standard for data in narrow
12 band channels, on the interoperability and potentially identifying the need, which was not
13 in the R&O as it stands today, for some narrow band data-only interoperability channels.

14 We will be looking at all of those over the next couple of months. As soon
15 as the copies get here, I will go ahead and pass them -- oh, they're here.

16 Bob, can you pass those out?

17 Those of us with computers are sitting up at the front here where there is
18 power today.

19 Last, I wanted to take this opportunity -- and Glen beat me to the punch
20 yesterday -- but to advise the Steering Committee and the quorum here the significant action
21 that happened last Friday with regard to Project 25. That is that Phase II, Phase II being
22 6.25 or equivalent technologies, 6.25 kHz or equivalent technologies, in the trunking arena

1 were adopted by the Project 25 Steering Committee supporting TDMA or time division
2 access.

3 One of those is a two-slot proposal that was presented to the Steering
4 Committee by Ericsson. The second is a four-slot proposal operating in 25 kHz that was
5 presented to the committee by Tetre.

6 Both of those organizations met the preliminary requirements that Project 25
7 established to become Phase II offerings, including support of compatibility with the Phase
8 I, 12.5 conventional common air interface, which will be included in all of their subscriber
9 units for interoperability.

10 We're very happy this action took place. We anticipate a formal press
11 release coming out, if not later today, certainly early next week.

12 That concludes my report, unless there are questions.

13 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Are there questions from the Steering
14 Committee for Sgt. Powell?

15 Questions from the floor for Sgt. Powell?

16 Okay, thank you very much.

17 We're scheduled to hear next from the Commissioner, but why don't we
18 move ahead. Could we hear next from the Technology Subcommittee?

19 MR. NASH: The Technology Subcommittee also had a very fruitful day
20 yesterday. Specifically significant accomplishments of the committee, the committee, after
21 reviewing the matrix that had been prepared by the Narrow Band Working Group through a
22 straw vote process, filled in, if you will, the answers to the matrix to help serve as a tool

1 for the committee to use in evaluating the various proposals for standards,
2 recommendations.

3 As a result of that, we then considered the standards under consideration.

4 As a result of that, the committee is recommending that ANSI/TIA/EIA 102.BABA Project
5 25 vo coder description be recommended as the standard for the vo coder portion of a
6 narrow band standard.

7 Based on a straw vote of that, there is wide consensus for that. There was
8 only one voter who chose to abstain from the vote. There were no negative votes on that
9 particular issue. Understand "votes" is a sensitive word, but if you are trying to determine
10 consensus, I had to have some mechanism.

11 The second issue was relative, what should be selected as the RF interface.
12 Under consideration, there was the ANSI TIA/EIA 102.BAA-1 Project 25 FDMA
13 Common Air Interface using the 12.5 kHz, also known as the Phase I mode of operation.

14 The second possibility was that same standard but utilizing the 6.25 a/k/a
15 Phase II mode of operation. Then there was also discussion of the ANSI 396 DMO mode
16 of operation as a possibility.

17 After lengthy discussion and consideration of the matrix, the selection of the
18 committee for recommendation was the first one, the ANSI TIA/EIA 102.BAA-1 FDMA
19 Common Air Interface using the 12.5 kHz or Phase I mode of operation.

20 A lot of the discussion on that centered around the feeling that there was
21 critical need for a standard to be selected immediately so that equipment could be made
22 available on the street.

1 Based on input from the manufacturers, the Phase II or 6.25 option was
2 going to be delayed for "several years" before that would be available. And so even
3 though that would be the mode that the report and order would indicate the Commission
4 would have most favored, that the issue of timeliness was an overriding factor in the
5 committee's recommendation for the 12.5 kHz Phase I mode.

6 Moving on, the Wide Band Working Group has not accomplished much
7 work at this point in time. What we believe is that there are no known standards for wide
8 band RF application, although I did hear a suggestion at this meeting that there may be one
9 of the amps standards that might be applicable here or that could be adapted, but
10 nonetheless, there are no existing standards that this committee could, if you will, take off
11 the shelf, dust off, and present as a recommended standard.

12 Therefore, that puts us into a much longer process of trying to have a
13 standard either -- say the existing amp standard or some other standard being used as a
14 model -- to have that modified in an ANSI-approved process and then adopted, at least as
15 an interim standard, by an ANSI standard-setting designated organization.

16 So our being able to make a specific recommendation for the wide band
17 channels at this point in time is much further off, and I really can't tell you exactly when that
18 might occur. We will be asking for the assistance of TIA in helping us to establish a
19 recommendation for that standard.

20 The Spectrum Working Group is collecting some information still as to
21 what they're going to be working on. The Receiver Standards Working Group has been
22 working with TIA, and I believe they are close to having a recommendation for us, but I

1 don't have a specific time frame on that.

2 In the area of new business, as a result of John's meeting, which had been
3 held in the morning, we're looking at the possibility of an encryption standard, and in this
4 situation, while there would be an encryption standard, it is not something that would
5 probably be forwarded to the FCC for adoption or inclusion in the rules, and that this is, if
6 you will, a mandatory option, something that would be not required to be included in all
7 radios; however, if included, then it must operate in accordance with this standard, at least
8 on the interoperability channels.

9 I solicited input as to what are the possibility for standards out there. One
10 suggestion was made to consider what would be referred to as the "companion" standard
11 under the Project 25 series of ANSI 102 documents. That standard currently does describe
12 a number of different modes of operation for encryption.

13 Our federal friends pointed out that the DES mode included in that standard
14 is, in reality, at the end of its life cycle, and in fact the federal agencies have been
15 developing a new standard FI-PS 46, I believe is the number, that would describe initially
16 an upgraded version of DAS and in the longer term what they are referring to as an
17 advanced encryption standard, and that we probably should be considering use of that
18 document as the model for a recommended standard, rather than the ANSI 102 document
19 which, as I say, recommends a standard that is probably at or near the end of its life cycle.

20 Any questions from the Steering Committee?

21 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: What do you expect is a life cycle for the
22 development of FI-PS?

1 MR. NASH: I would have to bow to Jimmy Downs or someone from the
2 federal side. The FI-PS 46 document, I understand, is pretty close to publication, if not
3 published.

4 (Comments made off mike.)

5 Okay, I'm informed that FI-PS 46-3 is published and is going through the
6 TIA process. It would appear, at least under the guidance that we were given under the
7 report and order and the MO&O, though, that the FI-PS process for review and
8 consideration of documents, in an of itself, may be adequate for us to consider that as the
9 recommended standard prior to ANSI final approval of it. So we may in fact have a viable
10 candidate right now.

11 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Questions from others?

12 MR. HOFMEISTER: Okay, just a comment in terms of the common air
13 interface and the vo coder. As you know, as we go forward and make these
14 recommendations to the FCC, assuming we do, that is really a long-term commitment for
15 that interface and that voice coder.

16 I think it was you who, at the Lansing meeting, said FM has been around for
17 50 years. So anything that we can say in terms of the life, expectant life, or future proofing
18 of those, I think, will be very helpful.

19 In particular, in the vo coder, if there is, say another future generation that
20 comes out of that family that would have some sort of backward compatibility or anything
21 we know about that I think would help us frame this such that it is a long-term solution.
22 Again, just a comment.

1 MR. NASH: Thank you very much. It certainly is a concern for me also as
2 a user that once the Commission endorses this as the standard, the vo coder, the common
3 air interface, whether it is what we are recommending here or something else that they may
4 choose to recommend, that that does begin a period of time in which people are in good
5 faith purchasing systems, installing them, and they become legacies that are out there that
6 must be protected when you consider any change to a standard in the future.

7 So while at this point there has been some discussion of possibly the 12.5
8 kHz recommendation being an interim standard, I certainly have some real concerns about
9 that in that once you manufacturers begin building equipment and once we, as users, begin
10 installing equipment is that then becomes the -- if nothing else, the de facto standard that
11 must exist for a reasonable period of time for us to amortize the cost of the equipment.

12 So while we might have -- at some future date decide to identify an
13 alternative technology as being the new desired standard, we also at that point have an
14 obligation to say, well, that's the vision of what the new standard will be 10 years from
15 now and in the interim, while certainly it is desirable that equipment be purchased and
16 equipped to meet whatever that new standard might be in that 10-year transition period, we
17 are still working to the "old" standard. I think that goes along with anything that we do
18 here.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Any other questions from the Steering
20 Committee?

21 Questions for Mr. Nash from the floor?

22 Okay, thank you very much.

1 Why don't we hear next from the Implementation Subcommittee? Ted, I'm
2 moving some of these things ahead of the Commissioner's remarks, and so as you get
3 signals about how close he is, just let us know and we'll cut to the chase.

4 LT. DEMPSEY: Thank you very much. Before I get started on reporting
5 our progress, I would just like to give a special thanks to Dick DeMello who sat in for me
6 for the past six months and did a great job while I was sort of tied up with other matters.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: We missed you. We appreciated Dick's
8 contribution. We're glad you're back.

9 LT. DEMPSEY: Thank you. We had a good meeting this morning. We
10 reviewed our progress so far. The majority of our discussion seemed to base around two
11 issues, one of the DTB transition and how we can monitor the DTB transition and
12 obviously how we can encourage it to happen as soon as possible to free up the spectrum.

13 Dave Eierman, the chairman of the subgroup, the working group that we
14 have, has asked for assistance from all the participants of the Steering Committee, as well
15 as all the NCC, to monitor the transition in your region and let us know how it is moving
16 along, whether it is quick, whether it is slow, and of course, what's being done in the area
17 to encourage it along. That is very important for us to know.

18 We are submitting, along with our report today, a white paper for -- it's a
19 draft outline of the 746-806 national regional plan. It is put out there for comments. We
20 haven't really looked at it yet. We'd appreciate everyone to comment as soon as possible.
21 Fred has asked us to get comments in to him by December 10 so he can turn it around to me
22 by December 15.

1 We also had a proposal to add a -- we still didn't decide what to call it -- a
2 subworking group to discuss funding. We haven't defined what part of funding, but we are
3 going to look at, obviously, funding the construction of systems, will there be money, is
4 there a way to get money for public safety agencies to build these systems, especially the
5 interoperability systems, and in addition, based upon the conclusions we draw about how
6 the spectrum is going to be implemented, will we need funding and is there a way to fund
7 some of the regional planning groups, state planning groups, whatever it is that we decide
8 to draw the borders around? So Tom Tollman has graciously accepted that task, which is
9 something that I think he is pretty good at.

10 The same note, speaking about Tom Tollman, the NIJ is currently preparing
11 an RFP to solicit a vendor for the pre-coordination database. That will be completed,
12 hopefully, in February of the year 2000. I guess at that point when it is awarded, they will
13 start working on it. That is all I have.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Questions from the Steering committee for Lt.
15 Dempsey?

16 MR. MCEWEN: I have.

17 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: You may have the bad microphone there, Chief.
18 That microphone makes you sound like the rock band, Kiss.

19 MR. MCEWEN: I noticed. I'd just like to comment on that funding issue,
20 particularly because Tom is here. I think you are right, Tom would be a good person for
21 the study of that.

22 It is clear to me that if we're going to have any impact on a national basis,

1 that some level of funding to support that is going to be absolutely necessary. That is not
2 going to come easy. In other words, I don't see in this year's budget process, other than in
3 some of the traditional things that we may be able to tap into, a lot of opportunities.

4 So what we really need to do, in my view, Tom, and those who work on
5 that, is to develop a strategy for this next year's budget process in which the public safety
6 community comes together with some kind of a coordinated effort to the Congress and
7 perhaps the Administration as well for some kind of a funding effort.

8 I think we need to start that in the spring at the very latest. In other words,
9 we need to come up with some kind of a limited or brief proposal and try to get that into
10 the process early on.

11 I would say that the International Association of Chiefs of Police would be
12 very supportive of that process. I would think the Fire Chiefs and many of the other
13 organizations involved in this process would also welcome the opportunity to help. If we
14 pool all of our resources as a public safety community, we will have a much more positive
15 influence.

16 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Any questions from other Steering Committee
17 members for Lt. Dempsey?

18 Questions from the floor for Lt. Dempsey?

19 Well, thank you for your hospitality.

20 LT. DEMPSEY: You're welcome.

21 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: And we made use of this beautiful auditorium.

22 LT. DEMPSEY: It was a pleasure.

1 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Okay. We still have a little time before the
2 Commissioner joins us. I'm wondering, are the folks from FLEWUG ready to do their
3 presentation? Can we move that up a little bit?

4 MR. MURPHY: There is a slide show. We are going to bring up the
5 engineer who did the study for us. Basically the Steering Committee, as well as FLEWUG,
6 Federal Law Enforcement Wireless Users Group, is very much concerned about the
7 interference on the new 24 MHz adjacent channel, as well as existing users as well as
8 future users.

9 So to that end, NTIA, National Telecommunications Information
10 Administration, has -- which is the largest member of FLEWUG -- did a white paper
11 basically to analyze and see what the minimum possible acceptable level of received radio
12 signal would be in order to assure that there is no interference on the part of safety
13 channels.

14 So, to that end, I will turn it over to Ed Drocella who will go ahead and
15 make the presentation from the technical viewpoint. This paper was presented to the FCC
16 formally today at this meeting.

17 MR. DROCELLA: Good afternoon. My name is Ed Drocella. As a
18 member of FLEWUG and on behalf of FLEWUG, I am here this afternoon to discuss
19 adjacent bands operating 746 to 764 MHz, 776-794 MHz band protection of safety
20 operations.

21 There are currently two band plans proposed this day for the 746 and 776
22 bands. There is a proposal by Motorola and a proposal by FreeSpace Communications.

1 During the NCC conference call that was held on October 12, the Steering
2 Committee members felt that there was a benefit in establishing, one, a protection limit for
3 the public safety receivers, and that protection limit could then be used to base suggestions
4 and recommendations on the adjacent band emission limits that would be necessary to
5 protect the public safety receivers and the adjacent bands.

6 The Steering Committee members requested that the federal partners
7 participate and provide some assistance in the development of that interference protection
8 limit and also to examine the proposed plans.

9 I'm sorry, should have went to the next slide. Okay. Let's go to the next
10 slide.

11 (Slide shown.)

12 In response to the NCC's request, FLEWUG, supported by NTIA,
13 performed the study and proposed a methodology, one, a methodology for developing the
14 interference protection limits; two, in protection limits we made a proposal for the
15 adjacent band emission limits that would protect public safety receivers. We also provide
16 a slight overview and examination of the two band plans that were presented.

17 Next slide.

18 (Slide shown.)

19 Just a little bit of background. The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 directs the
20 Commission to auction the 746 to 764, and 776 to 794 MHz bands. So, when we go into
21 this development of adjacent band emission limits, we have to kind of balance what we are
22 doing.

1 If you come in and you make emission limits that are just so restrictive it
2 could make the spectrum commercially unviable for somebody trying to use it, so we were
3 trying to come up with a balanced approach and a balanced look at it. Our focus going in
4 was protection of public safety receivers and the operation of public safety operations in
5 that band.

6 Next slide.

7 (Slide shown.)

8 Currently in the NPRM for the 746 and 776 bands, service rules that have
9 been proposed specifying adjacent emission limit of 43 plus 10 log transmit power. So the
10 question is, will these proposed emission limits protect public safety operations in the
11 adjacent band?

12 Next slide.

13 (Slide shown.)

14 The first thing, in order to determine whether these proposed emission
15 limits will protect public safety operations, you one, have to come up with an interference
16 protection level, a threshold for the receiver to determine what level of performance is.

17 And in two, you have to place your transmitter/ receiver some distance,
18 with respect to air, you have to assume some transmitter characteristics because the
19 problem we're working with is at this time we don't know what's going to go in that
20 adjacent band, it is going to be auctioned off for something, a commercial service of some
21 sort.

22 All in all, we don't know what its characteristics are, and the way we are

1 approaching it is a little bit on the conservative basis just to try to hedge our bets a little
2 bit.

3 Next slide, please.

4 (Slide shown.)

5 There are a lot of approaches you can go to when you are developing
6 interference receiver threshold. As I was just saying, given the fact that we don't know the
7 services that are going to be allocated and many of the factors that go into the interference
8 threshold -- maybe factors that go into the estimation of the threshold, the transmitter,
9 antenna gains, and the powers and things, we don't really know what they are, so we have
10 to estimate those a little bit.

11 When we develop the interference threshold, we believe the conservative
12 approach is the best way to go with regards to that, just so if we are a little bit wrong on
13 what we use for our transmitter parameters and our scenarios, we maybe can make up for a
14 little bit -- build a little bit of margin into our threshold.

15 Next slide.

16 (Slide shown.)

17 In general, there are a couple of different approaches you can take to
18 develop an interference threshold. One is you can assume -- actually there are two -- you
19 can assume that you have a noise-limited system or an interference-limited system.

20 An interference-limited system, that is one where the system is defined by
21 the C/N that is somewhat greater than the minimum required level so that interference can
22 be allowed to exceed the receiver noise threshold. The receiver performance is pretty

1 much a factor or function of C/I and it is pretty much independent of receiver noise power,
2 the noise level.

3 On the other hand, if you use a noise-limited approach where the
4 performance is limited by the receiver noise level, in this case you have the C/N that is just
5 slightly greater than your minimum acceptable value and the performances of the receiver
6 is dependent very much on the receiver and receiver noise level and the interference level.

7 Again, thinking about worst-case scenarios for the public safety, I would
8 imagine a worst-case scenario, at least that's what we presumed, would be a case where a
9 mobile receiver is at the edge of its coverage. At that point you've got a minimum carrier
10 power, you've got again a minimum C/N value.

11 We think this can best be represented by a
12 noise-limited situation. Based on that, we are proposing an I to N -- develop our threshold
13 based on $I/N_t = -6\text{dB}$. In other words, we are going to propose that the interference be kept
14 6dB below the receiver noise floor. This equates to a 1dB increase in the receiver noise
15 floor.

16 This kind of works back into the protection of the receivers with regard to
17 digital receivers because your digital receiver performance is based on the E_b/N , or energy
18 per bit over noise. So your receiver noise goes up, your E_b/N_0 goes down, and your bit
19 error rate goes up, which is kind of what we are doing because we are going to digital
20 technology in these new bands.

21 Next slide.

22 (Slide shown.)

1 At this point we're starting to look at interference scenarios. We propose
2 two interference scenarios. The first would be a base station transmitter interfering with a
3 mobile public safety receiver and then a mobile station transmitter interfering with a public
4 safety receiver.

5 Next slide.

6 (Slide shown.)

7 The analysis, I won't go into a lot of detail of the analysis here. We do have
8 copies in the paper in the back. I think I brought 50. I don't know if that is enough.

9 But based on our analysis results, what we concluded, or I concluded, was
10 that compared to the emission levels that were being proposed for the case of the base
11 station transmitter interfering with a mobile receiver, an additional 30T 2dB of rejection or
12 attenuation for the emissions out of adjacent bay emissions was required. Similarly, for the
13 mobile transmitter, an additional 33 dB of attenuation would be required.

14 Next slide.

15 (Slide shown.)

16 Now, at this point we turned our attention to band plans that have been
17 proposed. They have been somewhat discussed over the last couple of days. Essentially
18 they are similar in some ways but they are different.

19 The Motorola plan proposed a 1.5 MHz around the public safety bands and
20 the first adjacent channel to the public safety bands. They go through an analysis. I've
21 listed some of the factors that were used in their analysis. They do conclude that
22 essentially when you do get to the public safety bands, essentially 76 dB of adjacent band

1 attenuation is required.

2 Next slide.

3 (Slide shown.)

4 Now, the plan does have a lot of -- I mean, I guess I should go on to say that
5 in this whole conclusion, we're not concluding a plan. We're not promoting one plan
6 versus the other. From the federal agency standpoint, from NTI, from the FLEWUG
7 standpoint, as long as the adjacent band emission limits are met, it doesn't matter, really, to
8 us, which service is there, it just doesn't matter.

9 There are several bands in the Motorola plan, one being the fact that if you
10 put life services adjacent to each other, it makes it easier. I mean, you put services -- I
11 mean the public mobile rate of service, it is not really the rate of service but the
12 characteristics of the radio service is what makes it shareable.

13 Coordination is possible in this if you put these two adjacent to each other.
14 It also creates what I think has been termed the "transition" region for the higher-power
15 commercial equipment. It can be attenuated signal down to a level to protect the public
16 safety receiver. So it kind of makes sufficient use of the spectrum.

17 Now, with regard to the FreeSpace plan, they made a proposal very similar
18 that is somewhat changed from my analysis. My paper looks at their old proposal where
19 they had two 1 MHz chunks adjacent to the public safety spectrum and each one of those
20 had associated with it a power spectral density.

21 The first adjacent channel was 4 milliwatts per kHz and the next adjacent
22 channel was 20 milliwatts per 4 kHz, each with a 6dBi gain antenna associated with it.

1 There were no adjacent band limits provided when we started our analysis.

2 So what we did is we worked backwards. We took our protection level, developed a
3 scenario and worked it backwards to come up with what the protection limits should be,
4 the adjacent channel emission limit should be.

5 Next slide.

6 (Slide shown.)

7 I guess I should also mention, in this case we looked at both single entry and
8 aggregate interference because just from the description of the equipment, we thought there
9 could be some high-density use of it where a public safety receiver could be going into an
10 area where there are several transmitters, and we thought we should look at both single-
11 entry and aggregate interference, which is what we did.

12 What we concluded was for single-entry and adjacent band emission limit
13 in the area of 68 dB and for aggregate interference in emission limit in the area of about 78
14 dB would be required to protect public safety operations.

15 Next slide.

16 (Slide shown.)

17 I guess just to end up what our conclusions were, we are proposing that an
18 interference threshold for the receivers be based on an IM of 6dB or 6dB below the
19 receiver noise floor.

20 We don't believe that the 43 plus 10 log of power is adequate to protect
21 public safety operations. Based on the interference protection limits and scenarios that we
22 developed, we are proposing in the area of 78 dB. Again, these numbers, we don't know

1 what's going in the adjacent band. We had to make some assumptions there.

2 We had to make some assumptions on the scenarios because, to my
3 knowledge, there are no already-identified worst-case scenarios for public safety. I mean
4 how close do you put two mobile radios together to do your analysis? I mean, that's
5 essentially what you had to do to come up with these emission levels.

6 Again, you can put them right next to each other and you drive the adjacent
7 band emission limits through the floor and that would essentially make the spectrum
8 unusable for a commercial entity trying to come in and bid for this spectrum in an auction.

9 So, we tried to come at this in a fair way. Again, we do think there are
10 benefits to both plans. Our main point is we believe that if the emission levels are in the
11 area of around 78 dB, that that will provide the public safety a level of protection, an
12 adequate level or protection.

13 There is always going to be the case where the two emitters, the interfering
14 transmitter and the receiver get very close to each other, and that is something you hope
15 doesn't happen a lot and doesn't happen for a long duration.

16 Anyway, I guess I'd like to thank the FCC and the Steering Committee for
17 allowing me on behalf of FLEWUG to present our results. I guess I'll accept any questions.

18 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: You have the sole working microphone down
19 there.

20 MR. MCEWEN: I think you've done some good work there. I appreciate it,
21 I think on behalf of all of us.

22 One thing I am concerned about is I'm not an engineer, so I look at it fairly

1 simplistically. That is, at this point in time, because there are many unknowns, to try to
2 guess what kind of interference you might have or what levels of interference or anything
3 else is way premature.

4 From my perspective, I'm looking for some kind of a system, some kind of a
5 rule that gives public safety protection, no matter what might come up in the future. In other
6 words, we need to have some kind of a procedure that works that is a sure way for us to
7 complain, to raise an objection to interference that is truly destructive to our mission and
8 have a process that will truly work to resolve that.

9 I realize that there are a number of different ways to approach that and there
10 are discussions, but right now, to try to talk about different levels of things, it may be a
11 little bit difficult to do that.

12 I'm just looking at it simply. All I know is that when this is all in place, if
13 we don't have a process that protects us and that will work, this situation with the Nextel
14 interference in Phoenix is, that I've raised before at the last meeting, is a good example.

15 As far as I know, everything is within legal limits, but the problem is it's
16 causing a tremendous problem to the Phoenix Police Department. We've got to have a way
17 to resolve that in a way that is reasonable to all parties concerned. So I would just say that
18 in a general sort of way.

19 MR. DROCELLA: I understand that. The problem is the service rules are
20 going to be developed and adjacent band emissions limit is going to be adopted. I think
21 that is going to happen.

22 What we are saying is that the current limit that is there is not going to

1 protect your operations, unless we are talking about large distance operations. If you can
2 always assume that your interfering transmitter, victim receiver, always separated by a
3 good distance -- I don't know exactly what that distance is, but a distance -- then you are
4 going to have interference, given that the transmitter is built to that standard. That's, I
5 guess, all I can say on that.

6 MR. WILHELM: Would all speakers please identify themselves before
7 speaking.

8 MR. NASH: Okay, my name is Glen Nash. I will apologize to the non-
9 engineers here, but I'm going to start talking engineering terms.

10 (Laughter.)

11 One question I have for you is you indicate 78 dB of attenuation. Is that 78
12 dBc?

13 MR. DROCELLA: Yes.

14 MR. NASH: Okay, I guess the problem I would have with that, again, is
15 where the adjacent band that is not defined -- 78 dBc, 78 dB below a 100-watt carrier is a
16 whole lot different number than 78 dB below a million-watt carrier.

17 We certainly have to be concerned about what is in the adjacent channel,
18 and that certainly is one of the advantages of the Commission's $43 + 10 \log(\text{Power})$. If
19 you take out their comment of our 84 ADDDB, which certainly puts a limit on it, 43 dB
20 plus $10 \text{ Log}(\text{Power})$ starts to become a definable RF level or spectrum level.

21 So I guess my comment there is 78 dB is not a good way to term it because,
22 again, we don't know what is in that adjacent channel.

1 MR. DROCELLA: That's a very good point. Would probably be in terms
2 of 70 plus 10 Log(8) or something like that. I guess that's what a better proposal would be.
3 You are absolutely right.

4 MR. SHAFFER: Derek Shaffer from FreeSpace Communications. I
5 actually wanted to also support the notion that there probably should be some sort of
6 absolute limit on power. Obviously that entails some assumptions about distance between
7 units, as you already noted.

8 In general terms, I wanted to say that FreeSpace really appreciates the
9 balanced approach that you've taken. It seems very fair. Of course, in our situation we are
10 sensitive to fairness, for obvious reasons. So we appreciate your efforts.

11 I also wanted to note that, as you also noted, but just to emphasize, in our
12 recent filings we have more detail about the protection that would be offered under our
13 plan, and although we have not been very specific about adjacent channel interference
14 because we expected that bodies such as this one would arrive at the appropriate limits,
15 but we are definitely willing to abide by whatever limits are deemed appropriate by this
16 committee and other parties to the proceeding.

17 I was also going to note that although we use different methodologies, I do
18 believe that the attenuation that we ended up using in our analysis arrived at similar
19 numbers to what you have. So there is, at least in broad terms, some agreement there.

20 That's all, those are all of my comments. Thanks.

21 MR. DROCELLA: Thank you. I don't have anything else.

22 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Any other questions?

1 MR. HOFMEISTER: Ernie Hofmeister from Ericsson. Just a couple of
2 comments. I want to thank FLUWEG for doing this analysis. I think it is balanced. I think
3 it is based on fundamentals that all engineers would look at this problem and agree on.

4 We might disagree a little bit on the numbers of the interference, but I do
5 appreciate the requirements to be the basis for interference detection.

6 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Anything further for
7 Mr. Drocella?

8 Don Speights from NTIA promised he would apply his best talent to
9 whatever answers you needed. He certainly has, and we are very grateful for your help
10 and for Rick Vercelacki (phonetic), who has been with us throughout the process. Thank
11 you very much. Please convey our thanks to Don, too.

12 I think we are going to be hearing, momentarily, from Commissioner Safir,
13 so why don't we just be at ease for a moment while we wait for him to arrive.

14 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken from
15 2:28 p.m. to 2:33 p.m.)

16 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Okay. Could we come to order, please. We're
17 very honored to have here with us today Howard Safir, the 39th Police Commissioner of
18 the City of New York.

19 Commissioner Safir was appointed to this post by Mayor Guliani on April
20 15, 1996. In his 3 years as Police Commissioner he has achieved what some may have
21 thought to be impossible, New York City has seen a 32 percent reduction in major crime
22 and a 47 percent reduction in homicides. Thanks to his implementation of an aggressive

1 traffic safety program there has been a 24 percent reduction in traffic fatalities. He has
2 introduced the largest drug abuse resistance education program in the world.

3 Prior to his appointment as Police Commissioner he served as New York
4 City's 29th Fire Commissioner, in that role his achievements were equally remarkable.
5 The programs he initiated to improve the safety of both the fire fighters and the public
6 included the issuance of modern bunker gear to fire fighters to reduce burns and
7 implementation of a certified first responder defibrillation program to train fire fighters in
8 life saving medical care.

9 He began his career in law enforcement as a special agent assigned to the
10 New York Office of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, a fore runner to today's DEA. After
11 advancing through the ranks he joined the U.S. Marshall Service and eventually was
12 promoted to the position of Associate Director of Operations.

13 He has directed a wide variety of complex international and domestic
14 investigations, including the apprehensions of CIA agent Edwin Wilson, international drug
15 trafficker Juan Montalavistros, as well as the discovery of remains of Nazi war crime
16 doctor Joseph Mengela.

17 Commissioner Safir, you've had a long and distinguished career devoted to
18 the issues we in this room hold near and dear to our hearts and we're trying to work
19 diligently towards resolving. We are just thrilled that you were able to take a couple of
20 minutes out of your day to come talk to us. Thank you very much.

21 (Applause.)

22 COMMISSIONER SAFIR: Thank you very much. Good afternoon,

1 Chairman Wallman and members of the National Coordination Committee, good afternoon
2 and welcome to One Police Plaza. It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak with
3 you today.

4 As you may know, a few years back I had the honor of serving on the Public
5 Safety Wireless Advisory Committee. The committee was asked to define in a document
6 the critical needs of the public safety community in terms of the communications resources
7 and the spectrum which we would need to support our efforts through the year 2010.

8 We issued a report in September of 1996 which laid our conclusion that
9 unless immediate measures were taken to alleviate spectrum shortfalls and to enhance
10 interoperability, public safety agencies would not be able to adequately discharge their
11 obligation to protect life and property in a safe and efficient and cost-effective manner.

12 I don't think this conclusion surprised anyone. Radio-based voice
13 communication has long been the life line of any emergency response agency. Radio
14 systems allow our dispatchers to direct mobile units to the scenes of emergencies, they
15 allow the units themselves to coordinate their efforts and warn each other of the existence
16 of potential hazards, and they are relied upon to provide logistics and command support
17 during major emergencies and disasters like riots, bombings, and plane crashes.

18 These are just some of the existing uses of radio communications systems.
19 With the rapid advances that have been occurring in wireless technology the potential use
20 of radio communication is virtually limitless. From the law enforcement perspective we
21 envision being able to take fingerprints at the scene of an arrest and transmitting that
22 information directly into our criminal history databases. This will allow the cop on the

1 scene to immediately ascertain the arrest history of the individuals before him or her and
2 whether they are wanted for other crimes.

3 We also see the potential to do the same with mug shots, further enhancing
4 our ability to make positive identifications. So the top priority as far as public safety is
5 concerned is to increase the spectrum available to the public safety community.

6 Congress recognized our need and in August of 1998 the FCC adopted
7 service rules for 24 MHz of spectrum, the largest allocation for public safety use the FCC
8 has ever made. That brings us to today and the NCC and your mission to establish a plan
9 on how to best use this newly available airspace to best serve the people of the United
10 States.

11 I'm not going to get into specifics, that is your department, but I will tell you
12 how critical interoperability is to the public safety community's ability to respond rapidly
13 and efficiently to emergency incidents. The people in this room don't need me to list the
14 multitude of local, state, and federal agencies that share responsibility for the safety of our
15 citizens.

16 Suffice it to say, the pool of talent and resources that is available to address
17 matters of public safety is nothing short of immense, yet, as we pointed out in our report,
18 while we have the ability to transmit news, current events, and entertainment like the
19 Olympics at the farthest reaches of the world, police, fire fighters, and emergency medical
20 personnel working in the same city still cannot communicate with each other and that is just
21 on the local level. Add into the mix federal and state law enforcement, rescue and
22 regulatory agencies and you can have literally hundreds of individuals working towards a

1 common goal without the ability to communicate with each other.

2 We've seen the consequences of that inability to communicate and therefore
3 coordinate, with the World Trade Center bombing and the crash of TWA Flight 800 and
4 even more recent events like the tragedy at Columbine High School. The inability to share
5 vital information at the most critical stages of an emergency can impact matters as
6 complicated as determining which agency is best equipped and experienced to address the
7 problem at hand, to matters as basic as the best response routes to use and where to park
8 emergency vehicles.

9 The Avianca crash on the North Shore of Long Island showed us what a
10 traumatic effect seemingly minor logistical issues can have on our ability to fulfill our
11 obligations to the public.

12 I have had the somewhat unique experience of viewing public safety issues
13 from both a federal and local perspective. I can tell you the best responses I've seen in my
14 30 year career are those that made use of the collective talents at hand and the coordinated
15 and focused management. Each level of government in this country dedicates a substantial
16 portion of their resources in their budgets to public safety and that is the way it should be.

17 You have all seen what occurs when an emergency does happen, response
18 teams from countless agencies converge on the focal point of the incident, inevitably bring
19 duplicative equipment and personnel expertise. Operational coordination has to be
20 conducted very close to the scene, rather than in a more advantageous off-site command
21 center because there is no other alternative. We end up relying on face-to-face contact to
22 exchange ideas and to arrange for the specific equipment and expertise that is required.

1 As for cell phones, when the World Trade Center bombing occurred the
2 cell sites became so saturated from a literal flood of media personnel to the area that the
3 cellular system became overloaded and was rendered useless. Simply put, our inability to
4 communicate more efficiently impedes the effectiveness of our response efforts and
5 commits a disservice upon the public we are trying to protect.

6 Thanks to the newly allocated spectrum we now have the capability to
7 establish literal gateways of communication, the likes of which have never been seen
8 before. I know the task of the NCC is a difficult one. I also know that I'm in the company
9 of the most dedicated group of professionals who share my views on the importance of
10 interoperability and a need for its prompt implementation.

11 I ask only that your recommendation provide for the distribution of this air
12 space in a manner that is efficient and allows for maximum interoperability and that will
13 permit the public safety community to make full use of developments in technology that
14 have our endorsement.

15 Thank you for the opportunity to talk with you. I voice my support to your
16 efforts. Thank you very much.

17 (Applause.)

18 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: That man is a legend. One day someone will
19 write a book.

20 There are a couple of things remaining on our agenda. The main thing that
21 is listed on the agenda is a public discussion time which we always set aside at these
22 meetings. There is one other issue of particular interest that I want to raise but I need a

1 short break to talk with some folks about exactly how to frame it out. So, if we could take
2 a break, recognizing that people would like to keep to various schedule commitments. If
3 we could take a break just for 10 minutes and then reconvene here, I think we can probably
4 wrap up within the next hour.

5 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken from 2:44 p.m. to 2:55 p.m.)

6 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Okay, we're ready to reconvene. I think we can
7 move directly to our general public discussion. The issue that I had thought we would
8 frame up for specific discussion I think we're going to handle a little bit differently.

9 Nokia is going to send me a note identifying some concerns. That will be
10 the basis of my being able to identify some questions that they may wish to answer to
11 supplement what is already known about Nokia's position. What I'll probably do is share
12 that with the Steering Committee to see if they have additional questions that they'd like to
13 put back to Nokia and we will develop the information that we need in that fashion. So,
14 we'll look forward to seeing that from Nokia.

15 Alright, we don't have a talented or funny moderator for today's open mike
16 session so you'll have to just put up with me.

17 This is the time of the day that we allow people to raise new issues, say a
18 last word or two about things that have already been discussed. We will consider any
19 topical topic. Do we have anybody who would like to share a thought with us? Carlton?

20 MR. WELLS: Carlton Wells, State of Florida. I'd just like to express
21 thanks to the participants that were involved in cyberspace, via e-mail or by phone or by
22 fax, or what have you. Sharing information toward working up these documents leading up

1 to today and the previous meetings. I think that the more challenging that the input makes
2 the chairperson's job prior to the meetings can be conducive to the meetings happening
3 easier when we meet face-to-face.

4 There is no substitute for face-to-face because there are communications
5 that take place there, non-verbal or otherwise that you just can't put in the written word.
6 So, I challenge the participants here and even those who are not here and that we get the
7 word out to them over cyberspace, which is the way they may participate, so that they
8 know that they are being heard in these meetings and that their presence is felt. Thanks.

9 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Thank you. Bob, where's your computer?

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. SCHLIEMAN: I'll extemporize. During the course of our -- Robert
12 Schlieman, New York State Police, for the record -- during the course of some of our
13 subcommittee meetings we have had some discussion of digital television internationally
14 with respect to Mexico and with respect to Canada. I think that it would be desirable, from
15 the public safety perspective, if the NCC might consider taking a position, presenting a
16 position to the FCC on that matter.

17 I have a slide program, which I will not show today because it has to be
18 done from my computer. It is 10 megabytes of file storage and I can't get that on a floppy
19 disk but I will be glad to e-mail it to you and you can then consider putting it on the website
20 or however you want to treat the information. It does have significant impact if not in
21 every state, but at least in New York State where we have a substantial line up of digital
22 television stations proposed for Canada, right along the border.

1 We've gone through the impact calculations somewhat like NTIA's data.
2 We lose the ability to use 700 MHz in the Buffalo area, Rochester area, Syracuse area,
3 Watertown area, Plattsburg, in other words, all along the border within that 100 kilometer
4 or line A, whichever way you like to relate to that border issue.

5 We think that it is possible that a channel plant could be developed which
6 would clear those stations away from the border. Also, we note that the Canadian public
7 safety people have created a position paper that seeks to synchronize with the U.S. plan on
8 700 MHz for public safety in Canada. Hopefully, this thing could get steered more in line
9 with perhaps the NPSTC agreement and that sort of thing, although I would prefer to see
10 some improvements over the way it was done in NPSTC. But, essentially to provide both
11 countries what they need.

12 MR. MCEWEN: As you know, I've been involved a little bit in that
13 process along the Canadian border for probably close to 30 years. One of the things,
14 Michael, I know you referred to the fact that there are some on going discussions on this
15 topic but those of us that have been in the public safety business for a long time, we're
16 supposed to not be involved in international negotiations. That is a State Department issue.
17 It is a touchy legal issue.

18 Having been a police chief in New York State for 30 -- many many years,
19 we often resolved interference problems on a police department-to-police department
20 basis. When we had interference from Ontario down to Ithaca, New York I would talk to
21 the police chief. In fact, he drove down from Canada and met with me and we talked and
22 we figured out a way to solve it.

1 Legally we don't understand those international difficulties but in this
2 particular case my feeling is that unless we get public safety to understand the RCMP, the
3 Ontario Prevention Police and so on along the border, understand that they need to get
4 involved on their side of the line just like we're getting involved on our side of the line and
5 deal with their government so we have a meaningful discussion, it is not apt to be easily
6 resolved.

7 MR. SCHLIEMAN: As a matter of fact, the irony is that industry in Canada
8 has no problem contacting us when they have a technical issue about possible interference
9 in anticipation of a future allocation in NPSTC. They come right to the regional planning
10 committee technical chair and work out a satisfactory resolution. Yet, we are prohibited
11 from that technically. However, I second your view on that that it is the person-to-person
12 solution that solves the problem.

13 My only comment regarding the legal issue is that the negotiations between
14 the State Department in the U.S. and whoever it is in Canada that represents their
15 equivalent I can understand that. But the Federal Communications Commission provides
16 technical support to them and I believe that that should be an open process and it is not.
17 So, I would put that on the table as an issue that should be dealt with because it has direct
18 impact on public safety.

19 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: We have the advantage of having Michael
20 Wilhelm involved in the process at the FCC. As a government official he can be involved
21 in a way, as a federal official he can be involved in a way that others interested in this
22 issue really can't be. So I have been following his lead about whether and when NCC

1 might usefully become involved but I'll be guided by him and his ring side seat on the
2 process in figuring out when to come to the Steering Committee or if I should come to the
3 Steering Committee to suggest that we become involved.

4 MR. SCHLIEMAN: Okay. And in any case, probably the State of New
5 York will file a petition to the Commission that will have some impact, hopefully, on that.

6 MR. BUCHANAN: Dave Buchanan, County of San Bernadino.

7 On behalf of Southern California, I'd like to echo that for Mexico. We've
8 already, both the City and County of San Diego have asked me -- let me back up and say
9 that we have started our regional planning process, gotten organized and so we've been
10 having a few discussions on all these matters but the first thing that came up out of them
11 was, "What are we doing about Mexico in getting an agreement?" That was a problem in
12 the NPSTC process for us.

13 We had our complete plan done and then we discovered, well, there's been
14 no agreement with Mexico and we've got to come up with something. Luckily, we were
15 able to work with the Commission at that time and present some ideas to them and a plan
16 that they presented through the State Department to Mexico that eventually was approved
17 and we didn't have to completely redo our channel plan. We want to head that off at the
18 pass this time and get ahead of the game but we're going to be hot and heavy trying to plan
19 and get things started in Southern California.

20 So, I think from our standpoint, the sooner these things are happening the
21 better. We've heard nothing in regards to Mexico so I don't know if anything is happening
22 now or not. I'd sure like to see it happen.

1 MR. MCDOLE: On a slightly different, yet related subject -- Art McDole,
2 representing APCO. I mentioned this issue once before. In the report and order there is
3 very little meat in the regional planning process, there is no oversight provided. Many of
4 us who have worked with regional planning for a lot of years, APCO by default was very
5 active in finalizing the PSWC operation going to those areas which hadn't completed their
6 regional plan or seeing that that was accomplished, we strongly supported the regional
7 planning concept and continue to do so in this new spectrum.

8 We are concerned about the lack of communications and Commission
9 oversight in the process. We recognize and are sensitive to your fear of a funded mandate.
10 We'd like to somehow establish enough dialogue, and checking with your legal people, as
11 to how far we can expect you to go in strengthening the oversight process in the regional
12 planning so that the Steering Committee can get back to you with some meaningful
13 recommendations that you could accept. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Thank you.

15 MR. PIERCE: Bob Pierce. I actually have more of a question. I was
16 wondering if you might be able to clarify the time frame that you see for actions by the
17 committee between now and I guess the end of two January meetings? For example, the
18 Technical Subcommittee has made some recommendations which the process for that will
19 take place between now and that final recommendation to the FCC.

20 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: It is not set at this moment. What we typically
21 do after these meetings is we give Michael a half hour's rest or so and then I coordinate
22 with Michael to figure out what the schedule will be. I expect to talk to Michael probably

1 on Monday. Next week will be a short week because of Thanksgiving but I would expect
2 to regroup with the subcommittee leaders and the Steering Committee to start packing down
3 a schedule for decisions by the following week. So, that last week that trails from
4 November into December I think we'll have a better idea and we'll make sure that that's
5 widely circulated.

6 MR. PIERCE: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Anything else?

8 MR. MCEWEN: It looks like you're about ready to wind up -- I'd just like
9 to make a comment about the process. There are a number of things that I am observing that
10 I think are really positive and there are some things that are less than positive. From my
11 perspective, I have been in this process for a long time and I get them all mixed up.

12 Over a long period of time the involvement of the people in this room and
13 the involvement of the people around the country that are the movers and shakers of public
14 safety wireless matters are very important to the process because, from my perspective,
15 some of you in this room are very highly technical and some of you are more in the
16 category that I'm in, kind of a practitioner more than a technical guy. I need to hear both.
17 I've already memorized all of the information of these charts and data so, now having done
18 that I can put aside all of that and get back to my practical world.

19 I think what I want to say, the bottom line is this, that for those that really
20 have concerns or objections to any of this it is critical that you participate in the process as
21 we are moving along. We need to see that in writing. We need to hear it in oral arguments.
22 We need to have that as part of the process.

1 We realize that there are differences of opinion. If there wasn't a difference
2 of opinion we wouldn't need to be here. We would just write it using a situation. But, we
3 want that input. I don't want to see, after you've had two days of meetings, somebody then
4 sit down and put on the table something that has totally not been discussed or put into the
5 process. It doesn't help us. We need to have this coming in in a timely manner. Everybody
6 should be welcome to participate, if we don't we all suffer, we don't come out of this with
7 a good process.

8 I realize this band widths issue is a very touchy issue but there are a lot of
9 people that have been involved in that process for a long time. We're at that point now
10 where we've got to move forward with some of these issues. If there are still objections to
11 some of these things we need to hear about it and we need to hear about it now, not when
12 we get it all done and then have somebody stand up and say, "Well, I don't like what you
13 did." Let's hear about that now. So if there is anything we can do to make that a part of the
14 process... I mean, the whole process is a matter of compromise, it is a matter of give or
15 take, it is a matter of coming out with what is best for the people of the United States, not
16 what it is going to be to one group's wishes.

17 So, I would just encourage that. I see that as a very necessary thing. I've
18 seen some letters that are going around the committee, letters that are going to the FCC.
19 The FCC asked this committee to act on their behalf and to make some recommendations
20 and that is what we're trying to do here. If people think that by sending things to the FCC
21 directly that that's going to resolve it it isn't really going to do that. They've asked us to do
22 this. We are here to do that. We're here to have a frank, open discussion in a way that will

1 come up with the best solutions for all of us.

2 I can tell you, I have an open mind to these things and I want to listen to the
3 pros and cons so that I can make the best decisions on my behalf for the IACP that we can
4 make. I guess that's what I want to say.

5 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: Thank you, Chief. Any other remarks today?
6 Thank you very much. We will see you in San Francisco in January and we'll see you
7 virtually on conference calls and e-mail between now and then. Thank you very much for
8 coming. Thank you very much to our reporter of record, Mr. Bert Weintraub.

9 (Comments made off mike.)

10 CHAIRMAN WALLMAN: There is a Washington meeting.

11 I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I skipped over one. We've got the Washington meeting
12 and then the San Francisco meeting. Sorry.

13 January 13 and 14 in Washington and San Francisco at the end of the month.

14 Okay. Sorry for that confusion. Everybody have a safe trip home.

15 (Whereupon, at 3:15 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

16 //

17 //

18 //

19 //

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

CASE TITLE: The Public Safety National Coordination
Committee Full Membership Meeting to the
FCC.

HEARING DATE: November 19, 1999

LOCATION: New York, New York

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately on the tapes and notes reported by me at the hearing in the above case before the Federal Communications Commission.

Date: 11/19/99 Michael McCann
Official Reporter
Heritage Reporting Corporation
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005-4018

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence were fully and accurately transcribed from the tapes and notes provided by the above named reporter in the above case before the Federal Communications Commission.

Date: 11/26/99 Rose Kolb
Official Transcriber
Heritage Reporting Corporation

PROOFREADER'S CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the transcript of the proceedings and evidence in the above referenced case that was held before the Federal Communications Commission was proofread on the date specified below.

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4888

Date: _11/26/99_ _Barbara McGuire_____

Official Proofreader
Heritage Reporting Corporation

Heritage Reporting Corporation
(202) 628-4888