



AGENDA

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, January 20, 2011 : 9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200, Monterey Park, California 91754

AGENDA POSTED: January 14, 2011

Complete agendas are made available for review on the Authority's website at <http://www.la-rics.org>.

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call
3. APPROVAL OF December 16, 2010 MINUTES
4. REPORTS
 - 4.1 No reportable action
5. JUSTIFICATION FOR PURSUING THE D BLOCK V3 – Kevin Nida
 - 5.1 DISCUSSION ITEM: D BLOCK position (attachment 5)
6. CHANNEL USAGE – John Lenihan
 - 6.1 Analog Conventional Additions
 - 6.2 National Interoperability Channels
7. PUBLIC COMMENT
8. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING:
 - Date: TBD
 - Location: LA-RICS Project
2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200
Monterey Park, CA 91754



TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING INFORMATION

Members of the public are invited to address the LA-RICS TECHNICAL COMMITTEE on any item on the agenda prior to action by the TECHNICAL COMMITTEE on that specific item. Members of the public may also address the TECHNICAL COMMITTEE on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the TECHNICAL COMMITTEE. The TECHNICAL COMMITTEE will entertain such comments during the Public Comment period. Public Comment will be limited to three (3) minutes per individual for each item addressed, unless there are more than ten (10) comment cards for each item, in which case the Public Comment will be limited to one (1) minute per individual. The aforementioned limitation may be waived by the TECHNICAL COMMITTEE's Chair.

(NOTE: Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.3(b) the legislative body of a local agency may adopt reasonable regulations, including, but not limited to, regulations limiting the total amount of time allocated for public testimony on particular issues and for each individual speaker.)

Members of the public who wish to address the TECHNICAL COMMITTEE are urged to complete a Speaker Card and submit it to the TECHNICAL COMMITTEE Secretary prior to commencement of the public meeting. The cards are available in the meeting room. However, should a member of the public feel the need to address a matter while the meeting is in progress, a card may be submitted to the TECHNICAL COMMITTEE Secretary prior to final consideration of the matter.

It is requested that individuals who require the services of a translator contact the TECHNICAL COMMITTEE Secretary no later than the day preceding the meeting. Whenever possible, a translator will be provided. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability, you are advised to make your request at least 72 hours prior to the meeting you wish to attend.
(323) 881-8291 or (323) 881-8295

SI REQUIERE SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCION, FAVOR DE NOTIFICAR LA OFICINA CON 24 HORAS POR ANTICIPADO.

MEMORANDUM

TO: LA-RICS Technical Committee
FROM: Work Group (Technical Committee Ad Hoc & Operations Committee Procedures Working Group)
SUBJECT: Justification for Pursuing the D Block
DATE: January 20, 2011

Justification for Pursuing the “D” Block for Public Safety

“The mission of LA-RICS is to provide the finest interoperable communication system with unwavering focus on the public safety professional.”

Considerations

Costs

Bandwidth in the L.A. region is very costly and if the JPA has to buy or lease it in the future, funding may not be available. With the additional D-Block spectrum, LA-RICS subscribers would have to **roam less** often onto the commercial spectrum, thus reducing the operational costs. Additionally, the potential revenue stream of leasing back bandwidth to commercial carriers, other agencies, or utilities provides a much needed **revenue return** while guaranteeing public safety priority. The approximate value of an additional 5 + 5 MHz of spectrum in the LA Area is about \$400M. Although it is expected that the **cost of end-user equipment** may be higher if Public Safety gets the “D” Block, the fact that AT&T and Verizon will operate in the adjacent bands (12 and 13) means LTE will be the dominant commercial technology across the majority of the 700 MHz block. This shared 700 MHz spectrum will be the key factor in substantially reducing end-user equipment cost. LTE is a very scalable technology. Expanding from a 5X5 MHz to a 10X10 MHz spectrum system does not add significant cost. On the contrary, the same equipment can be reprogrammed to a 10X10 MHz configuration, doubling the system capacity while essentially using the same LTE equipment. The incremental cost of operating on the additional D-Block spectrum should be insignificant.

Quality

LA-SafetyNet will be of **public safety grade** & meet members’ needs. The incidents of 9-11, Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Ike, the Hudson River Plane Crash, and the Minneapolis bridge collapse are examples of situations that overwhelmed commercial wireless systems and justify the need for a public safety owned & operated system. Commercial wireless providers do not harden their systems in accordance with public-safety best practices. LA-SafetyNet will be highly reliable and will be **backed up by battery & generator** and built to greater specifications than commercial carrier sites. This “hardening” allows a site to survive earthquakes, fires and

floods. Since LA-RICS will administer the network, **it will be known when and where there are problems and in what priority to address & correct them.** LA-SafetyNet can adapt the system to meet LA-RICS' changing needs.

Capacity/Access

A 10x10 Megahertz system ("D" Block plus the Public Safety Spectrum Trust, PSST) is needed to meet the region's **capacity** for the most demanding incidents. Considering State and Federal responses to declared disasters, the PSST (5+5 MHz) will not meet the operational demands. Even during normal operations, regular **roaming** onto the commercial spectrum, and its associated costs, would be the likely outcome of having only 5 + 5 MHz of spectrum. Commercial carriers will not want to compromise their public customer base by reducing their grade of service to support public safety operations, calling into question the desired priority access. LA-SafetyNet will have **guaranteed priority access** for public safety as the JPA will set the priorities.

Interference

Auctioning the "D" Block to a commercial carrier will cause **interference** and coverage holes in LA-SafetyNet. The chances of a coverage hole increases as a Public Safety user moves away from an LA-SafetyNet site and towards a commercial carrier site using the "D" block. In order to reduce such interference and potential loss of service, LA-SafetyNet will have to co-locate additional base stations with the offending commercial carrier "D" Block site. This will force additional/non-budgeted outlays; money that should be spent on buying end-user equipment and operating LA-SafetyNet.

Interoperability

Even if Public Safety gets additional spectrum in other bands in the **future**, the fact that it would not be of contiguous spectrum will negatively impact the national interoperability goal. The "D" block ensures much needed contiguous spectrum in the 700 MHz band.

JL



MINUTES

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

December 16, 2010 - 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200, Monterey Park, California 91754

Official Voting Members Present:

Kevin Nida, Chair, City of Los Angeles Fire Department
John Black, Vice Chair, City of Long Beach
Mark S. Wilkins, Secretary, County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department
Mehrdad Larijaniha, City of Los Angeles – Chief Administrative Office
Tri Nguyen, P.E., City of Los Angeles Police Department
Ron Wong, County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office
Jose Betance, County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services
Rick Beck, Los Angeles Unified School District Police Department
Jay Coote, Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association
Phil Wagner, California Contract Cities Association
Ernest Gallo, At Large #1, City of Torrance
William T. Heins, At Large #2, City of Culver City
Jim Floyd, At Large #3, City of Burbank
John Curley, At Large #4, City of Covina

Representatives For Official Voting Members Present:

Jim Floyd, representing Steven Page, Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association
John Lenihan, representing Robert Hewitt, Los Angeles County Fire Department

Official Voting Members Absent:

June Gibson, City of Los Angeles – Chief Legislative Analyst Office



1. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the LA-RICS Technical Committee was called to order on December 16, 2010 at 9:30 a.m.

2. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call

Chair Kevin Nida conducted a formal roll call and acknowledged a quorum was present.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion made to approve the Technical Committee Meeting Minutes of November 18, 2010. Mehrdad Larijaniha made a Motion to approve the Minutes as written. Philip Wagner seconded the Motion. **MOTION APPROVED.**

Secretary Mark Wilkins mentioned that as this was a new committee that everyone introduce themselves before they speak so they can be properly identified in the Minutes.

4. REPORTS

4.1 No reportable action.

5. D-BLOCK SPECTRUM PRESENTATION – Charles Bryson, RCC Consulting, Inc.

Dieter Preiser, Director, RCC Consultants, Inc., introduced the guest speaker, his colleague, Charles Bryson, RCC Consulting, Virginia Office, who has been invited to provide a presentation on the D-Block Spectrum. He gave a brief background of Mr. Bryson—that he has been with RCC since 1988; has both a Bachelor and Master degree in Public Safety; is currently sitting as Broadband Consultant for the states of Maryland and Delaware; has worked on many broadband projects throughout the United States and served on several regional planning commissions including the Northern California Aqua Chapter; serves on the Broadband Taskforce of the National Public Telecommunications Council; he is also a retired Police Captain; and is an authority on the Broadband Commissions for Emergency Communications.

Charles Bryson provided a PowerPoint presentation to the Technical Committee. The entire transcript of the presentation is available for viewing on the web site: www.LA-RICS.org.



Question & Answer Session

Question #1: Lt. Mark Wilkins, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, asked to clarify what is meant by secondary use as was referred to in the "point-to-point" slides.

Response: Charles Bryson answered that under the Commission's rules, secondary use means you can't render interference when it hasn't accepted.

Question #2: Jay Coote, Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association, asked for a copy of the presentation...as might others.

Response: Charles Bryson answered no problem and that Dieter Preiser has a copy...just as long as you don't give to his competitors.

Question #3: Ron Wong, County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office, asked, "When you talk about critical infrastructure, does that mean that private providers of utilities are eligible for use on the spectrum?"

Response: Charles Bryson answered, "That's what people are advocating the Commission to do. There is an argument that they could come in and provide under Sub-Part 523B of the Eligibility Rule which talks about—non-governmental users such as non-governmental fire departments, ambulance, etc... that they coordinate public safety. He thinks the argument of the broadband plan is that perhaps the definition be expanded somewhat and that it's a little confusing (e.g. where he lives the power company is private. They are not Part 90 so it really tries to level the playing field). In places where the power companies are run by the government, there are few that already Part 90 or could be Part 90. The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) is a big advocate of it.

Question #4: Mehrdad Larijaniha, City of Los Angeles/LA-RICS, asked, "Based on the presentation, when and how do you see utilities such as the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power being able to participate?" (Presently the Federal Communications Commission [FCC's] ruling doesn't allow utilities to participate.)

Response: Charles Bryson answered that he doesn't know how that department is licensed. He said that if they are licensed today as a Part 90 User they fall under the rules and that you have to see how they are used or how they're licensed. But, even if they are a Part 90 Licensee, their use would be subject to the network plan or the plan that the LA-RICS people put together. This is where governance becomes a huge issue because you have to decide where they come in the pecking order as a police officer might be more important than a power... It's kind of like you have a lot of places where there's a trunk radio system and somebody in the management of it



says that a police officer is a 3 and a trash truck is a 9. They are all in the same system but they have different levels of priority. But in his mind, the same rules apply.

Question #5: Mehrdad Larijaniha asked, "If only an agency operates under Part 90 would they be eligible?"

Response: Charles Bryson answered, "Yes. If they are Part 90, they fall under the eligibility requirements, kind of Sub-Part 523 of the rules."

Question #6: Battalion Chief John Lenihan, County of Los Angeles Fire Department said, "Apparently the Feds have laid out some requirements that the system be built to certain standards." He asked, "Did they also mandate building penetration to handheld device versus street coverage?"

Response: Charles Bryson answered, "No. They are on-street coverage. This is what the Commission mandated."

Question #7: Battalion Chief John Lenihan then asked, "So you would advocate for in-building...worldwide?"

Response: Charles Bryson answered, "Yes." He thinks "public safety as a rule understands the criticality of ...in-building coverage lot better than the Commission. And there's a lot more practical experience in public safety. When he goes to the Public Safety Homeland Security Bureau, he see Jamie Barnett and every deputy chief they got, nice guy, lawyer, etc., but where's the technician guy? He [the technician] hasn't gone through Law school yet and he [Charles Bryson] doesn't mean to be critical of them; they understand ex post facto a lot better than...government."

With no further questions, Mr. Bryson thanked everyone.

5.1 Chair Kevin Nida asked if there was any discussion on the presentation.

John Lenihan – The Technical Committee is being asked to provide the Board...

Chair Kevin Nida stated that the Technical Committee was asked to provide the Board with a recommendation on which way to go. He doesn't know if we [the committee] are prepared or if they need more time to get more information. Also, if they didn't have to have a motion today, does that give us a timeframe for that?

He went on to say that he thinks it's a very informative presentation and knows there are some political issues that we also probably need to look at. He asked if there was another discussion of a proposed matter if not we will table it...and so we will table 5.1.



6. DISCUSS AND PRIORITIZE NEW BUSINESS

None

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

7.1 None

8. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING:

Motion made to adjourn the meeting. **MOTION APPROVED.**

The next meeting of the Technical Committee is scheduled for:

Date/Time: Thursday, January 20, 2011 at 9:30 a.m.

Location: LA-RICS PROJECT
2525 Corporate Place, Suite 200 – Large Conference Room
Monterey Park, CA 91754
(323) 881-8291