



# **AGENDA**

## **LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY**

### **LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

Thursday, March 28, 2013 – 2:00 p.m.

LA County Fire Department Headquarters, Training Room 25  
1320 N. Eastern Ave., Los Angeles, CA 900636

**AGENDA POSTED: March 22, 2013**

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 Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2013.

**Attachment: Item 3**

4. NEW BUSINESS – DISCUSSION ITEM

- 4.1 Public Notice from the FCC

**Attachment: Item 4.1**

- 4.2 LA-RICS Legislative Committee Meeting Schedule for 2013

**Attachment: Item 4.2**

5. PUBLIC COMMENT
6. ADJOURNMENT



#### LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING INFORMATION

Members of the public are invited to address the LA-RICS LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE on any item on the agenda prior to action by the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE on that specific item. Members of the public may also address the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE on any matter within the subject matter jurisdiction of the LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE. The LEGISLATIVE 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 LEGISLATIVE 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 LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE are urged to complete a Speaker Card and submit it to the LEGISLATIVE 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 LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE Secretary prior to final consideration of the matter.

It is requested that individuals who require the services of a translator contact the LEGISLATIVE 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.



# MEETING MINUTES

## LOS ANGELES REGIONAL INTEROPERABLE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM AUTHORITY

### LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, February 21, 2013 • 2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

LA County Fire Department Headquarters, Training Room 26  
1320 N. Eastern Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90063

---

---

#### **Official Voting Members Present:**

**Stephen Sotomayor**, representative for the City of Los Angeles, Mayor's Office  
**Greg Doyle**, representative for the City of Los Angeles Police Department  
**Joshua Drake**, representative for the City of Los Angeles Chief Legislative Analyst Office  
**Olyvia Rodriguez**, representative for the County of Los Angeles Chief Executive Office  
**Daryl Osby, Chair**, representative for the County of Los Angeles Fire Department  
**Mark S. Wilkins**, representative for the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department  
**Gerardo Pinedo**, representative for the County of Los Angeles DHS  
**Timothy Scranton**, representative for the Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association  
**Mitch Tavera**, representative for the City of Culver City, At Large Seat #2  
**Greg Simay**, representative for the City of Burbank, At Large Seat #3

---

#### **Representatives For Official Voting Members Present:**

**Nancy Ramirez**, representative for the Los Angeles School Police Department

---

#### **Official Voting Members Absent:**

**June Gibson**, representative for the City of Los Angeles, Office of the Chief Legislative Analyst  
**Mike Garcia**, representative for the City of Long Beach  
**Scott Pickwith**, representative for the Los Angeles County Police Chiefs Association  
**Mary Giordano**, representative for the City of Torrance, At Large Seat #1  
**Mark Alexander**, representative for the California Contract Cities Association  
**Joseph Payne**, representative for the City of Pasadena, At Large Seat #4



1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCE QUORUM – Roll Call taken by Committee Chair Daryl Osby.
3. APPROVAL OF Legislative Committee Meeting Minutes for January 30, 2013.  
**MOTION APPROVED**
4. NEW BUSINESS – DISCUSSION ITEM

4.1 FirstNet Board Meeting Results

Executive Director Pat Mallon stated that on February 12, 2013, the FirstNet meeting began and unanimously approved the Resolution that would allow a designated FirstNet Board member to negotiate with the seven grant recipients, the conditions and the focuses that they would like. He had a conversation with Sue Swenson, of the BTOP grant, prior to the meeting their goal was that within 90 days to have completed the negotiations. When Executive Director Mallon asked what exact focus areas were they looking at, she stated that the Los Angeles area for innovative business ways on how to build and maintain the system as LA-RICS moves forward, along with some options for the end users. They want all of the seven different projects to look at all of the different areas and see what could be applied to the national system. She suggested that LA-RICS focus on in-building coverage. LA-RICS is using the Public Safety Standards, so that if there was an event, the system would continue to stand. That Public Safety skeleton is designed to cover 95% of the urban areas of the County. The Board did unanimously approve the Resolution on February 12, 2013, and directed her that within the next 90-days to begin negotiations.

On Friday, February 22, 2013, the Executive Director Mallon has secured a conference call with all of the seven BTOP recipients.

At the previous Legislative meeting on January 30, 2013, the conditions had been proposed by NTIA that LA-RICS felt were trouble. What LA-RICS needs to find out is what are FirstNet's positions on those conditions. The condition of most concern is the claw-back, which has to be interoperable and intergradeable to any national system.

Executive Director Mallon stated that once LA-RICS gets spectrum, then FirstNet will communicate to NTIA and advise them that they are supporting us and are able to move forward. On August 30, 2013, the grant expires, but the NTIA is working on getting a 2-year extension, which will extend it for all recipients until August 30, 2015. There are some NEPA/CEQA issues that need to be overcome, but NTIA and FirstNet understand of these issues.



4.2 Selection of the Legislative Vice Chair and Secretary

Chair Osby opened the floor for the selection of the Vice Chair and Secretary, at which point Legislative Committee Member Mark Wilkins nominated Legislative Committee Member Olyvia Rodriguez for Vice Chair, which she did accept the nomination.

Legislative Committee Member Nancy Ramirez seconded the nomination. Committee Member Ramirez nominated Joshua Drake as Secretary, Committee Member Wilkins seconded the nomination; Committee Member Drake accepted the nomination.

**MOTION APPROVED**

4.3 Legislative Standards and Priorities

Committee Member Greg Simay brought up at the last committee meeting the starting of a legislative platform. Committee Member Simay stated that one of the immediate issues before the committee is H.R. 3630, does the Committee want to make a comment and along what lines.

Executive Director Mallon stated that in regard to the FCC, the T-Band is something that the Committee could take a stand on. LA-RICS has been working with the NPSTC working group to present information to the FCC and the House of Energy and Commerce Committee on the impact of the T-Band take-back and the cost associated with replacing those systems are; the report is close to finalization. Since NPSTC is a federally funding body, they cannot take a position and can only present facts.

Some of the Board Members met with Congressman Waxman to solicit some support for the early funding of the LMR system particularly considering the impact of H.R. 3630. The LA-RICS LMR system should be built out in 2021.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

6. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING

Chair Osby adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m. The next meeting is to be determined.



# PUBLIC NOTICE

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> St., S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

News Media Information 202 / 418-0500  
Internet: <http://www.fcc.gov>  
TTY: 1-888-835-5322

DA 13-187

Released: February 11, 2013

## WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS BUREAU AND PUBLIC SAFETY AND HOMELAND SECURITY BUREAU SEEK COMMENT ON OPTIONS FOR 470-512 MHz (T-BAND) SPECTRUM

PS Docket No. 13-42

**Comment Date: May 13, 2013**

**Reply Comment Date: June 11, 2013**

By this Public Notice, the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau (Bureaus) seek comment to inform the Bureaus in their recommendations to the Commission relating to its implementation of Section 6103 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (Act) as it applies to the 470-512 MHz band (T-Band).<sup>1</sup> Section 6103 provides that, not later than nine years after the date of enactment, the Commission shall (1) “reallocate the spectrum in the 470-512 MHz band ... currently used by public safety eligibles,” and (2) “begin a system of competitive bidding under Section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) to grant new initial licenses for use of the spectrum.”<sup>2</sup> It provides that “relocation of public safety entities from the T-Band Spectrum” shall be completed not later than two years after completion of the system of competitive bidding, and that proceeds from the auction of T-Band spectrum “shall be available to the Assistant Secretary [of Commerce for Communications and Information] to make grants in such sums as necessary to cover relocation costs for the relocation of public safety entities from the T-Band spectrum.”<sup>3</sup>

On April 26, 2012, the Bureaus announced a limited suspension of the acceptance and processing of certain applications for Part 22 and Part 90 services operating in the T-Band that could alter the spectrum landscape.<sup>4</sup> The Bureaus took this action to stabilize the spectral environment “while the Commission considers issues surrounding future use of the T-Band, solicits input from interested parties, and works to implement the directives of the Act.”<sup>5</sup> In a subsequent *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*

<sup>1</sup> Pub. L. No. 112-96, 126 Stat. 156 (2012).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* § 6103(a).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* § 6103(b), (c).

<sup>4</sup> Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Suspend the Acceptance and Processing of Certain Part 22 and 90 Applications for 470-512 MHz (T-Band) Spectrum, *Public Notice*, 27 FCC Rcd 4218 (WTB/PSHSB 2012). The Bureaus issued a further clarification of the suspension on June 7, 2012. Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau Clarify Suspension of the Acceptance and Processing of Certain Part 22 and 90 Applications for 470-512 MHz (T-Band) Spectrum, *Public Notice*, 27 FCC Rcd 6087 (WTB/PSHSB 2012).

<sup>5</sup> *Suspension Notice* at 1-2.

regarding other aspects of the Act, the Commission stated that T-Band issues would be addressed in a forthcoming Public Notice “to advance the record on issues related to the technical, financial, administrative, legal, and policy implications of the Act for T-Band licensees.”<sup>6</sup> This Public Notice initiates these next steps. This Public Notice does not propose any change to the current Commission rules regarding T-Band. Its purpose is to gather information in order to inform the Bureaus in their recommendations to the Commission concerning when, how, and under what circumstances it is most appropriate to reallocate the T-Band and relocate incumbent T-Band users as required by Section 6103.

We encourage commenters to present specific proposals for implementing the provisions of Section 6103, including the technical, financial, administrative, legal, and policy implications of each option. To further guide public input on these issues, we seek specific comment on the questions presented below, but also invite more general comment:

- How many licensees of all types use T-Band?
- What is the approximate percentage split between public safety licensees and non-public safety licensees on T-Band?
- How many base station/repeaters, mobile radios, and portable radios operate on T-Band frequencies?
- What is the approximate percentage split between the types of systems that these licensees use? For example: analog/digital, conventional/trunked, voice/data. What is the average cost, age, and useful life of these systems?
- What are the main “use cases” for T-Band systems (e.g., dispatch, field communications, command-and-control) and how much system capacity do these uses require?
- Can responses to the above questions be broken down with respect to each of the T-Band urbanized areas?<sup>7</sup>
- What additional information regarding incumbent T-Band users, apart from that contained in the Commission’s Universal Licensing System (ULS) records, should the Commission consider in its deliberations?

Section 6103 requires reallocation of T-Band spectrum “currently used by public safety eligibles” within nine years of enactment and “relocation of public safety entities” from the T-Band not later than two years after the completion of competitive bidding. This section further provides that the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information (Assistant Secretary) will “make grants in such sums as necessary to cover relocation costs for the relocation of public safety entities from the T-Band spectrum.” We seek comment on the following issues in connection with these provisions:

- What alternative spectrum bands are potentially available for relocation of T-Band public safety licensees? Could T-Band licensees relocate to other UHF-VHF spectrum bands, or to public safety spectrum in the 700 MHz or 800 MHz bands? Should spectrum bands that are not currently allocated for public safety use be considered?
- What is the future feasibility of T-Band public safety licensees migrating their operations to the 700 MHz public safety broadband spectrum by becoming users of the FirstNet public safety broadband network once that network becomes operational? Which use cases (e.g.,

---

<sup>6</sup> Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, Docket 12-268, 27 FCC Rcd 12357, 12365 ¶ 19 (2012).

<sup>7</sup> See 47 CFR § 90.303(b) for list of urbanized areas.

dispatch) are most easily migrated to a broadband data network? What capabilities must be developed in the FirstNet network (*e.g.*, mission-critical voice capability) in order for T-Band relocation to the network to be feasible, and how long will it take for the FirstNet network to develop these capabilities?

- How much time is appropriate under Section 6103 to reallocate T-Band spectrum and relocate public safety licensees? Should the Commission take the maximum period of years allowed under the statute for these steps? What factors should be relevant in making this assessment? If the Commission were to take these steps earlier than the statutory maximum, what would be an appropriate timeline?
- What relocation costs are T-Band licensees likely to incur to relocate out of T-Band? To what extent will relocation costs vary depending on what spectrum band is used for relocation? Recognizing that under the statute, the Assistant Secretary ultimately has the responsibility to administer the relocation grants, would it be appropriate to assume a compensation regime similar to those previously adopted by the Commission for other relocation obligations? For example, should we assume that the compensation regime would provide for recovery of all costs associated with relocation, including planning and administrative costs, or only the cost of retuning and/or replacing equipment? How should the Commission address these issues to minimize costs?
- Should we assume that the compensation regime would provide for recovery of the cost of retuning or replacing equipment acquired since the enactment of Section 6103? Or should we assume that such recovery would be conditioned on demonstrating that such acquisition has not increased the licensee's relocation costs over what they would have been otherwise? How should the Commission address these issues to minimize costs?
- Should the Commission encourage voluntary migration by T-Band public safety licensees prior to the reallocation and relocation required by Section 6103? Are there incentives that the Commission could implement to encourage voluntary relocation? Would licensees who relocate voluntarily be entitled to recover their relocation costs from T-Band auction proceeds? If so, would the delay in receiving such grants until after the auction be likely to make critical services unavailable in the interim?
- Are there potential incentives or requirements that would help facilitate T-Band relocation by making more efficient use of replacement spectrum or reducing relocation costs? For example, would consolidating adjacent T-Band public safety systems into larger regional systems enable them to use replacement spectrum more efficiently or reduce relocation costs? Are there potential costs or burdens associated with consolidation that would outweigh the potential benefits? If consolidation would facilitate implementation of Section 6103, what steps should the Commission take to encourage or require it?
- Some state and local government agencies that are public safety-eligible also use non-public safety frequencies in the T-Band for non-public safety activities. In addition, some public safety entities operate on non-public safety T-Band frequencies pursuant to waivers. Should the Commission treat these licensees as "public safety eligibles" for purposes of relocation to alternative spectrum pursuant to Section 6103(c)?

Section 6103 does not address the status of non-public safety licensees in the T-Band, nor does it require their relocation to other spectrum. We seek comment on whether the Commission should consider options for relocating non-public safety T-Band licensees in conjunction with the relocation of public safety licensees required by Section 6103.

- Should the Commission consider relocating non-public safety as well as public safety licensees out of T-Band in order to clear larger contiguous blocks of T-Band spectrum for



auction that would be likely to generate higher bids? Alternatively, should the Commission consider consolidating non-public safety licensees within a single segment of contiguous T-Band spectrum (e.g., TV Channel 14 at the bottom of the band) in order to clear the remaining T-Band spectrum for auction in contiguous blocks?

- What alternative spectrum bands are potentially available for relocation of T-Band non-public safety licensees? Do T-Band non-public safety licensees require replacement narrowband spectrum or could they relocate their operations to commercial broadband spectrum, either by operating their own broadband networks or becoming customers on existing commercial broadband networks?
- A limited amount of T-Band spectrum is designated for Part 22 use, but this spectrum does not appear to be subject to the same level of use as Part 90 T-Band frequencies. Do incumbent Part 22 systems in T-Band require replacement spectrum, or is existing Part 22 spectrum outside of T-Band sufficient to accommodate these operations?
- If the Commission were to relocate non-public safety licensees from T-Band, should it use the same timetable applicable to relocation of public safety licensees or a different timetable?
- Are there potential incentives or requirements that would help facilitate T-Band relocation or consolidation by non-public safety licensees, if needed? For example, if the Commission were to consolidate all non-public safety T-Band licensees into a single T-Band segment, could the Commission expand the current T-Band geographic limitations or relax other restrictions as incentives?
- While Section 6103 does not authorize use of auction proceeds to pay for relocation of non-public safety licensees, are there other mechanisms available that would enable non-public safety licensees to recover some or all of their relocation costs?
- In light of the enactment of Section 6103, T-Band licensees have been granted a waiver of the January 1, 2013 narrowbanding deadline.<sup>8</sup> If, as mentioned above, the Commission consolidates non-public safety licensees into a single segment of contiguous T-Band spectrum or relocates them out of the T-Band, should the Commission require those licensees to narrowband as a condition of receiving replacement spectrum? For T-Band licensees that have not already narrowbanded, would narrowbanding on replacement spectrum be any more costly than narrowbanding on their current channels?

We seek comment on what, if any, interim actions the Commission should take with respect to T-Band incumbents prior to implementing the reallocation and relocation provisions of Section 6103:

- As noted above, the Bureaus have suspended the processing and filing of T-Band applications for new or expanded operations while the Commission considers issues surrounding future use of the T-Band. Should the Commission continue this suspension until reallocation and relocation are implemented, even if this does not occur until the maximum period of years allowed by Section 6103?
- Should the Commission consider modifying the suspension to allow certain additional types of modifications? For example, should frequency replacements be permitted within the same TV channel or within TV channels already designated in a given urbanized area for PLMR use? Should Part 22 applications for Part 22 frequencies continue to be suspended? Should the Commission process applications that were pending prior to the announcement of the suspension and are currently being held in abeyance?

---

<sup>8</sup> See Implementation of Sections 309(j) and 337 of the Communications Act of 1934 as Amended; Promotion of Spectrum Efficient Technologies on Certain Part 90 Frequencies, *Order*, WT Docket No. 99-87, RM-9332, 27 FCC Rcd 4213 (WTB/PSHSB/OET 2012).

- Should the Commission consider other measures to restrict changes to T-Band incumbent systems that would increase their relocation costs?

This proceeding shall be treated as a “permit-but-disclose” proceeding in accordance with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules.<sup>9</sup> Persons making *ex parte* presentations must file a copy of any written presentation or a memorandum summarizing any oral presentation within two business days after the presentation (unless a different deadline applicable to the Sunshine period applies). Persons making oral *ex parte* presentations are reminded that memoranda summarizing the presentation must (1) list all persons attending or otherwise participating in the meeting at which the *ex parte* presentation was made, and (2) summarize all data presented and arguments made during the presentation. If the presentation consisted in whole or in part of the presentation of data or arguments already reflected in the presenter’s written comments, memoranda or other filings in the proceeding, the presenter may provide citations to such data or arguments in his or her prior comments, memoranda, or other filings (specifying the relevant page and/or paragraph numbers where such data or arguments can be found) in lieu of summarizing them in the memorandum. Documents shown or given to Commission staff during *ex parte* meetings are deemed to be written *ex parte* presentations and must be filed consistent with rule 1.1206(b). In proceedings governed by rule 1.49(f) or for which the Commission has made available a method of electronic filing, written *ex parte* presentations and memoranda summarizing oral *ex parte* presentations, and all attachments thereto, must be filed through the electronic comment filing system available for that proceeding, and must be filed in their native format (*e.g.*, .doc, .xml, .ppt, searchable .pdf). Participants in this proceeding should familiarize themselves with the Commission’s *ex parte* rules.

Interested parties may file comments and reply comments on or before the dates indicated on the first page of this document. Interested parties may file comments using: (1) the Commission’s Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS), or (2) by filing paper copies. *See Electronic Filing of Documents in Rulemaking Proceedings*, 63 FR 24121 (1998). **Commenters should refer to the docket number and the DA number on the front page of this Public Notice when filing comments.**

- Electronic Filers: Interested parties may file comments electronically using the Internet by accessing the ECFS: <http://efiling.fcc.gov/ecfs2/>.
- Paper Filers: Parties who choose to file by paper must file an original and one copy of each filing. If more than one docket or rulemaking number appears in the caption of this proceeding, filers must submit two additional copies for each additional docket or rulemaking number.

Filings can be sent by hand or messenger delivery, by commercial overnight courier, or by first-class or overnight U.S. Postal Service mail. All filings must be addressed to the Commission’s Secretary, Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission.

- All hand-delivered or messenger-delivered paper filings for the Commission’s Secretary must be delivered to FCC Headquarters at 445 12th St., SW, Room TW-A325, Washington, DC 20554. The filing hours are 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. All hand deliveries must be held together with rubber bands or fasteners. Any envelopes and boxes must be disposed of before entering the building.
- Commercial overnight mail (other than U.S. Postal Service Express Mail and Priority Mail) must be sent to 9300 East Hampton Drive, Capitol Heights, MD 20743.

---

<sup>9</sup> 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1200 *et seq.*

- U.S. Postal Service first-class, Express, and Priority mail must be addressed to 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Washington DC 20554.

People with Disabilities: To request materials in accessible formats for people with disabilities (braille, large print, electronic files, audio format), send an e-mail to [fcc504@fcc.gov](mailto:fcc504@fcc.gov) or call the Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau at 202-418-0530 (voice), 202-418-0432 (tty).

Interested parties may view documents filed in this proceeding on the Commission's Electronic Comment Filing System (ECFS) using the following steps: (1) Access ECFS at <http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs>. (2) In the introductory screen, click on "Search for Filings." (3) In the "Proceeding Number" box, enter the numerals in the docket number. (4) Click on the box marked "Search for Comments." A link to each document is provided in the document list. The public may inspect and copy filings and comments during regular business hours at the FCC Reference Information Center, 445 12th Street, SW, Room CY-A257, Washington, DC 20554. The public may also purchase filings and comments from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Best Copy and Printing, Inc., Portals II, 445 12th Street, SW, Room CY-B402, Washington, DC 20554, telephone 1-800-378-3160, or via e-mail to [fcc@bcpiweb.com](mailto:fcc@bcpiweb.com). The public may also download this Public Notice from the Commission's web site at <http://www.fcc.gov/>.

By the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau.

-FCC-



## ***A NPSTC Public Safety Communications Report***

*The National Public Safety Telecommunications Council is a federation of organizations whose mission is to improve public safety communications and interoperability through collaborative leadership.*

# **T-Band Report**

***March 15, 2013***

***The member organizations of the National Public Safety Telecommunications Council are grateful to the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate, Office for Interoperability and Compatibility (OIC), and the National Protection and Programs Directorate, Office of Emergency Communications (OEC), for their support.***

---

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials | American Radio Relay League | Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies | Association of Public Safety Communications Officials | Forestry Conservation Communications Association | International Association of Chiefs of Police | International Association of Emergency Managers | International Association of Fire Chiefs | International Municipal Signal Association | National Association of State Chief Information Officers | National Association of State Emergency Medical Services Officials | National Association of State Foresters | National Association of State Technology Directors | National Emergency Number Association | National Sheriffs' Association

---

191 Southpark Lane, #205 • Littleton, CO 80120 • Phone 866-807-4755 • Fax 303-649-1844 • Website [www.NPSTC.org](http://www.NPSTC.org)

## **Agenda Item 4.1, Attachment B**

## Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>KEY CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 T BAND HISTORY.....	5
1.2 PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 112-96.....	7
1.3 FCC FREEZE .....	8
1.4 FCC PUBLIC NOTICE SEEKING COMMENTS .....	8
1.5 NPSTC APPROACH.....	9
<b>2. T-BAND USAGE AND IMPACT.....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 OVERVIEW DESCRIPTIONS .....	10
2.2 SUMMARY OF FCC LICENSE STATISTICS.....	10
2.3 NPSTC QUESTIONNAIRE PROCESS AND RESULTS.....	11
<b>3. EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL SPECTRUM ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.1 OVERVIEW OF SPECTRUM EVALUATION .....	16
3.2 THE VHF BAND (150-174 MHz).....	16
3.3 UHF BAND (450-470 MHz).....	19
3.4 800 MHz BAND .....	20
3.5 700 MHz NARROWBAND SPECTRUM .....	28
3.6 700 MHz BROADBAND SPECTRUM .....	31
3.7 SPECTRUM EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS .....	33
<b>4. RELOCATION, COST, TIMING, AND PROCESS.....</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1 INTRODUCTION .....	34
4.2 TYPES OF SYSTEMS.....	36
4.3 COST MODEL OVERVIEW .....	37
4.4 COST MODEL RESULTS .....	45
4.5 DETAILED MODEL DESCRIPTION .....	47
4.5.1 ULS-Based Localized Costs .....	47
4.5.1 System-Related Costs.....	48
4.5.3 Site Related Costs.....	49
4.5.4 Receive Only Impact.....	51
4.5.6 Coverage Impact.....	51
4.5.7 Repeater-Related Costs.....	53
4.5.8 Subscriber-Related Costs.....	54
4.6 OTHER COSTS.....	56
4.6.1 Spares .....	57
4.6.3 Taxes.....	57
4.7 POTENTIAL CHANGES IN COST STRUCTURE .....	58

4.8 TIMING REQUIRED TO PLAN AND IMPLEMENT RELOCATION ..... 58

5. POTENTIAL AUCTION VALUE.....59

6. CONCLUSIONS: .....62

*ACKNOWLEDGEMENT* .....63

APPENDIX B: DETAILED COST MODEL BREAKDOWNS .....65

## Executive Summary

On February 22, 2012, the President signed Public Law 112-96 which requires the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to begin auctioning the public safety T-Band spectrum by February 2021 and clear all public safety operations from the band within 2 years of auction close, (i.e., by early 2023). This spectrum is used in 11 metropolitan areas to support critical public safety communications and provide regional interoperability among first responders. These areas are Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Washington, D.C.

While the law provides that auction revenues can be used toward the cost of relocating public safety operations out of the band, the law is silent on identifying a new spectrum home. The law is also silent on the status of thousands of industrial/business users who also utilize this spectrum and whose frequencies are intermingled with public safety frequencies. In response to the law, the FCC placed a freeze on new and expanded T-Band operations for all licensees, including both public safety and industrial/business entities.

The National Public Safety Telecommunications Council (NPSTC) responded by establishing a T-Band Working Group chartered to study the issue, assess and document the impact of the legislation and the FCC freeze on public safety, evaluate the viability and cost of potential relocation options, and provide its findings to the NPSTC Governing Board. Approximately 60 members of the public safety community and related industry representatives volunteered to serve on the Working Group. This report addresses NPSTC's analysis and findings.

## Key Conclusions

**Given the lack of alternative spectrum, cost of relocation, major disruption to vital public safety services, and likelihood that the spectrum auction would not even cover relocation costs, NPSTC believes implementing the T-Band legislation is not feasible, provides no public interest benefit, and the matter should be re-visited by Congress.**

1. **SPECTRUM** - Analysis of public safety spectrum bands shows that at least 5 of the 11 metro areas do not have sufficient spectrum in any band to relocate their existing T-Band operations. These areas are the Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and Philadelphia metros. The adequacy of relocation spectrum in three additional areas, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and Pittsburgh is marginal. It is not yet viable to rely on the planned Nationwide Public Safety Broadband Network (NPSBN) as a likely option to support mission critical voice operations that would be displaced from the T-Band.
2. **COST** - The cost to move public safety operations in the 11 metro areas to new frequencies is estimated to be in excess of \$5.9 billion, much greater than the likely auction revenue. If TV and industrial/business were also required to move, that would require additional relocation funding, resulting in the net auction revenue being an even greater negative value.
3. **PUBLIC GAIN** – It appears the intent of the law may be to gain additional broadband spectrum for public use. Extensive TV broadcast operations throughout the country and industrial/business systems in 11 metro markets will remain on T-Band channels even if public safety systems are relocated out of the band. These circumstances are unlikely to produce the auction revenue needed for public safety relocation or result in additional broadband spectrum for public use.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 T Band History

The T-Band (470-512 MHz) is a key spectrum resource allocated for land mobile communications operations in 11 top urban areas of the United States. These 11 urban areas, as listed in Section 90.303 are Boston, Chicago, Dallas/Ft. Worth, Washington, D.C. (including parts of Virginia and Maryland), Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, New York City/Northeast New Jersey, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and San Francisco/Oakland. This spectrum, which comprises television channels 14-20 throughout most of the country, was allocated on a shared basis for land mobile operations by the FCC in 1971 under Docket No. 18261.

Originally, the FCC planned to make some T-Band spectrum available in Detroit and Cleveland as well, so those additional two markets are also listed in the FCC rules. However, the United States was never able to reach agreement with Canada for T-Band operation in the Detroit and Cleveland border area.<sup>1</sup> Therefore T-Band land mobile operation is only in the 11 market areas listed above. The premise behind the allocation of this spectrum was that these 11 metropolitan areas had the greatest challenge in locating needed land mobile spectrum for public safety first responder operations, as well as industrial/business applications. The T-Band provided a significant supplement of channels to support public safety operations in these critical areas. The T-Band is still being used to support and upgrade public safety systems and those investments will be lost if the T-Band is reallocated.

In general, FCC rules allow base stations to be located within 50 miles of a set of reference coordinates listed for each of the 11 metro areas. Mobiles and portables are allowed to operate within a 30-mile radius around the base stations. This allowed public safety operations within 80 miles of these metro areas. It should be noted, however, that operation on some of the T-Band channels in certain metro areas is more restrictive to protect specific co-channel or adjacent channel TV stations. Some operations have also been authorized over the years, via FCC waiver, to allow for operations beyond the 50-mile radius.

Not all the spectrum in 470-512 MHz (TV channels 14-20) is authorized in each of the 11 markets. Each market has the use of only certain TV channels from within the T-Band and the specific channels and amount of spectrum vary by market, as shown in the Table 1. This table reflects channels originally allocated in 1971 plus additional channels that have been added since that time in the Los Angeles and New York areas. Column 3 in Table 1 denotes the nominal amount of total spectrum allocated from the T-Band to public safety and industrial/business land mobile radio services. Note that because this is television spectrum is being shared by land mobile operations, there are situations in some markets where the total amount of nominal spectrum is not actually

---

<sup>1</sup> The lack of a border agreement allowing use of the T-Band in Detroit and Cleveland did not eliminate the need for additional spectrum. Accordingly, the FCC subsequently made spectrum available for Detroit and Cleveland on some channels in the 421-430 MHz band.