

Matt McCreary

From: Laura Lippman
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2006 3:09 PM
To: Jeanne Elder; 'Jackie Siegel'; Matt McCreary
Subject: FW: Missouri SIEC response to NPSTC call for input on NCC InteroperabilityChannel Nomenclature Recommendations

From: Steve.Devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov [mailto:Steve.Devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov]

Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2006 12:13 PM

To: Root, Don

Cc: acharry@yahoo.com; adrodriguez@aemean.gobierno.net; artmcdoles@salinas.net; bill.decamp@dgs.ca.gov; bob.sanders@ci.amarillo.tx.us; boydwebb@utah.gov; carl.guse@dot.state.wi.us; cknights@azdps.gov; dappleby@state.pa.us; dave.scaadvisor@pacbell.net; david.cook@oft.state.ny.us; dean_strid@admin.state.ak.us; dloper@mdps.state.ms.us; EmReynolds@aol.com; fsmart@harrco911.org; geer@ksdot.org; george.carbonell@po.state.ct.us; gryan@dnr.state.md.us; gsi@mt.net; harold.meacombs@ncshp.org; jamesonwj@aol.com; jpowell@berkeley.edu; moapco911@yahoo.com; mosiec@mail.mo.gov; npspacregion24@yahoo.com; Laura Lippman; pccd@aristotle.net; region24siec@yahoo.com; rhessinger@state.nd.us; rmayworm@bryantx.gov; Robert.Pletcher@txdps.state.tx.us; rpc24@yahoo.com; SO2216@adaweb.net; WHALL@gta.ga.gov; wizard61@hotmail.com

Subject: Re: Missouri SIEC response to NPSTC call for input on NCC InteroperabilityChannel Nomenclature Recommendations

Don

I agree. While, as you stated, NPSTC has never claimed to have the authority to require public safety agencies to utilize or adhere to any standardized channel names, I highlighted that fact so those pondering whether to use these channel labels or not will understand that anything agreed upon as the result of this open forum February 5 will not become part of the FCC's rules, at least as we know them today. Those conclusions may, however, become best practices that DHS or the Commission can promote. In other words, I did not want people thinking that this effort was a mandate from the government, as many are less aware than you and I as to the Commission's position on this issue and the other NCC recommendations and unfunded mandates are never received well at the local level. Obviously, the costs involved in re-programming for local agencies will have to come from somewhere to promote compliance.

On that note, I'd like to see more more recognition on some of the other NCC recommendation byproducts (let's call them sister recommendations to the channel nomenclature...) not accepted by the Commission in 2003 that roll into the Channel nomenclature debate. Since John Powell and I wrote the initial NCC channel nomenclature recommendations/suggestions (and expanded them from 700 MHz only to include FCC designated channels in all bands) at 1 AM in a Washington DC hotel room in 2001, we acknowledged the fact that the FCC would be hesitant to "mandate" anything due to their inability to enforce such a rule. We felt strongly that the recommendation that each state/region develop, maintain and post on a national database an updated version of their state plan that would be able to show neighboring agencies and states their interoperability plan and, more importantly, the details in which it varies from the National Standard, would assist in promoting the commonality of channel nomenclature. We both felt strongly that in suggesting national nomenclature for implementation in a state, if a state indicated they had legacy use with a channel label different from the established standard it would be their charge to document that and make it available to those adhering to the standard so preparations could be made for response and compatibility, when necessary.

I think that we should be promoting overall interoperability and not just the requirement that people all use these same channels calling them the same names. To me, that is one piece of the puzzle and now the entire solution. I feel the solution resulting in maximum interoperability will be the sum of several initiatives, including improving the interoperable dialogue between users, states and regions. The end goal should be promoting interoperability across states and regions and it will take more than one tool to meet that end. In addition, without state plans being required (or promoted as a best practice), what about those users not requesting grant funding? There will be no mechanism to promote this type of commonality between grant awardees and non-grant awardees. Where is there incentive to adhere to a national standard or their neighbors variance of the standard. Putting all eggs in the common nomenclature basket will not, in my opinion, result in the degree of interoperability we all seek.

Here is the conversation the way I think it should go between advocates of the national nomenclature and users:.

Here is the list of common I/O channels with nationally designated channel labels you should use.

We don't use those channel names.....

OK, then document what you do use and post in on a website so those around you can document how you've varied from the plan.

In my opinion, it is in this vein where dialogue is promoted both within and between states and regions to provide either consistency or the tools and education that can promote such outreach. I will continue to push for both pieces to this puzzle, as I have for the last several years working to ensure that since the cookie cutter approach for every public safety agencies to conform to national channel designations is doomed to at best only a partial success nationally, I've acknowledged the remaining non-compliant users should be provided a mechanism to improve their compatibility and be able to communicate with their neighbors.

Just my two cents, of course

Stephen Devine, Missouri SIEC

Stephen T. Devine
Patrol Frequency Coordinator
Communications Division
Missouri State Highway Patrol General Headquarters
1510 East Elm
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
steve.devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov

Office (573) 526-6105
FAX (573) 526-1112

"Root, Don" <Don.Root@sdsheiff.org>

12/14/2006 12:04 PM

To <Steve.Devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov>, <npsstc@highlands-group.com>, <jpowell@berkeley.edu>

cc <rpc24@yahoogroups.com>, <npspacregion24@yahoogroups.com>, <mosiec@mail.mo.gov>, <moapco911@yahoogroups.com>, <region24siec@yahoogroups.com>, <SO2216@adaweb.net>, <bill.decamp@dgs.ca.gov>, <WHALL@gta.ga.gov>, <rhessinger@state.nd.us>, <harold.meacombs@ncshp.org>, <Robert.Pletcher@txdps.state.tx.us>, <adrodriguez@aemean.gobierno.net>, <artmcdole@salinas.net>, <jamesonwj@aol.com>, <wizard61@hotmail.com>, <bob.sanders@ci.amarillo.tx.us>, <boydwebb@utah.gov>, <acharry@yahoo.com>, <carl.guse@dot.state.wi.us>, <pccd@aristotle.net>, <cknight@azdps.gov>, <dave.scaadvisor@pacbell.net>, <david.cook@oft.state.ny.us>, <dean_strid@admin.state.ak.us>, <dappleby@state.pa.us>, <dloper@mdps.state.ms.us>, <geer@ksdot.org>, <EmReynolds@aol.com>, <fsmart@harrco911.org>, <george.carbonell@po.state.ct.us>, <gsi@mt.net>, <gryan@dnr.state.md.us>, <rmayworm@bryantx.gov>

Subject Re: Missouri SIEC response to NPSTC call for input on NCC InteroperabilityChannel Nomenclature Recommendations

1/31/2007

Steve -

Thanks for your comments. As someone involved in the process of attempting to solve the standard naming issue for a couple of decades, I don't ever recall seeing where NPSTC, an organization dedicated to continuing the work efforts of two Federal Advisory Committees (PSWAC and NCC) in the arena of Public Safety communications, has claimed "the authority to require public safety agencies to utilize or adhere to any standardized channel names."

As you stated, "the consistent use of a finalized channel label list for dedicated FCC designated interoperability channels could be used as a future requirement to be eligible for grants through DHS or other granting agencies." NPSTC has recognized that there are differences of opinions regarding the NCC's 'standardized channel names' list in different areas of the country, and that an open discussion in a public forum is needed to validate or update the list that you and I assisted in the development of as a component of the NCC's interoperability efforts. Lacking any other national body representing all aspects of Public Safety stepping forward to lead the discussion, NPSTC is doing it.

I appreciate your comments and input and look forward to your participation in the forum on February 5th.

Don Root
NPSTC SIEC Working Group Chair / Common Nomenclature Task Group Co-chair

--

Donald Root, Assistant Manager
Wireless Services Division
San Diego County Sheriff's Department
San Diego - Imperial County Regional Communications System
858.694.3903 V 858.694.3433 F 619.405.4379 C
Sent from my PDA

----- Original Message -----

From: Steve.Devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov <Steve.Devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov>
To: npstc@highlands-group.com <npstc@highlands-group.com>; Root, Don; JS Powell <jpowell@berkeley.edu>
Cc: rpc24@yahoogroups.com <rpc24@yahoogroups.com>; npspacregion24@yahoogroups.com <npspacregion24@yahoogroups.com>; mosiec@mail.mo.gov <mosiec@mail.mo.gov>; moapco911@yahoogroups.com <moapco911@yahoogroups.com>; region24siec@yahoogroups.com <region24siec@yahoogroups.com>; Bart Hamilton <SO2216@adaweb.net>; De Camp, Bill (William) <Bill.DeCamp@dgs.ca.gov>; Hall, Wray <WHALL@gta.ga.gov>; Hessinger, J. Rick <rhessinger@state.nd.us>; Meacombs, Harold <harold.meacombs@ncshp.org>; Pletcher, Robert <Robert.Pletcher@txdps.state.tx.us>; adrodriguez@aemean.gobierno.net <adrodriguez@aemean.gobierno.net>; artmcdoles@salinas.net <artmcdoles@salinas.net>; jamesonwj@aol.com <jamesonwj@aol.com>; wizard61@hotmail.com <wizard61@hotmail.com>; bob.sanders@ci.amarillo.tx.us <bob.sanders@ci.amarillo.tx.us>; boydwebb@utah.gov <boydwebb@utah.gov>; acharry@yahoo.com <acharry@yahoo.com>; carl.guse@dot.state.wi.us <carl.guse@dot.state.wi.us>; pccd@aristotle.net <pccd@aristotle.net>; CKnight@azdps.gov <CKnight@azdps.gov>; dave.scaadvisor@pacbell.net <dave.scaadvisor@pacbell.net>; david.cook@oft.state.ny.us <david.cook@oft.state.ny.us>; dean_strid@admin.state.ak.us <dean_strid@admin.state.ak.us>; dappleby@state.pa.us <dappleby@state.pa.us>; dloper@mdps.state.ms.us <dloper@mdps.state.ms.us>; geer@ksdot.org <geer@ksdot.org>; EmReynolds@aol.com <EmReynolds@aol.com>; fsmart@harrco911.org <fsmart@harrco911.org>; george.carbonell@po.state.ct.us <george.carbonell@po.state.ct.us>; gsi@mt.net <gsi@mt.net>; gryan@dnr.state.md.us <gryan@dnr.state.md.us>; gmayer@co.la.ca.us <gmayer@co.la.ca.us>; gary.cochran@isp.state.il.us <gary.cochran@isp.state.il.us>; gthaxton@dps.state.ok.us <gthaxton@dps.state.ok.us>; george.pohorilak@po.state.ct.us <george.pohorilak@po.state.ct.us>; gsettles@wvoes.state.wv.us <gsettles@wvoes.state.wv.us>; info@gov.state.ar.us <info@gov.state.ar.us>; stephenw@emsa.net <stephenw@emsa.net>; jroche@adm.state.id.us <jroche@adm.state.id.us>; jwalton@dps.state.vt.us <jwalton@dps.state.vt.us>; jimwi@co.clark.nv.us <jimwi@co.clark.nv.us>; Jenny_Hansen@MSHP.mshp.dps.mo.gov <Jenny_Hansen@MSHP.mshp.dps.mo.gov>; wilsonj@ci.anchorage.ak.us <wilsonj@ci.anchorage.ak.us>; jjohnson@tnema.org <jjohnson@tnema.org>; jkuran@wcca.com <jkuran@wcca.com>; sherriff02@apex2000.net <sherriff02@apex2000.net>; wyckoff@apco911.org <wyckoff@apco911.org>; jon.wiswell@seattle.gov <jon.wiswell@seattle.gov>; joseph.martinez@state.nm.us <joseph.martinez@state.nm.us>; kent.drummond@dot.state.wy.us <kent.drummond@dot.state.wy.us>; grayl@apco911.org <grayl@apco911.org>; oshierl@erie.gov <oshierl@erie.gov>; markschroeder@mail.maricopa.gov <markschroeder@mail.maricopa.gov>; mperez@dbm.state.md.us <mperez@dbm.state.md.us>; mconrey@ci.omaha.ne.us <mconrey@ci.omaha.ne.us>; morrism@attglobal.net <morrism@attglobal.net>; michael.hodgson@ncshp.org <michael.hodgson@ncshp.org>; mike.jeffres@cio.ne.gov <mike.jeffres@cio.ne.gov>; paul.mayer@ohio.gov <paul.mayer@ohio.gov>; sshony@aol.com <sshony@aol.com>; pmeade@nassaucountyny.gov <pmeade@nassaucountyny.gov>; raymond.hayling@lps.state.nj.us <raymond.hayling@lps.state.nj.us>; hesterr@apco911.org <hesterr@apco911.org>; rmatason@co.westmoreland.pa.us <rmatason@co.westmoreland.pa.us>; reynoldsr@apco911.org <reynoldsr@apco911.org>; richard.schmidt@state.co.us <richard.schmidt@state.co.us>; krwilson@rankincounty.org <krwilson@rankincounty.org>; radelman@co.bexar.tx.us <radelman@co.bexar.tx.us>; robert.j.hlivak@hawaii.gov <robert.j.hlivak@hawaii.gov>; sezron@hic.net <sezron@hic.net>; ron@ktsignals.com <ron@ktsignals.com>; rschreiner@ci.sheboygan.wi.us <rschreiner@ci.sheboygan.wi.us>;

1/31/2007

sjones@columbia911.com <sjones@columbia911.com>; sherwin.bigelow@dc.gov <sherwin.bigelow@dc.gov>; Stan.Passey@isp.idaho.gov <Stan.Passey@isp.idaho.gov>; steve.devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov <steve.devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov>; scc911@win.org <scc911@win.org>; smakky@pipeline.com <smakky@pipeline.com>; steve.pott@co.washington.mn.us <steve.pott@co.washington.mn.us>; steve@ucan800.org <steve@ucan800.org>; staylor2@ci.tacoma.wa.us <staylor2@ci.tacoma.wa.us>; wardt@apco911.org <wardt@apco911.org>; todd.dravland@state.sd.us <todd.dravland@state.sd.us>; Thomas@Albemarle.org <Thomas@Albemarle.org>; vperez@ci.sat.tx.us <vperez@ci.sat.tx.us>; campagna@charlottesville.org <campagna@charlottesville.org>; vincentw@apco911.org <vincentw@apco911.org>; whall@gta.ga.gov <whall@gta.ga.gov>

Sent: Thu Dec 14 08:12:22 2006

Subject: Missouri SIEC response to NPSTC call for input on NCC Interoperability Channel Nomenclature Recommendations

All

On November 30, 2006, the National Public Safety Telecommunications Council (NPSTC) indicated it would be having a open forum on Monday, February 5 in Orlando Florida to discuss the previous filed National Coordination Committee interoperability channel nomenclature recommendations filed with the final NCC Report in 2003 to the FCC and any changes to the document that may be appropriate.

It should be noted that NPSTC does not have the authority to require public safety agencies to utilize or adhere to any standardized channel names itself, but the consistent use of a finalized channel label list for dedicated FCC designated interoperability channels could be used as a future requirement to be eligible for grants through DHS or other granting agencies.

It should also be noted the Missouri SIEC has differentiated between what it has determined would be the best course for promoting the use of consistent nomenclature in Missouri for legacy interoperability channels (fire mutual aid, Law Enforcement mutual Aid, HEAR frequencies, etc.) below 512 MHz and establishing a naming convention for new non-legacy 700 MHz designated interoperability channels. The Missouri SIEC has discussed this issue at length and indicated that an approach that would best suit Missouri users would be to adopt the 700 MHz channel nomenclature format, when appropriate, but to document, publish and make available the channel labels that have been identified over years of use for legacy and discipline specific interoperability channels, primarily below 512 MHz. Attached are several documents, including the Missouri SIEC VHF UHF Memorandum of Understanding, The Missouri Fire Marshall Radio Frequency Sharing agreement promoting the use and channel names of fire discipline specific interoperability channels, the NPSTC announcement outlining the February 5 meeting and the Missouri SIEC 700 MHz Interoperability template.

The Missouri SIEC 700 MHz interoperability template borrows mostly from the original NCC recommendations with a few exceptions. The exceptions, voted unanimously by the Missouri SIEC, change the 700 MHz Calling Channels to (39-40) 7CALL1 and (681-682) 7CALL2 from the sequence established in the original format. For those not familiar with the other characteristics of the Missouri SIEC 700 MHz template, note that sixteen (16) "must carry" channels for non-discipline specific use are required by the SIEC for all 700 MHz subscribers in Missouri, which is half of the interoperability channel allotment. If that requirement is met by the subscriber, they can also utilize a portion or all of the discipline specific channels as outlined in the 700 MHz I/O template. The Missouri SIEC unanimously voted NOT to require all 700 MHz subscribers to be required to carry all thirty-two (32) 700 MHz designated interoperability channels. This was in part due to the prevalence of existing 800 MHz NPSPAC interoperability channel use in Missouri combined with channel capacity concerns in subscriber units of the users. The Missouri SIEC also voted NOT to utilize any FCC designated interoperability channels for "Secondary Trunking", as made available in the FCC rules.

While variances to the national plan seem to best fit Missouri, we feel that documentation of those variances to the national plan that best suit Missouri should be on a national database for view by all necessary adjacent states and regions and the Missouri SIEC also recognizes that the responsibility to ensure that the posted information is current rests with the Missouri SIEC. All of the above documents outlining Missouri SIEC initiatives using FCC designated interoperability channels are located on the Computer Assisted Pre-coordination Resource and Database (CAPRAD) database, as administered by the National Law Enforcement Corrections Technology Center-Rocky Mountain and are available for viewing by adjacent states and updated annually. We feel this outreach mechanism through CAPRAD creates the ideal environment in which Missouri can flexibly implement and get maximize use from these important interoperability channels while at the same time ensuring neighboring regions and states are aware and have the ability to consistently support Missouri's unique approach in their use of these channels.

The deadline for filing comments via the NPSTC website:

<http://www.npstc.org/meetings/Copy%20of%20Common%20Nomenclature%20Recommendation%20Package%20113006.xls>

Is January 15, 2007

Let me know should you have any questions on this issue facing public safety at a national level.

Stephen Devine, Missouri SIEC Chairperson

1/31/2007

Stephen T. Devine
Patrol Frequency Coordinator
Communications Division
Missouri State Highway Patrol General Headquarters
1510 East Elm
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101
steve.devine@mshp.dps.mo.gov

Office (573) 526-6105
FAX (573) 526-1112