

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

Enterprise Wireless Alliance and Pacific            )  
DataVision, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking            )     RM-11738  
Regarding Realignment of 900 MHz Spectrum        )

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE UTILITIES TELECOM COUNCIL**

**Utilities Telecom Council**

Brett Kilbourne  
Vice President and Deputy General Counsel  
Utilities Telecom Council  
1129 20<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Suite 350  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-872-0030

July 14, 2015

**Table of Contents**

**SUMMARY ..... i**

**I. The Proposed Process for the Realignment of the Band and Negotiation with Incumbents Needs Further Clarification..... 2**

**II. The Proposed Standards for Protection Against Interference Need Further Revision, and Interference Protection Needs to Be Extended to All Incumbents. .... 5**

**III. The Process for Relocation and Reimbursement of Incumbents Needs Further Clarification..... 9**

**IV. An Estimate of the Cost-Benefits of the Proposed Realignment Should Be Conducted as a Prerequisite to Any Realignment of the 900 MHz Band. .... 12**

**V. Conclusion ..... 13**

**Utilities Telecom Council ..... 14**

## SUMMARY

The comments on the record support UTC's recommendation that the Supplemental Submission by the Enterprise Wireless Alliance and Pacific DataVision needs to address fundamental issues in four main areas: 1) the process for the realignment and negotiation with incumbents; 2) the protection of incumbents against interference; 3) providing incumbents with comparable facilities and reimbursing their costs; and 4) an analysis of the benefits and costs of the proposed realignment. The comments echo the need to provide sufficient notice and opportunity to respond to the initiation of the realignment of the 900 MHz band and to provide more time and more safeguards for the negotiation of the relocation of incumbents. The comments universally agree that the proposed interference standards are insufficient to protect incumbent narrowband systems against interference from Private Enterprise Broadband Block (PEBB) operations. The standard needs to be more stringent to protect incumbents both in the 900 MHz band and in the narrowband PCS band. Comments also underscore the need to provide comparable facilities in terms of coverage, capacity and duration of costs. In that regard, reimbursement must cover all capital and additional operational costs going forward without any limitation that would cut off reimbursement over time or to certain incumbents. Finally, the comments on the record urge the Commission to conduct a cost-benefit analysis as a precondition for realigning the band. This analysis should consider the cost of deploying the network, including the impact on incumbent licensees and balance that against the potential benefits of realigning the band to support broadband communications, as well as narrowband communications.

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

Enterprise Wireless Alliance and Pacific )  
DataVision, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking ) RM-11738  
Regarding Realignment of 900 MHz Spectrum )

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE UTILITIES TELECOM COUNCIL**

Pursuant to Section 1.405 of the Commission’s Rules, the Utilities Telecom Council (“UTC”) hereby files its reply comments in response to the Commission’s Public Notice in the above-referenced proceeding.<sup>1</sup> Comments on the record show that the Supplemental Submission requires further clarification. It requires clarification in terms of the premise that there is sufficient spectrum to constitute a Private Enterprise Broadband Block (PEBB) of spectrum in all MTAs and whether there is sufficient spectrum in the 2X2 narrowband allocation to accommodate B/ILT operations in the 900 MHz band. It requires clarification in terms of the PEBB licensee’s obligation to avoid causing harmful interference and to correct harmful interference that it causes. It requires clarification in terms of providing reimbursement for an incumbent’s costs of modifying its operations in order to accommodate the establishment of the PEBB allocation. Finally, it requires clarification of the potential overall costs and benefits of the proposed realignment of the band, which requires an estimate of the total cost of the PEBB including reimbursement of the capital and additional ongoing operational costs of modifying incumbent operations to accommodate the PEBB, as well as a better definition of the terms of priority access, including making it a condition of the PEBB license.

---

<sup>1</sup> Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Seeks Comment on Supplement to Enterprise Wireless Alliance and Pacific DataVision, Inc. Petition for Rulemaking Regarding Realignment of 900 MHz Spectrum, Public Notice, RM-11738 (rel. May 13, 2015)(hereinafter “Public Notice”).

**I. The Proposed Process for the Realignment of the Band and Negotiation with Incumbents Needs Further Clarification.**

Comments on the record continue to raise substantial questions about whether and how the proposed realignment can be accomplished. There are underlying issues regarding the assertion that there is sufficient spectrum for the PEBB allocation and for the narrowband allocation. Then, there are additional questions about the fairness of the process for the realignment, including sufficient notice and opportunity to comment during the initial stages of the process, the realignment of the band and the relocation of incumbents, and the reimbursement of incumbents for their capital and increased ongoing operational costs caused by the PEBB. Finally, there are also substantial questions about the ancillary impact that the PEBB may have on public safety operations in the band and narrowband PCS operations outside of the band. UTC believes that these questions need to be answered clearly before the Commission takes up the petition in a rulemaking.

Comments by M2M Spectrum Networks, LLC question the process by which the proposed spectrum realignment would be accomplished. It asserts that the EWA/PDV Petition would result in a significant spectrum grant to PDV because of what it describes as the expansion of 13 existing PDV market-based licenses to cover 2.5 MHz of the spectrum; the addition of 0.5 MHz through the promotion of PDV's site-based licenses to market-wide status; and the grant of 0.5 MHz in areas where PDV has no site licenses at all.<sup>2</sup> It also asserts that the proposed reconfiguration will be complex, costly, and unpredictable, because the costs are likely to be higher than 800 MHz rebanding and the disruption to utilities and critical infrastructure

---

<sup>2</sup> Comments of M2M Spectrum Networks, LLC in RM-11738 at 2 (June 29, 2015).

industries will be significant.<sup>3</sup> Finally, it asserts that the EWA/PDV petition could create spectrum scarcity for B/ILT eligible users because “the proposed reduction of the available 900 MHz B/ILT spectrum by 20% (2.5 MHz to 2 MHz) and the forced relocation of existing market-based licensees would dramatically reduce spectrum availability for businesses.”<sup>4</sup>

Aside from these underlying issues surrounding the spectrum itself, numerous other comments object to the process by which EWA and PDV have proposed to accomplish the realignment of the band. Duke Energy and Salt River Project (SRP) agree with UTC that the proposed process does not provide incumbents with sufficient notice and opportunity to respond to the initiation of the realignment process.<sup>5</sup> The process is too accelerated and could likely result with incumbents missing their opportunity to participate in the realignment and/or to comment in response to the public notices that would be issued by the Commission under the proposed process. Comments by Duke and SRP also agree with UTC that the proposed process for the relocation of incumbents needs to be fairer. Owing to the complexity of the rebanding process, the voluntary and mandatory negotiation processes should be longer than one year, and the involuntary relocation process should be a last resort, which should only be invoked if there is bad faith that leads to failed negotiation and which should specify the minimum costs that would be covered.<sup>6</sup> Finally, these comments by Duke and SRP object to placing exclusive responsibility in a single realignment manager to determine where and how incumbents would be relocated. Instead, they agree with UTC that the Commission should certify multiple

---

<sup>3</sup>*Id.* at 5-6.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 6-7.

<sup>5</sup> Comments of Duke Energy Corporation in RM-11738 at 2-4 (filed June 29, 2015) and Comments of Salt River Project in RM-11738 at 2-4 (filed June 29, 2015).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

coordinators from among the existing pool of authorized frequency advisory committees who are certified by the Commission to coordinate Part 90 operations.<sup>7</sup>

As UTC observed in its comments, the Supplemental Submission would define “incumbents” narrowly, so that only those licensees in the PEBB allocation would be entitled to comparable facilities and reimbursement of their costs for relocation. Several commenting parties echo UTC that there is the potential for interference to other operations, besides those incumbents in the PEBB allocation. As Lower Colorado River Authority (LCRA) explains, the PEBB allocation would also impact “variety of public safety and other public service entities in the lower Colorado River region” who share its 900 MHz system.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, Sensus, as well as several utilities state that the PEBB operations will cause harmful interference to advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) systems that operate on spectrum in the narrowband PCS block at 901/940 MHz.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, the Association for American Railroads filed comments which declined to support the petition and the Supplemental Submission, because of continued concerns about interference to Advance Train Control Systems that operate on one of six of AAR’s frequency pairs (897.9875 MHz/936.9875 MHz) that is immediately adjacent to the proposed PEBB allocation.<sup>10</sup> Given the potential ancillary impact of the PEBB on these important operations, the proposed rules in the Supplemental Submission should broadly define incumbents to protect the interest of any operation in or adjacent to the 900 MHz band that

---

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> Comments of LCRA in RM-11738 at 2-3 (filed June 29, 2015).

<sup>9</sup> See Comments of Sensus USA, Inc. in RM-11738 at 6-16 (filed June 29, 2015). See also Comments of Southern Company Services, Inc. in RM-11738 at 2-6 (filed June 29, 2015) and Comments of PECO Energy in RM-11738 at 4-5 (filed June 29, 2015).

<sup>10</sup> Comments of the Association of American Railroads in RM-11738 at 1-2 (filed June 29, 2015).

would be impacted by the proposed PEBB operations, not just those operations in the proposed PEBB allocation.

## **II. The Proposed Standards for Protection Against Interference Need Further Revision, and Interference Protection Needs to Be Extended to All Incumbents.**

The Supplemental Submission raises new issues regarding the duties and obligations for the PEBB licensee to avoid causing interference and to mitigate it when it does. As UTC explained in its comments, the Supplemental Submission would propose interference levels at -88/-85 dbm that are inadequate to protect existing mobile and portable operations in the band. UTC recommended that the interference protection levels should be set at -119 dbm.

Comments on the record universally agree that the interference levels need to be set lower than are proposed in the Supplemental Submission. LCRA explains that its “system is designed to operate above -109 dBm, and any interference above this threshold directly reduces the established coverage of the system.”<sup>11</sup> LCRA added that matching the current interference levels used in the 800 MHz band (i.e. -104/-101 dBm) “still would not give the LCRA the needed interference protection, made worse by no guard band.”<sup>12</sup> Similarly, NextEra commented that it “remains very concerned about potential interference to its systems operating in the 900 MHz Band and does not believe that the interference protection rights in the proposed rules (§ 90.1421) will ensure that its systems remain free from interference from the PEBB licensees.”<sup>13</sup> Likewise, Eversource commented that the interference protection standard is unacceptable and

---

<sup>11</sup> Comments of LCRA at 6 (adding that “to allow interfering signals at a level of -88/-85 dBm is completely unrealistic.”)

<sup>12</sup> Comments of LCRA at 6.

<sup>13</sup> Comments of Nextera in RM-11738 at 2 (filed June 29, 2015).

unworkable, “because it relies on receive signal strengths for usable signals as low as approximately -100 dBm,” such that the proposed -88 dBm/-85 dBm level “leaves open the potential to create interference to large swaths of a narrowband user's service area.”<sup>14</sup>

Even Motorola, which supports the EWA/PDV petition, takes issue however with proposed Rule Section 90.1421. Motorola explains that its “900 MHz products are designed to provide reliable service with signals levels much lower than -88/-85 dBm,” and that “the standards adopted in this proceeding should not absolve the PEBB licensee from responsibility for correcting degradation that occurs well within the expected service area of incumbent systems.”<sup>15</sup> Motorola further observed that the proposed interference levels in the Supplemental Submission are 16 db higher than the levels that were adopted to protect 800 MHz public safety systems in the 800 MHz band (i.e., -104/-101 dBm for mobile and portable handset devices respectively). As such, Motorola concluded that “additional protection is warranted to prevent interference well within the expected service areas of incumbent systems.”<sup>16</sup>

Given the widespread concern about the interference levels proposed by EWA/PDV, UTC reiterates its recommendation that the levels should be made more stringent and lowered to -119 dBm. As Harris explained in its comments, reducing the interference levels is appropriate for a variety of reasons, including the fact that there is no guard band that is proposed by EWA/PDV.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Comments of Eversource in RM-11738 at 3 (filed June 29, 2015).

<sup>15</sup> Comments of Motorola Solutions, Inc. in RM-11738 at 2 (filed June 29, 2015).

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> Comments of Harris Corporation in RM-11738 at 3 (filed June 29, 2015)(“Using the adjusted interference protection within the guard band as a guide, more than 550 kHz of the upper portion of the proposed 2 MHz narrowband allocation would be expected to have noise levels above the proposed -88 dBm threshold, with the closest 400 kHz having recommended protections of >-70 dBm. Furthermore, even if the petitioners believe that spectral containment of broadband base transmitters and/ or auxiliary filtering has improved since 2008, the mobile and portable receiver performance in rejecting intermodulation and adjacent energy has not changed substantially.”)

Without a guard band, the fall-off of emissions will not likely be sufficiently attenuated to protect narrowband operations that are within 1 MHz from the PEBB allocation, even with advanced filtering on the PEBB transmitters.<sup>18</sup> At the very least, the PEBB should be required to submit engineering studies that demonstrate that filtering by itself would be effective at mitigating interference.<sup>19</sup> In any event, all of the comments agree that the proposed interference levels would dramatically reduce the coverage of incumbent systems, and would require that they add additional base stations to compensate for the increased interference that would be caused by PEBB operations.<sup>20</sup> As such, the interference protection levels need to be made more stringent generally for operations in the 900 MHz band.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> *See also* Comments of the American Association of Railroads at 2 (filed June 29, 2015) (“The Petitioners have not provided any interference analyses that demonstrate that there is adequate protection to AAR’s adjacent-band Advanced Train Control System license, which facilitates automated rail operations, enabling railroads to operate more safely, efficiently, and economically.”)

<sup>20</sup> *See e.g.* Comments of Lower Colorado River Authority in RM-11738 at 6 (filed June 29, 2015) (“For the Commission to allow interfering signals at a level of -88/-85 dBm is completely unrealistic. It would call for a massive increase in the number of sites and channels that would be required to provide equivalent system coverage. It is clear by requesting this interference level that the Petitioners want the FCC to condone a devastating rise in the noise floor with which B/ILT operators (and Public Safety entities that have shared access to the LCRA’s system) would have to contend.”); Comments of Nextera in RM-11738 at 6 (“FPL’s current analog radio receivers operate down to -120 dBm (typically -118 dBm for 12db sinad). This ‘high site’ design allows for minimal site density, with maximum coverage and channel reuse. Any degradation of this operating parameter due to the congestion of adjacent or short spacing channel reuse resulting from the proposed realignment will require additional site and backhaul capital expenses, as well as larger operating cost that will ultimately have to be passed to the users.”); Comments of Northeast Utilities in RM-11738 (filed Jan. 12, 2015) (“There is no information provided to determine whether there are expected reductions in coverage due to congestion and increased noise floor.”); and Comments of SRP in RM-11738 (filed June 29, 2015) (“The 900 MHz band is licensed on 12.5 kHz channels with transmitters 12.5 KHz apart. This requires very high loss hybrid combining allowing only very low ERP levels and necessitating more transmit sites for comparable coverage. With current access to channels in the entire 5 MHz band, incumbent users can get the required 500 KHz transmitter spacing for up to 7 channels at a site. But with only 2 MHz to choose from, that number drops to 2 to 3 maximum properly separated channels at one site. It becomes apparent that this band change will compromise existing system operation and guaranteeing equivalent system operation in this band after re-alignment may not even be possible for incumbent systems larger than a small handful of channels at any one site, especially with the congestion already in place in urban areas.”)

In addition, several comments stress the need to protect operations outside of the 900 MHz private land mobile spectrum, as well. Specifically, comments by Sensus USA, Inc. describe the potential for interference to advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) systems, and recommend that the interference levels be made more stringent and reduced to -168 dBm/Hz.<sup>21</sup> These interference levels are justified by measurements that show that the current radiofrequency environment is low and that the proposed PEBB operations would increase the noise floor, thus causing widespread interference to millions of meters that are in the field.<sup>22</sup> Southern Company Services and PECO echo the concerns raised by Sensus regarding the potential for interference from the PEBB to the AMI systems in the narrowband PCS spectrum.<sup>23</sup> Similar to the comments of LCRA, Southern and PECO explain that interference to these utility operations would affect important public safety related communications systems. In addition, it would undermine billions of dollars of investment that utilities have made in these systems, as well. UTC supports the comments by Sensus and utilities that recommend greater protection of AMI operations in the narrowband PCS spectrum from interference by PEBB operations.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Comments of Sensus USA in RM-11738 at 6-17 (filed June 29, 2015).

<sup>22</sup>*Id.* at 13.

<sup>23</sup> Comments of Southern Company Services in RM-11738 at 4 (filed June 29, 2015)(stating that “the Petitioners’ Suggested Rules, if adopted, would potentially allow greater levels of interference to incumbent systems than the terms of the Petition itself. Petitioners, in the Suggested Rules, have seemingly abandoned their earlier interest in at least a modest guard band between the broadband PEBB allocation and NPCS,4 and are now requesting a more relaxed emission mask than they had earlier proposed, while recommending an ambiguous rule that, if out-of-band emissions from PEBB transmitters cause harmful interference, ‘the Commission may, in its discretion, require greater attenuation than specified’” in their Suggested Rules.”); and Comments of PECO Energy Services in RM-11738 at 3-4 (filed June 29, 2015)(“It appears that Petitioners may have used an inappropriate model when they analyzed the potential for harmful interference to adjacent Narrowband PCS licenses. PECO believes that Petitioners failed to fully analyze the impact of the technical specifications on Narrowband PCS systems and that implementation of the draft proposed rules would not adequately protect Narrowband PCS systems.”)

<sup>24</sup> UTC notes that the Association of American Railroads has also filed comments expressing concerns about interference to Positive Train Control (PTC) systems that operate on channels adjacent to the propose PEBB allocation. Further, AAR stated for the record that it did not indicate its support for the proposed rules, although it did state that it continues to evaluate the proposed rules.

### **III. The Process for Relocation and Reimbursement of Incumbents Needs Further Clarification.**

Comments on the record also echo the issues raised by UTC regarding the need to ensure that incumbent operations are relocated to comparable facilities and that they be reimbursed for their capital and additional ongoing operational expenses that are attributable to PEBB operations.<sup>25</sup> As UTC explained in its comments, the rules would not provide reimbursement for comparable facilities to incumbent licensees who operate in spectrum adjacent to the PEBB allocation and who are also affected by interference from PEBB operations, such that they must modify their systems as well.<sup>26</sup> Further UTC expressed concerns about the proposed rules that would cut-off any further reimbursement after five years for increased operational costs of incumbent licensees.<sup>27</sup> Finally, UTC reiterates its concern that the proposed rules need to ensure that incumbent licensees are made completely whole in terms of comparable facilities, including the same amount of replacement spectrum.<sup>28</sup>

Comments on the record echo the concerns raised by UTC. SRP and Duke agree with UTC that any incumbent in the 900 MHz band should be reimbursed for their comparable facilities costs that are required due to PEBB operations, including any ongoing increased operating costs -- without restrictions on the duration of the obligation of the PEBB licensee to

---

<sup>25</sup> See e.g. Comments of Nextera in RM-11738 at 6-7 (filed June 29, 2015).

<sup>26</sup> Comments of UTC in RM-11738 at 7-8 (filed June 29, 2015) (“UTC is concerned that the proposed rules would only provide reimbursement for comparable facilities for relocation of incumbent licensees in the PEBB allocation; the rules would not provide reimbursement for comparable facilities to incumbent licensees who operate outside of the PEBB allocation and who are also affected by interference from PEBB operations, such that they must modify their systems as well.”)

<sup>27</sup> *Id.*

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* at 8 (“UTC urges the Commission to ensure that all incumbent licensees are made completely whole, such that any incumbent in the 900 MHz band should be reimbursed for their comparable facilities costs that are required due to PEBB operations, including any ongoing increased operating costs -- without restrictions on the duration of the obligation of the PEBB licensee to cover those costs.”)

cover those costs.<sup>29</sup> As Eversource explains, “[i]t is inequitable to pass these [increased operational] costs off on the public to the PEBB licensee's benefit.” Eversource also suggests that the State Public Utility Commissions should be given an opportunity to weigh-in on the cost impact of this proposal.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, the American Petroleum Institute objects to the 5-year cut-off of reimbursement for increased operational expenses, and it recommends instead that the PEBB licensee pay any increased operating costs incurred by the narrowband licensee as a result of retuning during the life of the retuned system. Alternatively, API recommends that the PEBB licensee should be able to elect to make an upfront payment to the incumbent licensee of a lump sum equal to the net present value of 15 years of operating cost increases.<sup>31</sup> UTC supports these comments that call for the PEBB licensee to provide incumbents that are located inside and outside the 900 MHz band with reimbursement of their capital and increased ongoing operational costs as a result of PEBB operations.

A case in point is Santee Cooper, South Carolina Public Service Authority. It operates on 75 frequency pairs over 65 sites, and uses the system for its own communications and fourteen of the electric cooperatives in the State of South Carolina which provide power to 1,100,000 customers. Of the 75 frequency pairs issued to Santee Cooper, 55 of them are located at 937 MHz or above and 20 of them are located below 937 MHz. Some of the sites, in order to be able to reuse frequencies have short-spaced sites less than 70 miles apart.

Santee Cooper is concerned that the proposed relocation plan would be almost impossible for it to implement with low-loss combiners, which require a minimum separation requirement of

---

<sup>29</sup> Comments of Salt River Project at 4-5. Comments of Duke at 4-5.

<sup>30</sup> Comments of Eversource at 3.

<sup>31</sup> Comments of the American Petroleum Institute (API) at 6.

250 kHz. The acceptance of any system with less frequency separation would require a hybrid combiner, which would induce losses of an additional 11 dB as compared to Santee Cooper's current maximum combiner losses of less than 3 dB. The use of a hybrid combiner would most likely require additional trunking sites to be built for comparable coverage which could result in the addition of several additional sites. The estimate for constructing a trunking site at a new location, including tower, buildings, generators, trunking equipment and backhaul equipment would be nearly \$500,000 per site. In addition to the cost of relocation, Santee Cooper is uncertain whether it could find sufficient frequencies to meet their capacity requirements in the proposed narrowband allocation.

Utilities need to be made whole, as part of the proposed relocation and reimbursement process. As noted above, this means that the PEBB licensee should be responsible for reimbursing incumbents for all increased operational costs as well as capital costs that all incumbent licensees have or will incur as a result of the realignment of the band. The PEBB licensee should not limit its responsibilities by extending reimbursement only to certain costs over a certain time period. Nor should it limit its responsibilities by reimbursing only certain incumbents that migrate to the narrowband allocation; it should be responsible to incumbent licensees in the narrowband PCS bands for any adjacent channel interference that is caused and should fully reimburse the costs of modifying those facilities to mitigate the effects of the interference.

In making utilities whole, UTC agrees with comments by Nextera that the PEBB should be responsible for providing incumbents with comparable facilities in terms of coverage,

capacity and duration of costs.<sup>32</sup> As Nextera, explained in its comments, utilities should receive the same capacity as their existing system. If an incumbent user operates a 12.5 kHz system today, the utility must receive an equivalent 12.5 kHz system that must be equal to or exceed current capacity levels after transition to the realigned spectrum, regardless of the talk paths obtained.<sup>33</sup> “At present, utilities have licensed 12.5 kHz channels but have business plans to utilize more talk paths for needed services in the future. Any reduction in current licensed bandwidth would not achieve a make whole status and would thereby limit such critical future plans for capacity.”<sup>34</sup> In addition, utilities should be reimbursed for the cost of any increased number of sites that would be required to compensate for the loss of coverage that would result from PEBB operations. Finally, these costs should extend going forward without restriction on the time, contrary to the proposal in the Supplemental Submission to cut-off reimbursement for any increased operational costs after five years.

#### **IV. An Estimate of the Cost-Benefits of the Proposed Realignment Should Be Conducted as a Prerequisite to Any Realignment of the 900 MHz Band.**

Comments on the record also support UTC’s recommendation that the Commission require an estimate of the costs and the benefits of the realignment of the band prior to its implementation. As Duke and SRP explained, the estimate should consider factors such as coverage, site hardening and sustainability, scalability, adaptability and security, as well as other factors; and it should also consider the cost of relocating incumbents within the band in order to

---

<sup>32</sup> Comments of Nextera in RM-11738 at 6-7 (filed June 29, 2015).

<sup>33</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>34</sup> *Id.*

accommodate the PEBB allocation.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, as Southern Company observes, “[t]he public interest analysis of the Petition must therefore consider whether the potential benefit to CII and other enterprise users to whom the PEBB licensees will offer service exceed the cost, disruption, interference, and diminished PLMR capacity to those same entities.”<sup>36</sup> UTC agrees with Southern and other commenters that “the Petition does not address the most significant public interest and public safety issues; namely, whether sixty percent of this band can be reallocated for commercial broadband use without causing a severely negative impact on the CII radio systems already operating at 900 MHz and in the adjacent Narrowband PCS band.”<sup>37</sup> Therefore, UTC respectfully requests that a cost-benefit analysis should be conducted prior to the initiation of any realignment of the band, and that the proposed realignment should only be initiated if the public interest benefits of the proposed realignment of the band clearly outweigh the costs.

## **V. Conclusion**

In conclusion, the process for the proposed realignment of the band should provide licensees with sufficient notice and an opportunity to negotiate to participate in the PEBB or to relocate into the narrowband allocation. Similarly, there must be more than one “realignment manager” to better ensure fairness in the process. Interference protection and compensation should be available to incumbent licensees who operate anywhere in the 900 MHz band, not just those incumbent licensees that relocate from the PEBB allocation to the narrowband allocation. The interference threshold should be set at a lower level than -88 dbm; and there needs to be a guard band to protect narrowband operations below 937 MHz and above 940 MHz. Incumbent

---

<sup>35</sup>See Comments of Duke Energy at 4-5 and Comments of SRP at 5-6.

<sup>36</sup>Reply Comments of Southern Company Services in RM-11738 at 6 (filed Jan. 17, 2015).

<sup>37</sup>*Id.*

licensees who are relocated below 937 MHz need to be provided comparable facilities that are equal or better in terms of cost, quality, reliability and resiliency – and costs need to account for both all additional ongoing operational and capital expenses with no limit on the time period. Finally, a cost-benefit analysis of the proposed realignment should be developed at the outset that includes the estimated cost of relocation of incumbents and the cost of constructing, operating and maintaining the PEBB in each MTA based upon a proposed set of standards for coverage, reliability and resiliency.

Respectfully,

**Utilities Telecom Council**

ss  
Brett Kilbourne  
Vice President and Deputy General Counsel  
Utilities Telecom Council  
1129 20<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Suite 350  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-872-0030

July 14, 2015