

---

**From:** jsobecke [mailto:jsobecke@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 16, 2006 8:18 PM  
**To:** Laura Lippman  
**Subject:** Common Nomenclature Recommendation

Didn't understand why such limited "comment space" was provided.  
Only allowing comment to each individual channel

My understanding is that the nomenclature format follows the sequence:

Characters 1-2 : band designation

\*recommend consideration that Federal bands use sequence F1 vice 1F, and F4 vice 4F

Knowing quite well that F1 and F4 seem too close to the old way of indicating radio channel settings; however I see more confusion with the sequence when it precedes the next character group (function)

Characters 3-5: function designation (DAT, EMS, FIR, LAW, TAC)

Characters 6-7: unique channel number (allows short reference to interop channel )

I understood that a three character channel number was being proposed to allow for the "hundreds groups (1xx through 9xx)" for region / state use.

Wasn't this being proposed to accommodate SIEC and regional efforts to identify statewide interoperability channels that are already in common use.

I applaud the initiative and see it as a great way of getting state stakeholder buy-in.

Character 8(9): reserved for "D" to indicate DIRECT or 'talk-around'.

The Appendix A, Table of Interoperability Channels (revised v 2.0) show many conflicts with the original nomenclature scheme –

Use of "7GTAC05", "7DTAC17", "7FTAC21", "7LTAC31", and "7OTAC33" is not consistent with what was originally (currently) being proposed.

"GTAC" could easily be changed to GTC to be consistent; same for FTAC changing to FTC and LTAC changing to LTC

I have a problem with "OTAC" - why not call it OTC or OTH

Keep up the great work that NPSTC is doing.

James Sobecke

W 703-284-8113  
C 703-887-1421  
H 703-978-2035