

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In reply refer to:
6320-F

June 24, 1971

AIR MAIL

Mr. W. J. Wilson
Director-General
Telecommunications Regulation Branch
Department of Communications
Ottawa, Ontario

Dear Mr. Wilson:

This refers to your letter of May 11, 1971, file 1070-19 6110-6 (RRP) concerning the frequency plan for the UHF domestic air-ground radiotelephone service.

In view of the concurrence of our respective offices, as well as that of the Telephone Association of Canada and the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, in the changes to be made in the U.S. table of channel allocations as discussed in the referenced letter and our letter of April 5, 1971, action is being initiated to undertake the necessary proposed rule making proceedings with respect to Pittsburgh, Bangor, Seattle and Washington, D.C. You will be kept informed of developments in this matter by receiving copies of Commission actions as they are released. It is anticipated that no difficulties will be encountered in making these changes.

The comment of the TAC with respect to the maximum power limitation has been noted, i.e., 40 watts ERP. Quite frankly, while it would be desirable to have the same maximum ERP limitation for both countries, the fact that our respective tables of channel assignments already have been developed and adopted, based on 100 watts ERP (U.S.) and 40 watts ERP (CANADA), would negate any particular advantage to be gained at this late date.

The assurance given by TAC to work out specific accommodations with regard to facilities at Port Hardy/Seattle and Toronto/Pittsburgh is appreciated. It is presumed that such accommodations can be worked out between TAC and U.S. licensees without the need for further assistance by either the D.O.C. or the Commission.

.../2

Finally, it is understood that you will hold re-activation of the Toronto and (Port?) Hawkesbury stations in abeyance pending the results of our proposed rule making proceedings. It is possible that Toronto might activate channel 12 prior to its deletion at Pittsburgh, since channel 12 has not yet been activated. The Hawkesbury assignment, which is desired for market evaluation purposes, presents a problem. However, the comment furnished on your coordination serial 71-405 of May 25, 1971, takes into account the fact that Hawkesbury is not in the Canadian channel assignment plan and that its operation is of a temporary nature.

Should you have any further comments the Commission would be glad to receive them.

Sincerely yours,

C. Phyll Horne
Assistant Chief Engineer in charge of
Frequency Allocation and Treaty Division

Berger Building
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0C8

1070-19
6110-6 (RRP)

May 11, 1971

Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Attention: S.M. Myers, Esq.
Assistant Chief Engineer in charge of
Frequency Allocation and Treaty Division

Dear Sir:

This refers to your letter of April 5 concerning the coordination of the frequency plan for the UHF Public Air-Ground Radiotelephone Service.

The changes in the allotment plan as outlined in your letter have been referred to the Telephone Association of Canada (TAC) and they have indicated that they coincide with their proposals and are acceptable. Specifically the changes agreed to by TAC and AT&T are as follows:

- 1) The deletion of channel 12 at Pittsburgh and its allocation to Toronto.
- 2) The change from channel 7 to channel 5 at Bangor, Maine (no allocation in New Brunswick).
- 3) The deletion of channel 9 at Seattle to permit an allocation for Port Hardy, B.C.
- 4) The transfer of channel 10 from Washington to Pittsburgh.

Comments from TAC with regard to items extracted from your letter are as follows:

"Our studies were based on the same separation criteria as used in the United States and the majority of our locations adopt this separation. However, there were some major air traffic locations in Canada which we felt required channel allocations to allow proper Canadian development of this service. To avoid the alternative of extensive rearrangement or major deletions in the American plan, the reduced spacing in these particular cases was considered and accepted, taking into account the probability of the existence of the conditions necessary for harmful interference. It is noted from your extract from the FCC letter that the AT&T have indicated they would offer no objection

for a similar situation between Elmira and Bangor. Although 40 watts ERP seems a logical maximum power equipment, it appears desirable that all North America should have the same maximum ERP limitation and we would certainly favor this over a different limitation for each country."

The TAC further advise that they would willingly work out specific accommodations with regard to facilities at Port Hardy/Seattle and Toronto/Pittsburg.

In view of the foregoing, you may now wish to proceed with the necessary proposed rule making proceedings.

The re-activation of the Toronto and Port Hawkesbury stations will be held in abeyance pending results of you proposed rule making proceedings.

We would appreciate a copy of the coordination plan when finalized.

Yours truly,

W.J. Wilson
Director-General
Telecommunications
Regulation Branch

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON D.C. 20554**

In reply refer to:
6320-F

April 5, 1971

AIRMAIL

Mr W. J. Wilson
Director-General
Telecommunications Regulations Branch
Department of Communications
Ottawa, Ontario

Dear Mr. Wilson:

The Commission has made a detailed study of the proposed air-ground telephone service for Canada, as prepared by the Telephone Association of Canada, furnished by your letter of August 11, 1970, file 1070-19 (RAF)/6110-6, and is taking into consideration personal conversations subsequently taking place between representatives of our respective offices.

In studying the plan, there appears to be a disparity in our basic power and separation criteria for base stations. With a permissible maximum 100 watts ERP, our calculations indicate that a minimum of 600 miles is required to avoid harmful interference to co-channel operations and the U.S. table of channel allocations reflects that requirement. Your proposal indicates a maximum of 40 watts ERP for Canadian stations with a correspondingly lesser separation of approximately 450 miles. This lesser separation affects United States operations only where co-channel Canadian operations are less than 600 miles. Under such circumstances, it may be that Canadian, but not U.S. operations, would suffer from interference.

Implementation of the proposed Canadian plan would require deletion of channel 9 at Seattle; deletion of channel 12 at Pittsburgh; substitution of channel 5 for channel 7 at Bangor with resultant short spacing of 450 miles with Elmira, New York. During discussions between the TAC and the AT&T, it is understood that the latter indicated it would offer no objection to rule making that would propose the aforementioned changes. Those same discussions also considered the possibility of deleting channel 10 at Washington, D.C., and adding it at Pittsburgh. The substitution of channel 10 for channel 12 would, of course, result in short spacing between Ottawa and Pittsburgh.

.../2

Your desire to implement the air-ground radiotelephone service in Canada without further delay is understood. In the interest of such expeditious implementation, we would have no objection to your proceeding with plans as outlined in the letter of August 11, 1970. Insofar as the conflicts discussed herein are concerned, we will initiate rule making proceedings recommending amendment of the U.S. plan to reflect the changes indicated. However, we cannot predict the final outcome of such proceedings. We will, in any event, strive to work out a mutually acceptable solution.

Should the deletion of channel 9 result in overloading of facilities at Seattle, it is understood that your Port Hardy station would be open for communications with U.S. aircraft. It is presumed that the same situation would prevail with respect to deletion of channel 12 at Pittsburgh and your Toronto station, if channel 10 is not allotted to Pittsburgh. Perhaps the TAC and AT&T could be called upon to work out specific accommodations in these areas.

With regard to transborder air-ground operations in this service, the Commission concurs with your suggestion to apply the provisions of Article II of the U.S.-Canada Convention and thereby exclude these aircraft from the necessity of obtaining a Certificate of Registration, as a means of authorizing communications between an aircraft registered in one country and a base station licenced by the other country.

It would be appreciated if you would inform the Commission when your allotment plan is finalized and of any changes thereto, so the rule making proceedings may be initiated, as appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

S.M. Myers
Assistant Chief Engineer in charge of
Frequency Allocation and Treaty Division

Berger Building
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0C8

1070-19 (RAF)
6110-6

August 11, 1970

Ben F. Waple, Esq.
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554
U.S.A.

Dear Sir:

Attached are four copies of a frequency coordination form for the proposed public air-ground telephone service for Canada as prepared by the Telephone Association of Canada (TAC). The proposed station locations, channel designations and frequency assignments are contained in the attachments to the form, also supplied in quadruplicate.

It is our understanding that the modifications of the original plan as proposed by TAC has been the subject of correspondence between TAC and the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. We would appreciate receiving a copy of the updated U.S. plan as soon as it becomes available. It is assumed that this exchange of letters would constitute an understanding or agreement between the Federal Communications Commission and the Department of Communications on the planned use of air-ground frequencies.

Should operational conflicts occur, it would be our view that the necessary adjustments should be recommended by those organizations who have taken part in developing this plan. Do you concur in this approach?

We feel that no further coordination would be necessary if assignments are made in accordance with the attached plan. In considering coordination of the plan in our view, base stations having a power of 40 watts and airborne stations a power of 15 watts would appear to be adequate. Any additional frequencies or new locations, however, would be subject to coordination on a case by case basis through the authorized coordination agencies or channels.

.../2

Should you agree with the plan as it applies to Canadian stations would you please return two copies of the coordination form (with attachments) together with any comments you may care to make.

Yours truly,

W. J. Wilson
Director, Telecommunications
Regulation Branch

Att.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS
OTTAWA**

Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington 25, D.C.

Serial: 70-629
Date: August 6, 1970

Sir,

This office has received an application for radio communication facilities containing the following technical details of operation. Your comments regarding the use of the frequencies indicated would be appreciated.

Name of Applicant: The Telephone Association of Canada

File No: 1070-19, 6110-6

Service: Air-Ground Telephone Service

CLASS OF STATION	NUMBER OF STATIONS	LOCATION		FREQUENCY (MC/S)	MEAN POWER TO ANTENNA (WATTS)	BAND WIDTH & EMISSION	ANTENNA GAIN & AZIMUTH	ANTENNA HEIGHT ABOVE M.S.L.	GROUND ELEVATION ABOVE M.S.L.
		LAT. N.	LONG. W.						
FA									

Additional information:

See attached map, also Appendices A and B concerning the station locations, channel designations and Frequency Assignments, for the proposed public Air/Ground Telephone Service for Canada.

Director, Telecommunications
Regulations Branch

Comments with regard to applications:

Secretary
Federal Communications Commission

The Telephone Association of Canada
1050 Beaver Hall Hill
Montreal, 128
Quebec, Canada

July 17, 1970

Mr. W.J. Wilson
Director
Telecommunications Regulations Branch
Department of Communications
100 Metcalfe Street
Ottawa, Ontario

Dear Mr. Wilson,

This is in reply to your letter of 20 January 1970 requesting additional information regarding frequency sharing with the United States for UHF Public Air/Ground Radiotelephone Service.

We hereby confirm that each of our affected members are aware of and agree with the changes included in our proposed plan. Also, the attached map includes some additional stations not previously shown in our 4 December 1969 submission. This latest allocation plan includes consideration of the stations proposed in Alaska and, to permit an allocation to Port Hardy, it is necessary that the channel 9 allocated to Seattle be deleted from the original American plan. This proposal seems reasonable since Seattle would still retain 3 other channel allocations. Since the American Telephone and Telegraph Company prepared the original American proposal, they have been advised of the required modifications to it as outlined above and in our 4 December 1969 letter. Although the desired minimum co-channel spacing is not achievable in all situations, it is felt to be sufficiently near the objective to be acceptable.

We have also informed the Railway Association of Canada of this proposed allocation plan and trust that you will now be able to proceed with final coordination of the plan.

Yours truly,

(J.L. Wilson)
Chairman - Technical Committees

Attachment

APPENDIX A
AIR/GROUND CHANNEL DESIGNATIONS
AND FREQUENCY ASSIGNMENTS

Base Station Freq - MHz	Working Channel Designation	Mobile and Aux. Test Station Freq - MHz
454.675	Signalling	-
454.700	6	459.700
454.725	7	459.725
454.750	5	459.750
454.775	8	459.775
454.800	4	459.800
454.825	9	459.825
454.850	3	459.850
454.875	10	459.875
454.900	2	459.900
454.925	11	459.925
454.950	1	459.950
454.975	12	459.975

[For US and Canadian plan see A.WENT FILE (Public Air/ground telephone service)]

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE OF STATION LOCATIONS FOR THE PROPOSED AIR/GROUND CHANNEL DESIGNATIONS AND FREQUENCY ASSIGNMENTS FOR CANADA

Station Location	Base Station Freq - MHz	Working Channel Designation	Mobile and Aux. Test Station Freq - MHz
	454.675	Signalling	-
Whitehorse, Y.T.	454.950	1	459.950
Norman Wells, NWT	454.775	8	459.775
Aklavik, NWT	454.800	4	459.800
Fort Smith, NWT	454.925	11	459.925
Fort Nelson, BC	454.825	9	459.825
Dawson Creek, BC	454.975	12	459.975
Prince George, BC	454.775	8	459.775
Prince Rupert, BC	454.700	6	459.700
Port Hardy, BC	454.825	9	459.825
Vancouver, BC	454.800	4	459.800
Vancouver, BC	454.875	10	459.875
Kamloops, BC	454.850	3	459.850
Calgary, Alta.	454.925	11	459.925
Edmonton, Alta.	454.950	1	459.950
Swift Current, Sask.	454.750	5	459.750
Regina, Sask.	454.700	6	459.700
Brandon, Man.	454.775	8	459.775
Winnipeg, Man.	454.825	9	459.825
Winnipeg, Man.	454.975	12	459.975
The Pas, Man.	454.875	10	459.875
Thompson, Man.	454.850	3	459.850
Churchill, Man.	454.725	7	459.725

Station Location	Base Station Freq - MHz	Working Channel Designation	Mobile and Aux. Test Station Freq - MHz
Thunder Bay, Ont.	454.700	6	459.700
Sault Ste Marie, Ont.	454.850	3	459.850
North Bay, Ont.	454.950	1	459.950
Toronto, Ont.	454.975	12	459.975
Ottawa, Ont. -Montreal, Que.	454.725	7	459.725
Ottawa, Ont. -Montreal, Que.	454.875	10	459.875
Quebec, Que.	454.975	12	459.975
Rimouski, Que.	454.700	6	459.700
Halifax, N.S.	454.825	9	459.825
Sydney, N.S.	454.775	8	459.775
St. John's, Nfld.	454.800	4	459.800
Gander, Nfld.	454.900	2	459.900
Cornerbrook, Nfld.	454.725	7	459.725
Goose Bay, Lab.	454.850	3	459.850
Schefferville, Que.	454.750	5	459.750
Moosonee, Que.	454.825	9	459.825