

From: CWells4944@aol.com
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2005 10:19 AM
To: John Kennedy
Subject: Re: 0029-EX-PL-2005

John,

Pursuant to over conversation this date I grant you permission to amend teh referenced application. The items to be amnended are contained in teh email of Joe Cramer dated 02/10/2005. If you have any questions regarding these changes you may contact myself or Joe Cramer joe.cramer@lmco.com

Thank you in advance for your assistance in this manner.

Claude

Claude E. Wells
Tech. Sup. Spec.
Lockheed MArtin Corporation
Tel: 410-682-2156
Fax: 410-682-0300

FW: Re: WD2XIV & WD2XIC From: Wells, Claude [claude.wells@lmco.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2005 1:18 PM
To: John Kennedy
Subject: FW: Re: WD2XIV & WD2XIC

John,

This is an email I received from Joe Cramer. It is in response to the email sent regarding the errors on the application mentioned for the VHF/OHF frequencies. My question is as follows:

Should I just file a modification of the existing license WD2XIV or file a new request with the correct info so as to not mess up the granted authorization, WD2XIV. Joe seems to think that WD2XIV was only an STA. Initially it was an STA until the license was approved with the limited number of frequencies. Me personally I think we now have too many hands in the pot. It is creating some confusion as to what needs to be done.

I know we already discussed this and you advised that the 138 and 140 frequencies may be out of the question all together. I will give you a call to go over this again.

Claude

Claude E. Wells

Tech. Specialist

Lockheed Martin RF Management Office

(410) 682-2156 Office

(410) 682-0300 FAX

claude.wells@lmco.com

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

From: Cramer, Joe
Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2005 1:05 PM
To: Wells, Claude
Cc: Deady, Edwin H
Subject: RE: Re: WD2XIV & WD2XIC

Claude,

John Kennedy sent a letter to Rick Coffey on February 7, 2005 regarding FCC File Number 0029-ex-pl-2005. It states some of the frequencies and emissions that were input into the application were incorrect. Mr. Kennedy is right. Our application does not accurately reflect FCC file number 0458-ex-st-2004. FCC File Number #0029-ex-pl-2005 needs to be exactly the same as STA Call Sign

WD2XIV from FCC file number 0458-ex-st-2004. (the license that became effective August 13, 2004 and ends February 11, 2005) This needs to be changed today.

In addition, we have to respond to Mr. Kennedy's letter today. The response should say:

The frequency requests submitted in STA 0029-ex-pl-2005 were submitted in error. The correct frequencies and emissions are:

Mobile Location: States of LA and OK:

Frequency: 138.75 MHz, 142.6 MHz, 252.6 MHz, 284.1 MHz, 292.5 MHz, 343.2 MHz.

Emissions Designator for each frequency: 25K0F1D, 25K0A1D, and 8K33A3E

Mobile Location: California

Frequency: 292.5 MHz, 343.2 MHz.

Emissions Designator for each frequency: 25K0F1D, 25K0A1D, and 8K33A3E

Mobile Location: Arizona:

Frequency: 252.6 MHz, 343.2 MHz.

Emissions Designator for each frequency: 25K0F1D, 25K0A1D, and 8K33A3E

Mobile Location: New Mexico:

Frequency: 252.6 MHz, 292.5 MHz, 343.2 MHz.

Emissions Designator for each frequency: 25K0F1D, 25K0A1D, and 8K33A3E

Mobile Location: Arkansas:

Frequency: 138.75 MHz, 142.6 MHz, 252.6 MHz, 284.1 MHz, 343.2 MHz.

Emissions Designator for each frequency: 25K0F1D, 25K0A1D, and 8K33A3E

Mobile Location: Texas:

Frequency: 138.75 MHz, 142.6 MHz, 252.6 MHz, 284.1 MHz, 343.2 MHz.

Emissions Designator for each frequency: 25K0F1D, 25K0A1D, and 8K33A3E

Please confirm be careful when submitting - John Kennedy is meticulous and will catch any mistakes.

In addition the letter back to the FCC should state: Lockheed Martin would like to Dismiss FCC File Number 0019-EX-ST-2005 PENDING the granting of FCC File Number 0029-EX-PL-2005. Lockheed Martin's initial frequency requests were submitted in error.

If you have any questions, please let me know asap. I have to return to a conference and do not have cell or blackberry signal.

If we can get this license approved today or tomorrow, then Ed will be okay for at least another 6 months and give me the opportunity to work the IRAC process. You will have to file another FULL experimental that is exactly the same as FCC File Number 0458-EX-ST-2004. But do not file it until after 0029-ex-pl-2005 gets approved.

Thanks!

Joe

Joe Cramer

Director

Technical Regulatory Affairs

Lockheed Martin, Corp.

1550 Crystal Drive

Crystal Square 2, Suite 300

Arlington, VA 22202

Ph: 703-413-5603

Fax: 703-413-5908

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

From: Wells, Claude

Sent: Thursday, February 10, 2005 8:23 AM

To: Cramer, Joe

Subject: RE: Re: WD2XIV & WD2XIC

We did but the FCC only granted them 2 frequencies on the authorization!

Claude

Claude E. Wells

Tech. Specialist

Lockheed Martin RF Management Office

(410) 682-2156 Office

(410) 682-0300 FAX

claude.wells@lmco.com <mailto:claude.wells@lmco.com>

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

From: Cramer, Joe
Sent: Friday, February 04, 2005 2:13 PM
To: Wells, Claude
Subject: RE: Re: WD2XIV & WD2XIC

Claude,

I thought we filed a full experimental of the VHF/UHF STA already? If not, we have to before the STA runs out so that we qualify under the "STA is still valid while full experimental is being reviewed" rule.

Also - I hope to get an answer by next Friday regarding Orlando's GPS re-rad experimental.

Enjoy the weekend!

Joe

Joe Cramer

Director

Technical Regulatory Affairs

Lockheed Martin, Corp.

1550 Crystal Drive

Crystal Square 2, Suite 300

Arlington, VA 22202

Ph: 703-413-5603

Fax: 703-413-5908

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

From: Wells, Claude

Sent: Friday, February 04, 2005 1:33 PM

To: Anthony.Searfini@fcc.gov

Cc: Cramer, Joe

Subject: Re: WD2XIV & WD2XIC

Tony,

I am writing in reference to the Block 60 authorization recently granted. Ed Deady has expressed his appreciation on the approval of the authorizations. But he is concerned about what was finally approved.

WD2XIC - AIFF approved authorization specifically states Mode 4 & 5 transmissions are NOT authorized. He thought he would be able to test in these modes, as approved under the STA (WB9XVO 0456-EX-ST-2004) granted for the AIFF transmissions. The STA had a condition that allowed them to transmit in Mode 4 & 5, as long as they prior coordinated with the appropriate regional FAA offices for the tests. They had no problem with this condition and felt it was a fair condition. Especially since it did allow them to meet their contractual requirements for development and testing of the systems prior to delivery and demonstration possibilities to potential clients.

I advised Ed that what was approved in an STA does not necessarily get clearance on a permanent authorization. As an STA is typically for short term operations and the personnel doing the review and coordination approval can live with some short term operations of specific systems. But they tend not to approve or feel comfortable approving the same conditions for extended operations, as they feel it could evolve into potential interference problems.

What could we do to get the original STA condition regarding the prior coordination of Modes 4 & 5 re-instated on to the regular authorization? These testing capabilities are critical to the systems being installed and for the future of these systems.

WD2XIV - VHF/UHF operations. Again they were happy to see it approved, but the limit of the two approved frequencies is inadequate for their needs. I thought I had amended the original application to more reflect the STA which was approved. I definitely know we eliminated the 118 MHz frequency from the request, but I may have assumed wrongly that an authorization being identical to the existing STA would be granted. According to Mr. Deady they are perfectly happy with the frequencies approved for the STA and the operational areas. Would it be worth our efforts to attempt to modify the license to bear the appearance of the STA, requesting the specific frequencies, emissions and powers approved on the STA. (0458-EX-ST-2004)?

Would we be attempting the impossible trying to get the modifications approved which we are willing to live with as they were granted on the STA's for each of these authorizations? I would rather have the regular authorizations modified to reflect the acceptable restrictions, rather than returning every six months with a new/renewal filing for the STA's and battling every six months for licenses which so far have not caused any interference problems and we have willingly complied with the restrictions granted in the STA's.

Claude

Claude E. Wells

Tech. Support Analyst

Lockheed Martin RF Management Office

Lockheed Martin Corporation

Lockheed Martin EIS

(410) 682-2156

(410) 682-0300 FAX

claude.wells@lmco.com