

James R. Burtle  
Chief, Experimental Licensing Branch  
Office of Engineering and Technology  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20554

In Re: Application of WIRELESS STRATEGIES, INC. For **Experimental**  
Radio Service Authorization (File No. 0051-EX-PL-2008)

Dear Mr. Burtle:

This letter responds to a May 14, 2008, letter filed by Wireless Strategies Inc. (“WSI”) with the Office of Engineering and Technology (“OET”). In that letter, WSI proposed conditions for its above-captioned experimental application in an attempt to address interference concerns raised by **Verizon**<sup>1</sup> and Verizon Wireless (collectively “**Verizon**”) and **AT&T**.<sup>2</sup> As discussed below, however, the proposed conditions fail to allay **Verizon’s** concerns about harmful interference **from** WSI’s unspecified and uncoordinated Distributed Radiating Element (“DRE”) transmitters. Verizon therefore reiterates its request that the Commission either dismiss the experimental application for being deficient, or alternatively, specifically condition any experimental authorization on compliance with the Commission’s prior coordination rules in Part 101.103.

Verizon previously explained its concerns about the subject experimental application in a letter dated April 14, 2008, to **OET**.<sup>3</sup> In that letter, Verizon urged the Commission to dismiss WSI’s experimental application because it failed to provide a detailed system description, a listing of DRE transmitters and operating parameters, or other explanation to assuage concerns that WSI’s proposed operations will cause harmful interference to existing and future systems in the area. Verizon requested that any subsequent license grant should be specifically conditioned on WSI’s compliance with the Commission’s prior coordination rules in Part 101.103.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Verizon companies participating in this filing are the regulated, wholly-owned subsidiaries of Verizon Communications Inc.

<sup>2</sup> See Letter from Michael Mulcay, Chairman, Wireless Strategies Inc., to James R. Burtle, Chief, Experimental Licensing Branch, Office of Engineering and Technology, FCC (filed May 14, 2008) (“WSI May Conditions Letter”); see also Wireless Strategies Inc., “Application for New or Modified Radio Station Under Part 5 of FCC Rules – Experimental Radio Service,” File No. 0051-EX-PL-2008, February 22, 2008.

<sup>3</sup> See Opposition Letter from Leslie V. Owsley, Assistant General Counsel, **Verizon**, to James R. Burtle, Chief, Experimental Licensing Branch, Office of Engineering and Technology, FCC (filed April 14, 2008).

<sup>4</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 101.103(d).

The conditions proposed in WSI's most recent letter do not satisfy the bilateral coordination process with current and future **Part** 101 licensees required by the Commission's rules. In the past, WSI has claimed that the operating parameters and interference potential of its **DRE** transmitters will somehow mirror the specifications of its authorized **Part** 101 licenses, so that prior coordination and licensing would not be required. In its May 14 letter, WSI modified its argument, and now claims that the activation of an unspecified and uncoordinated **DRE** is "a subsequent change to a successful **coordination**."<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, WSI argues that it only needs to adhere to Section 101.103(d)(2)(ix), and thus proposes that the Commission condition the experimental license to require WSI to provide Verizon and **AT&T**: (1) "the location of each **DRE** prior to its operation", and (2) the "coordination study of the **DRE** showing the coordinator's opinion that the **DRE** could have no impact on Verizon and **AT&T** and the coordinator's opinion that no response is **required**."<sup>6</sup> However, WSI does not provide any response period for current and prospective licensees potentially affected by interference from proposed **DRE** transmitters.

WSI's claim that the operation of uncoordinated **DRE** transmitters is a "subsequent change to a successful coordination" is incorrect. **DREs** appear to be individual transmitters located remotely from any authorized station, with unique operating parameters and unique potential to cause harmful interference to **Part** 101 station operations. As such, operation of an uncoordinated and previously unspecified **DRE** transmitter is not a minor change to a previously authorized point-to-point link between two authorized transmitters. Moreover, regardless of WSI's classification of its proposal, WSI's proposed conditions do not address the potential for harmful interference to all current and prospective licensees, and do not provide them with time to study potential interference from proposed **DREs** and respond to WSI, a coordinator, or the Commission with any unresolved interference concerns prior to **DRE** activation. This is contrary to regulatory requirements, established interference prevention processes, and the public interest.

---

<sup>5</sup> See WSI May Conditions Letter.

<sup>6</sup> See *id.*

For the foregoing reasons, Verizon requests that the Commission reject **WSI's** experimental application. Alternatively, if the Commission decides to grant an amended application, it should not adopt the conditions as proposed in **WSI's** recent letter, but should condition authorization on **WSI's** strict compliance with the Commission's prior coordination rules in Part 101.103.

Respectfully submitted,

By: **Leslie V. Owsley**  
Leslie V. Owsley  
Assistant General Counsel  
VERIZON  
1515 North Court House Road  
Suite 500  
Arlington VA 22201  
(703) 351-3158

By: **Donald C. Brittingham**  
Donald C. Brittingham  
Director, **Wireless/Spectrum** Policy  
VERIZON WIRELESS  
1300 Eye Street, N.W.  
Suite 400-West  
Washington D.C. 20005  
(202) 589-3785

June 16, 2008

CC:

Michael Mulcay  
Chairman  
Wireless Strategies, Inc.  
140 Western Maryland Parkway  
P.O. Box 3139  
Hagerstown, MD 21742