

MARJORIE K. CONNER  
ATTORNEY  
700 WEST VIEW TERRACE  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22301  
OCTOBER 17, 2014

703-706-5917  
mkconner@mkconnerlaw.com

**PUBLIC VERSION**

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 22, 24, 27, 90, and 95 of the Commission's Rules  
to Improve Wireless Coverage through the Use of Signal Boosters  
WT Docket 10-4

Dear Ms. Dortch:

CellAntenna, by counsel and in accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, writes to provide notice of *ex parte* contact with Amanda Huetinck of the FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau's Mobility Division by telephone on October 11, 2014 in relation to the captioned proceeding.

CellAntenna's counsel merely reiterated CellAntenna's frustrations set forth in a July 31, 2014 letter to the Commission, which was supplemented on August 7, 2014. In its letter, as supplemented, CellAntenna complained that various wireless carriers consistently denied requests for consent to installation of Industrial Signal Boosters outright, without explanation. In other situations, the carriers asked questions about the installation which seemed designed to solicit trade secrets – and not information to facilitate consideration of the request for consent.

In her conversation with Ms. Huetinck, CellAntenna's counsel noted that despite the Commission's expectation that licensees would act in good faith when responding to consent requests,<sup>1</sup> CellAntenna has experienced routine denial and delay of consent for installation of Industrial Signal Boosters<sup>2</sup> for several of its projects. In each instance, CellAntenna has provided engineering and design information meeting all carrier-specified engineering criteria and using Commission-approved Industrial Signal Boosters.<sup>3</sup> CellAntenna's customers' frustrations with their wireless service continue, despite their willingness to pay for a Signal Booster to improve it. The denial and delay continues.

Specifically, as the attached updated table illustrates, some of CellAntenna's Industrial Signal Booster Consent requests have lingered for almost a year with no carrier response. There is no apparent rhyme or reason to the denials. Importantly, only once has a carrier claimed interference as the basis for the rejection.

Clearly, the process requires some discipline, so that CellAntenna and its customers may realize the goals of the Signal Booster Order.

---

<sup>1</sup> Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 22, 24, 27, 90, and 95 of the Commission's Rules to Improve Wireless Coverage Through the Use of Signal Boosters, Report and Order, 28 FCC Rcd 1663, 1704 (2013) ("Signal Booster Order").

<sup>2</sup> CellAntenna uses words as defined in Section 20.3 of the rules, as adopted, and more fully referenced in the *ex parte* letter.

<sup>3</sup> As more fully noted in the *ex parte* letter, CellAntenna submitted the system design and engineering information in the format specified by each carrier.

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Wireless Telecommunications Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
October 17, 2014  
Page 2

In its July 31, 2014 letter, as supplemented, CellAntenna asked that the Commission revise proposed Section 20.21(c)(1) as follows (proposed additional wording underlined):

- (1) Has an FCC license or obtains the express consent of the licensee(s) whose frequencies are being retransmitted by the device on a regular basis, which licensee consent may be withheld only based on credible concerns about harmful interference from the proposed Industrial Signal Booster, and

CellAntenna reiterated the need for a specific consent process during the conversation with Ms. Huetinck.

Should questions arise in connection with this filing, please give me a call.

Very truly yours,

  
Marjorie K. Conner

cc: Roger S. Noel  
Amanda Huetinck  
Howard Melamed

# Status of CellAntenna Signal Booster Consent Requests As of October 17, 2014

Highlighted Status indicates Change Since September 5, 2014

P.O. Date	Name	Location	Status
11/5/13	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T consented Verizon consent not yet received <b>T-Mobile consented</b>
12/4/13	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T consented Verizon consented T-Mobile consented
4/7/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	<b>AT&amp;T rejected</b> Verizon consented T-Mobile consented
5/2/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	<b>AT&amp;T consented</b> Verizon consent not received T-Mobile cooperating (requesting BTS)
5/8/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T consented <b>Verizon consented</b> <b>T-Mobile consented</b>
5/8/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T consented Verizon consented T-Mobile request sent June 4, 2014; tickle on June 18, 2014; T-Mobile consent note received
5/29/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T Rejected Verizon consented T-Mobile consented
6/17/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T Rejected Verizon consented T-Mobile consented
7/2/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	<b>AT&amp;T consented</b> Verizon - consents not received T-Mobile Consented
	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T – awaiting site visit information Verizon consented T-Mobile consented

7/30/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T Rejected Verizon consented T-Mobile consented
7/31/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T Rejected Verizon consented T-Mobile service not required
8/11/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T no consent received yet Verizon no consent received yet T-Mobile no consent received yet
8/11/14	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T no consent received yet Verizon Consented T-Mobile Consented
	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AT&T demanded RF study Verizon Consent not received yet