

Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Amendment of Section 90.35	)	WT Docket No.
of the Commission Rules	)	
Regarding the Airport Terminal Use	)	RM No. 10184
Frequencies	)	

To: The Commission

**SUPPLEMENT TO PETITION FOR RULE MAKING**

The Personal Communications Industry Association, Inc. (“PCIA”), through counsel, respectfully submits the following additional information, regarding PCIA’s request that the Commission amend Sections 90.35(c)(11),(48) & (68) of the Commission's Rules 47 C.F.R. §90.35(c)(11),(48),(68), by removing the maximum allowable output power for the Airport terminal use frequencies.

In PCIA’s Petition for Rule Making, filed on June 25, 2001, PCIA noted that 47 C.F.R. §90.35(c)(68) restricted the output power for mobile units utilized by airlines on 450 MHz Airport Terminal Use (“ATU”) frequencies to 3 watts, with a 20 watt output limitation for repeaters.<sup>1</sup> PCIA asked that these restrictions be lifted, and that the general ERP provisions of Section 90.205 apply.

PCIA did not directly address the impact of the rule section on base stations, and whether similar release is necessary. Section 90.35(c)(68) provides that base stations on these frequencies will also be licensed as mobile stations, and therefore the 3 watt limitation applies. Unfortunately,

---

<sup>1</sup>47 C.F.R. §90.35(c)(48).

the same problem with mobiles being unable to communicate back to the repeater also applies to the base station, although the issue with base stations is sometimes more easily resolved by alternative means, such as using a wireline connection between the base and the repeater. Therefore, relief is necessary for these base stations.

With regard to the repeater output issue, PCIA is cognizant of the fact that non-airport operations are also licensed for these frequencies on a secondary basis, pursuant to Section 90.35(c)(ii) and (iii). Although these non-airport stations are secondary to airport operations, PCIA does not wish to advocate arbitrarily increasing permissible power to a point which would unnecessarily cause interference to these non-airport operations. However, airport authorities are increasingly sensitive to the existence of antennas at airports, and are restricting permissible locations for antennas at the airport, as well as asking for as much co-location amongst airlines as possible. Therefore, after consultation with PCIA's airline members, PCIA believes that an ERP limitation of 100 watts ERP for ATU repeaters in this band would be sufficient to provide adequate service on the airport facility, as well as limiting potential interference offsite.<sup>2</sup>

In addition, PCIA mentioned in its Petition that it was aware of a number of pre-ULS ATU licenses which had been granted without waiver for more than 3 watts output power for mobile units. PCIA recently conducted a random sample of ATU licenses, and PCIA quickly found over a dozen

---

<sup>2</sup>PCIA has over the past years consistently requested that the Commission utilize ERP as a measure of power limitation, instead of output power. ERP is the most effective methodology available to define how systems can be utilized in a shared radio environment. The utilization of output power can lead to a wide variety of ERP levels. The utilization of ERP is also more efficient and effective in the frequency coordination process. Thus, PCIA proposes that the 20 watt output limitation be removed completely, and replaced by an ERP limitation.

such call signs.<sup>3</sup> Thus, it is clear that the Commission previously had a pattern of granting licenses, albeit accidentally, for mobile outputs greater than 3 watts, yet PCIA is not aware of any cases of interference reported to date.

WHEREFORE, the premises considered, it is hereby respectfully requested that the Commission AMEND Sections 90.35(c)(11),(48),(68) of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. §90.35(c)(11),(48),(68) to remove the current limitation on the output power requirements for ATU frequencies, and implement an ERP-based limitation, consistent with the views expressed herein.

Respectfully submitted,

PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS  
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION

By: Alan S. Tilles, Esquire  
Jason Kerben, Esquire

Its Attorneys

Shulman, Rogers, Gandal, Pordy & Ecker, P.A.  
11921 Rockville Pike, Third Floor  
Rockville, Maryland 20852  
(301) 230-5200

Date: May 21, 2002

---

<sup>3</sup>See, for example, WQV585, KML555, KFJ292, WPHM432, WYY771, KNDJ269, KNIY931, KNIY932, KQO519 and KQV249.