Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In **the** Matter of	)	
	)	
Dcvclopment of Operational, Technical and Spcctruin Requirements for Meeting Federal, State and Local Public **Safety** Communications Requirements Through the Year 2010	)	WT **Docket** No. ***94-86***
	)	
Service Rules for the 698-746,747-762 and 777-792 MHz Bands	)	WT Docket No. 06-1*50*
	)	
Former Nextel Communications, Inc. **Upper** 700 MHz Guard Band Liccnscs and Revisions to Part 27 of the Commission's Rules	)	WT Docket No. 06-169
	)	
Implcmenting **a** Nationwide, Broadband, Interoperable Public Safety Network in the 700 MHz Band	)	PS Docket No. 06-229

COMMENTS *OF* SHARP COMMUNICATION, INC.

Sharp Communication, Tnc. hereby submits these comments in response to the Commission's *Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* in the above-captioned proceedings.

Sharp Communication **hopes** to sec the FCC reconsider the current **proposed plan** for **the** 700 MHz band. While a national network might be a benefit to some cities and certainly has some advantages, it is our position that all public safety agencies should also rctain the ability to license, own, and operate their own high-speed **data** systems in the 700 MHz band in addition to having an option to go on a national network.

By owning their own systems, public safety agencies in our area will **be** able to decidc an their own **coverage** area, and can implement the system when they are ready rather than having to wait until a national provider **decides** that they **are** rcady **to** cnter our **market.** We are truly concerned for some of our smallcr cities and communities, **as a** national provider will likely never extend coveragc into thcir areas, and if they do, it will be very far into thc future as they may **feel** it will not bc profitable **enough.**

Sharp Communication is also concerned about the level of **local** sales & technical support that would be made available **from a single** national provider. Today, our public safcty agcncies have the ability to choose from *a* number ofproducts **and** vendors for their wireless communication needs. **A** one *size* fits all solution, limiting the system choices of vendors **and** equipment **has** historically not bcen received well by public safety,

It sounds as though the FCC is considering the creation of a monopoly for the successful bidder of this nation-wide high-speed data system, raising serious concerns regarding the long-term impact this will have on the quality of service that can be expected for mission critical data communications. Today, wireless communication providers know they are competing with one another for public safety business, which has a direct impact on the quality of service. If the expected level of service is not met, there are more choices elsewhere, as mission critical public safety needs demand the very highest quality of service.

What choices will be available when the quality of service is lacking from a national provider of a high speed data network and there is no option to build a local network?

Respectfully submitted,

Trey Sharp
Sharp Communication, Inc.
May 21,2007