

I represent a wireless signal enhancement provider that specializes in cellular mobile and in building signal enhancement and has been deploying solutions since the early 2000's. I agree that there needs to be a better direction from the FCC regarding the legality of their use as the dependency on mobile and wireless communications has passed the level of convenience to necessity.

The wireless providers have completed beta testing and now are distributing Femtocell devices to home and small business users that have less than desirable signal. This is essentially an admission by the wireless providers that in select areas the in-home/in-building penetration is poor and that there is a need for this type of solution. The drawback of the femtocell solution is that the devices are often limited to a small number of simultaneous users, require a high speed data connection (often not available in rural areas) and are only designed to enhance coverage for one specific provider.

Full band cellular/PCS wireless signal enhancement devices from companies like Cellphone-mate, Cyfre (formally sold retail at all Alltel Store locations), Digital Antenna, Wilson Electronics, Wireless Extenders allow homeowners and business owners the ability to enhance the signal in their facility on most if not all carriers with one solution. The use of a full band solution is often desired by customers in an attempt to enhance the signal of their current devices, allow for the enhancement of users on other providers networks and allow for the flexibility of changing providers in the future without having to purchase additional equipment.

The company that I represent has been providing in-home and in-building cellular signal enhancement solutions since the early 2000's when there were few solutions available. The first solution offered was the Andrew Corporations EAC 50 with a retail price of over \$3000. This unit was a single band solution kit that was used by many however was priced too high for the average consumer or small business owner. In 2003 Wilson Electronics introduced the model 801103 cellular band in building repeater opening up a new market of affordable building enhancement solutions. We are one of the oldest and most recognized Wilson Electronics dealers in the world and have deployed more amplifiers and repeaters than any other reseller or integrator. In reading the comments posted the given fact that the number of physical complaints by the carriers and the small number of interference instances that have occurred compared to the literally millions of deployed amplifiers and repeaters throughout the country, the net result in our opinion is that a poorly installed solution likely caused these situations (or perhaps a defective device) and the introduction of some simple fail-safe's will likely end or significantly reduce the number of interference complaints.

In addition to the requirements suggested by Wilson Electronics that the devices be required to adhere to the specifications that would not create any adverse network conditions, the development by the FCC of a database that would contain the precise coordinates of each and every fixed cellular repeater would give network engineers from all carriers the ability to view repeater units deployed in a given market. In our dealings with the cellular tower and drive technicians the biggest complaint that we here is that there is too much time spent determining where the repeaters are located. This type of solution could be developed with a licensure type submission by the reseller, integrator or end user to the FCC with access granted to this data reducing the time spent locating possible interfering devices. In the defense of the end users the cellular carriers are not exactly approachable when it comes to getting consent on

the deployment of a wireless repeater and the solutions that are offered by the carriers are neither affordable nor available to the general public or single end user.

The consumer grade devices are now being sold by retailers like Best-Buy, Radio Shack, Fry's and e-commerce websites like Amazon.com and other large volume resellers. With this type of non-regulated sale consumers are able to purchase and install their own solution without resorting to a professional installer or network engineer for assistance further supporting the recommendation that the only devices that are completely "idiot proof" be made available to the general public and that systems designed for commercial deployment or ones requiring advanced engineering be limited to resellers that have competent engineering and support staff that can accurately assess the needs of the user and recommend a solution that will not create network interference.

I feel that there is an ulterior motive by some of the complaining parties involved in this situation as they are seeing their revenues drop over the years due to the lower cost competition as I have been approached by several end users regarding a second opinion after being presented with quotes from wireless carriers and/or integrators selected by the carrier to enhance their building signal that often times are 5 to 10 times higher in cost than a viable Wilson Electronics solution that will cover all providers. I have also been made aware of commissions and kickbacks being offered to the sales staff of the carriers by select integrators for every solution they sell. For example we had a customer with 6 devices that approached the carrier for a building solution. They were quoted a price of \$45,000 to have the carrier install an enhancement solution for their 8000 square foot building. The carrier was not willing to support the cost for this customer as they only had 6 lines of service.

In Mobile applications the regulation should be limited to ensuring that the devices operated are designed to adapt to the networks as the vehicle travels closer and further from a cellular site and that if the donor antenna is damaged or inoperable the device has a failsafe.

I have read the 500+ responses to this situation and a vast majority of the responses are in support of the devices for various reasons; most of them encompassing the enhanced security and safety that is created. Not one of the notices that I read made reference to leisure use like texting or socializing. I think that speaks for itself.

Matt Larson

Rochester MN