

Exhibit 1

Explanation of Columns

Column 1:	Petitioners showed PTC is not defined including with respect to wireless system architecture, radio protocols, total amount of spectrum for various railroad configurations and traffic, etc.
Column 2:	SCRRA has not asserted a definition of PTC nor referred to government-required PTC standards or industry-accepted standards including the spectrum band or bands and technical matters as noted in Column 1 and its description above. Petitioners have shown in their pleadings that these matters are not yet well defined or developed.
Column 3:	Regarding waiver of maritime specific rules, SCRRA has not demonstrated why it cannot and should not comply. It is a government agency and should seek to uphold maritime safety. With regard to SCRRA power level waiver and mobile antenna height waiver, SCRRA simply made bald assertions and gave no technical showing for need of these. In addition, SCRRA's assertion of need of the entire 1 MHz is based upon the assertion that a large amount of traffic is to be carried on the spectrum. On the other hand, higher power is wasteful of spectrum since it reduces spectrum reuse. In any case, no technical showing has been submitted in the application, waiver request, or subsequent SCRRA filings or third-party supportive filings.
Column 4:	The application contained no suggestion of any relation between SCRRA and other railroads involving the subject spectrum. Petitioners' pleadings showed such relation. In addition, PTC-220's letter confirms Petitioners' position. That relation should be fully disclosed.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
SCRRA Technical Showing for 1 MHz	FRA and PTC-220, LLC Spectrum Requirement Assertions	SCRRA Waiver Technical Showing Including Higher Power	SCRRA Relations with other Railroads in this Matter

1. Assignment Application and Associated Waiver Requests	None	None	None	None
--	------	------	------	------

2. SCRRA Pleadings in the Assignment Application Proceeding	None	None	None	None
---	------	------	------	------

3. SCRRA Filings in WT Docket No. 10-83, excluding the Section 309 Filings regarding the Assignment Application	None	None	None	None
---	------	------	------	------

4. SCRRA Response to Skybridge's California Public Records Act Request [See Note 1 below]	None	None	None	None
---	------	------	------	------

5. Other Relevant Public Documents Provided by Petitioners	None	None	None	Yes
--	------	------	------	-----

6. SSF FOIA Request to Federal Railroad Administration	The FRA has not yet responded to SSF's FOIA request. At this time, that is an effective denial of the SSF request. See the exhibit to this filing that contains an email from Warren Havens to the FRA demanding that they provide all responsive records immediately otherwise SSF will file a court suit. This SSF FOIA request is requesting documents relevant to the two proceedings involving the MCLM licenses.			
--	--	--	--	--

7. Filings by Third Parties in Support of SCRRA	None	None	None	None
---	------	------	------	------

Note 1: SCRRRA in responding to Petitioners CPRA requests, did not provide all responsive records but withheld several relevant documents. See Exhibit 4 to this filing that contains an email demand and intent to file a court case from Warren Havens to SCRRRA for failure to comply with the CPRA requests and provide all responsive records. SCRRRA has unlawfully withheld and denied providing virtually all documents that pertain to the Columns in this chart. This unlawful withholding is evidenced by SCRRRA's own internal documents that it provided to Petitioners that refer to and discuss certain studies and research conducted by SCRRRA's consultants--their legal counsel in this matter and a Mr. Alan Polivka of Transportation Technology Center Inc and any other consultants they have hired to date regarding their PTC plans and deployment. For example, in the internal SCRRRA documents provided to Skybridge's first CPRA Request, SCRRRA wrote: "Metrolink has obtained the services of a consultant, Alan Polivka of Transportation Technology Center, Inc." However, SCRRRA has not provided any technical or other studies conducted by any consultant to Skybridge per its CPRA request. That is unlawful. In addition, SCRRRA has not provided copies of any communications and arrangements or agreements that it has with other railroads regarding PTC, including those that it is apparently cooperating with and, as indicated by PTC-220 LLCs recent comments, may have had oral discussions or agreement with regarding reciprocal leases or sale of the AMTS spectrum. Once these records are obtained, Petitioners intend to amend their Petitions with relevant information obtained therefrom. At minimum, this means the FCC should abstain from making any decision in this proceeding until all relevant records are disclosed by SCRRRA.