

**Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
Petition for Rulemaking and Request for) RM-11626
Licensing Freezes)
)

REPLY COMMENTS OF VULCAN WIRELESS LLC

Michele C. Farquhar
Mark W. Brennan

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: (202) 637-5663
Fax: (202) 637-5910
michele.farquhar@hoganlovells.com

Attorneys for Vulcan Wireless LLC

May 12, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY.....	- 1 -
II. AUCTION 73 BIDDERS COULD NOT HAVE ANTICIPATED THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT ARE DRAMATICALLY IMPEDING 700 MHZ A BLOCK DEPLOYMENT.....	- 2 -
III. AN IMMEDIATE FREEZE IS NECESSARY TO PREVENT FURTHER HARM TO A BLOCK LICENSEES.....	- 8 -
IV. CONCLUSION.....	- 14 -

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

In the Matter of)
)
Petition for Rulemaking and Request for) RM-11626
Licensing Freezes)

REPLY COMMENTS OF VULCAN WIRELESS LLC

I. Introduction and Summary

Vulcan Wireless LLC (“Vulcan”),¹ through its attorneys, submits the following Reply Comments in response to comments submitted regarding the Petition for Rulemaking and Request for Licensing Freezes (“Petition”) filed by CTIA – The Wireless Association® and Rural Cellular Association in the above-captioned proceeding.²

As discussed below, Lower 700 MHz A Block bidders could not have anticipated at the time of the auction the myriad current problems hindering broadband deployment directly resulting from Channel 51 broadcast activity, particularly new regulatory arbitrage opportunities for Channel 51 broadcasters and a flood of Channel 51 broadcast applications. If not addressed, these problems could cause further harm to A Block licensees and consumers and negatively impact participation in as well as revenues from future Federal Communications Commission

¹ Vulcan is the Lower 700 MHz A Block licensee for the Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton, WA and Portland-Salem, OR-WA Economic Areas. *See Auction of 700 MHz Band Closes*, Public Notice, DA 08-595 (rel. Mar. 20, 2008). Vulcan acquired its licenses for approximately \$113 million in Auction 73, the sixth highest amount spent on A Block licenses and the tenth highest amount among all Auction 73 bidders. Vulcan purchased the spectrum recognizing that the 700 MHz band’s superior propagation characteristics would enable efficient and affordable service to consumers residing in and traveling through the urban and rural communities that comprise its markets.

² *See* Petition for Rulemaking and Request for Licensing Freezes by CTIA – The Wireless Association® and Rural Cellular Association, RM-11626 (filed Mar. 15, 2011) (“Petition”); *Media Bureau Seeks Comment on a Petition for Rulemaking and Request for Licensing Freezes*, RM-11626, Public Notice, DA 11-562 (rel. Mar. 28, 2011).

("Commission") spectrum auctions. Therefore, the Commission should grant the Petition and: (1) prohibit future licensing of all TV broadcast stations on Channel 51 (full power DTV, Class A, and LPTV³) and immediately remove all Channel 51 slots from the Table of Allotments in any and all markets where there are no active Channel 51 licenses; and (2) implement an immediate freeze on the acceptance, processing, and grant of applications for any current full power DTV, Class A, and LPTV broadcast facilities on Channel 51 except where the applicant commits to relocating to a lower channel in advance of June 13, 2013.

In addition, the Commission should also accelerate the clearance of existing Channel 51 broadcast operations by requiring all non-protected class broadcasters to clear from Channel 51 or begin protecting A Block licensees against interference no later than June 13, 2013 and by promoting the voluntary clearance of full-power Channel 51 broadcast operations, including through repacking allotment priorities, expedited application processing for future post-relocation station modifications, or other licensing or service rules incentives. Finally, the Commission should immediately create a centralized database with information on all Channel 51 applications that have been filed, and all licensing activity that has occurred, since the close of Auction 73, and it should implement a mechanism to ensure that affected A Block licensees are notified whenever any type of Channel 51 broadcast application is filed (or granted).

II. Auction 73 Bidders Could Not Have Anticipated the Circumstances that are Dramatically Impeding 700 MHz A Block Deployment.

In their comments, broadcasters and their trade associations encourage the Commission to deny the Petition, asserting that the Commission anticipated and considered the challenges facing A Block licensees and that those licensees were on notice that they would need to

³ References to LPTV throughout these Reply Comments are intended to include translator stations.

accommodate Channel 51 operations as they deploy new services.⁴ In fact, A Block licensees have taken many steps to accommodate Channel 51 broadcast operations, including by establishing a 3GPP Band Class 12 standard in which they collectively voted to give up 1 MHz of spectrum to serve as a guard band between Channels 51 and 52 (using up approximately 17% of their spectrum and its value).

Contrary to broadcasters' claims, however, A Block licensees could not have predicted the new and dramatic problems currently plaguing the A Block at the time of bidding on the licenses. As Vulcan and RTG discussed extensively in their Comments,⁵ a number of additional circumstances have occurred or became manifest after the Commission auctioned the A Block three years ago that have collectively impeded A Block broadband deployment (in addition to the interference issues, technical challenges, and other risks that are illustrated in the Petition and the Vulcan and RTG Comments).

In particular, several events occurring since the close of Auction 73 have created new opportunities and misaligned incentives for Channel 51 broadcasters and other parties to engage in regulatory arbitrage to the detriment of A Block licensees, consumers, and potentially to the U.S. Treasury. For example, broadcast spectrum repacking and incentive auction proposals – all of which emerged well after Auction 73 closed – have had the unintended effect of creating business uncertainty for Channel 51 broadcasters and disincentivizing Channel 51 broadcasters from relocating. Specifically, as verified by the actions of a Channel 51 broadcaster discussed below, prudent Channel 51 broadcasters would likely be similarly concerned about forfeiting

⁴ See, e.g., Comments of the National Association of Broadcasters and the Association for Maximum Service Television, Inc., RM-11626, 3, 6-7 (filed Apr. 27, 2011) (“NAB/MSTV Comments”); Comments of Sinclair Broadcast Group, Inc., RM-11626 (filed Apr. 27, 2011); Comments of the National Translator Association, RM-11626, 1-2 (filed Apr. 27, 2011).

⁵ Comments of Vulcan Wireless LLC and the Rural Telecommunications Group, Inc., RM-11626, 3-10 (filed Apr. 27, 2011) (“Vulcan/RTG Comments”).

potentially lucrative incentive auction revenues if they relocate prematurely from Channel 51 (even though there are potential economic benefits and public interest benefits to moving to a lower channel now such as being able to reach the same and/or potentially larger audience using lower power levels, at less cost, with a larger footprint, and with the potential for increased cable carriage rights).⁶ Some parties also may file new TV station applications in the hopes of seeking payment from a future incentive auction.⁷ These new possibilities have made it much more difficult if not impossible for A Block licensees to enter into voluntary relocation agreements with Channel 51 broadcasters. They have also imposed unnecessary additional costs on A Block licensees and created damaging uncertainty that prevents A Block licensees from conducting the business and network planning needed to deploy broadband in their licensed areas (or even from garnering the full and timely ecosystem support that is essential for equipment development).

Even broadcasters admit that the Commission's repacking and incentive auction initiatives were a surprise and have affected their behavior. For example, Southeastern Media Holdings, Inc. ("Southeastern"), licensee of WFXG(DT) in Augusta Georgia, recently requested that the Commission allow it to remain on Channel 51 instead of relocating to Channel 31 as it had initially and voluntarily requested, citing a series of benefits that collectively supported its business interest and were in the public interest.⁸ Prior to the DTV transition, Southeastern had

⁶ For example, if a broadcaster relocates now to a channel lower than the group of channels that might be included in an incentive auction, it may not be entitled to any auction proceeds if the new station channel is not affected in the repacking. Furthermore, it could be hard for a Channel 51 broadcaster to fully assess the value of an A Block licensee's relocation incentives relative to the potential revenue sharing or other incentives that an auction may yield.

⁷ As Vulcan and RTG noted in their Comments, authorizing additional broadcast licenses on Channel 51 could risk lowering the revenue to the U.S. Treasury obtained from incentive auctions because there would be more broadcasters to share the auction proceeds related to Channel 51. Vulcan/RTG Comments at 8, 13-14; *see also* Comments of Rural Cellular Association, RM-11626, 3-4 (filed Apr. 27, 2011).

⁸ *See* Petition for Rulemaking of Southeastern Media Holdings, Inc., MB Docket No. 11-54, RM-11624 (filed Feb. 25, 2011).

determined that relocating to Channel 31 would enable it to provide improved service to the Augusta, GA DMA.⁹ Since that time, however, Southeastern has determined that “the continued viability of television spectrum as a whole has become more uncertain due to the pressures created by the search for more spectrum from broadband. With the uncertainty created by the broadband proceeding and proposed television spectrum reallocation, infusion of a large amount of capital into particular TV spectrum would be a risky venture at this time.”¹⁰ Even though the ability to provide improved service to viewers would seemingly be a business imperative and consistent with their obligation to serve the public interest, the potential arbitrage opportunities appear simply too good for Channel 51 broadcasters to pass up.¹¹

Making things worse, the Commission’s A Block build-out requirements have further incentivized Channel 51 broadcasters to delay relocation. Broadcasters are aware of the A Block performance requirements and their consequences, and they may believe that A Block licensees will become more desperate as the interim performance requirement deadline approaches. The Commission has also required that A Block licensees file their intended build-out plans by June 2011, requiring A Block licensees to reveal business plans as much as two years ahead of time that could potentially conflict with and/or compete with Channel 51 broadcaster business plans. The filings also give Channel 51 broadcasters the opportunity to evaluate their neighboring A Block licensees’ plans and determine if staying on Channel 51 can be used as an inhibiting or blocking strategy.

⁹ *Id.* at 2.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 2-3.

¹¹ A recent White Paper prepared by CTIA and CEA estimated that broadcast incentive auctions could net the U.S. Treasury more than \$33 billion. *See Broadcast Spectrum Incentive Auctions White Paper*, CTIA and CEA (Feb. 15, 2011), at http://www.cesweb.org/shared_files/edm/Press/Spectrum_Whitepaper_FINAL.pdf.

A Block licensees also could not have predicted the sharply escalated Channel 51 licensing activity that complicates the interference issues and impedes A Block network planning and design. Before Auction 73, the level of licensing activity in Channel 51 was extremely limited, with only 4 new call signs authorized for that channel over the total three-year period prior to Auction 73.¹² A Block bidders had a reasonable expectation that such limited licensing activity (especially in the preceding two years, in which zero new call signs were authorized) would cease altogether with support from the Commission. Post-auction, however, there have been at least 175 instances where the Commission has granted or is considering granting new authority to operate on Channel 51, including at least two instances where the operations would be in Vulcan's licensed service areas.¹³ It also appears that there have been more than 500 instances in which the Commission has had an opportunity to prevent the location of new facilities on or promote the clearance of Channel 51 (*e.g.*, through conditions).

The Commission's actions keep changing the deployment landscape of Channel 51 stations, making the interference profile worse for A Block licensees, delaying the introduction of new wireless broadband services in the band.¹⁴ A Block licensees cannot plan effectively for

¹² Four new call signs were authorized from March 2005 through February 2006, and zero new call signs were authorized from March 2006 through February 2008.

¹³ The Commission has granted 22 new construction permits (and has accepted 72 applications for permits, including two in Vulcan's licensed service areas), 15 new special temporary authority licenses and 12 extensions for STA, 3 new digital companion licenses, and 51 digital flash cut conversion applications. It has also granted 79 licenses to operate (license to cover) and 99 other applications related to Channel 51 broadcast operations (including applications related to antenna height, power levels, transfers, etc.), while another 148 are accepted for filing and remain pending.

¹⁴ A Block licensees deploying mobile broadband services must arrange their tower deployment so as to minimize the potential for interference to high-power broadcast operations on Channel 51. They must also construct additional base stations to protect their users against interference due to the higher power limits afforded to Channel 51 broadcast operations (full power DTV, Class A, and LPTV). In addition, A Block licensees may have to relocate already deployed base stations or engage in large-scale network deployment redesign to protect a brand-new Channel 51 broadcaster against interference. Vulcan/RTG Comments at 5-6; *see also* Comments of Cincinnati Bell Wireless, LLC, RM-11626, 2 (filed Apr. 27, 2011) (stating that its build-out is "directly impacted by" an incumbent Channel 51 broadcaster, and

unknown future broadcast operations that either need to be protected or that they need to be protected from, and having to accommodate such operations makes A Block mobile broadband deployments unfairly cost-prohibitive.¹⁵ In addition, Channel 51 broadcasters are not required to notify adjacent A Block licensees when they commence or modify their operations. As a result, A Block licensees' network architecture designs and implementations could be adversely affected, requiring further reengineering; these problems are further compounded because A Block licensees only have a limited ability to adjust their systems before interference occurs. Furthermore, by granting many new Channel 51 construction permits and licensing applications, the Commission may be creating even more regulatory arbitrage opportunities for Channel 51 broadcasters to exploit the licensing process, which imposes inappropriate costs on A Block licensees, delays broadband deployment further, squanders valuable Commission administrative resources needed to review the applications and related engineering studies, and undermines efforts to ensure successful future incentive auctions.¹⁶

noting that current technology cannot resolve all of the interference problems); Comments of King Street Wireless, L.P., RM-11626, 5 (filed Apr. 27, 2011) (noting that Channel 51 issues appear to be present); Comments of Cellular South, RM-11626, 2 (filed Apr. 27, 2011) (discussing Channel 51 issues) (“Cellular South Comments”); Comments of Frontier Communications, RM-11626, 2 (filed Apr. 27, 2011) (expressing concern that future Channel 51 operations could impair its ability to maximize spectrum utility).

¹⁵ Although Class A and LPTV stations are not entitled to the same level of interference protection from A Block operations as are full power DTV TV stations, A Block systems must be designed to protect against full power DTV Channel 51 broadcast stations – so they will likely provide some protection to Class A and LPTV stations operating on the same channel. Class A and LPTV stations can also relocate their systems to other areas, potentially causing A Block licensees to relocate or add base stations and redesign their network deployment. As noted above, Class A and LPTV stations also transmit at relatively high power levels compared to A Block operations. Thus, they could engage in regulatory arbitrage by threatening to relocate their transmitters either before or after an A Block licensee deploys its network.

¹⁶ *See, e.g.*, Vulcan/RTG Comments at 10; *see also* Joint Comments in Opposition by Cavalier Wireless, LLC and Continuum 700 LLC, MB Docket No. 11-54, RM-11624, 4-5 (filed May 4, 2011) (noting that broadcasters could be tempted to enact settlement from wireless carriers simply by becoming authorized to operate on Channel 51).

III. An Immediate Freeze is Necessary to Prevent Further Harm to A Block Licensees.

Broadcasters also vastly overstate the impact of a freeze on Channel 51 broadcast operations, and any harm to such operations pales in comparison to the far greater harms to A Block licensees, broadband deployment, rural consumers, and future incentive auction participation.¹⁷ Thus, the Commission should grant the Petition to implement a Channel 51 application and licensing freeze and accelerate the clearance of Channel 51 broadcast operations.

The impact of a Channel 51 application and licensing freeze on consumers would be minimal. Although broadcasters assert that Channel 51 operations currently serve “millions” of Americans who rely on free over-the-air television for entertainment, news, and public safety information,¹⁸ they ignore the point that the Petition is not asking to curtail the delivery of free over-the-air TV by any authorized Channel 51 broadcaster. And as previously discussed above, even Channel 51 broadcasters have cited to the Commission the increased coverage and service benefits that can accrue to a broadcaster by moving to a lower channel, providing even a greater potential audience to view their channel over-the-air. Surprisingly, none of the comments filed by broadcasters seem to recognize these benefits.

Additionally, a recent Zogby/463 poll found that fewer than 10% of American households actually rely on free over-the-air television while the rest receive television programming via cable and satellite.¹⁹ These statistics represent the total number of viewers

¹⁷ As an initial matter, Vulcan is not seeking to have Channel 51 broadcast operations shut down entirely. Instead, they should simply be relocated to lower channel slots where they can reach the same audience using lower power levels, at less cost, with a larger footprint, and with increased cable carriage rights. A Block licensees have committed to entering into private arrangements to facilitate such relocations and compensate broadcasters for expenses incurred in the relocation.

¹⁸ NAB/MSTV Comments at 13, 15.

¹⁹ *Huge Majority of Americans Favor Auction of Underutilized Broadcast Spectrum*, CEA Press Release (Apr. 11, 2011), at http://www.ce.org/Press/CurrentNews/press_release_detail.asp?id=12083. In fact, 40% say broadcast television is the information medium they could most likely live without. *Id.*

across all broadcast channels, with Channel 51 viewership representing only a small fraction of the total (dwindling) broadcast audience.²⁰ In addition, assuming an average TV show rating of 3% for a Channel 51 broadcaster (across a 24-hour period) and only 10% of viewers receiving the signal over-the-air, then Channel 51 broadcasters are resisting moving to a lower channel even though, on average, only one third of 1% of total viewers in their DMA are watching their channel over-the-air during the course of the day.²¹ Furthermore, moving to a lower channel does not eliminate this audience for a Channel 51 broadcaster.

On the other hand, the severe interference problems, technical challenges, and regulatory arbitrage concerns facing A Block licensees will only magnify if left unchecked, hindering broadband deployment further in the band and potentially limiting new wireless device delivery of the same television programming that the broadcasters themselves have stated is in the public interest. Moreover, continuous network redesigns could end up disrupting broadband service to consumers that use the A Block network, including potentially leaving them without service in areas where a tower has to be relocated to accommodate a Channel 51 broadcaster or new and unplanned interference renders their device inoperable in certain locations. The impact on

²⁰ Moreover, the Zogby/463 poll also found that Americans generally assign a lower value to over-the-air broadcasts compared to other uses of wireless spectrum, as Americans would prefer (by a six-to-one ratio) that spectrum be utilized for faster wireless services instead of over-the-air local broadcast television. *Id.*

²¹ The broadcast audience continues to dwindle over time as Americans seek television and news programming on alternative devices that A Block licensees can provide. *See, e.g., Big Bang: TV Universe Declines For First Time Ever, Nielsen Cites Digital Transition, Economy, Multiplatform*, MediaDailyNews (May 3, 2011), at http://www.mediapost.com/publications/?fa=Articles.showArticle&art_aid=149737 (discussing Nielsen Company estimates that the percentage of U.S. households with a television set has declined for the first time). Broadcast stations have also been losing market share to cable television channels for more than a decade. *See, e.g., Cable Keeps its Groove Going in 2009*, Multichannel News (Jan. 4, 2010) (noting that cable programming nearly doubled the market share of broadcast programming in 2009), at http://www.multichannel.com/article/442183-Cable_Keeps_Its_Groove_Going_In_2009.php; *Surprise! Average TV Viewing Per Day Continues to Rise*, TV by the Numbers (Nov. 10, 2009) (noting that broadcast network viewing has continued to slide for more than a generation), at <http://tvbythenumbers.zap2it.com/2009/11/10/surprise-average-tv-viewing-per-day-continues-to-rise/>.

deployment in rural areas could be particularly destructive, as rural and small wireless carriers, along with new entrants such as Vulcan, hold all of the A Block licenses below the top 25 markets.

Furthermore, failing to address the problems facing A Block licensees could discourage potential bidders (particularly new entrants and smaller/rural carriers) from participating in future spectrum auctions. A major reason for the success of recent auctions is that there have been multiple bidders for spectrum licenses, creating marketplace diversity and greater competition during the auction. If new entrants and smaller/rural carriers do not participate, projected auction revenues for the U.S. Treasury, and competition, will suffer.

Regulatory certainty needs to be provided to establish business certainty for A Block licensees to address Channel 51 interference issues and bring innovative new mobile broadband services to consumers (particularly in rural areas). Therefore, the Commission should immediately remove all Channel 51 slots from the Table of Allotments in any and all markets where there are no active Channel 51 licenses. It should also impose a freeze on the acceptance, processing, and grant of applications for any current full power DTV, Class A, and LPTV broadcast facilities on Channel 51 except where the applicant commits to relocating to a lower channel in advance of June 13, 2013. As noted above, there have been more than 500 instances in which the Commission has had an opportunity to prevent the location of new facilities on or promote the clearance of Channel 51 through its application and licensing procedures (*e.g.*, through conditions). Imposing an immediate freeze and then developing a comprehensive policy to encourage and facilitate relocation would help ensure that the interference profile does not

worsen for A Block licensees, and it would help prevent future harm to A Block operations from Channel 51 broadcast transmissions.²²

To further minimize interference, the Commission should also immediately create a centralized database with information on all Channel 51 applications that have been filed, and all licensing activity that has occurred, since the close of Auction 73. The Commission's current repository of Channel 51 broadcast data is not transparent and may be incomplete, and there appears to be a significant delay in updating key information.²³ Just as the Spectrum Dashboard increased transparency and ease of use for finding key information about wireless broadband licensees, so too could a similar database for Channel 51 broadcast operations. In addition, the Commission should implement a mechanism to ensure that affected A Block licensees and relevant Wireless Telecommunications Bureau staff are notified whenever any type of Channel 51 broadcast application is filed (or granted).

Despite broadcasters' suggestions that the Commission is locked into its Channel 51 policies from the *2004 Second Periodic Review*²⁴ forever, the Commission can and often must change course in response to evolving and new circumstances, and it has ample authority to issue a freeze.²⁵ Indeed, today's wireless and broadband services are vastly different than what was available at the time of the *2004 Second Periodic Review*, and current wireless data traffic levels

²² See Petition at 12.

²³ Indeed, Vulcan representatives have had some difficulty in finding updated information from the Commission's database regarding a station in one of Vulcan's A Block markets that went dark in 2010.

²⁴ *Second Periodic Review of the Commission's Rules and Policies Affecting the Conversion to Digital Television*, Report and Order, 19 FCC Rcd 18279 (2004) ("*2004 Second Periodic Review*").

²⁵ See, e.g., Comments of CTIA – The Wireless Association,® 2 (filed Apr. 27, 2011) (noting that because the proposed freeze is procedural, the Commission need not issue a public notice or conduct a public hearing), 3 (explaining that a Channel 51 freeze is consistent with prior Commission actions); see also Vulcan/ RTG Comments at 11-12.

and demand are orders of magnitude higher than the relatively modest levels of a decade ago.²⁶ In addition, much of the programming that has traditionally been delivered by broadcasters has now moved to the Internet, and broadcasters no longer exclusively deliver video programming. Both fixed and wireless providers deliver video programming to consumers by means that were not available in 2004.

Moreover, the Commission should reject suggestions from some LPTV parties that the freeze should not apply to LPTV stations because such stations are less likely to interfere with A Block operations.²⁷ As Vulcan and RTG discussed in their comments, Class A and LPTV transmitters can interfere with A Block base stations because of their high power levels (relative to A Block transmitters), proximity to more densely populated areas, and the fact that they are generally deployed low to the ground, leaving little vertical separation from relatively low A Block transmitters.²⁸ In some cases, the interference effects from the far greater number of 125 Class A and LPTV stations can be more damaging than from full power stations.

In addition to imposing an application and licensing freeze, the Commission should accelerate the clearance of existing Channel 51 broadcast operations by requiring all non-protected class broadcasters (*i.e.*, all but full-power stations) to clear from Channel 51 or begin protecting A Block licensees against interference no later than June 13, 2013, the interim performance requirement deadline applicable to A Block licenses. Until broadcast operations are

²⁶ See, e.g., Cisco Visual Networking Index: Global Mobile Data Traffic Forecast Update, 2010-2015 (Feb. 1, 2011), at http://www.cisco.com/en/US/solutions/collateral/ns341/ns525/ns537/ns705/ns827/white_paper_c11-520862.html (reporting that global mobile data traffic in 2010 was more than three times larger than the total global Internet traffic in 2000; see also Comments of AT&T Services, Inc., RM-11626, 4-5 (filed Apr. 27, 2011)).

²⁷ See Opposition to Petition for Rulemaking by DTV America Corp. *et al.*, RM-11626, 3-4 (filed Apr. 27, 2011).

²⁸ Vulcan/RTG Comments at 4-5. There are currently 6 Class A and 119 LPTV stations authorized to use Channel 51, including several in Vulcan's A Block license area (1 Class A, 3 LPTV).

cleared out of Channel 51, A Block licensees will continue to face significant interference risks that could undermine broadband deployment.

The Commission should also use all available tools to continue encouraging and facilitating the voluntary clearance of full-power Channel 51 broadcast operations,²⁹ such as expediting its relocation procedures where a broadcaster has entered into a voluntary agreement with an A Block licensee (or licensees)³⁰ and establishing or selecting a clearinghouse for voluntary arrangements, similar to the clearinghouse used in the 2 GHz transition. It can also provide substantial relocation incentives to Channel 51 broadcasters, including through repacking allotment priorities, expedited application processing for future post-relocation station modifications,³¹ assurances regarding upcoming spectrum auction incentives, or other licensing benefits or other service rules flexibility. Such actions to clear Channel 51 and pave the way for A Block wireless broadband services would be consistent with the National Broadband Plan and the Commission's spectrum policy and broadband deployment goals.

²⁹ See Vulcan/RTG Comments at 15; Petition at 19-23.

³⁰ See Vulcan/RTG Comments at 15; Petition at 19-21. The Commission could, for example, establish a presumption in favor of approving voluntary relocation agreements that involve the relocation off of Channel 51. Petition at 20-22.

³¹ For example, Cellular South suggests that the Commission require a Channel 51 licensee seeking to relocate to an alternate channel to submit an application for the new channel with its petition for rulemaking. Cellular South Comments at 3-4.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should promptly grant the Petition and implement an immediate application and licensing freeze on Channel 51 broadcast operations. It should also accelerate the clearance of existing Channel 51 broadcast operations.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michele C. Farquhar

Michele C. Farquhar

Mark W. Brennan

HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

555 Thirteenth Street, NW

Washington, DC 20004

Tel: (202) 637-5663

Fax: (202) 637-5910

michele.farquhar@hoganlovells.com

Attorneys for Vulcan Wireless LLC

May 12, 2011