

Commissioners,

I fully support the proposed withdrawal of the January 2011 conditional waiver that allowed LightSquared to proceed with its wireless network, and the proposed modification of its satellite license to prohibit LightSquared from building a ground-based wireless network. I routinely use a GPS receiver in my car, and travel in and around Houston would become much more difficult should GPS signals be unavailable due to high-power transmissions on adjacent frequencies. Losing GPS functionality would certainly reduce my mobility and willingness to travel to previously unvisited locations. Additionally, I use GPS for navigation on my sailboat and on boats of various friends: GPS has allowed us to sail much more safely into unfamiliar areas than before. Most of my on-the-water use of GPS is on Galveston Bay, which presumably would be blanketed by LightSquared's proposed signals.

The engineering studies carried out by the NTIA make it clear that LightSquared's planned use of the spectrum will result in interference with the reception of GPS signals: if for no other reason, this fact should be enough justification for the withdrawal of the waiver and for the modification of LightSquared's satellite license.

I recognize the utility and need for wireless broadband signals. I currently reap the benefits of a 4g LTE phone, and appreciate having that connectivity: I do not believe that the choice between broadband and GPS needs to be made: the spectrum that LightSquared wants to use is what has forced that apparent choice.

In the interest of full disclosure, I'll note that until my recent retirement I was a software developer for Fugro Satellite Positioning (formerly, Omnistar, Inc.), a long-term provider of differential GPS corrections. The company actually uses LightSquared's satellite to broadcast differential corrections to their subscribers.