William L. Roughton, Jr.
General Attorney

AT&T Services, Inc.
1120 20th Street NW, Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036

Phone: 202.457.2040
Fax: 202.457.3073
E-mail:broughton@att.com

September 25, 2012

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Amendment of Parts 1, 2, 22, 24, 27, 90 and 95 of the Commission's Rules to Improve Wireless Coverage Through the Use of Signal Boosters; WT Docket No. 10-4

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Friday, September 21, 2012 Bill Roughton, Michael Goggin, Mike Roden, Jeanine Poltronieri, and Linda Vandeloop of AT&T spoke by conference call with Joyce Jones, Moslem Sawez, Roger Noel, and Becky Schwartz of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau. The conference call focused on an interference problem in Miami caused by a malfunctioning signal booster.

AT&T reported that the incident occurred on August 20, 2012 in an apartment building located in Miami, Florida. A Verizon customer had installed a Wilson Mobile Professional Dual-Band Wireless Amplifier Model 801240, S/N 801240E6011199145 in the condo about a year prior to the incident. The device interfered with 20 sectors on 12 AT&T cell sites with impairments ranging from 2.6 to 22.4 dBm. Five sectors were impaired by more than 10 dBm.

AT&T further explained that it took several hours to locate the building in which the device was installed. Once AT&T identified the building, it conducted a floor by floor search before finding that the booster was located in a unit on the 24th floor of the 43-story building. Because the resident was not home at the time of the investigation, the incident lasted for 48 hours until AT&T was able to speak with the resident on August 22, 2012. At that time, the resident agreed to disable the device.

There followed a short discussion in which staff asked questions about the means by which AT&T monitors its networks for interference and how these incidents come to light. AT&T explained the various procedures by which it monitors its network and how it follows up on customer inquiries regarding service issues. Staff was also interested in the process by which AT&T tracks down and resolves interference events.

Additionally, staff asked AT&T to provide list of the cell sites affected by the signal booster and distances of those cells from the interference. Those cells were:

Site number: 1
Distance from interference: 0.35 mile

Site number: 2
Distance from interference: 0.59 mile

Site number: 3
Distance from interference: 0.69 mile

Site number: 4
Distance from interference: 0.42mile

Site number: 5
Distance from interference: 0.28mile

Site number: 6
Distance from interference: 1.4mile

Site number: 7
Distance from interference: 2.9mile

Site number: 8
Distance from interference: 0.94mile

Site number: 9
Distance from interference: 1.5mile

Site number: 10
Distance from interference: 1.3mile

Site number: 11
Distance from interference: 4.3mile

Site number: 12
Distance from interference: 1.6mile

This letter is being filed electronically pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules. Should you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

William L. Roughton, Jr.