

LAWLER, METZGER, KEENEY & LOGAN, LLC

2001 K STREET, NW  
SUITE 802  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

CHARLES W. LOGAN  
blogan@lawlernetzger.com

PHONE (202) 777-7700  
FACSIMILE (202) 777-7763

October 29, 2012

*Via Electronic Filing*

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: WT Docket No. 12-64  
*Notice of Ex Parte Meeting*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On October 25, 2012, Lawrence Krevor, James Goldstein and Richard Engelman of Sprint Nextel Corporation (“Sprint”) and I met with Roger Noel, Brian Regan and Linda Chang of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau and Michael Wilhelm of the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau. During the meeting, the Sprint representatives discussed Sprint’s opposition to the petition for reconsideration filed by Orange County in the above-referenced proceeding. We discussed the strong record developed by the Commission to support its decision in the Report and Order. The Report and Order struck a well-reasoned and well-supported balance in permitting 800 MHz Enhanced Specialized Mobile Service (ESMR) licensees to deploy wideband and broadband technologies to benefit consumers, while at the same establishing and reinforcing effective conditions and processes to protect public safety licensees against harmful interference.

The Sprint representatives pointed out that the Orange County petition is procedurally flawed because instead of offering new facts that could not previously have been raised, it seeks to raise arguments on reconsideration that were previously presented to the Commission. The petition fails to provide any specific data or rationale for reconsidering the Report and Order. Rather, the petition raises issues regarding alleged interference caused by another carrier, not Sprint. The Sprint representatives submitted that the proper mechanism for addressing this interference issue is the interference resolution procedures established by the Commission’s 2004 *800 MHz Report and Order*, not reconsideration of the Commission’s decision in the instant proceeding. Sprint also noted that it has deployed nearly 1900 CDMA sites in the 800 MHz band to date, including in urban markets, and has not received any complaints of interference arising from these deployments.

Marlene H. Dortch

October 29, 2012

Page 2

The Sprint representatives also indicated that Sprint has not deployed any 800 MHz CDMA sites in Orange County and therefore, allegations that Sprint's 800 MHz CDMA operations are causing interference in Orange County are incorrect. Sprint re-emphasized that it has designed its CDMA equipment to provide particularly robust interference protection in the 800 MHz band and that it remains committed to full compliance with the rules, policies and objectives of the Commission's 800 MHz Reconfiguration Decision. The points made by Sprint during the meeting are set forth in detail in its opposition filed on September 17, 2012 in this docket.

Pursuant to section 1.206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206(b)(2), this *ex parte* notification is being filed electronically for inclusion in the public record of the above referenced proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

*/s/ Charles W. Logan*  
Charles W. Logan

cc: Roger Noel  
Brian Regan  
Linda Chang  
Michael Wilhelm