February 21, 2013

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

Re: United States Cellular Corporation

WT No 12-69

Dear Ms. Dortch:

In accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206, we hereby provide you with notice of an oral ex parte presentation in connection with the above-captioned proceedings. On February 20, 2013, representatives of U.S. Cellular including Jeff Baenke, Senior Director – Technology Development; Roberto Yanez, Director – RF Engineering; Stan Mlekodaj, Member of Technical Staff-Devices; and the undersigned, spoke by phone with Jim Schlichting and Tom Peters of the Wireless Telecommunications Bureau.

During the course of the discussions, we responded to a series of questions regarding our prior ex parte filing dated January 24, 2013.

3GPP Standards

We stressed our belief that all of our current commercially deployed band 12 devices would pass band 17 interference testing consistent with 3GPP specifications and that we had confirmed that fact in discussions with vendors. As further evidence, attached is table containing a set of test results shared with us by GCT Semiconductor, Inc.

Conversion of Band 13 to Band 12

We clarified that a conversion of a Band 13 device to a Band 12 device was more complicated than the conversion of a Band 17 device to a Band 12/17 device due in large part to the differing RF antenna configurations present in Band 13 devices

which are inherently smaller than Band 12/17 and therefore pose more complicated re-engineering challenges within a given device footprint.

Additional Costs to AT&T

We reiterated our strong belief that AT&T will not incur any additional costs to move to a dual 12/17 configuration beyond the $2,000,000 identified on slide 5 of the prior ex parte dated January 24, 2013.

Savings Resulting from a Dual 12/17 Device Platform

We further discussed our belief that A Block licensees as a group will save approximately $200 million per year in device costs as stated on Slide 5. To elaborate further, as it stands today purchasers of Band 17 equipment (primarily AT&T) expend at least $200 million on device platform development and purchasers of Band 12 equipment would face similar device platform development costs for a comparable suite of devices. Our point is that under a dual 12/17 device platform, that $200 million would only be spent once, not twice, thereby yielding the $200 million on savings that we discussed in the prior ex parte dated January 24, 2013. In addition, AT&T would actually enjoy a reduction in development costs through the inclusion of additional A block licensee purchase volumne.

Sincerely,

/S/

Grant B Spellmeyer, Esq.
Executive Director – Federal Affairs & Public Policy