

Before the  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of )  
)  
Maritime Communications/Land Mobile LLC ) DA 10-556  
and Southern California Regional Rail ) WT Docket No. 10-83  
Authority Applications to Modify License and ) File Nos. 0004153701, 0004144435  
Assign Spectrum for Positive Train Control ) File No. 0002303355  
Use, and Request Part 80 Waivers ) Call Sign: WQGF318  
)

To: Office of the Secretary  
Attn: Wireless Telecommunications Bureau

Further Statement in Support of Opposition,  
Notice of Pending Related Proceedings, and of Future Filings,  
And Suggested Resolution of Issues in Dispute

Warren Havens, Environmental LLC, Verde Systems LLC, Intelligent Transportation & Monitoring Wireless LLC, Telesaurus Holdings GB LLC, and Skybridge Spectrum Foundation (together “Opposing Parties”) state:

1. Opposing Parties obtained from public sources, including associations representing most of US public-agency and private railroad authorities, documents that show that PTC is not generally supported but opposed, that use of the funds that PTC will require can produce more safety and efficiency than if used for PTC, and that PTC is still not well defined or underway. Some of these documents are in the Internet links below and the attachments hereto.

They further show that major railroads and the American Association of Railroads find that PTC will decrease safety (they explain why) and that it will address only **3% (three percent)** of railroad accidents (most are not caused by human error, etc.).<sup>1</sup> What is needed is not stand-

---

<sup>1</sup> Others rail industry expert organization and persons may disagree with this number and other estimations cited in sources provided by Opposing Parties in their pleadings in this docket: but we only cite well established sources, and in most cases they refer or indicated studies they have done. In any case, what is clear is that PTC is *not* what SCRAA, MCLM, and its close-camp

alone PTC but an overhaul of railroad (and more broader, intermodal transportation) radio communications for various data and voice purposes. That is what other nations have done or are doing. US politicians has over reacted to the well-known SCRAA accident caused by gross human error to fund PTC without needed rail industry support, sound cost-benefit justification, or a well formed technical and deployment plan. 217-222 MHz is not mandated by the FCC or Congress for PTC. Freight and passenger rail are not the same. AAR does not back PTC as it now is planned. Nor does the American Public Transit Association, and various major railroad companies.

Thus, the presentation by SCRRA and MCLM is misleading. MCLM and its spectrum marketer, Spectrum Bridge (as shown in the public record of they courting railroads for a long time, with regard to acquiring AMTS spectrum) and SCRAA, were not candid in their representations in this docket.

Further, PTC plans are only recently drafted for submission to the Federal Railroad Administration. SCRRA describes itself as the nation's guinea pig for PTC-- that will need scores of millions of Federal dollars, and that is supported by PTC 220 LLC<sup>2</sup> held by private railroads (including Union Pacific and Burlington Southern, that will gain from the SCRRA public-money guinea-pig experiment. Opposing Parties are assembling these for presentation in this docket with annotations. Some are given in links herein and attachments hereto. PTC does not require 1 MHz of radio spectrum: no entity has asserted that in PTC discussion within the

---

supporters have presented in this proceeding: a clear sure need for the nation, ready now, that needs 1 MHz of AMTS spectrum in the SCRAA area, etc.

<sup>2</sup> See FCC GN Docket No. 09-157, GN Docket No. 09-51, Reply Comment of PTC 220 LLC: *Page 1, FN 1*: "PTC-220 is a joint venture of Ekanet, Inc. (a subsidiary of Union Pacific Corporation ("UP")) and Norfolk Southern Railway Company (a subsidiary of Norfolk Southern Corporation ("NS"))." *Page 5*: "In Southern California, PTC-220 member UP is working to construct a positive train control network covering its territory, which serves Metrolink, a regional commuter rail system linking the Los Angeles basin.<sup>23</sup> / *FN 23*: "See "Freight railroads pledge to install advanced safety measures by 2012," Los Angeles Times (Oct. 9, 2008), available at <http://www.latimes.com/news/printedition/california/la-me-metrolink9-2008oct09,0,5279929.story> .

railroad community. See generally, and specifically regarding SCRRA PTC: <http://www.railwayage.com/breaking-news/ptc-a-passenger-operator-perspective.html>.<sup>3</sup> This article does not even mention the MCLM spectrum. It appears that SCRRA has access to the PTC 220 LLC spectrum or other 217-222 MHz spectrum than the MCLM spectrum.

In any case, there is no showing in the instant proceeding, or by PTC 220 before the FCC, or anyone before the FRA or other entity, as to what spectrum PTC actually needs. Nor would any wireless system planner or economist or reasonable financial officer implement wide area or nationwide wireless for one relatively modest--from the wireless capacity perspective--application. US railroads do not even have good two-way or telemetry radio systems generally: those need upgrading, and safety (including the goals of PTC) can be cost-effectively implemented along with modernization of their wireless systems. Standalone implementation of PTC is an unsound idea. In various language, that is the majority view among the railroad community, if the public material are reviewed. See above link, Google searches on "PTC" and also the attachments hereto.

2. Prospective assignee, Southern California Railroad Authority ("SCRRA") recently, after delay vs. the requirements under below noted law, delivered additional documents to the Opposing Parties under the California FOIA-equivalent law. Opposing Parties are reviewing the materials delivered along with the previously delivered ones, and seeking other documents these indicate, much of which are relevant to the instant proceeding. Opposing Parties intend to have legal counsel, if needed, file a court suit for release of documents withheld within the scope of this request.

---

<sup>3</sup> See also attachments hereto, and the American Public Transit Association ("APTA") 8.20.09 letter to FRA here: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/31941299/APTA-American-Public-Transit-Assn-8-09-Comments-to-Federal-Railroad-Administration-on-Positive-Train-Control-Sky-Tel-Annotated-Problems-as-curren> . (Scribd documents can be downloaded in PDF.)

3. Opposing Parties submitted long ago a FOIA request to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) after first confirming with its staff that it had on hand redacted copies (with alleged FOIA-exempt information) of the PTC plans submitted by SCRRRA, BNFS and other railroad entities submitted as required by Federal law. FRA is well past the FOIA statutory time limit to respond but refuses to provide the requested documents or give any prediction of when it will act upon the request or what it will eventually release. Opposing Parties have retained counsel to file court suit against the FCC and responsible persons for the denial unless the documents are released soon.

4. The FCC denied, without exception, Opposing Parties FOIA request for the documents provided by MCLM and its affiliates in response to the FCC closed internal investigation of MCLM apparent violations in and related to its Auction 61 long form which resulted in the spectrum subject of the instant proceeding-- even documents that the FCC did not claim were subject to any FOIA exemption. These documents are of decisional importance to the Opposing Parties petitions to deny and for reconsideration of the spectrum subject of the instant proceeding. Opposing Parties submitted a objection and request to reconsider, and the FCC did not respond. Opposing Parties have retained counsel to sue the FCC for the denial and related relief.

5. Opposing Parties submitted a written demand upon MCLM in the time period of this proceeding, under Section 80.385(b) of FCC rules and the Declaratory Ruling Orders of 2009 and 2010 with regard to the obligation of MCLM under that rule to provide to Environmental LLC and Verde Systems LLC the technical parameters of its incumbent AMTS license stations required for the F(50,50) service contour calculations central to that rule, so that they can ascertain what regions they are free to serve—including for railroad ITS (of which some forms of PTC are involved). However, MCLM refused to provide this required information, as it has for years. See below. Opposing Parties submitted last week to the US Supreme Court a petition

for writ of certiorari in *Havens* (and Opposing Parties) v. *Mobex* (and MCLM et. al.) that involves torts and violation of antitrust law by MCLM and its agents, and the limits of Federal preemption of those State law claims under Section 332 of the Communications Act.<sup>4</sup> If the court accepts the case, it will proceed and settle that issue. Whether it does or does not, another case by and against the same entities (and others) will proceed including under certain Federal law claims in the US District Court for the Northern District of NJ.<sup>5</sup> If Opposing Parties prevail on Federal antitrust claims, the US court can order the FCC to revoke the MCLM licenses under Section 313 of the Communications Act. In the same case, Opposing Parties seek an injunction under Section 401(b) of the Communications Act to compel MCLM to follow the requirements of Section 80.385(b) and the two Declaratory Rulings on this rule noted above. Discovery in this case will most likely also produce evidence with regard to MCLM matters of relevance to the claims in litigation, that may also be relevant to MCLM's allegations before the FCC made to obtain and maintain the spectrum in the instant proceeding, as well as the FCC's closed internal investigation of MCLM noted above.

---

<sup>4</sup> See: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/33205937/Havens-v-Mobex-MCLM-PSI-Petition-for-a-Writ-of-Certiorari-US-Supreme-Court-June-2010> . Opposing Parties suit against MCLM and related entities in the New Jersey US District Court is essentially held in abeyance pending the outcome of some issues in this case now before the US Supreme Court. The USDC case involves, among other matters, relief sought under Section 313 of the Communications Act for an injunction to revoke the MCLM licenses including the one subject of this proceeding, if in that case the court finds as Opposing Parties assert (already in large part based on defendants' admissions and other own evidence) that defendants violated antitrust law. That could have been decided by now but for Defendants untenable position in USDC that Section 332 of the Communications Act bestows immunity, by field preemption, on them from being sued in court even under the sections of the Act that provide for specific private rights of action (including 401(b), 206, 207, and 313). MCLM's tactic is for forestall and block any proceeding against it and its AMTS licenses in court and before the FCC, via specious and spurious arguments and in cases outright lies [see the results to date in the investigation described in part at: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/28336861/FCC-Enforcement-Bureau-Letter-of-Investigation-dated-2-26-2010-to-Sandra-DePriest-of-MCLM> until it sells all it AMTS spectrum obtained by cheating in the first place.

<sup>5</sup> See: [http://dockets.justia.com/docket/court-njdce/case\\_no-2:2008cv03094/case\\_id-216107/](http://dockets.justia.com/docket/court-njdce/case_no-2:2008cv03094/case_id-216107/)

6. In addition, Petitioners will soon submit to the FCC Enforcement Bureau persuasive evidence from documents executed by Donald Depriest and John Reardon, and orders of various courts, that show MCLM repeatedly provided false statements to the FCC in its Auction 61 applications to enter the auction and obtain AMTS licenses including the spectrum subject of the instant proceeding, that further demonstrate disqualifying lack of required truthful certifications, change in control and change in (elimination of) bidder-discount level or size.<sup>6</sup> These court and other legal documents also show that MCLM used all its FCC licenses including as collateral for its loans into the eight-figure aggregate sums, and pledged member interest in MCLM in addition. The FCC had decided to take that public-licensing matter into a closed proceeding: Opposing Parties have objected, but to date still provide relevant information.

7. During the course of the instant proceeding, the Opposing Parties and affiliates offered AMTRAK 200 and 900 MHz spectrum at little or no cash cost (and in-kind consideration to allow use of wireless infrastructure for broader intelligent transportation systems [ITS] and environmental-protection wireless, the core services at no cost to the public, government and public-benefit nonprofit institutions) but after months, it did not respond. It expressed some interest in the 200 MHz for PTC, but then suspended that to focus on WiFi for passengers. More broadly: Opposing Parties (with their affiliates) hold the most 217-222 in the nation (1-3 MHz), and the most 900 MHz for ITS (6+ MHz), however, US railroads have never even been willing to seriously discuss use of this spectrum on a no- or little- cash cost-- or any—basis—even where Opposing Parties have taken the initiative a few dozen times. That—business relations with

---

<sup>6</sup> Also, the AMTS license that includes Southern California that is subject of this proceeding was the last one bid on by MCLM in Auction 61: MCLM subsequently stopped bidding against Opposing Parties and the auction then ended. If MCLC had bid with no bidding credit (and it has been demonstrated that it deserved none), then its actual-dollar bidding limit would have been reached prior its winning high bid on this subject AMTS license. While, the broader evidence shows MCLM is fully disqualified in Auction 61 under FCC and court case law, the above subject-license disqualification is also demonstrated by more limited evidence, in the alternative.

railroad entities—is not Opposing Parties focus, but when none have interest even after being approached often for close to ten years, SCRRRA cannot suggest now that they are desperate for MCLM spectrum. Warren Havens with Opposing Parties has details of these past communications. They include presentations to BNFS, UP, AMTRAK, AAR, Nortel for BNSF (re GSM-R), UP, Meteorcom, UTC with AAR, agents for the Capital Corridor in Northern California, and others. Further, the or one of the wireless technology and products company most closely aligned with US railroads for their current purposes, including PTC, is Metercom. There is no product on its website for 210-220 MHz.<sup>7</sup>

In addition, an authority on the Railroad industry, Ron Lindsay<sup>8</sup> writes (emphasis added):  
at: <http://strategicrailroading.com/author/admin/>

It was a slow process, but perseverance has paid off. This [Teddy Bear](#)<sup>9</sup> as to PTC being vital has only the faintest shade of presence. Most individuals that have

---

<sup>7</sup> See the product specifications listed at:

Also this site includes (emphasis added):

BNSF Ready to Implement Positive Train Control (PTC)

Posted on 10/14/2008 12:34:20 PM

....MeteorComm™, the leading provider of mission critical mobile wireless communication networks to the railroad industry, has won the contract for the Higher Performance Data Radio (HPDR) project from the Transportation Technology Center, Inc (TTCI). TTCI is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Association of American Railroads (AAR)... The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) funded the HPDR project as a part of their effort in positive train control system development.... MeteorComm will provide TTCI with the MCC-6200 SDR being developed this year.... to verify that it fulfills the HPDR requirements....The HPDR, which will communicate both voice and data at 160 MHz, will pave the way for new industry standards and guidelines for CBTC.

<sup>8</sup> Ron Lindsay. See <http://www.railwayage.com/abouteditors.html> : Listed as a Railway Age contributing editor, and: “Ron Lindsey is an independent consultant in the rail and intermodal industries. He began his career with IBM in 1970. He subsequently joined the Trustee Staff of the Penn Central bankruptcy and has spent the last 30 years in railroad management and independent consulting. He was Chief Engineer Communications at Conrail and Director of Advanced Train Control at CSX.”

<sup>9</sup> A “Teddy Bear” is described at: <http://strategicrailroading.com/2010/05/teddy-bears-popular-but-erroneous-notions-in-rail/>

anything to do with PTC now understand that PTC is NOT vital. But, just in case, here's the story.

at: <http://strategicrailroading.com/2010/05/teddy-bear-ptc-delivers-business-benefits/> :

The really unfortunate part of the PTC – business benefits controversy is that it is contributing to a substantial lack of business benefit pursuits that could be made with the advancement of a wireless data infrastructure that is now required for PTC. That is, it is the wireless data infrastructure that can deliver the business benefits that are falsely associated with PTC. PTC is just one application on the wireless data infrastructure as are traffic management, fuel utilization, locomotive diagnostics, work order, wayside detectors, etc.

Prior to the PTC mandate, the railroads were moving individually on wireless data systems, but without a true, holistic business strategy of what a wireless infrastructure could deliver. Now, at least they are moving together as an industry in the pursuit of a wireless solution, albeit an overly-design and overly-expensive one, but they still don't have a business strategy of how to use the infrastructure. The focus is only on PTC, and the fatuous statements that PTC will deliver business benefits is going to be very costly for the railroads, both individually and as an industry, as the railroads ignore such opportunities with or without PTC. The pathetic truth currently is that not only does PTC not deliver business benefits, but its pursuit to meet the December 31, 2015 deadline is actually preventing the realization of major business benefits.

at: <http://strategicrailroading.com/full-spectrum/fs-53-passion/>

#### FS#51 - A Wealth of Wireless

For an industry based upon the management of remote and mobile resources, the railroads now have an amazingly amount of wireless data available to them that can provide the timely data necessary to properly manage those resources. However, there are several wireless platform alternatives from which to chose. While each of the Class I's has made a selection via its particular rational process, the selection process to date for an industry-wide solution does not seem to be based upon technical, financial, functional, or even availability factors. Instead, it appears to be a matter of industry politics at play.

at: <http://strategicrailroading.com/category/wireless/> (bolding and italics in original)

There is also another reason that the ITC efforts are less than complete, certainly not altruistic, if not a bit misleading; it is the issue of *industry politics*. That is, each major railroad came to the ITC table with a very different technology agenda. There are solutions to address these differences, and the railroads more than ever are working in that direction. However, I believe the solution to develop a single technology platform is poorly evaluated as to both scope and costs, while other wireless spectrums are being very poorly utilized, i.e., Meteorcomm and narrowband 160-161 MHz ... clearly a discussion for a forthcoming post.

Other materials on topics noted above are in attachments hereto.

8. *However, if SCRRA reasonably demonstrates a practical plan for PTC-- that the costs-benefits make sense, that PTC is standardized and is the best choice as to how to improve its trains for the public (and it has not begun to do that publicly anywhere, and not in the instant proceeding), and that this PTC likely to spread nationwide and be viable and in the public interest--, then Opposing Parties will take part in discussions with a possibility to withdraw their opposition, if MCLM gives up its demand for payment, PTC 220 LLC (held by very large private for-profit railroad companies, along with Meteorcomm LLC) gives up profit in roles noted above and other reasonable public-interest goals are met.*

*That is, if SCRRA PTC is actually a sound guinea pig test for PTC in the US, and if it works, then private parties should assist the public SCRRA at little or no profit (and reserve potential material profit on other PTC opportunities once this test proves successful).*

*Opposing Parties have a very sound legal claim to the MCLM spectrum at issue, are pursuing that before the FCC and in court, and will consider the arrangement noted above even if they win the claim if SCRRA is pursues the matter along the responsible lines indicated above.<sup>10</sup> Otherwise, it should be opposed in the public interest, and for Opposing Parties lawful private (for profit and nonprofit) interests also.*

9. SCRAA and MCLM and supporters in this docket suggest PTC is essentially a public safety radio service but is it not classed that way with by the FCC or NTIA. If the Federal government mandates PTC on 217-222 MHz as these parties suggest, then the Congress or the FRA would have arranged for NTIA to re-allocate some government spectrum above 225 MHz for PTC but neither did so. Nor is there any showing as to why SCRRA did not obtain the public-safety set aside spectrum in the 220-222 MHz band—if its planned PTC is public safety

---

<sup>10</sup> Warren Havens, for Opposing Parties, communicated that in sum to the attorney representing SCRAA in the matter of the subject assignment application, but he expressed no interest, nor did the SCRAA employee representative listed in the application. That is at their risk, and probably not approved by SCRRA board. In any case, this is stated here again, at least for the record and for management in SCRAA and the local, State and Federal public agencies that back SCRAA.

wireless. There is ample spectrum in even part of that public safety set aside for any conceivably reasonable quantity of data communications between a small number of large trains on a limited number of tracks across the very large SCRAA service area. If what is actually intended is not PTC or not primarily PTC (in terms of need for wireless data capacity)—which appears to be the case--<sup>11</sup> then SCRAA and MCLM are not candid in this proceeding.

10. In sum, there is nothing close to a compelling need demonstrated in this proceeding for SCRAA to obtain one MHz of AMTS spectrum (or any spectrum from a sole source), especially prior to completion of the legal issues as to whether MCLM or Opposing Parties have the legitimate claim to the spectrum.

11. Once Opposing Parties obtain from SCRAA, the FCC, FRA and/or from the legal proceedings indicated above further information relevant to this proceeding and have processed it, they will present it by a further filing or filings in this docket. Some attachments hereto show the status of certain related FOIA requests.

12. Also, since the last pleading in this proceeding filed by the Opposing Parties, they have submitted substantial additional factual materials to the FCC Enforcement Bureau (“EB”) and will submit soon others soon, of decisional importance in the proceeding involving the long form of MCLM in Auction 61 (investigation directed mostly to Donald and Sandra Depriest, but also to Jason Smith of Maritel: the last Internet link above is one of the six EB letters of investigation in this matter) whose certifications and disclosures resulted in the geographic AMTS licenses, now in the name of MCLM, including the one subject of this proceeding.

---

<sup>11</sup> See those parties filings in this proceeding: the MCLM spectrum is sought not only for PTC but other applications as well. Also, consider the description of PTC, and the fact that SCRAA does not in this proceeding present a copy of, or even summary of, its Federally mandated PTC Plan submitted to FRA after this proceeding began. Why has SCRAA not presented that here? It probably does not support the need for 1 MHz of AMTS spectrum. SCRAA may be seeking the other spectrum for non-PTC forms of wireless and/ or for its deployment partner PTC 220 LLC.

13. Exhibits hereto are substantially discussed above. However, the information in the exhibits is important to the issues in this proceeding, as their content demonstrates, without introduction or summary.

14. Issues in this proceeding are also, in part, related to issues in FCC and court proceedings including those included or reflected in the following links. Below, "Opposing Parties," "we" and "our" indicate any one or more of the signers of the instant pleading.

Opposing Parties recent appeal to the FCC Office of General Counsel (OGC) of the unlawful denial by the FCC lower-level staff of our FOIA request to get documents the FCC demanded and received from the Depriests and affiliates. Opposing Parties plan to take this to court if the OGC does not grant in full our appeal.

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/34293918/FCC-FOIA-Denial-MCLM-Depriests-Investigation-Appeal-to-FCC-Office-General-Counsel-With-10-Attachments>

On the US Courts "PACER" system are Opposing Parties recent filings in the US Ninth Circuit on a related matter: FCC Auction 87 problems that stem from the FCC accommodating MCLM-Depriests rule violations and perjury in Auction 61. Some filings are at following links:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/34296103/Skybridge-Spectrum-Foundation-v-FCC-9th-Circuit-FCC-Violation-of-Its-Auction-Rules-Response-to-Order-Show-Cause>

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/33171472/Motion-Skybridge-Spectrum-Foundation-v-FCC-9th-Circuit-FCC-Violation-of-Its-Auction-Rules>

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/33171678/Reply-Skybridge-Spectrum-Foundation-v-FCC-9th-Circuit-FCC-Violation-of-Its-Auction-Rules>

Opposing Parties pending case (petition for cert) before the US Supreme Court is at the following link. This involves a case against MCLM and related parties for various State law violations and fraud, involving misuse of FCC licenses.

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/33205937/Havens-v-Mobex-MCLM-PSI-Petition-for-a-Writ-of-Certiorari-US-Supreme-Court-June-2010>

The Depriests- MCLM FCC Auction 61 "long form" application after the auction to get the AMTS-class wireless licenses by perjurious statements and rule violations, and pleadings challenging this (the challenging petitions and replies are by my companies):

<http://wireless2.fcc.gov/UlsApp/ApplicationSearch/applAdmin.jsp?applID=3612537>

At the above link, got to the bottom of this "Admin" tab page and see the list of pleadings: click on "all pleadings" to see all. There are additional filings in this proceeding in recent months, and other material will also be filed by Opposing Parties in upcoming periods. A number of other entities, members of the press, and agencies are also investigation these matters independently of Opposing Parties.

Respectfully,

**Environmental LLC**, by  
*[Filed electronically. Signature on file.]*  
Warren Havens  
President

**Verde Systems LLC**, by  
*[Filed electronically. Signature on file.]*  
Warren Havens  
President

**Intelligent Transportation & Monitoring Wireless LLC**, by  
*[Filed electronically. Signature on file.]*  
Warren Havens  
President

**Telesaurus Holdings GB LLC**, by  
*[Filed electronically. Signature on file.]*  
Warren Havens  
President

**Skybridge Spectrum Foundation**, by  
*[Filed electronically. Signature on file.]*  
Warren Havens  
President

**Warren Havens**, an Individual  
*[Filed electronically. Signature on file.]*  
Warren Havens

Date: July 13, 2010

Each at:

2649 Benvenue Ave, Berkeley, CA 94704  
Phone: 510-841-2220 Fax: 510-740-3412

Exhibits separately uploaded; most online.

Other referenced materials in links provided above.

Declaration

I, Warren Havens, as President of Petitioners, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing “Further Statement...”, including exhibits, were prepared pursuant to my direction and control and that all the factual statements and representations contained herein are true and correct.

*/s/ Warren Havens*  
*[Submitted Electronically. Signature on File.]*

---

Warren Havens

July 13, 2010

Certificate of Service

I, Warren C. Havens, certify that I have, on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of July 2010, caused to be served, by placing into the USPS mail system with first-class postage affixed, unless otherwise noted, a copy of the foregoing "Further Statement..." (exhibits included only on the ESFC copy) to the following.

Jeff Tobias, Mobility Division, WTB  
Federal Communications Commission  
Via email only to: [jeff.tobias@fcc.gov](mailto:jeff.tobias@fcc.gov)

Southern California Regional Rail  
Authority  
ATTN Darrell Maxey  
700 S. Flower St. Suite 2600  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Lloyd Coward, WTB  
Federal Communications Commission  
Via email only to:  
[Lloyd.coward@fcc.gov](mailto:Lloyd.coward@fcc.gov)

Russell Fox (legal counsel for MariTel,  
Inc.)  
Mintz Levin  
701 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004

Gary Schonman, Special Counsel  
Investigations and Hearings Division  
Enforcement Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Via email only to:  
[gary.schonman@fcc.gov](mailto:gary.schonman@fcc.gov)

Jason Smith  
MariTel, Inc.  
4635 Church Rd., Suite 100  
Cumming, GA 30028

Brian Carter  
Investigations and Hearings Division  
Enforcement Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Via email only to: [brian.carter@fcc.gov](mailto:brian.carter@fcc.gov)

Hall, Estill, Hardwick, Gable, Golden &  
Nelson, P.C. (counsel to PSI)  
Audrey P Rasmussen  
1120 20th Street, N.W., Suite 700 North  
Washington, DC 20036

Dennis Brown (legal counsel for MCLM  
and Mobex)  
8124 Cooke Court, Suite 201  
Manassas, VA 20109-7406

Joseph D. Hersey, Jr.  
U.S. National Committee Technical  
Advisor and,  
Technical Advisory Group  
Administrator  
United States Coast Guard  
Commandant (CG-622)  
Spectrum Management Division  
2100 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20593-0001  
Via email only to: [joe.hersey@uscg.mil](mailto:joe.hersey@uscg.mil)

Fletcher Heald & Hildreth (Legal  
counsel to SCRRA)  
Paul J Feldman  
1300 N. 17th St. 11th Fl.  
Arlington, VA 22209

Marion Ashley, Chairman  
Riverside County Board of Supervisors,  
District 5  
County Administrative Center  
4080 Lemon Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501

Edwin F. Kemp  
President  
PTC-220, LLC  
1400 Douglas Street, STOP 0640  
Omaha, NE 68179

Darren M. Kettle, Executive Director  
Ventura County Transportation  
Commission  
950 County Square Drive, Suite 207  
Ventura, CA 93003

Joseph C. Szabo, Administrator  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Railroad Administration  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE  
Washington, DC 20590

Don Knabe, Supervisor  
Board of Supervisors County of Los  
Angeles  
822 Kenneth Hahn Hall of  
Administration  
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Various personnel  
City Desk  
Los Angeles Times\*  
(With background materials on PTC,  
MCLM-Depriests, etc.)

SCRAA Board Members, and  
Legal counsel other than for FCC  
matters--  
At addresses once obtained

*[Filed Electronically. Signature on File]*

---

Warren Havens

---

The mailed copy being placed into a USPS drop-box today may not be processed by the USPS until the next business day.

\* At <http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-lanow-stafflist,0,2575670.htmlstory>