

M I L L E R & V A N E A T O N
P. L. L. C.

MATTHEW C. AMES
KENNETH A. BRUNETTI*
FREDERICK E. ELLROD III
MARC L. FRISCHKORN
MITSUKO R. HERRERA*
WILLIAM L. LOWERY
NICHOLAS P. MILLER
HOLLY L. SAURER
JOSEPH VAN EATON

Incorporating the Practice of
Miller & Holbrooke

1155 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-4320
TELEPHONE (202) 785-0600
FAX (202) 785-1234

MILLER & VAN EATON, L.L.P.
400 MONTGOMERY STREET
SUITE 501
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104-1215
TELEPHONE (415) 477-3650
FAX (415) 477-3652

WWW.MILLERVANEATON.COM

OF COUNSEL:

JAMES R. HOBSON
NANNETTE M. HOULISTON†
GERARD L. LEDERER**
WILLIAM R. MALONE
JOHN F. NOBLE

*Admitted to Practice in
California Only

**Admitted to Practice in
New Jersey Only

†Admitted to Practice in
New Mexico Only

July 2, 2003

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: WT Docket 02-55

Dear Ms. Dortch:

By teleconference today, Sue Levine and Ken Norton of the City of San Diego and Chris Hinshaw, Tim Thomas and Richard Whittlesey of San Diego County met with Jim Schlichting, Alan Scrimme, Bob Bromery and other OET staff members. The undersigned was on the call as counsel to the City and County.

The City and County representatives described discussions over the past several months with APCO and Nextel about the so-called Consensus Parties' plan in the referenced rulemaking, and, more recently, with Motorola and the 800 MHz Users Coalition about their respective contributions to the docket.

The San Diego participants reiterated the chief technical points from their Comments of February 10, 2003, and responded to questions from the OET staff. In particular, the City and County noted that the Consensus Parties' plan threatened to worsen the spectrum shortages and other special problems on the Mexican border. They expressed the hope that APCO and Nextel would respond to specific questions posed earlier by the San Diego public safety entities.

MILLER & VAN EATON, P.L.L.C.

- 2 -

The City and County also warned against making any particular public safety system signal level the condition for future interference mitigation. They said that while their own systems were relatively robust in this regard, even these systems -- covering extremes of topography -- could not avoid areas of relatively low signal levels. They strongly affirmed the view expressed at pages 9-10 of their February 2003 comments -- that interference to public safety systems must be mitigated without regard to the systems' signal levels in the area of interference.

Please direct any questions to the undersigned.

Sincerely,

James R. Hobson

cc: Jim Schlichting, OET; Sue Levine, City of San Diego; Chris Hinshaw, San Diego County