FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.

Frederick P. Fish
1855-1930

W.K. Richardson
1859-1951

1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

Telephone
202 783-5070

Facsimile
202 783-2331

Web Site
www.fr.com

Edwin N. Lavergne
(202) 626-6359
LAVERGNE@FR.COM

June 3, 2004

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

BOSTON
DALLAS
DELAWARE
NEW YORK
SAN DIEGO
SILICON VALLEY
TWIN CITIES
WASHINGTON, DC

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: **EX PARTE SUBMISSION**
WT Docket No. 03-66; Amendment of Parts 1, 21, 73, 74 and 101 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate the Provision of Fixed and Mobile Broadband Access, Educational and Other Advanced Services in the 2150-2162 and 2500-2690 MHz Bands

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Today, Monsignor Michael Dempsey of the Catholic Television Network, David Moore of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles Education and Welfare Corporation, Patrick Gossman, of the National ITFS Association, Todd Gray, counsel to the National ITFS Association, and the undersigned, counsel to the Catholic Television Network, met with Commissioner Michael J. Copps and his Spectrum and Legal Advisor, Paul Margie regarding the above-referenced proceeding. A summary of the points discussed during our meeting is attached to this letter. Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's Rules, this letter is being filed electronically.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Edwin N. Lavergne

Edwin N. Lavergne
Counsel to the Catholic Television Network

Edwin Lavergne

From: Edwin Lavergne
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2004 3:29 PM
To: Paul Margie (E-mail)
Cc: Todd D. Gray (E-mail)
Subject: Remaining Issues of Concern of Education Community

Paul:

As a follow up to our meeting today, this summarizes the key concerns of the Catholic Television Network and the National ITFS Association in WT Docket No. 03-66.

1. We understand that the WTB has proposed the adoption of a Report and Order which retains the existing ITFS eligibility requirements. This is good news. We want to ensure, however, that the language in the Report and Order does not create any uncertainty as to the Commission's commitment to maintain the educational eligibility requirements for ITFS.

2. We understand that a FNPRM will be released which will seek comment on several issues including ITFS eligibility. We are not opposed to a FNPRM per se. We do, however, want to ensure that the scope of the FNPRM is limited to evaluating ways to enhance the use of ITFS for the benefit of education (e.g., exploring whether changes should be made to the percentage of ITFS capacity that may be leased, exploring educational use requirements, exploring limits on ITFS excess capacity lease arrangements, exploring criteria to be evaluated at the time an ITFS license is renewed, etc.). The FNPRM should not reopen the question of whether eligibility itself should be kept in place. That question was decided affirmatively three years ago in ET Docket 00-258, and should be reaffirmed in the Report and Order.

3. We understand that a proposal has been circulated to create a "sunset provision" under which eligibility restrictions would expire after a set period of time, or there would be an rebuttable presumption that ITFS eligibility restrictions should expire after some period of time. We are adamantly opposed to any sunset proposal or presumption that eligibility should go away because it would create further uncertainty and undermine the decision in the Report and Order to keep eligibility restrictions in place.

4. With respect to proposed changes to the band plan, the use of 4 MHz transition bands (J and K bands) is feasible. However, from the perspective of ITFS licensees using the MBS, the Report and Order should make clear that a fundamental requirement is that the MBS noise floor must under all circumstances remain at -107 dBm in 6 MHz for analog, or -90 dBm in 6 MHz for digital. This can be done by requiring the upper-most LBS channel and the lower-most UBS channel to further suppress its OOBE at 4 MHz above its upper channel edge to what the suppression would have been at 6 MHz above the upper channel edge for the originally agreed upon 6-MHz wide J and K bands. Based on linear interpolation of the previously proposed 43 dB + 10logP suppression requirement at the channel edge, and the 55 dB + 10logP suppression requirement at 5.5 MHz above the channel edge, this would increase the suppression requirement by 8.7 dB. This additional suppression requirement would need to apply to both base stations and CPEs. Another alternative would be for the upper-most LBS channel licensee and the lower-most UBS channel licensee to upgrade the bottom-of-the-MBS band channel licensee, and the top-of-the-MBS band licensee, from analog to digital. This would result in a 17 dB relaxation of the MBS noise floor protection requirement.

Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Ed Lavergne
Counsel to the Catholic Television Network

Edwin N. Lavergne
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Direct: 202-626-6359

Main: 202-783-5070
Fax: 202-783-2331
E-mail: lavergne@fr.com
Web: www.fr.com