

# **NASNA Conference Call Minutes**

## **January 29, 2004 – 1:00 pm EST**

### **Participants**

Arizona, Barbara Jaeger  
California, Daphne Rho  
Connecticut, George Pohorilak  
Florida, Jim Martin  
Georgia, Elaine Sexton  
Illinois, Marci Scholl  
Iowa, John Benson  
Minnesota, Jim Beutelspacher  
Missouri, R.D. Porter

Montana, Becky Berger  
New Mexico, Art Rios  
North Carolina, Richard Taylor  
Oregon, Ken Keim  
Tennessee, Anthony Haynes  
Texas, Paul Mallet  
Virginia, Steve Marzolf  
Washington, Bob Oenning  
Wisconsin, Jeff Richter

### **Welcome and Introduction**

President Steve Marzolf welcomed all of the attendees listing all participants on the call.

### **NASNA Meeting Structure**

Steve Marzolf advised the membership of the recommendation from the Executive Board that the NASNA Meeting structure be revised in the following ways:

- a) continue holding the annual meeting in conjunction with the NENA National Conference in June of each year.
- b) conduct quarterly conference calls inviting the FCC to participate when appropriate.
- c) work with the FCC (and NGA) to coordinate an annual “State Coordinators Initiative” in the fall in Washington, DC in lieu of NENA TDC meeting.
- d) organize NASNA networking events at other national/regional events with members already attending (APCO, TDC, etc.)

Those participating on the call concurred with the change. The Executive Board will propose any necessary changes to the By-laws to implement the proposed meeting schedule. The March 14 NASNA meeting at the NENA TDC conference will be held as originally scheduled.

### **Voice over IP**

Steve Marzolf introduced the discussion on VoIP then turned over the discussion to Jim Beutelspacher for an update on the situation in Minnesota. The current regulatory action in California was also discussed. Finally, the six-point agreement between NENA and the Voice over network (VON) industry was discussed. Several members asked for more information about VoIP and NENA's action. Steve Marzolf will get that information and forward it to the membership.

## 9-1-1 Fees

The discussion regarding VoIP transitioned to a discussion of 9-1-1 fees. Several participants commented about reduction being seen in wireline E-911 revenues and the need to consider user fees from other services such as VoIP, etc. There was general agreement that the policy must be that any device with access to the E-911 system should contribute to the cost of the E-911 system.

## State Reports

There was insufficient time to present any state reports on the call.

## FCC Wireless Issues

At 2:00 pm, John Muleta, Wireless Bureau Chief of the FCC and several members of his staff joined the call. Steve Marzolf led the group in a discussion of the following topics:

### Overview of FCC reorganization and contact information

John Muleta provided an overview of the recent reorganization at the FCC. The E-911 function is now in the Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division, which is headed by D'wanna Terry. When asked for the best point of contact for NASNA members within the new Division, Mr. Muleta offered the names of either Genie Barton or Jeanie Kowalski. The FCC will provide detailed contact information for both and all other call participants to Steve Marzolf, who will forward it to the membership.

Mr. Muleta also commented that the FCC would be relying more and more on the state points of contact to provide an interface between the states and FCC on a variety of other issues. He commented that this would in some cases require increased coordination with some states between the E-911, Emergency Management and Homeland Security agencies.

### Continuing LEC issues

Several NASNA members provided examples of continued problems with the LEC when deploying wireless E-911. Mr. Muleta made it clear that this was likely NOT something the FCC would be able to help with. He explained that the authority of the FCC did not extend to intrastate telecommunications

issues. Each state's public utility commission handles intrastate issues. As a result, states have LEC problems need to resolve them at the state level. Complaints received from the FCC that are as a result of the action or inaction of a LEC will likely be referred to PUC for resolution.

### Wireless carrier point of contact issues

Steve Marzolf presented the issue that obtaining correct, up-to-date contact information for carriers has been difficult and will be compounded as more tier 2 and 3 carriers deploy service. The membership asked for help from the FCC in determining these contact numbers. The FCC is limited by what they can do by the Paperwork Elimination Act, but has offered to assist in anyway they can. They asked that the members check the existing "Carrier Locator List" available on the FCC website to see if it provides any or all of the necessary information.

### Rural (tier 3) carrier issues

In the final minutes of the call, the membership discussed the rural carrier issue with the FCC. Made clear was that NASNA does not support blanket or categorical waivers for rural carriers. Instead, the membership offered to assist the FCC with determining whether an extension of time is appropriate. It was noted that the situation might be different depending on the demographics of the service area and the current situation. As an example, a carrier providing service in two different states may have two entirely different situations. Since the state coordinator is often the best bridge between the community issues and FCC policy making, the coordinator can provide valuable insight and information to the FCC when evaluating the need for waiver.

The FCC participant left the call at 3:00 pm. The NASNA meeting continued for several minutes thereafter discussing the value of the conference call and whether more should be planned. The consensus was that more should be planned, but more time should be given to state reports.

The call adjourned at 3:20 pm.