



Sprint Nextel
401 9th Street NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004
Office: (202) 585-1926 Fax: (202) 585-1892

Jared M. Carlson
Director
Government Affairs – Wireless Regulatory

June 30, 2006

Via Electronic Submission

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W., Room TW-A325
Washington, D.C. 20554

**RE: *Ex Parte* Communication
In the Matter of Review of Emergency Alert System, WT 04-296**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On June 29, 2006, Jay Pabley, Director, Network Development, Tim Bowe, Manager, Homeland Security, and Jared Carlson, Director, Government Affairs, of Sprint Nextel Corp. (“Sprint Nextel”) met with Greg Cooke, Deputy Director, Office of Homeland Security, Mika Savir, Attorney Advisor, Office of Managing Director, Sherille Ismail, Senior Counsel, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis, and Walter Johnston, Office of Engineering and Technology, of the Federal Communications Commission (“Commission”) to discuss the above-captioned matter.

Sprint Nextel understands the Commission’s interest in including wireless service as an additional method of alerting the populace in times of emergency. Sprint Nextel believes that the Commission must work closely with other government agencies and industry to ensure that appropriate wireless emergency alerts are successfully implemented. And to avoid some of the problems affecting wireless E911 deployment, Sprint Nextel emphasized that all parties – carriers, vendors, and the government – must work together to ensure that EAS requirements reflect technical and timing requirements for deployment. In addition, Sprint Nextel urged that Commission requirements should be forward-looking only, reflecting difficulties in converting the embedded handset base based on customer choices.

Sprint Nextel also stated its view that the Commission should require wireless carriers to exercise best efforts in delivering wireless alerts. Many variables, including network congestion, lack of coverage, available battery power, etc. may affect receipt of emergency messages, and thus a guarantee of service is impossible.

Sprint Nextel discussed possible short- and longer-term alerting solutions, and certain impediments in both Sprint Nextel air interfaces – iDEN and CDMA – affecting the delivery of wireless emergency alerts. Sprint Nextel urged the Commission to recognize company timelines

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
June 30, 2006
Page 2

for implementation of EV-DO Rev. A as a rational way to integrate wireless emergency alerts into the suite of services available on its network.

Sprint Nextel stressed the importance of a single point of aggregation for wireless alerts, akin to the model that exists today in the AMBER Alert context. Although Sprint Nextel anticipates alerts at the state and local level, those alerts must arrive at our networks via a single point, and preferably from a government agency, to ensure the alert is authentic. In addition, having potentially hundreds of different policies and procedures in effect for every state and locality that may want the capability of issuing a wireless alert would be problematic for many reasons and undermine the important public safety benefits sought with the emergency alerts system.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules, a copy of this letter is being filed electronically in the above-referenced docket.

Sincerely,

/s/ Jared M. Carlson

Jared M. Carlson

cc: Greg Cooke
Mika Savir
Sherille Ismail
Walter Johnston