

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements	)	PS Docket No. 07-114
	)	
Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems	)	CC Docket No. 94-102
	)	
Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials-International, Inc.)	)	
Request for Declaratory Ruling	)	
	)	
911 Requirements for IP-Enabled Service Providers	)	WC Docket No. 05-196
	)	

**Reply Comments of the Rural Telecommunications Group, Inc.**

The Rural Telecommunications Group, Inc. (“RTG”),<sup>1</sup> by its attorneys, hereby submits its reply comments in response to comments filed in the above-captioned proceedings. The record in this proceeding demonstrates that requiring licensees subject to the accuracy standards of Section 20.18(h) of the Commission’s Rules to meet these standards at the geographic level defined by the coverage area of each respective Public Safety Answering Point (“PSAP”) will be an expensive, technically difficult, and unenforceable prospect. As providers of commercial mobile radio service (“CMRS”) in

---

<sup>1</sup> RTG is a Section 501(c)(6) trade association dedicated to promoting wireless opportunities for rural telecommunications companies through advocacy and education in a manner that best represents the interests of its membership. RTG’s members have joined together to speed delivery of new, efficient, and innovative telecommunications technologies to the populations of remote and underserved sections of the country. RTG’s members are small, rural businesses serving or seeking to serve secondary, tertiary and rural markets. RTG’s members are comprised of both independent wireless carriers and wireless carriers that are affiliated with rural telephone companies.

rural areas, RTG’s members have firsthand experience with the provision of Phase II emergency 911 (“Phase II E911”) location accuracy standards in rural settings and oppose a PSAP level standard.

**I. Providing E911 Service in Rural Areas Is Difficult and Costly**

The comments in this proceeding confirm the need for the Commission to consider the technical and financial difficulties of implementing Phase II service at the PSAP level, especially in rural settings. As SunCom Wireless, Inc. (“SunCom”), a Tier II carrier that provides service in both urban and rural settings, notes, “[f]actors such as local topography and existing cell site coverage in a particular area dramatically impact the accuracy and reliability of Automatic Location Information (“ALI”) for emergency callers, and no amount of investment in presently available technologies would ensure compliance with the Section 20.18(h) standard.”<sup>2</sup> RTG’s members, all of whom are Tier III carriers, can confirm that meeting the FCC’s accuracy standards at the PSAP level with network-based ALI systems can be cost prohibitive. Rural cellular networks are oftentimes constructed in an economical “string of pearls” fashion which makes the triangulation necessary to provide location information impossible without the construction of multiple new, prohibitively expensive cell sites. RTG agrees with SunCom that the Commission’s tentative conclusion “cannot be satisfied using present technology.”<sup>3</sup> Other carriers who serve rural areas echo this conclusion. For example, the Rural Cellular Association (“RCA”) hopes that the Commission “will not adopt rules that impose standards that are not technologically achievable at this time.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> SunCom Comments at 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>4</sup> RCA Comment at 6.

Even commenters who support a PSAP level standard or are relatively neutral about the tentative conclusion have determined that costs can be substantial, especially for rural carriers. Polaris Wireless, Inc. (“Polaris”) urges the Commission to take its time and recognize “realistic cost constraints.”<sup>5</sup> TruePosition, Inc. (“TruePosition”) provides a list of the substantial investments needed for carriers, including additional stand-alone sites, hybrid technologies, and the possible sharing of such facilities among networks in order to meet accuracy levels at the PSAP level.<sup>6</sup> Such technical solutions will take time to develop and coordinate and, as TruePosition notes, the extent to which coordination and expenditures are needed to meet accuracy standards at the PSAP level is greater for rural carriers.<sup>7</sup>

The State of Montana (“Montana”), a rural state served by numerous Tier III providers, has firsthand knowledge of the cost of new technologies and the expense this presents for states as well as carriers.<sup>8</sup> RTG agrees with Montana that it is premature to implement a rule that requires “new technologies” and that will have a definite “fiscal impact” on rural states and carriers.<sup>9</sup>

## **II. The Proposed Standard Is Unenforceable and Administratively Suspect**

In addition to being technically complex and expensive, requiring accuracy levels to be measured at the PSAP level will be unenforceable and arbitrary. As Verizon Wireless (“Verizon”) and other commenters show, “PSAP service areas themselves are

---

<sup>5</sup> Polaris Comments at 2.

<sup>6</sup> TruePosition Comments at 3.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> Montana Comments at 1.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

not established on a uniform, standardized basis.”<sup>10</sup> It is unclear to RTG how accuracy standards can be enforced at the PSAP level, “which are inconsistently defined in a manner that results in such a wide variation of size and environment.”<sup>11</sup>

Finally, as the National Emergency Number Association (“NENA”) notes, the proposed PSAP level requirement is “new because it has never been made explicit in Section 20.18.”<sup>12</sup> This “new” rule requires adequate notice and comment.<sup>13</sup> In light of the overwhelming request by almost all commenters to allow more time to consider the technical and financial aspects of a PSAP level standard, the Commission should refrain from imposing this standard without further comment and study. At a minimum, because this issue relates to the issues that will be addressed in the next round of comments to be filed in this proceeding, the Commission should wait until the record is fully developed before making any decision on this matter.

---

<sup>10</sup> *See* Verizon Comments at 23. *See also* RCA Comments at 5 (noting the difference in PSAP areas throughout the country).

<sup>11</sup> QUALCOMM Incorporated Comments at 6.

<sup>12</sup> NENA Comments at 2.

<sup>13</sup> *See* Verizon Comments at 7 – 10.

### **III. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, RTG respectfully requests that the Commission act in accordance with the views expressed herein.

Respectfully submitted,

**RURAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
GROUP, INC.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_

Caressa D. Bennet  
Kenneth C. Johnson  
Bennet & Bennet, PLLC  
4350 East West Highway  
Suite 201  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
(202) 371-1500

Its Attorneys

Date: July 11, 2007

### Certificate of Service

I, Linda Braboy, with the firm of Bennet & Bennet, PLLC, hereby certify that I have on this 11<sup>th</sup> day of July 2007 caused a copy of the foregoing Reply Comments of the Rural Telecommunications Group, Inc. to be delivered by first-class mail to the following:

Michele C. Farquhar  
Matthew F. Wood  
Hogan & Hartson LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
*Counsel to SunCom Wireless, Inc.*

Michele C. Farquhar  
Mark W. Brennan  
Hogan & Hartson, LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
*Counsel to Polaris Wireless, Inc.*

John T. Scott, III  
Vice President & Deputy General Counsel  
Lolita D. Forbes  
Counsel  
Verizon Wireless  
1300 I Street, NW  
Suite 400 West  
Washington, DC 20005

James R. Hobson  
Miller & Van Eaton, PLLC  
1155 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20036-4320  
*Counsel to NENA*

Dean R. Brenner  
Vice President, Government Affairs  
QUALCOMM Incorporated  
2001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW  
Suite 650  
Washington, DC 20006

Philip L. Verveer  
Daniel K. Alvarez  
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP  
1875 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-1238  
*Counsel for TruePosition, Inc.*

Becky Berger  
9-1-1 Program Manager  
State of Montana  
Public Safety Services Bureau  
111 N. Last Chance Gulch  
P.O. Box 200117  
Helena, MT 59620-0117

David L. Nace  
Pamela Gist  
Lukas, Nace, Gutierrez & Sachs, Chartered  
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1500  
McLean, VA 22102  
*Counsel to Rural Cellular Association*

/s/

---

Linda Braboy