

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

MATTHEW C. AMES  
KENNETH A. BRUNETTI\*  
MARC L. FRISCHKORN  
GAIL A. KARISH\*  
NICHOLAS P. MILLER  
MATTHEW K. SCHETTENHELM  
JOSEPH VAN EATON

\*Admitted to Practice in  
California Only

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.  
580 CALIFORNIA STREET  
SUITE 1600  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104  
TELEPHONE (415) 477-3650  
FAX (415) 738-2466

WWW.MILLERVANEATON.COM

OF COUNSEL:

JAMES R. HOBSON  
GERARD L. LEDERER  
WILLIAM R. MALONE

September 2, 2010

Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Public Notice, DA 04-3874, CC Docket 94-102

Dear Madame Secretary:

In the referenced Notice, the FCC asked for comment on the “status of state actions to achieve effective deployment of E911 capabilities for Multi-Line Telephone Systems (MLTS).” The National Emergency Number Association (“NENA”) filed comments and reply comments, observing that states were moving exceedingly slowly to address the dangerous risk of delayed response to emergency calls from MLTS where the caller’s location could not be determined accurately.

The slow pace of state action continues. According to NENA’s records,<sup>1</sup> only 16 of 51 states or state entities (counting the District of Columbia) had enacted regulations for location of MLTS callers, and many of these statutes only partially treated the subject. In the interest of keeping the Commission informed on this important subject, we are pleased to provide the link to a recent presentation to the California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) by the California NENA chapter.<sup>2</sup> In particular, slides 11-13 of the presentation give examples of delayed response from across the state, and help to explain the CPUC’s decision to conduct a workshop on the subject.

While it might be thought that the CPUC response is exactly what the FCC hoped for when, in 2003-2004, it chose not to enact national standards but to defer to state action, NENA remains deeply concerned about the snail’s pace of that process. In large part, the decision to defer to the states rested on the perceived costs, particularly to small businesses, of programming MLTS for greater granularity of location and keeping the entries up to date. NENA has responded many times in this and related dockets that the expense has been overstated. Nevertheless with the

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.nena.org/mlts-pbx/state-legislation>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/Telco/MLTS+E-911+Workshop.htm>

proliferation of IP-based equipment, and the hopes for Next Generation 9-1-1 (“NG9-1-1”) embodied in the FCC’s National Broadband Plan, we trust that cost will diminish as an excuse for continuing non-action, whether at the federal or state levels.

Sincerely,

James R. Hobson  
Counsel for NENA

cc: Jennifer Manner, PSHSB/FCC