+ + + + +

### CONSUMER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 2004

+ + + + +

The above entitled meeting commenced at 9:00 a.m. in Room TW-C305 of the Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street S.W., Washington, DC, Shirley L. Rooker, CAC Chairperson, presiding.

#### PANELISTS:

# PANEL 1- Update on Truth in Billing Issues:

JOY RAGSDALE, Moderator, Chair, Consumer Complaints Outreach, Education, and Participation Working Group MICHAEL ALTSCHUL, Presenter, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association

COMMISSIONER JOSEPH CURRAN, III, Presenter, Maryland Public Service Commission (representing NARUC)

PATRICK W. PEARLMAN, Presenter, Deputy Consumer Advocate, West Virginia Public Service Commission, (representing NASUCA)

ROBIN TUTTLE, Presenter, Associate Counsel, United States Telecom Association

#### PANEL 2- Update on Homeland Security Issues:

MIKE DUKE, Moderator, Chair, Homeland Security Working Group

JOSEPH GORDON, Presenter, League for the Hard of Hearing

BRENDA KELLY-FREY, Presenter, National Association of State Relay Administration

CLAUDE STOUT, Presenter, Deaf and Hard of Hearing Consumer Action Network

### PROGRESS REPORT - Broadband Working Group:

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701 DAVID BRUGGER, Member, Broadband Working Group, Brugger Consulting

#### ALSO PRESENT:

SHIRLEY ROOKER, Call for Action, CAC Chairperson THOMAS ALLIBONE, LTC Consulting and Teletruth CHRIS BAKER, AARP

ANN BERKOWOTZ, Verizon

DEBRA BERLYN, Consumer Policy Consultant

ANN BOBECK, NAB

DIANE BURSTEIN, National Cable Telecommunications

ANNETTE CLECKNER, MCI

CINDY COX, Bell South

MICHAEL DelCASINO, AT&T Corporation

MIKE DUKE

SUSAN GRANT, National Consumers League

CARL HILLIARD, Consumer First, Inc.

DAVID HOROWITZ, Fight Back Foundation for Consumer Education

SCOTT MARSHALL, CAC Designated Federal Officer

SUSAN PALMER-MAZRUI, Cingular Wireless

DAVID POEHLMAN

MARK PRANGER

K. DANE SNOWDEN, Chief, CGB

DONALD SNOOP, Hometown Online

BYRON ST. CLAIR, National Translator Association

LINDA WEST

ROBERT WENGER, Telecommunications Industry Association

ANDREA WILLIAMS, Cellular Telecommunications &

Internet Association

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

### I-N-D-E-X

Welcome and Call to Order
Meeting Logistics
FCC Update
Update on Homeland Security Issues 35
Truth in Billing Issues 46
Update on Homeland Security Issues 108
Public Safety
Discussion 123

#### P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2

1

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

9:04 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Welcome. It's nice to see everyone. We're having some weather issues this morning. Larry Goldberg, who was supposed to do a presentation for us this morning on broadband, accessibility of broadband content, unfortunately is not going to make it out of Boston, so we're going to make some changes to the agenda somewhat. Instead of Larry presenting this morning, we're going to do part of the homeland security presentation this morning. Mike Duke will give us kind of an overview of some of the issues, and then they will continue after lunch, as scheduled, after the truth in billing panel.

addition to that, Rebecca Ladew, Ιn unfortunately has broken her arm and is not going to be with us this morning. Sprint, very graciously, agreed to pick up her costs for this meeting, and that will be transferred to the November meeting. So we're going to send a card, I think, to Rebecca, and I'm going to send her an e-mail, as well. Yes, I think we have a card. We're going to pass a card around.

And I'm also going to pass around right now a list. I'd like everyone to sign the list, please, if you would. Just a few reminders. Be sure

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

that when you want to speak, this is not because you have to get permission from me, but I want you to raise your hand so that the people in the control booth can turn on your microphone. And then if you would just give them a minute, just a little bit of time to do that, and then state your name before you speak. That will help us in doing the transcript, so we'd appreciate that.

I'd like to thank some of our panel participants. Verizon and AT&T, who, very generously, have donated teleconferencing services to some of our working groups, and Cingular for our excellent food this morning. Yes, Mike Duke says the chocolate ones, the chocolate-chocolate are wonderful. At any rate, thank them. Also, to thank our working groups. I have been so impressed with all that's been going on, with the energy level and the ideas and the creativity that's coming out of this panel, out of this committee and out of the working groups I think has just been very wonderful.

At any rate, so lots of things have been going on. Be sure, as I said, sign the form. Dixie Ziegler is going to be on the phone. Is Dixie with us yet? Not yet. Okay. She'll be calling us.

At any rate, that's kind of some of the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	things. Before I turn it over to Scott for our
2	logistics and meeting places and all that sort of
3	stuff, I would like for us to go around the room and
4	just tell who you are and what organization you
5	represent because we do have a number of alternates
6	here today.
7	Susan Mazrui is coming, but unfortunately
8	her cab was late. So transportation is an issue for a
9	lot of people this morning. So we'll just start down
10	at this end with David.
11	MR. BRUGGER: David Brugger, Brugger
12	Consulting.
13	MS. RAGSDALE: Good morning. Joy
14	Ragsdale, NASUCA.
15	MR. BAKER: Good morning. Chris Baker
16	with AARP.
17	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: And I am Shirley
18	Rooker with Call For Action. Scott?
19	MR. MARSHALL: And I'm Scott Marshall with
20	FCC.
21	MR. DUKE: I'm Mike Duke, International
22	Association of Audio Information Services and Radio
23	Amateurs.
24	MR. POEHLMAN: Morning. I'm David
25	Poehlman, and I plant apple seeds. And other than

	that, I'm with the American Council of the Blind.
2	MS. GRANT: Hi. Susan Grant with the
3	National Consumers League.
4	MR. HOROWITZ: Morning. I'm David
5	Horowitz with the Fight Back Foundation for Consumer
6	Education.
7	MS. WILLIAMS: Andrea Williams with CTIA,
8	the Wireless Association.
9	MR. GORDON: Good morning. Joe Gordon,
10	League for the Hard of Hearing.
11	MS. BOBECK: Hi. I'm Ann Bobeck from the
12	National Association of Broadcasters.
13	MS. BERLYN: Debra Berlyn, Consumer Policy
14	Consulting.
15	MR. SNOOP: I'm Don Snoop with Hometown
16	Online.
17	MR. ALLIBONE: Tom Allibone with LTC
18	Consulting and Teletruth.
19	MS. WEST: Linda West, Native American and
20	Rural America Issues.
21	MR. PRANGER: Mark Pranger, Academic
22	Issues.
23	MR. DELCASINO: Mike Delcasino, AT&T.
24	MR. HILLIARD: Carl Hilliard, Wireless
25	Consumers Alliance.

1 MR. WENGER: Robert Wenger from Panasonic. MS. BERKOWOTZ: Ann Berkowotz, Verizon. 2 3 MS. COX: Cindy Cox, Bell South. 4 MS. KELLY-FREY: Brenda Kelly-Frey, 5 National Association of Relay Administrators. MS. CLECKNER: Annette Cleckner, MCI. 6 7 MR. ST. CLAIR: Byron St. Clair, National 8 Translators Association. And just so we don't confuse 9 people, we do re-broadcasting television and FMsignals in remote areas, no language translation. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Thank you all for 12 being here. For the alternates, we welcome you. 13 hope you'll find this an interesting and stimulating 14 Okay. The other order of business, I think, is 15 to turn this over to Scott, who will give us the 16 logistics on our meeting today. 17 MR. MARSHALL: Good morning, everyone. 18 importantly, for our folks today, Very new the restrooms are right out the door to my right, down a 19 20 short corridor to your left, both mens and ladies 21 rooms. If you keep going straight down that corridor, 22 that is where three of the four working groups will be meeting. The homeland security broadband and consumer 23 complaints and education groups will be meeting along 24

that corridor, and there is signage to direct you to

the appropriate rooms.

Please let us know, as you've heard me talk about in the past, we do have an interference issue with having too many assistive listening devices too close together. There's a much more fancy technical explanation, but that's all I understand. And I need to know if anyone in the breakout rooms will be needing an assistive listening device. We can have two of them going with two rooms equipped at once, and we just need to know this information so we can set that equipment up.

Anybody who will be needing an assistive listening device in one of the breakout rooms? Not here, not in the CMR, but in the other rooms? Yes, Joe?

MR. GORDON: I'm raising my hand, Scott.

MR. MARSHALL: All right. Which one, Joe?

MR. GORDON: The homeland security.

MR. MARSHALL: Homeland. Okay.

MR. GORDON: Thank you.

MR. MARSHALL: All right. Jeff, homeland security then for the assistive listening device. And, also, in connection with all of that, please, you know, when you're in your breakout groups, including when you're in this room, if you could please speak

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

into the microphones during the breakouts. Not only will that allow us to get a CART transcript of what's being said for those who need it right now in realtime, it will allow us to provide the working group chairs with an actual transcript of your breakout session, which you can use for further work as you go about developing your recommendations and so forth.

So I think that's it. And if I think of anything else, I'll let Shirley know, and we'll talk to you a little later. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Does anyone here have any questions or concerns that they want to talk about? All right. If not, then we are going to have, I believe, Commissioner Copps is going to be with us this morning, and Adelstein will be with us this afternoon. That's the way it looks right now.

And I think then what we'll do is move on to hear from Dane Snowden, who is Chief of the Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau. And for the alternates, just to let you know that Dane is our biggest supporter and has been at, I think, every meeting, except one when he had to attend to a loss in his family. So Dane, welcome, good to have you here.

MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you very much, Shirley. Commissioner Copps, unfortunately, will not,

we just found out last night, will not be able to make it. I'm not sure if he's having travel issues, as well, but Commissioner Adelstein will be down later this afternoon, we believe, provided there are no ?-he's flying in from what I understand, so hopefully he'll get in, as well.

When I heard you talk about Larry's troubles, it reminded me once when I was in Boston. I went to Boston for an overnight stay in the middle of February, and I think it was '96, so we had the blizzard of '96, and I was there for seven days. I didn't have a change of clothes for seven days. I was stuck in a hotel. It was 40-below outside. I didn't know it could actually get to 40-below, but it did. But I can't complain. We were staying at the Marriott Copley Center. If anyone's been to Boston, it's a very nice place connected to a mall, so I saw every single movie that that theater showed twice, not just once, twice. So I can relate to the weather issues.

And this is a fun time in Washington where those of you who have hair, unlike myself, you will get a lot of frizzy hair right now because of the humidity going on.

I wanted to share with you some of the things that are going on here, but, also, I wanted to

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

pass on our best wishes to Rebecca for her injury, and we will, of course, send our best wishes, as well, and wish her a speedy recovery. And I also wanted to echo something that Shirley said. As Scott gives me regular updates of what's going on with the committee, it seems to me that the working groups are working exactly how we had envisioned them to come into being. And so I want to thank you all for the time that you all spend that you're not here in this building and on your own time working on the various issues. So thank you for that, and I know we're very excited for some of the things that are coming out of the various working groups.

Let me give you an update on some things that have been coming through from our perspective. As some of you know, and I know it's on your agenda to discuss in more detail, we did receive a petition for declaratory ruling from NASUCA on some truth in billing issues, and we're going to, of course, you're all going to look at that, we're going to look at that. I think we just got a petition in, the oral request in the other day to extend the reply comments where the Commission is currently evaluating that now, and we should have something out very shortly. But we encourage you all to have a healthy debate on that

particular issue. It is very helpful to us, as we move forward. The truth in billing issues are always, of course, very key to many of the things we do to make sure consumers are in the loop.

Also, notice from your agenda that you're talking about homeland security issues. And I think I may have announced before, Chairman Powell announced that, he's not only announced, he's actually implemented, we have an Office of Homeland Security now in the Commission, in addition to our Homeland Security Policy Council. The differences between the two are, one, the Homeland Security Policy Council is made up of senior members of every office in every One of my deputies serves for me on that policy council, and we discuss all homeland security And, of course, the Office of Homeland matters. Security is based in our enforcement bureau, and they deal with the day-to-day activities of the agency's homeland security affairs.

I know we, as a commission, have been concentrating heavily on homeland security issues, most notably our March 25th emergency communication homeland security, working with this to build a community summit that we had. It was very successful, and it would not have been successful without members

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

from CAC, so I thank many of you who participated in that, not only in the planning but also who participated in the activities of that particular day.

We also had a June 2nd Media Security Reliability Council, or MSRC, as we call it, meeting just a few weeks ago addressing homeland security issues, looking at some captioning issues, and things of that nature. As we all know, it's going to take everyone inside this agency and outside this agency, all of us working together to work on various homeland security issues.

In terms of some of the positive things that have been going on, I think, most notably for this body here, the telecommunications relay services, or the TRS item, we call it the mega item, that we just got ordered. I guess it wasn't released yet because we're still under sunshine, so I'm very limited on what I can say about it. But in order that you all, I know, participated in and gave us some good comments and thoughts on various things that we should do, and I appreciate that.

One of the things that we do plan to do is to embark on an outreach campaign about telecommunications relay services. That is one of the things in the item that I can talk about, in terms of

that we're going to do it. So that is coming down the pike.

In terms of the item itself, the release of the item is imminent, so the sunshine has not been lifted yet, meaning, for some of you who are alternates and may not be familiar with some of the terms I'm using, we are barred from speaking publicly about items until they are officially law. And it's on its way of doing that. My staff is working on the final edits of that particular item with the various offices upstairs.

So we are moving forward, but one of the things in particular we will move forward on that I can share with you is that we will definitely have an outreach strategy put in place to focus on the TRS issues.

Speaking of outreach, as some of you know, we have been traveling, I can't say that I was part of it, but I've been to a couple of them, but many members of the Commission staff have been traveling around the country looking at localism issues, the localism hearings that we're calling them. We held one recently in South Dakota. In conjunction with the South Dakota localism hearing, we also held our Indian Telecommunications Initiative, or our ITI, Rapid City

roundtable and workshop, which was very successful. We will continue to reach out to tribal lands, as we afford. In fact, many members of my staff are getting back today from visiting with the Navajo tribe out in Albuquerque for their big meeting.

And what we're doing, as we've explained before, is trying to bring basic services and advanced services to tribal lands and also throughout rural communities throughout the country. We will also be working, we are going to embark on a trip next week to Tennessee to work with the Appalachian Regional Commission, or ARC, on various issues, particularly broadband issues. We want to make sure that broadband gets out to all parts of our communities, not just the urban areas but the rural areas, as well.

And in terms of our future outreach policy and outreach goals and ideas, on the horizon, we are going to be looking at digital television, the V chip, broadband, and when I say broadband I mean specifically as it relates to VOIP, and, of course, as I mentioned earlier, TRS.

In terms of D-TV, I think you all have talked about this some in your previous meetings. I would encourage this body to continue to look at the digital television transition that will take place in

January 1st, 2007. It seems like a long way away. It is not. People value, as we all know, I think, their televisions and their telephones more than they value anything else. They can have no air conditioning, but as long as they have a television, they're happy. And so this will be an issue coming down the pike, and we encourage you all to look into it, as well. I, of course, cannot direct this body to do that, but I can strongly encourage.

Another issue, as I mentioned a moment ago, in terms of our outreach is VOIP. We held a solutions summit on disabilities issues last May 7th, which was a follow-on to our 911 Solution Summit. We will continue to do these ideas, the solutions summits, as time rolls on, so that we can gather as much information for the record as we roll out this new technology of internet, IP-enabled services. It's new and advancing. It's excited. We're thrilled about it, but we want to make sure we don't forget the social obligations that we have, be it disabilities issues, be it 911 issues, be it law enforcement and CALEA issues, as we go forward.

And, of course, I would be remiss if I did not mention local number portability, which took effect nationwide May 24th. When I say nationwide, we

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

insisted, and the law went into effect. The remaining parts of the country that did not go into effect November 24th would have local number portability come May 24th.

Right now, since November 24th, we've seen three million consumers port their telephone I'm sure Andrea probably has the latest numbers. facts, and she can answer any questions on this issue probably better than Ι can from the wireless industries' point of view. But it is going as we had anticipated. There were some glitches, there were some hiccups, but the long and short of it is it's going in the right direction, and we're thrilled about it.

One of the issues that did come out of the LNP debate is various states have waivers before them right now, basically from smaller carriers, asking not to have to port telephone numbers for a little while. And our position on it is that we want consumers to have the freedom, we want consumers to have the choice. I have sent a letter to the president of the National Association of State Regulatory Utility Commissioners, NARUC, reiterating our point. They are in their domain to make the jurisdictional decisions on what they want to do with the waivers. It's not

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

before us, our commission, but it's before the various state commissions. I believe about 600 waivers that are out there right now.

It is our position that we do want to make sure that the law is followed, and the consumers can have a choice in these matters as we go forward. So the jury is still out on that, and the state commissions are working through it, and we're working hand-in-hand with the state commissions as they debate some of these issues internally among the states.

With that, I'll be happy to answer any questions you all might have. And I see one over here to my right. David?

MR. POEHLMAN: Oh, goody, I get to go first. Dave Poehlman with the American Council of the Blind. Dane, thank you for the update. It's very interesting, and I see that things have been very busy, and they're going to continue to be busy for quite some time to come. I had the opportunity, luckily, to observe the entire proceeding of the VOIP Summit or SOIP Summit, as it later became to be called, and I noticed that you mentioned VOIP as being on your agenda and as a follow-through and activity involvement. Would it be more appropriate to actually designate this process as service over IP, considering

2.1

the summit and also considering the activity that's going on in the area? And I only mention that because there are going to be some issues that are going to be combinative, such as video and voice-over IP in combination, various other, you know, types of things that are going to be delivered as an OIP kind of process. Those will be issues that will be carried forward. That was sort of a side-long question.

MR. SNOWDEN: I think it's a very good

MR. SNOWDEN: I think it's a very good question, and I'm probably remiss in calling it VOIP.

We're trying to start calling it IP-enabled services because, to your point, you're exactly right. There are many things that are going over the internet, not just voice. There's voice, data, and so I agree with you. It should be called IP-enabled services, and that is what the Commission is ?- and another thing, the general nomenclature is beginning to develop around this as IP-enabled services.

I saw a question over here?

MR. SNOOP: Am I on?

MR. SNOWDEN: Yes.

MR. SNOOP: One of the questions I've got is on the digital TV transition. Being in the video business for a number of years, I'm very familiar with the transition that took place from black and white to

color. Different situation because of the fact that a color set could also receive the black and white signals. Once we shut off the over-air analog signals, somebody with an older TV set is going to be forced to either have a new digital TV or some form of digital TV tuner box. What's your thought on the transition for those people that are not the early adapters and don't want to adapt at all?

That is one of the reasons MR. SNOWDEN: why we are starting, we the Commission are starting now in 2004 to look at these particular issues and reaching out to various consumers. Right now, percent of Americans receive their television through cable, it's 80 and growing, so when you look at it, you're looking at 20 percent that we need to look at, particularly those that are seniors. And so we need to work with our colleagues over at AARP to get some quidance from them as we move forward. And it's also more and more shows are becoming, having digital programming in place, and I think more and more people are beginning to enjoy it.

We are under congressional mandate. This has to happen. And so we're looking at it from two points of view. One, we have to fulfill Congress' wishes; and, two, we have to make sure that, as we do

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that, we bring people along. And, again, any guidance this body can bring to us, the Commission, will be greatly welcome. We do plan to embark on an aggressive outreach strategy for digital television. We know the set boxes right now are a little bit expensive, as our the televisions. But as the kinds of scale begin to take effect, those prices will begin to come down as more and more people either sign up for cable or just buy the television outright and can do that.

It is a debate. One of the things that we are, in our media bureau, who's tracking this more closely than I am, they are looking at the cut-off, the cut rates. When do we cut, where do we cut? Will it be a national cut? Which it, most likely, will not be. So we're looking at various issues regarding the question you just raised.

MR. SNOOP: I've got a follow-up question, also, because it probably ties in to what Ann is going to be asking about, dual must-carry. Do you see that as becoming an issue, where you'll have to be able to carry both the analog and digital signal?

MR. SNOWDEN: I'm going to pass on that one and leave it to my colleagues in the media bureau. Susan?

### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: I think Susan. 2 and then David. And Ann, was your question a follow-3 up? 4 MS. BOBECK: Actually, just a follow-up 5 that there is a current proceeding for the Commission and a public notice inquiry asking who, and the magic 6 7 number is the last 15 percent that aren't hooked up 8 via cable or satellite, who are those people, and it's a broad question because, quite frankly, the data is 9 10 not very good out there right now, and the Commission 11 is asking who are the last 15 percent and how do we 12 get them moving along in the transition and make sure 13 that they're not left behind. So I encourage you to 14 that proceeding. And if you 15 information, especially on who the people are with 16 respect to disability consumers, please chime in. Ι think this is the most appropriate time for that. 17 18 MR. SNOWDEN: I would actually add to Ann. 19 Not only watch it but comment on it. 20 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Oh, that's 21 excellent suggestion. I like the idea of the 22 committee becoming involved in this issue. Susan? 23 MS. GRANT: Thank you. Getting back to VOIP or IP-enabled services or whatever we want to 24 25 call it --

1 MR. SNOWDEN: I got us off on the wrong 2 track. 3 That's right. I just want to MS. GRANT: 4 take this opportunity to announce that the National 5 Consumers League hopes to have a one-day forum on the issue in early September, looking at it from 6 7 consumer perspective. We'll be reaching out to the 8 FCC for their involvement as speakers and participants and also to the other members of the council. 9 Ιf 10 anyone is interested in learning more about that, 11 please don't hesitate to talk to me. Thanks. 12 SNOWDEN: Thanks, Susan. We look MR. 13 forward to it. 14 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: I think David was 15 next. MR. HOROWITZ: David Horowitz from the 16 Fight Back Foundation for Consumer Education. One of 17 18 the things that's come up is we've been getting a lot 19 of complaints about phone number portability. In 20 fact, I've had some complaints about it. And that is 2.1 that the companies that are doing this are not really 22 giving you any specific time where this portability 23 will turn over. In other words, it took me seven days 24 to get from one cell phone company to the other. For 25 those seven days, I had no, I had absolutely no use of

one cell phone and, of course, my other one didn't work either. After that was done, the phone that was given to me and the portability took place, I was given a 30-day guarantee, and I'm bringing this up for a reason because I think it's something that we have to look at, and I had to bring the phone back because it wasn't working, and they refused to give me back my number until the bill was paid, which shouldn't have been assessed against me because it was part of the quarantee. And it took almost a month to get my phone number back. And what they were using is, basically, holding us hostage because there was a difference of opinion about what was happening with the bill that was due, and they were using the portability as, basically, a way to say, "You either pay up, or we don't give you back your phone number."

Now, I work with Susan Mazrui on this case since it was her company that did this, and we straightened it out. But what I find is more and more complaints about how much time, David, should it take for us to get our number changed? How much time should it get before we get our number back? Can they hold us and not give us our number back because of financial issues? Well, we found out through the Commission that it is against Commission regulations

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	to do this, but how are we going to let the public
2	know, first of all, the amount of time that's decent,
3	or I don't want to say legal because you can't legally
4	do it, but decent to change over from one number to
5	another and what can they do about not returning your
6	number to you if, in fact, there's a billing
7	complaint?
8	MR. SNOWDEN: A couple of things. I would
9	imagine, and I'm going on a lark here, you probably
10	ported your number shortly after November or began to
11	port your number?
12	MR. HOROWITZ: No, this was after the
13	first of the year.
14	MR. SNOWDEN: Exactly. So November,
15	December, January.
16	MR. HOROWITZ: Right.
17	MR. SNOWDEN: The industry was having some
18	challenges. That's when we noticed the biggest bulk
19	of delays in porting telephone numbers. They have
20	significantly improved that to where it was before. It
21	was two or three days, on average, of porting
22	telephone numbers. Now it's down to about two hours,
23	which is what the industry said it would be when they
24	thought they could do it on November 24th. So the

industry has worked to get that down. I don't speak

for the industry, of course. There are many members here who could probably articulate better than I can or probably want to on this particular issue, as well. But while I have the floor, one of the issues that we have raised with the industry when this was going on, we also met with the wireless industry regularly during those months. At one point, we were on conference calls with them every single week going over this: what are the problems, why can't this get done faster? And it's gotten done faster.

What we've seen in the next wave, the May 24th deadline, is not the same issues that we saw and to the same degree that we saw the November deadline, which is why we separated the two. We wanted the higher markets to do it first, so the rural markets can learn from what we learned in the top 100 MSAs.

What I would encourage you to do and others to do, and to answer your question of what do you do, is to file a complaint with the FCC. If there's a question about your bill, I have a wonderful group of individuals who do nothing but answer those complaints, and they call the Cingulars, the AT&Ts, the MCIs, the wireless industry, the box, etcetera, to work through these various issues.

Martha Contee, Martha raise your hand for

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

a second. Martha Contee of my staff, who actually happens to be down here, she is the individual who runs that division for me, and they do a very good job. We handle over a million calls a year with complaints.

MR. HOROWITZ: But, you know, I think it's also important to post this on our web site.

MR. SNOWDEN: Well, we have posted it, We have posted all this information. We have actually released our complaint numbers and trends. For six months we did that, up until May 24th, explaining what the delays were. I know Chairman Powell himself did an entire media tour on this particular issue, on the local number portability particular issue, what are some of the challenges that we saw down the road. I've done several media The wireless industry has done many, interviews. they've reached out to the media, as well, on these particular matters. And we've received complaints, so people do know to call our 1-877-CALL-FCC number.

MR. HOROWITZ: And I'm aware of that, but my concern here is that when these phones are sold, when these phones are sold from the representatives of the company, that they give you false dates, they give you false information. And to tell someone that you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

can't get your number back until you take care of your bill and then we'll take care of the number after we clear your bill is clearly what I consider to be, it's against the regulations, one; and, two, the companies should be able to be aware of the fact, which we can discuss, that the people who are selling these phones should be letting people know what the proper information is and not trying to use scare tactics in order to prevent them from getting back their number until bill disputes are settled.

MR. SNOWDEN: Well, I don't think anybody would disagree with you.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Andrea, you wanted to respond to that, I believe.

MS. WILLIAMS: This is Andrea Williams wireless local number from CTIA. terms of In portability, yes, we did have some significant challenges and glitches when we first started, and I'm glad to say that we are now down to a level where, as Dane mentioned, two hours. Some cases may go longer than that. It has been a very trying experience, shall we say, but we're going to get through this. What the industry has been doing is we even have an acceleration in terms of, if there is a problem, you're talking about, you know, inter-carrier

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

cooperation between wireless-to-wireless. We've got that pretty much under control. We're still having little problems with wireline to wireless porting.

What we have done is set up what I call a sort of crisis situation, working with the FCC, for example, and we worked very closely with Martha. When complaints come in, I think, as Martha has often told me, you'll find that, in terms of wireless carriers, we generally will resolve those complaints within 30 days, in terms of turnaround. There are some that go longer, but very few.

Now, in terms of the billing issues, yes, we realize that there were going to be some billing issues because of the fall-out from LNP. And the way it's being timed, billing doesn't hit until almost 60 in some cases and maybe 90 days. So now we're seeing implementation of the LNP, and now we're seeing the other half of this, what I call the phase-two of the billing issues. And it's going to take some time, I know, to work those things through.

You know, David, people who know me, I always say, you know, "We're going to get there."

Yes, there are going to be some challenges along the way, but the only thing we can ask you is to please, you know, the best thing that consumers can do is to

contact their carrier. If you're still having problems escalating within that company, even when you file a complaint with the FCC, Martha picks up the phone and calls immediately. She doesn't even wait. Well, some of my members call Martha, and they don't wait until they get the complaint. We have that type of relationship because the goal here is we want those subscribers, particularly the ones coming from wireline to wireless.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: I think what we're hearing here is an issue that is dwindling, and we're seeing the end of it. That's great. Joe, I think you were next.

MR. GORDON: Larry Goldberg is not here, and I have a feeling he would ask a question about digital TV. There have been many complaints to me by consumers and I believe to the captioning companies that digital TV lacks in providing closed captioning, as opposed to analog TV, which has been doing it for many years. There have been many complaints filed, I believe, and 2007 is right around the corner, as it you're saying. Would be possible for the Commission to send out a reminder? Is that something that you do to the cable TV companies, making sure that they have digital TV provide closed captioning

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	similar to the way they do it in analog? Because
2	another deadline is coming, January 1st, 2006, when
3	all new TV programs should be closed caption, both
4	analog and digital. Thank you.
5	MR. SNOWDEN: I think it's a great
6	question. We just sent out a notice reminding everyone
7	of the rules. I want to say it was two weeks ago or
8	three weeks ago. I'm looking at my legal advisor.
9	Three weeks ago on that, and we will periodically do
LO	that as time moves on.
1	MR. GORDON: Is that notice on the web
L2	site? Would I be able to find it?
L3	MR. SNOWDEN: It should be. If it's not,
L 4	we'll make sure you guys get a copy.
L 5	MR. GORDON: Thank you.
L 6	MS. BOBECK: Just a quick follow-up.
L7	Industry is aware that there are some technical
L 8	glitches, especially when it comes to live HD feeds
L 9	and digital closed captioning. I just literally got
20	three phone calls last week saying, "My equipment is
21	having problems, and my manufacturer can't commit to a
22	six-month or even a six-day fix." So I do know that
23	there are technical issues out there because we
24	format, in digital television there are multiple

whether standard, enhanced, or high

formats,

1 definition. So it's been brought to our attention recently, and rest assured we'll start to work with 2 3 industry to solve those problems. 4 MR. GORDON: Is that why Scott put us both 5 next to each other? (Laughter.) 6 7 I'm starting to notice Scott MR. SNOWDEN: 8 did a great job with the pairing, as well. Actually, 9 you're between that industry right now. 10 MS. BERLYN: Debra Berlyn, Consumer Policy 11 Consulting. I didn't want to let this morning go by 12 without at least one mentioning an issue that's been 13 in the headlines quite a bit lately, and that's the DC 14 Circuit Court's decision on local competition. 15 MR. SNOWDEN: Thought I could get out of here without that. 16 17 (Laughter.) 18 MS. BERLYN: Now that the FCC's rules have been rejected by the court and it looks like that's 19 20 going to stand, can you give us some insight as to 21 what the process will be at the FCC for writing new 22 rules? 23 MR. SNOWDEN: You know, I debated if I 24 wanted to talk about this at all, and the better part 25 of me said, "Why would you ever want to talk about the

TRO?" To answer your question, let me first say that it is our top priority, and the Chairman has said this repeatedly, to ensure that consumers do not experience any disruption whatsoever in their service, and so we are working, that's our bright line, as we go forward.

What we are in the process of promptly trying to write the rules now. As some of you who may not be following the TRO as closely as many of us here at the Commission, when the Solicitor General decided not to appeal the DC Circuit's decision, a lot of things have to take place, and we are working very quickly to get things up and running. This is a collective effort by everybody at the Commission. Eighth Floor is extremely busy working on various issues, as are my colleagues in the wireline competition bureau. So I will leave it at that. This is a matter before another bureau, but our goal, as I said before, in terms of our priorities, is to ensure that consumers are not experiencing disruption, and we believe that will be the case. It all comes down to, in our eyes, the Commission's eyes, we want to make sure there's fair and sustainable competition in the marketplace, and that's what this is all about. have to pay you back for that one, Debra.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: He'll get you Debra.

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

35 1 Thank you so much, Dane, for being with us and taking the time to spend with us this morning. We had some 2 3 very interesting questions for you. 4 MR. SNOWDEN: Thank you very much. 5 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Sorry about that last 6 one. 7 MR. SNOWDEN: Have a great meeting. Thank

you all.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Now, as I indicated earlier, Larry Goldberg is somewhere in Boston, certainly not on his way to Washington. And Mike Duke of the homeland security working group is going to give us an overview of some of the issues. You were e-mailed a set of, kind of a summary of the Homeland Summit, so I'm hoping that you had a chance to look at those. At any rate, I'm going to turn the floor over to Mike. He will brief us for 15 minutes. We'll take our two-hour working group session. We'll come back here for lunch, and then he will, after lunch, the first issue we'll have is the truth in billing, and then Mike and his group will finish the homeland security issues. So Mike Duke?

> Good morning and thank you. MR. DUKE:

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Part of this is being flexible, right? I don't think there's any question in anyone's mind that September 11th, 2001 created a new phrase for our language. It had kind of always been there under various names, such as civil defense, and some of us will admit to remembering the old system and things like that. But we now call it homeland security.

In addition to having a federal government agency or Office of Homeland Security, numerous government agencies, including the Federal Communications Commission, which, of course, is our focus, have offices of homeland security.

There was a summit held on Thursday, March 25th, which was the day prior to our last meeting, and this summit held in this very room, I think, was for homeland security communications issues as they relate to people with disabilities. Commissioner Snowden was there and some other commissioners, and there were various other presentations throughout the day.

There are more than 50 million citizens of this country who have some type of disability. And what we, as the homeland security workgroup within this committee and what the committee as a whole, anybody working with homeland security issues must remember is that we have to think in terms of what

will work, how to get messages to these different disabilities.

What works for David Poehlman or myself as a blind person won't work for people who have severe hearing loss or who are deaf or who have a combination of various disabilities in terms of getting messages We also have issues that this group won't to them. work with so much, but there are issues of getting people with disabilities to evacuation shelters and that type of thing. Now, the Red Cross is doing a really good job of signing on to work with that type of issue. And to their credit, they were beginning to do that long before September 11th, 2001. So they've got a running start, and I'm sure some other nonprofits and other agencies even, you know, have some things in that area.

Our focus is going to be, of course, primarily communications-related issues. How do we, how do we get what could potentially be life-saving communications out to the people who, for whatever reason, are not able to simply turn on a television and pick up that information? It's a pretty complex issue.

If you've read anything at all about the activities, particularly in the New York City area

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

after the towers fell, most of the television and a number of the radio transmitters and a number of the cellular telephone transmitters in that area went down with the World Trade Center. So their primary means of communications was lost. And so this is something that won't be solved certainly by one panel this afternoon.

What I would encourage everyone to do is, if you haven't had a chance to do it yet, look over the information. If it accidentally got under your delete key, let me know and I'll send it to you again. Look through the summaries of this Homeland Security Summit. Look at the ideas and the issues that were raised and discussed there. Develop any thoughts on those that you have or anything that you feel is relevant that our homeland security working group needs to address, and please communicate them to me so that I can pass them along to the working group.

It is our intent, indeed our hope that, for the November meeting, we can come forth with some form of representation. I don't expect us to solve every issue. It would be great if we could. We could all get jobs, and they could pay us the big bucks, right? But the point is we are in a position to offer suggestions and recommendations to the FCC through

this committee. The FCC, basically, has said this is a priority. So we have their ear. Let's not waste the opportunity.

In preparation for the panel this afternoon, we drew heavily on material supplied to us thanks to the Gordon, Northern Resource Center for the Hard of Hearing; is that the correct title? Okay. And he will have some more Also, things to say about that this afternoon. joining Joe and myself on the panel this afternoon will be Claude Stout, Brenda Kelly-Frey. Rebecca Ladew was planning to participate. As has already been mentioned, due to an accident, she will not be able to make it in. I was telling Scott earlier that she makes some of the most effective use of e-mail I think I've ever seen, so rest assured that she has been and continues to contribute to this effort, as it is also very important to her.

That really is sort of an overview and really pretty much the introduction that I would be giving this afternoon. Again, I cannot say it enough. If you have ideas, concerns, please communicate them to us. And if it's things that we've already thought about it, then that simply confirms to us that we're on the right track. The odds are good that it's items

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that we have not yet even considered.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our mission is a bit complicated by the fact, as I said earlier, what works for one does not work for all, and that's the unique thing about the disabilities issue. There's so many avenues that you Homeland security and this type of have to cover. accessibility extends beyond the Federal Communications Commission. It's addressed in the, the accessibility issues are addressed in the Americans for Disabilities Act. So there are any number of reasons, legal reasons for having this approach and this type of discussion as they relate to this committee.

I look forward to working with the group.

I have an excellent group of participants in the homeland security working group, and I thank everyone who has participated and look forward to working with you between now and November to see this project develop and grow, as I'm sure it will.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Mike, thank you so much. He will be reporting later. We'll be talking about some more and some of the content.

MR. DUKE: Some of the specific issues.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Right. This afternoon. But I do encourage you, it is a rather

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

41 1 lengthy, but it's a summary of the speakers at the Homeland Security Disabilities Summit. It's really 2 3 well worth reading. They've done an excellent job of 4 distilling the remarks, so you don't have to wade 5 through a lot, but it's worth looking at. Does anyone not have access to a copy of it? 6 7 If you really want the entire MR. DUKE: 8 remarks, I'm sure Scott can ?-9 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Take the summary. 10 MR. DUKE: But the summary is what I'm 11

working with. I have read the others, but the summary is quite good.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Yes.

GRANT: I just want to say that whoever did the summary did a great job. For those of us who weren't directly involved, it was very, very helpful.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Well, I think, unless you have some questions for Mike that can't wait until this afternoon, we can take a brief break and then head for your breakout rooms. They are all down the hall on the left and right. I believe there are signs in the windows or on the door telling you where to go. And any other questions or comments before we do Okay. We'll see you back here at noon for that?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

_	Tunch. Is there a question: No. I II see you back
2	here at noon for lunch, and then we will resume our
3	presentations at 1:00. Thank you very much everyone.
4	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
5	the record at 9:57 a.m. and resumed at 1:00 p.m.)
6	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Good afternoon,
7	everyone. If we could take our chairs? We've got a
8	busy agenda. Before we get started with our panelists
9	that Joy Ragsdale has put together for us, I would
10	like for you to hear from Louis Sigoulos, who is the
11	head of the Consumer Affairs and the Outreach.
12	Committee chair? What?
13	MR. SIGOULOS: I'm Chief of the Consumer
14	Affairs and Outreach Division.
15	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Division. He is
16	going to briefly talk about something that we are
17	going to pass out documents to you, I believe. Is
18	that correct?
19	MR. SIGOULOS: That is correct.
20	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Here we go. Let's
21	get you hooked up here.
22	MR. SIGOULOS: This will just take one
23	moment. Thank you for the brief opportunity here. We
24	will be working, especially through the subcommittee,
25	with Joy and Debra to put together a fact sheet that

1	was tailored to consumer affairs personnel to deal
2	with the public that have issues that they need to get
3	with us on.
4	We have got a lot of feedback. We have
5	the latest iteration. I wanted to get that around to
6	everyone today. If you have any further feedback,
7	please go through Debra or Joy. They will get them to
8	us, and we will take care of it.
9	We have it in floppy, CD, in or hard copy.
10	We removed all of the formatting and graphics because
11	we just want to get the content right. So I was going
12	to distribute this to you now for you to look at it
13	going forward. If you get those back to us, we really
14	want to get this thing finished.
15	Thank you very much for the opportunity to
16	say that.
17	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: One question. How
18	are we going to get the documents back to you? How do
19	you want us to communicate to you?
20	MS. BERLYN: This is Debra Berlyn. We'll
21	get them back. Joy and I will get them back to Louis
22	and his staff.
23	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. So we should
24	turn the documents over to either you or Joy?
25	MS. BERLYN: Yes. Just e-mail.

1	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: E-mail you our
2	comments?
3	MS. BERLYN: Joy and myself. Why don't
4	you e-mail both of us? And that way we'll both be
5	kept
6	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Is everyone
7	clear on that? All right. Well, we'll pass those out
8	right now.
9	Susan Grant?
10	MS. GRANT: Two things. Could we get this
11	in the electronic form? And could we set a deadline
12	for getting back? It might be helpful.
13	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Louis, do you
14	want to answer that?
15	MR. SIGOULOS: Absolutely, we can get that
16	in electronic form. And I would love a deadline to
17	get it back, but I don't think I will set that one.
18	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Debra?
19	MS. BERLYN: I think it is really now
20	dependant on this Committee to get some feedback so
21	that they can turn it around. So a deadline for all
22	of you would be helpful. If you could take a look at
23	it and within perhaps the next two weeks get your
24	suggestions to Joy and myself, that would be very
25	helpful.

1 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Then would it 2 be reasonable for us, then, to say that we all wanted 3 this in electronic form and we can just e-mail it to 4 the whole Committee? Would that be better? Okay. 5 MR. POEHLMAN: With the information as to where to send responses. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Right. We'll work 8 the logistics on that. Two weeks. Debra suggested 9 that you within two weeks get it back. MS. BERLYN: Put a deadline in there. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Right. And who will 12 we be sending it back to? So we can send the e-mails 13 out under your names so we can just reply? All right. 14 Does that work? Thank you, Louis. Scott will send 15 it out. And then he can distribute the answers. That 16 will be easier. 17 Also, just to let you know, there is a 18 card for Rebecca Ladew making the rounds. I hope you 19 will pass it down to the end and then pass it back 20 because some of you haven't signed it because you 21 weren't at the table. We signed it during lunch. So if you would do that, please? Thank you so much. 22 23 Now it gives me great pleasure to turn the 24 program over to Joy Ragsdale, our diligent chair of

one of our working groups. And we are going to talk

1	about truth in billing. Is that right? Yes, it is.
2	I'm right for a change. Thank you so much.
3	Joy, I'm going to let you take it from
4	here.
5	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Thank you.
6	PANEL DISCUSSION:
7	UPDATE ON TRUTH IN BILLING ISSUES
8	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Good afternoon. My
9	name is Joy Ragsdale. And, again, I am representing
LO	NASUCA.
L1	I on my far left, far, far left have
L2	representing NARUC Commissioner Max Curran, who is
L3	with the Maryland Public Service Commission.
L 4	And to his right is Mike Altschul, who is
L 5	a colleague of our co-member Andrea Williams. And he
16	is representing CTIA.
L7	Seated next to him is Robin Tuttle. Robin
L 8	is with USTA.
L 9	And sitting here to my immediate left is a
20	co-member and colleague of mine with NASUCA, Patrick
21	Pearlman, who is with the West Virginia Office of
22	Consumer Counsel. They are also located in the Public
23	Service Commission office in West Virginia.
24	Some time ago our member group decided
25	that it was necessary to discuss truth in billing

issues and that we wanted to submit recommendations to the overall consumer Advisory Committee but felt that there was a need to educate the whole panel first before we could make recommendations, hopefully in November.

But what we have found is that amongst ourselves, we have not been able to come up with a consensus. There are so many diverse perspectives representing the consumers and also industry.

So we have assembled a panel today to give you as broad a perspective as we can representing various industry and consumer interests and perspectives and concerns on the truth in billing issue.

You may know -- and I have forwarded to the Committee that NASUCA filed a petition that is now pending before the FCC, and the FCC has put this petition out for comment. And we have with us the drafter of NASUCA's petition. So feel free to ask him all the questions that you believe you need to have answered.

So, with that, also in your folders today you will find a full description and outline and biographies of the panelists that we have with us here today.

2.1

I will open up the first question and direct it to Patrick Pearlman, representing NASUCA. Just to give you a little background, we had submitted the questions to the panelists in advance so that they can prepare. Then we will open up the balance of our time to general questions and answers from the rest of the Committee members.

The first question we would like to ask is, in 1999, the FCC adopted broad binding truth in billing guidelines and principles to assure consumers have sufficient information to make informed decisions.

My question I would like to pose to Patrick is whether he believes that they have been sufficiently implemented today and if he could explain his answer.

MR. PEARLMAN: Sure. Thank you. And thank you to the Committee for inviting me to speak today regarding truth in billing.

I think the brief answer -- and I understand we have a brief period of time to respond to the questions -- both as a member of the West Virginia Consumer Advocates Division and as a member of NASUCA, which has filed the petition that Joy referred to, is no. The truth in billing order has

not been sufficient to constrain what we believe are anti-competitive, anti-consumer practices on the part of inter-exchange carriers and wireless carriers, in particular.

It has certainly been an improvement. And there are certainly aspects of utility practices that have improved over time. Certainly it is a good thing that carrier or service provider contact information appears on monthly bills for service.

It is generally a good thing that bills have the separate items that go into what makes up your monthly bill spelled out with some explanatory detail provided. However, if you have read NASUCA's petition, which was filed on March 30th, there is certainly room for improvement and, in fact, I would for rather drastic improvement room in constraining practices that frustrate consumers, that stymie consumers' ability to price shop between carriers to determine which carriers best fit their needs, how much they are actually going to pay for service when they sign up for service, and what those charges actually relate to.

So, generally speaking, it would be our position, it is our position -- and I think it is the right position -- that the truth in billing order

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	needs to go further than it did.
2	As some of you may know, the 1999 order
3	left certain aspects, such as standardized labels, to
4	be addressed in an industry forum, to be negotiated,
5	if you will, and that hasn't happened.
6	Certainly other aspects of I think the
7	practices that the commission was attempting to
8	address have gotten worse in some respects and the
9	monthly surcharges and line items that are the subject
10	of NASUCA's petition are a good example; in fact, a
11	prime example of where the truth in billing order has
12	not realized the pro-competitive, pro-consumer goals
13	that the commission identified in that order.
14	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Robin, would you like
15	to respond?
16	MS. TUTTLE: Sure. USTA does believe that
17	the guidelines are working well. Our members, which
18	are primarily wire line local exchange carriers, are
19	not experiencing many billing problems. But when
20	isolated complaints do arise, they are handled.
21	So we do not believe regulations are
22	needed in lieu of guidelines at this time.
23	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Commissioner Curran,

would you like to respond?

MR. CURRAN:

24

25

And I'm going to say an

answer I think that will satisfy both Robin and Patrick. The short answer is yes. In Maryland, we have experienced that when we have issued regulations that were not as comprehensive as the guidelines in the truth in billing order, we have seen a marked decline of the last few years in slanting and examining complaints that were the impetus for the truth in billing order to begin with.

Patrick makes an important point that you want to make sure the consumers have the quality of information they need to make an informed decision, but what we found is really through the growth in competition in the State of Maryland with the competitive pressures on the industry to make sure that they are being as consumer-friendly as possible, we have, quite frankly, since 1999 seen a marked decline in the number of complaints that we receive.

We don't even regulate the wireless industry, but we receive about 50 complaints on the wireless side. Our attorney general, who regulate the wireless industry, gets about 100 But most of those are resolved at the complaints. level of our Office of External Relations, our staff level.

Having said that, we have found that the

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

regulations that we have in place seem to have made a difference. Yes, the guidelines may have made a difference, but we think that the regulations that Maryland has in place that mirror some aspect of those truth in billing guidelines have been of assistance, certainly assistance to the folks at the agency that have to enforce these regulations. We have about 15 consumer advocates that take consumer complaint resolvers at the commission in our Office of External Relations.

Those folks, it's helpful to them. Instead of having a 100-page guideline from the FCC on what billing should look like, having the regulations spelled out has been an efficient way for them to deal with those complaints efficiently.

So yes, Robin, I would say many complaints have diminished. And that is good news. But regulations, Patrick, I think have been helpful as well. So hopefully that satisfies both of you.

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Well, Commissioner Curran, you raised a good point that many of the states do not have jurisdiction over the wireless industry. So I would like to ask Mike, what policies has the wireless industry implemented? And if you can explain if they have been helpful?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. ALTSCHUL: Thank you. And let me join with the others on the panel in thanking you for the invitation to participate.

Let me begin by adding my voice to the choir here that we believe that the guidelines and competition have ensured that consumers have the information they need, both to make informed choices and to understand the elements of their bill.

Specifically, as the commission had hoped in the 1999 truth in billing order, the wireless carriers have adopted and implemented a voluntary consumer code that goes beyond the truth in billing rules adopted by the commission.

In particular, our code and the carriers that have committed to the code disclose rates and terms of service to consumers, including whether any additional taxes, fees, or surcharges apply. And they separately identify carrier charges from taxes and surcharges on billing statements that are remitted to government agencies. And this is what a responsible, competitive industry does to benefit consumers.

Our code is available on our Web site, www.ctia.org. It is available electronically from us.

If anyone wishes it, contact Andrea Williams. I brought a summary, a little sheet that we printed out

1 just this morning to share with you today. 2 MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Thank you. 3 Would anyone like to 4 Commissioner Curran, do you believe there is a need 5 for states to get more involved in the wireless industry? 6 7 That's a good question. MR. CURRAN: 8 Based on the evidence that we have now, I would say I think that competitive pressures within the 9 10 industry, which has taken off in the last few years, 11 have been sufficient to let consumers know exactly 12 what they are purchasing and bargaining for as well as 13 the AG's office seems to have been a sufficient avenue 14 for redress for those folks who have complaints. 15 In fact, I was looking at the FCC's 16 wireless complaints before I came down here. Most of 17 the growth in complaints there seems to be centered 18 around the recent local number portability issue. 19 They don't seem to be addressed to the slamming and 20 cramming issues that were at the heart of the truth in 21 billing issue. 22 So right now I would have to say no, 23 although, quite frankly, Patrick's petition has raised 24 some important issues because it is not just the fact 25 that you don't have a lot of the complaints out there.

1	It may be that the quality of information that is
2	getting out to folks in these surcharges is
3	insufficient or misleading and that they are not
4	bringing complaints to commissions because they assume
5	that these surcharges are part of a regulatory
6	mandate.
7	So Patrick's petition deserves some review
8	and some scrutiny, whether that results in state
9	commission regulation, perhaps some clarity from the
10	FCC on exactly what should be included in these
11	surcharges.
12	I don't see evidence in Maryland that
13	there is a growth in these complaints, but that just
14	may be because folks you know, when you are
15	slammed, you know you have been slammed. But when you
16	have been crammed, it may be more difficult for folks
17	to discern that.
18	So at this point no, but, Patrick, maybe
19	you can convince me.
20	MR. PEARLMAN: I would like the
21	opportunity. If I may respond?
22	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Yes.
23	MR. PEARLMAN: One of the things in
24	putting together the petition and I shouldn't say
25	

1 MR. CURRAN: Patrick's petition. 2 MR. PEARLMAN: It's Patrick's petition, 3 but it is NASUCA's petition. 4 MR. CURRAN: Right. 5 And I was maybe a primary MR. PEARLMAN: drafter, but certainly it was a collaborative effort 6 7 and represents the joint position of 47 consumer 8 agencies in 44 states. 9 In doing the research, we asked constituency; in fact, we asked the constituency of 10 11 NARUC, to identify carrier, wireless and 12 distance, line item charges and concerns and 13 complaints that they had had. Most of the responses that came back on the wireless side were very short 14 15 and to the point. We don't regulate wireless. 16 don't know and we don't pay any attention to what 17 shows up on wireless bills. 18 So that is one aspect of it. I think the 19 number of complaints that come in with commissions is 20 going to fluctuate depending on how active the 2.1 commission is in regulating other terms and conditions of wireless service. 22 In West Virginia, we do have a modicum of 23 regulation over wireless carriers, although 24

commission sometimes seems to think we have less and

sometimes thinks we have more.

But I think that part of the reason -- and Commissioner Curran has already gotten to this -- is what do consumers understand these charges to be from their bill?

As we pointed out in the petition, the charges are labeled in, at best, vague fashion. And I don't think we're going out terribly far on a limb to say that some of the charges are, frankly, misleading. Some of the costs that are being recovered in the charges are misleading.

Some of the carriers do provide a disclaimer that makes it clear that these are not government taxes or government-required charges. That is usually the last line in a paragraph that appears in fine print, usually on the back of a consumer's bill.

And if there is a consumer out there who is looking at the fine print on the back of their bill, my hat is off to them, but I think the experience that we have had is that most consumers don't dig that deeply into their bill.

If they go to a Web site, some carriers do maintain information on their Web site that also discusses these charges. In our research, frankly,

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

some carriers don't provide any information regarding the charges or how much the charges are. So oftentimes the consumer's first experience with the charge is when they get their monthly bill.

We can draw our own conclusions as to whether or not consumers pay sufficient attention to their bill to understand what it is they're getting charged, how much, and why they are getting charged.

The other aspect of it, too -- and we experienced this in West Virginia -- was that with regard to the wire line long distance carriers, there, too, state commissions face a bit of a challenge because many of the charges -- and this was our experience with regard to AT&T -- are designated or claimed to be in the intrastate jurisdiction and the states don't have any jurisdiction.

We fought that battle with AT&T. And happily I can say that we actually won that battle. But I think that battle has got to be fought in 50 different jurisdictions.

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Robin, I would like to ask you, do you believe that the truth in billing guidelines have sufficiently balanced the need to provide consumers with protection and also to provide the carriers with the flexibility they need to

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	differentiate themselves to be competitive?
2	MS. TUTTLE: Yes, we believe that the
3	goals have worked and that there is not as much
4	customer confusion today about bills as there was five
5	years ago. The principles were helpful for meeting
6	the goals.
7	And also changes in the industry, for
8	example, things like wire line LECs are not billing as
9	much for other carriers, have helped reduce confusion.
10	So we do think that things are better.
11	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Commissioner Curran,
12	would you like to respond?
13	MR. CURRAN: In a certain sense, I want to
14	agree with Robin on that. Since '99, at least the
15	incumbent LEC in Maryland, Verizon, has changed their
16	billing format I think to be consistent with our
17	regulations as well as the truth in billing
18	guidelines.
19	There are more organized now. They
20	clearly separate out the carrier charges on the bill.
21	There is a description of services and surcharges on
22	the incumbent's bill.
23	Patrick, whether or not that is
24	sufficient, not misleading, and consistent with the
25	truth in billing guidelines is something that will be

at issue in your petition, NASUCA's petition.

We have also seen I think one of the major issues we had back in '99 were these third party billers that were getting onto the incumbents' bill. Folks didn't understand that. Verizon in Maryland has gotten more vigilant on -- you know, there is an open access requirement -- making sure that they are more astute in assuring that bad actors don't get on the bill.

So as a result of that, we have seen less complaints. But certainly while they have decreased and stabilized, we need to take a look at these issues surrounding the quality of information that is provided to citizens, customers on those bills.

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Thank you.

The next question I would like to ask has to go -- oh, Mike, sure.

MR. ALTSCHUL: I basically want to build on what Commissioner Curran has mentioned. In a competitive industry -- and most of the industries are competitive with wireless depending on who the author is, extremely competitive if there is such a thing -- spend an awful lot of time with focus groups talking to their customers about every aspect of their service in every way the carrier touches the customer

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

relationship.

2.1

The billing and the presentation of the information on a bill are a key component in how carriers interact with and satisfy their consumers. They have spent considerable resources in asking consumers how they want information conveyed to them.

We believe that is exactly the right incentive and that carriers, particularly now that we have number portability, where there is ready ability for a customer who is displeased, feels that a carrier has taken advantage of the trust between a consumer and their supplier, if they feel that their trust has been abused, can easily change carriers.

So the marketplace has done a very good job. I'm happy to hear that Commissioner Curran has echoed that in Maryland the complaint rate confirms that.

We have become students of the FCC's complaint rate reports. And we are very proud that the complaint rate per thousand or per million wireless carriers is below the complaint rate of those services that the commission more actively regulates.

So we think that the marketplace based on that empirical data is doing a better job satisfying consumers than the regulatory rules and the services

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 that are more intensively regulated. And that makes 2 sense. 3 MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Now, you mentioned 4 that you speak with some of the consumers about their 5 particular needs. Can you explain some of the issues were raised to your attention but 6 7 technical or legal impediments in terms of producing a 8 bill? What issues do you encounter in producing a wireless bill? 9 MR. ALTSCHUL: Well, of course, any of us 10 11 who are consumers know that the primary number that 12 consumers care about is the amount you write in a 13 check, right, at the end of the month. It's not the 14 line items and how the various blocks are put together 15 to build it up but how much am I paying. 16 Of course, the press and consumer groups 17 have done a very good job -- and there are Web sites 18 that also do this -- of summarizing and comparing all 19 of the different carriers. In terms of the impediments that 20 21 carriers, especially wireless carriers, face, we have 22 a number of them. First, the service is provided 23 without respect to state jurisdictional boundaries.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON D.C. 20005-3701

area know that the wireless markets include Maryland,

So those of us who live in the Washington

24

the District of Columbia, Virginia, sometimes parts of West Virginia and Delaware depending on the carrier.

So a patchwork quilt of different state rules makes it very difficult, costly, inefficient to operate on a market basis. The way consumers use their services is on a multi-state basis. So that is one area of concern.

Another area of concern that has been identified by our wireless tax group is there are more than 14,400 different taxing jurisdictions in the United States, so many different local sales taxes, so many different 911 surcharges.

Many consumers -- I must say I live in Arlington County. So it's easy for me. Our 911 surcharge is set on a county basis, but some are done by districts that don't necessarily respect county boundaries.

So creating 1,440 different bills and price structures depending on all of the unique taxes that are imposed legally by different tax jurisdictions is a huge technical impediment to wireless carriers, to all carriers.

In addition, the FCC's universal service fund support mechanism now adjusts the contribution factor four times a year. So every three months there

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 is going to be a change in the amount that consumers are assessed to support universal service. 2 3 There is also a number of very worthy and 4 worthwhile mandates imposed by the FCC that 5 carriers support. There is contribution to the TRS fund, contribution to support number administration. 6 7 There is a 25-cent-per-year regulatory fee 8 imposed on wireless carriers to support the FCC, something that I am sure the FCC finds valuable. 9 Prorated that 25-cent user fee is 2 and one-third 10 11 cents per month. It is remitted to the FCC by 12 carriers, and carriers are collecting it. 13 Combining all of those individual fees and 14 not giving consumers too much information is one of 15 the things that comes out of these focus groups. 16 In reviewing the truth in billing order in 17 was reminded that the California Public 18 Utilities Commission actually asked that a lot of these individual line items be combined into one line, 19 20 which is what the industry has responded by doing. 21 Finally, unlike wire line carriers that 22 often provide service pursuant to tariff, wireless 23 carriers use contracts. We are unable and actually benefit from being detariffed. 24

Because it is a contract, changes in

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

certain rates and terms, if material, can reopen the contractual relationship. That is a disincentive to both consumers and carriers because both sides benefit from the certainty of a contract in a one or two-year term. And the rewards that come from that loyalty to a particular service provider.

So having a lot of changes that opens up contracts every three months or so, for example, with the universal service fund would be a real impediment to consumer-friendly services.

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Robin, I would like to ask you the same question with regards to the wire line industry. What type of impediments may you encounter in producing a bill?

MS. TUTTLE: Sure. Actually, our impediments are very similar. I guess I would touch on some of the same points that Mike raised that we would have similar charges to bill for, USF contributions, federal excise taxes, TRS, PIC change charges, as well as any changes that may occur or may be requested, such as changing a font size or a paper size.

Those types of changes can be very costly.

They would increase the size of the bill, which adds

postage cost and may be only a few pennies per bill,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 but that adds up when you are doing that for all of 2 your customers. 3 I think those are probably the 4 significant of the impediments that we would 5 encounter. MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Okay. I would like 6 7 to ask -- yes? Sure. 8 MR. CURRAN: I think there's an assumption 9 that if you regulate the bills, that there is going to 10 be specific requirements on font size and how you 11 represent your name and logo and that sort of thing. 12 I don't think that is what we would try to do in 13 Maryland or other state regulators would try to do. be sensitive that these 14 We have to 15 are regional companies in nature, as Michael 16 referenced, that you can't a patchwork have 17 regulations that you have to comply with. 18 going to add costs to them, and it will be passed 19 along to consumers. 20 I think getting back to the truth 21 billing guidelines and what state regulators would try 22 to do in implementing regulations to support those 23 quidelines are to look for broad criteria. 24 The requirements are that the bills be 25 clear and understandable that provide descriptions of

I	67
	the services that are being provided, that they are
	not misleading, that there is a toll-free number on
	there that if you have a dispute, there is something,
	there is an avenue for you to call the company and get
	some redress, that you separate out surcharges like
	e-911 or universal service.
	Those are very general requirements that
	should be satisfied that are obligations that I think
	are fair to place on companies to ensure that
ı	

consumers have the information that they need to be in the marketplace or to make informed decisions.

I don't think we are looking for real rigid guidelines or real rigid requirements, just standards that folks should adhere to that flexible enough for them to compete in regional markets.

So I just want to dispel this suggestion that either state regulators or regulation would make these requirements too state-specific and then add unnecessary costs to the folks trying to compete.

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Robin, you wanted to respond to that?

And I would just add MS. TUTTLE: Sure. that we believe that our customers do want to have the surcharges and fees broken out. We think they find

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

that is useful to them as well as states often may have requirements, but we do note that they are willing to work within the federal requirements to make sure that there is not too much distinction and carriers don't have to create too many different types of bills.

### MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Patrick?

MR. PEARLMAN: I will try to keep it very brief and just address some of the points. In terms of what NASUCA has petitioned for, we view it as, frankly, simplifying bills greatly, namely taking off any surcharge that is not expressly mandated by federal, state, or local action.

So in terms of having to, if you will, incur the burden of additional line items, only if the government entity requires that fee to be imposed should that fee show up in your monthly bill.

It is interesting that in talking about taxes, one of the taxes that I am familiar with and everybody is is the three percent excise tax that is a federal excise tax.

My understanding is I don't think that has gone up since 1997. I don't think any carrier is having any difficulty in reacting to changes in that tax. Similarly, I think at the state level, most

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

state taxes that apply to consumers' bills are remarkably stable.

A number of the items that Mike addressed, TRS, Telecommunications Relay Service, contributions into the North American numbering plan, many of the carriers I don't think began recovering those costs through a separate line item charge until fairly recently. That is a cost of doing business, frankly.

You know, if you go to a hardware store to buy a gallon of paint, you pay eight dollars a gallon with a sales tax associated with it. You don't pay eight dollars plus a surcharge for the company's compliance with OSHA regulations, environmental regulations, or any other type of consumer product safety commission advisories. In other words, you are not paying \$8 plus 10 cents plus \$1.50 plus 50 cents and then you get the total bill at the end of your transaction. I think that is an issue that is fairly important that needs to be borne in mind.

So I think our goal is actually perhaps one and the same and mutually benefit, which is ultimately we would like to see bills simpler. You pay a monthly rate. If you have a calling plan that has a monthly rate, you pay that. You pay your per-minute usage rate, and you pay any federal taxes

1 or local taxes, your 911 fees, for example. And that is all that should be on the bill, and that is all 2 3 that has to be explained. 4 MODERATOR RAGSDALE: I think the gloves 5 are coming off on this question. Robin wants to respond and then Mike. 6 7 Sure. I just wanted to MS. TUTTLE: 8 address -- Patrick had raised the term "mandated." 9 Often regulatory agencies don't mandate a certain 10 They may authorize it or approve it. 11 certainly if those charges are authorized or approved, 12 then carriers should be able to recoup those charges. 13 MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Mike? MR. ALTSCHUL: I would like to in front of 14 15 all of you in this public forum wager a quarter bet 16 with Patrick that when he has his oil change the next 17 time or takes his car in for a repair and takes a look 18 on his shop bill, there is going to be a charge for 19 environmental compliance or a shop fee or both. 20 I have just gone through this with my own 21 car with this panel in mind. I said, "Oh, that is 22 interesting. I know an industry that does the same 23 They do it for a very good reason." There is no benefit to consumers 24

individually pricing the price of a washer or how many

quarts of oil when it is four or five or six quarts depending on the vehicle or how many paper towels are used. Rather, taking a lot of small costs, bundling them, averaging them, and passing them through on a uniform way is more efficient for the service provider. And in a competitive industry, those efficiencies get passed through. Their lower costs get shared with consumers.

It also goes back to the fact that we are facing 14,000 different price structures given all of the different tax jurisdictions. I wish Patrick was right that these taxes remain the same. Certainly the universal service contribution factor isn't.

Certainly in Baltimore City right now, where they are proposing to impose a new tax on wireless service, it is not going to be the same, hasn't been in the Maryland suburbs of Washington that have recently imposed new surcharges on wireless. We know in California, 911 surcharges at a community level are being increased on a regular basis.

So it is a very dynamic and changing environment. Absent tariffing, it doesn't do consumers any good if their contract has to change. It doesn't do consumers any good. They can't compare what are the true variable costs, which is the air

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

	time and monthly plans that allow them to shop across
2	all of the different service providers' rate plans.
3	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Another rebuttal,
4	Robin?
5	MS. TUTTLE: Actually, an agreement.
6	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Okay.
7	MS. TUTTLE: We agree with CTIA that if
8	you were to roll up all of these surcharges and fees
9	into a total package price, maybe unlike the wireless
10	industry that has a contract with their end-users, the
11	wire line companies are filing tariffs. And they
12	would have to be filing tariffs virtually every month
13	to encompass these changes that can happen, say, 9/11
14	changes from county to county or your universal
15	service contribution changes quarterly.
16	So we also believe that it is easier for
17	consumers to be able to compare a base price and get
18	information from the carrier as to additional
19	surcharges and fees that may be on top of that so that
20	they can actually compare apples to apples.
21	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Thank you.
22	MR. ALTSCHUL: Could I just inject
23	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Sure.
24	MR. ALTSCHUL: some regulatory
25	economics? There may be experts more expert than I on

this, but there is this notion that consumers benefit by separating fixed from variable costs so that they can get good price signals and adjust their consumption based on true price signals so that my natural gas bill in Arlington, Virginia has a fixed charge for a network system maintenance fee, which doesn't change, and then a usage-based charge based on how much gas. It also provides an incentive for me to buy a more efficient furnace the next time.

So, similarly, wireless carriers are breaking out for consumers the variable costs, which are within consumers' control, which is their air time, plans, and so on, which provides them with the kind of valuable information they can use to make decisions and separating out these fixed costs, which are really common across all carriers who do business in the same geographic area.

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: The fixed costs, you refer to those as taxes and fees or are there other fixed costs that you are referring to?

MR. ALTSCHUL: Well, certainly we all know that carriers have separate line items for taxes, surcharges, fees that are remitted to the government -- and our consumer code recognizes this -- as well as fees which the carriers have broken out from their

bills to recover their costs of complying with government mandates.

Patrick calls this the cost of doing business, but, for example, the FCC's numbering rules, number portability rules, allow the regulated LECs to recover their costs of complying with local number portability as a line item on their bill.

And with respect to wireless, the same order said that since wireless rates are not regulated, we will permit wireless carriers to recover these same costs in any lawful means. So wireless carriers have mirrored what the commission has mandated the wire line carriers to do.

MR. PEARLMAN: If I can respond to that? There is obviously a lot I would like to respond to but just a couple of the points. With regard to the local number portability fee, it is true the FCC authorized incumbent LECs to impose a fee.

That fee was imposed pursuant to a tariff that was filed with the FCC as part of their tariffing process and the fee that was allowed. And I emphasize the term "allowed." In other words, the incumbents did not simply pick a number out of the air, put it on your bill, and that was authorized.

In other words, the incumbents had to go

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

to the FCC and demonstrate that the fee bore some relationship to the direct cost that the carriers incur in providing local number portability and just local number portability.

The wireless carriers, in particular, do not have to make any sort of demonstration to the FCC.

There is no requirement to establish a demonstrable relationship between the fee that is being charged and the cost that the carrier is incurring.

One of the other things since Mike brought it up is the commission's order that allowed carriers to impose number portability fees also suggested that those fees ought to be roughly proportional to each other because smaller carriers have fewer facilities, may have a smaller number, a smaller customer base; whereas, larger carriers have large customer bases and large fixed costs to provide number portability. But, all things being equal, those ought to balance out. That has not been --

MR. CURRAN: Fortunately, you're going to know it is not true.

MR. PEARLMAN: Well, it is certainly not true when comparing across the fees that the incumbents were allowed by the FCC and the fees that the wireless carriers are imposing.

The other aspect of that is that the FCC's order suggested that carriers ought not to be able to recover a fee until the customer is reasonably able to receive the service for which the fee is being imposed.

In other words, you don't get charged for local number portability until you can actually port your number. That has not been something that has been the experience in the wireless industry because the fees began being imposed, I believe, in January of 2002. Local number portability was not a requirement for the wireless industry until November 2002 and, in fact, ended up being extended until November 2003.

The other concern -- and obviously our petition went at length regarding number portability since it is a fairly important issue -- is how much do the carriers get to recover over time associated with their local number portability cost?

To my knowledge, there has not been any inquiry into figuring out whether the costs match up to the amount recovered by the carriers, nor has there been any real look at whether or not the carriers are recovering beyond the direct costs of providing number portability.

In other words, some carriers are

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

providing advertising costs. Some are recovering win-back program costs. This is by their own admission.

So that is a concern with the number portability surcharge, in particular. Some of the other items, too, I think, number plan compliance, TRS, those are contributions that the FCC issues every year.

The percentage of the amount recovered is tiny. I think it is less than the annual. It would be less than the annual fee that the FCC recovers from the wireless carriers, the 25 cents that Mike referenced. So that is one of the concerns that was raised in our petition.

And I guess the last point that I will address is just that we are not convinced that customers want to see more surcharges in their bill so that they can shop among carriers.

Our experience is that consumers do shop, not on the amount that they write on the check but on the bottom line of the usage minutes, the 5 cents a minute plans, the \$19 all you can eat wireless plans and so forth. That is really what the consumers are looking at, not at the total charge at the end of the day.

Thank you.

2.1

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Mike?

MR. ALTSCHUL: A quick surrebuttal on a few of these points, maybe not so quick. First, I find it passing strange that a consumer advocate would suggest the consumers benefit from less information, rather than more information, about the elements of their charges and how they are built up and which charges are within the consumers' control and which are not.

Well, with respect to the specific number portability issues, first, there are petitions pending in nearly all of the states, probably about 40 states, from small rural LECs, as there have been petitions from small wireless carriers, that the costs versus the number of subscribers that they can spread those costs over given their smaller customer base and certain costs of implementing L&P are fixed are disproportionately large and disadvantage them in the marketplace. So there is some empirical marketplace information that is available today that wasn't available to the commission when they adopted the rules.

Second, the issue which is also raised in the petition that wireless carriers began charging for

number portability before number portability was made available to wireless consumers is actually not entirely correct.

Wireless carriers, like all carriers, had to upgrade their networks and start querying the number portability database. As soon as the wire line carriers started providing number portability, it was impossible to complete a call from a wireless phone to a wire line phone once those wire line phones have been opened up to porting without this network upgrade and without the database query to route the call to the right carrier.

Moreover, because of a parallel FCC rule when the timing was reversed between wire line and wireless, wireless carriers in 2002 had to complete their network upgrades to support a thousand-block pooling, something which the commission did to facilitate efficient number utilization but saying the commission only imposed on the industry after they imposed L&P on wire line carriers.

So the timing is not strange. It reflects the benefits that all consumers, including wireless consumers, received from both wire line portability, which began in 1999, and thousand-block pooling.

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Thank you.

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	One question I would like to ask before I
2	open it up to the floor for general questions, the
3	first important order for the truth in billing order
4	indicated that the consumer groups and industry
5	representatives should get together to discuss
6	standardization of federal regulatory action charges.
7	Are any of you aware if that action has taken place?
8	And if not, would you be interested in initiating an
9	action?
10	Who would like to be the first one?
11	Robin?
12	MS. TUTTLE: We're not aware that any such
13	initiatives have occurred to create focus groups. I
14	believe our members would be open to participating in
15	consumer focus groups to discuss labeling. And
16	perhaps this is something this Committee could assist
17	with.
18	MODERATOR RAGSDALE: We will try.
19	Mike?
20	MR. ALTSCHUL: I guess two answers. One
21	is that the question implies, as Patrick's petition
22	alleges, that something is broke, it needs to be
23	fixed. We really challenge that. We challenge on the
24	basis of complaints. We challenge it on the attention
25	that carriers give these issues.

81
Having said that, the CTIA consumer code
is a result of listening to consumer advocates as well
as consumers of a dialogue that has not always been in
the same room at the same time but has involved some
very frank discussions and back and forth with the
NARUC Consumer Affairs Committee.
We made presentations to them. They made
presentations and letters to us. And in adopting our
principles and our cost, we have started from the list
of issues that these regulatory and consumer groups
have brought forward.

MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Commissioner Curran with NARUC?

MR. CURRAN: I think that's fine. I think some of the issues for some of these guidelines were put into regulations. I think the labeling regs were stayed by OMB. And I assume that that stay is still in effect for that.

That may have been one of the reasons folks didn't huddle around to work on these labeling requirements because, actually, there was a fairly compelling dissent filed in that with the TIB by -- I don't want to get his name wrong --Furchtgott-Roth.

And it may be that folks had concerns about the commercial speech implications or the

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

constitutional concerns around that. It may also have been from the NARUC view that we were -- at least I can speak for Maryland and look at some of the data across the country -- seeing a decrease in the amount of slamming and cramming complaints. And we were seeing the separations in billings which were required under the TIB, separations between providers as well as between charges.

So it was those things that may have happened in combination with the stay, in combination with folks' review of the dissents filed in the TIB order, that folks didn't huddle around to do the labeling.

Whether or not that is required or not,

I'm sure that the NARUC consumer affairs folks if

there is a group put together, NASUCA and others ask

for an invitation to join, I am sure they would be

willing to participate in that.

I just wanted to follow up on the discussion. I didn't want to get between Michael and Patrick before. That was a dangerous place to be. But just on the surcharge issue, I think one of the concerns of the regulators is that the charges that are reflected on the bill with local number portability or e-911 or universal service, we are

concerned that those charges do, in fact, reflect the cost of the service that is provided to folks.

So in that aspect, we would agree with Patrick. On the other hand, if we get into this fixed and variable cost issue, Michael's clients, if some of them are being inefficient and hiding costs associated with the inefficiencies in their operation in surcharges, the more efficient carriers that are out there will be able to defeat them in the marketplace.

So, again, I am sympathetic because I think that Patrick is correct and NASUCA is correct that the goals of the TIB are that the charges that are on the bill should, in fact, reflect the services that are being provided to consumers. If that is not happening, then that is wrong. But, on the other hand, the competitive forces out there should drive those bad actors out of the marketplace.

MR. ALTSCHUL: This is a little surreal in that the Bureau of Labor Statistics has done for a period of almost eight years now the consumer price index for wireless service, which includes the bottom line, not just rate plan elements.

We all know that the wireless industry, in contrast to other segments of the telecommunications industry, has a record of continually declining total

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

prices.

2.1

And it's a little strange that regulators who have allowed consumers to benefit from totally deregulated prices, which have driven all of the prices that end-users pay down to carriers' costs, would seek to regulate a line item surcharge while the actual price would not be regulated, particularly when the government's price data indicates that the overall price of the air time as well as the line items as well as the taxes continues to go down.

MR. PEARLMAN: If I can, I guess, respond first to Joy's question and then just briefly to a couple of the other comments? NASUCA along with I think everybody else is unaware of that initiative, if you will, to address standardized labeling. But I think it is fair to say we would be happy to sit at the table and discuss those sorts of things.

With regard to the issue of the price for wireless service, that is probably true. You know, I think telecommunications is generally a declining cost industry. And we have certainly seen with access charge reductions, the cost or the price for wire line services generally declined, at least with regard to the usage rates.

I think the concern that Commissioner

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Curran raised is identical to or analogous to what we brought up in the NASUCA petition, which is, are consumers able to make that price comparison between efficient and inefficient carriers? We are skeptical, obviously.

The problem is that it is a competitive market. And some carriers are more efficient than others. Those which are inefficient can hide their costs or their inefficiency costs through surcharges. Those that are more efficient find a profit motive that is there by being able to do what everybody else is doing by imposing a surcharge.

Obviously I can't name names of who is the efficient and who is the inefficient, but I think the concern is that it really does frustrate the consumers' ability to shop between carriers. And I think it frustrates the goal of the competitive market to weed out those carriers that are truly inefficient.

As we point out in our petition, we are not suggesting that carriers should lose money. We are simply saying that recover your costs in your rates, not through separate surcharges.

I think part of the problem is exemplified, as we point out, in just the sampling of carrier surcharges with the number of programs, costs,

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 et cetera, that are lumped into these fees. I think it would be difficult, if not impossible, to correlate 2 3 the costs associated with each program carriers' fee. 4 5 Given the fact that there are something like 1,000 wire line long distance carriers and 1,400 6 7 wireless providers, no regulatory agency is going to 8 be able to make that kind of correlation either. 9 MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Anyone biting at the bit? 10 11 (No response.) 12 MODERATOR RAGSDALE: No? Shirley would 13 like to open it up to the floor. Are there any 14 questions? 15 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Yes. Because of our 16 rearrangement of schedules, we do have an extra half 17 an hour that we are going to use if we need it for 18 questions. So I would like to answer. And I think 19 David had his hand up and then Susan and I'm hoping 20 the rest of you. 21 MR. POEHLMAN: Goody, goody, goody. I get 22 to go first again. This is David Poehlman with the 23 American Council of the Blind today. 24 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Fast hand over there, 25 David.

MR. POEHLMAN: Yes. I have been fluttering for, oh, half an hour, 45 minutes here.

I appreciate the panel discussion. It has been informative and insightful. First, I just want to give you my perspective. I'm a bottom line guy. So I guess I am kind of weird or strange or unique or somewhat rare in that I do want to know what my bill is going to be at the end of every month.

Maving said that, having observed my monthly bill over the past several years, I was mystified by a statement that if these charges were to be bundled into the tariffing for wire line, that they would have to go back every couple or three months to adjust the tariffs because for years, my basic rate stayed the same. The only thing that changed was the amount that I paid for long distance based on the number of minutes I used on my long distance before I got into a bulk rate plan.

If somebody can clear that up for me, I would appreciate that. Maybe I am misunderstanding something.

MS. TUTTLE: I think maybe I can address that. What I was trying to indicate was that if the various surcharges and fees were rolled into a total package price so that consumers were comparing a total

1	price, that that could cause carriers to have to go
2	back and file tariffs every month because the various
3	surcharges that are rolled into that could change from
4	month to month or quarter to quarter. Does that help?
5	MR. POEHLMAN: That is what you said, but
6	I haven't seen that kind of evidence of those charges
7	over the past several years, the fluctuations.
8	MS. TUTTLE: Oh, the fluctuations in the
9	911 or the universal service?
10	MR. POEHLMAN: There have been minor
11	changes over the years, but basically my phone bill
12	has stayed the same or did stay the same up until
13	relatively recently.
14	MS. TUTTLE: I was just speaking with one
15	of our members earlier this week. He had mentioned
16	that his 911 charge had gone up from 50 cents to 75
17	cents. So I think it depends on where you live. His
18	county had just changed that. So if that were the
19	case, his would have to be changed to reflect that.
20	MR. POEHLMAN: Right. But when before
21	that did it go up to 50 cents?
22	MS. TUTTLE: I don't know.
23	MR. POEHLMAN: See, that is the question
24	that I have. Sure, we see incremental changes every
25	now and then but not every month, not every couple of

months. So that's what I was trying to get at. I was confused by the statement because of my experience.

MS. TUTTLE: Well, now, I would just also

add, too, that the universal service contribution does fluctuate every quarter. And you might see a change in your universal service contribution portion of your bill. It may be pennies, but that is still a difference in a charge.

MR. ALTSCHUL: And also under traditional rate of return regulation, carriers and their regulators may over-collect for the rate of return for a period and under-collect for a period because of regulatory lag, extending in a regulated monopoly environment rate stability in a way that you don't see in a competitive industry, whether it's the airline industry or the wireless industry, where rate changes are dynamic.

We were talking earlier about whether consumers really do shop and make informed choices. In the wireless industry for the last 3 years, 30 percent of subscribers have changed carriers each year.

We are not seeing number portability at that rate, but we are continuing to see churn at that rate. And we see on a quarterly basis that there are

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

clear winners and losers among the carriers, some gaining customers at a much greater percentage, some carriers in some quarters actually going in the wrong direction, losing more customers than they acquire.

So consumers are doing something out there. They are paying attention and rewarding carriers that provide value and attractive product and punishing those that don't.

MS. GRANT: Hi. Susan Grant from the National Consumers League. I've got three questions.

I was interested in the notion that these various kinds of fees and surcharges are somehow useful for consumers. Are the members of the industry suggesting that all businesses, not just telecom business, should provide bills or receipts that have essentially an X-ray vision of what goes into the price, including the social and legal responsibilities of the business, and, to take it one step further, things like executive compensation, the cost of travel for employees, and just all of the various costs of doing business? Maybe that would be good for consumers to see, but I am wondering if that is what you are advocating.

Second, if there is a trend towards businesses starting to break out what one could argue

are costs of doing business separately in their bills,
are you saying that that is a good thing for the
marketplace or does it create the danger of totally
skewing advertised prices so that they don't actually
have any basis in reality to the end price that
consumers pay?
And, finally, if you rolled these costs of
doing business into the price, instead of allowing
them to be what are essentially unsubstantiated line
items, wouldn't that reduce the incentive for
companies to pad those amounts, as the NASUCA petition
has documented is happening?
MODERATOR RAGSDALE: Were you directing
your question to anyone in particular?
MS. GRANT: Yes. No. Everyone.
(Laughter.)
MR. ALTSCHUL: I will be happy to jump in
in these waters. Let's take a real world example of
sales tax, something simple that is a little different
than your question about the doughnuts that executives
may have on Monday morning at their staff meeting.
It is the universal or nearly universal
practice in this country that products are advertised
without sales tax. That is because Maryland's tax is

going to be different from the District's, than

Virginia's. And everybody is going to be in the Washington Post.

This provides consumers with the ability to shop for the lowest price from a wide range of outlets. And then the taxes are variable. The consumer is not told what they are actually going to be paying out of their pocket for the good plus the service.

As a result, you see an awful lot of price advertising for goods. The Federal Trade Commission for reasons lost to history has required gasoline prices to be posted inclusive of all of the taxes, the federal tax, the local tax, and so on and so forth.

I defy you to point out price advertising of gasoline prices. It just doesn't happen because it is so variable. Consumers don't get price signals when all of these variable costs are included because it is too local.

So it goes back to the point I was suggesting, that by breaking out those elements which consumers can shop for and sending them strong price signals and separating those elements which are imposed on businesses by government regulations that are common across all of them, it actually encourages price advertising, price competition, and benefits

consumers.

Lumping together everything in one charge over 14,400 different jurisdictions will so muddy the information stream that consumers won't get the price signals that they get today, just as in gasoline versus other goods.

MS. GRANT: I just want to clarify that I am not including taxes in my question.

MR. ALTSCHUL: No. I am just explaining what happens when you have a unitary pricing versus a price system where the elements are separated on separate line items.

MR. PEARLMAN: I will go ahead and jump in, I guess, too. I guess I am still kind of confused by the price shopping for gasoline because I know I price shop based on what I see on the gasoline board.

And if it's \$1.39 -- well, let's be real.

(Laughter.)

MR. PEARLMAN: If it's \$2.39 -- boy, those seem like not that long ago days -- I am going to look for some place that's advertising at \$2.38 or \$2.37.

And I know that in West Virginia, we've got generally 44 or 45 cents per gallon state and federal taxes. It tells me so right on the pump. But what I am looking at is who is charging 2.39 and who

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

is charging 2.37.

The other thing that determines --

MR. ALTSCHUL: Don't you have to drive by to do that? You can't go look it up in a newspaper. There is no price advertisement.

MR. PEARLMAN: That's generally true. There is not because the price does fluctuate quite a bit. I guess what we are getting at, too, is the idea of putting it all in one fixed sum is I think a little disingenuous for what NASUCA is petitioning for because we are not saying, "Put it all in one charge" or "Put it all in one rate plan."

I mean, the carriers ought to have, I mean, we certainly want carriers to have, the flexibility to price plans out. We want consumers to have as many choices for types of plans and rate plans out there as they can get because ultimately the consumer ought to shop for what makes sense for him or her.

We are not saying, "Don't recover your costs of doing business." If your cost of doing business is \$150 million a year, well, then, recover \$150 million a year. And you can obviously recover some profit, too. But put that \$150 million in your profit and what you are charging consumers on their

But recovering \$150 million a year plus X, 2 3 which is incorporated into a surcharge that recovers 4 numerous costs of doing business, we don't think that 5 really sends the proper price signal to the consumer. And I can just real quickly relate the 6 7 story I had on the drive over here with the taxicab 8 driver. He said, "Where are you going?" And I said, "The FCC." 9 And he said, "What are you doing there?" 10 11 And I said, "We're having this forum. 12 I'm giving a presentation. And we're talking about 13 charges on bills." 14 And he said, you know, "I don't understand 15 I haven't understood my bill for years. my bill. 16 What do these things mean? Why do I have to pay them? Why does the government keep putting all of these 17 18 charges on my bill?" And I said, "Well, that is what we are 19 20 going to be talking about today." I don't know 21 whether these folks are filing complaints or not. Another D.C. cabbie -- and I've got to 22 23 give them credit because they're pretty sophisticated 24 here -- was telling me that what he does is he just 25 doesn't pay the surcharge, which I said, "Hey, that's

monthly rate plan or on their per-minute plan.

1	actually a good idea. I don't know if that is
2	deniable or undeniable." Oh, it's deniable? Okay.
3	But I think a number of consumers take
4	that approach. And I don't think that's something
5	that we necessarily want to do either. So I think
6	that the idea that consumers are benefitted by a
7	multitude of programs being recovered in one or more
8	line item charges, I'm not sold on that idea.
9	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Now let me
10	just ask you, is your question a follow-up to that
11	answer or is it separate?
12	MS. GRANT: No. It's separate.
13	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Well, Donald
14	had his hand up first.
15	MR. SNOOP: One of the questions I had
16	ties in with truth in billing, but it also has a lot
17	to say about what these taxes are all for and why the
18	average consumer has absolutely no control over it.
19	Nine, one, one, universal service are
20	probably two of the ones that I don't think anybody
21	would argue or would probably be extremely valuable
22	and would need to happen. We need to find funding
23	formulas that actually make sense.
24	Gross receipts, tax, surcharges, various
25	other things that the companies are forced to either

1 pay, pass through, or something of that nature, the average consumer has no control over those. 2 3 Quite often they become budgetary items 4 that become ways for municipalities, counties, states 5 to fund other initiatives. They have absolutely nothing to do with the cost of providing that service. 6 7 It's just a matter of it falls into a general fund. 8 It happens. It continues to happen. 9 have seen example after example, even abuses on 911, where counties take all of these funds supposedly to 10 11 subsidize the cost of assign a ring so that nothing 12 ever goes down with the system. 13 And then, all of a sudden, somebody cuts a 14 And guess what? Half of the county is out. 15 Why? Because they never completed it because it went 16 into the general fund. 17 It has nothing to do with truth 18 billing, but I think it is part of what you are 19 talking about because the actual control the consumer 20 has is absolutely zero when it comes to this. 21 costs get passed on to companies. To Michael's statement, I agree with him 22 23 that companies have absolutely no -- I mean, they can 24 absorb the costs. Sure, they could absorb it. Why 25 should they? They're being mandated.

1	MR. PEARLMAN: Is your question directed
2	to me or
3	MR. SNOOP: No.
4	(Laughter.)
5	MR. SNOOP: No. I just happened to look
6	at you, Patrick.
7	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Andrea was the
8	next question and then David.
9	MS. WILLIAMS: Andrea Williams with CTIA.
10	I'm not going to ask Mike because I can ask
11	MR. ALTSCHUL: You had better not ask me a
12	hard question.
13	MS. WILLIAMS: There are two things,
14	Patrick, that I wanted to ask you in terms of and
15	Commissioner Curran. You say that you don't know
16	whether consumers are filing or they're not filing,
17	but you say that the NASUCA petition is based on the
18	research.
19	I can only assume that is only based on
20	the complaints that you are receiving that consumers,
21	they don't want this, what we feel is, I guess you
22	would say, for the wireless industry informing them of
23	what they are paying for in terms of what we don't
24	view in the wireless industry as normal business
25	operating expenses.

1	We had an earlier discussion about this,
2	that we're even seeing in companies government
3	mandates are no longer. Those types of things,
4	they're different line items in a corporation's
5	finances. They're not part of cost of doing business.
6	I think it is sort of ironic that well,
7	not ironic, but one thing that I have not seen in
8	NASUCA's petition that I think all of us in this room
9	agree with, you said that consumers don't pay much
10	attention to their bills. Well, that says something
11	to us.
12	Why? Why aren't they paying much
13	attention? Is the level of consumer education not
14	where it needs to be? Consumer advocacy agencies,
15	industry, do we all need to be doing a better job so
16	consumers are reading their bills, showing them how to
17	read their bills?
18	It's so easy to say, "Let's regulate it"
19	because no one wants to take the time out to teach a
20	consumer as "Excuse me, Marcie Simms. An educated
21	consumer is our best consumer."
22	And I'm just wondering, in all of this
23	dialogue, where is the consumer education?
24	MR. PEARLMAN: Well, one thing I guess
25	maybe I should clarify what I said. When I said the

1	consumers weren't paying attention to the amount they
2	write on their check, they pay attention to that,
3	obviously. And I probably misspoke.
4	What I don't think they are paying
5	attention to is all the items that go between the
6	monthly plan that they signed up for and the rate that
7	they were promised in the advertising or the
8	telemarketing call and then all of the stuff in
9	between that and the bottom line at the end of the
10	month.
11	Some of those I think are just probably to
12	consumers relatively indecipherable. And certainly a
13	surcharge that recovers a multitude of things is going
14	to be something that the consumer is not going to know
15	whether or not it is valid, how much it ought to be
16	and so forth.
17	So with that clarification
18	MS. WILLIAMS: Don't we have a
19	responsibility, all of us in terms of government and
20	industry, in making sure they understand, educating
21	them?
22	MR. PEARLMAN: Certainly. I think we all
23	agree on that. We all make that effort. You know,
24	the effort, has it been sufficient? Maybe, maybe not.

Certainly the FCC has taken a step forward

1 with creating the Consumer and Government Affairs 2 Bureau. I think that was a positive step. 3 Part of it I think is, frankly, my office, 4 the Consumer Advocate Division in West Virginia, we 5 don't log consumer complaints. We get calls from consumers who complain about various things on their 6 7 bills or in their service, but we don't have a 8 consumer assistance team. 9 We have seven people in my office. And we don't log those types of complaints. I'm sure that in 10 11 a lot of states where they don't regulate wireless, 12 they are not really necessarily tracking complaints. 13 So I think some functions in terms of 14 tracking and in terms of outreach are functions of 15 frankly, administrative jurisdiction and, 16 capabilities. 17 We do maintain -- most I think of the 18 consumer advocate offices; in fact, I think all of 19 them, have got Web sites. And we will typically 20 provide consumer information. 21 The FCC has a Web site, in which it also 22 consumer information. I think carriers provides 23 maintain Web sites. Some of them provide more

much information to inform consumers.

information than others. Some provide, frankly, not

24

I would say that certainly a better job can be done by all of us, but, again, the thrust of our petition really is to simplify a consumer's bill as much as possible so that things that look like a government charge but aren't necessarily a government charge don't show up on that bill.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Well, I'm sorry. We only have time for one more question. And David had his hand up. And it is going to have to be a brief one. We have got five minutes. Sorry about that.

MR. HOROWITZ: It will be a brief question. That is, I wonder why the public wasn't told up front about these charges that they thought might have been government charges on their bills that were listed and that basically were being used according to the things that I read and the people that I spoke to in the industry to show that there are costs that needed to be paid by the companies.

And that is why they put these on the bills. And they didn't think it was necessary to have to put on the bills that these were nongovernment charges that were there because I find that a reason for a lot of this is overzealous salespeople from the companies, not the telemarketing companies but from

the companies that are selling these products, that are not telling people the truth. And people are walking around saying, "Oh, no. That's a government thing" because they tell them that.

I have gone into a number of stores that sell cell phones and have been given that line that these are government charges. That's what you pay on your bill.

My feeling is, why don't you just include this as part of a cost of doing business, which it is, and take your money out of that; in other words, saying that the cost of this call is not five cents but it actually is nine cents, instead of putting these nonsensical things on your bills?

MR. ALTSCHUL: Well, it gets back to all of the different themes. To take all of those costs and to put them into just air time would either involve averaging across the country and making it very easy for state and local governments to impose a lot of fees knowing that there would be no penalty in their local area.

I don't think consumer groups would necessarily want to encourage the kind of abuses we have seen. In some states, where 911 fees are being used to fund general government revenues, that is a

1 truth in billing issue, which is different from this 2 panel's focus. 3 There is another issue. It goes back to 4 the fact that we use contracts. It is common for 5 everything we buy to have a quantity discount. So if I subscribe to a magazine for 12 months, the price is 6 7 going to be per-month higher than if I sign up for a 8 few years' subscription. The same is true with wireless service. 9 10 If you sign up for a one-year contract, you have a 11 different set of benefits and price points and for a 12 two-year point of view. 13 If carriers cannot recover these variable 14 costs that are imposed on them, it's a cost of doing 15 business but a cost that is not under their control 16 government mandates Kaglia because the the 17 government changes the Kaglia cost recovery rules in 18 midstream. 19 As the FBI has petitioned the FCC and is 20 pending before the FCC right now, carriers will be 21 reluctant to enter into these long-run contracts 22 because they can't change the terms of those contracts 23 mid-year.

when you are buying your cell phone either.

MR. HOROWITZ: Well, you can't do that

24

if you dump out of it before your year is over, it's still going to cost you \$150 as a penalty.

So my feeling is I don't know why industry, which is so ready to go out and criticize the taxing system and all of that, doesn't come up with a system that can make it workable because here are the guys who are the brain trusts in these businesses.

Why don't you find a way that it will work so that it's honest and everyone can understand it across the board? I don't think it's impossible. I just think it takes manpower and brain power to do it.

MR. ALTSCHUL: Well, certainly there can be responsibilities on all sides. If the government is willing to provide stability the way it used to be in the regulated residential telephone world, where rates didn't change for eons. They changed at the speed of glaciers, it would be a lot easier task for what you are looking for. That is not the world we live in.

MR. HOROWITZ: But it isn't the same because that was caused by competition in the marketplace finally. Companies like MCI that went into long distances said, "We are going to lower the rates." and then suddenly Ma Bell and the baby Bells

1	were put into a situation that they had to do
2	something in order to compete.
3	And what they finally ended up going to
4	was court. The court said, "Okay, guys. We are going
5	to let you compete. We are just going to let you get
6	rid of all of the baby Bells," who had now become
7	monopolies like Ma was.
8	MR. ALTSCHUL: I'd love to engage you on
9	that discussion.
10	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Joe, I think you had
11	Tom?
12	MR. GORDON: Fast question.
13	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Very fast.
14	MR. GORDON: Patrick, back to Andrea's
15	question, have you ever analyzed consumer questions or
16	complaints about their billing as to whether they
17	write a check, have third party billing, or have
18	online billing?
19	Would you say that third party billing
20	will result third party payment; I'm sorry third
21	party payment results in less of a question or
22	complaint?
23	MR. PEARLMAN: Well, I guess in terms of
24	have we analyzed the complaints that have come in, I
25	guess no. Anecdotally we get complaints. You know,

1	it's more of the attorneys in the office talking
2	amongst ourselves or talking online with other
3	consumer advocates.
4	MR. GORDON: Well, when someone pays a
5	bill through their credit card company, would they be
6	more prone not to complain?
7	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: I'm afraid I'm going
8	to have to close it off. I only gave you one
9	question, Joe. I'm sorry. Our time is up. And I
10	really don't want to impinge more on the homeland
11	security presentation.
12	So I would like to thank all of you for
13	being with us today. You have been an excellent
14	panel. You have given us a lot to think about. And
15	it's lovely to hear agreements and disagreements.
16	Thank you very much.
17	(Applause.)
18	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: We are moving on to
19	the homeland security issues. I really want to again
20	thank Mike Duke for taking over this job or starting
21	this panel at our last meeting.
22	They have done a lot of work. They are
23	going to give you a status report today. And then
24	probably in November I don't want to put pressure
25	on them, but I think in November, they will probably

have some recommendations to make.

2.1

Again, I want to encourage you to go back and read the summary of the points that were presented at the summit, at the homeland security summit.

With that, I would like to turn it over to Mike Duke.

## PANEL DISCUSSION:

# UPDATE ON HOMELAND SECURITY ISSUES

MODERATOR DUKE: Okay. As I said this morning, the aftermath of September 11th has created this new catch phrase called "homeland security," which is more than a phrase. It is a reality.

On March the 25th, the Federal Communications Commission held a summit called "Homeland Security and People With Disabilities."

Homeland security is for everyone. We know that. But people with disabilities have some special issues and concerns with homeland security as they relate to communications and so forth.

Several people from this group attended that meeting. They and some others have agreed to give some brief presentations this afternoon. I will have to ask my panel. If we are going to stay on track, we have about a half-hour, as opposed to 45 minutes. But if you can adjust that appropriately, I

#### **NEAL R. GROSS**

would appreciate it.

2.1

And hopefully we will have a little bit of time at the end for some questions and/or input from the rest of you because that is an important part of what we are trying to do in time for November.

Presenting to you this afternoon will be Joe will go first, followed by Claude and then Brenda.

And then Ann has some comments for us as well. So we will begin with Joe Gordon.

MR. GORDON: Really, the summary that Mike sent all of us covers it all. And I just thought I would add or emphasize a few of the points made in the summary as far as homeland security or any emergency applies to people with disabilities, particularly in my case people that have a hearing loss.

I think it is important that we realize that not every emergency is a terrorist attack. We have to realize that there is fire and natural disasters and weather conditions, which can cause an emergency situation.

As far as people with a hearing loss are concerned, things that we know and should know are that we cannot normally always hear an alarm. We cannot follow verbal instructions. And in the dark, we're literally lost.

That is important for emergency personnel to realize and know. And they have been educated on this in local geographical areas, either by consumer organizations or by government regulation, the various things that should be provided in emergency situations whenever possible, sign language interpreters, assisted listening devices, and captioning, whether it's open or closed, on TV or hand-held devices, wherever we can do that.

And emergency captioning on television should be done correctly and promptly. It's important if FCC realized what is an emergency in one area should be captioned. As you know, the sniper situation last year was something that fell through the cracks and has been corrected.

The FCC has regulated since the early '90s telephones to be amplified and be aid-compatible. I know many people in the Wall Street financial area when we did have the 9/11 situation tried to pick up a street phone where there were wire line phones that had a hearing loss, a mild or moderate hearing loss. And they could not get through because the phone was not amplified or was compatible with their hearing aid. It was working, but it didn't have these features.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I think the FCC generally in cases like this is reactive, not proactive, should periodically send out reminders of what is required by communication industry.

We all should know that a 911 call on a wire line phone will give you the name, address, and location of the person making the emergency call. But in most cases, a 911 call on a wireless phone will not give the information.

My consumer group that I am associated with educates our members to give that information to the operator when they make a wireless 911 call. And we also tell them when they make a TTY or relay call during an emergency, not to go through the relay operator but to make their call direct.

The last thing that I want to share with you, it's very basic but things that we put out in our consumer deaf and hard of hearing organizations are sheets with tips, which we have given to emergency police, fire personnel in our areas telling them how to communicate with a person that is deaf or hard of hearing in an emergency situation or even when they stop your vehicle, how to communicate to the person.

Thank you, Shirley or thank you, Mike.

MODERATOR DUKE: Thank you.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Thank you, Joe.

MODERATOR DUKE: Okay. Claude is next.

MR. STOUT: Joe did a wonderful job in touching on the general characteristics of the deaf and hard of hearing population. The deaf population uses sign language. The hard of hearing population uses hearing aids, cochlear implants. Some others focus on sign language. Some focus on cued speech. Some focus on tactile issues. Deaf people tend to really rely on visual cues.

Joe did a wonderful job in mentioning the different technologies that we are able to use as of September 11th and after. Joe explained that we are happy to see captioning on television. And we are generally pleased with what we see on the national network broadcasts that provide captioning with their news reports.

However, a lot of local TV stations still are not providing captioning for their local news broadcasts. When we go to those local TV stations and request for them to caption their local news because if you know a lot of emergencies are happening in local areas, especially in regards to homeland issues, the local stations say, "We don't have enough resources" and that "We are doing what we can."

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

He talked about what happened in New York City. And on September 11th, the event happened in New York City, but with an airport in Nebraska, if an individual is flying out of Nebraska and the Nebraska airport was closed or basically all of the flights that day were cancelled, how would we get that information?

We would really depend on the captioning of our local news station. And if we had seen that on our local station, we wouldn't have made the drive to our local airport. So some issues on a national level are and become a local issue.

As Joe also mentioned, with the sniper situation, that again reflects the frustration that the disabled community has because we know that they had regulations in place. But having access to regulations on paper is one thing, but enforcing those regulations is definitely another.

We filed complaints to the FCC about the failure of five stations in this local area, in the D.C. metro area, in regards to the sniper issue. We continually filed complaints. And they ruled contrary to our expectations. And so we filed complaint after complaint. What happened is the FCC ended up criticizing itself.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

As the threat of terrorism increases, we are going to experience these things again. But we as a disabled community want full support. And we want support from television stations and local businesses to be ready for these kinds of situations.

If there is a terrorist situation or a national disaster, we want to be able to respond and be informed as quickly and just as well as anybody else in the community.

We would like the FCC and the business community and local organizations to be more open-minded in new technologies that are available and that can be used that can become a system of redundancy for television devices, closed captioning devices, 911 services.

Like, for example, if the power goes out, we can no longer rely on captioning from our television. And neither can we rely on our computers to gather information. But we still have two-way pagers that we could use.

If we try to place a call to our 911 service, we can't use our TTYs because the TTYs are charged with electricity. If we have a battery, the battery will last one, maybe two days, but that is it.

To compound the problem, the 911 centers

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

2.1

1	themselves are not updated. Their equipment, their
2	platforms, their software platforms, are not updated.
3	So as technology progresses, we are using
4	instant messenger. We are using two-way pagers. We
5	are using cell phones. We are using line phones,
6	internet services. But we only have access to the 911
7	centers if we use our TTY or out VCOs. We cannot use
8	our pages. We can't use our text telephones. We
9	don't have access to emergency services that way.
10	So I think we need to work with the FCC
11	and work with other federal agencies to make sure that
12	the 911 centers receive enough funding to update their
13	technology and to maintain their accessibility to
14	everyone in our community in our time of need.
15	I think I will stop there. Thank you.
16	MODERATOR DUKE: Thank you, Claude.
17	Brenda?
18	MS. KELLY-FREY: Thank you for the
19	privilege of being able to speak to you this afternoon
20	about the homeland security summit. That is an issue
21	that is near and dear to my heart: Public safety.
22	I've done a lot of training in the State
23	of Maryland with the 911 centers to make them
24	accessible and knowledgeable about accepting TTY relay
25	calls as well as making phone calls back to the deaf

consumers.

2.1

And I am working with the public, the police department, and so forth to make sure that they understand how to communicate effectively with individuals who are deaf and hard of hearing. So I guess this is another reason why I am involved with this particular issue at this point, not just relay issues but other issues as well. My parents are both deaf. So I have a vested interest in making sure that they're safe as well as their friends.

Dane Snowden on March 25th, he's the chief of the consumer and governmental affairs. He said, "A charge to homeland security should be for people with disabilities to have a functionally equivalent opportunity to survive." I think that was pretty profound.

He said, "We don't want to look back and say that the FCC was asleep at the switch." I guess that is literally and figuratively.

I want you to be aware that many train stations, subways, malls, shopping centers, strip malls, and so forth, do not have TTY telephones. So if there were to be an emergency, a deaf person probably would not be able to communicate with family, friends, or neighbors to find out what the emergency

is, if they got a page that said something was going on, or to find out if their family and friends are safe.

What happens when there is an emergency and a deaf or hard of hearing person is riding the train or the subway? How are they going to get evacuation information? What happens?

What ends up happening right now is they end up herding like little sheep and following all the hearing people to someplace unknown because the hearing people hear what is going on audibly but they don't get the information.

So the solution to this would be some kind of a scrolling message throughout the train station, throughout the trains, and so forth so that they know how to be independent, what is going on, what the nature of the emergency is, and what they should do.

Relay, as far as relay, we need to have telephoner service priority restoration of relay. If there were to be a disaster, natural or manmade disaster, and relay centers would go down, we want to make sure that the relay centers are put back up in operation at the same time that, say, the 911 centers are put up so that when a deaf person wants to make a phone call, they are able to do so because 911 is

118 their dial tone. Just like you and I pick up a phone, it is our dial tone, relay is their dial tone. additional information need and We education about speech to speech. We need to make sure that the 911 centers are fully capable of processing calls and handling calls from people who are speech-disabled. There are people who sound perfectly normal in their very beginning of their conversation. When they are upset and excited, their voice, speaking voice, deteriorates to the point where they need the assistance of someone who will be able to 13 re-voice for them to make their message understood.

> Nine, one, one centers and so forth, emergency personnel need to be aware of this. Ιt sounds like they're going to be speaking just fine in the very beginning. And then, all of a sudden, something happens and they are no longer able to express themselves.

> We need to have backup generators at the relay centers. I believe most of them do have that, but we want to ensure that that is something that is there in case the power were to go out.

> And while we're speaking of backup generators, I believe that the captioning centers

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

should also have backup generators as well so that their captioning will continue during emergency situations.

We would also like to encourage that there be a backup plan filed with the FCC in case the relay centers are not able to handle their own calls, that there be some agreements among other TRS providers so that their calls are then routed to other TRS providers, a different company, to ensure that individuals are able to still make telephone calls.

There was a situation. It was a hurricane in Florida. And there was a single provider for TRS in Florida. And that center went down. The whole State of Florida, their deaf and hard of hearing population could not communicate at all because nobody else was prepared. There was no agreement for another vendor to take over the relay calls for that particular state.

So imagine yourself in that particular situation involved in a hurricane wanting to call to get some help to check on how long this is going to be and not being able to make a phone call.

Relay centers need to be able to handle cellular calls so that they can handle cellular calls to the relay and out to the 911 centers with the

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

	120
1	ability to be able to locate the individual. If and
2	when our cellular phones are able to have some kind of
3	a call locator for the 911 centers to be able to
4	locate us, we want that to be true when they are
5	calling through the relay centers.
6	We do suggest strongly that individuals
7	who are deaf and hard of hearing who rely on relay not
8	call relay when they have a 911 call. However, we all
9	know that in an emergency, you will be doing exactly

And that would be to pick up the phone and dial 711, access relay, and say, "Please call 911 for me." So we need to make sure that the calls are handled properly.

what you do on a daily basis to make your phone calls.

I believe that is about it unless there are any questions.

MODERATOR DUKE: Okay. We will come back for questions in a moment. Now we have Ann from National Association of Broadcasters.

I just want to give a little MS. BOBECK: overview of what is in the big picture of homeland security that we hear in Washington. And in NAB and others who are in the room have been participating in, particularly the FCC.

There is a thought that the emergency

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

alert system, which is built on a very dated architecture technology-wise, is not sufficient to encompass today's technological world, that we really need to branch beyond near public safety avenues of radio and television to cover how public safety officers communicate to one another, how you can communicate via the internet, how wireless and wire line can be all part of a common protocol, an all hazard warning system. If you think about it, there are numerous ways and creative ways that we can address these issues.

Congress right now has pending legislation for an all hazard warning system a national alert system, to fund via the Department of Homeland Security an all hazard warning system. I strongly encourage as that legislation may or may not pass, but it certainly as to DHS, the Department of Homeland Security, is addressing these issues that the persons in this room get actively involved and let them know the needs of the disability communities.

Another group that is very active in this arena, the all hazard system warning arena, is the Partnership for Public Warning. Their Web site is www.partnershipforpublicwarning.org. They are very actively looking to see. In fact, they have a report

from last year on a best practices protocol for national homeland security disaster plans. They are also very tied into not only the FCC, the DHS, but the public safety network community on the ground in the state and local jurisdictions.

In addition, the FCC is rumored to have been perhaps releasing a notice of inquiry or some other similar vehicle in the near future to discuss revamping the EAS system or asking, "What can we do to encompass a broader spectrum of telecommunications services?"; be it EAS or another system. So we will wait and see how the FCC -- how that pans out here in the next coming few weeks or months.

Finally, the NOAA, the National Oceanic Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security yesterday had a press release announcing that they have a memorandum of understanding for their NOAA weather radio alerts. So if you see in the newspapers today, as Joe pointed out, they have already hit the press with details.

And anyone who wants a copy of that press release, I will be sure to give a copy to Shirley so she can distribute to the group. That is very forward thinking in terms of how do we get, at least for the visually impaired, an ability to get a weather radio

out there. And thinking creatively in the future is something that we can expand to video capacity.

So those are just a number of issues. DHS is definitely taking an active role in updating, streamlining an all hazard alert. And I think it is

incumbent upon this group to be a participant in it.

MODERATOR DUKE: Thank you, Ann. As you can tell, this is a complex issue that involves multiple areas of information distribution. And we have not even today and won't have time today to even talk about the redundancy issue, things that must be built into the system. That is being discussed within the workgroup as well.

So for the time that we have left, we would like to open the floor up for any questions or discussion that any of you may have that relate to this subject that would give the Committee a bit of an indication of some possible directions to move in.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: I had one comment,
Mike. In listening to it and then going through the
summary of the summit, I noticed that there is a lot
of focus on the deaf and not as much focus on blind.
We haven't at all talked except one brief mention by
Ann about issues affecting people who are blind.

Although I can't speak to that, really I

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 can tell you some of the things that are in this summary that I thought were particularly fascinating 2 3 to me. 4 I think, Ann, one comment here -- and 5 Scott and I were talking about this earlier -- a number on a TV screen and an announcer saying, "Call 6 7 the number on your TV screen" just simply doesn't 8 work. 9 MODERATOR DUKE: Right. CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: So that is one of the 10 11 little things that people need to think about and that 12 needs to be concerned. That is so easy to correct, 13 but I don't think most of us think about it. 14 That was one of the things I saw. Another 15 issue that was raised at the summit that I thought was 16 particularly intriguing -- and I don't know the answer to how you do this, but there is research going on 17 18 constantly in the Department of Defense and in other 19 government agencies. 20 Many or some of it may be applicable to 21 people with disabilities. For example, I learned from 22 Scott today that one of the early versions of Braille 23 was developed to help I think pilots. Was that right,

Scott?

MR. MARSHALL: No. Napoleon's army.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

24

1 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Napoleon's army. 2 Napoleon's army to communicate at night. And other 3 things have come out of some of the developments for 4 military, for example. So that is just another thing 5 to think about as to how those things might be useful. Anyway, I didn't mean to take up so much 6 7 time, but I just kind of felt compelled to make a 8 couple of comments here. 9 MODERATOR DUKE: Yes. This is a very 10 thorough summary that was supplied to us thanks to Joe 11 by way of the Northern Virginia Resource Committee, is 12 it, Joe, for --13 MR. GORDON: Center. 14 MODERATOR DUKE: Center. Northern 15 Virginia Resource Center for the Hard of Hearing. And 16 we appreciate them sharing that with us and allowing 17 to use that. It is a very, very good, very 18 accurate summary of the meeting that occurred during 19 that day. Blindness issues certainly will be a part 20 21 of what we do as will any number of other disability 22 issues. There are some that are outside the parameter 23 of the group in some respects, like how do you get 24 people from point A to a shelter or whatever, but

other groups are working on that as well.

Any others?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: David has a question.

MR. POEHLMAN: Not so much a question, but the issue of homeland security is touching a lot of diverse information-processing arms, I suppose, if you will. In a group that I am working with, one of the things that we are talking about is a way to provide information in parallel modalities such that a couple of things happen.

One of them is that there are appropriate modalities that will provide information for each requirement for that modality, such as audible information for people who require audible information, visually provided text information for those who require it, and other types of feedback and processing as well.

And one of the unique aspects to this that would be addressed would be also appropriate information for where you are. For example, there could be a worldwide security alert system emergency alert system, but if I am in Copenhagen, I don't really need to know what is going on in Helsinki necessarily. But at the same time, if I am on North Avenue and what is happening pertains specifically to North Avenue, I need to know.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	So this is the kind of thing and the kind
2	of complexity that we deal with when we talk about
3	alerting systems. And I think trains, malls, buses,
4	taxicabs, aircraft, public places of all kinds figure
5	into this.
6	And there needs to be a very detailed,
7	very concerted, ground floor up effort to provide the
8	appropriate venue under the appropriate circumstances
9	in the appropriate geographic setting.
10	MODERATOR DUKE: That issue was raised
11	this morning specifically as it applies to FM
12	translators and television transmitter translators
13	that are unattended and that often are fed by
14	satellite systems.
15	An example was given where a county in
16	Utah and one in Alabama had the same name. And the
17	county in Utah got the flash flood warning for
18	Alabama, et cetera. So that issue is on the plate.
19	I wasn't trying to cut you off, but
20	MR. POEHLMAN: No, no. That's fine.
21	That's about all I had.
22	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Do we have any other?
23	Let me see. Susan Mazrui? Susan, go ahead.
24	MS. PALMER-MAZRUI: I'm actually speaking
25	from a Vienna resident perspective, rather than

Cingular. I want to reiterate what Claude said about the importance of having the ability to access local information and looking at emergencies beyond the initial tragedy or event.

For example, today I might be able to tell that there is a hurricane coming, but in the last hurricane, I actually called the city to find out if we could drink the water, was told it was okay. Then it was later broadcast on television but not elsewhere that I am aware of, not even a Web site, saying it was not okay to drink the water.

So those types of things also need to be addressed when we are looking at emergency situations, not just the grander major terrorist attack but the long-term effects that affect. If we're sheltering in place, if we're doing something because of a chemical spill, or whatever, that type of information as well needs to be accessible.

MODERATOR DUKE: Right. It's not all terrorist-related. The terrorist thing gets the spotlight right now just because it's such a hot topic. The intent of homeland security overall is to go well beyond terrorism and cover any of this. It does make it a complex issue.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Do we have one other

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

question? Did somebody have their hand up? No? Claude?

MR. STOUT: I want to make an additional comment. David is correct in what he mentioned. Our communication information system needs to be more universal in how we access information on a daily basis.

For example, on our highways, there is a visual massaging system that says if you have a car wreck, dial 77 or if there happens to be an accident somewhere on the road, call this number for the police. I see the sign, and I can't call the police myself. So the signs need to provide more information on what is happening exactly on the road in front of us.

A lot of us here in this room depend on listening to the radio as we drive in our cars. That's audio communication. If we could get some sort of textual support in combination with the radio, that would help us.

Our hope is that his working group on our list of recommendations will recommend to the business community to work with the disabled community in developing new technologies that will ready us and also help us to recover from disasters.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: That's very thoughtful comments, Claude. Thank you.

We did take a few minutes extra because I felt guilty that we had cut short the homeland security presentation. I thank you for your graciousness because we only had one shot at the people from the truth in billing issues, but we are going to. In our next meeting, we will be talking about this at length. We will be working with the working group to make certain that we give them adequate time and that we can do whatever we can to support them. So thank you again for your generosity today.

We are going to take a brief break because we have some other people who want to make a couple of comments. So if you could be back here sharply at a quarter after, please? Thank you.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off the record at 3:05 p.m. and went back on the record at 3:16 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Mr. Adelstein sends his regrets. He's been very generous with his time in coming and speaking to this group, but, unfortunately, he was on the eastern shore today, and he's stuck in traffic. He can't get back here. So, well, you know

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

Friday afternoons. At any rate, he sends his regrets because he, as I said, has been very generous with giving his time and coming to speak with us. So we'll hope to see him in November.

In addition to that, Susan Mazrui has asked me for a couple of minutes, and then Scott needs a couple of minutes. Am I right, Scott? No, we took care of Scott. All right, okay. Susan, go ahead. Put your hand up again.

I'm short, they can't see me. I am dismayed. I have had the opportunity to meet with many commissioners and their staff and have been very impressed with the dedication they have toward making the FCC and the comment process and everything involved as assessable as possible for people with disabilities. But recently, I've seen a change. Now, one of the things that may be leading me to believe this is we did put in comments. We made recommendations and asked for status back. Well, maybe this meeting is too crowded and we couldn't do it this time, and we'll get it next time.

But I've also noticed things in terms of the accessibility of the meetings themselves, both this meeting here and the meetings in between. For

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

one thing, not having access to documentation that's on an ongoing basis like we've had in the past. For example, if we're reviewing a document and need to make comments, at least three of us can't do that. We can't participate fully unless we have that access. It's been there in the past, it's worked in the past, it's not working now. And if you want participation by people who are blind, and I honestly believe that that's the case, the quality has to improve. You need to get more immediate information.

In addition to that, and this may be a misinterpretation on my part, other people comment, I think it's been harder to try to schedule meetings in between. We're trying do teleconferences, which Ι think aren't really assessable for people who are deaf. And, finally, my concern is that if we're having this much difficulty in this meeting and we're guests of the FCC and probably get some special attention, what happens when we're outside? And the example that I can give is I requested a document last month. To date, I don't have that document in Braille. They have called me back to say they've received it. They've been very responsive, but the response isn't when anything is going to be available. I don't know.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	And had this occurred during a comment
2	cycle, that would mean that I would either have to pay
3	a lot of money to personally have this done, or I
4	would have to not comment or file late, perhaps too
5	late to make an impact on the decisions. And I really
6	think that that's against the intent expressed by the
7	FCC as a whole. I know they're great people, not just
8	at the commissioner level and the staff level, but the
9	people I work with, and I'm just really very, very
10	concerned.
11	I don't think it's a message that the FCC
12	wants to convey. You know, it is the Federal
13	Communications Commission. They really set a good
14	example in the past, and I really hate to see it lost.
15	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Susan, thank you, and
16	we're sensitive to the fact that there have been some
17	changes. I think Scott is going to address that for
18	just a minute.
19	MS. PALMER-MAZRUI: And I would hope if
20	David or Claude or Mike have some suggestions, I kind
21	of hogged the mike there, but please comment.
22	MR. MARSHALL: Am I on? Okay, good.
23	Susan, thank you for your comment, and let me just
24	assure you that we want our meetings to continue to be
25	the model of accessibility that they have been in the

1	past. I was in your group this morning and, as you
2	know, we have had the loss of our in-house assessable
3	documents person quite recently, and we're trying to
4	work out those details. But all that having been
5	said, I hear your concern, and I hope you'll convey
6	it, and you have, and that we can work out these
7	difficulties and fill that position quickly, so we can
8	provide documents in a timely fashion, as we have
9	previously.
10	But I am very much aware of the current challenges
11	that we're facing, given the fact that we've had to
12	use contractors and that sort of stuff, especially for
13	this meeting.
14	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Susan had further
15	comment.
16	MS. PALMER-MAZRUI: I just hope that ?-
17	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Put your hand up.
18	MS. PALMER-MAZRUI: I just hope that
19	people making the decision about the in-house and
20	whatever services that are occurring to provide access
21	understand that when they don't, it's like saying,
22	"Okay, now we're having a meeting, but all the blond
23	people better leave the room," or all the women or all
24	the people of certain colors. It's the same type of
25	situation, and it needs to be understood in that way,

as well.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Do you think that this is something that we should comment on formally? Scott, what would be the procedure for making sure that notice is brought to the attention of the FCC about this?

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly, the committee is welcome to write a letter, and I will certainly convey this conversation to Dane. But you certainly are welcome to write to him at any time with concerns, and that can be done.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Susan, it might not be a bad idea if you want to draft a letter and send it to the, as a member of this committee, to send it to Dane expressing your concerns. I think I'd put it in writing, if you don't mind doing that, or an email.

MS. PALMER-MAZRUI: I'd be happy to do that, and I'll ask some help from other members. But just as an advisory, because I think it's not the intent of the group, by any means.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: I don't believe it is either. I think it's circumstances that are dictating what have happened here, rather than loss of interest or wanting to make this assessable to everyone. I

mean, that's my own personal observation. David has a comment. We're going to have to move it along because I don't want to take time. We've got a presentation from David Brugger coming up, so David?

MR. POEHLMAN: I just wanted to mention that -? Dave Poehlman with the American Council of the Blind. I just wanted to mention that, this morning, for example, we were told that we didn't receive a document because it wasn't assessable, it wasn't available in an assessable format. And, you know, my feeling is that, you know, the whole committee shouldn't be denied a document just because, you know, some of us might not be able to process it. If the only format it's available in is a format that's not the best format in the world, then we should be made aware of that and then provided with a document, and somebody can find someway to process and get it to those who need an assessable form.

I think we're willing to help, and I don't think Susan meant to imply that you're going to lose blind people's support and participation, but what we will lose with this committee is effective participation by those of us who require assessable, alternate formats.

And I just have one more short little

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

thing. If we could somehow get some kind of response, impression of the things that we requested be looked into from the modernization, from the FCC modernization subgroup, it would be helpful because we would like to move forward and we would like to work with the FCC to put some of these things in place that we brought out and that were recommended through the entire CAC. So that's what Susan was referring to in the first part of her message.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Thank you, David. Andrea, one fast comment, and we've got to move on.

MS. WILLIAMS: In that letter, one quick thing that I would like to add, I'm very concerned, particularly of individuals who are blind, trying to participate in open proceedings where there are deadlines that need to be faced that the Commission have ?- you know, believe me, I understand with contractors, these things happen, but additional time be given those individuals who are waiting for documents, particularly in rulemaking proceedings, complaint proceedings, that they be given additional time to submit their comments and should be able to file late.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Thank you. I

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

appreciate that. Claude, you have one comment, if it's brief, please.

MS. STOUT: Yes, Shirley. I would like to make a suggestion to you, Shirley, as our chair, before every meeting or before each workgroup meets to make sure that all accessibility support is being provided. Otherwise, we can't have these meetings, or we can't have our working group meetings because if there's accessibility provided to the deaf, accessibility needs to be provided to the blind, no less, no more.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: You're absolutely As far as your working groups are concerned, right. I'm afraid that my time just doesn't permit me to do that. I would have to leave it up to the working groups to address that issue with the Commission if it's necessary. But as far as the regular meetings, I Dane the concerns that will convey to you've expressed. And I think your letters, your e-mails, or however you wish to communicate with him, would also be useful in expressing that. But as I understand it, this is a matter of not lack of support but lack of a person who left that has not been replaced yet. So as far as I can tell, I'm hoping that, by November, this will be resolved. Is that correct? Am I right on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that, Scott?

2.1

MR. MARSHALL: No one would hope more than I this will be resolved by November.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Yes, exactly. At any rate, we will do everything we possibly can to make sure that this situation doesn't occur again. So, anyway, and I really appreciate your comments on it. Thank you.

Now, we've got a presentation from David Brugger, who is with the broadband working group, and he's going to bring us up-to-date on what they're doing. We're not going to be asking for a vote by the committee today, but we do have some other.

But before we do that, I have got to find out who needs taxis for this afternoon? Let me see the hands. We've got one, two, three, four. All right. Is anyone going to Nashville? Who's going to Nashville? Only one, Cindy Cox. So we'll have four cabs then, okay? All right. We need four cabs here at 4:15, 4:10, thereabouts. Yes, about 4:15. Does that work? Okay, 4:00? We'll probably be out by 4:00. Yes, I think so.

Okay, all right. Moving right along. Was there anybody else that I was supposed to recognize for comments? Debra?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MS. BERLYN: Very quickly. We discussed this in our consumer outreach working group today, and I promised that I would bring it up before this full We're not sure where it actually fits in, but I would like to have some sort of task group or working group or subworking group, subcommittee take a look at the process that the FCC is going to undertake to rewrite the local competition access rules following the DC Circuit Court decision. And I'm not sure what our timing will be like, but, as Shirley has explained, what I was hoping is that we might get some sort of task group together shortly, work on it, and I guess aim for our November meeting for some sort of action.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: We'd have to bring it before the full committee before we could make presentations, so that's why it would have to be in November. Whether or not that's going to be timely or not, I don't know. I suggest that anyone who's interested in doing this contact Debra. We just don't really have time right now to do that.

MS. BERLYN: That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: I would also like to say that in the broadband discussion group this morning, they are going to look at the issue of

# **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

digital television. And anyone who would like to participate in that broadband group, please let them know and join them. You can do that by e-mail to Scott. He can make sure he puts you on the list for the braodband group, as well, because we are going to be looking at digital. We are going to do that over a period of some months, I think.

So, anyway, I'm sorry, David. Go ahead.

David Brugger.

MR. BRUGGER: The broadband working group has been discussing a list of items, which I know were sent out by Scott Marshall to you, and it's issues of concerns to consumers. There are 11 different areas that we've identified of concern to consumers so far, and I won't go through them all because you've received that document having to do with consumer choice, consumer complaints and problem solving, 911 safety emergency services, disability access, access to content, full disclosure of technology and services, broadband transport and choice of ISP, law enforcement, privacy, rates, and rural broadband networks.

We've been using a template to first create a statement or a definition of a consumer broadband issue. Secondly, we've been adding relevant

and supporting facts. And, thirdly, we plan to move to working group points of view on each issue.

For example, if you look at the second one, consumer complaints and problem solving, there is a statement of what that issue is and addressing how that might be handled. The relevant and supporting facts were added to explain how varoius government complaints agencies handle consumer and solve problems. For example, federal agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission and Consumer Product Safety Commission do not mediate or resolve individual consumer complaints. So we summarized information about how they do handle that issue.

Then we looked at how the FCC handles it, how state and local consumer affair agencies handle those issues, how state government agencies, like consumer protection departments and attorney general offices handle those, looking at how local government consumer affairs agencies do that. We bring these statements to you today not with all of the relevant facts and things we've collected so far, but, basically, to look at what we've been doing, the fact that we think there's no other FCC activity asking consumer reps what they think about these issues. And we thought that you should be involved in this process

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

in terms of identifying the most comprehensive list of issues that we could have concerning broadband and what consumers, what consumers' concerns are about that. We believe it would be good for the FCC to have a primer of what consumers are thinking and on this committee's view of what people are thinking about broadband in terms of their issues.

Just to give you an idea of some of the questions we've been asking ourselves, and we think that we want you to consider with us, is what issues are not here that ought to be here? What issues are here that maybe you think don't belong on the list of consumer issues?

Once we have a list of all these issues that the CAC believes should be on the list, do you have recommendations about what the next steps ought to be with those issues? Should we be working toward action recommendations for the FCC? Is it just enough to make sure that the FCC has a list of issues about which we think they should be aware? Can this list of issues serve as a background for the FCC as a working document to address issues of concerns to consumers concering broadband? Does this simply become part of the record of the CAC in that it lays out the concerns of their consumers as we. see them and as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

representatives? Is it possible that each of these issues could be a purpose for other working groups, assuming this Consumer Advisory Committee continues over the next two years? Maybe each could be part of a study or an action plan.

If you have questions about that, we have people here who can answer those questions. But we're more concerned about whether you have anything to contribute to the process that we're going through, whether you have issues about broadband that might be of concern to consumers that you could contribute for the consideration of our working group.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: David, would it be useful in the discussions that you're going to have over the next coming months before our next meeting, would it be useful to circulate to all of the committee memebers the comments and things that you all are doing? I mean, in other words, make everybody kind of a submember of the broadband working group and putting them on your e-mail list, as well as the regular subcommittee group? It's Friday afternoon, and I can't talk.

MR. BRUGGER: They have a list of the statements of what the issues are currently.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

MR. BRUGGER: And I guess the question is is there something there that should be there that's not there.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: So what you're asking for is for us to provide comments to you before November, right?

MR. BRUGGER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. So I'm sorry,
I just wanted clarification. Go ahead.

MR. BRUGGER: Okay. Dave Poehlman.

MR. POEHLMAN: Thanks. And also I think if people in the room have particular expertise that they can lend to the development process moving forward because this is such a tremendous undertaking or could be such a tremendous undertaking, that would be helpful, too, if you feel that you have something you can contribute, not just whether or not there's an issue or do you have an issue or is there an issue that shouldn't be here, but, "Oh, I'm looking at this issue, and it's right up my alley. I know a lot about this. I've studied this for 20 years. Let me get involved in this." Okay. Please, you know, come to We're very happy to work with people who have expertise in the various matters. So, you know, so we're looking forward to that.

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

1 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Do we have any other comments? David, is that ?-2 MR. BRUGGER: It's open for discussion or 3 4 comments or anything they can contribute. 5 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: They've put, I can tell you this group has been working so hard. 6 7 put so much effort into what they've been doing. 8 There's been a lot of thought and a lot of discussion because I get the e-mails from everybody, and I know 9 10 they've been working very, very hard. So I'm hoping 11 that you will take a look at these issues and give 12 them your input. I think it's very important that we 13 all give input, keeping in mind that we're going to be 14 discussing this in November, so you need to be up to 15 snuff on it so that you can give your opinions. Does 16 anybody have any questions or comments? Okay. Hold your hand up again. They've missed you. 17 18 MS. CLECKNER: Annette with MCI. David, I 19 was just wondering did you include universal service 20 issues in your list of issues here? I don't see it 21 right off. I didn't know if you like lumped it 22 together in one of these 11. 23 MS. BURNSTEIN: I think that it was part of the discussion under the rural broadband networks. 24 25 It was part of what was in there, but if it should be

elsewhere, as well, you know, let us know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BRUGGER: Thank you, Annette.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Any other questions or comments? All right. Last chance. Going one, two. It's Friday afternoon after all. It's late in the day, right? I've been vacationing most of this week. What am I doing back here working? At any rate, okay, then we will hope that you'll give input to the group before the November meeting, reading all the issues. And since we have just a couple of minutes, Debra, maybe we should go back and ask people if they want to form a task force. We've got about five minutes before we have the public comments Do you want to do that now? Why don't we just do it now? We've got time. It will save you some e-mails.

MS. BERLYN: Yes. I guess the thing to do at this point is to see if there are other members of the CAC who are interested in doing that and, if so, we will form a group and start to meet over the course of the summer and early fall.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: All right. What kind of interest do we have in doing this? This would be to provide information to the FCC on what we believe should be some considerations in the rulemaking

process.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MS. BERLYN: Yes. And I realize I've been giving it very short, you know, the code name, the DC Circuit Court case, but a lot of folks may not realize what the implications of that are. So very briefly, the FCC released an order in early 2003. called the Tri-Annual Review Order, and it basically laid the rules for competitors' access to the local network in order for those competitors to services to consumers, competitive services to consumers.

Those rules were overturned by the DC Circuit in early March, and now the FCC will be rewriting those rules. So it basically governs consumers' access to local competitive services.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. So does that push somebody's button? Are you interested in participating in doing this? Oh, we've got hands. All right. Let's take notes and sign them up. Who have we got here? We've got Annette, Cindy, Chris, and Joy. Anyone else? Okay. Scott will send an email to the entire committee asking for interested in joining, and he'll set up an e-mail list for you so that it will make life easy. He does that for us, you know. And anything else that we need to do on that?

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1 Well, thank you, Debra. I'm pleased that we've set up an ?- Andrea? 2 3 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. I'm going to ask you 4 another question. It's more of an administrative. 5 CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Well, we're through with that. Let's move on. 6 7 MS. WILLIAMS: Andrea Williams from CTI. 8 Shirley, just from an administrative standpoint, I know November will be this committee's last meeting. 9 How do you want to handle -? I know you don't want to 10 11 overwelmed with every working group having 12 recommendations. How do you want to handle that in 13 terms of particularly some of us who will be working 14 over the summer? Do you want written recommendations 15 submitted by a certain time? That would be helpful to 16 know so we can plan accordingly. CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: 17 Yes, that's a very 18 good question, Andrea, and we are sensitive to the 19 time issues. We probably, of course, won't have a 20 working group meeting that day, so we'll have the 21 entire day to deal with the issues that we feel are 22 important. What I would like, if you can do it, for 23 any of your working groups, it would be excellent if 24 you could suggest and submit, circulate a document

that has some of the things that you're considering.

1	This doesn't have to be the final document or the
2	final recommendations, but it could be what you're
3	thinking is as you go over the summer doing this work,
4	letting everyone know. Do you think that would work,
5	Scott? Yes.
6	MR. MARSHALL: We would need to know if
7	there's going to be recommendations six weeks out.
8	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Okay. Did you hear
9	that? The FCC needs to know six weeks out if there's
10	going to be recommendations presented.
11	MR. MARSHALL: Right. And that's only to
12	get it into the federal register.
13	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: That's to put it in
14	the federal register. Right, that's not Scott's rule,
15	he tells me. I don't know if I believe that or not.
16	But at any rate, yes, so about what? The first of
17	October?
18	MR. MARSHALL: Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Yes, approximately
20	the first of October, it would be necessary to know
21	from the working groups if you are going to make
22	recommendations to the committee that we would vote on
23	in the November meeting. So we will be doing a lot of
24	stuff.

MS. WILLIAMS: So circulating really the

first week of September or right after --

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: If you could start circulating things in early September or even August, if you've progressed that much, so that we'd have time to give input to what you're doing.

MS. WILLIAMS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: And just let Scott know that you want these circulated to the entire committee for comment, and that would work. Yes, we want you to work on Labor Day is what David is saying. It's called Labor Day. Why should you have a day of rest, for goodness sakes? Okay. I think that takes care of most of our business. Anything you need, of course you can call us or e-mail us. Thank you all so much. I can't tell you how exciting it is to be part of this group because you all are doing some great things. I'm just very, very thrilled with it.

At any rate, now it's time for our public comment section, and I believe we have someone who wants to make a public comment. If you would introduce yourself, please.

MR. CREAGAN: Yes. My name is Tim Creagan. I'm the Director of Consumer Training for the ITAC project. My name may be familiar to those of you who've looked inside your packets and seen the

brochure. The reason I'm bringing this up, I'm working for a project that's funded by NIDRR, the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research. And one of the things that we have put together is a compendium of all the disability laws in the United States. Included in here are, obviously, Section 255 of the Telecommunications Act and Section 508 of the Rehab Act. These materials are available for anyone for free in any quantity you would want them.

As Director of Consumer Training, I've had the opportunity to travel around the United States and present to consumer groups on what their rights and obligations are under Section 255 of the Telecom Act and under Section 508 of the Rehab Act, and I've had the opportunity to share some of that with FCC staff. One thing that comes out is that more information is always good. It's really surprising how many people are not that aware of 255 and how many people are not aware that they need to speak up.

As members of this committee, I think that you would be very interested in this, and I think this would be an excellent resource for you to take back to each of your various constituencies. If any of you have any questions, you have my contact information,

## **NEAL R. GROSS**

1	and I would be very happy to discuss the materials
2	with you.
3	These are funded by our government and the
4	whole purpose is to have an engaged and informed
5	citizenry. Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Thank you very much,
7	Tim. We appreciate your taking the time to come here.
8	It's a very impressive-looking brochure. I like the
9	free beside all those things.
LO	MR. CREAGAN: Yes, that's our government
11	at work.
12	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: Very much so. That's
13	exactly right. But at any rate, thank you. We
L 4	appreciate your being here. Do we have any other
15	public comments from anyone? Are there any concerns
16	that you all have that we might need to discuss in the
L7	ten minutes before you get to run out the door? I
18	mean, you know, you can either talk or sit here and
19	look at each other. They did not lock the doors. I
20	swear we can get out.
21	(Laughter.)
22	CHAIRPERSON ROOKER: At any rate, all
23	right. Well, then I think we're ten minutes early
24	today. My goodness. You all have behaved admirably.
25	Thank you so much. Have a wonderful summer. We'll

	154
1	look forward to hearing from you. Susan, I have to
2	thank you again. You were not here when I thanked you
3	for the wonderful food, but she's saying be sure to
4	leave your badges, along with your things. Yes, don't
5	take your badges with you. We do recycle. And Susan,
6	again, I'd like to thank you. Lunch and breakfast
7	were excellent, so Cingular was very nice.
8	By the way, we need somebody to pay for
9	November's lunch and breakfast. Do we have somebody
10	volunteering? Somebody's going to volunteer. We're
11	going to lock the door until you do. All right. I'll
12	go scrounge up money for food. Thank you very much.

I'll send an e-mail. You won't get out of it.

(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was concluded at 3:49 p.m.)

16

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23