

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Address  
Intrastate Rural Call Competition Issues

I.14-05-012  
(Filed May 15, 2014)

**MOTION OF THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK AND THE CENTER FOR  
ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE IN PHASE 2**

Melissa W. Kasnitz  
Michael Iseri  
Legal Counsel  
Center for Accessible Technology  
3075 Adeline Street, Ste. 220  
Berkeley, CA 94703  
(510) 841-3224 x2019  
[service@cforat.org](mailto:service@cforat.org)

Christine Mailloux  
Ashley L. Salas  
Staff Attorney  
The Utility Reform Network  
1620 5th Ave, Ste. 810  
San Diego, CA 92101  
(415) 929-8876  
[cmailloux@turn.org](mailto:cmailloux@turn.org)

Filed: December 21, 2017

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. DISCUSSION.....	6
A. Emergency Telecommunications Issues.....	6
1. The Wine Country Fires.....	6
2. The Wine Country Fires Demonstrate the Importance of Implementing the Phase 1 Requirements .....	12
B. The Commission Should Accelerate the Work Underway in Phase 2.....	19
1. Working Group Follow-Up (Ordering Paragraph 22).....	20
2. Ordering Paragraphs 17 and 18.....	24
3. Outage Reporting.....	25
4. Respondent Obligations.....	28
III. CONCLUSION.....	29

## MOTION TO SET A PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE FOR PHASE 2

Pursuant to Rule 11.1<sup>1</sup> of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, The Utility Reform Network and the Center for Accessible Technology, (Joint Consumers) submit this Motion requesting that the Commission set a procedural schedule for Phase 2 of this proceeding. Specifically, the Joint Consumers are asking the Commission to set a schedule to ensure that the Commission is effectively implementing the Phase 1 Decision previously issued in this proceeding<sup>2</sup> and moving forward with Phase 2 to enhance the availability of reliable communications to California consumers, especially during emergencies.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Commission initiated this proceeding in May of 2014 to address concerns about intrastate call completion failures in rural areas of California.<sup>3</sup> In a Scoping Memo issued in May of 2015, the scope was expanded to specifically include issues regarding access to 9-1-1 emergency services, including concerns about loss of access to 9-1-1 in emergency circumstances.<sup>4</sup> The Commission adopted the Phase 1 Decision in December of 2016<sup>5</sup> including multiple directives specifically focused on improved communication reliability in emergencies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Rule 11.1(e) requires responses to written motions to be filed and served within 15 days of the date that the motion was served except as otherwise provided in the Rules or if the Administrative Law Judge sets a different date. However, based on the timing of the filing of this motion just in advance of the holidays, the Joint Consumers would support an extended deadline for responses. Joint Consumers propose that a deadline for responses be set for January 8, 2018.

<sup>2</sup> D.16-12-066 (the Phase 1 Decision), issued on January 4, 2017.

<sup>3</sup> Order Instituting Investigation to Address Intrastate Rural Call Completion Issues, I.14-05-012, issued on May 15, 2014.

<sup>4</sup> Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo and Ruling, issued on May 6, 2015.

<sup>5</sup> While the decision was adopted at a voting meeting in December of 2016, it was formally issued in January of 2017.

The Commission also called for a second phase of the proceeding to oversee implementation of the Phase 1 requirements and to consider the need for additional action.

Recently, multiple devastating wildfires have plagued both the northern and southern areas of California. These fires reinforce the urgency to implement the requirements that this Commission found necessary to maximize the availability of reliable and effective communications during emergency situations.<sup>6</sup> In the wake of these fires, Joint Consumers are calling for renewed action in this docket, with a focus on the items that impact emergency communications.<sup>7</sup> We request that the Commission move promptly to address these items from the Phase 1 Decision, and then to further address other items in Phase 2. This may reasonably be done by setting a schedule for Phase 2 that addresses outstanding items in sequence (with the initial focus on emergency communications) or by breaking out some of the outstanding matters to be addressed in a future Phase 3.

In an emergency, there are multiple categories of vital communication. These include communications by the public to emergency responders, communications by emergency personnel to the public, and communications among emergency responders to organize their response. Within each of these categories, people rely on both wireline and wireless communications, and they need clear understanding of how each such channel will perform under emergency conditions.

---

<sup>6</sup> Joint Consumers recognize that telecommunications systems are subject to direct damage in a wildfire, and that loss of service in such a circumstance cannot be prevented. Below, we focus on situations where the service failures are not based on destruction of facilities by fire.

<sup>7</sup> Joint Consumers support the full array of Phase 1 and Phase 2 requirements on a wide range of issues impacting service reliability. However, in this motion, we have not attempted to address the complete range of all the action items ordered in the Phase 1 Decision. Our efforts to prioritize those items that specifically focus on emergency situations should not be taken as a lack of interest or support for other obligations set out in the Phase 1 Decision or raised in the scope of Phase 2. Each ordering paragraph and action item raised in this proceeding plays an important role in ensuring that all Californians have reliable access to robust communications networks and capabilities.

While wildfires have impacted numerous areas of the state in 2017 (with southern California fires still burning as this motion is submitted), Joint Consumers have been able to collect information specifically from communities impacted by the cluster of fires that have colloquially been referred to collectively as “the Wine Country Fires.” In particular, the Wine Country Fires impacted communities within Napa, Sonoma, and Mendocino Counties during the month of October, 2017.

After the fires were extinguished, the North Bay North Coast Broadband Consortium (NBNCBC) developed a survey which they distributed to thousands of residents in the affected counties.<sup>8</sup> This on-line survey was distributed by county officials in each of the three impacted counties through various channels including libraries, economic development organizations, social media, and county agencies. As of December 12th, 2017, when the survey closed, over 3700 residents of Napa, Sonoma and Mendocino Counties had responded to the survey.<sup>9</sup> In addition to questions designed to identify the scope and scale of telecommunications outages during the fires and the impact on customers, the survey included two open-ended questions, asking residents to “share your story of your experience with this fire,” and then asking “what would you like to tell the California Public Utilities Commissioners and your elected official with regards to this fire and telecommunications.”<sup>10</sup> In response, many residents gave detailed

---

<sup>8</sup> Concurrent with this Motion, Joint Consumers have submitted the Declaration of Trish Steele and attached redacted versions of the results and responses to the Bilingual 2017 Firestorm Mendocino-Napa-Sonoma Telecommunication Outage Survey Issued by North Bay North Coast Broadband Consortium. The attached surveys contain the responses received through December 5<sup>th</sup> for Napa and Mendocino Counties and through December 10<sup>th</sup> for Sonoma County. The only material redacted is the identifying information of the survey respondents.

<sup>9</sup> The December 12, 2017 results include over 2000 responses from residents of Napa County, over 1000 responses from residents of Sonoma County, almost 600 responses from residents of Mendocino County, as well as a handful of responses from visitors and tourists. *See* Declaration of Trish Steel. Because the additional data collected in the last few days of the survey changes the cited pagination of the survey responses, the updated responses are not attached, but can be provided upon request.

<sup>10</sup> *See* survey results attached to the Declaration of Trish Steele.

input about communications failures (as well as other issues such as power outages that impacted their communications services and otherwise affected their ability to respond to the emergency) that put them at increased risk, and emergency responders detailed difficulties in serving their communities and protecting residents. Survey respondents also provided details of failures to restore communications after the emergency receded, including ongoing lack of service to this day.

The Joint Consumers recognize that these responses are not drawn from a representative sample of the impacted communities, and do not purport to use the responses to draw statistically reliable conclusions. However, the thousands of collected stories represent a rich trove of information that paints a clear and provocative picture of the difficulties that people faced during and after the Wine Country Fires. While each individual report is anecdotal, the collected weight of the information provided should serve as a valuable resource in considering the ongoing fundamental problems with maximizing the availability of reliable communication during emergencies. Collectively, they highlight multiple ongoing concerns that the Commission intended to address and reduce through full implementation of the Phase 1 Decision.<sup>11</sup> These compelling stories also provide ongoing focus on various matters already under consideration in this proceeding, including efforts to improve system reliability in emergencies, improve service for emergency responders, improve service repairs following emergencies, and improve customer understanding of how their system is expected to function.

---

<sup>11</sup> *See, infra*, Section II. A. 1, quoting from the Phase 1 Decision regarding the intent of the Commission to support emergency communications capabilities. For example, the Phase 1 Decision notes the importance of providing 24-hour/seven-day-a-week contact information between public safety officials and telephone corporations to protect “public and worker safety and safe, reliable service” and the impact of communications outages on decisionmaking regarding the deployment of public safety personnel and the need for coordination and communication in those circumstances. *See* Phase 1 Decision at p. 171, Finding of Fact (FOFs) Nos. 31-32.

Some of the particular requirements of Phase 1 that are most entwined with effective communications during emergency situations include requirements to improve the ability of local officials to quickly and easily contact carriers at any time during an emergency (Ordering Paragraph 16), requirements for collaboration and development of recommendations specifically to address communications during emergencies such as wildfires (Ordering Paragraphs 17-18), requirements to investigate operational practices that result in questionable and hazardous placement of communication lines (Ordering Paragraph 11), and requirements that contemplate ongoing work to address “California’s public safety needs and this Commission’s responsibilities” based on the information collected through the other obligations set out in the Phase 1 Decision. (Ordering Paragraph 22; *see also* Ordering Paragraph 21). Collectively, effective implementation of the Phase 1 Decision and action in Phase 2 will make improvements designed to mitigate communications failures like the ones that impacted first responders and victims in the Wine Country Fires identified below.

At this time, we do not have feedback from residents in communities impacted by the southern California wildfires, including the ongoing Thomas Fire in Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties (as well as additional fires in Los Angeles and Orange Counties that have occurred during the fall of 2017), but it is highly likely that there will be similar stories, and missed opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of communications capabilities during these emergencies that would have come out of the Commission’s work in this proceeding.

/ / /

/ / /

## II. DISCUSSION

### A. Emergency Telecommunications Issues

#### 1. The Wine Country Fires

Based on the information collected from people impacted by the Wine Country Fires, there is substantial reason to believe that failures of the communication network put people at increased risk to life and property, impeded the ability of emergency responders to effectively protect the public, increased fear and confusion, and limited (and continues to limit) the ability of affected areas to recover after the fires were extinguished.

The Phase 1 Decision specifically finds that “the availability of communications services to first responders, including those fighting wildfires, is important to situational awareness and public safety. . .”<sup>12</sup> It further recognizes that “during communications outages public safety officials have to make decisions about deployment of public safety personnel, and the State Emergency Management System charges local and county level officials with coordination and communication.”<sup>13</sup> Yet the NBNCBC survey results include information from multiple emergency responders in the Wine Country Fires who experienced problems and failures with the telecommunications services that they rely on for their own operations. For example, a law enforcement manager in Napa County noted that cellular services for staff in the field were useless due to an outage of cellular networks for the first couple of days after the fire began, with AT&T service out for two days and Verizon service out for five days; this manager also noted that their emergency plans did not account for such a prolonged cellular outage.<sup>14</sup> Emergency

---

<sup>12</sup> Phase 1 Decision at p. 169, FOF 22.

<sup>13</sup> Phase 1 Decision at p. 171, FOF 32.

<sup>14</sup> “As a law enforcement manager, all of my sworn staff members were in the field. While I had wi-fi calling available on my cell phone from Home and Work, when I was in the field or when staff was in the field, cell phones were useless for the first couple of days. While we planned for lots of scenarios and we

personnel in Mendocino County reported similar failures, including an account from an Ukiah Police Department Dispatcher Supervisor who reported that none of the business lines for the Fort Bragg Police Department worked for days at the start of the fires, and only calls made from a landline could reach 911.<sup>15</sup> The Department resorted to issuing a press release asking citizens to call the business office to request assistance, but this had limited effectiveness,<sup>16</sup> and citizens were constrained in their ability to contact the police. Another account from a local firefighter reported that their district lost all landline service and were only able to maintain communications with the local sheriff and other public safety personnel because one local individual was a ham radio user.<sup>17</sup>

As discussed below, several of the Phase 1 Decision’s Ordering Paragraphs direct the Commission and carriers to set up meetings among multiple stakeholders to discuss matters

---

made use of radios, we did not plan for a long term widespread outage of cellular communication (2 days for AT&T & 5 days for Verizon). We had access to satellite phones, but that technology remains marginal and simply isn’t 100% reliable.” Survey Response #209 || 137/391 Napa.

<sup>15</sup> “I work for the Ukiah Police Department as the Dispatch Supervisor. We also dispatch for the Fort Bragg Police Department. None of the Fort Bragg Police Department business lines worked for several days at the start of the fire. People could only call 911 from a land line for several days. Radio communications were good and served as a relay back and forth from dispatch to officers. The citizens of Fort Bragg were irritated they couldn't get a hold of anyone on the business lines for a majority of the first few days. FBPD did put out a press release asking citizens to call the business office in Fort Bragg however this number was only being manned from 8am-6pm. The communications in Ukiah was at bit better however we lost all telecommunications with Cal Fire in Willits and the Willits Police Department. This caused issues when dispatchers needed to transfer a fire or medical call to Cal Fire. Cal Fire ultimately moved a dispatcher to Mendocino County Sheriff's dispatch center to handle calls from their agency. This caused a lot of confusion on the first day of the fire. This information didn't get relayed to our dispatch center ever! I would have expected someone to notify us from Cal Fire, AT&T or the State 911 Office. Mid-day on the first day of the fire, I found out accidently while talking with the Mendocino County Sheriff's Office Communications Supervisor.” Survey Response #182 || 90/150 Mendocino.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> “I'm a local firefighter who is injured, I had three engines with 7 personnel out on the fire lines, and 8 fire fighters in district who are injured, old, or fire explorers, to cover our district . . . We lost all landline out of the area, and some internet. We also were unable to reach Howard Forest at all for a period of time. We have an explorer who is a Ham radio guy and is also amazing with radio's and communications, he was able to make sure we were able to communicate with the sheriff and other public safety personnel. All in all we were pretty lucky.” Survey Response #27 || 65/150 Mendocino.

relating to the effectiveness and urgency of emergency communications between first responders.<sup>18</sup> Except for two single-day meetings, Joint Consumers are unaware of any work that has been done to facilitate these discussions. The Wine Country Fires, as well as the wildfire events in southern California, should serve as an unfortunate motivator for stakeholders and parties to this proceeding to dedicate sufficient resources to ensure these required meetings and discussions are timely, frequent, transparent, and thorough.

In addition to the problems experienced by emergency personnel, many members of the public were at increased risk of harm because they could not receive information from public safety officials, nor could they reach out for assistance when it was needed. This includes vulnerable residents who are most in need of support during an emergency. For example, one Mendocino resident had no connectivity through either wireless or wireline service, and was unable to call 9-1-1; this resident was told that “[i]f there was a medical emergency, . . . to drive to the nearest fire station to report it.”<sup>19</sup> Other examples of residents who lost access to 9-1-1 while at heightened risk include a household where a resident was unable to use his equipment for treating sleep apnea<sup>20</sup> and one who was receiving chemotherapy treatment.<sup>21</sup> Yet another resident raised concerns that the lack of communications might prevent them from receiving

---

<sup>18</sup> See discussion, *infra*, Section II.A.2. regarding meetings related to Ordering Paragraphs 5-7 and 22 and Section II. B. regarding meetings related to Ordering Paragraphs 17-18.

<sup>19</sup> “Lack of connectivity by internet, phone, or cell phone left no 911, no means to inform family outside of the affected area, all we could do was sit in the house and wait for some one to drive through the neighborhood saying “leave now!” If there was a medical emergency, we were later told to drive to the nearest fire station to report it.” Survey Response #25 || 78/150 Mendocino.

<sup>20</sup> “It is also unacceptable that emergency services would not have been able to be reached if needed. . . . My husband was unable to use a sleeping apnea machine which is direly needed for him during this time of outage.” Survey Response #191 || 90/150 Mendocino.

<sup>21</sup> “I’ve been getting chemo therapy treatments for cancer and being without telephone or internet put me at risk. I felt vulnerable. I don’t know if 911 was available. I could sometimes receive a call but any call I put out did not go through.” Survey Response #10 || 63/150 Mendocino.

advance warnings of any call for evacuation, since their household includes a person with a disability who would need additional time to get into a vehicle to leave.<sup>22</sup>

Countless others similarly reported a lack of telecommunications service and had limited options for learning about evacuation orders, leaving some to flee with limited preparation and to face increased risk to their safety and loss even of personal items that could potentially have been saved with greater warning. For example, one resident of Glen Ellen, wrote that her daughter who lived at a separate house nearby had no wireless or wireline service when the fires broke out, and they could not contact each other to determine whether to evacuate.<sup>23</sup> They eventually evacuated with no advance notice when a firefighter told them to get out immediately. Another resident wrote that there was no phone, text, email, or knock alerts and the resident was forced to leave home on no notice after a single emergency vehicle made an announcement on its bullhorn to evacuate immediately.<sup>24</sup> A different resident reported that cellphones, phones, internet, and TV were not working, and this person had no knowledge of the fires until arriving at their

---

<sup>22</sup> “Please please find a way to keep communications working during emergencies with a di[s]abled person in the house need help to get him into a vehicle which takes time i need advance warnings for this reason thank you in advance for listening.” Survey Response #168 || 88/150 Mendocino.

<sup>23</sup> “We own a large horse ranch in Glen Ellen, CA. I first awoke to the smell of smoke. I immediately checked the house to see if it were on fire, then looked out the window to check on the barns. At that time I saw the red sky, and was trying to decide how far away it was, when a fireman arrived with lights only, and said we had to get out NOW. My daughter came running down The Hill from her house, also on the Ranch to see why the trucks were there with lights....no horns or sirens..They had missed her house, so she thought we had an emergency, but she had also smelled the smoke, but had NO CELL NOR LAND LINE SERVICE at that time (before fire got to us)...so we could not have received an emergency alert in that fashion. Nor could we contact each other by phone. The only alert we could have received would have been Firestation Sirens, but there were none from any of the nearby stations. The firemen were going house to house to be sure everyone was evacuated. For that they are to be highly commended. Due to the fact we had no prior warning we were forced to leave our horses behind to fend for themselves. What a horrible thing for them to go through. They were all injured, frightened and one has since died of a heart attack. . . . Glen Ellen.” Survey Response #28 || 75/153 Sonoma.

<sup>24</sup> “I don't understand why I didn't get a phone or text email alert to evacuate? No one knocked on my door. I just happened to wake up when I heard one emergency vehicle announcement outside my house on a bullhorn announcing to evacuate immediately due to fire. If I hadn't heard that, my family and I would be dead.” Survey Response #200 || 136/153 Sonoma.

parent's house.<sup>25</sup> Yet another resident described how they had no cellphone service, nor did they have power, television, or access to emergency alerts in an area with only one road in and out of the community.<sup>26</sup>

Some residents without connectivity were customers who rely on advanced telecommunications services, but were unaware of the need for battery backup power to keep these services running during a power outage. While customers are supposed to be told about the option of obtaining battery backup power when they purchase service from a provider,<sup>27</sup> the survey responses demonstrate that many customers do not understand, and others find the added cost of backup power to be a barrier to obtaining it. For example, one Napa resident described his difficulty evacuating his disabled sister, including problems obtaining assistance from a fire crew when his Comcast service was not working; he noted that he had been unaware that he could have retained service with a battery backup.<sup>28</sup> Another resident was also unaware of the availability of battery backups for internet service until seeing a neighbor using one: "My confusion was why a neighbor had a battery pack and therefore had internet. Why didn't I know

---

<sup>25</sup> "I woke up early Monday morning to absolutely no communication means. Home phone, internet and TV were all non working even though I had power (Comcast). My cell phone (Verizon) was not allowing me to make calls, access the internet or text at all. I had no clue what was happening. I drove to my parents house to find out what is going on and to let them know I had no means of communication and that's when I found out about the horrible fires. . . . How am I supposed to know if I need to evacuate during a disaster if ALL communications are non working?" Survey Response #105 || 90/153 Sonoma.

<sup>26</sup> "We live near Hood Mountain and evacuated before it was considered a mandatory evacuation. This was due to having NO power which meant no cell phones, no TV, no landline and only ONE way to exit down the mountain. Our neighbors woke us up. I had already signed up for Nixel alerts but none were sent that night and we probably would NOT have gotten them since power was out and our cells phones work off wifi which only works if there is power." Survey Response #104 || 90/153 Sonoma.

<sup>27</sup> See D.10-01-026, issued in R.07-04-015, adopting guidelines for customer education programs regarding back up power systems pursuant to Assembly Bill 2393.

<sup>28</sup> Survey Response #150 || 128/391 Napa.

this was available?”<sup>29</sup> Yet another resident who previously had a router that included a battery backup was unaware that their new router did not.<sup>30</sup>

Yet others reported that the service provided via battery backup was limited,<sup>31</sup> and others were concerned about the cost of backup power. One resident expressly questioned the additional cost for backup power and its implications, noting that “means of communication, especially for disasters/emergencies should not be limited or reserved for only those that have the financial means to purchase these things.”<sup>32</sup>

Finally, residents reported delays and difficulty restoring service, even after the fires were extinguished. One resident noted that it took four weeks for his internet and phone service to be restored, including three occasions where he was scheduled to receive service but no one arrived; he further noted that he was charged for the time when he did not receive service.<sup>33</sup> Another resident noted that his service remains spotty two months after the fires, including a situation where he urgently needed to respond to a text message, and had to resend his response 13 times before it went through.<sup>34</sup> He also described how he often gets a message saying “service unavailable” when he tries to make a call, and he often either gives up or has to make multiple

---

<sup>29</sup> Survey Response #270 || 148/391 Napa.

<sup>30</sup> “I was really shocked at the lack of cell service and power. I remember that during the 2014 earthquake, even though our power was out, our house still had internet service because our router had a back-up battery. I did not realize that when we got a new router that it did not come with a back-up battery. The feeling of being in the dark (information-wise) was very disconcerting and made me feel scared about missing an important update from authorities or my loved ones.” Survey Response #8 || 101/391 Napa.

<sup>31</sup> “I kept my copper based phone service for a very long time mainly due to the ability to make calls when the power was out. Then finally ATT made it so financially beneficial to switch to digital that I reluctantly did, but only with the inclusion of a battery backup provided by ATT. The battery lasted only a few hours at most and our power was out for about 48 hours. Very disappointed that my phone service did not work as I expected.” Survey Response #597 || 216/391 Napa.

<sup>32</sup> Survey Response #247 || 187/391 Napa.

<sup>33</sup> Survey Response #333 || 158/391 Napa.

<sup>34</sup> Survey Response #1 || 61/150 Mendocino.

attempts.<sup>35</sup> Yet others described ongoing outages since the fires ended,<sup>36</sup> as well as poor signal strength for their cellular services in their areas after the fires,<sup>37</sup> or problems with obtaining support from their providers.<sup>38</sup>

2. The Wine Country Fires Demonstrate the Importance of Implementing the Phase 1 Requirements

Multiple provisions of the Phase 1 Decision require the Commission, Commission staff, and parties to the proceeding to take various actions to protect rural customers' access to reliable telecommunications services, especially in emergency situations. The Phase 1 Decision includes a variety of deadlines, many of which have long passed even after the Commission granted the carriers' requests for a generous extension of time to comply.<sup>39</sup> Even with the extensions of time, the carriers were required to take a number of actions within the first three quarters of 2017, prior to the outbreak of the Wine Country Fires. Some of these provisions have direct

---

<sup>35</sup> *Id.*

<sup>36</sup> *See e.g.* Survey Response #34 || 66/150 Mendocino; Survey Response #359 || 196/391 Napa.

<sup>37</sup> "Since the fire, we only have one bar on our cell phones in those neighborhoods and sometimes no cell service at all." Survey Response #17 || 102/391 Napa; "AT&T cell coverage is minimal (1 bar) at my house (Browns Valley, Napa) at the best of times." Survey Response #84 || 174/391 Napa.

<sup>38</sup> *See e.g.* Survey Response #656 || 220/391 Napa; Survey Response #32 || 66/150 Mendocino; and Survey Response #67 || 69/150 Mendocino ("My internet was restored after the fires but went out again on October 22. I have called AT&T five times for service. During the first call on October 23rd, I was told there were no problems in my area. NOT true at all! The agent wasn't aware of our disaster. The agent kept trying to get me to convert my land line to digital even though I explained the situation of needing a hard-wired phone for emergencies. I waited all day for a service person on October 26 to install internet U-Verse only. Never showed, didn't text me to cancel. I had to call again on October 27th only to be told it would be October 31st before [sic] he would [sic] show").

<sup>39</sup> The extension requests were granted by a series of letters issued by the Commission's Executive Director on or around February 7-8, 2017. The ALJ also sent a courtesy notice to the service list via email on February 2, 2017. The Utility Reform Network, the Center for Accessible Technology, and Mendocino County opposed the request via a letter sent to the Executive Director and copied to the service list on February 1, 2017.

safety impacts, while others are intended to inform the collaborative process contemplated by the Phase 1 Decision to support additional action to improve public safety.<sup>40</sup>

The express deadlines that were set out in the Phase 1 Decision include the following:

- First Quarter 2017 – Ordering Paragraph 10 (Requiring outreach by Commission staff to local governments, tribal authorities and law enforcement to provide information about the Commission’s informal and formal complaint processes);
- June 1, 2017 – Ordering Paragraph 1 (Requiring data requests from Commission staff to carriers regarding call completion gaps), Ordering Paragraph 2 (Establishing reporting requirements for carriers regarding call completion problems), Ordering Paragraphs 5-7 (Directing various improvements for multi-line telephone system customers regarding short code access), Ordering Paragraph 11 (Requiring a report addressing frequency and risks of tree attachments by carriers),<sup>41</sup> and Ordering Paragraph 16 (Requiring carriers to provide 24/7 emergency contact information to local emergency personnel);
- June 30, 2017 – Ordering Paragraph 15 (Requiring carriers to meet and confer with recognized tribes and County OES offices on improving 9-1-1 access on tribal lands), Ordering Paragraph 17 (Requiring Commission staff to meet and confer with OES officials specifically to discuss “communications during and after emergencies such as fires and means to shorten the time for accessible communications, and discuss

---

<sup>40</sup> This ongoing collaborative process is encapsulated in the requirements of Ordering Paragraphs 21 and 22, which do not contain deadlines but which were specifically identified as issues to be addressed in Phase 2 of the proceeding. These provisions, which require ongoing work including collaboration with first responders, are intended to take the collected information and propose additional steps to improve emergency communications systems.

<sup>41</sup> Ordering Paragraph 12 is related to Ordering Paragraph 11, requiring the report mandated in Ordering Paragraph 11 to be distributed to various Commission officials and offices.

appropriate next steps”), and Ordering Paragraph 18 (Requiring Commission staff to coordinate a meet and confer process including emergency agencies, utility and communications groups, staff, and other stakeholders specifically “to discuss options to improve speed of access to communications services during emergencies such as large-scale fires, and recommend appropriate next steps for this Commission” to improve speed of access to communications in emergencies); and

- Third Quarter 2017 – Ordering Paragraph 13 (Requiring a staff analysis of whether an OII should be initiated for past failures of 911 emergency communications).

Collectively, these actions were intended to both improve emergency communications directly and to inform further action as determined by the Commission to be appropriate in a second phase of the proceeding, which is also directly mandated by the Phase 1 Decision.

On March 6, 2017, the Commission issued a Phase 2 Scoping Memo that specifically addresses Ordering Paragraphs 21 and 22 of the Phase 1 Decision; these ordering paragraphs require consideration of expanded outage reporting requirements and consideration of any recommendations of a working group (intended to consist of Commission staff, parties, and emergency officials at state, local and tribal levels) that address reporting requirements, public safety needs, and the Commission’s responsibilities during emergencies including fires.<sup>42</sup> In light of the wildfire events of the past few months, the call for this working group process appears prescient.

---

<sup>42</sup> Phase 2 Scoping Memo at pp. 3-4 (quoting Phase 1 Decision). The full scope for Phase 2 was set out by vote of the Commission in the Phase 1 Decision. As noted below, Joint Consumers believe that the Phase 2 Scoping Memo does not fully account for all issues designated in the Phase 1 Decision to be addressed in Phase 2.

The Phase 2 Scoping Memo also includes the Commission's obligation to evaluate the carriers' responses to other requirements of the Phase 1 Decision, including those described above, and then take any appropriate additional action based on such evaluation.<sup>43</sup> It further calls for a discussion in Phase 2 regarding possible new requirements for carriers, and monitoring of the development of transfer or merger guidelines.<sup>44</sup>

The Phase 2 Scoping Memo scheduled party comments on the revised scope in March and April 2017, working group meetings starting in June 2017, and a subsequent comment period regarding the working group meetings.<sup>45</sup> Consumers submitted opening and reply comments on the Phase 2 Scoping Memo as directed;<sup>46</sup> the Commission has not subsequently addressed parties' concerns as set out in these comments, nor has it taken any further steps to issue a schedule for activity in Phase 2. Instead, there have only been two limited stakeholder meetings, as discussed below. While a year has passed since the Commission adopted the Phase 1 Final Decision, neither Joint Consumers nor other stakeholders have any information about the status of most of the Phase 1 requirements or the process to move forward with additional steps to address emergency communications or the other important matters addressed in Phase 1.

The two meetings that were convened were intended to begin the process of implementing certain Phase 1 requirements and providing a framework and input for Phase 2, but parties remain uncertain about any action taken or any final status. This includes a meeting held on June 14, 2017 and a separate meeting held on July 24, 2017. Each of these meetings was

---

<sup>43</sup> Phase 2 Scoping Memo at p. 4. Specifically, the parties were to evaluate the implementation progress of Ordering Paragraphs 1 and 2 (data collection on call completion), 5 -7 (MLTS short code dialing), 11 (report on tree attachments) and 16 (24/7 emergency contact numbers).

<sup>44</sup> Phase 2 Scoping Memo at p. 4.

<sup>45</sup> Phase 2 Scoping Memo at pp. 4-5.

<sup>46</sup> In these comments, Joint Consumers (which included TURN, CforAT and the Greenlining Institute) expressed concern that the Phase II scope was too narrow and urged the Commission to expressly address additional provisions of the Phase 1 Decision).

flawed, and the results are unclear. There is no reason to believe that they were sufficient to implement the provisions of the Phase 1 Decision.

a) *The June 2017 Meeting*

On June 14, 2017, the carriers hosted a “meet and confer” to address Ordering Paragraph 7 (addressing short code access and education), Ordering Paragraph 15 (addressing tribal access to 9-1-1), and Ordering Paragraph 16 (addressing the need for direct carrier contact information for local emergency officials) of the Phase 1 Decision. From discussions with staff, Joint Consumers learned that the invitation to the meeting was sent to a wide list of recipients, but do not believe that notice was provided to the service list of the proceeding.<sup>47</sup> Joint Consumers subsequently received the brief report and summary that was provided to meeting participants only (not parties).<sup>48</sup> This 1.5 page summary includes only high-level notes of the discussion regarding these three ordering paragraphs. It is unclear what actions – if any – were taken before or after this single meeting to substantively comply with any of the requirements of these Ordering Paragraphs.

On the issue of short code access (Ordering Paragraph 7), it appears from the report that two representatives from 2-1-1 and two representatives from 8-1-1 were present for the single meeting. The brief report describes some of the history of 2-1-1 and the problems consumers have accessing 2-1-1 and 8-1-1, especially from MLTS equipment (e.g. hotels or other large

---

<sup>47</sup> See June 23, 2017 email from Karen Eckersley forwarding a June 19, 2017 email from Micki Burton of AT&T to a larger list of recipients with an attachment that is entitled, “Report from 6-13-17 CalOES Meet-and-Confer,” attached to this Motion as Attachment A.

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*

complexes). The report does not indicate any discussion among meeting participants of what carriers could do to fix the access issues.<sup>49</sup>

On the issue of tribal access to 9-1-1 (Ordering Paragraph 15), the Phase 1 Decision requires a meet and confer between federally recognized Tribes and County Offices of Emergency Services to determine what – if any – action is needed to make Tribal residential addresses visible to 9-1-1 databases. Of the over 100 federally recognized Tribes in California, only two Tribal representatives attended. Although some first responders were at the meeting, no representatives from County Offices of Emergency Services are listed as attendees. The summary of the meeting reflects that one of the Tribal representatives discussed how her tribe had successfully worked with their County Office of Emergency Services to include tribal addresses in the 9-1-1 database. The other tribal representative spoke of the importance of urging County Offices of Emergency Services to work with tribes to implement similar methods of including tribal addresses in the 9-1-1 database. It is unclear what – if any – additional action has been taken. This represents a failure to comply with the Ordering Paragraph, which requires a determination of whether “action is needed to make residential addresses visible to the 9-1-1 database, including assigning a unique address by mutual agreement in areas where all households currently have the same address.”

---

<sup>49</sup> Although the meet and confer appears to comply with the letter of Ordering Paragraph 7, it does not appear to comply with the spirit of Ordering Paragraph 7, which is to ensure the public has the information it needs to ensure short code dialing. To understand the full intention of Ordering Paragraph 7, it must be read in conjunction with Ordering Paragraphs 6 and 8. Ordering Paragraph 6 requires carriers who program MLTS systems to enable short codes. Ordering Paragraph 8 refers to the Commission’s implementation of Senate Bill 1212 to require 2-1-1 access statewide.

Ordering Paragraph 16 requires carriers to provide 24/7 emergency contact information to the Offices of Emergency Services for cities, counties, and federally recognized Tribes.<sup>50</sup> The only action item from report memorializing the June 2017 meet and confer effort notes that the California Utilities Emergency Association was to provide AT&T with a list of officials from the city, county and federally recognized Tribal offices of Emergency Services and then, “Industry participants will email their Emergency Contact Information specified in OP 16 to AT&T’s representative at [email address]. This information will be compiled and sent to [CAL OES contact], CAL OES State Warning Center. This information will be treated as confidential.”<sup>51</sup> There has been no transparency regarding the compliance efforts for this requirement, and it is impossible for other parties to the proceeding to know whether the CUEA compiled the list of emergency services offices or whether AT&T forwarded the participants’ emergency contact information to that list as required.

*b) The July 2017 Meeting*

On July 24, 2017, Commission staff hosted a meeting to address Ordering Paragraph 22 of the Phase 1 Decision. Ordering Paragraph 22 requires that a working group be convened to “discuss and recommend outage reporting thresholds, requirements, and protocols . . . , including discussion of call completion reporting and improving communications between carriers and first responders during emergency situations.” There is no indication that this requirement for convening a working group could be satisfied by a single meeting in the nature of a workshop.

---

<sup>50</sup> D.16-12-066, OP 16 (“Respondents shall provide within 30 days of this Decision to city, county, and federally recognized tribal Office of Emergency Services officials an emergency contact name and number available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, that is not a general public 800 or 8xx number”).

<sup>51</sup> See Attachment A, June 13, 2017 Rural Call Competition Meet and Confer Report, at p. 2.

Additionally, Joint Consumers understand that notice of the single meeting was provided only to the service list of the proceeding.<sup>52</sup> Joint Consumers are unaware of any Commission efforts to invite or otherwise involve local Offices of Emergency Services, and, as a result, the meeting lacked this key stakeholder participation. Joint Consumers have not received any information from Commission staff regarding additional working group meetings, nor has staff distributed any notes or reports from the July meeting outlining action items or next steps, or provided an opportunity for party comment on these issues.

*c) Comment Period Following the July 2017 Working Group Meeting*

The Phase 2 Scoping Memo calls for a comment period to follow the initial working group meeting required by Ordering Paragraph 22.<sup>53</sup> Due to a scheduling conflict, the ALJ granted a party's request for the comment period set in the Phase 2 Scoping Memo to be removed from the schedule.<sup>54</sup> The request stated the working group would "propose a deadline for comments and reply comments following the July 24 Working Group meeting."<sup>55</sup> To date, the comment period has not been rescheduled. Further, even if comments on the single meeting of the working group meeting scheduled now – nearly five months later – it would be complicated by the fact that no working group report has been filed or circulated.

**B. The Commission Should Accelerate the Work Underway in Phase 2**

As discussed above, the Commission has taken on important issues in this proceeding, and full implementation of the Phase 1 Decision along with call completion data, robust outage

---

<sup>52</sup> See Attachment A, July 7, 2017 email from ALJ Mason to service list with the notice and agenda for the working group meeting scheduled for July 24, 2017.

<sup>53</sup> Phase 2 Scoping Memo at p. 5.

<sup>54</sup> ALJ Email Ruling Taking July Comment Deadlines Off Calendar, July 13, 2017, at p. 2.

<sup>55</sup> *Id.* at p. 3.

reporting, and first responder coordination will increase the reliability of telecommunications services, including emergency communications, and thus enhance the safety of California consumers, especially in the vast rural areas of this state. In particular, by collecting the required data and engaging in a true working group process to develop recommendations for “outage reporting thresholds, requirements, and protocols that reflect California’s public safety needs and this commission’s responsibilities, including discussion of call completion reporting and improving communications between carriers and first responders in emergency situations,”<sup>56</sup> situations where emergency personnel lack communication among themselves and with the public during wildfires could be mitigated. Joint Consumers file this Motion to ensure that the Commission’s important work continues with focused attention on implementation efforts for the action items of the Phase 1 Decision and the issues noted in Phase 2 that impact emergency situations.<sup>57</sup> In order to ensure that the Commission diligently addresses these issues, the Joint Consumers request that the Commission set a Phase 2 Schedule that requires action as follows:

1. Working Group Follow-Up (Ordering Paragraph 22)

As discussed above, Ordering Paragraph 22 of the Phase 1 Decision calls for the creation of a working group “to discuss and recommend outage reporting thresholds, requirements, and protocols that reflect California’s public safety needs and this Commission’s responsibilities.”<sup>58</sup> The Commission intended that this group’s discussion and analysis, at a minimum, would facilitate a discussion in Phase 2 regarding coordination of emergency communications and broader and more extensive outage reporting requirements under Ordering Paragraph 21.

---

<sup>56</sup> Phase 1 Decision at p. 183, Ordering Paragraph 22.

<sup>57</sup> As noted above, Joint Consumers still support the full range of items ordered in the Phase 1 Decision and recommend that items not specifically addressed in this motion should still be addressed later in Phase 2 or in a future Phase 3 of this proceeding.

<sup>58</sup> Phase 1 Decision at p. 183, Ordering Paragraph 22.

As described above, a single meeting of this “working group” took place in July of 2017.<sup>59</sup> The agenda for the meeting included a series of presentations (by state agencies in the morning and carriers in the afternoon).<sup>60</sup> The presentations focused on the types of outage information exchanged between the carriers and the agencies, how the information is handed off, and the personnel involved in the process. While the meeting lasted several hours, and provided a limited forum for discussion and exchange of information, Joint Consumers find that, unlike the call for a workshop, a requirement for the working group process as stated in Ordering Paragraph 22 cannot be satisfied by a single meeting for several reasons.

First, participation in even this single meeting was not sufficiently robust. The notice provided in advance of the meeting was inadequate to satisfy the Commission’s intent that a wide range of stakeholders, including CPUC staff, all the parties, Cal OES and “city, county, and federally recognized tribal Office of Emergency Services officials” along with the California Utility Emergency Association should participate in the discussion. It appears that the notice was sent only to parties to the formal proceeding with no clear attempt to reach out to additional stakeholders, state and local agencies, or first responders that would have brought in a diverse and experienced group to discuss this topic.<sup>61</sup> While the Joint Consumers attempted to do their own outreach in the week or two before the single meeting took place, this supplemental work cannot substitute for effective outreach by the Commission to invite emergency service agencies

---

<sup>59</sup> TURN representative Regina Costa attended the meeting by phone for the Joint Consumers. In addition, and Trish Steele, representative of the Broadband Alliance of Mendocino County, attended in person.

<sup>60</sup> See Attachment A, July 7, 2017 ALJ Email Ruling.

<sup>61</sup> Joint Consumers reached this conclusion based on the fact that both the initial email issued by ALJ Mason on June 28, 2017, and the revised agenda sent on July 7, 2017, were only sent to the proceeding’s service list with no additional parties identified.

and personnel. In fact, there was little participation by outside groups, emergency responders or other non-parties to the proceeding.<sup>62</sup>

Additionally, even had the notice been appropriate, the timing of the meeting was problematic. It was scheduled at the height of fire and tourist season when rural resources are spread thin. For example, long time Mendocino County Sheriff Tom Allman was planning to participate but an active fire in the county prevented his attendance, as it appears happened to several CalOES officials as well.<sup>63</sup> Setting a meeting in San Francisco in July during high fire season (when public safety officials would be hesitant to leave their home county to travel hundreds of miles even if there were not an active fire) substantially increases the difficulty of the very group of people vitally needed to participate - rural public safety officials- from being able to attend.

Next, there has been no follow-up to the meeting in terms of providing any report or summary to memorialize the discussion, no list of participants, no plan for a further meeting of the “working group,” and no opportunity for parties or other participants to comment on the meeting and/or provide proposals for next steps. Overall, there has been no way to fulfill the obligation set out in the Phase 1 Decision for the working group to make recommendations that “that reflect California’s public safety needs and this Commission’s responsibilities.”<sup>64</sup> This is contrary to the Phase 1 requirements and to Joint Consumers’ understanding of the implementation effort. On its face, the Phase 1 Decision establishes a working group to engage

---

<sup>62</sup> While participating parties have not received an attendee list or notes from the meeting, Joint Consumers believe that there were no representatives from local sheriff’s departments or other local first responder and emergency services organizations.

<sup>63</sup> Joint Consumers believe that multiple OES officials who were listed on the agenda were unable to attend the meeting due to fires; however, the lack of notes from the meeting means that we are unable to confirm this understanding.

<sup>64</sup> Phase 1 Decision at p. 183, Ordering Paragraph 22.

in an ongoing discussion among a broad range of participants and inform the Commission's consideration of the broad scope of issues taken up in Phase 2. This requirement cannot be met by a single, narrow meeting attended primarily by parties and staff. Yet, the Commission has made no attempt to schedule any subsequent follow up processes, meetings or discussion on this topic, or to follow through on the opportunity, set out in the Phase 2 Scoping Memo, to allow parties to comment on the limited work that has taken place.

Because this single meeting was inadequate to meet either the direct obligations or the intent of the Phase 1 Decision, the Joint Consumers respectfully request that the Commission set a schedule for ongoing working group meetings, pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 22 of the Phase 1 Decision. This schedule should be accompanied by wide notice of the working group's purpose and goals, including service to the service list in multiple relevant Commission proceedings<sup>65</sup> and *express invitations* to emergency response agencies in rural California counties to participate. Future working group meetings should be webcast (audio or video) with opportunity for online participation; this proceeding is of vital importance to rural communities across the state, and yet public safety officials from resource-thin counties often cannot take the time and resources to travel hundreds of miles to participate in person. The make-up of the working group should be specifically outlined with a set/minimum percentage of local OES representation, tribal representation, industry, and the other various stakeholders to ensure a balanced and fair outcome, and all working group participants should be identified. Transcripts, recordings and/or notes must be made available to all parties soon after each meeting. The working group should specifically be tasked with making recommendations, and the schedule should include a deadline for Commission staff to create a report summarizing the

---

<sup>65</sup> Joint Consumers suggest that, at minimum, notice should be provided to the service list in the California High Cost A Fund review (R.11-11-007) and the Service Quality Proceeding (R.11-12-001).

recommendations that come from the group and adding any of their own recommendations. Following the issuance of this report, parties to the proceeding should be given an opportunity to comment on the recommendations. Additionally, even after the issuance of such a report, working group participants should discuss the possibility of retaining the working group format in an ongoing manner to facilitate information sharing and cross-agency discussions.<sup>66</sup> As discussed above, the importance of effective communication in emergency situations has been demonstrated over and over again just in this past year. The Phase 1 Decision clearly saw the need and value of robust discussions with many stakeholders at the table to exchange information, develop proposals for emergency coordination, and work together to craft an effective communications plan.

## 2. Ordering Paragraphs 17 and 18

The Phase 1 Decision orders CD and SED to request a “meet and confer” with Cal OES and numerous other stakeholders on issues relating to “communications during and after emergencies” to discuss ways of streamlining and improving the processes to create emergency communications capabilities during an emergency, and set a deadline of June 30, 2017, for this to take place.<sup>67</sup> It further requires collaboration between SED and multiple entities, including emergency responders, the California Communications Association, Cal-Fire, the Governor’s Tree Mortality Taskforce, and others specifically to “discuss options to improve speed of access to communications services during emergencies *such as large-scale fires*, and recommend

---

<sup>66</sup> As an example, in D.07-05-030, the Commission established two working groups to assist staff with implementation of the LifeLine verification and certification processes. In D.08-08-029 (page 3) the Commission acknowledged that the input from these working groups was an “invaluable tool” and that the groups continued to “develop strategies that improve the LifeLine processes.” The Working Group process for LifeLine continues to meet regularly to this day.

<sup>67</sup> Phase 1 Decision at p. 182, Ordering Paragraph 17.

appropriate next steps for this Commission to speed communications services during emergencies to protect public safety, the environment, resources, and property including private, public, and utility property and infrastructure.”<sup>68</sup>

There has subsequently been no information provided to parties or other stakeholders about whether either of these meet and confer processes was convened, whether they were successful, or whether any recommendations were issued or implemented. Because these important obligations have not been addressed further, Joint Consumers request confirmation that a meeting or meetings have occurred among each required group; if meetings are ongoing, we request information about their status. In addition, Joint Consumers request that Commission staff produce a report or summary of the meeting or meetings, including a list of attendees. If no meeting has taken place for either group, Joint Consumers request an explanation for the year-long delay, and a proposal and schedule for the initiation of the required meet and confer process. The Wine Country Fires, and the ongoing wildfires in southern California, make clear that the collaboration required by these provisions of the Phase 1 Decision are crucial for improving communications effectiveness in emergency circumstances. In particular, a failure to move forward under Ordering Paragraph 18, which specifically contemplates efforts to improve communications during large-scale wildfires, would represent a serious missed opportunity to help many California communities and residents who have experienced wildfires in 2017.

### **3. Outage Reporting**

The Phase 1 Decision includes several action items to improve and expand outage reporting by carriers. The Commission found that, “Receiving timely information about such

---

<sup>68</sup> *Id.* at Ordering Paragraph 18 (emphasis added).

outages- between 90,000 and 300,000 user minutes, is critical to enabling this Commission to ensure that carriers provide service in compliance with California law...”<sup>69</sup> Several of the

Ordering Paragraphs included new or additional obligations:

- Ordering Paragraph 19 directs CD to make a format available for reporting outages to encourage consistency in the data and to facilitate monitoring, analysis and problem identification within the data.
- Ordering Paragraph 20 directs CD to issue a standing data request to “all respondents” to report outages with a threshold of 90,000 user minutes (or higher at CD’s discretion).
- Ordering Paragraph 20 also directs Respondents to provide concurrent notices of these outages to the California State Warning Center no later than 60 minutes after their discovery.
- Ordering Paragraph 21 directs the Commission, in Phase 2, to explore whether carriers that operate under the Commission’s jurisdiction, including COLRs, should report outages more broadly to other local, state, or federal agencies and to further discuss the thresholds and procedures for the Commission’s outage reporting obligations.
- Ordering Paragraph 23 requires CD to monitor outage reports and other outages that may fall below current thresholds but that may have an impact on public safety and users.

---

<sup>69</sup> Phase 1 Decision at p. 172, FOF 38

These Commission orders are clear and direct. The record in Phase 1 of this proceeding and the subsequent wildfire events in California discussed above support stronger outage reporting requirements and improvements in inter-agency reporting by both the carriers and the Commission. The Phase 1 Decision was not intended to be the end of the discussion, but just the beginning to further explore ways to hone and revise outage reporting requirements to help support emergency communications with all stakeholders involved. The Commission acknowledged that outage reporting of 300,000 user minutes lasting more than 30 minutes from COLRs -- literally the “last resort” for customers who rely on basic service communications as a lifeline during emergencies and for every day needs -- is valuable “to ensure that carriers provide safe and reliable service, comply with California law, and the Commission’s rules...”<sup>70</sup>

In Phase 2, Communications Division should submit a report on the status of its compliance with these Ordering Paragraphs, including any results from the monitoring of current outage reporting data called for in Ordering Paragraph 23. The Phase 2 Scoping Memo explicitly directs parties to determine whether carriers and the Commission should more broadly report outages, but fails to acknowledge that Ordering Paragraph 21 also requires the Commission to revisit outage reporting thresholds and procedures. In Phase 2, the carriers should also report on their efforts to revise their outage reporting processes and comply with new requirements in Ordering Paragraph 20. Joint Consumers hope that staff and the carriers have been busy behind the scenes to improve and monitor outage data. If so, then Phase 2 should focus on the results of that work and a substantive analysis of the outage data so that parties to the proceeding, along with other local and state agencies, can work pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 21 and consider whether outage reporting should be revised.

---

<sup>70</sup> Phase 1 Decision at p. 107, FOF 27.

#### 4. Respondent Obligations

Finally, as discussed above, the Phase 2 Scoping Memo calls for an evaluation of the “completeness” of the telephone carriers’ responses to seven different ordering paragraphs from the Phase 1 Decision and, perhaps most importantly, whether “any new requirements should be imposed on the telephone carriers, consistent with the Commission’s regulatory authority and the scope of this proceeding.” These obligations include the development and submission of an “itemized” call completion report (Ordering Paragraph 2), meetings and education regarding the use of 2-1-1 and other “short code” services and emergency services calling for multi-tenant housing (Ordering Paragraphs 5-7), analysis and reports regarding practices of attaching facilities to trees and cost estimates for moving those facilities from trees to poles (Ordering Paragraph 11) and, finally the provision of 24/7 emergency contact names and numbers by the respondents to “city, county, and federally recognized tribal Office of Emergency Services officials” (Ordering Paragraph 16).

The Phase 2 schedule should set formal deadlines for carriers to report on the status of these obligations, and for staff to issue recommendations for any further action that may be required. Once such recommendations are issued, parties should have the opportunity to comment to address any potential areas that need further review and/or work; parties should also have the opportunity to address completeness and next steps, and to analyze issues.

//  
  
//  
  
//  
  
//  
  
//

### III. CONCLUSION

Pursuant to the discussion above, Joint Consumers respectfully request that the Commission issue a procedural schedule for Phase 2 of I.14-05-012 that includes the items discussed above.

Dated: December 21, 2017

Submitted by,

/S/

---

Melissa W. Kasnitz  
Legal Counsel  
Center for Accessible Technology  
3075 Adeline Street, Ste. 220  
Berkeley, CA 94703  
(510) 841-3224 x2019  
[service@cforat.org](mailto:service@cforat.org)

# Attachment A

**Subject:** FW: 06.13.17 CalOES Meet and Confer on Rural Call Completion Report

**Date:** Friday, June 23, 2017 at 10:25:02 AM Pacific Daylight Time

**From:** Eckersley, Karen

**To:** Christine Mailloux (cmailloux@turn.org), mkasnitz@cforat.org, rcosta@turn.org, asalas@turn.org

**Karen Eckersley**

Communications Division  
415.703.2778, M 415.265.0632

---

**From:** BURTON, MICKI [<mailto:mb1469@att.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, June 19, 2017 3:14 PM

**To:** WINN, BARBARA J; BATONGBACAL, ERIC R; ABDUL-RAHIM, WALID (Legal); BERRY, MARK; BURTON, MICKI; [CathyA@caltel.com](mailto:CathyA@caltel.com); Yvonne Wooster; [Randy.Gonzales@caloes.ca.gov](mailto:Randy.Gonzales@caloes.ca.gov); [Andrew.Mattson@caloes.ca.gov](mailto:Andrew.Mattson@caloes.ca.gov); [Helen.Lopez@caloes.ca.gov](mailto:Helen.Lopez@caloes.ca.gov); [Mitchell.Mediguvich@caloes.ca.gov](mailto:Mitchell.Mediguvich@caloes.ca.gov); Zankel, Zeb; Lopez, Moises; Cho, Raymond; [PBrandes@cwclaw.com](mailto:PBrandes@cwclaw.com); Charles Born ([charlie.born@ftr.com](mailto:charlie.born@ftr.com)) ([charlie.born@ftr.com](mailto:charlie.born@ftr.com)); [Laurie.Somerhausen@yolocounty.org](mailto:Laurie.Somerhausen@yolocounty.org); [mmarin@211la.org](mailto:mmarin@211la.org); [richarda@goodwillsacto.org](mailto:richarda@goodwillsacto.org); [JLavallee@aguacaliente-nsn.gov](mailto:JLavallee@aguacaliente-nsn.gov); [Cynthia.Moore@cslb.ca.gov](mailto:Cynthia.Moore@cslb.ca.gov); JOHNSON, MARSHALL; [floyd.jasinski@consolidated.com](mailto:floyd.jasinski@consolidated.com); 'Esther Northrup ([Esther.northrup@cox.com](mailto:Esther.northrup@cox.com))'; [adejung@edenir.org](mailto:adejung@edenir.org); Jill Hughes; [Teresa.Jolin@lakecountyca.gov](mailto:Teresa.Jolin@lakecountyca.gov); [Lroller@ponderosatel.com](mailto:Lroller@ponderosatel.com); [Rick.Anderson@smud.org](mailto:Rick.Anderson@smud.org); [CarolF@STCG.net](mailto:CarolF@STCG.net); [Gilbert.Aceves@sce.com](mailto:Gilbert.Aceves@sce.com); [Gail.Long@tdstelecom.com](mailto:Gail.Long@tdstelecom.com); [DBietz@mewuk.com](mailto:DBietz@mewuk.com); [Erin.brockus@ventura.org](mailto:Erin.brockus@ventura.org); [Rex.Knowles@xo.com](mailto:Rex.Knowles@xo.com)

**Cc:** 'ta@cahto.org'; 'tribalsecretary@qvir-nsn.gov'; 'rotonne@svpomo.org'; 'ann@digalert.org'; 'gheid@so.cccounty.us'; 'mgrant@digitalpath.net'; 'rlondon@unitedwayslo.org'; [jclark@GoodinMacBride.com](mailto:jclark@GoodinMacBride.com); 'hhoush@cabazonindians-nsn.gov'; 'cmiyadi@usan.org'; 'Info@bigpinepaiute.org'; 'wmicklin@leaningrock.net'; 'pottervalleytribe@pottervalleytribe.com'; 'mrlawson@bluejaywireless.com'; 'kn@koination.com'; 'Martin Nogues'; 'Brian Dickinson'; 'info@campo-nsn.gov'; 'rramkiss@capk.org'; 'info@sherwoodvalleyband.com'; 'mpatribaloffice@gmail.com'; 'ghyde@co.yuba.ca.us'; 'rdurian@co.slo.ca.us'; 'cmartin@co.calaveras.ca.us'; 'ssilva@sycuan-nsn.gov'; 'dstanley@co.del-norte.ca.us'; 'kthomas@tachi-yokut.com'; 'Placer911cc@placer.ca.gov'; 'receptionist@pitrivertribe.org'; 'jessebrown@berrycreekrancheria.com'; 'dmcmechan@co.madera.ca.gov'; 'Morongo2@worldnet.attnet'; 'margiemejia@aol.com'; 'april.harper@fresnosheriff.org'; 'rhondaj@crisis-center.org'; 'tadmin@pinoleville-nsn.us'; 'rmorillo@soboba-nsn.gov'; 'LJ.avalon@pacbell.net'; 'rbonner@tmdci.org'; 'Ogle, Skip'; 'loscoyotes@earthlink.net'; 'jhostler@trinidadrancheria.com'; 'lross@gratonrancheria.com'; 'denean@buenavistatribe.com'; 'mcowart@co.merced.ca.us'; 'office@tejontribe.net'; 'cwelch@viejas-nsn.gov'; 'thughes@santarosacahuilla-nsn.gov'; 'abigail.mebrahtu@hamiltonrelay.com'; 'Numberz4me@aol.com'; 'Rex.Knowles@xo.com'; 'cborchardt@ocsd.org'; ABDUL-RAHIM, WALID (Legal); 'rosemary@unitedwaytc.org'; 'kimbrellt@kernsheriff.com'; 'lماغoski@marinsheriff.org'; 'mmarin@211la.org'; 'amcbride@uwfm.org'; 'sps02@monosheriff.us'; 'tribalchairperson@ssband.org'; 'MSchreiber@cwclaw.com'; 'TajmaRahimic@dwt.com'; 'teresa@stewartspoint.org'; 'Jill Hughes'; 'MRasher@West.com'; 'maria@connectriverside.org'; 'Isaacs, Kim'; 'collnsm@stancounty.com'; 'Executive\_secretary@upperlakepomo.com'; 'Tim Giuliani'; 'cwilliams@co.humboldt.ca.us'; 'lthomas@29palmsbomi-nsn.gov'; 'Priya Brandes'; 'rsb@smcgov.org'; 'Debrarv1@gmail.com'; 'Isowder@shascom911.com'; 'vmoorehead@earthlink.net'; 'icso911@inyocounty.us'; 'sreckker@ramona-nsn.gov'; 't.brown@elemindiancolony.org'; 'cindipetrasha@brb-nsn.gov'; '911Coordinator@saccounty.net'; 'info@enterpriserancheria.org'; 'resighini@gmail.com'; 'cww281@gmail.com'; 'Robert.McCausland@h3net.com'; 'Gerald.howard@bishoppaiute.org'; 'deyoung@caltel.org'; 'dkdenney@integratelecom.com'; 'trisha.adcock@911.sccgov.org'; 'SmallLeacs@cwlaw.com'; 'tfielden@karuk.us'; 'jeanette@211humboldt.org'; 'bbaker@co.sutter.ca.us'; 'sjimenez@tmr.org'; 'rvonkoeh@riversidesheriff.org'; 'zebzankel@dwt.com'; 'HarryW1@co.monterey.ca.us'; 'Michael.Moore@charter.com'; 'kbatson@uwba.org'; 'rabrams@cityofnapa.org'; 'lp13boots@aol.com'; 'fforman@cacsb.com'; 'rcarrillo@middletownrancheria.com'; 'tara@yuroktribe.nsn.us'; 'contact@pechanga-nsn.gov'; 'barbotc@edso.org'; 'utuutugwaitupaiutetribe@gmail.com'; 'tribalcouncil@cahuilla.net'; 'Leah Goodwin'; 'mralston@crtribal.com'; 'secretarytreasurer@fortindependence.com'; 'community@viejas.com'; 'm.emerson@quechantribe.com'; 'lwinner@mooretown.org'; 'chemehuevi@cit-nsn.gov'; 'doug.freeman@fire.ca.gov'; 'brian@wiyot.us'; 'Erin.brockus@ventura.org'; 'Erica Calloway'; 'spadi@hoplandtribe.com'; 'Elana.Shapochnikov@charter.com'; 'counciloffice@barona-nsn.gov'; 'sjohnson@colusasheriff.com'; 'tsullivanhames@ncen.org'; 'Bernie Orozco'; 'JArmstrong@GoodinMacBride.com';

'John\_Gutierrez@cable.comcast.com'; 'info@jamulindianvillage.com'; 'mit@mechoopda-nsn.gov'; 'Esther.northrup@cox.com'; 'Kris.Zuniga@co.kings.ca.us'; 'Laurie.Somerhausen@yolocounty.org'; 'iipay.inof@yahoo.com'; 'morozco@palatribe.com'; 'richarda@goodwillsacto.org'; 'Linda.c.stinar@centurylink.com'; 'mgbomi@mesagrandeband-nsn.gov'; 'admin@guidiville.net'; 'Andrew.Trygg@co.nevada.ca.us'; 'lavonne.peck@lajolla-nsn.gov'; 'Lauren Greenwood'; 'BANKS, GRETA L'; 'chris@alpineso.com'; 'mmorla@jacksoncasino.com'; 'kdisaacs@integratelecom.com'; 'aalejandre@paskenta.org'; 'bgonzalez@unitedwaysc.org'; 'mbland@chp.ca.gov'; 'Rachel.Cementina'; 'cicc@colusa-nsn.gov'; 'sirto@citlink.net'; 'Brian Poncho'; 'jeremy@unitedwaymerced.org'; 'lfregozo@aguacaliente.net'; 'lgoodwin@yeca911.org'; 'teresa.burns@sfgov.org'; 'Lori Keiser'; 'Marie Davis'; 'coldsprgstriben@netptc.net'; 'hhaines@augustinetribe.com'; 'Inaja\_cosmitrez@hotmail.com'; 'info@yochdehe-nsn.gov'; 'Lesla@calcable.org'; 'mjdeparto@solanocounty.com'; 'administrator@ionemiwok.org'; 'Teresa.Jolin@lakecountyca.gov'; 'anita@icommlaw.com'; 'pallen@greenvillerancheria.com'; 'nancy.mcdarment@tulerivertribe-nsn.gov'; 'amethyst@scr911.org'; 'nanettev@kingsunitedway.org'; 'cr.munholand@gmail.com'; 'keiserl@co.mendocino.ca.us'; 'kwilliams@211oc.org'; 'Warshauer, Amy'; [Charlie.Born@ftr.com](mailto:Charlie.Born@ftr.com); 'tshelton@co.siskiyou.ca.us'; 'loril@drycreekrancheria.com'; 'bacosta@ontarioca.gov'; 'griley@bsrnation.com'; 'council@rincontribe.org'; 'esternad@icfs.org'; 'srivera@folsom.ca.us'; 'kcastagna@unitedwaymcca.org'; 'srhyman@co.tulare.ca.us'; 'George.thomson@ftr.com'; 'tmtc@mlode.com'; 'mbstanbery@countyofglenn.net'; 'mlgoeke@unitedwaysc.org'; 'president@rvit.org'; 'ball@auburnrancheria.com'; 'Mark.Brown@charter.com'; 'Russ.crabtree@tolowa.com'; 'victoriahernandez@fortmojave.com'; 'marg@tobiaslo.com'; 'gmadden@ieuw.org'; 'eerhardt@co.tuolumne.ca.us'; 'ckahl@volunteernow.org'; 'Sue Johnson'; 'lolmstead@norcalunitedway.org'; 'McCausland, Robert W.'; 'tribe@californiavalleymiwoktribe-nsn.gov'; 'ella911@earthlink.net'; 'michelleanderson@sierracounty.ca.gov'; 'mel.joseph@lpps.org'; 'alewis@co.lassen.ca.us'; 'Mike DeSpain'; 'Betty.sanders@charter.com'; 'scramer@mariposacounty.org'; 'suzannetoller@dwt.com'; 'bvrittech@big-valley.net'; 'info@cloverdalerancheria.com'; 'kruhstaller@frcsj.org'; 'Chuck.Carrathers@ftr.com'; 'johanian@211sandiego.org'; 'admin@bridgeportindiancolony.com'; '911-coordinator@sonoma-county.org'; 'Jacqueline.Kinney@ftr.com'; 'mhopper@sanmanuel-nsn.gov'; 'aatins@trinidadrancheria.com'; 'hanan.harb@sdsheriff.org'; 'jclark@GoodinMacBride.com'; '911CountyCoordination@buttecounty.net'; 'lsantos@acgov.org'; 'Andrea Candelaria'; 'fdiciano@uwaystan.org'; 'AHuff@bluelakerancheria-nsn.gov'; 'melodiet@redding-rancheria.com'; 'rgetty@nfr-nsn.gov'; 'adejung@edenir.org'; 'ccchilson@modocsheriff.us'; 'info@santaynezechumash.org'; 'ljm0703@sbsheriff.org'; 'Ronn Rygg'; 'calindn1977@yahoo.com'; 'allen@sanpasqualtribe.org'; 'hjohnson@ecpd.org'; 'pbenson@amadorgov.org'; 'JMcTarnaghan@PerkinsCoie.com'; 'anng@connectingpoint.org'; 'swoods@elk-valley.com'; 'wdbell@pauma-nsn.gov'; 'BERRY, MARK'; 'Sward@West.com'

**Subject:** 06.13.17 CalOES Meet and Confer on Rural Call Completion Report

All,

Please find attached the Report of discussions held during the 6/13/17 Meet and Confer on Rural Call Completion hosted by CalOES. You'll also find attached the attendee tracking for those who attended in person and via conference call.

There is an action item included in this report which requires a response from each Industry Members. I've also pasted the Action Item below for your convenience:

- Action Item: Industry participants will email their Emergency Contact Information specified in OP16 to AT&T's representative at [mb1469@att.com](mailto:mb1469@att.com). This information will be compiled and sent to Randy Gonzales, CAL OES State Warning Center. This information will be treated as confidential

If you have not provided a response to this Action Item please do so before Tuesday, July 11<sup>th</sup>, if you have not sent this information already.

*Micki Burton*  
*Area Manager - Regulatory Relations*

*AT&T*

*Office: 415-417-5026 new number*

*Cell: 415-994-8077*

*E-mail: [mb1469@att.com](mailto:mb1469@att.com)*

Report from 6-13-17 CalOES Meet-and-Confer

The meeting commenced at approximately 9:50, after roll-call. Attendees List in Attachment A.

Topic 1 – Meet-and-confer with 211, 711 and 811 Coalitions (pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 7)

- Maribel Marin and Richard Abrusci spoke on behalf of the 211 Coalition:
  - 211 launched in California in 2005
  - The Coalition maintains a website which includes information about circumstances in which 211 calls are not completed, and specifically about programming of MLTS equipment
    - The Coalition advocates to businesses/entities with MLTS equipment to permit 211 calls, when instances of 211 blocking are brought to their attention
  - Most of the 38 counties that provide 211 service maintain similar websites
  - Ms. Marin cited “ghost calls” as the most significant telecommunications problem for 211 service providers
  - 211 is expanding soon to serve the 20 remaining unserved counties in CA within the next 2-5 years
  - There is an open proceeding at the CPUC looking at 211 issues
  
- Marshall Johnson and attendees at California Regional Common Ground Alliance (CARCGA) joined by phone and spoke on behalf of the 811 Coalition:
  - General conclusion is that 811 service is working well, although access to 811 calls from public locations with MLTS equipment (such as hotels) frequently do not allow 811 calls (similar to the blocking issues found by the 211 Coalition)
  - The 211 Coalition offered to forward its website information to the 811 Coalition, for its possible reference and use
    - Example of 211 Webpage Advisory (Handout 1):  
<http://www.211alamedacounty.org/211/problemsConnecting211.html>
  
- There was no representative from the 711 Coalition in attendance.

Topic 2 – Meet-and-Confer with California Federally Recognized Tribal Emergency Contacts and County Office of Emergency Services (pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 15)

- A general discussion was held about the need to create physical addresses in Tribal Communities visible to 911 databases, as well as first responders and emergency officials generally
- Dore Bietz of the Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians spoke about her tribe’s experience
  - There are complicated jurisdictional issues relating to tribal administration
  - Residential numbering in tribal lands is done independently of e.g., county planning (which has no jurisdiction in this area in tribal lands); the result is that if the tribe does not provide the information to e.g., county emergency service providers, those addresses are not represented.
  - Her tribe has taken the initiative to proactively provide tribal land addressing information to county emergency service providers.

- Her tribe has successfully employed GIS mapping of tribal residences, and has successfully shared this mapping with local OES officials
  - “Hat’s off” to OES for their support and encouragement of tribes building relationships with the counties; during the Rim Fire, the Tuolumne Band was very involved with county officials, had a seat at the table, and was able to provide facilities and staging areas to first responders.
  - She believes that only 10-15% of California tribes currently have the tools to implement GIS mapping, but her tribe is advocating to other tribes for this model as a solution to this problem
- John Lavallee from Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians generally agreed with the Tuolumne model, and urged that county OES officials reach out to tribes to implement this model.
    - Example of Yurok Tribe use of GIS Addressing for 911 database (Handout 2): <http://www.yuroktribe.org/departments/infoservices/GIS/Addressing.htm>

Topic 3 – Discussion re Distribution of Emergency Contact Information (pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 16)

- AT&T expressed concern that the proceeding record and history supporting this Ordering Paragraph did not adequately consider Cal OES and whether this mandate interfered with existing notification structures; one aspect of this meet-and-confer was to engage Cal OES and hear its input
- Several participants discussed their differing interpretations of OP 16
- The participants generally agreed that the most effective way to implement OP 16 was for each Respondent in the proceeding to provide emergency contact information to the officials identified in OP 16, which list is maintained by California Utilities Emergency Association (CUEA) and is utilized by CAL OES
- Don Boland, CUEA, volunteered to provide AT&T with the list of city, county, and federally recognized tribal Office of Emergency Services officials and to be shared with service providers for distribution of their emergency contact information.
- Cal OES and Moises Lopez from the CPUC’s Communications Division both supported this approach
- Action Item: Industry participants will email their Emergency Contact Information specified in OP16 to AT&T’s representative at [mb1469@att.com](mailto:mb1469@att.com). This information will be compiled and sent to Randy Gonzales, CAL OES State Warning Center. This information will be treated as confidential

Attendee List of Meet & Confer held June 14, 2017 at CalOES/CUEA re: Rural Call Completion OPs 7, 15 & 16

Attendee Name	Representing	Email Address	Phone Number	Attendance either In Person/On Phone
Barb Winn	AT&T	<a href="mailto:BW1513@att.com">BW1513@att.com</a>	916-541-9962	In Person
Eric Batongbacal	AT&T	<a href="mailto:EB1642@att.com">EB1642@att.com</a>	415-417-5016	In Person
Walid Abdul-Rahim	AT&T	<a href="mailto:WA3956@att.com">WA3956@att.com</a>	415-268-9460	In Person
Mark Berry	AT&T	<a href="mailto:MB2861@att.com">MB2861@att.com</a>	415-417-5018	In Person
Micki Burton	AT&T	<a href="mailto:MB1469@att.com">MB1469@att.com</a>	415-417-5026	In Person
Cathy Anderson	Calaveras Telephone	<a href="mailto:CathyA@caltel.com">CathyA@caltel.com</a>	209-785-2211	In Person
Yvonne Wooster	Calaveras Telephone	<a href="mailto:YSmythe@caltel.com">YSmythe@caltel.com</a>	209-785-2211	In Person
Randy Gonzales	CALOES	<a href="mailto:Randy.Gonzales@caloes.ca.gov">Randy.Gonzales@caloes.ca.gov</a>	916-845-8911	In Person
Andrew Matson	CALOES	<a href="mailto:Andrew.Mattson@caloes.ca.gov">Andrew.Mattson@caloes.ca.gov</a>	916-657-9459	In Person
Helen Lopez	CALOES	<a href="mailto:Helen.Lopez@caloes.ca.gov">Helen.Lopez@caloes.ca.gov</a>	916-845-8534	In Person
Mitch Mediguvich	CALOES	<a href="mailto:Mitchell.Mediguvich@caloes.ca.gov">Mitchell.Mediguvich@caloes.ca.gov</a>		In Person
Zeb Zankel	Comcast	<a href="mailto:ZebZankel@dw.com">ZebZankel@dw.com</a>	415-276-6551	In Person
Moises Lopez	CPUC	<a href="mailto:ML8@cpuc.ca.gov">ML8@cpuc.ca.gov</a>	415-703-1901	In Person
Raymond Cho	CPUC	<a href="mailto:RC7@cpuc.ca.gov">RC7@cpuc.ca.gov</a>	415-703-2236	In Person
Priva Brandes	Consolidated Communications CA & Small LEC's	<a href="mailto:PBrandes@cwclaw.com">PBrandes@cwclaw.com</a>	415-765-6292	In Person
Charlie Born	Frontier	<a href="mailto:Charlie.Born@ftr.com">Charlie.Born@ftr.com</a>	916-686-3570	In Person
Laurie Somerhausen	Yolo County Health and Human Services Agency	<a href="mailto:Laurie.Somerhausen@yolocounty.org">Laurie.Somerhausen@yolocounty.org</a>	530-666-8447	In Person
Maribel Marin	211 California	<a href="mailto:MMarin@211LA.org">MMarin@211LA.org</a>	626-350-1841	On Phone
Richard Abrusci	211 Sacramento	<a href="mailto:RichardA@goodwillsacto.org">RichardA@goodwillsacto.org</a>	916-949-0914	On Phone
John Lavallee	Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians	<a href="mailto:JLavallee@aguacaliente-nsn.gov">JLavallee@aguacaliente-nsn.gov</a>	760-883-1345	On Phone
Cynthia Moore	CARCGA	<a href="mailto:Cynthia.Moore@cslb.ca.gov">Cynthia.Moore@cslb.ca.gov</a>	916-843-6434	On Phone
Marshall Johnson	CARCGA	<a href="mailto:MJ2949@att.com">MJ2949@att.com</a>	213-633-3122	On Phone
Floyd Jasinski	Consolidated Communications, Inc.	<a href="mailto:Floyd.Jasinski@consolidated.com">Floyd.Jasinski@consolidated.com</a>	916-786-1597	On Phone
Esther Northrup	COX	<a href="mailto:Esther.Northrup@cox.com">Esther.Northrup@cox.com</a>	858-836-7308	On Phone
Alison DeJung	Eden I&R	<a href="mailto:ADeJung@edenir.org">ADeJung@edenir.org</a>	510-537-2710 ext.511	On Phone
Jillian R. Hughes	Glenn County Sheriff's Office	<a href="mailto:JRHughes@countyofglenn.net">JRHughes@countyofglenn.net</a>	530-934-6441	On Phone
Teresa J. Jolin	Lake County Sheriff's Office	<a href="mailto:Teresa.Jolin@lakecountycalifornia.gov">Teresa.Jolin@lakecountycalifornia.gov</a>	707-262-4364	On Phone

Attendee List of Meet & Confer held June 14, 2017 at CalOES/CUEA re: Rural Call Completion OPs 7, 15 & 16

Attendee Name	Representing	Email Address	Phone Number	Attendance either In Person/On Phone
Linda Roller	Ponderosa Telephone	<a href="mailto:LRoller@ponderosatel.com">LRoller@ponderosatel.com</a>	559-868-6310	On Phone
Rick Anderson	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	<a href="mailto:Rick.Anderson@smud.org">Rick.Anderson@smud.org</a>	916-732-5876	On Phone
Carol Fletcher	Sierra Telephone	<a href="mailto:CarolF@STCG.net">CarolF@STCG.net</a>	559-642-0309	On Phone
Gilbert William Aceves	Southern California Edison	<a href="mailto:Gilbert.Aceves@sce.com">Gilbert.Aceves@sce.com</a>	909-548-7249	On Phone
Gail Long	TDS Telecom	<a href="mailto:Gail.Long@tdstelecom.com">Gail.Long@tdstelecom.com</a>	541-516-8210	On Phone
Dore Bietz	Tuolumne Band of Me-Wuk Indians	<a href="mailto:DBietz@mewuk.com">DBietz@mewuk.com</a>		On Phone
Erin M. Brockus	Ventura County Sheriff's Office	<a href="mailto:Erin.Brockus@ventura.org">Erin.Brockus@ventura.org</a>	805-654-5158	On Phone
Rex Knowles	Verizon	<a href="mailto:Rex.Knowles@xo.com">Rex.Knowles@xo.com</a>	801-983-1504	On Phone

**Subject:** I.140-05-012--Updated Agenda for Working Group Meeting

**Date:** Friday, July 7, 2017 at 4:20:50 PM Pacific Daylight Time

**From:** Mason, Robert

**To:** John\_Gutierrez@cable.comcast.com, SWard@West.com, esther.northrup@cox.com, JebBrown@Co.Riverside.ca.us, jesus.g.roman@verizon.com, CMailoux@turn.org, JMcTarnaghan@PerkinsCoie.com, servicelist.cpuc@perkinscoie.com, walid.1@att.com, JArmstrong@GoodinMacBride.com, jclark@goodinmacbride.com, MSchreiber@cwclaw.com, SmallLecs@cwclaw.com, deyoung@caltel.org, PaulG@Greenlining.org, service@cforat.org, ElliottK@co.mendocino.ca.us, Lesla@calcable.org, george.thomson@ftr.com, IXG8@pge.com, janewhang@dwt.com, suzannetoller@dwt.com, TajmaRahimic@dwt.com, jr2762@att.com, dwtcpucdockets@dwt.com, JHawley@fh2.com, kwoods@fh2.com, mslawson@bluejaywireless.com, Robert.McCausland@h3net.com, MRasher@West.com, linda.c.stinar@centurylink.com, Chuck.Carrathers@ftr.com, ASalas@turn.org, Rcosta@turn.org, Hugh.Osborne@att.com, CPUC.ServiceList@PerkinsCoie.com, marg@tobiaslo.com, Elizebeth.Hansen@att.com, eb1642@att.com, mark.berry@att.com, Thomas.Selhorst@att.com, ZebZankel@dwt.com, anita@icommlaw.com, lmb@wblaw.net, rl@comrl.com, AngeloC@co.mendocino.ca.us, Charlie.Born@ftr.com, Jacqueline.Kinney@ftr.com, dkdenney@integratelecom.com, Clark, Adam, Ungson, Chris, Gallardo, Enrique, Tang, James, AppRhg, Colvin, Michael, Johnson, Ana Maria, Reed, Cameron, Naylor, Cody, Podolinsky, Elizabeth, Gallardo, Enrique, Robles, Felix V., Kasmar, Jeff, Lippi, Kimberly, Anning, Marna, Minkus, Michael J., Bawa, Niki, Momoh, Rahmon O., Maniscalco, Richard, Mason, Robert, Foss, Travis, Feizi, Kevin

**CC:** Eckersley, Karen

Dear Parties:

Below is the updated agenda for the Working Group Meeting:

## **Working Group Convened According to OP 22**

### **Agenda for 1<sup>st</sup> Working Group Meeting**

**Monday, July 24, 2017**

CA 911 Office Ground Floor, 630 Sequoia Pacific Blvd, Sacramento, CA 95811-02311

Go straight to 630, you do not need to get a badge for entry

Audio bridge for listening: 866 918 9521 passcode 621 1814 # (bridge problems? YAN@cpuc.ca.gov)

#### **10:00 Introductions, Context and Purpose**

Karen Eckersley, California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)

#### **Explanation of Network Outage and Reporting System (NORS)**

Moises Lopez, California Public Utilities Commission

Explanation of thresholds, types of reports, timing

#### **CUEA Notification Process**

Don Boland, California Utilities Emergency Association (CUEA)

#### **11:00 Agencies' Presentations**

Information received, overview of handoffs, who receives what

Requirements for information

#### **State Warning Center Notification Process**

Eric Lamoureux and Randy Gonzales, Cal OES

#### **California 9-1-1 Office Notification Process**

Andrew Mattson, CA State 9-1-1 Office

**CPUC Information**

Raymond Cho and Moises Lopez, CPUC

**Cal OES Tribal Notifications**

Denise Shemenski, Tribal Representative Cal OES

**12:00 Lunch break**

**1:15 Carrier Respondent Presentations**

Information provided, overview of handoffs, who receives what  
Proposals for solutions

**AT&T** Eric Batongbacal and operations representative

**Frontier** Charlie Born and operations representative

**Little LECs** Priya Brandes and LEC ops representative

**Business Carrier lead representative** – Jesús Román or/with representative

**Cable Carriers** Esther Northrup and ops representative

**Wireless Carriers** (Karen Eckersley is inviting facilities-based carriers)

**2:15 Discussion**

**2:45 Closing, Issues and Actions from the day**

Karen Eckersley

**3:00 Meeting Adjourned**

Please contact Karen Eckersley if you have any questions about this upcoming meeting.

Robert M. Mason III

Administrative Law Judge

California Public Utilities Commission

505 Van Ness Ave, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor

San Francisco, California, 94102

rim@cpuc.ca.gov