

(June 19, 2001), the ILEC may only self-certify the disaggregation of its FUSF support by adopting a plan for disaggregation that has received prior commission approval.

- (2) **Abstain from filing.** If a rural ILEC abstains from filing an election on or before May 15, 2002, the carrier will not be permitted to disaggregate its FUSF support unless it is ordered to do so by the commission pursuant to the terms of paragraph (5) of this subsection.
- (3) **Requirements for rural ILECs' disaggregation plans.** Pursuant to the federal requirements in 47 C.F.R. §54.315(e) a rural ILEC's disaggregation plan, whether submitted pursuant to paragraph (1)(B), (C) or (D) of this subsection, must meet the following requirements:
  - (A) the sum of the disaggregated annual support must be equal to the study area's total annual FUSF support amount without disaggregation;
  - (B) the ratio of the per line FUSF support between disaggregation zones for each disaggregated category of FUSF support shall remain fixed over time, except as changes are required pursuant to paragraph (5) of this subsection;
  - (C) the ratio of per line FUSF support shall be publicly available;
  - (D) the per line FUSF support amount for each disaggregated zone or wire center shall be recalculated whenever the rural ILEC's total annual FUSF support amount changes and revised total per line FUSF support and updated access line counts shall then be applied using the changed FUSF support amount and updated access line counts applicable at that point;

- (E) each support category complies with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph;
  - (F) monthly payments of FUSF support shall be based upon the annual amount of FUSF support divided by 12 months if the rural ILEC's study area does not contain a competitive carrier designated as an ETC; and
  - (G) a rural ILEC's disaggregation plan methodology and the underlying access line count upon which it is based will apply to any competitive carrier designated as an ETC in the study area.
- (4) **Additional requirements for self-certification of a disaggregation plan.** Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §54.315(d)(2), a rural ILEC's self-certified disaggregation plan must also include the following items in addition to those items required by paragraph (3) of this subsection:
- (A) support for, and a description of, the rationale used, including methods and data relied upon, as well as a discussion of how the plan meets the requirements in paragraph (3) of this subsection and this paragraph;
  - (B) a reasonable relationship between the cost of providing service for each disaggregation zone within each disaggregation category of support proposed;
  - (C) a clearly specified per-line level of FUSF support for each category pursuant to 47 C.F.R. §54.315(d)(2)(iii);
  - (D) if the plan uses a benchmark, a detailed explanation of the benchmark and how it was determined that is generally consistent with how the level of

support for each category of costs was derived so that competitive ETCs may compare the disaggregated costs for each cost zone proposed; and

(E) maps identifying the boundaries of the disaggregated zones within the study area.

(5) **Disaggregation upon commission order.** The commission on its own motion or upon the motion of an interested party may order a rural ILEC to disaggregate FUSF support under the following criteria:

(A) the commission determines that the public interest of the rural study area is best served by disaggregation of the rural ILEC's FUSF support;

(B) the commission establishes the appropriate disaggregated level of FUSF support for the rural ILEC; or

(C) changes in ownership or changes in state or federal regulation warrant the commission's action.

(6) **Effective dates of disaggregation plans.** The effective date of a rural ILEC's disaggregation plan shall be as specified in 47 C.F.R. §54.315.


This agency hereby certifies that the adoption has been reviewed by legal counsel and found to be a valid exercise of the agency's legal authority. It is therefore ordered by the Public Utility Commission of Texas that §26.418 relating to Designation of Common Carriers as Eligible Telecommunications Carriers to Receive Federal Universal Service Funds, is hereby adopted with no changes to the text as proposed.

SIGNED AT AUSTIN, TEXAS on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of November 2012.

**PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF TEXAS**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**DONNA L. NELSON, CHAIRMAN**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**KENNETH W. ANDERSON, JR., COMMISSIONER**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**ROLANDO PABLOS, COMMISSIONER**

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION  
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

AT RICHMOND, APRIL 9, 2004

IN RE:

2004 APR -9 A 11: 46

APPLICATION OF VIRGINIA CELLULAR LLC

CASE NO. PUC-2001-00263

For designation as an eligible  
telecommunications provider under  
47 U.S.C. § 214(e) (2)

ORDER INVITING COMMENTS AND/OR REQUESTS FOR HEARING

On December 21, 2001, Virginia Cellular LLC ("Virginia Cellular") filed an application with the State Corporation Commission ("Commission") for designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier ("ETC"). This was the first application by a Commercial Mobile Radio Service ("CMRS") carrier for ETC designation.<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the Order Requesting Comments, Objections, or Requests for Hearing, issued by the Commission on January 24, 2002, the Virginia Telecommunications Industry Association and NTELOS Telephone Inc. ("NTELOS") filed their respective comments and requests for hearing on February 20, 2002. Virginia Cellular filed Reply Comments on March 6, 2002. Our Order of April 9, 2002, found that § 214(e)(6) of the Act is applicable to Virginia Cellular's application because this Commission has not asserted jurisdiction over CMRS carriers and that Virginia Cellular should apply to the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") for ETC designation.

Virginia Cellular filed its Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Virginia with the FCC on April 26, 2002. On January 22, 2004, the FCC released its order designating Virginia Cellular as an ETC in specific portions of its licensed

---

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Cellular is a CMRS carrier as defined in 47 U.S.C. § 153(27) and is authorized as the "A-band" cellular carrier for the Virginia 6 Rural Service Area, serving the counties of Rockingham, Augusta, Nelson, and Highland and the cities of Harrisonburg, Staunton, and Waynesboro.

service area in the Commonwealth of Virginia subject to certain conditions ("FCC's January 22, 2004, Order").<sup>2</sup>

The FCC's January 22, 2004, Order further stated that Virginia Cellular's request to redefine the service areas of Shenandoah Telephone Company ("Shentel") and MGW Telephone Company ("MGW") in Virginia pursuant to § 214(3)(5) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("Act") was granted subject to the agreement of this Commission. On March 2, 2004, the FCC filed its January 22, 2004, Order as a petition in this case.<sup>3</sup>

Section 214(e)(5) of the Act states:

**SERVICE AREA DEFINED.** - The term "service area" means a geographic area established by a State commission (or the Commission under paragraph (6)) for the purpose of determining universal service obligations and support mechanisms. In the case of an area served by a rural telephone company, "service area" means such company's "study area" unless and until the Commission and the States, after taking into account recommendations of a Federal-State Joint Board instituted under section 410(c), establish a different definition of service area for such company.

In this instance, the FCC has determined that the service areas of Shentel and MGW, which are both rural telephone companies under the Act, should be redefined as requested by Virginia Cellular.<sup>4</sup> The FCC further recognizes that the "Virginia Commission's first-hand knowledge of the rural areas in question uniquely qualifies it to determine the redefinition proposal and examine whether it should be approved."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> CC Docket No. 96-45, *In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Virginia Cellular LLC Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the Commonwealth of Virginia.*

<sup>3</sup> See paragraph 45 of the FCC's January 22, 2004, Order. The FCC, in accordance with § 54.207(d) of its rules, requests that the Virginia Commission treat this Order as a petition to redefine a service area under § 54.207(d)(1) of the FCC's rules. A copy of the petition can be obtained from the Commission's website at: <http://www.state.va.us/scc/caseinfo.htm>.

<sup>4</sup> The FCC denied Virginia Cellular's request to redefine the study area of NTELOS. See paragraph 50 of the FCC's January 22, 2004, Order.

<sup>5</sup> The FCC's January 24, 2004, Order at paragraph 2. (citations omitted)

The Commission finds that interested parties should be afforded the opportunity to comment and/or request a hearing regarding the FCC's petition to redefine the service areas of Shentel and MGW. We note that the FCC believes that its proposed redefinition of these service areas should not harm either Shentel or MGW.<sup>6</sup> However, we request any interested party to specifically address in its comments whether our agreeing to the FCC's proposal to redefine the service areas of Shentel and MGW would harm these companies.

NOW UPON CONSIDERATION of all the pleadings of record and the applicable law, the Commission is of the opinion that interested parties should be allowed to comment or request a hearing regarding the FCC's proposed redefinition of Shentel's and MGW's service areas.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) Any interested party desiring to comment regarding the redefinition of Shentel's and MGW's service areas may do so by directing such comments in writing on or before May 7, 2004, to Joel H. Peck, Clerk of the State Corporation Commission, c/o Document Control Center, P.O. Box 2118, Richmond, Virginia 23218. Interested parties desiring to submit comments electronically may do so by following the instructions found on the Commission's website: <http://www.state.va.us/scc/caseinfo.htm>.

(2) On or before May 7, 2004, any interested party wishing to request a hearing regarding the redefinition of Shentel's and MGW's service areas shall file an original and fifteen (15) copies of its request for hearing in writing with the Clerk of the Commission at the address set forth above. Written requests for hearing shall refer to Case No. PUC-2001-00263 and shall include: (i) a precise statement of the interest of the filing party; (ii) a statement of the specific action sought to the extent then known; (iii) a statement of the legal basis for such action; and (iv) a precise statement why a hearing should be conducted in the matter.

---

<sup>6</sup> See paragraphs 43 and 44 of the FCC's January 22, 2004, Order.

(3) On or before June 1, 2004, interested parties may file with the Clerk of the Commission an original and fifteen (15) copies of any responses to the comments and requests for hearing filed with the Commission. A copy of the response shall be delivered to any person who filed comments or requests for hearing.

(4) This matter is continued generally.

AN ATTESTED COPY hereof shall be sent by the Clerk of the Commission to: each local exchange telephone company licensed to do business in Virginia, as shown on Attachment A hereto; David A. LaFuria, Esquire, Lukas, Nace, Gutierrez & Sachs, Chartered, 1111 19th Street, N.W., Suite 1200, Washington, D.C. 20036; Thomas Buckley, Attorney-Advisor, Telecommunications Access Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, 445 12th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20554; Virginia Telecommunications Industry Association, c/o Richard D. Gary, Esquire, Hunton & Williams LLP, Riverfront Plaza, East Tower, 951 East Byrd Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219-4074; L. Ronald Smith, President and General Manager, Shenandoah Telephone Company, P.O. Box 105, Williamsville, Virginia 24487; Lori Warren, Director of Regulatory Affairs, MGW Telephone Company, P.O. Box 459, Edinburg, Virginia 22824-0459; C. Meade Browder, Jr., Senior Assistant Attorney General, Division of Consumer Counsel, Office of Attorney General, 900 East Main Street, 2nd Floor, Richmond, Virginia 23219; and the Commission's Office of General Counsel and Divisions of Communications, Public Utility Accounting, and Economics and Finance.

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

**EXHIBIT 3**  
**WIRE CENTERS**

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION



REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED -- FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION

REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION



REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION