

Law Offices

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 100
Washington, D.C. 20006-6801

202-955-3000
FAX 202-955-5564
www.hklaw.com

Annapolis
Bethesda
Boston
Bradenton
Chicago
Fl. Lauderdale
Jacksonville
Lakeland
Los Angeles
Melbourne
Miami
International Offices
Caracas*
Helsinki
Mexico City
Rio de Janeiro

New York
Northern Virginia
Orlando
Portland
Providence
St. Petersburg
San Antonio
San Francisco
Seattle
Tallahassee
Tampa
West Palm Beach
Sao Paulo
Tel Aviv*
Tokyo
*Representative Office

January 10, 2003

DAVID A. O'CONNOR
202-828-1889

Internet Address:
doconnor@hklaw.com

RECEIVED

VIA HAND DELIVERY

JAN 10 2003

Marlene H. Dortch, Esq.
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
236 Massachusetts Ave., NE
Suite 110
Washington, DC 20002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District
Application for Review
DA 02-3077
File No. SLD-229391
CC Docket No. 96-45
CC Docket No. 97-21

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Transmitted herewith, on behalf of Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District ("Chawanakee"), are an original and four (4) copies of its Application for Review of the Wireline Competition Bureau's *Order on Reconsideration* in the above-captioned proceeding.

For the reasons set forth in the Application for Review, Chawanakee requests that the Commission grant the Application for Review and provide the relief requested therein.

An extra copy of this filing is enclosed. Please date-stamp the extra copy and return it to the courier for return to me.

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABOVE


0+4

Marlene H. Dortch, Esq.
January 10, 2003
Page 2

Should you have any questions concerning this matter, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP



David A. O'Connor
Counsel for Chawanakee Joint Elementary
School District

Enclosure

cc (w/encl.): Universal Service Administrative Company
Schools and Libraries Division
Box 125 – Correspondence Unit
80 South Jefferson Road
Whippany, NJ 07981

FCC Commissioners and Staff listed
in Certificate of Service

WAS1 #1096753 v1

**BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Petition for Reconsideration)	DA 02-3077
)	
Request for Review of the)	
Decision of the)	
Universal Service Administrator by)	
)	
Chawanakee Joint Elementary)	File No. SLD-229391
School District)	
)	
Federal-State Joint Board on)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service)	
)	
Changes to the Board of Directors)	CC Docket No. 97-21
of the National Exchange Carriers)	
Association, Inc.)	

RECEIVED

JAN 10 2003

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

To: The Commission

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

Alan Y. Naftalin
Mark J. Palchick
David A. O'Connor
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Suite 100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 955-3000

Counsel for Chawanakee
Joint Elementary School District

January 10, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents ii

Summary iii

I. Questions Presented for Review..... 2

II. Factors Warranting Commission Consideration of the Questions Presented 3

III. Background 4

IV. The Commission Is Authorized to Review SLD Decisions Pursuant to Section 1.117
of the Commission’s Rules and Section 5(c)(4) of the Act 6

V. The Bureau Lacks Authority to Review Novel Questions of Law and Policy 9

VI. The Commission’s Authority to Review SLD Decisions and Bureau Decisions Is Not
Redundant 10

VII. Conclusion 11

Exhibits

- Exhibit 1: Bureau’s ***Order on Reconsideration***
- Exhibit 2: Bureau’s ***Order***
- Exhibit 3: Chawanakee’s Petition for Reconsideration
- Exhibit 4: Chawanakee’s Request for Review
- Exhibit 5: Chawanakee’s Supplement to Request for Review

SUMMARY

Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District (“Chawanakee”) hereby seeks Commission review of the Wireline Competition Bureau’s (the “Bureau’s”) *Order on Reconsideration* in this proceeding. The issues raised in this proceeding are of great importance to the Commission. because the Bureau’s decision has in effect constricted the Commission’s authority to review decisions issued by the Schools and Libraries Division of the Universal Service Administrative Company (“SLD”). The Bureau has held that the Commission does not have authority to conduct *sua sponte* reviews of SLD decisions pursuant to Section 1.117 of the Commission’s rules. Chawanakee urges the Commission to reverse this dangerous precedent and affirm the Commission’s ultimate authority over the universal service program, including the authority to conduct *sua sponte* reviews of SLD decisions pursuant to Section 1.117 of the rules.

Having asserted its jurisdiction in this regard, the Commission should decide the substantive matters raised in Chawanakee’s appeal. Specifically, the Commission should hold that the Paperwork Reduction Act (“PRA”) entitled Chawanakee to appeal an SLD decision during the Commission’s “administrative process”, which process includes the period for *sua sponte* reviews under Section 1.117. Chawanakee submits that the FCC Form 471 used by Chawanakee to file its funding request with the SLD failed to comply with the Office of Management and Budget’s terms of clearance of the FCC Form 471 and, accordingly, Chawanakee was entitled under the PRA to provide any information missing from its application at any time during the administrative process, which Chawanakee has done. Consequently, the Commission should direct SLD to process Chawanakee’s FCC Form 471 application as having been timely filed during the Funding Year 4 filing window.

Because the issues raised in this Application for Review present novel questions of law and policy which will affect the entire operation of the universal service program, Chawanakee urges the Commission to decide these issues in an expeditious manner.

WAS1 #1150161 v1

**BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Petition for Reconsideration)	DA 02-3077
)	
Request for Review of the)	
Decision of the)	
Universal Service Administrator by)	
)	
Chawanakee Joint Elementary)	File No. SLD-229391
School District)	
)	
Federal-State Joint Board on)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service)	
)	
Changes to the Board of Directors)	CC Docket No. 97-21
of the National Exchange Carriers)	
Association, Inc.)	

To: The Commission

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District (“Chawanakee”), by its attorneys and pursuant to Sections 1.115(a), 1.115(c), and 54.722(b) of the rules of the Federal Communications Commission (“Commission”), 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.115(a), (c), 54.722(b), hereby submits this Application for Review of the Wireline Competition Bureau’s (“Bureau’s”) *Order on Reconsideration* released November 12,2002 in the above-captioned matter.’ This

¹ Request for Review of the Universal Service Administrator by Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District, CC Docket Nos. 96-45 and 97-21, Order on Reconsideration, DA 02-3077 (WCB rel. Nov. 12,2002) (“*Order on Reconsideration*”), *affirming* Request for Review of the Universal Service Administrator by Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District, CC Docket Nos. 96-45 and 97-21, Order, DA 02-1211 (WCB rel. May 23,2002) (“*Order*”). Copies of the Bureau’s Order on Reconsideration and Order are attached hereto as Exhibits 1 and 2, respectively.

Application for Review is timely filed pursuant to the Commission's procedural rules.²

I. Questions Presented for Review.³

The initial question presented to the Commission is whether the Bureau erred in concluding that a decision of the Administrator of the Schools and Libraries Division ("SLD") of the Universal Service Administrative Company ("USAC") is not an action "'taken pursuant to delegated authority' under Section 1.117 [of the Commission's rules]."⁴ For the reasons set forth below, Chawanakee submits that the SLD has been delegated its authority by the Commission and that the Commission therefore has authority to review such decisions on its own motion pursuant to Section 1.117 of the Commission's rules and Section 5(c)(4) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act"), 47 U.S.C. § 155(c)(4).

Assuming that the Commission has authority to conduct *sua sponte* reviews of SLD decisions within the forty-day period permitted by Section 1.117 of the Commission's rules, the second question presented for review is whether the Paperwork Reduction Act ("PRA")⁵ entitled

² See *Implementation of Interim Filing Procedures for Filings of Requests for Review*, Order, CC Docket No. 96-45, FCC 01-376, 67 Fed. Reg. 3441 (Jan. 24, 2002) (extending the period for filing an Application for Review arising from a Request for Review from 30 days to 60 days).

³ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.115(b)(1).

⁴ *Order on Reconsideration*, para. 6.

⁵ The relevant provisions of the PRA provide as follows:

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information . . . if—

(1) the collection of information does not display a valid control number assigned by the Director [of the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB")]. . . or

(2) the agency fails to inform the person who is to respond to the collection of information that such person is not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a valid control number.

(continued...)

Chawanakee to file its pleading during the Commission’s “administrative process”⁶ and if so, whether the “administrative process,” for purposes of the PRA, included the Commission’s *sua sponte* review period under Section 1.117.⁷ Finally, the Commission should decide whether the FCC Form 471 used by Chawanakee to file its funding request failed to comply with the terms of clearance issued by the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) in connection with OMB’s approval of FCC Form 471. In its initial Request for Review, Chawanakee argued that the FCC Form 471 filed electronically by Chawanakee did not comply with OMB’s terms of clearance, and that pursuant to the PRA Chawanakee was permitted to supply any information missing from its application at any time during which Chawanakee’s application remained within the administrative process. Chawanakee urges the Commission to address all of these questions and to determine that Chawanakee’s application should be approved in full by the SLD.

II. Factors Warranting Commission Consideration of the Questions Presented.*

The questions presented in this Application for Review are novel questions of law and policy, and the Commission has reserved consideration of such questions to itself.⁹ The questions presented are of considerable importance to the Commission, because the Bureau’s decision has in effect constricted the Commission’s authority to review decisions issued by the

(b) The protection provided by this section may be raised in the form of a complete defense, bar, or otherwise at any time during the agency administrative process or judicial action applicable thereto.

44 U.S.C. § 3512(a)-(b); see *also* *Saco River Cellular, Inc. v. FCC*, 133 F.3d 25, 33 (D.C. Cir. 1998), cert. denied *sub nom.* *Northeast Cellular Telephone Co. v. FCC*, 525 U.S. 813 (1998).

⁶ *Id.* § 3512(b).

⁷ See Chawanakee Petition for Reconsideration at 2-4 and Chawanakee Request for Review at 2-5, copies of which are attached hereto as Exhibits 3 and 4, respectively. The exhibits to the Petition for Reconsideration and Request for Review have been redacted but are available upon request.

⁸ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.115(b)(2).

⁹ See 41 C.F.R. § 54.722(a).

SLD. Moreover, if the Bureau is correct that **SLD** does not act pursuant to authority delegated from the Commission, then SLD lacks any statutory authority to carry out its functions, and all actions of SLD are and have been void *ab initio*. Therefore, Chawanakee urges the Commission to reverse the Bureau's decision and direct the SLD to grant Chawanakee's Funding Year 4 application in full.

III. Background.¹⁰

Chawanakee electronically filed and certified its funding request for Year 4¹¹ of the E-rate program on January 17, 2001. However, at that time the SLD required applicants to submit an original signature page to SLD even though applicants were permitted to sign the FCC Form 471 request electronically, as Chawanakee had done. The original signature page and Item 21 attachments were sent to SLD via Federal Express on January 19, 2001, one day after the filing window closed.

By a postcard dated July 10, 2001, **SLD** notified Chawanakee that its application was received after the filing window had closed. On July 26, 2001, Chawanakee filed a Letter of Appeal with the **SLD**, which was denied by the SLD Administrator on August 5, 2001

Chawanakee filed a Request for Review of the Administrator's decision with the Bureau on September 6, 2001, the thirty-first day after the Administrator's decision.¹² Although the thirty-day deadline for filing such an appeal had passed, Chawanakee argued that, procedurally, the Commission retained jurisdiction over the proceeding because the Commission was authorized to review the decision of the Administrator on the Commission's own motion until

¹⁰ More detailed background information is provided in Chawanakee's Petition for Reconsideration and Request for Review.

¹¹ Now referred to as Year 2001; *see Order on Reconsideration* 1 n.2.

¹² A Supplement to the Request for Review was filed on October 23, 2001, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit 5. The exhibits submitted with the Supplement have been redacted but are available upon request. In order to expedite processing of Chawanakee's application, Chawanakee requests that the Commission also resolve the issues presented in the Supplement.

September 17, 2001 pursuant to Section 1.117(a) of its rules.¹³ Because the Commission retained jurisdiction over the proceeding, Chawanakee argued that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the PRA entitled Chawanakee to present its appeal at any time during the agency administrative process, including the forty-day period specified in Section 1.117(a). Substantively, Chawanakee argued that the Commission's FCC Form 471 violated the PRA because the Commission had failed to comply with the OMB's terms of clearance of FCC Form 471 by failing to display information required by OMB. Because of this violation of the PRA, Chawanakee argued that the provisions of the PRA entitled Chawanakee to provide any information missing from its January 17, 2001 application at any time during the Commission's administrative process. Chawanakee did so on January 19, 2001, while the administrative process continued. Accordingly, Chawanakee requested that the Bureau reverse the decision of the Administrator and instruct SLD to accept Chawanakee's application as having been timely filed.

The Bureau rejected Chawanakee's arguments in the *Order* and in the *Order on Reconsideration*. In the *Order on Reconsideration*, the Bureau ruled that SLD does not act pursuant to delegated authority for purposes of Section 1.117 of the rules. Because of this ruling, the Bureau determined that it was unnecessary for the Bureau to determine whether this proceeding remained ongoing for purposes of the PRA by virtue of the Commission's right to review *sua sponte* the SLD's decision for forty days after the SLD's decision.¹⁴ Chawanakee now submits this timely appeal of the Bureau's decision.

¹³ See Request for Review at 4 n.10; Petition for Reconsideration at 2-4.

¹⁴ *Order on Reconsideration* n.10

IV. The Commission Is Authorized to Review SLD Decisions Pursuant to Section 1.117 of the Commission’s Rules and Section 5(c)(4) of the Act.

The Bureau has held that the Commission is without authority to review, on its own motion, a decision issued by the **SLD**. Chawanakee submits that the Bureau’s determination is inconsistent with the Act and the Commission’s orders establishing review procedures for USAC decisions. Moreover, Chawanakee notes that if the Bureau’s interpretation is correct that **SLD** does not act pursuant to authority delegated from the Commission, then **SLD** has not been delegated any authority from the Commission and **SLD** lacks any statutory authority to carry out its functions; accordingly, all actions of **SLD** are and have been void *ab initio*. Chawanakee disagrees with this interpretation and urges the Commission to confirm its delegation of authority to **SLD**, its jurisdiction over **SLD** decisions, and its plenary authority over the administration of the universal service program.

The Commission’s power to delegate its statutory authority derives from Section 5(c) of the Act, which provides that: “When necessary to the proper functioning of the Commission and the prompt and orderly conduct of its business, the Commission may, by published rule or by order, delegate any of its functions [except those not at issue here] to a panel of commissioners, an individual commissioner, and employee board or an individual employee”¹⁵

Chawanakee submits that even though USAC and **SLD** are not FCC commissioners or employees, USAC and **SLD** nonetheless have been delegated authority by the Commission and their actions are therefore subject to *sua sponte* review by the Commission for up to forty days after an SLD decision has been issued, pursuant to Section 1.117(a) of the Commission’s rules

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 did not prescribe a structure for administering the universal service program. In ordering the establishment of USAC and the **SLD**, the Commission determined that SLD would “bring to the administration of the schools and libraries

¹⁵ 47 U.S.C. § 155(c)(1).

[program] the necessary expertise” to ensure that the program would be administered efficiently and in the best interests of its intended beneficiaries.¹⁶ Thus, the Commission was delegating its specific congressional authority to implement the universal service provisions of Section 254(h) to USAC and SLD in order to ensure the proper functioning of the Commission and the prompt and orderly conduct of its business. This is exactly the type of authority delegation contemplated under Section 5(c) of the Act. When Congress enacted the Telecommunications Act of 1996, it specifically ordered the Commission to promulgate rules to implement the universal service provisions of Section 254(h).¹⁷ The Commission has interpreted Section 254(h) to permit the Commission to delegate these functions to USAC and SLD,¹⁸ and the Commission has so delegated its authority.” SLD is carrying out government functions, is operating under the Commission’s orders, and is directly accountable to the Commission. The fact that Section 5(c) of the Act does not specifically provide for delegation of authority to an entity such as USAC should not bar the Commission from delegating its authority to USAC.

Rather, the provisions of Section 5(c) which authorize the Commission to delegate its authority to commissioners and employees are intended to be an indicative, and not an exhaustive, list of the Commission’s authority to delegate its powers provided by Congress, and certainly these provisions were not intended to be a limitation on the Commission’s reviewing

¹⁶ *Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, Report and Order and Second Order on Reconsideration, CC Dockets No. 97-21, 96-45, FCC 97-253, 12 FCC Rcd 18,400, para. 2 (1997). Pursuant to congressional mandate, the Commission later merged SLD’s predecessor into USAC. See Conference Report on H.R. 3579, H.R. Rept. No. 105-504.

¹⁷ 47 U.S.C. § 254(h)(2)

¹⁸ See *Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carriers Association, Inc.; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, Third Report and Order in CC Docket No. 97-21, Fourth Report and Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 97-21 and Eight Order on Reconsideration in CC Docket No. 96-45, FCC 98-306, 13 FCC Rcd 25,058, para. 14 (1998) (“Third Report and Order”).

¹⁹ See *id.* paras. 2, 20.

authority. Section 5(c) is the only provision of the Act that would allow non-Commission employees to carry out the Commission’s functions.” Indeed, if the Bureau’s position that the SLD does not act under delegated authority is accepted, then the Commission had no authority to delegate its authority to SLD, and any actions taken by the SLD are and have been void *ab initio*.” There is no question that certain Commission functions have been delegated to SLD. The Commission therefore has necessarily expanded the scope of entities to whom authority may be delegated pursuant to Section 5(c)(1).

Accordingly, Section 5(c)(1) of the Act contemplates the delegation of authority to an entity such as the SLD, and the Commission is therefore entitled to review on its own motion any SLD decision pursuant to Section 5(c)(4), as promulgated under Section 1.117(a) of the Commission’s rules. The Commission cannot disclaim authority to conduct *sua sponte* reviews of decisions delegated to non-employee entities — it must retain the same, if not more, authority

²⁰ The Commission appears to have taken the position that it derives authority to direct the establishment of USAC and SLD from Section 4(i) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 154(i). See *Third Report and Order* para. 14. Whatever the source of the Commission’s authority to order the establishment of USAC and SLD, the Commission certainly retained the authority to conduct a *sua sponte* review of an SLD Administrator’s decision on the thirty-first day after the Administrator’s decision. Section 1.117 of the rules does not limit the Commission’s authority to review decisions issued pursuant to Section 5(c) delegated authority; rather, Section 1.117 authorizes the Commission to review *any* delegated authority decision, including decisions issued by an entity established pursuant to the Commission’s powers under Section 4(i). In addition, Section 0.201 sets forth the Commission’s delegations pursuant to Section 5(c). SLD is not included in Section 0.201. However, there can be no doubt that the Commission has delegated its authority under Section 254(h) to SLD. There is no other authority given to SLD other than that given by the Commission. Therefore, SLD is acting “pursuant to delegated authority” of the Commission for purposes of Section 1.117.

²¹ Chawanakee is not arguing that the Commission lacked authority to establish USAC and SLD, although this issue was raised by the General Accounting Office. See *FCC Lacked Authority to Create Corporations to Administer Universal Service Programs*, GAO/T-RCED/OGC-98-84 (rel. Mar. 31, 1998). Apparently the Commission has requested, but has not received, from Congress specific statutory authority to establish USAC and SLD. See *Third Report and Order* para. 21.

to review those decisions on its own motion as it has to review the decisions of employees that have been delegated authority.

The Commission has repeatedly reiterated its plenary authority over the universal service support mechanisms and the universal service administrator. In its 1998 Report to Congress, the Commission stated that it “retains ultimate authority over the operation of the support mechanisms [and that] [p]arties that object to any action taken by the [Administrator] can bring the matter to Commission’s attention and request remedial relief.”²² Clearly, then, the Administrator of the support mechanisms operates pursuant to authority delegated to it by the Commission, since the Commission retains plenary authority over the universal service fund and since the Administrator lacks any authority to act other than by the authority granted to it by the Commission. Consequently, the Commission is authorized to review any decision by the SLD pursuant to Section 1.117 of the Commission’s rules.

V. The Bureau Lacks Authority to Review Novel Questions of Law and Policy.

In any event, the Bureau should have referred Chawanakee’s appeal to the full Commission initially, because Chawanakee’s appeal raises novel questions of law and policy for which the Bureau has not been delegated authority to review.²³ As stated in the *Third Report and Order*, “Petitions that raise novel questions of fact, law or policy shall be brought before the full Commission.”²⁴ In this case, Chawanakee has argued that the PRA entitles Chawanakee to

²² *Report in Response to Senate Bill 1768 and Conference Report on H.R. 3579*, Report to Congress, FCC 98-85, para. 9 (1998); *see also Third Report and Order*, para. 17 (“[T]he Commission retains ultimate control over the operation of the federal universal support mechanisms through its authority to establish the rules governing the support mechanisms and through its review of administrative decisions that are appealed to the Commission.”).

²³ *Third Report and Order*, para. 68.

²⁴ *Id.*; *see also* 47 C.F.R. § 54.722(a). Indeed, Chawanakee captioned its appeal of the Bureau’s May 23, 2002 Order as an Application for Review by the full Commission, but stated that the appeal could be treated as a Petition for Reconsideration. In its *Order on Reconsideration*, the (continued..)

raise its arguments at any time during the administrative process, and that the “administrative process” extends until the time for *sua sponte* Commission review has expired under Section 1.117 of the Commission’s rules. Chawanakee’s substantive arguments concerning the PRA also raise questions of first impression for the Commission. Finally, the Bureau has raised the additional novel issue of whether the SLD acts pursuant to delegated authority. All of these issues present novel questions of law and policy, and therefore the appeal should not have been reviewed by the Bureau but rather by the full Commission. Chawanakee urges the Commission to address all of the novel questions raised in this proceeding due to their importance in connection with the proper functioning of the entire universal service program.

VI. The Commission’s Authority to Review SLD Decisions and Bureau Decisions Is Not Redundant.

The Bureau also appears to have ruled that the Commission lacks authority to review SLD decisions pursuant to Section 1.117 because Part 54 of the rules contains no language corresponding to the language contained in Section 1.106 and 1.115 regarding Commission review of actions taken pursuant to delegated authority. Chawanakee submits that the absence of corresponding language in Part 54 is not dispositive, and certainly does not demonstrate that the Commission lacks authority to review SLD decisions pursuant to Section 1.117. The Commission has clearly delegated its authority to administer the universal service program to SLD and USAC.²⁵ However, as the Commission has repeatedly stated, it retains ultimate authority over the administration of the universal service program,²⁶ and this includes the authority to conduct *sua sponte* reviews of any actions taken by SLD. Such *sua sponte* reviews

Bureau treated Chawanakee’s pleading as a Petition for Reconsideration. *Order on Reconsideration* n.1.

²⁵ See *Third Report and Order* paras. 2, 20

²⁶ See, e.g., *id.* para. 14.

must necessarily be covered by Section 1.117 because SLD is acting pursuant to authority delegated by the Commission. Accordingly, the Commission should reject the Bureau's argument.

The Commission should also reject the Bureau's apparent suggestion that the Commission's addition of Section 54.719 to the rules, rather than the amendment of Section 1.106 or 1.115 of the rules, in some way indicates that the SLD does not act pursuant to delegated authority.²⁷ Chawanakee submits that the Bureau's conclusion infers too much. However the delegation of Commission authority to SLD is viewed, and regardless of whether SLD's actions are reviewed under 1.106, 1.115 or 54.719, the Commission retains authority pursuant to Section 1.117 to review, on its own motion, any action taken by SLD, since such actions are taken pursuant to authority delegated by the Commission. Moreover, the Commission has specifically cross-referenced Sections 54.719 and 54.722(b) with the Commission's appellate review procedures under Part 1 of the rules, thus confirming that SLD acts pursuant to delegated authority and that any SLD decision may be reviewed by the Commission on its own motion pursuant to Section 1.117(a) of the rules.²⁸

VII. Conclusion.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, Chawanakee urges the Commission to: 1) reverse the Bureau's *Order on Reconsideration*; 2) affirm the Commission's jurisdiction over SLD and affirm that SLD acts pursuant to authority delegated by the Commission; 3) hold that the provisions of the PRA entitled Chawanakee to file its Request for Review during the Commission's *sua sponte* review period under Section 1.117; 4) hold that the Commission did not properly comply with OMB's terms of clearance of FCC Form 471; and, accordingly, 5)


²⁷ See Order on Reconsideration, para. 6.

²⁸ See 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.719(c), 54.722(b).

direct SLD to process Chawanakee's Year 4 funding request as having been timely filed during the filing window, and provide such other relief as may be deemed necessary and proper by the Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District



Alan Y. Naftalin

Mark J. Palchick

David A. O'Connor

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

2099 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 100

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 955-3000

Its Attorneys

Dated: January 10, 2003

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Laura Ledet, an employee of Holland & Knight LLP, hereby certify that on January 10, 2003, I caused a copy of the foregoing Application for Review to be delivered via first-class mail, postage prepaid to the following:

Chairman Michael K. Powell*
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy*
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Michael J. Copps*
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Kevin J. Martin*
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein*
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Jane E. Mago, Esq.*
General Counsel
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

William Maher*
Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Carol E. Matthey*
Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth St. SW
Washington, DC 20554

Universal Service Administrative Company
Schools and Libraries Division
Box 125 – Correspondence Unit
80 South Jefferson Road
Whippany, NJ 07981


Laura Ledet

* Via Hand Delivery

WAS1 #1148218 v4

EXHIBIT 1



Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

Memo

To: David A. O'Connor
Counsel for Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District

From: Mark G. Seifert, Deputy Chief
Telecommunications Access Policy Division
Wireline Competition Bureau

Date: November 15, 2002

Re: DA 02-3077, Released November 12, 2002

Please find accompanying this memo the Commission's decision on your Request for Review. The accompanying decision may be referenced in the future by its Proceeding Number and release date: DA 02-3077, November 12, 2002.

If you are not satisfied with this decision, you may file a petition for reconsideration with the Commission within 30 days of the release date of the decision.¹ However, the petition will generally be granted only if it demonstrates an error in the decision based upon (1) facts which relate to events which have occurred or circumstances which have changed since the last opportunity to present such matters; or (2) facts unknown to petitioner until after the Request for Review was filed and which could not, through the exercise of ordinary diligence, have been learned prior to that time.² Petitions for reconsideration are decided by the Wireline Competition Bureau of the Commission.

You may also file an application for review with the Commission if you are displeased with this decision. Your application for review must be filed within 60 days of the release date of the decision pursuant to section 1.115(c) of our rules. Please note that the application for review will not be granted if it relies on questions of fact or law upon which the designated

¹ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.106(f).

² See 47 C.F.R. § 1.106(b)(2)

authority has been afforded no opportunity to **pass?** Applications for review are decided by the full Commission.

Petitions for reconsideration **and** applications for review should be submitted to the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., 20554, they should reference CC Docket No. 02-6 as well as the Proceeding Number of the decision from which relief is sought, and should otherwise conform to the requirements the Commission's rules.⁴

If you have any questions regarding the foregoing, feel free to contact the Telecommunications Access Policy Division at (202) 418-7400.

cc: Craig Treber, Technology Director
Chawanakee Joint Elementary School District

³ See *Implementation of Interim Filing Procedures for Filings of Requests for Review*, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order, FCC-376, 17 FCC Rcd 339 (2002). See 47 U.S.C. § 1.115(c).

⁴ See 47 C.F.R. § 1.106, 1.115.