

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Federal-State Joint Board on	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service	)	
	)	
NPCR, Inc d/b/a/ Nextel Partners	)	DA 03-1959
	)	
Petition for Designation as an	)	
Eligible Telecommunications Carrier	)	
In the State of Virginia	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS  
of the  
ORGANIZATION FOR THE PROMOTION AND ADVANCEMENT  
OF SMALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The Organization for the Promotion and Advancement of Small Telecommunications Companies (OPASTCO) hereby submits these reply comments in response to the proceeding on the NPCR, Inc. d/b/a/ Nextel Partners (Nextel) petition for designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) for the state of Virginia.<sup>1</sup> OPASTCO is a national trade association representing approximately 500 small incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) serving rural areas of the United States. Its members, which include both commercial companies and cooperatives, together serve over 2.5 million customers. All of OPASTCO's members are rural telephone companies

---

<sup>1</sup>*Wireline Competition Bureau Seeks Comment on NPCR, Inc. d/b/a/ Nextel Partners Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Virginia*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Public Notice, DA 03-1959 (rel. June 16, 2003).

as defined in 47 U.S.C. §153(37). In addition, they are all ETCs in their respective service areas.

Nextel's application for ETC designation in the state of Virginia should be denied unless and until a more complete public interest showing, taking into account both the public benefits and the public costs of granting ETC status to Nextel, can be made.

Alternatively, Nextel's application should be stayed pending the resolution of the current proceeding that is considering changes to the Commission's rules relating to high-cost support in competitive study areas as well as the process for designating ETCs.

## **II. COMMENTS**

The applications of Nextel in Virginia and other states,<sup>2</sup> mark a significant change in the type of commercial mobile radio service (CMRS) providers that are applying for ETC designation. Prior applications that have come before the Commission have involved primarily smaller regional CMRS providers.<sup>3</sup> Nextel is the first CMRS provider with a national network to file ETC applications with the Commission. The manner in which the Commission addresses these applications will therefore have a significant impact on the future funding demands of the High-Cost program.

If the Commission grants Nextel's application for Virginia and other similar applications that are currently pending, it will only serve to encourage additional CMRS providers, including other large national carriers, to apply as well. This is because once one CMRS provider obtains ETC status in a rural area, the other CMRS providers in the

---

<sup>2</sup> To the best of OPASTCO's knowledge Nextel has applied for ETC status in New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Arkansas.

<sup>3</sup> Other regional carriers that have applied to the FCC for ETC status in areas served by rural telephone companies include RCC Cellular, Cellular South, and Western Wireless Corporation. Numerous others have applied for and received ETC designations from their respective state public utilities commissions.

area will be compelled to seek ETC designation as well in order to remain competitive.<sup>4</sup> In addition, should it become apparent that funding is readily available to CMRS providers merely for the asking, carriers may be violating their fiduciary obligation to their shareholders if they chose not to apply.

Such a large-scale increase in ETC designation requests will surely hasten the rapid escalation of the size of the Universal Service Fund (USF) as predicted by OPASTCO and other parties.<sup>5</sup> In its recent white paper *Universal Service in Rural America: A Congressional Mandate at Risk*, OPASTCO estimated that if all CMRS providers nationwide were to apply for and receive ETC status, the annual funding level of the High-Cost program would increase by approximately \$2 billion.<sup>6</sup> This would seriously threaten the continued ability of the High-Cost program to ensure the provision of affordable and “reasonably comparable” services and rates to consumers in the most remote regions of the nation.

On February 7, 2003, the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service (Joint Board) issued a Public Notice which sought comment on numerous competitive universal service issues, including the process for designating ETCs and the methodology for calculating support in competitive study areas.<sup>7</sup> Comments and reply comments have

---

<sup>4</sup> This is already occurring. For example, throughout Iowa many rural telephone company study areas have two, and in some cases even three mobile wireless providers that have been designated as ETCs. See, Universal Service Administrative Company, *Federal Universal Service Support Mechanisms Fund Size Projections for the Second Quarter 2003* (Jan. 31, 2003), Appendix HC07.

<sup>5</sup> See, OPASTCO Comments in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed May 5, 2003), pp. 10-11 (OPASTCO Portability Comments). See also, National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (NASUCA) Comments in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed May 5, 2003), p. 3 (NASUCA Portability Comments).

<sup>6</sup> Stuart Polikoff, *Universal Service in Rural America: A Congressional Mandate at Risk*, OPASTCO, (January 2003), p. 21.

<sup>7</sup> *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service Seeks Comment on Certain of the Commission's Rules Relating to High-Cost Universal Service Support and the ETC Designation Process*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Public Notice, 18 FCC Rcd 1941 (2003) (Joint Board Portability Public Notice).

been filed in this proceeding, and the Joint Board will be conducting a hearing on these issues on July 31, 2003. It is quite possible that, as a result of this proceeding, there will be significant changes in the way in which competitive ETCs are designated, and in the level of support that they receive.

In their comments on Nextel's petition, Verizon recommends that until the issues being considered in the Joint Board Portability Public Notice are resolved, the Commission should stay the approval of additional ETC applications.<sup>8</sup> OPASTCO believes that the public interest would best be served by preventing the USF from growing out of control at the same time that key policies related to universal service support levels and ETC designations are currently under review. Moreover, until these issues are resolved, it remains unclear how the Commission should evaluate whether or not the designation of an additional ETC would serve the public interest in any given rural service area. Thus, a stay on the review of pending ETC applications as proposed by Verizon and others would be one possible way in which this problem could be addressed.

While these comments are not intended to debate the many nuances of considering the public interest when evaluating an ETC application, OPASTCO wishes to briefly comment on the manner in which Nextel justifies its application as being in the public interest. Section 214(e)(2) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 requires that prior to designating an additional ETC in an area served by a rural telephone company,

---

<sup>8</sup> See, Verizon Comments, pp. 1, 8. This proposal is similar to one made by the National Telecommunications Cooperative Association (NTCA) in their reply comments to the Joint Board Portability Public Notice. See, NTCA Reply Comments in CC Docket No. 96-45 (filed June 3, 2003), pp. 22-23.

the Commission must find that such designation would be in the public interest. Within its application, Nextel argues that this criteria is met because:

[d]esignation of competitive ETCs promotes competition and benefits consumers in rural and high-cost areas by ...provid[ing] a valuable alternative to the existing telecommunications regime in these areas. In addition, designation ... will provide an incentive to the incumbent LECs in the Designated Areas to improve their existing networks in order to remain competitive, resulting in improved services to consumers.<sup>9</sup>

Thus, Nextel's application is based entirely on vague generalities regarding the generic benefits of competition. There is no evidence that Nextel would serve any new areas beyond those that it currently serves,<sup>10</sup> nor that Nextel would broaden its service offerings or reduce its prices if it were granted ETC status. There is also no indication that approval of ETC status for Nextel would materially increase the level of competition in the marketplace or hasten the delivery of advanced services.<sup>11</sup>

Furthermore, there is no discussion in Nextel's application of the public costs that would be incurred by providing high-cost support to Nextel for its existing customer base. In comments on the Joint Board Portability Public Notice, OPASTCO and other parties explained that a meaningful public interest analysis must address both the benefits and costs of designating an additional ETC in a rural service area, and that such a designation should occur only when the public benefits from supporting multiple

---

<sup>9</sup> See, *Petition of NPCR, Inc. d/b/a/ Nextel Partners for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Virginia* (filed April 23, 2003), pp. 7-8.

<sup>10</sup> The NTELOS Telephone Companies (NTELOS) state that, based upon existing information, they "are skeptical about whether Nextel actually has wireless coverage in all the areas it alleges." NTELOS Comments, p. 4.

<sup>11</sup> NTELOS correctly notes that "giving Nextel USF funding does not transform its services into anything new or different from what customers receive today." NTELOS Comments, p. 5. Moreover, as the amount of USF support going to CETCs continues to increase, "drastic cuts in [high-cost] funding are a distinct possibility," which would place "the ability of rural ILECs to continue to provide state-of-the-art services at reasonable prices at risk." *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

providers exceed the public costs created by supporting multiple networks.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, if the Commission decides not to stay all pending ETC applications, as suggested by Verizon and others, then the Commission should deny Nextel's application unless and until Nextel can make a meaningful demonstration that its designation as an ETC would serve the public interest.

Finally, OPASTCO would like to clarify a misunderstanding that may have been created by Verizon's comments regarding the Interstate Access Support (IAS) received by price cap carriers. Verizon states that "[u]nlike other portions of the high-cost fund, the interstate access support established by the CALLS Order was designed to reform the access charge regime."<sup>13</sup> While it is indeed true that IAS recovers costs previously recovered in access charges, the Interstate Common Line Support (ICLS) mechanism established by the Multi-Association Group (MAG) Order was similarly implemented in order to recover legitimate interstate access costs incurred by rate-of-return carriers.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> OPASTCO Portability Comments, pp. 40-44. *See also*, for example, NASUCA Portability Comments, pp. 8-11; CenturyTel Portability Comments, pp. 16-31; TCA Portability Comments, pp. 3-6; USTA Portability Comments, pp. 8-15; ICORE Portability Comments, pp. 10-16.

<sup>13</sup> Verizon Comments, Attachment p. 2.

<sup>14</sup> *Multi-Association Group (MAG) Plan for Regulation of Interstate Services of Non-Price Cap Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and Interexchange Carriers*, CC Docket No. 00-256, Second Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Fifteenth Report and Order, *Access Charge Reform for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers Subject to Rate-of-Return Regulation*, CC Docket No. 98-77, Report and Order, *Prescribing the Authorized Rate of Return for Interstate Services of Local Exchange Carriers*, CC Docket No. 98-166, Report and Order, 16 FCC Rcd 19613, 19667-19668, para. 128 (2001).

### III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should deny Nextel's application for ETC designation in Virginia unless and until a more complete public interest showing is made which takes into consideration both the public benefits and the public costs of granting Nextel ETC status. Alternatively, Nextel's application should be stayed pending the resolution of the current proceeding that is considering changes to the calculation of high-cost support for competitive ETCs and the development of policy guidelines for the review of ETC applications.

Respectfully submitted,

**THE ORGANIZATION FOR THE  
PROMOTION AND ADVANCEMENT OF  
SMALL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPANIES**

By: /s/ Stuart Polikoff  
Stuart Polikoff  
Director of Government Relations

By: /s/ Jeffrey W. Smith  
Jeffrey W. Smith  
Policy Analyst

OPASTCO  
21 Dupont Circle NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)659-5990

July 21, 2003

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Jeffrey W. Smith, hereby certify that a copy of the reply comments by the Organization for the Promotion and Advancement of Small Telecommunications Companies was sent by first class United States mail, postage prepaid, on this, the 21<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2003, to those listed on the attached list.

By: /s/ Jeffrey W. Smith  
Jeffrey W. Smith

## SERVICE LIST

**CC Docket No. 96-45  
DA 03-1959**

Sheryl Todd  
Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
Wireline Competition Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW  
Room 5-B540  
Washington, D.C. 20554  
(Three paper copies)

Kathleen Q. Abernathy,  
Commissioner and Chair  
Joint Board on Universal Service  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-B115  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Kevin J. Martin,  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-A204  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Jonathan Adelstein,  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-C302  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Michael J. Copps,  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-A302  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Bob Rowe,  
Commissioner  
Montana Public Service Commission  
1701 Prospect Avenue  
P.O. Box 202601  
Helena, MT 59620-2601

Nanette G. Thompson,  
Chair  
Regulatory Commission of Alaska  
1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 400  
Anchorage, AK 99501-1693

Chairman Michael Powell  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-B201  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Lila A. Jaber, Commissioner  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Gerald Gunter Building  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

J. Thomas Dunleavy, Commissioner  
New York Public Service Commission  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223-1350

Greg Fogleman,  
Economic Analyst  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Gerald Gunter Building  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Jeff Pursley  
Nebraska Public Service Commission  
300 The Atrium, 1200 N. Street  
P.O. Box 94927  
Lincoln, NE 68509-4927

Mary E. Newmeyer,  
Federal Affairs Advisor  
Alabama Public Service Commission  
100 N. Union Street, Suite 800  
Montgomery, AL 36104

Larry Stevens,  
Utility Specialist  
Iowa Utilities Board  
350 Maple Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Joel Shifman,  
Senior Advisor  
Maine Public Utilities Commission  
242 State Street  
State House Station 18  
Augusta, ME 04333-0018

Carl Johnson,  
Telecom Policy Analyst  
New York Public Service Commission  
3 Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223-1350

Peter Bluhm,  
Director of Policy Research  
Vermont Public Service Board  
Drawer 20  
112 State Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

Lori Kenyon,  
Common Carrier Specialist  
Regulatory Commission of Alaska  
1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 400  
Anchorage, AK 99501-1693

Charlie Bolle,  
Policy Advisor  
Nevada Public Utilities Commission  
1150 E. Williams Street  
Carson City, NV 89701-3105

Jennifer Gilmore,  
Principal Telecommunications Analyst  
Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission  
Indiana Government Center South  
302 West Washington Street, Suite E306  
Indianapolis, ID 46204

Peter Pescosolido,  
Chief, Telecom & Cable Division  
State of Connecticut  
Dept. of Public Utility Control  
10 Franklin Square  
New Britain, CT 06051

Michael Lee,  
Technical Advisor  
Montana Public Service Commission  
1701 Prospect Avenue  
P.O. Box 202601  
Helena, MT 59620-2601

Billy Jack Gregg  
Consumer Advocate Division  
Public Service Commission of  
West Virginia  
723 Kanawha Boulevard, East  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Union Building  
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Philip McClelland  
Assistant Consumer Advocate  
Pennsylvania Office of Consumer  
Advocate  
555 Walnut Street  
Forum Place, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923

Barbara Meisenheimer,  
Consumer Advocate  
Missouri Office of Public Counsel  
301 West High Street, Suite 250  
Truman Building  
P.O. Box 7800  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Earl Poucher,  
Legislative Analyst  
Office of the Public Counsel  
State of Florida  
111 West Madison, Room 812  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1400

Brad Ramsay,  
General Counsel  
NARUC  
1101 Vermont Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20005

David Dowds,  
Public Utilities Supervisor  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Gerald Gunter Building  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Matthew Brill,  
Legal Advisor  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-B115  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Daniel Gonzalez,  
Senior Legal Advisor  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-A204  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Lisa Zaina,  
Senior Legal Advisor  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 8-C302  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Carol Matthey,  
Deputy Bureau Chief  
Federal Communications Commission  
Wireline Competition Bureau  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-C451  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Katherine Schroder,  
Senior Advisor  
Federal Communications Commission  
Wireline Competition Bureau  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A426  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Sharon Webber,  
Deputy Division Chief  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A425  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Paul Garnett,  
Attorney  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A623  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Eric Einhorn,  
Division Chief  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A426  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Bryan Clopton,  
Mathematician  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A465  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Anita Cheng,  
Assistant Division Chief  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A445  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Shannon Lipp,  
Attorney  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A523  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Katie King,  
Attorney  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-B544  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Geoff Waldau,  
Economist  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-B524  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dana Walton-Bradford,  
Attorney  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-A314  
Washington, D.C. 20554

William Scher,  
Assistant Division Chief  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 5-B550  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Diane Law Hsu,  
Deputy Division Chief  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 6-A360  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Qualex International  
Portals II  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Room CY-B402  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Jennifer Schneider  
Attorney  
Federal Communications Commission  
WCB, Telecommunications Access  
Policy Division  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W., Room 6-C212  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Michael Glover  
Edward Shakin  
Ann Rakestraw  
Counsel for Verizon  
c/o Verizon  
1515 North Court House Road  
Suite 500  
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Mary McDermott  
NTELOS Telephone Companies  
401 Spring Lane Plaza  
Waynesboro, Virginia 22980

Albert Catalano  
Matthew Plache  
Ronald Jarvis  
Catalano & Plache PLLC  
*Counsel for Nextel Partners*  
3221 M Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20007