Mississippi Public Service Commission

NIELSEN COCHRAN, CHAIRMAN
JACKSON-FIRST DISTRICT
LEONARD L. BENTZ, VICE-CHAIRMAN
BILOXI- SECOND DISTRICT
BO ROBINSON, COMMISSIONER
HAMILTON-THIRD DISTRICT

BRIAN U. RAY
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
(601)961-5400

LYNN CARLISLE
SENIOR ATTORNEY
JOEL BENNETT, DIR.
FINANCE & PERSONNEL
MARK McCARVER, DIR.
GAS PIPELINE SAFETY

August 14, 2006

Marlene H. Dortch
Office of the Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445-12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

Karen Majcher
Vice President – High Cost & Low Income Division
Universal Service Administrative Company
2000 L Street, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20036

Re: CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service Support Certification for Rural Carriers

Dear Ms. Dortch and Ms. Majcher:

Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 54.314(d), The Mississippi Public Service Commission ("MPSC") files its required certification for **Alltel Communications, Inc. – Study Area Code No. 289010**.

In accordance with the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC") requirements in *Federal/State Joint Board on Universal Service, Ninth Report and Order, Eighteenth Order on Reconsideration, CC Docket No. 96-45; FCC 99-306*, the MPSC certifies that Alltel's proposed use of federal universal service high-cost support for the year 2006 will be used only for the provision, maintenance, and upgrading of facilities and services for which the support is intended, consistent with Section 254(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Pursuant to new FCC Rule 54.314(d)(6), the MPSC must certify Alltel's use of support to the FCC and USAC within sixty (60) days of the company's ETC designation to ensure that Alltel is eligible to receive high-cost universal service support commencing the date of its ETC designation.

Attached is a copy of the Commission's orders in its Docket No. 2005-UA-0581.

Sincerely,

Nielsen Cochran, Chairman

Leonard Bentz, Vice-Chairman

Bo Robinson, Commissioner

501 N. WEST STREET, SUITE 201-A, JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201
P.O. BOX 1174 JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39215-1174
FAX (601) 961-5469

BEFORE THE
MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

05-UA-581

ALLTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

IN RE: APPLICATION OF ALLTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC. FOR DESIGNATION AS AN ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER PURSUANT TO SECTION 214(e)(2) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

ORDER

HAVING COME ON BEFORE the Mississippi Public Service Commission ("Commission") for the consideration of ALLTEL Communications, Inc.'s ("ALLTEL's") Plan for Utilization of Federal Universal Service Funding in Rural Areas for the year 2006 (the "Plan") heretofore submitted to this Commission by ALLTEL, and after reviewing the Plan and being otherwise sufficiently advised, this Commission finds as follows:

I.

ALLTEL filed its Application in this docket on October 7, 2005, seeking Eligible Telecommunications Carrier ("ETC") status in certain rural areas of Mississippi ("Rural Areas") served entirely by ALLTEL, as well as rural areas partially served by ALLTEL. On May 23, 2006, ALLTEL requested bifurcation of its Application into two separate issues: 1) ETC designation in entirely-served areas and 2) ETC designation in partially-served areas. The Commission subsequently granted ALLTEL's request for bifurcation, and on June 14, 2006, the Commission entered its Order designating ALLTEL an ETC in the Rural Areas served entirely by ALLTEL under Section 47 U.S.C. 214(e)(2).

II.

On August 14, 2006, ALLTEL submitted its plan for utilization of the Federal Universal Service Fund for the year 2006 in Rural Areas for approval by the Commission.

III.

The Commission, after consultation with the Public Utilities Staff, concludes that ALLTEL's Plan for utilization of the Federal Universal Service Fund in Mississippi for the year 2006 is consistent with the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the pertinent FCC orders.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED:

1. The Commission hereby certifies that ALLTEL's Plan for Utilization of Federal Universal Service Funding is consistent with 47 U.S.C. 254(e).

2. ALLTEL shall file quarterly reports with the Commission providing the status of universal service fund expenditures and projects.

This Order shall be deemed issued on the day it is served upon the parties herein by the Executive Secretary of this Commission who shall note the service date in the file of this Docket.

Chairman Nielsen Cochran voted Aye; Vice Chairman Leonard Bentz voted Aye; and Commissioner Bo Robinson voted Aye.

Dated this the 14th day of August, 2006.

MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

NIELSEN COCHRAN, Chairman

LEONARD BENTZ, Vice Chairman

BO ROBINSON, Commissioner

ATTEST: A true copy.

BRIAN U. RAY
Executive Secretary

Effective this the 14TH day of August, 2006.

BEFORE THE MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

2005-UA-0581

IN RE: APPLICATION OF ALLTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC. FOR DESIGNATION AS AN ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER PURSUANT TO SECTION 214(e)(2) OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

ORDER

THIS DAY, there came on for consideration the Motion of Alltel Communications, Inc. ("Alltel") to Bifurcate Proceedings and Requesting Expedited Relief ("Motion"), and its Application for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier ("ETC") pursuant to Section 214(e)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended ("the Act"). In its Motion, Alltel requests that the proceedings in this docket be bifurcated into two separate and distinct issues for the Commission's consideration: 1) designation of Alltel as an ETC in the rural areas served entirely by Alltel as set forth in Exhibit C-1 to the Application; and 2) redefinition of the rural study areas not served entirely by Alltel as set forth in Exhibit D-1 to the Application.

In this proceeding Alltel seeks designation as an ETC in those geographic areas ("Rural Areas") of Mississippi served entirely by Alltel and certificated to Alltel Mississippi, Inc., Bay Springs Telephone Company, Inc., Calhoun City Telephone Company, Inc., Decatur Telephone Company, Inc., Delta Telephone Company, Inc., Franklin Telephone Company, Inc., Frontier Communications of Mississippi, Fulton Telephone Company, Inc., Lakeside Telephone Company, Inc., Myrtle Telephone Company, Inc., Noxapater Telephone Company, Inc., and Southeast Mississippi Telephone (collectively, the "Rural Independents"). In addition, Alltel has requested redefinition on a wire center-by-wire center basis of the following rural study areas:

Alltel Mississippi, Inc., Calhoun City Telephone Company, Inc., Delta Telephone Company, Inc., Franklin Telephone Company, Inc., and Frontier Communications of Mississippi.

On May 23, 2006, Alltel filed its Motion requesting bifurcation of these issues. The Commission, being sufficiently advised and on recommendation of the Public Utilities Staff finds that the Motion is well taken and should be granted. In addition, with respect to the first issue concerning Alltel's designation as an ETC in the rural areas served entirely by Alltel as set forth in Exhibit C-1 to the Application, the Commission being sufficiently advised and with the concurrence of the Public Utilities Staff, finds as follows:

(1) The Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties to enter this Order and entry hereof is in the public interest.

(2) On October 7, 2005, Alltel filed with this Commission its Application for designation as an ETC in the Rural Areas for purposes of receiving Universal Service Funds ("USF") pursuant to Section 214(e) of the Act and Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") Rules 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.201 through 54.207.

(3) Due and proper notice of the Application was given to all interested persons as required by law and the Commission's Public Utilities Rules of Practice and Procedure.

(4) By Order of the Commission dated October 13, 2005, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. intervened and became a party of record in this matter.

(5) By Order of the Commission dated November 1, 2005, Bay Springs Telephone Company, Bruce Telephone Company, Inc., Calhoun City Telephone Company, Myrtle Telephone Company, Southeast Mississippi Telephone Company, Century Telephone of North Mississippi, Decatur Telephone Company, Delta Telephone Company, Inc., Franklin Telephone Company, Inc., Frontier Telephone Company, Fulton Telephone Company, Georgetown

Telephone Company, Lakeside Telephone Company, Sledge Telephone Company, Fail, Inc. d/b/a Mound Bayou Telephone Company, Noxapater Telephone Company, and Smithville Telephone Company intervened and became parties of record in this matter.

(6) Alltel is licensed to provide wireless telecommunications service in the Mississippi cellular markets described in Exhibit "A" hereto and incorporated as part of this Order, which includes areas served by the Rural Independents. Alltel seeks ETC designation in the rural study areas served entirely by Alltel, attached hereto as Exhibit "B" (Exhibit "C-1" to the Application) and incorporated as part of this Order.

(7) Alltel serves in their entirety the rural study areas as set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto. Alltel seeks ETC designation for the entire rural study areas as set forth in Exhibit "B."

(8) Alltel previously sought and was granted ETC status in those areas served by BellSouth in Mississippi by Order of the Commission dated December 4, 2003, in Docket No. 03-UA-407. Alltel has been subsequently re-certified as an ETC for the BellSouth service areas on an annual basis on or before October 1st of each year.

(9) In its Application in this docket, Alltel has committed to each aspect of the public interest test as set forth in the Commission's Final Order in Docket No. 03-UA-234, *In re: Application of Centennial Tri-State Operating Partnership and Centennial Cellular Corp. for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier.*

PURPOSES OF THE ACT

(10) The Communications Act of 1934, as amended ("Act") has as its purpose the goal of making available to all Americans rapid and efficient radio and wire communication service.[1] Rural consumers are a specifically designated concern of the Act, in recognition of the reality

[1] 47 U.S.C. § 151.

that providing service in low population density areas is an expensive proposition to a provider. Congress explicitly stated rural, insular and high cost areas should have access to reasonably comparable services as those available in more profitable urban areas.[2]

(11) The 1996 amendments to the Act were intended to fully open the telecommunications market to competition. Specifically, "to provide for a pro-competitive, de-regulatory national policy framework designated to accelerate rapidly the private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition. . . ."[3] The Universal Service Fund was created as an explicit subsidy to assist in defraying the costs associated with achieving the Act's goals.[4]

(12) The focus of the Act is on consumers, not companies. Rural telephone companies have not been granted protection from competitive forces, but Congress did recognize the unique position of rural carriers and consumers. In particular, Congress was concerned about the continuation of adequate service to rural consumers in the event a rural incumbent elected to relinquish its ETC designation.[5] To that end, upon consideration of an ETC petition in rural areas, it is not sufficient that a telecommunications carrier is able to provide the necessary services. The Commission must also be persuaded that such a designation serves the public interest.[6]

(13) The importance of the public interest analysis has drawn much attention. The growth of the USF in recent years has drawn the future sustainability of the Fund into question.

---

[2] 47 U.S.C. § 254 (b).
[3] *Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of the Conference*, H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 458, 104th Cong., 2d Sess. At 131.
[4] 47 U.S.C. § 254(e).
[5] FCC Memorandum and Opinion and Order in Re: Western Wireless Corporation Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Wyoming, CC Docket No. 96-45 (¶ 18)(December 26, 2000).
[6] 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2).

Recent decisions of the FCC on ETC designation petitions have encouraged state Commissions to conduct thorough, fact-intensive reviews of ETC petitions for rural areas.[7]

(14) On August 10, 2004, the Commission entered its Order in Docket No. 2003-UA-0234, styled *In Re: Application of Centennial Cellular Tri-State Operating Partnership and Centennial Claiborne Cellular Corp. for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Pursuant to Section 214(e)(6) of the Telecommunications Act of 1937* (hereinafter, "Centennial Order"). In the Centennial Order, the Commission announced the following policy considerations to be applied to applications for ETC designations in rural areas:

(1) Benefits of increased competition.
(2) Impact of designation upon the Universal Service Fund.
(3) Commitment to quality of service by the competitive provider and ability to provide the supported services in a timely manner.
(4) Unique advantages and disadvantages of a competitor's service offering.
(5) Cream skimming analysis.

(15) Applying these considerations, the Commission finds that the granting of Alltel's application for designation as an ETC in the geographic areas certificated to the Rural Independents serves the public interest as set forth below.

Benefits of increased competition

(16) The public benefits of competition are well known. A competitive marketplace encourages innovation in products and services, produces incentives for efficiencies and increases the service options available to consumers. Competition alone is not sufficient to justify the granting of an ETC designation. It is, however, the articulated purpose of the 1996 amendments to the Act and is thus an important consideration. It is particularly important in the

---

[7] NCPR, Inc. d/b/a Nextel Partners, DA 04-2667 Order, (released Aug. 25, 2004) (designating Nextel as an ETC in seven states); *FCC Memorandum Opinion and Order in Re: Virginia Cellular, LLC, Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the Commonwealth of Virginia*, CC Docket No. 96-45 (¶ 28) (December 31, 2003).

rural setting where the cost of deploying new services is high. Wireless service, while ubiquitous in urban areas, is less competitive in rural ones and the distance between cellular towers makes service less predictable. Providing funds for cellular services to build and maintain the necessary infrastructure to serve rural areas meets the dual goals of the Act in providing rural Americans with comparable services and encouraging a pro-competitive environment.

(17) Alltel is licensed to provide cellular service in the Mississippi cellular market areas identified in Exhibit "A" hereto and does in fact already provide coverage throughout much of the State. With ETC designation in the areas certificated to the Rural Independents, Alltel would be able to expand its coverage area, increase the quality of service available to its customers and make available to more rural consumers comparable technology as is available in urban locations. Designation of Alltel as an ETC in the areas certificated to the Rural Independents under this consideration is therefore in the public interest.

Impact of designation on the Universal Service Fund

(18) A great deal of concern has been expressed regarding the sustainability of the USF due to the tremendous increase in the number of ETC designations granted.[8] Moreover, federal universal service funding policies are currently being reviewed by the FCC.

(19) The importance of sustaining the USF cannot be overstated. While one may reach a mathematical calculation which states what percentage of the USF as a whole a company receives, as a practical matter in state proceedings, that number will almost always be insignificantly small. The concern is not how much of the Fund an individual provider would receive but the effect of many companies upon the Fund.[9] While each provider only receives a

---

[8] See, e.g., In re Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service Recommended Decision, CC Docket No. 96-45 (February 27, 2004).

[9] FCC Memorandum Opinion and Order in Re: Virginia Cellular, LLC, Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the Commonwealth of Virginia, ¶ 31.

small amount in comparison to the total Fund, the aggregate directly affects future Fund viability.

(20) We acknowledge that granting an ETC designation to any company will impact the USF. In this instance, however, that alone is insufficient to deny Alltel's ETC petition. The benefits of designating Alltel as an ETC must also be considered, as explained below. We conclude that designating Alltel as an ETC in the rural areas will not cause a significant burden on the USF. Designation of Alltel as an ETC in the areas certificated to the Rural Independents under this consideration is therefore in the public interest.

Commitment to quality of service by the competitive provider and the ability to provide the supported services in a timely fashion

(21) The concern of the Commission under this consideration is to ensure rural consumers receive high quality, reliable service, particularly in the event a rural incumbent relinquishes its own ETC designation. In addition, the ability to provide quality service furthers the goal of making available to rural consumers technology comparable to that of urban locations.

(22) Before a provider may be granted ETC status, it must establish it is able to provide certain services:

a. Voice grade access to the public switched network;
b. Access to tree-of-charge "local usage" defined as an amount of minutes of use of exchange service;
c. Dual-tone multi-frequency signaling or its functional equivalent;
d. Single-party service or its functional equivalent;
e. Access to emergency services;
f. Access to operator services;
g. Access to directory assistance;
h. Access to interexchange services;
i. Toll limitations services for qualifying low-income customers.[10]

[10] 47 U.S.C. § 214(e) and C.F.R. § 54.201.

(23) In addition to these basic service requirements, the Commission prescribes the following requirements in order to assure quality, quantity and timeliness of service:

a. Mandatory compliance with the CTIA Consumer Code for Wireless Service;
b. Submission to the Commission the number of consumer complaints per 1000 handsets on a quarterly basis;
c. Designation of a representative for addressing customer service or quality of service complaints received by the Commission. The company representative should have the authority to resolve all complaint issues.
d. In providing supported services, the competitive provider shall provide immediate service to prospective customers within its existing network. When the prospective customer lies within the carrier's service area but outside of its existing network coverage, the ETC shall take the following steps in descending order:

    1. Determine whether the requesting customer's equipment can be modified or replaced to provide service;
    2. Determine whether a roof-mounted antenna or other equipment can be deployed to provide service;
    3. Determine whether adjustments can be made at the nearest cell tower to provide service;
    4. Determine whether a cell-extender or repeater can be employed to provide service;
    5. Determine whether there are any other adjustments to network or customer facilities that can be made to provide service;
    6. Determine whether it can offer resold services from another carrier's facilities to provide service;
    7. Determine whether an additional cell cite can be constructed to provide service and evaluate the costs and benefits of using high-cost support to serve the number of customers requesting service through such additional cell sites. If there is no possibility of providing service short of construction of a new cell site, the ETC will report this fact to the Commission along with the projected costs of construction and the ETC's determination as to whether the request for service is reasonable and whether high-cost funds should be expended on the request.
    8. Steps 1-6 of this procedure must be completed by the provider within thirty days of receiving a request for service. Should the provider find it necessary to proceed to Step 7, the provider will promptly notify the Commission and complete the analysis within an additional fifteen days.

(24) Financial stability of a company is also an inherent requirement of determining that company's ability to provide service. In addition to the disclosures submitted with an initial

filing of an application, a competitive ETC shall file annual reports with the Commission as required under Rule 3(F) of the Commission Rules and Regulations Governing Public Utility Service.

(25) All of these requirements are mandatory for all rural ETCs in the State of Mississippi. Failure to agree to them will result in the denial of an ETC designation petition regardless of any other considerations. Failure to abide by them after designation will result in an immediate inquiry into whether or not a designation should be suspended or withdrawn.

(26) Alltel has previously established its financial health in the review of its initial Application. Alltel has also established its ability to provide the services set forth in paragraph 22 above, as recognized by the Commission in its Order designating Alltel as an ETC in the areas served by BellSouth. Alltel has further demonstrated its capability to provide such services in the areas certificated to the Rural Independents as set forth in the Testimony of Bettye J. Willis. Pursuant to Alltel's commitment to abide by the Commission's public interest test and requirements, Alltel has voluntarily assumed all other requirements set forth in the Centennial Order. Designation of Alltel as an ETC in the areas set forth in Exhibit "B" certificated to the Rural Independents under this consideration therefore serves the public interest.

Unique advantages or disadvantages of a competitor's service offering

(27) Wireline and wireless services each have their own advantages and disadvantages. With wireless service the greatest and most obvious advantage is mobility. "The mobility of telecommunications assists customers in rural areas who often must drive significant distances to places of employment, stores, schools, and other critical community locations."[11] It is also invaluable in summoning emergency services in rural areas where public access telephones are

---

[11] *Virginia Cellular Memorandum Opinion and Order* (¶ 29).

few and far between. Wireless networks also tend to have broader local calling areas than wireline providers which assists in "leveling the field" between rural and urban areas and provides a direct benefit to the individual consumer.

(28) Disadvantages of wireless may include the common requirement by providers that a customer agree to a service contract, often for multiple years. The rural ILECs have no such binding service requirements.

(29) This Commission also has no authority to regulate the rates of wireless providers.[12] The incumbent carriers' rates are regulated and these companies must seek approval by this Commission before amending them. A wireless provider may alter its rates with no explanation or regulatory oversight. While this is certainly a competitive advantage in the marketplace, it raises for this Commission the concern of predatory pricing behavior. This will be of even greater concern in the future if the FCC adopts the recommendation to limit support to a single, primary line per household.[13] In the far more fiercely competitive atmosphere for Universal Service dollars such a decision would create, predatory pricing is not an insignificant possibility.

(30) At the present time, the advantages of deploying wireless service on the broadest possible scale outweigh the disadvantages, as well as furthering the goals of the Act. However, in order to assure that the competitive goals of the Act are met but not abused, we shall require wireless ETCs to make all service offerings available on their respective internet web sites, make available to the Commission all documentation to support the retail rates offered in areas in which the carrier receives federal universal service funds, and to file and update Lifeline/Linkup

---

[12] 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(3).

[13] *In re Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service Recommended Decision*, CC Docket No. 96-45, ¶ 3.

tariffs for Commission approval. Alltel has also agreed to these requirements as set forth in the Application.

(31) In view of Alltel's agreement to meet these requirements, we find designation of Alltel as an ETC in the areas set forth in Exhibit "B" certificated to the Rural Independents under this consideration is in the public interest.

Cream skimming analysis

(32) Another concern of designating competitive ETCs is that a competitor shall solicit and serve only in the high density, low cost areas of a rural telephone company's study area.[14] Mississippi is an overwhelmingly rural state. According to the 2000 Federal Census, only three Mississippi cities are classified as non-rural in this context, having populations of 50,000 or more residents.[15]

(33) However, there are areas of higher population concentrations than others even within an officially rural area. We must closely review applications which seek to serve only in those RSAs of *higher* population where a rural telephone company maintains several wire centers in different RSAs. We must also be concerned about competitive wireless providers who only advertise and make available its services in the most heavily populated portions of a rural incumbent's study area despite licensure to serve an entire study area.

(34) The FCC has made our analysis infinitely more manageable by their method of issuing cellular service licenses with clearly defined geographical boundaries. These boundaries are static and apply to all providers licensed in a particular market or rural area.

---

[14] *Virginia Cellular Memorandum Opinion and Order* (¶ 32).

[15] Biloxi-50,644
Gulfport-71,127
Jackson-184,256.

(35) With respect to Alltel's request for ETC designation in areas served entirely by Alltel, Alltel's request does not raise cream skimming concerns because, as evidenced by Exhibits C-1 and C-2 attached to the Application, Alltel serves the entirety of these rural study areas and seeks designation as an ETC for the entirety of these rural study areas. While rural creamskimming can occur when a competitor seeks to serve only the low-cost, high revenue customers in a rural telephone company's study area, in this case Alltel requests ETC designation throughout the entire study area of each rural telephone company set forth in Exhibit C-1 of the Application. Although none of the study areas listed in Exhibit B have disaggregated or targeted their support to the high cost areas, the Commission finds that, because of Alltel's commitment to serve the rural LEC study areas in their entirety, designating Alltel as an ETC in these study areas does not raise any cream skimming concerns.

(36) All competitive ETCs shall be required to advertise and make service available throughout the entirety of their FCC-licensed area. Failure to do so is more often than not an after-the-fact discovery rather than a problem which may be avoided in advance. However, in order to avoid noncompliance as much as is feasible, we shall also require the following reporting obligations of rural competitive ETCs:

1. Submission of quarterly reports detailing the number of service requests in the licensed ETC area which go unfulfilled and the basis for the refusal of service.
2. Submission of an initial build-out plan for areas where facilities do not yet exist upon designation as an eligible carrier.
3. Submission of maps showing existing facilities, coverage area, and planned sites of new facilities upon designation as an eligible carrier and updated annually.
4. Submission of a yearly Universal Service Plan on June 1st of each year for the Commission's use in complying with the October 1st certification deadline set forth by the FCC. The plan shall include the amount of universal service funds the company expects to receive the following year and the company's proposed use of those funds.

5. The company shall file quarterly reports of the amount of universal funds received for the quarter and updates of the progress of the projects previously approved by the Commission.

(37) Alltel has agreed to these reporting obligations as set forth in the Application.

(38) Upon consideration of all available facts and policy considerations, we find designation of Alltel as an ETC in the areas served entirely by Alltel as set forth in Exhibit "B" hereto serves the public interest.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED:

(1) Alltel's Motion to Bifurcate Proceedings and Requesting Expedited Relief is hereby GRANTED. Accordingly, the proceedings in this docket are bifurcated into the following separate and distinct issues: 1) designation of Alltel as an ETC in the rural areas served entirely by Alltel as set forth in Exhibit C-1 to the Application; and 2) redefinition of the rural study areas not served entirely by Alltel as set forth in Exhibit D-1 to the Application.

(2) The representations of Alltel contained in the Application are hereby approved and adopted by the Commission as Alltel's written commitment to meet the requirements and obligations of Rural ETCs as set forth herein. Nothing herein or in the Application is deemed to affect in any way the rights of any party under the Act.

(3) With respect to the first issue of Alltel's request for designation as an ETC in the rural areas served entirely by Alltel, the Application of Alltel Communications, Inc. for designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier in geographic areas served entirely by Alltel and certificated to the Rural Independents as described in Exhibit "B" hereto, is GRANTED. No redefinition is required with respect to these areas.

(4) Alltel's request for redefinition on a wire center-by-wire center basis of the rural study areas set forth in Exhibits "D-1" and "D-2" to the Application will be addressed by separate Order of the Commission.

(5) Alltel shall provide service either through its own facilities or through its own facilities in combination with resale to all subscribers upon request in its designated area.

(6) This designation is for federal universal service funds, and is based on federal rules and guidelines as they presently exist. This Commission retains continuing jurisdiction to review, modify, or revoke its designation. Additionally, should any substantive information in this docket supplied by Alltel prove inaccurate, the designation of Alltel as an ETC is subject to revocation.

(7) The entire file of the Commission is specially made part of the record in this matter. All information or documents submitted to the Commission as proprietary or confidential shall remain under seal.

(8) The designation of Alltel as a rural ETC shall be effective upon issuance of this Order.

(9) As with all carriers, designation as an ETC will be subject to the certification and reporting requirements adopted by the Commission in Docket No. 05-AD-662, *In Re: In the Matter of Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Designation for Federal Universal Service Support*.

This Order shall be deemed issued on the day it is served upon the parties herein by the Executive Secretary of this Commission who shall note the service date in the file of this Docket.

Chairman Nielsen Cochran voted Aye; Vice Chairman Leonard Bentz voted Aye; and Commissioner Bo Robinson voted Aye.

Dated this the 14th day of June, 2006.

MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

NIELSEN COCHRAN, Chairman

LEONARD BENTZ, Vice Chairman

BO ROBINSON, Commissioner

ATTEST: A true copy.

BRIAN U. RAY
Executive Secretary

Effective this the 14th day of June, 2006.

EXHIBIT
A

Alltel Communications, Inc.
Mississippi Cellular Market Areas
Where it is Authorized to Provide Service

CMA	NAME	RSA/MSA
106	Jackson, MS	MSA
173	Biloxi-Gulfport, MS	MSA
252	Pascagoula, MS	MSA
494	Mississippi 2 - Benton	RSA
497	Mississippi 5 - Washington	RSA
498	Mississippi 6 - Montgomery	RSA
499	Mississippi 7 - Leake	RSA
502	Mississippi 10 - Smith	RSA
503	Mississippi 11 - Lamar	RSA

EXHIBIT
B

ALLTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
RURAL STUDY AREAS SERVED IN THEIR ENTIRETY

INCUMBENT LEC NAME	COUNTY	CLLI CODE	WIRECENTER NAME
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Jones	BGCKMSXA	BIG CREEK
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Jasper	BYSPMSXA	BAY SPGS
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Smith	HMWDMSXA	HOMEWOOD
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Jasper	LOUNMSXA	LOUIN
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Smith	OLTYMSXA	OLD TAYLORSVILLE
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Smith	PLVLMSXA	POLKVILLE
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Jones	PTMNMSXA	PITTMAN
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Jasper	RSHLMSXA	ROSE HILL
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Jones	SOSOMSXA	SOSO
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Smith	SYLVMSXA	SYLVARENA
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Smith	WHOKMSXA	WHITEOAK
BAY SPRINGS TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Rankin	WLTRMSXA	WALTERS
DECATUR TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Newton	DCTRMSXA	DECATUR
FULTON TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Itawamba	FLTNMSXA	FULTON
FULTON TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Itawamba	FRVWMSXA	FAIRVIEW
FULTON TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Itawamba	MNTCMSXA	MANTACHIE
FULTON TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Itawamba	TRMTMSXA	TREMONT
LAKESIDE TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Washington	GLALMSXA	GLEN ALLAN
MYRTLE TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Union	MYRTMSXA	MYRTLE
NOXAPATER TELEPHONE CO. INC.	Winston	NXPRMSXA	NOXAPATER
SOUTHEAST MISSISSIPPI TELEPHONE	Greene	LKVLMSXA	LEAKESVILLE
SOUTHEAST MISSISSIPPI TELEPHONE	Greene	NELYMSXA	LEAKESVILLE
SOUTHEAST MISSISSIPPI TELEPHONE	Greene	SNHLMSXA	SANDHILL
SOUTHEAST MISSISSIPPI TELEPHONE	Greene	STTLMSXA	STATE LINE