

C. Waiver Requests from Petitioners Operating TDMA Networks

1. Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc. (Leaco)

57. As described in its waiver request, Leaco is a small cellular and PCS carrier serving approximately 7,000 subscribers in rural New Mexico using a TDMA air interface.” Leaco requested, “to the extent necessary,” a waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission’s rules to provide it with an additional seven months after September 16,2005 in which to come into compliance with the rule.” Leaco stated, however, that it does not believe that it requires such a waiver, but is filing this request out of an abundance of caution.¹⁷⁹ Leaco explained that it plans to overbuild its existing TDMA network with a CDMA network.” The overbuild is scheduled to be completed by March 31,2006, well in advance of the September 18,2006 date by which such overbuilds must be completed if the overbuilding TDMA carrier wishes, to take advantage of the relief provided in the *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*.¹⁸¹

58. Under Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1), Leaco’s existing obligation is to offer two compliant handsets to its customers that receive service from the overbuilt portion of its network. Leaco represented that, as of the date of submission of its waiver request, construction of the overbuild had yet to begin, and, as a consequence, there are no customers that receive service from the overbuilt portion of its network.¹⁸² Leaco therefore believes that it does not require a waiver of the handset deployment requirement.¹⁸³ We agree that, under the circumstances described, there is no need for Leaco to obtain a waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1).¹⁸⁴ We accordingly dismiss Leaco’s waiver request.

2. SLO Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellular One of San Luis Obispo (SLO) and affiliate Entertainment Unlimited, Inc. (EU)

59. As described in its petition, SLO is the licensee of Cellular Radiotelephone Service Station KNKQ332, serving the California 5 – San Luis Obispo RSA, and its affiliate, EU, is the licensee of Broadband PCS Stations KNLF915 (Frequency Block D, Salinas-Monterey, California BTA), KNLG742 (Frequency Block D, San Luis Obispo, California BTA), KNLG743 (Frequency Block F, San Luis Obispo, California BTA), KNLG744 (Frequency Block D, Santa Barbara-Santa Maria, California BTA), WPOK 945 (Frequency Block C, Bakersfield, California BTA), and WOK 946 (Frequency Block C, Visalia-Porterville-Hanford, California BTA). SLO and EU both currently employ the TDMA air interface, and they collectively have fewer than 500,000 subscribers.¹⁸⁵ SLO and EU requested waivers that would extend the September 16,2005 compliance deadline by one year.¹⁸⁶ SLO and EU cited the

¹⁷⁷ See Leaco Petition at 2. On May 16,2006, Leaco amended its Petition, stating that it “no longer requires relief until April 16, 2006 as [initially] requested. . . , and . . . amends its [Petition] to request relief only until February 20, 2006.” See Leaco Amendment at 1.

¹⁷⁸ See Leaco Petition at 1

¹⁷⁹ *Id.*

¹⁸⁰ *Id.* at 2.

¹⁸¹ *Id.*; Leaco November 17,2005 Report at 1-2.

¹⁸² See Leaco Petition at 2.

¹⁸³ *Id.* at 3.

¹⁸⁴ Of course, following completion of the overbuild and the initiation of CDMA service, Leaco will be obligated to provide compliant CDMA handsets to its customers.

¹⁸⁵ See SLO/EU Petition at 1

¹⁸⁶ *Id.*

unavailability of U3-rated handsets as grounds for the request,¹⁸⁷ stating that “it is not surprising that [hearing aid-compatible] handsets are not available for the TDMA air interface, a technology that is being discontinued by the equipment and handset manufacturers.”¹⁸⁸

60. We dismiss the waiver requests filed by SLO and EU given our view that neither carrier needs a waiver in light of the relief provided in the *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order* to TDMA carriers overbuilding their facilities with networks that employ a different air interface. SLO and EU represented that, as of the time of their waiver requests, they were employing only the TDMA air interface.¹⁸⁹ SLO and EU further explained, however, that they plan to replace their existing TDMA facilities with GSM facilities.¹⁹⁰ Moreover, the SLO and EU waiver requests are premised solely on the unavailability of compliant TDMA handsets.¹⁹¹ In light of these facts, SLO and EU are eligible for the relief provided to overbuilding TDMA carriers in the *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*. Accordingly, Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1), rather than Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(A), is the applicable regulatory provision for these carriers, and the only handset deployment requirement they would have had to meet as of September 16, 2005, would be for GSM handsets.¹⁹² Such a requirement would be triggered, however, only when SLO and EU began providing service using the GSM air interface and, as noted above, they represented that they are not doing so yet. We therefore dismiss the waiver requests filed by SLO and EU for the same reason we dismiss the waiver request filed by Leaco, *i.e.*, their current operations appear to comply with the hearing aid compatibility rules applicable to overbuilding TDMA carriers, and thus there is no need for a waiver.

3. Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc. (CPK) and Litchfield County Cellular, Inc. dba Ramcell of Kentucky LLC (Litchfield)

61. As described in their substantively identical petitions, CPK operates a cellular TDMA system in the Kentucky 6 – Madison RSA market,¹⁹³ and Litchfield operates a cellular TDMA system in the Kentucky 11 – Clay RSA market.¹⁹⁴ Pursuant to their initial waiver requests, CPK and Litchfield each requested a waiver of the hearing aid compatibility rules until February 28, 2006, to provide them with time to divest their TDMA systems.¹⁹⁵ In addition to noting the unavailability of U3-rated TDMA handsets, each carrier contended that it has determined “that it is not viable from a business standpoint to overbuild its current TDMA air interface system to employ an alternative air interface protocol and, thus,

¹⁸⁷ *Id.* at 5 (asserting that the basis for the waiver request “is starkly simple and can be concisely stated: There are no HAC compliant digital wireless telephones using the TDMA air interface available for purchase by wireless carriers, such as the Petitioners, that meet a U3 rating under the ANSI Standard C63.19 for radio frequency interference”).

¹⁸⁸ *Id.* at 6

¹⁸⁹ *Id.* at 1

¹⁹⁰ *Id.* SLO and EU did not provide an expected completion date for the GSM overbuild

¹⁹¹ *Id.* at 3-6

¹⁹² We note that neither the SLO/EU Petition nor the SLO or EU Reports discussed the relief that was provided to TDMA carriers in the *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*.

¹⁹³ See CPK Petition at 1

¹⁹⁴ See Litchfield Petition at 1

¹⁹⁵ See CPK Petition at 1; Litchfield Petition at 1. On September 1, 2005, CPK and Litchfield initially reported to the Commission (in the E911 rulemaking proceeding) that they had initiated efforts to sell their TDMA systems. See Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc., Interim Report in CC Docket No. 94-102 at 3-4 (filed September 1, 2005); Litchfield County Cellular, Inc. dba Ramcell of Kentucky LLC, Interim Report in CC Docket No. 94-102 at 3-4 (filed September 1, 2005).

cannot avail itself of the transition period for TDMA systems under Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B).”¹⁹⁶ In addition, each carrier stated that it has narrowly tailored its waiver request to provide the minimum time needed to secure a purchaser of its TDMA system and consummate the transaction.¹⁹⁷ On February 17, 2006, however, CPK and Litchfield filed supplements to their waiver requests, seeking an additional **six** months, until August 31, 2006, to complete the sales of their TDMA systems.¹⁹⁸ They contended that, despite their best efforts, it has been difficult to find buyers for these systems, necessitating the additional time to complete a sale.¹⁹⁹

62. On August 30, 2006, CPK and Litchfield filed further supplements, stating that each had secured an “agreement in principle” to sell their systems to “a large, well-established wireless carrier.”” They indicated that the purchasing carrier had promised to bring their systems into compliance with the Commission’s hearing aid compatibility and **E91 1** requirements, and that the carrier was currently “conducting its due diligence review in anticipation of purchasing” the systems.²⁰¹ They indicated that, once review was completed, they “anticipated” signing a final agreement and submitting the requisite assignment applications to the Commission, and that they were “hopeful” that the applications would be filed by October 31, 2006.²⁰² To permit them to complete the sale and to obtain the required Commission approval, they requested a further six-month extension of the compliance deadline to February 28, 2007.²⁰³

63. In their November 17, 2006 Reports, both CPK and Litchfield stated, for the first time, that they offer only two digital wireless phones and are therefore entitled to the *de minimis* exception.²⁰⁴ Their November 17, 2006 Reports did not discuss, however, the status of their attempts to sell their respective systems.

64. Finally, on March 30, 2007, CPK and Litchfield filed applications for assignment, seeking to have their cellular and other licenses assigned to Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless (Verizon Wireless).” In their attached Public Interest statements, CPK and Litchfield stated that “[w]ithin nine months after the close of the transaction” between Verizon Wireless and the two carriers, Verizon

¹⁹⁶ CPK Petition at 1; Litchfield Petition at 1. *See also* CPK November 17, 2005 Report at 1; Litchfield November 17, 2005 Report at 1. The carriers noted that if they had instead chosen to implement a CDMA overlay, as they initially planned, they would have been able to avail themselves of the full relief provided to TDMA carriers in the *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*, and thus would have had until September 18, 2006, to come into compliance, obviating the need for these waivers. CPK Petition at 2; Litchfield Petition at 2.

¹⁹⁷ *See* CPK Petition at 2-3; Litchfield Petition at 2-3

¹⁹⁸ *See* CPK Supplement at 1-2; Litchfield Supplement at 1-2.

¹⁹⁹ *See* CPK Supplement at 2; Litchfield Supplement at 2. Both carriers represented that they have listed their TDMA systems with a telecommunications broker, who “is bringing his company’s resources to bear to broadly market [the] system to prospective buyers,” but that potential buyers are reluctant to purchase a **system** that they will have to overlay with an alternative air interface. CPK Supplement at 2; Litchfield Supplement at 2.

²⁰⁰ *See* CPK Further Supplement at 2; Litchfield Further Supplement at 2.

²⁰¹ *See* CPK Further Supplement at 2-3; Litchfield Further Supplement at 2-3

²⁰² *See* CPK Further Supplement at 3; Litchfield Further Supplement at 3.

²⁰³ *See* CPK Further Supplement at 3; Litchfield Further Supplement at 3.

²⁰⁴ *See* CPK November 17, 2006 Report; Litchfield November 17, 2006 Report.

²⁰⁵ *See* Application for Assignment of Authorization by Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc. and CellCo Partnership, ULS No. 0002962219, filed Mar. 30, 2007 (CPK Application); Application for Assignment of Authorization by Litchfield County Cellular, Inc. and CellCo Partnership, ULS No. 0002962269, filed Mar. 30, 2007 (Litchfield Application).

Wireless would complete the conversion of both networks to CDMA.²⁰⁶ At that time, CPK and Litchfield asserted, “existing customers will be provided with CDMA digital handsets and transitioned to Verizon Wireless’ newly constructed CDMA network.”²⁰⁷

65. We deny the waiver requests of CPK and Litchfield because, in contrast to other carriers requesting waivers of the hearing aid compatibility rules, CPK and Litchfield have not shown diligent efforts to come into compliance as soon as possible. Reduced to its essentials, CPK’s and Litchfield’s argument is that they lack the financial resources to come into compliance, and therefore will have to sell their respective systems to an entity or entities that can afford our regulatory mandate. The claims of financial distress are not supported by the factual detail the Commission demands from licensees attempting to excuse compliance with the rules on financial grounds.” CPK’s and Litchfield’s decisions not to overlay their respective TDM.4 networks are business decisions, as are their determinations to sell the systems. Absent submission of the requisite financial documentation, we cannot determine whether CPK and Litchfield lacked the financial resources to change their network technology or bring themselves into hearing aid compatibility compliance in other ways, and, absent information to the contrary, we cannot conclude that the systems’ failure to sell at an earlier date is other than a function of the asking price.

66. The carriers could have implemented those business decisions, and sold their TDMA systems, well in advance of the September 16, 2005 compliance deadline. Had they sold these systems earlier to entities able and prepared to implement a CDMA or GSM air interface, the purchasing carrier(s) could have availed themselves of the relief provided to TDMA carriers in the *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*, and would have needed waiver relief, if at all, only for the areas receiving non-TDMA service.²⁰⁹ Although CPK and Litchfield represent that they acted diligently in listing the systems with a broker and otherwise took reasonable measures to complete the planned sales as soon as possible, they offer only conclusory assertions in this regard, and offer no explanation for their delay in listing the systems with a broker. CPK and Litchfield each observe that, “because TDMA is an outmoded air interface for commercial mobile radio service, it poses an economic disincentive to potential buyers as

²⁰⁶ See CPK Application, Attach. 4, Description of Transaction and Public Interest Statement (CPK Public Interest Statement), at 1; Litchfield Application, Attach. 4, Description of Transaction and Public Interest Statement (Litchfield Public Interest Statement), at 1.

²⁰⁷ CPK Public Interest Statement at 1; Litchfield Public Interest Statement at 1

²⁰⁸ See, e.g., Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, *Order to Stay*, CC Docket No. 94-102, 18 FCC Rcd 20987, 20997 ¶ 29 (2003) (providing that small carriers seeking waivers of E911 requirements partly on the basis of financial hardship should “provide the Commission with sufficient and specific factual information to assess the *bona fides* of the hardship showing” and that “to the extent this information contains data about the carrier’s financial condition that is not prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), it is unlikely that the Commission will be able to assign much weight to this data” and that “a carrier’s justification for a waiver on extraordinary financial hardship grounds will be strengthened by documentation demonstrating that it has used its best efforts to obtain financing for the required upgrades from Federal, state, or local sources of funding that are available to it”); Teleprompter of Quincy, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 83 FCC 2d 431, 438 ¶ 14 (1980) (parties seeking waivers of the broadcast network non-duplication rules are cautioned that “[m]ere arguments and predictions ... are insufficient substitutes for factual information ... including ... detailed financial information”).

²⁰⁹ To the extent the carriers suggest that a waiver is warranted in part because they *could* have availed themselves of the relief provided to overbuilding TDMA carriers, see n. 196, *supra*, we disagree. In fashioning this relief, the Commission made clear that it “is limited in scope and applies only to carriers that fully intend to completely replace their existing TDMA networks.” *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 11243 ¶ 48. In contrast to Leaco, SLO and EU, carriers that affirmatively state they will undertake overbuilds, CPK and Litchfield indicated that they had no intention of ‘overbuilding their TDMA systems themselves, but contemplated that the requisite overbuilds would be undertaken by the purchaser of their systems.

any buyer will have to overlay the TDMA system to an alternative air interface.”” This circumstance, however, was entirely foreseeable to the carriers. Indeed, it was the Commission’s recognition that hearing aid-compatible handsets would not be available for TDMA systems that impelled the provision of special relief to TDMA carriers in the *Hearing Aid Compatibility Reconsideration Order*.

67. CPK and Litchfield have not shown they satisfy any of the criteria for waiver set forth in Section 1.925(b)(3) of the Commission’s rules and the cases interpreting that rule. It is the Commission’s general policy not to grant extensions of compliance deadlines based on matters within the regulated entities’ control, such as business decisions of the sort made by CPK and Litchfield.²¹¹ While it is entirely a matter of each carrier’s business judgment as to whether to itself overbuild a CDMA system or to sell its TDMA system to another carrier that would undertake such an overbuild, the choice of the latter option does not excuse the failure to more diligently pursue such a transaction.

68. We also disagree with CPK’s and Litchfield’s assertions that grant of the requested waivers would be consistent with precedent where a Division waived the Commission’s rules “to accommodate the sale of systems from one carrier to another.”** The carriers each cite the same two cases as support for this contention: the *NOW E911 Waiver Order* and the *Dobson E911 Waiver Order*.”” As a preliminary matter, we note that the *NOW E911 Waiver Order* and the *Dobson E911 Waiver Order* both addressed essentially the same waiver request, *i.e.*, a request for additional time to comply with an E911 requirement for a system that had been acquired by Dobson Cellular Systems, Inc. (Dobson Cellular) from NOW Licenses, LLC (NOW). That waiver was granted based on the “totality of the circumstances presented.”²¹⁴ The circumstances surrounding that waiver are distinguishable from the circumstances surrounding the waiver requests by CPK and Litchfield. Critically, NOW provided more than conclusory assertions regarding the dire financial circumstances compelling the sale of its system; it provided documentation in the form of an independent auditor’s report to substantiate its claims of financial distress.”” In contrast, neither CPK nor Litchfield offers any documentation of its financial condition, each merely stating that it has determined “that due to the costs of an overlay, the rural nature of the market, and financial setbacks, such a measure is not economically viable from a business standpoint...”²¹⁶

²¹⁰ CPK Supplement at 2; Litchfield Supplement at 2.

²¹¹ *See, e.g.*, MCI Communications Corporation, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 2 FCC Rcd 233,234 ¶ 7 (1987) (stating that “independent business judgments based upon economic considerations traditionally have not been considered circumstances beyond a licensee’s control and thus have not justified extensions of time”); *P&R Temmer v. FCC*, 743 F.2d 918, 930 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (agreeing with the Commission that a licensee’s failure to meet a loading deadline “resulted from its own business decisions and is thus attributable to circumstances under [the licensee’s] control,” and finding as a consequence that the Commission was justified in denying the licensee’s request to waive or extend the loading deadline).

²¹² CPK Petition at 4; Litchfield Petition at 4.

²¹³ *See* CPK Petition at 4 n.9; Litchfield Petition at 4 n.9 (both citing Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, NOW Licenses, LLC Request for Temporary Waiver of Section 20.18(c) of the Commission’s Rules, *Order*, 19 FCC Rcd 10521 (WTB PSCID 2004) (*NOW E911 Waiver Order*), and Revision of the Commission’s Rules to Ensure Compatibility with Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems, Dobson Cellular Systems, Inc. Request for Temporary Waiver of Section 20.18(c) of the Commission’s Rules, *Order*, 19 FCC Rcd 10518 (WTB PSCID 2004) (*Dobson E911 Waiver Order*).

²¹⁴ *NOW E911 Waiver Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 10521 ¶ 1; *Dobson E911 Waiver Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 10518 ¶ 1.

²¹⁵ *See NOW E911 Waiver Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 10523 ¶ 9 (noting that auditor’s report concluded that “NOW is continuing to operate only because of its pending sale to Dobson” and that, “absent that sale, NOW would no longer be capable of operating, or not for as lengthy period of time”).

²¹⁶ CPK Petition at 2; Litchfield Petition at 2.

69. In addition, NOW did not rely merely on an assertion that it needed time to obtain a buyer for its systems, but on a demonstration that it had actively sought to obtain the upgrade necessary to achieve compliance from its switch vendor with no success. The Wireless Telecommunications Bureau had already granted relief to many other small carriers “because of vendor delay in providing software upgrades,” and the Public Safety and Critical Infrastructure Division found in NOW’s case that “it is clear from its filings that an extension is warranted for the same reasons underlying the relief granted by the Bureau to those carriers”²¹⁷ Thus, the Division found NOW’s delay justified partly by its own efforts at compliance, and not merely by the need to obtain a buyer for its network. CPK and Litchfield, however, seek to justify a similar period of delay based purely on their efforts at obtaining a buyer for their networks without any demonstrated effort either to obtain compliant handsets for their TDMA systems or to initiate an overlay that would have entitled them to relief under § 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B).

70. In sum, the Division granted relief to NOW “given the initial showing by NOW that it would have met the showing necessary to be granted an extension under the [previous order], the evidence of severe financial hardship, and the pending sale of NOW to Dobson.”²¹⁸ CPK and Litchfield have neither demonstrated severe financial hardship nor made any related demonstration that, despite good faith efforts, they were unable to achieve compliance themselves. The cases cited by CPK and Litchfield therefore do not support granting their waiver requests simply as an accommodation to their business decisions to sell their systems rather than undertake an overbuild. We conclude that they have not adequately justified their failure to bring their systems into compliance by the deadline, either through an earlier sale or by undertaking the overbuild themselves.

71. Finally, we find that CPK’s and Litchfield’s respective claims to the *de minimis* exception in their November 17, 2006 Reports do not provide a basis for relief for prior periods. Neither party identified the period(s) of time during which it was not in compliance with the hearing aid compatibility requirements. Further, the facts that they did not mention any entitlement to the exception before November 17, 2006, and that they have not withdrawn their pending waiver requests indicate that their excepted status began only recently. We therefore deny the waiver requests of CPK and Litchfield, and refer the matter of their non-compliance with the hearing aid compatibility rules to the Commission’s Enforcement Bureau.

IV. CONCLUSION

72. In this *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, we grant waivers *nuncpro tunc* to five of the petitioners, grant in part and deny in part waivers *nuncpro tunc* to five of the petitioners, deny waivers to six of the petitioners, and dismiss three remaining petitioners’ waiver requests as unnecessary. We conclude that these temporary limited waivers, viewed in broader context, would not result in a significant delay in achieving the Commission’s goal of ensuring that all Americans with hearing disabilities have full access to, and helpful technical information about, the benefits of wireless telephony. Our commitment to this important goal remains undiminished, and we reiterate that we will continue to closely monitor the ongoing deployment and marketing of hearing aid-compatible digital wireless handsets. With respect to those waivers that we deny in full or in part today, it is amply clear that the measures undertaken by these petitioners fall short of the Commission’s criteria for waiver of the hearing

²¹⁷ *NOW E911 Waiver Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 10523 ¶ 8.

²¹⁸ *NOW E911 Waiver Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 10523-24 ¶ 11. We note that, to the extent that CPK and Litchfield rely on relief that granted to Dobson Cellular as buyer, their positions as sellers are not comparable. *See Dobson E911 Waiver Order*, 19 FCC Rcd at 10519-20 (findings special circumstances supported granting a waiver to Dobson, e.g., Dobson’s plan to achieve full compliance within seven months of acquisition). We express no opinion herein as to whether Verizon Wireless could establish grounds for a waiver extending its period to come into compliance after acquiring CPK’s and Litchfield’s systems.

aid compatibility requirements. Accordingly, we find that petitioners' failure to meet these important requirements should be addressed through the enforcement process.

V. ORDERING CLAUSES

73. Accordingly, IT **IS ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that this *Memorandum Opinion und Order* **IS ADOPTED**.

74. IT **IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(A) of the Commission's rules, filed September 16, 2005, by AST Telecom, LLC dba Blue Sky Communications, as amended April 11, 2006, **IS DENIED**.

75. IT **IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Petition for Temporary Waiver *or* Temporary Stay, filed September 16, 2005, by CC Communications, as supplemented April 25, 2006, **IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART**, to the extent described above.

76. IT **IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2) of the Commission's rules, filed September 16, 2005, by Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc., as supplemented on February 17, 2006, **IS DENIED**.

77. IT **IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's rules, filed September 16, 2005, by C.T. Cube, L.P. dba West Central Wireless, as amended on January 25, 2006, **IS DENIED**.

78. IT **IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i) of the Commission's rules, filed September 8, 2005, by Dobson Communications Corp., as supplemented on September 14, 2005, and further supplemented on September 28, 2005, **IS GRANTED**.

79. IT **IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(C)(2)(i) [*sic*] of the Commission's rules, filed September 15, 2005, by Iowa Wireless Services, LLC dba i wireless and related licensees, **IS GRANTED**.

80. IT **IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Petition for Temporary Waiver *or* Temporary Stay, filed September 16, 2005, by IT&E Overseas, Inc., as supplemented April 26, 2006, **IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART**, to the extent described above.

81. IT **IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Conditional Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the

Commission's rules, filed September 16, 2005, by Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc., as amended May 16, 2006, **IS DISMISSED**.

82. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the **P**etition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2) of the Commission's rules, filed September 16, 2005 Litchfield County Cellular, Inc. dba Ramcell of Kentucky LLC, as supplemented on February 17, 2006, **IS DENIED**.

83. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the **P**etition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's rules, filed September 16, 2005, by Pine Cellular, Inc., as amended on December 6, 2005, **IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART**, to the extent described above.

84. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the **P**etition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay, filed September 16, 2005, by SLO Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellular One of San Luis Obispo, and Entertainment Unlimited, Inc., **IS DISMISSED**.

85. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that **P**etition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay, filed September 15, 2005, by the South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc., **IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART**, to the extent described above.

86. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the **P**etition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay, filed September 16, 2005, by South Slope Cooperative Telephone Company d/b/a South Slope Wireless, as amended December 1, 2005, **IS GRANTED**.

87. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the **P**etition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i) of the Commission's rules, filed September 14, 2005, by SunCom Wireless, Inc., as updated on October 14, 2005 and on January 6, 2006, **IS GRANTED**.

88. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the **P**etition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay, filed September 16, 2005, by Uintah Basin Electronic Telecommunications d/b/a UBET Wireless, as supplemented April 25, 2006, **IS GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART**, to the extent described above.

89. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that **P**etition for Limited Waiver, filed September 16, 2005, by Virgin Mobile, USA LLC, **IS GRANTED**.

90. **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED**, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the **P**etition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay, filed September 16, 2005, by WUE, Inc., as supplemented April 25, 2006, **IS DENIED**.

91. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, pursuant to Sections 1 and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), and Sections 1.3 and 1.925 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.925, that the Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's rules, filed September 16, 2005, by XIT Telecommunications & Technology, LTD d/b/a XIT Cellular, as amended April 25, 2006, IS DENIED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION



Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary

APPENDIX

List of Waiver Petitions and Other Filings

AST Telecom, LLC dba Blue Sky Communications (Blue Sky)

- AST Telecom, LLC dba Blue Sky Communications, Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(A) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 16,2005) (Blue Sky Petition)
- AST Telecom, LLC dba Blue Sky Communications, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17,2005) (Blue Sky November 17,2005 Report)
- AST Telecom, LLC dba Blue Sky Communications, Amendment to Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's Rules (filed April 11, 2006) (Blue Sky Amendment)
- Letter, dated April 25,2006, from Michael R. Bennet, counsel for Blue Sky, to Angela E. Giancarlo, Associate Chief, Public Safety & Critical Infrastructure Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Blue Sky Letter)
- AST Telecom, LLC dba Blue Sky Communications, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed May 17,2006) (Blue Sky May 17,2006 Report)
- AST Telecom, LLC dba Blue Sky Communications, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17,2006) (Blue Sky November 17,2006Report)

CC Communications (CC)

- CC Communications, Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed September 16, 2005) (CC Petition)
- CC Communications, Fourth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 16,2005)(CC November 17, 2005 Report)
- e CC Communications, Supplement to Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed April 25,2006) (CC Supplement)
- CC Communications, Fifth Semi-Annual Report (filed May 15,2006)(CC May 17,2006 Report)
- CC Communications, Sixth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 13,2006) (CC November 17, 2006 Report).

Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc (CPK)

- Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc., Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 16,,2005)(CPK Petition)
- Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc., Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17,2005) (CPK November 17,2005 Report)
- Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc., Supplement to Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2) of the Commission's Rules (filed February 17, 2006) (CPK Supplement)
- Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc., Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed May 17, 2006) (CPK May 17,2006Report)
- Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc., Further Supplement to Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2) of the Commission's Rules (filed August 30,2006) (CPK Further Supplement)
- Cellular Phone of Kentucky, Inc., Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17,2006) (CPK November 17,2006Report)

C.T. Cube, L.P. dba West Central Wireless (CT Cube)

- C.T. Cube, L.P. dba West Central Wireless, Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the (Commission'sRules (filed September 16,2005)(CT Cube Petition)
- C.T. Cube, L.P. dba West Central Wireless, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17,2005) (CT Cube November 17,2005 Report)

- C.T. Cube, L.P. dba West Central Wireless, Amendment to Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's Rules (filed January 25,2006) (CT Cube Amendment)
- Letter, dated April 25, 2006, from Michael R. Bennet, counsel for CT Cube, to Angela E. Giancarlo, Associate Chief, Public Safety & Critical Infrastructure Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (CT Cube Letter)
- C.T. Cube, L.P. dba West Central Wireless, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed May 17, 2006) (CT Cube May 17,2006 Report)
- C.T. Cube, L.P. dba West Central Wireless, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17,2006)(CT Cube November 17,2006 Report)

Dobson Communications Corp. (Dobson)

- Dobson Communications Corp., Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 8,2005) (Dobson Petition)
- Dobson Communications Corp., Supplement to Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 14, 2005) (Dobson Supplement)
- Dobson Communications Corp., Further Supplement to Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 28,2005) (Dobson Further Supplement)
- Dobson Cellular Systems, Inc. and American Cellular Corporation, Status Report on Hearing Aid Compatibility (as of November 1,2005) (filed November 17,2005) (Dobson November 17, 2005 Report)
- Dobson Cellular Systems, Inc. and American Cellular Corporation, Supplement to Hearing Aid Compatibility Status Report #4 (filed November 17,2005) (Dobson November 17,2005 Report Supplement)
- American Cellular Corporation and Dobson Cellular Systems, Inc., Status Report on Hearing Aid Compatibility (as of May 15,2006) (filed May 17,2006) (Dobson May 17,2006 Report)
- Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, Hearing Aid Compatibility Compliance Efforts Status Report #6 (filed November 17, 2006), Attach. A (Dobson November 17,2006 Report)

Iowa Wireless Services, LLC dba I wireless and related licensees (Iowa Wireless)

- Iowa Wireless Services, LLC dba I wireless and related licensees, Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(C)(2)(i) [*sic*]of the Commission's Rules (filed September 15, 2005) (Iowa Wireless Petition)
- Iowa Wireless Services, LLC dba I wireless, Status Report on Hearing Aid Compatibility (filed November 16,2005)(Iowa Wireless November 17,2005 Report)
- Iowa Wireless Services, LLC dba I wireless, Compliance Report Regarding Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(C)(2)(i) [*sic*]of the Commission's Rules (filed April 18, 2006) (Iowa Wireless Compliance Report)
- Iowa Wireless Services, LLC dba I wireless, Status Report on Hearing Aid Compatibility (as of May 8,2006) (filed May 17,2006) (Iowa Wireless May 17,2006 Report)
- Iowa Wireless Services, LLC dba I wireless, Status Report on Hearing Aid Compatible Wireless Devices (filed November 21,2006) (Iowa Wireless November 17,2006 Report)

IT&E Overseas, Inc. (IT&E)

- IT&E Overseas, Inc., Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed September 16, 2005) (IT&E Petition)
- IT&E Overseas, Inc., Semi-Annual Report (filed November 14,2005)(IT&E November 17,2005 Report)
- IT&E Overseas, Inc., Supplement to Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed April 26, 2006) (IT&E Supplement)
- IT&E Overseas, Inc., Semi-Annual Report (filed May 16,2006)(IT&E May 17,2006 Report)

- IT&E Overseas, Inc., Sixth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 16, 2006) (IT&E November 17, 2006 Report)

Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc. (Leaco)

- Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Conditional Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 16, 2005) (Leaco Petition)
- Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17, 2005) (Leaco November 17, 2005 Report)
- Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Amendment to Conditional Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's Rules (filed May 16, 2006) (Leaco Amendment)
- Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed May 16, 2006) (Leaco May 17, 2006 Report)
- Leaco Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17, 2006) (Leaco November 17, 2006 Report)

Litchfield County Cellular, Inc. dba Ramcell of Kentucky LLC (Litchfield)

- Litchfield County Cellular, Inc. dba Ramcell of Kentucky LLC, Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 16, 2005) (Litchfield Petition)
 - Litchfield County Cellular, Inc., Semi-Annual Hearing aid compatibility Report (filed November 17, 2005) (Litchfield November 17, 2005 Report)
- Litchfield County Cellular, Inc. dba Ramcell of Kentucky LLC, Supplement to Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2) of the Commission's Rules (filed February 17, 2006) (Litchfield Supplement)
- Litchfield County Cellular, Inc., Semi-Annual Hearing aid compatibility Report (filed May 17, 2006) (Litchfield May 17, 2006 Report)
- Litchfield County Cellular, Inc. dba Ramcell of Kentucky LLC Further Supplement to Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2) of the Commission's Rules (filed August 30, 2006) (Litchfield Further Supplement)
- Litchfield County Cellular, Inc., Semi-Annual Hearing aid compatibility Report (filed November 17, 2006) (Litchfield November 17, 2006 Report)

Pine Cellular, Inc. (Pine)

- Pine Cellular, Inc., Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 16, 2005) (Pine Petition)
- Pine Telephone Company, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17, 2005) (Pine November 17, 2005 Report)
- Pine Cellular, Inc., Amendment to Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's Rules (filed December 6, 2005) (Pine Amendment)
- Letter, dated April 14, 2006, from Michael R. Bennet, Counsel to Pine Telephone Company, to Angela E. Giancarlo, Associate Chief, Public Safety & Critical Infrastructure Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Pine Letter)
- Pine Telephone Company, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed May 17, 2006) (Pine May 17, 2006 Report)
- Letter, dated May 25, 2006, from Michael R. Bennet, Counsel to Pine Telephone Company, to David Siehl, Public Safety & Critical Infrastructure Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (Pine May 25, 2006 Letter)
- Pine Telephone Company, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 14, 2006) (Pine November 17, 2006 Report)

SLO Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellular One of San Luis Obispo, and Entertainment Unlimited, Inc. (SLO/EU) (filing jointly)

- SLO Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellular One of San Luis Obispo, and Entertainment Unlimited, Inc., Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed September 16,2005)(SLO/EU Petition)
- Entertainment Unlimited, Inc., Fourth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 17,2005)(EU November 17,2005 Report)
- SLO Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellular One of San Luis Obispo, Fourth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 17,2005) (SLO November 17,2005 Report)
- Entertainment Unlimited, Inc., Fifth Semi-Annual Report (filed May 16,2006) (EU May 17, 2006 Report)
- SLO Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellular One of San Luis Obispo, Fifth Semi-Annual Report (filed May 16,2006)(SLO May 17,2006 Report)
- SLO Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Cellular One of San Luis Obispo, Sixth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 17,2006)(SLO November 17,2006 Report)

South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc. (South Central Utah)

- South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc., Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed September 15,2005) (South Central Utah Petition)
- South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc., Fourth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 17,2005)(South Central Utah November 17,2005 Report)
- South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc., Fifth Semi-Annual Report (filed May 17, 2006) (South Central Utah May 17,2006 Report)
- South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc., Sixth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 17, 2006) (South Central Utah November 17,2006 Report)

South Slope Cooperative Telephone Company d/b/a South Slope Wireless (South Slope)

- South Slope Cooperative Telephone Company d/b/a South Slope Wireless, Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed September 16,2005) (South Slope Petition)
- South Slope Cooperative Telephone Company d/b/a South Slope Wireless, Semi-Annual Report (filed November 14,2005)(South Slope November 17,2005 Report)
- South Slope Cooperative Telephone Company d/b/a South Slope Wireless, Minor Amendment to Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed December 1, 2005) (South Slope December 1,2005 Amendment)
- South Slope Cooperative Telephone Company d/b/a South Slope Wireless, Semi-Annual Report (filed May 15,2006) (South Slope May 17,2006 Report)
- South Slope Cooperative Telephone Company d/b/a South Slope Wireless, Amendment to Semi-Annual Report (filed May 23,2006) (South Slope May 23,2006 Amendment)
- South Slope Cooperative Telephone Company d/b/a South Slope Wireless, Sixth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 15,2006)(November 17,2006 Report)

SunCom Wireless, Inc. (SunCom)

- SunCom Wireless, Inc., Petition for Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 14,2005) (SunCom Petition)
- SunCom Wireless, Inc., Update to Pending HAC Waiver Request (filed October 14,2005) (SunCom Update)
- SunCom Wireless, Inc., Notification of Compliance with HAC Rules; Second Update to Waiver Petition (filed January 6,2006) (SunCom Second Update)
- SunCom Wireless, Inc., Status Report on Hearing Aid Compatibility (as of November 1, 2005) (filed November 17,2005) (SunCom November 17,2005 Report)
- SunCom Wireless, Inc., Status Report on Hearing Aid Compatibility (as of May 15,2006)(filed May 17,2006)(SunCom May 17,2006 Report)
- Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions, Hearing Aid Compatibility Compliance Efforts Status Report #6 (filed November 17, 2006), Attach. A (SunCom November 17,2006 Report)

Uintah Basin Electronic Telecommunications d/b/a UBET Wireless (UBET Wireless)

- Uintah Basin Electronic Telecommunications d/b/a UBET Wireless, Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed September 16, 2005) (UBET Wireless Petition)
- Uintah Basin Electronic Telecommunications d/b/a UBET Wireless, Fourth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 16, 2005) (UBET Wireless November 17, 2005 Report)
- Uintah Basin Electronic Telecommunications d/b/a UBET Wireless, Supplement to Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed April 25, 2006) (UBET Wireless Supplement)
- Uintah Basin Electronic Telecommunications d/b/a UBET Wireless, Fifth Semi-Annual Report (filed May 17, 2006) (UBET Wireless May 17, 2006 Report)
- Uintah Basin Electronic Telecommunications d/b/a UBET Wireless, Sixth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 16, 2006) (UBET November 17, 2006 Report)

Virgin Mobile, USA LLC (Virgin Mobile)

- Virgin Mobile, USA LLC, Petition for Limited Waiver (filed September 16, 2005) (Virgin Mobile Petition)
- Letter, dated Nov. 4, 2005, from Antoinette C. Bush and John Beahn, Counsel to Virgin Mobile USA, LLC, and Peter Lurie, General Counsel, Virgin Mobile USA, LLC, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC (Virgin Mobile Letter)
- Virgin Mobile, USA LLC, Fourth Report of Virgin Mobile, USA LLC (filed November 17, 2005) (Virgin Mobile November 17, 2005 Report)
- Letter, dated Apr. 3, 2006, from Antoinette C. Bush and John M. Beahn, Counsel for Virgin Mobile, and Peter Lune, General Counsel, Virgin Mobile, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, FCC (Virgin Mobile April 3 Letter)
- Virgin Mobile, USA LLC, Fifth Report of Virgin Mobile, USA LLC (filed May 17, 2006) (Virgin Mobile May 17, 2006 Report)

WUE, Inc. (W E)

- WUE, Inc., Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed September 16, 2005) (WUE Petition)
- WUE, Inc., Fourth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 15, 2005) (WUE November 17, 2005 Report)
- WUE, Inc., Supplement to Petition for Temporary Waiver or Temporary Stay (filed April 25, 2006) (W E Supplement)
- WUE, Inc., Fifth Semi-Annual Report (filed May 17, 2006) (WUE May 17, 2006 Report)
- W E , Inc., Sixth Semi-Annual Report (filed November 14, 2006) (WUE November 17, 2006 Report)

XIT Telecommunications & Technology, LTD d/b/a XIT Cellular (XIT)

- XIT Telecommunications & Technology, LTD d/b/a XIT Cellular, Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i)(B)(1) of the Commission's Rules (filed September 16, 2005) (XIT Petition)
- XIT Telecommunications & Technology, LTD d/b/a XIT Cellular, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 17, 2005) (XIT November 17, 2005 Report)
- Letter, dated April 25, 2006, from Michael R. Bennet, Counsel to XIT, to Angela E. Giancarlo, Associate Chief, Public Safety & Critical Infrastructure Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau (XIT Letter)
- Texas RSA-1 Limited Partnership d/b/a XIT Cellular, Amendment to Petition for Limited Waiver of Section 20.19(c)(2)(i) of the Commission's Rules (filed April 25, 2006) (XIT Amendment)
- XIT Telecommunications & Technology, LTD d/b/a XIT Cellular, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed May 17, 2006) (XIT May 17, 2006 Report)
- XIT Telecommunication & Technology, LTD d/b/a XIT Wireless, Hearing Aid Compatibility Report (filed November 16, 2006) (XIT November 17, 2006 Report)