

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Universal Service Reform)	WT Docket No. 10-208
)	
Mobility Fund)	
)	

COMMENTS

Of the

National Tribal Telecommunications Association

I. Introduction

The National Tribal Telecommunications Association (“NTTA”) hereby submits these comments in response to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).

NTTA is a national trade association representing tribally owned telecommunications companies and their customers.¹ The eight regulated tribal telecommunications companies and two associate non-regulated Tribal telecommunications companies comprise NTTA. NTTA members serve and are a part of their respective tribal communities. These comments address the concerns of NTTA.

¹ The United States currently recognizes more than 565 American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Villages. *See The Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994*, Pub. L. 103-454, 108 Stat. 4791 (1994) (Secretary of the Interior is required to publish in the Federal Register an annual list of all Indian Tribes which the Secretary recognizes to be eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians).

The NPRM addresses the proposal to provide a one-time build-out of wireless mobility broadband infrastructure in rural areas and seeks comments how to allocate funding (from the Mobility Fund) for such a build-out. The Commission ties the proposed Mobility Fund allocation to the underlying mechanisms of the federal universal service support fund (“USF”) as part of the future National Broadband Plan (NBP).²

II. Executive Summary

- The Federal government’s trust responsibility to Native communities³ and the Communications Act of 1934’s mandate⁴ to provide universal service to all communities requires the Federal government to assist tribal governments to attain broadband.⁵
- The Commission’s pursuit of broadband technology deployment must not leave Native communities without voice dial-tone.
- The FCC’s regulatory paradigms in the proposed Mobility Fund rule will increase the gap between the “have” and “have not” communities. The proposed Mobility Fund predicates: a) funding to incumbent ETCs; b) that have access to proprietary spectrum; and, c) with focus on larger populated rural areas. None of these

²Federal Communications Commission, *Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan*, 146-48 (rel. Mar. 16, 2010) (*National Broadband Plan*)

³ Statement of Policy on Establishing a Government-to-Government Relationship with Indian Tribes, *Policy Statement*, 16 FCC Rcd 4078 (2000) (*Tribal Policy Statement*)

⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 151

⁵ Statement of Policy on Establishing a Government-to-Government Relationship with Indian Tribes, *Policy Statement*, 16 FCC Rcd 4078 (2000) (*Tribal Policy Statement*)

criteria will help Native and remote rural communities, despite pronouncements of targeting “unserved” areas.⁶

- By applying the proposed criteria, the FCC will end up funding incumbent wireless providers that have bypassed Native communities, with no guarantee service history in the neglected regions will not be repeated;
- An FCC reverse auction proposal for the cheapest solution in a rural region favors providers with “deep pockets” and continues “legacy strategy” of deploying networks as cheaply as possible in the highest cost areas;
- The FCC must support Native communities’ efforts to provision their own regulatory needs.⁷ Tribal governments must be permitted to designate their communities as a single service area.
- Instead of implementing reverse auctions, the FCC should permit tribal governments to bid out high-cost support to a provider willing to connect an entire community—based not on lowest price, but on efficiency and connectivity metrics.
- The FCC must apply newer ways of meeting the challenge of non-competitive markets.
- Wireless providers have bypassed Native communities--except in high-density areas—and thus most Native communities are “unserved”.

⁶ In addressing the mobility gap, the FCC commented: Such gaps impose significant disadvantages on those who live, work, and travel in these areas. Moreover, without existing modern wireless infrastructure, they are at risk of much-delayed access to the coming generations of high-speed wireless broadband services. *Nprm at paragraph 2.*

⁷ The *National Broadband Plan* observed that many Tribal communities face significant obstacles to the deployment of broadband infrastructure, including high build-out costs, limited financial resources that deter investment by commercial providers and a shortage of technically trained members who can undertake deployment and adoption planning. *Id*

- NTTA urges the FCC to define “unserved” areas for infrastructure, broadband and wireless services;
- NTTA proposes that Tribal communities that are underserved by infrastructure, broadband and wireless networks be deemed “Native Unserved Areas” (NUAs);
- Because Native Unserved Areas lack connectivity, NUAs should receive priority of Broadband Mobility funding to facilitate a safety-net 911 network in every American community;
- The FCC can apply the public interest principles that validated the adoption of the Mass Media Section 307(b) Native Priority to broadband priority for Native Governments;
- The FCC should support deployment of the most current and highest capacity wireless networks (4G) for Native safety-net service.
- The FCC should help Native governments to attain broadband financing through the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture;
- The FCC should expedite processing and assist Native governments to attain ETC status—to support deployment of broadband to Native communities;
- To support wireless broadband deployment in Native communities, the FCC must set aside appropriate and sufficient spectrum (on an open platform) to achieve universal access;
- The FCC should also require partitioning and disaggregation of spectrum for use by a Native community when licensees have failed to build out in Native Unserved Areas.

III. Comments

A. Native Sovereignty and Telecommunications: A Separate Track for Mobility

Fund targeting?

Native peoples reside in the worst-connected communities in America for both broadband and for basic voice dial-tone. Native communities almost uniformly lack wireless service except in higher density areas.⁸

As both Eligible Telecommunications Carriers (“ETCs”) and Providers of Last Resort the National Tribal Telecommunications Association members understand the economic and political pressures building on the Universal Service Fund (USF) and applaud the Commission’s continuing intent to relieve these pressures while addressing the lack of broadband in rural communities.

The Federal Communications Commission has acknowledged the need to connect Native communities through the National Broadband Plan.⁹ In the National Broadband Plan the FCC stated:

“Tribes need substantially greater financial support than is presently available to them, and accelerating Tribal broadband will require increased funding.”¹⁰

⁸ Data is sparse on wireless connectivity in Native communities but every Native resident can point to wireless service cell reach in their community.

⁹ See Federal Communications Commission, *Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan*, at 152, (rel. Mar. 16, 2010) (*National Broadband Plan*).

¹⁰ *Id.*

However, as the National Tribal Telecommunications Association pointed out in its April 17, 2008 comments on the FCC proposed High Cost Universal Service Support NPRM, WC Docket No. 05-337:

“While thirty percent of the residents of tribal lands wait for simple dial tone, the Commission is preparing to provide broadband and mobile services to those who already enjoy universal service. The current situation is unacceptable and the Commission must take all necessary steps to ensure that the promise of universal service is finally achieved in all areas of the country.”

The Commission needs to honor its trust responsibility to provide parity of technology and service to Native communities.

The Commission has acknowledged its special responsibility to Native tribes.¹¹ In the Commission’s First Order on Rural Radio Service providing a Tribal priority for licensing¹², the Commission said:

“Tribes have an obligation to ‘maintain peace and good order, improve their condition, establish school systems, and aid their people in their efforts to acquire the arts of civilized life,’ within their jurisdictions,¹³ and that the Commission has a longstanding policy of promoting tribal self-sufficiency and economic development, as well as providing adequate access to communications services to Tribes.¹⁴”

The Commission asks in this NPRM whether Tribal solutions for the Mobility Fund should take a separate track:

“Because this relationship warrants a tailored approach that takes into consideration the unique characteristics of Tribal lands,¹⁵ we believe addressing Mobility Fund support for Tribal lands on a separate track will be beneficial in providing adequate time to coordinate with American Indian Tribes and Alaska Native Village governments and seek their input.”

¹¹ *Rural NPRM*, 24 FCC Rcd at 5247-49.

¹² 47 U.S.C. § 307(b) (“Section 307(b)”).

¹³ S.Rep. No. 698, 45th Cong., 3d Sess. 1-2 (1879) (quoted in *Merrion v. Jicarilla Apache Tribe*, 455 U.S. 130, 140, 102 S.Ct. 894, 903, 71 L.Ed.2d 21 (1981)).

¹⁴ *Statement of Policy on Establishing a Government-to-Government Relationship with Indian Tribes*, Policy Statement, 16 FCC Rcd 4078, 4080-81 (2000) (“*Tribal Policy Statement*”).

¹⁵ *National Broadband Plan* at 146.

While NTTA supports additional time for Native communities to respond and to shape regulatory measures to promote tribal provisioning, NTTA is not clear how this separate deliberation might impact the allocation of the proposed Broadband Fund. Not only does NTTA feel that a material portion of the proposed Mobility Fund should be set aside for Native communities (see next discussion of “Native Unserved Areas” for the Broadband Mobility Fund), but Native communities that have been neglected and underserved should receive priority of funding under the proposed Mobility Fund.

NTTA cautiously supports a separate track provided sufficient assurances are given that Native governments will be given ample opportunity to attain their fair share of Mobility Funding. NTTA also urges FCC assistance to attain ETC certification and any other regulatory support as to permit a Native government to provision its own regulatory services. If the Commission feels a need to fast-track funding for the Broadband Mobility Fund, NTTA would then urge the FCC to reserve up to thirty percent of the available Broadband Mobility Fund for Native Unserved Areas. (This approximates the roughly thirty percent disparity between voice-dialtone service in Indian communities and non-Indian communities.)

B. The Crucial Difference Mobility Infrastructure can make in Native Communities.

In the Mobility Fund NPRM the Commission acknowledges the challenge of providing broadband in rural areas:

“We seek comment on ways to structure the program so that it directs funding to those places where deployment of advanced mobile wireless service is otherwise not likely to happen.”¹⁶

¹⁶ In the Matter of Universal Service Reform Broadband Mobility Fund, para. 11, WT Docket 10-208.

Simply put, but for federal intervention, market forces would not meet the lack of broadband or wireless service in isolated communities of America.

NTTA distinguishes the value of mobility service in non-Native and Native communities. In non-Native areas mobile service is a luxury service that supplements wireline and broadband connectivity. On the other hand, in Native communities where there is a lack of voice and broadband service, building the next generation wireless platform network can mean the difference between life and death for Native residents.

For these reasons, NTTA feels targeting “unserved” Native communities is paramount.

C. The Inclusion of Mobile Broadband in the USF: Targeting “Unserved Areas”

NTTA recognizes that this proposed Order marks the first formal effort to unify the USF program with Broadband service. As such, there are many assumptions tied to Section 214 regulatory framework that may not work well for Native communities in a new broadband funding mechanism—even in a one-time fix regime.

The first issue is targeting. NTTA has long urged the FCC to define “unserved” areas within the context of Section 214 infrastructure regulatory targeting as well as within Section 254 framework of broadband service. Indeed in proposed congressional broadband legislation and the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, Congress has sought a definition of “unserved” areas for broadband deployment. The availability of wireless data in Native communities is sparse¹⁷ but it is apparent that Native communities exceed the three percent disparity proposed guideline for “unserved” wireless areas.

NTTA proposes several “unserved” definitions to arrive at eligibility for Mobility Fund priority. Historically, NTTA has proposed 15 percent as separation for infrastructure “unserved

¹⁷ In the proposed NPRM the Commission estimates over 98.5 percent of Americans have access to wireless service.

areas.” In light of the importance of the Mobility Fund to Native communities, NTTA now proposes for section 214 purposes, 10 percent below nation-wide average as “unserved” for infrastructure services. For Broadband, where data for Native communities is similarly scarce, it is estimated that Native communities are below 10 percent penetration. NTTA proposes a benchmark of 5 percent below nation-wide broadband service average as definition of “unserved broadband area.” NTTA adopts the FCC proposed 3 percent below average penetration rate as “unserved wireless area” definition. For the purposes of the Broadband Mobility Fund, NTTA proposes any Native community that meets all three of the NTTA definitions of “unserved area” for infrastructure (10 percent disparity), for broadband (5 percent disparity) and for wireless (3 percent disparity) that such a community be deemed “Native Unserved Area” for purposes of priority targeting for Broadband Mobility funds.

To qualify for NUA funding, the Native government must provide census, industry or such other proxy data as are available. In turn, the FCC must set aside sufficient funding to meet these funding priorities.

D. Priority of Funding for Native Communities

In addition to applying “Native Unserved Areas” as a targeting guide, NTTA urges the FCC to prioritize funding for Native communities because of the unique relationship of tribal governments with the Federal government and the sovereign status of tribal nations.¹⁸

In promulgating the FCC first order on Rural Radio Service¹⁹ the FCC displayed enlightened awareness of Tribal issues:

¹⁸ The Commission also emphasized the historic federal trust relationship between itself and the Tribes, as part of the relationship between the United States government and the sovereign nations that are Tribes. *Rural NPRM*, 24 FCC Rcd at 5247-48

¹⁹ MB Docket No. 09-52.

“...the Commission noted that Tribes have an obligation to ‘maintain peace and good order, improve their condition, establish school systems, and aid their people in their efforts to acquire the arts of civilized life,’ within their jurisdictions,²⁰ and that the Commission has a longstanding policy of promoting tribal self-sufficiency and economic development, as well as providing adequate access to communications services to Tribes.”²¹

In accordance with these acknowledged principles, the FCC enacted the new Section 307(b) Native American and Alaska Tribal Groups priority for media license filings.

To reach that result, the commission applied the Public Interest test and found the Commission failed to meet the diversity requirements of Section 307(b):

“... to ‘make such distribution of licenses ... among the several States and communities as to provide a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of radio service’²² with regard to tribal lands”

By any application of provisions, Title I, Section 214 or Section 254, it is apparent Tribes have not been afforded a “fair, efficient, and equitable distribution” of broadband service with regard to Tribal lands. It would not take much of a leap for the Commission to prioritize distribution of broadband resources, or future wireless licenses, to Native American and Alaska Tribal Groups “seeking to promote self sufficiency and economic development, as well as providing adequate access to Communications Services.”²³

Rejecting arguments that a tribal preference was unconstitutional, the FCC stated:

the priority established herein for the benefit of federally recognized Tribes is not constitutionally suspect because it is based on “the unique legal status of Indian tribes under Federal law.”²⁴

²⁰ S.Rep. No. 698, 45th Cong., 3d Sess. 1-2 (1879) (quoted in *Merrion v. Jicarilla Apache Tribe*, 455 U.S. 130, 140, 102 S.Ct. 894, 903, 71 L.Ed.2d 21 (1981)).

²¹ *Statement of Policy on Establishing a Government-to-Government Relationship with Indian Tribes*, Policy Statement, 16 FCC Rcd 4078, 4080-81 (2000) (“*Tribal Policy Statement*”).

²² 47 U.S.C. § 307(b).

²³ *Statement of Policy on Establishing a Government-to-Government Relationship with Indian Tribes*, Policy Statement, 16 FCC Rcd 4078, 4080-81 (2000) (“*Tribal Policy Statement*”).

²⁴ *Morton*, 417 U.S. at 551-52.

Applying the same public interest standard to broadband and infrastructure, the FCC would be justified in extending a priority for funding mobility infrastructure in Native communities that will then act as a safety-net network for Native residents in unserved areas.²⁵

E. Mobility Fund ETCs: Choice and the Impact on Native Communities, How the FCC can make a difference

The second important challenge of migrating broadband support to the USF delivery mechanism is determining who receives Mobility Fund support, who decides ETC status, and what are the requirements of a Broadband ETC in this new framework of support.

NTTA is concerned that the cast of legacy providers has not been good for Native communities who remain the worst-connected communities in America by any of the three transmission criteria: voice-dialtone, broadband, and wireless connectivity (which is a misnomer as wireless connectivity obligations end at the construction of towers.)

Given a new emphasis on providing universal broadband access and a new approach to supporting broadband build-out, NTTA feels the Commission should also re-examine the role of providers. Discussion on telecommunications challenges always focus solution on two of the three corners of the puzzle: the regulator and the provider. Seldom do solutions include the consumer. In the case of Native communities, that are both the victims of historic under-service and occupy unique sovereign standing of governmental rights and trust obligations, the FCC should look to providing extraordinary relief to Native communities.

²⁵ The FCC comments: the Joint Board also contemplated that funds would be available to construct facilities along roads and highways, to advance important public safety interests. Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, WC Docket No. 05-337, CC Docket No. 96-45, *Recommended Decision* In the Matter of High-Cost Universal Service Support, FCC07J-4 (Fed.-State Jt. Bd., rel. Nov. 20, 2007) (*Recommended Decision*).

First, Native Governments should be permitted to designate their entire community as a service area. Many Native communities are served by as many as 6 different providers, making it difficult to hold providers to uniform accountability and quality of service. But more damaging is the stigma of a community not being able to react and be perceived as a single community and be able to exert leverage over a lifeline service as an aggregate consumer.

Second, the FCC should empower tribal governments as a consumer with the choice to decide which provider will provide regulatory lifeline service in a community. In every consumer setting, the most powerful impetus is the underlying power to change providers if a provider under-performs, neglects or discriminates against the community. Native governments and tribal communities must be able to exert greater leverage over regulatory providers that effect life and death, and public safety in a community.

Third, the FCC must support efforts of sovereign governments to provision their own regulatory telecommunications services. The story of the eight regulated tribal telecommunications companies has been well documented. Six of the eight tribal communities had less than 10 percent penetration in the 1990 census. Today every one of the eight regulated communities has benefited from over 600 percent increase in connectivity for both voice and broadband access, with most attaining over 900 percent increase in connectivity. Despite the dramatic impact of self-provisioning by Tribes, since the passage of the 1996 Telecom Act, only 3 tribes have become FCC regulated providers. The FCC must do better to assist Tribes to become their own regulated providers.

Fourth, The FCC must create a “fast-track” path and support for Tribes to become their own providers, should they choose. The case for self-provisioning has been made by NTTA’s success in bringing essential telecommunications infrastructure to previously “unserved”

communities. How the FCC proceeds in assisting Tribes become their own regulated providers can make a large impact on the future of Native communities. However, the timing of FCC efforts as it impacts allocation of Mobility Broadband funds remains a challenge. Perhaps the FCC should hold a portion of the Mobility Broadband Fund in reserve for a gradual funding of Native government ETCs and expedite processing of Native governmental ETCs.

Finally, the FCC should require Mobility Fund providers to consult with Native governments. An essential component of Native sovereignty is the process of consultation. While federal trust principles require government-to-government consultation with Native governments, the notion of consultation with tribal governments for commercial transactions affecting an entire community is emerging. The National Congress of American Indians passed a resolution (becoming the official policy of Indian country)²⁶ urging the FCC to set aside a sufficient amount from the Broadband Mobility Fund to assist Tribes with essential safety-net infrastructure predicated on a 4G platform. That resolution included a requirement for any Mobility Fund provider serving Native communities to consult with the Native government to better meet the needs of the community and to obtain all the necessary legal permissions for bringing service and infrastructure to Native communities.

F. Reverse Auctions

NTTA has stated its objections to Reverse Auctions.²⁷ In 2008, NTTA stated:

“Efficiency reforms in the Universal Service Fund should be aggressively crafted to maximize broadband and infrastructure investment impact in rural areas. However, efficiency does not mean lowest cost support for cheapest networks.”

²⁶ NCAI resolution ABQ-10-061 calling for Federal support for Native broadband development and earmarking Broadband Mobility Fund for Native communities.

²⁷ NTTA’s comments on the FCC proposed High Cost Universal Service Support NPRM, p. 10, WC Docket No. 05-337

Among many problems, NTTA is concerned that a reverse auction would not provide enough network investment incentive to truly achieve the goal of universal service in unserved areas. The reverse auction stratagem in an isolated market would create a disincentive for providers to participate.

In addition, questions abound about how the reverse auctions would work: for instance, how long would the winner enjoy broadband support before its support term is up and the provider loses embedded costs? In the realm of finite support funds, reverse auctions are unworkable because it interrupts the life-cycle of capital cost amortization. Failure to recoup costs and uncertainty over the length of support will only discourage long-term investment in high-cost infrastructure. (The Rural Utilities Service has articulated this concern.)

Reverse auctions are also problematic in competitive areas as the Commission cannot force the sale or liquidation of the incumbent provider's equipment and assets. If the winning bidder in a reverse auction is not the incumbent, then the new provider would have to duplicate and overbuild the entire network in the service area. This would result in an even higher and inefficient cost to the USF to replace and overbuild existing infrastructure.

Lastly, NTTA has articulated a key misunderstanding of efficiency in market isolated areas: the laudable goal of attaining USF efficiency in high cost areas has less to do with cost of build-out than with outcomes of connectivity, quality of service provided, and with dependability of service and equipment. As emphasis of what efficiency comprises, by becoming its own provider, NTTA tribal governments were able to greatly increase connectivity in previously unserved areas. As an example, within six years of startup, Mescalero Apache Telecommunications Incorporated was able to connect 98 percent of all Mescalero residents with voice-dial tone, a 980% increase from its 1990 service level! By any measure, this end result is an efficient use of federal dollars and should continue to warrant universal service support without resorting to periodic auctions to secure the cheapest infrastructure for high cost service.

As NTTA advocated earlier, the FCC should put the Native government in the role of bidding out through an RFP process which provider shall attain USF support to provide the most efficient and value-laden service to the community. NTTA urges the FCC to adopt the requirement for Mobility providers to consult with Native governments to both assess customer

care outcomes and to determine if the provider has abided by all the legal requirements of providing service and locating equipment on Native lands.

If the Commission adopts a reverse auction policy, then it must exempt tribal lands. In extreme rural areas higher quality and reliability of service is crucial. In these areas, real cost reimbursements are crucial to accounting integrity. Because of the obligation of the federal trust responsibility to Native Americans, quality and reliability of service cannot be sacrificed for the cheapest infrastructure available.

In addition, if the Commission adopts the reverse auction mechanism and does not exempt tribal land areas, then tribal land areas should be recognized as separate geographic serving areas. This carve-out of federally-recognized Native service areas would enable tribes to self-provision communications service as well as provide federal incentive to target high-cost support where it is most needed.

G. Broadband Platform

In Native Unserved Areas NTTA advocates the FCC fund deployment of a 4G network, rather than the 3G network. Similar to when the FCC adopted a broadband standard of 286 kilobits, that standard of broadband quickly became obsolete. Even 4 Megabits down and 1 megabit upstream is quickly becoming an obsolete broadband goal.

While the FCC is trying to maximize the amount of funding for Broadband Mobility, this shortsighted adoption of 3G as a make-ready stage to promote future commercial advanced technology will have lasting legacy drag as 3G are not revenue producing platforms for the demands of today, notwithstanding the demands of tomorrow. Once built, like all infrastructures, it is unlikely investors will arrive in waves or stages in “unserved” and isolated regions to overbuild for the near future. It is better to provide the best capacity network in remote markets to stimulate investment in the intermediate markets.

H. Operations

NTTA strongly endorses the Joint Board recommendation to provide continuing operating subsidies to carriers where service is essential but where usage is so slight that there is not a business case to support ongoing operations, even with substantial support for construction.²⁸ In remote markets, the cost of operations can rarely be recovered sufficiently by cost recoveries. Yet these are essential activities to running a remote communications service and the costs are the difference between sustainability and failure. With Broadband wireless service, it is uncertain how sustainable infrastructure investments will be given the uncertain nature of revenues and take-rates.

H. Deployment

NTTA has two concerns: non-Native providers should be held accountable for broadband infrastructure and service deployment to Native Unserved Areas. Failure to meet build-out requirements, and to meet consultation requirements with the Native government, should result in forfeiture of the Mobility funds received. Native governments should play a role in the review and assessment of community service and service obligation.

On the other hand, if a Native government were to become its own provider, the FCC should make every effort to assist, the Native government, see FCC Trust Policy, to become compliant with FCC and Mobility Fund rules and requirements. The Tribal government may be given waiver options to extend its build-out process as the startup arc is a high one to learn for a non-incumbent provider.

²⁸ Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, WC Docket No. 05-337, CC Docket No. 96-45, *Recommended Decision* In the Matter of High-Cost Universal Service Support, FCC07J-4 (Fed.-State Jt. Bd., rel. Nov. 20, 2007) (*Recommended Decision*), at ¶¶ 18, 38.

If at any time a spectrum license holder fails to meet build-out obligations on Native lands, the FCC should cause the license holder to disaggregate or partition the spectrum and permit the Native government to acquire and build out the service area.

IV. Conclusion:

For Native communities, this one-time opportunity to build a safety-net network for 911 and public safety support can be the difference of life and death for Native residents. Wireless services have largely bypassed the less-densely populated communities. While the FCC seeks to maximize the chance to deploy a wireless broadband network—to promote commercial adoption—“unserved” areas inherently require higher costs to build backbone networks. There are simply no investors and no competitors for service in the remote Native communities. The FCC has a chance to help Native communities attain critical network connectivity and meet its trust and Communications Act universal service mandates through this Mobility Fund opportunity.

Respectfully submitted,

By: [electronically filed]
Darrell Gerlaugh, President
National Tribal Telecommunications Association

Gila River Telecommunications, Inc.
P.O. Box 5015
7065 West Allison Drive
Chandler, Arizona 85226-5135

December 15, 2010