

**BEFORE THE  
MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the Matter of the Application of )  
Missouri RSA No. 5 Partnership )  
for Designation as a Telecommunications )  
Company Carrier Eligible for Federal Universal ) Case No. TO-2006-0172  
Service Support Pursuant to § 254 of the )  
Telecommunications Act of 1996. )

**POST HEARING BRIEF OF  
MISSOURI RSA NO. 5 PARTNERSHIP**

COMES NOW Applicant Missouri RSA No. 5 Partnership (“MO 5”) and submits the following Post hearing Brief.

**Introduction**

On June 14, 2006, MO 5 submitted a comprehensive Prehearing Brief in this matter. In prior similar cases Post hearing Briefs have been limited in length and purpose. Specifically Post hearing Briefs were limited to ten pages and were to "generally update" Prehearing Briefs based upon evidence adduced at the hearing. To accommodate these goals MO 5 will follow the format of it's Prehearing Brief.

**I. Issue One**

**Telecommunications companies seeking eligible telecommunications carrier (“ETC”) status must meet the requirements of Section 214(e)(1) throughout the service area for which designation is received. Section 214(e)(1) requires a carrier to offer the services that are supported by Federal universal service support mechanisms either using its own facilities or a combination of its own facilities and resale of another carrier’s services (including the services offered by another eligible telecommunications carrier); and to advertise the availability of such services and the charges therefore using media of general distribution. Does MO 5 meet the requirements of Section 214(e)(1) throughout the service area for which it seeks designation?**

No party apparently seriously contests the fact that MO 5 meets the requirements of Section 214(e)(1). No evidence was adduced during the course of the hearing that in anyway suggested that the Company could not or would not provide the required services. The Company has in fact demonstrated that it will offer and advertise the required services throughout the service area for which it seeks designation.

**A. MO 5 provides the core services required to qualify for universal service support.**

The core services and functions required to be offered by an ETC are specified in Section 54.101(a) of the FCC's rules:

- Voice grade access to the public switched network;
- Local usage;
- Dual tone multi-frequency signaling or its functional equivalent;
- Single-party service or its functional equivalent;
- Access to emergency services;
- Access to operator services;
- Access to interexchange service;
- Access to directory assistance; and
- Toll limitation for qualifying low-income consumers.<sup>1</sup>

MO 5 has conclusively established that it can and will provide all of the listed functions and services.

---

<sup>1</sup> On December 30, 1997, the FCC changed its definition of toll-limitation services in its Fourth Order on Reconsideration of the Universal Service Report and Order, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, *et al.* The FCC stated, "We define toll-limitation services as either toll blocking or toll control and require telecommunications carriers to offer only one, and not necessarily both, of those services at this time in order to be designated as eligible telecommunications carriers." *Id.* at 210.

**B. MO 5 will advertise the core universal services.**

Pursuant to § 254(c) of the Act, an ETC must advertise, using media of general distribution, the availability of and charges for the core services required to qualify for universal service support. Again, no party has contested the fact that MO 5 does this required advertising and will expand its advertising upon grant of its application.

**II. Issue Two**

**ETC designations by a state commission must be consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity pursuant to Section 214(e)(2). The Federal Communication Commission's ("FCC's") *ETC Designation Order* determined that this public interest standard applies regardless of whether the area is served by a rural or non-rural carrier. Is granting ETC status to MO 5 consistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity throughout the service area for which MO 5 seeks ETC designation?**

The parties opposing MO 5's application have, for a variety of unfounded reasons, contended that granting ETC status to MO 5 is not consistent with the public interest. Contrary to their assertions granting MO 5 ETC status will promote the public interest because it will enable MO 5 to bring wireless service, including improved E911 and GSM, to many unserved, under-served, remote and difficult-to-reach locales and it will increase competition for primary telephone service in remote areas. Moreover, Lifeline and Linkup customers would have the ability to choose wireless service that would otherwise be unavailable to them. (Tr. pp. 87-88).

**A. USF support will result in increased competition in rural areas.**

The FCC has long recognized that promoting competition in specific telecommunications service markets has multiple public interest benefits (*e.g.*, cost-based

pricing, higher quality and more innovative services, increased consumer choice and a decreased need for regulatory oversight). As a result, stimulating competition, whenever possible, is a paramount FCC policy objective. MO 5 nonetheless acknowledged at the hearing that increased competition by itself is unlikely to satisfy the public interest test. (Tr. pp. 88-92). It was for that reason MO 5 presented evidence demonstrating the benefits USF support would bring to the public in its designated areas.

**B. USF support will maximize consumer welfare.**

Section 214(e)(2) of the Act is concerned with maximizing consumer welfare. As Simon testified, affording USF support to MO 5 will advance consumer welfare in numerous ways:

USF support will allow MO 5 to continue to bring wireless service to rural parts of its FCC-licensed service area despite the high costs of providing service in this market.<sup>2</sup>

In those counties which have requested it, USF support will allow MO 5 to provide Phase II E911 services that are critical to public safety, particularly in the rural-most portions of the service area.<sup>3</sup> In fact MO 5 has the most towers in the licensed area and as such provides the best option with USF support to make Phase II Enhanced 911 service available. (Tr. pp. 104-105).

USF support will allow MO 5 to provide enhanced GSM coverage to significant portions of its FCC-licensed service area (some of the most rural portions of the market) that still do not have such coverage.<sup>4</sup>

USF support will allow MO 5 to provide additional cell sites and improved coverage in its service area through new cell site construction; in addition to providing service, this will bring

---

<sup>2</sup> Simon Direct 9:15-10:6.

<sup>3</sup> Simon Direct 10:7-10.

<sup>4</sup> Simon Direct 10:11 – 11:8.

wireless Phase II E911 services to those counties who have requested the service.<sup>5</sup>

USF support will allow MO 5 to provide wireless Phase II E911 service to any compatible handset in MO 5's coverage area, whether or not the user is a MO 5 customer.<sup>6</sup>

**C. MO 5 is committed to providing quality service to requesting customers throughout its designated service area.**

OPC expressed concern that absent imposition of the Commission's quality of service and billing standards rules applicable to wireline companies that customers will not be adequately protected. MO 5 has affirmatively committed to comply with all consumer safeguards addressed in the Commission's newly adopted ETC rule. (Tr. pp. 66 & 88). This commitment includes adoption of the Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association ("CTIA") Consumer Code for Wireless Service. Further, MO 5 has met all FCC consumer privacy requirements .

In light of the Commission's newly promulgated ETC rule, it would be inappropriate and possibly unlawful to impose additional rules and conditions on a wireless ETC applicant. All interested parties had full opportunity to participate in the Commission's rulemaking and failure to have successfully advocated consumer protection positions in that proceeding should not be reason to reopen those issues in an individual contested case proceeding. OPC is of course free to seek amendment to the Commission's new ETC rule in another rulemaking proceeding.

---

<sup>5</sup> Simon Direct 11:9 – 12:5.

<sup>6</sup> Simon Direct 12:6 – 7.

**D. MO 5 will advertise supported services throughout its designated service area.**

This issue has been adequately addressed in MO 5's Prehearing Brief and herein above.

**E. ETC designation for MO 5 will greatly enhance lifeline and link-up service available in rural Missouri.**

This issue has been adequately addressed in MO 5's Prehearing Brief and herein above.

**F. USF policy arguments relating to ETC designation for wireless carriers are not at issue in this application.**

Various parties continue to raise policy arguments against granting wireless carriers, such as MO 5, ETC status. These policy arguments have little to do with the MO 5 Application. The current federal statutory requirements and regulatory processes allow CMRS carriers to obtain universal service support. Without taking any position as to merits of the arguments advanced in the ongoing policy debate, MO 5 respectfully submits that it is not relevant to the consideration of MO 5's Application and that grant of the MO 5 Application will neither prejudice those arguments when they are considered in the proper forum nor insulate MO 5 from any subsequent changes in the rules regarding access to USF. MO 5 witness Zentgraf acknowledged the fact that the Fund and its administration may need to be modified

This forum is supposed to decide if we can be designated as an ETC, not if the fund's being handled properly, not if the fund dollars are going to be run out. Is that something that's going to eventually have to be addressed? I'm sure it is. I think the FCC knows that, I think USAC knows that, I think the carriers in this room know that. There's no secret there. (Tr. p. 89).

The MO 5 Application is before this Commission under an established set of rules and statutory requirements. Denial of MO 5's Application will not affect the ability of wireless carriers in other states to draw upon the USF; it will only affect the ability of the citizens of rural Missouri to benefit from those federal funds. The grant of the MO 5 Application will, in and of itself, place an insignificant burden on the USF. Accordingly, the Commission should avoid consideration of generalized policy issues which are presently being fully considered by the Joint Board, Congress and the FCC. Those ongoing deliberations have no bearing on the designation of MO 5 as an ETC nor should this Commission weigh those arguments at all in ruling on the MO 5 Application; knowing full well that any ETC designation will be subject to any changes ultimately adopted in those proceedings.

### **III. Issue Three**

**In addition to the standards set out in the FCC's *ETC Designation Order*, the Commission has promulgated rules to be used in evaluating ETC applications. A final Order of Rulemaking for these rules, designated as 4 CSR 240-3.570, was published in the Missouri Register on May 15, 2006. Does MO 5 meet the requirements of the Commission's ETC rules?**

Rather than attempting to address each provision of the Commission's new ETC rule, MO 5 will focus on the specific provisions addressed during the hearing. First, Staff contends that MO 5 has failed to commit to meet the requirements of 4 CSR 240-3.570(2) (A) 8 and 10. Those provisions require a statement that the carrier will satisfy the consumer privacy protection standards in the federal rules and that the carrier commit to offer a local usage plan comparable to those offered by the incumbent local exchange carrier. Staff's concerns are totally unfounded. MO 5, as indicated above, meets and exceeds the rules addressing consumer privacy. (See (Tr. p. 125). Similarly, MO 5 has

confirmed its commitment to continue offering local usage plans comparable or superior to those offered by the incumbent LECs. (See, Tr. pp.125-126).

The provisions of the Commission's ETC rule that drew the most attention during the hearing were those related to the required plans for use of the high cost support. Various parties sought to show that MO 5's plan was flawed and not sufficient to meet the rules requirements. The Commission's rule requires a two (2) year plan demonstrating, with specificity, that high-cost universal service support shall only be used for the provision, maintenance and upgrading of facilities and services for which the support is intended in the Missouri service area in which ETC designation was granted. MO 5 has submitted a five (5) year plan rather than a two (2) year plan in part because the FCC requires a five year plan and in part because MO 5 wished to provide as much information as possible. MO 5 acknowledged at hearing that there were aspects of the five year plan that would require modification. (Tr. pp. 134, 194-195 and 250). In the end MO 5 was unequivocal in its commitment to use all USF support received on only appropriate facilities and to account for those expenditures to the Commission on an annual basis. (Tr. pp. 107-108, 194-195).

Any perceived deficiencies in MO 5's five year plan are clearly offset by MO 5's sworn commitment to build out the seventeen specified tower sites as quickly as possible given the level of funding available. (Tr. pp. 194-195) MO 5 used its best effort to project a five year plan but candidly acknowledged that it was and is at all times subject to change. (Tr. pp. 134, 194-195 and 250). MO 5 believes it is impossible to predict the future and that its best effort to do so combined with its commitment to report and be



accountable to this Commission for expenditures of support received is more than adequate justification for it to be granted ETC status.

## V. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission should: (1) designate MO 5 as a telecommunications carrier eligible under the provisions of Section 54.201(d) of the FCC's rules to receive federal universal service support; and (2) issue such other orders as are deemed necessary or convenient in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

LATHROP & GAGE L.C.

Dated: August 11, 2006

/s/ Paul S. DeFord

Paul S. DeFord Mo. #29509

David G. Brown Mo. #42559

Suite 2800

2345 Grand Boulevard

Kansas City, MO 64108-2612

Telephone: (816) 292-2000

Facsimile: (816) 292-2001

E-mail: [pdeford@lathropgage.com](mailto:pdeford@lathropgage.com)

*Attorneys for Missouri RSA No. 5  
Partnership*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I do hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Post hearing Brief has been hand-delivered, transmitted by e-mail or mailed, First Class, postage prepaid, this 11th day of August, 2006, to:

\* **Case No.** TO-2006-0172

<b><u>Name of Company</u></b> <b><u>Name of Party</u></b>	<b><u>Email Phone</u></b> <b><u>Fax</u></b>	<b><u>Mailing Address</u></b>	<b><u>Street Address</u></b>	<b><u>City</u></b>	<b><u>State</u></b>	<b><u>Zip</u></b>
Missouri Public Service Commission Joyce K Dana	GenCounsel@psc.mo.gov	200 Madison Street, Suite 800	P.O. Box 360	Jefferson City	MO	65102
Office Of The Public Counsel Mills R Lewis	opcservice@ded.mo.gov	200 Madison Street, Suite 650	P.O. Box 2230	Jefferson City	MO	65102
Holway Telephone Corporation McCartney Brian	bmccartney@brydonlaw.com 573-635-7166 573-634-7431	P.O. Box 456	312 East Capitol Avenue	Jefferson City	MO	65102
Missouri Public Service Commission Haas William	William.Haas@psc.mo.gov	200 Madison Street, Suite 800	P.O. Box 360	Jefferson City	MO	65102
AT&T Missouri Gryzmala Robert	robert.gryzmala@att.com 314-235-6060 314-247-0014		One SBC Center	St. Louis	MO	63101
Spectra Communications Group, LLC d/b/a CenturyTel Stewart B Charles	Stewart499@aol.com 573-499-0635 573-499-0638		4603 John Garry Drive, Suite 11	Columbia	MO	65203

*/s/ Paul S. DeFord*  


---

Paul S. DeFord