1	FLORIDA	BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
2	In the Matter o	
3		DOCKET NO. 090507-TP
4	PETITION FOR DE	
5	ELIGIBLE TELECO CARRIER (ETC) B	MMUNICATIONS
6	SOUTH LLC.	1 1-MOBILE
7		SIGNATION AS DOCKET NO. 090510-TP
8	ELIGIBLE TELECO	MMUNICATIONS
9	CARRIER (ETC) B SOUTH LLC.	A A-WORITE
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		• • •
16	PROCEEDINGS:	AGENDA CONFERENCE ITEM NOS. 9 and 10
17		
18	COMMISSIONERS PARTICIPATING:	CHAIRMAN NANCY ARGENZIANO
19		COMMISSIONER LISA POLAK EDGAR COMMISSIONER NATHAN A. SKOP
20		
21	DATE:	Tuesday, July 13, 2010
22	PLACE:	Betty Easley Conference Center Room 148
23		4075 Esplanade Way Tallahassee, Florida
24	REPORTED BY:	JANE FAUROT, RPR
25		Official FPSC Reporter (850) 413-6732

PROCEEDINGS

chairman argenziano: Okay. Now, we are on -- we are going to move to Item 9. We are going to take up 9 and 10 together, but we are going to be voting on them independently. So we will give staff a moment.

(Pause.)

2.5

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Item 9. Good to go. Thank you.

MR. POLK: Good morning, Commissioners.

Jim Polk on behalf of staff. Items 9 and 10 both address petitions by T-Mobile.

Item 9 addresses T-Mobile's request for designation as an eligible telecommunication carrier in the nonrural areas of AT&T and Verizon.

Item Number 10 addresses T-Mobile's request for designation as an eligible telecommunication carrier in the rural areas of CenturyLink, Frontier, Indiantown, NEFCOM, TDS, Smart City, and Windstream.

Based on staff's review, along with

T-Mobile's commitment to abide by both state and

federal rules and procedures, staff believes that

T-Mobile's petition to be designated as an ETC is in

the public interest and should be approved.

Mr. Floyd Self is here this morning to answer any questions on behalf of T-Mobile, and staff is prepared to answer any questions

Commissioners may have.

Thank you.

MR. SELF: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Floyd Self with the Messer, Caparello, and Self law firm. With me is Michele Thomas, who is principal attorney from T-Mobile, and we are happy to answer any questions that you have. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just a quick question to staff. Again, I think what is important for me and I think for the Commission is making sure that we are being consistent when granting ETC status for wireless providers. And I know on Item 6 today that was withdrawn, but for Virgin Mobile and its petition for status it had not requested high-cost Universal Service Funds, and specifically the Commission order on Page 11 of the order had a requirement that if it were to seek high-cost support that it would have to seek additional Commission approval to show that it was in the public interest.

In this petition in 9 and 10, T-Mobile has

sought high-cost support from the Universal Service Fund, so I'm trying to distinguish as a wireless carrier, you know, what is appropriate and why specifically on 9 and 10 that it would be deemed in the public interest, given the concerns the Commission has had historically with the Universal Service Fund and high-cost support.

MR. CASEY: First of all, Virgin Mobile when they filed their petition, they requested only Lifeline, only low-income support for Lifeline and Link-Up. The reason that we put that phrase in there, if they decided that they would seek high cost at a future date, they would have to come back to the Commission and show what the public interest is in that. We went ahead, and -- I'm sorry, the Commission went ahead and granted the ETC designation to Virgin Mobile. The consummating order was issued yesterday on that.

T-Mobile, on the other hand, has come in and asked for ETC designation for low-income support and also high-cost support. We don't have a problem with that right now. It's up to the carrier to decide whether they want low income and high cost or just low income. If they are a facilities-based provider they can get high-cost support.

Back in 2008 there was a cap put on the competitive ETC high-cost support. In other words, it was frozen. In March of 2008, what they did is they took the amount of high-cost support for each state, annualized it, and for Florida it was approximately \$16 million, and we can't go above that.

It would not effect the existing rural ILECs because it is a separate pie. The pie is for competitive ETCs in Florida that receive high-cost support. So if the Commission grants another ETC for high-cost support, what they would do is go into that pie, the existing people in there that are receiving support would get a little smaller piece.

commissioner skop: Okay. And so, basically if I understood correctly that on Page 5 of the staff recommendation where it looks at the 2009 amounts that T-Mobile received in North Carolina for high-cost support, that under the established cap that the result on granting T-Mobile ETC status in Florida, allowing it to have high-cost support, that it would just merely tap some of the existing money within the capped amounts and bring it to Florida rather than it going elsewhere, is that correct?

2.5

MR. CASEY: The pie is for Florida, okay.

It is by state. So is it a \$16 million pot,

approximately.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay.

MR. CASEY: And if T-Mobile is granted ETC designation for high cost, it would get a piece of that pie. And they would have to share it with, I believe, there is three other competitive ETCs that are receiving high-cost money, which is is Alltel Wireless, Sprint-Nextel, and Knology.

commissioner skop: Okay. And so, staff, based on the analysis, looking at all things before the Commission previously, has deemed that the application for ETC status is in the public interest on both Item 9 and 10 on today's agenda?

MR. CASEY: Yes, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: All right. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Just a question on the -- I guess we used to call it cherry picking, cream-skimming in the rural areas. Could you just give me a little bit more on that?

MR. CASEY: Cream-skimming is a term that the FCC uses if a carrier goes into an area and just picks certain areas to provide service in.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: How do we avoid 1 that? 2 MR. CASEY: How do you avoid that? 3 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Yes. MR. CASEY: A lot of times carriers will 5 ask to split up a service area so that they can just 6 provide support to that. Now, if we went in and 7 determined that, yes, they are going to be 8 cream-skimming, then you could require them to do 9 the whole service area and not just the big city 10 where they are going to make a lot of money. But in 11 this case they are providing service in the whole 12 area, and we are not concerned with cream-skimming. 13 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Great. Thank you. 14 Commissioner Edgar. 15 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Thank you. 16 17 I do believe we have one other interested 18 entity that would like to speak. CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Absolutely. 19 MR. McCABE: Good morning. Tom McCabe on 20 behalf of TDS Telecom. 21 With the national broadband plan that is 22 sitting out there today, we think perhaps maybe 23 deferring on this until all the issues of the 24 universal high-cost fund are resolved, that would be 25

a good thing to do.

Also, with respect to ETC status and high-cost support, I mean, the revenues that we receive, the high-cost support that we receive is used to ensure that the facilities -- it goes to pay for those facilities and to ensure that there is -- and that money was then used to establish a local rate for us. That money was added into the rate base, which is significantly different than what's going on with competitive ETCs in which they simply take the money and it goes from there.

recommendation would be to ensure that the money that is recovered from a particular high-cost area is used in that high-cost area to support the facilities that are in place in that high-cost area. My understanding, you have some that are simply resellers. It needs to -- it should be used to be supporting those facilities. You should not be able to take revenues that they receive from the Smart City's customers for high-cost support and use those up in our service area, and that would be a suggestion we would make if you approved this.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Commissioner Skop.

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Thank you, Madam COMMISSIONER SKOP: 1 Chair. 2 To the point that was just made, if staff 3 could respond to that, and if there is any 4 Commission precedent. My memory seems to recall 5 that at one point a similar argument was raised of 6 keep the money local. But, again, I'm getting a little bit old, so I will look to staff to try to 8 bring some clarity. 9 MR. CASEY: For that I would like it defer 10 to Mr. Fogleman, who is our high-cost specialist. 11 MR. FOGLEMAN: Good morning, 12 13 Commissioners. 14 I believe you have discretion to the extent you wish to require that new ETC T-Mobile 15 to use the high-cost support within the state, you 16 have that discretion as part of their designation 17 18 process. CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Commissioner Skop. 19 20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Any response, Mr. Self, from T-Mobile's position as to inserting that 21 22 requirement?

23

24

25

MR. SELF: Thank you, Commissioners. In our application, and I think in some of the data request responses we did, in fact, indicate that we

were going to keep the money in Florida. I don't
know that you can trace dollar-for-dollar; you got a
dollar in the TDS area you have to use in TDS versus
two dollars that you got in Smart City and used
there.

Given the construction budget that the company has, I think the bottom line is we are going to use that money in Florida. The money we are going to be spending and investing in infrastructure in Florida, because T-Mobile is a facilities-based carrier, is substantially in excess of what we are going to be -- whatever we are going to be getting out of that high cost support. So I think you are more than adequately protected, given the kind of investments that T-Mobile will be making in infrastructure.

MR. McCABE: If I may respond.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Yes.

MR. McCABE: When we file a cost study with the FCC that identifies all the costs that are associated with the service area. I think when they go ahead -- and, I mean, this Commission on a going forward basis will be approving the ongoing ETC certification, and in that application they can simply show where that money is being spent. And it

is pretty easy to determine, well, I've got -- I recovered, you know, 2,500 customers in Gadsden County, it generated this amount of support, and this is how much money was spent in infrastructure investment in this study area. I think that is really pretty simple. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Any questions?

Commissioner Skop.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just to staff, in terms of incorporating that into a motion within the staff recommendation, does staff have some proposed language?

MR. CASEY: First, may I ask T-Mobile, is it impossible to separate it by carrier in that area? Could you identify those costs? That would be the major thing. And one other thing I'd like to bring up is if you are going to be receiving high-cost support, they have to come into the Commission on an annual basis. And when they do come in on an annual basis, we could require them to show us the money that you spent and show us where you spent it. We could do it that way, too, as an alternative.

MR. SELF: We don't believe that you can

provide it down to such a microscopic level. You know, the infrastructure that might serve Gadsden County, some of it is going to potentially be located in Leon County, or it might be in Madison County for all that matter. So we don't think you can trace it quite that specifically.

You know, again, we have pledged that we will be making the investment in Florida, and that the investment in Florida is going to certainly be greatly in excess of the support that is going to be provided by the high-cost fund.

chairman argenziano: Okay. Your
response?

position doesn't change. I mean, and if it is for some reason that they can demonstrate that infrastructure investment in Leon County is ensuring that folks out at the lake, at Lake Talquin have adequate cell phone reception, that's fine. You know, staff can come to those conclusions based on that analysis. But I think there needs to be some showing that these benefits are going to go into those areas in which the high-cost support is intended. That is what the requirements are, and to me that is pretty simple.

۷	II
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	İ
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
L 8	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
) <u>C</u>	

MR. FOGLEMAN: Another alternative might
be that you look at you know, to the extent you
don't want to micromanage and you are not able to
find that level of detail, perhaps looking at the
nonrural study areas that you are seeking ETC
designation versus the nonrurals. Rurals versus the
nonrurals. Maybe, you know, that's large enough.
That's another alternative.

MR. SELF: I think what you said is what we are talking about doing. Since we have two separate applications, Item 9, the 090507 docket is the low income only. So really this discussion that we are having about the high cost only pertains to the Docket 090510.

MR. FOGLEMAN: I thought the high cost, there was still some high-cost support for the nonrural for IAS support, so you could --

MR. SELF: I'm sorry, I misspoke. Strike that.

CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Commissioner Skop.

COMMISSIONER SKOP: Thank you, Madam

Chair.

At the appropriate time, if there are no further questions, I'm willing to make a motion that would embody the staff recommendation, but to add

1	the additional requirement that T-Mobile demonstrate
2	that the amount equal to the high-cost support would
3	be invested in infrastructure within the state of
4	Florida, and they would have to demonstrate that
5	annually to staff. But I'll make the motion at the
6	appropriate time.
7	CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Any other questions
8	first? Any other discussion?
9	Okay. We're ready for a motion.
10	No. Here we go.
11	MR. CASEY: Might I just clarify one
12	thing?
13	CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Yes.
14	MR. CASEY: Commissioner, did you want to
15	do that on the annual recertification, during the
16	annual recertification process?
17	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes, I think that
18	would be the appropriate mechanism, if staff would
19	agree that that would be.
20	MR. CASEY: That would be fine; yes, sir.
21	CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Okay. We're ready
22	for a motion. Oh, sorry.
23	MR. SELF: And, Commissioner Skop, I think
24	that would work from our standpoint.
25	COMMISSIONER SKOP: Great. It's always

good to get agreement. 1 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: All right. Here we 2 3 go. COMMISSIONER SKOP: Okay. Thank you, 4 Madam Chair. 5 With respect to the disposition of Item 9 6 before the Commission, I would respectfully move the 7 staff recommendation for Issues 1 and 2 with the 8 amendment that during the annual certification of 9 ETC status that T-Mobile demonstrate that the amount 10 of high-cost support would be invested in 11 infrastructure within the state of Florida. 12 13 COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Second. CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: All those in favor. 14 (Vote taken.) 15 16 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: Opposed? The motion 17 passes. Let's move to -- I'm sorry. 18 **COMMISSIONER SKOP: No.** 19 CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: To Item 10. 20 COMMISSIONER SKOP: Yes. And I think that 21 the discussion embodied both of those, so at the 22 appropriate time, Madam Chair, I will make the same 23 motion. And that would be for the disposition of 24 Item 10 before the Commission to adopt the staff 25 recommendation for Issues 1 and 2 as modified to

require T-Mobile during the annual ETC certification process to demonstrate that the amount of high-cost support would be invested in infrastructure within the state of Florida. COMMISSIONER EDGAR: Second. CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: All those in favor. (Vote taken.) CHAIRMAN ARGENZIANO: It's adopted. Thank you very much.

1 2 STATE OF FLORIDA 3 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 4 COUNTY OF LEON 5 I, JANE FAUROT, RPR, Chief, Hearing Reporter Services Section, FPSC Division of Commission Clerk, do 6 hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was heard 7 at the time and place herein stated. 8 IT IS FURTHER CERTIFIED that I stenographically reported the said proceedings; that 9 the same has been transcribed under my direct supervision; and that this transcript constitutes a 10 true transcription of my notes of said proceedings. 11 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative, employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, 12 nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or counsel connected with the action, nor am I 13 financially interested in the action. 1.4 DATED THIS 16th day of July, 2010. 15 16 FAUROT, RPR 17 Official FPSC Hearings Reporter (850) 413-6732 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25