

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

**Midcontinent Communications/Missouri Valley
Communications, Inc.
Rural Exemption
Investigation**

Case No. PU-08-61

**Missouri Valley Communications, Inc.
Suspend/Modify Interconnection Requirements
Application**

Case No. PU-08-176

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE REGULAR, INSIDE, OR ELECTRONIC MAIL

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
COUNTY OF BURLEIGH

Janet Marquart deposes and says that:

she is over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action and, on the **17th** day of **October, 2008**, she deposited in the United States Mail, Bismarck, North Dakota, 24 envelopes by first class mail, fully prepaid, 1 envelope by inside mail, all securely sealed and each containing a photocopy, and 67 electronic mail messages, each with an attached electronic copy of:

Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order


The envelopes and electronic mails respectively were addressed as follows:

See attached list.

Each post office address shown is the respective addressee's last reasonably ascertainable post office address and each email address is the respective addressee's last reasonably ascertainable electronic mailing address.

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this **17th** day of **October, 2008**.

SEAL



Janet Marquart

John G. Hamre

Notary Public

Arch Wireless Inc
6910 Richmond Hwy #80
Alexandria VA 22306-1801

VINCENT WOODBURY
BELL ATLANTIC COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
1 VERIZON WAY VC11E207
BASKING RIDGE NJ 07920

Lawrence Freedman
Fleischman & Walsh
1255 23rd St NW, Ste 800
Washington DC 20037-1105

Houlton Enterprises Inc
2201 W Bdwy Ste 1
Council Bluffs IA 51501

Nanette Edwards
ITC DeltaCom Communications Inc
7037 Old Madison Pike NW #400
Huntsville AL 35806-2107

Local Telcom Holdings LLC
485 Madison Ave 15th Fl
New York NY 10022-5803

Bonnie Lorang
MITS
PO Box 5237
Helena MT 59604-5237

Dave Crothers
NDATC
Box 1144
Mandan ND 58554-1144

Kristin L Smith
Qwest Corporation
1801 California St Ste 900
Denver CO 80202

Kimberly Nielson
RTC-1
Legal & External Affairs 7277 164th Ave
Redmond WA 98052

Kimberly Nielsen
AT&T Wireless
P O Box 3611
Bothell WA 98073-9761

Beth Choroser
Comcast Business Communications Inc
1500 Market St
Philadelphia PA 19102

Global Tel*Link Corporation
2609 Cameron St
Mobile AL 36607-3104

Ken Hanks
International Telcom Ltd
417 2nd Ave W
Seattle WA 98119

Thomas K Crowe
Law Offices of Thomas K Crowe PC
1250 24th St NW Ste 300
Washington DC 20037

Mark Wilhelmi
Midstate Telephone Co
PO Box 400
Stanley ND 58784-0400

Jim Arbury
National Multi Housing Council
1850 M St NW Ste 540
Washington DC 20036

Allen Hoberg
Office of Administrative Hearings
INSIDE MAIL

Dean Polkow
RCC Network Inc
PO Box 2000
Alexandria MN 56308-2000

Diane C Browning
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6450 SPRINT PARKWAY KSOPHN0212-2A511
OVERLAND PARK KS 66251-6100

Harris Saele
T P C Inc
PO Box 180
Devils Lake ND 58301-0180

CURTIS HOPFINGER
T-NETIX TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, I
14651 DALLAS PARKWAY SUITE 600
DALLAS TX 75254

Western CLEC Corporation
3650 131st Ave SE #400
Bellevue WA 98006

Carolyn Fodor
Winstar Communications
520 Broad St
Newark NJ 07102

WTC Competitive Services Inc
P O Box 270
Park River ND 58270-0270

abby.knowlton@acceris.com
Abby Knowlton
Acceris Management & Acquisition LLC
9530 Padgett St Ste 101
San Diego CA 92126

jlchapman@acomminc.com
Jerry Chapman
Acomm Inc
510 1st Ave N Ste 203
Minneapolis MN 55403-0343

maryanne.allen@att.com
Mary Anne Allen
AT&T Nevada
645 E Plumb Lane, C-144 PO Box 11010
Reno NV 89520

smassey@bepc.com
Sheryl Massey
Basin Electric Power Coop
1717 E Interstate Ave
Bismarck ND 58501-0564

aeconomou@mettel.net
Andoni Economou
Business Productivity Solutions Inc
44 Wall St 6th FL
New York NY 10005

charlie@cicom.net
CHARLES BRENNEMAN
COAST INTERNATIONAL, INC.
14303 W 95TH STREET
LENEXA KS 66215-5210

bryan@consolidatedtelcom.com
Bryan W Personne
Consolidated Telcom
PO Box 1077
Dickinson ND 58601-1077

ninaburslem@imagitel.com
NINA BURSLEM
D.D.D. CALLING, INC.
2400 AUGUSTA DRIVE SUITE 263
HOUSTON TX 77057-4922

mjrasher@msn.com
Mary Jane Rasher
DCI Group

glenn.richards@shawpittman.com
Glenn Richards
Glenn Richards
ShawPittman 2300 N St NW

tseat@acninc.com
TIMOTHY SEAT
ACN COMMUNICATION SERVICES, INC.
32991 HAMILTON CT
FARMINGTON HILL MI 48334-3301

janice.ono@att.com
Janice L Ono
AT&T Nevada
645 E Plumb Lane, C-144 P O Box 11010
Reno NV 89520

jcremer@bantzlzaw.com
James Cremer
Bantz Gosh & Cremer LLC
305 6th Ave SE
Aberdeen SD 57402-0970

derrick@bektel.com
Derrick Bulawa
BEK Communications Cooperative
P. O. Box 230
Steele ND 58482-0230

scott.geston@cableone.net
Scott Geston
Cable One of Fargo
P O Box 10757
Fargo ND 58106-0757

ken@consolidatedtelcom.com
Paul Schuetzler
Consolidated Telcom
PO Box 1077
Dickinson ND 58601-1077

paul@consolidatedtelcom.com
Paul Schuetzler
Consolidated Telcom
PO Box 1077
Dickinson ND 58601-1077

keithl@daktel.com
Keith Larson
Dakota Central Tele Coop
PO Box 299
Carrington ND 58421-0299

tschilling@drtel.com
Troy Schilling
Dickey Rural Telephone Cooperative
PO Box 69
Ellendale ND 58436-0069

rlaqua@rrv.net
Ronald Laqua
Halstad Telephone Company
PO Box 55
Halstad MN 56548-0055

bjohnson@ideaone.com
Robert K Johnson
IdeaOne Telecom Group LLC
3239 39th St SW
Fargo ND 58104

kander@ictc.com
Keith Anderson
Inter-Community Telephone Company LLC
PO Box 8
Nome ND 58062-0008

jlowe@ldcb.com
JAN LOWE
LONG DISTANCE CONSOLIDATED BILLING CO.
7111 DIXIE HWY SUITE 211
CLARKSTON MI 48346

dhoyle@matrixbt.com
DANA HOYLE
MATRIX TELECOM, INC.
7171 FOREST LANE SUITE 700
DALLAS TX 75230

gerrya@midrivers.com
GERRY ANDERSON
MID-RIVERS TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC.
904 C AVENUE P O BOX 280
CIRCLE MT 59215-0280

sbunn@mlgc.com
Shelie Bunn
Moore & Liberty Telephone Co
301 Dewey St PO Box 66
Enderlin ND 58027-0066

pschaner@ndarec.com
Patti Schaner
ND Assn Rural Electric Coops
PO Box 727
Mandan ND 58554-0727

carla.deutsch@thomson.com
Carla Deutsch
Netscan

rer@norlight.com
Robert E Rogers
NorLight Inc
275 N Corporate Dr
Brookfield WI 53045

Diana.Stevens@VerizonWireless.com
Diana Stevens
North Dakota RSA No. 3 LP

Carl.Billek@corp.idt.net
CARL BILLEK
IDT AMERICA, CORP.
520 BROAD STREET 4TH FLOOR
NEWARK NJ 07102-3111

sales@kmavradio.com
KMAV AM/FM RADIO
PO Box 216
Mayville ND 58257-0216

loretel@loretel.net
Steven Katka
Loretel Systems, Inc
PO Box 72 13 e 4ath Ave
Ada MN 56510-0072

foss@btinet.net
Marilyn Foss
MCI
P O Box 2216
Bismarck ND 58502-2216

rdelfiacco@nemont.net
Roger Del Fiacco
Missouri Valley Communications Inc
P O Box 600
Scobey MT 59263-0600

dhill@ndarec.com
Dennis Hill
ND Assn Rural Electric Coops
PO Box 727
Mandan ND 58554-0727

2kathyg@nemontel.net
KATHY GREENWOOD
NEMONT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
61 HWY 13 S PO BOX 600
SCOBEY MT 59263-0600

julie.tessier@thomson.com
Julie Tessier
Netscan

Diana.Stevens@VerizonWireless.com
Diana Stevens
North Dakota 5 - Kidder LP

pat@ndta.net
Patricia Gisinger
North Dakota Telephone Assoc
PO Box 2614
Bismarck ND 58502-2614

dwrights@nccray.com
Dwight Schmitt
Northwest Communications Coop
PO Box 38
Ray ND 58849-0038

donn@srt.com
Don Negaard
Pringle and Herigstad P C
PO Box 1000
Minot ND 58702-1000

kblicke@qwest.com
Kent Blickensderfer
Qwest Corporation
220 N 5th St PO Box 5508
Bismarck ND 58502-5508

smacint@qwest.com
Scott Macintosh
Qwest Corporation
220 N 5th St PO Box 5508
Bismarck ND 58502-5508

jeffolson@rrt.net
Jeff Olson
Red River Rural Tele Assoc
PO Box 136
Abercrombie ND 58001-0136

arthur.paquette@att.com
ARTHUR PAQUETTE
SNET AMERICA, INC.
310 ORANGE STREET 3RD FLOOR
NEW HAVEN CT 06510

kimrw@srttel.com
Kim Weydahl
SRT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
3615 N BDWY PO BOX 2027
MINOT ND 58702-2027

julieel@srttel.com
Julie Lizotte
SRT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
3615 N BDWY PO BOX 2027
MINOT ND 58702-2027

jasonrg@srttel.com
Jason Gemar
SRT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
3615 N BDWY PO BOX 2027
MINOT ND 58702-2027

mdickerson@nd.gov
Marcy Dickerson
State Tax Department
State Capitol
Bismarck ND 58505

ddunning@polarcomm.com
David Dunning
Polar Commun Mut Aid Corp
PO Box 270
Park River ND 58270-0270

tresch1@attbi.com
THOMAS RESCH
PROTEL ADVANTAGE, INC.
1308 MEDORA ROAD
MENDOTA HEIGHTS MN 55118

sschwan@qwest.com
Suzy Schwandt
Qwest Corporation

jason.topp@qwest.com
Jason Topp
Qwest Services Corporation
200 S 5th St Rm 2200
Minneapolis MN 55402

rthoreson@tnics.com
Robin Thoreson
Roberts County Telephone Coop Assoc
205 Main Street PO Box 197
New Effington SD 57255

stevedl@srttel.com
STEVEN LYSNE
SRT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
3615 N BDWY PO BOX 2027
MINOT ND 58702-2027

christm@srttel.com
Chris Morsefield
SRT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
3615 N BDWY PO BOX 2027
MINOT ND 58702-2027

janehp@srttel.com
Jane Petersen
SRT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
3615 N BDWY PO BOX 2027
MINOT ND 58702-2027

johnar@srttel.com
John Reiser
SRT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
3615 N BDWY PO BOX 2027
MINOT ND 58702-2027

Tele-beep@butlerpropertiesinc.com
AL BOSCH
TELE-BEEP PAGING CO.
PO BOX 7072
BISMARCK ND 58507-7072

lwh@thlglaw.com
Loubna W Haddad
The Helein Law Group LLP
8180 Greensboro Dr Ste 700
McLean VA 22102

kcarlson@utma.com
Kenneth Carlson
United Telephone Mut Aid Corp
P O Box 729
Langdon ND 58249-0729

david.armey@verizonwireless.com; Nicole.Barlow@Verizo
David Armev
Verizon
750 State Hwy 121, Ste 100
Louisville TX 75067

mickg@westriv.com
Mick Grosz
West River Telecommunications Cooperative
PO Box 467
Hazen ND 58545-0467

kjvannin@usgs.gov
K Vannin
U S Geological Survey

vilaire@comcast.net
STAN EFFERDING
VCI COMPANY
PO BOX 98907
LAKEWOOD WA 98496-0907

bonniek@westriv.com
Bonnie Krause
West River Telecomm Coop
PO Box 467
Hazen ND 58545-0467

**STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**Midcontinent Communications/Missouri Valley
Communications, Inc.
Rural Exemption
Investigation**

Case No. PU-08-61

**Missouri Valley Communications, Inc.
Suspend/Modify Interconnection Requirements
Application**

Case No. PU-08-176

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER

Appearances

Commissioners Susan E. Wefald, Kevin Cramer, and Tony Clark.

John M. Olson, John M. Olson, P.C., 418 East Broadway, Suite 9, Bismarck, ND 58501, and J.G. Harrington, Dow Lohnes, PLLC, 1200 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Suite 800, Washington, D.C. 20036, on behalf of Midcontinent Communications.

David J. Hogue, Pringle & Herigstad, P.C. 2525 Elk Drive, Minot, ND 58702-1000, on behalf of Missouri Valley Communications, Inc.

Annette Bendish, Public Service Commission, State Capitol, 600 E Boulevard Ave., Bismarck, North Dakota 58505, on behalf of the Public Service Commission.

Allen Hoberg, Office of Administrative Hearings, 1701 North Ninth Street, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501-1882, as Administrative Law Judge.

Preliminary Statement

On November 14, 2007, Midcontinent Communications (Midcontinent) made a request for a facilities based interconnection agreement with local number portability (LNP) services for the Williston North Dakota exchange from Missouri Valley Communications, Inc. d/b/a Nemont (Missouri Valley). On February 8, 2008, Midcontinent filed with the Commission its Notice of Bona Fide Request for Services and Interconnection and Petition to Find Rural Exemption Waived, Case No. PU-08-61.

Midcontinent requests that the Commission determine that Missouri Valley has waived its rural exemption, or in the alternative that the Commission conduct an inquiry under the provisions of 47 USC § 251(f)(1)(A) for the purpose of determining whether to

terminate Missouri Valley's exemption from providing its services as requested by Midcontinent.

On April 9, 2008, Missouri Valley filed an Application for Suspension under 47 USC § 251(f)(2), Case No. PU-08-176. Missouri Valley requests that the Commission grant to Missouri Valley a suspension of the requirements of subsections (b) and (c) of section 251 for Missouri Valley's telephone exchange service facilities in the Williston exchange area for such duration as the Commission determines.

On May 1, 2008, Administrative Law Judge Allen Hoberg issued an Order for Consolidation and Scheduling pursuant to Stipulation for Consolidation filed by the parties consolidating these cases for hearing.

On May 7, 2008, the Commission issued a Notice of Consolidated Hearing scheduling a hearing in Cases No. PU-08-61 and No. PU-08-176 for July 9, 2008, and identifying the following issues:

1. Whether the request of Midcontinent is unduly economically burdensome.
2. Whether the request of Midcontinent is technically feasible.
3. Whether the request of Midcontinent is consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 254 (other than subsections (b)(7) and (d)(1)(D) thereof).
4. The implementation schedule for compliance with the request should the exemption be terminated.
5. Whether suspension or modification is necessary.
6. Whether suspension or modification is consistent with public interest, convenience, and necessity.
7. The extent and duration should any suspension or modification be granted.

Having allowed all interested persons an opportunity to be heard and having heard, reviewed, and considered all testimony and evidence presented, the Commission makes the following:

Findings of Fact

The Commission finds:

1. Missouri Valley is an incumbent local exchange carrier authorized by the Commission to provide telecommunications services in the Williston exchange. Missouri Valley is a rural telephone company as defined under 47 U.S.C. § 153(b)(37).

2. Midcontinent is a South Dakota general partnership registered with the Commission to provide local exchange telecommunications services. Midcontinent is a competitive local exchange carrier and is a reseller of telecommunications service in the Williston exchange (Case No. PU-04-638). Midcontinent is also a cable operator providing video programming. Midcontinent has a certificate of public convenience and necessity to provide facilities based competitive local exchange telecommunications services throughout North Dakota (Case No. PU-04-546).

3. Missouri Valley provides the nine services or functionalities designated in Federal Communications Commission (FCC) rules, 47 CFR 54.101. These are: (1) voice grade access to the public switched network; (2) flat rated local service pricing where the incremental cost of local usage to the customer is free; (3) dual tone multi-frequency (DTMF) signaling, commonly referred to as touch tone to support efficient call set up; (4) single party service; (5) access to emergency services through compliance with E911 requirements; (6) access to operator services; (7) 1 plus equal access to interexchange carriers; (8) access to directory assistance through the dialing of 411; and (9) toll limitation for qualifying low-income consumers and the offering of lifeline service. Missouri Valley complies with the requirement to advertise the availability and charges for these nine services.

4. Missouri Valley complies with the requirement to provide the supported services throughout the designated service area of the entire Williston exchange to all customers making a reasonable request for service, including low income, low density, rural insular, and high cost customers in a manner that is reasonably comparable and at rates equivalent to those charged in the municipality of Williston.

5. In April 2008, there were 8,806 access lines in the Williston exchange, including 1,575 lines resold to Midcontinent and 7,231 lines served by Missouri Valley. The Williston exchange area is 390.6 square miles, including approximately 7.3 square miles that comprise the City of Williston. As of April 2008, Missouri Valley served the 8,806 access lines in the area over a network of 933.3 network route miles of telecommunications cable, of which 477 miles are in the City of Williston and 456.3 miles serve the rural portion of the exchange beyond the city limits. Of the 8,806 access lines, approximately 7,065 are inside the Williston City limits, including the lines that are resold to Midcontinent. 1,741 lines served by Missouri Valley are outside of the Williston city limits.

Bona Fide Request

6. Under Section 252(a)(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1934 as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act), an incumbent local exchange carrier may negotiate and enter into a binding agreement with a requesting telecommunications carrier upon receiving a request for interconnection, service or network elements under Section 251. Section 251(c) requires incumbent local exchange carriers to interconnect

with competitive local exchange carriers and to negotiate the terms of interconnection agreements.

7. Under Section 251(c) of the Act, an incumbent local exchange carrier is obligated to provide (1) good faith negotiation, (2) facilities and equipment interconnection, (3) unbundled network elements, (4) retail services as wholesale rates, (5) notice of network changes, and (6) collocation of equipment.

8. Under Section 251(f)(1)(A) of the Act, a rural telephone company is exempt from the requirements of Section 251(c) until (1) the rural company has received a bona fide request for interconnection, services, or network elements, and (2) the state commission determines (under subparagraph B) that such request is not unduly economically burdensome, is technically feasible, and is consistent with Section 254 of the Act.

9. Missouri Valley acknowledged that Midcontinent's November 14, 2007 request for interconnection is a bona fide request.

10. Midcontinent has made a bona fide request for interconnection, which a local exchange carrier must provide under Section 251(c) of the Act. Midcontinent has specifically requested facilities-based interconnection with local number portability.

Rural Exemption

11. Under Section 251(f)(1)(A) of the Act, Missouri Valley is exempt from the requirement to provide the service requested until Missouri Valley has received a bona fide request from Midcontinent and the Commission determines (under subparagraph B) that such "...request is not unduly economically burdensome, is technically feasible, and is consistent with section 254..." To initiate a Commission proceeding to terminate Missouri Valley's rural exemption, Midcontinent is required to submit to the Commission a Section 251(f)(1)(B) notice of its bona fide request. Under Section 251(f)(1)(C), the rural exemption from interconnection is not available to a rural telephone company if the competitive local exchange carrier that has requested interconnection is a cable operator providing video programming and the rural telephone company also provides video programming. Midcontinent is a cable operator, but Missouri Valley is not, so the exemption remains in effect unless it is terminated under Section 251(f)(1)(B).

12. Under Section 251(f)(1)(B) of the Act and *Iowa Utilities Board v. Federal Communications Commission*, 219 F.3d 744, at 759-763 (8th Cir. 2000) Midcontinent has the burden of proving that Midcontinent's requested interconnection is not unduly economically burdensome, is technically feasible, and is consistent with Section 254.

Undue Economic Burden

13. Shawn Hanson, General Manager of Missouri Valley, testified that the economic impact from Midcontinent's requested interconnection would be a cumulative net

revenue loss over the 2009-2012 timeframe of \$3.58 million due to Missouri Valley customers migrating to Midcontinent as a facilities-based service provider rather than as a service reseller. This impact would be a 31% reduction of annual net revenues in 2009 and a 56% reduction of annual net revenues in 2012. Hanson testified that such a loss of revenues would not damage Missouri Valley's ability to continue to offer service but would damage Missouri Valley's ability to invest in facility upgrades and replacements. Hanson testified that a loss of \$3.58 million would be unduly economically burdensome.

14. Midcontinent witness Scott Lundquist testified that the economic impact from the interconnection would be a cumulative net revenue loss over the 2009-2012 timeframe of \$888,577. The \$2.69 million difference between Lundquist's and Hanson's economic impact is due to four adjustments Lundquist proposed to Missouri Valley's impact analysis. The four adjustments were named and calculated as Migration Timing \$154,300, Resale Line Growth Factors \$572,600, Special Access Revenues \$367,600 and \$2.234 million adjustment to universal service fund (USF) revenue; or \$3.33 million total adjustment. Lundquist's testimony indicated the adjustments "interact" and therefore actually result in the \$2.69 million difference. Lundquist did not explain how the proposed adjustments interact or how much each adjustment contributed to the \$2.69 million.

15. Lundquist based his Migration Timing adjustment of \$154,300 on an assumption that Midcontinent would take six months, from January 1, 2009 through June 2009 to migrate its existing resale-based customers to Midcontinent's facilities. Missouri Valley's analysis assumes Midcontinent would complete the migration by January 1, 2009.

16. Midcontinent has not met its burden of proof on its proposed Migration Timing adjustment of \$154,300. Midcontinent's evidence about migration timing is not more persuasive than Missouri Valley's evidence.

17. Regarding the Resale Line Growth Factors adjustment of \$572,600, Lundquist projected linear growth and Hanson projected compounding growth in the numbers of Missouri Valley customers migrating to taking service from Midcontinent. Linear growth projections produce a lower estimate of the numbers of customers, and that produces a lower estimate of the financial impact of the interconnection. Missouri Valley's Exhibit 1 shows the projected growth in Midcontinent's customer count, beginning at 1,488 in 2007 growing to 3,663 over the study period through 2012, a total growth of about 1,800.

18. Midcontinent has not met its burden of proof on its proposed Resale Line Growth Factors adjustment of \$572,600. Midcontinent's evidence about resale line growth is not more persuasive than Missouri Valley's evidence.

19. Regarding the Special Access Revenues proposed adjustment of \$367,600, Lundquist testified Midcontinent could offer special access services over its existing cable TV facilities without the interconnection, so Missouri Valley's estimate of net

revenue loss due to customer migration to Midcontinent's special access service would not occur because of the interconnection. Therefore, Lundquist's adjustment reflects no net revenue loss to Missouri Valley due to interconnection-related migration of special access service customers.

20. Hanson testified that business customers would move special access service at the same time voice service is moved.

21. Lundquist's testimony that there should be no net revenue loss to Missouri Valley due to migration of its customers to become special access customers of Midcontinent is not more persuasive than Hanson's testimony that there would be a net revenue loss due to migration of its customers to become special access customers of Midcontinent.

22. Midcontinent has not met its burden of proof on its proposed Special Access Revenues adjustment of \$367,600, but Missouri Valley makes a compelling argument that, over time with full facilities-based competition, special access service revenue to Missouri Valley will decline.

23. Lundquist testified that the interconnection-related revenue losses to Missouri Valley could be offset by significant additional federal universal service funding obtained via the safety valve mechanism. Lundquist therefore proposed a \$2.234 million adjustment to Missouri Valley's net revenue loss. Lundquist testified that additional funding under the federal Safety Valve mechanism would be available to Missouri Valley as line and revenue losses drive up per line costs.

24. Hanson testified that Missouri Valley does not qualify for support from the safety valve mechanism. Safety valve is an official shorthand expression to describe a provision of 47 CFR 54.305 that is unofficially referred to as the parent trap rule. The parent trap rule limits a rural telephone company's receipt of universal service funds for an acquired exchange that was not historically qualified under USF rules. Missouri Valley is a rural telephone company affected by the parent trap rule, because the Williston exchange was not qualified under USF rules when it was owned by Citizens Telecommunications Company of North Dakota, Inc. Specifically, the parent trap rule prevents a rural telephone company from receiving universal service funds to support or subsidize old investment in the exchange, investment that was not made by the rural telephone company but was made by the former owner. The safety valve exception permits a rural telephone company that is subject to the parent trap rule to receive some USF support for post-acquisition new investments in rural infrastructure, investments that are made by the rural telephone company. ("Universal Service Order," Fourteenth Report and Order, FCC 01-257 (May 23, 2001) Paragraphs 91-135.) The FCC's explanation of the safety valve exception emphasized that rural telephone companies "will only receive support for new investment in rural infrastructure." *Id.* The FCC also stated that excessive fund growth related to the impact on the fund of competitive entry and incumbent line loss to CLECs in rural areas should be closely monitored (*Id.* Para 101, 124, 131.)

25. Lundquist proposed in his testimony that Missouri Valley apply for USF support under the safety valve rule where the post-acquisition number in the formulae is not new investments made by Missouri Valley, but is a post acquisition per line costs increase, "...which is likely to happen if Missouri Valley loses lines in the case of Midcontinent's entry."

26. The argument that Missouri Valley would be able to receive additional USF subsidies under the safety valve mechanism if Missouri Valley experiences interconnection-related line and revenue losses in the case of Midcontinent's entry is not persuasive.

27. Midcontinent witness Timothy Gates testified that a cumulative net revenue loss over the 2009-2012 timeframe of \$888,577 would not be unduly economically burdensome. Gates' testimony did not speak to whether any amounts larger than \$888,577 were not unduly economically burdensome.

28. Gates testified that unduly economically burdensome is a point at which the competition damages Missouri Valley's ability to operate efficiently or to continue to offer services.

29. The Commission's interpretation is guided by the opinion of the Court in *Iowa Utilities Board v Federal Communications Commission*, 219 F.3d 744 (8th Cir. 2000) which states in pertinent parts:

In the Act, Congress sought both to promote competition and to protect rural telephone companies as evidenced by the Congressional debates. ... There can be no doubt that it is an economic burden on an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) to provide what Congress has directed it to provide to new competitors in 251(b) or 251(c). Because the small and rural ILECs, while they may be entrenched in their markets, have less of a financial capacity than larger and more urban ILECs to meet such a request, the Congress declared that their statutorily granted exemption should continue unless the state commission found all three pre-requisites for terminating the exemption. By limiting the phrase 'unduly economically burdensome' to exclude burdens ordinarily associated with competitive entry, the FCC has impermissibly weakened the broad protection Congress granted to small and rural telephone companies. (*Iowa v FCC*, at 761)

30. The rural exemption is not limited to protection against the most extreme economic burdens such as threats to economic survival. Even though the loss of revenue might not threaten Missouri Valley's ability to offer existing services in the immediate future, its efficiency in offering those services would be damaged because the revenue loss would unduly impair Missouri Valley's ability to invest in facility upgrades and replacements.

31. Gates testified that the impact on the Nemont group of companies in total should be the relevant benchmark for determining undue economic burden. Neither Section 251(f)(1) of the Act, 47 CFR 51.405, nor the FCC's Local Competition Order supports a finding that the impact on the Nemont group of companies in total should be the relevant benchmark. The Commission agrees that consideration as to economic burden that the interconnection would impose must be limited to the economic burden that the interconnection would impose on Missouri Valley.

32. Midcontinent has not proven that a cumulative net revenue loss over the 2009-2012 timeframe of \$3.58 million is not unduly economically burdensome, or that a smaller financial impact is not unduly economically burdensome.

33. Midcontinent's evidence that the economic impact is \$888,577 is not more persuasive than Missouri Valley's evidence that the economic impact is \$3.58 million.

Technical Feasibility

34. Midcontinent presented testimony that the interconnection with number portability is technically feasible. Missouri Valley does not contend that interconnection is not technically feasible.

35. The interconnection, with number portability, is technically feasible.

Consistent with Section 254

36. Under 47 U.S.C. § 254, the policies for the preservation and advancement of universal service are based on the principles that quality services should be available at just, reasonable, and affordable rates; that advanced telecommunications and information services should be provided in all regions of the Nation; that consumers in all regions of the Nation, including low-income consumers and those in rural, insular, and high cost areas, should have access to telecommunications and information services that are reasonable comparable to those services provided in urban areas and that are available at rates that are reasonably comparable to rates charged for similar services in urban areas; that elementary and secondary schools and classrooms, health care providers, and libraries should have access to advanced telecommunications services.

37. Gates testified that the "...key issue" of 'unduly economically burdensome' also affects "... whether interconnection will harm Missouri Valley's ability to meet its universal service requirements." Gates testified the interconnection would not be unduly economically burdensome to Missouri Valley and that "Midcontinent's interconnection with Missouri Valley will not harm Missouri Valley's ability to maintain its universal service obligations."

38. Hanson testified that economic burdens of the interconnection would impair Missouri Valley's performance of its universal service obligations. Hanson testified

Midcontinent's impact analysis showed that Missouri Valley's annual net revenues would be substantially reduced as a consequence of the interconnection while its universal service obligations and the expenses to perform those obligations would be unchanged and likely increased. Hanson testified that universal service is being redefined and the new expanded definition of universal service will likely include broadband Internet access. ILECs and eligible telecommunications carriers will likely be required to have reliable, predictable, and sufficient financial resources to upgrade facilities to comply with this revised definition of universal service. Loss of substantial proportions of revenue as a consequence of the interconnection would impair Missouri Valley's ability to perform its universal service obligations in the entire Williston exchange area, including all the area outside the city of Williston where its line costs are far greater and where Midcontinent has no facilities.

39. Hanson testified that Missouri Valley does not have the same financial resources as other rural telephone companies to perform its universal service obligations. There are six universal service support categories that are applicable to rural ILECs. Missouri Valley does not qualify to receive universal service support under five categories. Missouri Valley, designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier in the Williston exchange, is eligible to receive universal service support for providing Lifeline services.

40. Lundquist testified, "... despite the 'parent trap' rule, Missouri Valley may be able to receive significant additional USF subsidies...via the safety valve mechanism," \$2.234 million over the 2009-2012 timeframe. The Commission is not persuaded that Missouri Valley would be able to receive additional USF subsidies under the safety valve mechanism.

41. Missouri Valley provides discounts to Lifeline consumers. Hanson testified that the interconnection resulting in Missouri Valley's declining revenues would have a negative impact on Missouri Valley's ability to continue to offer the Lifeline discount. Midcontinent has not requested and is not designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier to receive universal service support for providing Lifeline services in the Williston exchange (Order, Case No. PU-05-272).

42. Missouri Valley's testimony regarding the parent trap rule and safety valve mechanism are persuasive and Midcontinent has not met its burden of proof that the interconnection would be consistent with 47 U.S.C. § 254 regarding universal service.

Implementation Schedule

43. Midcontinent witness Tom Simmons testified that implementation should allow 30 days for negotiations and 60 days for actual connection and that interconnection could be implemented sooner than 90 days. Missouri Valley testified that interconnection could be implemented within 90 days.

44. An implementation schedule for the interconnection is an issue if the Missouri Valley's rural exemption is terminated, the issue is moot if the rural exemption is not terminated.

Suspension of Interconnection Requirements

45. Suspension of Missouri Valley's interconnection requirements is an issue if the Missouri Valley's rural exemption is terminated, the issue is moot if the exemption is not terminated.

From the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Commission now makes its:

Conclusions of Law

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this proceeding.
2. Midcontinent failed to prove that the request of Midcontinent to Missouri Valley for interconnection in the Williston exchange is not unduly economically burdensome.
3. Midcontinent failed to prove that the request of Midcontinent to Missouri Valley for interconnection in the Williston exchange is consistent with 47 U.S.C. §254, regarding universal service.
4. The issue of technical feasibility is moot, where Midcontinent failed to prove that the request of Midcontinent to Missouri Valley for interconnection is unduly economically burdensome and not consistent with 47 U.S.C. §254, regarding universal service.


From the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Commission makes the following:

Order


The Commission Orders:

The rural exemption under 47 U.S.C. § 251(f)(1)(A) for interconnection in Missouri Valley's Williston exchange is not terminated.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION



Tony Clark
Commissioner



Susan E. Wefald
President



Kevin Cramer
Commissioner

DISSENT
Commissioner Susan Wefald

October 8, 2008

**Midcontinent Communications/Missouri
Valley Communications, Inc.
Rural Exemption
Investigation**

Case No. PU-08-61

**Missouri Valley Communications, Inc.
Suspend/Modify Interconnection
Requirements
Application**


Case No. PU-08-176

I do not agree with Conclusion of Law #2 in this Order which states that "Midcontinent failed to prove that the request of Midcontinent to Missouri Valley for interconnection in the Williston exchange is not unduly economically burdensome."

The Findings of Fact in this Order, #s 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, demonstrate that Midcontinent put forth strong factual arguments on the potential economic impact to Missouri Valley if the rural exemption is lifted. For example, in Finding of Fact #15, the order notes that Midcontinent witness Lundquist based his Migration Timing adjustment of \$154,300 on an assumption that Midcontinent would take six months, from January 1, 2009 through June 2009, to migrate its existing resale-based customers to Midcontinent's facilities. Missouri Valley's analysis assumes Midcontinent would complete the migration by January 1, 2009. I agree with Midcontinent on this matter, since Missouri Valley has a limited ability to handle new orders, and some 1570 customers need to be migrated. Midcontinent's testimony stated that in similar situations in South Dakota, it has taken five to seven months to migrate its embedded customer bases from resold service to Midcontinent's own facilities.

Also, the Commission's Findings of Fact in this Order do not reflect any of the information that was presented by Midcontinent regarding depreciation expenses, and that Missouri Valley did not invest all, most, or even one-third of their cash flow in 2007 (\$2.75 million) in its plant and network. (pages 7 and 8, Reply Brief of Midcontinent Communications dated August 11, 2008.)

My preference in this case, based on the facts, would have been to terminate Missouri Valley's rural exemption and then require a suspension of that termination until Midcontinent met the requirements in 47 USC Section 214 E 1 to be a designated eligible communication carrier. This would require Midcontinent to serve the entire service area (not just the City of Williston) as an eligible communication carrier, just as Missouri Valley does now.


Susan E. Wefald, Commissioner