

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of ) Application No. NUSF-77.08  
the Nebraska Telecommunications )  
Association for Investigation )  
and Review of Processes and )  
Procedures Regarding the ) GRANTED, IN PART  
Nebraska Universal Service Fund: )  
Application to the Nebraska )  
Broadband Pilot Program (NEBP) )  
received from Cambridge )  
Telephone Company. ) Entered: November 25, 2013

APPEARANCES:

**For Cambridge Telephone Company:**

Paul Schudel  
James Overcash  
WOODS AITKEN, LLP  
301 South 13th Street, Suite #500  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

**For Great Plains Communications, Nebraska Central Telephone Company, Rock County Telephone Company, Eastern Nebraska Telephone Company, Pierce Telephone Company & Consolidated Telco, Inc.:**

Paul Schudel  
James Overcash  
WOODS AITKEN, LLP  
301 South 13th Street, Suite #500  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

**For Frontier Communications:**

Kevin Saville  
Associate General Counsel  
Frontier Communications Solutions  
2378 Wilshire Boulevard  
Mound, Minnesota 55364  
and  
Paul Schudel  
WOODS AITKEN, LLP  
301 South 13th Street, Suite #500  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

**For N.E. Colorado Cellular, Inc. d/b/a Viaero:**

Loel P. Brooks  
BROOKS, PANSING BROOKS, PC, LLO  
1248 O Street, Suite 984  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508-1424

**For CenturyLink:**

William E. Hendricks  
805 Broadway Street  
Vancouver, Washington 98660-3277  
and  
Jill Vinjamuri Gettman  
Gettman & Mills, LLP  
10250 Regency Circle Suite 350  
Omaha, Nebraska 68114

**For Windstream Communications:**

Matthew Feil  
1201 West Peachtree Street  
Suite #610  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

**For United States Cellular Corporation:**

Deonne Bruning  
Deonne Bruning PC LLO  
2901 Bonacum Drive  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68502

**For Cable One Inc.:**

Loel P. Brooks  
BROOKS, PANSING BROOKS, PC, LLO  
1248 O Street, Suite 984  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508-1424

**For Diode Cable:**

Andy Pollock  
Rembolt Ludtke LLP  
1201 Lincoln Mall Suite #102  
Lincoln, NE 68508

**For Charter Communications:**

Loel P. Brooks  
BROOKS, PANSING BROOKS, PC, LLO  
1248 O Street, Suite 984  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508-1424  
and  
K.C. Halm  
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP  
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue NW #800  
Washington DC 20006

**For the Commission:**

Shana Knutson  
1200 N Street, Suite 300  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

BY THE COMMISSION:

***Background***

By Application filed February 27, 2013 Cambridge Telephone Company (Applicant or Cambridge) seeks Nebraska Broadband Pilot (NEBP) Program support. Notice of the Application appeared in the Daily Record, Omaha, Nebraska on March 8, 2013.

On April 5, 2013, N.E. Colorado Cellular, Inc., d/b/a Viaero Wireless (Viaero) filed a Formal Petition of Intervention in the above-captioned proceeding. This Petition was granted on May 17, 2013.

A procedural conference was held on June 19, 2013. With the consent of the applicant, a procedural schedule was adopted. Pursuant to the Procedural Order, the staff's recommendation was filed on August 28, 2013. Pre-filed testimony was filed on September 27, 2013 and reply testimony was filed on October 11, 2013.

On November 5, 2013 the Commission held a public hearing on the application in Lincoln, Nebraska. For administrative efficiency, and with the consent of all parties, the hearing was consolidated with the hearings in NUSF-77.09 through NUSF-77.23. Mr. James Overcash entered an appearance on behalf of the applicant.

***Project Overview***

Cambridge is a common carrier subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. Its principal office located in Cambridge, Nebraska. Cambridge originally proposed five broadband projects across the state.

Cambridge provided a project timeline, a proposed budget showing project costs, a 25 percent match, and a detailed breakdown of the cost elements. Cambridge provided a depreciation schedule showing the life of the investment. Cambridge provided a copy of its latest financial report to demonstrate financial qualifications to complete its portion of the proposed project. In addition, Cambridge provided detailed map information showing the proposed project coverage in census blocks.

***Staff Analysis***

The Commission staff analyzed each project including the projects filed by Cambridge. The staff first reviewed the application to determine whether the eligibility requirements had been met. Next, the staff reviewed the application to determine whether all application requirements listed in Progression Order No. 5 were fulfilled. Each project was then scored.

To score this application, the Commission staff took various pieces of information directly from the applications submitted for each project and utilized in factor development. This data included; retail monthly recurring and nonrecurring end-user rates for the provisioning of broadband service; the speed (Mbps) of the respective service being offered; and the total grant request amount for each project.

Additionally, the staff obtained various other data, from publicly available sources, also used in factor development. This data included: residential monthly recurring rates for voice service and subscriber line charges, if applicable;<sup>1</sup> population and household by census block;<sup>2</sup> area by census block;<sup>3</sup> and broadband availability.<sup>4</sup>

The Commission staff then utilized a group assignment to prioritize areas determined as unserved,<sup>5</sup> using the broadband mapping data as a starting point for its review. Staff triaged the projects into categories, or groups, based on the nature of each area being served and the total cost of each project. Any project comprised completely of unserved areas received a group assignment value of one (1). All remaining projects, containing some hybrid of various levels of unserved and underserved areas, received a group assignment of two (2) through (4), based on the total cost of the project.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Company specific publicly filed tariffs.

<sup>2</sup> United States Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File 1.

<sup>3</sup> United States Census Bureau, 2010 Tiger/Line Shapefiles.

<sup>4</sup> State Broadband Initiative Broadband Mapping Data, April 2013 submission.

<sup>5</sup> See *In the Matter of the Petition of the Nebraska Telecommunications Association for Investigation and Review of Processes and Procedures Regarding the Nebraska Universal Service Fund*, Docket No. NUSF-77, Progression Order No. 5, ORDER at 7 (November 21, 2011).

<sup>6</sup> All projects filed for the NEBP in 2013 are independent of all other projects filed by the same applicant.

The Commission staff noted the dramatic increase in the number of projects submitted resulting in demand which significantly outpaced supply. As such, the Commission staff utilized total cost in the determination of the group assignment in an effort to advance the objectives of the NEBP; expanding broadband service availability to the greatest number of Nebraskans.<sup>7</sup> The staff's group assignment created a priority hierarchy. Within each hierarchy, the project was then scored based on the criteria described in the Staff Recommendation.

As a result, the staff recommended approving Cambridge's application, in part, for the RCSA12C and RCSA3 projects in the amount of **\$219,536**.

### ***Hearing***

Ms. Sue Vanicek, Director of the Department presented testimony at the hearing relative to the recommended adjustments to funding amounts. She testified that the Department reviewed each application and identified certain costs which should be excluded. Ms. Vanicek's testimony was offered and received into the record as Exhibit No. 19.

Mr. Tyler Frost, the staff Economist presented testimony related to the staff's methodology for recommending NEBP support. Mr. Frost provided further details about how the staff reviewed and scored each application. Mr. Frost's testimony was offered and received into the record as Exhibit No. 20.

Mr. James Shoemaker, Executive Vice President and Chief Regulatory Officer, testified in support of Cambridge's application. Mr. Shoemaker's pre-filed testimony described the two projects recommended for broadband support and was received into evidence as Exhibit No. 21.

The Commission staff recommended broadband grant support for two projects. The first project, referred to as RCSA12C was located in the Northwest portion of Cambridge's exchange. It included adding new customers in the most remote areas of the exchange. The second project was in the southern portion of Cambridge's exchange. According to Mr. Shoemaker's pre-filed

---

<sup>7</sup> See *In the Matter of the Petition of the Nebraska Telecommunications Association for Investigation and Review of Processes and Procedures Regarding the Nebraska Universal Service Fund*, Docket No. NUSF-77, Progression Order No. 7, ORDER at 5 (January 15, 2013)(describing the NUSF Act's goal to ensure all Nebraskans have comparable access to advanced services).

testimony, the additional network improvements will bring the remote subscribers in these areas with advanced services via Fiber to the Home. Mr. Shoemaker's pre-filed testimony requested the Commission adopt the staff recommendation.

No party testified in opposition to the Cambridge request for NEBP support as recommended by the Commission staff.

## O P I N I O N      A N D      F I N D I N G S

On June 14, 2011, the Commission issued Progression Order No. 3 in NUSF-77, finding that making explicit NUSF support available for broadband deployment would complement the Commission's existing goal to support networks that provide voice service as well as advanced services. In addition, the Commission found promoting ubiquitous broadband availability was a state and federal responsibility which would require both state and federal financial support. Through further progression orders the Commission adopted criteria for the NEBP program eligibility, application requirements, and provided a timeline for the consideration of NEBP projects.

Based on the application and the evidence in the record, the Commission finds Cambridge's application for NEBP program support should be approved, in part, consistent with the staff recommendation. The Commission approves support up to an amount of **\$219,536 or actual cost** of construction for the project(s) whichever amount is lower.

### Reimbursement Process:

Cambridge must first make the investment and then may file a request for reimbursement with the NTIPS Department. Cambridge does not need to complete the construction process prior to seeking reimbursement; rather, it may work with the NTIPS Department to develop intervals at which reimbursement can be sought. The NEBP program will reimburse Cambridge for reasonable expenditures made related to project specifications detailed in the application and approved in this Order. Once the investment is made, Cambridge shall file a request for support, provide the NTIPS Department with copies of the invoices or other acceptable documentation<sup>8</sup> and shall certify to the Department that it had made the described investment for the provision, maintenance and upgrading of facilities and services in the area defined in the application.

---

<sup>8</sup> The Commission will provide the Department with the discretion to determine the type of documentation needed to verify the expenditures made when not provided through a third-party invoice.

As a NEBP program recipient, the Commission finds Cambridge must meet the following conditions:

1. The supported broadband service upon completion of the deployment must be available as a service offering to all households within the area defined by the application for a minimum period of five (5) years;
2. The project must be completed within 24 months from the date of this Order unless otherwise extended by the Commission;
3. Voice grade service must be available to customers within the service area of the broadband deployment;
4. Access to emergency services must be available to customers within the service area of broadband deployment;
5. Broadband support must only be used for the purposes intended and which have been approved by the Commission;
6. Voice and broadband service in the area described in its application must be offered at reasonably comparable rates for comparable services it offers in urban areas;
7. Reporting, verification, and audit requirements adopted by the Commission for oversight of the NEBP program must be met; and
8. Adherence to all applicable Commission rules, regulations and orders.

Continuing Nature of Requirements:

The Commission will enforce these requirements throughout the period of the grant and the five (5) year period following the completion of the project to ensure the Commission's objectives for this program are being met. Cambridge shall notify the Commission in writing once the project(s) have been completed and the proposed broadband service is being offered. The Commission may take any action it deems necessary and appropriate to enforce the requirements and conditions in this Order.

To encourage public awareness about the deployment of broadband service in Nebraska, we find Cambridge should be required to report broadband availability to the Commission and its broadband mapping vendor for the duration of the State Broadband Data and Development (SBDD) Program.

These opinions and findings carry no precedential value other than establishing minimum standards and criteria the Commission applied in this application for NEBP program support. The Commission may modify the minimum requirements and

conditions for future petitions for support from the NEBP program.

O R D E R

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Nebraska Public Service Commission that the Application filed by Cambridge Telephone Company shall be and it is hereby granted to the extent provided herein.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Applicant shall comply with requirements set forth herein.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Applicant shall submit detailed and accurate invoices and other documentation required by the Department prior to reimbursement for the supported project(s).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Applicant shall use Nebraska Broadband Pilot Program support only for the purposes described in its application and authorized by the Commission.

MADE AND ENTERED at Lincoln, Nebraska, this 25<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2013.

NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS CONCURRING:

Chair

ATTEST:

Executive Director