

BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of ) Application No. NUSF-77.12  
the Nebraska Telecommunications )  
Association for Investigation )  
and Review of Processes and )  
Procedures Regarding the ) DENIED  
Nebraska Universal Service Fund: )  
Application to the Nebraska )  
Broadband Pilot Program (NEBP) )  
received from Glenwood )  
Telecommunications, Inc. ) Entered: December 3, 2013

APPEARANCES:

**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

**Frontier Communications:**

Kevin Saville  
Associate General Counsel  
Frontier Communications Solutions  
2378 Wilshire Boulevard  
Mound, Minnesota 55364

**For Diode Cable Company:**

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

**For Cambridge Telephone Company, 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 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 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 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 68508

BY THE COMMISSION:

***Background***

By Application filed March 1, 2013 Glenwood Telecommunications, Inc. (Glenwood or Applicant) seeks Nebraska Broadband Pilot (NEBP) Program support. Notice of the

Application appeared in the Daily Record, Omaha, Nebraska on March 8, 2013. The Glenwood application was received into evidence as Exhibit No. 7.

A Petition of Formal Intervention was filed by N.E. Colorado Cellular d/b/a Viaero Wireless (Viaero). Viaero subsequently withdrew its Intervention.

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 NUSF-77.08 through NUSF-77.11 and NUSF-77.13 through NUSF-77.23. No appearances were entered for Glenwood.

### ***Project Overview***

Glenwood is a common carrier subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. Glenwood holds a certificate of public convenience and necessity and operates general telecommunications businesses in Nebraska. Its principal office is located in Blue Hill, Nebraska. Glenwood applied for NEBP support for two broadband projects.

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

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

---

<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.

<sup>7</sup> See *In the Matter of the Petition of the Nebraska Telecommunications Association for Investigation and Review of Processes and Procedures*

hierarchy. Within each hierarchy, the project was then scored based on the criteria described in the staff's recommendation.

The staff recommendation did not include support for Glenwood's NEBP projects as funding for the current year was exhausted.

### **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.

No testimony in opposition to the staff recommendation was proffered by Glenwood.

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

Based upon the testimony presented in this particular case, we find the application filed by Glenwood for 2013 NEBP support should be denied consistent with the staff recommendation. However, we encourage Glenwood to submit an application for 2014 NEBP support.

### O R D E R

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Nebraska Public Service Commission that the Application filed by Glenwood Telephone Company shall be, and it is hereby, denied.

MADE AND ENTERED at Lincoln, Nebraska, this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of  
December, 2013.

NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS CONCURRING:

Chair

ATTEST:

Executive Director

SECRETARY'S RECORD, NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Application No. NUSF-77.12

Page 6

MADE AND ENTERED at Lincoln, Nebraska, this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of December, 2013.

NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS CONCURRING:

*Tim Schwan*

*Anne Boyle*

Chair

*Red Johnson*

*Frank E. Landis*

ATTEST:

*Steve Meredith*

Executive Director

//s//Anne C. Boyle

//s//Frank E. Landis