BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Nebraska Public Service Commission, on its own motion, seeking to establish a long-term universal service funding mechanism.	)))))	Application No. NUSF-26 PROGRESSION ORDER NO. 4 Entered: January 7, 2003

APPEARANCES:

For Alltel:
Victor Covalt
440 South 13th Street
Suite C
Lincoln, NE 68508

For the Nebraska Hospital Association:
Roger S. Keetle
1640 L Street,
Suite D
Lincoln, NE 68508-2581

For the Rural Independents:
Paul Schudel
301 South 13th Street
Suite 500
Lincoln, NE 68508

For the Commission:
Shana Knutson
300 The Atrium
1200 N Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

For NICE-BCS:
Timothy F. Clare
1201 Lincoln Mall, Suite 102
Lincoln, NE 68508

For Western Wireless:
William R. Kutilek
134 South 13th Street
Lincoln, NE 68508

For Qwest Corporation:
Jill Vinjamuri
1650 Farnam Street
Omaha, NE 68102-2186

Pro Se:
Wayne Fisher
301 Centennial Mall South
P.O. Box 94987
Lincoln, NE 68509

BY THE COMMISSION:

B A C K G R O U N D

1. The Nebraska Public Service Commission (Commission), on its own motion, opened the above captioned docket seeking to establish a long-term universal service funding mechanism. Notice of the application was published in The Daily Record, Omaha, Nebraska, on August 24, 2001.

2. The order initiating this docket was entered on August 21, 2001. The Commission requested and received written comments by interested parties. Commenters included the Nebraska Telecommunications Association (NTA); Sprint; K&M Telephone Company, Inc.; AT&T; ALLTEL Nebraska, Inc., ALLTEL Communications of the Midwest Inc., ALLTEL Systems of the Midwest Inc., and ALLTEL Communications of Nebraska (collectively ALLTEL); Western Wireless; Cox Nebraska Telcom LLC (Cox); Qwest

Corporation (Qwest); and a collective group of rural independent companies (the "rural independent companies" or "RIC").[1] Reply comments were filed by Western Wireless, the NICE-BCS group,[2] RIC, Qwest Corporation, ALLTEL and Sprint on December 14, 2001. In the RIC reply comments, the Commission received a proposal entitled the "Public Policy Goals Plan" (PPGP). Because the PPGP was outside the scope of the Commission's initial inquiry, the Commission requested that separate comments be filed by interested parties on the PPGP.[3]

3. The Commission held a prehearing conference on January 15, 2002, after due notice to the interested parties. On January 28, 2002, the Commission entered a prehearing conference order which bifurcated this docket into two components. The service quality component was set for hearing on February 14, 2002 and briefs on the Commission's statutory authority regarding this issue were filed by ALLTEL, Western Wireless and the rural independent companies on March 11, 2002.

4. The other issues the Commission requested parties to address in its August 21, 2001 order were reserved for the hearing held on March 18 and 19, 2002. Post hearing briefs were requested by the Commission and filed by Western Wireless, NICE-BCS, the Rural Independent Companies, Qwest, Alltel, the Nebraska Hospital Association, and the Nebraska Department of Education on May 13, 2002.

5. In general terms, there were six questions open for Commission consideration. The first question was whether the Commission should modify the list of proposed goals detailed in its August 21, 2001 order. The second question asked how support should be determined for each provider. The third question asked how support should be calculated. Fourth, the Commission asked what additional services should be supported by the NUSF. Next, the Commission sought testimony on the eligibility requirements for receipt of support. Finally, the Commission asked whether it should support stranded investment.

6. Twelve witnesses testified at the two-day hearing. Mr. Pursley also testified and summarized the issues before the Commission for consideration.

---

[1] The rural independent companies, in this context, are comprised of Arlington Telephone Company, Blair Telephone Company, Cambridge Telephone Company, Clarks Telecommunications Co., Consolidated Telephone Company, Consolidated Telco, Inc., Eastern Nebraska Telephone Company, Great Plains Communications, Inc., Hartington Telecommunications Co., Inc., Hershey Cooperative Telephone Company, Inc., Hooper Telephone Company, K&M Telephone Company, Inc., Nebcom, Inc., Nebraska Central Telephone Company, Northeast Nebraska Telephone Company, Pierce Telephone Co., Rock County Telephone Co., Stanton Telephone Co., Inc., and Three River Telco.

[2] The NICE-BCS group, for the purposes of this proceeding, is comprised of Arapahoe Telephone Company, Benkelman Telephone Company Inc., Cozad Telephone Company, Curtis Telephone Company, Dalton Telephone Company, Diller Telephone Company, Elsie Communications, Glenwood Telephone Membership Corporation, Hartman Telephone Company, Hemingford Cooperative Telephone Company, Keystone-Arthur Telephone Company, Mainstay Communications, and Wauneta Telephone Company.

[3] *See In the Matter of the Public Service Commission, on its own motion, seeking to establish a long-term universal Service funding mechanism*. Application No. NUSF-26, ORDER SEEKING COMMENTS (Entered: January 8, 2001).

7. In Application No. NUSF-26, Progression Order No. 2 entered on August 27, 2002, the Commission established the goals of the NUSF.[4] We further found that that determining support separately for each provider best accomplishes the goals of the NUSF. We concluded that support on that basis would be competitively neutral and would provide an incentive for all carriers to make investments in the telecommunications infrastructure.[5] We found that the decision with respect to the calculation of support should be rendered at a later date after taking the comments and the testimony previously filed and given at the March hearings under continuing consideration in the next phase of this proceeding. We also found that we should further consider an allocation of support for the rural health care providers and for public interest payphone providers. We requested and received further comments from interested parties on those issues. We held a hearing with respect to the allocation of NUSF support for rural health care providers on November 6, 2002. We also found that for the present time, we should not allocate support to the schools and libraries. We found that many of the eligibility standards for the receipt of support have already been decided through the rulemaking process in Rule and Regulation No. 150, and that any further decisions with respect to eligibility criteria will be decided at a later time. Finally, we found that the NUSF should not be allocated to cover the costs of stranded investment.[6]

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

8. This order further addresses the questions set forth in the Order initiating this docket and reserved from NUSF-26, Progression Order No. 2. Specifically, we propose to implement the model detailed below for the calculation of support. A hearing will be held on these issues following the initial and reply comments as set forth below.

I. Calculation of Support

A. Background

9. The Commission also solicited testimony on the manner in which support should be calculated on a going-forward basis. Generally, there were four options recommended which were: 1) forward-looking cost less revenues; 2) embedded cost less revenue; 3) performance-based calculation; 4) density or scale.

B. Position of the Parties

10. Alltel supported an embedded cost approach minus the revenues generated by the services on a wire center or exchange basis. Alltel

[4] *See* ¶¶ 7-29.
[5] *Id*. at ¶ 37.
[6] *Id*. at ¶ 87.

further recommended that an additional component should be set up to offset the removal of implicit subsidies due to competitive pressures in high cost areas.

11. Western Wireless recommended the use of a forward-looking proxy cost model. Western Wireless claimed that the use of a forward-looking cost model was the most accurate method for determining levels of high-cost support in areas served by non-rural local exchange carriers at the most efficient level. Western Wireless further stated that the FCC and almost all states with state universal service funds in the Western Wireless territory have adopted a forward-looking cost model for determining the level of universal service support.

12. Sprint also recommended a forward-looking cost proxy model in its initial comments.

13. Qwest also supported the use of a forward-looking cost model. Qwest recommended that the Commission base the calculation of support on the most efficient provider. Qwest also stated that using embedded costs will necessarily include a variety of costs incurred through the years including costs resulting from poor planning and mistakes. Qwest provided that the forward-looking cost approach they recommended, was endorsed by the FCC and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.[7]

14. The NICE-BCS group supported an embedded cost methodology to calculate NUSF support. NICE-BCS devoted a significant portion of its Post Hearing Brief arguing for embedded cost support. NICE-BCS recommended that the current transitional system should be modified and retained as the permanent NUSF mechanism for rural LECs as a means of ensuring that rural LECs receive sufficient support. In support of its recommendation, NICE-BCS cites the FCC's recent MAG order in which the FCC concluded that for the present time, an embedded cost methodology was the most appropriate cost methodology on which to base universal service support for rural LECs. This finding was the result of a four year proceeding. The "modified embedded cost mechanism" will be in place on the federal level until July 1, 2006. The NICE-BCS also pointed out that an embedded calculation methodology was being used in the calculation of state support for rural LECs in both Colorado and Kansas.

15. The Rural Independent Companies recommended that support be calculated using a combination of density-based, scale-based, and performance-based systems. The RIC witness stated that using a density based component would ensure that NUSF funding is targeted to high cost areas of the state that have the least density. The RIC witness relied on an empirical study which indicated that density has a high correlation with relative cost to provision service in a given area. An added benefit to this approach was that the Commission would not need to rely on company specific data which could be subject to manipulation. Additionally, the

[7] *See* Qwest Corporation's Post Hearing Brief, (filed May 14, 2002) at 7.

Commission would not need to examine a myriad of cost data and assumptions as it would using a forward-looking cost proxy model. The scale-based component would ensure that the NUSF is targeted to high-cost areas of the state and the performance-based component would incent higher service quality measurements and further broadband deployment.

16. The NUSF Director, Mr. Pursley, reiterated that the purpose of the Commission hearing was not to pick a model. He recommended that the Commission pick certain criteria to adopt prior to selecting a model. Mr. Pursley recommended that any model adopted by the Commission should be made in light of the goals of the NUSF. Advocates of a model should explain how their model would meet the Commission's goals. Mr. Pursley further recommended the calculation of NUSF support should be based on an independent set of criteria and not based on company specific data because it is difficult to verify and audit this data. He stated that basing a model on an independent set of criteria would be the fairest determination of where support needs to be allocated. Under questioning, Mr. Pursley stated that density is an independent option and arguably forward-looking cost models are independent. Finally, Mr. Pursley recommended that the Commission adopt a method to calculate support on a more granule level than an exchange level. Simply averaging support across an exchange did not, in his opinion, fairly match where that support is necessary.

C. Discussion

17. Upon consideration of the testimony and submissions in this matter, the Commission proposes to determine NUSF support based upon density. The Commission proposes to implement a density-based model as outlined herein.

18. The first step would be to identify the distinct NUSF support areas. The Commission proposes that each ILEC exchange broken into "town" and "out-of-town" support areas. Town areas would be identified as cities or villages with 20 or more households according to the 2000 census. The out-of-town areas would be the remaining area within an exchange that has not assigned to a town. For example, if in a given exchange with three towns of 20 or more households, there would be four identified support areas: the three towns and the remaining area within the exchange.

19. The next step would be to determine the density, i.e., households per square mile, within each support area. For towns, the 2000 census data contains households and square miles. Town density would be calculated by dividing these households by square miles. Out-of-town density would be calculated based on county density after the removal of town data. The 2000 census contain households and square miles within each county in Nebraska. The households and square miles assigned to each town would be subtracted from the total county information. The remaining households would be divided by the remaining square miles to determine the average out-of-town density in each county. County out-of-town averages will be weighted based on square miles served to determine the average out-of-town density in a given exchange. Appendices A and B contain the

proposed list of “town” and out-of-town” support areas and their calculated densities.

20. This method of calculating out-of-town density assumes that the households outside of towns are evenly distributed. The Commission seeks comments on whether this assumption is correct and significantly affects the density results. Should actual households served in each out-of-town support be used? If so, would using this company-supplied data violate the Commission's finding that the permanent NUSF funding model should be independent?

21. The next step would be to develop costs to provide basic local exchange service within each support area. The Commission proposes to develop a cost function based on density using the Hatfield model version 5.0A with the following adjustments. In the Hatfield model, the Company data table associates each company with an Excel workbook. If the company submits ARMIS data the data table points to a workbook containing ARMIS data for that company. If the company does not submit ARMIS data the data table points to a workbook containing generic data. Our analysis shows that using the workbook containing generic data results in lower loop costs. Changes would be made to the Company data table such that all companies were associated with the generic data workbook. The Cluster Data database contains a record for each census block in the state. Fields in the record include Total Lines, Total Area, and Density. However, the density field is not the quotient of the lines and area fields. The density field would be changed to reflect the calculated density.

22. The Commission proposes to make these changes to the Hatfield databases and then run the model for all companies in the state. Actual density for each density bracket will be calculated from the Cluster Data database and associated with the correlating cost from the model run. A cost function will be developed using the density and cost data.

23. The purpose of this cost function is to calculate the costs to provide basic local exchange service. Accordingly, the Commission seeks comment on whether the Hatfield results include costs not attributable to the provision of basic local exchange service.

24. Also, the cost function described above does not take into account company size or the quality of a company's network. Therefore, the Commission seeks comment on whether costs should be adjusted to reflect differences in costs, if they exist, between companies. Further, should cost(s) be adjusted to reflect the quality of the telecommunications network that a company has in place? Parties advocating adjustments in costs should provide comments on the way to measure these differences and how any adjustments should be made.

25. The next step is to determine a "revenue benchmark", that is, how much customers should pay toward the costs identified above. Given

that for the purposes of this proceeding, the goal of the NUSF is to provide cost recovery for costs to provide basic local exchange service, the Commission proposes that this revenue benchmark be calculated as the tariffed local rate, including any zone charges, and the tariffed subscriber line charge.

26. Then, the Commission proposes to determine the level of support within each support area. These amounts will be calculated by first subtracting the revenue benchmark from the cost determined above. If the revenue benchmark exceeds the costs, the difference will be set to zero. This difference will then be multiplied by the number of households in a support area and then the result will be divided by the total number of households in the state to determine a weight within each study area. This weight will be multiplied by the total available support to determine the support in the support area.

27. The next step will be to match the support areas with the manner in which each NETC experiences costs. The de-averaging of NUSF support into small, discrete areas is designed primarily to match costs for companies that provide telecommunications services via their own facilities. In the event, a NETC competes through the use of resale, such a company will not be eligible for support. When a NETC competes through the direct use of another company's network, such as through UNEs or UNE-P, their NUSF support should be averaged in the same manner as such a company incurs its costs for using such facilities. For example, if a company pays for UNE-P services on an exchange basis, its NUSF support areas would be averaged on an exchange basis. If its costs are incurred on a zone basis, their NUSF support areas would be averaged into the same zones.

28. Ideally, the total forward-looking cost could be the basis for support in each support area. However, this would most likely result in an amount that will exceed the monies that the NUSF would be able to generate at the current surcharge level. Consistent with its stated goal of not burdening Nebraska telecommunications consumers, the Commission does not believe that the NUSF surcharge should be raised above its current level. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to allocate the high-cost funding that is available at current NUSF surcharge levels based upon the calculated support area weights.

29. The Commission proposes to then cap the support within each support area. The cap would only change based upon inflation and household growth. The Commission proposes that these cap growth rates be set for a period of two years. The Commission also proposes that the household growth rate in any area, should not be negative. In the event household growth actually declines in a given area, a household growth rate of zero will be assigned to that area.

30. Support within a company's support area will be based on the ratio of lines that the company served compared to the total lines in a

support area. For example, if a company serves 30% of the lines in a support area, it would receive 30% of the support. In order to facilitate this calculation, companies would be required to report the number of lines served within each support area on a monthly basis. In support areas, where there is a single NETC providing service, access lines will not need to be reported. Under this proposal, the NUSF could be used to support more than one network in a given support area. The Commission is concerned that, due to economies of scale, this might result in inadequate funding to all networks within a given support area. Accordingly, the Commission seeks comments on whether NUSF support should be limited to a single network in a given support area.

31. Finally, the provision of NUSF support will be subject to an earnings test. Companies whose earnings exceed the Commission established benchmark of 12% will have their NUSF support reduced by an amount that equal to the amount of the earnings above the Commission benchmark.

III. Requirements to receive NUSF support

A. Position of the Parties

32. Western Wireless recommended that the Commission adopt a set of very basic distribution requirements similar to those required by the FCC. The FCC requires that carriers be designated as an ETC, be a common carrier, offer and advertise the supported services throughout the entire exchange or study area, and file a certification that the carrier will "use that support only for the provision, maintenance and upgrading of facilities and services for which the support is intended."[8]

33. The RIC group testified that requiring a provider to obtain separate and distinct designation as an NETC for NUSF support and as an ETC for federal support is necessary. States can impose additional criteria for NETC designation beyond those specified by the FCC.

34. Qwest supported the Commission's previous findings in its C-1628 Order regarding the requirements for a carrier to be eligible for NUSF support.

35. Alltel, the RIC group and Qwest all testified that an NETC should be required to offer all of the NUSF supported services in order to receive NUSF support. The witnesses for Alltel, Qwest and RIC further testified that an NETC should be required to demonstrate an ability to provide service within an entire geographic area designated by the Commission as eligible to receive support. Alltel, Qwest, RIC and NICE-BCS all testified that the Commission should impose the same pricing benchmark requirements on all NETCs in order for an NETC to receive support.

---

[8] *See* Post-Hearing Brief of Western Wireless (filed May 13, 2002) at 5 (quoting 47 U.S.C. § 254(e)).

36. Mr. Pursley recommended that carriers be designated as an NETC consistent with the Commission's proposed rules and regulations, prior to receiving support. The Commission was encouraged to differentiate between an ETC for federal universal service purposes and an NETC for state NUSF purposes. Mr. Pursley stated that to receive NUSF support the NETC should be required to provide its services in specific geographic areas, comply with the Commission's service quality standards and price services at Commission-prescribed levels. These same requirements should not, according to Mr. Pursley, apply to the receipt of federal support.

B. Discussion

37. In order to be an NETC, a company must comply with existing Commission rules and orders. Additionally, the Commission proposes that an NETC be required to be able to provide service to all subscribers within an entire service area within 6 months. Currently, NETCs must offer service to an entire area. However, there is no requirement that an NETC have the ability to serve all of the customers within that service area if the other provider(s) would exit the market.

38. The Commission also proposes to amend the definition of Basic Local Exchange Service, contained in NUSF rule 4.02A, to require that NETC offer access to Enhanced 911, where PSAP capable. The current rule, 4.02A6, requires that NETCs offer access to either 911 or Enhanced 911 services.

39. In addition, the Commission proposes to require that a Basic Local Exchange service for which an NETC receives NUSF support be designed to interconnect with the existing inside-wire at a customer's premise and allow customer owned telecommunications equipment to connect to the service through a RJ-45 jack. Further, the Commission proposes that such service primary power source be either from the service provider's network or the customer's existing A/C electrical service and that such service have a minimum of three hours of battery back-up in the event of an A/C power failure either on the service provider's network or the customer's premise.

40. The Commission reaffirms its finding that NETCs must comply with any and all service quality standards adopted by the Commission for purposes of the NUSF. To this purpose, the Commission proposes that any completion standards define a completed call as call that is terminated by one of the parties and not "dropped" by the telecommunications network. Also, the Commission proposes that the service quality standards include toll blocking and 800/900 call blocking.

41. The Commission seeks comment on all aspects of the proposals contained above. These comments are not solely limited to any question specifically detailed in this order. The Commission will consider all comments on items germane to this proceeding and the proposals set forth

in this order. Parties interested in filing comments or otherwise participating in this phase of the proceeding should indicate such interest by filing a response to this order on or before January 21, 2003.

O R D E R

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Nebraska Public Service Commission that interested parties may file comments on any matters germane to issues proposed herein on or before March 10, 2003. Reply comments shall be due on or before April 9, 2003.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that parties interested in filing comments or otherwise participating in this phase of the proceeding shall indicate such interest by filing a written response to this order on or before January 21, 2003. Such responses shall be sent to the Commission's office at 300 The Atrium, 1200 "N" Street, P.O. Box 94927, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED by the Nebraska Public Service Commission that a pre-hearing conference will be held with all interested parties to determine the date, time, and format for a hearing in this matter.

MADE AND ENTERED at Lincoln, Nebraska, this 7th day of January, 2003.

NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS CONCURRING:

Chair

ATTEST:

Executive Director

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
ALLTEL	Bruno	Abie	108	0.1097	40	364.67
ALLTEL	Adams	Adams	489	0.5950	187	314.27
ALLTEL	Alexandria	Alexandria	216	0.4001	99	247.45
ALLTEL	Eagle	Alvo	142	0.1001	58	579.47
ALLTEL	Ashland	Ashland	2,262	1.0619	877	825.90
ALLTEL	Auburn	Auburn	3,350	1.5338	1479	964.26
ALLTEL	Avoca	Avoca	270	0.1330	105	789.52
ALLTEL	Hastings	Ayr	98	0.1724	40	232.08
ALLTEL	Barneston	Barneston	122	0.2365	49	207.21
ALLTEL	Beatrice	Beatrice	12,496	7.4975	5395	719.58
ALLTEL	Beaver Crossing	Beaver Crossing	457	0.6616	184	278.09
ALLTEL	Seward	Bee	223	0.2480	84	338.71
ALLTEL	Bellwood	Bellwood	446	0.2383	185	776.38
ALLTEL	Hebron	Belvidere	98	0.4802	40	83.31
ALLTEL	Benedict	Benedict	278	0.1897	96	506.04
ALLTEL	Bennet	Bennet	570	0.4255	222	521.78
ALLTEL	Wymore	Blue Springs	383	0.7887	166	210.47
ALLTEL	Bradshaw	Bradshaw	336	0.3329	138	414.58
ALLTEL	Brainard	Brainard	351	0.2803	148	527.95
ALLTEL	Brock	Brock	162	0.3109	68	218.73
ALLTEL	Brownville	Brownville	146	0.6242	74	118.55
ALLTEL	Bruning	Bruning	300	0.2802	150	535.30
ALLTEL	Bruno	Bruno	112	0.2670	49	183.49
ALLTEL	Burchard	Burchard	103	0.1585	42	264.93
ALLTEL	Burr	Burr	66	0.0841	36	428.02
ALLTEL	Carleton	Carleton	136	0.4876	54	110.74
ALLTEL	Cedar Bluffs	Cedar Bluffs	615	0.3979	247	620.79
ALLTEL	Louisville	Cedar Creek	396	0.6995	168	240.16
ALLTEL	Ceresco	Ceresco	920	0.4238	333	785.74
ALLTEL	Clatonia	Clatonia	275	0.2658	120	451.55
ALLTEL	Clay Center	Clay Center	861	0.7085	343	484.14
ALLTEL	Colon	Colon	138	0.1322	50	378.08
ALLTEL	Cook	Cook	322	0.1736	159	915.93
ALLTEL	Cordova	Cordova	127	0.2553	62	242.87
ALLTEL	Cortland	Cortland	488	0.2553	198	775.45
ALLTEL	Crab Orchard	Crab Orchard	49	0.1658	25	150.82
ALLTEL	Crete	Crete	6,028	2.3715	2078	876.26
ALLTEL	Davenport	Davenport	339	0.6608	160	242.12
ALLTEL	Davey	Davey	153	0.1549	67	432.61
ALLTEL	David City	David City	2,597	1.5059	1082	718.53
ALLTEL	Dawson	Dawson	209	0.2139	84	392.63
ALLTEL	Daykin	Daykin	177	0.1685	81	480.83
ALLTEL	Denton	Denton	189	0.1416	77	543.64
ALLTEL	Deweese	Deweese	80	0.0935	35	374.46
ALLTEL	DeWitt	DeWitt	572	0.4174	243	582.14
ALLTEL	Dorchester	Dorchester	615	0.4558	248	544.11
ALLTEL	Douglas	Douglas	231	0.2224	91	409.18

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
ALLTEL	DuBois	Du Bois	166	0.4559	76	166.70
ALLTEL	Dunbar	Dunbar	237	0.2475	79	319.13
ALLTEL	Dwight	Dwight	259	0.2421	116	479.23
ALLTEL	Eagle	Eagle	1,105	0.3224	401	1,243.68
ALLTEL	Edgar	Edgar	539	0.7622	240	314.89
ALLTEL	Elk Creek	Elk Creek	112	0.1303	48	368.27
ALLTEL	Elmwood	Elmwood	668	0.3787	254	670.63
ALLTEL	Fairbury	Endicott	139	0.5036	65	129.06
ALLTEL	Exeter	Exeter	712	0.6363	276	433.77
ALLTEL	Fairbury	Fairbury	4,262	1.9136	1884	984.52
ALLTEL	Fairfield	Fairfield	467	0.7307	185	253.18
ALLTEL	Fairmont	Fairmont	691	0.6936	275	396.46
ALLTEL	Filley	Filley	174	0.1125	73	648.78
ALLTEL	Firth	Firth	564	0.3045	192	630.64
ALLTEL	Friend	Friend	1,174	0.7968	475	596.14
ALLTEL	Garland	Garland	247	0.1645	99	601.70
ALLTEL	David City	Garrison	67	0.1171	27	230.63
ALLTEL	Geneva	Geneva	2,226	1.4975	957	639.07
ALLTEL	Glenvil	Glenvil	332	0.1660	132	795.10
ALLTEL	Tamora	Goehner	186	0.1730	75	433.55
ALLTEL	Grafton	Grafton	152	0.3464	68	196.31
ALLTEL	Greenwood	Greenwood	544	0.3867	215	556.00
ALLTEL	Gresham	Gresham	270	0.2668	113	423.50
ALLTEL	Guide Rock	Guide Rock	245	0.5044	133	263.67
ALLTEL	Hallam	Hallam	276	0.1643	110	669.64
ALLTEL	Hardy	Hardy	179	0.6097	68	111.54
ALLTEL	Harvard	Harvard	998	0.6402	385	601.38
ALLTEL	Hastings	Hastings	24,064	9.8281	9610	977.81
ALLTEL	Hebron	Hebron	1,565	1.3992	700	500.29
ALLTEL	Hickman	Hickman	1,111	0.5063	381	752.47
ALLTEL	Humboldt	Humboldt	941	1.3376	427	319.23
ALLTEL	Ithaca	Ithaca	168	0.2301	57	247.75
ALLTEL	Jansen	Jansen	143	0.2225	65	292.09
ALLTEL	Johnson	Johnson	280	0.1768	150	848.36
ALLTEL	Julian	Julian	63	0.0882	28	317.56
ALLTEL	Juniata	Juniata	693	0.5253	274	521.63
ALLTEL	Kenesaw	Kenesaw	873	0.8542	318	372.27
ALLTEL	Valley	Leshara	111	0.0678	50	737.70
ALLTEL	Burchard	Lewiston	86	0.1172	33	281.69
ALLTEL	Liberty	Liberty	86	0.2471	34	137.58
ALLTEL	Lincoln	Lincoln	225,581	74.6413	90485	1,212.26
ALLTEL	Louisville	Louisville	1,046	0.5133	436	849.32
ALLTEL	Malcolm	Malcolm	413	0.1135	139	1,224.21
ALLTEL	Louisville	Manley	191	0.0892	69	773.67
ALLTEL	McCool Junction	McCool Junction	385	0.2905	162	557.66
ALLTEL	Mead	Mead	564	0.3207	203	633.04
ALLTEL	Ashland	Memphis	106	0.0864	44	509.03

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
ALLTEL	Milford	Milford	2,070	0.7133	722	1,012.16
ALLTEL	Milligan	Milligan	315	0.2328	149	640.13
ALLTEL	Murdock	Murdock	269	0.1205	110	912.51
ALLTEL	Murray	Murray	481	0.2327	188	807.93
ALLTEL	Nebraska City	Nebraska City	7,228	4.4246	2898	654.98
ALLTEL	Nehawka	Nehawka	232	0.2255	92	407.89
ALLTEL	Nelson	Nelson	587	0.8099	271	334.62
ALLTEL	Nemaha	Nemaha	178	0.3090	76	245.93
ALLTEL	Nelson	Oak	60	0.1481	31	209.30
ALLTEL	Octavia	Octavia	145	0.1550	47	303.26
ALLTEL	Ohiowa	Ohiowa	142	0.2476	69	278.62
ALLTEL	Ong	Ong	67	0.2810	34	120.98
ALLTEL	Osceola	Osceola	921	0.8883	381	428.90
ALLTEL	Otoe	Otoe	217	0.1581	83	525.08
ALLTEL	Palmyra	Palmyra	546	0.3417	209	611.61
ALLTEL	Panama	Panama	253	0.2682	97	361.62
ALLTEL	Pawnee City	Pawnee City	1,033	1.1713	474	404.67
ALLTEL	Peru	Peru	569	0.5365	246	458.49
ALLTEL	Pickrell	Pickrell	182	0.1043	78	747.60
ALLTEL	Plattsmouth	Plattsmouth	6,887	2.8918	2618	905.33
ALLTEL	Pleasant Dale	Pleasant Dale	245	0.0866	105	1,213.03
ALLTEL	Plymouth	Plymouth	477	0.2761	198	717.20
ALLTEL	Polk	Polk	322	0.4891	152	310.80
ALLTEL	Hansen	Prosser	94	0.2480	37	149.18
ALLTEL	Raymond	Raymond	186	0.1283	73	569.09
ALLTEL	Rising City	Rising City	386	0.3698	158	427.30
ALLTEL	Lincoln	Roca	220	0.1392	80	574.69
ALLTEL	Ruskin	Ruskin	195	0.4179	78	186.64
ALLTEL	Sutton	Saronville	61	0.1465	20	136.52
ALLTEL	Seward	Seward	6,319	3.2726	2281	697.01
ALLTEL	Shelby	Shelby	690	0.5440	299	549.64
ALLTEL	Shickley	Shickley	376	0.2937	154	524.34
ALLTEL	Ashland	South Bend	86	0.1232	34	275.95
ALLTEL	Martell	Sprague	146	0.1253	59	470.75
ALLTEL	Steele City	Steele City	84	0.2308	45	195.00
ALLTEL	Steinauer	Steinauer	74	0.1355	37	273.05
ALLTEL	Sterling	Sterling	507	0.4044	223	551.47
ALLTEL	Stromsburg	Stromsburg	1,232	1.0147	487	479.96
ALLTEL	Superior	Superior	2,055	1.8843	980	520.09
ALLTEL	Sutton	Sutton	1,447	1.6956	586	345.61
ALLTEL	Swanton	Swanton	106	0.1992	50	250.99
ALLTEL	Syracuse	Syracuse	1,762	0.9379	754	803.94
ALLTEL	Table Rock	Table Rock	264	0.5851	144	246.11
ALLTEL	Talmage	Talmage	268	0.1612	109	676.37
ALLTEL	Tecumseh	Tecumseh	1,716	1.4799	729	492.58
ALLTEL	York	Thayer	71	0.3010	26	86.39
ALLTEL	Tobias	Tobias	158	0.2615	65	248.60
ALLTEL	Unadilla	Unadilla	342	0.2890	139	481.01

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
ALLTEL	Union	Union	260	0.2075	102	491.48
ALLTEL	Utica	Utica	844	0.4368	326	746.36
ALLTEL	Valparaiso	Valparaiso	563	0.5474	232	423.82
ALLTEL	Waco	Waco	256	0.2280	106	464.99
ALLTEL	Wahoo	Wahoo	3,942	2.1411	1583	739.34
ALLTEL	Waverly	Waverly	2,448	0.9337	838	897.53
ALLTEL	Weeping Water	Weeping Water	1,103	0.8790	434	493.73
ALLTEL	Western	Western	287	0.4455	128	287.31
ALLTEL	Wilber	Wilber	1,761	0.8984	728	810.35
ALLTEL	Wymore	Wymore	1,656	1.9052	713	374.24
ALLTEL	York	York	8,081	5.6369	3304	586.14
ALLTEL	Yutan	Yutan	1,216	0.4748	406	855.17
Arapahoe	Arapahoe	Arapahoe	1,028	0.9725	456	468.91
Arapahoe	Brule	Brule	372	0.2967	169	569.65
Arapahoe	Farnam	Farnam	223	0.6717	95	141.43
Arapahoe	Holbrook	Holbrook	225	0.2010	100	497.42
Arapahoe	Loomis	Loomis	397	0.3230	162	501.51
Arapahoe	Overton	Overton	646	0.5443	254	466.64
Arlington	Arlington	Arlington	1,197	0.5688	475	835.04
Arlington	Bennington	Washington	126	0.1680	49	291.59
Benkelman	Benkelman	Benkelman	1,006	0.7936	458	577.10
Blair	Blair	Blair	7,512	4.6448	2871	618.11
Blair	Fort Calhoun	Fort Calhoun	856	0.6201	342	551.55
Blair	Kennard	Kennard	371	0.2987	143	478.72
Cambridge	Bartley	Bartley	355	0.6943	146	210.28
Cambridge	Cambridge	Cambridge	1,041	0.8087	486	600.99
Citizens	Albion	Albion	1,797	0.7980	754	944.91
Citizens	Alma	Alma	1,214	0.6958	520	747.32
Citizens	Amherst	Amherst	277	0.2194	110	501.39
Citizens	Atkinson	Atkinson	1,244	1.3336	537	402.66
Citizens	Atlanta	Atlanta	130	0.2307	53	229.69
Citizens	Battle Creek	Battle Creek	1,158	0.6489	434	668.84
Citizens	Beaver City	Beaver City	641	0.9573	281	293.54
Citizens	Bertrand	Bertrand	786	0.5648	307	543.58
Citizens	Bloomington	Bloomington	124	0.7969	60	75.29
Citizens	Brunswick	Brunswick	179	0.5929	71	119.75
Citizens	Columbus	Columbus	20,971	8.9723	8302	925.29
Citizens	Creston	Creston	215	0.2066	96	464.64
Citizens	Duncan	Duncan	359	0.4033	138	342.19
Citizens	Edison	Edison	154	0.2591	66	254.74
Citizens	Ord	Elyria	54	0.2595	26	100.20
Citizens	Emerson	Emerson	817	0.4791	329	686.71
Citizens	O'Neill	Emmet	77	0.2595	26	100.18
Citizens	Farwell	Farwell	148	0.1775	63	354.93
Citizens	Franklin	Franklin	1,026	0.9977	440	441.03
Citizens	Genoa	Genoa	981	0.7925	411	518.63
Citizens	Greeley	Greeley Center	531	0.6288	213	338.75
Citizens	Heartwell	Heartwell	80	0.0757	31	409.51

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
Citizens	Hildreth	Hildreth	370	0.5510	172	312.16
Citizens	Howells	Howells	632	0.5609	281	501.00
Citizens	Humphrey	Humphrey	786	0.4346	317	729.34
Citizens	Kearney	Kearney	27,431	10.9790	10549	960.84
Citizens	Leigh	Leigh	442	0.6036	190	314.79
Citizens	Lindsay	Lindsay	276	0.3416	124	363.01
Citizens	Madison	Madison	2,367	1.1423	749	655.68
Citizens	Miller	Miller	156	0.3684	64	173.70
Citizens	Monroe	Monroe	307	0.1750	119	679.81
Citizens	Naponee	Naponee	132	0.2326	55	236.50
Citizens	Neligh	Neligh	1,651	0.9534	697	731.07
Citizens	Newman Grove	Newman Grove	797	0.5083	323	635.42
Citizens	O'Neill	O'Neill	3,733	2.3616	1554	658.03
Citizens	Orchard	Orchard	391	0.4172	183	438.59
Citizens	Ord	Ord	2,269	1.6607	1006	605.77
Citizens	Orleans	Orleans	425	0.6055	203	335.26
Citizens	Oxford	Oxford	876	0.9077	379	417.55
Citizens	Palmer	Palmer	472	0.5293	189	357.10
Citizens	Pilger	Pilger	378	0.3036	164	540.12
Citizens	Platte Center	Platte Center	359	0.2986	147	492.27
Citizens	Pleasanton	Pleasanton	360	0.3302	145	439.07
Citizens	Randolph	Randolph	955	0.9391	409	435.51
Citizens	Republican City	Republican City	209	0.3298	107	324.48
Citizens	Columbus	Richland	89	0.2186	45	205.89
Citizens	Riverdale	Riverdale	213	0.2643	83	314.08
Citizens	Orchard	Royal	75	0.1432	34	237.37
Citizens	Silver Creek	Silver Creek	441	0.2877	195	677.68
Citizens	Stamford	Stamford	202	0.4742	90	189.80
Citizens	Sumner	Sumner	237	0.2901	102	351.62
Citizens	Platte Center	Tarnov	63	0.0298	24	806.67
Citizens	Tilden	Tilden	1,078	0.7306	418	572.13
Citizens	Wilsonville	Wilsonville	118	0.2681	57	212.59
Clarks	Clarks	Clarks	361	0.3101	157	506.36
Clarks	Staplehurst	Staplehurst	270	0.1361	108	793.48
Clarks	Ulysses	Ulysses	276	0.2002	107	534.34
Cons Telco	Madrid	Madrid	265	0.4154	104	250.35
Cons Telco	Maywood	Maywood	331	0.4734	125	264.05
Cons Telco	Paxton	Paxton	614	0.5490	237	431.70
Cons Telco	Wallace	Wallace	329	0.7037	134	190.41
Cons Telco	Wellfleet	Wellfleet	76	0.2788	27	96.84
Cons Telecom	Brady	Brady	366	0.3274	155	473.43
Cons Telecom	Eustis	Eustis	464	0.4034	187	463.51
Cons Telecom	Maxwell	Maxwell	315	0.3374	116	343.77
Cons Telephone	Anselmo	Anselmo	159	0.2656	68	256.01
Cons Telephone	Arthur	Arthur	145	0.3149	62	196.90
Cons Telephone	Dunning	Dunning	109	0.2271	53	233.39
Cons Telephone	Halsey	Halsey	59	0.1973	34	172.31
Cons Telephone	Hyannis	Hyannis	287	0.6788	116	170.89

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
Cons Telephone	Merna	Merna	391	0.5323	157	294.93
Cons Telephone	Mullen	Mullen	491	0.3754	236	628.60
Cons Telephone	Seneca	Seneca	51	0.1206	26	215.55
Cons Telephone	Thedford	Thedford	211	0.2437	101	414.48
Cozad	Cozad	Cozad	4,163	2.0740	1722	830.27
Curtis	Curtis	Curtis	832	1.2006	336	279.87
Dalton	Bushnell	Bushnell	162	0.2105	70	332.59
Dalton	Dalton	Dalton	332	0.3436	156	454.00
Dalton	Dix	Dix	267	0.2181	107	490.52
Dalton	Gurley	Gurley	228	0.1870	97	518.78
Dalton	Lodgepole	Lodgepole	348	0.4715	158	335.11
Diller	Diller	Diller	287	0.4172	118	282.83
Diller	Harbine	Harbine	56	0.0999	24	240.13
Diller	Odell	Odell	345	0.2638	142	538.37
Diller	Virginia	Virginia	67	0.0985	31	314.72
Eastern	Belden	Belden	131	0.1561	52	333.12
Eastern	Carroll	Carroll	238	0.1495	104	695.88
Eastern	Macy	Macy CDP	956	1.6075	210	130.63
Eastern	Meadow Grove	Meadow Grove	311	0.3038	146	480.63
Eastern	Osmond	Osmond	796	0.7023	340	484.12
Eastern	Rosalie	Rosalie	194	0.2018	74	366.64
Eastern	Walthill	Walthill	909	0.4296	284	661.14
Eastern	Winnebago	Winnebago	768	0.2840	211	743.01
Elsie	Elsie	Elsie	139	0.1718	57	331.79
Glenwood	Bladen	Bladen	291	0.3576	112	313.18
Glenwood	Blue Hill	Blue Hill	867	0.7358	350	475.67
Glenwood	Campbell	Campbell	387	0.3621	151	417.06
Glenwood	Funk	Funk	204	0.2650	77	290.52
Glenwood	Holstein	Holstein	229	0.2237	91	406.80
Glenwood	Lawrence	Lawrence	312	0.4148	157	378.51
Glenwood	Norman	Norman	49	0.0989	23	232.68
Glenwood	Roseland	Roseland	242	0.2529	102	403.36
Glenwood	Upland	Upland	179	0.4125	70	169.68
Great Plains	Arnold	Arnold	630	0.7733	303	391.83
Great Plains	Bancroft	Bancroft	520	0.3668	227	618.88
Great Plains	Beemer	Beemer	773	0.4024	298	740.61
Great Plains	Belgrade	Belgrade	134	0.1835	63	343.35
Great Plains	Bloomfield	Bloomfield	1,126	0.8158	521	638.62
Great Plains	Byron	Byron	144	0.1546	58	375.11
Great Plains	Callaway	Callaway	637	0.6948	262	377.08
Great Plains	Cedar Rapids	Cedar Rapids	407	0.3581	179	499.84
Great Plains	Center	Center	90	0.1071	43	401.33
Great Plains	Chapman	Chapman	341	0.4490	131	291.77
Great Plains	Chester	Chester	294	0.5468	140	256.05
Great Plains	Cody	Cody	149	1.0262	66	64.32
Great Plains	Cotesfield	Cotesfield	66	0.5293	26	49.12
Great Plains	Creighton	Creighton	1,270	1.1761	559	475.28
Great Plains	Crofton	Crofton	754	0.6490	321	494.57

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
Great Plains	Crookston	Crookston	98	0.4263	40	93.84
Great Plains	Culbertson	Culbertson	594	0.8453	251	296.93
Great Plains	Deshler	Deshler	879	0.4970	373	750.50
Great Plains	Dodge	Dodge	700	0.3980	270	678.36
Great Plains	Eddyville	Eddyville	96	0.2730	41	150.21
Great Plains	Elgin	Elgin	735	0.7170	333	464.43
Great Plains	Ewing	Ewing	433	0.4061	192	472.77
Great Plains	Fordyce	Fordyce	182	0.1551	65	418.96
Great Plains	Gordon	Gordon	1,756	0.9335	733	785.18
Great Plains	Grant	Grant	1,225	0.7315	535	731.36
Great Plains	Palisade	Hamlet	54	0.3303	27	81.75
Great Plains	Hay Springs	Hay Springs	652	0.3801	283	744.48
Great Plains	Hayes Center	Hayes Center	240	0.2581	106	410.71
Great Plains	Herman	Herman	310	0.1471	134	911.07
Great Plains	Hubbell	Hubbell	73	0.3174	29	91.37
Great Plains	Huntley	Huntley	67	0.3521	25	71.01
Great Plains	Imperial	Imperial	1,982	2.5178	807	320.52
Great Plains	Indianola	Indianola	642	1.2468	275	220.56
Great Plains	Kilgore	Kilgore	99	0.4468	37	82.82
Great Plains	Merriman	Merriman	118	1.0261	51	49.70
Great Plains	Niobrara	Niobrara	379	0.7216	184	254.98
Great Plains	North Bend	North Bend	1,213	0.7638	468	612.72
Great Plains	Oakdale	Oakdale	345	0.5193	140	269.61
Great Plains	Oconto	Oconto	141	0.2051	65	316.93
Great Plains	Page	Page	157	0.2442	79	323.45
Great Plains	Palisade	Palisade	386	0.3568	162	453.98
Great Plains	Petersburg	Petersburg	374	0.3690	165	447.13
Great Plains	Ponca	Ponca	1,062	0.7042	403	572.32
Great Plains	Primrose	Primrose	69	0.2782	31	111.42
Great Plains	Red Cloud	Red Cloud	1,131	1.0203	520	509.66
Great Plains	Reynolds	Reynolds	88	0.2540	44	173.20
Great Plains	Riverton	Riverton	145	0.3932	63	160.24
Great Plains	Rushville	Rushville	999	1.1654	419	359.53
Great Plains	Santee	Santee	302	0.5630	98	174.06
Great Plains	Scribner	Scribner	971	0.6375	389	610.22
Great Plains	Snyder	Snyder	318	0.4948	135	272.84
Great Plains	Spalding	Spalding	537	0.3396	220	647.91
Great Plains	Stapleton	Stapleton	301	0.2468	126	510.49
Great Plains	Stratton	Stratton	396	0.4486	174	387.90
Great Plains	Saint Edward	St. Edward	796	0.6553	315	480.73
Great Plains	Saint Helena	St. Helena	86	0.4205	37	87.98
Great Plains	Sutherland	Sutherland	1,129	0.9386	442	470.89
Great Plains	Trenton	Trenton	507	0.5770	246	426.35
Great Plains	Venango	Venango	175	0.2476	68	274.64
Great Plains	Verdigre	Verdigre	519	0.5556	232	417.56
Great Plains	Wausa	Wausa	636	0.5259	276	524.83
Great Plains	Wilcox	Wilcox	360	0.5441	147	270.19
Great Plains	Winnetoon	Winnetoon	70	0.2874	33	114.84

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
Great Plains	Wisner	Wisner	1,270	1.0333	564	545.84
Great Plains	Wolbach	Wolbach	287	0.6811	128	187.94
Great Plains	Wood Lake	Wood Lake	72	0.3214	36	112.00
Great Plains	Wynot	Wynot	191	0.1914	83	433.60
Hamilton	Aurora	Aurora	4,225	1.8836	1662	882.34
Hamilton	Doniphan	Doniphan	763	0.4611	288	624.54
Hamilton	Giltner	Giltner	389	0.3031	139	458.66
Hamilton	Hampton	Hampton	439	0.3270	179	547.44
Hamilton	Hordville	Hordville	150	0.2632	58	220.36
Hamilton	Marquette	Marquette	282	0.2061	106	514.40
Hamilton	Phillips	Phillips	336	0.2458	135	549.24
Hamilton	Trumbull	Trumbull	212	0.4332	76	175.45
Hartington	Hartington	Hartington	1,640	0.9004	670	744.15
Hartman	Danbury	Danbury	127	0.3354	54	161.02
Hartman	Haigler	Haigler	211	0.2421	92	379.99
Hartman	Lebanon	Lebanon	70	0.1604	34	212.01
Hemingford	Hemingford	Hemingford	993	0.6488	373	574.86
Henderson	Henderson	Henderson	986	0.5504	417	757.62
Hershey	Hershey	Hershey	572	0.5007	232	463.35
Hooper	Hooper	Hooper	827	0.6351	350	551.11
Hooper	Uehling	Uehling	275	0.2134	122	571.76
Hooper	Hooper	Winslow	104	0.0596	41	687.89
K&M	Chambers	Chambers	333	1.0042	153	152.36
K&M	Inman	Inman	148	0.2879	62	215.32
Neb Central	Ansley	Ansley	520	0.6023	224	371.93
Neb Central	Arcadia	Arcadia	359	0.5632	155	275.20
Neb Central	Ashton	Ashton	237	0.5832	102	174.91
Neb Central	Broken Bow	Berwyn	134	0.2554	46	180.09
Neb Central	Burwell	Burwell	1,130	1.0357	507	489.50
Neb Central	Comstock	Comstock	110	0.3480	62	178.17
Neb Central	Dannebrog	Dannebrog	352	0.3566	136	381.42
Neb Central	Elba	Elba	243	0.3661	102	278.59
Neb Central	Ericson	Ericson	104	0.3721	57	153.19
Neb Central	Gibbon	Gibbon	1,759	0.8389	641	764.13
Neb Central	Ravenna	Hazard	66	0.2532	34	134.30
Neb Central	Boelus	Howard City	221	0.7081	92	129.92
Neb Central	Litchfield	Litchfield	280	0.3022	124	410.31
Neb Central	Mason City	Mason City	178	0.4718	72	152.62
Neb Central	North Loup	North Loup	339	0.4115	159	386.38
Neb Central	Ravenna	Ravenna	1,341	0.7525	534	709.61
Neb Central	Rockville	Rockville	111	0.2242	53	236.35
Neb Central	Sargent	Sargent	649	0.8887	279	313.95
Neb Central	Scotia	Scotia	308	0.3465	140	404.09
Neb Central	Shelton	Shelton	1,140	0.7348	425	578.41
Neb Central	Taylor	Taylor	207	0.2596	97	373.61
NebCom	Allen	Allen	411	0.3748	166	442.87
NebCom	Bristow	Bristow	88	0.1738	40	230.18
NebCom	Butte	Butte	366	0.4219	152	360.31

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
NebCom	Decatur	Decatur	618	0.9070	278	306.52
NebCom	Long Pine	Long Pine	341	0.5782	154	266.36
NebCom	Spencer	Spencer	541	0.5246	230	438.40
NebCom	Stuart	Stuart	625	0.6247	237	379.39
NebCom	Waterbury	Waterbury	89	0.1378	34	246.75
NebCom	Winside	Winside	468	0.2631	189	718.24
NorthEast	Bartlett	Bartlett	128	0.1417	57	402.34
NorthEast	Clearwater	Clearwater	384	0.3662	166	453.26
NorthEast	Coleridge	Coleridge	541	0.4956	242	488.34
NorthEast	Concord	Concord	160	0.1282	65	506.84
NorthEast	Craig	Craig	241	0.2814	99	351.84
NorthEast	Dixon	Dixon	108	0.1538	49	318.64
NorthEast	Hubbard	Hubbard	234	0.1765	83	470.30
NorthEast	Jackson	Jackson	205	0.1745	83	475.73
NorthEast	Linwood	Linwood	118	0.3634	45	123.83
NorthEast	Malmo	Malmo	109	0.1361	42	308.64
NorthEast	Martinsburg	Martinsburg	103	0.1034	39	377.35
NorthEast	Maskell	Maskell	67	0.1529	24	156.93
NorthEast	Morse Bluff	Morse Bluff	134	0.1795	58	323.07
NorthEast	Newcastle	Newcastle	299	0.3350	134	399.98
NorthEast	Prague	Prague	346	0.2743	136	495.81
NorthEast	Weston	Weston	310	0.3081	132	428.40
Pierce	Pierce	Foster	63	0.2163	32	147.96
Pierce	Hoskins	Hoskins	283	0.3014	112	371.58
Pierce	Pierce	Pierce	1,774	0.8768	682	777.80
Plainview	Plainview	Plainview	1,353	1.0832	588	542.85
Qwest	Ainsworth	Ainsworth	1,862	0.9907	845	852.94
QWest	Grand Island	Alda	652	0.3507	237	675.85
QWest	Alliance	Alliance	8,959	4.7677	3565	747.74
QWest	Axtell	Axtell	696	0.3848	258	670.54
QWest	Bellevue	Bellevue	44,382	13.2626	16937	1,277.05
QWest	Bennington	Bennington	937	0.3858	346	896.83
QWest	Big Springs	Big Springs	418	0.3683	187	507.76
QWest	Omaha	Boys Town	818	1.3871	57	41.09
QWest	Bridgeport	Bridgeport	1,594	0.9539	654	685.63
QWest	Broken Bow	Broken Bow	3,491	1.6246	1509	928.83
QWest	Cairo	Cairo	790	0.5385	295	547.80
QWest	Central City	Central City	2,998	1.9893	1212	609.27
QWest	Chadron	Chadron	5,634	3.6269	2187	603.00
QWest	Omaha	Chalco CDP	10,736	2.8990	3719	1,282.84
QWest	Clarkson	Clarkson	685	0.6855	311	453.70
QWest	Crawford	Crawford	1,107	1.1414	473	414.42
QWest	Dakota City	Dakota City	1,821	1.0534	596	565.79
QWest	Elkhorn	Elkhorn	6,062	3.7434	2000	534.28
QWest	Elm Creek	Elm Creek	894	0.6927	363	524.04
QWest	Elwood	Elwood	761	0.4872	294	603.41
QWest	Fremont	Fremont	25,174	7.4187	10171	1,370.99
QWest	Fullerton	Fullerton	1,378	1.2414	551	443.84

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
QWest	Gothenburg	Gothenburg	3,619	2.5439	1457	572.74
QWest	Grand Island	Grand Island	42,940	21.4679	16426	765.14
QWest	Gretna	Gretna	2,355	1.1797	889	753.55
QWest	Norfolk	Hadar	312	0.3975	117	294.34
QWest	Harrison	Harrison	279	0.3081	137	444.64
QWest	Holdrege	Holdrege	5,636	3.7611	2355	626.15
QWest	Homer	Homer	590	0.3778	211	558.43
QWest	Fremont	Inglewood	382	0.2364	154	651.52
QWest	Omaha	La Vista	11,699	2.8432	4404	1,548.99
QWest	Laurel	Laurel	986	0.9193	414	450.32
QWest	Lexington	Lexington	10,011	2.9429	3095	1,051.67
QWest	Loup City	Loup City	996	0.8738	472	540.19
QWest	Lyons	Lyons	963	0.6992	423	604.94
QWest	Wausa	Magnet	79	0.1442	37	256.52
QWest	McCook	McCook	7,994	5.3828	3371	626.25
QWest	Minden	Minden	2,964	1.6378	1185	723.51
QWest	Fremont	Nickerson	431	0.3809	144	378.04
QWest	Norfolk	Norfolk	23,516	9.9729	9360	938.55
QWest	North Platte	North Platte	23,878	10.4659	9944	950.13
QWest	Oakland	Oakland	1,367	0.8063	565	700.69
QWest	Bellevue	Offutt West CDP	8,901	4.2123	2304	546.97
QWest	Ogallala	Ogallala	4,930	3.3483	2052	612.85
QWest	Omaha	Omaha	390,007	115.7050	156738	1,354.63
QWest	Omaha	Papillion	16,363	4.1658	5505	1,321.46
QWest	Pender	Pender	1,148	0.6371	489	767.53
QWest	Omaha	Ralston	6,314	1.6947	2538	1,497.60
QWest	Schuyler	Rogers	95	0.1701	32	188.16
QWest	Schuyler	Schuyler	5,371	2.0737	1748	842.95
QWest	Sidney	Sidney	6,282	6.1679	2621	424.94
QWest	Lexington	Smithfield	68	0.1649	27	163.71
QWest	South Sioux City	South Sioux City	11,925	4.9042	4304	877.62
QWest	Springfield	Springfield	1,450	0.5461	529	968.69
QWest	Saint Paul	St. Paul	2,218	1.0644	935	878.43
QWest	Tekamah	Tekamah	1,892	1.2679	778	613.60
QWest	Thurston	Thurston	125	0.1147	51	444.60
QWest	Valentine	Valentine	2,820	2.0127	1209	600.68
QWest	Valley	Valley	1,788	1.5150	696	459.41
QWest	Wakefield	Wakefield	1,411	0.6984	522	747.45
QWest	Waterloo	Waterloo	459	0.3551	183	515.39
QWest	Wayne	Wayne	5,583	2.1886	1850	845.27
QWest	West Point	West Point	3,660	2.4743	1432	578.75
QWest	Whitney	Whitney	87	0.1578	34	215.41
QWest	Wood River	Wood River	1,204	0.7184	456	634.73
Rock County	Bassett	Bassett	743	0.4431	355	801.16
Rock County	Newport	Newport	98	0.3140	45	143.31
SouthEast	Falls City	Falls City	4,671	2.6170	2008	767.30
SouthEast	Falls City	Rulo	226	0.6280	97	154.47

"TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	City	2000 Popl	Square Miles	2000 Hshld	City Density
SouthEast	Falls City	Salem	138	0.6227	65	104.38
SouthEast	Tri City	Shubert	252	0.2091	100	478.13
SouthEast	Tri City	Stella	220	0.1761	98	556.51
SouthEast	Tri City	Verdon	223	0.2393	90	376.06
Stanton	Stanton	Stanton	1,627	1.7591	612	347.90
Three River	Johnstown	Johnstown	53	0.5258	24	45.65
Three River	Lynch	Lynch	269	0.5649	131	231.90
Three River	Naper	Naper	105	0.1343	54	402.07
Three River	Springview	Springview	244	0.2439	122	500.30
Three River	Verdel	Verdel	58	0.1734	32	184.50
United	Bayard	Bayard	1,247	0.6974	497	712.62
United	Broadwater	Broadwater	140	0.1558	68	436.46
United	Chappell	Chappell	983	0.5331	437	819.72
United	Gering	Gering	7,751	3.7484	3173	846.49
United	Gering	Harrisburg CDP	75	5.3571	31	5.79
United	Morrill	Henry	162	0.2957	56	189.40
United	Kimball	Kimball	2,559	1.5362	1110	722.56
United	Lewellen	Lewellen	282	0.3572	137	383.55
United	Lyman	Lyman	421	0.3886	162	416.85
United	Minatare	McGrew	103	0.3835	46	119.96
United	Minatare	Melbeta	138	0.0950	57	599.82
United	Minatare	Minatare	810	0.3807	326	856.29
United	Mitchell	Mitchell	1,831	0.6719	714	1,062.69
United	Morrill	Morrill	957	0.5943	416	699.94
United	Oshkosh	Oshkosh	887	0.6736	413	613.12
United	Potter	Potter	390	0.4881	159	325.75
United	Scottsbluff	Scottsbluff	14,732	5.8822	6088	1,034.98
United	Scottsbluff	Terrytown	646	0.4247	246	579.20
Wauneta	Wauneta	Wauneta	625	0.7646	280	366.20

Appendix B

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
ALLTEL	Alexandria	61.67	89.27	1.45
ALLTEL	Ashland	135.32	906.90	6.70
ALLTEL	Auburn	170.70	453.11	2.65
ALLTEL	Avoca	39.45	270.29	6.85
ALLTEL	Barneston	47.39	140.65	2.97
ALLTEL	Beatrice	190.86	564.48	2.96
ALLTEL	Beaver Crossing	53.96	203.95	3.78
ALLTEL	Bellwood	58.58	158.85	2.71
ALLTEL	Benedict	62.44	161.40	2.58
ALLTEL	Bennet	58.27	584.16	10.02
ALLTEL	Bradshaw	53.77	139.62	2.60
ALLTEL	Brainard	85.96	240.78	2.80
ALLTEL	Brock	29.96	79.61	2.66
ALLTEL	Brownville	10.23	27.15	2.65
ALLTEL	Bruning	65.84	83.98	1.28
ALLTEL	Bruno	62.74	188.21	3.00
ALLTEL	Burchard	69.06	83.32	1.21
ALLTEL	Burr	38.39	108.83	2.84
ALLTEL	Carleton	35.72	45.48	1.27
ALLTEL	Cedar Bluffs	56.45	258.19	4.57
ALLTEL	Ceresco	42.74	240.74	5.63
ALLTEL	Clatonia	30.93	91.02	2.94
ALLTEL	Clay Center	92.98	135.07	1.45
ALLTEL	Colon	27.61	126.29	4.57
ALLTEL	Cook	67.20	157.86	2.35
ALLTEL	Cordova	29.97	90.37	3.01
ALLTEL	Cortland	53.68	400.07	7.45
ALLTEL	Crab Orchard	66.57	120.54	1.81
ALLTEL	Crete	141.74	1,074.71	7.58
ALLTEL	Davenport	75.63	91.01	1.20
ALLTEL	Davey	60.35	630.24	10.44
ALLTEL	David City	119.30	324.66	2.72
ALLTEL	Dawson	59.52	101.48	1.70
ALLTEL	Daykin	67.08	124.04	1.85
ALLTEL	Denton	47.13	484.49	10.28
ALLTEL	Deweese	56.36	73.41	1.30
ALLTEL	Dewitt	68.68	184.92	2.69
ALLTEL	Dorchester	82.40	191.42	2.32
ALLTEL	Douglas	36.78	110.71	3.01
ALLTEL	Dubois	51.07	65.15	1.28
ALLTEL	Dunbar	78.86	237.38	3.01
ALLTEL	Dwight	41.42	126.13	3.05
ALLTEL	Eagle	60.63	499.75	8.24
ALLTEL	Edgar	78.40	106.35	1.36
ALLTEL	Elk Creek	35.40	74.97	2.12
ALLTEL	Elmwood	48.20	374.53	7.77

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
ALLTEL	Exeter	73.48	114.99	1.56
ALLTEL	Fairbury	205.77	372.84	1.81
ALLTEL	Fairfield	64.34	93.47	1.45
ALLTEL	Fairmont	59.96	77.96	1.30
ALLTEL	Filley	50.07	148.59	2.97
ALLTEL	Firth	48.31	433.56	8.97
ALLTEL	Friend	112.69	262.78	2.33
ALLTEL	Garland	36.69	147.94	4.03
ALLTEL	Geneva	137.88	177.76	1.29
ALLTEL	Glenvil	74.00	204.98	2.77
ALLTEL	Grafton	41.47	53.46	1.29
ALLTEL	Greenwood	43.46	369.63	8.50
ALLTEL	Gresham	67.40	183.01	2.72
ALLTEL	Guide Rock	106.68	111.51	1.05
ALLTEL	Hallam	39.73	391.44	9.85
ALLTEL	Hansen	100.38	469.41	4.68
ALLTEL	Hardy	40.57	45.18	1.11
ALLTEL	Harvard	96.98	151.79	1.57
ALLTEL	Hastings	128.14	382.96	2.99
ALLTEL	Hebron	155.74	199.51	1.28
ALLTEL	Hickman	46.36	484.16	10.44
ALLTEL	Humboldt	134.19	233.42	1.74
ALLTEL	Ithaca	19.95	91.24	4.57
ALLTEL	Jansen	40.24	72.91	1.81
ALLTEL	Johnson	67.06	176.23	2.63
ALLTEL	Julian	19.27	54.30	2.82
ALLTEL	Juniata	49.97	159.16	3.19
ALLTEL	Kenesaw	70.40	247.50	3.52
ALLTEL	Liberty	75.07	190.79	2.54
ALLTEL	Lincoln	114.88	1,199.71	10.44
ALLTEL	Louisville	43.60	344.54	7.90
ALLTEL	Malcolm	37.66	384.87	10.22
ALLTEL	Martell	41.11	429.30	10.44
ALLTEL	Mccool Junction	80.65	206.38	2.56
ALLTEL	Mead	52.87	241.82	4.57
ALLTEL	Milford	93.22	352.05	3.78
ALLTEL	Milligan	69.60	125.73	1.81
ALLTEL	Murdock	42.97	339.53	7.90
ALLTEL	Murray	38.25	302.23	7.90
ALLTEL	Nebraska City	124.81	375.69	3.01
ALLTEL	Nehawka	41.26	315.43	7.64
ALLTEL	Nelson	169.27	188.51	1.11
ALLTEL	Nemaha	31.62	83.94	2.65
ALLTEL	Octavia	34.20	93.08	2.72
ALLTEL	Ohiowa	60.61	79.26	1.31
ALLTEL	Ong	30.14	42.92	1.42
ALLTEL	Osceola	105.31	228.89	2.17

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
ALLTEL	Otoe	19.42	58.46	3.01
ALLTEL	Palmyra	63.03	202.39	3.21
ALLTEL	Panama	32.77	331.09	10.10
ALLTEL	Pawnee City	114.03	136.26	1.20
ALLTEL	Peru	21.17	56.88	2.69
ALLTEL	Pickrell	61.02	181.09	2.97
ALLTEL	Plattsmouth	89.37	706.24	7.90
ALLTEL	Pleasant Dale	32.48	200.95	6.19
ALLTEL	Plymouth	73.33	136.77	1.87
ALLTEL	Polk	87.50	206.79	2.36
ALLTEL	Raymond	51.17	524.12	10.24
ALLTEL	Rising City	67.59	183.13	2.71
ALLTEL	Ruskin	43.47	48.41	1.11
ALLTEL	Seward	115.44	436.20	3.78
ALLTEL	Shelby	85.63	188.15	2.20
ALLTEL	Shickley	87.52	112.83	1.29
ALLTEL	Steele City	28.31	51.30	1.81
ALLTEL	Steinauer	65.39	78.93	1.21
ALLTEL	Sterling	92.00	168.37	1.83
ALLTEL	Stromsburg	92.70	202.50	2.18
ALLTEL	Superior	113.29	126.17	1.11
ALLTEL	Surprise	38.88	106.18	2.73
ALLTEL	Sutton	171.30	263.64	1.54
ALLTEL	Swanton	3.72	6.74	1.81
ALLTEL	Syracuse	90.81	273.35	3.01
ALLTEL	Table Rock	57.02	68.13	1.20
ALLTEL	Talmage	49.82	138.98	2.79
ALLTEL	Tamora	37.70	142.76	3.79
ALLTEL	Tecumseh	148.33	259.40	1.75
ALLTEL	Tobias	50.54	109.14	2.16
ALLTEL	Unadilla	53.14	159.94	3.01
ALLTEL	Union	37.05	284.79	7.69
ALLTEL	Utica	70.87	251.45	3.55
ALLTEL	Valparaiso	100.02	665.68	6.66
ALLTEL	Waco	77.27	200.65	2.60
ALLTEL	Wahoo	85.32	390.24	4.57
ALLTEL	Waverly	61.02	620.32	10.17
ALLTEL	Weeping Water	65.93	520.95	7.90
ALLTEL	Western	65.23	141.66	2.17
ALLTEL	Wilber	114.50	309.15	2.70
ALLTEL	Wymore	75.77	224.85	2.97
ALLTEL	York	136.49	354.42	2.60
ALLTEL	Yutan	42.36	193.74	4.57
Arapahoe	Arapahoe	162.46	142.55	0.88
Arapahoe	Brule	199.66	210.28	1.05
Arapahoe	Farnam	158.03	211.36	1.34
Arapahoe	Hendley	67.75	41.49	0.61

Appendix B

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
Arapahoe	Holbrook	157.86	126.25	0.80
Arapahoe	Loomis	99.84	187.89	1.88
Arapahoe	Overton	121.86	259.49	2.13
Arlington	Arlington	98.91	4,482.77	45.32
Benkelman	Benkelman	537.58	229.41	0.43
Blair	Blair	110.95	1,013.26	9.13
Blair	Fort Calhoun	35.14	320.87	9.13
Blair	Kennard	37.80	1,198.45	31.71
Cambridge	Bartley	25.20	23.81	0.94
Cambridge	Cambridge	334.56	314.17	0.94
Citizens	Albion	213.48	338.11	1.58
Citizens	Alma	84.53	100.29	1.19
Citizens	Amherst	123.90	456.53	3.68
Citizens	Battle Creek	113.52	499.25	4.40
Citizens	Beaver City	139.19	85.24	0.61
Citizens	Bertrand	179.62	277.14	1.54
Citizens	Bloomington	63.23	49.75	0.79
Citizens	Brunswick	83.73	137.00	1.64
Citizens	Columbus	177.06	772.79	4.36
Citizens	Duncan	62.24	277.82	4.46
Citizens	Edison	92.67	82.52	0.89
Citizens	Franklin	132.32	104.11	0.79
Citizens	Genoa	131.81	463.00	3.51
Citizens	Greeley	131.49	92.73	0.71
Citizens	Heartwell	45.06	95.03	2.11
Citizens	Hildreth	103.12	142.11	1.38
Citizens	Kearney	228.82	775.12	3.39
Citizens	Leigh	117.90	466.97	3.96
Citizens	Lindsay	77.69	367.94	4.74
Citizens	Madison	191.95	853.80	4.45
Citizens	Miller	93.28	306.32	3.28
Citizens	Monroe	46.86	223.32	4.77
Citizens	Naponee	70.64	59.61	0.84
Citizens	Neligh	137.78	225.44	1.64
Citizens	Newman Grove	130.20	552.49	4.24
Citizens	Orchard	135.74	217.36	1.60
Citizens	Ord	291.76	322.37	1.10
Citizens	Orleans	128.57	152.55	1.19
Citizens	Palmer	124.94	298.85	2.39
Citizens	Platte Center	83.00	395.57	4.77
Citizens	Pleasanton	131.58	481.71	3.66
Citizens	Republican City	64.88	76.99	1.19
Citizens	Riverdale	57.09	210.36	3.68
Citizens	Stamford	127.49	122.35	0.96
Citizens	Sumner	124.94	253.17	2.03
Citizens	Tilden	117.43	357.99	3.05
Citizens	Wilsonville	119.76	93.41	0.78

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
Clarks	Clarks	110.78	313.19	2.83
Clarks	Staplehurst	65.41	247.72	3.79
Clarks	Ulysses	65.80	195.88	2.98
Cons Telco	Madrid	130.44	79.38	0.61
Cons Telco	Maywood	257.79	170.59	0.66
Cons Telco	Paxton	243.52	251.42	1.03
Cons Telco	Wallace	289.88	335.59	1.16
Cons Telco	Wellfleet	319.96	391.71	1.22
Cons Tele	Anselmo	330.44	230.10	0.70
Cons Tele	Arthur	650.13	137.82	0.21
Cons Tele	Ashby	249.03	59.05	0.24
Cons Tele	Bingham	314.65	104.47	0.33
Cons Tele	Brewster	316.95	82.66	0.26
Cons Tele	Brownlee	431.76	79.70	0.18
Cons Tele	Dunning	407.84	144.05	0.35
Cons Tele	Halsey	130.52	29.78	0.23
Cons Tele	Hyannis	1,042.74	229.57	0.22
Cons Tele	Merna	176.49	125.16	0.71
Cons Tele	Mullen	1,216.89	206.17	0.17
Cons Tele	Purdum	389.32	80.09	0.21
Cons Tele	Seneca	294.44	56.44	0.19
Cons Tele	Thedford	423.38	91.64	0.22
Cons Tele	Whitman	561.65	113.12	0.20
Cons Telecom	Brady	319.19	386.92	1.21
Cons Telecom	Eustis	214.67	318.35	1.48
Cons Telecom	Maxwell	205.22	251.23	1.22
Cozad	Cozad	221.51	474.71	2.14
Curtis	Curtis	427.81	417.33	0.98
Dalton	Bushnell	518.38	218.25	0.42
Dalton	Dalton	312.84	232.48	0.74
Dalton	Dix	261.89	112.75	0.43
Dalton	Gurley	109.98	88.09	0.80
Dalton	Lodgepole	284.53	210.74	0.74
Diller	Diller	87.88	203.52	2.32
Diller	Harbine	58.97	134.69	2.28
Diller	Odell	92.78	275.33	2.97
Diller	Virginia	52.90	136.45	2.58
Eastern	Belden	34.40	87.01	2.53
Eastern	Carroll	76.85	214.59	2.79
Eastern	Macy	15.65	50.77	3.24
Eastern	Meadow Grove	83.67	356.05	4.26
Eastern	Osmond	69.99	171.21	2.45
Eastern	Rosalie	40.70	131.95	3.24
Eastern	Walthill	73.60	238.81	3.24
Eastern	Winnebago	59.99	194.66	3.24
Elsie	Elsie	225.01	141.00	0.63
Glenwood	Blue Hill	788.49	1,853.25	2.35

Appendix B

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
Glenwood	Funk	122.80	236.53	1.93
Great Plains	Archer	50.26	144.47	2.87
Great Plains	Arnold	522.79	454.00	0.87
Great Plains	Bancroft	75.48	203.90	2.70
Great Plains	Beemer	59.31	160.79	2.71
Great Plains	Belgrade	93.33	130.57	1.40
Great Plains	Bloomfield	255.63	365.43	1.43
Great Plains	Byron	53.98	67.05	1.24
Great Plains	Callaway	282.91	200.63	0.71
Great Plains	Cedar Rapids	90.57	143.45	1.58
Great Plains	Center	52.48	75.02	1.43
Great Plains	Chapman	71.82	206.45	2.87
Great Plains	Chester	38.10	48.43	1.27
Great Plains	Cody	489.84	90.41	0.18
Great Plains	Cotesfield	63.07	140.61	2.23
Great Plains	Creighton	136.68	203.75	1.49
Great Plains	Crofton	150.53	299.65	1.99
Great Plains	Crookston	130.41	24.07	0.18
Great Plains	Culbertson	284.80	187.08	0.66
Great Plains	Deshler	117.60	148.51	1.26
Great Plains	Dodge	75.93	268.36	3.53
Great Plains	Elgin	213.06	328.94	1.54
Great Plains	Ewing	149.53	126.15	0.84
Great Plains	Gordon	1,222.12	430.71	0.35
Great Plains	Grant	316.22	192.43	0.61
Great Plains	Hay Springs	324.54	157.36	0.48
Great Plains	Hayes Center	303.44	136.34	0.45
Great Plains	Herman	79.71	667.00	8.37
Great Plains	Hubbell	36.55	46.46	1.27
Great Plains	Huntley	121.66	149.81	1.23
Great Plains	Imperial	686.17	416.61	0.61
Great Plains	Indianola	207.52	230.43	1.11
Great Plains	Kilgore	165.09	30.47	0.18
Great Plains	Merriman	544.70	100.54	0.18
Great Plains	Mirage Flats	245.59	117.61	0.48
Great Plains	Niobrara	151.47	216.53	1.43
Great Plains	North Bend	105.93	445.77	4.21
Great Plains	Oakdale	38.69	63.30	1.64
Great Plains	Oconto	273.13	400.73	1.47
Great Plains	Page	97.96	74.50	0.76
Great Plains	Palisade	183.55	102.68	0.56
Great Plains	Petersburg	193.78	305.44	1.58
Great Plains	Ponca	71.56	178.36	2.49
Great Plains	Primrose	59.96	89.48	1.49
Great Plains	Red Cloud	313.40	306.64	0.98
Great Plains	Reynolds	53.28	89.83	1.69
Great Plains	Rushville	628.03	265.28	0.42

Appendix B

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
Great Plains	Saint Edward	119.56	399.41	3.34
Great Plains	Scribner	87.93	370.05	4.21
Great Plains	Snyder	56.79	236.24	4.16
Great Plains	Spalding	228.56	188.58	0.83
Great Plains	Stapleton	582.25	431.04	0.74
Great Plains	Stratton	208.45	138.93	0.67
Great Plains	Sutherland	286.97	350.66	1.22
Great Plains	Trenton	205.57	138.50	0.67
Great Plains	Tryon	910.28	218.56	0.24
Great Plains	Venango	86.99	52.94	0.61
Great Plains	Verdigre	173.50	248.02	1.43
Great Plains	Walnut	64.10	91.24	1.42
Great Plains	Wausa	140.99	287.54	2.04
Great Plains	Wilcox	62.66	96.89	1.55
Great Plains	Winnetoon	90.28	129.76	1.44
Great Plains	Wisner	163.24	450.23	2.76
Great Plains	Wolbach	152.66	244.58	1.60
Great Plains	Wood Lake	320.20	59.42	0.19
Great Plains	Wynot	148.96	376.85	2.53
Hamilton	Aurora	118.11	315.23	2.67
Hamilton	Doniphan	79.36	344.26	4.34
Hamilton	Giltner	72.08	192.37	2.67
Hamilton	Hampton	59.43	158.22	2.66
Hamilton	Hordville	29.39	78.44	2.67
Hamilton	Marquette	68.28	182.24	2.67
Hamilton	Phillips	58.15	166.95	2.87
Hamilton	Stockham	25.79	67.46	2.62
Hamilton	Trumbull	42.29	119.99	2.84
Hartington	Hartington	152.81	386.56	2.53
Hartman	Danbury	123.17	153.55	1.25
Hartman	Haigler	284.73	121.51	0.43
Hartman	Lebanon	43.17	53.81	1.25
Hemingford	Hemingford	859.13	551.50	0.64
Hershey	Hershey	162.04	198.37	1.22
Hooper	Hooper	130.22	803.13	6.17
Hooper	Uehling	38.69	145.02	3.75
Keystone	Keystone	503.56	528.18	1.05
Keystone	Lemoyne	120.92	132.97	1.10
K&M	Chambers	508.75	370.88	0.73
K&M	Inman	121.74	92.58	0.76
Mainstay	Henderson	83.09	218.30	2.63
Neb Central	Ansley	217.57	154.29	0.71
Neb Central	Arcadia	136.29	143.84	1.06
Neb Central	Ashton	75.77	106.18	1.40
Neb Central	Boelus	51.72	115.91	2.24
Neb Central	Burwell	463.28	318.24	0.69
Neb Central	Comstock	106.47	90.60	0.85

Appendix B

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
Neb Central	Dannebrog	73.97	169.89	2.30
Neb Central	Elba	41.52	94.32	2.27
Neb Central	Ericson	259.81	138.50	0.53
Neb Central	Gibbon	135.24	460.72	3.41
Neb Central	Litchfield	137.57	146.01	1.06
Neb Central	Mason City	163.93	116.25	0.71
Neb Central	North Burwell	386.41	234.84	0.61
Neb Central	North Loup	104.08	112.41	1.08
Neb Central	Ravenna	243.25	788.98	3.24
Neb Central	Rockville	39.03	43.05	1.10
Neb Central	Sargent	238.14	168.88	0.71
Neb Central	Scotia	145.20	107.28	0.74
Neb Central	Shelton	107.74	463.11	4.30
Neb Central	Taylor	445.74	176.03	0.39
NEBCOM	Allen	47.78	68.24	1.43
NEBCOM	Bristow	43.88	50.72	1.16
NEBCOM	Butte	118.56	137.04	1.16
NEBCOM	Decatur	65.77	181.92	2.77
NEBCOM	Long Pine	193.56	56.98	0.29
NEBCOM	Spencer	92.38	106.01	1.15
NEBCOM	Stuart	305.68	230.97	0.76
NEBCOM	Waterbury	23.03	158.32	6.87
NEBCOM	Winside	68.72	196.56	2.86
Northeast	Bartlett	201.51	87.29	0.43
Northeast	Clearwater	186.07	270.20	1.45
Northeast	Coleridge	98.01	247.94	2.53
Northeast	Craig	83.95	264.65	3.15
Northeast	Dixon	90.09	151.69	1.68
Northeast	Jackson	88.83	765.57	8.62
Northeast	Linwood	76.25	325.52	4.27
Northeast	Martinsburg	33.85	48.34	1.43
Northeast	Newcastle	102.66	146.61	1.43
Northeast	Obert	68.65	153.36	2.23
Northeast	Prague	79.79	364.65	4.57
Northeast	Weston	94.69	432.03	4.56
Pierce	Hoskins	74.53	242.75	3.26
Pierce	Pierce	196.83	482.89	2.45
Plainview	Plainview	232.27	529.32	2.28
Qwest	Ainsworth	764.75	185.40	0.24
Qwest	Alliance	1,711.16	980.63	0.57
Qwest	Atkinson	514.29	390.76	0.76
Qwest	Atlanta	75.94	117.84	1.55
Qwest	Axtell	55.86	117.82	2.11
Qwest	Bennington	36.65	4,091.82	111.65
Qwest	Big Springs	216.14	148.62	0.69
Qwest	Bridgeport	493.34	328.94	0.67
Qwest	Broken Bow	293.62	208.22	0.71

Appendix B

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
Qwest	Cairo	89.10	455.40	5.11
Qwest	Central City	169.17	484.94	2.87
Qwest	Chadron	682.12	406.84	0.60
Qwest	Clarkson	100.45	357.77	3.56
Qwest	Crawford	848.25	452.17	0.53
Qwest	Dakota City	6.72	57.96	8.62
Qwest	Elkhorn	42.21	4,827.33	114.36
Qwest	Elm Creek	115.91	371.53	3.21
Qwest	Elwood	162.17	196.96	1.21
Qwest	Emerson	100.51	666.27	6.63
Qwest	Farwell	55.70	126.54	2.27
Qwest	Fremont	148.03	10,446.02	70.57
Qwest	Fullerton	198.77	276.88	1.39
Qwest	Gothenburg	265.07	492.37	1.86
Qwest	Grand Island	157.15	831.33	5.29
Qwest	Gretna	69.87	4,714.29	67.48
Qwest	Harrison	728.46	157.03	0.22
Qwest	Holdrege	166.60	311.34	1.87
Qwest	Homer	63.70	532.92	8.37
Qwest	Howells	110.98	368.89	3.32
Qwest	Humphrey	180.67	851.49	4.71
Qwest	Laurel	99.75	251.72	2.52
Qwest	Lexington	240.78	505.04	2.10
Qwest	Loup City	214.76	236.87	1.10
Qwest	Lyons	115.02	267.53	2.33
Qwest	Mccook	319.16	374.74	1.17
Qwest	Minden	162.31	342.34	2.11
Qwest	Norfolk	164.81	679.27	4.12
Qwest	North Platte	516.64	632.48	1.22
Qwest	Oakland	103.57	238.57	2.30
Qwest	Ogallala	238.63	260.62	1.09
Qwest	Omaha	117.83	6,497.86	55.15
Qwest	O'Neill	552.56	420.56	0.76
Qwest	Oxford	77.45	78.42	1.01
Qwest	Pender	153.29	476.56	3.11
Qwest	Pilger	83.65	332.54	3.98
Qwest	Randolph	140.50	360.03	2.56
Qwest	Saint Libory	96.48	357.48	3.71
Qwest	Saint Paul	126.63	287.70	2.27
Qwest	Schuyler	200.75	613.98	3.06
Qwest	Sidney	478.94	383.63	0.80
Qwest	Silver Creek	85.30	211.53	2.48
Qwest	South Sioux City	57.23	493.24	8.62
Qwest	Springfield	53.67	3,007.20	56.03
Qwest	Tekamah	157.46	334.98	2.13
Qwest	Valentine	1,374.40	269.06	0.20
Qwest	Valley	56.13	6,316.60	112.53

"OUT-OF-TOWN" Support Areas

Company	Exchange	Square Miles	Households	Density
ALLTEL	Adams	57.91	208.56	3.60
Qwest	Wakefield	103.47	240.97	2.33
Qwest	Wayne	137.61	374.55	2.72
Qwest	West Point	167.22	459.41	2.75
Qwest	Wood River	91.21	482.49	5.29
Rock	Bassett	613.79	214.72	0.35
Rock	Newport	359.56	128.32	0.36
Sodtown	Sodtown	50.75	200.74	3.96
Southeast	Falls City	225.50	384.44	1.70
Southeast	Tri City	163.76	318.04	1.94
Sprint	Bayard	219.76	525.29	2.39
Sprint	Broadwater	304.91	203.12	0.67
Sprint	Chappell	300.91	175.74	0.58
Sprint	Gering	347.45	1,512.43	4.35
Sprint	Kimball	510.04	212.95	0.42
Sprint	Lewellen	326.74	83.10	0.25
Sprint	Lyman	46.57	231.15	4.96
Sprint	Minatare	377.76	1,766.45	4.68
Sprint	Mitchell	294.21	1,281.43	4.36
Sprint	Morrill	447.83	2,071.97	4.63
Sprint	Oshkosh	697.52	171.16	0.25
Sprint	Potter	269.10	207.51	0.77
Sprint	Scottsbluff	322.57	1,494.25	4.63
Stanton	Stanton	158.97	653.29	4.11
Three River	Johnstown	274.02	66.62	0.24
Three River	Lynch	244.73	257.58	1.05
Three River	Naper	193.50	202.93	1.05
Three River	Springview	574.75	208.16	0.36
Three River	Verdel	63.71	91.08	1.43
Wauneta	Wauneta	420.35	233.28	0.55