BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Virgin Mobile USA L.P. Petition for Limited Designation As an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier))))	Docket No. 10 Cheryl Murray For the Office Consumer Sea Response to S Testimony by
)	for Virgin Mob

Docket No. 10-2521-01 Cheryl Murray For the Office of Consumer Services Response to Supplemental Testimony by Elaine Devilbliss for Virgin Mobile USA L.P.

February 24, 2011

1	Q.	WHAT IS YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?
2	A.	My name is Cheryl Murray. I am a utility analyst for the Office of
3		Consumer Services (Office). My business address is 160 East 300 South
4		Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.
5	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?
6	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to respond to the February 10, 2011
7		Supplemental Testimony of Elaine Divelbliss on behalf of Virgin Mobile.
8	Q.	WHAT IS THE OFFICE'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING VIRGIN
9		MOBILE'S REQUEST FOR ETC DESIGNATION?
10	A.	The Office recommends that the Commission approve Virgin Mobile's
11		request for ETC designation and allow them to begin providing Lifeline
12		service to eligible customers with the following three conditions:
13		1) Development and Use of a Utah-specific information sheet.
14		Virgin Mobile has addressed most of the Office's concerns, but we
15		continue to recommend that the Commission require the Company to
16		provide new Lifeline customers with a Utah-specific information sheet
17		regarding their service. This would ensure that Utah customers have a
18		complete understanding of their service, as some provisions will vary
19		based upon state rules and regulations.
20		2) Payment of appropriate taxes and fees. A complete description
21		of these fees is included in my direct testimony. Virgin Mobile asserts that
22		it pays some of these fees. To my knowledge, the Commission has not
23		determined whether Virgin Mobile's total payment is comparable to what

would be collected by wireline providers. This comparability should be
enforced in order to maintain an even playing field for different types of
telecommunication providers.

27 3) Use of an interim certification and verification process and 28 agreement to adopt any changes to the process developed within 29 Docket No. 10-2528-01. The Office is largely satisfied with the 30 verification of eligibility processes described by Virgin Mobile as being 31 appropriate until the Commission completes its process examining this 32 issue. However, we request one additional protection and recommend 33 that applicants certifying through program-based eligibility be required to 34 provide Virgin Mobile documentation regarding their participation in 35 qualifying public assistance programs. We recognize the uncertainty 36 created by requiring compliance with rules that are not yet fully developed. 37 Therefore, we also recommend that the Commission proceed quickly with 38 Docket No. 10-2528-01 and designate Utah regulations to govern Lifeline 39 eligibility certification and verification.

40 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE RATIONALE FOR THE OFFICE'S

41

RECOMMENDATIONS.

42 A. Having analyzed the applications and documentation provided by

43 TracFone, Virgin Mobile and i-wireless and reviewed information from

- 44 outside sources it is clear that wireless Lifeline service can provide
- 45 important benefits for low-income customers.

OCS-1R	Murray
--------	--------

46		The Office continues to recommend that the Commission determine the
47		methods to be used in Utah to establish:
48		1) that a customer is eligible for Lifeline service;
49		2) to verify eligibility;
50		3) that a customer is receiving Lifeline funds from only one
51		telecommunication service
52		4) the costs to make these determinations if they are made by or with the
53		assistance of the Commission or a Commission vendor, or other Utah
54		state agency; and
55		5) the circumstances under which the State universal service fund will or
56		will not be a source for paying such costs.
57		
58		It is has become apparent that Commission rules are not adequate to
59		address the five concerns listed above. Therefore, the Office
60		recommends that the Commission take appropriate steps to remedy the
61		inadequacy of the current rules and we are hopeful that our concerns will
62		be resolved through the course of Docket No. 10-2528-01. However, low
63		income customers should not have to wait for Commission rulemaking
64		before wireless Lifeline service is available. For this reason the Office has
65		revised its position to support an interim methodology for verification of
66		eligibility.
67	Q.	DOES VIRGIN MOBILE'S PROCESS FOR DETERMINING LIFELINE

68 ELIGIBILITY CONFORM TO COMMISSION RULE?

OCS-1R Murray

Page 4

69 Α. Commission Rule R746-341-3 as well as FCC rules allow Lifeline 70 applicants to self-certify eligibility under income based and public 71 assistance program based criteria. Utah rules require documented 72 income based eligibility. In supplemental testimony Ms. Divelbliss 73 describes Virgin Mobile's process to determine eligibility for Lifeline 74 service from self-certification. Virgin Mobile's processes appear to 75 conform to Federal requirements as well as current Commission rule. 76 However, the Office recommends that the Commission augment this 77 process by requiring that self certification includes documentation of 78 program based eligibility. 79 Q DOES THE REQUIREMENT OF DOCUMENTATION FOR SELF 80 CERTIFICATION OF PROGRAM BASED ELIGIBILITY REPRESENT A 81 SHIFT IN THE OFFICE'S POSITION? 82 Α. The Office has continued its research and analysis on this issue from the 83 time that the first request for wireless provision of Lifeline services was 84 filed with the Commission. Consequently, we have a much better 85 understanding of the issue now than when we first filed testimony on the 86 issue. The Office recognizes that the Commission rules allow self 87 certification, but through the use of the Department of Community and 88 Culture (DCC) under contract with the Commission, the eligibility of every 89 program-based application is verified. However, 100% verification is 90 currently impractical or impossible with the expanded participation due to

91 wireless ETCs providing Lifeline service.

10-2521-01

Page 5

92		
93		Therefore, the Office is requesting the additional protection of
94		documentation for program-based eligibility when an applicant self
95		certifies. In our view, the requirement for documentation for self
96		certification represents an appropriate balance between efficiency and
97		adequate verification of eligibility.
98		
99		It has always been, and continues to be, the Office's intent to have all
100		policies with respect to ETC requirements be applied consistently to all
101		providers. Therefore, the Office recommends and will advocate to have
102		this requirement applied to all potential wireless Lifeline providers.
103	Q.	HOW DOES VIRGIN MOBILE CONDUCT VERIFICATION OF LIFELINE
104		ELIGIBILITY?
105	Α.	Virgin Mobile indicates that in other states where it operates it obtains the
106		required customer verifications pursuant to the requirements of the FCC or
107		state-specific requirements of the annual review procedures.
108	Q.	IS THE OFFICE SATISFIED THAT VIRGIN MOBILE'S ANNUAL
109		VERIFICATION PROCESS IS APPROPRIATE FOR UTAH?
110	Α.	The Office is satisfied that Virgin Mobile understands the need for
111		verification and is prepared to work with the Commission to implement an
112		approved method. The difficulty is that current Commission rules require
113		the responsible agency to verify continued eligibility of Lifeline customers
114		under the program-based and income-based criteria. At the time the rule

115 was established it was not contemplated that wireless telephone service 116 providers would be applying to provide Lifeline service or possibly that 117 Lifeline eligibility would ever be determined outside of the Department of 118 Community and Culture's home energy assistance program 119 administration. The role of responsible agency¹ referenced in the Rule is 120 currently served by the DCC under a contract with the Commission². We 121 have been told that the DCC does not view their obligations under the 122 contract to include certifying and verifying applications for Lifeline 123 customers of wireless providers and that they are currently not in a 124 position to take on that responsibility. 125 126 This circumstance makes it impossible for Virgin Mobile to comply with the Rule as it currently exists therefore we believe that the alternative process 127 128 it has offered is adequate as a temporary measure. 129 Q. HAS VIRGIN MOBILE INDICATED IT WILL FOLLOW COMMISSION 130 **REQUIREMENTS?** 131 Α. Yes. Virgin Mobile has indicated that it will abide by any procedures 132 adopted by the Commission that are applicable to all ETCs. Further, if the 133 Commission requires that it establish an interface with a Utah state 134 agency Virgin Mobile will implement the necessary procedures.³ Virgin

¹ It is the Office's opinion that the Commission remains the responsible agency even though some of the processes have been delegated to a third party through contract. ² The Division of Public Utilities administers the contract on behalf of the Commission.

³ Subject to compliance with privacy laws.

```
OCS-1R Murray
```

135 Mobile has also committed to work with Solix, in conjunction with the 136 Commission, to establish the system for its Lifeline services in Utah. The 137 Office believes that the experience of Virgin Mobile and Solix in other 138 states can be beneficial in establishing the process to be used in Utah for 139 determining Lifeline certification and verification. 140 Q. IN DIRECT TESTIMONY THE OFFICE RECOMMENDED THAT VIRGIN 141 MOBILE BE REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT A 60 DAY NON-USAGE 142 DEACTIVATION POLICY. HAS THE COMPANY AGREED? 143 Α. Yes they have. In her rebuttal testimony Ms. Divelbliss describes Virgin 144 Mobile's proposed 60-day non-usage deactivation policy which the Office 145 believes is satisfactory. THE OFFICE PREVIOUSLY RECOMMENDED THAT VIRGIN MOBILE 146 Q. 147 BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE NEW LIFELINE CUSTOMERS WITH A 148 UTAH-SPECIFIC INFORMATION SHEET REGARDING THEIR 149 SERVICE. DOES THE OFFICE CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THAT 150 **RECOMMENDATION?** Yes. The Office views adequate information as an essential element to 151 Α. 152 customers being able to make appropriate choices regarding Lifeline 153 service. As stated in its September 13, 2010 Report and Order in Docket 154 No. 09-2511-01⁴ the Commission holds a similar view.

⁴ In the Matter of the Petition of TracFone Wireless, Inc. for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Utah for the Limited Purpose of Offering Lifeline Service to Qualified Households.

155 156 157		"One of the Commission's main concerns with allowing the market to dictate consumer choice would be that the consumer has adequate and reliable information to make the well-informed choices."
158 159		The Office continues to recommend that the Commission require all
160		wireless ETCs to provide a "Utah-specific consumer information sheet to
161		potential Lifeline customers which contains certain information about the
162		service".
163	Q.	DOES THE OFFICE HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS
164		REGARDING ETC PROVIDERS?
165	Α.	Yes. The Office recommends that the Commission under take the tasks
166		of Docket No. 10-2528-01 at its earliest convenience. We are concerned
167		that the uncertainty of costs associated with certification and verification of
168		Lifeline eligibility could deter prepaid wireless providers from entry into the
169		Utah market and deprive low-income customers of the benefits provided
170		by that service.
171	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

172 A. Yes.