

List of Exhibits

Exhibit A – Designated Service Area

Exhibit B – Articles of Incorporation

Exhibit C – Certificate of Authority

Exhibit D – Outreach Photograph

Exhibit E – White Paper on Benefits of Prepaid Wireless

Exhibit F – Letters of Support

Exhibit A
Designated Service Area

Utah Wire Centers

State	Company	Wire Center
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	ALTAUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	AMFKUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	BEVRUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	BGCYUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	BNHDUTMARS2
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	BNTFUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	CDCYUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	CLFDUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	CRNNUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	CTWDUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	DRPRUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	EVTNWYMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	FRTNUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	HBCYUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	HLDYUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	HNVIUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	HRCNUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	HYRMUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	KRNSUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	KRNSUTMADS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	KYVLUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	LEDSUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	LEHIUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	LOGNUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	LYTNUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	MAGNUTNMRS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	MDVAUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	MONRUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	MRGNUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	MRRYUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	MTGNUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	NEPHUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	NOCLLIKNOVN
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	NSLKUTMARS2
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	OGDNUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	OGDNUTNODS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	OGDNUTSODS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	OGDNUTWERS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	OREMUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	PAGEAZMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	PLGVUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	PRCYUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	PROVUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	PRWNUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	PYSNUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	RCFDUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	RCMDUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	ROY UTMARS3
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	RVTNUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SALMUTMARS1

Utah Wire Centers

State	Company	Wire Center
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SALNUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SLKCUTEADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SLKCUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SLKCUTMADS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SLKCUTSODS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SLKCUTWEDS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SMFDUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SNTQUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SPDLUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SPFKUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	SPVLUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	STGRUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	TOOLUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	VEYOUTMARS1
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	WASHUTMADS0
UT	QWEST CORPORATION	WJRDUTMADS0

Utah Wire Centers

State	Company	Wire Center
UT	SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P.	SLKDUTGNM1
UT	SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P.	TOOLUTMADS0
UT	SPRINT SPECTRUM L.P.	TOOLUTNB0MD

Exhibit B

Articles of Incorporation



DATE:	DOCUMENT ID	DESCRIPTION	FILING	EXPED	PENALTY	CERT	COPY
09/14/2000	200025800014	DOMESTIC ARTICLES/FOR PROFIT (ARF)	85.00	.00	.00	.00	.00

Receipt

This is not a bill. Please do not remit payment.

NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE
 27600 CHAGRIN BLVD
 NO. 260
 CLEVELAND, OH 44122

STATE OF OHIO

Ohio Secretary of State, J. Kenneth Blackwell

1180608

It is hereby certified that the Secretary of State of Ohio has custody of the business records for
NEXUS COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
 and, that said business records show the filing and recording of:

Document(s)
DOMESTIC ARTICLES/FOR PROFIT

Document No(s):
200025800014



United States of America
 State of Ohio
 Office of the Secretary of State

Witness my hand and the seal of
 the Secretary of State at Columbus,
 Ohio this 11th day of September,
 A.D. 2000.

J. Kenneth Blackwell
 Ohio Secretary of State



Prescribed by **J. Kenneth Blackwell**

Please obtain fee amount and mailing instructions from the Forms Inventory List (using the 3 digit form # located at the bottom of this form). To obtain the Forms Inventory List or for assistance, please call Customer Service:

Central Ohio: (614)-466-3910 Toll Free: 1-877-SOS-FILE (1-877-767-3453)

Expedite this form
Yes Yes

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

(Under Chapter 1701 of the Ohio Revised Code)
Profit Corporation

The undersigned, desiring to form a corporation, for profit, under Sections 1701.01 et seq. of the Ohio Revised Code, do hereby state the following:

FIRST. The name of said corporation shall be:
Nexus Communications, Inc.

SECOND. The place in Ohio where its principal office is to be located is
Lewis Center, Franklin County, Ohio
(city, village or township)

THIRD. The purpose(s) for which this corporation is formed is:
To provide local and long distance telecommunications, internet access, cellular, paging and other telecommunications services.

FOURTH. The number of shares which the corporation is authorized to have outstanding is: 100
(Please state whether shares are common or preferred, and their par value, if any. Shares will be recorded as common with no par value unless otherwise indicated.)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, we have hereunto subscribed our names, on September 10, 2000
(date)

Signature: Nathaniel Hawthorne, Incorporator
Name: Nathaniel Hawthorne

Signature: Paul Karas, Incorporator
Name: Paul Karas

Signature: Marcia Schmidt, Incorporator
Name: Marcia Schmidt



Prescribed by **J. Kenneth Blackwell**

Please obtain fee amount and mailing instructions from the Forms Inventory List (using the 3 digit form # located at the bottom of this form). To obtain the Forms Inventory List or for assistance, please call Customer Service:
Central Ohio: (614)-466-3910 Toll Free: 1-877-SOS-FILE (1-877-767-3453)

ORIGINAL APPOINTMENT OF STATUTORY AGENT

The undersigned, being at least a majority of the incorporators of Nexus Communications, Inc.
hereby appoint Nathaniel Hawthorne to be statutory agent upon whom any process, notice or demand required or permitted by statute to be served upon the corporation may be served. The complete address of the agent is:

27600 Chagrin Blvd., Suite 260
(street name and number P.O. Boxes are not acceptable)
Cleveland, Ohio 44122
(city, village or township) (zip code)

Signature: _____
Name: Nathaniel Hawthorne

Signature: Paul Karas
Name: Paul Karas

Signature: Marcia Schmidt
Name: Marcia Schmidt

ACCEPTANCE OF APPOINTMENT

The undersigned, Nathaniel Hawthorne, named herein as the statutory agent for, Nexus Communications, Inc., hereby acknowledges and accepts the appointment of statutory agent for said corporation.

Signature: Nathaniel Hawthorne
Statutory Agent

Exhibit C
Certificate of Authority



Francine Giani
Executive Director
Department of Commerce

Gary Herbert
Governor
State of Utah

Kathy Berg
Director
Division of Corporations
& Commercial Code

STATE OF UTAH
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS & COMMERCIAL CODE
CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY
NEXUS COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
2180 SOUTH 1300 EAST, SUITE 650
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84106

Access Code
Code: 4796821



State of Utah
Department of Commerce
Division of Corporations & Commercial Code

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

Corporation - Foreign - Profit

This certifies that **NEXUS COMMUNICATIONS, INC.** has been filed and approved on **March 21, 2011** and has been issued the registration number **7947747-0143** in the office of the Division and hereby issues this Certification thereof.

KATHY BERG
Division Director

*The Access Code is used for Online Applications used by this Division only.

**United States of America
State of Ohio
Office of the Secretary of State**

I, Jon Husted, do hereby certify that I am the duly elected, qualified and present acting Secretary of State for the State of Ohio, and as such have custody of the records of Ohio and Foreign business entities; that said records show NEXUS COMMUNICATIONS, INC., an Ohio corporation, Charter No. 1180608, having its principal location in Lewis Center, County of Franklin, was incorporated on September 11, 2000 and is currently in GOOD STANDING upon the records of this office.



*Witness my hand and the seal of the
Secretary of State at Columbus, Ohio
this 16th day of March, A.D. 2011*

Jon Husted

Ohio Secretary of State

Validation Number: V201175M0D25B

Exhibit D

Outreach Photograph



Exhibit E

White Paper on Benefits of Prepaid Wireless

Prepaid Wireless: Exactly What's Needed For Universal Service

Prepared for Nexus Communications

Introduction

For over twenty-five years, the Federal Government has assisted low income Americans gain access to the telephone system that knits the nation together.¹ The modern Low Income program (Lifeline and Link Up) was created in 1996 as part of the formal, explicit Universal Service program established by the Telecommunications Act of 1996. It is intended to help ensure that “[q]uality services [will] be available at just, reasonable, and affordable rates” for *all* citizens.² In the years since passage of the 1996 Act, services supported by the Low Income program have grown more varied and sophisticated as technology has evolved. Much of this change has been driven by consumers themselves. Like everyone else, low income consumers look for new ways of communicating, new technologies, and new service offerings. And like everyone else, low income consumers know that they need wireless services to navigate in today’s economy.

The goals of the Universal Service program remain undiminished today, but whereas 25 years ago all that was really at issue was plain old wired telephone service, today the program operates in a communications industry that continues to evolve at an ever-increasing pace. It is a testament to Congress’s foresight – in declaring Universal Service to be an “evolving” standard, and one that is not bound to any particular technology – that the program has adapted and has

¹ The Lifeline program was created by the FCC in 1984. *MTS and WATS Market Structure, and Amendment of Part 67 of the Commission's Rules and Establishment of a Joint Board*, Recommended Decision, CC Docket nos. 78-72 and 80-286, 49 Fed. Reg. 48325 (rel. November 23, 1984) (recommending the adoption of federal Lifeline assistance measures); Decision and Order, CC Docket nos. 78-72 and 80-286, FCC 84-637, 50 Fed. Reg. 939 (rel. December 28, 1984) (adopting the Joint Board’s recommendation).

² 47 U.S.C. § 254(b).

come to encompass wireless services for low income Americans. Wireless, especially prepaid wireless, is one of the best tools presently available to combat the communications divide. Prepaid wireless has introduced new services and new power to low income customers, and they have responded positively and overwhelmingly. The result is an enlivened Low Income program—that makes these services possible for these consumers—that is on course to complete the goal of connecting all Americans in a wireless century.

Wireless Telephone Service is Ubiquitous

Wireless telephone service is now the dominant form of communication in the nation. According to the Federal Communications Commission, 90% of Americans have a mobile device.³ The availability of this technology is virtually universal: 99.6% of Americans live and work in areas that are covered by one or more mobile voice providers.⁴ Now that wireless service has become ubiquitous, it is quickly displacing the older wireline system. Wireline service has been declining for years, and currently one quarter of American households have “cut the cord” and rely on wireless voice service alone.⁵ In 2009, the number of American households that had only wireless phones exceeded the number that had only landlines for the first time.⁶ Twenty or even ten years ago that would have been remarkable – the majority of Americans have both landline and wireless but among those who have only one service, there are *more* that choose wireless-only than choose landline-only. And, this balance will only continue to tilt in favor of wireless: fifteen percent of those who retain wireline service report that they

³ FCC 10-81, “Annual Report and Analysis of Competitive Market Conditions with Respect to Mobile Wireless, including Commercial Mobile Services,” 20 May 2010, p.5, p.11

⁴ *Id.*, p.7

⁵ *Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates From the National Health Interview Survey, July–December 2009*, by Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D., and Julian V. Luke, Division of Health Interview Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics

⁶ Amy Farnsworth, *A cellphone plan to bridge digital divide: Firms and feds offer free connections to customers shut out by high costs*, Christian Science Monitor, July 2, 2009.

receive all or almost all of their calls on wireless telephones.⁷ Wireline is a “legacy” service – it’s not going away entirely any time soon, but it is shrinking, not growing, as it is displaced by wireless service throughout the population.

It’s not surprising that customers prefer wireless to landline by such a large margin. Wireless service by its very nature is portable, and it has allowed Americans to adapt to a new era of ubiquitous and constant connectivity, something that was never possible with landline service. Wireless service also engenders more excitement than wireline service ever could, with new technology – both more robust handsets and associated features implemented in hardware, as well as new network capabilities – expanding the possibilities of communication and related economic productivity year after year. Even the lowest-priced wireless handsets offer features that landline phones don’t, such as text messages, built-in phonebooks, and mobile voicemail. The cost of wireless service has also decreased dramatically, making it easily affordable for the majority of Americans.⁸ At the same time, consumer satisfaction with wireless offerings has reached higher levels.⁹ The wireless industry’s dramatic rise is not a fluke; it is the result of millions of Americans—especially those on limited budgets—making the rational decision to choose a mobile, technologically advanced product over the increasingly antiquated and wall-bound Twentieth Century telephone system.

Wireless Provides Special Advantages for Low Income Americans

Congress took specific steps to ensure that low income Americans aren’t left out of the wireless revolution. Like other wireless customers, low income Americans enjoy the better

⁷ *Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates From the National Health Interview Survey, July–December 2009*, by Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D., and Julian V. Luke, Division of Health Interview Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics

⁸ CTIA, Semi-annual wireless industry survey, available at <http://www.ctia.org/advocacy/research/index.cfm/AID/10316>

⁹ CTIA, *The Wireless Industry Facts: An Independent Review*, available at http://files.ctia.org/pdf/082010_Independent_Assessment_of_Wireless_Industry.pdf

handsets and added features that come with wireless service. But wireless also provides critical benefits for low income Americans that improve their security, mobility, and economic welfare in ways that are particularly important to them in light of the economic and at times social challenges they face. Numerous studies have demonstrated that wireless phones help low income Americans in profound ways, and that they recognize it.

First, wireless phones provide and enhance physical, personal security. Survey respondents prefer wireless to landline for emergency uses by more than three to one, and forty-eight percent of Americans have already used a wireless phone in an emergency.¹⁰ Wireless phones have been called a “lifeline” for the homeless, who use them to call for help and to report assaults.¹¹ Studies have called wireless phone service “essential” to low income Americans, largely because it provides a constant connection with family, friends, and others who can offer support and protection when needed.¹²

Second, low income Americans benefit, even more than other wireless customers, from the mobility of their phones. Low income customers often spend less time during the day at a fixed location like a home or a desk. If unemployed, a wireless service is more useful than a landline service, as discussed below. But employed Americans with lower incomes will more likely be in jobs that do not come with an office phone available to them. This is particularly true for the homeless. For homeless Americans, wireless service is the only realistic means of

¹⁰ Amy Farnsworth, *A cellphone plan to bridge digital divide: Firms and feds offer free connections to customers shut out by high costs*, Christian Science Monitor, July 2, 2009; Sullivan, N.P. *Cell phones provide significant economic gains for low-income American households: A review of literature and data from two new surveys* at 15; available at http://www.newmilleniumresearch.org/archive/Sullivan_Report_032608.pdf (“Sullivan Report”)

¹¹ Petula Dvorak, *D.C. Homeless People Use Cellphones, Blogs and E-mail to Stay on Top of Things*, Washington Post, March 23, 2009.

¹² Janice A. Hauge, et al., *Whose call is it? Targeting universal service programs to low-income households' telecommunications preferences*, 33 Telecomm. Pol’y 129, 130 (2009), available at http://warrington.ufl.edu/purc/purcdocs/papers/0805_Hauge_Whose_Call_is.pdf

voice communication, especially as payphones disappear.¹³ Advocates report that wireless phones are crucial for the homeless, who use them to stay in touch with their families, arrange appointments for medical care, and pay bills.¹⁴

Wireless service is also very important in helping low income Americans get and keep jobs. Unless they have a wireless phone and accessible voicemail, low income job applicants are at a serious disadvantage during the process of seeking and setting up job interviews, as well as making and receiving the follow-up calls that are an integral part of actually getting hired. A mobile phone allows prospective employees to respond immediately to potential employers and, once hired, allows them to stay in contact with their employers and to better manage their schedules. In this respect, inbound use of wireless phones – the ability to receive calls – is just as critical as the ability to call others. Once they are employed, low income Americans use their wireless phones to contact employers and co-workers. In this regard, most wireless customers use their phones for work-related calls, and it would be difficult to imagine navigating the responsibilities and assignments of the work world without a mobile telephone.¹⁵

Another way wireless is useful to low income Americans is as a tool for obtaining the most effective access to other social services for which they are targeted. A wireless service allows low income families to have reliable communication with government or medical offices, since they will not have to sit near a wired phone – which may not be an option in any case – and since, if they do miss a call, there is typically Caller ID and voice mail available to facilitate the exchange of information and any necessary call-backs.

Prepaid billing is perhaps the most important aspect of wireless service for low income Americans. As the observers have noted, the flat fees attached to most contractual postpaid

¹³ Kevin Graham, *Wireless a Lifeline for Homeless*, St. Petersburg Times, April 9, 2007.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ Sullivan Report at 22.

plans are disproportionately onerous on low income customers.¹⁶ By contrast, prepaid wireless service costs only as much as a customer can afford. The low income customer does not have to commit to pay for more service than she will likely use, and does not have to worry about bill shock if the unduly-large monthly commitment becomes too onerous. With pre-paid, the financial burden is both precise and fair. This is a crucial benefit to families who must count every dollar each month. The FCC itself has noted that the “prepaid feature, which essentially functions as a toll control feature, may be an attractive feature to Lifeline-eligible consumers who are concerned about usage charges or long-term contracts.”¹⁷ With prepaid, low income customers can purchase only as many minutes as they need for their phone.

Prepaid Wireless—Bridging the Communications Divide

The advantages of wireless service are not lost on low income Americans. Quite the contrary: low income customers are migrating quickly to wireless, and their rate of switching to wireless only – that is, “cutting the cord” – is higher than that of the rest of the population.¹⁸ When asked, low income families confirm that if they can only have one phone, they want it to be wireless.¹⁹ They also want it to be prepaid. In the last few years, the increase in prepaid subscribership has been particularly high in low income households, which makes sense. Studies

¹⁶ Reply Comments of the Minority Media and Telecommunications Council, *In the Matter of Fostering Innovation and Investment in the Wireless Communications Market; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future*, Notice of Inquiry, GN Docket Nos. 09-157, 09-51, FCC 09-66 (rel. Aug., 27, 2009).

¹⁷ *In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, TracFone Wireless, Inc. Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in New York, Florida, Virginia, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Alabama, North Carolina, Tennessee, Delaware, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia*, CC Docket No. 96-45, FCC 08-100, Released April 11, 2008.

¹⁸ Hauge at 141; *Wireless Substitution: Early Release of Estimates From the National Health Interview Survey, July–December 2009*, by Stephen J. Blumberg, Ph.D., and Julian V. Luke, Division of Health Interview Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics.

¹⁹ Hauge at 136.

have shown that low income customers choose prepaid in higher numbers than any other group.²⁰

The success of prepaid wireless among this segment of the population is borne out by a recent study that found that the penetration of prepaid service in low income Floridian households has doubled over the past three years.²¹ The prepaid wireless industry is also growing quickly as a whole: two out of three new wireless subscribers choose prepaid.²² As the FCC predicted, the ability to control costs is the big reason that prepaid wireless has been so successful among low income purchasers.²³ Being able to decide how much or how little to spend on phone service from month to month allows low income families to manage their costs and phone usage in accordance with family budget. By pre-paying, they can control the cost of critical wireless service on a highly granular level, down to the dollar and the minute.²⁴

Crucially, minority populations are of particular interest in any policy discussion concerning prepaid wireless and the digital divide. First, minorities have a higher wireless penetration rate than the overall population.²⁵ Additionally, the Low Income program is of particular relevance in combating the communications divide in minority populations because they suffer from higher poverty rates. For example, the poverty rate for Latinos in was 23.2 percent and 24.7 percent for African-Americans in 2008, compared to the overall poverty rate of

²⁰ *Id.* at 138.

²¹ *Id.* at 137.

²² Marguerite Reardon, *Prepaid wireless outpaces contract service*, CNET News, April 5, 2010, available at http://news.cnet.com/8301-30686_3-20001793-266.html

²³ Hauge at 139.

²⁴ As the National Consumers League has written, “[p]repaid wireless service is a good option for low-income consumers because there are no long-term contracts, no credit checks, and no early termination penalties or late payment fees. With prepaid service, people pay only for the service that they can afford.” Comments to the Federal Communications Commission from the National Consumers League *In the matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket 96-45, WC Docket 03-109, September 17, 2004.

²⁵ Hauge at 135.

13.2 percent.²⁶ Prepaid wireless is crucial to narrowing the communications divide due to its unique mix of affordability and ease of use allows it to achieve high penetration in minority communities.

Prepaid Wireless as Low Income Eligible Telecommunication Carriers (“ETCs”)

The overwhelming success of prepaid wireless among low income households has rejuvenated the Lifeline and Link Up programs. Unlike the High Cost program, Lifeline and Link Up payments are directly tied to the exact number of qualifying low income customers that an ETC serves.²⁷ Thus, while growth in the High Cost program might well be a basis for concern – if costs are so high, and growing, perhaps there is an underlying inefficiency in how the service is providing – growth in the Low Income program means that more and more of the population the program is trying to reach, is actually being reached. This is a success, not a problem. And, where states have approved prepaid wireless providers as eligible telecommunications carriers (ETCs), participation rates in these programs have jumped. Texas saw an immediate 10% increase in Lifeline participation when it began approving wireless ETCs.²⁸ In Florida, the combination of automatic enrollment and the approval of SafeLink, a prepaid wireless phone provider, to be a Lifeline ETC, led to a increased participation rate of 236% in a single year.²⁹

Still, overall participation in the Lifeline and Link Up programs is still far from what it should be if the program’s goals – all Americans, including low income Americans, having

²⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, *Summary of the Current Population Survey (CPS), 2009 Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC)*, available at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/about/overview/index.html>

²⁷ The High Cost program provides subsidies based on the total amount of cost a carrier incurs (incumbent eligible telecommunications carriers (ETCs)) or total volume of customers (competitive ETCs).

²⁸ Memorandum from Edward Randolph, Director of the Office of Governmental Affairs, to the California Public Utilities Commission on AB 2213 (Fuentes) – Moore Universal Telephone Service Act as Amended (May 26, 2010). available at <http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PUBLISHED/REPORT/118920.htm>

²⁹ Florida Public Service Commission news release, *Florida's lifeline enrollment increases dramatically*, December 28, 2009. available at <http://www.psc.state.fl.us/home/news/index.aspx?id=615>

access to modern, effective, affordable communications – are going to be met. Unfortunately, only 32% percent of eligible households took part last year.³⁰ The FCC has attributed this low success rate in part to state restrictions on wireless ETCs, of which it urges reconsideration.³¹ Certainly, new outreach efforts should be encouraged.

Best Practices in the Prepaid Wireless Industry

As the prepaid wireless industry grows in size, its business practices are also evolving. Already, there are a recognizable set of best practices that many companies follow in order to offer the most attractive packages to consumers and to maintain the advantages of prepaid for low income Americans. First, many ETCs offer a reasonable number of minutes upon activation of the phone, and additional minutes can be purchased affordably. Nexus Communications’ (“Nexus”), like most prepaid wireless ETCs, offers additional prepaid cards, whose minutes rollover into the next month if not used, at stores such as Walmart, CVS/Pharmacy, Rent A Center and Giant Eagle.³² Second, Nexus and other wireless ETCs waive the balance of their activation fees not covered by Link Up, and also provide free wireless handsets, thereby eliminating any cost barrier to obtaining service. Third, as mentioned before, Nexus and Tracfone (in most markets) provide sixty eight free minutes of service with basic service packages, and unused minutes roll over from month to month for as long as the Lifeline subscriber remains enrolled in the lifeline program. Just recently, Tracfone announced that it is adding additional packages for Lifeline subscribers to choose from, including one plan that provides Lifeline subscribers with up to two hundred fifty free minutes every month.

³⁰ USAC Lifeline Participation Rate Study (2009), available at <http://www.usac.org/li/about/participation-rate-information.aspx>

³¹ National Broadband Plan, Chapter 9, at 172.

³² Details of Nexus’ service offerings are available at <https://www.reachoutmobile.com/index.php/site/page/C3/>

Fourth, as active and responsible participants in the government's Low Income programs, prepaid wireless ETCs support the creation of a national certification and verification database. In addition, prepaid wireless ETCs are helping to eliminate fraud, waste, and abuse from the Low Income program by de-enrolling Lifeline subscribers who do not use the handset for 60 days. This ensures that ETCs will not inadvertently seek USF reimbursements for subscribers who are no longer using their services. Only subscribers who actually use their wireless service will continue to participate in the Lifeline program, and wireless ETCs will only receive Low Income support for those subscribers who remain enrolled in the Lifeline program.

The Challenges that Remain

The rapid growth of prepaid wireless within the Lifeline program has not been without critics. Some have charged that prepaid wireless ETCs have not demonstrated a commitment to consumer value in the services they offer through Lifeline and Link Up, and that the number of minutes offered monthly is too low.³³ Others have noted that the non-contractual nature of the prepaid model makes it difficult to verify that customers remain eligible for government support.³⁴

It's certainly true that prepaid wireless ETCs don't operate like traditional landline ILECs when offering Lifeline services. But over the last few years, low income Americans have announced clearly, in every way possible, that they prefer limited minutes on a wireless phone to unlimited local minutes on a landline phone. Given all the advantages of wireless noted above,

³³ Comments of the Advocates for Basic Legal Equality, et al. *In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service Seeks Comment on Lifeline and Link-Up Eligibility, Verification, and Outreach Issues Referred to Joint Board*, Public Notice, FCC 10J-2, CC Docket 96-45 and WC Docket 03-109 (FCC rel. June 15, 2010), seeking comment on *In Re Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Lifeline and Link Up, Order*, FCC 10-72, CC Docket 96-45 and WC Docket 03-109 (FCC rel. May 4, 2010).

³⁴ Comments of the National Association of State Utility Advocates *In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service Seeks Comment on Lifeline and Link-Up Eligibility, Verification, and Outreach Issues Referred to Joint Board*, Public Notice, FCC 10J-2, CC Docket 96-45 and WC Docket 03-109 (FCC rel. June 15, 2010), seeking comment on *In Re Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Lifeline and Link Up, Order*, FCC 10-72, CC Docket 96-45 and WC Docket 03-109 (FCC rel. May 4, 2010).

this is hardly surprising. The old landline model is simply not useful to most Americans in today's economic and social environment. Likewise, it is true that making sure prepaid wireless customers can be certified and verified through the Low Income system has required some innovative solutions, and may require further adjustments to guard against waste, fraud, and abuse. But this innovation is happening, will continue to happen, and is indicative of the prepaid wireless industry's ability to expand the boundaries of service and the traditional definitions of telephone networks. Fundamentally, the problems identified by critics, mismatching of service offerings to need, and a potential for waste while more effective verification methods are put in place, are simply growing pains. Any new entrant into established programs like Lifeline and Link Up will face these kinds of challenges. But these challenges are far preferable to the problems that would face a wireline-only Lifeline program: quickly decreasing participation and growing irrelevance to the needs of those Americans it is supposed to help. Prepaid wireless has already solved the problems that would otherwise endanger the very existence of the Low Income programs, and it is one of the best tools to combat the communications divide.

Solutions

None of the challenges facing prepaid wireless ETCs is intractable. By following the best practices outlined above, companies like Safelink Wireless, Nexus, and Assurance Wireless already give their customers great value in prepaid wireless phones, and subscription numbers show that low income consumers recognize this value. Many ETCs are also offering new types of packages to Lifeline subscribers, including ones with up to two hundred fifty free minutes ever month, as part of their efforts to respond to the suggestions of consumer groups. The wide availability of prepaid cards and the increasing competition among providers are also making it easier for customers to find the best choice among phones. State public service commissions can

provide another easy way to increase competition among wireless ETCs. Many states, through their implementation of the Lifeline and Link Up programs, already publish the names of qualifying ETCs that customers may choose among.³⁵ State public service commissions could take the next step of publishing the terms of various prepaid plans, which would point out which ETCs' plans offer the best value for state residents. This centralized information repository, combined with the natural competition in a fast-growing industry, would do much to eliminate or reduce cost concerns.

Prepaid wireless ETCs are also playing an active role in the push to reform the eligibility and verification systems that the Lifeline and Link Up programs use to prevent fraud and abuse. A nationally-maintained eligibility database, which wireless ETCs have urged the FCC to implement soon, would resolve any issues associated with subscribers attempting to obtain Lifeline service from more than one carrier simultaneously or when a subscriber is not qualified for the Lifeline program.³⁶

Conclusion

Low Income Americans were among the first to recognize how well prepaid wireless meets their needs by providing security, mobility, and cost control that was not being offered by traditional landline services. Their response has been swift and clear, and the rate at which low income customers abandon landlines in order to make the move to prepaid wireless is increasing. The FCC and many state governments have recognized the trend, and are adapting the Lifeline

³⁵ See, e.g., Illinois (<http://www.icc.illinois.gov/utility/list.aspx?type=prepaid>), California (<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/Telco/Public+Programs/lifeline/details.htm>)

³⁶ See, e.g. Comments of Leap Wireless International, Inc. and Cricket Communications, Inc.; Comments of Nexus Communications, Inc.; Comments of PR Wireless, Inc.; Comments of TracFone Wireless; CC Docket 96-45 and WC Docket 03-109 (FCC rel. June 15, 2010), *seeking comment on In Re Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Lifeline and Link Up*, Order, FCC 10-72, CC Docket 96-45 and EC Docket 03-109 (FCC rel. May 4, 2010).

and Link Up programs so that they can help more low income Americans get jobs and stay employed, better manage their budgets, and care for their families. This constitutes no less than a revolution in the usefulness and desirability of Lifeline and Link Up service for low income Americans

Exhibit F
Letters of Support



NATIONAL CONSUMERS LEAGUE

1701 K Street, NW, Suite 1200, Washington, DC 20006
PHONE (202) 835-3323 FAX (202) 835-0747 www.nclnet.org

January 7, 2009

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20544

Re: CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Ms. Dortch:

I am writing on behalf of the National Consumers League (NCL)¹ to express concern that delays in providing Eligible Telecommunications Carrier (ETC) certification to prepaid wireless carriers may be delaying the expansion of Lifeline wireless service to low-income consumers.

As we have stated in previous comments², wireless telephone service has become an essential part of modern life. That is why we have consistently supported the use of Universal Service Fund monies to bring wireless telephone service to low-income consumer via the Lifeline program. We believe that all carriers that are able to meet the service obligations of Lifeline should be able to serve Lifeline customers so that low-income Americans can have the same access to wireless and competitive services as other consumers.

The advantages that wireless service brings to low-income and working Americans, particularly minority consumers, are well-documented. For example, a recent report³ concluded that providing cell phones to the 38 percent of America's 45 million poorest households now without them -- including millions of seniors, Hispanics and African-Americans -- could help them get work or earn income at levels approaching \$2.9 billion-\$11 billion. Consumers will surely

¹ The National Consumers League, founded in 1899, is America's pioneer consumer organization. Our non-profit mission is to protect and promote social and economic justice for consumers and workers in the United States and abroad.

² CC Docket 96-45, WC Docket 03-109, NCL PETITIONS CONCERNING ELIGIBLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS DESIGNATIONS AND THE LIFELINE AND LINK-UP UNIVERSAL SERVICE SUPPORT MECHANISM, September 17, 2004

³ Sullivan, Nicholas. Cell Phones Provide Significant Economic Gains for Low-Income American Households. New Millennium Research Council. April 2008. Online: http://www.newmillenniumresearch.org/archive/Sullivan_Report_032608.pdf

benefit if more providers were able to offer Lifeline services.

Given the benefits of wireless service to low-income and working consumers, we urge you to adopt policies that allow more Americans to access Lifeline wireless services.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sally Greenberg". The signature is fluid and extends to the right with a long horizontal stroke.

Sally Greenberg
Executive Director

Consumer Action

www.consumer-action.org

**PO Box 70037
Washington, DC 20024
202-544-3088**

**221 Main St, Suite 480
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-777-9648**

**523 W. Sixth St., Suite 1105
Los Angeles, CA 90014
213-624-4631**

May 10, 2010

Dear Commissioner:

As an organization dedicated to protecting and helping consumers, Consumer Action¹ believes that all carriers who seek certification to provide Lifeline and Link-Up services to low-income Americans should be also granted the authority to allow the consumer to decide what type of Lifeline offering they would prefer---wireless or wire-line. Low-income consumers should have access to the same type of competitive telecommunication services as other consumers. That is why we are writing today to support the Wireless Lifeline telecommunications service offered by Nexus Communications, Inc.

Consumer Action has been engaged in ensuring that Lifeline and Link-Up serves those in need and we applaud the goal to achieve a 100 percent participation rate among eligible and qualified low-income consumers. Unfortunately, federal figures indicate that Lifeline participation rates nationwide remain low. As a result, low-income households across the country continue to lag behind in obtaining the goal of enjoying access to services that are routinely enjoyed by other consumers everyday. Consumer Action believes that the Nexus Wireless Lifeline program will bring new opportunities for participation by low-income residents of your state.

Nexus' Wireless Lifeline offering is a prepaid wireless service that includes a free wireless handset and fixed amount of free monthly minutes available to qualifying consumers with no credit check, deposit requirements or long term agreements. As such, we believe that it can provide a vital option for low-income consumers who seek access to mobile wireless service, but who are wary of the early termination penalties and late payment fees that are associated with more traditional post-paid service. Through Nexus' Wireless Lifeline service, low-income consumers would also be afforded the opportunity to access services that other consumers currently receive with mobile cell phones, including voice mail, nationwide long distance and other essential features not currently offered with landline providers under their Lifeline programs. In addition, this new

¹ Founded in 1971, Consumer Action is a national non-profit education and advocacy organization serving more than 10,000 community-based organizations with training, educational modules, and multi-lingual publications.

Wireless Lifeline service would help the neediest to participate equitably in the convenience, benefits, and security afforded by wireless service.

Granting swift approval of Nexus' Wireless Lifeline service offering would further the principles of universal service enumerated in Section 254(b)(3) of The Communications Act of 1934, as Amended ("The Act") and allow low-income consumers in all regions of the country to have "access to telecommunications...services"---thereby fulfilling an important social imperative to ensure that all low-income residents are able to communicate by telephone with family, support networks, employers and emergency services. Approval of the Nexus Wireless Lifeline service would also greatly expand the range of telecommunications services available to low-income consumers and bring Lifeline and Link-Up into the 21st century. Consumer Action believes that as more providers enter this space, it will further uphold the principle of competitive and technological neutrality that is a cornerstone of federal and state regulation.

Consumer Action also believes that low-income consumers should have the same choice of the technology and service available to all other consumers, and that participation in vital low-income programs, such as Lifeline and Link-Up, should not serve as a barrier to new technologies, but should instead be a channel to greater access to competitive choices such as wireless. The Wireless Lifeline service offered by Nexus provides eligible consumers with a free wireless handset and a set amount of free minutes of local and domestic long distance usage each month.

We hope that the Commission will continue to support the availability of Wireless Lifeline and Link-Up and encourage other prepaid wireless providers to pursue Lifeline ETC authority. Wireless Lifeline consumers can benefit from increased competition in the marketplace, and we support this petition by Nexus Communications, Inc. because we believe that additional providers in the arena will create a robust marketplace to benefit the very low-income households that are so badly in need of economic assistance in these difficult times.

Respectfully submitted,



Ken McElDowney
Executive Director



NATIONAL OFFICE

1140 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1210
Washington, DC 20036

PHONE: 202.265.7546
FAX: 202.265.5048

info@communityactionpartnership.com
www.communityactionpartnership.com

PRESIDENT and CEO
Donald W. Mathis

EXECUTIVE BOARD
John W. Edwards, Jr., CCAP
Board Chair
Jacksonville, FL

Joyce Dorsey
1st Vice Chair
Atlanta, GA

Karen K. Lueck, CCAP
2nd Vice Chair
Kearney, NE

Peter Kilde
3rd Vice Chair
Glenwood City, WI

Elizabeth "Biz" Steinberg
Secretary
San Luis Obispo, CA

Tom Tenorio, CCAP
Treasurer
Oroville, CA

February 18, 2011

Mr. Julius Genachowski
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

I write on behalf of the Community Action Partnership (Partnership), the non-profit membership organization that represents the interests of more than 1,000 Community Action Agencies across America. In 2009, these Community Action Agencies served 20.7 million low-income people and families in more than 96% of America's counties. The Partnership's mission is to strengthen, promote, and provide training and technical assistance to our member agencies that receive federal Community Services Block Grants. We work to promote economic security and self-sufficiency for our nation's poor (43.7 million in 2009).

The Partnership is a strong advocate and proponent of the Lifeline program. We support measures that streamline the process for helping low-income consumers take advantage of the free wireless services Lifeline offers.

These free, prepaid services have helped revive a languishing program while bringing new access and opportunity to millions of Americans. Every day, in every state of America, Community Action staff meet with people who are struggling to pay their bills, find a job or even just meet their families' basic needs of food, shelter, and safety. Our member agencies tell us about the transformation that occurs when disadvantaged and vulnerable people and families are empowered to improve their circumstances.

These peoples' lives are more secure, easier when they have a cell phone and the Lifeline program. Lifeline contributes to their economic stability, personal security, and future opportunities. Having access to free cell phone makes Community Action clients more competitive with other job seekers; it gives our folks a leg up in an economy that continues to be very hard on our nation's poor and near-poor. Helping their lives become better improves their overall community and our society as a whole.

We are aware, however, that the Federal Communications Commission is considering proposals that could have an immediate negative impact on the free phone offerings available through Lifeline. The Partnership is convinced that any efforts that would hinder an individual's ability to obtain these services or complicate the enrollment process would be very detrimental to the low-income people we represent and serve and to the Lifeline program itself.

The FCC is to be commended for having the vision to recognize the true potential of a free wireless phone program for low-income people and for extending Lifeline to include such an offering. Retreating from that decision and implementing a minimum monthly charge on those least able to afford it would be a significant step in the wrong direction. It would instantly inhibit and discourage the people who need it the most. Even a fee of a few dollars per month is too much for people who do not know where their next meal is coming from and struggle to pay their heat and utility bills. Carriers have found a way to make the program work; charging for such service should not be left to their discretion.

As you might expect, after 47 years of providing programs, our Community Action Network is thoroughly familiar with the intake and enrollment processes for the wide variety of social service, employment and training and other economic security programs. During the four plus decades, Community Action has helped hundreds of millions of Americans obtain services that meet their most pressing needs. Our experience confirms that the success or failure of a program can occur even before someone tries to utilize the service being offered.



The Partnership fully understands that certain verification requirements must—and should—be in place to prevent fraud or mismanagement. Yet, the reality is that each additional enrollment requirement translates into a barrier to enrollment for clients with very little or no resources. Requiring individuals to provide written proof or documentation of their eligibility—can you prove you're poor?—will deny certain people the opportunity to apply.

There is little, if any, evidence that suggest that widespread fraud is taking place now. The FCC first should investigate the probability that such fraud exists before it implements a policy change that would discourage enrollments by eligible participants and result in significant, perhaps unsustainable, costs for providers.

In summary, the Community Action Partnership opposes any changes in prepaid Lifeline that would make it more difficult for our clients to obtain this valuable, life-saving service. The goal of the Universal Service Fund, and by extension Lifeline, is to make sure that everyone has access to phone service, especially those low-income people whose lives are more susceptible to emergencies and unexpected crises. Altering free prepaid Lifeline offerings in a way that they no longer become viable is counter to that goal. The Partnership is committed to helping people help themselves, and free cell phones for low-income people substantially help achieve that goal.

We respectfully ask that the FCC carefully consider any changes to Lifeline that would hurt or curtail service to the very people it was intended to help. Thank you for considering these comments and for the opportunity to submit them to the FCC.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Don Mathis". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, sweeping "D" and "M".

Don Mathis



February 18, 2011

Julius Genachowski
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: CC Docket 96-45

Dear Chairman Genachowski:

The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) and the Hispanic Federation have both previously expressed their support for Lifeline, which has provided access to communication for Latinos across the United States. Prepaid Lifeline service has finally expanded the program to its full potential. Latinos have a higher propensity to utilize prepaid cell phones compared to other populations and the ability to obtain service through Lifeline free of charge has opened up doors for many struggling members in our community.

LULAC and Hispanic Federation are both dedicated to empowering Latinos to improve their economic condition and empower their lives. We believe that cell phone access helps achieve this mission. A cell phone truly is a lifeline, serving as a vehicle for security, stability and economic attainment. For this reason we are concerned about certain proposals before the FCC that could do irreparable harm to prepaid Lifeline services.

First, making the enrollment process more difficult for applicants will hurt participation and significantly increase the cost to administer the service. It is not always possible for an eligible individual to provide written documentation that they qualify for the program and it is unfair to shut that person out of the program because of a lack of means. Also, the additional paperwork this will create is an administrative burden that providers will likely not be able to shoulder.

Similarly, implementing a minimum charge for service could have a devastating effect on participation. These are times of unprecedented need and the recession has hit Latinos disproportionately hard. A study by the Joint Economic Committee found that in October 2009 the Hispanic unemployment rate had reached 13.1%, 3 percentage points higher than the overall rate. With little or no income many Hispanics simply cannot afford any extra expense, no matter how small. Regressing to a system that makes people pay for service, especially when it is not necessary, is clearly in conflict with the goal of Lifeline.



Participation rates in Lifeline have suffered for so long, despite the efforts of the FCC to build awareness of the program. We applaud the FCC for approving services that are finally reversing that trend, so it would be tragic to see providers that have found a working solution to this issue disappear from the program.

As we have outlined, the proposed changes would have unintended consequences that could ultimately result in the discontinuation of prepaid Lifeline services. This would not only harm low-income Latinos, but all struggling Americans that are seeking support. On behalf of our community, we respectfully request that the FCC seriously consider the disadvantages of implementing the above changes before choosing a course of action.

Sincerely,

Margaret Moran
National President
League of United Latin American Citizens

Lillian Rodríguez López
President
Hispanic Federation

CERTIFICATION

I, Steven Fenker, state that I am President of Nexus Communications, Inc. ("Nexus"); that I am authorized to make this certification on behalf of Nexus; that the foregoing petition was prepared under my direction and supervision; and that the contents are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

I also certify that to the best of my knowledge that Nexus, including all officers, directors, or all persons holding five percent or more of the outstanding stock or shares (voting and/or non-voting) of Nexus is subject to denial of federal benefits pursuant to Section 5301 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1998.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct



Steven Fenker

Executed this 29 day of March, 2011