[1]

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Application Docket No. of Cricket Communications, Inc., 12-2551-01 for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Utah

HEARING PROCEEDINGS

TAKEN AT:

Public Service Commission

Hearing Room 451 160 East 300 South Salt Lake City, Utah

DATE:

Thursday, September 20, 2012

TIME:

9:08 a.m.

REPORTED BY: Scott M. Knight, RPR

		3/20/2012
		[2]
1	APPEARANCES	
2	ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: MELANIE A. REIF	
3	EOD CDICKER COMMINICARIONS INC.	
4	FOR CRICKET COMMUNICATIONS, INC.:	
5	BRIAN W. BURNETT, ESQ., CALLISTER, NEBEKER McCULLOUGH	
6	10 East South Temple, Suite 900 Salt Lake City, Utah 84133	
7	FOR DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES:	
8	JUSTIN JETTER, ESQ.,	
9	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 500 Heber M. Wells Building	
10	160 East 300 South Salt Lake City, Utah 84114	
11		
12	* * *	
13		
14	INDEX	
15	WITNESS	Page
16	JULIE BUECHLER	
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION	4
18	BY-MR.BURNETT	
19		
20	* * *	
21		
22	EXHIBITS	
23	No. Description	Page
24	1 Settlement Stipulation	9
25		
۷ ک		

[3]

MS. REIF: We'll be on the record. Good morning, everyone. My name is Melanie Reif, and I'm the administrative law judge for the Public Service Commission. This morning we are here to hear the Docket No. 12-2551-01, entitled In the Matter of the Application of Cricket Communications, Inc., for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Utah.

I'd like to take appearances, please.

Mr. Burnett, would you like to start?

MR. BURNETT: Brian Burnett. I'm the attorney for Cricket Communications, Inc.

MS. REIF: And would you like to identify who's on the telephone?

MR. BURNETT: On the telephone is Julie Buechler from Cricket Communications.

MS. REIF: Thank you.

MR. JETTER: And Justin Jetter for the Division of Public Utilities. With me is Casey Coleman with the Division.

MR. ORTON: I'm Eric Orton with the Office of Consumer Services. And I'm here representing the Office without counsel.

MS. REIF: Thank you, Mr. Orton.

Mr. Burnett, before we continue, have the

[4]

intervenors in this case been notified of the stipulation?

MR. BURNETT: They have. They have. They've actually reviewed and had some comments on the settlement stipulation, but they have represented to me that Utah Rural Telecom Association, through Kira Slawson, and the Salt Lake Community Action Program, through Betsy Wolf--that they--although they were not--they did not want to sign the settlement stipulation, that they were not going to oppose the settlement stipulation.

MS. REIF: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

The Commission has received a copy of the settlement stipulation, which was filed on September 13th, along with the certificate of service. And, Mr. Burnett, would you like to-since this is your application, would you like to proceed on-on the issue of whether the Commission should approve this stipulation as just and reasonable?

MR. BURNETT: Sure. Sure.

JULIE BUECHLER,

called as a witness for and on behalf of Cricket

21 | Communications, Inc., was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY-MR.BURNETT:

Q Julie, can you hear me?

25 A Yes, I can.

[5]

- Q Would you state your name for the record, please.
- 2 A Julie Buechler, spelled B as in "boy,"
 3 u-e-c-h-l-e-r.
 - Q Would you state your position, please.
 - A I'm the manager of government programs for Cricket Communications.
 - Q Are you the same person who prefiled testimony in this docket on June 14th of 2012?
 - A Yes, I am.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q And if I asked you the questions that were set forth in your prefiled testimony, would your answers be the same today?
 - A Yes, they would.
- Q And have you had an opportunity to review the settlement stipulation which has been filed in this docket?
 - A Yes, I have.
- Q And are you in agreement with the terms and conditions set forth therein?
 - A Yes, I am.
- Q At this time, I think it'd be helpful maybe if you would briefly describe the--the Cricket service and how this Lifeline services would work, just in a kind of a synopsis form for the Commission.
- A Cricket Communications is the sixth largest wireless carrier. We are a facilities-based carrier with

[6]

service in Utah. Our ETC designation would mirror that facilities-based coverage.

Cricket, due to its product offering, reaches the demographic that's ideally suited for Lifeline. We are considered a low-cost provider. Our plans start at \$35 a month, and those include unlimited local, long distance, and texting. The Lifeline program is a \$10 discount off of any of our available rate plans, so Lifeline customers can choose whichever plan best suits their needs. With the--we--let's see how do I say? So it gives them an opportunity as--adding more Lifeline providers, it increases the competition. It gives consumers more choices.

Cricket satisfies all the statutory requirements for ETC designation. We have no activation fees, no connection fees for Lifeline or for any services. We don't require contracts or any credit checks. We are a pay-in-advance provider, meaning consumers pay for their service month in advance, so we don't have the issues of, you know, past-due bills or consumers getting into trouble running up calls.

Again, our calls are all local, long distance unlimited, so there's no worry about the toll charges or overages or running out of minutes. We will not be seeking state USF support. Cricket does pay all the applicable taxes and public interest charges. Cricket currently is an

ETC in 26 states and the District of Columbia. We have--five of those states, the petition went through the FCC under their new Lifeline reform orders, and we were granted designation by the FCC.

- Q So you're offering these services through your own facilities?
 - A Correct.
- Q And you're willing to advertise the availability of those services?
 - A Yes.

- Q Do you believe that you are--well, let me run through a couple of these things that you mentioned quickly. You will certify and verify the customer eligibility of the people, just make sure they qualify?
 - A Yes.
- Q And you're willing to comply with the Commission decision in Docket 10-2528-01?
- A Yes.
 - Q And--let's see here. You will ensure that only one person per household receive the Lifeline discount?

A Yes. That's--it is one of the certifications on the Lifeline petition. And additionally, we have a back office staff. All--all Lifeline applications are run through that staff specifically trained in that state. And one of the checks they do is that there is no other Lifeline

benefit at that household.

- Q Okay. And you're not seeking Utah Universal Service funds?
 - A Correct, we are not.
- Q And in the future, if you would be deemed eligible for those, you would be--you'd file a separate application for--with the Public Service Commission of Utah asking for that?
 - A Yes.
- Q And you mentioned that you'd pay all applicable federal, state, and local regulatory fees?
 - A Correct.
- Q Now, some--the wire centers are listed as an exhibit of where you'd be requesting service. Now, there's--a few of those are--pardon me--rural ILECs. Would you describe for the Commission briefly what you've done with your filings at the FCC regarding that?
- A Yes. We filed for forbearance from the requirements to cover a hundred percent of a rural study area. That forbearance was granted contingent on Cricket filing and receiving approval on a compliance plan, and that was done. The compliance plan was approved in February of 2012.
- Q And those orders from the FCC were attached to Cricket's application in this docket; is that correct?

[9]

A Correct.

MR. BURNETT: Okay. I have given the court reporter a copy of the settlement stipulation. I believe we should mark it as Cricket Exhibit 1. This document has been circulated to the parties. Parties have commented on it, as well as the intervening parties. We've made some changes based on their comments. And the Division and the Office have signed the settlement stipulation. And as I mentioned, the other two intervenors have told me that they do not intend to oppose it.

Exhibit-1 marked

MR. BURNETT: As one of the provisions in the settlement stipulation, they—they agree—they stipulate to the admission into evidence in this docket of Cricket's application and prefiled testimony and exhibits. That's paragraph 58.

So with the--with this testimony, I would move for the admission of Cricket Exhibit 1 in this case, and by reference also, the application and the prefiled testimony--testimony which we have previously submitted to the Commission, and would so move the admission of that.

MS. REIF: Any objection?

MR. JETTER: No.

MS. REIF: Mr. Burnett, before we admit those documents, just for clarification, the document that was

[10] provided to the court reporter, does that include the 1 certificate of service? 2 MR. BURNETT: It does, I believe. Yes. 3 MS. REIF: And the application and the testimony 4 that you're requesting to be admitted, we'll take judicial 5 notice of that. 6 7 MR. BURNETT: Okay. MS. REIF: Is that acceptable, or did you want to 8 9 have that admitted as an exhibit as well? MR. BURNETT: No, as long as it's in the record--10 11 MS. REIF: Okay. MR. BURNETT: --it's fine. 12 MS. REIF: All right. Very good. 13 14 MR. BURNETT: I just wanted you to be able to 15 refer to it if you needed to as part of your draft of any 16 findings of fact or conclusions of law. 17 MS. REIF: Okay. Those documents are admitted. 18 And for clarification, I neglected to swear 19 Ms.--is it "BEWCH-ler"? THE WITNESS: Yes. 20 MS. REIF: I neglected to swear her in. I'm 21 22 assuming you are offering her testimony today in support of the application? 23 24 MR. BURNETT: I am, yeah.

MS. REIF: Okay. Ms. Buechler, do you swear that

[11] the testimony that you just gave in this matter is the 1 truth? 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. 3 MS. REIF: Thank you. 4 5 Is there any cross-examination for Ms. Buechler? MR. JETTER: No. 6 7 MS. REIF: Mr. Burnett, I think you did a very fine job of answering, I think, most everything I was noting 8 9 in the settlement stipulation. I may have a question or two. If we could just go off the record a second, I'll just 10 11 take a look at my notes. MR. BURNETT: There was one question or two 12 questions, maybe, I can combine into one for her. 13 14 BY MR. BURNETT: 15 Julie, do you believe that this--that this 16 application is consistent with the public convenience and 17 necessity, is just and reasonable, and in the public 18 interest? 19 Α Yes. MR. BURNETT: Thank you. 20 MS. REIF: Okay. Thank you. We'll be off the 21 22 record for just one moment. (A discussion was held off the record.) 23

MS. REIF: We'll be back on the record. And,

Mr. Burnett, as we were discussing off the record, there was

24

[12]

a concern in my mind about paragraph 60 inasmuch as it cites 1 to a particular Utah administrative rule, in particular, 2 Rule 746-100-10.F.5. And I was noting that the concepts 3 that are stated here aren't necessarily supported by that 4 5 rule, and I would like to get your thoughts on that. MR. BURNETT: As I mentioned, I took this 6 7 particular paragraph from a recently executed stipulation filed in the PacifiCorp rate case, which was--which 8 9 stipulation was adopted by the Commission recently this week. But I have no problem with striking anything in 10 paragraph 60, except for the first sentence, which deals 11 with the negotiations are confidential. 12 13 MS. REIF: Okay. So is it--is it your proposal, 14 then, that the first sentence be left and the remaining 15 portion of the paragraph be--16 MR. BURNETT: That would be fine. 17 MS. REIF: --stricken? 18 MR. BURNETT: That would be fine. 19 MS. REIF: And is there any objection to that from 20 the parties present? MR. JETTER: (To Mr. Coleman) Do you want to take 21 22 a look at it? MR. COLEMAN: I don't know that . . . 23 24 Can we look at that paragraph just real quick? 25 MS. REIF: We'll be off the record while

[13] you're . . . 1 2 (A discussion was held off the record.) 3 MS. REIF: Let's go back on the record. Thank 4 you. 5 MR. JETTER: I think the Division would suggest that we strike about the first ten words of the second 6 7 sentence up until the identification of the code section, and then continue with "neither the execution." 8 9 MR. BURNETT: Taking out the dependent clause--MR. JETTER: Yeah. 10 MR. BURNETT: --that refers to the rule? 11 12 MR. JETTER: Yeah. 13 MR. BURNETT: And I don't have a problem with that 14 either. 15 MR. JETTER: Keeps the concept and simply removes 16 reference to that particular administrative rule. 17 MS. REIF: Is that acceptable to the Office? 18 MR. ORTON: Yes. 19 MS. REIF: Okay. And, Mr. Burnett, is that acceptable to you? 20 21 MR. BURNETT: Yes, that's fine. 22 MS. REIF: So just to eliminate any confusion--23 MR. BURNETT: Sure. MS. REIF: --about what that reference to the rule 24 25 means or applies, it's my understanding that--that paragraph

[14]

60--the paragraph will remain, except for the second sentence, the following words will be stricken: "Except as expressly provided in this stipulation, and in accordance with Utah Administrative Code Rule 746-10-10"--excuse me-"Rule 746-100-10.F.5."

Does that capture what you're hoping to capture?

MR. BURNETT: That's correct.

MS. REIF: All right. That is—that resolved my question.

The other thing I wish to note for the record is that the parties in this proceeding have requested a hearing, and as such, we are holding the hearing today in accordance with statute that requires us to do so.

Mr. Burnett, that concludes my questions.

Are there questions or concerns from any of the parties about the stipulation? Okay. Commission will take the matter under advisement and issue a decision. And this matter is adjourned.

MR. BURNETT: Thank you so much.

MS. REIF: Thank you.

(Proceedings concluded at 9:29 a.m.)

[15]

CERTIFICATE
CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, SCOTT M. KNIGHT, a Registered

Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah, residing at South Jordan, Utah;

That the proceedings were reported by me in stenotype and thereafter caused by me to be transcribed into typewriting, and that a full, true, and correct transcription of said proceedings so taken and transcribed is set forth in the foregoing pages, inclusive.

I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties to said cause of action, and that I am not interested in the event thereof.

Scott M. Knight, RPR Utah License No. 110171-7801