

- BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH -

In the Matter of the Joint Application of NextG Networks of California, Inc., NextG Networks, Inc., and Crown Castle Solutions Corp. for the Transfer of Indirect Control of NextG Networks of California to Crown Castle Solutions)))))))))))	<u>DOCKET NO. 12-2445-01</u> <u>REPORT AND ORDER</u>
--	---	---

ISSUED: February 22, 2012

By The Commission:

This matter is before the Commission on the Joint Application of NextG Networks of California, Inc. (“NextG-CA”), NextG Networks, Inc. (“NextG Networks”), and Crown Castle Solutions Corp. (“Solutions”) (collectively, “Applicants”) for Approval of Transfer of Indirect Control of NextG-CA to Solutions. Applicants filed a joint application on January 11, 2012 and requested expedited review and action. The application contains all the information required by Utah Admin. Code R746-349-7(A)(1).

On January 23, 2012 the Division of Public Utilities (the “Division”) submitted a recommendation to approve the application. Pursuant to Utah Admin. Code R746-349-7(A)(2), the Commission issued a public notice of the application on January 26, 2012, allowing for the submission of comments by any interested party regarding the application. No comments or objections were received.

Pursuant to Utah Admin. Code R746-349-7(A)(2), the administrative law judge for the Commission held a hearing on February 15, 2012. No one appeared at the hearing objecting to the application. Brett Ferenchak and Monica Gambino, Counsel for the Applicants,

appeared telephonically. Amanda Jex and Tom Roberts, Assistant Attorneys General, appeared for the Division, and were accompanied by Ron Slusher (“Mr. Slusher”), Utility Technical Consultant for the Division. Patricia Schmid, Assistant Attorney General, appeared telephonically for the Division.

Mr. Ferenchak is an attorney licensed to practice in a foreign state. He made an oral motion at the hearing, asking to be admitted as *pro hac vice*, and the ALJ granted the motion.¹ The Commission finds that requiring the Applicants to retain local counsel for this uncontested, unopposed matter for just a short hearing would work a hardship for the Applicants. Similarly, requiring Applicants to retain local counsel would run counter to the policy expressed in Utah Code Ann. § 54-8b-1.1 to allow flexible and reduced regulation for telecommunications corporations and public telecommunications services. See Utah Code Ann. § 54-8b-1.1(4) (2010).

The ALJ took administrative notice of both the application and recommendation filed by the Division recommending approval. Mr. Slusher was sworn in and his testimony received regarding the recommendation.

Under Utah Admin. Code R746-349-7, “[i]f no objection to the proposed transaction is submitted in any filed comments or reply comments, the Commission will presume that approval of the transaction is in the public interest and use the information contained in the application and accompanying documents as evidence to support a Commission order.” Utah

¹ Utah Admin. Code R746-100-6 permits a licensed attorney in a foreign state to represent a party before the Commission when engaging local counsel “would impose an unreasonable financial or other hardship upon the party.” Utah Admin. Code R746-100-6(B).

Admin. Code R746-349-7(A)(3). Because there is no objection to the granting of the application, the Commission thus presumes the application for approval of transfer of indirect control is in the public interest. Moreover, the Division's memorandum provides additional support for approval of the application.

ORDER

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission approves the transfer of indirect control of NextG-CA to Solutions.

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, this 22 day of February 2012.

/s/ Melanie A. Reif
Administrative Law Judge

Approved and confirmed this 22 day of February, 2012, as the Order Approving Transfer of Indirect Control issued by the Public Service Commission of Utah.

/s/ Ted Boyer, Chairman

/s/ Ric Campbell, Commissioner

/s/ Ron Allen, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Gary Widerburg
Commission Secretary
216150

Notice of Opportunity for Agency Review or Rehearing

Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-4-301 and 54-7-15, a party may seek agency review or rehearing of this order by filing a request for review or rehearing with the Commission within 30 days after the issuance of the order. Responses to a request for agency review or rehearing must be filed within 15 days of the filing of the request for review or rehearing. If the Commission fails to grant a request for review or rehearing within 20 days after the filing of a request for review or rehearing, it is deemed denied. Judicial review of the Commission's final agency action may be obtained by filing a Petition for Review with the Utah Supreme Court within 30 days after final agency action. Any Petition for Review must comply with the requirements of Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-4-401, 63G-4-403, and the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on the 22 day of February, 2012, a true and correct copy of the foregoing REPORT AND ORDER, was delivered upon the following as indicated below:

By Electronic-Mail

Jean L. Kiddoo
Brett P. Ferenchak
Bingham McCutchen LLP
jean.kiddoo@bingham.com
brett.ferenchak@bingham.com

Monica Gambino
Crown Castle
monica.gambino@crowncastle.com

Winafred Brantl
H. Anthony Lehv
NextG-CA and NextG Networks
wbrantl@kelleydrye.com
alehv@nextgnetworks.net

Patricia Schmid
Amanda Jex
Office of the Attorney General
pschmid@utah.gov
ajex@utah.gov

By Hand Delivery

Division of Public Utilities
160 East 300 South, 4th Flr.
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Office of Consumer Services
160 East 300 South, 2nd Flr.
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Administrative Assistant