In the Matter of the Nebraska Public Service Commission, on its own motion, seeking to implement policies and procedures related to providing dedicated universal service support for wireless telecommunications services: Petition received June 27, 2013 from Pinpoint Wireless, Inc. d/b/a BLAZE Wireless.

PREFILED TESTIMONY OF SUE VANICEK

Q: Please state your name for the record.

A: Sue Vanicek, V-A-N-I-C-E-K

Q: Where are you employed and in what capacity?

A: I am the Director of the Nebraska Telecommunications Infrastructure and Public Safety Department of the Nebraska Public Service Commission which administers the Nebraska Universal Service Fund. I have been employed by the Commission as Director since August 14, 2008.

Q: What Was Your Experience Prior To Your Current Position?

A: For 14 years I was employed by Lincoln Telephone/Aliant Communications. I held a variety of positions specializing in regulatory and legislative analysis and strategic planning. There I also served as Economic Costs and Analysis Manager. In that position I was responsible for managing the development of cost information, both forward-looking and historical. After leaving Aliant, I was
employed as a Senior Consultant at TELEC Consulting Resources now known as Consortia Consulting.

Q: **What Is Your Educational Background?**

A: I have Master of Arts degree in Economics and a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration, both from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Q: **What is the purpose of your testimony?**

A: To make recommendations and to discuss the Department’s opinion regarding the application of Pinpoint Wireless, Inc. d/b/a BLAZE Wireless (BLAZE).

Q: **Will you please describe the Department’s views regarding BLAZE’s application for NUSF support?**

A: Yes. My testimony will generally support the grant of support to BLAZE. The Commission has conditioned the grant of dedicated wireless fund program support on compliance with several requirements in prior years. I will briefly discuss these requirements.

Q: **Please describe the conditions the Commission has adopted in order for an applicant to receive Dedicated Wireless Fund Program support.**

A: The Commission has adopted five conditions for carriers seeking Dedicated Wireless Fund Program support. First, the Commission will approve new towers only in high-cost unserved andunderserved areas. Mr. Tyler Frost, the
Commission’s economist, will present testimony more fully explaining the staff’s methodology for determining towers which meet these criteria and for ranking the proposed tower locations in order to receive benefits for the greatest number of households.

Second, the Commission requires a carrier receiving support to construct the towers in such a way that the towers would be able to accommodate the collocation of additional equipment, such as CDMA and GSM, and have space reserved on those towers for public safety equipment. Third, the Commission requires a carrier receiving support to enter into roaming agreements with other carriers where technically feasible. Fourth, the Commission requires a carrier receiving support to place equipment on its towers to ensure that it is Phase II E911 capable in the event that it is requested to provide Phase II E911 by the particular PSAP in the area. Finally, the Commission will require a commitment from dedicated wireless fund program recipients which provide mobile broadband service in Nebraska to submit broadband availability data to the Commission and its vendors for the duration of the State Broadband Data and Development (SBDD) program so that this broadband coverage area can be depicted on the Commission’s state broadband data inventory map and on the National
Telecommunications and Information Administration’s (NTIA’s) national broadband map. This requirement applies to all towers a carrier operates which provide broadband service, not only the towers for which a carrier may receive dedicated wireless fund program support. The data should be updated on the schedule for updating data under the SBDD program, which calls for semiannual updates.

Q. **Do you have any recommendations as to costs the Commission should consider to be eligible for funding?**

A. Yes. The Commission has paid for equipment to be located on towers and for the costs associated with constructing a tower. We believe that these are the minimum necessary costs to fund so that a wireless carrier may construct a tower in an unserved or underserved area. BLAZE has included permitting costs and legal costs in its application. These costs have not been funded for any other applicants under this program. Therefore, the staff recommends that the permitting and legal costs should not be funded.

Q: **Does this conclude your testimony?**

A: Yes it does.
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