

Decision No. C04-0629

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO**

DOCKET NO. 04M-220T

---

IN THE MATTER OF DUBOIS TELEPHONE EXCHANGE, INC.'S PETITION FOR  
SUSPENSION OF LNP REQUIREMENTS.

---

**DECISION GRANTING PETITION IN PART**

---

---

Mailed Date: June 11, 2004  
Adopted Date: June 2, 2004

**I. BY THE COMMISSION**

**A. Statement**

1. On May 3, 2004, Dubois Telephone Exchange, Inc. (Dubois), filed a Combined Petition for Suspension and Motion for Expedited Treatment and Waiver of Response Time (Petition) requesting that the Commission temporarily suspend its wireline to wireless local number portability (LNP) obligations to Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS or wireless) providers in its exchange until May 24, 2006. Dubois makes this request pursuant to § 251(f)(2) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act), 47 U.S.C. § 251(f)(2).

2. At our weekly meeting on May 5, 2004, we shortened the notice period of this Petition to 15 days. No interventions were filed in this matter.

3. The Dubois exchange is geographically located outside the Denver Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which is the only MSA in Colorado that is in the top 100 in the United States. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) rules require that telecommunications carriers providing service outside the top 100 MSAs provide LNP by May 24, 2004, or six months after receiving a request to port a number, whichever is later. Dubois, in its Petition,

requests that we find under § 251(f)(2) that it is contrary to the public interest, unduly economically burdensome, and technically infeasible for the Petitioner to implement LNP in its exchange.

4. Section 251(f)(2) of the Act provides:

Suspension and modifications for rural carriers. A local exchange carrier with fewer than 2 percent of the Nation's subscriber lines installed in the aggregate nationwide may petition a State commission for a suspension or modification of the application of a requirement or requirements of subsection (b) or (c) of this section to telephone exchange service facilities specified in such petition. The State commission shall grant such petition to the extent that, and for such duration as, the State commission determines that such suspension or modification –

- (A) is necessary –
  - i. to avoid a significant adverse economic impact on users of telecommunications service generally;
  - ii. to avoid imposing a requirement that is unduly economically burdensome; or
  - iii. to avoid imposing a requirement that is technically infeasible; and
- (B) is consistent with the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

5. Dubois qualifies as a “rural telephone company” as defined in 47 U.S.C. § 153(37) and is a local exchange carrier with fewer than 2 percent of the nation's subscriber lines installed in the aggregate nationwide.

6. Dubois states in its Petition that one of the most significant reasons why this Petition should be granted, and why the implementation of LNP by rural carriers is contrary to the public interest and unduly economically burdensome, is because of the complete lack of any demand for LNP in the Dubois exchange. Dubois asserts that it has not received any customer requests to port a number since the enactment of the Act eight years ago, even with the increased publicity since November 2003.

7. As to economic burden, Dubois states that its costs for implementing LNP will total approximately \$20,298 or \$5.55 per month per access line with a five-year recovery period. Dubois asserts that it is contrary to the public interest to force its customers (currently only 90 access lines) to incur the expense for a service they do not demand.

8. Dubois does admit in its Petition that it has received a request for LNP service by May 24, 2004 from the CMRS provider Verizon Wireless. To Dubois' knowledge, none of its end-use customers has made any request to have his or her wireline number ported to a wireless carrier. We note that Verizon Wireless did not file an intervention in this docket.

9. In its November 10, 2003 order,<sup>1</sup> the FCC stated: "Carriers inside the 100 largest MSAs (or outside the 100 largest MSAs, after the transition period) may file petitions for waiver of their obligation to port numbers to wireless carriers, if they can provide substantial, credible evidence that there are special circumstances that warrant departure from existing rules." This high level of scrutiny imposed by the FCC is a direct result of the FCC's strong statement that "we continue to deem rapid implementation of number portability to be in the public interest."<sup>2</sup> Further, in its November 10, 2003 order, the FCC reiterated its position that "number portability promotes competition between telecommunications service providers by, among other things, allowing customers to respond to price and service changes without changing their telephone numbers."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See In Re Telephone Number Portability, CTIA Petitions for Declaratory Ruling on Wireline-Wireless Porting Issues, CC Docket No. 95-116 (November 10, 2003 Order).

<sup>2</sup> See In Re Telephone Number Portability, CC Docket No. 95-116 (January 16, 2004 Order).

<sup>3</sup> November 10, 2003 Order, at ¶ 4.

10. We agree with Dubois that consumers will not likely be adversely impacted by the grant of a waiver to this carrier. According to the Petition, Dubois has not received requests or even inquiries from its customers concerning its ability to port their wireline numbers. This fact and that fact that this is an uncontested matter, demonstrate to us an impracticality of imposing such a large economic burden on Dubois' customers without purpose.

11. We agree with the FCC's statement in its January 16, 2004 order, that:

. . . [I]n order to offer intermodal portability to their subscribers, these smaller carriers must acquire the hardware and software necessary to provide porting, make the necessary network upgrades, and ensure that their upgraded networks work reliably and accurately. Some of the Petitioners also assert that Two Percent Carriers often lack the experience and technical experience with number porting to quickly implement the necessary upgrades to their systems to ensure accurate porting. Accordingly, we conclude that special circumstances exist to grant Two Percent Carriers who have not previously upgraded their systems to support LNP a limited amount of additional time to overcome the technological obstacles they face to successfully meet a request for wireline-to-wireless porting.<sup>4</sup>

12. In that order, the FCC granted these rural providers an additional six months to provide LNP.

13. We note that Dubois states in its Petition for waiver that it has already purchased and installed the necessary LNP software to upgrade its switch, but the software has not yet been tested with the switch vendor. It appears to us that because Dubois has taken proactive steps to implement LNP, a two-year waiver is not necessary. We believe that Dubois can accomplish the necessary testing, vendor agreements, and administrative changes within one year. If this is not the case, or if there are circumstances with Dubois' Wyoming operations that will make this

---

<sup>4</sup> January 16, 2004 Order.

impossible, Dubois can file for an additional waiver next year and supply us with further information.

14. Therefore, Dubois is required to implement LNP in its exchange no later than May 24, 2005, absent further order from this Commission. We do not agree with, and will not grant, Dubois' request for biennial renewals after May 24, 2005, absent further filing from Dubois.

**II. ORDER**

**A. The Commission Orders That:**

1. The Petition for Suspension of the Local Number Portability Requirements of Dubois Telephone Exchange, Inc., is granted in part consistent with the above discussion.
2. This Order is effective on its Mailed Date.

**B. ADOPTED IN COMMISSIONERS' WEEKLY MEETING  
June 2, 2004.**

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Commissioners