

OPEN MEETING ITEM



0000020077

22

COMMISSIONERS
JEFF HATCH-MILLER - Chairman
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
MARC SPITZER
MIKE GLEASON
KRISTIN K. MAYES

ORIGINAL



ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DATE: April 11, 2005
DOCKET NO: T-04296A-04-0897
TO ALL PARTIES:

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Amanda Pope. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Order on:

RED RIVER NETWORKS, LLC
(CC&N/RESELLER)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and thirteen (13) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by **4:00 p.m.** on or before:

APRIL 20, 2005

The enclosed is NOT an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has tentatively been scheduled for the Commission's Open Meeting to be held on:

MAY 3 AND 4, 2005

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602)542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602)542-4250. For information about the Open Meeting, contact the Executive Secretary's Office at (602) 542-3931.

RECEIVED

2005 APR 11 A 11: 25

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

BRIAN C. McNEIL
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

APR 11 2005

DOCKETED BY

1
2 **BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

3 COMMISSIONERS

4 JEFF HATCH-MILLER, Chairman
5 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
6 MARC SPITZER
7 MIKE GLEASON
8 KRISTIN K. MAYES

9 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
10 RED RIVER NETWORKS, LLC FOR A
11 CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND
12 NECESSITY TO PROVIDE RESOLD
13 INTEREXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS
14 SERVICES, EXCEPT LOCAL EXCHANGE
15 SERVICES.

DOCKET NO. T-04296A-04-0897

DECISION NO. _____

ORDER

16 Open Meeting
17 May 3 and 4, 2005
18 Phoenix, Arizona

19 **BY THE COMMISSION:**

20 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the
21 Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that:

22 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

- 23 1. On December 15, 2004, Red River Networks, LLC ("Applicant" or "Red River") filed
24 with the Commission an application for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("Certificate") to
25 provide competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services within the State of Arizona.
- 26 2. Applicant is a switchless reseller that purchases telecommunications services from a
27 variety of carriers for resale to its customers.
- 28 3. In Decision No. 58926 (December 22, 1994), the Commission found that resold
telecommunications providers ("resellers") are public service corporations subject to the jurisdiction
of the Commission.
4. Red River has authority to transact business in the State of Arizona.
5. On January 25, 2005, Red River filed in this docket an Affidavit of Publication
verifying that it had published notice of its application in all counties where service will be provided.
6. On February 28, 2005, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed a Staff

1 Report in this matter recommending approval of the application subject to certain conditions.

2 7. In the Staff Report, Staff stated that Red River provided unaudited financial statements
3 for the six months ending June 30, 2004, which list assets of \$2,086,036, negative equity of
4 \$707,222, and a net income of \$332,687.

5 8. In its Staff Report, Staff stated that based on information obtained from the Applicant,
6 it has determined that Red River's fair value rate base ("FVRB") is zero and is not useful in either a
7 fair value analysis or in setting rates. Staff further stated that in general, rates for competitive
8 services are not set according to rate of return regulation. Staff has reviewed the rates to be charged
9 by the Applicant and believes they are just and reasonable as they are comparable to several long
10 distance carriers operating in Arizona and comparable to the rates the Applicant charges in other
11 jurisdictions. Therefore, while Staff considered the FVRB information submitted by the Applicant,
12 that information should not be given substantial weight in this analysis.

13 9. Staff believes that Red River has no market power and that the reasonableness of its
14 rates will be evaluated in a market with numerous competitors. Staff believes that the rates in
15 Applicant's proposed tariffs for its competitive services will be just and reasonable and recommends
16 that the Commission approve them.

17 10. Based on its evaluation of the Applicant's technical, managerial, and financial
18 capabilities to provide resold interexchange services, Staff recommended approval of Red River's
19 application and also recommended that:

20 (a) The Applicant should be ordered to comply with all Commission rules, orders,
21 and other requirements relevant to the provision of intrastate telecommunications
22 service;

23 (b) The Applicant should be ordered to maintain its accounts and records as
24 required by the Commission;

25 (c) The Applicant should be ordered to file with the Commission all financial and
26 other reports that the Commission may require, and in a form and at such times as the
27 Commission may designate;

28 (d) The Applicant should be ordered to maintain on file with the Commission all
current tariffs and rates, and any service standards that the Commission may require;

1 (e) The Applicant should be ordered to comply with the Commission's rules and
2 modify its tariffs to conform to those rules if it is determined that there is a conflict
between the Applicant's tariffs and the Commission's rules;

3 (f) The Applicant should be ordered to cooperate with Commission investigations
4 including, but not limited to customer complaints;

5 (g) The Applicant should be ordered to participate in and contribute to the Arizona
6 Universal Service Fund, as required by the Commission;

7 (h) The Applicant should be ordered to notify the Commission immediately upon
8 changes to the Applicant's name, address or telephone number;

9 (i) The Applicant's intrastate interexchange service offerings should be classified
10 as competitive pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1108;

11 (j) The Applicant's maximum rates should be the maximum rates proposed by the
12 Applicant in its proposed tariffs. The minimum rates for the Applicant's competitive
services should be the Applicant's total service long run incremental costs of
providing those services as set forth in A.A.C. R14-2-1109; and

13 (k) In the event that the Applicant states only one rate in its proposed tariff for a
14 competitive service, the rate stated should be the effective (actual) price to be charged
for the service as well as the service's maximum rate.

15 11. Staff further recommended that Red River's Certificate should be conditioned upon
16 the Applicant filing conforming tariffs in accordance with this Decision within 365 days from the
17 date of an Order in this matter, or 30 days prior to providing service, whichever comes first.

18 12. Staff recommended that if the Applicant fails to meet the timeframes outlined in
19 Findings of Fact No. 11 above, that Red River's Certificate should become null and void without
20 further Order of the Commission and that no time extensions for compliance should be granted.

21 13. Based upon Red River's original tariff, Staff indicated that it may collect advances,
22 deposits and/or prepayments from its customers. Consequently, Staff recommended that Red River's
23 Certificate should be conditioned upon the Applicant procuring a performance bond in the amount of
24 \$10,000 within 365 days from the date of an Order in this matter, or 30 days prior to providing
25 service, whichever comes first.

26 14. Staff further recommended that the Applicant be required to file a request for
27 cancellation of its established performance bond relating to the provision of resold interexchange
28

1 service if, at some time in the future, the Applicant does not collect from its customers an advance,
2 deposit, and/or prepayment. Such request shall be filed with the Commission for Staff review. Upon
3 receipt of such filing and after Staff review, Staff will forward its recommendation to the
4 Commission

5 15. On March 11, 2005, Red River filed a revision to its Arizona Tariff by which it
6 indicated that it would not require customer deposits, and accordingly, Red River requested a waiver
7 of the performance bond recommended by Staff in its February 28, 2005 Staff Report.

8 16. By Procedural Order dated March 21, 2005, Staff was ordered to respond to Red
9 River's March 11, 2005 filing.

10 17. On April 1, 2005, Staff filed a responsive memorandum, which indicated that a
11 performance bond is not necessary given Red River's tariff revision.

12 18. Additionally, Staff recommended that Red River be required to file an application with
13 the Commission for Commission approval if, at some future date, Red River wants to collect
14 advances, deposits and/or prepayments from its resold interexchange customers. Such application
15 must reference the decision in this Docket and explain Red River's plan for procuring a performance
16 bond.

17 19. Staff recommended that the Applicant should be required to provide notice to the
18 Commission and its customers in the event it requests to discontinue service and/or abandon its
19 service area, and Staff indicates that such notice(s) shall be in accordance with Arizona
20 Administrative Code ("A.A.C.") R14-2-1107. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1107, Red River is required
21 to comply, and obtain Commission authorization of compliance, with all of the requirements,
22 including but not limited to the notice requirements, prior to the discontinuance of service and/or
23 abandonment of its service area.

24 20. The rates proposed by this filing are for competitive services.

25 21. Staff's recommendations, as modified by its April 1, 2005 filing, are reasonable and
26 should be adopted.

27 22. Red River's fair value rate base is zero.

28

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1
2 1. Applicant is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the
3 Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§ 40-281 and 40-282.

4 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Applicant and the subject matter of the
5 application.

6 3. Notice of the application was given in accordance with the law.

7 4. Applicant's provision of resold interexchange telecommunications services is in the
8 public interest.

9 5. Applicant is a fit and proper entity to receive a Certificate as conditioned herein for
10 providing competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services in Arizona.

11 6. Staff's recommendations, as modified by its April 1, 2005 filing, are reasonable and
12 should be adopted.

13 7. Red River's fair value rate base is not useful in determining just and reasonable rates
14 for the competitive services it proposes to provide to Arizona customers.

15 8. Red River's rates, as they appear in its proposed tariffs, are just and reasonable and
16 should be approved.

17 **ORDER**

18 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application of Red River Networks, LLC for a
19 Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for authority to provide competitive resold interexchange
20 telecommunications services is hereby granted, conditioned upon Red River Network LLC's timely
21 compliance with the following Ordering Paragraphs.

22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Red River Networks, LLC shall file conforming tariffs in
23 accordance with this Decision within 365 days of this Decision or 30 days prior to providing service,
24 whichever comes first.

25 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if Red River Networks, LLC fails to meet the timeframe
26 outlined in the Ordering Paragraph above, that the Certificate of Convenience and Necessity
27 conditionally granted herein shall become null and void without further Order of the Commission.

28 ...

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Red River Networks, LLC shall comply with all of the
2 Staff recommendations as modified and set forth in the above-stated Findings of Fact and
3 Conclusions of Law.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

5 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.
6
7

8 CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER

10
11 COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER

12
13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive
14 Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have
15 hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
16 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,
17 this ____ day of _____, 2005.

18
19 _____
20 BRIAN C. McNEIL
21 EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

22 DISSENT _____

23 DISSENT _____

24 AP:mj
25
26
27
28

1 SERVICE LIST FOR: RED RIVER NETWORKS, LLC

2 DOCKET NO. T-04296A-04-0897

3
4 Judith A. Riley
5 Telecom Professionals, Inc.
6 2912 Lakeside Drive
7 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73120

8 Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
9 Legal Division
10 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
11 1200 West Washington Street
12 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

13 Ernest G. Johnson, Director
14 Utilities Division
15 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
16 1200 West Washington Street
17 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33