

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
)	
Verizon-West Virginia)	
Petition for Limited Modification of LATA)	
Boundary to Provide Expanded Local)	File No. NSD-L-00-232
Calling Service (ELCS))	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Adopted: December 19, 2001

Released: December 19, 2001

By the Acting Chief, Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On September 14, 2000, Verizon-West Virginia (“Verizon”), pursuant to Section 3(25) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended,¹ filed a petition (Petition) to provide two-way, non-optional expanded local calling service (ELCS) between various exchanges in West Virginia.² Verizon’s petition requests limited modifications of local access and transport area (LATA) boundaries.³ The requested modification would not affect the current local calling options; instead, the modification would only increase the local calling area. The petition was placed on public notice,⁴ and no comments were filed. For the reasons stated below, we grant Verizon’s request.

¹ See 47 U.S.C. § 153(25).

² Glenville and Gassaway are Verizon exchanges. Grantsville and Arnoldsburg are Citizens Telecommunications Company exchanges.

³ Section 3(25) of the Act defines LATAs as those areas established prior to enactment of the 1996 Act by a Bell Operating Company (BOC) such that no exchange area includes points within more than “one metropolitan statistical area, consolidated metropolitan statistical area, or State, except as expressly permitted under the AT&T Consent Decree”; or established or modified by a BOC after such date of enactment and approved by the Commission.

⁴ See Public Notice, “Comment Sought on Verizon-West Virginia Request for Limited Modification of LATA Boundaries to Provide Expanded Local Calling Service Between Various Exchanges in West Virginia, rel. Nov. 15, 2000.

II. BACKGROUND

2. Requests for new ELCS routes are generally initiated by local subscribers. IntraLATA ELCS routes can be ordered by the state commission.⁵ For interLATA routes, prior to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (1996 Act),⁶ the Bell Operating Companies (BOCs) were required to secure state approval and then obtain a waiver from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia (District Court).⁷ In the years between the Consent Decree⁸ and the 1996 Act, the District Court received more than one hundred requests for Consent Decree waivers to permit new interLATA ELCS routes.⁹ Because of the large number of requests involved and because most of the requests were non-controversial, the District Court developed a streamlined process for handling such requests.¹⁰

3. Under the streamlined process developed by the District Court, the BOC submitted its waiver request to the Department of Justice (Department). The Department reviewed the request and then submitted the request, along with the Department's recommendation, to the District Court. In evaluating ELCS requests, the Department and the District Court considered the number of customers or access lines involved¹¹ as well as whether a sufficiently strong community of interest between the exchanges justified granting a waiver of the Consent Decree.¹² A community of interest could be demonstrated by such evidence as: (1) poll results showing that customers in the affected exchange were willing to pay higher rates to be included in an expanded local calling area;¹³ (2) usage data demonstrating a high level of calling between the exchanges; and (3) narrative statements describing how the two exchanges were part of one community and how the lack of

⁵ *United States v. Western Electric Company, Inc.*, 569 F. Supp. 990, 995 (D.D.C. 1983). "The distance at which a local call becomes a long distance toll call has been, and will continue to be, determined exclusively by the various state regulatory bodies." *Id.*

⁶ Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).

⁷ *United States v. Western Electric*, 569 F. Supp. at 995.

⁸ The Consent Decree required AT&T to divest its ownership of the BOCs. *United States v. American Telephone and Telegraph Co.*, 552 F. Supp. 131 (D.D.C. 1982), *aff'd sub nom. Maryland v. United States*, 460 U.S. 1001 (1983).

⁹ Petitions for Limited Modification of LATA Boundaries to Provide Expanded Local Calling Service (ELCS) at Various Locations, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 10646, 10648 (*July 1997 Order*).

¹⁰ See *United States v. Western Electric Company, Inc.*, No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Feb. 6, 1984); *United States v. Western Electric Company, Inc.*, No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Mar. 15, 1984).

¹¹ See *United States v. Western Electric Company, Inc.*, No. 82-0192, slip op. at 3 n.8 (D.D.C. July 19, 1984) (*July 1984 Order*).

¹² See, e.g., *United States v. Western Electric Company, Inc.*, No. 82-0192 slip op. at 2, 3 n.3 (D.D.C. Jan. 31, 1985) (*Jan. 1985 Order*); *United States v. Western Electric Company, Inc.*, No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Dec. 3, 1993); *United States v. Western Electric Company, Inc.*, No. 82-0192 (D.D.C. Dec. 17, 1993).

¹³ See *July 1984 Order* at 2 n.5.

local calling between the exchanges caused problems for community residents.¹⁴ In addition, the Department and the District Court gave deference to the state's community of interest finding. The District Court also considered the competitive effects of granting a proposed ELCS waiver.¹⁵

4. Matters previously subject to the Consent Decree are now governed by the Act.¹⁶ Under section 3(25)(B) of the Act, BOCs may modify LATA boundaries, if such modifications are approved by the Commission.¹⁷ On July 15, 1997, the Commission released a decision granting 23 requests for limited boundary modification to permit ELCS.¹⁸ Although calls between the ELCS exchanges would now be treated as intraLATA, each ELCS exchange would remain assigned to the same LATA for purposes of classifying all other calls.¹⁹ The Commission stated that it would grant requests for such limited modifications only where a petitioning BOC showed that the ELCS was a traditional, non-optional service, a significant community of interest existed among the affected exchanges, and grant of the requested waiver would not have any anticompetitive effects.²⁰ The Commission stated further that a carrier would be deemed to have made a prima facie case supporting grant of the proposed modification if the ELCS petition: (1) has been approved by the state commission; (2) proposes only traditional local service (i.e., traditional, non-optional ELCS);

¹⁴ See *Jan. 1985 Order* at 2-3 & n.3.

¹⁵ See *July 1984 Order* at 3; *Jan. 1985 Order* at 2-3; *United States v. Western Electric Company, Inc.*, No. 82-0192, slip op. at 2 (D.D.C. May 18, 1993) (*May 1993 Order*). The District Court granted waivers for more than one hundred traditional, non-optional ELCS plans that allow the provision of traditional local telephone service between nearby exchanges. See, e.g., *Western Electric*, 569 F. Supp. at 1002 n.54; *July 1984 Order* at 3; *January 1985 Order* at 4. Under such plans, subscribers pay no extra charge for calls beyond their established monthly service charge (the plan involves a traditional charge), and all subscribers in the exchange are included in the plan (the plan is non-optional).

¹⁶ Section 601(a)(1) of the 1996 Act states that "[a]ny conduct or activity that was, before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to any restriction or obligation imposed by the AT&T Consent Decree shall, on and after such date, be subject to the restrictions and obligations imposed by the Communications Act of 1934 as amended by this Act and shall not be subject to the restrictions and obligations imposed by such Consent Decree." Exclusive Commission authority to approve any changes to LATA boundaries is consistent with the 1996 Act. See *Application for Review and Petition for Reconsideration or Clarification of Declaratory Ruling Regarding U S West Petitions to Consolidate LATAs in Minnesota and Arizona, Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 14 FCC Rcd 14392, 14399-14401, paras. 14-18 (1999).

¹⁷ See 47 U.S.C. § 153(25)(B).

¹⁸ *July 1997 Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 10646.

¹⁹ If an exchange were assigned to another LATA for all purposes, any existing local calling routes between that exchange and the original LATA would be lost because such traffic would now be interLATA and could no longer be carried by the BOC. Instead, the traffic would generally be carried by an interexchange carrier charging long distance toll rates.

²⁰ *July 1997 Order*, 12 FCC Rcd at 10649-50.

(3) indicates that the state commission found a sufficient community of interest to warrant such service; (4) documents this community of interest through such evidence as poll results, usage data, and descriptions of the communities involved; and (5) involves a limited number of customers or access lines.²¹

III. DISCUSSION

5. In 1988, the West Virginia Public Service Commission (WVPSC) adopted a calling plan known as the “Winfield Plan.”²² The Winfield Plan defined local calling areas as all wire centers within 22 miles of a customer’s home exchange, along with all contiguous exchanges even if the wire center of the contiguous exchange was beyond 22 miles. Calls to exchanges beyond the local calling area were defined as toll calls. This definition resulted in an expansion of local calling areas for all customers in the state, and ensured that calls to neighbors in adjacent exchanges would no longer be long distance calls.²³

6. Verizon proposes that the local calling area of its Glenville exchange be expanded to include Citizens’ Grantsville and Arnoldsburg exchanges. Verizon also proposes that the local calling area of its Gassaway exchange be expanded to include Grantsville and Arnoldsburg.²⁴ Were it not for the LATA boundary, local calling would exist between these exchanges pursuant to the Winfield Plan.

7. The Verizon petition proposes to establish two-way, non-optional ELCS, and is accompanied by: (1) a statement that no new local calling service plans will result from Commission approval of this request; callers will retain their existing plan, and only the local calling area will increase; (2) an order issued by the WVPSC finding a sufficient community of interest to warrant such service; (3) a statement of the number of access lines involved;²⁵ and (4)

²¹ *Id.* at 10659. The Commission also delegated authority to act on petitions to modify LATA boundaries to the Common Carrier Bureau. *Id.* at para 10657-58. On August 6, 1997, the Commission released a decision granting requests to modify LATA boundaries to permit three independent telephone company (ITC) exchanges in Texas to change LATA association for purposes of improving service to subscribers. The Commission stated that a carrier will be deemed to have made a prima facie case supporting grant of a proposed association change if the petition: (1) states that the association change is necessary because of planned upgrades to the ITC’s network or service that will require routing traffic through a different BOC LATA; (2) involves a limited number of access lines; and (3) includes a statement from the affected BOC(s) requesting a LATA modification, pursuant to section 3(25) of the Act, to permit the change in association. Petitions for LATA Association Changes by Independent Telephone Companies, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, 12 FCC Rcd 11769 (1977) (*August 1997 Order*).

²² Petition at 2. *See also* letter from Billy Jack Gregg, Director, Consumer Advocate Division, State of West Virginia, Public Service Commission (WVPSC) at 1.

²³ WVPSC at 1-2.

²⁴ Petition at 2-3.

²⁵ Glenville has 3,329 access lines. Gassaway has 2,558 access lines. Grantsville has 2,298 access lines. Arnoldsburg has 1,201 access lines.

usage data (expressed in messages per main station per month).²⁶ The brief descriptions of the community of interest reveal that many services (such as government services, schools, and businesses) are located such that customers must often incur toll calls and that making interLATA toll calls for such services generates significant expenses for these callers.

8. As we noted in the *July 1997 Order*, granting an ELCS petition removes the proposed route from the competitive interexchange market, and some LATA modifications could reduce the BOCs' incentive to open their own markets to competition pursuant to section 271 of the Act.²⁷ We believe that the small number of access lines and the small volume of traffic involved for the proposed ELCS areas in this petition, and the type of service to be offered makes it highly unlikely that provision of ELCS service would reduce Verizon's motivation to open its own market to competition. We conclude, therefore, that the information in the petition satisfies the criteria established in the *July 1997 Order*. Accordingly, the Division finds that the proposed LATA modifications will not have a significant anticompetitive effect on the interexchange market or on Verizon's incentive to open its own market to competition, and we approve Verizon's petition for limited LATA modifications in order to provide traditional, two-way, non-optional ELCS.

9. Granting Verizon's petition serves the public interest by permitting a minor LATA modification where such modification is necessary to meet the needs of local subscribers and will not have any significant effect on competition. The LATAs are modified solely for the limited purpose of allowing Verizon to provide traditional, two-way, non-optional local calling service between the specific exchanges or geographic areas identified in the requests. The LATAs are not modified to permit the BOC to offer any other type of service, including calls that originate or terminate outside the specified areas. Thus, traditional, two-way, non-optional ELCS between the specified exchanges will be treated as intraLATA, and the provisions of the Act governing intraLATA service will apply.²⁸ Other types of service between the specified exchanges will remain interLATA, and the provisions of the Act governing interLATA service will apply.

VI. CONCLUSION AND ORDERING CLAUSES

10. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to sections 3(25) and 4(i) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 153(25), 154(i), and authority delegated by Sections 0.91 and 0.291 of the Commission's rules, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.91, 0.291, that the request of Verizon-West Virginia for LATA modification for the limited purpose of providing traditional, two-way, non-optional ELCS at the specific location, identified in File No. NSD-L-00-232, IS APPROVED. The LATA boundary is modified solely for the purpose of providing traditional, two-way, non-optional ELCS between points in the specific exchanges or geographic areas indicated in the request. The LATA boundary for all other services shall remain unchanged.

²⁶ Glenville to Arnoldsburg: 0.11. Arnoldsburg to Glenville: 0.21. Glenville to Grantsville: 0.91. Grantsville to Glenville: 0.73. Gassaway to Arnoldsburg: 0.22. Arnoldsburg to Gassaway: 0.31.

²⁷ See U.S.C. § 271(b)(1).

²⁸ The BOC may provide ELCS service without meeting the section 271 requirements, see 47 U.S.C. § 271(a), and a separate affiliate is not required, see 47 U.S.C. § 272(a)(2)(B).

11. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that pursuant to section 416(a) of the Act, 47 U.S.C. § 416(a), the Secretary SHALL SERVE a copy of this order upon the petitioner, Verizon-West Virginia.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Diane Griffin Harmon
Acting Chief, Network Services Division
Common Carrier Bureau