

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

In the Matter of)
Connect America Fund) WC Docket No. 10-90
Rural Digital Opportunity Fund) WC Docket No. 19-126
Rural Digital Opportunity Fund Auction (Auction) AU Docket No. 20-34
904))

ORDER

Adopted: March 3, 2026

Released: March 3, 2026

By the Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau:

1. In this Order, the Wireline Competition Bureau (WCB or Bureau) denies Savage Communications, Inc.'s (Savage) request for waiver of the Federal Communications Commission's (Commission) Rural Digital Opportunity Fund (RDOF) non-compliance rules. We find that Savage did not demonstrate that good cause supports waiving the non-compliance rules or reducing the required support recovery.

I. BACKGROUND

2. Savage submitted a short-form application to participate in the RDOF auction pursuant to the program rules and was found qualified to bid. Savage then bid in the auction where it identified the areas where it would like to provide service meeting the RDOF obligations, the performance tier and level of latency at which it proposed to provide service, and the level of support it would need to offer voice and broadband service meeting the relevant performance obligations. Savage outbid other auction participants and was announced as a winning bidder.

3. After being announced as an RDOF winning bidder, Savage filed a long-form application seeking to be authorized to receive support for the winning bids in exchange for providing voice and

1 Savage Communications Petition for Review, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al. (filed Nov. 24, 2025) (Savage Petition).

2 386 Applicants Qualified to Bid in the Rural Digital Opportunity Fund Phase I Auction (Auction 904); Bidding to Begin on October 29, 2020, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, 35 FCC Rcd 11356, 11382-83, Attach A. (WCB/OEA 2020).

3 Rural Digital Opportunity Fund Phase I Auction Scheduled for October 29, 2020; Notice and Filing Requirements and Other Procedures for Auction 904, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, 35 FCC Rcd 6077, 6146, paras. 209-11 (2020) (Auction 904 Procedures Public Notice).

4 Rural Digital Opportunity Fund Phase I Auction (Auction 904) Closes; Winning Bidders Announced; FCC Form 683 Due January 29, 2021, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, 35 FCC Rcd 13888, 13923, 13926, Attach A (WCB/OEA 2020).

broadband service.⁵ In December 2021, Savage was authorized to receive \$6,090,479.10 in RDOF support over 10 years to serve 4,541 model-estimated locations in Minnesota.⁶ In September 2025, WCB approved Savage's transfer of its remaining RDOF support and obligations associated with its non-defaulted RDOF winning bids to Midcontinent Communications (Midcontinent).⁷

4. Once authorized for support, RDOF carriers must offer voice and broadband service meeting the relevant performance requirements to a set number of locations by certain service milestones.⁸ The number of locations carriers are required to serve is based on the Connect America Cost Model's (CAM) estimate of how many locations are in the eligible census blocks in the carrier's service area, and compliance with service milestones is determined on a state-level basis—i.e., the Bureau will confirm a carrier is serving the required location total across all of its eligible census blocks within a state, rather than on a census-block-by-census-block basis.⁹

5. In November 2025, Savage officially notified the Bureau that it did not intend to meet its RDOF obligations in certain census block groups (CBGs) covering 1,310 model-estimated locations and acknowledging it “may be subject to the applicable non-compliance rules.”¹⁰ The Bureau stopped Savage's future RDOF support and announced Savage's default in a public notice in February 2026.¹¹

6. The Commission takes compliance with the terms and conditions of RDOF seriously and imposes non-compliance measures if the requirements are not met. If an RDOF carrier fails to meet the interim service milestones, it will be subject to non-compliance measures that scale with the extent of non-compliance, including additional reporting requirements, withholding of future support, and recovery of support already paid.¹² For an RDOF carrier's sixth year 100% service milestone, the amount of support recovery scales with the size of the non-compliance gap.¹³ Carriers must pay the required support

⁵ *417 Long-Form Applicants in the Rural Digital Opportunity Fund Phase I Auction (Auction 904)*, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, 36 FCC Rcd 4140 (WCB/OEA 2021) (*Auction 904 Long-Form Applicants Public Notice*).

⁶ *Rural Digital Opportunity Fund Support Authorized for 2,008 Winning Bids*, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, 36 FCC Rcd 17198 (WCB/OEA 2021) (*Savage Authorization Public Notice*).

⁷ *Domestic Section 214 Application Granted for the Acquisition of Certain Assets of Savage Communications, Inc. by Midcontinent Media, Inc.*, WC Docket No. 25-507, Public Notice, DA 25-908 (WCB Sept. 26, 2025).

⁸ 47 CFR § 54.802(c); *Rural Digital Opportunity Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 19-126 et al., Report and Order, 35 FCC Rcd 686, 709-12, paras. 45-55 (2020) (*RDOF Order*).

⁹ *RDOF Order*, 35 FCC Rcd at 712, para. 54.

¹⁰ Letter from Scott Friedman, Counsel for Savage Communications, Inc., to Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, FCC, WC Docket No. 19-126 et al. (filed Nov. 19, 2025) (*Savage Withdrawal Letter*).

¹¹ *Wireline Competition Bureau Announces Savage Communications, FiberLight of Virginia, South Central Connect, Siuslaw Broadband, and Southwest Arkansas Telecommunications & Technology Open Certain Minnesota, Virginia, Arkansas, Oregon, and Louisiana RDOF Census Block Groups to Eligibility for Other Funding Programs*, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, DA 26-126 (WCB Feb. 5, 2026) (*Savage Default Public Notice*).

¹² 47 CFR §§ 54.320(d)(1), 54.806(c); *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Report and Order, 29 FCC Rcd 15644, 15694-700, paras. 142-54 (2014) (*2014 Connect America Order*) (adopting a framework for support reductions, support recovery, and reporting obligations that are calibrated to the extent of a carrier's non-compliance with service milestones).

¹³ 47 CFR § 54.806(c)(1)(i)(A)-(C); *RDOF Order*, 35 FCC Rcd at 714-15, para. 60. Specifically, 1) if the RDOF carrier has deployed to 95% or more of its required locations but less than 100%, USAC will recover an amount of support that is equal to 1.25 times the average amount of support per location the RDOF carrier received in the state over the support term for the unserved locations; 2) if the RDOF carrier has deployed to 90% or more of its required locations but less than 95%, USAC will recover an amount of support that is equal to 1.5 times the average amount

(continued....)

recovery within six months after support recovery is initiated, or the Bureau will direct the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) to draw on the carrier's letter of credit.¹⁴ RDOF carriers are also subject to other non-compliance measures including, but not limited to, the Commission's enforcement procedures and penalties, reductions in support amounts, potential revocation of eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) designation, and suspension or debarment.¹⁵

7. *Savage's Request for Waiver.* In December 2025, Savage submitted a petition requesting waiver of the Commission's non-compliance rules.¹⁶ Savage requests that the Commission generally waive its non-compliance rules,¹⁷ and if it denies this relief, Savage requests that the Commission reduce the required support recovery.¹⁸ Savage claims there is good cause to grant the waiver, citing its inability to obtain a right-of-way access "despite good faith efforts and consultation with Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Tribe,"¹⁹ and explains that Consolidated Telephone Company (Consolidated) had received funding from a Minnesota county to offer broadband in one of the defaulted CBGs.²⁰ Savage also indicates that it "was required to surrender four" of its RDOF CBGs as a result of being acquired by and transferring the RDOF support and obligations associated with the remaining 14 RDOF CBGs to Midcontinent,²¹ and emphasizes its commitment to meeting the RDOF obligations as evidenced by the fact that had "connected 572 locations" across the defaulted CBGs.²² Finally, Savage claims that the support recovery "would be unreasonable and disproportionate to the harm" caused by the defaults.²³

II. DISCUSSION

8. Generally, the Commission's rules may be waived for good cause shown.²⁴ Waiver of the Commission's rules is appropriate only if both: (1) special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule, and (2) such deviation will serve the public interest.²⁵

9. We do not find good cause to waive the non-compliance rules or reduce the required support recovery for Savage. Specifically, we are not convinced that Savage has demonstrated special

(Continued from previous page) _____
of support per location the RDOF carrier received in the state over the support term for the unserved locations, plus 5% of total authorized RDOF support for that state; and 3) if the RDOF carrier has deployed to fewer than 90% of its required locations, USAC will recover an amount of support that is equal to 1.75 times the average amount of support per location the RDOF carrier received in the state over the support term for the unserved locations, plus 10% of total authorized RDOF support for that state. *Id.*

¹⁴ 47 CFR § 54.804(c)(4)(i); *RDOF Order*, 35 FCC Rcd at 715, para. 63.

¹⁵ 47 CFR §§ 54.320(c), 54.806(b); *RDOF Order*, 35 FCC Rcd at 716, para. 63.

¹⁶ *See generally* Savage Petition.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 1 (citing 47 CFR §§ 1.21004, 54.320(d), 54.806(c)). We note that 47 CFR § 1.21004 applies to pre-authorization defaults and is not applicable here.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 1 (requesting that in the alternative the Commission reduce the 1.75 multiplier and 10% of authorized support that will apply pursuant to section 54.806(c)(i)(C)).

¹⁹ *Id.* at 3-4, 6-7.

²⁰ *Id.* at 4, 7-8.

²¹ *Id.* at 2, 8-9.

²² *Id.* at 3, 9-10.

²³ *Id.* at 10.

²⁴ 47 CFR § 1.3.

²⁵ *See Northeast Cellular Tel. Co. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d 1164, 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (citing *WAIT Radio v. FCC*, 418 F.2d 1153, 1157-59 (D.C. Cir. 1969), *cert. denied*, 93 S.Ct. 461 (1972)).

circumstances that warrant eliminating or reducing the required support recovery, or otherwise waiving the non-compliance rules. Although Savage claims its commitment to fulfilling the RDOF obligations up until its transaction with Midcontinent demonstrates “good faith efforts” that warrant relief,²⁶ we do not consider it special circumstances warranting relief for Savage to work towards meeting the service milestones it is required to achieve as an authorized recipient of RDOF support.²⁷ Additionally, while Savage has served 572 locations within the defaulted RDOF CBGs,²⁸ it has not met its commitment to be subject to the RDOF obligations for the full 10-year support term as a condition of being authorized to receive the support. For example, by exiting the RDOF program Savage is no longer committed to continue serving the locations at reasonably comparable rates for the duration of the 10-year support term, is not subject to the requirements that it conduct performance testing to demonstrate it is meeting the applicable performance requirements, and is not required to serve any newly built locations in the CBG upon reasonable request.²⁹ Moreover, Savage made the business decision to enter into an agreement with Midcontinent in which Savage was acquired.³⁰ The fact that this business decision resulted in Savage having to default on its RDOF obligations does not constitute special circumstances.

10. Similarly, we are not convinced that Savage’s inability to secure a right-of-way to complete its build constitutes special circumstances in this context.³¹ Although the Commission has previously said that a carrier may seek an extension of time or waiver of service milestones due to “circumstances beyond its control” and cites “an inability to secure a right of way” as one such circumstance,³² RDOF bidders were also required to conduct the necessary due diligence to identify any obstacles to meeting their RDOF obligations and certify in their short-form applications that they acknowledged this responsibility.³³ The Commission explained that due diligence included “engag[ing] in outreach to Tribal entities as early as possible to ensure that no issues arise post-auction”³⁴ Accordingly, a failure to obtain a right-of-way does not necessarily constitute good cause for the waiver

²⁶ Savage Petition at 3, 9-10.

²⁷ See *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Order, DA 25-1082, at 9-10, para. 20 (WCB Dec. 18, 2025) (*Blackfoot Support Recovery Order*).

²⁸ Savage Petition at 1, 3, 9.

²⁹ See, e.g., 47 CFR §§ 54.320(d)(2), 54.802(c), 54.806(b); *Savage Authorization Public Notice*, 36 FCC Rcd at 17198-208 (providing a non-comprehensive summary of the RDOF terms and conditions). See also *Wireline Competition Bureau Announces Certain RDOF and CAF Phase II Auction Census Block Groups are Eligible for Other Funding Programs*, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, 39 FCC Rcd 3871, 3875-76 (disagreeing with a defaulting RDOF carrier’s claims that it had met its RDOF obligations by serving the relevant locations because the carrier “will not be subject to performance testing and reporting in the state, and we will have no way to confirm that [the carrier] will continue to meet the required performance obligations for the remainder of the RDOF support term”).

³⁰ Savage Petition at 2, 8-9 (explaining that it “was required to surrender” the defaulted CBGs as part of its transaction with Midcontinent).

³¹ *Id.* at 3-4, 6-7.

³² *2014 Connect America Order*, 29 FCC Rcd at 15700, para. 154.

³³ Each RDOF bidder was required to certify in its short-form application that it acknowledged it “has sole responsibility for investigating and evaluating all technical and marketplace factors that may have a bearing on the level of [RDOF] support it submits as a bid, and that if the applicant wins support, it will be able to build and operate facilities in accordance with the [RDOF] obligations and the Commission’s rules generally.” *Auction 904 Procedures Public Notice*, 35 FCC Rcd at 6125-27, paras. 128-33. See also *RDOF Order*, 20 FCC Rcd at 725, para. 85 (explaining that the certification “will help ensure . . . the applicant will not attempt to place responsibility for the consequences of its bidding activity on either the Commission or third parties.”).

³⁴ *Auction 904 Procedures Public Notice*, 35 FCC Rcd at 6126-27, para. 134.

of an RDOF service milestone and any applicable non-compliance measures. The Minnesota Department of Transportation's Cultural Resources Unit denied the right-of-way, citing its finding that a Minnesota Indian Affairs Council "burial ground overlaps the current permit area" as a reason the state could not "approve the permit work as currently proposed."³⁵ Although Savage claims it engaged in "good faith efforts and consultation" with the impacted Tribe, it has not demonstrated that it conducted sufficient due diligence to determine whether it would have difficulty securing or not be able to obtain the necessary rights-of-way from the state in the areas where it bid to receive support or whether it pursued any other alternatives for completing the required build.³⁶ Essentially, Savage has not demonstrated its inability to deploy service to the affected locations resulted from "circumstances beyond its control" or whether there is otherwise good cause to grant the waiver.³⁷

11. Moreover, we disagree with Savage's claim that the Bureau's previous decision to waive a service milestone for Frontier Communications Corporation (Frontier) which was delayed in obtaining rights-of-way from a Tribe is controlling here.³⁸ Frontier participated in the Connect America Fund Phase II model-based support program, which did not require a due diligence certification, and was offered support for its service area on a statewide basis rather than having the opportunity to choose the CBGs for which it would seek support.³⁹ Moreover, the Bureau was persuaded by Frontier's demonstration that it in good faith mistakenly believed that it had the appropriate rights-of-way.⁴⁰ The Bureau provided a limited waiver of a service milestone for Frontier to give it more time to work through its rights-of-way issues with the relevant Tribe.⁴¹ However, the Bureau did not relieve Frontier from its CAF Phase II service obligations and reiterated that it anticipated that the locations would be served.⁴² In fact, the Bureau found the waiver served the public interest because it would facilitate Frontier's ability to serve the impacted locations by the end of the deployment term, "promot[ing] the Commission's universal service goal of ensuring deployment of broadband service to previously unserved and underserved high-cost locations."⁴³ The facts materially differ from Savage's situation. Savage was subject to due diligence requirements, did not have a reason to believe it already had the appropriate right-of-way, was denied the right-of-way by the state, and now seeks to avoid the support recovery associated with its failure to serve the required locations.

12. Despite the fact that Consolidated received some public funding to serve a portion of the CBG after Savage was announced as an RDOF winning bidder, we also do not agree that our

³⁵ Savage Petition at Exh. 3.

³⁶ Savage claims to have pursued the right-of-way for over two years, but did not indicate what steps, if any, it took prior to bidding or while pursuing its authorization to determine whether it may face obstacles in serving the locations covered by its winning bids. *Id.* at 7.

³⁷ *2014 Connect America Order*, 29 FCC Rcd at 15700, para. 154.

³⁸ Savage Petition at 6-7.

³⁹ *Connect America Fund Petition for Waiver of Frontier Communications Corporation*, WC Docket No. 10-90, Order, 35 FCC Rcd 496 (WCB 2020) (*Frontier Waiver Order*). See also *2014 Connect America Order*, 29 FCC Rcd 15644 (adopting the terms and conditions for Connect America Fund Phase II model-based support).

⁴⁰ *Frontier Waiver Order*, 35 FCC Rcd at 497-98, para. 5 (finding that "Frontier presented ample evidence" and noting that the Bureau made its decision on "[t]he totality of the evidence").

⁴¹ *Id.* at 498, para. 6.

⁴² *Id.* (explaining that the Bureau expected "Frontier will continue to work diligently to reach a resolution on this issue with both [the Bureau of Indian Affairs] and the Navajo Nation and anticipate that the locations in question here will be served no later than the end of 2020.").

⁴³ *Id.*

deduplication precedent is relevant.⁴⁴ While we have acknowledged the importance of maximizing public support, we have only deduplicated funding where an entire CBG is covered to ensure no rural Americans are left behind, except in the narrow, unique circumstance of locations on Tribal land, which does not apply in this situation.⁴⁵ Consolidated has only received funding to serve some of the locations in the relevant CBG.⁴⁶ Savage offers service to the remaining locations, but Savage is not offering all of the locations broadband at the required RDOF speeds of 1 Gbps/500 Mbps.⁴⁷ Moreover, because Savage is exiting RDOF, it is not committed to continue to offer service at the required speeds or meet the remaining terms and conditions of the 10-year RDOF program. There is a greater risk that Savage (or Midcontinent which acquired Savage), which sought RDOF support to serve the relevant locations, would cease providing service to the affected locations once it no longer receives RDOF support when compared to a carrier that is obligated to offer service to the locations pursuant to an enforceable buildout commitment or a carrier that made the business decision to offer service to a location at RDOF speeds without public funding. We also find that the public interest considerations are different when an RDOF carrier is renegeing on its commitment to meet the terms and conditions of the program for locations within a CBG that are not otherwise being served by another carrier at RDOF speeds.

13. We find that waiving the support recovery rules to reduce or eliminate support recovery or otherwise waive the Commission's non-compliance rules would not serve the public interest. Savage sought authorization fully on notice of the terms and conditions of the RDOF program, that its authorization was conditioned on meeting the terms and conditions of the program, and of the objective calculation that the Commission would use to determine the required support recovery if Savage did not meet these obligations.⁴⁸ Consistent with precedent, we conclude that in these specific circumstances it would undermine auction integrity to provide the requested relief.⁴⁹ RDOF bidders may have bid differently in the auction if they knew that the Bureau would reduce or apply a different methodology for

⁴⁴ Savage Petition at 4, 7-8.

⁴⁵ See *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Order, 39 FCC Rcd 13732, 13734-35, paras. 9-10 (WCB 2024) (granting deduplication relief where another carrier had “an enforceable buildout obligation to serve every location” in the RDOF carrier’s relevant RDOF CBGs). Compare *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Order, 39 FCC Rcd 9751, 9754-55, paras. 9-10 (WCB 2024) (granting deduplication relief in a carrier’s RDOF areas overlapped by two Tribes’ Tribal Broadband Connectivity Program awards when the carrier and Tribes mutually agreed that the RDOF carrier should forgo the RDOF funding). Tribal boundaries do not neatly align with CBGs, and the Tribe typically in these scenarios has not explicitly granted consent to a carrier’s network deployment on Tribal land. See also *Wireline Competition Bureau Announces Lumen Technologies, Inc. and Commnet Four Corners, LLC Open RDOF Census Block Groups to Eligibility for other Funding Programs in Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Oregon, and Washington*, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, 40 FCC Rcd 5279 (WCB 2025) (explaining that “[t]he minimum geographic unit for bidding for RDOF was a CBG containing one [or] more eligible census blocks” and thus, “a default must occur at the CBG level”).

⁴⁶ Savage Petition at 7-8 & Exh. 4.

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 7. See also National Broadband Map, <https://broadbandmap.fcc.gov/home> (last visited Mar. 2, 2026).

⁴⁸ 47 CFR §§ 54.804(c)(4); 54.806(c); *RDOF Order*, 31 FCC Rcd at 714-15, paras. 60-61.

⁴⁹ See, e.g., *Blackfoot Early Support Recovery Order* at 11, para. 24; *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Order, DA 25-953, at 6, para. 15 (WCB Nov. 18, 2025) (*NAEC and Sandhill Support Recovery Waiver Denial Order*); *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Order, 39 FCC Rcd 12627, 12636, para. 23 (WCB 2024) (*RTC Early Support Recovery Order*); *Connect America Fund et al.*, WC Docket No. 10-90 et al., Order, 40 FCC Rcd 5984, 5991, para. 18 (WCB 2025) (*Mercury Support Recovery Waiver Denial Order*). See also *Wireline Competition Bureau Provides Guidance For RDOF and CAF Phase II Support Recipients on Procedures for Provider Defaults to Ensure that Broadband Networks are Deployed to All Consumers*, AU Docket No. 20-34 et al., Public Notice, 39 FCC Rcd 7015 (WCB 2024) (*WCB Default Guidance Public Notice*) (noting the Bureau’s “strong interest in preserving the integrity of the Commission’s broadband deployment programs”).

support recovery for post-authorization defaults than the one set forth in our rules. Instead, we believe that our actions to date have achieved the appropriate balance between preserving an incentive for carriers to fulfill their RDOF obligations while also providing carriers the flexibility to notify us early that they plan to default.

14. We are similarly not convinced by Savage's further pleas for relief by arguing that the Commission's support recovery rules are "unreasonable and disproportionate to the harm" caused by Savage's default.⁵⁰ These arguments amount to an untimely petition for reconsideration of the Commission's decision to adopt the support recovery rules in the *RDOF Order*.⁵¹ At the outset, Savage could have chosen not to seek funding through RDOF if it disagreed with the support recovery rules. To the extent an entity believed that the support recovery was unreasonable or disproportionate for RDOF post-authorization defaults, the time to challenge the support recovery rules was when those rules were adopted, prior to bidding in the auction and long before filing a post-auction long-form application for support.⁵² Moreover, because Savage defaulted on all of its remaining CBGs, we stopped all of Savage's future RDOF payments immediately upon being officially notified of the default. Because a portion of the support recovery calculation is based on "support received" by Savage, this means that Savage's support recovery is smaller than if Savage had not notified the Bureau of its default until later in, or after, the deployment term.⁵³

15. The Commission adopted objective support recovery rules for all authorized RDOF carriers after an opportunity for notice and comment and did not introduce into the calculation any assessment of the carrier's intent, its good faith efforts to meet the obligations, or whether the default caused any harm.⁵⁴ Savage agreed to the terms and conditions of the RDOF program by seeking authorization, had the opportunity to conduct due diligence to ensure it could meet its obligations with full notice regarding the objective support recovery that would be required if it could not meet those obligations, and then made the decision to default by identifying the specific CBGs where it would not meet its obligations, acknowledging the applicable non-compliance measures. The fact that Savage now finds that the required support recovery is too expensive does not entitle it to support recovery that is tailored and discounted to account for its own business decisions.

III. ORDERING CLAUSES

16. Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to sections 1, 4(i), 5(c), and 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. §§ 151, 154(i), 155(c), 254, and sections 0.91, 0.291, and 1.3 of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR §§ 0.91, 0.291, 1.3, that this Order IS ADOPTED.

17. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for waiver of Savage Communications, Inc. is DENIED to the extent described herein.

⁵⁰ Savage Petition at 10.

⁵¹ Petitions for reconsideration must be filed within 30 days from the date of public notice of the Commission's action. 47 CFR § 1.429(d). The *RDOF Order* was published in the Federal Register in March 2020. FCC, Rural Digital Opportunity Fund, Connect America Fund, Final Rule, 85 FR 13773 (Mar. 10, 2020).

⁵² See *Mercury Order* at 5991, para. 19; *NAEC and Sandhill Support Recovery Waiver Denial Order* at 8, para. 21.

⁵³ 47 CFR § 54.806(c); *RDOF Order*, 35 FCC Rcd at 714-15, paras. 60-61.

⁵⁴ 47 CFR § 54.806(c); *RDOF Order*, 35 FCC Rcd at 713-16, paras. 58-63; *NAEC and Sandhill Support Recovery Waiver Denial Order* at 10, para. 26. See Savage Petition at 10 (claiming the Commission's support recovery rules "were not designed to levy penalties on providers who engaged in good faith efforts to provide broadband Internet access service to rural, unserved areas yet, for reasons outside their control, had no choice but to hand back locations early").

18. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, pursuant to section 1.102(b)(1) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR § 1.102(b)(1), this Order SHALL BE EFFECTIVE upon release.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Joseph S. Calascione
Chief
Wireline Competition Bureau