

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**Communications Division  
Carrier Oversight & Programs Branch**

**RESOLUTION T-17312  
April 9, 2015**

**R E S O L U T I O N**

**RESOLUTION T-17312. This Resolution resolves Ducor Telephone Company's five capital expenditure items that the Commission granted a limited rehearing on in Decision 10-05-022, in response to Ducor's Application for Rehearing (A.) 09-03-002 of Resolution T-17157. This Resolution increases Ducor Telephone Company's California High Cost Fund-A support amount from \$2,514,516 to \$2,561,408 for Test Year 2009.**

By Advice Letter No. 318 C filed June 7, 2010.

**SUMMARY**

This Resolution responds to Decision (D.) 10-05-022<sup>1</sup>, which granted a limited hearing on the determination of five capital expenditure items that Ducor Telephone Company (Ducor) challenged in its Application for Rehearing (A.) 09-03-002 of General Rate Case Resolution T-17157 (Res.T-17157). Upon further review, this Resolution modifies two of the five capital expenditure disallowances adopted in Res. T-17157, and increases Ducor's Test Year 2009 support from the California High Cost Fund (CHCF) -A by \$46,892, from \$2,514,516 to \$2,561,408.

**BACKGROUND**

Ducor (U-1007-C) is a small incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) serving approximately 985 access lines within areas of Tulare, Kern and Tehama Counties, furnishing local, toll and access telephone services. Ducor's principal place of business is located in Ducor, California. Ducor serves three exchanges, Ducor, Kennedy Meadows and Rancho Tehama.

Ducor filed its General Rate Case (GRC) for Test Year (TY) 2009 through Advice Letters (AL) 318 and 318 Supplement A (318 A) on December 19, 2007, and July 21, 2008,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Order Modifying Resolution T-17157, Granting Limited Rehearing on the Determination Regarding of Five Capital Expenditure Items, and Denying Rehearing of the Resolution, as Modified, in All Other Respects (May 7, 2010).

respectively, in compliance with General Order 96-B, Industry Rule 6. On January 29, 2009, the Commission adopted Resolution T-17157, which approved the Ducor GRC. Res. T-17157 also authorized Ducor to receive \$2,514,450 in CHCF-A support beginning January 1, 2009. On January 30, 2009, Ducor filed AL 318 B in response to Res. T-17157, providing revised tariffs for this GRC.

On March 2, 2009, Ducor filed an Application for Rehearing (A.) 09-03-002 of Res. T-17157, asserting that some of the adopted adjustments in the Resolution were improper and not supported by the record:

On May 6, 2010, the Commission adopted D.10-05-022, which denied rehearing on all issues raised by Ducor in A.09-03-002, with the exception of the issue of five capital expenditures as follows:

- In D. 10-05-022, Ordering Paragraph (O.P.) 4, the Commission granted a limited rehearing on five capital expense items that Ducor alleged were not supported by the record, and ordered Ducor to provide responses to the following questions:
  - a) Provide detailed information regarding the need for and cost estimates for all vehicles requested under account 211200. In addition, provide information and a rationale supporting the request in this GRC for \$30,715 in excess of its budget for vehicle purchases in 2007.
  - b) Provide information detailing the cost estimates and the need for two redundant fiber projects out of the Ranch Tehama and Ducor exchanges.
  - c) Provide information to substantiate the cost estimates and the need for two digital loop carrier projects in the Ducor exchange.
  - d) Provide information substantiating the need for and cost estimates for a fiber optic project to a weather station in the Ducor exchange, while including 1) alternatives to provide similar service, and 2) a maintenance history for this cable facility.
  - e) Provide information substantiating a \$6,000 request for furniture for the Kennedy Meadows exchange.
- O.P. 5 ordered Ducor to submit responses to the questions posed in O.P.4 (a) through (e) by a supplemental advice letter to AL 318 and 318 A.

On July 24, 2009, Ducor filed a Petition for Modification (A.09-07-022) of Res. T-17157, asserting that the resolution contained calculation and/or methodological errors. On May 26, 2011, the Commission adopted D.11-05-032, granting, in part, Ducor's Petition to Modify Res. T-17157 to correct those calculation errors, and approved a small increase in Ducor's CHCF-A funding for TY 2009 in the amount of \$66, to \$2,514,516.

This is reflected in workpapers provided in D.11-05-032 Attachment A, which includes a revised version of Res. T-17157. D.11-05-032 closed A.09-07-022.

## NOTICE/PROTESTS

Ducor filed AL 318 C on June 7, 2010, with information responsive to questions in O.P. 4 of D.10-05-022. AL 318 C appeared in the Commission's Daily Calendar on June 9, 2010. No parties submitted a protest to this supplemental advice letter filing.

## DISCUSSION

On June 7, 2010, in compliance with O.P. 4 and 5 of D.10-05-022, Ducor provided responses to the Commission in AL 318 C. In the following discussion, we present a summary of Ducor's responses to the five capital expenditure issues in Section I and CD's corresponding analysis in Section II.

### I. D.10-05-022, O.P. 4 Questions, and Ducor's Response:

#### **O.P. 4(a.) of D.10-05-022, Account 211200 Service Vehicles:**

*Ducor should provide detailed information regarding the need for and cost estimates for all vehicles requested under this account. In addition, Ducor should provide information and a rationale supporting its request in this GRC for \$30,715 in excess of its budget for vehicle purchases in 2007.*

Ducor reply to O.P. 4(a.)

In AL 318 C, Ducor provided additional cost information and the rationale for the purchase of the service vehicles in question, stating that all have been placed into service as follows:

1. Trailer purchased in 2008 cost \$7,074, to haul track-equipped vehicles that enable a vehicle to drive on snow, to access remote microwave sites in adverse weather conditions.
2. Utility and towing truck cost \$93,800, used to tow heavy equipment and haul supplies and staff to job sites around the exchange.
3. Pickup truck purchased in 2008 for \$52,826 for Rancho Tehama exchange. This vehicle is used to haul staff and equipment around the exchange.
4. Pickup truck purchased in 2009 for \$43,261, used as the work vehicle of the Vice President responsible for Rancho Tehama exchange.
5. Pickup Truck purchased in 2009 for \$38,485, used as the work vehicle for the Vice President of Ducor Telephone Company.

6. The request for an additional \$30,715 for the 2007 budget was for a pickup truck equipped with a camper shell and tracks.

**O.P. 4(b.) of D.10-05-022, Two Redundant Fiber Projects out of Rancho Tehama and**

**Ducor:**

*Ducor should provide information detailing its cost estimates and the need for these two fiber projects.*

Ducor reply to O.P. 4(b.)

Ducor continued to disagree with the \$35,000 disallowance in 2009 additions to the proposed \$500,000 rate base increase for the Ducor exchange redundant fiber project, and \$35,000 disallowance from the proposed \$500,000 rate base increase for the Rancho Tehama exchange redundant fiber project, resulting in a net rate base additions totaling \$930,000 rather than \$1,000,000.

In AL 318 C, Ducor provided an updated quote for the Rancho Tehama redundant fiber project in the amount of \$960,595.20 for 2009 additions. However, in AL 318 C, "Ducor did not provide a quote for the Ducor redundant toll route, as it had an application pending for an ARRA grant through CVIN, LLC that would cover the cost of this route. ARRA refers to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and CVIN refers to Central Valley Independent Network, which administers the Central Valley Next Generation Broadband Infrastructure Project.

**O.P. 4(c.) of D.10-05-022, regarding two digital loop carrier projects in the Ducor**

**Exchange:**

*Ducor should provide information to substantiate its cost estimates and the need for these two projects.*

Ducor reply to O.P. 4(c.)

Ducor replied by discussing placement of two unrelated Digital Loop Carriers (DLCs) along State Highway 65 that had already been approved into rate base in 2008 (and placed in 2009), at a total cost of \$593,015. Ducor did not discuss the two DLCs that had been partially disallowed, which were to be placed on Roads 208 and 240, respectively, in Tulare County in 2009. These DLCs would have represented capital additions at \$183,000 each, or \$366,000 total.

**O.P. 4(d.) of D.10-05-022, Fiber optic project to a weather station in the Ducor**

**Exchange:**

*Ducor should provide information substantiating the need for and cost estimates for this project. In addition, Ducor should provide information regarding the number of current customers being served by this cable facility and the number of future customers Ducor anticipates will need to use it. Ducor should also provide information regarding what alternatives are available to Ducor that could provide a similar service to its customers*

*besides the proposed project. Finally, Ducor should provide a maintenance history for this cable facility.*

Ducor reply to O.P. 4(d.)

Ducor's AL 318 C states, "This is not a fiber optic project, this is a replacement of an existing copper route, which was placed in service in 1975, which will provide service to customers from the DLC on the east side of Highway 65 to a weather station at the end of that route. The weather station is a customer of Ducor, not a facility owned by Ducor, and the term weather station is used merely to identify that segment of cable route. There are six customers currently served on this route, and Ducor estimates that the future demand on this route could be as many as 100 customers, as there is planned development in the area. Ducor is not aware of any viable alternatives that are available to it to provide similar services of the same reliability and quality, to its customers. The existing copper facility is a combination of temporary cable laid on top of the ground and direct buried cable in an area that is overrun with ground squirrels, which have chewed into the sheath of the cable in many places. Historically, there have been 3 to 4 trouble calls per year on this route."

The reply further stated "Ducor has not yet begun construction on this project and does not have a written quote on the cost of the route from its engineering firm. Ducor's Outside Plant Manager drove the route with a representative of their outside plant vendor prior to submission of the GRC and received a verbal quote of \$145,000."

**O.P. 4(e.) of D.10-05-022, Furniture for the Kennedy Meadows Exchange:**

*Ducor should provide all information substantiating its \$6,000 request for this furniture, as well as other data and explanations that indicate what alternatives Ducor considered in making its request and why they were rejected.*

Ducor reply to O.P. 4(e.)

Ducor's AL 318 C states, "Ducor no longer objects to the adjustment made by CD Staff related to furniture for the Kennedy Meadows building, therefore a detailed response is not provided."

II. CD Analysis of Ducor Replies to D.10-05-022, O.P.4 (a.)-(e.)

**O.P. 4(a.) of D.10-05-022, Account 211200 Service Vehicles:**

CD staff has reviewed supporting data provided by Ducor substantiating the purchase of service vehicles, and CD believes that the additionally provided information satisfactorily addresses the question for these vehicles purchased in 2007, by demonstrating the need for this vehicle in servicing microwave facilities located in

mountainous terrain and other areas with challenging weather conditions, as well as transport employees and equipment around the Ducor exchange.

Accordingly, CD proposes to add to Ducor's rate base for Service Vehicles line 211200: \$30,715 previously disallowed from the 2007 actual rate base. Additionally, CD recommends adding \$25,000 originally deducted for 2008 additions to rate base; and \$25,000 originally deducted from 2009 additions to rate base.

**O.P. 4(b.) of D.10-05-022, Two Redundant Fiber Projects out of Rancho Tehama and Ducor:**

In Res. T-17157, CD disallowed \$35,000 in 2009 additions to the proposed \$500,000 rate base increase for the Ducor exchange redundant fiber project, and \$35,000 from the proposed \$500,000 rate base increase for the Rancho Tehama exchange redundant fiber project. Thus, CD approved \$465,000 in 2009 rate base additions for each of the Ducor and Rancho Tehama projects, totaling \$930,000.

Ducor had proposed a rate base addition of \$1,000,000 for the redundant fiber projects, and emphasized in AL 318 C that "These routes are necessary to provide redundant transport to the tandem, including: toll and EAS trunking, special access circuits, and emergency 911 services. Absent these redundant routes, Ducor claims it has a single point of failure between these two exchanges and the rest of the world. If the existing fiber cable is cut or damaged, customers in Ducor and Ranch Tehama would not complete calls outside the exchange, including access to emergency services, until the fiber has been repaired.

CD originally reduced the funding for each project by seven percent, or \$35,000 (\$70,000 total). Although CD had recognized the safety measures ensured and value gained by establishing network redundancies, CD made a modest reduction of seven percent.

After receiving Ducor's AL 318 C discussing the redundant fiber projects serving the Rancho Tehama and Ducor exchanges, CD staff sent a data request to Ducor on August 28, 2012, seeking answers for fourteen detailed questions about the redundant fiber projects in Ducor and Rancho Tehama exchanges. In its September 7, 2012 response Ducor stated, "following the initial planning of this project, it became apparent that there would be significant obstacles to completing the project due to factors beyond Ducor's control." Ducor reported that AT&T was resistant to interconnecting with Ducor's planned project, and later found that total project costs appeared to be significantly greater than previously anticipated. Revised estimates for the separate projects totaled \$759,000 each, and slightly over \$1.5 million for both. Due to these issues, Ducor stated that it would not pursue the project at this time, and would evaluate other means of delivering long distance traffic.

CD staff sent a subsequent data request to Ducor on January 14, 2014, asking for the status of these redundant fiber projects. Ducor responded by stating that the projects were abandoned due to factors beyond their control. AT&T reportedly denied Ducor's proposal for the Rancho Tehama and Ducor exchange projects, stating that it had no funds budgeted to meet Ducor's requests. Additionally, as construction difficulties increased both project cost estimates substantially, Ducor has no plans to revisit the projects in the near future.

Accordingly, since Ducor has abandoned the project, CD finds no justification to propose a change in its prior disallowance of \$70,000. CD will maintain its disallowance, and leave the prior adopted funding unchanged.

**O.P. 4(c.) of D.10-05-022, regarding two digital loop carrier projects in the Ducor Exchange:**

Although Ducor's AL 318 C erroneously discussed DLC projects along State Highway 65, CD followed up with Ducor via a data request to obtain a justification for two 2009 capital addition DLC projects that were previously adjusted on Roads 208 and 240, respectively. Ducor provided additional information addressing customer need specific to serving these respective areas, by demonstrating that this installation replaced aging, outmoded and unreliable cable plant with modernized facilities. CD finds that this information substantiates Ducor's cost estimates while demonstrating the need for both DLCs to serve Ducor's customers as required by Res. T-17157. CD recommends approving the DLC into rate base in the amount of \$183,000, which was previously disallowed for 2009 additions.

**O.P. 4(d.) of D.10-05-022, Fiber optic project to a weather station in the Ducor Exchange:**

As of the date of the response to O.P. 4 (d) of D.10-05-022, Ducor has not yet begun construction on this project, and Ducor does not have a written quote on the cost of the route from its engineering firm, although they reported receiving a verbal quote of \$145,000. Finally, Ducor did not provide a maintenance history other than a count of "3 or 4 trouble calls per year on this route" as required by O.P. 4 (d) of D.10-05-022.

Since Ducor has not provided documentation of a written quote or maintenance history to CD, and has not constructed the project, CD does not believe that Ducor has sufficiently substantiated need and cost estimates for this fiber optic project. Therefore, CD affirms its previous disallowance of this project in the amount of \$145,000 from 2008 additions.

**O.P. 4(e.) of D.10-05-022, Furniture for the Kennedy Meadows Exchange:**

Since Ducor is no longer contesting the disallowance of \$3,000 from \$6,000 for furniture for Kennedy Meadows exchange from 2008 additions, CD accepts this response and no further adjustment is necessary.

Resulting Rate Base Adjustments:

The rate base adjustments discussed above are summarized in Table 1. For these line-item categories, Ducor originally requested \$1,770,215 in capital additions, and the Commission approved \$1,288,500 of this request in Res. T-17157. CD recommends in this resolution that the Commission approve an additional \$263,715 in Ducor’s rate base for TY 2009.

**Summary of Capital Expenditure Items addressed in D.10-05-022, O.P. 4:**

Table 1					
Description of Accounts to be addressed in response to O.P. 4 (a) - (e)	Account Number	Ducor Request	R.T-17157 Originally Approved	R.T-17312 Approved	Differential, Approved Rate Base Adjustments
(a) Service Vehicles					
(1) 2007 in excess of budget	211200	\$30,715	\$0	\$30,715	\$30,715
(2) 2008 additions	211200	\$185,500	\$160,500	\$185,500	\$25,000
(3) 2009 additions	211200	\$37,000	\$12,000	\$37,000	\$25,000
(b) Redundant Fiber 2009 additions:					
(1) Ducor Exchange	242310	\$500,000	\$465,000	\$465,000	\$0
(2) Rancho Tehama Exchange	242310	\$500,000	\$465,000	\$465,000	\$0
(c) DLC 2009 additions: Ducor Exchange	223230	\$366,000	\$183,000	\$366,000	\$183,000
(d) Fiber optic project to weather station 2008 additions:	242310	\$145,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
(e) Furniture 2008 additions: Kennedy Meadows Exchange	212200	\$6,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$0
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$1,770,215</b>	<b>\$1,288,500</b>	<b>\$1,552,215</b>	<b>\$263,715</b>

Evidentiary Hearings

O.P. 5 of D.10-05-022 states, “Ducor may also request evidentiary hearings by making such a request in the Supplemental AL. In that event, Ducor should explain why evidentiary hearings are necessary, and what material factual issues are in dispute that would warrant evidentiary hearings before an Administrative Law Judge.” Ducor did not request evidentiary hearings in AL 318 C filed June 7, 2010.



O.P.5, of D.10-05-022 further states, "Should it be determined that evidentiary hearings are necessary, CD Staff shall make this recommendation in the resolution." In light of the fact that Ducor has not requested evidentiary hearings and CD does not believe that the issues in the five capital expenditure items require hearings, CD does not recommend evidentiary hearings in this Resolution.

CHCF-A Support Impact

After applying the \$263,715 addition to Ducor's rate base, the corresponding increase to Ducor's CHCF-A support equals \$46,892. Accordingly, this Resolution results in a total increase of \$46,892, to \$2,561,408 in CHCF-A support for Ducor for TY 2009, as shown in Table 4, plus late interest at the three-month commercial paper rate issued by financial institutions as D.02-04-059 O.P. 7:

<b>Table 4</b>		
	Additional CHCF-A Funding Amount	New CHCF-A Amount for Test Year 2009
Res. T-17157	n/a	\$2,514,450
Decision 11-05-032	\$66	\$2,514,516
<b>Res. T-17312</b>	<b>\$46,892</b>	<b>\$2,561,408</b>

COMMENTS

In compliance with Section 311 (g), the Commission initially e-mailed notice letters on March 6, 2015, for this Resolution to the service list, informing these parties that this draft resolution is available at the Commission's website <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/> and is available for public comments. In addition, CD informed these parties of the availability of the conformed resolution at the same website.

On March 30, 2015, Ducor filed comments on the Resolution. Ducor supports the recognition of the DLC projects along Road 208 and Road 240 as appropriate for inclusion in rate base for the 2009 Test Year. Ducor stated "these facilities are important to replace aging plant and to ensure the availability of reliable, high-quality voice service and access to advanced services." Ducor supports the adoption of this Resolution.

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

The Small ILECs are required to adhere to all Commission rules, decisions, General Orders and statutes including P.U. Code § 451 by undertaking all actions "...necessary to promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and

the public.” The CHCF-A subsidy provides carriers with the resources to provide safe, reliable and affordable telephone service to their customers in rural, high cost areas.

Reliable telephone service is essential in these generally rural, remote and isolated areas. The CHCF-A program provides financial support to the Small ILECs to aid them in providing customers residing in these areas with access to 211 for essential community services, 311 for non-emergency municipal services, 511 for traffic and transportation information, 811 for public infrastructure underground location information, and 911 to reach police, fire and emergency medical responders when fire, natural disasters, medical emergencies, or other crises occur.

CHCF-A funding has allowed the Small ILECs to locate their facilities underground and use fiber optic cable which protects equipment in case of fire and allows for the quicker deployment of broadband-capable facilities. In some Small ILEC territories, emergency responders set up emergency command centers and the Small ILECs must quickly provide responders with access to high quality voice communications and broadband. This Resolution ensures that the CHCF-A program continues to promote the goals of safe, reliable and affordable telephone service by subsidizing essential communications links in high cost, rural communities.

### FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Ducor Telephone Company (Ducor) filed its General Rate Case (GRC) by Advice Letter (AL) No. 318 and AL 318A on December 19, 2007, and July 21, 2008, respectively, for Test Year (TY) 2009.
2. On January 29, 2009, the Commission adopted Resolution T-17157 approving the Ducor GRC for TY 2009, and California High Cost Fund (CHCF) -A funding in the amount of \$2,514,450.
3. On March 2, 2009, Ducor filed an Application for Rehearing (A.) 09-03-002, of Resolution T-17157, asserting that some of the adopted adjustments in the Resolution were improper and not supported by the record.
4. On May 6, 2010, the Commission adopted Decision (D.) 10-05-022, denying A.09-03-002 on all issues, with the exception of the issue of five capital expenditures on which was granted a limited rehearing. Ordering Paragraphs (O.P.) 4 and 5 directed Ducor to provide additional information regarding the five capital expenditure items through a supplemental advice letter.
5. On July 24, 2009, Ducor filed a Petition for Modification 09-07-022 of Resolution T-17157, asserting that the resolution contained calculation and/or methodological errors.

6. Commission Decision (D.) 11-05-032, adopted May 26, 2011, granted, in part, Ducor's Petition to Modify Resolution T-17157 to correct the calculation errors, by approving an increase in Ducor's CHCF-A funding for TY 2009 of \$66, which increased Ducor's TY 2009 CHCF-A funding to \$2,514,516.
7. Pursuant to O.P. 5 of D.10-05-022, Ducor filed AL 318, Supplement C (AL 318 C) on June 7, 2010, with information responsive to O.P. 4(a.) through (e.).
8. After reviewing Ducor's response to O.P.4(a.) of D.10-05-022, Communications Division (CD) finds it reasonable to add to Ducor's rate base \$30,715 for 2007 actual, \$25,000 for 2008 additions and \$25,000 for 2009 additions.
9. In response to O.P. 4(b) of D.10-05-022, Ducor states that it has not built two fiber projects because it has encountered problems due to cost increases and the inability to reach an agreement with AT&T to interconnect, Thus, the amount approved in Resolution T-17157 in the amount of \$465,000 for each project or \$930,000 total for 2009 additions, remains unchanged.
10. In response to O.P. 4(c) of D.10-05-022, Ducor provided additional information addressing customer needs specific to serving these respective areas, by demonstrating that this installation replaced aging, outmoded and unreliable cable plant with modernized facilities. CD finds that this information substantiates Ducor's cost estimates while demonstrating the need for both DLCs to serve Ducor's customers.
11. In O.P. 4(d.) of D.10-05-022, addressing copper route to a weather station run by a customer, the Commission asked Ducor to provide a project cost estimate. Ducor only provided a verbal estimate, and did not provide a maintenance history other than an outage count, and as of the June 7, 2010 AL filing, the project had not been constructed. Accordingly, Ducor has not sufficiently substantiated the need for or cost estimates for this fiber optic project. CD affirms its previous disallowance of this project in the amount of \$145,000 from 2008 additions adopted in Resolution T-17157.
12. In response O.P. 4(e) of D.10-05-022, addressing furniture for the Kennedy Meadows Exchange, Ducor is no longer contesting the disallowance of \$3,000 from \$6,000 from 2008 additions. Therefore, CD finds that no further adjustment is necessary.
13. CD recommends that the Commission approve an additional \$263,715 in Ducor's rate base for TY 2009.
14. In O.P. 5 of D.10-05-022, the Commission gave Ducor the option to request evidentiary hearings. In AL 318 C, Ducor did not make such a request and therefore there is no need for evidentiary hearings.
15. This Resolution approves an increase in the amount of \$46,892 for Ducor's TY 2009 CHCF-A funding support from \$2,514,516 to \$2,561,408, plus late interest at the

three-month commercial paper rate issued by financial institutions as per D.02-04-059 O.P. 7.

16. On March 30, 2015, Ducor filed comments supporting the adoption of this Resolution.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:**

1. This Resolution modifies and replaces Resolution T-17157's determination of Ducor Telephone Company's five capital expenditure items.
2. This Resolution resolves Ducor Telephone Company's five capital expenditure items that the Commission granted a limited rehearing on in Decision 10-05-022.
3. Ducor Telephone Company's rate base for Test Year 2009, as previously adopted in Resolution T-17157, shall be increased by \$263,715.
4. Ducor Telephone Company's Test Year 2009 California High Cost Fund-A support shall be increased by \$46,892, from \$2,514,516 to \$2,561,408.
5. The Commission shall remit the additional California High Cost Fund-A support in the amount of \$46,892, for test year 2009, to Ducor Telephone Company plus late interest at the three-month commercial paper rate issued by financial institutions as per Decision 02-04-059, Ordering Paragraph 7.
6. Application 09-03-002 is closed.

This resolution is effective today.

I hereby certify that this Resolution was adopted by the Public Utilities Commission at its regular meeting on April 9, 2015. The following Commissioners approved it:

---

TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN  
Executive Director