



Advocates for Rural Broadband

Paul Kelly
President

Kelly Worthington
Executive Vice President

S

February 4, 2016

Filed Via ECFS

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: *Connect America Fund*, WC Docket No. 10-90

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Tuesday, February 2, 2016, Bob DeBroux of TDS Telecom; Mark Gailey of Totah Communications (via telephone); and Derrick Owens and Gerry Duffy representing WTA – Advocates for Rural Broadband (“WTA”) met with Nicholas Degani, Legal Advisor, Wireline to Commissioner Ajit Pai, to discuss various alternatives regarding the Commission’s contemplated order regarding changes to universal service support mechanisms for rural telephone companies (“RLECs”).

WTA noted that there were indications that the Commission was considering reduction of the rate of return applicable to RLEC high-cost support mechanisms. It is not clear what legal authority the Commission has to re-prescribe rates of return without an appropriate Section 205 proceeding. The Commission does not appear to have compiled a record consisting of current information and analysis regarding the cost of debt and/or the cost of equity affecting RLECs that would support a re-prescription, nor has it sought comment upon the rationale for its action. WTA pointed out that some states tie their intrastate rates of return and/or state universal service support to FCC rates and mechanisms, so that a Commission reduction in the rate of return for RLECs could have substantial additional adverse consequences on RLEC intrastate cost recovery in some states.

WTA indicated that it is also likely that the Commission is considering the imposition of additional build-out obligations on RLECs electing to remain on the rate-of-return path without necessarily increasing the high-cost support distributed to them. Given that existing high-cost mechanisms have been designed to allow recovery of investments that were previously made and operating expenses that were previously paid, it is difficult for many WTA members to understand the rationale for such additional build-out obligations. WTA has concerns that the contemplated build-out obligations will become unfunded mandates. It is also concerned that build-out obligations calculated in terms of specific numbers of additional locations per year will not be congruent with the way that many RLECs build and upgrade their networks. Because it is expensive to negotiate loans and construction contracts and to bring heavy equipment and construction crews to rural areas, many RLECs have found it more efficient and economical to extend and upgrade their networks as much as possible during concentrated periods of one or two construction seasons (thereby minimizing their start-up and set-up costs) so that they will not have substantial construction projects for several years thereafter. While this approach has proven successful in extending RLEC broadband service while saving significant dollars in the long run, it may not comply with requirements to build out a minimum number of new locations every year.

With respect to the prospective limitation of high-cost support in areas served by “unsubsidized competitors,” WTA expressed its strong preference that only future new investment in areas served by a “qualifying competitor” should be affected. This could be accomplished without bifurcation in several ways – for example, by treating new investment in “competitive” areas in a manner similar to the way that investment paid for by stimulus grants and broadband experiment grants has been treated, or by treating such investment like investment in non-regulated competitive local exchange carrier (“CLEC”) facilities. It would be equitable and effective public policy not to reduce or eliminate high-cost support for existing investments because many such investments were made under the current rules before a competitor entered the market. Moreover, reduction of the high-cost support flows upon which the loans for such investments were based will not only disrupt repayment of the loans but also will discourage lenders from making future loans to rural telephone companies for broadband upgrades. Finally, competitors in areas served by RLECs knew that the RLECs were getting high-cost support when they entered the markets.

If an RLEC is going to lose high-cost support in an area and thereby be discouraged or impeded from investing further in that area, it is essential that the alleged “unsubsidized competitor” be able to provide the residents of the area with service that is of equivalent quality, cost and reliability. In particular, if an RLEC is providing a broadband speed greater than 10/1 to its customers in an area, an alleged “competitor” must be required to demonstrate the ability to match that higher speed in order to become a “qualified competitor.” This will avoid unfortunate situations where an RLEC that has deployed fiber-to-the-home (“FTTH”) and is capable of meeting increasing broadband capacity demands for decades to come is crippled or driven from a market by a “competitor” that can temporarily satisfy a 10/1 criterion but has minimal capability to satisfy greater future bandwidth needs.

WTA has attached a listing of the standards that a “qualified competitor” should be required to meet before an existing RLEC is deprived of high-cost support within portions of its service area.

WTA reiterates its interest in working with the Commission to finalize and implement universal service reforms that enable its members to continue to invest in and upgrade their networks and to provide their rural customers with quality, affordable and reasonably comparable voice and broadband services.

Pursuant to Section 1.1206(b) of the Commission's Rules, this submission is being filed for inclusion in the public record of the referenced proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gerard J. Duffy

Gerard J. Duffy
WTA Regulatory Counsel

Blooston, Mordkofsky, Dickens, Duffy & Prendergast, LLP
2120 L Street NW (Suite 300)
Washington, DC 20037
Telephone: (202) 659-0830
Email: gjd@bloostonlaw.com

cc: Nicholas Degani

Attachment**Requirements of a “Qualifying Carrier”**

WTA proposes that an entity claiming to be an “unsubsidized competitor” be required to submit the following information (via officer certification and supporting documentary evidence): to verify its ability to deliver the requisite levels of fixed terrestrial quality voice and broadband to the requisite percentage of customer locations in each applicable Census Block (or alternative specified geographic area):

- a. Availability of fixed terrestrial facilities-based broadband at least at 10/1 speeds to at least the requisite percentage of the customer locations in the relevant census block(s) or alternative geographic area(s), including provision by the competitor of address or other geocoding information sufficient for the RLEC to be able to identify each location that comprises the asserted percentage coverage (*i.e.*, data with respect to both the locations served and the total number of locations that form the basis of the assertion);
- b. Availability of fixed terrestrial facilities-based voice service (including 911 or E911 capabilities and CALEA compliance) to every customer location in the relevant census block(s) or alternative geographic area(s), including: (i) an interconnection agreement with the affected RLEC; (ii) compliance with applicable Section 251 obligations; (iii) the offering of Lifeline service to eligible consumers; and (iv) the ability to port telephone numbers to and from the RLEC;
- c. The ability to deliver such voice and broadband service to the identified customer locations in the census block(s) or alternative geographic area(s) within seven (7) to ten (10) business days of a service request without an extraordinary commitment of resources;
- d. Ownership (or lease from an entity other than the RLEC) of all facilities needed to serve the identified customer locations in the relevant census block(s) or alternative geographic area(s);
- e. Verification of no use of other federal or State support (including, but not limited to, USF support other than Lifeline support) for investment or operations in the relevant census block(s) or alternative geographic area(s);
- f. Offering of fixed voice and broadband separately, without requiring consumers to purchase services in a “bundle”;
- g. Rates for fixed terrestrial facilities-based voice and broadband at or below established reasonable comparability benchmarks;
- h. Technical confirmation that broadband latency is suitable for real time applications, including Voice over Internet Protocol;
- i. Broadband usage capacity that is reasonably comparable to offerings in urban areas (*e.g.*, minimum 100GB);

- j. Provision of a broadband speed at least as high as the highest broadband speed offered by the subject RLEC in the relevant census block(s) or alternative geographic area(s) (WTA understands that the Commission does not want to deal with multiple broadband speeds in various geographic areas when making “qualified competitor” determinations. However, consideration of comparable broadband speeds will preclude situations where, for example, an RLEC that has deployed fiber-to-the-home (“FTTH”) and can provide virtually unlimited bandwidth and advanced services to its rural customers for the foreseeable future is forced to curtail or discontinue services because of loss of substantial support due to a competitor that barely provides a 10/1 service);
- k. Provision of the required level of service and minimum required broadband speed on a 24 hours per day, 365 days per year basis (except during situations where severe weather and similar uncontrollable disasters cause service on substantial portions of a network to be interrupted);
- l. No fee or charge may be assessed to prospective customers for location visits or other preparatory work to determine whether the purported competitor can provide the required level of service and minimum required broadband speed to their residences or businesses (even if all or a portion of the fee is credited to those who ultimately subscribe to the service); and
- m. Compliance with state service quality and other regulatory requirements applicable to the voice service of the RLEC.