

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)

Fayette Medical Center)

WC Docket No. 02-60

Request for Review of Decisions of the)
Universal Service Administrative Company)

Received & Inspected

AUG 04 2017

To: Wireline Competition Bureau

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FCC Mailroom

REQUEST FOR REVIEW AND RULE WAIVER

Pursuant to §§ 54.719(c) and 54.720(a) of the Commission's Rules ("Rules"), Fayette Medical Center ("Fayette") hereby requests that the Commission review and reverse the decision of the Universal Service Administrative Company ("USAC") below, waive § 54.605 of the Rules, and grant funding to Fayette as specified herein. In support thereof, the following is respectfully submitted:

FACTS

Fayette Medical Center, located in Fayette, Ala. opened in 1936, has been under a lease agreement with DCH Health System since 1984. Fayette Medical Center continues to serve Fayette County with a wide range of health services. In 2009, Fayette Medical Center engaged a consulting firm, USF Healthcare Consulting, Inc. ("UHC"), to assist it in obtaining Universal Service support through the Telecommunications Program ("Telecom Program") for rural health care providers ("HCPs"). Fayette Medical Center authorized UHC to prepare the FCC Forms 465 ("Form 465") and the FCC Forms 466 ("Form 466") necessary to obtain Telecom Program funding and to submit them electronically to USAC's Rural Health Care

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

Division (“RHCD”).

UHC helped Fayette obtain funding for switched Ethernet services to DCH Health System in Tuscaloosa, AL.

As the Commission is aware, participants in the Telecom Program have found it difficult to determine urban rates as required by § 54.605 of the Rules.¹ As set forth in the Declaration of Geoff W. Boggs, UHC’s Chief Executive Officer, UHC found it difficult to obtain tariffed or publicly available rates for high-speed Ethernet packet-based services that are offered in urban areas (cities with populations of 50,000 or more).² Consequently, UHC followed the practice of obtaining urban rates from urban service providers.³ To document the urban rate, UHC asked the provider to supply a letter on its letterhead that states the rate that is charged in an urban area in the state.⁴

In the case of Fayette, UHC relied on a letter, dated September 21, 2016, from Scott Madison, the managing member of Network Services Solutions (“NSS”). Mr. Madison represented that “[t]he urban rate for a 50M Ethernet connection in Birmingham, AL. is \$195.00 per channel termination. This rate is based upon a 36-month contract.”⁵ UHC prepared and submitted a Form 466 for Fayette that gave \$390.00 as the urban rate for 50 Mbps Ethernet service.⁶

On March 29, 2017, the RHCD requested that Fayette explain how it derived the \$390.00

¹ See, e.g., Comments of Alaska Communications, GN Docket No. 16-46, at 12-13 (May 24, 2017) (“Alaska Communications Comments”).

² See Exhibit 1 at 2 (¶ 7).

³ See *id.* (¶ 8).

⁴ See *id.*

⁵ *Id.* (¶ 9).

⁶ See *id.* at 6 (¶ 6), 2 (Table 2).

urban rate to provide urban rate documentation.⁷ In response, UHC provided the RHCD with documents showing that BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC offered to provide 50 Mbps switched Ethernet service throughout Alabama at monthly charge of \$195.00 under a three-year contract.⁸ Thereafter, UHC repeatedly asked if the RHCD needed additional information or if it could speak with the RHCD staffer who was reviewing the \$195.00 urban rate.⁹ UHC expected that it would be contacted if the RHCD had any questions with regard to the urban rate, and that it would be afforded the opportunity to address any such questions before the RHCD would render its funding decisions.¹⁰ However, UHC was given no such opportunity.¹¹

On June 2, 2017, the RHCD notified Fayette that USAC was “unable to provide support” to Fayette, specifically because it had not “demonstrated that the urban rate provided for the requested service is ‘no higher than the highest tariffed or publicly-available rate charged to a commercial customer for a *functionally similar* service’ in any city with a population of 50,000 or more in that state.”¹² The RHCD did not explain why Fayette’s submissions were insufficient or why it did not grant Fayette’s requests for the opportunity to address the urban rate issue.

The grant funding obtained through the Telecom Program in past years has allowed DCH Health System to use the money that would otherwise be allocated for the Ethernet services provided for Fayette Medical Center to be used for other budgetary needs. Without these funds,

⁷ See *id.* at 3 (¶¶ 11, 12).

⁸ See *id.* (¶ 13).

⁹ See *id.* at 4-5 (¶¶ 14, 15, 17-19).

¹⁰ See *id.* at 5 (¶ 21).

¹¹ See *id.*

¹² *Id.* (¶ 22).

money will have to be diverted from these needs to cover the Fayette Ethernet circuit. With the current economic challenges facing healthcare institutions, losing this funding could adversely affect the services DCH is able to provide.

WAIVER STANDARD

Fayette seeks a waiver of § 54.603 of the Rules to permit it to receive the appropriate level of USF support for the Funding Year 2016. The Commission has the discretion to grant the requested waiver under § 1.3 of the Rules, which provides:

The provisions of this chapter may be suspended, revoked, amended, or waived for good cause shown, in whole or in part, at any time by the Commission, subject to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act [“APA”] and the provisions of this chapter. Any provision of the rules may be waived by the Commission on its own motion or on petition if good cause therefor is shown.¹³

Generally speaking, the Commission may exercise its discretion under the APA and § 1.3 of the Rules to suspend or waive a Rule for good cause “only if special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general and such deviation will serve the public interest.” *Northeast Cellular Telephone Co., L.P. v. FCC*, 897 F.2d 1164, 1166 (D.C. Cir. 1990). Of course, the Commission must grant waivers pursuant to an “appropriate general standard.” *WAIT Radio v. FCC*, 418 F.2d 1153, 1159 (D.C. Cir. 1969). The Wireline Competition Bureau (“WTB”) recently set forth the general standard that is applied to requests for waivers of §§ 54.600 – 54.625 of the Rules, which govern the Telecom Program:

The Commission may exercise its discretion to waive a rule where the particular facts make strict compliance inconsistent with the public interest. In addition, the Commission may take into account considerations of hardship, equity, or more effective implementation of overall policy on an individual basis. Waiver of the Commission's rules is appropriate only if both (i) special circumstances warrant a deviation from the general rule, and (ii) such deviation will serve the public interest.¹⁴

¹³ 47 C.F.R. § 1.3.

¹⁴ *Rural Health Care Universal Service Support Mechanism*, 2017 WL 735668, at *2 (WTB Feb. 10,

ARGUMENT

In the words of one participant in the Telecom Program, the rules governing the program (“Telecom Rules”) “written two decades ago for a world of tariffed low-bandwidth, circuit-switched services are increasingly unworkable.”¹⁵ In 2012, the Commission promised to address potential reforms to the Telecom Program “at a future date.”¹⁶ In the meantime, it has allowed its woefully outdated Telecom Rules to remain in effect.¹⁷ Section 54.605 of the Telecom Rules is one such rule.

Adopted in 1997, § 54.605 of the Telecom Rules has remained virtually unchanged.¹⁸ The rule provides that the “urban rate” that an HCP should pay is “a rate no higher than the highest tariffed or publicly-available rate charged to a commercial customer for a functionally similar service in any city with a population of 50,000 or more in that state, calculated as if it were provided between two points within the city.” Although “[d]etermining the urban rate” is the heading of § 54.605, the rule does address exactly how an HCP should go about determining the “highest tariffed or publicly-available rate charged” for a similar service in an urban area.

The Commission assumed in 1997 that such the urban rate would be “tariffed or publicly available” and thus readily accessible. That assumption may have been well founded in 1997, but not so today. Now, HCPs use high-bandwidth services, like video and teleconferencing, which are provided by lightly-regulated competitive carriers over high-speed Ethernet packet-based networks. Those services are provided at competitive, market-driven rates, which often

2017). (footnotes omitted) (“*NSS Waiver Decision*”).

¹⁵ Alaska Communications Comments at 12.

¹⁶ *Rural Health Care Support Mechanism*, 27 FCC Rcd 16678, 16751 n.433 (2012)

¹⁷ *See id.* at 16815 (¶ 344).

¹⁸ *Compare Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, 12 FCC Rcd 8776, 9348-49 (1997) with 47 C.F.R. § 54.605 (2017).

are neither tariffed nor publicly-available.¹⁹ USAC was undoubtedly aware that HCPs were experiencing difficulty in ascertaining the urban rates for broadband Ethernet-based services.

The difficulties UHC experienced in obtaining urban rates for Ethernet services led it to obtain the urban rates for such services from urban service providers.²⁰ UHC's practice would be to obtain a letter on a service provider's letterhead that would state the rate that is charged in an urban area in the state for an Ethernet service similar to that required by the HCP. UHC would provide USAC with a copy of the service provider's letter to document the urban rate. The provision of such a letter is an approved means of documenting an urban rate.²¹

In this case, UHC obtained a letter on NSS's letterhead that represented that the urban rate for 50 Mbps Ethernet service in Birmingham, Alabama was \$195.00 per channel termination. The Commission subsequently found that NSS's determinations of urban rates apparently were not calculated in the manner required by § 54.605 of the Telecom Rules.²² Accordingly, when the RHCD questioned the validity of the urban rate that NSS supplied to Fayette, UHC was forced to obtain documentation from another urban service provider to confirm that NSS had correctly determined that \$195.00 was the urban rate for 50 Mbps Ethernet service in Alabama.²³ UHC obtained such documentation and submitted it to the RHCD in timely fashion.²⁴

¹⁹ See Exhibit 1 at 2 (¶ 7).

²⁰ See *id.* at 2 (¶ 8).

²¹ See Form 466 Instructions, at 8 (July 2014) (urban rate documentation "may include tariff pages, contracts, a letter on company letterhead from the urban service provider, rate pricing information printed from the urban service provider's website, or similar documentation").

²² See *Network Services Solutions, LLC*, 31 FCC Rcd 12238, 12275 (¶ 107) (2016).

²³ See Exhibit 1 at 3-4 (¶ 13).

²⁴ See *id.*

During the 65-day period between March 29, 2017, when Fayette responded to the RHCD's inquiry, and June 2, 2017, when the RHCD rendered its funding decision, the RHCD did not: (1) advise UHC that its submission did not demonstrate its urban rate was no higher than the highest rate charged in Birmingham, Alabama for 50 Mbps Ethernet service; (2) respond to UHC's repeated requests for feedback; or (3) give UHC an opportunity to correct Fayette's response by specifying that the urban rate for the Ethernet service should be \$585.75. The RHCD simply and inexplicably denied funding to Fayette.

Under the special circumstances of this case, the strict enforcement of § 54.605 would be inequitable, inconsistent with the policies embodied in § 254(h)(1)(A) of the Act, and ultimately inconsistent with the public interest. With respect to the equities, the Commission should note the following facts.

- It is difficult for HCPs to determine the urban rates for Ethernet services in accordance with the outdated requirements of § 54.605.
- Fayette complied with the Commission's requirement that it submit "missing or relevant support documentation" within 14 days of the RHCD's request for information.²⁵
- UHC relied on NSS's \$195.00 urban rate in good faith, and that reliance led it to incorrectly identify AT&T's Ethernet basic port charge of \$195.00 as the urban rate in its initial response to the RHCD's inquiry.²⁶
- UHC reasonably expected that the RHCD would give it the opportunity to correct any errors in its initial submission.²⁷

²⁵ *Rural Health Care Support Mechanism*, 30 FCC Rcd 230, 231 (¶ 3) (WCB 2015).

²⁶ See Exhibit 1 at 3-4 (¶ 13), Attachment 1.

²⁷ See *id.* at 5 (¶ 21).

- The RHCD ignored UHC's repeated requests to be informed of any problem with its proposed urban rate, and to be given the opportunity to address any such problem.
- UHC could have corrected its error in timely fashion had the RHCD clearly informed UHC that the urban rate had to include one of AT&T's "committed information rates" ("CIRs") as well as its basic port charge.²⁸
- Once Fayette learned that the urban rate should include AT&T's port charge and a CIR, UHC proposed the correct urban rate of \$585.75 per terminating end.²⁹

Fayette respectfully submits that RHCD abused its discretion when it refused to allow UHC to correct its mistaken reliance on NSS. The RHCD's refusal to grant equitable relief to Fayette makes it inequitable for the Commission to strictly enforce § 54.605 in this case. The Commission should grant Fayette a limited waiver of § 54.605 to permit it to receive funding for the Fiscal Year 2016. Such action would be consistent with the relief that the Commission has afforded other HCPs whose reliance on NSS led USAC to deny their funding requests. *See NSS Waiver Decision*, 2017 WL 735668, at *2-3 (¶¶ 6-8).

Grant of the requested waiver would comport with the policy that Congress codified when it authorized the Commission to establish the Telecom Program. Congress instructed the Commission to base policies for the preservation and advancement of universal service in part on the principle that HCPs "should have access to advance telecommunications services as described in [§ 254(h) of the Act]."³⁰ Section 254(h)(1)(A) of the Act provides:

A telecommunications carrier shall, upon receiving a bona fide request, provide telecommunications services which are necessary for the provision of health care

²⁸ *See id.* at 5-6 (¶¶ 23, 24), Attachment 3.

²⁹ *See id.* at 5-6 (¶ 23), Attachment 3.

³⁰ 47 U.S.C. § 254(b)(6).

services in a State, including instruction relating to such services, to any public or nonprofit [HCP] that serves persons who reside in rural areas in that State at rates that are reasonably comparable to rates charged for similar services in urban areas in that State. A telecommunications carrier providing service under this paragraph shall be entitled to have an amount equal to the difference, if any, between the rates for services provided to [HCPs] for rural areas in a State and the rates for similar services provided to other customers in comparable rural areas in that State treated as a service obligation as a part of its obligation to participate in the mechanisms to preserve and advance universal service.³¹

Congress codified the policy that HCPs be afforded access to advanced telecommunications services, such as Ethernet-based broadband services, at rates that are reasonably comparable to urban rates for similar services. That Congressional policy must outweigh the interests of “efficiency and effectiveness” that are served by the 14-day deadline for submitting urban rate documentation to the RHCD.³² And that policy would clearly be served if the Commission permits Fayette to submit a Form 466 that will allow it to receive Ethernet services at rates that are in fact reasonably comparable to the rates charged by AT&T for similar Ethernet services in cities in Alabama. The Commission should reverse the RHCD and grant the rule waiver that is necessary to allow Fayette to submit such a Form 466 to the RHCD *nunc pro tunc* as of March 29, 2017.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 is a Form 466 for Fayette that lists a rural rate of \$3397.70 that is split between AT&T and CenturyLink for 50 Mbps Ethernet service and an urban rate of \$1,171.50 (\$585.75 per terminating end). Fayette respectfully requests that the Commission; (1) waive § 54.605 of the Telecom Rules to the limited extent of allowing Fayette to submit the Form 466 that is attached as Exhibit 2 to USAC; and (2) direct USAC to process the Form 466 as if it had been submitted on March 29, 2017 in response to the RHCD’s request for information.

³¹ 47 U.S.C. § 254(h)(1)(A).

³² *Rural Health Care Support Mechanism*, 30 FCC Rcd at 231 (¶ 3).

Respectfully submitted,

Fayette Medical Center

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jay Waldrop", written over a horizontal line.

Jay Waldrop
DCH Health System
IT Team Leader
809 University Blvd E, Tuscaloosa, AL 35406
205-759-6090

07/28/17

EXHIBIT 1

DECLARATION

I, Geoff W. Boggs, do hereby declare as follows:

1. I am the Chief Executive Officer of USF Healthcare Consulting, Inc. ("UHC").
2. USF Healthcare Consulting, Inc. is a Kentucky based corporation that assists nonprofit Healthcare Facility with their Universal Service Fund ("USF") applications.
3. Fayette Medical Center (Fayette) is a not-for-profit hospital that is located in Fayette, Alabama. Fayette Medical Center has been under a lease agreement with DCH Health System since 1984.
4. UHC was retained to assist Fayette in obtaining USF support through the Telecommunications Program ("Telecom Program") for rural health care providers ("HCPs"). Fayette authorized UHC to prepare the FCC Forms 465 ("Form 465s") and the FCC Forms 466 ("Form 466s") necessary to obtain Telecom Program funding and to submit them electronically to the Rural Health Care Division ("RHCD") of the Universal Service Administrative Company ("USAC").
5. I am preparing this declaration to support the appeal and request for waiver that Fayette plans to file with respect to the RHCD's decisions not to approve the funding request number ("FRN") identified in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1

FUND YEAR	HCP NO	HCP NAME	FRN
2016	10434	Fayette Medical Center	1698666

6. UHC prepared and submitted the Form 465s and Form 466s associated with the FRN identified above. I was listed as the contact person at Line 16 of the Form 465s and I electronically signed and certified the Form 466s. The Form 466 that was submitted electronically to USAC on November 30, 2016 included the information set forth in Table 2.

TABLE 2

HCP	FRN	SERVICE	BANDWIDTH	RURAL RATE	URBAN RATE
Fayette	1698666	Ethernet	50 Meg	*\$3,394.70	*\$390.00

* The \$3,394.70 is split between two carriers, AT&T and CenturyLink, (\$1,280.00+\$2,114.70).

7. UHC found it difficult to obtain tariffed or publicly available rates for high-speed Ethernet packet-based services that are offered in urban areas (cities with populations of 50,000 or more). Typically, such services are provided by lightly-regulated competitive carriers that neither publish tariffs nor make their urban rates available to the public.

8. Because of the difficulty of obtaining publicly-available urban rates for Ethernet services, UHC followed the practice of obtaining urban rates from urban service providers. To document the urban rate, UHC asked the provider to supply a letter on its letterhead that states the rate that is charged in an urban area in the state for an Ethernet service similar to that required by the HCP.

9. To provide the urban rate documentation required by Line 41 of the Form 466, Fayette submitted a letter, dated September 21, 2016, from Scott Madison, the managing member of Network Services Solutions ("NSS"). Mr. Madison represented that "[t]he urban rate for a 50 Meg Ethernet connection in Birmingham, AL. is \$195.00 per channel termination. This rate is based upon a 36-month contract." I understood that NSS provided service to HCPs in the Telecom Program, and I was led to believe that I could rely on the urban rates that NSS supplied.

10. As far as I am aware, there is no Commission rule that informs an HCP of how it must submit a Form 466 electronically to USAC, or how the HCP must document the urban rate that is provided in a Form 466. Moreover, I do not know of a Commission rule that affords an HCP no more than 14 calendar days to respond to a USAC request for omitted or adequate documentation of the urban rate. I was led to believe that an HCP was free to supplement its initial

response to a USAC request for urban rate documentation.

11. On March 27, 2017, the RHCD sent emails to Fayette and UHC, it referred to an attachment that posed questions with regard to the HCP's the above-identified FRN. The email stated, "Please submit your responses to these inquiries by no later than fourteen (14) calendar days from the date of this letter. Failure to provide the requested information within this time frame will result in denial of the funding requests." In contrast, the attachment concluded:

Please submit your responses to the above requests by no later than **fourteen (14) calendar days** from the date of this letter. Failure to respond to USAC's information requests in a timely manner and/or provide the requested documentation demonstrating compliance with the Commission's rules may result in denial of the funding request, a commitment adjustment, rejection of an invoice, and/or recovery of improperly disbursed funds. The responses you provide may also result in a follow-up information requests by USAC as necessary.

12. Fayette was requested to provide: (a) an explanation of "how the urban of \$195.00 was derived;" (b) "documentation to support the urban rate provided, including, but not limited to, documentation that supports that the urban rate for the requested service is 'no higher than the highest tariffed or publicly-available rate charged to a commercial customer for a functionally similar service' in any city with a population of 50,000 or more in that state;" and (c) an "explanation how the HCP's request for 50 Mbps Ethernet service is 'functionally similar' to the services(s) used for purposes of this comparison."

13. Attachment 1 to this declaration is a copy of the email that I sent to the RHCD on March 29, 2017, which was in response the RCHD's information request. I provided the RHCD with a two-page rate card that showed AT&T's rates for its switched Ethernet Services effective May 1, 2016 and an excerpt from the "AT&T Ethernet Service Guide," which described the service. Those documents showed that BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC offered to provide 50 Mbps switched Ethernet service throughout Alabama at monthly charge of \$195.00 under a

three-year contract.

14. In my March 29, 2017 email, I asked the RHCD to confirm that it received my email. I also requested that the RHCD "let me know if we are missing anything."

15. Concerned that USAC had not approved the Forms 466s that UHC had filed that relied on the \$195.00 urban rate, I sent an email to Erica Stauter at USAC on April 14, 2017 in which I stated:

I wanted to ask about the Ethernet applications we filed and then resubmitted urban rates. We have not received any approvals on these and I wanted to make sure that you did not need anything else from us. Jeremy [Matkovich] told us our urban rates were fine, so I am just checking.

Some of our HCP [clients] are clamoring about their credits and I want to give them an answer.

16. On April 14, 2017, Blythe Albert responded to my email to Ms. Stauter. She sent me an email informing me as follows:

There seems to be some miscommunication about the forms below. These forms are being reviewed using the documentation provided. Until the reviews of all of these forms has been completed no commitments will be issued. During the review process, additional questions may be asked to verify the information provided. The attached email is the correspondence between you and Jeremy. He did not explicitly say that the urban rates were fine. The first sentence says, "If the monthly recurring cost for services(s) that the HCP is requesting only for the transport and does not include any service charges(s)....." We will reach out with more questions if necessary. Thanks.

17. I immediately sent Ms. Albert an email in which I asked her: "If they are not accepted, will you tell us before denying? We want to make sure we are providing the right urban rates." Ms. Albert did not answer my question.

18. Beginning on May 11, 2017, I began providing Ms. Albert with copies AT&T pricing schedules showing that AT&T offered 100 Mbps switched Ethernet service to HCPs at rates comparable to the \$195 urban rate specified in the Form 466s that the Fayette HCP submitted. I sent her rate schedules showing that AT&T had agreed to provide 100 Mbps switched Ethernet

services to an HCP in Hondo, Texas at a monthly rate of \$214.50, and to an HCP in Independence, Kansas at a monthly rate of \$235.95. These rates were good throughout all AT&T territories including Alabama. I offered to discuss the rate schedules with Ms. Albert, and I asked her if I could speak with the person who was reviewing the 195.00 urban rate.

19. Attachment 2 is a copy of the email that I sent USAC on behalf of Fayette on June 1, 2017. In my email, I stated:

I understand the \$195 urban rate is still under review. Since these FRNs have not been approved ... I am submitting a new urban rate, similar to the \$195, to be used if the \$195 is not accepted. I have attached the urban rate. This is to be used for the following [HCPs] and [FRNs].

HCP 10434 FRN 1698666

20. Attached to my email was a copy of a document showing that an AT&T customer had accepted the rates, terms and conditions of an AT&T switched Ethernet service pricing schedule. I circled the terms of the pricing schedule indicating that the urban rate for the Ethernet circuits should be \$214.50.

21. I fully expected that the RHCD would contact me if it had any questions with regard to the \$195 or the \$214.50 urban rate, and UHC would be afforded the opportunity to address any such questions before the RHCD would render its funding decisions. UHC was given no such opportunity. I asked Blythe Albert multiple times to talk to the reviewer and never received any communication from a reviewer.

22. On June 2, 2017, I was notified that USAC was "unable to provide support" to Fayette, specifically because it had not "demonstrated that the urban rate provided for the requested is 'no higher than the highest tariffed or publicly-available rate charged to a commercial customer for a *functionally similar* service' in any city with a population of 50,000 or more in that state."

23. I subsequently learned that the urban rate should have included AT&T's "Basic

Port” charge and its “Committed Information Rate” or “CIR.” Accordingly, I went back to the AT&T pricing schedule that I sent Ms. Albert on May 15, 2017, and I circled the \$214.50 port charge and the appropriate CIR. I then wrote the information set forth in Table 3 on page 4 of the pricing schedule.

TABLE 3

BANDWIDTH	PORT CHARGE	CIR	TOTAL
5 Mbps	\$214.50	\$158.85	\$373.35
10 Mbps	\$214.50	\$255.00	\$464.50
20 Mbps	\$214.50	\$321.30	\$535.80
50 Mbps	\$214.50	\$371.25	\$585.75
100 Mbps	\$214.50	\$433.94	\$648.44

24. Attachment 3 consists of the emails that I sent the RHCD and Ms. Albert on June 12, 2017, and the AT&T pricing schedule that was an attachment to the first of my two emails. I requested feedback on whether the AT&T pricing schedule could be used to document urban rates that would be comprised of its basic port rate and a CIR. Thus, I proposed to use Ethernet urban rates set forth in Table 3 for Funding Year 2017. I inquired whether UHC would be given the opportunity to fix any problems that USAC would have with regard to the proposed urban rates. I also asked for a prompt response to my question so that UHC could complete applications for funding prior to the upcoming deadline.


25. Ms. Albert called me on June 13, 2017 and left the following message:

Hey Geoff, it's Blythe calling from USAC. My direct line is 202-772-5248. About that urban rate document, we've kind of can't talk about them outside of the review but it looks like it has a pretty decent information and a reviewer will definitely reach out to you. I would suggest just submitting your application using that urban rate document if that makes sense and they, the reviewer, will reach out to you and we'll see what comes of that, ok. Anyway, you can call me back but that's pretty much, you know, the best answer I can give you, we don't typically review documents outside of the review. But it, for all intents and purposes, looks like it has decent information to me, I'm not sure what the reviewer will come up with but they will definitely, no question, reach out to you. Ok? Thanks. Bye.

26. We believe if RHCD had reached out in a call to communicate their questions

they would have approved this application.

27. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on July 27, 2017.



Geoff W. Boggs

ATTACHMENT 1

Geoff Boggs

From: Geoff Boggs
Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2017 10:27 AM
To: 'RHC-Assist'
Subject: RE: Request for Information for HCP#(s) 10434 for FY 2016
Attachments: AT&T Ethernet @ \$195.00.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I have attached the AT&T tariff which is for a 100 Meg. That will cover this 50 Meg.

Please confirm receipt and let me know if we are missing anything.

Thanks

Geoff Boggs
USF Healthcare Consulting, Inc.
P. O. Box 326
Prospect, KY 40059
502-228-1907
888-875-8810 Fax
gboggs@uasave.com

From: RHC-Assist [mailto:rhc-assist@usac.org]
Sent: Monday, March 27, 2017 1:50 PM
To: kwells@dchsystem.com; jwaldrop@dchsystem.com
Cc: gboggs@uasave.com
Subject: Request for Information for HCP#(s) 10434 for FY 2016

Kelly Wells,

Please see attached document for additional information regarding HCP number(s) 10434 for FY 2016.

Please submit your responses to these inquiries by no later than fourteen (14) calendar days from the date of this letter. Failure to provide the requested information within this time frame will result in denial of the funding requests.

The information contained in this electronic communication and any attachments and links to websites are intended for the exclusive use of the addressee(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, or the person responsible for delivering this communication to the intended recipient, be advised you have received this communication in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately and destroy all copies of this communication and any attachments.

ATTACHMENT 2

Geoff Boggs

From: Geoff Boggs
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 11:38 AM
To: 'RHC-Assist'; 'Nikoletta Theodoropoulos'; 'Blythe Albert'
Subject: HCP 10434 2016 Applications
Attachments: AT&T Ethernet contract \$214.00 Multi state.pdf

I understand the \$195 urban rate is still under review. Since these FRN's have not been approved and I am submitting a new urban rate, similar to the \$195, to be used if the \$195 is not accepted. I have attached the urban here. This is to be used for the following HCP's and FRN's.

HCP 10434 FRN 1698666

Please call me if you have any questions.

Geoff Boggs
USF Healthcare Consulting, Inc.
P. O. Box 326
Prospect, KY 40059
502-228-1907
888-875-8810 Fax
gboggs@uasave.com

ATTACHMENT 3

Geoff Boggs

From: Geoff Boggs
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2017 4:54 PM
To: 'RHC-Assist'; 'Blythe Albert'; 'Nikoletta Theodoropoulos'
Subject: RE: 2017 Telecommunication Program Applications Urban Rate
Attachments: AT&T Ethernet contract \$214.00 COS Multi state.pdf

Were you able to review this contract to be used as an urban rate for Ethernet circuits? I would appreciate some feedback.

Thanks,

Geoff Boggs
USF Healthcare Consulting, Inc.
P. O. Box 326
Prospect, KY 40059
502-228-1907
888-875-8810 Fax
gboggs@uasave.com

From: Geoff Boggs [<mailto:gboggs@uasave.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 12, 2017 7:57 AM
To: 'RHC-Assist' <rhc-assist@usac.org>; 'Blythe Albert' <Blythe.Albert@usac.org>; 'Nikoletta Theodoropoulos' <Nikoletta.Theodoropoulos@usac.org>
Subject: 2017 Telecommunication Program Applications Urban Rate

Can you give me some feedback?

We are using this urban rate for some Ethernet circuits for the states covered on this contract. The speeds are from 2 Meg to 1 GIG.

If the services are non-Internet Ethernet circuits will this work as an urban rate?

If you have any questions on urban rates will you notify us and give an opportunity to fix it for 2017 applications?

Please respond as soon as possible so that we can complete the applications in question before the deadline.

Geoff Boggs
USF Healthcare Consulting, Inc.
P. O. Box 326
Prospect, KY 40059
502-228-1907
888-875-8810 Fax
gboggs@uasave.com




Contract ID: 4870831

AT&T MA Reference No. 138180UA
AT&T Contract ID No. SDN50MJUPR

AT&T SWITCHED ETHERNET SERVICESM (with NETWORK ON DEMAND)
Pricing Schedule Provided Pursuant to Custom Terms

By signing this Pricing Schedule, Customer accepts all rates, terms and conditions herein, as presented to Customer by AT&T.

Customer (by its authorized representative)	
By:	
Printed or Typed Name:	KEVIN FROSCH
Title:	CPO
Date:	8/25/2016

For AT&T internal use only:

Contract Ordering and Billing Number (CNUM):

pcs_processed, cs_approved

AT&T and Customer Confidential Information
Page 2 of 5

ASE_NoD_ps_11 EC etool_customer
v09-17-15 1

WK# - Interstate-InterLATA - TBD	For AT&T Administrative Use Only Pricing Schedule No. _____ Original Effective Date: _____
----------------------------------	--

AT&T Switched Ethernet ServiceSM (with Network On Demand) Pricing Schedule Provided Pursuant to Custom Terms

1. SERVICE, SERVICE PROVIDER(S) and SERVICE PUBLICATION(S)

1.1 AT&T Switched Ethernet ServiceSM

Service Areas

Service	Service Publication (Incorporated by reference)	Service Publication location
AT&T Switched Ethernet Service SM	AT&T Switched Ethernet Service Guide	http://cpr.att.com/pdf/commonEthServGuide.html

Service Providers			
AT&T Alabama	AT&T Indiana	AT&T Missouri	AT&T Tennessee
AT&T Arkansas	AT&T Kansas	AT&T Nevada	AT&T Texas
AT&T California	AT&T Kentucky	AT&T North Carolina	AT&T Wisconsin
AT&T Florida	AT&T Louisiana	AT&T Ohio	BellSouth Telecommunications, LLC d/b/a AT&T Southeast
AT&T Georgia	AT&T Michigan	AT&T Oklahoma	
AT&T Illinois	AT&T Mississippi	AT&T South Carolina	

1.2 Inside Wiring

Service	AT&T Inside Wiring		
Service Provider	Service Publication	Service Publication Location	
Same as the AT&T Service Provider for the AT&T Switched Ethernet Service	AT&T Inside Wiring Service Attachment	http://cpr.att.com/pdf/service_publications/ASE_SDN_Inside_Wiring_Attachment.pdf	

2. PRICING SCHEDULE TERM, EFFECTIVE DATES

* Term

Pricing Schedule Term	36 months
Pricing following the end of Pricing Schedule Term	Non-stabilized prices as modified from time to time in applicable Service Publication or, if there is no such pricing, the pricing in this Pricing Schedule

3. MINIMUM PAYMENT PERIOD

Service Components	Percentage of Monthly Recurring Charge Applied for Calculation of Early Termination Charges*	Minimum Payment Period per Service Component
All Service Components	50% plus any unpaid or waived non-recurring charges	Until end of Pricing Schedule Term
*Early termination charges shall not exceed the total amount of monthly recurring charges for the remainder of the Minimum Payment Period; refer to <u>Network on Demand Guide</u> for details.		

4. ADDS

AT&T Switched Ethernet Service Customer Port Connections may be purchased during the Pricing Schedule Term at the rates, terms and conditions herein.

* ETHERNET URBAN RATES

Contract Id: 4870831

WK# - Interstate-InterLATA - TBD

For AT&T Administrative Use Only
Pricing Schedule No. _____
Original Effective Date: _____

AT&T Switched Ethernet ServiceSM (with Network On Demand) Pricing Schedule Provided Pursuant to Custom Terms

5. RATES and CHARGES

5.1 AT&T SWITCHED ETHERNET SERVICE

5.1.1 Monthly Recurring Charges (MRC)

All Monthly Recurring Charge (MRC) rates are per port. The total MRC for a port is the sum of the Port Connection MRC, the Bandwidth MRC, and any associated Feature MRC(s).

Port Connection MRC

* Cost of Circuit

Customer Port Connection Speed	MRC
100 Mbps	\$214.5
1 Gbps	\$214.5

Bandwidth MRC

If Customer changes the CIR and/or CoS configuration during the billing cycle, the Bandwidth MRC will be prorated based on the time interval for each configuration.

Bandwidth MRC (100 Mbps and 1 Gbps Basic Port Connections)					
Committed Information Rate (CIR)	Class of Service (CoS)				
	Non Critical High	Business Critical Medium	Business Critical High	Interactive	Real Time
2 Mbps	\$91.09	\$94.23	\$113.08	\$133.49	\$144.49
4 Mbps	\$107.34	\$110.50	\$129.44	\$146.80	\$157.85
5 Mbps	\$136.61	\$142.97	\$158.85	\$174.74	\$187.44
8 Mbps	\$180.88	\$187.50	\$202.84	\$216.47	\$231.81
10 Mbps	\$210.80	\$221.00	\$255.00	\$289.00	\$309.40
20 Mbps	\$276.32	\$289.17	\$321.30	\$353.43	\$379.13
50 Mbps	\$323.40	\$338.25	\$371.25	\$404.25	\$435.60
100 Mbps	\$380.53	\$400.56	\$433.94	\$467.32	\$500.70
150 Mbps	\$530.94	\$557.29	\$582.82	\$607.95	\$652.53
250 Mbps	\$604.95	\$635.20	\$715.86	\$796.52	\$855.00
400 Mbps	\$665.91	\$699.50	\$778.54	\$857.58	\$920.82
500 Mbps	\$707.17	\$742.33	\$820.47	\$898.61	\$965.03
600 Mbps	\$809.63	\$849.73	\$939.47	\$1002.49	\$1073.14
1000 Mbps	\$918.26	\$965.11	\$1040.07	\$1115.03	\$1195.61

5M 214.50 10M 214.50 20M 214.50 50M 214.50 100M 214.50
 158.85 255.00 321.30 371.25 433.94
 Feature MRC \$ 373.35 \$ 464.50 \$ 535.00 \$ 589.15 \$ 648.44

Feature	MRC
Enhanced Multicast	\$70

5.1.2 Non Recurring Charges (NRC)

Standard Non Recurring Charges for installation of new Customer Port Connections, per the applicable Service Publication, will be waived.

EXHIBIT 2

The deadline to submit this form is the June 30th end of the funding year.

Estimated time per response: 3 hours

Read instructions thoroughly before completing this form. Failure to comply may cause delayed or denied funding.**Block 1: HCP Information**

1 HCP Name Fayette Regional Medical Center	2 HCP Number 10434
3 Form 465 Application #43162715	4 Consortium Name (If any)

Block 2: Bill Payer Information

5 Billed Entity Name Fayette Regional Medical Center	6 Billed Entity FCC RN 0004557195
7 Contact Name Jay Waldrop	
8 Address Line 1 1653 Temple Ave	
9 Address Line 2	
10 City Fayette	11 State AL 12 Zip 35555
13 Contact Phone #205-759-7111	14 Fax # 15 Email jwaldrop@dchsystem.com

Block 3: Funding Year Information

16 Funding Year - Check only one box
<input type="checkbox"/> Year 2014 (7/1/2014-6/30/2015) <input type="checkbox"/> Year 2015 (7/1/2015-6/30/2016) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Year 2016 (7/1/2016-6/30/2017)

Block 4: Service Information

17 Type of Service & Circuit Bandwidth (Documentation required) 50 Mbps Ethernet
18 Total Billed Miles 0 19 Maximum Allowable Distance (From Form 465)
20 Percentage of HCP's service used for the provision of health care. 100 (If less than 100%, please explain.) If the HCP indicated it is a part-time eligible entity (on Form 465), describe method of allocating prorated support.

Connection Information	Carrier A	Carrier B	Carrier C	Carrier D
21 Service Provider Name	Centurylink	AT&T		
22 Service Provider Identification Number (SPIN)	143019614	143004824		
23 Service Provider Contact Person Name	Tommy Shelton	Michael Goode		
24 Service Provider Contact Person's Phone #	256-259-1988	205-969-4326		
25 Service Provider Contact Person Email	tommy.shelton@centurylink.com	mg0854@att.com		
26 Circuit Start Location	1653 Temple Ave Fayette AL 35555	1653 Temple Ave., Fayette AL 35555		
27 Circuit Termination Location	809 University Blvd. E Tuscaloosa AL	809 University Blvd. E 205-1401-001		
28 Billing Account Number	300973181			
29 Tariff, Contract or other document reference number	NA	NA		
30 Date Contract Signed or Date HCP Selected Carrier	10/24/2011	11/24/2011		
31 Contract Expiration Date (mm/dd/yyyy or NA if MTM)	MTM	MTM		
32 Service Installation Date	12/29/2011	12/29/2011		
33 Actual Rural Rate per Month (Enclose Documentation)	1280.00	2114.70		
34 If you are a consortium member OR have multiple carriers, please attach a Circuit Diagram to show how the sites interconnect and which carrier(s) provides each circuit segment. Circuit Diagram included: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No				
35 Are you a mobile rural health care provider? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If yes, see instructions and attach a list of all sites to be served.				

IF YOU ARE REQUESTING SUPPORT FOR MILEAGE-BASED CHARGES, COMPLETE BLOCK 5 ONLY AND SKIP BLOCK 6. (PLEASE SEE INSTRUCTIONS). IF YOU ARE REQUESTING SUPPORT BASED ON URBAN/RURAL RATE COMPARISON, SKIP BLOCK 5 AND COMPLETE ONLY BLOCK 6. YOUR APPLICATION CANNOT BE PROCESSED IF BOTH BLOCKS ARE COMPLETED.

Block 5: Mileage-based Charge Discount Request

Complete this block if you are seeking support for mileage (distance-based) charges only. Do not enter any other charges in this block. You may need to ask your service provider representative to provide this information.

36 Billed Circuit Miles	0			
37 Monthly Mileage Charges (Exclude Channel Termination chgs, etc.) °				
38 Cost per Mile per Month	0			

If Line 33 equals Line 37, please ensure that ONLY mileage-related charges are included in Line 37. (See instructions.)

Block 6: Comprehensive Rate Comparison Request

Complete Block 6 if you have not completed Block 5 and are requesting support for all elements of your telecommunications service necessary for the provision of health care. The information in this block will establish the difference between the urban and rural rates for your requested service. Please contact RHCD at (800 453-1546 if you need assistance.

39 One-time Urban Rate Charge (in selected large city)				
40 One-time Rural Rate Charge (in city where HCP is located)				
41 Monthly Urban Rate (in selected large city). From RHCD website: <input type="checkbox"/> or Other rate documentation attached: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	\$1,171.50			

If your circuit includes charges for mileage over the Maximum Allowable Dist., (Line 19), please complete Lines 42 to 44. Otherwise, skip to Block 7.

42 Billed Circuit Miles	0			
43 Monthly Mileage Based Charges	0			
44 Cost per Mile per Month	0			

Block 7: Bid Documentation

45 Did you receive any bids in response to the Form 465 Request for Services posted on the RHCD website? ☐ Yes ☒ No
If you checked yes, copies of the bids MUST be submitted to RHCD.


Block 8: Certification

46 ☒ I certify that the above named entity has considered all bids received and selected the most cost-effective method of providing the requested service or services. The "most cost-effective service" is defined in the Universal Service Order as the service available at the lowest cost after consideration of the features, quality of transmission, reliability, and other factors that the health care provider deems necessary for the service to adequately transmit the health care services required by the health care provider.

47 ☒ Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. Secs. 54.601 and 54.603, I certify that the HCP or consortium that I am representing satisfies all of the requirements herein and will abide by all of the relevant requirements, including all applicable FCC rules, with respect to universal service benefits provided under 47 U.S.C. Sec. 254. I understand that any letter from RHCD that erroneously states that funds will be made available for the benefit of the applicant may be subject to rescission.

48 ☒ I hereby certify that the billed entity will maintain complete billing records for the service for five years.

49 ☒ I certify that I am authorized to submit this request on behalf of the above-named Billed Entity and HCP, and that I have examined this form and attachments and that to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, all statements of fact contained herein are true.

50 Signature 	51 Date 7-27-17
52 Printed name of authorized person Geoff Boggs	53 Title or position of authorized person CEO
54 Employer of authorized person USF Healthcare Consulting	55 Employer's FCC RN 0018694075

Please remember:

- ♦ You must submit one Form 466 for **each service** (i.e., circuit) for which you request reduced rates. For example:
 - If you are requesting reduced rates for **two** T1 lines, you must submit **two** Forms 466.
 - If you are requesting reduced rates for **two** ISDN lines & **one** Frame Relay line, you must submit **three** Forms 466.
- ♦ **If the service described on this form is subject to the 28-day competitive bidding requirement, do not select a carrier or complete the Form 466 before or during the 28-day posting period.**
- ♦ **You must provide evidence of the urban rate if you have completed Block 6 and have not used the urban rates from the website.**
- ♦ This form, attachments, and supporting documents should be combined in one envelope and sent to the RHCD.
- ♦ If the service described on this form changes (e.g., rate change) during the funding year, **you must notify RHCD immediately** and submit a revised Form 466.
- ♦ If you have any questions, contact RHCD at (800) 453-1546.

Persons willfully making false statements on this form can be punished by fine or forfeiture under the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. Secs. 502, 503(b), or fine or imprisonment under Title 18 of the United States Code, 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1001.

FCC NOTICE FOR INDIVIDUALS REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT AND THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

Part 3 of the Commission's Rules authorize the FCC to request the information on this form. The data reported will be used to ensure that health care providers have selected the most cost-effective method of providing the requested services as set forth in 47 C.F.R. Section 54.603(b)(4). The information will be used by the Universal Service Administrative Company and/or the staff of the Federal Communications Commission, to evaluate this form, to provide information for enforcement and rulemaking proceedings and to maintain a current inventory of applicants, health care providers, billed entities, and service providers. No authorization can be granted unless all information requested is provided. Failure to provide all requested information will delay the processing of the application or result in the application being returned without action. Information requested by this form will be available for public inspection. Your response is required to obtain the requested authorization.

The public reporting for this collection of information is estimated to average 3 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the required data, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. If you have any comments on this burden estimate, or how we can improve the collection and reduce the burden it causes you, please write to the Federal Communications Commission, AMD-PER, Paperwork Reduction Act Project (3060-0804), Washington, DC 20554. We will also accept your comments regarding the Paperwork Reduction Act aspects of this collection via the Internet if you send them to pra@fcc.gov. PLEASE DO NOT SEND YOUR RESPONSE TO THIS ADDRESS.

Remember - You are not required to respond to a collection of information sponsored by the Federal government, and the government may not conduct or sponsor this collection, unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number or if we fail to provide you with this notice. This collection has been assigned an OMB control number of 3060-0804.

THE FOREGOING NOTICE IS REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974, PUBLIC LAW 93-579, DECEMBER 31, 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(3) AND THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1995, PUBLIC LAW 104-13, OCTOBER 1, 1995, 44 U.S.C. SECTION 3507.

This form should be submitted online through the RHC Program online application system, My Portal.
<https://forms.universalservice.org/usaclogin/login.asp>

Fayette Regional Medical Center
1653 Temple Ave
Fayette, AL 35555

This Ethernet Circuit has a "meet point" at the Central Office before terminating in Tuscaloosa

SA: 1653 Temple Ave Fayette AL to Central Office
End Location: Central Office to 809 University Blvd. E Tuscaloosa, AL 35401

HCP: 10434

Split A Ethernet 50M
Centurylink 300973181
Spin 143019614

Split B
AT&T 205-M21-3434-001
Spin 143004824

Rural Rate:

Split A	\$1280.00
Split B	\$1995.00
<u>Taxes on B</u>	<u>119.70</u>
Total	\$3,394.70

Urban Rate: 36 month AT&T switched Ethernet contract

\$1171.50 (\$585.75 x 2)

- * Still receiving 36 month contracted pricing
- * All of the urban rate was put on Split A

Account Name: FAYETTE COUNTY HOSPITAL
Account Number: 300973181

P.O. Box 4300
Carol Stream, IL 60197-4300

Page: 1 of 13
Bill Date: Dec. 11, 2016

Previous Balance	Payments	Adjustments Credits	Current Charges
7,325.41 CR	0.00	0.00	3,783.07

Payment Summary

Previous Balance	7,325.41 CR
Less Payments	0.00

Balance	7,325.41 CR
----------------	-------------

Adjustments/Credits Summary

Adjustments to Previous Balance	0.00
---------------------------------	------

Total Adjustments	0.00
--------------------------	-------------

Current Charge Summary

Monthly Charges	3,659.23
One-Time Charges	0.00
Usage Charges	0.00
Discount	0.00
Adjustments	0.00
Taxes, Fees, and Surcharges	123.84

Total Current Charges	3,783.07
------------------------------	-----------------

Due Date	Jan. 03, 2017	Amount Due	3,542.34 CR
-----------------	----------------------	-------------------	--------------------

IMPORTANT NEWS

CenturyLink understands that your telecommunication service is your lifeline to your business. Thank you for trusting us to help you make connections that count with your customers. For questions, or inquiries about additional services, call our Customer Contact Center at 1-800-201-4102 or call your local CenturyLink representative.

PLEASE FOLD, TEAR HERE AND RETURN THIS PORTION WITH YOUR PAYMENT

YOUR ACCOUNT CONTAINS A CREDIT - DO NOT PAY

FOR CHANGE OF ADDRESS OR PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION:

11

Please check here and complete reverse. Thank You.

Account Number:

300973181

FAYETTE COUNTY HOSPITAL
809 UNIVERSITY BLVD E
TUSCALOOSA, AL 35401-2029

CenturyLink
P.O. Box 4300
Carol Stream, IL 60197-4300

[illegible]

P.O. Box 4300
Carol Stream, IL 60197-4300

Page: 4 of 13
Bill Date: Dec. 11, 2016

Current Charges Summary

Service From Dec. 11, 2016

Monthly Charges

	Qty	Rate	Amount
Additional Listing-Bus	1 @	2.50	2.50
B1 + Basic Calling Plan	3 @	30.00	90.00
Block of 20 Numbers SPRequest	15 @	4.00	60.00
Broadband Cost Recovery Fee	6 @	3.99	23.94
Business HSI 6.0M/512K	1 @	59.95	59.95
Business HSI 6.0M/512K	1 @	69.95	69.95
Call Forward Busy Bus	1 @	1.57	1.57
Call Forwarding Business	1 @	5.25	5.25
Community Plus Calling Plan	1 @	8.27	8.27
Facility Relocation Cost Recovery Fee	9 @	0.54	4.86
Facility Relocation Fee BUS	5 @	0.54	2.70
Federal Subscriber Line & Access Recovery Charge	14 @	9.11	127.54
HSI 8.0M/768K Business	1 @	59.95	59.95
High Speed Internet DSL 1.5M/512K	1 @	49.95	49.95
High Speed Internet Up to 3.0M/512K	1 @	59.95	59.95
ISDN Line Port PRI	1 @	10.00	10.00
ISDN PRI 36 - 59 Months	1 @	700.00	700.00
Local Channel	60 @	2.40	144.00
Local Channel	4 @	7.20	28.80
Local Chnl Mo2Mo 1st 1/2 Mile	2 @	105.00	210.00
Local Chnl Mo2Mo Addl 1/2 Mile	4 @	39.00	156.00
Local Loop Mlg-Addl 1/4	9 @	2.00	18.00
Long Distance Line Charge	2 @	3.99	7.98
Metro Ethernet 50 Mbps	1 @	1,280.00	1,280.00
Modem Equipment Fee	1 @	9.99	9.99
Multi Line 1 Party Business	6 @	44.23	265.38
Off Premise Mileage -1/4	1 @	2.00	2.00
Off Premise Mlg-Addl 1/4	2 @	2.00	4.00
Private Line Signaling	20 @	2.40	48.00
Private Line Signaling	4 @	7.20	28.80
Router Equipment Fee	5 @	9.99	49.95
Pure Business Broadband	1 @	69.95	69.95
Total Monthly Charges			3,659.23

Taxes, Fees and Surcharges

ALABAMA Rental Tax	2.10
ALABAMA State 911 Business	57.75
ALABAMA State Telecommunications Relay Service Surcharge	4.95
FAYETTE Franchise Fee	31.32
FAYETTE Rental Tax	1.00
Federal Property Tax Recovery Fee	0.14
Federal Regulatory Recovery Fee	0.02
Federal Telecommunications Relay Fee	0.18
Federal Universal Service Fund Surcharge	26.38
Total Taxes, Fees and Surcharges	123.84

Total Current Charges

3,783.07

P.O. Box 4300
Carol Stream, IL 60197-4300

Page: 10 of 13
Bill Date: Dec. 11, 2016

Charge Detail

Local Service from DEC 11 to JAN 10

Product-ID: F76-450-3141 05/UHXX/106708//CTAL ASR#603747

Circuit-ID: 05/UHXX/106708//CTAL

Monthly Charges

Total Optional Features/Services	366.00	
Total Monthly Charges		366.00

Charge Detail For F76-450-3141	366.00
--------------------------------	--------

Product-ID: F76-495-1331

Circuit-ID: Unknown

Monthly Charges

Private Line Signaling	24.00	
Total Optional Features/Services	24.00	
Total Monthly Charges		24.00

Charge Detail For F76-495-1331	24.00
--------------------------------	-------

Product-ID: F76-495-1451

Circuit-ID: 00/OSXX/107193//CTAL

Monthly Charges

Private Line Signaling	24.00	
Total Optional Features/Services	24.00	
Total Monthly Charges		24.00

Charge Detail For F76-495-1451	24.00
--------------------------------	-------

Product-ID: F90-856-3554 METRO ETHERNET 50 M; PON #11-049779 ME/KEFS/281311//CTAL

Circuit-ID: ME/KEFS/281311//CTAL

Monthly Charges

** Metro Ethernet 50 Mbps	1,280.00	
Total Optional Features/Services	1,280.00	
Total Monthly Charges		1,280.00

Charge Detail For F90-856-3554	1,280.00
--------------------------------	----------

Product-ID: F91-682-9910 PROD EXT: 2 WIRE

Circuit-ID: 60/OPXX/234070//CTAL

Monthly Charges

Local Channel	36.00	
Total Optional Features/Services	36.00	
Total Monthly Charges		36.00

Charge Detail For F91-682-9910	36.00
--------------------------------	-------

205132134340010540000002000700000000000000000000000002209975



BILLING NUMBER 205 M21-3434 001
BILLING PERIOD JUN 25,2016 00013
PAGE 134

CHARGES FOR DEPARTMENT IDENTIFIER - UNIVERSITYBLVD-ME

CHARGES FOR EARNING NUMBER 205 M57-8247

(CIRCUIT NUMBER - 10.L2XN.501231..SC)

MONTHLY SERVICE

93. MONTHLY SERVICE - JUN 25 THROUGH JUL 24 1,995.00
BREAKDOWN BY STATION NUMBER
10.L2XN.501231..SC 1,995.00
TOTAL MONTHLY SERVICE 1,995.00

TAXES AND FRANCHISE

94. AL - STATE/LOCAL TAX. 119.70
TOTAL TAX APPLIED. 119.70
TOTAL FOR EARNING NUMBER 205 M57-8247 2,114.70

TAXES AND FRANCHISE

AL - STATE/LOCAL TAX. 119.70
TOTAL TAX APPLIED. 119.70
TOTAL FOR DEPARTMENT IDENTIFIER - UNIVERSITYBLVD-ME 2,114.70



Fayette County Hospital
Proposal For CenturyTel Metro Ethernet
Proposal Date: 9/6/2011
Expire Quote Date: 11/5/2011
Customer Copy - Quote #: 11-049779

SA Proof



Customer Contact Information:

Company Name: FAYETTE COUNTY HOSPITAL
Billing Address: 809 UNIVERSITY BLVD E
Billing City, State, Zip: TUSCALOOSA AL 35401-2029
BAN ID: 300973181
Customer Contact Name: Kelly Wells
Customer Contact Phone: 205-759-7543
Customer Contact E-mail:

Customer Service Location:

Primary Location Name: FAYETTE COUNTY HOSPITAL
Address: 1653 TEMPLE AVE N
Site City, State, Zip: FAYETTE AL 35555-1314
NPA-NXX:
On-Site Contact Name: Kelly Wells
Work TN: 205-759-7543

Telco Central Office Information:

Telco: CENTURYTEL OF ALABAMA, LLC (NORTHERN) DBA CENTURYLINK
Serving Central Office CLLI: FYTTALXA
Serving Central Office Address: 208 3RD AVE SW
Serving Central Office City, State, Zip: FAYETTE AL 35555
TCompany / Submarket: T801 / AL028

CenturyLink Contact Information:

Sales Person: Tommy Shelton [1056808]
Email: Tommy.Shelton@CenturyLink.com
Sales Contact Number: 256-259-1988
Dealer Code: 1056808

Engineer: N/A
Email: N/A
Engineer Contact Number: N/A

Service Description:

Type of Service: CenturyTel Metro Ethernet
Term Agreement: 36 month

Term Options:

Site	Qty	Price Plan	Feature Code	Item	MRR	OTC	NRR
A	1	PPECTL3ZB	E174	50M (Zone 4-B)	\$1,280.00		
TOTAL					\$1,280.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Optional Features:

Site	Qty	Price Plan	Feature Code	Item	MRR	OTC	NRR
TOTAL					\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00



Addendum Agreement

Case Number AL11-4454-00
Option 1 of 1

RATES AND CHARGES

NOTES:

The 'NOTES' section of the 'RATES AND CHARGES' pages of Contract Service Arrangement Agreement AL09-5537-06 is modified as follows:

1. Customer's Metro Ethernet service includes the service locations listed below. Metro Ethernet service is location specific. If facilities do not exist, special construction charges may apply.

809 University Blvd East, Tuscaloosa
1653 N Temple Avenue, Fayette
600 Paul W Bryant Dr East, Tuscaloosa (NEW)
1401 Greensboro Ave, Tuscaloosa, (NEW)

SA Proof

2. These rates and charges are only valid if the Customer is served from a central office equipped for Metro Ethernet service, or can be extended to a central office equipped for Metro Ethernet service.

3. Upon Customer's request to disconnect all service prior to the expiration of the selected term, Customer will be charged a one-time Contract Preparation Charge in the amount of \$472.00.

4. Evolution of Subject Services

The Parties mutually acknowledge the following: (A) from time to time during the Agreement Term, AT&T may (i) modify the features and/or functionalities of Subject Services, and/or (ii) offer a more advanced new service or a more advanced version of Subject Services (whether (i) or (ii), a "Successor Service"); (B) AT&T may limit or preclude new purchases of Subject Service upon introduction of a Successor Service; and (C) the Parties contemplate that any modification to Subject Services, the offering of a Successor Service and/or the limitation or preclusion of new purchases of Subject Services be accomplished without materially and adversely impairing the features, functionalities or specifications of Subject Services, as used by the Customer. If the Customer believes that any modification of the features and/or functionalities of Subject Services or the replacement of Subject Services by a Successor Services results in a Material Adverse Change to the Customer, the Customer's claims, if any, shall be pursued under Section 10 of this Agreement. To facilitate the potential evolution of the Subject Services consistent with (C), above, the Parties agree as follows:

At AT&T's option, AT&T will either: (A) continue to provide to the Customer with Subject Services as described in this Agreement, or (B) provide the Customer with the Successor Service at the same rates provided in this Agreement, for service of like speed and functionality. If AT&T provides the Customer with the Successor Service, Customer may terminate those Subject Services that have been replaced by the Successor Service without Termination Liability Charges (as provided in Section 9, below), and without incurring any additional non-recurring charges for the installation of the Successor Service

AT&T will provide the Customer with notice of all material changes to the Subject Services through accessible letters or by electronic mail, U.S. Mail or commercial messenger service, no later than thirty (30) days prior to implementing such changes.

The Parties shall cooperate in good faith to implement any modifications to the Subject Services in a manner that avoids, to the extent technically and commercially practicable, the disruption or impairment of service to the Customer (subject to planned outages and maintenance periods) consistent with convenience, efficiency and cost-effectiveness for both Parties.