

**STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

**THREE EMPIRE STATE PLAZA, ALBANY, NY 12223-1350**

Internet Address: <http://www.dps.state.ny.us>

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**MAUREEN O. HELMER**  
Chairman

**JOHN B. DALY**  
Deputy Chairman

**THOMAS J. DUNLEAVY**  
**JAMES D. BENNETT**



**EX PARTE OR LATE FILED**

**LAWRENCE G. MALONE**  
General Counsel

**JOHN C. CRARY**  
Secretary

October 26, 1998

Hon. Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**RE: In the Matter of Federal/State Joint Board on Universal Service - CC 96-45; Forward Looking Mechanism for High Cost Support - CC 97-160, DA 98-715; Ex Parte Comments of New York State Department of Public Service**

Dear Secretary Salas:

The New York State Department of Public Service (NYDPS) submits for filing an original and two (2) copies of its ex parte comments in the above-captioned matters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lawrence G. Malone".

Lawrence G. Malone  
General Counsel  
New York State Department  
of Public Service  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, New York 12223-1350  
(518) 474-2510

enc. 3

No. of Copies rec'd  
List A B C D E

0+2

RECEIVED

OCT 27 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of

Federal/State Joint Board on Universal Service	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
	)	
Forward-Looking Mechanism For High Cost Support	)	CC Docket No. 97-160
	)	DA 98-715

EX PARTE COMMENTS OF  
NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE

The New York State Department of Public Service (NYDPS) submits the following comments in response to questions posed by the Federal/State Joint Board on Universal Service (Joint Board) and discussed during a conference call with other state commissions conducted by the Board on October 9, 1998. The questions relate to a series of issues concerning support mechanisms for "high cost" areas that were referred to the Joint Board by the Federal Communications Commission in July.<sup>1</sup>

I. Overview

The NYDPS supports the efforts of the Joint Board and Commission to implement programs to achieve the universal service goals of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act). As a threshold matter, telephone rates in the United States are generally affordable and meet the comparability principles enunciated in the Act. Thus, we believe the Joint Board and Commission should begin their deliberations with the rebuttable

---

<sup>1</sup> In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45, Order and Order on Reconsideration (hereinafter Referral Order), FCC 98-160, adopted July 13, 1998, released July 17, 1998.

presumption that no increase in any carrier's total interstate revenue requirement currently is necessary to achieve the Act's universal service goals.

Section 254 of the Act sets forth the principle of state and the federal responsibility for universal service.<sup>1</sup> The Act, however, does not suggest that one universal service fund be adopted. State and federal universal service efforts share a common overall goal, but need not jointly address the components of universal service. For example, rate comparability between states can only be addressed by a federal mechanism, but intrastate "rate rebalancing" in the name of universal service is better done by those most familiar with local conditions (see also § 254(f)).

Both the Joint Board<sup>2</sup> and the Commission<sup>3</sup> have previously concluded that there existed three federal mechanisms to support "high cost" areas -- the Universal Service fund (high cost assistance), DEM Weighting, and Long Term Support (LTS). Neither the Joint Board nor the Commission determined that any other portion of the interstate access charge structure was or is

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 254(b)(5) - "There should be specific, predictable and sufficient Federal and State mechanisms to preserve and advance universal service."

<sup>2</sup> In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket 96-45, Recommended Decision, FCC 96J-3, Adopted November 7, 1996, released November 8, 1996, para. 187.

<sup>3</sup> In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Report and Order, FCC 97-157, adopted May 7, 1997, released May 8, 1997, para. 208.

"implicit" universal service support. In its referral order,<sup>1</sup> the Commission now implies that such is the case and asks the Joint Board whether access charges should be reduced to transition this undefined and unquantified, implicit support to explicit support. To the extent implicit universal service support can be identified in current interstate access charges, it should be included for recovery through a federal high cost mechanism only to the extent it is removed from those access charges. We are, however, unable to assist the Joint Board in defining or quantifying any amount in interstate access charges that properly should be identified as universal service support because there has not been a thorough discussion of what constitutes "universal service support" in this context.

In view of the foregoing, the NYDPS urges the Joint Board to develop and recommend a federal support mechanism for "high cost" areas that does not increase the current total interstate revenue requirement. While it may be found that redistribution of currently available high cost support is desirable to improve "rate comparability," it has not been shown that the total amount of federal support need be increased. We further urge the Board not to recommend a federal universal service support mechanism that is deliberately designed to enable or assist states in the "rebalancing" of intrastate rates or creating intrastate universal service programs. Finally, we can offer the Board no advice on whether or how much universal

---

<sup>1</sup> Referral Order, para. 6, item (2)(a)

service support may now be implicit in interstate access charges.

## II. Responses to the Joint Board's Specific Questions

### 1. What is the purpose of the high cost fund?

The fundamental purpose of a federal high cost fund is to offset, through interstate rates, a portion of costs of the local telephone network in areas with exceptionally high costs (i.e., to effect state-to-state revenue transfers to help defray exceptionally high local costs).

### 2. To what extent should the high cost fund be used to reduce implicit subsidies in interstate rates, intrastate rates, or both?

The federal high cost fund should NOT be used to make intrastate "subsidies" explicit, nor should receipt of such funds be conditioned in any way on any state's intrastate rate design.

The federal fund may be used to make interstate "subsidies" explicit only to the extent such implicit "subsidies" can be identified. However, we do not believe the universal service fund should be used simply to make additional interstate access charge reductions, unless and until implicit subsidies are identified.

### 3. How large should the fund be?

The current "high cost fund" for non-rural carriers (apparently, around \$150 - \$200 million) is sufficient. This amount refers only to the portion of the fund that is intended to lower intrastate costs in high cost areas. Again, until the implicit subsidies are identified, a larger fund is unnecessary.

4. Should the fund be capped?

Yes. Absent a change in the definition of "basic" service, there should be no need to increase federal high cost funding in a declining cost industry.

5. Should there continue to be a shared responsibility between the federal and state jurisdictions for the high cost fund? If so, what should be the respective roles of the state and federal jurisdictions (i.e., 75/25)?

We do not agree that responsibility for the current federal high cost effort is shared between the jurisdictions. The two jurisdictions share responsibility for ensuring universal service, but the intrastate jurisdiction bears no responsibility for funding the federal high cost program.

The 75/25 issue is a "red herring." The federal jurisdiction bears 100% of the responsibility for funding 100% of whatever federal high cost support is determined to be necessary. Whether and to what extent any state bears a responsibility to "fund" universal service is entirely up to that state and bears no presumptive relationship to the amount of federal support deemed necessary for that state.

6. Should the funds be directly disbursed by the federal administrator to companies or should the state have the option of receiving and disbursing the funds?

The federal administrator should disburse funds directly to carriers and adjust the separations process to ensure assignment of the appropriate additional costs to the interstate jurisdiction.

7. Should revenues from low-cost, high density states be used to fund universal service in high-cost, low density states (i.e., should high cost revenues flow from state to state), and, if so, should there be conditions, limits, or qualifications for the transfers?

Although Section 254 suggests this, such transfers should be limited in magnitude, as noted in our response to question one. They may be conditioned on the state's certification that the potential recipient carrier requires such funding, but may not be conditioned on the state taking any other action, in particular on the state implementing either intrastate "rate rebalancing" or a universal service fund.

8. Should the high cost fund be funded by interstate revenues, intrastate revenues, or both?

The federal high cost fund should be funded by interstate revenues only.

9. Should states (not carriers) be held harmless under the new fund, at least for some transition period? This may include states continuing to receive the same support, states limited to outflows at current levels, and/or states having their net inflow/outflow dollars remain the same.

States need not be "held harmless" per se, but if the total interstate revenue requirement is not increased, as we recommend, each state would, in fact, be "held harmless" on an outflow basis. In the event the Joint Board recommends changes to the specific allocation of the funds, it would be reasonable for increases and decreases to the carriers' funding levels to be transitioned over several years if necessary to mitigate significant rate impacts.

### III. Conclusion

In conclusion, the NYDPS urges the Joint Board to develop and recommend a federal support mechanism for "high cost" areas that does not increase the current total interstate revenue requirement. We further urge the Board not to recommend a federal universal service support mechanism that is designed to enable or assist states in "rebalancing" their intrastate rates or creating intrastate universal service programs. Finally, we can offer the Board no advice on whether or how much universal service support may now be implicit in interstate access charges.

Respectfully submitted,



Lawrence G. Malone  
General Counsel  
New York State  
Department of Public Service  
3 Empire State Plaza  
Albany, New York 12223  
(518) 474-2510

Dated: October 26, 1998

CC Docket No. 96-45

In the Matter of

Federal-State Joint Board on  
Universal Service

CC Docket No. 97-160  
DA 98-715

In the Matter of

Forward-Looking Mechanism for High Cost  
Support for Non-Rural LECs

Ex Parte Comments of New York State  
Department of Public Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jacquelynn R. Nash, hereby certify that on October 26, 1998 an original and two (2) copies of comments in the above-captioned proceeding were sent via Airborne Express to Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary to the Federal Communications Commission. In addition, copies were sent on October 26, 1998 via Airborne Express to:

Commissioner Susan Ness, FCC  
Commissioner Gloria Tristani, FCC  
Commissioner Harold Furchgott-Roth, FCC  
Emily Hoffnar, Federal Staff Chair, FCC  
Julia Johnson, State Chair, Florida PSC  
Mark Long, Economic Analyst, Florida PSC  
David Baker, Commissioner, Georgia PSC  
Martha Hogerty, Public Counsel for the State of Missouri  
Patrick Wood, III, Chairman, Texas PUC  
Laska Schoenfelder, Commissioner, South Dakota PUC

Copies were also sent on October 26, 1998, via First Class Mail, postage prepaid, to all parties on the attached service list.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jacquelynn R. Nash

Dated: October 26, 1998  
Albany, New York

Peter Bluhm  
Vermont Department of  
Public Service  
112 State Street  
4th Floor  
Montpelier VT 05602-2701

Telecommunications Report  
1333 H Street, N.W. - 11th Floor  
West Tower  
Washington DC 20005

International Transcription  
Services, Inc.  
1231 20th Street, NW  
Washington DC 20036

Brad Ramsay  
NARUC  
Interstate Commerce  
Commission Bldg., Room 1102  
12th & Constitution St., NW  
Washington DC 20044

Magalie Roman Salas  
Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
Room 222  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington DC 20554

Kathryn Brown, Chief  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington DC 20554

Mary Newmeyer  
Federal Affairs Advisor  
Alabama Public Service  
Commission  
100 N Union Street  
Suite 800  
Montgomery AL 36104

Sandra Adams  
Iowa Utilities Board  
Lucas Building  
5th Floor  
Des Moines IA 50316

Brian Roberts  
Public Utilities Commission of the  
State of California  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco CA 94102

Tom Wilson  
Washington U&TC  
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr., S.W.  
P.O. Box 47250  
Olympia WA 98504-7250

Policy and Planning Division  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington DC 20554

Ms. Sheryl Todd  
Universal Service Branch  
Accounts and Audits Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
2100 M Street, NW  
8th Floor  
Washington DC 20554

The Honorable William E. Kennard  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 814  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Michael K. Powell  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Room 844  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Susan Ness  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Room 832  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Gloria Tristani  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Harold Furchgott-Roth  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Room 802  
Washington, DC 20554

Kevin Martin  
Senior Legal Advisor  
Office of Commissioner Furchgott-Roth  
1919 M Street, NW  
Room 802  
Washington, DC 20554

John Nakahata  
Office of the Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Room 814  
Washington, DC 20554

James Casserly  
Office of Commissioner Ness  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Room 832  
Washington, DC 20554

Paul Gallant, Legal Advisor  
Office of Commissioner Tristani  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Room 826  
Washington, DC 20554

Emily Hoffnar, Federal Staff Chair  
Accounting and Audits Division  
Universal Service Branch  
Federal Communications Commission  
2100 M Street, NW  
Room 8617  
Washington, DC 20554

The Honorable Julia Johnson  
State Chair  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Gerald Gunther Building  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

The Honorable David Baker  
Commissioner  
Georgia Public Service Commission  
244 Washington Street, SW  
Atlanta, GA 30334-5701

Philip F. McClelland  
Pennsylvania Office of  
Consumer Advocate  
555 Walnut Street  
Forum Place  
5th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1921

The Honorable Laska Schoenfelder  
Commissioner  
South Dakota Public Utilities  
Commission  
State Capitol  
500 E. Capitol Street  
Pierre, SD 57501-5070

Martha S. Hogerty  
Public Counsel for the State  
of Missouri  
301 West High Street  
Suite 250  
PO Box 7800  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

David Rosenbloom  
Nebraska Public Service Commission  
300 The Atrium  
1200 N Street  
PO Box 94927  
Lincoln, NE 68509-4927

Rowland Curry  
Texas Public Utility Commission  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
PO Box 13326  
Austin, TX 78701

Pat Wood, Chairman  
Texas Public Utilities Commission  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78711-3326

Walter Bolter  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Suite 270  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0866

Sandra Adams  
Iowa Utilities Board  
Lucas State Office Building  
350 Maple Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Lori Kenyon  
Alaska Public Utilities Commission  
1016 West Sixth Avenue  
Suite 400  
Anchorage, AK 99501

Susan Stevens Miller  
Ann Dean  
Maryland Public Service Commission  
6 St. Paul Street  
16th Floor  
Baltimore, MD 21202-6806

Thor Nelson  
Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel  
1580 Logan Street  
Suite 610  
Denver, CO 80203

Barry Payne  
Indiana Office of the  
Consumer Counsel  
100 North Senate Avenue  
Room N501  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2208

Brian Roberts  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Tiane Sommer  
Georgia Public Service Commission  
47 Trinity Avenue  
Atlanta, GA 30334-5701

Doris McCarter  
Ohio Public Utilities Commission  
180 E Broad Street  
3rd Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215

Mark Long  
Economic Analyst  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Gerald Gunter Building  
Tallahassee, FL 32399