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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Connect America Fund	)	WC Docket No. 10-90
	)	
A National Broadband Plan for Our Future	)	GN Docket No. 09-51
	)	
Establishing Just and Reasonable Rates for Local Exchange Carriers	)	WC Docket No. 07-135
	)	
High-Cost Universal Service Support	)	WC Docket No. 05-337
	)	
Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime	)	CC Docket No. 01-92
	)	
Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
	)	
Lifeline and Link-Up	)	WC Docket No. 03-109

NOTICE OF INQUIRY AND NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Adopted: February 8, 2011 **Released: February 9, 2011**

Comment Date on Section XV: [30 days after date of publication in the Federal Register]
Reply Comment Section XV: [45 days after date of publication in Federal Register]
Comment Date on the Remaining Sections: [45 days after date of publication in the Federal Register]
Comment Date of State Members of the Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service: [59 days after date of publication in the federal Register]
Reply Comment Date on Remaining Sections: [80 days after date of publication in the Federal Register]

Comments of: Madison Telephone LLC

Mary Meyer
Chief Executive Officer
Madison Telephone LLC
117 N Third Street
Madison, Kansas 66860-0037
mmeyer@madtel.net
Telephone: (620) 437-2109
Facsimile: (620) 437-2108

April 18, 2011

I. INTRODUCTION

Madison Telephone LLC ("Madison") submits these comments in response to the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") Notice of Inquiry and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM") released February 9, 2011. The FCC proposes comprehensive reform to the current Universal Service Fund ("USF") and Intercarrier Compensation ("ICC") system by transiting the current USF support to a broadband focused Connect America Fund ("CAF") and to replace the current ICC system which is currently based on per-minute compensation.

Madison previously filed comments on July 12, 2010 in response to the FCC's NPRM released April 21, 2010 in the matter of a CAF, a national broadband plan ("NBP") and USF support. Madison is a rural local exchange company that offers service in the east central portion of Kansas from our office in Madison, Kansas. We are a company that is responsive to the needs of our customers and take pride in providing quality voice and data services because our customers are also our neighbors.

Madison applied for and was granted stimulus funds; construction should be completed by the end of 2012. In Madison's July 12, 2010 comments, Madison filed financial documentation with the FCC to support our opinion that the FCC's proposal to cap the legacy support at 2010 levels and phase-out the legacy high-cost funding by 2020 would negatively affect the affordable and dependable voice and data services for our customers. Madison requested that the FCC consider the potentially harmful financial impact to the rural companies from its proposed changes to the legacy USF support mechanisms if the FCC adopts policies that reduces USF support. As Madison's financial information demonstrated (and demonstrates with these comments), Madison requires sufficient support to maintain affordable quality services to our customers.

Madison wishes to address the financial impact of proposed rule changes documented in Appendix A of this NPRM. Madison's comments address the following areas:

- Limit total USF support per line to $3,000
- Changes to the High Cost Loop Support ("HCLS") calculation
- Elimination of the Safety-net Additive ("SNA")
- High Cost Loop change for Corporate Operations Expense
- Local Switching Support ("LSS") changes and elimination of LSS
- Interstate Common Line Support ("ICLS") changes for Corporate Operation Expense

II. IMPACT OF THE FCC's PROPOSED CHANGES TO USF SUPPORT

Madison provides comments and supporting documentation under a protective order related to the impact of the FCC's proposed changes to Madison's customers if the reduced USF amount is to be recovered through SLCs or an increase to the local rate to recover the losses from the following changes:

A. Limit Total Support per Line to $3,000 – The FCC proposes, subject to specified exceptions, ***beginning January 1, 2012***, each study area in the continental United States shall be limited to $3,000 per-line annually in universal service support.

Madison's total annual support per line is under the $3,000 proposed cap, as determined under current rules. However, as stated in the NPRM, there are ILECs that will be affected by the $3,000 annual support limitation proposal.[1] The FCC should consider the impact to effected companies on a case-by-case basis because there are unique circumstances, (e.g. terrain and number of customers) that contribute to the costs requiring the high level of support in those areas. The FCC should realize that establishing such a limit on existing companies, who have made substantial investments and have high expense levels to allocate over a small number of customers in order to serve customers in these high-cost areas, may be detrimental to the intent of universal service and contrary to the stated goals. The Act states: "quality services at just, reasonable and affordable rates."

B. Changes to the High Cost Loop Support calculation - The FCC proposes, ***beginning January 1, 2012***, to revise that portion of the HCLS algorithm to fifty-five percent (55%) of the study average unseparated cost per working loop ("SACPL") as calculated by §36.622 (b) in excess of 115 percent of the national average cost per loop ("NACPL") but not greater than 150 percent of the NACPL. Also ***beginning January 1, 2012***, the FCC proposes to revise that portion of the HCLS algorithm to sixty-five percent (65%) of the study average unseparated cost per working loop ("SACPL") as calculated by §36.622 (b) in excess of 150 percent of the NACPL.

Madison does not believe that the FCC should revise these percentages as this will reduce support for those ILECs who invested using the higher percentages and depended upon that USF

[1] Refer to ¶ 209 in the FCC's NPRM published February 9, 2011

support to be predictable. Shifting this revenue causes instability in the preservation of universal service based on the principles that USF support should be specific, predictable and sufficient as stated in Section 254 (b)(5) of the Act.

C. ***Safety-net Additive*** – The FCC proposes, for ***calendar year 2012*** payments, that SNA disbursements shall be 75% of the amount calculated for SNA; for ***calendar year 2013*** payments, that SNA disbursements shall be 50% of the calculated SNA; for ***calendar year 2014*** payments, that SNA disbursements shall be 25% of the calculated SNA; and beginning ***January 1, 2015***, no carrier shall receive SNA.

Madison believes that the FCC should not eliminate the SNA which was designed to provide support to companies who make significant investments in plant. Many rural companies make periodic major investments. Therefore, for the years that the ILEC makes major investments in plant, usually outside plant or central office equipment, the percent growth in investment per line would probably exceed the 14% threshold. There has been discussion within the industry that perhaps the FCC should consider the overall growth in the investment percentages, rather than calculating and measuring the SNA threshold based on total telephone plant in service on a per-line basis. Using the overall growth in plant would eliminate any skewed results when a company is experiencing a drop in customer access lines. Madison requests that the FCC consider alternatives rather than eliminate the SNA.

D. ***Local Switching Support Changes*** – Subject to specified exceptions, ***for***

calendar year 2012 payments, LSS shall be 67% of the amount calculated per § 54.301, and ***for the calendar year 2013*** payments, LSS shall be 33% of the amount calculated. ***Beginning January 1, 2014***, no carrier shall receive LSS, subject to specified exceptions. This phase out of LSS is in addition to the proposed phase out of corporate operations expense beginning in 2012.

Madison does not agree with the FCC's proposal to eliminate LSS as this will increase the local switching rates that are billed to carriers on a per minute-of-use basis. Madison understands that the FCC proposes to eliminate per minute-of-use charges with the migration to an all internet protocol ("IP") network, however, the FCC has yet to identify where the local switching investments and costs will be recovered under an IP network.

Madison purchased a soft-switch and is in the process of migrating customers to that switching platform. Madison encourages the FCC to further study the costs related to switching and implement reforms that appropriately address the migration of local switching costs to an IP network.

E. High Cost Loop Change – The FCC proposes that for purposes of calculating universal service support payments ***in the calendar year 2012***, total corporate operations expense shall be limited to the lesser of § 36.621(a)(4)(i) or (ii) multiplied by 67%. ***In the calendar year 2013***, total corporate operations expense shall be limited to the lesser of §36.621(a)(4)(i) or (ii), multiplied by 33%. ***Beginning January 1, 2014***, corporate operations expense shall no longer be eligible for purposes of calculating universal support payments.

Madison does not agree with the elimination of corporate operations expenses from ICLS, HCLS, and LSS as discussed below.

F. Interstate Common Line Support Changes ("ICLS") – For purposes of calculating ICLS, ***for calendar year 2012***, corporate operations expense allocated to the Common Line Revenue Requirement pursuant to § 69.409 shall be reduced by multiplying the corporate operations expense allocated by 67%. For calendar year 2013, corporate operations expense shall be reduced by multiplying the corporate operations expense by 33%. ***Beginning January 1, 2014***, corporate operations expense shall no longer be eligible for purposes of calculating ICLS.

Madison questions the FCC's wisdom in its proposal to limit or eliminate corporate operations expenses from USF support. Most of Madison's management functions are recorded in the corporate operations accounts which include executive officer salaries and benefits, board of director's expenses, all accounting functions, human resources, legal, and regulatory consulting expenses. These accounts are used to accumulate the many costs that are required to run a business and meet the multitude of regulatory rules and reporting requirements imposed on a telecommunications company.

The following activities are included in corporate operations expense: preparation of financial reports; filing multiple required FCC forms; monthly reporting obligations for the National Exchange Carrier Association ("NECA") settlements; filing reports required by the State; preparing supporting documentation required for annual cost studies; preparing business cases; meeting the Universal Service Administration Company's ("USAC") filing requirements; maintaining employee and payroll records; completing tax returns; providing required information to lending institutions; and monitoring the financial activities of the company. Corporate operations' functions and their related expenses are essential for the provision of high quality and affordable telecommunications services and these costs should remain in the base for USF and/or CAF support calculations.[2]

G. Financial Impact of FCC proposed USF Reforms

The FCC's NPRM identified the following four priorities for the federal high-cost program: (1) preserve voice services, (2) ensure universal deployment of a modern network capable of supporting broadband applications as well as voice, (3) ensure rates for broadband are reasonably comparable in all regions of the nation; and (4) limit the contribution from households.[3]

The FCC further stated "if the universal service fund grows too large, it will jeopardize other statuary mandates, such as ensuring affordable rates in all parts of the country, and ensuring that contributions from carriers are fair and equitable". Yet, the FCC proposes to reduce the current level of USF support and suggests that rural local exchange carriers ("ILECs"), such as Madison, can increase local rates or the Subscriber Line Charge ("SLC") to offset this reduction. This portion of the FCC's proposal would add much more to households than an increase in the Federal Universal Service Charge ("FUSC").

[2] As an alternative to the elimination of corporate operations expense from support, Madison would support the use of a cap on corporate operations similar to that used in the current HCLS algorithm
[3] Refer to ¶ 80 of the FCC's NPRM released February 9, 2011

Upon analysis of the FCC's proposed reforms to existing USF programs and procedures, Madison calculated the financial impacts of the changes proposed by the FCC and presents the following exhibits to reflect the reductions in revenue per line that will need to be recovered from alternative sources.

Exhibit I, *"Impact of Proposed FCC Changes To Monthly High Cost Support Per Loop",* provides the amount of USF support for Madison under current rules and the amount that would be provided under the changes proposed in the FCC's NPRM. If the FCC's proposals are implemented and Madison is required to obtain the reduced USF support from its customers by 2015, Madison would need to increase its basic local rates by $ per month per line to recover the USF support eliminated or reduced by the FCC's proposals. Madison's current average local rate without additional charges, such as the SLC, FUSC, State USF and 9-1-1 is $. The NPRM states that the rural national average for local rates is $15.62, without additional charges and $25.62 with additional charges.[4] Madison's current average local rate without additional charges is already $ over the national average. Madison's average local rate per line would become $, without the estimated $10.00 for additional charges, in order to recover the USF support eliminated or reduced by the FCC's proposals. Madison strongly believes that none of our customers would consider this rate increase fair, equitable and affordable.

Exhibit II, *"Impact of Proposed FCC Changes To High Cost Support*", provides the impact of the FCC's proposed changes to the HCLS, LSS and ICLS mechanisms and equates the

[4] Refer to ¶ 460 of the FCC's NPRM published February 9, 2011

changes on a per-line, per year basis by each support mechanism. The SNA is included with the HCL amount through 2013.

Exhibit III, *"Remaining Life Schedule*", provides a remaining life schedule based on 2012 balances that indicates Madison's fiber plant from our investment with the stimulus award has an anticipated remaining life balance of 18 years.

The purpose of ICLS was to provide recovery for the balance of the common line revenue requirement, including a return on investment that is not covered by the SLCs billed to the ILEC customers. The high cost loop support was implemented to assist ILECs in high cost areas the ability to provide services to consumers at a fair and equitable rate. Madison is a high-cost company. In response to customer demand, business plans have been developed and will be implemented based on the FCC's current rules.

The FCC's proposals to reduce the amount of ICLS and HCLS and transition the remaining balances to the CAF does not consider the legal requirement that USF be sufficient, predictable and provide affordable rates, nor does the FCC consider the remaining life of the plant investments that were made to satisfy the needs of our customers.

By 2015, when the FCC proposes to transition to the CAF, Madison's fiber plant will still have about 15 years of remaining life. Madison believes the FCC's proposed rules need to provide enough specificity that Madison can approximately compute revenue requirements and USF support levels in every year, especially in ten, twelve, or fifteen years out when the fiber plant will be fully depreciated and will likely require replacement or an upgrade. Madison needs adequate and predictable recovery mechanisms for each of Madison's plant investments as they approach the end of their economic remaining lives.

Madison believes the FCC's proposed rules need to provide enough specificity that Madison can approximately compute revenue requirements and USF support levels in every year. Especially in ten, twelve or fifteen when the fiber plant will be fully depreciated and will likely require replacement or an upgrade. This should also apply to each of Madison's plant investments as they approach the end of their economic remaining lives.

Madison requests that the FCC consider the negative impact to rural rate-of-return companies who approved and implemented business plans under one set of rules and, if the FCC's proposals are adopted, will be subject to recovery, or the lack thereof, under another set of rules. If the changes in the FCC's proposed rules are implemented, these changes should be on a forward-looking basis so that revisions are not made in mid-stream and do not jeopardize the recovery of prior investments. Unless the FCC replaces the USF support currently received by Madison, and other small ROR ILECS with other support (such as the CAF) for the recovery of our prior investments as authorized under current USF rules, the FCC's proposed changes will place tremendous additional financial burden on our customers who are currently receiving quality and affordable services from Madison.

III. TRANSITION TO THE CONNECT AMERICA FUND

The FCC proposes to ultimately provide all funding through a Connect America Fund to provide ongoing support for an IP-based network. The FCC's goal is to transition all remaining high-cost loop support, interstate common line support, and high-cost model support to the CAF.

Under one option, in each part of the country requiring ongoing universal service support, the FCC would hold a competitive, technology-neutral bidding mechanism to select the provider that would serve the area and assume all broadband and voice obligations.

Under another option, the FCC would offer the current voice carrier of last resort ("COLR"), probably an incumbent LEC, the right of first refusal ("ROFR") to serve as the broadband and voice provider for ongoing annual support based on a cost model. If the provider refuses this offer, the FCC would award ongoing support through the competitive bidding process.

In the alternative, the FCC could limit full transition to the CAF to a subset of geographic areas, such as those served by price cap companies, while continuing to provide ongoing support based on reasonable actual investment to smaller rate-of-return companies, including shifting ICLS to an incentive regulation framework.[5]

Madison supports the FCC's "alternative" method noted above. However, as discussed in response to the SNA, consideration should be made to special circumstances that may require additional investment by some ILECs in some part of our country. Small rural ROR ILECs operate in accordance with the FCC's rules and regulations. Our track record supports that we serve our customers well.[6]

[5] Refer to paragraphs 398 to 401 in the FCC's NPRM published February 9, 2011
[6] Refer to NECA's 2010 Trends Report

In 2010, Madison received about % of its regulated revenue from current USF support; % from interstate services other than LSS and ICLS; and % from intrastate services, local and miscellaneous services.

Anytime that Madison loses a customer or a support mechanism, additional pressure is placed on other customer rates or on the need to obtain additional support. The network still needs to be in place, operational and maintained even if the customers migrate away from Madison.

Madison requests that the FCC ensure there is a recovery replacement mechanism for the reductions to the USF support as proposed in this NPRM to ensure affordable local rates are comparable to those in urban areas.

If, and when, the FCC implements CAF for support, Madison and the industry need to understand specifically, with granular detail, how the CAF will apply to ILECs.

IV. INTERCARRIER COMPENSATION

The FCC proposes to comprehensively reform the intercarrier compensation system of payments between carriers to compensate each other for the origination, transport and termination of telecommunications traffic. The FCC identified the issues with the current ICC system and provided a framework to address the issues. The FCC offers several proposals, but the end result is to reform the current interstate access charge rules to eliminate per-minute rates and to create a new methodology for reciprocal compensation. The FCC proposes a cost or revenue recovery that could be provided through the CAF. The FCC also seeks comments on providing incentives for states to reduce intrastate intercarrier compensation without penalizing the states that have already begun this process.[7]

Madison is a Kansas ROR ILEC. Intrastate rates in Kansas mirror interstate rates, adjusted every other year. The Kansas Corporation Commission ("KCC") establishes the local benchmark rates for the rural ILECs. Effective March 1, 2011, the new rural statewide average rates are $16.25 for residence and $19.25 for business. The intrastate access rates mirror the National Exchange Carrier Association's ("NECA") rates of July, 1, 2010. Kansas has a State USF; effective March 1, 2011, the KUSF assessment for rural LECs per line is $1.45 (based on a 6.18% assessment rate).[8] Therefore, if the reduced USF support for LSS and ICLS is shifted to the intrastate jurisdiction, Kansas will be required to consider the loss of this USF revenue, as well as the reduction to HCLS which is considered as local revenue in a state rate-making procedure.

Madison believes that the intrastate/interstate intercarrier compensation issue should involve the Joint Board and requests the FCC work in partnership with states such as Kansas to achieve intrastate reform.

V. SUMMARY

Madison respectively requests that the FCC consider the impact to rural ROR carriers in

[7] Refer to paragraphs 538 to 549 in the FCC's NPRM published February 9, 2011
[8] Kansas Docket No. 11-GIMT-201-GIT

its desire to bring an all broadband IP network to America. Madison continues deploying broadband in our rural network to meet the needs of our customers while other carriers, who serve the more urban areas of the state and also have rural customers, appear to have elected to concentrate its broadband efforts in non rural areas.

Madison does not agree with the FCC's proposal to reduce USF support for small rural ILECs who have limited resources and a small customer base in order to provide additional USF or CAF to carriers that have apparently neglected their rural customers. The FCC should consider alternatives such as raising SLCs to the maximum allowed[9] to pay for the deployment of broadband networks before USF is redirected from the high-cost rural ILECs.

Madison supports the Rural Associations[10]in their comments and their efforts to assist the FCC in designing a reasonable solution to USF and intercarrier compensation. Some of Madison's historical financial information will be included in the data the FCC requested from NECA. Madison plans to file additional information with the FCC either through reply comments under the protective order or through an ex parte filing. The additional financial information will provide detailed analysis of the NPRM's Appendix A proposed rules and demonstrate the estimated impacts on Madison. Additional ICC reform data that was not addressed in these comments may also be provided.

In Madison's comments filed last July[11], Madison provided financial documentation to

---

[9] Refer to the attached Exhibit IV

[10] The National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., National Telecommunications Cooperative Association, Organization for the Promotion and Advancement of Small Telecommunications Companies, Western Telecommunications Alliance, Eastern Rural Telecom Association, and The Rural Alliance

[11] Filed July 10, 2010 in the FCC's NBP WC Docket 10-90; GN Docket No. 09-51; WC Docket No. 05-337

support our position that without an adequate and sustainable revenue replacement for reductions in USF support, Madison will lack ongoing financial resources to provide high quality and broadband services in the high-cost areas of rural Kansas. As demonstrated with the financial information provided with these comments, Madison has not changed our opinion on these issues.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Mary Meyer

Chief Executive Officer
Madison Telephone LLC.
117 N Third Street
Madison, Kansas 66860-0337
mmeyer@madtel.net
Telephone: (620) 437-2109
Facsimile: (620) 437-2108

Filed via ECFS

cc: Best Copy and Printing, Inc. (BCPI) fcc@bcpiweb.com

National Broadband Plan
Potential Additional Revenues for Large ILECs requesting USF for Unserved Territories
Based on the FCC's December 2010 Monitoring Report - Table 7.9

TOP 6 COMPANIES ONLY

	Subscriber Line Charge - Monthly Rates			Variance Needed to get to Standard			2008 Avg Monthly Access Lines (in 1000s)			**Potential Annual SLC Revenue Available for Broadband Deployment and NOT Needed from USF**			
Company	Res & SLB	Non-Primary	MLB & Centrex	Res & SLB	Non-Primary	MLB & Centrex	Res & SLB	Non-Primary	MLB & Centrex	Res & SLB	Non-Primary	MLB & Centrex	Total
AT&T	$ 5.48	$ 5.24	$ 5.40	$ 1.02	$ 1.76	$ 3.80	27,857	2,937	16,616	$ 340,969,680	$ 62,029,440	$ 757,689,600	$ 1,160,688,720
Century Link	5.75	5.53	6.93	0.75	1.47	2.27	4,934	297	1,721	44,406,000	5,239,080	46,880,040	96,525,120.00
Frontier	6.39	6.89	8.83	0.11	0.11	0.37	4,207	205	1,407	5,553,240	270,600	6,247,080	12,070,920.00
Qwest	5.97	6.09	6.29	0.53	0.91	2.91	5,854	519	2,514	37,231,440	5,667,480	87,788,880	130,687,800.00
Verizon	6.21	6.18	6.48	0.29	0.82	2.72	15,955	1,826	8,254	55,523,400	17,967,840	269,410,560	342,901,800.00
Windstream	6.34	6.55	7.89	0.16	0.45	1.31	1,839	306	752	3,530,880	1,652,400	11,821,440	17,004,720.00
TOTALS - TOP 6 ILECS										**$ 487,214,640**	**$ 92,826,840**	**$ 1,179,837,600**	**$ 1,759,879,080**
TOTALS - WITHOUT NON-PRIMARY LINES										**$ 487,214,640**	**N/A**	**$ 1,179,837,600**	**$ 1,667,052,240**

FCC CAP = Assumed Standard	**$ 6.50**	**$ 7.00**	**$ 9.20**