### COMMONWEALTHOFKENTUCKY BEFORETHEPUBLICSERVICECOMMISSION

IntheMatterof:

ANINVESTIGATIONINTOTHE INTRASTATESWITCHEDACCESSRATES OFALLKENTUCKYINCUMBENTAND COMPETITIVELOCALEXCHANGE CARRIERS ADMINISTRATIVE CASENO. 2010-00398

# <u>RLECs'MOTIONTOAMENDTHEPROCEDURALSCHEDULE</u> <u>TOALLOWFORSUPPLEMENTALCOMMENTS</u>

)

)

)

)

Inresponse to the March 10,2011 Order (the "Order") of the Public Service Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the "Commission") in the above-capt ioned case (the "Intrastate Access Case"), the RLECs <sup>1</sup> respectfully request that the Commission amend the procedural schedule to allow for the filing of supplemental comment s on AT&T's <sup>2</sup> proposed plan (the "AT&TPlan") following the close of the comment period at the federal level on May 23,2011. Insupport of the irmotion, the RLEC state as follows.

## I. GroundsforAmendingProceduralScheduletoAllowforSuppleme ntalComments.

As the Commission is aware, parallel proceedings are underway at the federal level to address intercarrier compensation issues. <sup>3</sup> Those proceedings are currently in a comment and review period that will close on May 23, 2011. The Federal Communicat ions Commission ("FCC") has requested comments on, among other issues, interstate a ccess reform as well as different approaches for states to follow in implementing intra state access reform. On both

ucky,AT&TCommunicationsoftheSouthCentralStat es, DistanceService,andTCGOhio(collectively"AT&T").

d Plan for Our Future, 2011WL 466775 (Notice of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, I Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc., Foothills Co., Inc.; Highland Telephone Cooperative, Inc.; Lo Cooperative, Inc.; North Central Telephone Cooperative South Central Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporati WestKentuckyRural Telephone CooperativeCorporati <sup>2</sup>BellSouthTelecommunications, Inc. d/b/aAT&TKent LLC, BellSouthLongDistance, Inc. d/b/aAT&TLong

n, I nc.; Brandenburg Telephone Company; Duo County
Rural Telephone Cooperative, Inc.; Gearhart Communi cations
gan Telephone Cooperative, Inc.; Mountain Rural Tel ephone
ive Corporation; Peoples Rural Telephone Cooperative e, Inc.;
i on, Inc.; Thacker-Grigsby Telephone Company, Inc.; and on, Inc.(collectivelythe"RLECs").

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See In re Connect America Fund: A National Broadban ProposedRulemaking,rel.Feb9,2011).

counts, the direction of the parallel federal proceedings will have profound implications for the participants in this case and will provide essential context for the hegeneral import of the AT&T Plan.

In particular, the treatment of inter\_\_\_state access rates will have a direct effect on cost recoveryatthestatelevel.Adecreaseininterstaterate swillservetoincreasethefinancialstrain on the RLECs and other carriers as cost recovery is further s hifted to local and intrastate rates. Moreover, the FCC has requested comments on such essential issues as the proper sequencing (whether inter\_state and intra\_state reform should occur at the same time or sequentially) and timing (whether a shorter or a longer glide path will be used to transition from per-minute intercarriercharges)forreform.

Due to the symbiotic nature of interstate and intrastate rates as they relate to cost recovery, the comments submitted to the FCC on these issues will further illuminate the path forwardinthisproceeding. The RLECs, as well as the other participants in this proceeding, need to know what the rules of the game are likely to be – or, at least , what others are advocating they should be – at the federal level before they can adequately addres s, comment on, or propose alternatives to the AT&TPlan. Likewise, the Commission should ma ke certain that it is, itself, fully aware of the degree to which what ever action it takes in t his proceeding may be further exacerbated by the FCC's pending reform.

Inorder for the participants in this proceeding to comment fully and with confidence on the AT&TPlan, and to ensure the Commission is fully apprised of the present proceeding, the RLECs respectfully request the Commiss schedule to allow for supplemental comment periodint his proceeding will 23,2011. Allowing for a supplemental comment periodint his proceeding will not cause further

2

delayintheCommission'scurrentproceduralschedule,asitcan bescheduledforatimepriorto the August 5,2011 due date for the second round of data requests. This will allow the parties time to incorporate information gleaned from the federal comments into their second round of data requests. It will also serve to ensure that whatever de cision the Commission makes in this proceeding is one that accounts for the full-range of variables that are at play in intercarrier compensation reform.

### II. Conclusion.

For the reasons stated above, the RLECs request that the Commiss ion amend the procedural schedule to allow for filing supplemental comments on AT&T' sproposed plan (the "AT&TPlan") after the close of the comment period at the fede rallevel on May 23, 2011 and prior to the August 5, 2011 deadline for serving supplemental data requests.

The RLEC sensor age all other participants in this proceeding to join in this motion.

Respectfullysubmitted,

JohnE.Selent EdwardT.Depp StephenD.Thompson **DINSMORE&SHOHLLLP** 1400PNCPlaza 500WestJeffersonStreet Louisville,Kentucky40202 (502)540-2300(Telephone) (502)585-2207(Facsimile) *CounseltotheRLECs* 

### **CERTIFICATEOFSERVICE**

In accordance with Ordering Paragraph No. 5 of the Commission's March 10, 2011 Order, this is to certify that the RLECs' April 15, 2011 elect ronic filing is a true and accurate copyof the documents to be filed in paper medium; that the electronic filing has be entransmitted to the Commission on April 15, 2011; that an original and one copy of t he filing will be delivered to the Commission on April 15, 2011; and that, on April 15, 2011, ele ctronic mail notification of the electronic filing will be provided through the Commission's electronic filing system.

CounseltotheRLECs

845091v1