

EXHIBIT 1 TO ALLTEL'S MOTION TO COMPEL -
KENNEBEC

CONTAINS: RELEVANT RESPONSES TO ALLTEL'S
INTERROGATORIES AND REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION
DATED FEBRUARY 29, 2008

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF
KENNEBEC TELEPHONE COMPANY,
INC. FOR ARBITRATION PURSUANT
TO THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT
OF 1996 TO RESOLVE ISSUES
RELATING TO AN
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT
WITH ALLTEL, INC.**

DOCKET No. TC 07-114

**KENNEBEC TELEPHONE COMPANY,
INC.'S RESPONSES TO ALLTEL'S
INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS
FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES MADE BY ALLTEL

DR 1 For each Data Request, identify each person who assisted in the preparation of these responses, or who provided information for the purpose of preparing these responses.

RESPONSE: These responses were prepared by Consortia Consulting, Vantage Point Solutions, General Manager Rod Bowar, and undersigned counsel. Consortia Consulting assisted with those responses pertaining to the FLEC study. Vantage Point Solutions assisted with those responses pertaining to the InterMTA analysis and the FLEC study.

DR 2 Provide 2007 minute of use data by your terminating CLLI code. State the type of traffic (i.e., intra-exchange voice traffic, intra-exchange dial-up ISP traffic, inter-exchange local and/or EAS, CMRS, intrastate toll, and interstate toll) whether the reported data are actual measured or estimated, and identify the records that support the responses. If 2007 usage is not available provide data for the most current period measured for each type of traffic.

- (a) To the extent the MOU data provided differs from the MOU data used in Petitioner's cost study filed in this proceeding, explain and reconcile the differences.
- (b) To the extent the MOU data provided herewith are actual, identify all usage terminating to an ISP trunk group.
- (c) To the extent the MOU data are actual, identify all usage originated to Alltel and the trunk group that carries that traffic to Alltel.
- (d) To the extent the MOU data provided is an estimate, explain the method by which ISP-bound traffic (i.e., dial-up internet traffic) estimate was derived.

OBJECTION AND RESPONSE: Petition objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is not relevant to this proceeding. Petitioner further objects to this request on the basis that it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant or admissible evidence. The requirements for the development of a FLEC study does not require consideration of Universal Service and, therefore, receipt of any such funding is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues identified in this arbitration proceeding.

DR 10 Provide copies of all documents upon which you rely to support your answers to all Data Requests.

RESPONSE: See exhibits attached hereto and identified herein.

DR 11 Provide complete cost models, cost schedules, work papers or other documentation underlying switching “price inputs” contained in the “Price Inputs” spreadsheet of each of your FLEC Model. This documentation should identify:

- (a) Composition of Switch Processor prices in terms of quantities and unit investments for hardware and software. (Provide separately quantities and unit investments for standalone, host and remote switches.)
- (b) Composition of Trunk Card prices in terms of quantities and unit investments for hardware and software, if any.
- (c) Various “loading” factors used, such as engineering and installation factors, sales tax factors, miscellaneous construction cost factors and others.
- (d) Composition of other switch investments, if any.

RESPONSE: See Exhibit G attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

DR 12 Provide the sources of unit investments identified in DR11. These may include analyses of actual switch investments, analyses of vendor quotes, analyses based on vendor switch configuration models used for construction estimates or others.

RESPONSE: The source of the unit investment associated with the switch electronics estimates is based upon actual proposals received from vendors for entities other than Kennebec Telephone Company. The pricing utilized is specific to projects of similar size and scope to the Kennebec network.

DR 13 Provide vendor or other documentation describing the engineering of “Switch Processor” hardware and software components in terms of the following:

The Tributary Cost estimates for the Inter-Exchange transport electronics include any circuit interface cards required to provide the necessary ports to add or drop the appropriate circuits at each respective location.

DR 21 Provide the complete cost models, cost schedules, work papers or other documentation underlying switched transport electronics by exchange and for the three equipment categories. This documentation should identify:

- (a) Composition of the investment (by exchange and equipment category) in terms of equipment items (name and description), quantities and unit investments.
- (b) Basis for equipment item quantities in terms of total demand and the engineering parameters used to determine quantities needed to serve total demand.
- (c) Source of unit investments; *e.g.*, analyses of actual switched transport electronics installations, analyses of vendor quotes, analyses based on vendor configuration models or other.

RESPONSE: See Exhibit H attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

DR 22 Confirm that the following switched trunks (DS0s) are consistent with the total interoffice minutes of use, such that the resulting minutes of use/trunk is a valid measure of trunk usage. If not, provide consistent quantities.

<u>RLEC</u>	<u>Switched Trunks</u>	<u>Total IO MOU</u>	<u>MOU/Trunk</u>
Kennebec Teleco	312	7,378,128	23,648

RESPONSE: The switched trunks are correct, but the total interoffice minutes of use contained an error. The MOU in Run 1a was 7,378,128. The corrected MOU in Run 1b was 6,128,473.

DR 23 Provide your current or most recent measure of interoffice trunk utilization (annual MOU/trunk) and the supporting work papers used to compute the measure.

OBJECTION: Petitioner objects to this request on the basis that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome. Petitioner further objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is not required in conformance with the development of a FLEC analysis. Petitioner further objects to the extent that such request improperly suggests that the Petitioner has a duty to

continuously update its FLEC study as each input becomes more currently available.

DR 24 Provide a breakdown of the special circuit (paths) quantities by bandwidth as shown in the table below.

RLEC	Special Circuits (paths)	DS0	DS1	DS3	OC3	OC12	OC48
Kennebec Teleco	30						

RESPONSE: The special circuit paths consist of 10 DS-0 paths and 20 DS-1 paths.

DR 25 For each special circuit bandwidth describe the proportion of OC-192 equipment capacity consumed by one circuit of each bandwidth. Provide capacity consumption separately for common equipment and plug-ins. (For example, a DS0 special circuit may consume 1/(24 X % engineering fill) of a DS1, a DS1 may consume 1/(84 X % engineering fill) of an OC3 plug-in; and, an OC3 plug-in may require one slot on the OC-192 common equipment. Likewise, an OC3 special circuit may require one OC3 plug-in and consume one slot of common equipment.)

OBJECTION: Petitioner objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant or admissible evidence. Petitioner further objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is not related to the FLEC study used in connection with this proceeding.

DR 26. Provide a copy of the documentation describing the architecture, equipment and engineering rules/parameters for the OC-192 transport system represented in your cost studies, or for one commonly used.

OBJECTION AND RESPONSE: Petitioner objections to this request to the extent that it seeks information which is confidential and proprietary. Petitioner further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks information that is equally available to Alltel and the burden on Alltel to obtain the requested information is no greater than the burden on Petitioner. The OC-192 SONET electronics included in the estimates for the FLEC model is available from a number of vendors including Alcatel-Lucent, Cisco Systems, Fujitsu Network Communications and Nortel Networks. These vendors provide detailed product documentation to consultants and telecommunications service providers within the confines of a Non-Disclosure Agreement. The requested information can be obtained directly from these vendors.

DR 27 Kennebec Telephone’s “Fiber Table” (Kennebec FLEC:00056) indicates the RLEC has as many as 58.66 miles of fiber cable used for transport (eleven cable routes). Why does the 76.26 miles of fiber cable reflected in the Kennebec FLEC Model substantially exceed actual cable length?

RESPONSE: Projected cable placements are based on the most probable and direct routes utilizing ring technology.

DR 28 Provide the bandwidth of the additional transiting circuits (463) for you.

OBJECTION AND RESPONSE: Petitioner objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information that is irrelevant to this proceeding and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant or admissible evidence.

DR 29 Provide the rationale for excluding the SDN circuits from the quantity of additional transiting circuits for Kennebec.

RESPONSE: The 8 SDN circuits were excluded from the transiting circuits but were included in the special access circuits.

DR 30 Provide measures of utilization of OC-192 transport electronics underlying the FLEC Model as shown in the following table.

RLEC	OC-192 Nominal Capacity - DS1s	Average Equipped Capacity (DS1s)	% Equipped Capacity of Nominal Capacity	DS1- Equivalents in Service	% Utilization of Equipped Capacity
Kennebec		5,376			

OBJECTION: Petitioner objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant or admissible evidence. Petitioner further objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is not related to the FLEC study used in connection with this proceeding.

DR 31 Indicate whether switched transport electronics direct expenses include expenses for both *transport electronics maintenance/repair* and *provisioning of retail services* (e.g., establishing private lines and special service circuits). If so, provide an estimate of the *percentage of transport electronics direct expenses attributable to activities for retail services*.

RESPONSE: No.

DR 32 Provide the cost models, cost schedules, work papers or other documentation showing the components and costs of the urban and rural cable investments per foot.

RESPONSE: See Exhibit I attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

DR 33 Indicate whether you share cable structures (trenches, conduit, poles) with other utilities, telecommunications carriers or affiliates.

RESPONSE: Interoffice cable structures are not shared with other utilities, telecommunications carriers or affiliates.

DR 34. Indicate whether multiple cables (metallic or non-metallic) share your cable structures.

RESPONSE: Multiple cables are not included in the cable structures.

DR 35 Indicate whether a portion of cable structures costs was allocated to users or uses other than interoffice cable in developing the urban and rural cable investments per foot.

RESPONSE: No.

DR 36 Provide cable investments per foot (urban and rural) for 12- and 24-fiber buried fiber cables, similar to the 48-fiber cable (BFO48) investments per foot reflected in the FLEC Models.

OBJECTION: Petitioner objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is neither relevant to this proceeding nor is it reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant or admissible evidence. Petitioner further objects to this request to the extent that it seeks information that is equally available to Alltel and the burden on Alltel to obtain the requested information is no greater than the burden on Petitioner.

DR 37. In computing the % of fiber-miles in service for transport (vs. non-transport), provide the rationale for not including the fiber-miles used by digital loop carrier (DLC) in the total fiber-miles in service (*i.e.*, the denominator or total demand for fiber-miles)?

RESPONSE: The forward looking engineering design does not include DLC fibers in the interoffice transport plant.

DR 38 Provide the current or most recent average quantity of trunks or DS0 circuits per DS1. Provide source data and supporting calculations.

OBJECTION: Petitioner objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is neither relevant to this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant or admissible evidence. This information is not required for the development of an appropriate FLEC model.

DR 39 Provide the current or most recent average quantity of switched lines per common transport trunk or DS0 circuit.

RESPONSE: Petitioner objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is neither relevant to this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant or admissible evidence. This information is not required for the development of an appropriate FLEC model.

DR 40 Kennebec's network diagram (Kennebec FLEC:00006) indicates that the Qwest Match Point is in the Presho central office. Given this, explain why any of the 7,200 feet of urban cable in the Presho exchange, with investment of \$98,784, should be allocated to interoffice transport.

RESPONSE: The equipment in the Presho office is a remote switch off the Kennebec host. A remote switch does not have the capability of interfacing with an interexchange carrier. The interfacing function is accomplished in the host switch in Kennebec. This requires the interoffice transport route between the Kennebec host switch and the Qwest meet point

DR 41 Kennebec's network diagram indicates that there are four cable links to Vivian Tel. (#'s 2, 3, 5 and 6). Explain whether Alltel's mobile-to-land traffic is transported over these cable links, and if not, why the investment and costs of these links should be included in the RLEC's transport and termination costs.

OBJECTION AND RESPONSE: Petitioner objects to this request on the basis that it seeks information which is neither relevant to this proceeding nor is it reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant or admissible evidence. Without waiving this objection, Alltel's mobile-to-land traffic is transported to Vivian exchanges over the cable links identified. The FLEC model calculates the cost/minute of transport by dividing the total cost of transport by the total transport minutes of use. The cost and usage of individual links are not examined in these calculations nor are they relevant.

DR 42 Provide the following:

- (a) Current amount of long-term debt.
- (b) Average interest rate on long-term debt.