

REDACTED

Sean M. Galvin  
Assistant General Counsel  
1 Davis Farm Road  
Portland, ME 04101



BY HAND DELIVERY AND  
ELECTRONIC MAIL

May 21, 2014

Ms. Debra A. Howland  
Executive Director & Secretary  
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

**Re: DT 14-102; William G. Whalen Complaint Against FairPoint Communications, Inc.  
– Rate Increase Dispute; FairPoint Communications’ Responses to Record Requests  
CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL ENCLOSED**

Dear Ms. Howland:

Northern New England Telephone Operations LLC d/b/a FairPoint Communications – NNE (“FairPoint”) hereby files responses to record requests made at the hearing of May 7, 2014. Included with these responses are multiple exhibits.

Certain portions of Exhibits 7 and 7A are marked as confidential and are redacted as such. This material qualifies for protection in accordance with Rules Puc 201.04(a)(3), 201.04(a)(4), 201.04(a)(5), 201.06(a)(6) and 201.07. Accordingly, a Motion for Confidential Treatment will also be submitted.

Enclosed are an original and six (6) copies each of a Confidential version of Exhibits 7 and 7A, and one (1) redacted copy, pursuant to Rule Puc 203.02(a)(1).

Sincerely,

  
Sean M. Galvin

CONFIDENTIAL

**REDACTED**

Sean M. Galvin  
Assistant General Counsel  
1 Davis Farm Road  
Portland, ME 04101

Enclosures

cc: Electronic Service List

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE  
BEFORE THE  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
DT 14-102

William Whalen G. Whalen Complaint Against FairPoint Communications, Inc. – Rate Increase Dispute

Northern New England Telephone Operations LLC d/b/a FairPoint Communications - NNE's Responses to Oral Record Requests Propounded by the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission (the "Commission"), the Commission Staff and New Hampshire Legal Assistance.

**General and Specific Objections**

1. Northern New England Telephone Operations LLC d/b/a FairPoint Communications - NNE ("FairPoint" herein) hereby objects to these oral data/record requests to the extent that they purport to impose obligations beyond the applicable law and Commission rules and decisional law.

2. FairPoint objects to any record or data request that seek information or data protected by the attorney-client privilege and attorney work product doctrine. In this regard, FairPoint waives no privilege or objection by inadvertent, unintentional or unauthorized disclosure of such information or documents.

3. FairPoint objects to any definition or instruction which provides for definitions of terms at variance with their common meaning. In responding to these record requests, FairPoint shall apply the common meanings of such terms.

4. FairPoint objects to any record or data request that seeks all documents or information concerning a particular subject as overbroad in that FairPoint can and will only

produce such documents reasonably relating to a particular subject within FairPoint's custody, possession and control that may be relevant to the present proceedings in this docket.

5. FairPoint objects to any record request to which the response requires disclosure, response or production of confidential, commercial or proprietary information of FairPoint. FairPoint is only producing such information to the Commission and Staff in accordance with its Motion for Confidential Treatment and Request for Protective Order and applicable rules and laws. If the Commission denies this motion in part by allowing disclosure to any other party in this proceeding other than Staff, FairPoint preserves its objection to such disclosure; however, in such event, FairPoint further objects to any disclosure without such party (or parties) being required to enter into a Protective Agreement prior to such disclosure.

6. Not in limitation of any other objections, FairPoint specifically objects to Record Request Number 2 as i) it is not relevant to this docket and outside the scope of the issues raised in Mr. Whalen's complaint, ii) to the extent relevant, FairPoint takes exception in that any probative value of this request is substantially outweighed by the likelihood that this will cause undue delay, unfair prejudice and/or confusion of the issues and iii) this request is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

7. Not in limitation of any other objections, FairPoint specifically objects to Record Request Number 4 as it is overly broad and not relevant in part as it applies to all basic service eligibility (not just multiline) and any document referenced when determining basic service eligibility. To the extent relevant, FairPoint takes exception to the extent this response is not specific to the multiline issue of basic service and specific policies or methods and procedures related thereto, and that, therefore, this request will result in undue delay and/or confusion of the

issues presented in this docket to FairPoint's prejudice to the extent information or documentation is used for purposes outside of the multiline issue.