

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

CONSUMER ADVOCATE
Meredith A. Hatfield

ASSISTANT CONSUMER ADVOCATE
Kenneth E. Traum



TDD Access: Relay NH
1-800-735-2964

Tel. (603) 271-1172

FAX No. 271-1177

Website:
www.oca.nh.gov

OFFICE OF THE CONSUMER ADVOCATE
21 S. FRUIT ST., SUITE 18
CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03301-2429

April 27, 2007

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



**Re: DT 07-011 Verizon New England/FairPoint Communications
OCA's Motion to Compel Verizon's Responses to Group II Data Requests**

Dear Ms. Howland:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission please find an original and seven copies of the Office of Consumer Advocate's (OCA's) Motion to Compel Verizon Response to Group II Data Requests. A copy of this motion has been served electronically on all parties in this docket.

Sincerely,

Meredith A. Hatfield
Consumer Advocate

cc: Service List

NHPUC APR27 07 PM 3:36



BEFORE THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DT 07-011

VERIZON NEW ENGLAND, INC., BELL ATLANTIC COMMUNICATIONS, INC., NYNEX LONG DISTANCE CO., VERIZON SELECT SERVICES, INC., AND FAIRPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Transfer of Assets to FairPoint Communications, Inc.

OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE'S MOTION TO COMPEL VERIZON'S RESPONSES TO GROUP II SET 1 DATA REQUESTS

The Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) respectfully requests that the N.H. Public Utilities Commission (Commission) compel Verizon New England (Verizon NE), Inc., Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc., NYNEX Long Distance Co., and Verizon Select Services, Inc. (collectively, Verizon) to respond to certain data requests. In support, the OCA states the following facts and law.

I. Introduction

1. On January 31, 2007, Verizon and FairPoint Communications, Inc. (FairPoint) (together, Joint Petitioners) filed with the Commission a joint petition seeking approval of a series of transactions that, if consummated, would result in FairPoint (through subsidiaries) acquiring the current Verizon NE franchise to provide wireline telecommunications services in New Hampshire and owning the network Verizon NE currently uses to provide those services.
2. The Joint Petitioners request, *inter alia*,¹ a determination by the Commission that the proposed transactions are for the public good pursuant to RSA 374:30 (governing

¹ The Joint Petitioners also request that the appropriate subsidiary of FairPoint be designated an "eligible telecommunications carrier" pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §§ 254(e) and 214(e)(2) (concerning universal service assistance fund) for purposes of the affected service territory and that Verizon's current designation be rescinded. The Joint Petitioners further request that the Commission authorize Verizon NE to discontinue service as a public utility in New Hampshire pursuant to RSA 374:28 (governing authority to discontinue providing service as a public utility).

4. On March 16, 2007, the Commission issued the procedural schedule.⁸
5. Pursuant to the procedural schedule, the OCA propounded data requests to Verizon on April 13, 2007. These data requests concerned Group II, Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure and Quality of Service.⁹
6. On April 20, 2007, at or about 6:21 PM, Verizon filed its objections to certain of these data requests, including ten “General Objections” to “each and every” data request.¹⁰
7. Therein, Verizon specifically objected in whole or in part to the following Group II data requests: OCA GII 1-3 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 1-7, 1-8, 1-9, 1-10, 1-11, 1-12, 1-13, 1-14, 1-15, 1-16, 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 1-21, 1-22, 1-24, 1-27, 1-28, 1-29, 1-30, 1-31, 1-32, 1-33, 1-34, 1-35, 1-36, 1-37, 1-38, 1-39, 1-41, 1-42, 1-43, 1-45, 1-46, 1-48, 1-50, 1-51, 1-52, 1-53, 1-54, 1-55, 1-56, 1-57, 1-59, 1-60, 1-61, 1-62, 1-63, 1-64, 1-65, 1-66, 1-67, 1-68, 1-69, 1-70, 1-71, 1-72, 1-73, 1-74, and 1-75.
8. Within the objections to the following data requests, however, Verizon indicated an intent to provide some response: OCA GII 1-5, 1-6, 1-9, 1-10, 1-11, 1-12, 1-13, 1-14, 1-15, 1-16, 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 1-21, 1-22, 1-24, 1-27, 1-28, 1-29, 1-30, 1-31, 1-32, 1-33, 1-34, 1-35, 1-36, 1-37, 1-38, 1-51, 1-52, 1-55, 1-56, 1-57, 1-59, 1-60, 1-61, 1-62,

recovery is “equitable, appropriate, and balanced.”); Re Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, 83 N.H.P.U.C. 278 (1998) (Commission’s finding that renegotiated rates paid by PSNH to wood-fired generators were not in the public interest required balancing of savings achieved for ratepayers against the costs and risks shifted from PSNH and the wood-fired generators, in addition to consideration of the economic impact upon the state, the community impact, enhanced energy security by utilizing mixed energy sources, including indigenous and renewable electrical energy production, and the potential environmental and health-related impacts); Grafton Electric Company v. State, 77 N.H. 539, 542 (1915) (“public good” finding required by statute requiring Commission approval of utility’s issuance of securities equated to “reasonable taking all interests into consideration.”); Re Connecticut Light and Power Co., 84 N.H.P.U.C. 634 (1999) (finding that allowing the generating assets in question to be an eligible facility will be beneficial to consumers and is in the public interest because the assets in question are being transferred to an entity that will be engaged in the competitive electricity market in New England, and the development and growth of that market is in the interest of New Hampshire electric customers).

⁸ Order 24,733, March 16, 2007, pp. 6-7, and 20.

⁹ Staff Report of Technical Session held on February 27, 2007, dated March 5, 2007.

¹⁰ Attachment A and B.

1-63, 1-65, 1-67, 1-70, 1-71, 1-72, and 1-75. Verizon's responses are due after the deadline for filing this motion to compel.

9. On April 25, 26, and 27, 2007, the OCA and its consultants spoke with Verizon by telephone and communicated via email in a good faith attempt to reach informal resolution of Verizon's objections to the OCA's Group II data requests. Although some differences were resolved, at least temporarily, disagreements remained at the conclusion of these discussions.
10. Consequently, pursuant to Puc 203.09, the OCA seeks to compel Verizon's responses to the following data requests: OCA GII 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 1-32, 1-53, 1-54, 1-64, and 1-66.
11. Additionally, the OCA reserves its rights to compel further response or propound additional data requests concerning the data requests to which Verizon indicated, in its written objection or in subsequent discussions, its intent to provide some response, but which response the OCA will not receive until after the present deadline for filing motions to compel.

II. Standard of review – Discovery

12. The scope of discovery in Commission proceedings is broad and extends to information that is relevant to the proceeding or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. See Re Public Service of New Hampshire, 86 NH PUC 730, 731 (2001) (citation omitted); and Re Public Service Company of New Hampshire, 89 NH PUC 226, 229 (2004) (citation omitted).
13. The Commission will deny discovery requests only when it "can perceive of no circumstance in which the requested data will be relevant." Re Public Service of

New Hampshire, 86 NH PUC at 731-732; and Re Public Service Company of New Hampshire, 89 NH PUC at 229.

14. The underlying purpose of discovery in legal proceedings is to reach the truth. See Scontsas v. Citizens Insurance Co., 109 N.H. 386, 388 (1969), citing Hartford Accident &c. Co. v. Cutter, 108 N.H. 112, 113 (1967).
15. A party in a legal proceeding in New Hampshire is entitled to “be fully informed and have access to all evidence favorable to his side of the issue. This is true whether the issue is one which has been raised by him or by his opponents and whether the evidence is in the possession of his opponent or someone else.” Scontsas v. Citizens Insurance Co., 109 N.H. at 388.
16. “If a party is surprised [at trial] by the introduction of evidence or an issue or the presentation of a witness previously unknown to him, the trier of fact is likely to be deprived of having that party's side of the issue fully presented, and the system becomes less effective as a means of discovering the truth.” Id.
17. Likewise, the Commission has recognized the “liberality of the applicable discovery rule.” Re Public Service of New Hampshire, 86 NH PUC at 732.

III. OCA’s Responses to Verizon’s Objections

A. OCA’s General Responses to Verizon’s Objections

a. Verizon’s objections to the OCA’s data requests were not timely filed, and, as such, Verizon waived its objections.

18. The procedural schedule required Verizon to file objections to Group II data requests on or before April 20, 2007.¹¹
19. The objections were due by or before 4:30 PM.¹²

¹¹ Order 24,733, March 16, 2007, pp. 6 and 20.

20. Verizon filed its objections to the OCA's Group II data requests at or about 6:21 PM on April 20, 2007.¹³
21. As such, the OCA may ask for a ruling that Verizon's untimely objections were waived.¹⁴
22. Instead, in good faith and in the spirit of cooperation, the OCA reserves its rights to request such a ruling until the conclusion of the conference with the hearings examiner on May 4, 2007.

b. Verizon's attempts to narrow the scope of the OCA's inquiry should not be permitted.

23. It is difficult to imagine a transaction of greater moment and importance to New Hampshire consumers than the proposed transaction. An investment-grade, financially-stable entity with approximately a century of providing service seeks to transfer its franchise, tangible assets, customers and operations to an entity that has no history of managing operations of this size and significance, an entity that may be characterized fairly as "high debt/high dividend" with "junk bond" or non-investment grade bond ratings.
24. Group II contains issues of utmost importance to all of the Verizon's customers, and the state as a whole. One issue is quality of service, which is the subject of a pending 2004 docket at the Commission in which findings of declining service quality have yet to be addressed. It also covers technical capabilities, current infrastructure, issues which go to both the status of the existing telecommunications network in the state, and to FairPoint's plans for its future operation.

¹² Puc 103.01 (j) sets the hours of the commission "from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m."

¹³ See Attachments A and B.

¹⁴ RSA 541-A:37.

25. In its objections to the OCA's Group II data requests, Verizon seeks to restrict from the Commission and the parties key information pertaining to the assets it seeks to transfer to FairPoint on the issues contained in the group.
26. Contrary to Verizon's assertions, information from Verizon's own analyses and ongoing management of the system is crucial to the Commission's and intervenors' understanding of the full nature of the proposed transaction and its impact on the public and ratepayers. No clearer information exists than that which is collected, created, and utilized for the ongoing operation of the state's largest telecommunications utility. In fact, Verizon is the only party that has this information, and its failure to provide it will severely limit the ability of the parties to undertake the analysis necessary in this case.

B. OCA's Responses to Verizon's "General" Objections

27. Without waiving its objection to the untimely nature of Verizon's "general" objections, the OCA responds to these as follows.
28. Verizon's response to the OCA's Group II data requests included a "Preliminary Statement and General Objections." Therein, Verizon asserts numerous general grounds for objection to and reservations of rights to object regarding "each and every" data request.
 - a. **Verizon's "general" objections and reservations of rights, numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8.**
29. In its "general" objection number 1, in pertinent part, Verizon asserts attorney-client privilege or attorney work-product doctrine.
30. In its "general" objection number 2, in pertinent part, Verizon reserves its right to object to further discovery into the subject matter of any of its responses.

31. In its “general” objection number 3, in pertinent part, Verizon objects to the production of information and documents “equally available to the requester or that are not within Verizon’s possession, custody or control.”
32. In its “general” objection number 4, in pertinent part, Verizon objects to the production of information and documents “that Verizon has already made available to the requester in this or other dockets.”
33. In its “general” objection number 6, in pertinent part, Verizon reserves the right to object “that any data requests, in the aggregate, are overly burdensome and exceed reasonable limits of discovery.”
34. In its “general” objection number 7, in pertinent part, Verizon reserves “the right to object to definitions and instructions to the extent that there are differences in them among the requesters.”
35. In its “general” objection 8, Verizon objects “to the extent that the instructions and/or definitions seek to impose burdens on Verizon that are greater than those imposed by applicable portions of N.H. Admin. Rules, Puc 200, impose undue burdens on Verizon, and/or have the effect of making the data requests overbroad.”
36. Verizon’s “general” objections are broad and vague, particularly as to how they actually apply to the OCA’s Group I data requests.
37. In most cases, the OCA may not know the impact of these “general” objections and reservations of rights unless and until Verizon responds to the data requests.
38. To the extent that Verizon asserts any of these general objections or rights in its responses, the Commission should require Verizon to do more than just make the assertion as a preamble to its question-specific objections.

39. Rather, to the extent that Verizon relies upon a “general” objection in a response, the Commission should require Verizon to specifically set forth the basis or bases for asserting the objection and to provide a log of withheld information and documents (e.g., privilege log).
40. Until such time as Verizon provides more specific information as to how each “general” objection applies to “each and every” data request, the OCA reserves its rights to challenge Verizon’s characterizations and refusals to respond on the basis of these “general” objections or reservations of rights.

b. Verizon’s “general” objection 5: Definition of “Verizon”.

41. In its “general” objection 5, in pertinent part, Verizon objects to producing information regarding non-party affiliates Verizon affiliate or operations of party-affiliates outside of New Hampshire.
42. The intent of this definition was to avoid the situation where responsive documents exist but Verizon NH does not possess these documents because of an internal decision of Verizon NH, its parent or subsidiary. For example, Verizon Communications, Inc. (Verizon Communications) or another Verizon entity may intentionally limit the information in Verizon NH’s control or custody as a way to avoid turning over information in these state regulatory proceedings. Given the structure and interrelationships of the Verizon companies as well as the structure of the proposed transaction, going up through and including Verizon Communications, the identity of the particular entity that possess and needs to produce the information responsive to relevant data requests should not control.

c. Verizon’s “general” objection 9: Proprietary information.

43. In its “general” objection 9, in pertinent part, Verizon objections to “all data requests to the extent they seek information that is proprietary, competitively sensitive and subject to confidential treatment in accordance with RSA 378:43.”
44. The OCA and its consultants are signatories to a Protective Agreement with Verizon and FairPoint in this matter. Therefore, there should be no issue limiting production of confidential information to OCA or its consultants.
45. To the extent that Verizon refuses to provide a response on this basis, the Commission should require Verizon to do more than just make the assertion that the request seeks proprietary information.
46. Rather, the Commission should require Verizon to specifically set forth the basis or bases for asserting this objection and to provide a log of withheld information and documents (i.e., privilege log).

d. Verizon’s “general” objection 10: Pre-2003 data.

47. In “general” objection 10, in pertinent part, Verizon objects to providing data for periods before 2003.
48. Verizon’s determination of 2003 as the cut-off for discovery in this proceeding is arbitrary.
49. The OCA has and will continue in good faith to limit the scope of its requests in time to the extent reasonable given the nature of the specific questions and the data it seeks. It will not, however, agree to the use of a single arbitrary date determined by Verizon as a cut-off for responses to all questions.
50. While the OCA has agreed to limit the scope of some of its Group I data requests to the period after 2003, the OCA does not agree that such a limit is appropriate in all

circumstances and does not waive its right to compel the production of information and documents for periods before 2003.

51. In the following section, addressing Verizon's objections to specific data requests, where appropriate, the OCA provides justification for requesting pre-2003 data.

C. OCA's Response to Verizon's Objections to Specific Data Requests

52. Without waiving its objection to the untimely nature of Verizon's question-specific objections, the OCA responds to these as follows.

a. OCA's Reservation of Rights Regarding Responses Offered by Verizon in its Written Objections

53. In its written objections, Verizon has indicated an intent to provide some response to the following requests: OCA GII 1-5, 1-6, 1-9, 1-10, 1-11, 1-12, 1-13, 1-14, 1-15, 1-16, 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 1-21, 1-22, 1-24, 1-27, 1-28, 1-29, 1-30, 1-31, 1-32, 1-33, 1-34, 1-35, 1-36, 1-37, 1-38, 1-51, 1-52, 1-55, 1-56, 1-57, 1-59, 1-60, 1-61, 1-62, 1-63, 1-65, 1-67, 1-70, 1-71, 1-72, and 1-75. Verizon's responses are due after the deadline for filing this motion to compel.
54. As such, the OCA reserves its rights to compel further responses or to propound further data requests seeking additional information.
55. To the extent that the OCA agreed for the time being to accept post-2003 information, data and documents or to any other limitation in Verizon's responses, the OCA did not waive its rights to compel full responses or to propound further data requests seeking data pre-2003 or other information restricted by any other temporary limitation.

b. OCA's Reservation of Rights Regarding Responses Offered by Verizon in Discussions about Objections

56. In discussions with the OCA, Verizon has indicated an intent to provide some response to the following requests: OCA GII 1-41, 1-42, 1-43, 1-45, 1-46, 1-47, 1-48, 1-50, 1-73 and 1-74.

57. Verizon's responses are due after the deadline for filing this motion to compel.

OCA GII 1-41, 1-42, 1-43, 1-45, 1-46, 1-47, 1-48 1-50

58. These data requests seek information related to service quality, focused on Verizon's ability to, and plans for, timely completion of both routine and specific construction projects, including the current backlog.

59. In discussions with Verizon, the company agreed to respond to revised requests proposed by the OCA, at least in part.

60. Until such time as Verizon responds, the OCA reserves its rights to compel further response or to propound additional data requests seeking further response.

OCA GII 1-73 and 1-74

61. The OCA has clarified that these questions do not intend to request information about "FiOS" specifically, a Verizon trademarked product or brand that is not an asset to be conveyed as part of the proposed transaction. Instead, the OCA seeks information about the fiber network and infrastructure that are assets to be conveyed as part of the proposed transaction, including costs and how those costs have been allocated.

62. In discussions with Verizon, the company agreed to respond to revised requests proposed by the OCA, at least in part.

63. Until such time as Verizon responds, the OCA reserves its rights to compel further response or to propound additional data requests seeking additional information.

c. Contested Data Requests

OCA GII 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 1-32

64. Four of Verizon's objections relate to service quality: OCA GII 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, and 1-32. These questions concern key service quality metrics, the responses to which will provide data necessary to assess whether the proposed transaction will meet the standard of providing public benefits.
65. Verizon objected to these data requests on the grounds that they are overbroad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Notwithstanding these objections, Verizon has proposed to provide responsive information dating back to 2003 for these data requests.
66. However, this data has already been tracked, tabulated and provided in Verizon's open Quality of Service docket, DT 04-019, going back to 1996. For example, the OCA has identified certain information from DT 04-019 including a Staff memorandum dated February 24, 2004, and a Curry & Associates Report on Initial Analysis dated February 4, 2005, that would be responsive to these data requests.
67. The requested information is vital to an informed analysis of Verizon's service quality history and abilities, which, when compared with FairPoint's, will speak to whether the public will be better off or worse if the proposed transaction is approved.

OCA GII 1-53 and OCA 1-54

68. OCA GII 1-53 and OCA 1-54 request documents related to the deployment of DSL by Verizon.
69. Verizon objected to these data requests on the basis that they are overbroad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

70. In response to Verizon's objections, the OCA is willing to accept information and documents specifically relating to New Hampshire DSL deployment, and only dating back to 2003.
71. This information is necessary for the parties and the Commission to be able to fully understand the current status of DSL deployment in order to assess, in comparison, whether FairPoint's plans to expand DSL service is in the public interest.
72. This information is also needed to analyze aspects of FairPoint's DSL deployment plans with respect to cost, timing, and related issues that could go to the reasonableness of future rates.
73. Verizon only can provide this unique information concerning DSL deployment for the system that will they propose to transfer in this case.

OCA GII 1-64 and 1-66

74. OCA GII 1-64 and 1-66 also request information related to DSL deployment. However, they seek Verizon's DSL deployment plans under a business as usual assumption, and for the years 2007 and 2008.
75. Verizon objected to these data requests on the basis that they seek trade secret information, are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, and are overbroad and unduly burdensome.
76. As with the information in 1-53 and 1-54, this information is necessary for the parties and Commission to be able to fully assess FairPoint's proposed undertakings to deploy DSL, which it has characterized as a top priority, against the backdrop of what the public could expect from Verizon, should the proposed transaction not be approved.
77. Verizon alone possesses the requested information.

IV. Compliance with Puc 203.09(i)(4)

78. Puc 203.09(i)(4) requires a motion to compel responses to data requests to “certify that the movant has made a good faith effort to resolve the dispute informally.”
79. OCA counsel and witnesses, in good faith, spoke by telephone and had several email exchanges with Verizon’s counsel and witnesses on April 25, 2007, April 26, 2007, and April 27, 2007 in an attempt to informally resolve the discovery disputes.
80. The OCA and Verizon were unable to resolve all disputes despite this effort.

Wherefore, the OCA respectfully requests that the Commission provide the following relief:

- A. Compel Verizon’s responses to the following OCA Group II data requests: OCA GII 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 1-32, 1-53, 1-54, 1-64, and 1-66; and
- B. Grant such other relief as justice requires.

Respectfully submitted,



Meredith A. Hatfield
Rorie E.P. Hollenberg
Office of Consumer Advocate
21 S. Fruit St., Ste. 18
Concord, N.H. 03301
(603) 271-1172
meredith.hatfield@puc.nh.gov
rorie.hollenberg@puc.nh.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing motion was forwarded this day to the parties by electronic mail.

April 27, 2007



Meredith A. Hatfield

Victor D. Del Vecchio
Assistant General Counsel



185 Franklin Street, 13th Floor
Boston, MA 02110-1585

Phone 617 743-2323
Fax 617 737-0648
victor.delvecchio@verizon.com

April 20, 2007

VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

Meredith A. Hatfield
Consumer Advocate
Office of Consumer Advocate
21 S. Fruit Street, Suite 18
Concord, NH 03301-2429



Re: DT 07-011 – VERIZON NEW ENGLAND INC., BELL ATLANTIC COMMUNICATIONS, INC., NYNEX LONG DISTANCE COMPANY, VERIZON SELECT SERVICES INC. AND FAIRPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC. Joint Application for Approvals Related to Verizon’s Transfer of Property and Customer Relations to Company to be Merged with and into FairPoint Communications, Inc.

Dear Ms. Hatfield:

Enclosed are Verizon New Hampshire’s Objections to Office of Consumer Advocate’s Second Set of Data Requests.

Please note that to comply with the Commission’s procedural order, Verizon is serving the objections now but, in certain instances (where indicated with the phrase “subject to and without waiver of the objection, Verizon responds as follows”), Verizon will nonetheless be providing a response in accordance with the procedural schedule and its objection.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Victor Del Vecchio

cc: DT 07-011 Service List

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT AND GENERAL OBJECTIONS

In response to each and every data request, Verizon states the following:

1. Verizon has attempted to identify every data request that seeks information and/or documents protected against discovery by the attorney-client privilege or the attorney work-product doctrine or any other applicable privilege. However, given that objections to data requests are due prior to the responses, Verizon has not had the opportunity to review every document that is responsive to each data request. To the extent that any specific data request is intended to elicit such privileged information and/or documents, Verizon objects and asserts the applicable privilege to the fullest extent permitted by law.

2. To the extent that Verizon responds to these data requests, Verizon does not concede the relevancy of the responses or documents to this action, nor does it concede that such responses or documents may be used for any purpose in this or any other action, lawsuit or proceeding. Verizon expressly reserves the right to object to further discovery into the subject matter of any of the responses or any portion thereof.

3. Verizon objects to each data request to the extent that it seeks information and/or documents equally available to the requester or that are not within Verizon's possession, custody or control.

4. Verizon objects to data requests that solicit information and/or documents that Verizon has already made available to the requester in this or other dockets.

5. Verizon objects to the definition of "Verizon" as defined in the requests to the extent it seeks information regarding a Verizon affiliate that is not a party to this

proceeding or regarding operations outside of New Hampshire of those Verizon affiliates that are parties to the proceeding.

6. Verizon reserves the right to object that any data requests, in the aggregate, are overly burdensome and exceed reasonable limits of discovery.

7. Verizon has attempted to respond to each data request based on the instructions and definitions provided. However, Verizon reserves the right to object to such definitions and instructions to the extent that there are differences in them among the requesters.

8. Verizon objects to the extent that the instructions and/or definitions seek to impose burdens on Verizon that are greater than those imposed by applicable portions of N.H. Admin. Rules, Puc 200, impose undue burdens on Verizon, and/or have the effect of making the data requests overbroad. Verizon will make a good faith effort to provide information responsive to the data requests subject to this objection, but it specifically objects to providing, among other things, drafts of documents, identical copies of documents, non-identical copies of documents that contain handwritten notes, and descriptions of responsive documents that once existed but cannot be produced due to loss or destruction.

9. Verizon objects to all data requests to the extent they seek information that is proprietary, competitively sensitive and subject to confidential treatment in accordance with RSA 378:43. Subject to specific instances where Verizon considers information responsive to a particular request to be extraordinarily, highly proprietary and competitively sensitive, Verizon will produce the requested information pursuant to RSA 378:43 and a duly executed protective agreement.

10. Verizon objects to all data requests to the extent they seek historical data for periods before 2003 on the basis that it would be unduly burdensome to produce that information in the circumstances of this case, and the production of such dated material is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this proceeding.

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-3
Has the E911 system been subject to regulatory or legislative review since its inception? If yes, provide the results and reports related to such review.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information regarding whether the E911 system has been subject to regulatory or legislative review since its inception is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Has the operation of the E911 system ever been subject to an external
G II 1-4 audit? If so, please provide the results of such audits.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information regarding whether the E911 system has ever been subject to an external audit is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-5
Provide New Hampshire's E911 total Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) costs and all of Verizon's costs broken out by element to furnish E911 service to the NH E911 Bureau for each of the years 2001 through 2006, and describe fully the way in which Verizon recovers these costs.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on all of Verizon's costs broken out by element to furnish E911 service to the NH E911 Bureau seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. In addition, the request for E911 total Public Switched Telephone Network costs for each of the past 5 years is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which information is requested. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Re page 21, lines 6-10. Provide a detailed description of the "911
G II 1-6 network and associated responsibilities of the New Hampshire 911
contract" including the scope of the responsibilities, the costs of
fulfilling the responsibilities, and Verizon's present method of
recovering the costs associating with fulfilling the responsibilities.

REPLY: Objection. The request for a detailed description of the 911 network
and associated responsibilities of the New Hampshire 911 contract, the
costs of fulfilling the responsibilities and Verizon's present method of
recovering the costs seeks information not reasonably calculated to
lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the
transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before
the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and
will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the
objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-7
What steps, if any, has Verizon taken to improve the efficiency of its E911 operations since assuming E911 operations (*e.g.*, regarding hardware, software, data base structure, etc.)?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on steps Verizon has taken to improve E911 operations since assuming E911 operations is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-8 Assuming business as usual (*i.e.*, that the proposed transaction does not occur), what steps, if any, would Verizon undertake during the next five years to improve the operational efficiency of the E911 system (*i.e.*, reducing operating expenses and system improvements, without jeopardizing the quality of the E911 delivery system)?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on steps Verizon would take in the next five years to improve the efficiency of E911 operations is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, to the extent the request seeks information assuming the proposed transaction does not occur, it seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-9
Re page 24, lines 15-23. Provide all quality of service reports filed with the New Hampshire Commission for the past five years. Please consider this request ongoing and update as appropriate throughout the proceeding.

REPLY: Objection. The request for all quality of service reports filed with the New Hampshire PUC for the past 5 years is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which information is requested. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Assuming business as usual (*i.e.*, that the proposed transaction does not
G II 1-10 occur), describe fully Verizon's efforts to improve service quality.

REPLY: Objection. The request for a description of Verizon's efforts to improve service quality is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce, and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, to the extent the request seeks information assuming the proposed transaction does not occur, it seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA . Has Verizon suspended efforts to improve service quality pending the
G II 1-11 outcome of this proceeding? Explain fully.

REPLY: Objection. The request for a statement regarding whether Verizon has suspended efforts to improve service quality pending the outcome of this proceeding is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, the request seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Describe fully Verizon's plans for improving service quality pending
G II 1-12 review of the proposed transaction for:
a. 2007; and
b. 2008.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information regarding Verizon's plans for improving service quality for 2007 and 2008 is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, the request seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Does Verizon consider the quality of its basic local exchange service to
G II 1-13 be acceptable? Explain fully and provide any and all data, studies and
other materials relied upon in support of the response.

REPLY: Objection. The request for a statement regarding the quality of
Verizon's basic local exchange service and any and all data, studies
and other materials related to it is overbroad and calls for information
that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information
not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New
Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission
meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based
on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not
parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire
and would require Verizon to provide any and all information in
existence that would support its response. Subject to and without
waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please provide an Excel spread sheet reflecting for the years 1996
G II 1-14 through 2006 the total dollars budgeted versus spent for all classes of
plant in New Hampshire broken out by the categories of capital,
removal, maintenance and repair (C, X, M, &R).

REPLY: Objection. The request for data on the total dollars budgeted versus
spent for all classes of plant in New Hampshire by category for the
years 1996 to 2006 is overbroad and calls for information that would
be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which
information is requested. Subject to and without waiving the
objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to
the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-15
Assuming business as usual (*i.e.*, that the transaction does not occur), please provide an Excel spread sheet reflecting for the years 2007 through 2012 the total dollars budgeted for all classes of plant in New Hampshire broken out by the categories of capital, removal, maintenance and repair (C, X, M, &R).

REPLY: Objection. The request for data on the total dollars budgeted versus spent for all classes of plant in New Hampshire by category for the years 2007 through 2012 based on the assumption that the proposed FairPoint transaction does not occur seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please provide organization charts reflecting the total authorized year
G II 1-16 end head count for the entire New Hampshire operations for the years
1996 through 2006.

REPLY: Objection. The request for organizational charts reflecting the total
authorized head count for the years 1996 to 2006 is overbroad and calls
for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the
number of years for which information is requested. Subject to and
without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive
information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-18
Please provide in Excel spreadsheet format, separately for each wire center, district (or other geographic unit smaller than the state), and for statewide, totals by month from January 1996 to June 2006, the objective versus actual result for *residential* customers for the following metrics:

- a. Held orders over thirty days;
- b. Average trouble report/100 lines;
- c. Average % out of service less than 24 hours;
- d. Average hours repair completion;
- e. Average % repair commitments met;
- f. Repair service answer time;
- g. Average installation intervals (days);
- h. Out-of-service repair intervals (hours);
- i. Percent installation commitments met;
- j. Repeat troubles as percent of initial troubles;
- k. Percent installation dissatisfaction;
- l. Percent repair dissatisfaction;
- m. Switch outages; and
- n. Average switch downtime (seconds).

REPLY: Objection. The request for metrics on residential customers each month from January 1996 to June 2006 by each wire center and district, and statewide, is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for

which information is requested and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-19 Please provide in Excel spreadsheet format, separately for each wire center, district (or other geographic unit smaller than the state), and for statewide, totals by month from January 1996 to June 2006, the objective versus actual result for *business* customers for the following metrics:

- a. Held orders over thirty days;
- b. Average trouble report/100 lines;
- c. Average % out of service less than 24 hours;
- d. Average hours repair completion;
- e. Average % repair commitments met;
- f. Repair service answer time;
- g. Average installation intervals (days);
- h. Out-of-service repair intervals (hours);
- i. Percent installation commitments met;
- j. Repeat troubles as percent of initial troubles;
- k. Percent installation dissatisfaction;
- l. Percent repair dissatisfaction;
- m. Switch outages; and
- n. Average switch downtime (seconds).

REPLY: Objection. The request for metrics on business customers each month from January 1996 to June 2006 by each wire center and district, and statewide, is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which

information is requested and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please identify by name and title the individuals responsible for
G II 1-21 monitoring the quality of basic local exchange service and those
responsible for remedying any service quality lapses.

REPLY: Objection. The request for the identity of the individuals by name and
title at Verizon responsible for monitoring the quality of basic local
exchange service seeks information the disclosure of which would
result in an invasion of privacy of Verizon employees to the extent
names are sought. Subject to and without waiving the objection,
Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please provide Verizon's business plan for 2006 and 2007 concerning
G II 1-22 service quality, infrastructure and DSL deployment.

REPLY: Objection. The request for Verizon's business plans for 2006 and 2007 concerning service quality, infrastructure and DSL deployment is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Provide a complete list of the service quality standards, benchmarks
G II 1-24. and/or other measures presently used for external purposes (*e.g.*,
regulatory).

REPLY: Objection. The request seeks a legal opinion. Subject to and without
waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please describe fully the consequences of failing to meet specified
G II 1-27 regulatory standards for service quality in:

- a. New Hampshire;
- b. Maine;
- c. Vermont;
- d. Massachusetts;
- e. Rhode Island; and
- f. New York.

REPLY: Objection. The request seeks a legal opinion and is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, the request seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Are there any internal consequences if Verizon fails to meet service
G II 1-28 quality standards? If yes, please describe fully.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on any internal consequences if Verizon fails to meet service quality standards is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please provide the regulatory quality of service standards (benchmarks,
G II 1-29 objectives, etc.) for:

- a. New Hampshire;
- b. Maine;
- c. Vermont;
- d. Massachusetts;
- e. Rhode Island; and
- f. New York.

REPLY: Objection. The request seeks a legal opinion and is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, the request seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please provide the company's internal quality of service standards
G II 1-30 (benchmarks, objectives, etc.) for:

- a. New Hampshire;
- b. Maine;
- c. Vermont;
- d. Massachusetts;
- e. Rhode Island; and
- f. New York.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, the request seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please provide any and all studies, analyses, memoranda, consumer
G II 1-31 surveys and other documents prepared by or on behalf of Verizon since
January 1, 2001 regarding its service quality.

REPLY: Objection. The request for any and all studies, analyses, memoranda, consumer surveys and other documents regarding service quality since January 1, 2001 is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which information and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA How many technician and crew hours are required to address the over-
G II 1-41 age routine-order backlog identified in response to the previous
question?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on the number of technician
and crew hours that would be required to address any over-age routine-
order backlog seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to
the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction
with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public
Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for
the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA What is the identified level of C, X, M and R dollars required to
G II 1-42 eliminate the routine-order backlog?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on the level of C, X, M and R dollars to eliminate the routine-order backlog seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA What is Verizon's objective for acceptable float level (*i.e.*, number of
G II 1-43 open over-age orders) in the routine-order category?

REPLY: Objection. The request for a statement of Verizon's objective for acceptable float level in the routine-order category seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, to the extent the request seeks information on an objective for an acceptable float level in the routine-order category, it seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA How many technician and crew hours are required to address the over-
G II 1-45 age specific-estimate backlog identified in response to the previous
question?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on the number of technician
and crew hours that would be required to address the over-age specific-
estimate backlog seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to
the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction
with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public
Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for
the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA What is the identified level of C, X, M, and R dollars required to
G II 1-46 eliminate the specific-estimate backlog?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on the level of C, X, M and R dollars required to eliminate any specific-estimate backlog seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA How many crew hours are required to perform the transfers identified
G II 1-48 in the response to the previous question?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on the number of crew hours that would be required to perform any pending pole transfers seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA How many crew hours are required to accomplish the removals
G II 1-50 identified in the response to the previous question?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on the number of crew hours that would be required to accomplish any pending pole removals seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Have any customers, since January 1, 2001, requested that Verizon
G II 1-51 provide ADSL service without being required to also purchase circuit
switched voice grade telephone service (*i.e.*, stand alone, “naked”
DSL)? If so, provide the following information:

- a. Manner in which such request was made (telephone, letter, etc.);
- b. Date(s) of such request;
- c. Wire centers (CCLI code and plain English name) serving the customer making such a request; and
- d. Disposition of such a request.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on whether any customers, since January 1, 2001, requested that Verizon provide ADSL service without being required to purchase circuit switched voice grade telephone service is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which information is requested and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-52 Separately for each year beginning 2001 to the present, and totals shown separately by wire center (CCLI code and plain English name) and statewide:

- a. Indicate the quantities of customers that have requested DSL service from Verizon.
- b. Of the quantities indicated in response to subpart (a) of this question, indicate the quantities of customers that were supplied with Verizon's DSL.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information quantities of customers requesting DSL service, by wire center, for each year beginning in 2001 is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which information is requested and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Provide any and all memoranda, studies, marketing reports,
G II 1-53 presentations, business case studies and other documents prepared by
or on behalf of Verizon corporate and/or Verizon New England since
January 1, 2001 regarding the deployment of DSL.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information and documents regarding the
deployment of DSL since January 1, 2001 is overbroad and calls for
information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the
number of years for which information is requested and seeks
information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint
in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities
Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public
good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that
are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New
Hampshire.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Provide any and all memoranda, studies, marketing reports,
G II 1-54 presentations, business case studies and other documents prepared by
or on behalf of Verizon corporate and/or Verizon New England since
January 1, 2001 regarding the deployment of stand-alone DSL.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information and documents regarding the
deployment of stand-alone DSL since January 1, 2001 is overbroad and
calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce
given the number of years for which information is requested and seeks
information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint
in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities
Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public
good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that
are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New
Hampshire.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Identify by name and title the individuals at Verizon corporate and
G II 1-55 Verizon New England who are responsible for decisions regarding the
deployment and pricing of:
a. DSL; and
b. Stand-alone DSL.

REPLY: Objection. The request for the identity of the individuals by name and title at Verizon responsible for decisions regarding deployment and pricing of DSL and stand-alone DSL seeks information the disclosure of which would result in an invasion of privacy of Verizon employees to the extent names are sought and is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which information is requested and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Separately by month, beginning with January 2001, and specifically for
G II 1-56 those wire centers for which DSL was available, indicate:

- a. The quantity of customers ordering DSL;
- b. The average lag time between when a customer ordered DSL and when Verizon completed the service order for such DSL;
- c. The number of customers for whom the lag time between ordering and receiving DSL was
 - i. Less than a month;
 - ii. Between one and two months;
 - iii. Between two and three months; and
 - iv. More than three months.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on DSL service by wire center by month beginning with January 1, 2001 is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which information is requested and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. The request for information on average lag time in Request 56(b) seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public

Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-57 Separately by year, beginning with 2001, provide quantities of complaints, if any, regarding DSL, and categorize the complaints (*e.g.*, lack of DSL availability, timeliness of installation, etc.).

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on the number of customer complaints regarding DSL since 2001 is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the number of years for which information is requested. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Describe in detail the criteria by which Verizon corporate and Verizon
G II 1-59 New England determine when and where to deploy DSL, including any
and all business case criteria or factors used in the deployment
decisions.

REPLY: Objection. The term "business case criteria" is vague and ambiguous.
In addition, the request seeks trade secret information and is overbroad
and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce
and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the
discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction
with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public
Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for
the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon
companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations
other than in New Hampshire. The request seeks information not
reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence
regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire
that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no
net harm standard and will be for the public good. Subject to and
without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Provide any and all maps prepared by or relied upon by Verizon in its
G II 1-60 assessment of and planning for DSL deployment.

REPLY: Objection. The request seeks trade secret information and is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA
G II 1-61 List all maps created by or on behalf of Verizon or in Verizon's possession for its New Hampshire operations, and identify the format (*i.e.*, electronic or printed, if electronic, name of software used to create map) and purpose of the maps (*e.g.*, illustrates central office switch locations, etc.),

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Provide a map of Verizon's serving territory with the wire center
G II 1-62 boundaries shown and the wire centers labeled.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Provide a map of Verizon's serving territory with the wire center
G II 1-63 boundaries shown and marking:

- a. The wire centers where DSL is available; and
- b. The wire centers where FiOS is available.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Assuming business as usual (*i.e.*, that the proposed transaction does not
G II 1-64 occur), describe fully Verizon's DSL deployment plans.

REPLY: Objection. The request for a description of Verizon's DSL deployment plans assuming that the proposed FairPoint transaction does not occur seeks trade secret information and information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good. In addition, the request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Has Verizon suspended DSL deployment pending the outcome of this
G II 1-65 proceeding? Explain fully.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Describe fully Verizon's DSL deployment plans pending review of the
G II 1-66 proposed transaction for:
a. 2007; and
b. 2008.

REPLY: See Objection to OCA 64 and 65.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Describe fully Verizon's current DSL offering (*e.g.*, speed,
G II 1-67 nonrecurring charge, recurring rates, fees, termination penalty, if any,
etc.).

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Has Verizon, in any jurisdiction, opposed any municipality's wireless
G II 1-68 broadband plans? If so, please describe fully such opposition and the
outcome of such opposition.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, the request for information regarding whether Verizon has opposed any municipality's wireless broadband plans seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Provide any and all memoranda, studies, presentations, and other
G II 1-69 documents regarding Verizon's position regarding municipal
deployment of wireless broadband.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that
would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not
reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence
regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire
that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no
net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request
for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the
proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. In
addition, the request for information regarding whether Verizon has
opposed any municipality's wireless broadband plans seeks
information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint
in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities
Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public
good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service
DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please identify by each Verizon wire center the percentage of
G II 1-70 embedded copper loops that currently are not considered acceptable for
xDSL deployment due to distance limitations or other technical factors.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please identify by each Verizon wire center the percentage of
G II 1-71 embedded copper loops that are presently rated acceptable to support
xDSL service offerings.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Describe fully the status of Verizon's FiOS plans, and indicate by wire
G II 1-72 center where FiOS is available and the quantity of customers
subscribing to Verizon's FiOS services in New Hampshire.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please provide any studies, analyses, presentations, memoranda
G II 1-73 regarding the costs or revenues or other business case analyses of
FiOS.

REPLY: Objection. The request is overbroad and calls for information that
would be unduly burdensome to produce because it seeks unlimited
information regarding FiOS. In addition, the request seeks information
not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible
evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New
Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission
meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

Respondent:

Title:

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please describe fully the manner in which Verizon assigns and
G II 1-74 allocates its costs to the FiOS project including ongoing maintenance
and operations.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information regarding the manner in which Verizon assigns and allocates its costs to the FiOS project is overbroad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce and seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good, based on the request for information on Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding and on operations other than in New Hampshire. In addition, the request seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence regarding whether the transaction with FairPoint in New Hampshire that is currently before the Public Utilities Commission meets the no net harm standard and will be for the public good.

VZ #

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DT 07-011

**Respondent:
Title:**

REQUEST: Office of the Consumer Advocate, Group II, Set 1
Technical Capabilities, Current Infrastructure & Quality of Service

DATED: April 13, 2007

ITEM: OCA For year end 2001 through 2006, provide the total sheath route miles of
G II 1-75 copper cable, total sheath route miles of fiber cable, sheath route miles
of fiber cable dedicated to FiOS and fiber miles dedicated to FiOS.

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on the total sheath route miles
of copper cable, fiber cable, fiber cable dedicated to FiOS, and fiber
miles dedicated to FiOS from 2001 to 2006 is overbroad and calls for
information that would be unduly burdensome to produce given the
number of years for which information is requested. Subject to and
without waiving the objection, Verizon will produce responsive
information from 2003 to the present to the extent available.

VZ #

From: ellen.m.cummings@verizon.com
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2007 6:21 PM
To: Hatfield, Meredith
Cc: sheila.gorman@verizon.com; victor.delvecchio@verizon.com
Subject: 04-20-07 NH 07-011: FairPoint/VZ App. - VZ Objections to OCA

Attached please find Verizon's Objections to the OCA's Second Set of Data Requests in docket 07-011.

Thank you.

(See attached file: 04-20-07 NH 07-011 VZ General Objections.pdf)(See attached file: 04-20-07 NH 07-011 VZ Cvr Ltr- OCA re Obj Set 2.pdf)(See attached file: 04-20-07 NH 07-011 VZ Objections OCA Group 2.doc)

Ellen Cummings
State Regulatory Planning
(617) 743-4645