

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

CONSUMER ADVOCATE
Meredith A. Hatfield



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

Tel. (603) 271-1172

FAX No. 271-1177

Website:
www.oca.nh.gov

ASSISTANT CONSUMER ADVOCATE
Kenneth E. Traum

OFFICE OF THE CONSUMER ADVOCATE

21 S. FRUIT ST., SUITE 18
CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03301-2429

May 11, 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 Notice of Reservation of Rights

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) Notice of Reservation of Rights Concerning Verizon's Responses to Group IV, Set 1 Data Requests. A copy of this filing has been served electronically on all parties in this docket.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "M.A. Hatfield".

Meredith A. Hatfield
Consumer Advocate

cc: Service List

Q:\Consumer Advocate\Telecom\DT 07-011 FairPoint Vz Purchase\Correspondence

NHPUC
MAY 11 2007 PM 3:05



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

May 4, 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 FAIRPORINT COMMUNIATIONS, 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 Fourth Group 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,

/s/ Victor Del Vecchio

Victor Del Vecchio

cc: DT 07-011 Service List (email)

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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-2
What is the average cost to Verizon per working loop based on the most recent year for which data are available (specify the year), as computed by the FCC's high cost model used for determining non-rural high cost support:

- a. in New Hampshire?
- b. in Maine?
- c. in Vermont?

REPLY: Objection. The request for information on average cost per working loop 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. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 587

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Does 47 C.F.R. § 54.305 apply to the proposed transaction? Please
GIV 1-4 explain.

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

VZ # 589

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED:

April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-5

In Verizon's view, are the transferred exchanges eligible for safety valve funds in New Hampshire? Explain fully, including the bases and assumptions relied upon for the response.

REPLY:

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

VZ # 590

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-8
How will the proposed transaction affect the benefits, eligibility and service to Verizon's Lifeline customers, including those in process of applying for the program and those customers who have completed the application process but who have not yet received any benefit?

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 593

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA How will the proposed transaction affect the number of customers
GIV 1-9 enrolled in the Lifeline program?

REPLY: Objection. The term “affect” is vague and ambiguous and overly broad and calls for information that would be unduly burdensome to produce. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ # 594

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Does Verizon have any policies or a plan that it follows currently for
GIV 1-10 retaining on Lifeline the customers who are presently on Lifeline and
are eligible to remain on Lifeline?

REPLY: Objection. The request is vague and ambiguous, 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
responds as follows:

VZ # 595

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-11
What steps has Verizon taken to ensure that its current Lifeline customers remain on Lifeline following the consummation of the proposed transaction, if it is approved.

REPLY: Objection. The request is vague and ambiguous, 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 responds as follows:

VZ # 596

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-15
Please provide a detailed description of the process presently in place in New Hampshire to enroll customers in the Lifeline telephone assistance program. If major changes have occurred in this process since 2003, describe each such major change, the year in which it occurred, and the reason for the change.

REPLY: Objection. The term “major changes” is vague and ambiguous and 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. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 600

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-16
Please provide a detailed description of the eligibility guidelines in New Hampshire for the Lifeline telephone assistance program. If major changes have occurred in the eligibility guidelines within the past ten years, describe each such major change, the year in which it occurred, and the reason for the change.

REPLY: Objection. The term “major changes” is vague and ambiguous and 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. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 601

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-17
How will the proposed transaction affect the eligibility and benefits of, as well as service to, Verizon's LinkUp customers, including those customers who are in the process of applying for LinkUp and those customers who have completed the application process but who have not yet received any benefit?

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 602

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA How will the proposed transaction affect the number of customers
GIV 1-19 enrolled in LinkUp?

REPLY: Objection. The term “affect” is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ # 604

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-22
Please provide a detailed description of the process presently in place in New Hampshire to enroll customers in the LinkUp program. If major changes have occurred in this process since 2003, describe each such major change, the year in which it occurred, and the reason for the change.

REPLY: Objection. The term "major changes" is vague and ambiguous and 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. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 607

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-23
Please provide a detailed description of the eligibility guidelines in New Hampshire for the LinkUp telephone assistance program. If major changes have occurred in the eligibility guidelines within the past five years, describe each such major change, the year in which it occurred, and the reason for the change.

REPLY: Objection. The term "major changes" is vague and ambiguous and 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. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 608

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-27
Is Verizon aware of any complaints regarding its Lifeline or LinkUp programs? If the response is in the affirmative, please provide separately for each of the years 2003 through the present, the quantity of such complaints and describe generally the nature of the complaint(s).

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 612

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Has Verizon NH or anyone on behalf of Verizon NH conducted any
GIV 1-29 study, research, analysis or survey regarding the New Hampshire
Lifeline or LinkUp programs since January 1, 2003? If the response is
in the affirmative, please provide such documents.

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. Subject to and
without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 614

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-30
Has Verizon Corporate, or anyone on behalf of Verizon Corporate, since January 1, 2003, conducted any study, research, analysis or survey regarding ways to increase Lifeline participation? If the response is in the affirmative, please provide such documents.

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 615

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Does Verizon NH have any internal procedures, benchmarks,
GIV 1-31 guidelines or other criteria by which it measures the effectiveness of its
Lifeline or LinkUp programs? If the response is in the affirmative,
please describe completely.

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. Subject to and
without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 616

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Does Verizon Corporate have any internal procedures, benchmarks,
GIV 1-32 guidelines or other criteria by which it measures the effectiveness of its
Lifeline or LinkUp programs? If the response is in the affirmative,
please describe completely.

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 responds as follows:

VZ# 617

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please identify by title and name the individual(s) at Verizon NH with
GIV 1-33 the primary responsibility for the Lifeline and LinkUp programs.

REPLY: Objection. The request for the identity of the individuals by name and title at Verizon responsible for Lifeline and LinkUp programs 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 # 618

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-35
Is there automatic Lifeline Program enrollment in any state in which Verizon operates? If so, please identify the state(s) and identify for each state whether the state is a default state.

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 620

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-37 Based on Verizon's multi-year experience offering a Lifeline Program in New Hampshire, please identify the major challenges Verizon perceives to increasing enrollment.

REPLY: Objection. The term "major challenges" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon will respond as follows:

VZ # 622

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-38
Based on Verizon's multi-year experience offering a Lifeline Program throughout its many jurisdictions, please identify the major challenges Verizon perceives to increasing enrollment.

REPLY: Objection. The term "major challenges" is vague and ambiguous and 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 responds as follows:

VZ # 623

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-39 Based on Verizon's multi-year experience offering a Lifeline Program in New Hampshire, please identify the major measures that Verizon has implemented that it considers to have enhanced enrollment.

REPLY: Objection. The term "major challenges" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 624

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-40
Based on Verizon's multi-year experience offering a Lifeline Program throughout its many jurisdictions, please identify the major [sic] the major measures that Verizon has implemented that it considers to have enhanced enrollment.

REPLY: Objection. The term "major measures" is vague and ambiguous and 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 responds as follows:

VZ # 625

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Please identify and provide the key documents or other planning
GIV 1-41 materials that Verizon would provide to FairPoint to assist FairPoint in
operating the Lifeline program in New Hampshire.

REPLY: Objection. The term "key" is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and
without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 626

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-42
Does Verizon possess any documents, databases, or other materials that provide in part or in whole data about average income by wire center or municipality or other area of the state? If the response is in the affirmative, please provide such information.

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 627

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-43
Separately, for each of the years 2003 through the present, and separately for New Hampshire, New York, Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Rhode Island, provide the annual customer education expenses incurred by Verizon for Lifeline and Link-Up programs.

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 628

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-44
For the most recent year for which data are available (specify the year) and separately for Verizon's serving territory within New Hampshire, New York, Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Rhode Island, provide the following;

- a. Number of Lifeline participants;
- b. Estimate of number of customers eligible for Lifeline;
- c. Total number of households (or, alternatively, number of primary residential lines) in Verizon's serving territory within the states; and
- d. Indicate whether the state is a federal "default" state.

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 629

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Is there any state in which Verizon offers a discounted DSL rate to
GIV 1-45 Lifeline customers. If so, please identify.

Re Issue A.7. (Soft Dial Tone)

REPLY: Objection. 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, 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 responds as follows:

VZ # 630

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED:

April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-47

Identify each jurisdiction in which your company offers SDT.

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 632

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues
DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA
GIV 1-48
If your company offers SDT in any of the New England states, please provide the following information; the reason for offering SDT; the date first offered by your company; an estimate of the cost to your company, if any, of offering SDT; and whether, the call reverts to the incumbent carrier's business office with SDT or connects to the carrier that most recently served the location at the time of service termination.

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 responds as follows:

VZ # 633

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Does SDT have any impact on numbering resources (e.g., tie up
GIV 1-49 telephone numbers and prevent their re-assignment)?

REPLY: Objection. The term “impact” is vague and ambiguous. Subject to and without waiving the objection, Verizon responds as follows:

VZ # 634

**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 IV, Set #1
Universal Service and Intercarrier Compensation Issues

DATED: April 27, 2007

ITEM: OCA Provide the amount of revenue that Verizon's unregulated operations
GIV 1-55 receives from provision of DSL service in New Hampshire for each of
the years 2003 through the present.

REPLY: Objection. 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, based on the request for information on
Verizon companies that are not parties to the proceeding.

VZ # 640

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
NOTICE OF RESERVATION OF RIGHTS CONCERNING
VERIZON'S RESPONSES TO GROUP IV, SET 1, DATA REQUESTS**

The Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) hereby notifies the N.H. Public Utilities Commission (Commission), Verizon New England, Inc. (Verizon NE), Bell Atlantic Communications, Inc., NYNEX Long Distance Co., and Verizon Select Services, Inc. (collectively, Verizon), the other parties and Commission Staff that the OCA reserves its rights to compel the responses of Verizon to Group IV data requests and to propound additional data requests concerning the subjects covered by the OCA's Group IV, set 1. In support, the OCA states the following:

1. The procedural schedule in this docket provides for the filing today of motions to compel responses to disputed Group IV data requests.¹

2. In addition to ten "General Objections," Verizon specifically objected in whole or in part to the following data requests: OCA IV 1-2, OCA IV 1-4, OCA IV 1-5, OCA IV 1-8, OCA IV 1-9, OCA IV 1-10, OCA IV 1-11, OCA IV 1-15, OCA IV 1-16, OCA IV 1-17, OCA IV 1-19, OCA IV 1-22, OCA IV 1-23, OCA IV 1-27, OCA IV 1-29, OCA IV 1-30, OCA IV 1-31, OCA IV 1-32, OCA IV 1-33, OCA IV 1-35, OCA IV 1-37, OCA IV 1-

¹ See Order 24,733, March 16, 2007, pp. 6-7, and 20.

38, OCA IV 1-39, OCA IV 1-40, OCA IV 1-41, OCA IV 1-42, OCA IV 1-43, OCA IV 1-44, OCA IV 1-45, OCA IV 1-47, OCA IV 1-48, OCA IV 1-49, OCA IV 1-55.²

3. Within its written objections, Verizon agreed to provide some response to all but one (OCA IV 1-55) of these data requests.

4. On May 8th the OCA spoke with Verizon by telephone, in an attempt to informally resolve Verizon objection to OCA IV 1-55.

5. Thereafter, Verizon indicated its intent to provide some response to that data request.

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

7. In agreeing to accept, for the time being, Verizon's offer to provide some response to its Group IV, set 1 data requests, the OCA does not waive its rights to compel further responses to these data requests or to propound additional data requests concerning the subjects covered by the OCA's Group IV, set 1.

8. As such, the OCA reserves these rights and hereby notifies the Commission, Verizon, other parties and Staff of this reservation of rights.

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

² See Attachment A.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

May 11, 2006



Meredith A. Hatfield