



Holland N. McTyeire, V
Direct (502) 587-3672 Fax (502) 540-2223 E-mail hnm@gdm.com

Via Hand Delivery

September 7, 2006

Ms. Beth A. O'Donnell
Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615

RECEIVED

SEP 07 2006

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

Re: *Petition Of Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. For Arbitration Of Certain Terms And Conditions Of Proposed Interconnection Agreement With American Cellular F/K/A/ ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant To The Communications Act Of 1934, As Amended By The Telecommunications Act Of 1996, Case No. 2006-00215 ✓*

Petition of Logan Telephone Cooperative Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement With American Cellular f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Case No. 2006-00218

Petition of West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement with American Cellular f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Case No. 2006-00220

Petition of North Central Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement with American Cellular f/k/a ACC Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Case No. 2006-00252


Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

Enclosed herewith please find for filing with the Commission an original and ten (10) copies of Response Of American Cellular Corporation To The Interrogatories And Requests For Production Of Documents Submitted By Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc., Logan Telephone Cooperative, Inc., North Central Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. And West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. in the above styled matter.

Ms. Beth A. O'Donnell
September 7, 2006
Page 2

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you have any questions concerning this filing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Holland N. McTyeire". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Holland N. McTyeire, V

HNM/jh

Enclosures

cc: Amy E. Dougherty, Esq.
Leon M. Bloomfield, Esq.

1160376_1

**COMMONWELATH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

RECEIVED

SEP 07 2006

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

- | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|
| Petition of Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement With American Cellular f/k/a Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 |) | Case No. 2006-00215 |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Petition of Logan Telephone Cooperative Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement With American Cellular f/k/a Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 |) | Case No. 2006-00218 |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Petition of West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. for Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement with American Cellular f/k/a Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant to the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 |) | Case No. 2006-00220 |
| |) | |
| |) | |
| Petition of North Central Telephone Cooperative Corporation, For Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions of Proposed Interconnection Agreement with American Cellular Corporation f/k/a Kentucky License LLC, Pursuant To the Communications Act of 1934, As Amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996 |) | Case No. 2006-00252 |
| |) | |
| |) | |

**RESPONSE OF AMERICAN CELLULAR CORPORATION TO THE
INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
SUBMITTED BY BALLARD RURAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE
CORPORATION, INC., LOGAN TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC., NORTH
CENTRAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC. AND WEST
KENTUCKY RURAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE CORPORATION, INC.**

American Cellular Corporation (“ACC”); hereby files this response to the “Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to CMRS Carriers” served on ACC by Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. (“Ballard”) which were adopted and served on ACC by Logan Telephone Cooperative, Inc. (“Logan”), North Central Telephone Cooperative Corporation (“North Central”), and West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. (“West Kentucky”) by letter dated August 23, 2006.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. ACC objects to these Interrogatories and Document Demands to the extent they seek documents or information that is (1) subject to the attorney-client privilege, (2) attorney work-product, or (2) prepared in anticipation of litigation.

2. ACC objects to these Interrogatories and Document Demands to the extent that they seek to impose obligations on ACC that exceed the requirements of the Kentucky Rules of Civil Procedure, the Commission’s Procedural Schedule as set forth in Exhibit A to its August 18, 2006 Order or other applicable Kentucky law.

3. ACC objects to Interrogatories and Document Demands to the extent that they are vague, ambiguous, overly broad, imprecise, call for speculation or to the extent that they utilize undefined or insufficiently defined terms or phrases.

4. ACC objects to these Interrogatories and Document Demands to the extent that they seek the production of documents or information that is equally accessible to petitioner (e.g., documents or information that is in the public domain, or on record with the Commission or the Federal Communications Commission, or which is already in petitioners' possession, custody or control).

5. ACC objects to these Interrogatories and Document Demands to the extent that they seek to have ACC create documents or information not in existence at the time of the discovery request.

Subject to and without waiving any of the above objections, ACC responds as follows:

INTERROGATORIES

1. Identify each person who participated in the consideration and preparation of your answers to these Discovery Requests and identify to which particular Discovery Request each person was involved in answering.

ANSWER: Tom Spears, Interconnect Manager and John Herbst, Senior Director of Network Switching participated in the consideration and preparation of the answers to these Discovery Requests on behalf of ACC.

2. Identify all persons you intend to call as witnesses at the October 16-18, 2006 evidentiary hearing in the above styled matter (the "Evidentiary Hearing").

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks to circumvent the Commission's Procedural Schedule as set forth in Exhibit A to its August 18, 2006 Order (the "Procedural Schedule") which provides for the filing of direct

testimony on September 29, 2006. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it seeks information which is subject to the attorney-client privilege. Subject to and notwithstanding its objections, ACC responds that while it currently intends to call at least one witness during the Evidentiary Hearing, witness(es) selection has not been made. Witness identity, the substance of witness' testimony, as well as documents used, referenced or relied upon in such witness' testimony will be provided pursuant to the Commission's Procedural Schedule or any further order of the Commission or by mutual agreement between the parties.

3. For each person identified in response to Interrogatory No. 2 above, state the facts known and substance of his/her expected testimony at the Evidentiary Hearing.

ANSWER: ACC refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 2 above.

4. Identify all documents that each person identified in response to Interrogatory No. 2 above intends to use, reference, or rely upon during his/her testimony at the Evidentiary Hearing.

ANSWER: ACC refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 2 above.

5. Identify each person you will or may call as an expert or to offer any expert testimony at the Evidentiary Hearing in this matter.

ANSWER: ACC refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 2 above.

6. For each person identified in response to Interrogatory No. 5 above, state all facts known and opinions held by that person with respect to this proceeding, identifying all written reports of the expert containing or referring to those facts or opinions.

ANSWER: ACC refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 2 above.

7. Identify all potential Intermediary Carriers with and through whom the CMRS Carriers have contemplated exchanging traffic with the petitioner in this matter.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous with respect the phrase “potential Intermediary Carriers with and through whom” and the phrase “contemplated exchanging traffic”. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about “CMRS Carriers” and not ACC specifically. ACC also object to this Interrogatory on the grounds it seeks information which is neither relevant to this proceeding nor likely to lead to the discovery of relevant information since, among other things, the identity of intermediary carriers has no bearing on respective parties’ obligations with respect to interconnection under the Act. For example, regardless of the identity of an intermediary carrier each originating party is obligated to, among other things, pay the terminating carrier reciprocal compensation based on rates developed using forward-looking cost studies for

all intraMTA traffic exchanged. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that it currently utilizes transiting services provided by BellSouth to deliver its Telecommunications Traffic to the petitioners and that it contemplates the continued use of such service.

8. With respect to each Intermediary Carrier identified in response to Interrogatory No. 7, above, identify and describe in detail all existing arrangements pursuant which the Intermediary Carrier has agreed to transit traffic between the CMRS Carriers and the petitioner in this matter. Such detailed description shall include, but not be limited to, all physical and financial terms and conditions associated with the proposed transit of traffic through or across the Intermediary Carrier's network.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it seeks information which is readily available to the Petitioners. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about "CMRS Carriers" and not ACC specifically. Subject to, and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that its existing arrangements with BellSouth are governed by its interconnection agreement with BellSouth in Kentucky which is available on the Commission's website. ACC is also informed and believes and on that basis states that the interconnection agreement is also available on the BellSouth website.

9. State whether it is the CMRS Providers' position(s) that the exchange of traffic through an Intermediary Carrier should be required regardless of the volume of traffic exchanged between the parties. If this is not the position of the CMRS Providers,

describe in detail the circumstances (including, but not limited to the appropriate traffic volume threshold and/or transit cost threshold) under which the exchange of traffic through an Intermediary Carrier should not be required of the parties.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about “CMRS Carriers” and not ACC specifically. ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “exchange of traffic through an Intermediary Carrier should be required regardless of the volume of traffic exchanged.” ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis it seems to call for a legal conclusion. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that under the Act, each carrier has a duty to “interconnect directly or indirectly.” ACC is not aware of any traffic volume limitations in the Act for indirect interconnection arrangements.

10. Identify all rates for transport and termination of traffic proposed by the CMRS Carriers. If the CMRS Carriers do not propose a rate for transport and termination of traffic, explain in detail that basis for that failure to propose such rates, and explain in detail the basis by which the CMRS Carriers would propose that the Commission resolve the existing dispute with respect to such rates.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about “CMRS Carriers” and not ACC specifically. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that is based on an inaccurate premise since ACC does not intend to establish asymmetrical rates under 47 C.F.R. section 51.711(d) and thus the establishment of rates for the transport and termination of

Telecommunications Traffic under the Act should be based on each individual RLEC's forward looking costs as established by appropriate TELRIC-based cost studies (which the RLECs have already been ordered by the Commission to produce). Subject to and notwithstanding its objections, ACC responds that in the event no such cost studies are produced by the RLECs, the FCC proxy rates should apply. Alternatively, the Commission may have the option of applying a bill and keep compensation arrangement if a TELRIC-based rate is not established.

11. Identify the proposed default intraMTA and interMTA traffic factors that the CMRS Carriers propose be included in the interconnection agreement resulting from this arbitration, and explain in detail the means by which the CMRS Carriers have determined those factors. If the CMRS Carriers do not propose default intraMTA and interMTA traffic factors, explain in detail the basis for that failure to propose such traffic factors.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks to circumvent the Commission's Procedural Schedule. ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "intraMTA and interMTA traffic factors." ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about "CMRS Carriers" and not ACC specifically. Subject to and notwithstanding its objections, and to the extent this interrogatory seeks information on the relative amount of land-originated intraMTA traffic as opposed to mobile-originated Telecommunications Traffic exchanged by the parties as the "intraMTA traffic factor" and the relative amount of intraMTA and

interMTA traffic exchanged as the “interMTA factor”, ACC responds that it intends to provide testimony in that regard when it submits its direct testimony per the Procedural Schedule. See also answer to Interrogatory No. 2 above.

12. Explain in detail the CMRS Carriers’ rationale for concluding that the traffic volume forecasts proposed by the petitioner in this matter “are unnecessary,” (*see* CMRS Providers’ Issues Matrix at Issue 24), and explain in detail how the CMRS Carriers propose to plan for adequate network capacity if such forecasts are not utilized.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about “CMRS Carriers” and not ACC specifically. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that it currently utilizes the transit services of third-party carriers to deliver its Telecommunications Traffic to the petitioners. ACC is informed and believes, and on that basis states, that such traffic is delivered from the third-party carrier to the petitioner using common trunks and that the third party tandem provider and the petitioner are responsible for maintaining adequate network capacity between their networks. ACC is not involved with this process. In the event a direct connection is utilized by parties to exchange traffic, ACC’s practice has been to work cooperatively with the ILECs so that both parties can try to assure that adequate network capacity is in place.

13. For each month during the period from May 1, 2004 through the present date, identify the CMRS Carriers’ respective minutes of usage (“MOU”) delivered to, and received from the petitioner in this matter.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in temporal scope and seeks information which is neither relevant to the issues in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the basis it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “minutes of use” since it is unclear what type of traffic that is intended to include. ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it refers to “CMRS Carriers’ respective minutes of usage” and not to ACC specifically. In addition, ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the ground it seeks information which is, or should be, in the custody, possession or control of the petitioners. ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information which is confidential and proprietary. Finally, ACC objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it assumes or implies that ACC has any responsibility to identify and measure ACC originated traffic terminated to a petitioner, much less retain records regarding such traffic, and affirmatively states to the contrary that it is each petitioner’s responsibility to make arrangements to identify and measure the traffic originated by ACC that terminates on the petitioner’s network. *See, In the Matter of Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, First Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 15499 1045 (rel. August 8, 1996). Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that although it has the ability to conduct traffic studies over defined periods of time, it does not in the ordinary course of business measure, record, retrieve or retain ACC originated monthly traffic data that terminates to a petitioner’s network or measure, retrieve or retain records on traffic originated on the petitioner’s network and terminated by ACC. Moreover, ACC

understands that BellSouth has been providing petitioners with standard industry records (i.e., 110101 records) that identify the minutes of use that ACC originates for delivery to each petitioner via BellSouth in Kentucky.

14. For each month from the present date through the end of 2006, identify the CMRS Carriers' respective, forecast MOU to be delivered to the petitioner in this matter.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it seeks information which is neither relevant to the issues in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information. ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the ground it seeks information which is, or should be, in the custody, possession or control of the petitioners. ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information which is confidential and proprietary. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that it does not currently have MOU forecasts for traffic it originates to petitioners although petitioners can likely extrapolate a reasonable forecast using the records petitioner received from BellSouth.

15. For each Intermediary Carrier identified in response to Interrogatory No. 7 above, identify all per minute transit and other charges (each identified separately) that such Intermediary Carrier has contractually agreed or is otherwise anticipated to assess against each respective CMRS Carrier.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase "has contractually agreed or is otherwise anticipated to assess against petitioner in this matter." ACC also objects to this

Interrogatory on the ground it seems to seek information which is, or should be, in the custody, possession or control of the petitioners and/or BellSouth. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it appears to seek information which is neither relevant to the issues in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 8 above.

16. For each Intermediary Carrier identified in response to Interrogatory No. 7, above, identify all per minute transit and other charges (each identified separately) that such Intermediary Carrier has contractually agreed or is otherwise anticipated to assess against petitioner in this matter.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “has contractually agreed or is otherwise anticipated to assess against petitioner in this matter.” ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the ground it seems to seek information which is, or should be, in the custody, possession or control of the petitioners and/or BellSouth. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it appears to seek information which is neither relevant to the issues in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information. In addition, ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is unintelligible as written and is more properly directed at the petitioners. Subject to and without waiving its objections, and to the extent this Interrogatory refers to charges BellSouth may assess against petitioners as a result of this arbitration proceeding, ACC responds that it is not aware of any such charges and is not otherwise privy to any

charges BellSouth assesses against petitioners under any circumstances other than those, if any, which are a matter of public record. Pending further clarification, ACC cannot respond further at this time.

17. Identify all agreements, arrangements, rebates, or other formal or informal understandings between the CMRS Carriers and any potential Intermediary Carriers pursuant to which the CMRS Carriers would receive any amount or kind of financial or other incentive from the Intermediary Carrier as the volume of minutes transiting the Intermediary Carrier to or from the CMRS Carriers increases.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “agreements, arrangements, rebates, or other formal or informal understandings between the CMRS Carriers and any potential Intermediary Carriers pursuant to which the CMRS Carriers would receive any amount or kind of financial or other incentive from the Intermediary Carrier.” ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the ground it seems to seek information which is a matter of public record and thus equally accessible to petitioners. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it appears to seek information which is neither relevant to the issues in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information. In addition, ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it refers to “CMRS Carriers” and not to ACC specifically. Subject to and without waiving its objections, and to the extent that this Interrogatory refers to the transiting rates provided to ACC per its interconnection agreement with BellSouth, ACC refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 8 above.

18. State whether any of the CMRS Carriers have a direct or indirect ownership interest in any proposed Intermediary Carrier(s). If any CMRS Carrier answers in the affirmative, identify the CMRS Carrier, the proposed Intermediary Carrier, and the nature and extent of the ownership interest.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “proposed Intermediary Carrier(s)”. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about “any of the CMRS Carriers” and not ACC specifically. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that it has no direct or indirect ownership interest in BellSouth or any third-party transit service provider in Kentucky.

19. Identify and explain in detail all financial, technical, operational and other factors that CMRS Carriers believe support their position that they should be entitled to utilize an Intermediary Carrier to exchange traffic with the petitioner in this matter.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad in that it seeks information on behalf of all the CMRS Carriers and not ACC specifically. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks to circumvent the Procedural Order. ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “should be entitled to”. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that under the Act, each carrier has a duty to “interconnect directly or indirectly.”

20. For each respective CMRS Carrier, identify all States or Commonwealths in which the such [sic] CMRS Carrier has either (i) voluntarily agreed; or (ii) been ordered to exchange traffic with Rural Telephone Companies at rates other than TELRIC-based rates. For each such State or Commonwealth, identify the Rural Telephone Companies with whom such CMRS Carrier exchanges traffic at rates other than TLERIC-based rates, identify the rate at which traffic is exchanged with such Rural Telephone Company, and identify the manner in which the rate was derived.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and seeks information which is neither relevant to the issues in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. ACC further objects on the grounds that the Interrogatory is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “been ordered” since even interconnection agreements which are the result of negotiations are subject to commission approval. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that it has negotiated rates with various ILECs/RLECs in Kentucky including the following and that no determination was made whether the rates were TELRIC or not:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| BellSouth | \$0.007 |
| Brandenburg | \$0.012 (based on net rate/billing arrangement) |
| Duo County | \$0.01919 (based on net rate/billing arrangement) |
| Highland | \$0.02 |
| Mountain Rural | \$0.01212 (based on net rate/billing arrangement) |
| South Central Rural | \$0.009 (based on net rate/billing arrangement) |
| Verizon | \$.0007 |

21. For each respective CMRS Carrier, identify all States or Commonwealths in which the such [sic] CMRS Carrier has either (i) voluntarily agreed; or (ii) been

ordered to exchange traffic with Rural Telephone Companies at TELRIC-based rates. For each such State or Commonwealth, identify the Rural Telephone Companies with whom such CMRS Carrier exchanges traffic at rates other than TLERIC-based rates, identify the rate at which traffic is exchanged with such Rural Telephone Company, and identify the manner in which the rate was derived.

ANSWER: ACC refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 20 above. ACC further notes that it is informed and believes and on that basis states that certain state commissions, for example those in Tennessee, Oklahoma, Michigan, Missouri and California, have either attempted to establish termination and compensation rates based on TELRIC cost studies in various proceedings or ordered the RLECs in those states to produce such studies so that rates can be established.

22. Identify all Intermediary Carriers with which the CMRS Carriers have existing, direct network connectivity in Kentucky.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about all the CMRS Carriers and not ACC specifically. ACC also objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks information which is neither relevant to the issues in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that it has interconnection arrangements with BellSouth which provide for direct interconnection and transiting services for ACC-originated traffic to, among others, the petitioners.

23. Describe in detail all rates and other charges that the CMRS Carriers propose to assess against the petitioners in this matter if the parties exchange traffic: (i) through direct connections of their respective networks; and (ii) through an Intermediary Carrier.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about all the CMRS Carriers and not ACC specifically. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds that it seeks certain information which is equally available to the petitioners by reviewing the template agreement attached to the CMRS Consolidated Response. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC refers to the draft CMRS interconnection agreement attached to the CMRS Consolidated Response. ACC also refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 10 above.

24. With respect to all Intermediary Carriers identified in response to Interrogatory No. 7, describe in detail the financial (including but not limited to applicable rates and charges) and operational (including, but not limited to provision of traffic billing data) terms and conditions that would be imposed by such Intermediary Carriers upon petitioner in this matter if petitioner was required to exchange traffic with the CMRS Carriers through such Intermediate Carriers.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “in this matter”. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it seems to seek information which should be the result of

negotiations between the petitioner and BellSouth (as contemplated by the Agreement effective May 1, 2004) and to which ACC is not, and should not be a party. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC cannot respond further at this time other than to note that petitioners have the discretion to deliver their traffic to ACC as they choose provided it is done in a manner that is consistent with the Act (e.g., that they (a) pay reciprocal compensation for Telecommunications Traffic originated by their customers and terminated by ACC, (b) are responsible for the costs of delivering their traffic to ACC; and (c) ensure that dialing parity and non-discrimination principles are maintained – both in terms of the number of digits dialed and the charges to their customers).

25. Identify the actual intraMTA and interMTA traffic factors that the CMRS Carriers propose be included in the interconnection agreement resulting from this arbitration, and explain in detail the means by which the CMRS Carriers have determined those factors. If the CMRS Carriers do not propose default intraMTA and interMTA traffic factors, explain in detail the basis for that failure to propose such traffic factors.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is duplicative of Interrogatory No. 11 above with the exception of the word “actual” in place of “proposed”. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “actual intraMTA and interMTA traffic factors”. Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC refers to and incorporates by reference its answer to Interrogatory No. 11 above.

REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

1. Produce all documents identified in, referenced, referred to, reviewed, consulted, or relied upon in any way in responding to any of the Interrogatories or Requests for Admission propounded herein.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Demand on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect the phrase “Requests for Admission” since none have been received by ACC in this proceeding. ACC further objects to this Demand on the grounds it seeks information which is equally available to the petitioners since the only responsive documents are matters of public record (e.g., interconnection agreements on the Commission website). Subject to and notwithstanding its objections, ACC refers the petitioners to the Commission website.

2. Produce all documents that you plan to introduce or use as exhibits at the Evidentiary Hearing.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks to circumvent the Commission’s Procedural Schedule. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it seeks information which is subject to the attorney-client privilege. Subject to and notwithstanding its objections, ACC responds that while it anticipates that it will produce documents at the hearing, no such documents have been identified at this time. All responsive documents will be produced at the time pre-filed testimony is submitted or pursuant to a supplemental response. See also answer to Interrogatory No. 2 above.

3. Produce all documents that support the opinion of any expert who has been identified, and attach all documents such expert relied upon in forming his/her opinions and all documents that the expert reviewed, whether or not the documents were relied upon in forming his/her opinions.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Interrogatory on the basis that it seeks to circumvent the Commission's Procedural Schedule. Subject to and notwithstanding its objections, ACC responds that no expert has been identified at this time. Responsive documents will be produced at the time pre-filed testimony is submitted. See also answer to Interrogatory No. 2 above.

4. Produce the *curriculum vitae* of each expert witness and fact witness you expect to testify on your behalf at the Evidentiary Hearing.

ANSWER: See answer to Document Demand No. 3 above.

5. Produce all documents relied upon by each expert witness you expect to testify on your behalf at the Evidentiary Hearing.

ANSWER: See answer to Document Demand No. 3 above.

6. Produce all documents that refer to, relate to, or evidence any evaluation, analyses, studies, or reports made by, tests performed by, or conclusions reached by any expert witness you expect to testify on your behalf at the Evidentiary Hearing.

ANSWER: See answer to Document Demand No. 3 above.

7. Produce all photographs, drawings, videotapes, electronic presentations (for example, Power Point presentations), blueprints or other demonstrative documents in your possession or of which you are aware relating to the subject matter of the above styled case.

ANSWER: See answer to Document Demand No. 2 above.

8. Produce all photographs, drawings, videotapes, electronic presentations (for example, Power Point presentations), blueprints or other demonstrative documents that you intend to use at the Evidentiary Hearing.

ANSWER: See answer to Document Demand No. 2 above.

9. Produce all arbitration proceeding orders in your possession in which a state public utility commission has ordered that CMRS Carriers exchange traffic with Rural Telephone Companies at rates other than TELRIC-based rates.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Demand on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks documents relating to all CMRS Carriers and not to ACC specifically. ACC also objects to this Demand on the grounds it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the phrase “has ordered that CMRS Carriers exchange traffic.” Subject to and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that it is not aware of any instance where a state public utility commission has ordered ACC and an RLEC to pay reciprocal compensation to one another at rates other than TELRIC-based rates and believes that such an order would be contrary to the Act.

10. Produce all documents that refer to, relate to, or otherwise reference the CMRS Carriers' agreements, understandings, and/or contractual relationships with the Intermediary Carriers identified in response to Interrogatory No. 7.

ANSWER: ACC objects to this Demand on the ground it is overbroad and does not seek information which is neither relevant to the issues in this proceeding nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information. ACC further objects to this Demand on the grounds it seeks information which is readily available to the Petitioners. ACC further objects to this Interrogatory on the grounds it is overbroad in that it seeks information about "CMRS Carriers" and not ACC specifically. Subject to, and without waiving its objections, ACC responds that its interconnection agreement with BellSouth in Kentucky is available on the Commission's website as well as the BellSouth website. See also ACC's answer to Interrogatory No. 7 above.

Dated: September 7, 2006

By 
Holland N. McTyeire, V
GREENEBAUM DOLL & McDONALD PLLC
3500 National City Tower
101 South Fifth Street
Louisville, KY 40202
Telephone: (502) 587-3672
Facsimile: (502) 540-2223
E-mail: hnm@gdm.com

and

Leon M. Bloomfield
WILSON & BLOOMFIELD LLP
1901 Harrison St., Suite 1620
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (510) 625-1164
Facsimile: (510) 625-8253
E-mail: lmb@wblaw.net

ATTORNEYS FOR AMERICAN CELLULAR
CORPORATION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the Response Of American Cellular Corporation To The Interrogatories And Requests For Production Of Documents Submitted By Ballard Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc., Logan Telephone Cooperative, Inc., North Central Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. And West Kentucky Rural Telephone Cooperative Corporation, Inc. was on this 7th day of September, 2006 served via United States mail, postage prepaid to the following:

John E. Selent
Holly C. Wallace
Edward T. Depp

DINSMORE & SHOHL, LLP
1400 PNC Plaza
500 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
James Dean Liebman

LIEBMAN & LIEBMAN
403 West Main Street
P.O. Box 478
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602
Bhogan M. Modi
Vice President

COMSCAPE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
1926 10th Avenue, North
Suite 305
West Palm Beach, Florida 33461

William G. Francis

FRANCIS, KENDRICK AND FRANCIS
First Commonwealth Bank Building
311 North Arnold Avenue, Suite 504
P.O. Box 268
Prestonburg, Kentucky 41653-0268
Thomas Sams

NTCH, INC.
1600 Ute Avenue, Suite 10
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501
toms@cleartalk.net

NTCH-WEST, INC.
1970 N. Highland Avenue
Suite E
Jackson, Tennessee 38305



ATTORNEYS FOR AMERICAN
CELLULAR CORPORATION