



testimony, as exhibited by KBCA's ability to routinely file intervenor testimony in prior Commission proceedings and without the need for any "clarification." KBCA's motion should be considered for what it really is: an attempt to modify the procedural schedule so that KBCA can continue the same advocacy it has undertaken incessantly since the new pole attachment regulations were proposed.

Respectfully, the Commission has already heard legal and other arguments from KBCA during the approximately 2.5 year process to develop the Commission's new pole attachment regulation. For the reasons set forth in the Commission's Statement of Consideration, the Commission rejected many of KBCA's legal arguments when implementing 807 KAR 5:015. Neither the Commission nor the RLECs should be forced to expend time and resources responding to KBCA's already-rejected legal arguments, including further attempts to explain non-binding "FCC precedent," which the "Motion for Clarification" explicitly requests the right to do.

The Commission is distinctly capable of implementing its own regulations and determining if the tariffs comply with 807 KAR 5:015 based on the evidence presented. Accordingly, the RLECs do not believe legal briefing is necessary in this proceeding.

Finally, the Commission should not overlook the fact that the procedural schedule KBCA proposes would allow the RLECs just one (1) business day to review intervenor responses to requests for information before the proposed deadline to submit both a responsive legal brief and rebuttal testimony. This is patently unreasonable. Moreover, the Commission should be aware that KBCA filed its Motion for Clarification and suggested this schedule without any prior discussion with or concurrence from the RLECs. As an intervenor, KBCA may not unduly complicate or disrupt the proceedings, which it seeks to do by forcing the RLECs into an unfair

procedural schedule and by seeking revision to the procedural schedule without any forewarning or attempts at cooperation.

No briefing is necessary. No clarification of how to draft factual testimony is necessary. Consequently, the RLECs respectfully request the Commission deny KBCA's Motion for Clarification.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Edward T. Depp  
Edward T. Depp, Esq.  
R. Brooks Herrick  
**DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP**  
101 South Fifth Street, Suite 2500  
Louisville, KY 40202  
Tel: (502) 5430-2300  
Fax: (502) 585-2207  
[tip.depp@dinsmore.com](mailto:tip.depp@dinsmore.com)  
[brooks.herrick@dinsmore.com](mailto:brooks.herrick@dinsmore.com)

and

M. Evan Buckley  
**DINSMORE & SHOHL LLP**  
100 West Main Street, Suite 900  
Lexington, KY 40507  
Tel: (859) 425-1000  
Fax: (859) 425-1099  
[evan.buckley@dinsmore.com](mailto:evan.buckley@dinsmore.com)

**Counsel to the RLECs**

**Certification**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing has been served electronically on all parties of record through the use of the Commission's electronic filing system, and there are currently no parties that the Commission has excused from participation by electronic means. Pursuant to the Commission's July 22, 2021 Order in Case No. 2020-00085, a paper copy of this filing has not been transmitted to the Commission.

/s/ Edward T. Depp  
*Counsel to the RLECs*

25115290