



Jennifer M. Granholm
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES
PETER L. PLUMMER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

J. Peter Lark
CHAIRMAN

Laura Chappelle
COMMISSIONER

Monica Martinez
COMMISSIONER

June 30, 2006

Steve Gatto, Esq.
Steve Gatto, P.C.
210 S. Washington Square
Suite A
Lansing, MI 48933

Michael S. Ashton, Esq.
Fraser Trebilcock Davis & Dunlap, P.C.
Counsel for Alltel Communications, Inc.
124 West Allegan, Suite 1000
Lansing, MI 48933

Re: In the matter of the Petition of Ace Telephone Company, Allendale Telephone Company, Barry County Telephone Company, Blanchard Telephone Company, Bloomingdale Telephone Company, Chippewa County Telephone Company, Deerfield Farmers' Telephone Company, Hiawatha Telephone Company, Kaleva Telephone Company, Midway Telephone Company, Ogden Telephone Company, Ontonagon Telephone Company, Pigeon Telephone Company, Upper Peninsula Telephone Company, Waldron Telephone Company, and Winn Telephone Company, for the Arbitration of Interconnection Rates, Terms, and Conditions and Related Arrangements with Alltel Communications, Inc., Pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. – Case No. U-14889

Dear Counsel:

The Arbitration Panel has conducted a preliminary review of the materials submitted by the Petitioners and Alltel in this proceeding. To further our understanding of the materials submitted, we request that you provide answers to the following questions:

For Petitioners:

1. The Commission's March 14, 2000 order in Case No. U-12261, p. 1, identifies the following companies as seeking approval of the cost study presented in that case: Ace Telephone Company of Michigan, Inc., Barry County Telephone Company, Blanchard Telephone Association, Inc., Bloomingdale Telephone Company, Carr Telephone Company, Chapin Telephone Company, Drenthe Telephone Company, Kaleva Telephone Company, Lennon Telephone Company, Ogden Telephone Company, Pigeon Telephone Company, Sand Creek Telephone Company, Springport Telephone Company, and Waldron Telephone Company. The order does not expressly mention the following petitioners: Allendale Telephone Company, Deerfield Farmers' Telephone Company, Midway Telephone Company, and Ontonagon Telephone Company.

Did these petitioners participate in the cost study approved in Case No. U-12261? If yes, please provide the basis for your answer. If not, please explain the basis for the reciprocal compensation rates requested by these petitioners.

2. What is Petitioners' response to Alltel's claim, presented in the affidavit of Ron Williams, pp. 3-11, that reciprocal compensation should be based on bill and keep, or a rate of \$0.00, because of Petitioners' handling of ISP traffic? Do Petitioners agree that they exchange ISP traffic on a bill and keep basis or at a rate of \$0.00? If the answer varies by petitioner, please provide a petitioner-specific response.

For Alltel:

1. Please explain how the supporting material attached to Mr. Williams's affidavit supports his conclusion that Petitioners exchange ISP traffic on a bill and keep basis, or at a rate lower than Petitioners seek for reciprocal compensation in this proceeding? Does Alltel have any additional information to support its claim?

2. Does Alltel distinguish its position in this arbitration from the position of Verizon Wireless in Case No. U-14678? If so, how?

We are asking that counsel submit the answers to the questions directed to that party no later than July 10, 2006. Each of you may then file a reply to the other party's submission no later than July 17, 2006.

The Petitioners and Alltel shall also file a Proposed Decision of the Arbitration Panel on the sole issue of determining the appropriate rates regarding local switching, local transport-termination, and local transport-facility relative to terminating CMRS traffic. This Proposed Decision shall be submitted no later than July 10, 2006. Again, each party may respond the other party's submission with responses due by July 17, 2006.

The panel has not decided what decision to propose in this matter, and counsel are cautioned against interpreting these requests as an indication of the decision the panel is likely to propose in this matter.

Thank you both for your cooperation in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Sharon L. Feldman

Digitally signed by Sharon L. Feldman
DN: CN = Sharon L. Feldman, C = US
Date: 2006.06.30 09:04:47 -04'00'

Sharon L. Feldman
Administrative Law Judge

SLF/dmp

pc: Ms. Wendy Thelen
Ms. Anne-Marie Clark