

Dear Mr. Dennis Johnson,

I read Mr. Komeiji's response to my concerns about Hawaiian Telcom's aging interisland submarine fiber-optic cables. There is several points that I'd like to respond to. Firstly, the statements I made are not inaccurate assumptions, and assertions. They are based on thorough research of all available information pertaining to these cables.

I never questioned the ownership control of HICS or HIFN because of this merger. However, I did question Hawaiian Telcom's plans going forward with regard to these cables. I tried asking Hawaiian Telcom's public affairs about this. They told me they couldn't tell me anything because Hawaiian Telcom is a publicly traded company.

As far as your response to my concerns about the age of the cables, and Hawaiian Telcom's proactive maintenance, I strongly question the latter. Both of these cables utilize dense wave division multiplexing, which restricts the amount of additional available bandwidth compared to modern submarine cables, like Sandwich Isles's Paniolo Fiber-optic cable. These concerns were raised during an ongoing FCC docket pertaining to NECA subsidies being paid to Sandwich Isles for use of the Paniolo fiber-optic cable. For example, Hawaiian Telcom had to create custom-engineered lasers to increase the amount of bandwidth between Oahu and Kauai at great expense. In short, SIC felt Hawaiian Telcom didn't have adequate interisland bandwidth going forward, so they constructed their own fiber-optic network.

I'd also like to point out that Paniolo's fiber-optic cable was built for the sole use of Sandwich Isles Communications. They did lease bandwidth on an emergency basis about seven years ago to Oceanic Time Warner Cable, but it came back to haunt them. NECA brought this up and successfully had the FCC deduct the amount Oceanic was paying from their NECA subsidies.

Thank you for your time in this matter.

Sincerely,
Aaron Stene