



Richard T. Ellis
Director – Federal Affairs

1300 I Street, NW
Suite 400 West
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 515-2534
(202) 336-7866 (fax)

April 12, 2002

ERRATA

Ms. William Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Application by Verizon New England For Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Vermont, CC Docket No. 02-7 - REDACTED

Dear Mr. Caton:

On behalf of Verizon New England Inc. (“Verizon”) and pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 1.65(a), I am writing to clarify certain information provided in Verizon’s Vermont 271 filing.

Paragraph 50 of the Reply Declaration of Paul A. Lacouture, Virginia P. Ruesterholz and Catherine T. Webster (FCC filed March 1, 2002) stated as follows:

By contrast, the retail comparison group includes Verizon’s retail ISDN service, which Verizon can easily test at the time of installation. Verizon’s retail ISDN service includes voice service so that Verizon’s technician can call the customer to verify that the service is working. In addition, when Verizon installs its retail ISDN service, it can test that service using its central office testing equipment.

The retail comparison group for 2-wire digital loops (PR-6-01-3341) was changed from retail ISDN service to retail dispatch POTS service beginning with the November 2001 Carrier-to-Carrier Performance Report. *See* Letter from Richard T. Ellis, Verizon, to William Caton, FCC (Feb. 26, 2002). Paragraph 50 should read as follows:

By contrast, the retail comparison group includes Verizon’s retail POTS service, which Verizon can easily test at the time of installation. Verizon’s retail POTS service is a voice service so that Verizon’s technician can call the customer to verify that the service is working. In addition, when Verizon installs its retail POTS service, it can test that service using its central office testing equipment.

In addition, Verizon has discovered an error in certain data provided with the Reply Declaration of V. Louise McCarren, Patrick A. Garzillo and Michael J. Anglin. Verizon stated that the total UNE-P cost was *****, which included ***** in costs in the “other” category. See Reply Declaration of V. Louise McCarren, Patrick A. Garzillo and Michael J. Anglin at Attachment 2. The “other” costs should be *****, and therefore the total UNE-P cost should be *****. This modification does not result in any change in the margin percentages computed on Attachment 2.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Richard Telli in cursive script.

cc: J. Veach
J. Stanley
G. Remondino