

WOODS & AITKEN

L • L • P

SUITE 200
2154 WISCONSIN AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007
TELEPHONE 202-944-9500
FAX 202-944-9501

www.woodsaitken.com

LINCOLN OFFICE
SUITE 500
301 SOUTH 13TH STREET
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA 68508-2578
TELEPHONE 402-437-8500
FAX 402-437-8558

OMAHA OFFICE
SUITE 350
10250 REGENCY CIRCLE
OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68114-3754
TELEPHONE 402-898-7400
FAX 402-898-7401

THOMAS J. MOORMAN

Direct Dial: 202-944-9503

E-Mail: jseidemann@woodsaitken.com

Admitted to practice in the District
of Columbia

June 28, 2006

Via Electronic Filing

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: Petition of Time Warner Cable for Declaratory Ruling that
Competitive Local Exchange Carriers May Obtain Interconnection
Under Section 251 of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended,
to Provide Wholesale Telecommunications Services to VoIP
Providers
WC Docket No. 06-55
Notice of Ex Parte Meeting**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On June 27, 2006, Paul M. Schudel and Thomas J. Moorman of Woods & Aitken LLP, and Elizabeth Sickel of Southeast Nebraska Telephone Company (“Counsel” and “Company,” respectively), met with Jennifer Schneider and Jeremy Miller of the Competition Policy Division of the Wireline Competition Bureau along with Tamara Preiss and Victoria Goldberg of the Pricing Policy Division of the Wireline Competition Bureau. During this meeting, Counsel and the Company discussed the issues and positions the Company and the concurring independent telephone companies have presented in their comments and reply comments in the above-referenced docket. In addition to reaffirming those positions taken therein, Counsel and the Company made the following points.

Counsel and the Company explained that certain contentions being made by opposing parties in this proceeding with respect to the Company and the underlying Nebraska Public Service Commission (“NPSC”) actions required correction. To this end, Counsel and the Company specifically addressed contentions stated in the May 31, 2006 ex parte letter filed by Time Warner Cable. Pointing to, among other things, the NPSC’s directions in the certification

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
June 28, 2006
Page 2

proceeding of Time Warner Cable Information Services, LLC d/b/a Time Warner Cable, Nebraska, Counsel and the Company explained that the Company's actions have not prohibited competitive entry. Moreover, the NPSC's actions with regard to proceedings discussed in the Petition were consistent with the scope of state commission fact-finding as envisioned by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act").

Counsel discussed the fact the NPSC was not addressing Voice over Internet Protocol in the certification proceeding, and efforts in the Petition to suggest otherwise are without factual basis. Counsel also described that even if the Petition is not dismissed for being procedurally deficient, the construction of the law as set out in the Petition is incorrect for the reasons set forth in the comments and reply comments filed by the Company and the concurring independent telephone companies in this proceeding.

Finally, Counsel discussed the fact that Section 251(b) of the Act and applicable Commission rules envision that the actual competitors for end users engage in negotiations or arbitrations of the terms of their interconnection agreements.

The undersigned may be contacted should you have any questions or require additional information.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Thomas J. Moorman
Thomas J. Moorman