

Exhibit 1

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Petition of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. Pursuant to)	
Section 10 of the Communications Act of 1934, as)	WC Docket No. []
amended (47 U.S.C. 160(c)), for Forbearance from)	
Certain Dominant Carrier Regulation of Its)	
Interstate Access Services, and for Forbearance)	
from Title II Regulation of Its Broadband Services,)	
in the Anchorage, Alaska, Incumbent Local)	
Exchange Carrier Study Area)	

STATEMENT OF MARK ENZENBERGER

1. I currently serve as Director of Complex Services for Alaska Communications Systems, the parent of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. ("ACS"). I have 16 years of experience in the Alaska telecommunications industry: seven years with Anchorage Telephone Utility, seven years with General Communication, Inc. ("GCI"), where I served as Local Service Product Manager and Senior Manager of Network Solutions, and two years with Alaska Communications Systems. All of this experience has been in Anchorage, Alaska.

2. Based on my professional experience in Anchorage, the Anchorage business telecommunications market is accurately characterized as hyper-competitive. Anchorage is a market driven primarily by price. Indeed, the high degree of competition and price sensitivity in the Anchorage market is responsible for the large market share gains that GCI captured within only five years after its entry into the Anchorage local exchange market. The competitive environment in Anchorage is such that both GCI and ACS must earn each customer's business every day, repricing services in order to remain competitive.

3. Three recent examples in the last year illustrate the competitive environment now inherent in the Anchorage telecommunications market. GCI made a competitive proposal to [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] in Anchorage, an ACS customer at the time. GCI's proposal was [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] of ACS's then-current pricing. ACS was able to retain the customer by matching GCI's proposal, resulting in a [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] reduction in price. Likewise, [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] in Anchorage, an ACS customer at the time, issued a formal Request for Proposal ("RFP"). ACS responded with a bid reducing its current pricing by [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL]. Even so, GCI won the bid—offering a [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] reduction in price. Finally, [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] in Anchorage, an ACS customer at the time, issued an RFP to which both ACS and at least one other party responded. ACS won the bid—reducing current pricing by [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL]. Examples such as these demonstrate just how competitive the Anchorage market is and just how quickly and easily Anchorage business customers can and do switch service providers.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark Enzenberger
Mark Enzenberger
600 Telephone Avenue
MS 60
Anchorage, AK 99503-6091

Exhibit 2

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Petition of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. Pursuant to)	
Section 10 of the Communications Act of 1934, as)	WC Docket No. []
amended (47 U.S.C. 160(c)), for Forbearance from)	
Certain Dominant Carrier Regulation of Its)	
Interstate Access Services, and for Forbearance)	
from Title II Regulation of Its Broadband Services,)	
in the Anchorage, Alaska, Incumbent Local)	
Exchange Carrier Study Area)	

STATEMENT OF MITCHELL ANDREW COON

1. I currently serve as Government Sales Manager for Alaska Communications Systems, the parent of ACS of Anchorage, Inc. ("ACS"). I have at total of 10 years of experience in the Alaska telecommunications industry: eight years as Vice President of Sales for General Communication, Inc. ("GCI") and two years with Alaska Communications Systems, all of this experience in Anchorage.

2. GCI has captured a large portion of the Anchorage telecommunications market within five years after its entry into the Anchorage local exchange market. One vehicle by which GCI accomplished this was the "Guaranteed Value" contract GCI provided its business customers. Under this tariff, GCI essentially promised its customers that it would provide them with the best value (i.e., price) for a range of telecommunications services including local, long-distance, and broadband. If a competitor offered a GCI customer a better price—at any time during the term of the contract—and GCI did not match that offer, the customer could cancel the GCI contract without penalty. Additionally, ACS customers who switched to GCI during this

five-year period informed ACS employees that GCI would reimburse them for the cost of any contract termination penalties assessed for the switch.

3. Following the success of GCI's Guaranteed Value program, ACS instituted its own Guaranteed Value Service in order to be competitive. Currently, both GCI and ACS operate under customer contracts with the Guaranteed Value concept. Because both companies filed a tariff to cover this promotion, all contracts with business customers include the Guarantee Value concept. As such, each company must reprice its services when a customer under this type of contract receives a competitive offer, or face losing the customer, who may then accept the better competitive offer without penalty.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mitchell Andrew Coon
Mitchell Andrew Coon
600 Telephone Avenue
MS 60
Anchorage, AK 99503-6091