

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, Infrastructure and Operating Data Gathering)	WC Docket No. 08-190
)	
Petition of AT&T Inc. for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) From Enforcement Of Certain of the Commission’s ARMIS Reporting Requirements)	WC Docket No. 07-139
)	
Petition of Qwest Corporation for Forbearance from Enforcement of the Commission’s ARMIS and 492A Reporting Requirements Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c))	
)	
Petition of Embarq Local Operating Companies for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) From Enforcement of Certain of ARMIS Reporting Requirements)	WC Docket No. 07-204
)	
Petition of Frontier and Citizens ILECs for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) From Enforcement of Certain of the Commission’s ARMIS Reporting Requirements)	
)	
Petition of Verizon for Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) From Enforcement Of Certain of the Commission’s Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements)	WC Docket No. 07-273
)	
Petition of AT&T Inc. For Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160 From Enforcement Of Certain of the Commission’s Cost Assignment Rules)	WC Docket No. 07-21
)	

OPPOSITION

Sprint Nextel Corporation, COMPTTEL, One Communications Corp., and tw telecom inc.
(together “Opponents”) hereby file their Opposition to the Petition for Reconsideration filed by

Embarq, Frontier, and Windstream (together “Petitioners”) on behalf of their respective incumbent local exchange carrier (“ILEC”) affiliates that are subject to federal price cap regulation in the above-referenced proceedings (the “Petition”). The Commission should not exacerbate its error in granting cost assignment forbearance to AT&T, Verizon, and Qwest (*i.e.*, the Bell Operating Companies (“BOCs”)) by extending such relief to these additional ILECs. If the Commission does choose to extend cost assignment forbearance to these additional ILECs, however, it should provide more detailed cost assignment compliance plan requirements and should, as a condition of that forbearance, eliminate the Universal Service Fund (“USF”) funding that the BOCs and these ILECs receive.

I. The Commission Must Not Compound Its Mistake by Extending Cost Assignment Forbearance to All Federal Price Cap ILECs.

The Petitioners ask the Commission to extend the conditional cost assignment forbearance relief it granted AT&T, Verizon, and Qwest to all ILECs subject to federal price cap regulation, or at a minimum, to Embarq, Frontier, and Windstream.¹ The Petitioners maintain that the Commission correctly granted forbearance to AT&T and appropriately extended forbearance to Verizon and Qwest as similarly situated carriers since Verizon and Qwest are federal price cap carriers like AT&T.² Given that they too are federal price cap carriers, the Petitioners argue that they are similarly situated with AT&T, Verizon, and Qwest, and thus are entitled to the same conditional cost assignment forbearance relief.³ They allege that the Commission’s failure to extend the same forbearance relief to them and all other federal price

¹ Petition at 4-5.

² Petition at 5-9.

³ Petition at 9-11.

cap carriers would violate Section 10 of the Communications Act,⁴ and would violate the Administrative Procedures Act⁵ as arbitrary and capricious.⁶

The Commission must flatly reject the Petition. Granting the Petition will only serve to further compound the Commission's error in granting AT&T cost assignment forbearance relief and extending that same relief to Verizon and Qwest. As discussed in greater detail in the Opponents' Petition for Reconsideration of the *AT&T Cost Assignment Forbearance Order*⁷ and their more recent Petition for Reconsideration of the *Verizon/Qwest Cost Assignment Forbearance Order*,⁸ which are both incorporated herein by reference, the Commission erred in concluding that the Cost Assignment Rules are unnecessary to fulfill its statutory oversight responsibilities with respect to interstate access service rates, to detect and prevent anti-competitive cost-shifting and pricing, and to foreclose cross-subsidization prohibited under

⁴ 47 U.S.C. § 160.

⁵ 5 U.S.C. §§ 551 *et seq.*

⁶ Petition at 11-13.

⁷ *Petition of AT&T Inc. For Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160 From Enforcement Of Certain of the Commission's Cost Assignment Rules and Petition of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. For Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160 From Enforcement of Certain of the Commission's Cost Assignment Rules*, WC Docket Nos. 07-21 and 05-342, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 23 FCC Rcd 7302 (*AT&T Cost Assignment Forbearance Order*), *pet. for recon. pending, pet. for review pending, NASUCA v. FCC*, Case No. 08-1226 (D.C. Cir. filed June 23, 2008). The statutory provisions, Commission rules, and related reporting requirements from which AT&T, Verizon, and Qwest received forbearance collectively will be referred to herein as the "Cost Assignment Rules." The data the Cost Assignment Rules generate will be referred to herein as "cost assignment data." See *Petition of Reconsideration of Sprint Nextel Corporation, AdHoc Telecommunications Users Committee, COMPTTEL, and tw telecom inc. (formerly Time Warner Telecom Inc.)*, WC Docket Nos. 07-21 and 05-342 (filed May 27, 2008).

⁸ *Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, Infrastructure and Operating Data Gathering; Petition of AT&T Inc. For Forbearance Under 47 U.S.C. § 160(c) From Enforcement Of Certain of the Commission's ARMIS Reporting Requirements; et al.*, WC Docket Nos. 08-190, 07-139, 07-204, 07-273, and 07-21, Memorandum Opinion and Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, FCC 08-203 (rel. Sept. 6, 2008) (*Verizon/Qwest Cost Assignment Forbearance Order*). See *Petition for Reconsideration of Sprint Nextel Corporation, COMPTTEL, One Communications Corp., and tw telecom inc.*, WC Docket Nos. 07-21, 07-204 and 07-273 (filed Oct. 6, 2008).

Section 254(k) of the Communications Act.⁹ Eliminating the Cost Assignment Rules and replacing them with an inadequate compliance plan eliminates safeguards on the front end and effective enforcement on the back end, leaving BOC and ILEC market power to go unchecked to the detriment of consumers, competition and the public interest. The Commission must not exacerbate this problem by extending conditional cost assignment forbearance to additional ILECs wielding exclusionary market power.

II. If the Commission Extends Cost Assignment Forbearance Relief, It Must Provide More Detailed Compliance Plan Guidance.

If the Commission decides to extend conditional cost assignment forbearance to any ILEC, it first must issue more detailed guidance outlining the specific information each compliance plan must contain. The compliance plans that AT&T, Verizon, and Qwest have submitted so far to the Wireline Competition Bureau for review and approval have proven to be woefully inadequate. They merely halt ongoing allocations, update allocation ratios only when they deem it necessary, and maintain in a file drawer old Methods and Procedures (“M&P”) materials, as discussed in greater detail in the Opponents’ comments, which are incorporated herein by reference.¹⁰ The Commission must issue more explicit requirements detailing the specific type of information the compliance plans must contain to ensure that it has access to “*useable* information on a *timely* basis” as it mandated in the *AT&T Cost Assignment*

⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 254(k).

¹⁰ See Comments on the AT&T Compliance Plan, WC Docket Nos. 07-21 and 05-342, filed by Sprint Nextel Corporation, COMPTTEL, One Communications Corp. and tw telecom inc. (filed Aug. 18, 2008); Comments on the Verizon Compliance Plan, WC Docket No. 07-21, filed by Sprint Nextel Corporation, AdHoc Telecommunications Users Committee, COMPTTEL, One Communications Corp., and tw telecom inc. (filed Oct. 8, 2008); Comments on the Qwest Compliance Plan, WC Docket No. 07-21, filed by Sprint Nextel Corporation, AdHoc Telecommunications Users Committee, COMPTTEL, One Communications Corp., and tw telecom inc. (filed Oct. 14, 2008).

Forbearance Order.¹¹ “The Blueprint For A Compliance Methodology Cost Assignment Plan,” proposed by several parties to this proceeding, could serve as a starting point for such requirements.¹²

III. If the Commission Extends Cost Assignment Forbearance Relief, It Should Condition Such Forbearance on the Elimination of Further USF Distributions.

If the Commission chooses to extend cost assignment forbearance, which removes regulatory requirements that the BOCs and ILECs claim are so costly and burdensome, then it should also condition that forbearance on the elimination of certain regulatory benefits such carriers enjoy. For instance, many parties to this proceeding have demonstrated that forbearance from the Cost Assignment Rules permits the BOCs and ILECs to mask their exorbitant earnings (*i.e.*, earnings well over 11.25 percent), especially for Special Access services. As a result of the grant of these forbearance petitions, the Commission and other interested parties will be left without cost assignment data to assess whether the system of price cap regulation is properly calibrated, and the price cap ILECs will be able to hide their over-earnings unchecked. Such over-earnings greatly exceed the distributions they currently receive from the USF. In fact, AT&T, Verizon, Qwest, Embarq, Windstream, and Frontier are all earning above 11.25 percent on their total Interstate operations by much more than they receive from the USF. As a condition for receiving the forbearance they seek, all price cap carriers should be required to forego drawing from the USF.

The table below displays the 2007 Interstate rates of return based on the 2007 ARMIS reports for the price cap ILECs who are seeking or have been granted forbearance.¹³ It also

¹¹ *AT&T Cost Assignment Forbearance Order* at ¶ 31 (emphasis added).

¹² “Blueprint For A Compliance Methodology Cost Assignment Plan” filed by AdHoc Telecommunications Users Committee, COMPTel, tw telecom inc., and One Communications Corp. on July 7, 2008 (“Blueprint Plan”).

reports their computed earnings above 11.25 percent, including the income tax effect, as well as their annualized draw on the federal USF, based on the fourth quarter data submitted by the Universal Service Administrative Company.

	2007 Interstate Rate of Return	Earnings above 11.25% (000s)	Current USF Draw (000s)
Qwest	53.2%	1,918,300	71,008
AT&T	35.0%	3,823,476	204,204
Verizon	25.0%	2,155,442	238,405
Windstream	28.2%	109,609	87,507
Citizens	52.9%	164,450	84,240
Embarq	31.7%	306,323	104,558
Total			789,922

In every case, these carriers have managed to achieve returns under the “burden” of regulation that is substantially larger than the benefit of regulation that they receive from their draw on the USF. It is hard to understand how these companies should be relieved from a regulatory burden – especially one that the Commission has itself acknowledged provides information that might prove useful in future proceedings – and at the same time hold onto a regulatory benefit that they do not need.

¹³ Interstate data is reported in ARMIS 43-01, column (h). The rate of return for Interstate operations is computed by dividing the amount reported in row 1915 – Net Return by the amount reported in row 1910 – Average Net Investment. The amount of overearnings is computed by subtracting 11.25 percent from the resulting rate of return and multiplying that difference by the amount reported in row 1910, and multiplying that result by a tax factor that assumes a composite state and federal income tax rate of 39 percent. The results for Citizens reflect combined results for its Citizens and Frontier holding companies.

If the Commission were to condition forbearance from the Cost Assignment Rules on these carriers foregoing any further draw on USF, it would have a significant pro-competitive benefit. At the same time it reduces these carriers' burdens, it would also reduce the burden on all purchasers of interstate services, including those of these ILECs' competitors, who have to fund the USF. The Commission has already deemed that granting forbearance in this case to the BOCs will reduce their costs, and thereby provide a benefit to their customers.¹⁴ By simultaneously reducing these carriers' draws on the USF, the Commission will also reduce the costs of all carriers, providing further consumer benefits.

These carriers have no financial need to draw any funds from the USF. Their windfall over-earnings will more than cover these carriers for any loss in USF distributions. Should the Commission grant the pending forbearance request and condition that grant on carriers' agreeing to give up their USF receipts, the Commission would save the USF approximately \$276 million. If the Commission also modified its conditional grants to AT&T, Verizon and Qwest to require those companies also to forego their USF receipts, the USF could be reduced by \$789 million.

IV. Conclusion

In sum, the Commission should not compound its mistake of granting cost assignment forbearance to AT&T, Verizon, and Qwest by extending its grant to any additional carriers, including Embarq, Frontier, and Windstream. If the Commission chooses to do so, however, it should provide clearer guidance regarding compliance plan requirements as well as eliminate the unwarranted USF distributions any BOC or ILEC receiving cost assignment forbearance currently receives.

¹⁴ See *AT&T Cost Assignment Forbearance Order* at ¶¶ 40-44.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Anna M. Gomez

Anna M. Gomez
Maria L. Cattafesta
SPRINT NEXTEL CORPORATION
2001 Edmund Halley Drive
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 592-5115

/s/ Karen Reidy

Karen Reidy
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
COMPTTEL
900 17th Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 296-6650

/s/ Thomas Jones

Thomas Jones
Jonathan Lechter
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP
1875 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 303-1000
ATTORNEYS FOR TW TELECOM INC.
AND ONE COMMUNICATIONS CORP.

Dated: October 21, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Jo-Ann Monroe, do hereby certify that on this 21st day of October 2008, copies of the foregoing "Opposition" in WC Docket Nos. 08-190, 07-139, 07-204, 07-273, and 07-21 were served by U.S. first-class mail, postage prepaid, to the following:

Chairman Eddie Roberson
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243-0505

David C. Bergmann, Chair
NASUCA Telecommunications Committee
8380 Colesville Road, Suite 101
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Paul M.A. Baker
Project Director, Policy
Wireless RERC
500 10th Street, 3rd Floor NW
Atlanta, GA 30332-0620

Paul Kjellander, President
Idaho Public Utilities Commission
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0074

Steven L. Beeler
Assistant Attorney General
Public Utilities Section
Ohio Public Utilities Commission
180 E. Broad Street, 9th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215

John D. Burke, Esq.
Vermont Public Service Board
112 State Street, Drawer 20
Montpelier, VT 05620-2701

Suzi Ray McClellan
Katherine H. Farrell
Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel
1701 N. Congress Avenue, Suite 9-180
P.O. Box 12307
Austin, TX 78711-2397

Mark K. Johnson, Commissioner
Regulatory Commission of Alaska
1016 West 6th, Suite 400
Anchorage, AK 99501

James. W. Olson
Indra S. Chalk
United States Telecom Association
607 14th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005

Curt Stamp, Commissioner
Iowa Utilities Board
350 Maple Street
Des Moines, IA 53019-0069

Paul M. Schudel
James A. Overash
Woods & Aitken LLP
301 South 13th Street, Suite 500
Lincoln, NE 68508

Ann Berkowitz
Associate Director – Federal Regulatory
Verizon
1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Joel Shifman
Maine Public Utilities Commission
242 State Street
18 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0018

J. Bradford Ramsay, Counsel
State Members of the Federal State Joint
Board on Separations
1101 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20005

James S. Blaszak
Colleen Boothby
Levine, Blaszak, Block & Boothby, LLP
2001 L Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20036

Robert W. Quinn
Theodore C. Marcus
Linda Vandeloop
AT&T Services, Inc.
1120 20th Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036

Mike Gleason, Chairman
William A. Mundell, Commissioner
Jeff Hatch-Miller, Commissioner
Kristin K. Mayers, Commissioner
Gary Pierce, Commissioner
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Sara Kyle, Director
Tre Hargett, Director
Ron Jones, Director
Tennessee Regulatory Authority
460 James Robertson Parkway
Nashville, TN 37243

Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr.
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
Washington Harbour, Suite 400
3050 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007-5108

Philip Jones, Commissioner
Washington Utilities & Trans Comm
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Daniel Mitchell, Vice President
Legal and Industry
National Telecommunications Cooperative
Association
4121 Wilson Blvd., Tenth Floor
Arlington, VA 22203

Anne L. Hammerstein
Assistant Attorney General
Public Utilities Section
Ohio Public Utilities Commission
180 East Broad Street, 9th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

Frank S. Simone
Executive Director – Federal Regulatory
AT&T Services Inc.
1120 20th Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036

David C. Bergmann
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215-3485

Aryeh Friedman
BT Americas Inc.
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 720
Washington, DC 20036

Randolph Wu
Helen M. Mickiewicz
Natalie D. Wales
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

John Heitman
J. Isaac Himowitz
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
3050 K Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20007

Edward Shakin
Christopher M. Miller
Verizon
1515 North Courthouse Road, Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22201-2909

Melissa E. Newman
Vice President – Federal Regulatory
Qwest Communications International Inc.
607 14th Street, NW, Suite 950
Washington, DC 20005

Bennet L. Ross
Bredan T. Carr
Marjorie B. Manne
Wiley Rein LLP
1776 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Terri L. Hoskins
Christopher M. Heimann
Gary L. Phillips
Paul K. Mancini
AT&T Services Inc.
1120 20th Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036

Sandra J. Paske
Secretary to the Commission
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

Ronald K. Chen
Seema M. Singh
Christopher J. White
State of NJ Dept of the Public Advocate
Division of Rate Counsel
31 Clinton Street, 11th Floor
P.O. Box 46005
Newark, NJ 07101

Cindy B. Miller, Senior Attorney
State of Florida Public Service Commission
Capital Circle Office Center
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0880

Eric Einhorn
Jennie B. Chandra
Windstream Communications, Inc.
1101 17th Street, NW, Suite 802
Washington, DC 20036

Susanne A. Guyer
Senior Vice President – Federal Regulatory
Affairs
Verizon
1300 I Street, NW, Suite 400 West
Washington, DC 20005

Sharon E. Gillett
Commissioner
Massachusetts Dept of Telecommunications
and Cable
Two South Station
Boston, MA 02110

David C. Bartlett, Esq.
John E. Benedict, Esq.
Jeffrey S. Lanning, Esq.
Embarq Corporation
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 820
Washington, DC 20004

Lynn Starr
Craig J. Brown
Timothy M. Boucher
Qwest Corporation
607 14th Street, NW, Suite 950
Washington, DC 20005

Kenneth F. Mason
Gregg C. Sayre
Frontier Communications
180 South Clinton Avenue
Rochester, NY 14646-0700

Peter McGowan, Acting General Counsel
Brian Ossias, Assistant Counsel
New York State Department of Public
Service
3 Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223-1350

Joshua Seidemann
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
Independent Telephone & Telecom
Alliance
975 F Street, NW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20004

Jonathan Banks
David Cohen
United States Telecom Association
607 14th Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005

Alan R. Schriber
Chairman
Ohio Office of the Attorney General
180 E. Broad Street, 9th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215

Daniel L. Brenner
Steven F. Morris
National Cable & Telecommunications
Association
25 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 100
Washington, DC 20001

Larry F. Darby, Senior Fellow
American Consumer Institute CCR
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006

Jeff Cloud, Chairman
Oklahoma Corporation Commission
Jim Thorpe Building
2101 N. Lincoln Blvd.
Oklahoma City, OK 73105

Shirley Bloomfield
Senior Vice President – Federal Relations
Qwest Communications International Inc.
607 14th Street, NW, Suite 950
Washington, DC 20005

Connie Murray
Commissioner
Missouri Public Service Commission
Governor Office Building, Suite 900
200 Madison Street – P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65109

Jason Marks, Chairman
Sandy Jones, Vice Chairman
David W. King, Commissioner
Ben R. Lujan, Commissioner
Carol K. Sloan, Commissioner
New Mexico Public Regulation Commission
P.E.R.A. Building
1120 Paseo De Peralta
Santa Fe, NM 87501

Joseph K. Witmer, Assistant Counsel
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

John F. Jones
Jeffrey S. Glover
Robert D. Shannon
CenturyTel, Inc.
100 CenturyTel Drive
Monroe, LA 71203

Robin Ancona, Director
Telecommunications Division
Michigan Public Service Commission
6545 Mercantile Way
Lansing, MI 48909

David W. Danner
Executive Director
Washington Utilities and Transportation
Commission
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Whit Adamson, President
Tennessee Association of Broadcasters
50 Music Square West, Suite 900
Nashville, TN 37203-3208

Gregory E. Bunker, Assistant AG
Colorado Attorney General's Office
Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel
1525 Sherman Street, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203

Laura Y. Otsuka
Senior Manager – Regulatory Affairs
Hawaiian Telcom, Inc.
P.O. Box 2200
Honolulu, HI 96841

Ron Binz, Commissioner
Polly Page, Commissioner
Carl Miller, Commissioner
The Public Utilities Commission of the
State of Colorado
1560 Broadway, Suite 250
Denver, CO 80202

Douglas K. Denney
Director, Costs and Policy
Integra Telecom, Inc.
3213 Duke Street, #246
Alexandria, VA 22314

Edward B. Krachmer
Director – Regulatory Affairs
Iowa Telecommunications Services, Inc.
403 W. 4th Street N
Newton, IA 50208

Walter Arroyo
Regulatory Affairs Director
Puerto Rico Telephone Company
P.O. Box 360998
San Juan, PR 00936-0998

James Y. Kerr, II, Commissioner
State of North Carolina Utilities
Commission
430 North Salisbury Street
Raleigh, NC 27603

Dawn Hipp, Director
Telecommunications, Transportation, Water
And Wastewater
1401 Main Street, Suite 900
Columbia, SC 29201

Kenneth Peres, PhD
Research Economist
Communications Workers of America
501 Third Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Bartlett D. Cleland, Director
Center for Technology Freedom
Institute for Policy Innovation
1660 Stemmons, Suite 245
Lewisville, TX 75067

Gene Kimmelman
Vice President for Federal & Int'l Policy
Consumers Union
1101 17th Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

Ben Scott, Policy Director
Free Press
501 third Street, NW, Suite 875
Washington, DC 20001

Ed Mierzwinski
Senior Fellow, Consumer Program
U.S. PIRG
218 D Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Hance Haney, Director
Senior Fellow, Technology & Democracy
Discovery Institute
1015 15th Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005

Atif Malik, Organizer
New Jersey Citizen Action
744 Broad Street, Suite 2080
Newark, NJ 07102

Public Utility Commission of Texas
Infrastructure Reliability Division
1711 North Congress Avenue
P.O. Box 13326
Austin, TX 78711-3326

Burce Kushnick
Chairman, Teletruth
Executive Director, New Networks Institute
568 Broadway, Suite 404
New York, NY 10012

Christopher J. Wilson
Vice President, General Counsel
& Secretary
Cincinnati Bell Telephone
221 E. Fourth Street, Rm 103-1280
Cincinnati, OH 45202

/s/ Jo-Ann Monroe

Jo-Ann Monroe