

**From:** Hicks, Thomas  
**Sent:** Friday, February 15, 2008 12:47 AM  
**To:** james.c.dail@verizon.com  
**Cc:** Hicks, Thomas  
**Subject:** RE: Intrado Redlines to Verizon-modified 251 Interconnection Template

Jim,

Our priority states are FL OH, NC and VA. Should you need a starting point, Florida will suffice.

When you call me in the morning, use my cell number below.

Thanks,

Tom Hicks, ENP  
Intrado Communications Inc.  
Director-Carrier Relations  
Tel: (972) 772-5883  
Mob: (972) 342-4482  
Email: [thomas.hicks@intrado.com](mailto:thomas.hicks@intrado.com)

---

**From:** james.c.dail@verizon.com [mailto:james.c.dail@verizon.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 14, 2008 4:03 PM  
**To:** Hicks, Thomas  
**Subject:** Fw: Intrado Redlines to Verizon-modified 251 Interconnection Template

Tom:

I received your voice mail message this afternoon. Yes, we received the redline of the interconnection agreement that you sent yesterday, and we are reviewing the over 100 new proposed revisions and the eighteen changes that were made to the previously proposed revisions that were included in this redline.

I'm unclear what your question is about the states that you mentioned when we spoke on Monday. You and I were discussing the short time remaining before the close of the arbitration filing window and I noted that Intrado still has not identified a specific state for which we could focus our negotiation. I gathered that the states you mentioned on Monday were among those on a general list that Intrado considers to be high priority, but I didn't understand that these were specific states where we should focus our attention.

Since there are a variety of situations existing in the various states that require the use of different language in the agreement, it is most practical if one state is used as a focus of an initial negotiation and then state-specific changes can be made to other state agreements based on the language agreed to in the first negotiation. For example, in North Carolina, Texas, Oregon and Idaho different collocation terms are part of the agreement. And in the former GTE states, a Traffic Exchange Attachment is part of the agreement. The Collocation Attachments were provided to you in June, 2007 and the Traffic Exchange Attachment was provided in December. Since you have not returned redlines of any of these attachments, I'm unsure if you agree with this language, or if, perhaps, your focus is on states that are unaffected by these attachments.

I'll try to give you a call tomorrow and we can check-point on where we stand.

Jim