

BINGHAM

REDACTED -  
FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION  
WC DOCKET NO. 05-25, RM 10593,  
Before the Federal Communications Commission

Eric J. Branfman  
Direct Phone: 202.373.6553  
Direct Fax: 202.373.6415  
eric.branfman@bingham.com

FILED/ACCEPTED

JAN 27 2011

January 27, 2011

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Via Hand Delivery

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Room TW-5-A325  
Washington, DC 20554

**Re: In the Matter of Special Access Rates for Price Cap Local Exchange Carriers, WC Docket No. 05-25; AT&T Corp. Petition for Rulemaking to Reform Regulation of Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier Rates for Interstate Special Access Services, RM-10593**

Dear Secretary,

On behalf of U.S. TelePacific Corp. d/b/a TelePacific Communications ("TelePacific"), FRN 0003-7338-13, enclosed for filing are two (2) copies of the redacted version of TelePacific's Responses to the Commission's data requested in Special Access NPRM Public Notice ("Special Access Public Notice")<sup>1</sup>. Included with this transmittal are data specifications (submitted in electronic format on CD) in response to Questions III.B.1 (Connections by Location) and III.B.2 (Collocations by Wire Center) and narratives in response to Questions III.A. and III.D, attached hereto. The data specifications and narrative responses are a full response to the data requested.

With respect to the redacted version of Questions III.B.1 and III.B.2, Tele Pacific has designated all of the information as Highly Confidential, therefore the redacted version only contains TelePacific's contact information. With respect to the response to Question III.B.3(i), TelePacific would like to point out that it utilized a universal program to convert the maps into a format that it believes is compatible to the required ESRI Shapefile, referenced in the Special Access Public Notice. However, because TelePacific could not review the converted files, a redacted version of the response to Question III.B.3(i) is not available.

<sup>1</sup> "Data Requested in *Special Access NPRM*," WC Docket No. 05-25; RM-10593, Public Notice, DA 10-2073 (rel. Oct. 28, 2010).

- Boston
- Frankfurt
- Hartford
- Hong Kong
- London
- Los Angeles
- New York
- Orange County
- San Francisco
- Santa Monica
- Silicon Valley
- Tokyo
- Washington

No. of Copies rec'd 0+1  
List A B C D E


**REDACTED –  
FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION  
WC DOCKET NO. 05-25, RM 10593,  
Before the Federal Communications Commission**

January 27, 2011  
Page 2

In accordance with the Second Protective Order issued in this proceeding, all pages of this filing are marked "REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION."

Please date-stamp and return the enclosed extra copy of this transmittal. Any questions relating to the enclosed materials, should be directed to Marilyn Ash of TelePacific at (415) 430-3119, or to the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Eric J. Branfman  
Counsel to U.S. TelePacific Corp. d/b/a  
TelePacific Communications

cc: Marilyn Ash

**REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION  
WC DOCKET NO. 05-25, RM 10593,  
Before the Federal Communications Commission**

**U.S. TelePacific Corp., d/b/a TelePacific Communications, FRN 0003-7338-13,  
Responses to:**

**SPECIAL ACCESS NPRM DATA REQUEST QUESTION III.A.**

For each Listed Statistical Area, state whether the company has any connections that it owns, or leases from another entity under an IRU agreement.

**Response:**

**[BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL]**

**. [END CONFIDENTIAL]**

**REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSEPCTION  
WC DOCKET NO. 05-25,  
RM 10593, Before the Federal Communications Commission**

**REDACTED - FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION  
WC DOCKET NO. 05-25, RM 10593,  
Before the Federal Communications Commission**

**U.S. TelePacific Corp., d/b/a TelePacific Communications, FRN 0003-7338-13,  
Responses to:**

**SPECIAL ACCESS NPRM DATA REQUEST QUESTION III.D.**

1. Explain the business rule you use to determine whether to build a channel termination to a particular location. Enumerate all underlying assumptions.

**Response to 1:**

**[BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL]**

**[END CONFIDENTIAL]**

2. Describe reasons why, even if the business rule would suggest it makes sense to build, you would not, e.g. inability to access building, issues with rights of way, inability to obtain capital, issues of timing.

**Response to 2.**

**[BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL]**

**[END CONFIDENTIAL]**

**REDACTED – FOR PUBLIC INSEPCTION  
WC DOCKET NO. 05-25,  
RM 10593, Before the Federal Communications Commission**

DOCKET NO. 05-25

**DOCUMENT OFF-LINE**

This page has been substituted for one of the following:

- o This document is confidential (NOT FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION)
- o An oversize page or document (such as a map) which was too large to be scanned into the ECFS system.
- o Microfilm, microform, ~~certain photographs or videotape~~
- o Other materials which, for one reason or another, could not be scanned into the ECFS system.

The actual document, page(s) or materials may be reviewed (EXCLUDING CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS) by contacting an Information Technician at the FCC Reference Information Centers) at 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Washington, DC, Room CY-A257. Please note the applicable docket or rulemaking number, document type and any other relevant information about the document in order to ensure speedy retrieval by the Information Technician