BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

Amended Application of: ) ) Momentum Telecom, Inc. ) For a Certificate of ) Public Convenience and ) Necessity to Operate as ) a Competitive Local ) Exchange Carrier In Utah)

TECHNICAL CONFERENCE

TAKEN AT:	Public Service Commission 160 East 300 South, Room 401 Salt Lake City, Utah
DATE:	September 16, 2008
TIME:	9:13 a.m.
REPORTED BY:	Kelly L. Wilburn, CSR, RPR

1 APPEARANCES 2 For the Public Service Commission: 3 SANDER J. MOOY, ESQ. PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 4 160 East 300 South, Fourth Floor Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 5 (801) 530-6716 (801) 530-6796 (fax) 6 RUBEN H. ARREDONDO, ESQ. 7 JACKMAN ARREDONDO, PLLC 1327 South 800 East, Suite 110 8 Orem, Utah 84097 (801) 225-1632 9 (801) 225-9443 (fax) For the Division of Public Utilities: 10 11 PATRICIA E. SCHMID, ESQ. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 12 160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor Post Office Box 140857 13 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0857 (801) 366-0353 14 (801) 366-0352 (fax) 15 Also Present for the Division of Public Utilities: Paul Anderson 16 Phil Powlick Casey Coleman, Technical Consultant 17 Peggy Egbert 18 For Momentum Telecom: 19 DAVID J. SHAW, ESQ. 20 KIRTON & MCCONKIE, P.C. 518 West 800 North, Suite 204 21 Orem, Utah 84057 (801) 426-2100 (801) 426-2101 (fax) 22 23 BILL MAGNESS, ESQ. (By telephone) CASEY, GENTZ & MAGNESS 24 98 Jacinto Boulevard, Suite 1400 Austin, Texas 78701-4286 25 (512) 480-9900 (512) 480-9200 (fax)

(Momentum Telecom Technical Conference) 1 APPEARANCES, CONTINUED ROSE MULVANY HENRY, ESQ. (By telephone) 2 BOULT, CUMMINGS, CONNERS & BERRY, PLC 3 1600 Division Street, Suite 700 Nashville, Tennessee 37203 4 (615) 252-4634 (615) 252-4713 (fax) 5 For Utah Rural Telecom: 6 STEPHEN F. MECHAM, ESQ. 7 CALLISTER, NEBEKER & McCULLOUGH Gateway Tower East, Suite 900 8 10 East South Temple Salt Lake City, Utah 84133 9 (801) 530-7300 (801) 364-9127 (fax) 10 Also Present for Utah Rural Telecom: 11 Douglas Meredith 12 For Carbon/Emery Telecom, Inc.: 13 BROCK E. JOHANSEN, ESQ. (By telephone) 14 LAW OFFICE OF BROCK E. JOHANSEN 445 East SR 29 15 Post Office Box 540 Orangeville, Utah 84537 (435) 748-2354 16 (435) 748-2385 (fax) 17 For Centracom Interactive: 18 KIRA M. SLAWSON, ESQ. 19 (Also for Carbon-Emery Telecom) BLACKBURN & STOLL, LC 257 East 200 South, Suite 800 20 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-2048 21 (801) 521-7900 (801) 521-7965 (fax) 22 SPENCER J. COX, ESQ. 23 SKYLINE TELECOM 35 South State 24 Post Office Box 7 Fairview, Utah 84629 25 (435) 427-3331 (435) 427-0310 (fax)

APPEARANCES, CONTINUED Also Present for Centracom Interactive: Brad Welch For Frontier Communications: CURT HUTTSELL, Ph.D. FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS Post Office Box 708970 б Sandy, Utah 84070-8970 (801) 298-0757 (801) 298-0758 (fax) For CCS: Eric Orton -000-

SEPTEMBER 16, 2008 1 9:13 A.M. PROCEEDINGS 2 3 MR. MOOY: I'm gonna identify the docket. 4 This is in Docket No. 08249601, a technical conference 5 which was scheduled by the Public Service Commission in order to provide Momentum Telecom an opportunity to 6 7 provide information concerning their planned services 8 and to respond to questions that other participants 9 may have. 10 This meeting is being transcribed because it may well be used as part of the record upon which 11 12 Momentum's request for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity may be issued. I won't take 13 14 testimony in the context of people being sworn, unless 15 those who want to make comments or make presentations want to do so. 16 If we find out later on that information on 17 this record is such that it is going to be necessary 18 19 to be entered as a sworn or under oath, we'll deal with that later on. I don't anticipate as such at 20 this time. 21 22 We've taken information for the court 23 reporter. She -- those again on the phone, if you do 24 speak, if you again would identify yourselves so the

25 court reporter can attribute the comments. And

1 Mr. Shaw, since you're appearing here physically on 2 behalf of Momentum, we're just gonna turn the show 3 over to you. 4 MR. SHAW: Fantastic. I, in turn, will turn 5 the time over to Bill Magness, counsel for Momentum. Bill, and Rose Mulvany Henry may join in as well. So б 7 Bill, Rose. 8 MR. MAGNESS: Okay. Yes, this is Bill 9 Magness, on behalf of Momentum Telecom. And as 10 Mr. Shaw said, Rose and I may both be chiming in. And we'll endeavor to identify ourselves every time we do. 11 12 And if we don't, please let us know. Momentum Telecom filed its amended 13 14 application for a Certificate of Public Convenience 15 and Necessity. The application I suppose could be 16 broken down in a few parts. One is in the Qwest territories a CPCN for, I guess we'll call it general 17 retail service as a CLEC in the state. 18 19 Then, in compliance with the state statutes 20 concerning smaller or rural telephone companies, we 21 made specific representations in our application 22 regarding service in the Price and Moab exchanges as 23 well as the Wendover exchange. 24 As described in the application, the specific 25 service in the Price, and Moab, and Wendover exchanges

б

as contemplated was to provide service in conjunction
with Utah cable companies to provide a VOIP service
alternative in the areas in which those companies
serve.

5 This is a, call it a wholesale model of 6 providing service that Momentum has engaged in in a 7 number of states. In fact, the company is now 8 certificated in 34 states. I think updating, we've 9 been certificated in several more states since our 10 amended application.

In addition, it's a business model similar to that used by several other companies across the country in order to advance competition in the voice market as cable companies and incumbent local exchange companies compete against one another for several types of services.

17 One thing I want to raise up front regarding 18 the Wendover exchange. In our amended application the 19 cable entity that Momentum was working with indicated 20 that Wendover was in a service territory and it may be 21 offering voice service there.

Based on those representations in Skyline's intervention pleading regarding that exchange being under 5,000, and in addition further discussions with the cable entity about its service territory and

plans, we intend to withdraw the application as to
Wendover.

3 So that's something we will get documented 4 and filed shortly. But we have had further 5 discussions and wanted to let everyone know that up 6 front. So the, the application going forward would be 7 for the Price and Moab exchanges as well as for the 8 Qwest exchanges.

9 I -- in, in reading the intervention, it -we were not certain besides, you know, companies 10 11 certainly being interested in, you know, a new 12 competitor entering their service territory, what 13 specific issues there are regarding the certification. 14 And so I, I guess in large measure we'd like 15 to kind of open that up and see if there are 16 particular questions about what Momentum is doing. Or if there are particular issues that we can identify 17 that, that need to be addressed here or in testimony 18 19 as we go forward in the certification phase. 20 MR. MOOY: Don't be shy. MR. MEREDITH: This is Douglas Meredith. I 21 22 have a question. Is Momentum then intending to 23 provide exclusive wholesale services to cable 24 companies who are providing an interconnected VOIP 25 service to their end-user customers?

1 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. In the 2 Qwest exchanges the answer would be no. Momentum may 3 provide services using resale. It may provide 4 services using unbundled network elements or other 5 what have become sort of standard CLEC business entry б methods. 7 Currently what we are contemplating in the 8 Price and Moab exchanges is the wholesale offering that we describe in our application. And currently we 9 could not tell you there is a, you know, a business 10 11 plan to do something besides those arrangements that 12 are current -- that were -- that are discussed 13 specifically in the application. 14 MR. MEREDITH: So current plans are exclusive 15 wholesale service to a cable company providing interconnective VOIP service to its end user 16 17 customers. 18 MR. MAGNESS: For Price and Moab. 19 MR. MEREDITH: Yes, thank you. 20 Do you have -- this is Douglas Meredith 21 again. Do you have information regarding the cable 22 offerings in Price and Moab specifically. Whether 23 those cable offerings to their end-user customers will 24 be directed to residential services or -- and/or 25 business services?

1 MR. MAGNESS: We certainly understand they would be residential services. I am not sure. 2 3 Maybe, Rose, you could chime in here. The 4 cable company there is (inaudible) communications. 5 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm sorry б sir, someone coughed on this end and I didn't hear the 7 name of the cable company. MR. MAGNESS: The name of the cable company 8 9 in that area is Crecis, C-r-e-c-i-s, Communications. 10 Certainly I know that the offering is residential. And on the business side, Rose, did you --11 12 can you confirm that? MS. MULVANY HENRY: This is Rose Mulvany 13 14 Henry. Honestly at this time, Mr. Meredith, I 15 couldn't answer that question for you. I don't know. MR. MEREDITH: Okay. 16 17 MR. MAGNESS: Bill Magness again. We do know it's certainly a residential offering at the outset. 18 19 MR. MEREDITH: And one last question and then I'll let others -- let others who are eagerly raising 20 their hands to ask questions. 21 22 The question is, with regards to the cable 23 offerings, have you done any research or can you 24 provide any guidance as to whether the cable service 25 offerings are overlapping the existing service areas

1 of the underlying telecommunications carriers that are 2 providing service in Moab and Price? 3 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. I 4 couldn't provide you, you know, for example an overlay 5 map that would show specifically. But I think the б general answer is yes. That there would be service 7 offerings in those exchanges that would be in 8 competition with the existing service offerings 9 provided by the incumbent. 10 I think similar to the Bresnan case, the Commission approved a certification a few months ago. 11 It may not be a house for a house, but I think there 12 13 would be overlap certainly. 14 MR. MEREDITH: And the -- certainly in the 15 exchange. But have you -- has any work been done or research been done on whether the study area is 16 covered by the cable, cable service company? 17 MS. MULVANY HENRY: This is Rose Mulvany 18 19 Henry. And the answer to that is no research has been 20 done to date that we're aware of. 21 MR. MEREDITH: Thank you. 22 (Pause.) 23 MR. MOOY: This is Sandy Mooy. I'll fill the 24 pause. In the context of the Price and Moab exchanges 25 will Momentum be seeking an interconnection agreement

1 with the local service provider? Or will Momentum let 2 the -- whoever is buying your wholesale services 3 undertake that responsibility? 4 MS. MULVANY HENRY: This is Rose Mulvany 5 Henry. And Momentum would be seeking interconnection with the incumbent local exchange carrier in the 6 7 applicable area. 8 MR. HUTTSELL: This is Curt Huttsell with 9 Frontier Communications, and we serve the Moab 10 exchange. Would you be seeking local number 11 portability? 12 MS. MULVANY HENRY: This is Rose Mulvany Henry. And the answer to that is yes. 13 14 MR. MEREDITH: This is Douglas Meredith. To 15 follow up on that response, is it Momentum's position 16 that you do not need an interconnection agreement for local number portability issues? 17 MS. MULVANY HENRY: This is Rose Mulvany 18 19 Henry. Can you please repeat that question? I'm not 20 sure I understood it. MR. MEREDITH: Yes. Do you need -- in order 21 22 to effect local number portability between two 23 carriers does there have to be some agreement, 24 interconnection agreement of that -- in order to make 25 that work? Is that, is that Momentum's position or

1 what is, what is Momentum's position on that issue? 2 MS. MULVANY HENRY: This is Rose Mulvany 3 Henry. And with respect to interconnection between 4 the carriers, Momentum has not entered into any 5 agreement with any incumbent local exchange carrier across the country specifically and exclusively for 6 7 local number portability. 8 In fact, local number portability has been 9 included in every single interconnection agreement that has been effectuated between Momentum and any 10 11 ILEC across the country. MR. MEREDITH: Thank you. 12 MR. MECHAM: This is Steve Mecham from the 13 14 Utah Rural Telecom Association. Do you know if Crecis 15 has a certificate to provide retail services in the state? 16 17 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. A telecommunications retail certificate? 18 19 MR. MECHAM: Yeah. MR. MAGNESS: To our knowledge they do not, 20 21 no. 22 MR. MECHAM: Do you know if they intend to 23 seek one? 24 MR. MAGNESS: Bill Magness again. We have 25 had some discussion in that regard. And I think it's

a, you know, business determination that they're
considering.

3 Whether they would come in for that or, you 4 know, come in simultaneously or at a different time 5 than Momentum is, that's a determination I know 6 they're considering and we really can't speak to at 7 this point.

8 We think the Momentum application stands on 9 its own and satisfies the statutory standards as a 10 standalone application, so had hoped to proceed with 11 this case and -- as Crecis makes those considerations. 12 MR. MECHAM: Now, as I understand it though, 13 you intend to provide wholesale-only services in Moab 14 and Price?

15 MR. MAGNESS: Yes.

MR. MECHAM: And you'll be the certificated carrier, or will Crecis be the certificated carrier? MR. MAGNESS: Bill Magness again. Well, if we receive a CPCN, we would be a certificated carrier. If Crecis receives one as well, both are certificated. MR. MECHAM: Say that again.

22 MR. MAGNESS: I think we, we would be 23 providing the services that we -- that Momentum would 24 provide pursuant to Momentum's certificate. It's --25 we have applied for the CPCN, as we noted in our

1 application.

2 We, you know, caveat it by saying we're not 3 necessarily taking the position that a CPCN is 4 required for the services Momentum is offering. But 5 we are seeking one in Utah and consent to the б Commission's jurisdiction to, to make sure we, you 7 know, can provide the service in a way that's 8 satisfactory under state laws and regulations. 9 However, we are coming in and seeking the certificate, and obtaining that, and would be 10 11 providing what we were providing pursuant to that certificate. If, if Crecis has a separate 12 certificate, they would be a certificated carrier as 13 14 well. MR. MECHAM: So if I'm a Crecis customer in 15 16 Moab and I have a problem with Crecis, are you saying 17 they would have a certificate that I could go then pursue my troubles at the Public Service Commission, 18 19 or would you only have the certificate? 20 That's what I'm trying to get at. Who -where does the customer go in a situation like this if 21 22 Crecis winds up thinking it doesn't have to have a 23 certificate? MR. MAGNESS: The customer would -- if the 24

25 problem is with voice service. I mean, setting aside

cable or Internet service that wouldn't, you know,

1

2 isn't subject to the CPCN anyway. 3 MR. MECHAM: Right. 4 MR. MAGNESS: I think, you know, Momentum's 5 intention, and the way Momentum operates in other states, is if there is a voice problem and a problem 6 7 with the service we are providing on a wholesale 8 basis, that's something we would be responsible for. 9 So any consumer that had a problem with voice service through Crecis, I mean, even for example if 10 they contacted Crecis first as the front-line company 11 12 there would still be a company, to put it colloquially, "on the hook" for service quality 13 14 problems under a state certificate if Momentum has a 15 certification. If Crecis has a certification as well, you 16 know, obviously there's two companies that could be 17 pursued. But if Momentum has one, then that, that's 18 19 an issue that consumers could take up with Momentum as 20 the certificated carrier. MR. HUTTSELL: This is Curt Huttsell with 21 22 Frontier again. Assuming Crecis doesn't get a 23 certificate, how will the retail customer know who to 24 complain to? Will Momentum advertise that it's 25 providing service -- its services -- will it advertise

1 retail?

2 MR. MAGNESS: I don't think we -- there are 3 probably business arrangements between Momentum and 4 Crecis that, that will be, you know, finalized and 5 ironed out as service offerings are complete once we 6 have the certificate.

7 With that said, I can assure you that if a 8 Crecis customer has a problem with the voice service 9 Momentum is providing, Crecis is going to address that with Momentum and get Momentum in with the customer. 10 11 So the -- whether it's, you know, noted on 12 the bill or whether it's something that, that Crecis makes certain the customer is aware of, Momentum is, 13 14 is on the line to resolve problems with the voice 15 service that it provides.

MR. HUTTSELL: And this is Curt Huttsell again. To follow up on a question that Douglas asked in the beginning, is it -- is Momentum's intention to serve only the City of Moab, or the entire Moab exchange, or all of Grand County?

21 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. I'd have 22 to get clarification on that. I, I think the, the 23 business arrangement where Moab -- where Momentum is 24 providing the wholesale service is -- and again, I 25 think this is similar to what was in the Bresnan

1 case -- where the Crecis network is passing customers 2 and offering customers other types of services and 3 could offer the voice offering through Momentum, that 4 is where we would be serving. 5 Now, whether those particular customers in б the Crecis footprint fall inside or outside the county 7 line or the city line, I, I couldn't tell you. 8 MR. MEREDITH: Follow up. This is Douglas 9 Meredith. Is Momentum's intent or business plan to offer these services to Crecis in, in Price, is that 10 11 an exclusive arrangement with, with Crecis? MR. MAGNESS: As far as the offering in Price 12 13 goes? 14 MR. MEREDITH: Yes. 15 MR. MAGNESS: I don't -- I could not tell you 16 if the, you know, the particular business arrangement 17 between the two companies has an exclusivity clause. 18 You know, I know however that, that the idea, the 19 business plan, is that Crecis and Momentum are 20 partnering for service in that exchange. And since Crecis is a wholesale -- I'm sorry, 21 22 Momentum is the wholesale provider to Crecis, I doubt 23 there would be another offering by Momentum in that 24 exchange. 25 MR. MEREDITH: Okay, thank you.

1 MR. MECHAM: This is Steve Mecham again. In 2 the other states where you're certificated, do you --3 does the retail service provider have a certificate? 4 MR. MAGNESS: In most of them the answer is 5 no. I mean, I -- and let me, let me clarify that. In situations where Momentum is providing the wholesale б 7 service partner with a cable company similar to the 8 arrangement for Price and Moab, in most cases the 9 underlying cable company is not required to have a 10 telecom certificate. 11 And there are, you know, arrange -- as I mentioned, arrangements similar to this in I know of 12 at least 30 states where Sprint and Time Warner Cable 13 14 provide this sort of service where Sprint is a certificated carrier. And in most cases the cable 15 16 entity does not have the equivalent of Utah's CPCN. 17 MR. MOOY: This is Sandy Mooy. Is Momentum aware that in the Bresnan circumstance the incumbent 18 19 local exchange carrier has maintained that it has no 20 interconnection obligation under federal law? MR. MAGNESS: That is my understanding of 21 22 what the incumbent local exchange carrier's position 23 is. I mean, I, I have heard that, yes. 24 MR. MOOY: And in that context, if a local

exchange carrier in the area in which Momentum seeks

25
to operate refuses to interconnect because of a, an argument that the service is not a telecommunications service, how does that affect Momentum's plans? MR. MAGNESS: Well, I guess I'd have to say we can -- we'll cross that bridge if we come to it. We are seek -- simply seeking certification to provide service in the state.

8 If there are further disputes down the line 9 with incumbent local exchange carriers -- which, you 10 know, frankly would not surprise me -- then those are 11 issues that the companies hopefully could negotiate to 12 a resolution. Or if not, would have to come before 13 the Commission or other authorities if and when they 14 arise.

MS. SCHMID: This is Tricia Schmid with the Division. Has Momentum encountered situations in other states where interconnections have been refused? MS. MULVANY HENRY: This is Rose Mulvany Henry. To my knowledge there has been no refusal of an interconnection agreement with any ILEC with which Momentum has sought interconnection.

22 MR. MAGNESS: And I, I mean, I -- this is 23 Bill Magness again. I mean, I suppose if it's the 24 incumbent's position that they don't have any 25 obligations because this is not a telecommunications

```
1
     service, then they would also agree that this
 2
     certification isn't even really necessary. Which, you
 3
     know, raises the question of what the source of the
 4
     opposition is. But that's another matter.
 5
              I think generally, as Rose said, there has,
 б
     there has not been a refusal. And, you know, in large
 7
     measure it's 251A and B interconnection -- or maybe
 8
     that's 252 -- that, that's sought here, so. In any
 9
     event.
10
             MR. MEREDITH: It's 251.
             MR. HUTTSELL: This is Curt Huttsell again.
11
12
     Will Momentum be seeking a designation as an ETC, an
     eligible telecommunications carrier?
13
14
             MR. MAGNESS: No.
15
             MR. HUTTSELL: Will Momentum seek support
     from the Utah Universal Service Fund?
16
17
             MR. MAGNESS: It is my understanding no.
             Rose, tell me if that's incorrect.
18
19
             MS. MULVANY HENRY: No, that is correct Bill.
             MR. HUTTSELL: Does Momentum intend to
20
21
     contribute to the Universal Service Fund? The state
22
     Universal Service Fund?
23
             MR. MAGNESS: Yes.
             MR. MECHAM: What, what is -- this is Steve
24
25
    Mecham again. What is the relationship between
```

1 Momentum and Crecis?

2 MR. MAGNESS: They're two companies who would 3 like to do business together to provide a competitive 4 telecommunications service.

5 MR. MECHAM: They're not under the same6 umbrella in any business way?

7 MR. MAGNESS: No. I'm sorry, this is Bill8 Magness. But the answer is no.

9 MR. JOHANSEN: This is Brock Johansen. When 10 you say they'd like to do business together, I guess 11 that's -- will you expand on that? I mean, when we're 12 talking about the viability of this product your 13 relationship with Crecis is gonna be, is gonna be 14 crucial. So can you expand upon "they would like to 15 do business together"?

16 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. Well, 17 they, they made business arrangements for Momentum to 18 provide the wholesale voice service so Crecis can make 19 that offering to its customers as well as its video 20 and Internet offerings.

If, if -- Momentum has come in seeking the certificate so that -- and then plans to, you know, get underway if we send in the application once we get the certificate.

25 MR. COX: Bill, this is Spencer Cox. What

1 happens in the event that Crecis is sold or --MR. MAGNESS: Bill -- I'm sorry, go ahead. 2 3 MR. COX: Yeah. Sold, or changes ownership, 4 or something to that effect. 5 MR. MAGNESS: I think it would be as if -б you know, any company that has a contract with any 7 other company that is sold, or acquired, or merges, I 8 don't know if there's anything -- you know, again I --9 not really speaking to the specific legal agreements between the companies, but I think Momentum would have 10 a contract with the successor in interest. 11 12 And I mean, you know, I think certainly our 13 intention would be to continue providing the service 14 under the terms that we agreed to with Crecis. If the 15 successor in interest decides that it doesn't want to 16 be in the business anymore, then that's another matter. But I couldn't speculate about how that would 17 all work out legally. 18 19 MR. JOHANSEN: This is Brock Johansen. And a 20 follow up to that. You know, before you said that you 21 were thinking that you and Crecis would 22 have (inaudible.) 23 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, sir, I'm 24 having trouble hearing on this end. Would you 25 please -- you said that you were thinking in that

1 process you would have?

2 MR. JOHANSEN: This is Brock Johansen. Can 3 you hear me better?

4 THE COURT REPORTER: Yes. Just keep your5 voice up, please.

6 MR. JOHANSEN: All right. This is Brock 7 Johansen. Just a follow up to Spencer's question. 8 Before you had indicated that you would have an 9 exclusive relationship with Crecis. Is that actually 10 in your contract?

I guess, when you say that you -- that this contract would succeed to the successor or the buyer of Crecis, what terms are in there to make sure that you are the exclusive provider under that? And what terms -- when you said that that contract would continue forward, how long a term would it continue for?

18 I'm just trying to get an idea of what would 19 happen if Crecis were to change owner -- ownership. 20 Because cable companies are changing ownership right 21 now throughout the nation.

22 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. I think 23 that's also true of phone companies. And I think 24 that's, you know, a business issue that I would be 25 doing nothing more than speculating about if I, I

1 tried to answer it.

2 I -- when you asked me the question about 3 exclusivity I didn't represent specifically that 4 there's an exclusivity clause in the contract. And I 5 think actually, you know, we're getting rather far afield about certification standards and kind of into 6 7 areas that, you know, we may -- I don't know if we 8 need to, you know, invoke a protective order or 9 confidentiality about the competitive issues in that 10 contract.

But that said, I think, as I referenced before, I think the, you know, certainly a marketing arrangement, if, if -- would have Momentum providing a wholesale service to Crecis. And, you know, any number of things could happen in the future, depending on business circumstances.

17 It -- there's, there's no way to know. Just 18 as there is no way to know the exact fate of any 19 particular company in the communications business 20 today.

21 MR. COX: Bill, this is Spencer Cox. The 22 reason it's different and the reason it's relevant is 23 it's public knowledge that Crecis has been trying to 24 sell these assets for years.

25 MR. MAGNESS: Okay.

1 MR. JOHANSEN: And it's also relevant because 2 we've had a lot of discussion about where the 3 complaints would go as, I think Curt Huttsell was 4 asking, and Douglas Meredith, about complaints coming 5 to Crecis.

6 And you talked about you working through it 7 with Crecis. So the ownership of Crecis is very 8 relevant, and is the difference between this and the 9 Bresnan case.

10 MR. MAGNESS: Number -- this is Bill Magness. 11 Number one, the -- Momentum, if they get the 12 certificate, is going to be the certificated carrier 13 that's providing voice service to these customers in 14 Utah. And is going to be answerable to the Public 15 Service Commission because we have come in and sought 16 the CPCN.

So no matter who the underlying carrier is --17 I mean, for example, hypothetically if Crecis sold the 18 19 assets to Comcast, or to Time Warner, or to a richer 20 Bresnan, or any regional cable company. If Momentum is still providing that wholesale voice service, 21 22 Momentum is still answerable, as it would be if Crecis 23 were the underlying carrier. We still have the 24 certificate. That doesn't change based on who the 25 business relationship is on -- with on the cable side.

1	And the second piece, as far as Crecis being
2	in discussions for sale, or selling assets, or
3	whatever it is people are hearing I don't think
4	changes it distinguishes this case from Bresnan in
5	the sense that the Commission's findings about the
б	benefit of providing a competitive alternative on the
7	voice service, and the benefits that, that made it in
8	the public interest to approve the CPCN, are any
9	different than they are here.
10	The fact that the underlying company may be
11	having business discussions that may come to something
12	or may not come to something, as you said, what you
13	hear is they've been doing it for years. Well, you
14	know, people have been discussing lots of things for
15	years. Sometimes they happen and sometimes they
16	don't.
17	That, that is not the legal standard for
18	whether Momentum should be able to get a CPCN and
19	provide a competitive alternative in Utah.
20	MR. HUTTSELL: This is Curt Huttsell again.
21	Under the rules of the Public Service Commission my
22	company has an obligation, if a customer asked for
23	service, to foot I believe the first \$2,000 of a line
24	extension.

25 Is that roughly correct, Paul?

1 MR. ANDERSON: I couldn't tell you for sure. I'm not familiar with that rule. 2 3 MR. HUTTSELL: It's roughly 1,500 or 2,000 --4 the first 1,500 or 2,000 dollars. Is it, is it 5 Momentum's intention to observe that rule? б MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. That is, 7 that Momentum would be subject to that rule? 8 MR. HUTTSELL: Yes. 9 MR. MAGNESS: I think, again, as that was, you know, also discussed in the Bresnan case and that 10 11 wasn't applied in that situation. And Momentum would 12 be providing, you know, a wholesale-only service. And isn't -- that isn't a rule that is going to apply to 13 14 the service they're providing. 15 Momentum would be providing service in the footprint of, of the underlying carrier in the Price 16 17 and Moab areas. 18 MS. SCHMID: And this is Tricia with the 19 Division, who might have an incredibly stupid question but I'm gonna ask anyway. I normally don't do 20 21 telephone. Would Momentum be offering a plain basic 22 telephone service in addition to other offerings? UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Not in Price and Moab. 23 MS. SCHMID: Not in Price and Moab? 24 25 MR. MAGNESS: Momentum would be offering

1 is -- what Momentum is offering is IPE, Internet 2 protocol phase phone service, in conjunction with the 3 cable company, Crecis, in Price and Moab. Or if the 4 underlying cable company changes, the underlying cable 5 company. б That, that is the service that Momentum would 7 be providing, excuse me, as part of an offering with 8 the cable company's service offerings. 9 Unless, Rose, unless you can expand on that. MS. MULVANY HENRY: This is Rose Mulvany 10 11 Henry. No, Bill, you're correct. 12 MR. MAGNESS: Yeah. So for example, Momentum would not, would not advertise that they, you know, 13 14 they will make available a freestanding service 15 offering. Their service offerings would be, you know, 16 under the, under the marketing banner of the, of the 17 underlying carrier. And what it has determined it can offer economically. 18 19 MR. MEREDITH: Douglas Meredith --20 MR. JOHANSEN: Just an expansion on that. So this would be lumped into Crecis's offering? Meaning 21 22 when they are advertising it just goes on their bill 23 and on their advertisement as another service to their 24 data and video; is that what you're saying? So it's 25 actually under -- advertised by Crecis?

1 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. I, you 2 know, I don't write the ads. And I don't think the 3 ads have been written until we get the certificate and 4 can provide the service.

5 I think this is -- I'll -- just to analogize 6 to other offerings that have, you know, given people 7 an alternative for phone service from the cable 8 company. It's often called a "triple play." It's 9 often called, you know, "bundled service." I think 10 phone companies are familiar with such offerings as 11 well.

12 And I would expect that it would be offered 13 under the Crecis name. If there is a, a business 14 advantage that is, is gained by identifying Momentum 15 as the wholesale carrier, if that's the case, you 16 know, Crecis may want to take advantage of that as a 17 business matter.

But yes, I would expect this to be part of abundled offering.

20 MR. MEREDITH: This is Douglas Meredith. Is 21 it correct, for the Moab and Price exchanges, that 22 Momentum will not have facilities in those areas. And 23 will actually a presis -- or Crecis facilities will be 24 used exclusively to deliver services to end-user 25 customers?

1 MR. MAGNESS: Well, Momentum typically in 2 these wholesale-type arrangements will utilize a soft 3 switch that -- and may place media gateways at the 4 cable company's head-ins. You know, just basically 5 they're put on the central offices. б So it's not correct to say that there would 7 be no Momentum equipment whatsoever. I think it would 8 be typically -- at least some of it may be co-located 9 with the cable company's equipment. 10 MR. MEREDITH: And outside -- toward the 11 end-user customer. You know, granted, soft switch or media gateway at a cable head-in. Transport to and 12 from that cable head-in to other network facilities. 13 14 But from that location to the end-user 15 customer Momentum doesn't plan on having any 16 facilities, outside plant facilities to end-user customers, do they? 17 18 MR. MAGNESS: In the Price and Moab 19 exchanges, no. The arrangement would utilize the 20 existing last-mile portion of the cable company's 21 network. 22 MR. MEREDITH: Yes. 23 MR. MAGNESS: And the voice service can be 24 provided over the facilities that are in the ground 25 that provide video and broadband Internet. Those

1 would be, in the Price and Moab areas, what we would 2 anticipate that the service would run over for outside 3 plant purposes. 4 MR. MEREDITH: Thank you. 5 (Pause.) б MR. MOOY: It looks like we've run to the 7 end. If there are no more questions. Anything 8 further from Momentum that you'd like to add? Bill, 9 Rose, anything further on your side? 10 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. No, I 11 don't think we have anything further to add. We just 12 wanted to understand sort of how the, how the process 13 works next. 14 MR. MOOY: There will be a hearing on your 15 certificate. Those who want to participate and present their evidence will do so. And the Commission 16 17 will then consider whether a certificate should be issued under Utah law. 18 19 MR. MAGNESS: And your Honor, will there be 20 any -- again, Bill Magness, sorry -- occasion in which 21 the contested issues are identified by the 22 interveners? I think the, the assertions in the intervention motions were, were broad. And didn't 23 really give us notice specifically of what contested 24 25 issues we're facing.

1 Whether we're looking at primarily legal 2 issues, or factual issues, or, you know. If nothing 3 else, what resources we need to bring forward to 4 satisfy concerns. I mean, obviously we heard a lot of 5 questions today, but I'm still not sure exactly what б the nature of the opposition is. 7 MR. MOOY: I would anticipate that during a 8 scheduling conference you could raise that. And to 9 the extent that the Administrative Law Judge who is conducting the hearing, or the Commission's secretary 10 11 who's conducting the scheduling conference, if there 12 are desired parties to present an issue list and to address those, whether they're legal or factual, that 13 14 that could be mapped out at the scheduling conference. 15 MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. I 16 appreciate the clarification. MR. MOOY: If there's nothing further, we'll 17 adjourn. 18 19 MR. COLEMAN: Do we want to set a scheduling 20 conference now? I mean, is there any reason why we 21 don't set a date today on this? We've got all parties 22 participating. Sorry, this is Casey Coleman with the 23 Division. MR. MOOY: Only because the Commission hasn't 24

resolved who the Administrative Law Judge will be.

25

1 Nor the person --

MR. MAGNESS: This is Bill Magness. I'm 2 3 sorry, I couldn't hear the question. 4 MR. MOOY: The question was made from 5 Mr. Casey, on behalf of the Division of Public б Utilities, as to whether we should actually go ahead 7 and do a scheduling conference now. 8 The difficulty is that the Commission has not 9 designated who the Administrative Law Judge will be 10 for this case. I also raise independently, it may be 11 that there are some parties -- some people who are interested who have not come forward today or even 12 petitioned to intervene. 13 14 And once there's a scheduling conference 15 noticed, they may then do so. And so I think 16 procedurally it would be better that the Commission 17 notice up a scheduling conference in the normal 18 course. Do that in writing, and publicly announce 19 that. And then we'll just go to the scheduling 20 conference when it's set. 21 MR. COLEMAN: This is Casey again. The only 22 reason I bring that up is we've got a 240-day clock that's been ticking, and we're already probably more 23 24 than halfway through it.

25 And so if we want to complete all the other

1	elements that's gonna happen with the CPCN application
2	we need to start something fairly quickly. Or the
3	other option is to see if that 240-day clock can be
4	waived.
5	MR. MOOY: Okay. Again, thank you for your
б	participation today. We'll adjourn, and go off the
7	record.
8	(The meeting was concluded at 9:53 a.m.)
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(Momentum Telecom Technical Conference) 1 CERTIFICATE 2 STATE OF UTAH ) 3 ) ss. COUNTY OF SALT LAKE ) 4 5 This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, KELLY L. WILBURN, a Registered б Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah. 7 That the proceedings were reported by me in 8 stenotype and thereafter caused by me to be transcribed into typewriting. And that a full, true, 9 and correct transcription of said proceedings so taken and transcribed is set forth in the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 35, inclusive. 10 I further certify that I am not of kin or 11 otherwise associated with any of the parties to said 12 cause of action, and that I am not interested in the event thereof. 13 WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL AT KEARNS, UTAH 14 THIS 26th DAY OF September, 2008. 15 16 Kelly L. Wilburn, CSR, RPR My Commission Expires: 17 May 16, 2009 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25