

Stephen F. Mecham (4089)
CALLISTER NEBEKER & McCULLOUGH
10 East South Temple Suite 900
Salt Lake City, Utah 84133
Telephone: (801) 530-7300
Facsimile: (801) 364-9127
Email: sfmecham@cnmlaw.com

Attorneys for All West Communications, Inc.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In Regard to the Request of ALL WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC. for Revision to Exchange Boundaries	DOCKET NO. 02-2270-01 All West Communications, Inc.’s Responses to the Division of Public Utilities’ Second Set of Data Requests
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

All West Communications, Inc. (“All West”) hereby submits the following Responses to the Division of Public Utilities’ Second Set of Data Requests to All West pursuant to the applicable rules and procedure.

- 2.1 With existing facility arrangements at Promontory, how is All West currently providing its subscribers with same rates, same options and same calling area? Please provide response in detail for a clear understanding.

Response: All West is charging different rates for customers served by the CLEC verses those served by the CLEC. CLEC customers have local calling into the Park City exchange and the Kamas exchange while ILEC customers have only local calling into the Kamas exchange , unless they purchase a switched FX line which then gives them local calling into the Park City exchange. Customers do have the same options, but rates are not the same.

- 2.2 All West serves in Qwest territory as a CLEC. It appears from the testimony of Vernile Prince that facility costs and expenses are booked to the ILEC. Please explain how costs and expenses for the All West CLEC are allocated.

Response: Most facility costs are booked to the ILEC and where they are used jointly, the CLEC purchases services from the ILEC. In areas where facilities are used solely by the CLEC, the CLEC purchases the equipment and it is booked to the CLEC accounts. All other expenses, such as labor and vehicles, are booked to the ILEC and then billed to the CLEC based on time charged to each company.

- 2.3 Will All West provide to West Promontory subscribers a triple play package through its CLEC or ILEC? Please provide a detailed explanation.

Response: All West will provide all services to West Promontory customers through its CLEC, unless a boundary change is approved. If the boundary change is approved, telecommunications services will be provided via the ILEC and other services will be provided by the CLEC as is now done in all other ILEC areas.

- 2.4 Based on the answer to question 1.2 of the DPU's first set of Data Requests, the DPU perceives that All West intends to be an exclusive provider for the developers at Promontory. Is this a correct perception? If not please provide a detailed explanation of how other carriers will access All West's facilities, place their own facilities and/or gain access to public and private rights of way.

Response: It is All West's belief that it will be the exclusive wireline provider for Promontory simply because no other company is likely to overbuild. Any other certified utility can use the existing public rights-of-way, build their own facilities, and provide services if they choose to do so.

- 2.5 Has All West already placed feeder facilities to and throughout both the East and West Promontory Development? Please provide facility maps and a detailed explanation. Include CPR costs for those facilities.

Response: All West deems this to be competitively sensitive, confidential information.

- 2.6 Is there a natural dividing line between the Promontory Development that All West is requesting and other Qwest Park City exchanges, or will the same problem All West is trying to avoid continue to exist for other subscribers in Qwest's Park City serving area? In other words, does the problem that All West expresses, continue to perpetuate throughout the Park City area as the area continues to develop? What placement of the boundary does All West believe would solve this issue?

Response: The logical dividing line that All West is requesting is the boundary of the Promontory development. Consequently anyone residing within the development will have the same service provider and the same services. There are other developing areas along the boundary between Qwest and All West that may present similar problems that will need to be addressed in the future. One possible solution when a development straddles a boundary line would be to allow the developer to choose its ILEC.

- 2.7 It is the Division's understanding that the Developer collects \$500.00 from each home owner at the time of purchase and gives that \$500.00 to All West as a contribution toward facility placement. All West's tariff states that All West shall pay the first \$500.00 toward facility placement. If this is so, will the customer also pay an additional contribution toward facility placement for items such as terminals, cross connect box, power, etc.? Please provide a detailed description of the additional construction costs customers will incur to have fiber to the home, broadband connection, etc.

Response: The \$500.00 collected is a contribution toward the fiber-to-the-home cost and is only collected on homes served by fiber facilities. This fee is the only fee collected from the customer. They pay no other connection or installation fee.

- 2.8 Are there any construction costs charged to the developer other than costs incurred for opening a trench for utility placement?

Response: The developer has agreed to open the trench, place sand bedding in trenches for All West's conduit and to backfill trenches. No other costs have been agreed to.

- 2.9 If another CLEC or Qwest competes in the Promontory area please explain the financial impact on All West.

Response: It is very hard to assess what financial impact wireline competition would have on All West because there are so many variables, the primary one being their prices and their penetration rate.

- 2.10 What permissions do other providers have to seek, and from whom, in order to serve a subscriber in the Promontory development, if the Commission authorizes All West to serve the entire Promontory area?

Response: Other providers would have to be certified as a CLEC in the state of Utah, and based on the law and current policy, a CLEC is required to show it is in the public interest to compete in an area served by a telecommunications carrier with fewer than 30,000 lines.

- 2.11 Are the Fiber to the Home and Broadband facilities that have been placed in both East and West Promontory included in All West's financials that are submitted to collect monies from the Federal USF?

Response: Financial data for East Promontory is submitted to NECA and is included in their determination of All West's USF support. Financial data for West Promontory is kept under All West / Utah, which provides no data to NECA or the FCC for USF support.

- 2.12 Is the new area that All West wants included in its service area now included in its study area to determine federal USF since some facilities have been placed?

Response: The area that All West wants included is not in our present study area. Our intention would be to seek a study area waiver from the FCC so we could include it.

- 2.13 To determine the effect on USF please provide total investment in plant allocated by jurisdiction and service type, i.e. interstate, intrastate, CATV, internet, etc.

Response: All West deems this to be competitively sensitive, confidential information.

- 14 If not, will this new area be included in All West's study area if boundary change is granted?

Response: All West would make the request, but the determination would be made by the FCC.

- 2.15 What financial impact will your proposed boundary change have on All West? Please explain in detail.

Response: The exact financial impact is impossible to determine because there are so many variable factors and unknowns. All West does not know at this point if Federal or State USF will become available. The primary known impact will be on economies that will be obtained by not having to keep separate accounts and trying to determine what goes with which company.

- 2.16 Please provide names of developers that have contracts with All West to provide facilities in the East and West Promontory development.

Response: The Pivotal Group is the only developer in Promontory.

- 2.17 Does All West offer broadband, cable, internet, and wireless under its ILEC or CLEC? Please provide a detailed explanation.

Response: In its ILEC territory, All West Communications (ILEC) provides the broadband connection at NECA tariff rates. Telecommunications services are then billed to the customer by the ILEC, Internet and Video services are billed by the CLEC. In All West / Utah CLEC territory, the CLEC bills for all services.

- 2.18 All West does not have a CLEC price list for services offered by its CLEC on file at the DPU. Please provide a CLEC Price List of services offered.

Response: All West filed a CLEC price list with the PSC some time ago for which it has proof of delivery from the US Post Office. At the request of the Division, that price list was re-filed in August of 2006.

- 2.19 All West does not have an up to date tariff map of its exchange areas in Utah on file at the DPU. Please provide a tariff map for each of All West's exchanges in Utah.

Response: An updated exchange territory map for the Kamas area was filed with the DPU in August of 2006.

- 2.20 Please explain in detail the price differences mentioned in the testimony of Vernile Prince of July 31, 2006 on page 12, line 265.

Response: This question appears to address line 270 and refers back to lines 201-203. For basic local residential telephone service, CLEC customers in West Promontory pay \$29.95. ILEC customers in East Promontory pay \$20.95.

- 2.21 What are the cost differences to provide service in Promontory as a CLEC verses as an ILEC?

Response: As an ILEC, All West's costs along with a reasonable rate of return are recovered in the regulated rate making process. Just and reasonable rates are based on what actual costs are. As a CLEC, services must be purchased from the ILEC and a reasonable profit margin added. There are certain fees that the ILEC must charge, such as the federal SLC, which the CLEC doesn't have to charge and this helps keep the actual pricing of service relatively close.

- 2.22 Do you charge for FX service in both the ILEC and CLEC sides of the Promontory development?

Response: No, only the ILEC. There is no reason for a CLEC customer to purchase an FX since they already have local dialing into Park City.

- 2.23 If so, is it a mandatory service because of the developer's mandate or is it optional based on the customer's choice?

Response: In our agreement with the developer, All West agreed to provide non-toll calling to Park City for all customers within the Promontory development. CLEC customers automatically get that service. ILEC customers have the option to purchase an FX line.

- 2.24 Are there sufficient inter-office facilities in place between Jordanelle and Park City to accommodate the FX circuits and CLEC access facilities required to provide Park City dial tone to Promontory residents for now and for future demand?

Response: The facilities in place are sufficient to handle all traffic generated in Promontory now and well into the future. It is presumed, as in all growth situations, that additional trunks will be added as needed.

- 2.25 Are there sufficient inter-office facilities in place between Jordanelle and Park City to accommodate possible EAS trunks?

Response: Yes. All existing traffic between Jordanelle and Park City is carried on existing trunks. Traffic patterns would change very little if the traffic was changed from FX to EAS. Some trunk rearrangement will be needed, and for convenience another trunk group may need to be added but that is a simple thing to do on a digital facility.

- 2.26 What is All West's position on the feasibility of providing EAS between the Park City Exchange and the Jordanelle Exchange in All West territory? Please provide the estimated costs.

Response: EAS between our Jordanelle exchange and Qwest's Park City exchange would be a very simple arrangement. Since interexchange facilities are already in place, the cost would be minimal, requiring simply some switch programming to change routing tables. There would also be a lost toll calculation which would be minimal since most of the customers that call Park City currently have FX lines and do not make toll calls. Also, as mentioned in response to question 2.26, an additional trunk group may need to be added.

- 2.27 Please discuss the concerns All West would have including the results of any negotiations previously attempted.

Response: At present, the FX arrangement is working relatively well in providing customers in East Promontory the local calling they desire into Park City. It is an extra charge on their bill, but even if EAS were available, there would be some charge for that.

We have attempted to negotiate an EAS arrangement with Qwest for several years. Initially nothing could be done because the EAS rules were being re-written. Once new rules were in place Qwest kept trying to do traffic studies of various kinds, asking for traffic data and all kinds of irrelevant information and producing no results. All West even offered to pay Qwest's associated costs but that offer was also ignored.

- 2.28 In All West's opinion, is there a community of interest between the Promontory development and Park City that would possibly justify EAS expenditures?

Response: Park City is the only community of interest for the Jordanelle exchange. People locate in Promontory for the recreational activities of the Park City area. They patronize Park City's restaurants, grocery stores, shops and theaters. They have no need or desire to call Kamas other than to talk to All West.

- 2.29 Please provide documentation of any customer complaints from Promontory customers about long distance calls to their neighbors or differences in their billing with their neighbors caused by the CLEC/ILEC situation.

Response: To date there have been none. This is due primarily to the fact that All West has offered the FX arrangement and customers don't have to make a toll call.

- 2.30 If a major boundary change is not granted what minor adjustments in the Qwest/All West serving area boundaries would All West be willing to make to locate the boundary along natural boundaries rather than through private property so that the determination between CLEC and ILEC is simplified?

Response: Any change would be better than it is presently. Quasi-natural boundaries such as roads would at least make it easier for All West personnel to determine which side of the boundary the customer is on, but All West petitioned for the entire Promontory development to completely settle this issue.

- 2.31 Does All West's CLEC provide service to customers in the Park City exchange other than the Promontory development?

Response: Yes.

- 2.32 Describe in detail what method All West uses to provide voice service to the subscribers in the Promontory development? Explain how the voice signal gets from the home to the PSTN network.

Response: The network used to provide voice service begins at the switching center in Kamas where T-1s (groups of 24 circuits) are connected digitally (GR-303) from the base switch to a transport facility. The circuits (voice paths) are then transported to the remote equipment building in the Promontory development via a fiber optic transport facility. At the remote equipment building the voice circuits are multiplexed onto fiber optic distribution facilities (cables) and delivered to the customer. At the customer's premise, the NID (network interface device) de-multiplexes the voice signal to analog and it is then distributed through the home on the customer's wiring. When a customer picks up the phone, that service request is extended back to the central office switch which then opens a voice circuit and extends a tone to the customer to indicate the ability to dial via the PSTN.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Response of All West Communications, Inc. to the Division of Public Utilities' Second Set of Data Requests** in Docket No. 02-2270-01 to be emailed this 8th day of September, 2006 to the following:

Dennis Miller
Division of Public Utilities
Heber M. Wells Bldg - 4th Floor
160 E 300 S - Box 146751
Salt Lake City UT 84114-6751
DennisMiller@utah.gov

Michael Ginsberg
mginsberg@utah.gov

Christine Keyser
ckeyser@utah.gov

Paul Proctor
pproctor@utah.gov

s/ Stephen F. Mecham