

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

BEFORE THE

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

DT 10-025

Request for Approvals in Connection with the Reorganization Plan of FairPoint Communications, Inc., et al.

PREFILED TESTIMONY OF

JEFFREY W. ALLEN
ON BEHALF OF FAIRPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

FEBRUARY 24, 2010

Summary: Mr. Allen's testimony should be read in context with the testimony provided by Ms. Vicky Weatherwax, Mr. Bryan Lamphere and Mr. Thomas Nolting. Such testimony, when considered in its entirety, addresses the reorganized FairPoint's technical, operational and management capabilities. Mr. Allen also explains how the broadband related provisions contained within FairPoint's regulatory settlement with the New Hampshire Staff Advocates preserve the benefits to New Hampshire customers of the broadband requirements embodied in the New Hampshire merger order issued by the Public Utilities Commission in 2008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Summary of Testimony	1
Northern New England Management and Organization Changes	
Service Quality Metrics and Service Quality Reporting	
Escalations and State Regulatory Communications	
Billing	16
Broadband	

Mr. Allen sponsors the following Exhibits:

Exhibit JA-1	Resum	e of Jeffrey W. Allen
Exhibit JA-2	Retail	Service Quality Report for December 2009
Exhibit JA-3	Retail	Service Quality Report for January 2010
Exhibit JA-4	Retail	Service Quality Graphic Data for 2008 and 2009
Confidential Exhibit J	A-5	FairPoint VantagePoint Core Transport Network
Confidential Exhibit J	A-6	FairPoint VantagePoint Network Buildout Status

1	Q.	State your name.
2	A.	My name is Jeffrey W. Allen.
3		
4	Q.	What is your position, and by whom are you employed?
5	A.	I am Executive Vice President for the Northern New England Operations of FairPoint
6		Communications, Inc ("FairPoint"). My offices are located in South Burlington,
7		Vermont, and Portland, Maine.
8		
9	Q.	What are your current duties at FairPoint?
10	A.	I was appointed to my current position on July 15, 2009. As Executive Vice President for
11		FairPoint's Northern New England Operations, I have responsibility over operations,
12		engineering, customer care, operations support, sales, and billing for FairPoint's business
13		in Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine. I report directly to David L. Hauser, who
14		became Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of FairPoint on July 1, 2009.
15		
16	Q.	Could you provide some information regarding your background and
17		qualifications?
18	A.	Yes. I have been working as an executive in the telecommunications industry for over 20
19		years. Prior to joining FairPoint, I held several management positions, including
20		President of the East for Frontier Communications, a position that encompassed most of
21		my current responsibilities. I also started and operated a competitive local exchange
22		carrier ("CLEC") as the Vice President and General Manager of Conectiv

1		Communication. In addition, I operated a data communication company as the CEO of
2		Intellispace, Inc. Exhibit JA-1 is a copy of my resume.
3		
4	Q.	What is the purpose of the testimony being filed today by FairPoint?
5	A.	Mr. Giammarino's testimony describes the FairPoint Chapter 11 bankruptcy
6		reorganization plan (the "Plan") and the New Hampshire regulatory settlement included
7		therein (the "Regulatory Settlement") and addresses the financial strength of the
8		reorganized company. My testimony, together with that of Ms. Weatherwax and Messrs
9		Nolting, Lamphere and Murtha addresses the reorganized company's technical,
10		operational and management capabilities. Together, our testimony supports FairPoint's
11		requested approvals associated with (i) the indirect acquisition of control that may occur
12		upon the effectiveness of FairPoint's bankruptcy reorganization plan (ii) the Regulatory
13		Settlement and (iii) the requested modifications of this Commission's Order No. 24,823
14		(the "NH 2008 Order"), which approved with conditions (including conditions embodied
15		in the settlement agreement with the Commission Staff, the "NH 2008 Settlement") the
16		acquisition of the former Verizon New England Inc. landline telecommunications
17		business in New Hampshire.
18		
19	Q.	Please provide a brief outline of the rest of your testimony?
20	A.	My testimony addresses managerial and organizational changes within FairPoint's
21		Northern New England organization as well as FairPoint's Service Quality Metrics for
22		New Hampshire. Next, I explain some of the company's initiatives related to billing. I

1 also discuss FairPoint's efforts in the area of customer-complaint escalations, including our efforts to facilitate and improve communications with customers and regulators. 2 3 I then discuss the broadband provisions in the settlement. I explain how the broadband-4 related provisions in our settlement with the New Hampshire Staff Advocates preserve 5 the benefits to New Hampshire customers of the broadband requirements embodied in the 6 NH 2008 Order. 7 8 9 Northern New England Management and Organization Changes Mr. Giammarino discusses certain management changes made since July 1, 2009. 10 Q. Please summarize some of the other changes that have been made within FairPoint's 11 12 Northern New England organization? I will describe several of the changes that I have made since September, 2009. 13 A. 14 15 First, Tom Nolting was promoted in September 2009 to Vice President of Billing and Revenue Assurance. In his prior role as Director of Revenue Assurance, Mr. Nolting 16 identified billing issues and made global corrections to insure more accurate billing for 17 both our retail and wholesale customers. He also led the effort executing a switch-to-bill 18 audit to assign the proper traffic to the appropriate customer. In addition, Mr. Nolting 19 had bill-dispute and collections responsibilities for our wholesale customers. In his new 20 role, Mr. Nolting will retain his prior responsibilities and add to those the leadership of 21 the billing teams. With the tight alignment of these functions, FairPoint will be able to 22

1 identify any billing issues sooner and resolve them in an expedited fashion. Mr. Nolting's prefiled testimony further describes his work. 2 3 In addition, the Provisioning and Billing & Revenue Assurance teams have been moved 4 5 under Senior Vice President of Customer Care Steve Rush in order to create a true endto-end customer care operation. Steve has done a superb job building his customer sales 6 7 and service organization and they are providing service to our customers at an 8 outstanding level. 9 Next, Janet Brack took over as Vice President of the Metrics Group effective September 10 11 2009. Assigning a separate Vice President to this organization, has allowed FairPoint to put additional emphasis on accurately capturing results and providing timely information 12 to our operating teams so that they can take actions to continually improve our 13 performance. This group provides all the SQI, PAP, internal and external non-financial 14 reporting for FairPoint. 15 16 With regard to the Operations and Engineering organizations, FairPoint has divided this 17 large and critical organization into two sections to provide additional executive focus. 18 19 Brian Lippold was promoted to Senior Vice President of Engineering and Network 20 Planning in September 2009. Mr. Lippold's strong engineering background and leadership skills make him ideally suited for this challenging position. Mr. Lippold has 21 22 responsibility for engineering and network planning.

1	Karen Mead will continue as the Senior Vice President of Operations for FairPoint. Ms.
2	Mead can now focus exclusively on improvements in the operations organization to
3	improve mean time to repair and FairPoint's ability to meet its installation commitments.
4	Ms. Mead will also continue to lead the Proact, Central Office, Network Operations
5	Center and Outside Plant groups.
6	
7	Next, Bryan Lamphere, our Director for Engineering and Operations Systems Support
8	has been made responsible for end-to-end systems and process improvement. Mr.
9	Lamphere and his team are focused on evaluating and improving the end-to-end
10	performance for all FairPoint products. This work covers the point at which a customer
11	approaches FairPoint through to the completion of billing and collections. Mr. Lamphere
12	reports to Steve Rush.
13	
14	Finally, in order to address concerns raised by CLECs and to ensure excellent and
15	consistent customer care across both our retail and wholesale segments, all end-to-end
16	customer care now reports to Mr. Rush.
17	
18	Mr. Giammarino's pre-filed direct testimony contains Exhibit AG-1 and this document is
19	the current FairPoint organization chart.
20	

1		Service Quality Metrics and Service Quality Reporting
2	Q.	The Regulatory Settlement for New Hampshire includes items relating to
3		FairPoint's service quality. Before turning to those provisions, can you update the
4		Commission on FairPoint's retail service quality index performance?
5	A.	Yes, I will first provide an overall assessment of our service-quality levels. I will then
6		address the New Hampshire retail service quality issues that continue to be a challenge
7		for us. The existing service quality requirements were set forth in Exhibit 3 to the NH
8		2008 Settlement (the "NH SQI Plan").
9		
10		Service Quality
11	Q.	Please summarize FairPoint's performance as detailed in recent Retail Service
11 12	Q.	Please summarize FairPoint's performance as detailed in recent Retail Service Quality Reports?
	Q. A.	-
12		Quality Reports?
12 13		Quality Reports? The Cutover from the Verizon back office systems to the new FairPoint systems had a
12 13 14		Quality Reports? The Cutover from the Verizon back office systems to the new FairPoint systems had a material and adverse effect on the ability of FairPoint during 2009 to satisfy the service
12 13 14 15		Quality Reports? The Cutover from the Verizon back office systems to the new FairPoint systems had a material and adverse effect on the ability of FairPoint during 2009 to satisfy the service quality commitments it made in the NH SQI Plan. While basic network performance
12 13 14 15 16		Quality Reports? The Cutover from the Verizon back office systems to the new FairPoint systems had a material and adverse effect on the ability of FairPoint during 2009 to satisfy the service quality commitments it made in the NH SQI Plan. While basic network performance parameters continued to be met, such as operator assistance, directory assistance/intercept
12 13 14 15 16		Quality Reports? The Cutover from the Verizon back office systems to the new FairPoint systems had a material and adverse effect on the ability of FairPoint during 2009 to satisfy the service quality commitments it made in the NH SQI Plan. While basic network performance parameters continued to be met, such as operator assistance, directory assistance/intercept response (with the exception of February 2009), dial tone speed and call completion, the

21

For the NH SQI Plan, compliance is ultimately measured on an average year-to-date basis against the specified baseline standard. FairPoint is currently meeting the January year-to-date service quality baselines for 10 of the 12 defined metrics. As of December 2009 FairPoint met the year-to-date service quality baselines for 5 of the 12 metrics. Our more recent performance has improved. Since October, FairPoint has operated at or better than the baseline standards for 7 of the 12 metrics. Still more recently, for the months of December 2009 and January 2010, FairPoint performed at or better than the baseline standard for 10 of the 12 metrics.

Meeting the established benchmarks for two service quality metrics in particular"Percent Out of Service (OOS) Troubles Cleared within 24 Hours," and "Held Orders for
Facility Reasons – Average Delay Days" – has been challenging for FairPoint and
therefore those two metrics are receiving special focus. Our February interim data
indicate that we are currently meeting the OOS metric benchmark of 87%. With regard
to the Held Orders for Facility Reasons, we have established a new monitoring process
for this metric. We are reviewing the accuracy of the dated order activity, and after
addressing accuracy issues with this data, we expect to be in compliance with this service
quality metric's benchmark as well.

Items 7 through 18 of Exhibit JA-2 illustrate the monthly measurements for the 12 service quality metrics and the results for 2008 and 2009, through December as compared

1 to the established baseline standards. Information for January 2010 is contained in 2 Exhibit JA-3. Exhibit JA-4 contains graphical representations of this data over time. 3 4 For the "% Installation Services Orders Met Commitment and % Installation Service 5 Orders Met w/in 30 days", the company is performing above the benchmark at 96% and 6 100%, respectively, for the month of January, 2010 as illustrated in the February Quality 7 of Service Report (Exhibit JA-3). For the calendar year 2009 as reflected in the January 8 Quality of Service Report (Exhibit JA-2), FairPoint's year-to-date average is below the 9 metrics' benchmarks as monitored under the NH SQI Plan with the baseline standards of 10 90% and 95%, respectively. 11 12 With respect to service quality indices related to Percent Calls Answered for Operator 13 Assistance, Directory Assistance, Business Office and Repair Centers, the management, systems and process plans implemented by the company regarding call center matters, 14 15 have enabled the company to address issues in this area. The company has been meeting 16 the benchmarks for these metrics on a monthly basis since October, 2009 and continuing into January, 2010. Related to 2009, FairPoint met the year to date average benchmarks 17 18 for both the Operator Assistance and Directory Assistance Centers but not the Business Office and Repair Centers. 19 20 21 The company is in compliance with the three (3) metrics regarding "Customer Trouble Report Rate", "Percent Dialtone Speed within 3 seconds", and "Percent Call 22

Completion". FairPoint has met the benchmarks for these metrics both for average year to date 2009 and in January 2010.

In 2009 FairPoint's service quality metrics for "Percent Out of Service (OOS) Troubles Cleared within 24 Hours" and "Held Orders for Facility Reasons – Average Delay Days" have been unfavorably exceeding the defined baselines. These metrics have historically (and predating the transaction) been a challenge for the company, especially for the Percent Out of Service (OOS) Cleared in 24 Hours. FairPoint had challenges in measuring the Percent OOS metric but has recently completed a restatement for 2009 with the corrected methodology and data. This restatement will be reflected in our annual filing of the service quality metrics. We are continuing to show improvement in these two metrics after exiting the summer months of June, July and August when these areas are typically negatively affected by an increase in weather related troubles. The Network Engineering and Operations organization is working on new performance indicators and metrics to better demonstrate how this aspect of the business is performing.

FairPoint monitors its customer commitment strategy on an ongoing basis to ensure that the Repair and Resolution Center ("RRC") provides the customer with the most accurate commitment time by which their service will be restored. Currently, these commitments range from same day by 6:00 PM, or the next day by 6:00 PM. When the installation and repair load increases substantially due to seasonal conditions or other business demands,

the commitment may need to be extended. Many troubles are repaired without the need to dispatch a repair technician to the customer's location. In these cases, the customer should receive a call from FairPoint verifying that service is working to their satisfaction before the trouble report is closed. In those cases in which the commitment time is extended due to higher priorities or unexpected delays, such as sickness or emergency days off by our technicians, the customer should receive a call from FairPoint apologizing for the delay and letting them know that we will dispatch a technician first thing the next day.

FairPoint's results for customer commitments met for repair times are identified on the following chart:

Percent (%) Customer Commitments Met in New Hampshire

Month	July	August	September	October	November	December	January
Business	88	90	90	89	89	90	92
Residence	86	88	91	90	93	92	94

As explained by Mr. Lamphere, FairPoint is taking a multi-tiered approach to understanding and addressing the provisioning and order flow-through issues, which negatively impact the Service Quality Indices related to Installation Orders. Indeed, order flow-through is one of the specific areas that Accenture has reviewed and on which it has made recommendations for action. The details of the above-mentioned initiatives are provided in the testimony of Ms. Weatherwax and Mr. Lamphere's testimony.

1	Q.	You have provided an assessment of FairPoint's overall service level	as well as
2		several service-quality areas that remain an issue. How will the reso	lution of the
3		Chapter 11 proceeding and the terms of the Regulatory Settlement b	enefit
4		FairPoint's New Hampshire customers?	
5	A.	The service quality benefits for customers contained in the NH SQI Plan	are preserved
6		with the Regulatory Settlement. In general, all of the service quality prog	gram
7		requirements of the NH SQI Plan will remain in place; however, penaltie	s for 2009 will
8		be deferred. If FairPoint meets the following benchmarks for each of the	following
9		performance areas averaged over the twelve calendar months ending Dec	ember 31, 2010,
10		the 2009 penalties will be waived:	
11		% Installation Appointments Met:	90%
12		• % Installation Service Roders Met within 30 Days:	95%
13		• Customer Trouble Reports Rate per 100 Lines - Network:	1.12
14		• % OOS Service Troubles Cleared in 24 Hours (excl. Sunday):	87%
15		• % Repair Commitments Met:	89%
16		If FairPoint meets some but not all of these objectives, the 2009 penalties	s will be reduced
17		by 20% for each performance area for which FairPoint achieves the servi	ce objective
18		averaged over the period of twelve calendar months ending December 31	, 2010.
19		The Regulatory Settlement requires FairPoint to adhere to the service qua	ality metrics of
20		the NH SQI Plan during 2010 and thereafter and pay the prescribed pena	lties for any
21		failure to meet the metrics in 2010 and any subsequent year.	

1		Under the Regulatory Settlement, the provisions of the NH SQI Plan are amended by
2		deleting references to DSL service in Section 3.2 . This change reflects the fact that retail
3		DSL is an unregulated competitive service. Additionally, Section 4 of that NH SQI Plan
4		is clarified so that the New Hampshire penalty structure will be calculated as it is in
5		Maine, using the percentage "not met" formulation. The maximum total annual liability
6		for penalties is set at \$12.5 million.
7		
8		The Regulatory Settlement provides that at the end of the five-year basic exchange retail
9		rate "stay-out" period in the NH 2008 Settlement (in which FairPoint does not seek to
10		raise retail basic exchange rates and other parties do not seek to lower them), FairPoint
11		can ask the Commission for changes in the service quality standards and penalties.
12		
13	Q.	FairPoint has experienced issues regarding the reporting of its service quality
14		metrics since Cutover. Please provide an update regarding FairPoint's service
15		quality reporting.
16	A.	As mentioned above FairPoint had difficulty during 2009 in producing the "Percent of
17		OOS within 24 hour" metric. We have subsequently been able to correct that issue and
18		will provide a restatement for each month of 2009 in our final annual filing for the
19		period.
20		
21		As communicated in our January Quality of Service filing (Exhibit JA-2) FairPoint will
22		be implementing additional SQI metrics for the calendar period 2010 as discussed in our

1		meeting with the Commission Staff in December. These metric measurements are
2		available in our February Quality of Service filing and represent additional installation
3		performance metrics beginning with January 2010 results.
4		
5	Q.	Have the issues that have impacted other parts of the business (such as order flow-
6		through and data synchronization) impacted FairPoint's ability to report service
7		metrics?
8	A.	The system/database that supports the reporting of the performance metrics for both the
9		NH SQI Plan and the Performance Assurance Plan, or PAP/C2C, reporting is continuing
10		to be reviewed and evaluated similarly to the operational systems and processes. To the
11		extent there are issues or enhancements in the interrelated systems or processes in the
12		work stream, the reporting associated with those systems or processes will be impacted.
13		As a result FairPoint conducts a weekly and a monthly review process with members of
14		the metrics reporting and operations teams to monitor and analyze the metric issues. This
15		review includes both an in depth review of the calculation of the metric and the
16		underlying data quality, as well as a review of operational system and process
17		performance represented in the metric results.
18		
19		Going forward, the "Metric Remediation," project identified by Accenture is a high
20		priority project that is being implemented as part of the CDIP Program being
21		administered by Ms. Weatherwax. The project plan includes analyzing the metric results,
22		reviewing the calculation methodologies, evaluating the impacts of subsequent system

enhancements on reporting and reviewing issues related to the ordering, provisioning, and/or maintenance systems and the operational processes. This is an iterative review process conducted in conjunction with Mr. Lamphere's End-to-End performance team as we continue to gain additional knowledge about the systems and refine our operational environment.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

FairPoint adopted service quality metrics that were agreed upon by Verizon and state regulators in other states prior to the FairPoint acquisition. Verizon participated in the definition and design of these measurements. FairPoint has worked diligently to convert these measurements to access data points in our more than seventy (70) newly implemented systems, as well as to interpret the intention of the service quality indices. FairPoint's intent is to deliver a consistent measure of the service quality metrics that is comparable to the metrics that were measured in prior years by Verizon. This consistency is imperative because the benchmarks and results that are established for these performance metrics, although they may have transitional increments in 2009, are comparable to the benchmarks that were measured and established in connection with the previously established service quality indices. Therefore, to have a correct evaluation of the performance to the benchmark one must have precisely defined the associated performance metric, which has been a challenging deliverable for some of the performance metrics, particularly those related to Installation and Repair. The product of this iterative refining process enables the company to produce annual service quality

metrics measurements that may be compared to the designated benchmarks associated with service quality plans and requirements that were conditions of the acquisition.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1

2

Each month FairPoint has scheduled deployments for enhancements to the reporting database to improve the calculation methodologies and/or implement changes to reflect enhancements to the other operational systems or processes. FairPoint restates previous measurements when appropriate and data is available. These restatements are communicated in our filings with the Commission. The 2009 annual Quality of Service Report will be filed in March and will include the final service quality performance metrics results.

11

12

10

Escalations and State Regulatory Communications

- 13 Q. The number of escalations has been an issue since cutover. Can you summarize the 14 steps FairPoint has taken to deal with this problem?
- FairPoint has worked diligently with the Commission Staff, as well as the Maine

 commission and the Vermont Department of Public Service ("DPS") to address the

 escalations themselves as well as the procedure for dealing with them. Across the three

 states, the number of escalations continues to decline in all categories except billing and

 collections. As of February 12, 2010, open escalations in all categories had fallen to 28

 in Maine, 50 in New Hampshire and 105 in Vermont. Of the 183 open escalations, 108

 are in the category of billing and collections.

The major reason for the increase in escalations in the billing and collections category is FairPoint's re-establishment of its normal collection and service suspension activities in the three Northern New England states. These collection and service suspension activities had been curtailed after cutover at the request of the staffs of the Maine and New Hampshire commissions and the Vermont Department of Public Service. The service suspension process was reinstated on August 15, 2009, after review and input from the three states' staffs. FairPoint had emphasized that any reinstating of a collections and suspension activity after a hiatus of several months would result in a substantial increase in escalations. This would occur simply from the fact that customers would be subject to treatment, including service suspension, even if FairPoint's processes were working perfectly. Because the collection and service suspension process involves increased personal interaction with customers, including the discussion of individual payment arrangements, customers are likely to find reasons to escalate these issues.

Billing

- Q. Please describe how FairPoint has addressed retail-customer billing issues.
- 17 A. FairPoint has implemented a multi-tiered plan to identify and address retail billing issues.

At the first level, FairPoint maintains a Bill Review Team that proactively examines a sampling of approximately 1,500 bills, representative of account types (residential, small business, large business, etc.), and state jurisdictions, for each of the 11 monthly billing cycles (for a total of approximately 16,500 bills monthly) to find errors across a range of

criteria for product type. Any errors identified in this process are counted as one part of the "known billing errors" and are recorded in an account corrections work log for Customer Service. The errors are corrected for individual bills as well as by product type for generic issues.

At a second level, a billing team meets with customer service representative teams from the retail call centers twice each week to track billing issues that have been raised by customers with call center representatives. The billing and customer service teams share information regarding common billing defects, i.e., defects that are not limited to individual customers, and they explore potential causes to determine whether the defects are the result of human error and can be addressed by training or other means, or whether the defects are caused by data or system issues.

At a third level, FairPoint's IT department is continually updating and providing enhancements to the billing (Kenan) and other upstream systems to address systemic issues identified by the billing department in its proactive and reactive bill review processes. FairPoint conducts a weekly Billing Leadership Forum in which billing representatives responsible for retail, business and wholesale billing accounts meet with IT department representatives to review common billing defects across all three customer groups, identify solutions and work with the IT department to prioritize and deploy system fixes.

At a fourth level, FairPoint's Billing and Revenue Assurance group has undertaken several initiatives to identify and eliminate defects in upstream systems, processes or data that can lead to inaccurate retail bills. For example, the company has completed a Switch-to-Bill Audit, which is discussed in greater detail in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Nolting. In addition, the Billing and Revenue Assurance group has been working with an industry analytic software provider, Martin Dawes Analytics ("MDA"), on a database synchronization project. This project is also discussed in greater detail in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Nolting.

At a fifth level and as discussed in greater detail in the prefiled testimony of Ms.

Weatherwax, a number of the CDIP projects recommended by Accenture address billing issues. These projects are ongoing and should yield a significant improvement in billing performance.

Taken together, we believe that the above initiatives have and will result in short, intermediate and long term improvements in the quality and accuracy of FairPoint's customer billing. I should note that while I will discuss business and wholesale billing below, the data synchronization work being undertaken by Mr. Nolting and his team, as well as the work being undertaken by Ms. Weatherwax as part of the CDIP Program, will result in benefits for all three categories of FairPoint customers.

1	Q.	What has FairPoint done to resolve the business billing issues on a going forward
2		basis?
3	A.	Our initial task was to identify and fix the system issues that were causing multiple-
4		location customers to receive inaccurate bills. Thus, for example, FairPoint determined
5		that a leading cause of the inaccuracies arose from the fact that the individual-location
6		and summary bills were being generated on different dates, and we developed a solution
7		to synchronize the data contained on the bills.
8		
9		These changes resolved the larger issues on multiple-location accounts, but we recognize
10		that other issues exist and have processes and initiatives in place to resolve billing issues
11		on a going-forward basis. Business Customer Operations has developed the following
12		process for identification and resolution of billing defects.
13		
14		Billing errors are reported to the Business Customer Operations group through a variety
15		of sources, including call center customer service representatives, specialists, account
16		teams and directly from customers. The billing issues are investigated by Business
17		Customer Operations, and if they cannot be resolved through order issuance, they are
18		reported to the billing department for further system investigations. The billing
19		department either determines a fix itself or refers the issue to the IT department for a
20		defect development fix. The IT department next determines the system course of action
21		and provides an estimated Planned Fix Date (or "PFD"). Once testing has been
22		completed in a test environment, the fix will be deployed by the IT department in the next

available deployment window. Business Customer Operations confirms that the fix has been successfully deployed. It also takes the appropriate customer follow-up actions to issue credits or adjustments as necessary if credits are not issued on a generic basis to a class of customers.

FairPoint maintains on-going monitoring of defects in this area as well. As with retail customers, FairPoint has a process in place to review a sampling of business bills for errors in each billing cycle. In addition, the Business Customer Operations group has twice-weekly meetings with the billing department, to track billing-related issues, review the business department's "Top Ten List" of defects and continue to set priorities on fixes. All defects are logged into FairPoint's Remedy database and tracked by the billing and IT departments.

FairPoint put in place a separate Business Reconciliation Team to reconcile business customer bills. The team initially reviewed 3,250 business customer bills in an effort to reconcile all past bills and to identify any root causes for errors that could be addressed on a generic, going-forward basis. The review work of this team was completed at the end of October 2009. In connection with this process, FairPoint has been meeting with business customers to resolve past billing issues and identify any current billing issues.

As I mentioned previously, FairPoint is pursuing intermediate and long term data synchronization, systems and process solutions through the work of the Billing and

Revenue Assurance group as well as through the work of Ms. Weatherwax's Project Management Organization to implement Accenture's recommendations as part of the CDIP Program. These initiatives should also provide benefits to business customers in terms of the quality and accuracy of bills.

A.

Q. Please describe what FairPoint has done to address billing issues with its wholesale customers?

We have put in place a Wholesale Billing Team, which is specifically dedicated to CLEC billing issues and is available to CLEC customers to address any questions or inquiries. The Wholesale Billing Team has developed and begun operating bill quality audits using the MDA software program to verify the accuracy of underlying service parameters, component charges and overall customer invoicing. For example, a recently completed mileage audit performed against Special Access circuits identified over-and under-billing conditions, all of which were subsequently corrected in our system, and on the customer monthly charges, with back credits appropriately adjusted. The Wholesale Billing Team also conducts twice-weekly meetings with the wholesale customer call centers to identify and track systems issues and maintains ongoing lists of defects affecting bill quality for remediation by the IT department. In addition, FairPoint has undertaken a wholesale billing initiative, which includes intermediate term projects reviewing contract and tariff plans, cancellation charges on ASR service requests and other issues.

1	Q.	On February 23, 2010, FairPoint filed a Form 8-K with the United States Securities
2		and Exchange Commission that reported certain billing adjustment information
3		transfer deficiencies between FairPoint's billing platform and the general ledger.
4		How does this recent development affect your testimony regarding FairPoint's
5		billing issues?
6	A.	It is difficult to say until FairPoint concludes its analysis of the information transfer
7		deficiencies reported in the Form 8-K. However, while this subject is covered more
8		fully in Mr. Giammarino's testimony, it is safe to say that the initiatives I have described
9		above will be informed by this analysis. To the extent that the analysis reveals the need
10		to revise the information I have presented in my testimony, I will provide supplemental
11		information. I should also emphasize that, as Mr. Giammarino states in his testimony,
12		FairPoint does not expect that the error and the adjustments reported in the Form 8-K will
13		have a significant impact on customer accounts.
14		
15	<u>Broa</u>	dband
16	Q.	Can you provide an update on FairPoint's broadband plans in the three states?
17	A.	FairPoint undertook obligations in the merger approval process for a major broadband
18		build-out in the three Northern New England states. However, broadband is not merely a
19		regulatory requirement, it is the future of the company. Since the acquisition of the NNE
20		assets, FairPoint has committed significant operational, financial and managerial
21		resources to its broadband efforts.

While the legacy ATM network purchased from Verizon has offered broadband expansion opportunities in some locations in the Northern New England territory (and FairPoint has pursued those opportunities where available), FairPoint's primary focus has been on the engineering, design, construction and deployment of its "next generation network" ("NGN") called "VantagePoint." VantagePoint is FairPoint's network of tomorrow. In the near term, VantagePoint will offer broadband speeds of up to 15 MB/second, compared to maximum speeds of 7 MB/second with the existing ATM network. The VantagePoint NGN will provide bandwidth that can support an array of new products, such as IPTV, fiber to the home and other advanced services. It will also be designed to be scalable, providing the capability for bandwidth to be increased quickly to provide products and services to meet future business and residential customer demands.

The VantagePoint NGN is a carrier class Internet protocol/multi-protocol label switching ("IP/MPLS") broadband network with Ethernet transport that features a layered and ringed architecture that can be conceptualized as a series of layers. The first is a dense wave division multiplexing ("DWDM") transport mesh network layer capable of transporting forty 10-gigabit light path circuits over a pair of fibers. The second layer is the multi-layer switching network. At the network center is the core switching fabric comprised of six core routers, two in each of the Northern New England states. Each of the edge routers are diversely homed to the two core routers within a state. Ten-gigabit aggregation rings radiate from each edge router location to link surrounding central

offices. Radiating from each central office will be one-gigabit subtended access rings 1 terminating in remote terminals. This structure then provides broadband access from 2 3 central offices or remote terminals to customers. Initial roll-out will reach areas previously unequipped for broadband services. 4 5 Completion of this network will entail the construction of 85 inter-office fiber spans, 6 consisting of approximately 875 miles of new fiber. A map of the three states showing 7 the core transport network is attached to this testimony as Confidential Exhibit JA-5. 8 9 While construction of the core network is time consuming and expensive, the benefits to customers are not realized until the transport network is done, central offices and remotes 10 are equipped and service is available to customers. As we come into 2010 and 2011, 11 customers will start to see availability of service from the NGN. A summary of the 12 current status of the broadband build-out in New Hampshire is attached as Confidential 13 14 Exhibit JA-6 (Confidential). 15 Please summarize the provisions with respect to broadband under the NH 2008 16 Q. 17 Settlement. In the NH 2008 Settlement, FairPoint agreed to achieve broadband availability for 75% 18 A. of its access lines within 18 months following the closing (October 1, 2009), 85% within 19 24 months following the closing (April 1, 2010) and 95% within 60 months following the 20 21 closing (April 1, 2013).

1	Q.	How does FairPoint's Regulatory Settlement with the Staff Advocates of the New
2		Hampshire Public Utilities Commission propose to alter what you have described?
3	A.	In the Regulatory Settlement, FairPoint has agreed to adhere to these broadband coverage
4		commitments with the exception that the 85% coverage deadline would be extended to
5		December 31, 2010. FairPoint has confirmed its commitment to spend a total of at least
6		\$56.4 million on its New Hampshire broadband build-out. FairPoint will have the option
7		to resell terrestrial (non-satellite) based service providers' broadband service offerings in
8		order to fulfill FairPoint's broadband build out and/or service requirements with respect
9		to the last eight percent (8%) of FairPoint's broadband availability requirements as
10		contained within the NH 2008 Settlement, provided that the services meet or exceed all
11		requirements of the NH 2008 Order, and the resold services are purchased through and
12		serviced by FairPoint.
13		
14		The Regulatory Settlement provides that pricing restrictions regarding stand-alone DSL
15		service will terminate on April 1, 2011; provided, however, that FairPoint will continue
16		to honor the "for life" pricing that Verizon had offered to certain customers.
17		
18		Under the Regulatory Settlement, the provisions regarding application of penalty
19		payments would be amended such that the first \$500,000 of any penalty amounts
20		resulting from any failure to meet broadband commitments will be paid to the New
21		Hampshire Telecommunications Planning and Development Fund. Any penalties above

DT 10-025 Prefiled Testimony of Jeffrey W. Allen February 24, 2010 Page 26 of 26

1		\$500,000 will be invested within three years of the date of the penalty as additional
2		expenditures for FairPoint's network.
3		
4		FairPoint made significant broadband commitments in connection with the acquisition of
5		the Verizon properties. The benefits of those commitments are preserved in the
6		Regulatory Settlement. In addition, FairPoint will continue to look for other
7		opportunities, including partnerships in both the public and private sectors, to provide
8		even further broadband benefits.
9		
10	Q.	Does this conclude your testimony?
11	A.	Yes.

JEFFREY W. ALLEN

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

- Innovative senior executive with broad ranging sales, management, and service expertise in the telecommunications industry.
- High energy, solutions oriented, and experienced in creating and implementing sales initiatives and strategic marketing plans to achieve corporate objectives.
- Honest, hard working, and quick to learn the structure of an organization, with demonstrated proficiencies in raising capital, generating revenue, growing market share, and improving profitability.
- Versatile leader with proven experience in identifying and grooming personnel for key positions within a sales and service organization.
- Articulate, resourceful, and successful in building relationships in a corporate setting.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

FAIRPOINT COMMUNICATIONS, INC., Portland ME

June 2007 - Present

Executive VP Northern New England Operations

- Lead the Northern New England Business for FairPoint.
- Responsibilities include, Sales, Engineering and Operations, IT, Reporting and Metrics, Customer Operations, Billing and Customer Service.

Accomplishments:

- Reorganized organization to achieve success.
- Substantially improved virtually all performance metrics.

Executive VP External Relations

 Responsible for Government Relations, Economic Development and Community Relations for FairPoint nationwide.

Accomplishments:

- Established a strong link with state government to jointly roll out economic development programs such as Mobilize Maine in the state of Maine.
- Established a comprehensive program of Community Giving throughout Northern New England.

Assistant VP Customer Operations

 Responsible for establishing and running the customer operation organization in NNE for the Business and Wholesale units.

Accomplishments:

- Defined customer operations organization and staffed with professional leaders.
- Initiated the processes and procedures necessary to run the business.

DATAPATH, INC., Nashua, NH

December 2005-June 2007

)

General Manager Wireless

- Manage daily operations of the newly acquired Wireless division for a satellite communications company.
- Played a key role in the sale, transition, and integration of Third Rail Americas, Inc. into the Datapath organization.
- Identified potential new markets and worked with sales executives and engineers to expand and modify Datapath's product and service offerings.
- Determined staffing needs, interviewed and hired personnel for general and engineering staff, assembled functional teams, and developed reporting systems during the first several months of operation.

Accomplishments:

- Recognized for securing the first wireless revenue stream for the company in less than 12 months of service.
- Sold and delivered the first production orders for a military robotics program and a Homeland Security network sale.

THIRD RAIL AMERICAS, INC., Nashua, NH

January 2005-December 2005

Chief Executive Officer

- Directed the operational strategies of the organization and secured the necessary capital for the company to thrive.
- Established profitable business relationships with four large partners and closed several substantial government contracts.
- Defined specific markets and transformed Third Rail's products and services into marketable offerings to serve client needs.

Accomplishments:

- Successfully promoted and sold the company to Datapath at a market premium.

INTELLISPACE, INC., New York, NY

April 2000-June 2004

President / CEO / Chairman of the Board

- Created and directed the implementation of daily efforts related to the overall strategy of the organization. Accomplishments:

- Increased annual revenue \$15MM, gross profit \$23MM, and EBITDA \$43MM.
- Raised \$100MM from the venture capitalist marketplace.
- Reduced monthly cash burn from \$5MM to \$500K.
- Expanded the number of customers four fold to 4,000 business clients.

Chief Operating Officer

- Transformed a start-up organization into an industry leader and directed all daily operations of the firm.
- Represented the firm in the media, including appearances on CNNfn, ABC News, and WOR radio.

Accomplishments:

- Successfully opened up the New England, Mid Atlantic, Mid West, and UK markets.

CONECTIV CORPORATION, Wilmington, DE

July 1997-January 2000

Corporate Vice President / General Manager Conectiv Communications

- Initiated and managed the Conectiv Communications subsidiary serving primarily business clients, with total executive responsibility for all functional areas.
- Assembled, trained, and coached a team of 350 telecom professionals and installed 75,000 access line equivalents. Accomplishments:
- Achieved a \$50 million revenue runrate in two years.
- Received an enterprise valuation of \$450 million by CSFB and Merrill Lynch.

INTERMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., Tampa, FL

January 1997-July 1997

Vice President - Alternate Channels Sales

- Directed global sales through the agent, partner, and wholesale channels and reorganized all non-direct sales functions into one cohesive unit.

Accomplishments:

- Closed a significant wholesale frame relay contract with Bell Atlantic.

FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS, Rochester, NY

1992-1996

President - Frontier Communications of Rochester (August 1995- December 1996)

- Managed the operations of deregulated business in the Rochester, NY market.
- Designed and implemented strategies to increase revenues and market share in an open market environment.
- Developed a business plan and implemented corporate strategies to provide integrated telecommunications services to the market.

Vice President of Sales - Integrated Services (August 1995-December 1996)

- Managed a direct sales organization offering bundled total telecommunications solutions to business customers in nine states and generating \$500 million in revenues.
- Integrated the sales organizations from five acquired companies into one cohesive team.

Accomplishments:

- Developed a top producing direct sales team and achieved twice the company average in revenue per sales rep.
- Reduced customer attrition to less than 2%.

Jeffrey W. Allen - Page 3

President - Eastern Region (March 1995-August 1995)

- Managed sales, customer relations, and credit/collections efforts for the East Coast and upper mid-west states. Accomplishments:
- Increased sales productivity by 57.3%, decreased business customer attrition to 1.63%, and reduced bad debt to 1.27%.

President - New England Region (August 1993-March 1995)

- Directed a separate business entity with total executive responsibility for Sales and Operations, including Human Resources, Information Systems, Marketing, Customer Service, and Regulatory.
- Managed the upgrade of main switch without service interruptions to customers.
- Developed a positive regulatory environment in all markets served.

Accomplishments:

- Increased profitability by over 50% and maintained the highest sales productivity in the corporation.

Vice President - Metro Sales, RCI (January 1992-August 1993)

- Managed six branch offices selling long distance service in major metropolitan markets in the Northeast.
- Developed professional sales teams in each branch office and established a sales agent distribution channel. Accomplishments:
- Increased the average sale by 225% through targeting of larger customers and using consultative sales techniques.
- Grew average monthly revenue by 700% with only a 10% increase in head count.

MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION

1989-1992

Senior Branch Manager, Boston, MA (1990-1992)

- Managed sales and customer service operations in the Boston market, with profit/loss accountability. Accomplishments:
- Improved sales from 50% of quota to 134.5% of quota in 12 months and dramatically reduced employee turnover.
- Achieved top profit contribution in the division for 1991.

Branch Manager, Rochester/Syracuse, NY (1989-1990)

Accomplishments:

Attained #1 Branch in the Division (1990) and #1 in Sales Nationally for Vision Product Sales (1990).

ACCEL SYSTEMS, INC., Rochester, NY

1985-1988

Executive Vice President / Owner

- Operated an office equipment dealership with oversight of Sales, Service, and Administration.

Accomplishments:

- Secured over \$1 million in capital to fund a company expansion.
- Built revenues from \$600K per year to \$3 million per year.

RAYTHEON DATA SYSTEMS, Norwood, MA

1983-1985

North American Sales Manager - Distributor Operations

- Directed activities of 19 distributors selling data equipment in the U.S. and Canada.

IBM CORPORATION, Rochester, NY & Boston, MA

1977-1983

Regional Account Representative/Account Representative - National Accounts Division

EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, Graduate School of Business, Ann Arbor, MI

1996

Executive Program Certificate

- Intensive one month program for senior executives covering Strategic Planning, Finance, Human Resources, Marketing, and Information Systems.

UPSALA COLLEGE, East Orange, NJ **B.S. Degree in Business Administration**

1977

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Member, Council on Foreign Relations Board Member, PENJERDEL Council Board Member, Highland Hospital Vermont Business Round Table 2001-2005 1999-2000 1996-1997 1993-1995 2007-Present

REFERENCES

References are available upon request.



Kevin M. Shea Vice President Government Relations NH 900 Elm Street, Suite 1922 Manchester, NH 03101 603-641-1667

January 20, 2010

Kathryn M. Bailey, PE
Telecommunications Division Director
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission
21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

- RECEIPT -

Dear Kate:

In accordance with the Commission's Electronic Report Filing (ERF) program, FairPoint Communications - NNE has electronically filed the Quality of Service report for December 2009 and is also filling the attached paper copy.

Below are changes that FairPoint will be making to the SQI metric as discussed in our meeting with the Commission Staff on December 4, 2009.

Metrics 1-7

- Metric 1, we will measure the average time to install for POTS dial tone, premise.
- Metric 2, we will measure the average time to install for POTS dial tone, Mechanized.
- Metric 3, we will measure the average time to install for POTS dial tone, combined premise and mechanized.
- Metric 6, we will measure the average time to install for DSL, combined premise and mechanized.
- Metric 4 & 5 will not be reported as discussed during the meeting, it does not make sense to try and break out DSL into premise and mechanized.
- Metric 7, we will continue to measure % Met commitment for POTS, combined premise and mechanized. Restatement: will be done for Feb – Oct 2009 months in the February – March time frame, see Note 1 below.

The average time to install will be measured as the times from order creation to completion of the installation work, with the order create date counted as day 0.

The % met commitment will be measure as the committed date (due date) vs. the completion of the installation work.

We expect to be able to start reporting metrics 1,2,3 and 6 for the February data month. The first time that they will be reported will be when the February SQI report is released in March. We will be able to restate and report the Jan metrics when the restatement process is complete – in the Feb-Mar time frame.

Metric 8

Metric 8, % Installation Appointments Met w/in 30 days.

The data as reported in 2009 has no value. The create date that was being used as the starting point of the day count is not valid.

Restatement: Results will be good for December. No restatement of prior months for this metric, due to a new data field being sourced.

Metric 13, 25, & 26

- Metric 13, Customer trouble report rate per 100 lines Network
- Metric 25, Repeat Trouble Report
- Metric 26, Access Lines in Service.

Results adjusted, see note 1 below.

ISSUE WITH CURRENT MONTH DENOMINATOR - NOV 09

Restatement: Feb – Nov will be done in the Feb – Mar time frame.

Metric 14

Metric 14, % OOS Troubles cleared w/in 24 hours (excluding Sundays)

Results adjusted, see note 1 below.

November data uses the correct logic for identifying the out of service logic. There is still an issue with understanding the Cleared Time of the tickets.

Restatement: With corrected Cleared Time logic, the results for December will be correct. This metric will be restated for May, July & August.

Metric 18, 19, 20 & 27

- Metric 18, Held Orders Average Delay Days.
- Metric 19, Total Held Orders on Hand Month End.
- Metric 20, Average Delay days for Installation of Service.
- Metric 27, Held Orders Over 30 Days Due to Facilities Reasons.

Results adjusted, see note 1 below.

There is a known code issue for these metrics that is expected to be corrected at the end of December. Restatement: With corrected logic, the results

FairPoint reserves its right to argue that the proceedings requiring this report are stayed or should be stayed and to seek appropriate relief with the Bankruptcy Court.

Please call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Attachments

Meredith Hatfield cc:

win In Shew

Peter Nixon Janet Brack

Karen Mead

Michael Morrissey

Brian Lippold

		AVG	-																																					97		98	1.	4,		26	
		DEC																																					98	6	97	86	92	44		26	
		NOV																																					98	97	86	88	84	્		27	
		OCT																																					86	97	66	88	333	7/		28	
		SEP																													1	-							97	97	88	86	4 79	2		30	
New Hampshire SQI Results		AUG														_					_							-			-							-	97	97	97	88	25	B	ļ	34	
New Hampshire SQI Results	r 2009	1010								-			-	1	-					-	-			-								-			-				-			+	74	╀		32	
ıpshire	ě	NON								+				+	-					1															_	-		-	+		+	+	8/ 1/8	+		33	
эм Нап										+		-	-	+	-						-		-					-			1	+	-		+						+	+	7 (5	-	-	7 35	
Ž	ļ	MAR APR								-				-	_													-							-				-		+	+	63 63	+	-	37 37	
		FEB MA					+			+											-														-						+	-	45	+	\vdash	28	
		JAN									-			+							+			-						+		-			+				+	Н	+	+	8 8	÷		2	
		1		YTD	2009	TBD	2002	YTD	2008	2002	E F	TBD	2002	/ATY	2008	QLX.	2009	YTD	TBD	7000	XTD X	2008	QLX S	5003	TBD	-000) (T) X	2008	YTD	2009	VID CRIT	2	2007	YTD	8007 CEX	2009	YTD	TBD	2002	TTD	2008	A S	ATD A	06		10	
		DOT. Drawica lastallation	% Appointments Met			Baseline	DOTE Mechanizad Inchallation	% Appointments Met	and the second s	And the state of t		Baseline	DOTe Combined Installation	% Appointments Met					Baseline	A DOI December 1 Define 197 Authority	4 DSC Plenilise installation - 76 Aprilise % Appointments Met				Basline		% Appointments Met				Baseline		6 DSL Combined Installation	% Appointments Met				Baseline	7 % Installation Services Orders	Met Commitment	- p de maliferações de la compansa d			Baseline		Baseline - Penalty Calculation	

	2	_	0	0	_ >	0	0	-	0	0	 o	0	0	
Met - w/in 30 days	YTD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
, ,	2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	QL,	-	c	C	С	c	0	-	-			0	0	c
	2009	n/a	0	53	75	92	63	69	70	77	84	84	100	,
A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	YTD	n/a	0	27	\$3	51	54	56	58	19	63	65	89	89
Baseline	95													
1 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1		1												
Baseline - Penalty Calculation	2	n/a	9	73	57	49	46	44	45	88	37	35	32	32
o Toll and Local Assistance	2007	97	96	94	96	94	95	95	94	96	94	94	95	
Operator Calls answered within	άτγ	97	97	96	96	95	95	95	92	95	95	95	95	95
10 seconds	2008	97	97	92	88	86	97	96	97	88	66	88	96	
	λī	97	97	96	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
	5009	97	93	95	96	92	06	91	92	93	94	96	95	
-	YTD	97	95	95	95	95	94	93	93	93	93	94	98	94
Baseline	06													
	-	1						1						
Baseline - Penalty Calculation	10	3	2	D.	2	2	9	_	7	_	7	9	9	9
10 % Directory Assistance and Intercept	2007	93	94	06	91	06	88	92	96	95	95	95	8	
Calls answered within	YTD	93	94	92	92	92	16	16	92	92	92	. 93	93	93
10 seconds	2008	92	93	95	96	86	86	97	9	9	19	100	6	
	YTD	92	93	93	94	95	95	96	98	97	97	97	97	97
	2009	100	82	92	95	91	98	85	88	06	93	93	91	
	YTD	100	91	91	92	91	91	90	8	8	8	6	8	06
Baseline	85													
Beceline - Denethy Calculation	42	c	c	c	٥		6	0,	,	ç	Ş	1	,	,
Cascinia - Charly Calculation	2		n .	n		0	n	2	2	2	2	2		01
11 % Repair Service Calls answered within	2007	86	87	88	85	86	86	86	87	87	86	06	68	
20 seconds	Ę	98	87	87	87	88	98	86	86	98	86	87	87	87
	2008	88	87	88	93	92	85	88	85	94	92	91	57	
	Y	88	88	88	89	90	68	88	87	88	88	88	98	86
	2009	81	25	30	56	31	51	30	88	91	96	93	93	
	YTD	81	53	45	41	33	41	39	43	48	53	57	8	09
Baseline	85													
Baseline - Penalty Calculation	15	19	47	55	29	9.	59	6	57	52	47	2	Q.	40
									5	3		2	?	7
12 % Business Office and Other Calls	2007	75	75	76	74	68	65	65	72	29	62	65	58	
Answered within 20 seconds	<u>Q</u>	75	75	75	75	74	72	71	71	7.1	20	69	69	69
	2008	62	74	99	26	49	69	75	93	98	88	7.7	75	
	E	62	88	67	65	61	63	64	89	22	72	72	73	73
	2009	87	55	16	45	72	72	73	84	77	85	85	94	
	YTD	87	71	53	51	55	28	09	83	65	29	88	۶	102
Baseline	77													
in land and and and	- 6	Ş	6	!										
Daseille - Penalty Calculation	73	2	53	4/	46	45	42	40	37	35	33	32	30	30

1.05	Year Year 1489 1411 148		7007	1.47	0.7	9	3		2				-			
YTD USS	CAUCHO C	00 lines-Network	22.5	1.47	1.09		1.46	1.48	1.52	1.56	1.55	1.52	1.52	1.47	1.42	1.42
100 100 110 111	2000 1500 1512 1		2002	0.83	1.38		3.5	1.93	8.	/S	28.5	35.	1.28	1:1	3.34	
125	Year		7 000	000	21.1	:	60.	3.5	46.14	97.7	55	55.1	1.32	1.30	1.47	1.47
1.15 1.50 1.15	1,10 1,20 1,12 1,12 1,12 1,12 1,13 1,24		2008	00,	40,0	2 5	- (21.1	1.40	9.	08.	2 3	7.7.	98.5	1.16	
2007 68	2007 68 63 70 46 69 65 66 66 66 67 66 67 67 77 77 2007 66 66 66 66 66 66 66 66 67 77 77 68 77 68 77 77 77 77 77 77 77 77 77		125	8	71.	7 -	71.	71	9	1.24	1.51	RZ-L	1.29	1.26	1.25	1.25
2007 68 83 70 48 60 67 2008 66 70 80 86 85 77 2008 66 70 80 86 85 77 710 66 66 72 76 77 77 80 84 89 90 92 710 62 80 84 89 90 92 710 62 80 84 89 90 92 710 62 80 84 89 87 78 710 77 86 77 77 78 711 77 86 77 77 78 712 77 82 80 77 77 78 712 77 82 80 77 77 78 713 81 80 82 84 85 85 85 85 85 85 86 87 88 87 87 710 77 86 87 81 85 85 87 88 77 86 89 88 87 710 77 86 46 39 35 32 711 77 44 54 61 65 88 87 70 100 100 100 100 100 710 100 100 100 100 100 100 711 100 100 100 100 100 100 712 100 100 100 100 100 100 713 714 715 716 716 716 716 714 715 716 716 716 716 716 715 716 716 716 716 716 716 716 717 718 718 718 718 718 718 717 718 719 710 710 710 710 710 718 719 710 710 710 710 710 710 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718 718	2007 66 6		2	1										+		
YTD 68 76 74 67 66 66	YYIO 665 766 766 766 766 766 766 766 767 767 775	oubles cleared within	2007	88	83	22	48	09	29	65	69	69	73	76	79	
2008 66 70 80 86 85 77 77 YTD 65 68 94 98 70 77 77 YTD 62 80 84 88 90 92 NTD 62 80 84 88 90 92 80 38 20 16 12 10 8 1 2007 77 86 77 68 87 81 2008 81 77 69 76 81 85 88 2008 81 77 69 77 77 78 2008 81 77 69 76 86 88 88 87 2008 81 82 89 88 88 87 86 88 88 88 2008 81 77 61 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	YOOR 66 70 80 66 77 76 70 7	excluding Sunday)	YTD	88	92	74	29	99	99	99	99	67	67	, g	69	9
YTD 66 68 72 76 77 77 77 Solution 62 98 94 99 100 99 Solution 61 98 94 99 100 99 Solution 77 86 77 69 77 78 Solution 77 86 77 69 76 81 Solution 77 82 80 77 77 78 Solution 77 82 80 82 84 85 85 YTD 81 80 82 84 85 85 YTD 77 44 54 61 65 68 Solution 77 44 54 61 65 68 Solution 77 44 54 61 65 68 Solution 77 44 54 61 65 68 YTD 100 100 100 100 100 100 YTD 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	2007 6.6 6.8 7.2 7.6 7.7 8.6 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.8 8.7 8.8 8.8 <td></td> <td>2008</td> <td>99</td> <td>2</td> <td>8</td> <td>98</td> <td>85</td> <td>1</td> <td>85</td> <td>6</td> <td>14</td> <td>7.4</td> <td>70</td> <td>30</td> <td>3</td>		2008	99	2	8	98	85	1	85	6	14	7.4	70	30	3
1000 100	2003 62		Y.	99	ä	7.5	76	77	-	7,6	1/2	1	12	24	152	123
The color of the	Year		2000	3 6	8 8	10	2 8		9	2 5	2 5	10	1,12	2 5	2/2	7,
10	100 22 38 20 54 56 56 56 57 56 57 56 57 57		2 2	3 6	3 6		3 6	3 8	3 8	3 2	3		2 8		9 (.
n 20 38 20 16 12 10 8 2007 77 86 77 69 76 81 2008 81 77 69 76 81 2008 81 86 89 88 87 2008 81 77 74 77 78 2008 81 86 89 88 87 2008 81 86 89 88 87 2009 81 86 89 88 87 2009 81 86 89 88 87 2009 81 80 89 88 87 81 77 44 54 61 65 68 88 82 86 89 88 88 88 88 88 81 82 86 89 88 88 89 89 81	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10			70	3	\$	8	OS.	35	3	42	35	S	88	88	88
n 20 38 20 16 12 10 8 2007 77 86 77 77 78 77 78 87 77 78 87 77 78 87 77 78 87 87 77 78 87 </td <td> 2007 77 86 77 69 76 81 81 81 79 81 86 77 78 81 81 81 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 7</td> <td></td> <td>00</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td> </td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>+</td> <td></td>	2007 77 86 77 69 76 81 81 81 79 81 86 77 78 81 81 81 79 79 79 79 79 79 79 7		00	1						1		1		1	+	
2007 77 86 77 69 76 81 81 82 80 77 77 86 77 69 76 81 81 81 82 82 84 85 85 82 82 84 85 85 82 82 84 85 85 82 83 82 82 83 82 83 82 83 82 83 82 83 82 83 83	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	in Benefit Colonia	C	00	6	4	ç	,		,		,	,		,	
2007 77 86 77 69 76 81	2007 77 86 77 69 76 81 81 87 89 81 87 89 8	mie - renauy Carculation	77	၀	3	٥	21	2		1		×	2		72	12
YTD 77 82 80 77 77 78	YVID 77 82 80 77 77 76 76 73 77 76 76 78 79 7	Commitments Met	2007	17	98	11	69	76	84	. W	٤	ğ	ă	ä	eg G	
2008 81 79 86 89 88 87 YTD 81 86 89 88 87 87 YTD 81 80 82 84 85 85 8 YTD 10 75 81 85 85 8 85 87 81 85 85 85 8 85 87 87 86 86 85 85 8 85 87 87 81 85 85 88 85 85 88 85 85 88 85 85 88 85 85 88 88 85 85 88 88 85 85 88 85 88 85 88 85 88	2008 61 75 86 89 89 87 82 80 85 85 84 85 85 84 85 85 84 84 85 85 84 84 85 85 84 84 87 8		XTD	77	8	2	12	1	78	, g	2	2	2	3 8	8 8	00
YTD 81 80 82 84 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85 85	Year		SOUG	ă	2 2	3 8	g	88	2,6	2 6	2 6	20	200	6,0	8 8	6
10	2009 77 64 64 65 64 65 65 65 65		2002	5 5	2 6	3 8	60	8 8	٥١٥	70	8 2	8 3	8 3	à	70	
YTO 77 44 54 61 65 68 68 68 68 68 68 68	17.00 17.0			101	3 5	76	5 6	8 8	3 5	6 8	40	40 5	45	84	83	83
TID 1/7 444 594 619 658 688	15 17 44 54 54 61 65 68 71 72 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 76 77 74 75 74 76 77 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 75 74 74		SOO3	=	2 :	0 :	5 0	3 3	78	8	g	6	88	91	88	
Name	15 23 56 46 39 35 32 29 28 26 24 23 2007 100 1		ڪا ڏ	1	4	54	وا	3	89	1	72	74	26	11	28	78
n 15 23 56 46 39 35 32 n 2007 100 100 100 100 100 100 YTD 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 2008 n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 100 100 100 YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a 100 100 100 YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a 100 100 100 YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 100 100 100 YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 100 100 100 YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a g.7.3 g.7.3 g.00 YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a g.7.3 g.7.3 g.00 YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a </td <td> The color of the</td> <td></td> <td>82</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td> </td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	The color of the		82													
Name	2007 100	line - Penalty Calculation	1,1	33	25	45	30	35	33	000	ac	90			5	8
2007 100	The contract of the contract		2	3	3	2	3	3	35	62	9	8	47	3	77	777
YTD 100	YTD 100	e Speed within 3 seconds	2007	100	100	100	100	189	9	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Penalty Calculation 2008 100	VTD 100		YTD	100	100	100	100	8	8	100	100	8	Ę	190	100	100
YTD 100	YTD 100		2008	100	9	100	100	6	100	100	100	8	100	139	100	
2009 n/a n/a n/a 100 100 100 9B n/a n/a n/a 100 100 100 100 9B n/a n/a n/a n/a 0 0 0 0 10n 2007 100	2008 n/a n/a n/a n/a 100		YTD	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	9	901	100	8	100	100
Penalty Calculation 2007 n/a n/a n/a n/a 100	YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a 100		2009	n/a	п/а	n/a	100	100	100	198	100	5	18	8	100	
Penalty Calculation 2 n/a n/a n/a 0 0 0 0 On	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10		YTD	n/a	e/u	n/a	100	100	100	100	100	9	100	100	100	100
Penalty Calculation 2 n/a n/a n/a 0 0 0 0	Section Color Co		86													
Incomplete	2007 100			Ť	-	1		,								
ion 2007 160 100 <td> YTD 100</td> <td>sime - Penany Calculation</td> <td>7</td> <td>o/a</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>n/a</td> <td></td> <td>></td> <td>5</td> <td>-</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0</td>	YTD 100	sime - Penany Calculation	7	o/a	n/a	n/a		>	5	-	0	0	0			0
Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.23 98.00 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.23 98.00 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.89 97.79 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.89 97.79 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 6.67 5.53 6.02 Delay Days 7TD 12.40 10.10 10.21 8.75 8.56 8.14 YTD 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 YTD 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 YTD 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 YTD 141 19 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 Secondary Sec	YTD 100 <td>moletion</td> <td>2007</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> <td>18</td> <td>100</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>9</td> <td>5</td> <td>00,</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> <td></td>	moletion	2007	100	100	100	18	100	5	5	9	5	00,	100		
Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.23 98.00 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.68 97.79 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.68 97.79 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 2 2 2 Delay Days 7TD 12.40 7.79 10.43 6.67 5.53 6.02 Delay Days 7TD 12.40 7.79 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 YTD 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 YTD n/a 2.73 4.74 7.99 14.60 0.00 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 YTD 41 19 22 26 26 SECONDARY ATT 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	2008 100		2	100	100	901	8 8	2	100	3 5	36	3 5	35	3 5	200	400
Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.23 98.00 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.68 97.79 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.68 97.79 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 2 2 2 2007 12.40 7.79 10.43 6.67 5.53 6.02 2008 8.78 8.36 13.66 4.05 8.14 YTD 12.40 10.10 10.21 9.32 8.56 8.14 YTD 8.78 8.36 13.66 4.05 8.07 9.54 YTD n/a 2.73 4.74 7.99 14.60 0.00 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 T.18 19 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 26 26 2008 17 15 12 14 11 14	YTD 100		2008	100	9	100	Ę	100	38	2 2	36	3 5	36	3 5	3 5	200
Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.23 98.00 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.69 97.79 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 2 2 2 2 2 Delay Days 7TD 12.40 10.10 10.21 9.32 8.56 8.14 YTD 12.40 10.10 10.21 9.32 8.56 8.14 YTD 8.78 8.36 10.27 8.74 5.53 6.02 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 YTD 12.40 11.40 12.47 12.49 14.60 0.00 YTD 12.40 14.74 19 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 YTD 12.40 14.10 2.00 14.10 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	YTD n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.23 98.00 97.70 97.50 98.00 99.000 99.000 99.000 99.000 99.000 99.000 99.0000 99.0000 99.0000 99.00000 99.0000000000		Z	9	100	90	100	100	100	2 5	3 5	2 2	38	3 5	3 5	5
Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.68 97.79 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 2 2 2 2 2 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 2 2 2 2 2 Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 6.67 5.53 6.02 Pelay Days YTD 12.40 7.79 10.43 6.67 5.53 6.02 Z008 8.78 8.36 13.66 4.05 8.07 9.54 YTD 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 T.18 7.18 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 YTD 41 19 22 18 30 24 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 Z008 17 15 12 14 11 14	YTD n/a n/a n/a n/a 98.13 97.68 97.79 97.77 97.71 98.09 98.08 98.07		2009	n/a	n/a	n/a	98 13	97 23	98.00	07 70	07 50	100 00	200	200	200	3
Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	97 17 17 17 17 17 17 17		YTD.	2/2	6/0	2/2	08 13	07.58	07 70	77 70	27.70	0.00	20.00	30.00	08.78	
Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Second S		97			3	2	200	2			30.03	30.00	30.07	20.02	200
Penalty Calculation 3 n/a n/a n/a 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	slculation 3 n/a n/a n/a n/a 1/a 2														†	
Delay Days 2007 12.40 7.79 10.43 6.67 5.53 6.02 Delay Days YTD 12.40 10.10 10.21 9.32 8.56 8.14 2008 8.78 8.36 13.66 4.05 8.74 8.74 2009 n/a 2.73 4.74 7.99 14.60 0.00 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 7.18 7.18 7.18 7.52 6.01 7.71 ATD 41 19 22 18 30 24 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 YTD 41 15 12 14 11 14	2007 12.40 7.79 10.43 6.67 5.53 6.02 3.83 5.54 13.18 6.15 10.00 YTD 12.40 10.10 10.21 9.32 8.56 8.14 7.52 7.28 7.33 7.75 7.96 2008 8.78 8.36 4.05 8.07 9.54 5.80 8.13 8.75 7.96 YTD 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 8.32 8.13 8.55 8.51 8.66 2009 n/a 2.73 4.74 7.39 14.60 0.00 0.00 0.00 26.10 24.25 8.07 8.94 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 5.01 5.01 4.29 7.02 8.93 10.11 YTD n/a 2.73 3.74 5.15 6.01 5.01 4.29 7.02 8.93 10.11 2007 41 19 2.2 18 <td< td=""><td>eline - Penalty Calculation</td><td>3</td><td>n/a</td><td>n/a</td><td>n/a</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td></td<>	eline - Penalty Calculation	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Delay Days YTD 12.40	VTD 12.40 7.79 10.43 5.67 5.53 6.02 3.83 5.54 13.18 6.15 10.00 2008 8.78 10.27 8.71 8.56 8.14 7.52 7.28 7.75 7.96 VTD 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 8.32 8.13 8.55 8.13 8.55 8.13 VTD 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.58 8.74 8.32 8.13 8.55 8.51 8.32 VTD n/a 2.73 4.74 7.99 14.60 0.00 0.00 0.00 26.10 24.25 20.70 VTD T 18 2.73 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 5.01 4.29 7.02 8.93 10.11 VTD 41 19 22 18 30 24 19 37 29 25 32 VTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 25 26 27 26 27 VTD T 15 12 14 11 14 14 15 15 14 VTD T 16 15 15 14 14 14 15 15 15		1000	9	ļ		į									
2008 17 D 12.40 10.10 10.21 10.22 8.50 8.14 10.20 8.78 8.57 10.25 8.70 8.14 10.20 8.77 8.20 8.57 10.27 8.78 8.57 10.27 8.71 8.20 8.77 10.27 8.77 10.27 8.77 10.27 8.77 10.27 8.77 10.27 8.77 10.27 10.27 8.77 10.27 8.77 10.20 10.00	Triangle Triangle	als of all Dolar Dane	7007	12.40	67.7	10.43	6.67	5.53	6.02	3.83	5.54	13.18	6.15	10.00	10.30	
ars on Hand 2007 41 30 27 25 26 26 26 27 2008 17 15 15 15 15 20 8.07 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	Court Cour	Oral Delay Days	2000	07.0	2 5	17.0	3.32	8.35	8.14	7.52	7.28	7.93	7.75	7.96	8.15	8.15
ars on Hand 2007 41 15 12 16 26 26 26 26 2008 17 15 15 16 27 2009 17 16 27 27 3 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 27 27 2 2009 17 15 15 15 15 2 20 20 27 25 26 26 26 2008 17 15 12 14 11 14	10 0.70 0.37 0.27 0.			0,10	0.50	13.00	CO.4	9.07	9.54	2.80	9,78	11.88	8.15	6.46	2.90	
2009 n/a 2.73 4,74 7.99 14,60 0.00 YTD n/a 2.73 3,74 5.15 7.52 6.01 7.18 218 2007 41 19 22 18 30 24 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 2008 17 15 12 14 11 14	2009 n/a 2.73 4.74 7.89 14.60 0.00 0.00 26.10 26.10 24.25 20.70 7.18 7.18 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 5.01 4.29 7.02 8.93 10.11 7.18 7.18 3.74 5.15 7.52 6.01 5.01 4.29 7.02 8.93 10.11 2007 41 19 22 18 30 24 19 37 29 25 32 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 26 27 26 27 YTD 17 15 12 14 11 14 14 15 15 14 2008 17 23 24 14 14 14 15 15 14 YTD 17 23 414 362 37 245 165 1760		2 2	0,70	8.57	10.27	8.71	8.58	8.74	8.32	8.13	8.55	8.51	8.32	7.87	7.87
ars on Hand 2007 41 19 27 18 30 24 71 19 27 26 26 26 208 17 15 12 14 11 14	7.18		2003	e/u	2.73	4.74	7.59	14.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	26.10	24.25	20.70	13.30	
ars on Hand 2007 41 19 22 18 30 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 2008 17 15 12 14 11	2007 41 19 22 18 30 24 19 37 29 25 32 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 25 26 27 26 27 2008 17 15 12 14 11 14 14 13 25 11 8 YTD 17 16 15 15 15 14 14 14 15 15 15 14 2009 9 424 6.511 9.620 3.060 2.06 2.7 26 27 27 26 27 27 26 27 27 26 27 27 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27		7 48	2	2.13	3.74	0.10	7.52	P.U1	5.01	4.29	7.02	8.93	10.11	10.40	10.40
ars on Hand 2007 41 19 22 18 30 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 2008 17 15 12 14 11	2007 41 19 22 18 30 24 19 37 29 25 32 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 25 26 27 26 27 2008 17 15 12 14 11 14 14 13 25 11 8 YTD 17 16 15 15 14 14 14 15 15 14 YTD 9 217 2315 4 14 3955 3271 2803 248 1 667 1 7807 1 7807 1 7807 1 7807															
ars on Hand 2007 41 19 22 18 30 7	2007 41 19 22 18 30 24 19 37 29 25 32 YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 25 26 27 27 26 2	Only														
YTD 41 30 27 25 26 2008 17 15 12 14 11	YTD 41 30 27 25 26 26 26 25 26 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 20 20 20 20 40	d Orders on Hand	2007	41	19	22	18	30	24	9	37	20	35	33	26	
2008 17 15 12 14 11	17 15 12 14 11 14 13 25 11 8 17 16 15 15 14 14 14 14 15 15 14 9 424 6.511 9,620 3,060 0 0 0 42 3 5 9 217 2,315 4,141 3,955 3,271 2,803 2,453 2,453 2,485 1,067 1,780	p	Ę	41	30	27	25	38	2,5	2,5	3 %	27	3 80	20	77	7.0
	17 16 15 15 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 14 15 15 14 9 424 6.511 9,620 3,060 0 0 0 42 3 5 9 217 2,315 4,141 3,955 3,271 2,803 2,453 2,485 1,067 1,780	The state of the s	2008	17	5	12	14	11	14	3 5	120	25	2 5	7	77	17
17 16 15 15 14	9 424 6.511 9,620 3,060 0 0 42 3 5 9 217 2,315 4,141 3,925 3,271 2,803 2,453 2,485 1,067 1,780		Ę	11	16	15	15	14	14	14	14	15	- L	٥	2 2	11
9 424 6.511 9.620 3.060 O	9 2.77 2.315 4.141 3.925 3.271 2.803 2.453 2.185 1.067 1.780		2009	o	424	6.511	0620	3.080	-			3 5	2 ,	<u>.</u>	±	<u> </u>
0 0000 03,000 0,011 0,000 0	3 2/1 2 3 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3			, 0	177	?	3,040	2000	2	:					;	

VIOL C239 0.53 0.74 0.75		\perp	- 00	1	1	20,7	500		, 1	11.					
Number of fiscaliation Orders 2007 20,809 20,827 13,697 13,709	Average Delay Days for Installation		12.99	8.53	8./4	14.92	8.50	5.48	5.54	13.45	23.04	20.63	13.41	10.34	
Minches of measurable Content Trib	of Service		12.99	10.76	10.09	11.30	10.74	9.86	9.24	9.77	11.24	12.18	12.29	12.13	12.13
Vince 8 8 8 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		2008	8.69	10.55	12.63	6.54	11.78	10.38	6.28	10.84	14.73	15.92	8.42	6.04	
Vinite of healitation Orders Vinite August		YTD	8.69	9.62	10.62	9.60	10.04	10.10	9.55	9.71	10.27	10.83	10.61	10.23	10.23
Number of installiation Orders YTD 6.87 4.84 4.79 5.50 7.00 7.73 7.89 7.89 7.89 7.89 7.89 7.89 7.89 7.89 1.89 7.89		2009	6.97	2.71	4.69	7.61	13.00	11.40	9.30	7.10	9.30	7.10	2.90	3.80	
Number of Installation Orders 2007 20.0603 18.271 15.461 17.346 17.925 15.535 14.847 13.356 13.756 13.775 13.756 13.757 13.756 13.775 13.756 13.757 13.757 13.756 13.757 13.756 13.757 13.756 13.757 13.757 13.757 13.757 13.757 13.757 13.757 13.757 13.757		YTD	6.97	4.84	4.79	5.50	7.00	7.73	7.95	7.85	8.01	7.92	7.46	7.16	7.16
Mumber of heatailation Orders 2007 20.003 98241 9.2451 1.6547 1773-94 17.955 16.85-569 141.41 154.774 17.0556 16.85-569 14.141 154.774 17.0556 16.85-569 14.141 154.774 17.0556 16.85-569 14.141 154.774 17.0556 16.85-569 14.141 154.774 17.0556 16.85-569 14.141 154.774 17.0556 16.85-569 14.141 154.774 17.0556 16.85-69 14.141 154.774 17.0556 16.85-69 14.141 154.774 17.0556 16.85-69 16.85-775 17.0556 17.0556 17.05															
YOU DE ADD 18	Number of Installation Orders	1 8	20,603	16,221	16,617	17,348	_		15,933	14,847	13,358	18,282	13,756	10,376	
Monther of Access Lines Intained 2007 6,400 12,712 21,412 1,486 6,657 1,486 6,657 1,271 1,486 1,487			509'02	36,824	53,441	70,789	١.,	L	126,569	141,416	154,774	173.056	186.812	197.188	197.188
Year- Year		1	12,721	9,451	9,426	12,868	⊢	-	-	+	12.549		12.068	11.274	
Minche of Access Unes Insalied 2009 (10-844 41.24) 21,470 21,885 (14.07) 21,470 21,885 (14.05) 20,894 (15.07) 11,155 (15.04) 25,904 22,814 22,814 (15.04) 21,814 21,81		ı	12.721	22,172	31.598	44,466	-	74 864	-	+-	109 EU2	125 730	-	140 081	140 084
Year	The state of the s	1	0.944	400	21.470	21.685	╁	+-	+	-	25 GRB	19 910		5,200	100,001
Without off Access Lines Installed 2007 6,100 5,501 5,119 5,100 6,203 6,114 5,119 6,100 1,500			7700	11 344	32 814	57 700	+	+-				-+-	-	0,040	10000
Mincher of Access Linea helahed 2007 6,000 15,01 6,024 6,639 6,839 16,14 6,179 5,500 16,14 6,14 6,14 6,14 6,14 6,14 6,14 6,1		_	200	##C,1	22,014	24,433	+	-				182,242	+	138.877	199,977
Modern Tree to Repair Calls 2007 1180		ı	6.400	5 501	5 719	5 504	E 838	8 331	B 11/	g 77g	5,020	2,40	4 604	4 4 45	
The continued Repair Calls The Call		ı	9700	11 901	17 620	23.224	30.05	38 303	44 507	E4 202	2,020	0,010	4,031	4, 40	70.01
Main-Time to Repair Calls 1,000 2,000			4 805	3 960	3 806	3 067	3 882	320	1 287	7757	4 604	3077	406.304	0,043	10,043
%Abandoned Repair Calls 2009 3.482 3.80 15.160 19.746 4.435 2.167 2.020 2.541 2.020 2.541 2.020 2.541 2.020 2.547 1.300 1.3800 3.547 3.457 3.647 3.6			4 805	8 765	12 661	16 628	20 510	24 BBO	20 167	32 511	20,00	47.570	100.5	2020	200 07
"Abandoned Repair Calls TTD 3.62 3.602 9.600 4.284 4.5151 4.7503 6.004 2.004 1.004		1	3 482	380	15.100	10 7.40	7 783	2 167	2,052	25.71	202,202	717	40,030	43,000	43,000
% Abandoned Repair Calls 1 p. 3742 2002 36.00 1.2 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.5 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.4 <t< td=""><td></td><td>1</td><td>707 6</td><td>2 06.7</td><td>10,130</td><td>20 001</td><td>1,400</td><td>45 454</td><td>47 500</td><td>140,2</td><td>7,007</td><td>21772</td><td>1,5004</td><td>1,580</td><td>!!</td></t<>		1	707 6	2 06.7	10,130	20 001	1,400	45 454	47 500	140,2	7,007	21772	1,5004	1,580	!!
Mean Time to Repair Calls 1.0 1.8 1.6 1.7 1.8 1.5	3		3,402	3,002	720,81	100,00	49,204	42,431	47,503	50,044	150,25	55,363	26,867	58,447	58,447
Wight 1.8 1.8 1.7 1.6 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.6 1.7 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.5 1.6 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.4 1.7 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.1 1.2 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.1 1.2 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.1 1.1 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.6 1.1 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.1 1.4 1.5 1.6 1.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.7 1.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 </td <td></td> <td>2007</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>1.7</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>13</td> <td>1.4</td> <td>13</td> <td>٠,</td> <td>1</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>2 7</td> <td></td>		2007	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.2	13	1.4	13	٠,	1	1.5	2 7	
Mean Time to Repair 2006 1.4 1.1 1.4 1.3 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.6 1.1 1.2 1.6 1.1 1.6 1.0		YTD	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	5 4	1.4	1 P	1 4	1.4
YER 1.2 1.3 1.4 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.4 1.5 1.5 1.4 Wash Time to Repair 2007 23.52 17.57 21.92 44.80 32.02 24.27 24.67 22.83 25.77 21.58 11.8 11.9 10.9 All Service Problems		2008	1.2	1.4	-	1.4	1.3	1.6	1.4	.5	4	7	12	8	
Mean Time to Repair 2009 1.4 25.4 26.2 17.8 16.7 23.6 6.0 1.2 0.6 1.0 0.7 All Service Problems YTD 1.4 13.4 17.6 17.7 17.3 16.2 17.3 16.2 17.2 16.6 1.2 0.6 1.0 0.7 All Service Problems 2007 23.52 17.57 21.92 24.02 24.02 26.13 21.68 19.37 21.58 19.90 18.38 All Service Problems YTD 20.05 21.01 18.58 18.59 18.73 24.02 26.13 20.1 26.1 26.0 18.38 18.69 18.87 18.60 20.37 20.51 20.28 18.39 18.89 18.89 18.87 18.60 20.37 20.51 20.28 20.00 35.10 26.89 30.70 28.10 20.89 20.00 23.20 23.20 23.20 23.50 23.40 20.28 20.51 20.51 24.10 <	Table 1	Q.L.	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.3	13	13	1.3	1		14	4 6		
Mean Time to Repair VTD 1.4 13.4 17.6 17.7 17.3 16.2 17.3 16.2 17.3 16.2 17.9 17.9 17.9 17.6 17.7 17.3 16.2 17.5 12.9 17.5 21.0 26.86 27.97 27.35 26.47 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 27.88 18.37 26.80 25.16 24.30 25.80 25.16 24.30 25.80 25.16 24.50 25.80 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.80 25.10 27.97 27.35 24.80 38.70 38.20 27.97 26.89 18.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.87 26.80 26.80 26.80 26.80 26.80 26.80 26.80 26.80 26.80 26.80 <td></td> <td>2009</td> <td>1.4</td> <td>25.4</td> <td>26.2</td> <td>17.8</td> <td>15.8</td> <td>10.7</td> <td>23.6</td> <td>90</td> <td>12</td> <td>90</td> <td>5</td> <td>1.0</td> <td><u>t.</u></td>		2009	1.4	25.4	26.2	17.8	15.8	10.7	23.6	90	12	90	5	1.0	<u>t.</u>
Mean Time to Repair 2007 23.52 17.57 21.92 44.80 32.02 24.27 24.87 22.83 23.57 21.58 19.90 18.33 All Service Problems YTD 23.52 20.55 21.00 26.95 27.97 24.46 22.03 22.67 21.68 23.79 26.45 26.13 25.67 21.68 23.18 20.88 23.18 20.90 18.31 20.88 23.69 20.97 26.67 26.13 20.68 23.18 23.18 20.90 20.89 20.70 28.80 20.77 26.70 26.80 20.77 26.70 26.80 20.77 26.70 26.83 20.90 20.00 23.70 26.80 20.77 26.70 26.80 20.70 26.70 26.80 20.77 26.70 26.83 27.97 26.80 20.77 26.70 26.83 26.90 20.77 26.70 26.83 26.90 20.77 26.70 26.83 26.90 26.77 27.80 27.80		CEX.	1.4	13.4	17.6	17.7	17.3	16.2	173	15.8	14.0	120	4.0		007
Mean Time to Repair 2007 23.52 17.57 21.92 44.80 32.02 24.27 24.67 22.83 23.57 21.58 19.90 16.33 16.35 17.57 21.05 22.59 22.50					?		?	2.5	3:	200	7.4.7	6.3	0	S	10.9
Milestrice Problems	Mean Time to Repair	2007	23.52	17.57	21.92	44.80	32.02	24.27	24.67	22.83	23.57	21.58	19.90	18.33	
2008 20.00 21.11 18.58 18.23 17.04 20.25 24.02 25.71 21.63 20.26 19.37 24.13 YTD 20.00 22.00 32.00 32.00 28.00 34.20 28.70 28.70 28.70 28.70 28.20 23.20 23.20 YTD 23.22 24.80 38.40 36.83 35.06 34.20 23.28 23.17 31.10 30.37 23.90 22.20 YTD 23.22 24.80 38.40 36.83 35.06 34.20 33.28 32.17 31.10 30.37 28.72 23.90 YTD 28.2 4.90 986 1.619 14.36 1.391 1.341 1.017 1.017 1.014 1.017 YTD 88.2 1.372 2.388 3.977 5.413 6.139 1.361 10.284 11.388 1.360 1.587 YTD 62.2 7.99 7.89 5.87 4.11 6.12 6.12 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 YTD 62.2 7.99 7.89 5.87 4.11 6.12 6.12 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 Access Lines in Service 2007 574.768 574.41 68.21 6.13 6.15 6.12 6.27 2.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 6.13 Held Orders over 30 Days 2006 48.8.109 488.109 488.101 477.012 470.222 484.330 456.916 450.231 431.77 43.701 427.079 421.862 YTD 2008 48.8.103 48.8.103 470.222 64.330 456.916 450.231 431.725 438.005 432.001 432.001 437.013 431.725 431.70 6.13 431.725 431.70 431.725	All Service Problems	YTD	23.52	20.55	21.00	26.95	27.97	27.35	26.97	26.45	26.13	25.68	25.15	24.58	24.58
## Seperal Trouble Reports 7TD 20.00 20.56 19.90 18.39 18.87 19.60 20.37 20.51 20.48 20.38 23.70 28.80 30.70 28.50 24.50 23.90 22.00 22.00 22.00 33.22 24.80 38.70 38.80 34.20 28.80 30.70 28.50 24.50 23.90 22.00 22.00 22.00 38.2 4.80 38.70 4.20 38.70 28.50 3.70 28.50 24.50 23.90 22.00 22.00 22.00 38.2 4.60 38.70 4.10 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 4.11 50.2 51.80 4.15 2.20 51.80 4.15 2.20 51.80 4.12 52.70 51.80 4.14 5.33 6.80 4.14 5.33 6.80 6.41 4.15 4.14 5.33 6.80 4.15 1.14 4.17 4.15 4.15 <		2008	20.00	21.11	18.58	16.23	17.04	20.25	24.02	25.71	21.63	20.26	19.37	54.13	
Repeat Trouble Reports 2009 33,22 24,80 38,40 36,83 35,08 34,20 33,28 32,17 31,10 30,37 29,72 29,04 29,04 20,004 20,007 882 4,90 886 1,619 1,436 1,349 1,341 1,114 1,017 1,114 502 29,72 29,04 20,004 20,005 1,24 20,005 20,005 1,24 20,005 2		ΣŢ	20.00	20.56	19.90	18.98	18.59	18.87	19.60	20.37	20.51	20.48	20.38	23 19	23.19
# Repeat Trouble Reports 2007 88.2 4.90 38.40 36.80 34.20 33.28 32.17 31.10 30.37 29.72 29.04 # Repeat Trouble Reports 7TD 88.2 490 16.1 14.36 1.349 1.114 10.17 1.114 50.7 29.04 18.6 ATD 68.2 13.2 2.356 3.977 471 879 1.186 1.316 75.4 1.396 1.900 1.287 ATD 62.2 1.421 2.197 3.268 4.147 5.33 6.49 7.403 8.146 5.05 5.87 ATD 62.2 1.421 2.197 3.268 4.147 5.33 6.49 7.403 8.146 8.76 4.76 8.96 7.403 8.146 8.76 4.76 8.76 8.76 8.77 8.147 8.76 8.76 8.76 8.76 8.77 8.76 8.76 8.76 8.76 8.76 8.77 8.76 8.77 8.77 <td></td> <td>2009</td> <td>33,22</td> <td>24.80</td> <td>52.00</td> <td>33.70</td> <td>29.80</td> <td>30.70</td> <td>28.70</td> <td>25.50</td> <td>23.60</td> <td>24.50</td> <td>23.90</td> <td>22.20</td> <td>2</td>		2009	33,22	24.80	52.00	33.70	29.80	30.70	28.70	25.50	23.60	24.50	23.90	22.20	2
# Repeat Trouble Reports		ATD.	33 22	24.80	38.40	36.83	35.08	34 20	33.28	32 17	31 10	30 37	20.22	2000	70.00
# Repeat Trouble Reports	5							2	27122	-		3	20.12	43.04	£3.04
YTD 882 1,372 2,358 3,977 5,413 6,815 9,267 10,284 11,398 11,900 12,418 2006 622 799 789 587 471 879 1,186 1316 754 743 630 1,587 2008 622 7421 2,210 2,891 5,649 7403 8,146 8,776 10,385 Access Lines in Service 2009 747 476 476 62,271 2,891 3,528 4,175 6,045 4,570 6,045 Access Lines in Service 2005 574,789 671,410 687,321 658,289 555,056 6,642 50,777 60,45 4,570 6,045 Access Lines in Service 2005 574,789 471,710 470,222 464,350 456,916 450,221 2,891 3,528 4,175 4,770 471,962 471,962 471,962 471,962 471,962 471,962 471,962 471,962 471,962 471,962	#	2007	882	490	986	1,619	1.436	1.399	1.341	1.114	1017	1114	503	448	
Access Lines in Service 2006 622 799 787 587 471 879 1,186 1,316 754 743 630 1,587 Access Lines in Service 2009 n/a 129 347 338 339 516 6049 7,403 8,146 8,776 10,363 Access Lines in Service 2009 n/a 129 476 814 1,153 1,689 2,271 2,891 35.28 4,775 647 395 475 Access Lines in Service 2007 574,789 571,410 567,321 569,298 555,035 550,606 545,442 507,77 503,613 498,370 437,862 Access Lines in Service 2006 488,109 482,104 477,012 470,222 464,350 550,606 545,442 507,77 503,613 498,370 471,862 Access Lines in Service 2009 415,671 386,153 375,243 375,323 366,836 350,204 432,001 427,079 471,862 <		ATP.	882	1,372	2,358	3,977	5,413	6,812	8.153	9.267	10.284	11 398	11 900	12 418	12 418
ATD 622 1,421 2,797 3,268 4,147 5,333 6,649 7,403 8,146 8,776 10,333 Access Lines in Service 2009 n/a 129 347 336 516 602 620 637 647 395 475 16,333 Access Lines in Service 2007 574,789 571,410 567,321 563,105 550,505 565,642 507,777 503,613 498,370 437,079 41,862 Held Orders over 30 Days 2009 415,671 36,131 386,133 366,836 360,244 353,995 337,499 298,431 293,404 Leid Orders over 30 Days 2006 1 1 1 0 2 0 1 4 4 2 2 4 2009 1 1 1 1 0 2 0 1 4 4 2 2 4 Access Lines in Service 2006 412 36,231 464,320 <td< td=""><td></td><td>2008</td><td>622</td><td>799</td><td>789</td><td>587</td><td>471</td><td>879</td><td>1.186</td><td>1,316</td><td>754</td><td>743</td><td>630</td><td>1 587</td><td>21.1.</td></td<>		2008	622	799	789	587	471	879	1.186	1,316	754	743	630	1 587	21.1.
Access Lines in Service 2007 674.769 671.410 677.321 664.350 455.035 550.606 645,442 677.77 636.77 676.595 677.77 676.295 677.		YTD	622	1,421	2,210	2,797	3,268	4,147	5,333	6,649	7.403	8.146	8.776	10.363	10.363
ACCESS Lines in Service 2007 574,769 571,410 567,321 563,110 559,289 555,035 556,842 507,777 503,613 4,175 4,570 5,045 ACCESS Lines in Service 2006 574,776 577,171 563,110 559,289 555,035 550,606 545,422 307,777 503,613 493,595 ACCESS Lines in Service 2008 488,109 482,104 477,012 470,222 464,350 456,916 450,231 437,725 438,005 432,001 427,007 427,862 Held Orders over 30 Days 2007 1 1 1 0 2 0 1 4 4 2 2 4 2008 1 2 2 2 2 3 2 3 2 4 7 ACCESS Lines in Service 2009 415 1 1 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 2 4 4 2 4 4 2 </td <td></td> <td>2009</td> <td>n/a</td> <td>129</td> <td>347</td> <td>338</td> <td>339</td> <td>516</td> <td>602</td> <td>620</td> <td>637</td> <td>647</td> <td>395</td> <td>475</td> <td></td>		2009	n/a	129	347	338	339	516	602	620	637	647	395	475	
Access Lines in Service 2007 574,769 571,410 687,321 659,288 555,035 550,606 545,442 507,777 603,613 498,370 435,955 Held Orders over 30 Days 2009 415,671 386,114 477,012 470,222 464,350 456,916 456,204 560,231 431,775 603,613 498,370 427,001 427,001 427,002 42		YTD	n/a	129	476	814	1,153	1,669	2,271	2,891	3,528	4,175	4.570	5.045	5.045
Access Lines in Service 2007 574,769 57,1410 567,310 559,296 555,035 550,606 545,442 507,777 603,613 498,370 493,595 Access Lines in Service 2008 488,109 482,104 477,012 470,222 464,350 456,916 402,775 433,705 432,001 427,079 421,862 Held Orders over 30 Days 2009 415,671 386,134 375,331 366,836 360,244 353,995 343,970 427,079 421,862 Access Lines in Service 2007 1 1 0 2 0 2 2 4 Access Lines in Service 2008 1 1 1 0 2 2 2 4 Access Lines in Service 2008 1 2 2 0 2 2 2 4 Access Lines in Service 2009 3 2 2 3 2 4 4 Access Lines in Service 3 3 3 <td></td>															
2006 488,109 482,104 477,012 470,222 464,350 456,916 450,231 443,726 438,726 436,036 436,031 433,726 438,036 436,031 437,726 438,005 432,001 427,079 421,862 Held Orders over 30 Days 2007 1 1 1 0 2 0 1 4 4 2 2 4 Local Solution of Control Solution o	Access Lines in Service		574,769	571,410	567,321	563,110				-	L	٠	-	493,595	540.862
Held Orders over 30 Days 2009 415,671 358,314 386,153 375,243 375,331 366,836 360,244 353,956 343,970 337,499 298,431 293,404 Held Orders over 30 Days 2007 1 1 1 0 2 0 1 4 4 2 2 4 2008 3 2 2 2 3 2 2 4 2009 3 0 512 2,169 412 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 YTD 3 2 172 671 619 619 619 619 619 619 619 81			488,109	482,104	477,012	470,222	464,350			-	-		427.079	421.862	454.301
Held Orders over 30 Days 2007 1 1 1 0 2 0 1 4 4 4 2 2 4 2008 1 2 2 1 2 0 2 2 3 2 2 4 2009 3 0 512 2.169 412 0 0 0 1 4 7 YTD 3 2 172 671 619	<u> </u>		115,671	358,314		379,243	375,331		360,244	353,995	-		298,431	293,404	355,758
2007 1 1 0 2 0 1 4 4 2 2 4 2008 1 2 2 0 2 2 3 2 2 4 2008 3 0 512 2.169 412 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 YTD 3 2 172 671 619 619 619 619 619 619 310 282 259															
1 2 2 2 3 2 2 4 3 0 512 2,169 412 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 3 2 172 671 619 619 619 619 619 310 282 259	Held Orders over 30 Days	2007	-	-	-	0	2	0	1	4	4	2	2	4	2
3 0 512 2,169 412 0 0 0 0 1 4 7 3 2 172 671 619 619 619 619 619 310 282 259		2008	-	2	2	-	2	0	2	2	3	2	2	4	2
3 2 172 671 619 619 619 619 619 310 282 259		2009	က	0	512	2,169	412	0	0	0	0	-	4	7	
		<u>A</u>	6	2	172	671	619	619	619	619	619	310	282	259	259

Part 2009 & Remaining of 2008 report

ntral Offices with stomer Trouble Reports > 2.5

Dec-09	Bedford	Bethlehem	Colebrook	Franconia	Jefferson	Lyme	Pittsburg	Rumney	Sunapee	Twin Mountain	Whitfield																				
Nov-09	Colebrook	Groveton	Jefferson	Kingston	Lancaster	Lyme	Marlboro	Twin Mountain	West Stewartstown																						
Oct-09	Fitzwilliam	Hampstead	Hanover	Jefferson	Lancaster	Lyme	Milan	Rumney	Winchester							- Louisian and a second															
Sep-09	Fitzwilliam	Franconia	Lyme	Milan																									,		
Aug-09	Belmont	Center Ossipee	Center Sandwich	Danbury	Dublin	Errol	Fitzwilliam	Franconia	Hancock	Hanover	Harrisville	Lancaster	Mariow	Merrimack	Milan	Milton	Newport	North Haverhill	Pittsburg	Rye Beach	Sanbornville	Sunapee	Whitefield								
ful-09	Bartlett	Belmont	Canaan	Center Harbor	Center Sandwich	Colebrook	Deerfield	Dublin	Durham	Fitzwilliam	Goffstown	Jefferson	Kingston	Lyme	Madison	· Marlow	Milton Mills	Newmarket	Northwood	Rindge	Rye Beach	Sanbornville	Spofford	Warren	Winchester						
60-unf	Alstead	Atkinson	Bristol	Danbury	Deerfield ·	Epsom	Fitzwilliam	Kingston	Littleton	Lyme	Marlow	North Stratford	Raymond	Sunapee	West Stewartstown																
May-09	Candia	Epping	Errol	Fitzwilliam	Marlow																										
Apr-09	Barrington	Candia	Fitzwilliam	Newmarket	Rindge	Sanbornville																									
Mar-09	Candia	Canaan	Raymond	Rumney	Waterville Valley																										
Feb-09																															
Jan-09	Fitzwilliam																														

Dec-09 Plaistow Attachment 2 Item 4 Nov-09
Plaistow
Sunapee
Walpole
Whitfield Oct-09 Sep-09 Aug-09 Jul-09 Jun-09 2009 & REMAINING OF 2008 REPORT May-09 Hanover Apr-09 Newport Mar-09 Feb-09 ld Orders > 30 days Jan-09
Exeter
Portsmouth



Kevin M. Shea Vice President Government Relations NH 900 Elm Street, Suite 1922 Manchester, NH 03101 603-641-1667

February 19, 2010

Kathryn M. Bailey, PE Telecommunications Division Director New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission 21 South Fruit Street, Suite 10 Concord, New Hampshire 03301

Dear Kate:

In accordance with the Commission's Electronic Report Filing (ERF) program, FairPoint Communications - NNE has electronically filed the Quality of Service report for January 2010 and is also filling the attached paper copy.

Metrics 1-3 & 6 -these will replace the original Metrics 1-6

- Metric 1, POTS Premise Installation-we will measure the average time to repair Metric 2, POTS Mechanized Installation – we will measure the average time to repair.
- Metric 3, POTS Combined Installation we will measure the average time to repair.
- Metric 6, DSL Combined Installation we will measure the average time to repair this metric was not required to be broken out premise vs. mechanized.
- Metric 4 & 5 will not be reported as discussed during the meeting, it does not make sense to try and break out DSL into premise and mechanized.

There will not be any restatement for 2009 for these 4 metrics.

Metric 7

· Metric 7, we will continue to measure % Met commitment for POTS, combined premise and mechanized.

Restatement: will be done for Feb - Oct 2009 months in the February - March 2010 time frame.

Metric 8

• Metric 8, % Installation Appointments Met w/in 30 days.

The data as reported in 2009 has no value. The create date that was being used as the starting point of the 30 day count is not valid.

Restatement: Results will be good for Dec. 2009 and January 2010. No restatement of prior months for this metric, due to a new data field being sourced.

Metrics 9-12, 16-17 & 23

- Metric 9, Toll and Assist Calls answered within 10 seconds
- Metric 10, D/A and Intercept Calls answered within 10 seconds
- Metric 11, Repair Service Calls answered within 20 seconds
- Metric 12, Business Office Calls answered within 20 seconds
- Metric 16, Dial tone speed within 3 seconds
- Metric 17, % Call completion
- Metric 23, % Abandoned Calls Repair

No changes expected for any of these metrics. Restatement: None needed for these metrics.

Metric 13, 15, 21-22 & 24-26

- Metric 13, Customer trouble reports rate per 100 lines Network
- Metric 15, % Repair Commitments Met
- Metric 21, Number of Installation Orders
- Metric 22, Number of Access Lines Installed Inward Movement only
- Metric 24, Mean Time to Repair
- Metric 25, Repeat Trouble Report
- Metric 26, Access Lines in Service.

Restatement: Feb - Oct 2009 time frame. Results available in the Feb - Mar time frame.

Metric 14

Metric 14, % OOS Troubles cleared within 24 hours (excluding Sundays)

Beginning with the Jan 2010 results, these results are being reported from a new database. This change allows for more accurate reporting of the OOS metric. An investigation is underway to determine if any historical results can be accurately produced.

Metric 18, 19, 20 & 27

- Metric 18, Held Orders Average Delay Days.
- Metric 19, Total Held Orders on Hand Month End.
- Metric 20, Average Delay days for Installation of Service.
- Metric 27, Held Orders Over 30 Days Due to Facilities Reasons.

Restatement: we will not be able to restate any of the previous months.

FairPoint reserves its right to argue that the proceedings requiring this report are stayed or should be stayed and to seek appropriate relief with the Bankruptcy Court.

Please call if you have any questions.

You Willen

Sincerely,

Kevin M. Shea

Attachments

cc: Meredith Hatfield

Peter Nixon

Janet Brack

Brian Lippold

Karen Mead

Michael Morrissey

Teresa Rosenberger

					FairP	oint Co	ommun	ication	s - NNE					
								SQI Res						
						Ja	anuary	2010						
			FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	AVG
POTs Premise Installation	2007	JAN	PED	MAR	VED	WIAL	3014	300	2000					
Average Time to Install	YTD 2008													
	YTD 2009													
	YTD 2010	3.8												
Parallar	YTD TBD	3.8												3.8
Baseline														
POTs Mechanized Installation Average Time to Install	2007 YTD													
	2008 YTD													
	2009 YTD		-											
	2010 YTD	2.2												2.2
Baseline	TBD													***
POTs Combined Installation	2007													
Average Time to Install	2008													
	YTD 2009													
	YTD 2010	3.2												
Pagalina	YTD TBD	3.2												3.2
Baseline														
DSL Combined Installation Average Time to Install	2007 YTD													
	2008 YTD													
	2009 YTD													
	2010 YTD	3.2											-	3.2
Baseline	TBD	J. <u>L</u>												
% Installation Services Orders	2007	97	98	97	97 97	97 97	97 97	97 97	97 97	97 97	98 97	98 97	98 97	97
Met Commitment	YTD 2008	97 97	98 97	97 98	99	99	99	98	97	98 98	99 98	98 98	97 98	98
	YTD 2009	97 98	97 45	97 46	98 62	98 75	98 78	98 74	98 75	79	83	84	92	
	YTD 2010	98 96	72	63	63	65	67	68	69	70	72	73	74	74
Baseline	YTD 90	96												96
	10	2	28	37	37	35	33	32	31	30	28	27	26	26
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	10	4	10	<u> </u>										4
% Installation Service Orders	2007	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Met - w/in 30 days	2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2009	0 n/a	0	0 53	75	0 76	0 63	69	0 70	0 77	84	84	100	
	YTD 2010	n/a 100	0	27	43	51	54	56	58	61	63	65	68	68
Baseline	YTO 95	100						 						100
	5	n/a	100	73	57	49	46	44	42	39	37	35	32	32
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	5	0	100	10	<u> </u>	ļ								0
% Toll and Local Assistance	2007	97	96	94	96	94	95	95	94	96	94	94 95	95 95	95
Operator Calls answered within 10 seconds	2008	97 97	97 97	96 95	96 98	95 98	95 97	95 96	95 97	95 98	95 99	98	96	
	YTD 2009	97 97	97 93	96 95	97 96	97 92	97 90	97 91	97 92	97 93	97 94	97 96	97 95	97
	YTD 2010	97	95	95	95	95	94	93	93	93	93	94	94	94
	YTD	95												95
Baseline	90											<u> </u>		<u> </u>
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	10 10		5	5	5	5	6	7	7	7	7	6	6	6 5
% Directory Assistance and Intercept	2007	93	94	90	91	90	88	92	96	95	95	95	93	
Calts answered within	YTD 2008		94 93	92 95	92 96	92 98	91 98	91 97	92	92 100	92 100	93 100	93 99	93
10 seconds	YTO	92	93	93	94	95 91	95 86	96 85	96 89	97 90	97 93	97 93	97 91	97
	2009 YTD		91	92 91	92	91	91	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
	2010 YTD	93			<u> </u>									93
Baseline	85				 				<u> </u>					
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009	15 15		9	9	8	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10 7
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	15				<u> </u>								I	

					Fair	Point C	ommur	ilcation	s - NNF					
								SQI Res						
						J	anuary	2010						
		1001	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	AVG
% Repair Service Calls answered within	2007 YTD	JAN 86 86	87 87	88 87	85 87	86 86	86 86	86 86	87 86	87 86	86 86	90	89 87	87
20 seconds	2008 YTD	88 88	87 88	89 88	93 89	92 90	85 89	80 88	85 87	94 88	92 89	91 89	57 86	86
	2009 YTD	81 81	25 53	30 45	26 41	31 39	51 41	30 39	68 43	91 46	96 53	93 57	93 60	60
	2010 YTD	96 96	- 33											96
Baseline	85													
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	15 15	19 4	47	55 4	59 4	61 4	59 4	61 4	57 4	52 4	47	43 4	40 4	40 4
% Business Office and Other Calls Answered within 20 seconds	2007 YTD	75 75	75 75	76 75	74 75	68 74	65 72	65 71	72 71	67 71	62 70	65 69	58 69	69
	2008 YTD	62 62	74 68	66 67	56 65	49 61	69 63	75 64	93 68	86 70	89 72	77 72 85	75 73 94	73
(bazašne waz 77 in 2009)	2009 YTD	87 87	55 71	16 53	45 51	72 55	72 58	73 60	84 63	77 65	85 67	68	70	70
	2010 YTD	90 90												90
Baseline	85 23	13	29	47	49	45	42	40	37	35	33	32	30	30
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	15	10			2.51	1 53	1.73	1.80	1.50	1,30	1.51	0.94	0.85	10
Customer Trouble Reports Rate per 100 lines-Network	2007 YTD 2008	1.47 1.47 0.85	0.71 1.09 1.38	1.16 1.11 1.11	1 46	1.48	1 52	1.56	1.55	1.52	1.52	1 47	1.42 3.34	1.42
	YTD 2009	0.85 1.60	1.12	1.11	1 09	1.05	1.14	1.26	1.33	1.33	1 32 1 27	1.30 0.96	1.47 1.16	1.47
(baseline was 1.25 in 2009)	YTD 2010	1.60	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.12	1.18	1.24	1 31	1.29	1,29	1.26	1.25	1.25
Baseline	YTD 1.12	0.90												0.90
% OOS Troubles cleared within	2007	68	83	70	48	60	67	65	69	69	73	76	79	
24 hours (excluding Sunday)	YTD 2008	68 66	76 70	74 80	67 86	66 85	66 77	66 65	66 62	67 77	67 74	68 79	69 42	69
	YTD 2009	66 62	68 98	72 94	76 99	77 100	77 99	76 100	74 100	74 76	74 73	75 77	72 76	72
(baschne was 80 in 2009)	YTD 2010		80	84	88	90	92	93	94	92	90	89	88	88 78
	YTD 87													
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	20 13		20	16	12	10	8	7	6	È	10	11	12	12 22
% Repair Commitments Met	2007	77	86 82	77 80	69 77	76 77	81 78	61 78	81 79	79 79	81 79	86 79	83	80
	2008 YTD	81 81	79 80	86 82	89 84	88 85	87 85	82 85	80 84	85 84	85 84	87 84	62 83	83
(54selino was 85 in 2009)	2009 YTD	77	10	75 54	81 61	83 65	82 68	86 71	86 72	91 74	89 76	91 77	89 78	78
3435777	2010 YTD													93
	89													
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	15 11		56	46	39	35	32	29	28	26	24	23	22	7
% Dialtone Speed within 3 seconds	2007 YTD	100 100	100	100	100 100	100	100 100	100	100 100	100	100	100	100	100
	2008 YTD	100	100	100	100	100 100	100 100	100 100	100 100	100 100	100 100	100	100 100	100
	2009 YTD	n/a r/a	n/a n/a	n/a n/a	100 100	100 100	100 100	100 100	100 100	100 100	100 100	100	100	100
	2010 YTD	100												100
	98		- 6			0	0	0	0	0	C	0	0	0
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	2		n/a	n/a	0		, v						-	0
% Call Completion	2007 YTD	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100 100	100
	2008 YTO	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100 100	100
	2009 YTD	n/a	n/a n/a	n/a	98.13 98.13	97.23 97.68	98 00 97 79	97.70 97.77	97 50 97 71	100.00 98.09	98 00 98 08	98.00 98.07	97.90 98.05	98
	2010 YTD	98												98
	97													
Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2009 Baseline - Penalty Calculation - 2010	3		n/a	n/a	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Held Orders	2007 YTD	12 40 12 40	7.79 10 10	10 43 10 21	6 67 9 32	5.53 8.56	6 02 8 14	3.83 7.52	5,54 7 28	13.18 7.93	6 15 7 75	10 00 7 96	10 30 8.15	8.15
Average Total Delay Days	2008 YTD	8.78	8.36 8.57	13 66	4 05 8 71	8.07 8.58	9.54	5.80 8 32	678 8.13	11.88 8.55	8 15 8.51	6.46 8.32	2.90	7.87
(baseline was 7.18 in 2009)	2009 YTD	n/a	273	474	7.99	14 60 7 52	0 00	0 00	0 00	26 10 7.02	24 25 8.93	20 70	14.80 10.54	10.54
destains was vira in saasi	2010 YTD	12.30												12.30
Baseline	6.46													

					FairF	oint C	ommur	nication	s - NNE	:				
	—							SQI Res						
					1461				GILO					
						J;	anuary	2010	1					
									1112	000	000	VOV	DEC	AVG
		JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	AVG
Tracking Only														
Total Held Orders on Hand	2007 YTD	41	19 30	22 27	18 25	30 26	24 26	19 25	37 26	29 27	25 26	32 27	27 27	27
Month End	2008	17	15	12	14	11	14	14	13	25	11	8	19	
	YTD	17	16	15	15 9,620	14	14 0	14 0	14 0	15 42	15 3	14 5	14 11	14
	2009 YTD	9	424 217	6.511 2.315	4,141	3.060	3,271	2,803	2,453	2,185	1,967	1,789	1,640	1,640
	2010	3												3
	YTD	3												3
Average Delay Days for Installation	2007	12.99	8 53	8.74	14.92	8 50	5.48	5 54	13.45	23 04	20 63	13.41	10 34	12.13
of Service	YTD 2008	12 99 8.69	10.76 10.55	10.09 12.63	11 30 6.54	10.74	9 86 10 38	9.24 6.28	9 77 10.84	11.24 14.73	12.18 15.92	12.29 8 42	12.13 6.04	12.13
	YTD	8 69	9.62	10.62	9.60	10.04	10.10	9.55	9.71	10.27	10.83	10.61	10.23	10.23
	2009	6 97	271	4.69	7.61 5.50	13 00 7.00	11.40 7.73	9.30 7.95	7.10 7.85	9.30 8.01	7.10	2.90 7.46	3.80 7.16	7.16
	2010	6.97 7.10	4 84	479	0.00	7.00	1.73	, 95		0.01			1	
	YTO	7.10												7.10
Number of Installation Orders	2007	20,603	16,221	16,617	17.348	21,925	17.922	15,933	14,847	13,358	18,282	13.756	10.376	
	YTO	20.603	36.824	53,441	70,789	92,714	110,636	126,569	141,416	154.774	173,056	186,812	197,188 11,274	197,188
	2008 YTD	12,721 12,721	9.451 22,172	9.426 31,598	12,868 44,466	16,676 61.142	13,722 74.864	11.628 86,492	10,561 97,053	12,549 109,602	16,137 125,739	12,068 137,807	149,081	149,081
	2009	10.944	400	21,470	21.685	20.471	21.274	18,381	22,019	25,688	19,910	11.195	6,540	
	YTD		11,344	32.814	54,499	74,970	96,244	114,625	136,644	162,332	182,242	193,437	199,977	199,977
	2010 YTD													7,902
					5.504	0.000	0.004	5444	6,776	5,020	5,510	4,691	4,145	
Number of Access Lines Installed	2007 YTD	6,400 6,400	5,501 11,901	5.719 17,620	5,604 23,224	6,838 30,062	8,331 38.393	6,114 44,507	51,283	56,303	61,813	66.504	70.649	70,649
	2008	4.805	3.960	3,896	3,967	3,882	4.370	4,287	4,344	4,691	4,425	4.067	2,991	40 coc
	YTD 2009		8,765 380	12,661 15,190	16.628 19.749	20,510 4,483	24.880 2,167	29.167 2,052	33.511 2,541	38.202 2.607	42,628 2,712	46.695 1,504	49.686 1,580	49,686
	YTO	3,482	3.862	19,052	38,801	43,284	45,451	47,503	50,044	52,651	55,363	56.867	58,447	58,447
	2010 YTD	1,249 1,249					ļ						-	1,249
	110	1,245												
% Abandoned Repair Calls	2007	1.8	17	18	1.5	1.2	1.3 1.5	1.4 1.5	1.3 1.5	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.2 1.4	1.4
	YTD 2008	1.8	1.8	1.1	1.7	13	16	1.5	1.5	16	11	1.2	16	
	YTD		13	1.2	13	1.3	1.3	1.3	6.0	1.4	1.4 0.6	1.3	0.7	1,4
	2009 YTD	1.4	25.4 13.4	26.2 17.6	17.8	15.8 17.3	10.7 16.2	23 6 17.3	15.8	14.2	12.9	11.8	109	10.9
	2010	0.5												1,0
	YTD	0.5	ļ											1,0
Mean Time to Repair	2007	23.52	17.57	21.92	44 80	32.02	24.27	24 67	22.83	23.57	21.58	19 90	18.33	24.50
All Service Problems	Y7D 2008		20 55	21.00 18.58	26.95 16.23	27.97 17.04	27.35 20.25	26.97 24.02	26 45 25.71	26.13 21.63	25 68 20 26	25 15 19 37	24 58 54.13	24.58
	YTD	20.00	20 56	19.90	18.98	18.59	18.87	19.60	20.37	20 51	20.48	20 38	23 19	23.19
	2009 YTD		24 80 24 80	52.00 38.40	33.70 36.83	29.80 35.08	30 70 34.20	28 70 33 28	25 50 32.17	23.60 31.10	24.50 30.37	23.90 29.72	22.20 29.04	29.04
	2010		24.00	36 40	30.03	1000	54.20	50.00						
	YTO							ļ					-	20.60
# Repeat Trouble Reports	2007	882	490	986	1,619	1,436	1,399	1,341	1,114	1,017	1,114	502	518	
	YTD	882	1,372	2.358	3,977	5,413	6,812	8,153	9.267	10,284 754	11,398 743	11,900 630	12,418 1.587	12,418
	2008 YTD		799 1.421	789 2,210	587 2,797	471 3.268	879 4,147	1,186 5.333	1,316 6.649	7,403	8,146	8.776	10.363	10,363
	2009	n/a	129	347	338	339	516	602	620	637	647	395	475	5,045
	2010		129	476	814	1,153	1,669	2,271	2,891	3,528	4,175	4,570	5,045	3,043
	YTD													369
Access Lines in Service	2007	574,769	571,410	567 321	563 110	559,298	555,035	550,606	545,442	507,777	503,613	498.370	493,595	540,862
Vicesa Files #1 Oct And	2008	488,109	482,104	477,012	470.222	464,350	456,916	450,231	443,725	438,005	432,001	427,079	421.862	454,301
	2009 2010		358.314	386,153	379,243	375,331	366,836	360,244	353.995	343.970	337,499	298,431	293.404	355,758
	2010	201,424												
Held Orders over 30 Days	2007		1	1	0	2	0	1 2	4 2	3	2	2 2	4	2
	2008		0	512	2,169	412	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	
	YID	3	2	172	671	619	619	619	619	619	310	282	259	259
	2010 YTD			 		 	 	<u> </u>	 	-	ļ	 	-	1
	1 110	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	<u> </u>								
			T						l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	L	

				Fairl	oint C	ommur	nication	s - NNE					
				Ne	w Ham	pshire	SQI Res	uits					
					J	anuary	2010						
William D.													
	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	AVG
Footnotes		1	T							L			
	1/6/10 - Benchmar	ks update	d to reflec	t transitio	n benchr	narks					İ		
	Metric	SQI Des	ription					-					
	1:	Business I	Office - Cal	s answered	w/in 20 se	conds							
	1:	Customer	Trouble Re	ports - Rat	e per 100 fir	ies - Netwo	rk						
	1	% OOS T	roubles clea	red w/in 24	hours (exc	luding Sund	ay)						
	1	5 % Repair	Commitme	nts Met									
	1	Held orde	rs - average	delay day	s					Ĺ			
											<u> </u>		
			1							1			
2	1/20/10 - Penalty c	alculation	s updated	to reflec	same me	thodolog	y of calcul	ating pena	ities as M	alne			
	(inserted a	row for ea	ch metric t	hat will ca	culate the	penalty bas	n %" no bos	ot met" - M	aine metho	dology)			
			1		1								
	Metric	SOI Des	cription										
							ity is % NOT						
		6 % instalia	tion Service	Orders - N	let w/in 30 c	lays (penalt	y is % NOT I	MET)					
		9 Toll and A	ssist - Ope	rator calls a	nswered wi	in 10 secon	ds (penaky i	NOT ANS	MERED wi	n 00 seconds	s)		
	1	0 Directory	Assistance	and Interce	pt calls ans	wered w/m :	5 seconds (penalty is N	OT ANSWE	RED w/m 85	seconds)		
	1	1 Repair Se	rvice calls	inswered w	fin 10 seco	nds (penalty	IS NOT ANS	WERED W	in 90 secor	ds)		L	
	1	2 Business	Office - Gal	ls answered	win 20 se	conds (pena	aty is NOT A	NSWERED	wim 80 sec	conds)	<u> </u>		
	1	4 % OOS T	roubles cle	ared w/in 24	hours (exc	luding Sund	ay) (penalty	is NOT CLE	ARED)	L	L	ļ	
		5 % Repair						<u> </u>		<u> </u>	ļ		
							HAN 2 seco	nds)			ļ		
	1	7 % Call Co	mpletion (p	enaky is Gl	REATER TI	IAN 3 seco	nds)			ļ	ļ	\vdash	
	7	3		1	1	1	}	Į	l .	ı	I	ı I	

Wint I A GLOCIC TO				,						Attachment 2	
Held Olders 2 30 days			2010 & REMAINING OF 2009 REPORT	VING OF 2009	REPORT					Item 4	
4,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,0							•		00 1		00
Jan-10	Feb-09	Mar-09	Apr-09	May-09	Jun-09	90-Inc	Aug-09	Sep-09	Oct-09	SO-AON	ຄດ-ລອດ
			Newport	Hanover						Plaistow	Plaistow
	1111 N. MANUAL INC. AND									Sunapee	
									AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PERSON OF THE P	Walpole	
					and an area of the state of the		V			Whitfield	
The second state of the se											

.,								V-0000-1000-1000-1000-1000-1000-1000-10			
								A			
								200	THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY		
AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER											
		The second secon				The second secon					
The state of the s											
- Control of the Cont				1							

Attachment 1 Item 12a

sport	
of 2009 r	
maining	
2010 & Re	
Part	

Dec-09	Bedford	Bethlehem	Colebrook	Franconia	Jefferson	Lyme	Pittsburg	Rumney	Sunapee	Twin Mountain	Whitfield																			
										Twit	>																			
Nov-09	Colebrook	Groveton	Jefferson	Kingston	Lancaster	Lyme	Marlboro	Twin Mountain	West Stewartstown																					
Oct-09	Fitzwilliam	Hampstead	Hanover	Jefferson	Lancaster	Lyme	Milan	Rumney	Winchester																					
Sep-09	Fitzwilliam	Franconia	Lyme	Milan																										
Aug-09	Belmont	Center Ossipee	Center Sandwich	Danbury	Dublin	Errol	Fitzwilliam	Franconia	Hancock	Hanover	Harrisville	Lancaster	Marlow	Merrimack	Milan	Milton	Newport	North Haverhill	Pittsburg	Rye Beach	Sanbornville	Sunapee	Whitefield							
60-Inf	Bartlett	Belmont	Canaan	Center Harbor	Center Sandwich	Colebrook	Deerfield	Dublin	Durham	Fitzwilliam	Goffstown	Jefferson	Kingston	гүте	Madison	Marlow	Milton Mills	Newmarket	Northwood	Rindge	Rye Beach	Sanbornville	Spofford	Warren	Winchester					
Jun-09	Alstead	Atkinson	Bristol	Danbury	Deerfield	Epsom	Fitzwilliam	Kingston	Littleton	Lyme	Marlow	North Stratford	Raymond	Sunapee	West Stewartstown															
May-09	Candia	Epping	Errol	Fitzwilliam	Marlow																									
Apr-09	Barrington	Candia	Fitzwilliam	Newmarket	Rindge	Sanbornville																								
Mar-09	Candia	Canaan	Raymond	Rumney	Waterville Valley																		***************************************							
Feb-09																														
Jan-10	Fitzwilliam																													





































