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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We're here in Docket DT 16-872, which is the Petition by Consolidated Communications Holdings, Inc. regarding FairPoint. We're here for the beginning of what will be a multi-day hearing on the merits. Before we do anything else, let's take appearances.

MS. GEIGER: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. I'm Susan Geiger from the law firm of Orr \& Reno, and I'm representing Consolidated Communications Holdings, Inc.

MR. PHILLIPS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. My name is Paul Phillips. I'm an attorney with Primmer, Piper, Eggleston \& Cramer in Manchester, here on behalf of FairPoint Communications. And I'm joined by Michael Reed, who is the State President in Maine and Vermont, and Robert Meehan, who's the Director of Regulatory Affairs.

MR. RUBIN: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
Commissioners. My name is Scott Rubin. I
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: SHULTZ|WAGGONER|CHILDERS|REED]
represent the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and Communications Workers of America. Seated to my left is Randy Barber, who is our witness this morning.

MR. WIESNER: Good morning, Mr.
Chairman and Commissioners. I'm David Wiesner, representing Commission Staff. And with me are Mike Ladam, Director of the Regulatory Innovation and Strategy Division at the Commission, and also with that division is Lisa Cleveland.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: How are we proceeding this morning, Mr. Wiesner?

MR. WIESNER: Well, as you know, this is opening day of a multi-day hearing. And today we are primarily going to hear from Labor Witness Randy Barber, in large part because of his unavailability in May when we have two further days of hearing scheduled. The panel of witnesses representing the Joint Petitioners will also take the stand as an initial matter and swear in their direct testimony. But per agreement of the parties, there will be no
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: SHULTZ|WAGGONER|CHILDERS|REED]
cross-examination of those witnesses and, with your indulgence, no questions from the Bench today. Please hold those questions until we resume the hearings in about a month.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
MR. WIESNER: I asked nicely.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't know what you expected us really to do. But all right. All right, if that's what you want. Are there any preliminary matters we need to deal with before we -- I guess the panel goes first? Yes, Ms. Geiger. MS. GEIGER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of Consolidated, I filed a Motion for Protective Order yesterday, along with a couple of other motions relating to the requirements for redacting and presenting confidential information in a particular format, as well as a partial waiver of the Commission's earlier order on the same issue. And that's the only preliminary matter of which I'm aware.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, we're
aware of the motions that were filed. I don't
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: SHULTZ|WAGGONER|CHILDERS|REED]
think we need to rule on them this morning. Under the Commission's rules, matters are deemed confidential and will continue to be confidential until the issue is finally adjudicated regarding confidentiality.

With respect to the waiver, it is what it is at this point. I understand the parties have agreed that if documents are going to be used that contain confidential information, they will have appropriate redactions, so how we deal with it down the road will resolve. But we don't need to do anything today. Is that the agreement? Is everybody agreed on that? I see lots of nodding heads. I like to see nodding heads.

All right. So if there is nothing else, then $I$ guess the panel can take the stand to do their business, and then we'll move on from there.

MS. GEIGER: Thank you.
So, for Consolidated
Communications Holdings, Inc. we've called to the stand, Mr. Steve Childers, Mr. Mike Shultz and Mr. Gabe Waggoner.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS PANEL: SHULTZ|WAGGONER|CHILDERS|REED]

MR. PHILLIPS: And on behalf of FairPoint Communications, $I$ call to the stand Michael C. Reed.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record. (Discussion off the record.) (WHEREUPON, MICHAEL J. SHULTZ, GABE WAGGONER, STEVEN CHILDERS, MICHAEL C. REED were duly sworn and cautioned by the Court Reporter.)

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Geiger, you may proceed.

## DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Please state your name and spell your last name for the record.
A. (Shultz) Michael Shultz, S-H-U-L-T-Z.
Q. And where are you employed, and what position do you hold?
A. I am Vice-president of Regulatory and Public Policy for Consolidated Communications Holdings, and I'm located in Conroe, Texas.
Q. How long have you had held your current position?
A. (Shultz) About 13 years.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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Q. Could you please briefly describe your responsibilities as Vice-president of Regulatory and Public Policy Consolidated Communications.
A. (Shultz) Yes, I am responsible for state and federal regulatory advocacy; legislative strategy; regulatory compliance, including tariffs, interconnection, industry relations, settlements and billing operations.
Q. Could you please briefly describe your telecommunications experience.
A. (Shultz) Yes. I have over 30 years in the telecommunications industry, primarily regulatory affairs. Prior to joining Consolidated Communications in 2014 [sic], I was with TXU Communications, and prior to that with varying degrees and various positions with increasing responsibility at Citizens Communications, and then prior to that with John Staurulakis, Incorporated.
Q. I believe, Mr. Shultz, you may have said that you were working -- or prior to working at Consolidated in 2014? Is that date correct?
A. I started working with Consolidated in 2004
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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when we were acquired.
Q. Okay. I thought I heard you say 2014. I just wanted to make sure that 2004 was the correct year.

Could you please briefly describe Consolidated's history and experience owning and managing telecommunications companies.
A. (Shultz) Yes. Consolidated Communications started over 120 years ago in Mattoon, Illinois, as Mattoon Telephone Company. It grew through a series of acquisitions of nearby telephone companies in the 1920 s and 1930s and became Illinois Consolidated Telephone Company. In 1984, Consolidated Communications, Inc., or CCI, was formed, and with the bedrock of ICTC it expanded its line of businesses into business systems, directories, long distance and operator services, and what we call public services and telemarketing. In 1997, the Lumpkin family sold Consolidated to McLeodUSA, and in 2002 the Lumpkin family and two private equity firms purchased CCI back from McLeodUSA. During the 2004 to 2016 time
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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frame, Consolidated has completed an IPO and grown with multiple acquisitions.

In 2004, it acquired TXU Communications; 2007, North Pittsburgh Systems, Inc; in 2012, SureWest Communications; 2014, Enventis, Inc. So we expanded from one state into now 11 states.
Q. Was there an acquisition in 2016?
A. (Shultz) Yes, there was. Champaign Telephone Company, in Champaign, Illinois, about 50 miles north of our corporate headquarters.
Q. And in what states does Consolidated concurrently operate?
A. (Shultz) It operates in California, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Texas, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa and Wisconsin.
Q. And what services does Consolidated provide?
A. (Shultz) It provides voice services, both POTs and Voice Over Internet Protocol; unbundled network elements; broadband; cloud computing; data centers; fiber services; Internet; video; both IPTV, as well as cable in Kansas. We also have long distance,
[WITNESS PANEL: SHULTZ|WAGGONER|CHILDERS|REED]
directory, home automation and security. And we have a couple of private -- or partnership with East Texas Fiber Line, which is part of our fiber product, as well as five minority interests in Verizon Wireless, both in Texas and Pennsylvania.
Q. Mr. Shultz, I'm going to show you a document that we premarked for identification as Exhibit 1, and it's entitled "Joint Petition for Findings in Furtherance of the Acquisition of FairPoint Communications, Inc. and its New Hampshire Operating Subsidiaries by Consolidated Communications Holdings, Inc." Did you assist in the preparation of that petition?
A. (Shultz) Yes, I did.
Q. And could you please briefly describe what the transaction that is the subject of that petition will entail?
A. (Shultz) Mr. Childers' prefiled testimony will provide the details of the transaction, but $I$ can briefly summarize it.

Consolidated will acquire all the outstanding equity interests in FairPoint in
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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exchange for Consolidated stock valued at approximately $\$ 1.5$ billion. Post-close, Consolidated shareholders will own 71.3 percent of the combined company, and FairPoint shareholders will own 28.7 percent. One director from the FairPoint Board of Directors will join the Board of Directors of Consolidated, which will expand from eight to nine directors.

Under the Merger Agreement, which was submitted with the Joint Petition as Attachment 2, Falcon Merger Sub, Inc, a corporation wholly owned by Consolidated and formed for the purposes of this transaction, will merge into -- with and into FairPoint, whereupon Merger [Sub] will cease to exist, and FairPoint will remain as the surviving corporation. Upon completion of the transaction, Consolidated will contribute all of the equity interest in FairPoint to CCI, so that FairPoint will be a direct, wholly-owned subsidiary of CCI.
Q. And Mr. Shultz, did you submit prefiled testimony in support of the Petition that's
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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been marked as Exhibit 1?
A. (Shultz) Yes, I did.
Q. And do you recognize what's been marked as Exhibit 2 as that prefiled testimony?
A. (Shultz) Yes.
Q. Do you have any updates or corrections to your compiled testimony?
A. (Shultz) I do. Two. On Page 4, Line 16 and 17, we talked about the states requiring approvals. Four states have approved the merger transaction. They are Colorado, Georgia, Ohio and Pennsylvania.

And then on Page 5 there's a correction on Line 20, where it says "approximately \$4 million," it should say "3.1 million."
Q. And Mr. Shultz, with those corrections and updates that you just provided, do you have -- do you adopt your prefiled testimony today under oath?
A. (Shultz) Yes, I do.
Q. And what topics are covered in that prefiled testimony?
A. (Shultz) It covers technical, managerial and financial. My focus is more on the
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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managerial.
Q. Do you -- could you please briefly summarize your prefiled testimony.
A. (Shultz) Yes. Mr. Childers will be providing testimony on the financial capabilities of Consolidated, and Mr. Waggoner will be providing testimony on the technical capabilities, and I will focus primarily on managerial.

Consolidated's experienced management team averages 25 years of industry experience and has a wide variety of experiences not only with Consolidated, but also working in larger -- with working in larger local exchange carriers like Bell of Pennsylvania, Frontier, and CLECs like Integra.

Consolidated company management has significant experience in operating ILECs in rural and small urban areas. It has successfully served customers in such markets, bringing innovative broadband and video services, while running a financially sound company with the ability to invest and maintain the network and foster growth.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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Consolidated is familiar with FairPoint's obligations as a successor to a regional Bell operating company, including interconnection obligations, pole attachments and local access and transport area tandem provider obligations, what's known as LATA tandem provider obligations. We are very experienced in those areas and work with other CLECs and Carriers. New Hampshire wholesale performance assurance plan is one item that Consolidated as an ILEC has not been required to implement; however, with this transaction, FairPoint's wholesale carrier group does that have experience and will continue to provide that service post-close. In short, Consolidated's management will ensure that all FairPoint's existing ILEC obligations will continue to be met.

Consolidated will also honor FairPoint's collective bargaining agreements with FairPoint's union employees. Consolidated will evaluate the potential for realizing efficiencies through the elimination of
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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overlapping executive and corporate functions of the combined companies as we get closer to the closing dated.

In addition to myself, Consolidated's senior management personnel who will be primarily responsible for managing the proposed transition and for overseeing FairPoint's continued operations after close include: Robert Udell, President and Chief Executive Officer; Steve Childers, Chief Financial Officer; Steve Shirar, Chief Information Officer; Michael Smith, Chief Marketing Officer; Gabe Waggoner, Vice-president of Operations; Tom White, Chief Technology Officer; Ryan Whitlock, Vice-president of Human Resources, and Carol Wirsbinski, Chief Sales Officer. Attachment MJS-1, which was submitted with my prefiled testimony, contains biographies of these key Consolidated management team members.

Consolidated has had substantial success in integrating acquired companies.

Consolidated employes a highly-structured project management approach to each
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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acquisition, which includes collaboration with its counterparties. Senior manager will continue to work closely with FairPoint management before and after closing to ensure employees and customers are kept informed. Consolidated will ensure that it has management personnel with responsibilities for New Hampshire and available to work collaboratively with New Hampshire stakeholders, regulators, communities and customers.

As Mr. Reed's prefiled testimony indicates, FairPoint is currently meeting all the ILEC obligations listed in RSA 362:8 and RSA 372:22.

Because the transaction involves a stock purchase, FairPoint and its New Hampshire operating subsidiaries will remain intact and continue with their current operations after the transaction closes. Therefore, FairPoint's existing ILEC to ELEC obligations will continue to be fulfilled in a seamless fashion. Also, because there are no systems or billing conversions required in connection
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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with this transaction, the transaction will be seamless to FairPoint's wholesale and retail customers.
Q. Mr. Shultz, do you wish to add anything further to your prefiled testimony at this time?
A. (Shultz) Not at this time. However, I do expect to file rebuttal testimony on or before May 18th in accordance with the procedural schedule for this docket.
Q. Thank you.

We'll go to Mr. Waggoner next.
A. (Waggoner) Good morning.
Q. Good morning. Could you state your name and please spell your last name for the record.
A. (Waggoner) Gabe Waggoner, $\mathbf{W}-\mathbf{A}-\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}$.
Q. Mr. Waggoner, where are you employed, and what position do you hold?
A. (Waggoner) Consolidated Communications, Incorporated, and I hold the role of Vice-president of Operations.
Q. How long have you held that position?
A. (Waggoner) I've been employed with Consolidated Communications since 2000 --
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since 1996. I have held my current role since 2013.
Q. Could you please describe your responsibilities as Vice-president of Operations at Consolidated.
A. (Waggoner) Overall service, delivery, strategy and execution, which includes installation, management, maintenance of CCI's physical assets, as well as managing our overall call center strategy, repair and technical support and customer service, network, central office technicians and our field technicians, and installation and repair for the entire organization.
Q. Could you please briefly describe your professional and educational background.
A. (Waggoner) I have 20 years of telecommunications experience, including leadership roles in customer service, engineering, network operations and field operations. I've also held primary responsibilities for integration strategy and implementation in Consolidated's previous acquisitions. I hold a bachelor of science
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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in business and a master's in business administration from Eastern Illinois University.
Q. And Mr. Waggoner, did you prefile testimony in this docket in support of the Petition that is the subject of this docket?
A. (Waggoner) Yes.
Q. And I'd like to show you what's been marked for identification as Exhibit 3. Do you recognize this as your prefiled testimony that you just referred to?
A. (Waggoner) Yes.
Q. Mr. Waggoner, do you have any updates or corrections to that prefiled testimony?
A. (Waggoner) Updates. On Page 5 of my prefiled direct testimony, submitted back on

January 17th, in Lines 9 through 14 I describe some of the review and analysis of FairPoint engineering and operations processes with their leadership. Since that time, significantly more analysis and collaboration has been taking place. Tom White, our Chief Technology Officer, has had multiple discussions, face-to-face
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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meetings and technical sessions with various engineering and NOC functional leaders, including detailed discussions between CCI and FairPoint's functional managers this week in person in Manchester, as well as face-to-face sessions there two weeks ago. Steve Shirar, our Chief Information Officer, is doing the same, including this week with IT functional leads.

Ryan Whitlock, Our vice-president of
Human Resources, has not only began recurring meetings with FairPoint staff to get more detailed assessments of employer relations, he's also met with union leadership representatives here in Northern New England last week face-to-face, as well as this week, face-to-face.

As for myself, I've held additional discussions on operation strategy with FairPoint management in 10 different sessions in the weeks since we filed the testimony. This level of activity, this uptick at this juncture is very consistent with how Consolidated has operated in the previous
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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five acquisitions.
Q. And Mr. Waggoner, subject to the changes that you just mentioned, do you adopt your prefiled testimony today under oath?
A. (Waggoner) Yes.
Q. Could you please briefly summarize that testimony.
A. (Waggoner) My testimony demonstrates Consolidated's technical capabilities of maintaining FairPoint's ILEC obligations. My testimony describes Consolidated's network and its comprehensive review of FairPoint's network, as well as Consolidated's technical capabilities, knowledge and experience with successfully transitioning network and service operations of acquired companies. In addition, I discussed Consolidated's plans to make the proposed integration of FairPoint's operations with those of Consolidated's seamless from the point of view of FairPoint's current New Hampshire wholesale and retail customers.
Q. Could you please briefly summarize -- I believe you mentioned that your testimony
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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talks about Consolidated's current network and experience. Could you briefly summarize that aspect of your testimony.
A. (Waggoner) As Mr. Shultz mentioned earlier, Consolidated's network extends over an 11-state footprint with both local exchange carrier, or LEC, and competitive local exchange carrier, or CLEC, networks. The network infrastructure includes time division multiplexing, TDM, equipment providing traditional switch services, as well as advanced Internet protocol, IP-based components. The core network include next-generation wave division multiplexing, or WDM, and multi-protocol layer switching, MPLS, IP core supporting traditional services and advanced broadband services. The last mile networks include copper, coax and fiber to the node, fiber to the house and fiber to the building. Consolidated has deep experience operating as a local access and transport area, LATA, provider, a TM provider, and 5911 provider, as well as partnering with telecommunications to provide
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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these services in some scenarios. Consolidated has connected all 11 state markets with a multi-state mesh, MPLS, network to provide further geographic redundancy for operational and subscriber services.
Q. Mr. Waggoner, do you have anything further to add to your testimony?
A. (Waggoner) Consolidated has spent a significant amount of time with the engineering and operations leadership of FairPoint reviewing the New England network. A comprehensive review of network diagrams, equipment deployments and last-mile deployments in fiber and copper was conducted. Physical inspections of portions of the network were conducted. In addition, an evaluation of network design within core and last mile was conducted, as well as how FairPoint delivers and supports the services within the state.

The purpose of the review was to understand the current capabilities and state of the FairPoint deployed network. This
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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understanding led to the valuation of the network and provided insight and guidance as to how Consolidated would manage the network once owned. Consolidated has performed similar reviews in the five other acquisitions I mentioned earlier. Through these reviews we've refined our inspection points to assure we understand what the current network deployment status is and what Consolidated will need to do to advance that network to support next-generation services.

Beyond the network, Consolidated also reviews and analyzes the processes, procedures and personnel within the company to be acquired to determine how Consolidated will integrate these into a combined company.
Q. Mr. Waggoner, could you briefly summarize the portion of your prefiled testimony that discusses Consolidated's proposed integration plan.
A. (Waggoner) So, as with previous acquisitions, Consolidated will establish an Integration Management Office, or IMO, that monitors all integration projects for every functional
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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area and ensures that no transitional initiatives adversely affect any other effort. This methodical approach has proven very successful for Consolidated as we have sought to balance expedient, efficient transition with minimal disruption to employees or to customers. This process is typically an 18- to 24-month incremental process, beginning with such functions as ERP, or financial systems, and the network inventory systems.

Consolidated will approach the New
Hampshire network and the customer base it supports, as it does all networks within the company, by focusing on continued evolution to support the next generation of services, while diligently working to improve the customer experience. Since FairPoint is an independent operating company already servicing customers on systems which will remain in place with the entity Consolidated is acquiring, there is no cutover necessary as was experienced in the asset sale of the

New Hampshire network from Verizon to
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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FairPoint. As a result, any future billing or operation support system integrations will only occur when it's necessary for supporting new services or efficiency gains.

From a network perspective, FairPoint's retail and wholesale customers will experience no changes following the closing of the deal. All of the existing tariffs and wholesale agreements, pricing and processes and systems in place with FairPoint today will continue post-close.
Q. Mr. Waggoner, is there anything else from your prefiled testimony that you wish to summarize?
A. (Waggoner) Regarding our technical capabilities, we've got a long history and extensive experience in providing telecommunication services, and therefore we have the technical capability of maintaining the ILEC obligations that FairPoint is currently meeting. That capability will be enhanced by the fact that the combined company will include FairPoint's existing operating entities and systems which will
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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remain in place post-closing.
Q. Thank you. Does that conclude your summary?
A. (Waggoner) Not at this -- yes, at this time. However, I do expect to file rebuttal testimony on or before May 18 in accordance with the procedural schedule for this docket.
Q. Thank you.

And now we'll proceed with Mr. Childers.
Could you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.
A. (Childers) Steve Childers, $C-H-I-L-D-E-R-S$.
Q. Mr. Childers, where are you employed and what position do you hold?
A. (Childers) I am based in Mattoon, Illinois. I'm employed by Consolidated Communications, Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Consolidated Communications Holdings, Inc. And I hold the position as Chief Financial Officer.
Q. How long have you held the position of CFO at Consolidated?
A. (Childers)I've been with Consolidated since 1986, and I've held the CFO title since 2004.
Q. And could you please briefly describe your \{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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responsibilities as CFO at Consolidated.
A. (Childers) Sure. My primary responsibilities are to manage all the external financial reporting, including SOX compliance, or Sarbanes-Oxley requirements, and lead investor communications --
(Court Reporter inquiry)
A. -- also lead the treasury, insurance, tax and financial planning functions for the company. Anytime we're looking at an acquisition opportunity, I'm very involved in that, as well as doing any diligence or integration activities. I manage our capital structure, lead the effort for financing equity or debt, whether it's on a stand-alone basis or acquisition-related.
Q. Could you please briefly describe your background and experience.
A. (Childers) Yeah, I think I have a pretty diversified background in finance and accounting and operations, not to mention $I$ started with Consolidated in 1986, and currently am CFO. Through that time I've held a variety of positions on the finance
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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side of the business. Also ran our telemarketing division and served as the president of Consolidated Marketing Response. When we were part of McLeodUSA, I held a variety of executive and operational roles with McLeod. That time period was 1997 to -or I'm sorry -- 2002. I ran customer service. I was involved in sales. Also ran business process teams to implement revenue assurance processes and controls.
Q. And did you submit prefiled testimony in this docket?
A. (Childers) I did.
Q. And I'd like to show you a document that's been premarked for identification as Exhibit 4. Is that the confidential version of your prefiled testimony?
A. (Childers) Yes.
Q. And I'd also like to show you a document that's been premarked for identification as Exhibit 5 in this docket. And is this a copy of your redacted version of your prefiled testimony?
A. (Childers) Yes, it is.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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Q. Do you have any updates or corrections to your prefiled testimony?
A. (Childers) I do. Similar to Mr. Shultz, on Page 8, Line 2 of my testimony, 1 need to correct the $\$ 4$ million number. It should be \$3. 1 million.
Q. Do you have any other updates or changes to your testimony?
A. (Childers) I do not.
Q. And subject to the changes that you've just discussed, do you adopt your prefiled testimony today under oath?
A. (Childers) Yes.
Q. And could you please briefly summarize your prefiled testimony.
A. (Childers) My prefiled testimony provides a description of the proposed transaction between Consolidated and FairPoint, the company's financial soundness, the transaction's financial impact on Consolidated, and our capabilities to maintain FairPoint's New Hampshire ILEC responsibilities that Mr . Shultz described. Mr. Shultz already provided an overview
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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of the transaction, so $I$ won't go into that part, other than to say that when we announced the deal back in December, we estimated a transaction value of $\$ 1.5$ billion, including $\$ 916$ million of FairPoint's debt that we needed to refinance. We did refinance that debt in December -- or had commitments for the refinancing under a secured term loan at rates of one half of what FairPoint is currently carrying that debt at. FairPoint will also have access to a $\$ 110$ million revolver as part of our overall capital structure. The financing does involve a pledge of assets, as well as the FairPoint stock. However, by pledging both, we believe that, in part, it contributes to the favorable rate we got compared to what FairPoint's cost of debt is. It also provides a much stronger balance sheet for the combined company.

The transaction obviously provides a scale for both companies. Again, at the time of the transaction, we estimated our capitalization or enterprise value to be
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about $\$ 2.5$ billion pro forma for the transactions, on a combined basis enterprise value approached $\$ 4$ billion.

The business combination with FairPoint consolidated provides a scale for both companies demonstrated by the pro forma metrics for the new company. We'll have over 35,000 route miles of fiber, making us a top ten fiber provider on a national basis. We'll be doing business in over 24 states. We'll support 8500 on-net buildings, 2400 connected towers. We'll serve over 1.6 million customer connections, with 4400 employees.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Childers, can you slow down just a hair --

WITNESS CHILDERS: Sure. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: -- so that we don't set the stenographer's fingers on fire?

WITNESS CHILDERS: I apologize.
A. (Childers) Pro forma for the transaction, we expect revenue to be $\$ 1.5$ billion, and adjusted EBITDA, given the effect to the proposed $\$ 55$ million in run rate synergy to
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be right around $\$ 600$ million. The proposed acquisition makes both companies more competitive from a service and product perspective, better capitalized to deploy broadband and expand our network to support our three customer channels, which are consumer, commercial and carrier. The transaction is meaningfully accretive to our cash flow, given the opportunity to improve revenue trends, improve operating cost while enhancing the quality of service, as well as minimizing, at least in the short-term, cash income taxes by utilizing $\$ 300$ million in federal net operating losses. Also, cash flow of the company will be improved due to the financing efforts we did in December based on a better interest rate than FairPoint is currently carrying.

The combination better positions us to continue our commitment for financial and operational stability in all the markets we serve. And in my professional opinion, the transaction is financially positive for both
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companies.
Our financial and operating results for the last five years have been very consistent and very solid on a stand-alone basis, and especially strong as compared to our peer group. We are in a period of revenue transformation consistent with the industry trends as we manage the erosion of our legacy voice services, including network access, and reduced subsidy revenues due to the implementation of Connect America funding for high cost support. We have continued to support -- to be successful by focusing on stabilizing revenues through our organic growth strategy, differentiating ourselves from our competition based on quality of product and quality of service, while continuing our disciplined approach to diversifying revenue and investing in the business.

We are focused on growing and sustaining free cash flow, cash generated after expenditures, to maintain expanded asset base.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}

As to our financial health, we measure basically looking at our revenue diversity, which is 80 percent of our business comes from our strategic revenues, which we define as consumer, broadband, commercial and carrier. And historically we've consistently invested 16 to 17 percent of our revenue back into the business to expand the network, promote broadband services, while maintaining a dividend payout ratio of roughly 65 to 70 percent of our free cash flow as defined in our credit agreement, and improving leverage. Due to some refinancing that we did in December, we have no short -- no current maturities, actually maturities -- no debt maturities until 2022, and average cost of debt is approximately 5 percent.

As we do with all acquisitions, we did a substantial amount of due diligence on FairPoint's operating and financial historical results and management projections of future results. We spent substantial time meeting with FairPoint's senior management to discuss results, IT, network infrastructure,
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customer service, personnel and labor agreements, as well as regulatory environments in each state in which FairPoint operates. Also as part of our diligence effort, we worked closely with FairPoint's management team to review and stress-test their business plan and long-term model. In addition, we also toured the key markets in the Northern New England properties with and without FairPoint management.

We also use Morgan Stanley as our investment banking support due to the strong level of involvement and expertise they have in similar industry transactions.

Because the transaction will produce a financially stronger combined company post-closing, Consolidated has the financial capacity of maintaining the New Hampshire ILEC obligations that FairPoint is now meeting.
Q. Mr. Childers, do you have anything further to add to your testimony?
A. (Childers) Not at this time. However, I do expect to file rebuttal testimony on or about
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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May 18th in accordance with the procedural schedule for this docket.
Q. Thank you.
A. (Childers) And I apologize for talking too fast.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Geiger, before we leave Mr. Childers, if you could take a look at Page 12 of the confidential version and note what is marked as confidential and then look at the bottom of Page 9 and the top of Page 10.

MS. GEIGER: I'm sorry. Could you please repeat? Page 4 did you say?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, Page 11 --
I'm sorry, Page 12. Things marked as confidential on Page 12 and compare some of those things to what is at the bottom of 9 and the top of 10. You don't have to do this on the fly, but perhaps at the break you could take a look at those pages and see if there's anything that should be done.

MS. GEIGER: Sure. I see what you're
saying. And I will work with the witness on that. I had assumed that the -- I see there is
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
some overlap there. So thank you for bringing that to my attention.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Now, Mr. Phillips.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. PHILLIPS:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Reed.
A. (Reed) Good morning.
Q. Could you please state your name for the record and spell it, please.
A. (Reed) Michael C. Reed, R-E-E-D.
Q. By whom are you employed, and what is your title?
A. (Reed) I'm employed by FairPoint Communications, and I'm State President for Maine and Vermont.
Q. Are you the same Michael C. Reed who submitted prefiled direct testimony in this docket on behalf of FairPoint on January 13, 2017?
A. (Reed) Yes.
Q. Was that prefiled testimony prepared by you or under your direct supervision?
A. (Reed) Yes.
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Q. Is your professional background set forth in that initial or in that prefiled testimony?
A. (Reed) Yes.
Q. Do you have any changes or corrections you wish to make to your prefiled testimony?
A. (Reed) Just one slight update on Page 1 , Line 5. Just about a month ago, on March 27th, I was named as FairPoint's State President of Vermont, along with keeping my title as State President in Maine.
Q. And your prefiled direct testimony was premarked as Exhibit 6; is that right, Mr. Reed?
A. (Reed) Yes.
Q. Could you briefly summarize your direct testimony for the Commission.
A. (Reed) Yes. FairPoint supports a favorable Commission decision in this docket. The acquisition of FairPoint stock by Consolidated will give FairPoint a new corporate owner, with improved financial and strategic flexibility and greater operational capacity and scale, while leaving FairPoint's existing systems and services in place,
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including its accounting and billing system, its existing contracts and agreements, and its existing wholesale agreements. No system cutover is required in this transaction. The transaction will be seamless to FairPoint's wholesale and retail customers in New Hampshire. I also point out in my testimony that FairPoint has satisfied the existing statutory conditions. And my testimony describes Consolidated satisfies all statutory requirements for a favorable Commission decision.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Reed. Do you adopt your prefiled direct testimony as amended as your sworn testimony in this proceeding?
A. (Reed) Yes.
Q. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Under the agreement, then, there's going to be no further questioning of these witnesses at this time; is that correct?
[No verbal response]
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
Q. Let me make sure $I$ get my numbering right here.

MR. RUBIN: Mr. Chair, Mr. Barber's testimony and exhibits were submitted in both confidential and public versions. The confidential version of the testimony we're marking as Exhibit 7, the public version as Exhibit 8, and then separate exhibits numbers for his attachments, which obviously I'll identify with the witness. The confidential version of the attachments is Exhibit 9, and the public version of those is Exhibit 10. BY MR. RUBIN:
Q. So, Mr. Barber, initially did you submit testimony in question-and-answer form?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And was that testimony prepared by you or under your direction and supervision?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And if I were to ask you the questions contained in that testimony, would your answers be the same?
A. Yes, they would.
Q. Do you have any changes or corrections in
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
those answers?
A. I do not.
Q. And did you also prepare attachments to the testimony labeled "Schedule RB-1 through RB-9"?
A. That I did.
Q. And were those attachments either prepared by or compiled by you or under your direction and supervision?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. And for those that you prepared, is that information accurate, to the best of your knowledge and information and belief?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And for those that were compiled, are those true copies of documents that you've received?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. Thank you.

MR. RUBIN: With that, we would move Exhibits 7 through 10 into the record and tender the witness for cross-examination.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Before taking up
any of that, $I$ just want to make sure that $I$
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
understand what I have in front of me as it relates to the numbering.

I have one packet of the confidential testimony with Pages 1 through 74. Is there a point at which that becomes -- when it's no longer Exhibit 7 and it becomes Exhibit 9?

MR. RUBIN: Well, that was something I should have addressed yesterday -- or Tuesday during our prehearing session, and I did not. The list was prepared as having two separate documents. The dividing line would be Page 51, which is the beginning of the attachments. If you would prefer to keep the entire document as one exhibit, we can just eliminate a couple of numbers.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I don't know which, honestly, is an easier, more seamless way to do it. You've done it this particular way. All I need to know is where to separate the document and re-attach it, and I think we can work with it from that point.

Off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So why don't we go back on the record.

All right. Mr. Wiesner, how are we going to work out Exhibits 7 through 10 then?

MR. WIESNER: The reason for separately listing the attachments, Mr . Chairman, was because a complete set of redacted attachments was filed subsequent to the original filing of Mr. Barber's testimony. But $I$ believe that it would make sense, if all parties agree, that we consolidate for purposes of exhibit numbering the direct testimony and attachments of Mr . Barber in their confidential form as No. 7. So, premarked for I.D. No. 7 would be Labor Intervenors Direct Testimony and Attachments of Randy Barber, Confidential Version. And then I.D. No. 8 would be Labor Intervenors Direct Testimony of Randy Barber, Redacted Version. No. 9 will not be used, and 10 will be Labor Intervenors complete attachments of Randy Barber in redacted version.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}

Without objection, that's how we'll deal with that.

Mr. Rubin moved the exhibits.
I mean, typically we have held the moving of exhibits until the end. I'm happy not to do it. I'm happy to do it as we go, on the off chance that there's problems. I assume, then that, Ms. Geiger and Mr. Phillips, you would want to move the direct testimonies that you introduced, which would be Exhibits 1 through 6; is that correct?

MS. GEIGER: I don't think I've ever done it this way before, but $I$ think that's fine. I think my preference would be to move them all in at the end, as we typically do. But if that's the Chair's pleasure, I can go along with that.

MR. RUBIN: Mr. Chair, I'm happy to withdraw the motion and we can do it all at the end. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Then why don't we do it in what is the more typical process here.

All right. Mr. Rubin, $I$ think
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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you are done and we're ready to move on to the others questioning. Ms. Geiger, Mr. Phillips, who's going to go first? MS. GEIGER: I believe I'm going first.

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Barber.
A. Good morning.
Q. You've been asked to review the Consolidated/FairPoint transaction from a financial perspective; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you've been asked to provide analyses and other information that might be useful to the Commission in determining whether

Consolidated is technically, managerially and financially capable of maintaining the obligations of an incumbent local exchange carrier as required by New Hampshire law; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what is your understanding of those obligations?
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. My understanding of the obligations, in terms of maintaining FairPoint's operations in an adequate manner -- I mean, I could ask you to repeat the exact language, but fundamentally my understanding is that the Commission has to determine whether or not Consolidated is capable and, in fact, stepping into FairPoint's shoes to maintain FairPoint's operations in a safe and reliable manner.
Q. Is that every operation in the state, or just some?
A. Well, the Commission, as I understand it -and I'm not a lawyer -- but as I understand, the Commission has direct authority over what we would call the "regulated" portion of the FairPoint operations and not over the non-regulated portions thereof.
Q. Okay. So it's not your understanding that the operations that are at issue in this transaction in this docket relate to something more particular than just FairPoint's general operations in New Hampshire.
A. My understanding is it relates to the
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}

FairPoint operations over which the Commission has purview.
Q. And again, not to belabor this point, but I think your testimony on Page 4, Lines 9 through 13, you refer to FairPoint's "obligations under New Hampshire law," and you reference a statute there, RSA 374:30, II; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your understanding of that statute?
A. My understanding of that statute is -- I mean, if you want me to actually repeat it, I would have to look it up. But I believe your recitation of those obligations was what $I$ recall it would be.
Q. I don't recall reciting those obligations.
A. Well, you recited several, you know, basic standards that the Commission had to determine whether or not Consolidated was capable of maintaining, and that's what I was referring to.
Q. Okay. And I borrowed that from your testimony.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. Okay.
Q. So is it your testimony, with respect to Consolidated's financial capabilities, that the Company is not financially capable to assume the statutory responsibilities that FairPoint has under New Hampshire law?
A. My testimony is that, from my analysis, there are substantial risks for which I do not believe either of the parties have provided sufficient information to make that judgment.
Q. And are you aware that Staff's financial consultant in this docket, Mr. Vickroy, of the Liberty Consulting Group, has concluded that Consolidated has the financial capability to meet the standards required by New Hampshire statute?
A. I've read Mr. Vickroy's testimony.
Q. And is it fair to say --
A. Let me say I've read Mr. Vickroy's redacted testimony, which apparently is in the process of being changed, which I have not read.
Q. But is it fair to say that you disagree with Staff's consultant on Consolidated's financial capability in this docket?
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MR. RUBIN: I object to the question, Mr. Chair. Staff's testimony was filed well after Mr. Barber's testimony was filed. As Mr. Barber indicated, he has not yet received a version of Mr. Vickroy's testimony that actually contains most of the numbers in that testimony and the analysis the witness did. There were several issues with the way --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay, okay. I understand the objection.

Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: I asked the witness whether he agreed with Mr. Vickroy's conclusion. I'm not asking about any specific numbers. I'm asking about the statement in Mr . Vickroy's --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Overruled. He can answer.
A. Without having access to his reasoning, which includes a significant amount of financial data which has been redacted, I cannot tell you whether $I$ agree or disagree with his position.

BY MS. GEIGER:
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
Q. Okay. So, turning to your conclusions now in statements concerning Consolidated's financial capabilities, I believe on Page 45, Lines 9 through 10 of your prefiled testimony, you say that, "The ability to raise capital on reasonable terms is a key indicator of a utility holding company's financial capability"; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it true that Consolidated has already obtained financing for this transaction?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it also true that Consolidated's financing is at a more favorable rate than FairPoint's current debt obligations?
A. Yes.
Q. Isn't it also true that Consolidated's credit rating from Moody's and Standard \& Poor's are higher than FairPoint's?
A. Yes.
Q. Now shifting gears a little bit. On Page 11, Lines 7 through 8 of your prefiled testimony, you said --
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. I'm sorry. Which page?
Q. Page 11, Lines 7 through 8.
A. Yes.
Q. You say that FairPoint could probably refinance its own debt at a much lower rate than its current 7.9 percent and without needing to increase the debt by $\$ 18$ million. Is that your testimony?
A. It is.
Q. But you don't know for sure that FairPoint could refinance its own debt at a much lower rate, or even at all, do you?
A. As I stated in my testimony, this was a hypothetical exercise designed to determine the order of magnitude of a potential stand-alone refinancing versus the refinancing which occurred in this transaction. I noted multiple times that there was no way to be sure about any of those numbers without testing the market. But I also noted that looking at the published spreads between the rating agency determinations of FairPoint versus

Consolidated led me to believe that FairPoint
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would achieve a rate that would be higher than Consolidated achieved, but would be significantly lower than the current average rate that FairPoint pays on the debt that it refinanced I believe in 2012 or 2013.
Q. But I believe you just said this was a hypothetical conjecture on your part;
correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. Would you agree that FairPoint's bankruptcy would likely affect FairPoint's ability to refinance at lower rates than those it currently pays on its debt service?
A. I would agree that certainly within the first few years of the bankruptcy that it would have an effect. It's less clear to me now whether or not that bankruptcy would have an effect on creditors' willingness to lend or cooperate, particularly since we're, what, seven, eight years out from the bankruptcy at this point.
Q. Now, have you reviewed Mr. Vickroy's position that FairPoint has difficulties with debt financing markets due to its bankruptcy and
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
financial performance following emergence from bankruptcy?
A. I read that that was his statement, yes.
Q. And isn't it also true that Mr. Vickroy said that FairPoint faces real refinancing risk at this point and would probably be saddled with financing terms and interest rates similar to its lower high-yield debt financing currently in place?
A. I read that.
Q. And isn't it true that this transaction with Consolidated would assist FairPoint with refinancing its debt at lower interest rates?
A. As I indicated, it's definitely a lower rate than even I believe FairPoint could have refinanced on a stand-alone basis.
Q. Okay. On Page 46 of your prefiled testimony --
A. Okay.
Q. Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. At Lines 5 through 6, you state, "It appears that the New Hampshire company, on its own, would lack the ability to make capital
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
investments without the approval of
Consolidated at the parent company level."
Is that your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is a concern that you expressed with respect to the merged company at the New

Hampshire level; correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. But isn't it true that today, FairPoint New Hampshire would require the approval of its parent company for material capital
investments?
A. Yes.
Q. Now turning to Page 46 of your testimony, at Lines 8 through 11, you suggest that this Commission place strictures on the amount of investment funds that are diverted from FairPoint New Hampshire to Consolidated, to ensure that the New Hampshire operations have the financial capability necessary to maintain and upgrade the state's predominant telecommunications network. Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, it is.
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Q. Do you know whether this Commission has the authority to direct FairPoint's investment funds in the manner that you're suggesting?
A. I am not a lawyer.
Q. So you don't know whether the suggestion you're making can in fact be adopted by this Commission.
A. I don't know whether or not it can be ordered or part of some kind of stipulated agreement. I don't make that distinction.
Q. And isn't it true that Mr. Vickroy has not made this suggestion in his testimony?
A. He has not, as far as I can tell.
Q. Okay. So, turning to the issue of synergies, on Page 14 of your testimony, at Lines 4 to 5 you state, "There is a real possibility that the Petitioners cannot achieve both the level of synergies they project and at the same time maintain or improve FairPoint's operation"; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But you haven't analyzed FairPoint's own ability to maintain or improve its operations without this proposed transaction, have you?
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. That would require an answer that is confidential.
Q. Well, perhaps $I$ can refresh your memory. With respect to a data request that Consolidated posed to you -- and this would be 1-10 Labor, Barber -- we asked you to state whether you've analyzed FairPoint's ability on a stand-alone basis to maintain or improve FairPoint's operations without the proposed transaction with Consolidated. And in response you said, "Mr. Barber has not conducted such an analysis."
A. Well, $I$ get -- no, $I$ have it right here. Thank you.

I guess I heard your question a little differently. There is an answer that $I$ would provide, as I say, confidentially. It is not my direct analysis, which is what this answer is. But I'm --
Q. Okay.
A. I'm privy to information that may be perhaps enlightening on this count.
Q. So when you answered the data request, you said that you have not conducted such an
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analysis. But has your analysis been conducted subsequent to that time?
A. No.
Q. So I guess I'm confused as to why the answer to Data Request 1-10 from Consolidated was that you had not conducted the analysis.
A. Well, as I said in the answer to the $D R$, it was specifically whether "I" had conducted "an analysis," and whereas at least what I heard you ask was, in effect, was I aware of information that would lead me to believe that FairPoint could improve on a stand-alone basis. To me, those are two different issues.
Q. Well, I believe my question -- and I don't think we need to stop and have it read back -- but I believe my question was about your specific analysis.
A. Well, then, my specific analysis, I have not done a specific analysis.
Q. All right. Thank you.

So, with regard to Consolidated's ability to achieve the anticipated synergies from this transaction, have you revived the
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synergy levels that Consolidated actually did achieve from its prior acquisitions of North Pittsburgh, SureWest, an Eventus.
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Now, they actually did achieve synergies with those transactions; correct?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Okay. Are you aware that Mr. Vickroy, in his testimony, performed some stress tests related to synergies in Consolidated's finance model? Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it true that Mr. Vickroy concluded that realized synergies could be significantly negative before causing financial distress for Consolidated?
A. This is where I'm at a disadvantage with the redactions. I would agree that it appears that's what he's saying. But there are significant redactions in there $I$ would want to be able to read to understand the underlying rationale in that argument.
Q. Okay. So --
A. And actually, not just the rationale. There
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appear to be some important punchlines which are redacted.
Q. Fair enough. So did you estimate the probability of each of the stress tests that Mr. Vickroy performed ever actually occurring?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. And didn't Mr. Vickroy do exactly that and find that it would be extreme and unlikely for each of those scenarios in the stress tests to occur simultaneously?

MR. RUBIN: Mr. Chair, I need to object again at this point. She's asking this witness about testimony from Mr. Vickroy. This portion of that testimony was mostly marked "Highly Confidential." It was an improper --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I want to
hear -- can I hear the question again, Ms. Geiger?

MS. GEIGER: Sure. The question -perhaps I don't -- I don't want to misstate anything, so $I$ would ask Ms. Robidas to read it back.
(Record read as requested.)
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Do You understand the question, Mr. Barber?

WITNESS BARBER: I do.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Are you able to answer it?

WITNESS BARBER: I am. I'll answer it exactly as I did. I believe that he used a phrase similar to that. Maybe exactly that phrase. But there were significant redactions, and I do not know how he qualified it or how he quantified it.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
MS. GEIGER: So there's an objection.
I guess what --
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think you got your answer. He doesn't know.

MS. GEIGER: Doesn't know. Okay.
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Now, on Page 42 of your prefiled testimony, you indicate that Consolidated would be -will be unable to achieve $\$ 55$ million in synergy savings without significant integration activities and that the Commission should require Petitioners to
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
provide detailed integration plans; is that correct?
A. That's what I believe.
Q. And isn't it true that since 2004,

Consolidated has been able to successfully integrate acquired operations into its own company?
A. Every integration's -- the answer is yes.

Every integration is different and on
different scales. And this particular case
has specific issues that we raise separately
that lead me to believe this.
Q. Are you aware of any of Consolidated's
acquisitions where this successful
integration did not occur?
A. I'm not aware of anything like that.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Turning to the issue of managerial
capability now. I believe you indicated that
your testimony was primarily geared toward a financial assessment; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Yet you did give some opinions about
managerial capability. Is that also correct?
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A. Yes.
Q. Now, your testimony does not indicate that Consolidated lacks technical capabilities; is that correct?
A. It does not.
Q. So on Page 15, Lines 14 to 15 --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I'm sorry, Ms. Geiger. Which page?

MS. GEIGER: It's Page 15, Lines 14 to 15.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Thank you. BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. You say there that Consolidated is unprepared to acquire FairPoint and manage its operations. And then on the same page, at Lines 10 through 12, you say that the Petitioners simply have not provided information, plans or commitments demonstrating their financial and managerial capabilities to absorb and manage an operation of the size and diversity of FairPoint; is that correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. But isn't it true that Consolidated
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
does have experience in acquiring and managing companies larger than itself?
A. At different points in time it's acquired entities that are larger, but the order of magnitude of this acquisition is significantly different.
Q. Well, isn't it true that with the acquisition of TXU in 2004, Consolidated tripled its size?
A. It is.
Q. Isn't it also true that since 2004, Consolidated has acquired other telecom companies in various parts of the United States and is currently managing their operations?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, on Page 16 of your prefiled testimony, at Lines 1 through 2, you say that Consolidated witnesses evinced a startling lack of knowledge about FairPoint's varied operations, not to mention a lack of concrete plans, actions, or even intentions with respect to the company they propose to acquire? Is that your testimony?
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. Yes, it is.
Q. But isn't it true that Mr. Waggoner's prefiled testimony contains a section describing Consolidated's review of FairPoint's network and a section discussing Consolidated's integration plan?
A. Yes.
Q. And isn't it also true that Consolidated's answers to several data requests from Staff provided information about Consolidated's due diligence?
A. They provided information.
Q. Okay. Now I'd like to show you what we've marked, or premarked for identification as Exhibits 17 through 22. And I believe you have copies of these, but I'll give you the ones with the stickers on them, and I'll give them to the Bench as well. (Pause in proceedings)

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Now, would you agree that Consolidated's responses to those data requests indicate that they did in fact perform substantial due diligence with respect to FairPoint's New
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}

Hampshire operations?
A. No. I believe that what it indicates is that they performed an examination. That, to me, that is not a due diligence and -- anyway, I'll leave it at that.
Q. Okay. So would you not agree that -- I guess it's your testimony that these responses demonstrate some sort of, did you say an examination?
A. Overview.
Q. But that, in your mind, that's not the same thing as doing due diligence.
A. Well, we're talking about 17 now; right?
Q. I think we're talking about all of --
A. You want me to read them all?
Q. -- all of them together. Well, I believe in response to a data request $I$ asked you, you said you have read them all.
A. I read them all, but I didn't memorize them.
Q. Okay.
A. If you want me to go through, I can quickly scan them.
Q. Sure. Why don't we do that.
A. All right.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
(Witness reviews document.)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's go off the record while Mr. Barber's reviewing the request.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Geiger, you may proceed.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. The question $I$ have, Mr. Barber, is wouldn't you agree that those responses describe at least some of Consolidated's due diligence with respect to FairPoint's New Hampshire assets?
A. Certainly describes specific activities.
Q. Okay. Yet, you've stated at Page 47, Lines 14 through 15 of your testimony, that Consolidated appears to be singularly uninformed about the actual operations of FairPoint in New Hampshire. Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And on Page 33, Lines 6 through 7, you speak of Consolidated's failure to meet with union officials.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. Yes.
Q. And you heard Mr. Waggoner's updates to his testimony this morning; is that correct?
A. $\mathrm{Hmm}-\mathrm{hmm}$. Yes.
Q. So does that give you any reason to change that portion of your testimony regarding the failure to meet with union officials?
A. Uh-huh. No.
Q. No? So is it your position that Consolidated has still failed to meet with union officials?
A. On any substantive basis. That's correct.
Q. On any substantive basis. Okay.

Turning now to Page 8 of your prefiled testimony. On Lines 14 through 15, you say that you will analyze key financial risks associated with this transaction; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But your testimony did not identify as a key financial risk the fact that Consolidated will pledge its assets as security for the financing associated with this transaction, did it?
A. No.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
Q. On Page 10, Lines 20 through 21, you state that the Petitioners have identified very few verifiable benefits for FairPoint's customers, communities or employees in New Hampshire. Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. But verifiable benefits are not among the findings that the Commission must make in this docket, is it?
A. Again, I'm not a lawyer. I was observing what they actually provided.
Q. And on Page 48 to the top of 49 of your testimony, you say that the Commission should not approve the proposed transaction until Consolidated makes certain commitments, and you also propose that the Commission impose certain requirements on Consolidated; is that correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. What is the Commission's legal authority to do as you suggest?
A. Again, $I$ am --

MR. RUBIN: Excuse me. I object if she's asking the witness for a legal
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
conclusion.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Geiger.
MS. GEIGER: I'll withdraw the question.

BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. Do you know whether this Commission regulates telecommunications companies in the same manner that it did prior to 2012?
A. No, it's changed.
Q. It has changed. Would you characterize that change as "significant"?
A. Certainly important.
Q. Thank you.

MS. GEIGER: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Why don't we give everybody ten minutes or so, and we'll be back here at twenty minutes to twelve. (Brief recess taken.)

CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. PHILLIPS:
A. Good morning.
Q. I just have a few questions for you this
morning. I do have a small amount of inquiry
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
into confidential information, but $I$ will leave that to the end so we only have to change transcripts once. I do want to note that my questions in the confidential record delve into the same area that Ms. Geiger was talking about, which is Mr. Vickroy's testimony about the stress tests. And I just wanted to note that the entire section that Mr. Vickroy uses to describe those stress tests, which is Pages 31 to 34 of his prefiled testimony, there is a significant amount of confidential material. There is no -- nothing that's designated as highly confidential in that section.

Mr. Barber, I understand that you are allowed access to the confidential information, but not to the highly confidential information; is that right?

MR. RUBIN: Excuse me.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Rubin, yes.
MR. RUBIN: Because of the way Staff
had filed Mr. Vickroy's testimony initially, there were not separate confidential and highly confidential versions. So the only document
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}

Mr. Barber has seen is the public version of that testimony, so he has not -- even though he has access to confidential information, there was not a confidential-only version of Mr. Vickroy's testimony that could be made available to him. So he has not seen that part of the testimony.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay.
MR. PHILLIPS: Understood. I will see if $I$ can avoid references to the confidential information that Mr. Barber has not seen.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. This is all hypothetical for me at this point. We'll see how it goes.

MR. PHILLIPS: Understood.
BY MR. PHILLIPS:
Q. All right. Mr. Barber, would you please turn to Page 47 of your testimony. I'm looking at the section called Conclusions and Recommendations.
A. I'm there.
Q. And in Lines 11 through 13, the question is,
"What are your recommendations?" And your
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
answer there is, "The Commission has not been provided with sufficient information to permit it to make an informed decision." Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. But as you testified earlier this morning, you've not actually reviewed all the information that the Petitioners provided to the Staff; is that right?
A. I didn't testify to that. Only to the extent that it was designated highly confidential and I was not permitted to review it. I've read every DR that either FairPoint or Consolidated responded to, both to Labor and to the Staff in this case.
Q. Except for those portions marked --
A. Highly confidential.
Q. And the reason for that is that you have an ongoing role in collective bargaining on behalf of your clients with FairPoint?
A. That's my understanding that's the rationale.
Q. Now, just staying with the public portions of the record, would you please turn to Page 11 of your testimony. I'm looking at Lines 10
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
and 11. Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. So you say there, "Other than agreeing to follow the law, they" -- the Petitioners -"have failed to provide any tangible commitments."
A. Yes.
Q. Have I quoted that accurately?
A. You did.
Q. Okay. Now, the way that I read that second sentence is that the Petitioners have only agreed to follow the law. They have not agreed to go beyond what the law requires and provide any tangible commitments. Is that a fair reading of that sentence?
A. I wouldn't quite read it that way. What I said or what I wrote and what I meant was that the tangible commitments that I'm aware of were effectively ones that are already requirements.
Q. So when you say "other than agreeing to follow the law," what do you mean by that?
A. What $I$ mean is that, at least to my knowledge, Consolidated has not made any
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
specific commitments with respect to whether it is improved service or even with respect to level of capital investments in New Hampshire, with respect to employment levels in New Hampshire. Those are all tangible or concrete commitments that $I$ don't believe they've made.
Q. But in your view, under the statement you made here, are those inside the law or outside the law, the tangible commitments?
A. Well, one would hope they're not outside the law.
Q. Well, I would hope so, too.

And later on Page 48 of your
testimony --
A. Forty which? What was the page?
Q. Page 48 of your testimony?
A. Okay.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
Q. So, Mr. Barber, turning to Page 48 of your testimony, Lines 6 through 11, you again talk there about the Commission not approving the proposed transaction until Consolidated
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
agrees to concrete, enforceable commitments to improve operations and service in New Hampshire and to increase capital investments in New Hampshire similar to those which were required by the Commission in the FairPoint/Verizon transaction. Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And are those the sorts of commitments that you would characterize as requiring doing something other than following the law?
A. I'm not particularly comfortable with your "following the law" or "outside the law" or whatever. What I will say is that, in my experience, and it's my understanding, that nothing precludes the parties from agreeing to or committing to commitments that are either enforceable in the first case or specifically tied to capital investments in New Hampshire.
Q. Mr. Barber, do you have on the stand there with you premarked Exhibit No. 24? I can --
A. I doubt it.
Q. I can give you a copy.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. What is it?
Q. So, Mr. Barber, this is an exhibit that's been premarked as Exhibit No. 24, and it is Labor's answer to FairPoint's Data Request No. 6 .

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Phillips, I'm fairly certain that we don't.

MR. PHILLIPS: I did provide copies to the clerk.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. It's coming.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Sorry, Mr.
Phillips. We do have 24.
MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
BY MR. PHILLIPS:
Q. In this data request, Mr. Barber, you were asked to identify the legal and statutory authority or authorities for each and every recommendation made in your testimony and -is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And your answer there is a recitation of the
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS: RANDY BARBER]
terms and provisions of RSA 374:30, II; is that right?

MR. RUBIN: Excuse me. Mr. Chair, I object to that characterization. The question did not ask Mr. Barber for his understanding. They asked for the legal and statutory authority. The response was provided by me, as noted at the bottom. Frankly, I think it was an objectionable question. But as a courtesy we provided FairPoint with some insight into our legal theory and rationale. I have no problem with their questioning Mr. Barber about, you know, the basis for his professional judgment, but this should not be characterized as his legal opinion. It is mine.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, Mr.
Barber is the Labor's witness. There was no objection made to the data request.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And I'm not even sure what your question is about it. I think Mr. Rubin was mainly challenging your characterization of it as Mr. Barber's answer. I think Mr. Rubin has clarified that it is his answer. I'm sure there are questions you can
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
ask Mr. Barber about it that will not draw an objection.

BY MR. PHILLIPS:
Q. Mr. Barber, is it your understanding that the answer to FairPoint Labor 6 is the labor union's understanding of the current state of the law in New Hampshire?
A. That is correct.
Q. All right. Thank you.

Now, one of the areas you talk about in your testimony is customer service. You have two things to say about that, and I want to be sure I understand what it is you're saying. So on Page 3 of your written testimony, if you could turn there, please, on Line 16 -- do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. You talk about events that have happened since 2008. And one of those things that has happened, according to you, is that the Company's customer service has deteriorated. That's your testimony?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And then turning to Page 43 of your
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
testimony, starting on Line 12 -- are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. -- you say, "As Labor Witness Soule will explain, there is a risk that serious" -"there is a serious risk that further cuts would result in deteriorating network conditions and poor customer service." Have I quoted your testimony accurately there?
A. You have.
Q. Now, Mr. Barber, you don't have any personal knowledge about any deteriorations in FairPoint's customer service since 2008, do you?
A. If by "personal knowledge" you mean that $I$ actually performed customer service tasks and so forth, the answer would be no.
Q. You're not aware --
A. However -- sorry. However, I have been engaged in continual conversations with many FairPoint employees, including union representatives over that time frame, up to and including now, about their direct experiences and observation about everything
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
from customer services to the state of the network and so forth. I would consider that a personal observation; it's just not direct experience.
Q. You're not aware of any customer complaints about FairPoint's customer service that have been filed in New Hampshire, are you?
A. I have not tracked them.
Q. You're not aware of any docket proceedings that have been opened in this state to investigate FairPoint's customer service?
A. I'm not aware of any.
Q. Do you know whether this Commission even regulates FairPoint's customer service?
A. I do not.
Q. And you're not aware of any cases in any other court or agency in New Hampshire involving complaints about FairPoint's customer service, are you?
A. Not aware.
Q. Now I'm going to get into some financial questions, and I'll try to stay within the information in the public record.

First, you characterize the proposed
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
transaction from a financial perspective as a "one-way street"; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you go on to say, and this is on Page 13 of your testimony, at Line 13, "As I discussed below, there are essentially no benefits to FairPoint's financial condition." Is that your testimony?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Now, Mr. Barber, you have reviewed the prefiled direct testimony of Randall Vickroy; have you not?
A. Yes, I have. Well, the --
Q. Public.
A. -- public version, yes.
Q. All right. That's the version that's been premarked as Exhibit 16, I believe.
A. I'll take your word.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: The list I'm looking at, $I$ think it says 15.

MR. PHILLIPS: Fifteen is the confidential version.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I have 14 as the confidential version of Vickroy.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS: RANDY BARBER]

MR. PHILLIPS: Is this the revised list here that David distributed?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's go off the record and get this sorted out.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Back on the record.

BY MR. PHILLIPS:
Q. So, excuse my misreference there, Mr. Barber. So this is the redacted version of Mr . Vickroy's testimony which has been premarked as Exhibit 15. Have you got that testimony with you on the stand?
A. I do not.

MR. PHILLIPS: Is it possible, Scott, we can get him a copy?

MR. RUBIN: The only copy, the only hard copy I have with me is the highly confidential version that was originally filed. We can give Mr. Barber his computer. I should ask if he has it on there.

WITNESS BARBER: NO, I don't have a printout. I have it on the computer.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Let's go off the
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
record.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: We are back on the record, Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you.
BY MR. PHILLIPS:
Q. Now, you're aware, Mr. Barber, are you not, that Mr. Vickroy reached several opposite conclusions to the conclusions that you've reached; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'll take you through these. The first one is FairPoint's debt financing. So let's turn first to your testimony on Page 36, and we'll start at Lines 6 through 9 there. And you acknowledge there, do you not, that Consolidated is refinancing FairPoint's debt at a much lower interest rate than FairPoint currently pays?
A. Yes.
Q. And Consolidated has obtained debt financing -- debt refinancing at a 4 percent interest rate compared to the 7.9 percent interest rate that FairPoint currently pays;
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
right?
A. Correct.
Q. But then you go on to question whether that's a real financial benefit to FairPoint because, as you say, interest rates today are much lower overall than they were when FairPoint first financed its debt; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And in your testimony -- this is starting at Lines 11 through 14 -- you say, "If FairPoint had sought to refinance its debt on its own, making it fully secured on similar terms to those obtained by Consolidated, with the exception that the interest rate would be somewhat higher, it certainly would have been able to obtain a much lower rate." Is that your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. And what you mean by that I think is explained a little bit later on Page 37, the next page, Lines 3 to 5, where you offer your view that FairPoint could have obtained debt financing at an interest rate no more than
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS: RANDY BARBER]
0.75 percent to 1.5 percent higher than Consolidated obtained.
A. Yes.
Q. All right. So let's turn to Mr. Vickroy's testimony. We'll start on Page 11 --
A. Bear with me.
Q. -- at the bottom.
A. Which line?
Q. Line 21.
A. Okay.
Q. As of December 31st, 2016, FairPoint had a total outstanding debt -- and this is now turning onto Page 12 -- of about $\$ 916$ million, the term loan and the senior notes, over $\$ 900$ million, maturing in February 2019, and the revolving credit matures in February 2018. Is that an accurate reflection of his testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. And you don't have any reason to doubt the accuracy of his figures there, do you?
A. Of his description of the current FairPoint debt or the pre-refinanced FairPoint debt?
Q. Right.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. No.
Q. That's consistent with your understanding.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So then, turning to Page 16 of the Vickroy testimony, at Line 14 -- do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. He's saying that FairPoint's financials improved in 2015 and 2016, but its debt covenant coverages have not improved. And in fact, FairPoint has experienced slight increases in net leverage and slight decreases in interest coverages. And he describes that as quote -- this is at Line 20 -- "painting a less optimistic picture," unquote. Do you see that? (Witness reviews document.)
A. I think you need to read the full sentence. He notes that the covenant calculations are different than the calculations used by Moody's and Standard \& Poor's. And actually, I read that in the context of him observing that there were significant differences between some of these metrics. And the
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
difference between the fourth quarter -sorry -- the third quarter 2016 and the fourth quarter 2016, indeed the leverage ratio went up a little bit, interest coverage ratio went down a little bit, and that in itself certainly would paint a negative picture.
Q. Thank you.
A. A more negative picture.
Q. Right, or "a less optimistic picture."
A. You could say the same.
Q. Okay. So then, on Page 17 , starting at Line 1, Mr. Vickroy's testimony is, "FairPoint may be able to refinance its debt on a stand-alone basis, but appears unlikely to improve on its 'deep junk category' interest rates, which currently include very expensive term loan interest rates of 7.50 percent and senior notes interest rate of rates of 8.75 percent." Do you see that testimony?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. All right. Do you have any reason to dispute his calculations there?
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. Only that the timing of the notes and loans that he describes was $4-1 / 2,5$ years ago, and that $I$ believe there is significant reason to project a lower interest rate even at the level of rating that FairPoint has in certain --
(Court Reporter inquiry)
A. So what $I$ was say is these numbers were derived from 2013, I believe, in terms of the interest rates. Interest rates I believe that would be available to a similarly rated company as FairPoint today would be lower. That's actually one of the main thrusts of my analysis. I'm sorry I couldn't remember exactly the words I said.
Q. But Mr. Barber, when Mr. Vickroy talks about FairPoint appearing "unlikely to improve on it's 'deep junk category' interest rates," he's not talking about 2008. He's talking about today; isn't that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

So, turning to Page 36 -- this is the conclusion to Mr . Vickroy's point here.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}

Lines 12 through 14 --
A. Hold on. Line 12 through 13?
Q. Twelve to 14. He says, "As noted above, Consolidated Term Loan B financing for the FairPoint acquisition takes 2019 refinancing risk off the table and provides substantially lower financing costs that strengthen legacy FairPoint's post-acquisition financial health."
A. That's what he says.
Q. That's what he says. And do you have any reason to doubt Mr. Vickroy's facts and conclusions there?
A. I think it's a question of analysis. I view post-transaction FairPoint as both a subsidiary of Consolidated and financially intermingled with Consolidated. And I don't think you can look at FairPoint on a stand-alone basis at that point, from the perspective that he made this argument.
Q. But wouldn't you agree, and this goes back to your testimony, that Mr. Vickroy's analysis of Consolidated's debt refinancing represents a tangible financial benefit to FairPoint?
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. I would agree with that. It's better terms.
Q. Okay. Another area where you and Mr. Vickroy reach opposite conclusions concerns the synergies that may result from this transaction. And I do want to be careful here. So as Ms. Geiger discussed with you -well, let me strike that and go back to your testimony.

So in your written testimony, let's turn to Page 43. And I'm looking at the testimony that begins on Line 7. Are you there?
A. Yes.
Q. So you say, "It is important to understand that if the synergies target is not achieved, there could be serious financial problems for Consolidated. Consolidated's ability to improve its financial condition, meet its debt service obligations and continue to pay its dividend to stockholders will depend on achieving synergies." Is that your testimony?
A. Yes. Absolutely.
Q. But you're aware that in Mr. Vickroy's stress test which Ms. Geiger described to you, he
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
actually reached the conclusion that Consolidated could not only fail to achieve its synergies, but actually have negative synergies, and it would still not -- it would still have, I think he described it as "lots of space" to meet its debt covenants. Do you remember that?
A. We were analyzing different things. He was analyzing the ability of Consolidated to meet various covenant restrictions. That is different than failing to achieve the level of savings that they're projecting in their synergies.
Q. In the language I quoted to you from your testimony on Page 43, you said that Consolidated's ability to meet its debt service obligations will depend on achieving synergies.
A. Meeting debt service obligations is a cash issue. It's not a financial covenant issue.
Q. All right. Fair enough.

You didn't independently run any stress tests on Consolidated's pro forma financials, did you?
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. No, although $I$ did use a combination of stress test results that originated in Vermont and were replicated here. But I did not -- first of all, $I$ did not have access to his testimony when I was writing mine; secondly, I used a combination of events that were part of a stress test that I think probably was the progenitor of the one that was asked for in this state. But did I independently run them? No.
Q. No. Okay. And after you reviewed Mr. Vickroy's testimony, you didn't go back and rerun his stress tests to verify their accuracy, did you?

MR. RUBIN: Objection. Mr. Barber does not yet have access to Mr. Vickroy's stress test.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'll withdraw the question.

BY MR. PHILLIPS:
Q. Mr. Barber, could you turn to Page 10 of your testimony.
A. Okay.
Q. Starting on Line 12 , there's a $Q \& A$ there
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
that says, "Based on your review and analysis, are you able to render an opinion about the reasonableness of the companies' financial assumptions and analyses, and Consolidated's financial capability to own and operate FairPoint's operations in New Hampshire?"

And your answer is, "Yes, I address these issues throughout my testimony"; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. But in fact, in response to Ms. Geiger's question this morning when she asked you if you have reached a conclusion about Consolidated's financial capability, you didn't say "Yes" or "No." You talked about certain risks and certain commitments and conditions. Have you in fact reached a conclusion about Consolidated's financial capability?
A. Based on the information that I have available to date, yes.
Q. And what is that conclusion?
A. And that is that they in fact have not
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
provided sufficient information to determine that they are capable.
Q. And you're aware that Mr. Vickroy's conclusion is exactly the opposite; right? He said -- and this is Page 6 of his testimony, Lines 11 and 12 -- "Consolidated has the financial capability to meet the standards required by New Hampshire statutes."
A. Yes, that's what he says.
Q. But you do acknowledge that Consolidated has refinanced FairPoint's existing debt; do you not?
A. I do.
Q. And they've done so at more favorable rates?
A. Yes.
Q. And they've extended the maturity by a period of three or four years?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you said on Page 45 of your testimony, Lines 9 and 10, "The ability to raise capital on reasonable terms is a key indicator of a utility holding company's financial capability." Is that your
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS: RANDY BARBER]
testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Wiesner.
MR. WIESNER: Mr. Chairman, every
issue that I might have explored with Mr. Barber has been covered by or through the questioning of Attorney Geiger or Attorney Phillips. We have no questions.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Then
Commissioner Scott.
INTERROGATORIES BY CMSR. SCOTT:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Barber. How are you?
A. I'm fine. How are you?
Q. Good. Better every day.

I want to explore a couple quick things with you. You were talking with Mr.

Phillips, and in some of your back and forth he brought up Moody's and Standard \& Poor's ratings.
A. Yes.
Q. So when I looked at the original filing for
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
the acquisition, $I$ see that both ratings for Consolidated are higher than FairPoint;
correct?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. All right. So help me with that. That sounds like a good thing, right, for financial capability? It sounds like -should I not conclude, based on that, that Consolidated has better financial capability?
A. It's better if you look at the details of the ratings. FairPoint and Consolidated are both basically towards the bottom of their various risk profiles, but it's better.
Q. Okay. On Page 14, you make reference to service quality. I think you use the word "violations" in Kansas and Texas for Consolidated; is that correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. What conclusions would you expect the Commission to draw from that, those --
A. No, no, I understood the question. You know, Consolidated has acquired and operated companies in the past with which there had been service quality issues or other related
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS: RANDY BARBER]
types of issues, which are documented in those footnotes. And therefore, the Commission should at least take notice of what I guess I would argue is not, you know, an unspotted history. Therefore, look at their ability to operate FairPoint in a way that perhaps avoids these kinds of issues in New Hampshire.
Q. Thank you for that.

On Page 48, on your recommendations you talk about basically that -- and I'm paraphrasing because I haven't opened it up -- but that Consolidated should be in a position to improve operations and increase capital investments at FairPoint. And then on Page 43 you seem to call into question the -- you mention the depleted state of employees and, you know, the Company should take into the account the current state of operations.

So am I to conclude from that, that your position is that the current operation of FairPoint is unsustainable as far as the service quality requirements being met?
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. I don't think there's been enough time lapse since FairPoint reduced employment in December of 2016, which, by the way, was not contained in Consolidated's synergies or other projections which were based on third quarter 2016. And from conversations with, in this state, Steve Soule, but also others in New Hampshire and Vermont, you know, there is a serious concern that this already cut to the bone. But $I$ will say there's -- I don't think there's been enough time lapse to understand the impact of that, much less than -- and I'm not going to use the number -- a significantly greater number of employee reductions that are part of the synergies projections. That's a long way I think of saying yes.
Q. So help me with that. So on the synergies projection, reading your testimony, I would presume that part of the synergies would be cut to the operational force, linemen, people actually directly impacting service quality. Is that --
A. There is a confidential document, and I
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
couldn't give you the number off my head, which details the union-represented employees being impacted, at least projected within the synergies projections. And those are -there's a list of seven or eight different job categories, and I believe they are all service-impacting, and most of them are customer-facing.
Q. And again, your characterization. So those type of potential cuts are not duplicative, assuming there's another layer now -assuming Consolidated takes ownership, these aren't cuts made because there's, you know, back-office duplication. You're suggesting again these are not backed up by some new --
A. In the same document that $I$ was referencing, there is a separate category of what is called "management," but it really is more than that. But a lot of it is headquarters in Charlotte, and I believe, without getting into anything confidential, that that would be what you were describing.
Q. Correct. I think that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Commissioner
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}

Bailey.
CMSR. BAILEY: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
INTERROGATORIES BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Barber.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Can you look at Page 34 of your testimony, please?
A. Hmm-hmm. Yes.
Q. You define, I think it's Lines 5 through 7, "customer-facing personnel."
A. Yes.
Q. And you list broadband technical support, call centers, field operations, I \& R. Is that field operations, installation and repair, all in one category?
A. Field operations, those are subcategories, last three.
Q. Oh, okay. All right. So my question is which of these categories are primarily union?
A. All.
Q. All of them? Broadband tech support is run by union --
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. It's my understanding.
Q. I don't know. I just --
A. This is definitely my understanding.
Q. Okay. And wholesale services?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. On Page 35 you talk about the level expected by Consolidated in Table 6. And some of this is confidential, and I don't want you to --
A. It's all confidential.
Q. Yes.
A. The numbers are confidential.
Q. The numbers are confidential. And I hope we don't have to answer or put confidential numbers on the record, but my question is: Did you look at FairPoint's capital
expenditures as a percent of revenue, say over the last five years, what they've been investing?
A. No, I have looked at them in the past for the purposes of this. I relied on this table, which $I$ did not -- this is derived from, it's 1-7, either Staff 1-7 or Labor 1-7. It's a confidential document. It's the underlying
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
transaction model. It has FairPoint stand-alone, Consolidated stand-alone, combined, and a whole bunch of other tabs. This has historic data that goes back before 2016. I didn't reproduce it because $I$ was only basically wanting to use '16 going forward. My understanding is that FairPoint's capital intensity was a little higher in the earlier years. But again, what I was focused on was what the plans were going forward for FairPoint's capital intensity versus Consolidated's capital intensity.
Q. And this table shows what FairPoint would be expected to spend as a result of the merger or even without the merger?
A. This is, again, my understanding. They're better able to tell you what this is. But my understanding is that this is what's called the "FairPoint stand-alone model," which was developed by FairPoint management. I do not know whether it was developed prior to engagement in conversations that led to this transaction or whether it was done in
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
conjunction with that. But what I do know, based on what I've read in both -- in public testimony as well, is they have adopted those projections without making any additional adjustments. We don't know what they actually planned. But this is what FairPoint was planning and they've adopted it.
Q. Okay. So they were planning this before the merger, and they're going to continue this level. That's what you think?
A. They certainly -- no. They certainly created these projections prior to the consummation of the transaction because this data was shared at least as of December 3rd. But I don't know whether it was created independent of this transaction. All I can tell you is that it was created by FairPoint management.
Q. Okay. And do you recall from the data request that you got this from how it compares to the investments that were made over the last five years on the same percentage basis?
A. I would have to go back and look. As I say, I believe the investments were a little bit
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
higher as capital intensity, but I wouldn't -- I don't believe they were materially higher.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

MR. RUBIN: Excuse me, Commissioner Bailey. If I may just -- I'm not sure what information you have with you there. I believe attached to Mr. Childers' testimony is an exhibit or Attachment SLC-2. That has some historic capital expenditure and capital intensity information for FairPoint.

CMSR. BAILEY: I don't have any attachments to Mr. Childers' testimony.

MR. RUBIN: Oh, sorry.
MS. GEIGER: If you look at the confidential version --

CMSR. BAILEY: I do have the confidential version. I don't have any attachments. I'll get them and look at them before the next hearing. Thank you.

MS. GEIGER: I mean, $I$ don't know if this is helpful, but $I$ actually have the data request, and it is labeled "Exhibit SLC-2." And it's been redacted. I did this in response
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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to your request yesterday to make a redacted copy. I don't know if that's helpful or not.

MR. RUBIN: All right. I'm just saying there is information kind of in the public record about FairPoint's historic capital spending.

MS. GEIGER: And if it would help you, I can give it to you right now.

CMSR. BAILEY: No, I'll look at the attachments to Mr. Childers' testimony. And if you want to do something on redirect, you can do that.

MR. RUBIN: Okay.
CMSR. BAILEY: Thanks.
BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q. Okay. So, on Page 48 of your testimony, you recommend that the Commission require Consolidated to increase capital expenditure in New Hampshire. Can you tell me by how much you think they should increase it and what they should use it on specifically?
A. No. No. If I could explain --
Q. No, I'm interested.
A. We have been asking for New
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}

Hampshire-specific capital expenditures, operating expenditures and so forth data and have not received it, or don't have it. I cannot tell you what CAPEX in New Hampshire has been or what, in terms of the projections you were just referring me to, would be in New Hampshire in the future. So, without at least looking at that and looking at some detail below that, I couldn't tell you what it should be. That's why I basically made a broad statement that they should be required to increase their capital expenditures in New Hampshire, based on my understanding of some of the issues with the plant itself. But I don't have access to the underlying details, so therefore I couldn't tell you.
Q. So the issues with the plant itself, I mean, do you have an understanding of what needs to be done to improve that plant, or just that it's --
A. After $I$ wrote -- first of all, I had conversations not just with the union representatives in New Hampshire, but also in Maine and Vermont, about specific issues
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
regarding the plant. And that had everything to do from batteries to truck, maintenance of trucks, through cable splices and, you know, section throws and the like. And again, it's my understanding that the technicians in the field run into significant problems which they're instructed to work around as opposed to repair.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

And then on Page 49 and 50 you give us some advice about if we don't defer action, that you would recommend that we require Consolidated to return a fair portion of New Hampshire-generated operating cash flows to the state?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any advice on how much is fair?
A. I mean, yes, although I -- since this was basically advice to the Commission if it determined to take actions other than what we recommended. It was in some ways putting it back on the Commission to think through what "fair" would be.

I would say a fairly simple metric would
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
be, to the extent that cash flows are being generated in New Hampshire, that those cash flows ought to be available in New Hampshire for, again, capital expenditures, you know, operating expenditures and the like. But again, adjustments would almost certainly need to be made. You know, I can think of some specific adjustments, but I don't think we need to get into that.
Q. Here's your opportunity give me advice.
A. Well, no -- well, this is probably what counsel tells me not to do. I'm sure you're going to hear the argument that, "Well, we've got a dividend to pay." So, some of the money coming from New Hampshire has to go pay for the dividend. That would be something you'd have to judge. But, you know, start out with what's generated in New Hampshire ought to be used for the benefit of New Hampshire and have discussions from there.
Q. Okay. You were discussing with Ms. Geiger an analysis of FairPoint's ability to improve operations. And you said there was some, perhaps, confidential -- she asked you if
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
you'd done an analysis, and you said you hadn't personally done an analysis, but you had information.
A. I think I can stay away from confidential -Q. Okay.
A. -- and simply point, actually, to one of the tabs in the same document that was $I$ referring to earlier that you were asking me to look at which had to do with capital intensity. There's a lot of information in that document. One of the sets data in that document for FairPoint on a stand-alone basis reveals projected improvements in key measures. I'll leave it at that. If you want to go confidential, $I$ can get to the line and show it to you.

CMSR. BAILEY: I don't know. Maybe we should have this marked as an exhibit. CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: If you're interested in hearing about it, then that's what we should do.

CMSR. BAILEY: Is it different than what's attached to Mr . Childers' testimony? MS. GEIGER: I think it's the same
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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thing. If you look at the confidential version of Mr. Childers' testimony that I think has been premarked --

MR. RUBIN: Susan, we can't hear you.
MS. GEIGER: I think if you look at what's been premarked as Exhibit 4, hopefully there should be an attachment that's Mr. Childers's confidential information. I believe that's the document to which Mr. Barber is referring, but $I$ don't know for sure.

WITNESS BARBER: I don't have what you're talking about.

CMSR. BAILEY: Is he allowed to see that?

MS. GEIGER: Yes. That is just confidential. It's not highly confidential. So he is able to see that.

CMSR. BAILEY: Mr. Rubin, can you give him a copy of that, do you know?

MR. RUBIN: I can show it to him on -- well, actually, can we go off the record a minute?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, sure.
(Discussion off the record.)
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Where we are is that the unredacted version of attachment to Mr. Childers's testimony has been given to the witness, and Commissioner Bailey has one, and now everybody has one. My understanding is that Commissioner Bailey has some questions that may or may not call for reference to what is confidential. So we will be prepared to mark this confidential if necessary.

Commissioner Bailey.
CMSR. BAILEY: Thank you.
BY CMSR. BAILEY:
Q. So, Mr. Barber, is this the confidential exhibit that you were discussing with Ms. Geiger?
A. This appears to be derived from the data that I was referring to, at least some of it, not all of it. But there's some data in here that I believe is the same that I was referring to.
Q. Okay. And do you want to tell me what you were thinking about that?
A. Sure. What $I$ was thinking about
specifically -- and are we -- we are
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
confidential now; right?
Q. If you're going to say something that's confidential --
A. Okay. Well, I --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Feel free.
A. In other words, growing and shrinking --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: You're asking the wrong person. It's not my decision about what they think is confidential.

MS. GEIGER: I'd ask that we go on the confidential record because it seems to me there could be a combination of statements that go back and forth between confidential and public, and I think we should err on the side of caution and --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, why don't you assume that everything you're about to say is confidential. And it will be for at least a while until everybody has a chance to think about it. That way, you are not -- you should not feel restricted in how you respond to the questions.

WITNESS BARBER: Good.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
[WITNESS: RANDY BARBER]
(Pages 119 through 128 of the
transcript are contained under separate cover designated as "Confidential and Proprietary.")
(Hearing now resumes in the public portion of the record.)

MR. RUBIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. RUBIN:
Q. Mr. Barber, under questioning from Ms.

Geiger, at least according to my notes, you indicated that Consolidated still has failed to meet with union officials on any substantive basis. Can you tell us what you mean by "substantive basis"?
A. "Substantive" would be more than, Hello, how are you? We're going to be one, big, happy family, or something along those lines. My understanding -- again, I was not in these meetings, but I've had them reported to me -is the substance of the meetings were what was characterized most recently as "meet and greet." There are many, many, many things that are on the minds of, you know, not just the union leadership, but all FairPoint employees about what Consolidated has planned for them, assuming this transaction is closed. And to my knowledge, there have been
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
a number of "invitations to engage" is the best way $I$ would put it. And to this point, that has not occurred.
Q. Okay. And have you been involved in a similar role in other telecommunications mergers and acquisitions?
A. Yes.
Q. How does Consolidated's treatment of the unions in this transaction compare to what you have observed in other telecommunications mergers and acquisitions?
A. They're by far the most stand-off-ish I've observed. And I've observed the interactions with, well, FairPoint, when Verizon was the seller; with Frontier Communications when Verizon was the seller to actually 14 states, and that was in 2009; Verizon's purchase of, or sale of additional assets in California, Texas and Florida to Frontier, 2014; of CenturyTel's acquisition of Embarq; CenturyLink's acquisition of Qwest; and Frontier's acquisition of AT\&T's Southern New England Telephone in Connecticut. And in each of those cases, there were significant
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
conversations between the Labor representatives and the acquirers well before any approval was reached or any transaction was closed, and again including at FairPoint, where it's my recollection we started discussions with FairPoint about five or six months before closing. They were not negotiations. You can't negotiate with a non-employer. But they did lead to what became, the day after the closing, a new collective bargaining agreement. There was significant engagement. Verizon was well aware and encouraged those -- at least I can't put myself in their mind. They permitted those engagements. Same most recently with Frontier and SNET in Connecticut. There were significant conversations between, in this case it was CWA and Frontier well before there was any final termination made by the regulators in that state, much less closing.
Q. Mr. Barber, Mr. Phillips asked you some questions. One of them -- or excuse me. For one of them he referred you to Page 3 in your
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
testimony. If you could let me know when you have that.
A. I'm there.
Q. And on Lines 13 through 16 you have a statement about what changed at FairPoint since 2008. And he specifically asked you about deterioration and customer service since 2008. On what did you base that statement?
A. Extensive conversation with both union leaders representing FairPoint employees and specific conversations with FairPoint employees who, from my recollection, were at everything from retail up to wholesale call centers, to people who were working out in the field in a number of different ways, to people working the NOC.
Q. And I believe you said in your list of experience with the unions here and FairPoint, that you were involved with the unions in FairPoint's bankruptcy proceeding?
A. That is correct.
Q. To your understanding, were some of the issues that led to FairPoint's bankruptcy
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
A. Yes.
Q. Mr. Phillips also asked you about some differences between your conclusions and Mr. Vickroy's conclusions. Do you recall that?
A. I do.
Q. Do I recall correctly that when Mr. Phillips questioned you about that, he said that Mr. Vickroy was looking at -- basically, his task was: Would Consolidated's financial covenants be violated? Do you recall that correctly?
A. That's what I recall, too.
Q. Okay. And when you were looking at Consolidated's financial capability, was that the same test you were using?
A. It was not.
Q. What test did you use?
A. Again, I used -- I looked at it through a number of different lenses. But what I used in the case of a stress test was what $I$ guess one could consider to be four elements of variance from plan, negative variance from plan, and then I combined them to approximate
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
what I think I probably too informally described as "the perfect storm" that FairPoint encountered subsequent to acquiring the Northern New England properties. I'm not predicting that that's occurring. I'm not putting a probability on it. But I am observing that in fact there are elements in those four stress test numbers that combine to provide and produce -- can't say this in -- produce unhappy results. And they are consistent broadly with what FairPoint experienced just at the time that they acquired the Northern New England properties and through the next year with interest rate changes and the like.
Q. I appreciate your reluctance to characterize it further on the public record. Is what you're talking about the testimony in the table you have on Page 40 of your testimony that's marked "confidential"?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Just so we have that in some context.

In your opinion, is there more to
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
assessing a company's financial capability than just looking at whether it would violate its financial covenants?
A. Absolutely.
Q. And I assume that's what you did?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. Now, not including any effects from synergies for the moment, just in -- I'm sorry.

Mr. Phillips asked you on page -referring to Page 36 in your testimony, whether there was a financial benefit to FairPoint with Consolidated's refinancing of the debt. Now, in terms of cash flow available to FairPoint to make investments or pay employees and that type of thing, excluding synergies, is there any difference in the cash available to FairPoint under Consolidated's ownership compared to FairPoint stand-alone?
A. Yes.
Q. And what would that difference be?
A. Well, among others, there would be the dividend obligations that would be presumably \{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
attributable to former FairPoint shareholders who were then being paid a dividend by Consolidated.
Q. Okay. Again, in rough numbers, without getting into anything confidential, how does the effect of FairPoint dividend obligation compare to the amount that Consolidated is saving FairPoint by refinancing the debt?
A. Roughly comparable.
Q. And again, just for some clarity in the record, Commissioner Scott I believe asked you about areas that Consolidated was looking to reduce the FairPoint work force. And again you were understandably reluctant to discuss that on the public record. Are those categories listed on Page 31 of your testimony, again, in a confidential section?
A. That they are.
Q. Thank you.

MR. RUBIN: And that's all I have on redirect, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Ms. Geiger, you're grabbing the microphone.

MS. GEIGER: Yes, I did. I was
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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wondering, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask a brief question on recross. It would be limited to what Mr. Rubin asked on redirect.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And if you were permitted to ask that question, what would it sound like?

MS. GEIGER: It would sound like this: The witness testified about certain acquisitions with which he was familiar in the telecommunications industry where the acquiring company engaged in significant conversations with the acquired company's employees.

Correct?
WITNESS BARBER: Yes.
MS. GEIGER: And the question I would
have, if $I$ were allowed to ask it, would be:
Weren't all of the transactions that you
mentioned situations where the acquiring company was buying assets, not a stock transaction such as this one; and in those instances, weren't new collective bargaining agreements going to be necessary?

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Rubin.
MR. RUBIN: I have no objection to
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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the question. It's obviously testing the witness's memory a bit. But if he can answer it, that's fine.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: He has an excellent memory I think. But we'll see.

WITNESS BARBER: The answer is no. Both of these involved CenturyTel or CenturyLink. CenturyLink [sic] bought Embarq, hundred percent of the company. CenturyLink bought -- CenturyTel then became CenturyLink, and they bought Qwest.

RECROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MS. GEIGER:
Q. How about FairPoint, the FairPoint situation?
A. Well, that wasn't what you asked. The FairPoint situation was an asset sale, yes.
Q. Great. How about Frontier?
A. Frontier/Verizon were asset sales.
Q. Okay.
A. Frontier/Southern New England Tel -- again, even though it was more recent, I'd have to test my memory. I believe they bought the stock of a whole, separate operating company.
Q. So at least some of the companies you
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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|  |  | 139 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | mentioned were situations in which the |
| 2 |  | acquiring company was, by necessity, because |
| 3 |  | it was buying assets, in a position of |
| 4 |  | needing to negotiate a collective bargaining |
| 5 |  | agreement pretty soon after the acquisition; |
| 6 |  | is that true? |
| 7 | A. | That is correct. But these conversations |
| 8 |  | occurred before the acquisition closed. |
| 9 | Q. | I understand that. Thank you. |
| 10 |  | MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman? |
| 11 |  | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Phillips. |
| 12 |  | MR. PHILLIPS: If I were allowed to |
| 13 |  | recross the witness -- |
| 14 |  | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. |
| 15 |  | MR. PHILLIPS: -- I would have only |
| 16 |  | one question. |
| 17 |  | CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: And it would |
| 18 |  | sound like what? |
| 19 |  | MR. PHILLIPS: It would reference the |
| 20 |  | interchange Mr. Rubin just had with Mr. Barber |
| 21 |  | about the basis for his statement about the |
| 22 |  | deteriorated customer service of FairPoint, and |
| 23 |  | would refer to the premarked Exhibit 23, which |
| 24 |  | was a discovery request we asked of Labor to |

\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
identify all facts that supported the statement and any and all documents or analyses that supported the statement. And nowhere in the answer did Mr. Barber include any of the conversations that he supposedly had with FairPoint employees who told him of these problems.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Okay. I've heard an argument so far. And the question associated with that argument is what?

MR. PHILLIPS: The question is whether his discovery response is true and accurate and complete.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Rubin?
My sense, Mr. Phillips, is
that you asked him questions about that topic, and he made reference to his conversations, I've forgotten with whom, but with representatives. And then Mr. Rubin reiterated in a lot of ways that answer. So I'm a little -- I don't quite know why, if this was significant to you, you didn't ask him about in round one.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, I don't recall
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
him talking about the conversations he had with respect to that particular issue. But Mr. Rubin certainly felt it was important to rehabilitate him on that matter, and now we have an issue of his credibility.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Mr. Rubin.
MR. RUBIN: Mr. Chair, if I may, what's been marked as Exhibit 23 is a response to a FairPoint Data Request $1-5$ in which Mr. Barber referred to his response to a Consolidated Data Request 1-9 which asked essentially the identical question. And in the response to 1-9, he specifically talks about conversations with Labor Witness Steve Soule, obviously in New Hampshire, as well as testimony filed by Labor witnesses in Vermont and Maine. So it's exactly what he was talking about with me on redirect.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yeah, it seems to me, Mr. Phillips, you're going to be able to make whatever arguments you want to make based on that answer, the written answer to the data request and work it from there.

MR. PHILLIPS: I will do so, Mr.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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Chairman. My recollection of his answer was that he described his conversations with the witnesses, but he went further than that and said he had additional conversations with FairPoint employees.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I recall the same answer. And so your argument is that when he gave the written answer, it was less complete than what he just gave orally, and you're questioning the sincerity of the oral answer that he gave?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. Well, I have to figure out which one is true, I suppose.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Yes. So were you lying then or are you lying now, right, the one we would see on TV? I think you have what you need.

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Is there anything else we need to do with Mr. Barber today?

MR. RUBIN: I don't believe so, Mr. Chair.
\{DT 16-872\} (Hearing on the Merits - Day 1) (04/27/17\}
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CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right.
Thank you very much, Mr. Barber.
WITNESS BARBER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Anything else we need to do today before we adjourn?

MS. GEIGER: The only thing I can think of, Mr. Chairman, is that you did raise with me an issue about the prefiled testimony of Mr . Childers, both in redacted and confidential forms. I think there may be a number or two on the public version that may need to be confidential. And so 1 will -- in lieu of refiling both pieces of testimony, $I$ will refile just the pages of both the public and confidential versions to redact a number that has been redacted prior.

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: Why don't you work with Staff and the parties as to how to deal with the issue.

MS. GEIGER: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: All right. Off the record.
(Discussion off the record)
CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: So we're back on
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the record. So the next time we'll be together with you all is on May 24th. At that point, the expectation is that we'll resume with the first panel. All decisions are final until changed. If something happens in between that we need to do something different on that day, you'll let us know. We also understand that there are deadlines and dates between now and then where work will be continuing. There's rebuttal testimony coming and other things. Understanding that, is there anything else we need to deal with before we adjourn for the day?

MR. WIESNER: Is this the point where we address the admission of exhibits --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: No, I think --
MR. WIESNER: -- or will we defer them until --

CHAIRMAN HONIGBERG: I think the idea is we'll defer that until the end-end, not just the end of today.

All right. Seeing nothing else, thank you very much. We will adjourn. (Whereupon the hearing was adjourned at 1:31 p.m.)
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