

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Joint Application of Frontier Communications Corporation, Frontier Communications of America, Inc (U 5429C), Verizon California Inc. (U 1002 C), Verizon Long Distance, LLC (U 5732 C), and Newco West Holdings LLC for Approval of Transfer of Control Over Verizon California Inc. and Related Approval of Transfer of Assets and Certifications

Application 15-03-005 (Filed March 18, 2015)

JOINT MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

15 Richard H. Levin, Attorney at Law 309 South Main St. 16 P.O. Box 240 Sebastopol, CA 95473-0240 17 Telephone: (707) 824-0440 rl@comrl.com 18

Counsel for CALTEL

Michel Singer Nelson VP of Regulatory and Public Policy O1 Communications, Inc. 5190 Golden Foothill Parkway El Dorado Hills, CA 95762 Telephone: (916) 235-2028 mnelson@o1.com

September 4, 2015

MARK P. SCHREIBER PATRICK M. ROSVALL COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP 201 CALIFORNIA STREET, 17th FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-5002 (415) 433-1900 Telephone: Facsimile: (415) 433-5530 Email: prosvall@cwclaw.com

Attorneys for Frontier Communications Corporation and Frontier Communications of America, Inc.

Lyndall Nipps PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS INC 100 SPEAR STREET, #1950 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105 Telephone: (415) 536-7456

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1047291-2

COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP

I. INTRODUCTION.

Pursuant to Rule 12.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission's ("Commission")
Rules of Practice and Procedure ("Rules"), Frontier Communications Corporation and Frontier
Communications of America, Inc. (collectively, "Frontier"), the California Association of
Competitive Telecommunication Companies ("CALTEL"), PAETEC Communications Inc.
("PAETEC"), and O1 Communications ("O1") (CALTEL, PAETEC and O1 are collectively
referred to as the "Joint CLECs") each join in this Joint Motion. Frontier and the Joint CLECs are
collectively identified as the "Parties." The Parties request the Commission adopt the Settlement
Agreement entered into between and among the Parties on August 21, 2015 ("Settlement
Agreement") as to the issues covered by the Settlement Agreement. A copy of the Settlement
Agreement is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

The Settlement Agreement reflects the agreed-upon resolution of issues raised by each of the Joint CLECs in this proceeding and the Parties submit that the attached Settlement Agreement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law, and in the public interest. This Settlement Agreement meets the standard under Rule 12.1(d), and should be adopted by the Commission as a resolution of the issues raised by the CLECs and wholesale access customers in this proceeding.

This motion is being submitted contemporaneously with a Motion for Order Shortening

Time, pursuant to which the Parties request that comments on the Settlement Agreement presented
by this Motion be submitted within 15 days, with a due date of September 21, 2015. This will
allow all views on this Settlement Agreement to be known sufficiently in advance of the briefing
dates to allow these issues to be fully addressed in the briefs.

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.

Frontier and Verizon California Inc., Verizon Long Distance and Newco West Holdings LLC filed Application 15-03-005 on March 18, 2015 seeking Commission approval to transfer assets and certifications held by Verizon California ("Verizon") to Frontier ("the Transaction").

1 | CA 2 | Ap 3 | Co 4 | for 5 | Re 6 | Co 7 | to 1

9

10

17 18

19

20

15

16

2122

24

23

2526

27

28

CALTEL filed a Motion for party status on March 26, 2015 and a Response to the Application on April 27, 2015 raising key areas of concern relating to effects the Transaction might have on Competitive Local Exchange Carriers ("CLECs"). Also on April 27, 2015, O1 submitted a motion for party status in this proceeding and raised concerns similar to those raised in the CALTEL Response. PAETEC later made an oral motion for party status at the June 10, 2015 Pre-Hearing Conference in this proceeding. Both O1 and PAETEC were granted party status. Frontier replied to the CALTEL Response in a Joint Reply filed on May 7, 2015 addressing the subjects in CALTEL's Response.

Frontier submitted pre-filed testimony summarizing the proposed Transaction between Frontier and Verizon and addressing its compliance with the California Public Utilities Code and Commission Rules, including the requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 854. The Joint CLECs submitted pre-filed testimony summarizing the potential impacts of the Proposed Transaction on CLECs, on competition, and on the end user customers that they serve. CALTEL also propounded various Data Requests on the Applicants related to concerns CALTEL raised in its Response to the Application.

On June 5, 2015 the Administration Law Judge ("ALJ") issued a ruling setting a series of Public Participation Hearings ("PPH") to be held throughout Verizon's service territory. These PPHs have been ongoing as scheduled. On June 10, 2015 the assigned and the Assigned Commissioner jointly presided over a prehearing conference ("PHC"). On July 2, 2015 the Assigned Commissioner issued an Amended Scoping Ruling incorporating several additional issues raised at the PHC.

During this time, the Parties have engaged in substantive settlement discussions to settle issues and concerns raised by the Joint CLECs in this proceeding. Key issues discussed and now resolved through this Settlement Agreement include: (1) most issues related to Section 251/252 Interconnection Agreements and Commercial Agreements, particularly Unbundled Network Elements ("UNEs") and other wholesale inputs and services, (2) access to loop-to-port combinations provided in wholesale commercial agreements, (3) collocation agreements and arrangements, (4) special access issues, (5) wholesale Operations Support Systems ("OSS"), (6)

5

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

business processes and resources/staffing, (7) issues related to machine-to-machine Electronic Data Interchange ("EDI") electric ordering and Electric Bonding ("e-bonding") trouble report interfaces.

Frontier and the Joint CLECs had a formally noticed settlement conference attended by various other parties to the proceeding on August 21, 2015, in accordance with Rule 12.1(b). The Parties have now arrived at an agreement that is reasonable in light of the record, is in the public interest, and is consistent with the law of the State of California. The Settlement Agreement resolves most of the key issues raised between and among the Parties and issues raised in the July 2, 2015 Assigned Commissioner's Amended Scoping Ruling ("Scoping Ruling"). Issue No. 6 in part addresses adequate staffing and resources. Issues No. 10 and 11 are directly focused on competition and CLECs.

In summary, the Settlement Agreement resolves many of the key issues raised in this proceeding related to the impact of the transaction on wholesale customers and on competition.

Resolving these key issues is in the public interest and therefore, the Parties hereby request the Commission approve this Settlement Agreement.

III. SUMMARY OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

As a result of their negotiations, the Parties have resolved most of the outstanding issues raised by the Joint CLECs. While this is not an all-party settlement, and it is not a settlement on all issues, this settlement resolves a defined subset of issues relating to wholesale service, Operational Support Systems ("OSS"), and other concerns raised by CLECs. The Parties' Settlement Agreement is summarized as follows:

A. A primary concern of the Joint CLECs is to assure that the transition of services from Verizon to Frontier be seamless and that existing Agreements between the individual CLECs and Verizon will be honored by Frontier without changes. Frontier has agreed to this with the exception for changes in law. There are also provisions in the Settlement Agreement covering the negotiation of new or replacement contracts and grandfathering in prices in Verizon's Wholesale Tariffs for an agreed upon period of time.

B. The Parties all reached mutual agreement on issues related to the manner of assignments of obligations from Verizon to Frontier, the bill and keep arrangements, rates for Unbundled Network Elements ("UNEs"), volume and term agreements, and existing wholesale commercial agreements.

- C. Further, the Settlement Agreement contains resolution of issues related to operational support system and performance metrics including Frontier committing to implement electronically bonded ("e-bonded") Operational Support Systems that comply with industry standards, and resolves issues related to local number portability, directory listing, ordering, testing prior to cutover, training sessions for CLEC customers, mitigating extended delays related to wholesale provisioning and repair intervals and performance metrics.
- D. Paragraphs 15 through 25 include miscellaneous provisions mutually agreed upon by all of the Parties. For example, this section addresses issues related to business processes such as creating a single point of contact or account manager for the CLECs with the authority to handle all CLEC issues, sufficient staffing of trained personnel devoted exclusively to wholesale operations, Frontier agreement not to seek to eliminate any of Verizon's obligations under Section 251 of the Communications Act or the Federal Communications Commission rules, issues related to new build ICB charges and issues related to billing disputes with Verizon that might not be resolved prior to the Closing of the Transaction.

While the Settlement Agreement resolves the vast majority of the issues raised by the Joint CLECs, it explicitly does not resolve the question of whether the Commission should gather information regarding the physical condition of Verizon California's network for the purpose of evaluating potential network rehabilitation requirements or adopt other remedies to address service quality, wholesale performance and copper retirement issues and concerns. The Settlement Agreement also does not address the question of whether Frontier should be required to file existing IP-to-IP interconnection agreements that it is assuming from Verizon and make them available for opt-in. The Parties reserve and retain the right to continue to advance their own positions regarding these issues. The specific issues unaffected by the Settlement Agreement are addressed in Paragraph 23 of the Settlement Agreement.

IV. THE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IS REASONABLE, LAWFUL, AND IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

To obtain Commission approval of a settlement, the parties must demonstrate that the settlement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest. *See* Rule 12.1(d). In evaluating settlements, the Commission has recognized a strong public policy in California favoring settlements and avoiding litigation. *Re Pacific Bell*, 45 CPUC.2d 158, 169, D.92-07-076 (July 22, 1992). The Settlement Agreement satisfies all three requirements of Rule 12.1(d) and should be adopted.

First, the terms of the Settlement Agreement are reasonable in light of the whole record. The Settlement Agreement resolves multiple issues related to the provision of competitive local exchange services and removes these issues from any dispute or contention and thereby, preserving and enhancing the competitive local exchange market.

Second, the Settlement Agreement is consistent with applicable law. California Public Utilities Code Sections 851 through 854 set forth the criteria for the Commission's review of mergers such as in this case. One of the key provisions is for the Commission to assure that the transaction will not adversely affect competition (PU Code § 854(b)(3)). This Settlement Agreement reflects an agreement between Frontier and its competitors regarding a set of terms that will allow them to compete on reasonable terms.

Third, the public interest supports adoption of the Settlement Agreement. Under this Agreement, upon completion of the Transaction, wholesale inputs will be protected, thus enabling CLECs to continue to provide service to their end user retail customers and the Agreement helps to facilitate a prompt review of this Application by the Commission. For these reasons, and all the detailed factual references in the Settlement Agreement itself, adopting the Settlement Agreement is in the public interest.

1	V. CONCLUSION.							
2	Ba	Based on the foregoing, the Parties respectfully request that the Commission grant this						
3	Joint Mot	Joint Motion and adopt the Settlement Agreement in its entirety as a resolution of the majority of						
4	the issues	s presented by competitive c	arriers in this	proceeding.				
5								
6	DATED:	September 4, 2015	COOPER, V	WHITE & COOPER LLP				
7			D	ii				
8			By:	/s/ Patrick M. Rosvall Patrick M. Rosvall				
9				Attorneys for Frontier Communications				
10				Corporation and Frontier Communications of America, Inc.				
11								
12	DATED:	September 4, 2015	CALIFORN	IA ASSOCIATION OF COMPETITIVE				
13			TELECOM	MUNICATION COMPANIES				
14								
15			By:	/s/ Richard H. Levin				
16				Richard H. Levin Counsel for CALTEL				
17								
18	DATED:	September 4, 2015	PAETEO	C COMMUNICATIONS INC.				
19			g6.					
20			By:	/s/ Lyndall Nipps				
21			-	ndall Nipps torney for PAETEC Communications Inc.				
22			710	torney for TALTLE Communications me.				
23	DATED:	September 4, 2015	O1 COM	MMUNICATIONS INC.				
24								
25			R _v ,	/./M' 1 10' N 1				
26				/s/ Michel Singer Nelson chel Singer Nelson				
27			VP	of Regulatory and Public Policy				
28								

ATTORNEYS AT LAV

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement is entered into as of August 21, 2015, by and between Frontier Communications Corporation on behalf of itself and its subsidiaries ("Frontier"), the California Association of Competitive Telecommunication Companies ("CALTEL"), PAETEC Communications Inc. ("PAETEC"), and O1 Communications ("O1") in accordance with Article 12 of the California Public Utilities Commission's ("Commission") Rules of Practice and Procedure ("Rules"). CALTEL, PAETEC, and O1 Communications are referred to herein individually and collectively as the "Joint CLECs." Frontier and the Joint CLECs are collectively identified as the "Parties" to this Settlement.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on March 18, 2015 Frontier and Verizon Communications Inc. ("Verizon") jointly filed this Application for approval of a transfer of control of Verizon California Inc. ("Verizon California") to Frontier and related approval to transfer assets and certifications held by Verizon California ("Transaction"); and

WHEREAS, CALTEL filed a Response to the Application on April 27, 2015 highlighting areas of concern relating to the effects of the Transaction on Competitive Local Exchange Carriers

("CLECs"); and

WHEREAS, O1 submitted a motion for party status in this proceeding on April 27, 2015, noting concerns similar to what CALTEL had raised in its Response;

WHEREAS, PAETEC made an oral motion for party status at the June 10, 2015 Pre-Hearing Conference;

WHEREAS, O1's and PAETEC's motions for party status have been granted;

WHEREAS, on May 7, 2015, Frontier submitted a reply to CALTEL's Response to the Application that addressed the subjects in CALTEL's Response;

WHEREAS, on May 11, 2015, Frontier submitted pre-filed testimony summarizing the proposed Transaction between Frontier and Verizon, and demonstrating compliance with the California Public Utilities Code and Commission Rules, including the requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 854; and

WHEREAS, on July 28, 2015, the Joint CLECs submitted pre-filed testimony summarizing the potential impacts of the Proposed Transaction on CLECs, on competition and on the end user customers that they serve; and

WHEREAS, CALTEL propounded various Data Requests on the Applicants related to concerns CALTEL raised in its Response to the Application; and

WHEREAS, the Parties have engaged in substantive settlement discussions to settle issues and concerns raised by the Joint CLECs in this proceeding; and

WHEREAS, Frontier and the Joint CLECs had a formally noticed settlement conference attended by various other parties to the proceeding on August 21, 2015, in accordance with Rule 12.1(b);

WHEREAS, the Parties have arrived at an agreement that is reasonable in light of the record, is in the public interest, and is consistent with the law of the State of California;

3

5

8

7

1011

12

13

14

16

15

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

27

26

28 COOPER, WHITE

& COOPER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW 201 CALIFORNIA STREET SAN FRANCISCO...CA 94111-500

AGREEMENT

NOW, THEREFORE, based upon mutual agreement reflected in this Settlement

Agreement, Frontier and the Joint CLECs agree to resolve issues raised by the Joint CLECs as
follows:

- A. Interconnection Agreements, Wholesale Tariffs and Other Wholesale Contracts:
 - Frontier will honor Verizon California's existing interconnection agreements entered into pursuant to Sections 251 and 252 of the Communications Act of 1996 and filed with the California PUC ("Interconnection Agreement"), for the later of: their remaining terms or January 1, 2019 (hereinafter "Extended Term").
 - Frontier will not request negotiation of any amendment to an effective
 Interconnection Agreement with Verizon California except for change of law
 amendments until expiration of the Extended Term.
 - Frontier will permit any CLEC to use its existing Interconnection Agreement with Verizon California as the starting draft for negotiating a new or replacement Interconnection Agreement for California.
 - 4. Frontier will grandfather and continue to provide any Verizon California

 Interconnection Agreement services provided to a particular Joint CLEC as of the
 completion of the California Transaction ("Closing") or wholesale services included
 in Verizon California intrastate carrier service tariffs and regulated by the
 Commission ("Wholesale Tariffs") during the Extended Term.
 - 5. Frontier will honor, assume or take assignment, in whole or in part, of all obligations under Verizon California Wholesale Tariffs and Frontier shall not terminate or increase the Wholesale Tariff rates in effect as of Closing, including maintaining

existing bill-and-keep arrangements, terms or conditions of any effective Wholesale Tariffs during the Extended Term.

- Rates for Unbundled Network Elements offered pursuant to Section 251(c)(3), and rates for 251(c) facilities or arrangements offered pursuant to an Interconnection Agreement in effect as of Closing shall not be increased by Frontier during the Extended Term. Frontier will be permitted to advise the Commission that it plans to seek a rate increase in these rates no earlier than one year after Closing. Nothing herein shall be construed to prevent CALTEL, or any Joint CLECs from intervening and opposing such a request.
- 7. Frontier agrees that Verizon California will adjust revenue commitments and volume thresholds for CLECs with volume and term agreements so that customers retain the same contractual rights after the Closing. Following the Closing, CLECs that maintain the volumes they purchase in California will pay the same effective rates under the volume and term agreements after the Closing that were in effect for California services at Closing.
- 8. Frontier will honor Verizon California's existing wholesale agreements with CLECs (regardless of whether such contracts is expired by its terms if services are provided under that contract as of the closing date)) entered into as commercial agreements.

B. Operational Support Systems and Performance Metrics:

9. Frontier shall implement electronically bonded ("e-bonded") Frontier Operational Support Systems ("Frontier Systems") that comply with industry standards and maintain in aggregate similar quality of service and level of flow through

capability for local number portability ("LNP") and directory listing ("DL") orders as the current Verizon California Operational Support Systems ("Verizon California OSS") for Access Service Requests ("ASRs") associated with ordering interconnection facility trunks, and for Local Service Requests ("LSRs") associated with LNP and DL orders. The e-bonded Frontier Systems will include associated pre-ordering, ordering, maintenance and provisioning functionality.

- 10. Frontier will establish and permit CLECs that have submitted orders to Verizon

 California within one year prior to Closing to use a testing environment on the

 Frontier Systems to test wholesale orders, including orders for interconnection

 facilities and trunks and LNP and DL orders. Frontier will work with CLECs on a

 business-to-business basis to identify and correct any problems that arise during such
 testing prior to cutover.
- 11. Frontier shall provide CLECs that do not currently use the Frontier Systems in at least one Frontier service area a 90-day notice period prior to Closing to implement and obtain training. Between 15 and 90 days prior to the Frontier Systems cutover Frontier shall provide at no cost to a requesting CLEC training sessions regarding the use of Frontier's Systems for entering LSR, DL and ASR orders (including pre-ordering, ordering, maintenance and provisioning functions).
- 12. Frontier will take steps to mitigate extended delays or adverse consequences, related to wholesale provisioning and repair intervals as a result of the OSS conversion.

 Frontier will deploy sufficient staff, including additional employees, to respond to and mitigate service issues that may arise during and following the conversion.

Frontier will proactively communicate to CLECs account manager and escalation lists, along with a description of the actions and timelines associated with these mitigation measures.

- 13. Frontier will comply with reporting requirements for applicable performance metrics that currently apply to Verizon California, including retail services subject to G.O 133-C, UNEs and other 251/252 services subject to the Joint Partial Settlement Agreement (JPSA), and special access, Wholesale Advantage and other services subject to contractual Service Level Agreements (SLAs). On an aggregate basis considering all reported JPSA metrics, Frontier will provide comparable or better performance than that provided by Verizon California in the year prior to Closing.
- 14. Frontier will maintain a Change Management Process ("CMP") including CMP meetings, the frequency of which for the first 12 months from Closing shall be monthly, and thereafter, as agreed upon by the Parties.

C. Miscellaneous:

15. Frontier shall provide to CALTEL's Executive Director as well as to individual CLECs, including but not limited to those wholesale customers that purchase UNEs, special access services, and collocation arrangements, and shall maintain on a going-forward basis, updated escalation procedures, contact lists and account manager information as are in place at least 30 days prior to the Closing. The updated contact lists shall identify and assign a single point of contact or account manager ("SPOC") for the CLECs with the authority to address ordering, provisioning, billing and Frontier System maintenance issues. Frontier agrees that CALTEL may be requested by its members to interface with the SPOC and/or document issues that are common

to one or more CALTEL members. Frontier will work with CALTEL and/or individual CLECs to identify the appropriate point of contact to address technical and network escalation issues.

- 16. Frontier shall ensure that the Wholesale and CLEC support centers are sufficiently staffed by adequately trained personnel dedicated exclusively to wholesale operations so as to provide a level of service that is at least of the same level of quality provided by Verizon California prior to Closing.
- 7. Frontier shall not seek to eliminate any of Verizon California's current obligations under Section 251 of the Communications Act or the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") rules implementing Section 251 except pursuant to generally-applicable changes resulting from court interpretations of Section 251 or changes to the FCC's rules. For example, Frontier shall not seek to reclassify any California wire centers as "non-impaired" or file any new petition under Section 10 of the Communications Act seeking forbearance from any Section 251 or dominant carrier regulation. Frontier shall also not file any requests to seek relief (to the extent it might be available) to be characterized as a rural carrier under or pursuant to Section 251(f)(1). Frontier agrees that if Verizon or Frontier builds transport facilities between non-contiguous Verizon California exchanges in the same local calling area, and sufficient transport capacity exists, Frontier will make the transport facilities available between the exchanges in accordance with the terms of an ICA between the parties or on commercially agreed upon terms.

- 18. Frontier will not require carriers to pay construction charges to install fiber, if working copper facilities have capacity and are available. Frontier will perform routine network modifications on copper facilities as Frontier reasonable determines to be appropriate and necessary. If Frontier denies any service request on the basis that no facilities are available, Frontier will inform the requesting CLEC of the copper facilities that terminate at the requested service location and identify the copper facilities that were tested.
- 19. For each collocation arrangement (including expansion) or power augment provided under the existing Verizon California Interconnection Agreement for which Frontier seeks to assess new build ICB charges (NRCs, MRCs, or both), Frontier will provide the CLEC with a detailed cost estimate, including details regarding equipment being purchased, construction timeline, and documentation demonstrating the proposed charges only cover the reasonable costs attributable to the request. A Joint CLEC will have the right to dispute the collocation estimate via the dispute resolution process contained in its Interconnection Agreement
- 20. Frontier commits to work in good faith to promptly resolve any billing disputes that were not resolved with Verizon California prior to Closing.
- 21. Frontier commits to meeting with CALTEL and the other Joint CLECs following Closing to discuss in good faith alternative or commercial arrangements on a case by case basis that may allow a CLEC to interconnect Verizon California noncontiguous service areas in California.
- 22. Except as provided in paragraph 24 and 25 below, the Joint CLECs agree that CALTEL its members, PAETEC and O1 Communications will not oppose, seek to

delay, or seek to impose conditions on the proposed transaction regarding Frontier's acquisition of the Verizon California operations in California in any federal, state or local regulatory or legislative proceeding, including Docket 15-03-005. As agreed to by Frontier and the Joint CLECs and based on applicable regulatory requirements, the Parties will file a joint motion with the Commission asking the Commission to approve this Settlement Agreement in Docket 15-03-005.

- 23. Frontier agrees that nothing in this Settlement Agreement prohibits CALTEL or the other Joint CLECs from advocating (including by filing comments, briefs and testimony), in this or any other Commission proceeding that:
 - 1) the Commission should gather information regarding the physical condition of Verizon California's network to determine whether Verizon should be ordered to rehabilitate the network facilities or adopt other remedies to address service quality, wholesale performance, and copper retirement issues and concerns;
 - the Commission should require Frontier to file and make available for optin on a non-discriminatory basis agreements relating to the exchange of IP-to-IP traffic (interconnection), including agreements (written or unwritten) that it is assuming between the Verizon California and Verizon Wireless, Verizon CLEC affiliates, any other Verizon subsidiary or affiliate, and/or with any third party carrier or IP provider in the areas served by the Frontier ILEC.
 - 3) XO Communications, as a member of CALTEL, from advocating in this or any other proceeding with respect to those issue set forth in the testimony XO Communications filed on July 28, 2015 in Application 15-03-005. In addition, XO

Communications is not precluded from responding to pre-filed testimony of Frontier and Verizon concerning XO specific issues.

24. Frontier agrees that nothing in this Settlement Agreement forecloses any of the Joint CLECs from opposing, seeking delay, or seeking to impose conditions at the FCC or in any regulatory, legislative or judicial proceedings, which concern intrastate services outside California, interstate or unregulated services or issues of national interest.

D. Legal Terms:

- A. The provisions of this Settlement Agreement are not severable and shall only become effective after the Commission has entered an order approving this Settlement Agreement without modification. If the Proposed Transaction is not approved by the Commission, or otherwise does not close, or this Settlement Agreement is modified in any way by the Commission, the Settlement Agreement is null and void. If the Commission orders any changes to the Settlement Agreement, the Parties agree to negotiate in good faith in order to restore the balance of benefits and burdens of the Settlement Agreement in light of the Commission's decision.
- B. Unless expressly provided herein the obligations under the Settlement Agreement expire January 1, 2019.
- C. Frontier agrees to provide quarterly compliance reports for all settlement terms herein to the service list in this proceeding (or a new proceeding established for compliance monitoring) during the term of this agreement. CALTEL and/or individual Joint CLECs will have the opportunity to notify Frontier with any complaints about

compliance, and be afforded the opportunity of speedy resolution of any disputes. If the Commission determines that Frontier does not promptly and fully comply with the terms of this Settlement Agreement then CALTEL, or individual Joint CLECs, may take enforcement action against Frontier.

- D. The Commission shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any issues related to this

 Settlement Agreement and no other court, regulatory agency or other governing body

 will have jurisdiction over any issue related to the interpretation of this Settlement

 Agreement, or the rights of the Parties in this Settlement Agreement, with the

 exception of any court that may now or in the future, by statute or otherwise, have

 jurisdiction to review Commission decisions.
- E. This Settlement Agreement was jointly prepared by the Parties and any uncertainty or ambiguity existing in the document will not be interpreted against any party on the basis that such party drafted or prepared the Settlement Agreement.
- Each of the undersigned Parties agrees to abide by the terms of this Settlement Agreement. The rights conferred and obligations imposed on any Party by the Settlement Agreement shall inure to the benefit of and be binding on that Party's successors in interest and assignees as if such successor or assignee were itself a party hereto.
- G. The Settlement Agreement may be executed in counterparts.
- H. This Settlement Agreement constitutes and represents the entire agreement between the Parties and supersedes all prior and contemporaneous agreements, negotiations,

1			representations, warranties and understandings of the Parties with respect	to the
2			subject matter set forth herein.	
3				
4		I.	This Settlement Agreement cannot be amended or changed except by a wr	titten
5			amendment signed by all Parties and approved by the Commission.	
6		J.	By signing below, each signatory represents and warrants that he/she is au	ithorized to
7			sign this Settlement Agreement on such Party's behalf and thereby binds s	
9			to the terms of this Settlement Agreement.	
10				
11			FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION	
12				
13	Dated:		By:	-
14				
15			CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMPETITIVE COMPANIES	
16				
17	Dated:		Ву:	-
18				
19			PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS INC.	
20				,
21 22	Dated:	9	-4-15 By: Welfal	
23				
24			O1 COMMUNICATIONS	
25				
26	Dated:	-	Ву:	
27				
28				
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW 201 CALIFORNIA STREET SANFRANCISCO, CA 94111-5002				
000/00441115008	1047048.1		12	

1		representations, warranties and understandings of the Parties with respect to the
2		subject matter set forth herein.
3		
4		I. This Settlement Agreement cannot be amended or changed except by a written
5		amendment signed by all Parties and approved by the Commission.
6		J. By signing below, each signatory represents and warrants that he/she is authorized to
7		
8		sign this Settlement Agreement on such Party's behalf and thereby binds such Party
9		to the terms of this Settlement Agreement.
10		FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
11		FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
12		
13	Dated:	By:
14		
15		CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMPETITIVE COMPANIES
16		
17	Dated:	By:
18		
19		PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS INC.
20		
21		D. Control of the con
22	Dated:	By:
23		
24		O1 COMMUNICATIONS
25		$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}$
26	Dated:	9415 By: Metal 1
27		
28		
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW 201 CALIFORNIA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-6002		10

1047048.1

	II .	
1		representations, warranties and understandings of the Parties with respect to the
2		subject matter set forth herein.
3	I.	This Settlement Agreement cannot be amended or changed except by a written
5		amendment signed by all Parties and approved by the Commission.
6		
7	J.	By signing below, each signatory represents and warrant, that he/she is authorized to
8		sign this Settlement Agreement on such Party's behalf and thereby binds such Party
9		to the terms of this Settlement Agreement.
10 11		FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
12		
13	Dated:	9-4-15 By: MC
14		
15		CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMPETITIVE COMPANIES
16 17	Dated:	By:
18	Dated:	Dy.
19		PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS INC.
20		
21	Dated:	By;
22		
24		O1 COMMUNICATIONS
25		
26	Dated:	By:
27		
28 COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP		
ATTORNEYS AT LAW ROLCALIFORMA 6 TREET FRANCISCO, CA 94111 6002	1047048.1	12
		¥ # 11 11 - F

Sep 04 15 11:44a

ii a		
1		representations, warranties and understandings of the Parties with respect to the
2		subject matter set forth herein.
3		mula a un annual annual ha amandad ar changed eveent hy a written
4	I.	This Settlement Agreement cannot be amended or changed except by a written
5		amendment signed by all Parties and approved by the Commission.
6	J.	By signing below, each signatory represents and warrants that he/she is authorized to
8		sign this Settlement Agreement on such Party's behalf and thereby binds such Party
9		to the terms of this Settlement Agreement.
10		FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
11		FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS CORTORATION
12	Dated:	By:
13	Dated.	
14	Ï	CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF COMPETITIVE COMPANIES
15 16		
17	Dated:	9/4/15 By: Mancy Eclebrane
18		
19		PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS INC.
20		
21	Dated:	Ву:
22		
23 24		O1 COMMUNICATIONS
25	i	
26	Dated:	By:
27		
28	Ĭ	
COOPER, WHITE & COOPER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAV 201 CALIFORNAN OTHER SANFRANCISCO, CA 94111-5002	1047048.1	12