



2703 Clark Lane | Columbia, MO 65202
1-800-SOCKET-3 | www.socket.net

December 18, 2007

Mr. Joey Bales
100 CenturyTel Dr.
Monroe, LA 71203

Sent Via email to joey.bales@centurytel.com and Certified Mail

Dear Mr. Bales:

I received your December 12, 2007 letter asserting Socket Telecom, LLC ("Socket") is required to establish an additional Point of Interconnection ("POI") in the exchanges of Mountain View, Thayer, Cabool and Stewartville. Upon receipt of your letter, we reviewed the volume of traffic exchanged between Socket and CenturyTel of Missouri, LLC ("CenturyTel") for Mountain View, Thayer, and Cabool. The peak number of channels used at any one time is in the table below.

Exchange	September 2007	October 2007	November 2007	POI Threshold
Mountain View	5	7	49	68
Thayer	12	23	38	58
Cabool	35	41	39	63

The volume of traffic has not exceeded the POI threshold for three consecutive months. For that reason, pursuant to Article V, Section 4.5, Socket disputes the necessity of establishing additional POIs for these three exchanges. If you have any information supporting your belief that an additional POI is required, I would appreciate it if you would share that with me.

I could not find an exchange served by CenturyTel named "Stewartville" in Missouri. For this reason, Socket also disputes the necessity of establishing an additional POI for the exchange of Stewartville. For Mountain View, Thayer, and Cabool, Socket would be willing to agree to dedicated trunking in order to better manage the network. Please let me know if CenturyTel would be interested.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Matt Kohly'.

Matt Kohly

cc: Susan Smith
Guy Miller



2703 Clark Lane | Columbia, MO 65202
1-800-SOCKET-3 | www.socket.net

December 12, 2007

Mr. Joey Bales
100 CenturyTel Dr.
Monroe, LA 71203

Sent Via email to joey.bales@centurytel.com and Certified Mail

Dear Mr. Bales:

I received your December 12, 2007 letter alleging that Socket Telecom, LLC ("Socket") is required to establish additional Points of Interconnection ("POI") in the exchanges of Houston, LaPlata, Birch Tree, Eminence, Winona, and Lewiston. As you know, Socket is Indirectly Interconnected with each of these exchanges pursuant to Article V, Section 7.0. During negotiations of the language that went into the final Interconnection Agreement, the Parties recognized that the POI thresholds did not apply to situations involving Indirect Interconnection. This is why the contract language related to Requirements for Establishing Point of Interconnection is limited to when the Parties are directly interconnected and have an initial POI. Also, the POI requirements related to traffic volume only apply to "additional" POIs. This contract language with these limitations was specifically negotiated and agreed upon. For that reason, pursuant to Article V, Section 4.5, Socket disputes the necessity of establishing POIs for these three exchanges.

As you know, Socket has proposed to Spectra that we establish an initial POI in each LATA and exchange all traffic through that POI until traffic volumes dictate that additional POIs be established. Socket is proposing this direct interconnection in response Spectra's complaints about the current Indirect Interconnection arrangements. If this were done, the additional POI requirements would then apply. However, despite no claim that such an arrangement is not "Technically Feasible" Spectra has refused to directly connect as Socket proposed. I would urge you to reconsider that.

Sincerely,

Matt Kohly

cc: Susan Smith
Guy Miller