

STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

METAMORA TELEPHONE COMPANY)
and GTE WIRELESS OF THE MIDWEST)
INCORPORATED, CHICAGO SMSA LP,)
ILLINOIS SMSA LIMITED)
PARTNERSHIP, CHICAGO 10 MHZ LLC,)
ILLINOIS RSA 1 LIMITED)
PARTNERSHIP, ILLINOIS RSA 6 AND 7)
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ROCKFORD)
MSA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, and) Docket No. 06-
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP for itself and as)
agent for SOUTHERN AND CENTRAL)
WIRELESS, LLC, (“VERIZON)
WIRELESS”))
)
Joint Petition Submitting Arbitrated)
Interconnection Agreement pursuant to 47)
U.S.C. §252(e))

**VERIFIED STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF
JOINT PETITION SUBMITTING ARBITRATED
INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT**

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF WOODFORD)

The undersigned, Ann E. Dickerson, being duly sworn on my oath, provides the following statements in support of the Joint Petition Submitting Arbitrated Interconnection Agreement.

1. I am the Chief Financial Officer for Metamora Telephone Company (“Metamora”). I have knowledge of the Interconnection Agreement executed between Metamora and Verizon Wireless.

2. On or about February 23, 2006, Metamora and Verizon Wireless reached a conforming Interconnection Agreement in accordance with the Illinois Commerce Commission’s (“Commission”) Arbitration Decision in Docket Nos. 05-0644, 05-0645, 05-0646, 05-0647, 05-

0648, 05-0649 and 05-0657 Consolidated (“05-0644 et al” or the “Consolidated Arbitration”). The Agreement has been executed by both parties and is being submitted to the Commission pursuant to the Commission’s direction that Metamora and Verizon Wireless file “their complete interconnection agreement for Commission approval pursuant to Section 252(e) of the Federal Act.” (05-0644 et al Arbitration Decision at 56).

3. I hereby state on behalf of Metamora that all the terms of the Agreement are consistent with the Parties’ negotiations, and the reciprocal compensation rate set forth on Attachment 1 to the Agreement is consistent with the Commission’s rulings in the Arbitration Decision in Docket 05-0644 et al.

4. For the reasons previously advanced in its written filings in Dockets 05-0644 et al, Metamora continues to take the position that the Commission’s conclusions in its Arbitration Decision in Docket No. 05-0644 setting the input to the model for recovery of switching costs at 0% and thereby denying Metamora any recovery for Verizon Wireless’ use of its switch were made in error and that such conclusions cause the Agreement and the reciprocal compensation rate therein to be inconsistent with the public interest, convenience and necessity. Specifically, Metamora hereby incorporates into this proceeding by this reference the arguments set forth at pages 7-26 of the Petitioners’ Brief on Exceptions filed in Docket 05-0644 et al on January 9, 2006 by Hamilton County Telephone Co-Op, LaHarpe Telephone Company, Inc., McDonough Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Mid-Century Telephone Cooperative, Inc., Marseilles Telephone Company, Metamora Telephone Company and Grafton Telephone Company and the arguments set forth in the entire Petition to Reopen on the Commission’s Own Motion filed in Docket 05-0644 et al on February 24, 2006 by Marseilles Telephone Company, Metamora Telephone Company and Grafton Telephone Company.

5. Nothing in this Verified Statement or the Joint Petition Submitting Arbitrated Interconnection Agreement is intended nor shall it be deemed to be or act as a waiver of Metamora's right to seek judicial review of the Agreement and the Commission's actions requiring Metamora to execute the Agreement pursuant to Section 252(e)(6) of the Federal Act. Metamora has joined in the filing of the Joint Petition Submitting Arbitrated Interconnection Agreement based on the mandatory direction of the Commission to do so.

6. Metamora makes no statement regarding whether the Agreement, or any portion thereof, discriminates against a carrier not a party to the Agreement. However, I hereby affirmatively state on behalf of Metamora that if the Commission approves the Agreement, Metamora will make the Agreement available to any other similarly situated telecommunications carrier operating in its service area to the extent required by Section 252(i) and other applicable law, and that other carriers are also free to negotiate their own terms and conditions pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Act.

Ann E. Dickerson

Ann E. Dickerson

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 24th day of February, 2006

Jill A. Fisher

Notary Public

