

ORIGINAL



0000010073

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
**RECEIVED**

**MARC SPITZER**  
Chairman  
**JIM IRVIN**  
Commissioner  
**WILLIAM A. MUNDELL**  
Commissioner  
**JEFF HATCH-MILLER**  
Commissioner  
**MIKE GLEASON**  
Commissioner

Arizona Corporation Commission

**DOCKETED**

SEP 10 2003

2003 SEP 10 A 11: 10

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKETED BY

**IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION )**  
**INTO QWEST'S CABLE AND WIRE )**  
**SERVICE TERMINATION POLICIES AND )**  
**TARIFFS AND THE POLICIES AND )**  
**TARIFFS OF OTHER )**  
**TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS )**  
**WITH RESPECT TO ACCESS TO MTE/MDU )**  
**TENANTS. )**

**Docket No. T-00000A-02-0280**

**AT&T'S RESPONSE TO STAFF'S  
STATUS REPORT**

AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc. and TCG Phoenix  
(collectively "AT&T") hereby respond to Staff's Status Report dated September 5, 2003.

AT&T takes exception to Staff's procedural recommendations. Staff recommends that parties be given 30 days to submit their interpretation of the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") Triennial Review Order. Parties would be given 14 days to file replies. However, "[i]f at any point, Cox determines that its concerns have been addressed and notifies the Commission of its decision, Staff recommends that this docket be closed. Status Report at 4. Since Staff recommends that the proceeding be closed if Cox determines its concerns have been met, Cox should be required to notify the Commission if its concerns have been met *before* the parties waste their time filing initial comments and reply comments in response to Staff's questions. It is AT&T's understanding that Cox's concerns were addressed by the Commission in its

Decision No. 64922 (June 12, 2002).

Cox should be required to provide initial comments, stating what its concerns are and why its concerns have not been addressed. In the Response Comments of Cox Arizona Telecom (at 1), Cox acknowledged that its proposal has evolved over time. It is unclear to AT&T what Cox's latest proposal is. It would be extremely difficult to answer a number of Staff's questions without an understanding of what Cox's position is presently. Therefore, Cox should also be required to explain its latest proposal. After Cox explains its latest proposal and concerns, parties should have 30 days to respond to Staff's questions and Cox's proposal and concerns. The parties also should have 14 days to file rebuttal comments.

Submitted September 9, 2003.

**AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE  
MOUNTAIN STATES, INC. AND TCG  
PHOENIX**



Mary B. Tribby  
Richard S. Wolters  
1875 Lawrence St. Suite 1503  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
(303) 298-6741  
(303) 298-6301 Fax

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
(Docket No. T-00000A-02-0280)

I certify that the original and 13 copies of AT&T's Response to Staff's Status Report were sent by overnight delivery on September 9, 2003 to:

Arizona Corporation Commission  
Docket Control - Utilities Division  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

and a true and correct copy was sent by overnight delivery on September 9, 2003 to:

Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel  
Legal Division  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Ernest G. Johnson, Director  
Director - Utilities Division  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Maureen A. Scott, Attorney  
Legal Division  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Jane Rodda  
Administrative Law Judge  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
400 West Congress  
Tucson, AZ 85701-1347

and a true and correct copy was sent by U. S Mail, postage prepaid, on September 9, 2003 to:

Timothy Berg  
Fennemore Craig  
3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600  
Phoenix, AZ 85012-2913

Mark Brown  
Qwest Corporation  
4041 N. Central Avenue, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Joan Burke  
Osborn Maledon  
2929 North Central Avenue, 21<sup>st</sup> Floor  
P.O. Box 36379  
Phoenix, Arizona 85067-6379

Michael Morris  
Allegiance Telecom of Arizona, Inc.  
505 Sansome St., 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Maureen Arnold  
Qwest Corporation  
4041 North Central, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Michael W. Patten  
Roshka Heyman & DeWulf  
400 E. Van Buren, Suite 800  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Michael M. Grant  
Gallagher and Kennedy  
2575 East Camelback Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225

Nigel Bates  
Electric Lightwave, Inc.  
4400 NE 77<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Vancouver, WA 98662

Scott S. Wakefield  
Chief Counsel  
RUCO  
1110 W. Washington, Suite 220  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Thomas H. Campbell  
Lewis and Roca  
40 N. Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Jon Loehman  
SBC Telecom, Inc.  
5800 Northwest Parkway  
Suite 135, Room 1S40  
San Antonio, TX 78249

Douglas Hsiao  
Jim Scheltema  
Blumenfeld & Cohen  
1625 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20036

Harry Pliskin  
Covad Communications  
7901 Lowry Blvd.  
Denver, CO 80230

Brian Thomas  
Time Warner Telecom  
520 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 300  
Portland, OR 97204

Thomas F. Dixon  
WorldCom  
707 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 3900  
Denver, CO 80202

Jeffrey W. Crockett  
Snell & Wilmer  
One Arizona Center  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-0001

Eric Heath  
Sprint Communications  
1850 Gateway Drive, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Mateo, CA 94404-2467

Mark Trincherro  
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP  
1300 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300  
Portland, OR 97201

Lydall Nipps  
Regulatory Director  
Allegiance Telecom Inc.  
845 Camino Sur  
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Diane Bacon  
Legislative Director  
Communications Workers of America  
5818 North 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 206  
Phoenix, AZ 85014-5811

Al Sterman  
Arizona Consumers Council  
2849 East 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Tucson, AZ 85716

Jon Poston  
ACTS  
6733 E. Dale Lane  
Cave Creek, AZ 85331-6561

  
\_\_\_\_\_