

ORIGINAL



BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS

JEFF HATCH-MILLER - Chairman 2006 JUL -5 1 P 3: 59
WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
MARC SPITZER
MIKE GLEASON AZ CORP COMMISSION
KRISTIN K. MAYES DOCUMENT CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF) DOCKET NO. T-03267A-06-0105
MCLEODUSA TELECOMMUNICATIONS) DOCKET NO. T-01051B-06-0105
SERVICES, INC. AGAINST QWEST)
CORPORATION.)

OPPOSITION TO QWEST'S MOTION TO STRIKE

THE SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL STARKEY

McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. ("McLeodUSA") hereby opposes to the motion of Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") to strike the Supplemental Direct Testimony of Michael Starkey filed June 9, 2006 ("Qwest Motion"). That testimony directly supports McLeodUSA's interpretation of the contract amendment at issue in this case and McLeodUSA's discrimination and undue preference claim and raises no new or improper issues. Accordingly, the Commission should deny Qwest's Motion for the following reasons:

BACKGROUND

1. On February 21, 2006, McLeodUSA filed its complaint seeking to enforce the parties' interconnection agreement and alleging that Qwest is unlawfully discriminating against McLeodUSA and has created an undue preference. Specifically, McLeodUSA seeks to enforce Qwest's obligation under the DC Power Measuring Amendment to the interconnection agreement to charge for the DC power plant used to provide electricity to McLeodUSA's collocated

1 Qwest filed nearly identical motions to strike in Utah and Washington. Both motions were denied.

1 equipment in Qwest central offices according to the amount of power that McLeodUSA actually
2 uses, rather than on the amount of DC power capacity of the power cables that McLeodUSA
3 originally ordered on its collocation application. Complaint §§ 6-10. McLeodUSA also has
4 alleged that Qwest's insistence on charging for DC power plant based on the capacity of the power
5 cables is unlawfully discriminatory because it results in McLeodUSA paying Qwest more for DC
6 power than Qwest charges itself. *Id.* § 11.

7 2. Qwest responded, in part, that McLeodUSA's interpretation of the Amendment is
8 unreasonable because the charge for DC power plant is calculated to recover fixed equipment costs
9 that are not usage sensitive:

10 [T]he underlying purpose of the charge was to recover the fixed costs of
11 equipment required to provide the amount of DC power capacity
12 requested by McLeod in its collocation application to Qwest. It would
13 not have been appropriate to prorate the recovery of these fixed costs
14 based on actual usage because they do not vary with usage.

15 Qwest Answer § 8.

16 3. McLeodUSA filed direct testimony May 12, 2006, including the Direct Testimony
17 of Michael Starkey. In that testimony, Mr. Starkey stated that incumbent local exchange carrier
18 ("ILEC") cost studies with which he is familiar do not support Qwest's interpretation of its DC
19 Power charges but that he had not been able to review Qwest's Arizona-specific cost study to
20 confirm that this study is consistent with his experience. Starkey Direct at 13-16. Mr. Starkey's
21 Supplemental Direct Testimony reflects his analysis of that Arizona-specific cost study and his
22 conclusion that this study "develops the Power Plant rate on the basis of DC power usage – not the
23 size of the power feeder cables – which supports McLeodUSA's interpretation of the *Power*
24 *Measuring Amendment*, wherein the Power Plant rate should be assessed based on measured
25 usage." Starkey Supp. Direct at 1, lines 12-15. This testimony further supports McLeodUSA's
26 discrimination and undue preference claim by demonstrating that Qwest's application of the Power
27 Plant rate approved by the Commission is discriminatory and creates an undue preference because

1 it results in McLeodUSA and other collocating competitors paying far more than their
2 proportionate share of Qwest's power plant costs. *Id.* at 7-10.

3 **ARGUMENT**

4 4. Qwest identifies two reasons why it believes that the Commission should strike Mr.
5 Starkey's Supplemental Direct Testimony: "first, the cost study testimony is irrelevant; second, it
6 is an impermissible collateral attack on the Commission-approved Power Plant rate." Qwest
7 Motion at 1, lines 19-21. Neither reason withstands scrutiny. Indeed, both the Utah and
8 Washington Administrative Law Judges denied the same motion when Qwest raised it in the
9 comparable proceeding in those state.

10 **A. The Testimony Is Relevant to Both of McLeodUSA's Claims.**

11 5. The analysis of Qwest's collocation cost study in Mr. Starkey's Supplemental
12 Direct Testimony directly supports McLeodUSA's interpretation of the DC Power Measuring
13 Amendment, as well as McLeodUSA's discrimination and undue preference claim. Qwest, in its
14 Answer, contended that McLeodUSA's interpretation of that Amendment is unreasonable because
15 the charge for DC power plant is calculated to recover fixed equipment costs that are not usage
16 sensitive and thus application of that charge to the power actually used would result in under-
17 recovery of Qwest's costs. Qwest Answer § 8. Mr. Starkey's analysis of the cost study on which
18 those charges are based shows that the opposite is true.

19 6. That analysis demonstrates that Qwest's rate for power plant was developed by
20 dividing the total plant costs by an assumed level of power usage (measured in amps), ultimately
21 resulting in a per amp charge for DC power plant. Starkey Supp. Direct at 2-4. As Mr. Starkey
22 explains, the development of the rate is consistent with the application of the resulting charges to
23 the amount of DC power actually used – which is how McLeodUSA interprets the DC Power
24 Measuring Amendment. Qwest's interpretation of the Amendment, on the other hand, would
25 result in Qwest applying charges developed based on actual usage to the total capacity of the
26 power cables that deliver the power to the collocated equipment and thus substantially over-
27 recovering its power plant investment. *Id.* at 4-7. The testimony supports McLeodUSA's position

1 that the Commission should not interpret the Amendment establishing application of DC power
2 charges in a manner that is inconsistent with how those charges were developed, which is directly
3 relevant to the issue of contract interpretation at the core of McLeodUSA's petition.

4 7. McLeodUSA thus is not engaging in "a full blown exploration of Qwest's costs" as
5 Qwest contends. Qwest Motion at 2, lines 6-8. Rather, McLeodUSA has prepared testimony to
6 demonstrate that based on the manner in which Qwest's collocation cost study models power plant
7 costs, the only reasonable interpretation of the Amendment governing how "DC Power Usage"
8 charges are to be assessed is that *all* such charges – including the DC Power Plant charge – apply
9 on an "as used," not an "as ordered," basis. Qwest interprets the Amendment as not including
10 power plant charges, but Qwest's disagreement with McLeodUSA's contrary interpretation does
11 not render irrelevant evidence that supports McLeodUSA's position.

12 9. Qwest, moreover, completely ignores McLeodUSA's discrimination and undue
13 preference claim. McLeodUSA alleges that Qwest is discriminating against McLeodUSA when
14 charging for DC Power Plant based on the number of amps of capacity that could be delivered
15 over the DC power cables that McLeodUSA ordered. Such an application of the DC power plant
16 charge requires McLeodUSA to pay far more for DC power in a Qwest central office than Qwest
17 pays itself. Mr. Starkey's analysis of the collocation cost study supports that claim. Starkey Supp.
18 Direct at 7-10. Qwest has not even attempted to explain how this testimony is not relevant to
19 McLeodUSA's discrimination and undue preference claim.

20 10. Mr. Starkey's Supplemental Direct Testimony supports McLeodUSA's
21 interpretation of the DC Power Measuring Amendment and McLeodUSA's allegations that Qwest
22 is discriminating against McLeodUSA and granting itself an undue preference by applying the per
23 amp power plant charge to the number of amps of capacity of the power cables to McLeodUSA's
24 collocation space, rather than to the number of amps of power McLeodUSA actually uses. Such
25 testimony is unquestionably relevant.

26
27

1 **B. McLeodUSA Is Not Collaterally Attacking Commission-Approved Rates.**

2 11. Qwest's second basis for seeking to strike the June 9, 2006 testimony is that "Mr.
3 Starkey's cost testimony is nothing more than a thinly veiled, or perhaps not veiled at all, attack on
4 the actual Commission-approved Power Plant rates." The testimony itself demonstrates that this
5 contention has no merit. Mr. Starkey testifies that nothing in his testimony "is critical of the actual
6 Power Plant rate approved by the Commission, or the manner by which the rate is developed."
7 Starkey Supp. Direct at 10, lines 190-191. Mr. Starkey pointedly explains, "It is Qwest's
8 *misapplication* of its Power Plant rate that causes the discrimination discussed above and likewise,
9 it is this same *misapplication* that should have been (and McLeodUSA believes was) rectified by
10 the DC Power Measuring Amendment." *Id.* at 10, lines 197-200 (emphasis added).

11 12. Qwest cites to no Commission cost docket order that considered, much less
12 expressly approved, Qwest's application of the DC power rate elements to the total amperage
13 capacity of the power cables. The Commission's cost docket orders, at best, approved only the per
14 amp rates themselves, not the specific amps to which the rates apply. McLeodUSA is not
15 disputing the rates the Commission approved. McLeodUSA is challenging Qwest's *application* of
16 those rates under the DC Power Measuring Amendment. Nothing in that challenge implicates or
17 collaterally attacks any Commission cost-docket order.

18 13. Qwest nevertheless complains that Mr. Starkey's "criticisms would have been
19 equally applicable to the rates as they existed before the amendment." Qwest Motion at 3, lines 1-
20 2.. As discussed above, however, Mr. Starkey's criticisms do not go to the rates at all. It is
21 irrelevant, moreover, whether Mr. Starkey's analysis *could* apply to Qwest's *application* of the DC
22 power charges prior to the effective date of the DC Power Measuring Amendment. McLeodUSA
23 is not making that claim in this proceeding. Qwest's argument also misses the point.
24 McLeodUSA is challenging Qwest's interpretation of the Amendment as authorizing Qwest to
25 apply the Commission-approved DC Power Plant rate to the total amperage capacity of the power
26 cables from that power plant to McLeodUSA's collocation space. Mr. Starkey's Supplemental
27 Direct Testimony explains that such an interpretation results in an application of that rate that is

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET - SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
TELEPHONE NO. 602-256-6100
FACSIMILE 602-256-6800

1 inconsistent with how the rate was developed and that is discriminatory and results in an undue
2 preference to Qwest. The testimony thus supports McLeodUSA's position on the issues raised in
3 the Petition and does not broaden the scope of this proceeding.

4 **CONCLUSION**

5 Mr. Starkey's Supplemental Direct Testimony is relevant to McLeodUSA's contract
6 interpretation and discrimination and undue preference claims and does not collaterally attack
7 Commission cost docket orders or otherwise expand the issues to be considered in this docket.
8 Qwest, therefore, has identified no legitimate basis on which that testimony should not be received
9 into evidence, and the Commission should deny Qwest's Motion.

10 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 5th day of July 2006.

11 ROSKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC

12
13
14 By _____


15 Michael W. Patten
16 One Arizona Center
17 400 East Van Buren Street, Suite 800
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

17 Original and 15 copies of the foregoing
18 filed this 5th day of July 2006 with:

18 Docket Control
19 Arizona Corporation Commission
20 1200 West Washington Street
21 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

21 Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered/mailed
22 this 5th day of July 2006 to:

22 Amy Bjelland
23 Administrative Law Judge
24 Hearing Division
25 Arizona Corporation Commission
26 1200 West Washington Street
27 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET - SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004
TELEPHONE NO 602-256-6100
FACSIMILE 602-256-6800

1 Maureen A. Scott, Esq.
2 Chief Counsel, Legal Division
3 Arizona Corporation Commission
4 1200 West Washington Street
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

4 Ernest G. Johnson
5 Director, Utilities Division
6 Arizona Corporation Commission
7 1200 West Washington
8 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

7 Norman G. Curtright
8 Qwest Corporation
9 20 East Thomas Road, 16th Floor
10 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

9 Lisa A. Anderl
10 Qwest Corporation
11 1600 7th Avenue, Room 3206
12 Seattle, Washington 98191

13
14 By Mary Spolits
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET
SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN

ROSHKA DEWULF & PATTEN, PLC
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET
SUITE 800
PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004