



0000110542

ORIGINAL

Arizona Corporation Commission
BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

DOCKETED

1
2 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
CHAIRMAN
3 JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER
4 MARC SPITZER
COMMISSIONER

JUL - 9 2002

2002 JUL -9 P 3:07

DOCKETED BY *CAJ*

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

5
6 IN THE MATTER OF QWEST CORPORATIONS
COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 252(e) OF THE
7 TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

DOCKET NO. RT-00000F-02-0271

8
9 IN THE MATTER OF U. S. WEST
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S COMPLIANCE
10 WITH SECTION 271 OF THE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

DOCKET NO. T-00000A-97-0238

PROCEDURAL ORDER

11 **BY THE COMMISSION:**

12 On April 8, 2002, the Staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") opened
13 the above-captioned docket for the purpose of conducting an inquiry into whether Qwest Corporation
14 ("Qwest") has complied with Section 252(e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. In this docket
15 the Commission is reviewing whether Qwest should have filed certain agreements for Commission
16 approval, and if so, whether, and what, remedial action is appropriate.

17 Our Procedural Orders dated April 18, 2002, May 7, 2002, and May 20, 2002, directed the
18 parties to make various filings. Qwest submitted copies of the subject agreements on May 10, 2002.
19 The Residential Utility Consumers Office ("RUCO"), AT&T Communications of the Mountain
20 States, Inc. and TCG Phoenix (collectively "AT&T") and Time Warner Telecom of Arizona, LLC
21 ("TWTA") filed Comments on Qwest's submission on May 24, 2002. Qwest filed Responsive
22 Comments on May 31, 2002. Staff filed its Staff Report on June 7, 2002.

23 On June 19, 2002, the Commission held a Procedural Conference for the purpose of
24 determining whether an evidentiary hearing is necessary and if so, the appropriate scope of the
25 proceeding.

26 In the Staff Report, Staff concludes that Section 252 should be read more broadly than Qwest
27 had been reading it. In Staff's view, any agreement that concerns interconnection, services or
28

1 network elements should be filed pursuant to Section 252(a)(1). Thus, of the approximately 100
2 agreements which Qwest did not file for Commission approval, Staff identified 25 which it believes
3 should have been filed pursuant to Section 252. Staff further recommended that Qwest be assessed
4 fines totaling \$104,000. For 23 of the unfiled agreements, Staff recommended fines of \$3,000 for
5 each agreement that Staff believes should have been filed under its interpretation of Section 252.
6 Staff's recommendation for a nominal fine for these agreements is based on Staff's inability to rule
7 out the possibility that Qwest's failure to file the agreement was due to a good faith difference of
8 interpretation of the requirements of Section 252. Seven of the agreements contained prohibitions
9 against the carrier or CLEC from participating in a Commission proceeding – either the Qwest/ US
10 West merger docket or the Section 271 docket. Because Staff found this type of provision
11 particularly egregious and contrary to the public interest, Staff recommended fines of \$5,000 per
12 agreement for the seven agreements that fell into this category.

13 At the June 19, 2002 Procedural Conference, Qwest stated that it does not believe a hearing is
14 necessary as the essential material facts are not in dispute. Although Qwest believes it is debatable
15 whether Staff's proposed standard for whether the agreements should have been filed is correct,
16 Qwest accepts Staff's proposed standard and recommended fines.

17 In a letter dated June 18, 2002, Qwest sets forth its arguments why the agreements containing
18 the prohibitions against participating in the Section 271 docket did not affect the integrity of that
19 proceeding. Qwest notes that only two of the agreements affected the 271 docket, and in these cases,
20 Qwest argues the CLECs' concerns that resulted in the secret settlement agreements were resolved so
21 that it was natural that the complaining party withdraw from the 271 proceeding.

22 In its May 24, 2002 Comments, and at the Procedural Conference, RUCO requested that the
23 Commission conduct a hearing. RUCO believes there are disputed issues of material fact, including
24 the willfulness of Qwest's alleged violations; to determine if there are additional oral agreements that
25 have not been considered yet; whether there has been harm to competition; whether Qwest enjoyed
26 economic benefit; and what the Commission should do. RUCO estimated that it would require two
27 months to conduct discovery and prepare for hearing.
28

1 AT&T agreed with Staff's proposed standard, but expressed the desire to comment on the list
2 of agreements that Staff has recommended should have been filed. In Comments filed June 26, 2002,
3 AT&T recommended that the Commission aggressively seek further evidence regarding whether
4 Qwest's Section 271 application is in the public interest and any additional information that may not
5 have been admitted into the Section 271 record as a result of the unfiled agreements. AT&T believes
6 that the Section 271 docket was the proper forum to conduct the investigation, and that the process
7 might benefit from the consolidation of the Section 271 and Section 252 dockets.

8 WorldCom believes that there are questions that remain to be answered such as whether the
9 agreements are still in effect; whether they are available for opting in; whether Staff has identified all
10 of the agreements that should have been filed; whether any party received preferential treatment;
11 whether Cap Gemini Ernst & Young relied on data from a party involved in the secret agreements in
12 its OSS test; the timing of the activity; and whether Qwest truly acted in good faith.

13 On June 24, 2002, Eschelon Telecom, Inc. ("Eschelon") filed a letter in response to Qwest's
14 June 18, 2002 letter. In Eschelon's response, it disputed some of Qwest's representations and
15 conclusions and indicated that all of its service quality issues were not necessarily resolved prior to
16 Qwest's insistence that it drop out of the 271 proceedings.

17 On June 27, 2002, Qwest filed a letter in reply to Eschelon, and states that Eschelon's letter
18 does not identify any specific terms or issues that were not raised or addressed in the 271 workshop
19 process. Qwest states that the Commission should permit Staff to complete its analysis and then
20 make a determination of how to proceed.

21 At the June 19, 2002 Procedural Conference, Staff re-stated its position that the question of
22 which agreements should have been filed is a legal issue that does not require an evidentiary hearing.
23 Staff stated it was revising the list of agreements that it believes should have been filed pursuant to
24 Section 252, and agreed that parties should have an opportunity to comment on Staff's revised list.

25 Regarding the Section 271 proceeding, Staff believes that the Commission must determine the
26 impact of the unfiled agreements on the 271 process. Consequently, Staff intends to send out data
27 requests to the 271 participants in an attempt to determine if the Section 271 proceeding should be re-
28

1 opened. Staff anticipates filing reports in the Section 271 proceeding and in the 252 docket
2 containing the results of its investigation and its recommendations whether to re-open the Section 271
3 proceeding. As of this date, Staff's investigation into the effect of the agreements on the section 271
4 process is continuing. Staff expects to file an updated list of agreements and reports on its
5 investigation of the effect on the Section 271 docket shortly.

6 Based on the comments and arguments of the parties, a hearing in the Section 252 docket is
7 required to address, at a minimum, the issue of the appropriateness of, and reasons for, Qwest's
8 failure to file the agreements and the appropriate amount of any fines. Due to the inter-relationship
9 between the Section 252 proceeding and the Section 271 issues, it may be beneficial to consolidate
10 the two two dockets for the purpose of hearing. Staff's on-going investigation into the effect of the
11 unfiled agreements, especially those containing prohibitions on participating in the 271 proceeding,
12 will assist in the determination on whether the matters should be consolidated.

13 The scope of the hearing will depend on the results of discovery into the questions raised by
14 RUCO and Worldcom as well as Staff's investigation. Although we are aware that discovery is being
15 conducted in the Section 271 docket, we expect the parties to initiate discovery in the Section 252
16 docket if they have not yet done so.

17 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that interested parties shall file comments to Staff's amended
18 list of agreements within ten calendar days of the date Staff files its amended list.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that interested parties shall file written comments containing
20 their recommendations for the scope of a hearing, the time needed to prepare, whether the Section
21 271 and Section 252 dockets should be consolidated for the purposes of a hearing and proposed
22 hearing procedures, within ten days of Staff filing its report on the results of its investigation.

23 ...

24 ...

25 ...

26 ...

27 ...

28

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Presiding Officer may rescind, alter, amend, or waive any portion of this Procedural Order either by subsequent Procedural Order or by ruling at hearing.

DATED this 9th day of July, 2002.

Jane L. Rodda / by Dnodes
JANE L. RODDA
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

Copies of the foregoing mailed/delivered this 9th day of July, 2002, to

QWEST Corporation
1801 California Street, #5100
Denver, Colorado 80202

TRI
4312 92nd Avenue, N.W.
Gig Harbor, Washington 98335

Maureen Arnold
U S WEST Communications, Inc.
3033 N. Third Street, Room 1010
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Bradley Carroll
Cox Arizona Telcom, L.L.C.
20401 N. 29th Avenue, Suite 100
Phoenix, Arizona 85027

Michael M. Grant
GALLAGHER AND KENNEDY
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

Richard M. Rindler
Morton J. Posner
SWIDER & BERLIN
3000 K Street, N.W. Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007

Timothy Berg
FENNEMORE CRAIG
3003 N. Central Ave., Suite 2600
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Michael W. Patten
ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF
400 E. Van Buren, Suite 800
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Mark Dioguardi
TIFFANY AND BOSCO PA
500 Dial Tower
1850 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Charles Kallenbach
AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES INC
131 National Business Parkway
Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701

Nigel Bates
ELECTRIC LIGHTWAVE, INC.
4400 NE 77th Avenue
Vancouver, Washington 98662

Karen L. Clauson
Thomas F. Dixon
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORP
707 17th Street, #3900
Denver, Colorado 80202

Thomas L. Mumaw
Jeffrey W. Crockett
SNELL & WILMER
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-0001

Richard S. Wolters
AT&T & TCG
1875 Lawrence Street, Room 1575
Denver, Colorado 80202

Darren S. Weingard
Stephen H. Kukta
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CO L.P.
1850 Gateway Drive, 7th Floor
San Mateo, California 94404-2467

Joyce Hundley
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Antitrust Division
1401 H Street NW, Suite 8000
Washington, DC 20530

Thomas H. Campbell
LEWIS & ROCA
40 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Joan Burke
OSBORN MALEDON
2929 N. Central Avenue, 21st Floor
P.O. Box 36379
Phoenix, Arizona 85067-6379

Andrew O. Isar

1 Scott S. Wakefield, Chief Counsel
 RUCO
 2828 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1200
 2 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

3 Gregory Hoffman
 795 Folsom Street, Room 2159
 4 San Francisco, CA 94107-1243

5 Daniel Waggoner
 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE
 2600 Century Square
 6 1501 Fourth Avenue
 Seattle, WA 98101-1688

7 Douglas Hsiao
 Jim Scheltema
 Blumenfeld & Cohen
 8 1625 Massachusetts Ave. N.W., Suite 300
 Washington, DC 20036

9 Raymond S. Heyman
 Randall H. Warner
 10 ROSHKA HEYMAN & DeWULF
 400 E. Van Buren, Suite 800
 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

11 Diane Bacon, Legislative Director
 COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA
 12 5818 North 7th Street, Suite 206
 Phoenix, Arizona 85014-5811

13 Mark N. Rogers
 14 Excell Agent Services, L.L.C.
 2175 W. 14th Street
 Tempe, Arizona 85281

15 Robert S. Tanner
 16 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
 17 17203 n. 42nd Street
 Phoenix, Arizona 85032

18 Mark P. Trinchero
 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
 1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300
 Portland, Oregon 97201

19 Jon Loehman
 20 Managing Director-Regulatory
 SBC Telecom, Inc.
 5800 Northwest Parkway
 21 Suite 135, Room 1.S.40
 San Antonio, Texas 78249

22 Lyndall Nipps
 Director, Regulatory
 23 Allegiance Telecom, Inc.
 845 Camino Sure
 Palm Springs, California 92262

24 M. Andrew Andrade
 25 5261 S. Quebec Street, Suite 150
 Greenwood Village, CO 80111
 Attorney for TESS Communications, Inc.

26

27 Todd C. Wiley
 GALLAGHER & KENNEDY
 28 2575 E. Camelback Road
 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

Megan Doberneck
 Senior Counsel
 Covad Communications Company
 7901 Lowry Boulevard
 Denver, CO 80230

Al Sterman
 ARIZONA CONSUMERS COUNCIL
 2849 E 8th Street
 Tucson Arizona 85716

Brian Thomas
 TIME WARNER TELECOM, INC.
 520 S.W. 6th Avenue, Suite 300
 Portland, Oregon 97204

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

Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel
 Legal Division
 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
 1200 West Washington Street
 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Ernest G. Johnson, Director
 Utilities Division
 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
 1200 West Washington Street
 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

ARIZONA REPORTING SERVICE, INC
 2627 N. Third Street, Suite Three
 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-1103

By:


 Molly Johnson
 Secretary to Jane Rodda