The question before the Arizona Corporation Commission (the “Commission”) is whether Qwest should continue to reduce access charges and apply a productivity adjustment to other rates during an interim period between the end of the initial three-year term of the price cap plan and the approval of a new price cap plan or the completion of a traditional rate case. The current price cap plan had contemplated that Qwest would make a filing nine months prior to the end of the initial three-year term so that the Commission could rule on a new or extended plan before the initial three-year term ended. As a result, no interim or, “gap” period would arise. At its February 10, 2004 Open Meeting, the
Commission, faced with an emergency situation in which it could not approve a new plan by April 1, 2004, took decisive action to continue the productivity adjustment and access charge reduction during an interim period while it conducted a complete review of Qwest’s rates and modified price cap plan. (ACC Decision No. 66772).

On March 8, 2004, WorldCom, Inc., on behalf of its operating affiliates (“MCI”), filed a Response to Qwest’s Application for Rehearing on ACC Decision No. 66772, which supported the Commission’s access charge decision. That response is incorporated by reference as MCI’s response requested by the April 6, 2004 Procedural Order.

The March 8, 2004, response filed by MCI made three points.

1. The price cap plan language supports an additional access charge reduction because it specifically states that further reductions in intrastate switched access service would occur during any subsequent term of the price cap plan. Even Mr. Shooshan, the current Qwest witness and former Staff witness, made it clear that future access charge reductions is “where we’re headed” if the settlement is approved.

2. Substantial evidence supports an access charge reduction. Qwest and Staff testimony filed in the access charge case, which has been consolidated with the price cap case, demonstrates that access charges are well above cost.

3. MCI provided a detailed history of access charge proceedings and policies supporting an additional access charge reduction.

MCI briefly supplements its March 8 response to address issues raised by RUCO after MCI filed its Response.

In its April 5, 2004 Response to Qwest’s Application for Rehearing, RUCO argues that the additional $5 million access reduction is inconsistent with the Commission’s
statements in Decision No. 63487, in which it stated that it did not want to grant any further access reductions until it could weigh broader public policy issues. What RUCO fails to note is that, since Decision No. 63487, there have been significant new events impacting those public policy issues. First, Qwest has been allowed into the long-distance market and given 271 approval thereby making price squeeze issues, imputation issues, and access reform even more important. Second, there have been continued delays in the Commission’s access proceedings. Third, the Commission is faced with this emergency, interim situation due to Qwest’s inability to provide adequate information in a timely fashion. These significant changed circumstances support Decision No. 66772.

RUCO also maintains that access rates cannot be adjusted without a fair value rate base finding. First, RUCO’s position is inconsistent. RUCO believes that rates can be adjusted using the productivity factor without a new fair value finding. RUCO argues that the fair value finding in Decision 63487 is still valid for the productivity adjustment, but maintains that the same fair value finding is not valid for an additional access charge reduction. Second, the interim access charge reduction can be revenue neutral or subject to a true-up thereby mooting any Scates issues. It should be noted that the access charge reductions during the initial three-year term of the price cap plan were revenue neutral because they were offset by an increase in the basket three cap. A similar $5 million increase in the basket three cap during this interim period would also result in a revenue neutral adjustment. The Commission can also make the new access reduction subject to a true-up. Third, the new access charge reduction does not run afoul of Scates because it is an interim response to an emergency situation. Scates allows interim rate adjustments in emergency situations pending the completion of a full rate review. While the emergency situation referenced in Scates and discussed in detail in Arizona Attorney General Opinion
71-17 address an increase, not a decrease, in rates, the interim rate concept from those authorities is useful here.  

CONCLUSION

The Commission's decision to reduce access charges by $5 million is a reasonable response in this interim period, is supported by the record, and is good public policy. Qwest's Application should be denied and Decision 66772 should be upheld.
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