INTRODUCTION

Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") hereby files this Memorandum Regarding Constitutional Requirements for Changing Access Rates and Comment on Procedural Schedule ("Memorandum") in the above-referenced docket. This Memorandum responds to Assistant Chief Administrative Law Judge ("ACALJ") Nodes’ request that the parties brief legal issues on the provisions of the Arizona Constitution that require the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") to determine the fair value of a public service corporation's property when setting regulated rates in this proceeding. Art. XV, §§ 3 and 14 of the Arizona Constitution require that the Commission ascertain the fair value of the property of any public service corporation in conjunction with setting rates for intrastate telecommunications service. This requirement applies to either increase or decrease in some or all of a utility’s rates, as much as it does to a full rate case. In determining fair value and setting rates, the Commission must also consider the effect the rate change will have on the public service corporation’s authorized rate of return. In order to comply with the Arizona Constitution, the Commission may only restructure intrastate access in a
revenue neutral manner, or in the context of a rate case with a finding of fair value rate base and reasonable rate of return thereon.

Finally, this Memorandum also briefly addresses the procedural schedule offered jointly by AT&T and Commission Staff ("Staff"), in addition to providing Qwest's proposed schedule.

**DISCUSSION**

1. **Constitutional Requirements**

   The Commission cannot lower Qwest's access line rates in Arizona without: 1) a determination of fair value and an assessment of the impact of such rate change on Qwest's rate of return; or 2) structuring the rate change so that it is revenue-neutral. Otherwise, the order would result in ratemaking without a finding of fair value - a practice not permitted under Arizona law. The Arizona Constitution gives the Commission the authority to prescribe "just and reasonable rates and charges" to be made and collected by public service corporations. Ariz. Const. art. XV, § 3. The Constitution also dictates, to some degree, what process the Commission must use in determining such rates. For example, the Commission must, "to aid it in the proper discharge of its duties, ascertain the fair value of the property within the State of every public service corporation doing business therein." Ariz. Const. art. XV, § 14.

   Article XV, §§ 3 and 14, of the Arizona Constitution prohibit the Commission from either increasing or decreasing a public service corporation's rates on a piecemeal basis without first conducting a fair value determination and then setting rates that allow a reasonable return on that rate base. Scates v. Arizona Corp. Comm'n, 118 Ariz. at 534, 537, 578 P.2d at 615, 618; Simms v. Round Valley Light & Power Co., 80 Ariz. 145, 294 P.2d 378 (1956).

   The scope of this constitutional limitation on the Commission's authority was discussed in both Simms and Scates. In Simms, a power company challenged the
Commission’s authority to reduce its rates without first determining fair value. On appeal, one of the questions before the Court was whether the Commission, prior to reducing rates, was required to find the fair value of the company’s properties being used to serve the public as a basis for calculating reasonable rates. \textit{Id.} at 148, 294 P.2d at 379. The Arizona Supreme Court held that, indeed, the Commission must first find and use fair value as the basis for setting rates:

\textit{[U]nder our constitution as interpreted by this court, the commission is required to find the fair value of the company’s property and use such finding as a rate base for the purpose of calculating what are just and reasonable rates. . . . While our constitution does not establish a formula for arriving at fair value, it does require such value to be found and used as the base in fixing rates. The reasonableness and justness of the rates must be related to this finding of fair value.}} \textit{Id.} at 151, 294 P.2d at 382 (emphasis added).

In \textit{Scates}, 118 Ariz. at 531, 578 P.2d at 612, the Arizona Court of Appeals considered whether Article XV, §§ 3 and 14, of the Arizona Constitution prohibits the Commission from increasing some of a public service corporation’s rates without first conducting a fair value determination and then setting rates that allow a reasonable return on that rate base. In that case, Mountain Bell applied for and was granted permission to increase charges for installation, moving, and changing of telephones within Arizona. \textit{Id.} at 533, 578 P.2d at 614.

On appeal, the Arizona Court of Appeals reversed the Commission’s decision, finding that because the Commission failed to determine the fair value of the company’s rate base and to consider the effect of the increase on rate of return, its decision did not satisfy Article XV, §§ 3 and 14. \textit{Id.} at 537, 578 P.2d at 618. See also \textit{Residential Utility Consumer Office v. Arizona Corp. Com’n}, 199 Ariz. 588, 591, 20 P.3d 1169, 1172 (Ariz.App 2001) (“When setting rates for public utilities, the Commission should focus on
the principle that ‘total revenue, including income from rates and charges, should be sufficient to meet a utility’s operating costs and to give the utility and its stockholders a reasonable rate of return on the utility’s investment.’”)

Since Simms and Scates, the Arizona Supreme Court has clarified that although not required to use fair value as the exclusive rate basis for setting rates, the Commission must nevertheless ascertain the fair value of the corporation’s property and at least consider it in determining what rates will be sufficient to allow a reasonable regulated rate of return to a public service corporation. See, e.g., U.S. West Communications, Inc. v. Arizona Corporation Commission, 201 Ariz. 242, 246, 34 P.3d 351, 355 (2001) (“Thus, fair value, in conjunction with other information, may be used to insure that both the corporation and the consumer are treated fairly.”)

Two narrow exceptions exist to the constitutional requirement of a fair value determination prior to changing rates, neither of which applies here. The first exception is an automatic adjustment clause that permits rates to adjust automatically to reflect changes in specific operating costs. Such clauses are designed to ensure that the public service corporation’s rate of return does not change. Scates, 118 Ariz. at 535, 578 P.2d at 616. No automatic adjustment clause is applicable in this case.

The other exception is that the Commission may only set rates outside a rate case “in limited situations where an emergency exists.” Scates, 118 Ariz. at 535, 578 P.2d at 616. When the Commission establishes rates outside a rate case, such rates are interim in nature and the Commission must follow “appropriate safeguards to insure that rates will not become permanent until there is adequate inquiry into whether they are just and reasonable.”1 Id. There is no contention that an emergency exists here justifying a

---

1 The Arizona Attorney General has defined when an emergency exists for purposes of changing a rate. See Op. Att’y Gen. 71-17 (1971). An emergency exists “when sudden change brings hardship to a company, when the company is insolvent, . . . when the condition of the company is such that its ability to maintain service pending a formal rate
reduction in Qwest's access line rates.

Scates did leave undetermined whether the fair value finding requirement could be established short of a full rate hearing. Id. at 537 ("We do not decide in this case, for example, whether the Commission could have referred to previous submissions with some updating or whether it could have accepted summary financial information.") Indeed, Commission Staff suggested at the October 14, 2003 Procedural Conference to "explore options in this proceeding short of a full-blown rate case that could be used to effectuate any rate changes within the context of this case." See October 14, 2003, Transcript of Procedural Conference at 30. Indeed, if the Commission were to utilize some process or mechanism that does not ultimately affect Qwest's revenue (i.e. a revenue-neutral restatement of Qwest's rates) requirement, a fair value finding required by the Arizona Constitution is negated since the Company's rate of return will not change.

2. Alternatives for Commission to Consider

Qwest's current Price Cap Plan ("Settlement") calls for a $15 million reduction in access rates, $5 million a year for three years. This Settlement between Qwest and the Commission provides no further reductions in access rates. Given the legal constraints imposed on the Commission by Scates, any further reductions in access rates must be accomplished in a revenue-neutral manner, or within the context of a rate proceeding (i.e. the adoption of a revised price cap plan in a procedure to set rates).

One alternative is to accomplish a revenue-neutral resetting of Qwest's access rates through a reduction of those rates to interstate levels, and the implementation of an end-user charge to offset the revenue loss of the rate reduction. Another alternative is to use this proceeding to identify issues salient to access reform, including an analysis of current determination is in serious doubt," or when the Commission cannot "grant permanent rate relief within a reasonable time."
access rates of all parties, and develop policies and procedures that can be implemented through rate proceedings to effectuate the rate changes.

3. Proposed Procedural Schedule

Qwest opposes Staff and AT&T’s proposal to bifurcate this proceeding into two separate inquiries; one into Qwest’s access line rates, and one for all other parties. Certainly, any bifurcation that results in lowering Qwest’s access line charge while leaving those of the other parties intact would be inequitable. As previously recognized by the Commission in Decision No. 63487\(^2\), access rate “reform” cannot be achieved exclusive of other public policy issues that permeate the telecommunications industry as a whole.

While we agree that achieving parity between intrastate and interstate switched access rates is a laudable goal, there are many other public policy issues that impact our ability to reach that goal, such as the desirability of imposing End User Common Line Charge. Such decision concerning the structure of toll service charges should occur in a generic docket as it affects more than just Qwest.

Decision No. 63487 at 12.

In ordering this generic docket on the cost of telecommunications access, the Commission recognized that its goals are best served by utilizing other public policy issues as regulatory tools to establish parity in switched access rates for all telecommunications providers. As the Residential Utility Consumers Office (“RU CO”) opined, “We do see this is as a proceeding that is meant to examine the issues on a global basis. And we see that there can be inefficiency that would result in bifurcating the issue.” Tr. at 20.

Despite the inefficiency in conducting two separate proceedings that will address

\(^2\) In the Matter of the Application of US West Communications, Inc. for a Hearing to Determine the Earnings of the Company, the Fair Value of the Company for Ratemaking Purposes, to Fix Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon and to Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return, Docket No T-01051B-99-0105.
interrelated issues, Staff nevertheless contends that bifurcation is necessary to expedite this matter in light of the Commissioners’ discussion during their discussion of Qwest’s § 271 application. However, Qwest supports the schedule proposed by Staff and AT&T for Phase I as the procedural timeline to address the access rates of all parties, not just Qwest. This accelerated schedule dovetails with the expiration of Qwest’s current price cap plan, and allows the Commission flexibility in developing a mechanism to effectuate any rate change consistent with the constitutional limitations discussed herein. While each party may focus on different issues, they are nonetheless interrelated and should be resolved in a consolidated manner to avoid a duplication of effort, provide for an equitable application and remain consistent with Arizona law.

With slight modification to Staff and AT&T’s proposed schedule for Phase I as discussed above, the following deadlines would apply:

- November 20, 2003: Qwest, ICO and Intervenor’s Direct Testimony
- December 18, 2003: Staff Testimony
- January 19, 2004: Rebuttal Testimony
- February 2, 2004: Staff Rebuttal
- February 23, 2004 (Week): Hearing
- March 22, 2004: Briefs
- April 15, 2004: Reply Brief

However, to the extent that the Assistant Chief Administrative Law Judge chooses to grant Staff and AT&T’s request to bifurcate the issues, Qwest would propose the following schedules in the two phases of the proceeding.

The first phase of the docket should address access charges for Qwest and the CLECs. If Qwest’s rates are reduced without a contemporaneous resetting of the CLEC’s access rates, Qwest will face the very real possibility of paying the CLECs significantly more in originating and terminating access than the CLECs pay Qwest for performing the
exact same functions.

Phase I (Qwest and CLECs):

- November 20, 2003: Qwest, CLECs and other Intervenors Direct Testimony
- December 18, 2003: Staff Direct Testimony
- January 19, 2004: Rebuttal Testimony
- February 2, 2004: Staff Rebuttal
- Week of February 23, 2004: Hearing
- March 22, 2004: Opening Briefs
- April 15, 2004: Reply Briefs

Phase 2 (Independents):

- April 5, 2004: Independents and Intervenors Direct
- May 10, 2004: Staff Direct Testimony
- June 11, 2004: Rebuttal Testimony
- Week of July 19, 2004: Hearing
- August 20, 2004: Opening Briefs
- September 3, 2004: Reply Briefs

DATED this 3rd day of November, 2003.
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San Carlos Apache Telecommunications Utility, Inc.
PO Box 701
245 S. Hill
Globe, AZ 85502
1. Accipiter Communications, Inc.
   2238 W. Lone Cactus Dr., Ste.100
   Phoenix, AZ 85027

2. South Central Utah Telephone Association, Inc.
   PO Box 226
   Escalante, UT 84726-000

3. Southwestern Telephone Co., Inc.
   PO Box 5158
   Madison, WI 53705-0158

4. Centruytel
   PO Box 4065
   Monroe, LA 71211-4065

5. Table Top Telephone Co, Inc.
   600 N. Second Avenue
   Ajo, AZ 85321-0000

   Citizens Communications Co. of Arizona
   4 Triad Center, Suite 200
   Salt Lake City, UT 84180

7. Valley Telephone Cooperative, Inc.
   752 E. Malley Street
   PO Box 970
   Willcox, AZ 85644

8. Copper Valley Telephone, Inc.
   PO Box 970
   Willcox, AZ 85644

   One Verizon Way – CA500GCF
   Thousand Oaks, CA 91362-3811

10. Midvale Telephone Exchange
    PO Box 7
    Midvale, ID 83645

11. AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc.
    111 W. Monroe, Ste. 1201
    Phoenix, AZ 85003

12. Navajo Communications Co., Inc.
    4 Triad Center, Suite 200
    Salt Lake City, UT 84180
1. Brooks Fiber Communications of Tucson, Inc.
   201 Spear Street, 9th Floor
   San Francisco, CA 94105

2. Caprock Telecommunications Corporation
   15601 N. Dallas Parkway, Ste. 700
   Dallas, TX 75248

3. Citizens Long Distance Co.
   5600 Headquarters Drive
   Plano, TX 75024

4. Citizens Telecommunications Co. of the White Mountains, Inc.
   4 Triad Center, Ste. 200
   Salt Lake City, UT 84180

5. Max-Tel Communications, Inc.
   105 N. Wickham
   PO Box 280
   Alvord, TX 76225

6. Comm South Companies, Inc.
   2909 N. Buckner Blvd., Ste. 200
   Dallas, TX 75228

7. MCI WorldCom Communications
   201 Spear Street, 9th Floor
   San Francisco, CA 94105

8. Covad Communications Co.
   4250 Burton Drive
   Santa Clara, CA 95054

9. MCIMetro
   201 Spear Street, 9th Floor
   San Francisco, CA 94105

10. Cox Communications
    20401 N. 29th Avenue
    Phoenix, AZ 85027

    201 Spear Street, 9th Floor
    San Francisco, CA 94105

12. Digital Services Corp.
    211 N. Union Street, Ste. 300
    Alexandria, VA 22314
1 Mountain Telecommunications Inc.
   2540 E. 6th Street
   Tucson, AZ 85716

2 eSpire
   131 National Business Parkway, Ste. 100
   Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

3 North County Communications Corporation
   3802 Rosencrans, Ste. 485
   San Diego, CA 92110

4 Electric Lightwave, Inc.
   4 Triad Center, Ste. 200
   Salt Lake City, UT 84180

5 One Point Communications
   Two Conway Park
   150 Field Drive, Ste. 300
   Lake Forest, IL 60045

6 Eschelon Telecom of Arizona, Inc.
   730 Second Avenue South, Ste. 1200
   Minneapolis, MN 55402

7 RCN Telecom Services, Inc.
   105 Carnegie Center
   Princeton, NJ 08540

8 Global Crossing Local Services, Inc.
   180 South Clinton
   Rochester, NY 14646

9 Reflex Communications, Inc.
   83 South King Street, Ste. 106
   Seattle, WA 98104

10 Global Crossing Telemanagement, Inc.
   180 South Clinton
   Rochester, NY 14646

11 Rhythm Links, Inc.
   9100 E. Mineral Circle
   Englewood, CO 80112

12 Intermedia Communications, Inc.
   One Intermedia Way
   Tampa, FL 33647-1752
1. Sprint Communications Company, L.P.
   6860 W. 115th, MS:KSOPKD0105
   Overland Park, KS 66211

2. Jato Operating Corporation
   6200 Syracuse Way, Ste. 200
   Englewood, CA 80111

3. TCG Phoenix
   111 West Monroe St., Ste. 1201
   Phoenix, AZ 85004

4. Level 3 Communications, LLC
   1025 Eldorado Blvd.
   Broomfield, CO 80021

5. The Phone Company/Network Services of New Hope
   6805 Route 202
   New Hope, PA 18938

6. Verizon Select Services Inc.
   6665 MacArthur Blvd, HQK02D84
   Irving, TX 75039

7. IG2, Inc.
   80-02 Kew Garden Road, Ste. 5000
   Kew Gardens, NY 11415

8. Winstar Wireless of Arizona
   1577 Spring Hill Road, 2nd Fl.
   Vienna, VA 22182

9. Independent Network Services Corp. (FN)
   2600 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 1750
   Phoenix, AZ 85004

10. XO Arizona Inc.
    3930 Watkins, Ste. 200
    Phoenix, AZ 85034

11. 360 Networks (USA) Inc.
    12101 Airport Way
    Broomfield, CO 80021

12. Main Street Telephone Company
    200 Ithan Creek Avenue
    Villanova, PA 19085
1. Allcom USA
   2151 E. Convention Ctr Way, Ste. 207-A
   Ontario, CA 91764-4483

2. Alliance Group Services, Inc.
   1221 Post Road East
   Westport, CT 06880

3. Net-Tel Corporation
   11921 Freedom Drive
   Reston, VA 20190

4. Nextlink Long Distance Svcs.
   3930 E. Watkins, Ste. 200
   Phoenix, AZ 85034

5. Archtel, Inc.
   1800 West Park Drive, Ste. 250
   Westborough, MA 01581

6. GST Net, Inc.
   4001 Main Street
   Vancouver, WA 98663

7. One Point Communications
   Two Conway Park, #300
   Lake Forest, IL 60045

8. Communique Telecommunications, Inc.
   4015 Guasti Road
   Ontario, CA 91761

9. Opex Communications, Inc.
   500 E. Higgins Rd., Ste. 200
   Elk Grove Village, IL 60007

10. Enhanced Communications Network, Inc.
    37 Winthrop Place
    Hazlet, NJ 07730

11. Pac-West Telecomm, Inc.
    1776 W. March Lane, #250
    Stockton, CA 95207

12. Ernest Communications, Inc.
    6475 Jimmy Carter Blvd., Ste. 300
    Norcross, GA 30071

13. RCN Telecom Services, Inc.
    105 Carnegie Center
    Princeton, NJ 08540
1 Single Billing Services, Inc.
   9550 Flair Drive, Ste. 409
   El Monte, CA  91731

2 Special Accounts Billing Group
   1523 Withorn Lane
   Inverness, IL  60067

3 Joan S. Burke
   Osborne Maledon
   2929 N. Central Ave., 21st Fl.
   Phoenix, AZ  85067

4 Teligent Services, Inc.
   8065 Leesburg Pike, Ste. 400
   Vienna VA  22182

5 Michael Patten
   Roshka, Heyman & DeWulf
   Two Arizona Center
   400 Fifth Street, Ste. 100
   Phoenix, AZ  85004

6 Tess Communications, Inc
   12050 Pecos Street, Ste. 300
   Westminster, CO  80234

7 Touch America
   130 N. Main Street
   Butte, MT  59701

8 VYVX, LLC
   One Williams Center, MD 29-1
   Tulsa, OK  74172

9 Western CLEC Corporation
   3650 131st Avenue SE, Ste. 400
   Bellevue, WA  98006

10 Williams Local Network, Inc.
    One Williams Center, MD 29-1
    Tulsa, OK  74172

11 Main Street Telephone Company
   200 Ithan Creek Avenue
   Villanova, PA  19085

12 North County Communications Corporation
   3802 Rosencrans, #485
   San Diego, CA  92110