BRIEF OF SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P. REGARDING
PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Pursuant to the order of the Administrative Law Judge at the prehearing
conference of October 14, 2003 requesting briefs on certain procedural issues, Sprint
Communications Company L.P. ("Sprint") files this brief.

Issue 1. Bifurcating the Access Investigation:

With the understanding that achieving access reform will benefit Arizona
consumers by allowing for greater competition among providers of long distance
services, and with the anticipated granting of Qwest's petition for interLATA relief under
Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Sprint urges the Commission to
proceed to reform Arizona intrastate access charges in the most expeditious manner.
Sprint notes the necessity of access reform in Arizona in relation to and because of
Qwest's built-in advantages as the incumbent local carrier, and thus the main access provider for Arizona’s largest population centers as well much of the rest of the state. Accordingly, the impact of achieving access reform within Qwest’s territory will benefit the greatest number of Arizona customers in the shortest amount of time. Unless the Commission anticipates that including all LECs in a single phase will not delay the access reform that would be achieved by bifurcating the process into a Qwest phase and a non-Qwest phase, Sprint encourages the Commission to bifurcate this proceeding.

Issue 2: Schedule for the Access Investigation:

As with most other parties to this matter, Sprint is participating in many resource-intensive proceedings that restrict its ability to allocate personnel to matters such as this docket. Current matters that Sprint is engaged in include the state proceedings required by the Federal Communications Commission’s Triennial Review Order. The bulk of these proceedings will culminate during the late winter and spring of 2004. As a result, Sprint urges the Commission to adopt a schedule for this matter that will allow it to finish hearings (should any be necessary) by the end of the year or late January 2004. Delaying it any further will severely compromise Sprint’s ability to participate due to the schedules in many of the states’ Triennial Review Proceedings as well as other regulatory dockets.

Issue 3: Fair value and the application of Scates:

Sprint reads Scates v. Arizona Corporation Commission, 118 Ariz 531; 578 P.2d 612 (1978) as requiring a rate case only in situations where revenue would increase or decrease. However, in this docket, Sprint believes access reform can be accomplished in
this docket with revenue neutral rate rebalancing. Rate rebalancing will avoid a rate increase in the sense contemplated by Scates.

A rate rebalancing approach to access reform will allow the Commission to comply with the Arizona Constitution and fulfill the mandate of the 1996 Telecom Act by making explicit those subsidies which are now only implicit (such as those found in intrastate access charges). Moving these charges properly from the end-users’ long distance bill to their local rates allows for the costs to be placed on the cost-causer. Although the end user of local exchange carriers may perceive an increase to their local rates as a result of rebalancing, the end result to the local companies will not be to change their rates of return or authorized price cap limits, thus avoiding the Scates issue.
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