Eschelon Telecom of Arizona, Inc. ("Eschelon") provides these comments on the appropriate procedure for addressing access charges in Arizona as requested by the Administrative Law Judge at the October 14, 2003 Procedural Hearing.

Eschelon believes that the access charge proceeding should be bifurcated with Phase I focusing on Qwest access charges. During the Arizona Corporation Commission (the "Commission") open meeting at which the Commission supported Qwest’s entry into the Arizona long distance market, the Commission directed its staff to investigate Qwest access costs and charges. The Commission’s directive was in response to concerns of interexchange carriers that they will experience a price squeeze because Qwest sets a very significant component of interexchange carrier costs and can influence the pricing of long distance calling. Since this investigation is driven by Qwest’s imminent entry into long distance, time is of the essence. Consolidating the Qwest access charge matter with the
access charges relating to other carriers will needlessly complicate and delay the
determination of new Qwest access charges and defeat the purpose of the Commission
directive.

Eschelon also urges the Commission to postpone for at least a year any evaluation
of CLEC access charges for two reasons.

1. **The regulatory environment is changing.**

   There are a number of significant regulatory proceedings that may have major
impact on the CLEC industry. It would be premature to study CLEC access charges until
those proceedings are done. For instance, implementing the triennial review order may
change CLEC business plans significantly, such as if RBOC’s are no longer required to
offer UNE-P. Qwest and other ILECs also have filed petitions for forbearance at the FCC
that may prevent CLEC’s from collecting access charges for UNE-P lines which would
dramatically change CLECs access revenues it earns today. Moreover, the FCC’s current
rulemaking proceeding on TELRIC cost structure may change costing principles. Finally,
the FCC will likely commence an intercarrier compensation proceeding that could affect
the principles that should apply in access pricing.

   While some of these proceedings also may have some impact on Qwest, the
investigation of Qwest access charges should not be delayed because of the Commission’s
desire to address interexchange carrier price squeeze concerns prior to Qwest’s entry into
long distance.

2. **CLEC markets are not yet mature.**

   Facilities-based CLECs, like Eschelon, are still moving towards making full
use of their capacity and, therefore, moving towards average minimum cost. Long
established companies, like Qwest and other ILECs, have had almost a century to adjust
and grow capacity and demand and, as a result, their costs are much lower than a CLEC.
Small CLEC networks do not yet have the economies of scale and scope. Since the CLECs are a very small part of the overall local market, postponing evaluation of CLEC access charges will not have a significant impact on the public. On the other hand, unfairly tying CLEC access charges to Qwest access charges will damage emerging local competition.

While the investigation of Qwest access rates at this time is reasonable, it is not reasonable or necessary to investigate CLEC access charges at this time. Eschelon urges the Commission to wait for the CLEC industry to mature and for certain FCC regulatory matters to be resolved before reviewing CLEC access charges.

Respectfully submitted this 3rd day of November, 2003.

LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

Thomas H. Campbell
Michael T. Hallam
40 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
(602) 262-5723
Attorneys for Eschelon Telecom, Inc.

J. Jeffrey Oxley
Dennis D. Ahlers
Eschelon Telecom, Inc.
730 Second Avenue South, Suite 1200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 436-6249

ORIGINAL AND thirteen (13) copies of the foregoing hand-delivered this 3rd day of November, 2003, to:

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Division – Docket Control
1200 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
COPY of the foregoing hand-delivered this 3rd day of November, 2003, to:

Dwight Nodes  
ALJ, Hearing Division  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Maureen Scott  
Legal Division  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Ernest Johnson  
Director, Utilities Division  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

COPIES of the foregoing mailed this 3rd day of November, 2003, to:

Scott Wakefield, Chief Counsel  
RUCO  
2828 N. Central Avenue  
Suite 1200  
Phoenix, AZ  85004-1022

Timothy Berg  
Theresa Dwyer  
Fennemore Craig  
3003 N. Central Avenue  
Suite 2600  
Phoenix, AZ  85012

Richard S. Wolters  
AT&T  
1875 Lawrence Street  
Suite 1503  
Denver, CO  80202

Michael Patten  
Roshka Heyman & DeWulf  
400 E. Van Buren Street  
Suite 800  
Phoenix, Arizona  85004
Brian Thomas
Time Warner Telecom, Inc.
223 Taylor Avenue N
Seattle, Washington 98109

Eric Heath
Sprint Communications
100 Spear Street, Suite 930
San Francisco, CA 94105

Curt Huttsell
Citizens Communications
4 Triad Center, Suite 200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180

Steven J. Duffy
Ridge & Isaacson P.C.
3101 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1090
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-1638

Jeffrey Crockett
Snell & Wilmer
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202

[Signature]