I. INTRODUCTION

Through agreement of the parties, this phase of the proceeding was to resolve, on an interim basis, three discrete and relatively narrow issues arising from Decision Nos. 64922 and 65451, until they are addressed on a permanent basis in Phase III of this proceeding. With regard to the first issue, Staff recommends that the Commission reinstate the separate transport and entrance facility rates in effect before Decision 64922 until permanent entrance facility and transport rates can be set in Phase III. On the second issue, Staff believes these separate rates should be effective from the date of Decision 64922 or June 12, 2002. Staff does not believe that this constitutes retroactive ratemaking since the Commission is merely establishing a new separate rate for entrance facilities, because it has been determined that this rate element continues to be necessary in some cases. With regard to the final issue, Staff believes that the 60/40% allocation of switch costs between port and usage adopted in Decision 65451 is reasonable and accordingly the port rate adopted in Decision 65451 should be changed effective with the Commission’s new order.

II. BACKGROUND

This Docket was opened to address issues related to Qwest Corporation’s (“Qwest”) pricing of wholesale products and services offered to carriers providing local service in competition with Qwest. Phase I of this proceeding addressed the issue of geographical deaveraging of unbundled
network element ("UNE") rates. On July 25, 2000, the Commission issued Decision No. 62753 adopting interim geographically deaveraged UNE rates.

Phase II of the Docket was opened to address issues raised by subsequent FCC orders and judicial decisions, and to establish permanent geographically deaveraged rates. On June 12, 2002, the Commission issued Decision No. 64922 in Phase II adopting permanent geographically deaveraged wholesale rates for Qwest in Arizona. The Decision also established prices for many recurring and nonrecurring charges for UNEs, collocation, transport and other ancillary services.

The parties agreed to defer consideration of switching issues to a separate hearing, or Phase IIA of this proceeding. On December 12, 2002, the Arizona Corporation Commission issued Decision No. 65451 establishing permanent wholesale switching rates to be charged by Qwest to carriers providing local service in competition with Qwest.

Mountain Telecommunications, Inc. ("MTI") subsequently filed Applications to Intervene in the Show Cause Docket and in Phase III of the Wholesale Cost Docket. MTI claimed that in January 2003 it received the first bills from Qwest reflecting the new UNE rates established in Decision No. 64922. MTI stated that the charges for transport service and local interconnection service are far higher than previous charges and that the Commission could not possibly have intended such a significant increase in transport rates. On January 17, 2003, MTI filed a Motion for Injunction requesting that the Commission enjoin Qwest from charging unjust and unreasonable prices to MTI for UNEs. On February 14, 2003, MTI also filed a Complaint arguing that the rate increases for transport facilities, as well as Qwest's continued delay in implementing new lower rates for local loops are inconsistent with the Commission's intent in Decision No. 64922 and violate the federal statutory requirements set forth in the 1996 Telecommunications Act.

On February 11, 2003, Qwest filed a Motion to Reopen the Record and Modify Decision 65451. Qwest contended that the $1.61 analog line side port recurring charge adopted by the Commission in Decision No. 65451 should be modified because it does not represent the reasonable middle ground approach that the Commission believed it was approving. According to Qwest, because the Commission approved the assignment of 60 percent of switching costs to the port rate, rather than the 40 percent assumed by Staff witness Dunkel in recommending the $1.61 rate, the
Commission should adopt Qwest's proposed rate of $2.44 produced by the HAI model.

On April 8, 2003, Qwest, MTI, AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc. ("AT&T"), Time Warner and the Commission Staff (collectively "the Parties") filed a Stipulation Concerning Expedited Hearing on Transport and Analog Port Rates ("Stipulation"). In the Stipulation, the Parties jointly requested that the Commission's Hearing Division schedule and conduct an expedited hearing on the following issues:

Transport Rates

1. Should Staff's Option 1 (the transport rates prior to this Cost Docket) or Staff's Option 2 (the transport rates adopted in Decision No. 64922 minus the entrance facility charges where no entrance facility is provided) be adopted as the rates for DS1 and DS3 transport effective until the reconsideration of these rates in Phase III of the Cost Docket?

2. Are the revised rates that are determined as a result of the expedited hearing effective as of June 12, 2002 or from the effective date of the Order adopting the revised rates?

Analog Port Rates

1. What is the appropriate analog port rate using the HAI model as adopted by the Commission? Included in this issue is the appropriate allocation of switching costs between the port rate and usage rates. The parties agree that reciprocal compensation rates will not be addressed in the expedited hearing.

A Procedural Order was subsequently issued which scheduled a hearing on May 28, 2003 to address the transport and analog port rate issues identified in the Stipulation. Direct testimony was filed by the Parties on April 28, 2003. Rebuttal testimony was filed on May 12, 2003, and a hearing was held on May 28, 2003. Following is Staff's Closing Brief.

III. ARGUMENT

A. Transport Rates

1. Staff Supports Adoption of Option 1 As an Interim Measure Until Reconsideration of the Transport Rates in Phase III

The impacts of the new transport rates should have been fairly minor. Staff witness Dunkel gave the following example in his direct testimony:

For example, a 15 mile DS1 circuit plus entrance facility had "before" rates that totaled $139.51 ($89.42 for the entrance facility plus a $35.99 fixed transport charge, plus $0.94 per mile for transport). After Phase II, the transport rate was $148.97. This would have been an increase of about 7 percent.

Id. at 4, lines 18-22.
However, when the rates went into effect, MTI provided information at the time they were first billed, that the actual effects of these rates were large percentage increases, much greater than 7 percent. Dunkel Direct, Ex. S-1, p. 5.

As a result of MTI’s filings, Staff conducted discovery of both Qwest and MTI to determine if the transport rates adopted in Decision 64922 were being applied correctly by Qwest. Both Qwest’s and MTI’s responses indicated that many of the circuits are arranged in ways that do not include an entrance facility. In MTI’s case, transport lines were provided in such a way that they were not previously paying entrance facilities charges. Dunkel Direct, Ex. S-1, p. 5. The rate impact on such lines was very large. Id. In the 15 mile DS1 example, the rate went from $50.09 ($35.99 fixed transport charge, plus $0.94 per mile for transport) to $148.97, a 200% increase. Id.

The following two options were proposed by Staff as interim measures until the entrance facility and transport rates could be reviewed again in Phase III of this proceeding. Option 1 would be for the Commission to reinstate the separate entrance facility and transport rates that were in effect prior to the Cost Docket. Option 2 would be for the Commission to utilize the transport rates adopted in Decision No. 64922 minus the entrance facility charges from Decision 60635 where no entrance facility is provided.

Since Staff proposed both options as interim solutions, Staff believes that either option would be a reasonable interim measure until Phase III of this case. Of the two, however Staff prefers Option 1 which is to reinstate the separate entrance facility and transport rates that had previously been approved by the Commission in Decision No. 60635. Dunkel Direct Testimony, Staff Ex. S-1 p.4.

2. **The Transport Rates Should be Effective as of June 12, 2002**

The second issue to be addressed is the date the separate entrance facility and transport rates should be effective. Staff believes that the separate entrance facility and transport rates adopted as a result of this proceeding should be effective as of June 12, 2002.

Prior to Phase II and Decision No. 64922, Qwest charged a separate “entrance facility” rate and separate “transport” charges. In Phase II, the separate entrance facility rate was eliminated.
Dunkel Direct, Ex. S-1, p. 4. The cost studies and rates inaccurately assumed that there was one entrance facility for each transport rate. Id. In actuality, because transport facilities are arranged in ways that do and do not require entrance facilities, a separate tariffed rate for entrance facilities is needed.

The elimination of the separate rate for entrance facilities only impacted certain carriers such as MTI, Time Warner and Covad. With elimination of the separate entrance facility rate, Qwest effectively began charging MTI and other carriers for facilities they were not using. In effect, the combination rate resulted in MTI and other similarly situated carriers being assessed transport charges much higher than other carriers. Staff believes that it would be discriminatory to require MTI and other similarly situated carriers to pay a higher rate than other carriers for transport facilities. Even Qwest conceded at the hearing that they were “surprised” by the impact of the combination rate on MTI and other similarly situated carriers. Tr. pp.100-101. This result was not at all intended by the Commission in Decision No. 64922.

The new separate tariffed rate for entrance facilities should be applied back to the date of the Commission’s Order, or June 12, 2002. This is necessary to ensure that MTI and other similarly situated carriers pay only for services that they receive from Qwest. It is also necessary to ensure that Qwest does not obtain a “windfall” for services and facilities it did actually provide.

Any argument that this constitutes retroactive ratemaking, is misplaced. Establishment of a new separate tariffed rate for a service, is not retroactive ratemaking. Had Qwest implemented the rates ordered in Decision No. 64922 in a timely manner rather than taking 6 months, the need for a separate rate would have come to the Commission’s attention much earlier. Qwest should not be allowed to benefit from its dilatory conduct in not implementing the rates on a timely basis.

B. Analog Port Rate

1. Staff Supports the 60/40% port/usage Allocation Contained in The Current Phase II Order

Decision No. 65451 specified a port rate of $1.61 and 60/40% allocation of switch costs between the port and usage. The problem is that the $1.61 port rate is not based upon 60% of the switching costs being allocated to the port. If the $1.61 port rate is used with usage rates that are based on 40% of the switch cost, Qwest will not recover 100% of the switch costs. Dunkel Direct,
Both Qwest and Staff support adoption of a rate design that is made up of both flat rate and usage based charges. AT&T and MCIWorldCom, on the other hand, sponsored joint testimony that support 100% of the switching equipment being assigned to the port with a flat rate charge. The Commission should reject the arguments of AT&T and MCIWorldCom since their proposed rate design does not reflect fundamental cost causation principles.

As Staff witness Dunkel noted, the switching equipment contains traffic sensitive equipment and also contains non-traffic sensitive equipment (termed the “port”). Dunkel Direct, Ex. S-1, p. 6. The non-traffic sensitive equipment (port) includes a “line card”. The line card is connected to the loop facilities. Id. The number of line cards required depends on the number of loops, not the level of traffic. Id. Thus, this cost is considered to be “non-traffic sensitive.” Id. On the other hand, inside the switch there is what is called the “switching fabric”, which is the equipment that switches calls, and is thus a “traffic sensitive cost”. Id.

The exact distribution between the traffic sensitive and non-traffic sensitive costs vary by switch manufacturer, and other factors. Id. The number of lines served by the switch could also impact the percent that is traffic sensitive versus non-traffic sensitive. Id. AT&T and MCIWorldCom argue that since the initial usage investment is made at a high enough level to handle the expected usage, that usage investment is no longer a usage related costs. Gillan-Chandler Direct, Ex. AT&T/MCI-1, p. 18. The Commission should reject this argument. The fact that the company installs a high level of usage switching capacity at the time of initial switch installation does not change the fact that this usage investment is made for the purpose of switching usage. Dunkel Rebuttal, Ex. S-2, p. 3. Further, the fact that the investment is made at the time of initial installation does not make the cost of that usage-related investment zero. Id. The AT&T/MCIWorldCom proposal to consider the switch as 100 percent “port” and zero percent “usage” is not an accurate reflection of cost causation. Dunkel Rebuttal, Ex. S-2, p. 4.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Commission should reinstate the separate entrance facility and transport rates in effect before Decision 64922 effective June 12, 2002. The Commission should adopt an analog port rate
which reflects 60% allocation of the switch to the port and 40% to usage.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 15th day of July, 2003.

Maureen A. Scott, Attorney
Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007
Telephone: 602/542-6022
Facsimile: 602/542-4870
e-mail: maureenscott@cc.state.az.us

The ORIGINAL and thirteen (13) copies of the foregoing were filed this 15th day of July, 2003 with:

Docket Control
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

COPIES of the foregoing were mailed this 15th day of July, 2003 to:

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

Richard S. Wolters
AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc.
1875 Lawrence Street, Room 1575
Denver, CO 80202-1847

Joan Burke
Osborn Maledon, P.A.
2929 N. Central Avenue, 21st Floor
Phoenix AZ 85067-6379

Gregory Kopta
Davis Wright Tremaine
2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-1688

Drake Tempest
Qwest Communications
555 Seventeenth Street
Denver, CO 80202

Kathryn E. Ford
QWEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
1801 California Street, Suite 4900
Denver, CO 80202

Timothy Berg
Fennemore Craig, P.C.
3003 North Central Avenue, Suite 2600
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Michael W. Patten
Roshka Heyman & DeWulf
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren, Suite 800
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Jeffrey W. Crockett  
Jeffrey B. Guldner  
Snell & Wilmer L. L. P.  
One Arizona Center  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202

Harry L. Pliskin, Sr. Counsel  
Covad Communications Co.  
7901 Lowry Blvd  
Denver, CO 80230

Steve Sager  
McLeodUSA  
215 S. State Street, 10th Floor  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Marti Allbright, Esq.  
Mpower Communications Corp.  
5711 South Benton Circle  
Littleton, Colorado 80123

Rex Knowles  
Nextlink Communications  
111 East Broadway, Suite 1000  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Dennis D. Ahlers, Sr. Attorney  
Eschelon Telecom, Inc.  
730 Second Ave. South, Ste 1200  
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Michael Grant  
Todd C. Wiley  
GALLAGHER & KENNEDY  
2575 E. Camelback Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225

Janet Livengood, Reg. VP  
Z-Tel  
Tampa, FL 33602

Thomas F. Dixon, Jr.  
MCI WORLDCOM  
707 17th Street, #3900  
Denver, CO 80202

Michael B. Hazzard  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
1200 – 19th St., NW 5th Fl.  
WA DC 20036

Eric S. Heath, Esq.  
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CO., L.P.  
100 Spear Street, Suite 930  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Ray Heyman  
Roshka-Heyman & DeWulf  
One Arizona Center  
400 East Van Buren, Suite 800  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
Attorneys for Alltel Communications

Scott S. Wakefield  
RUCO  
1110 West Washington, Suite 220  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Gregory Hoffman  
AT&T Telecommunications  
795 Folsom Street, Room 2159  
San Francisco, CA 94107-1243

Curt Huttsell  
ELECTRIC LIGHTWAVE, INC.  
4 Triad Center, Suite 200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84180

Kevin Chapman, Dir. Regulatory Relations  
SBC Telecom, Inc.  
300 Convent Street, Rm. 13-Q-40  
San Antonio, TX 78205

Douglas Hsiao  
RHYTHMS LINKS, INC.  
6933 S. Revere Pkwy.  
Englewood, CO 80112

Thomas H. Campbell  
LEWIS & ROCA  
40 N. Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004

NEW EDGE NETWORKS  
P.O. Box 5159  
3000 Columbia House Blvd.  
Vancouver, WA 98668

Brian Thomas  
Vice-President Regulatory-West  
Time Warner Telecom, Inc.  
520 S.W. 6th Avenue, Suite 300  
Portland, Oregon 97204

Douglas Hsiao  
RHYTHMS LINKS, INC.  
6933 S. Revere Pkwy.  
Englewood, CO 80112

Steven J. Duffy  
Ridge & Isaacson P.C.  
3101 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1090  
Phoenix, AZ 85012-2638
Jacqueline Manogian
Mountain Telecommunications, Inc.
1430 Broadway Road, Suite A200
Tempe, AZ 85282

Deborah R. Scott
Associate General Counsel
2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 1660
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Robert S. Kant
E. Jeffrey Walsh
Greenberg, Traurig, LLP
2375 East Camelback Road, Suite 700
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Kimberly M. Kirby
Davis Dixon Kirby LLP
19200 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 600
Irvin, CA 92612

Mitchell F. Brecher
Greenberg Traurig LLP
800 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Qwest Services Corporation
Attn: Law Department
4041 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1100
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Deborah A. Amaral
Assistant to Maureen A. Scott