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IN THE MATTER OF THE REVIEW AND POSSIBLE REVISION OF ARIZONA UNIVERSAL SERVICE FUND RULES, ARTICLE 12 OF THE ARIZONA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE

DOCKET NO. RT-00000H-97-0137

DOCKET NO. T-00000D-00-0672

IN THE MATTER OF THE INVESTIGATION OF THE COST OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACCESS.

QWEST CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO AT&T'S REQUEST FOR PROCEDURAL CONFERENCE OR PROCEDURAL ORDER IN AUSF AND ACCESS CHARGES DOCKETS AND MOTION TO STRIKE INsofar AS THE REQUEST IS IMPROPERLY CAPTIONED AND DOCKETED IN DOCKET NO. T-01051B-03-0454

Qwest Corporation hereby (1) responds to AT&T's Request for Procedural Conference in RT-00000H-97-0137 ("AUSF Docket") and Docket No. T-00000D-00-0672 ("Access Charges Docket") and (2) moves to strike AT&T's Request for Procedural Conference or Procedural Order filed on August 5, 2009 ("Request for Procedural Conference"), as improperly captioned and docketed in Docket No. T-01051B-03-0454.
INTRODUCTION

AT&T filed its Request for Procedural Conference with Arizona Corporation Commission Docket Control and caused it to be docketed in the consolidated dockets involving the Arizona Universal Service Fund Rules (the "AUSF Docket") and the Investigation of the Cost of Telecommunications Access (the "Access Docket"). However, AT&T also captioned its Request for Procedural Conference with another proceeding, In the Matter of Qwest Corporation’s Filing of Renewed Price Regulation Plan, Docket No. T-01051B-03-0454 (the "Qwest Price Cap Plan Docket") and caused it to be filed in that docket as well. Qwest does not object to AT&T’s request for a procedural conference in the consolidated AUSF Docket and the Access Docket, as discussed below. However, AT&T’s Request for Procedural Conference in the Price Cap Plan Docket together with the consolidated Access Charges Docket and AUSF Docket is improperly formed, is improperly lodged, and should be stricken. The Commission has not decided that Phase II of the Access Charges Docket is consolidated with the Price Cap Plan Docket. In fact, as discussed below, the record to date reflects the understanding of the Commission and the Staff that Qwest’s Price Cap Plan is not part of this proceeding. AT&T’s Motion, captioned and filed as a consolidated proceeding, is therefore unauthorized and out of order.

DISCUSSION

A. Response to Request For Procedural Conference in the AUSF and Access Charges Dockets

1 In the Matter of the Review and Possible Revision of Arizona Universal Service Fund Rules, Article 12 of the Arizona Administrative Code, Docket No. RT-00000H-97-0137 ("AUSF Docket").

2 In the Matter of the Investigation of the Cost of Telecommunications Access, Docket No. T-00000D-00-0672 ("Access Charges Docket").
Qwest does not object to the Request for Procedural Conference, for the AUSF Docket and the Access Charges Docket. The closure of the Staff’s workshops, and Qwest’s request that the Commission investigate switched access contracts in the context of the analysis of issues relating to access charges, is a natural point at which the Commission should pause to determine the next procedural steps. In fact, at the close of the last workshop on July 27, 2009, the Staff asked each party to submit its proposals for the process that should follow. Oversight of that process by the Hearing Division is quite appropriate. In light of AT&T’s Request, which has been seconded by Integra, Qwest will respectfully await the direction of the Commission’s disposition of the Request for Procedural Conference before submitting its process suggestions.

Currently, the procedural schedule requires that the Staff shall file a request for Procedural Conference to determine the next steps, within 30 days after the conclusion of the Staff workshop. See Procedural Order, February 5, 2009, at 4:25-27. Qwest respectfully suggests that before the next steps for the consolidated docket may be determined, decisions must be made about whether, and how, Staff and the parties examine the CLECs’ private access charges agreements and the issues that are raised by such agreements. Qwest asks that the existing procedural schedule be modified to accommodate such investigation, and that the obligation of Staff to file for a procedural conference 30 days after the conclusion of its workshop (which occurred July 27, 2009), should be stayed temporarily.

B. Motion to Strike the Request For Procedural Conference in the Price Cap Plan Docket

At the urging of AT&T, the Access Charges Docket was split into two phases in 2003. Phase I considered access charges in combination with Qwest’s Price Cap Plan. The Commission consolidated the Qwest Price Cap Plan Docket with Phase I of the Access charges Docket. Qwest’s access charges were the only carrier’s access charges addressed in Phase I. That consolidated docket was completed and resolved. See Procedural Order, December 19,
2008. ("Phase I of the Access Charge Docket, addressed Qwest Corporation's access charges, and was consolidated with, and resolved, in conjunction with Qwest's rate cap review. Phase II of the Access charge Docket is intended to address access charges for all other telephone companies that provide access services").

More recently, AT&T asked that Phase II of the Access Charges Docket, which had not progressed in over five years and had not resulted in the reduction of any carriers rates, be expanded to include an analysis of Qwest's access rates again. By Procedural Order issued March 17, 2009, it was determined that Qwest's participation in Phase II was necessary in order for the Commission to develop a full understanding of the access issues. See Procedural Order, Mar. 17, 2009, 4:5-17 ("It is difficult to see how the Commission can get a clear picture of the issues and fairly assess the impact for access charges in the state without the participation of Qwest, the largest carrier in the state, as well as the Arizona CLECs"). However, the extent of the order to re-involve Qwest, is, at this time, quite narrow—it only subjects Qwest to data requests. See, Procedural Order, March 17, 2009, at 4:17-18. ("Consequently, Staff should be able to include Qwest and the Arizona CLECs in the data request to be sent prior to workshops").

The March 17, 2009 Procedural Order, did not consolidate the current phase of the Access Charges Docket with the Price Cap Docket. Rather, the Procedural Order asked the Commission Staff for its views. See Procedural Order, at 4:24-26—5:1-3. ("Consequently, Staff is directed to file Comments and Recommendations in these dockets regarding whether, and in what context, Qwest's switched access charges should be reviewed, including Staff's position on the relationship, if any, between Qwest's request to renew the Price Cap Plan and Phase II of the Access Charge Docket"). (Emphasis added).

---

3 See Procedural Comments filed by AT&T, January 23, 2009; see also Comments of AT&T in Response to February 3, 2009 Procedural Order, February 18, 2009.

4 The dockets the Commission refers to are the AUSF Docket and the Access Charges Docket, not the Price Cap Plan. The Commission has never lodged any of its orders in the consolidated Phase 2 Price Cap Plan Docket and AUSF Docket in the Price Cap Plan Docket.
Subsequently, the Staff filed its Comments and Recommendations on April 8, 2009, concluding that the current Access Charges Docket is a *generic docket designed to address policy issues* concerning access charges, and not to set any individual carrier’s level of access charges. See Staff Response, Access Charges Docket and AUSF Docket, April 8, 2009, p. 2. ("Staff believes that the ALJ’s inclusion of Qwest in this *generic docket designed to address policy issues* concerning access charges is appropriate.") (Emphasis added).

AT&T’s attempt to conflate the generic docket designed to address policy issues regarding access charges with an adjudication of the rates of a particular carrier, is fraught with serious risk to the constitutional guarantee of due process for that carrier. Indeed, as the Commission has already stated, it likely will have to establish separate proceedings to determine the access rates of individual carriers. See Procedural Order, September 19, 2007, at 2:13-16. ("At some point, portions of the Access Charge Docket may become contested in nature as the Commission determines appropriate intrastate access charges for individual carriers. At that time, the Commission will establish separate procedures for adjudicating any potentially contested cases").

However, a constitutional law analysis is not necessary, because as a practical matter it makes no sense whatsoever to set access charge rates for any carrier at the same time, or even before, the Commission has determined the policy that should apply to access charge issues. AT&T’s Request for Procedural Conference should be stricken from the record in so far as it is improperly captioned and docketed.
RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7th day of August, 2009.

QWEST CORPORATION

By: 
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Norman G. Curttright
20 East Thomas Road, 16th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
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Fax: (602) 235-3107
Attorney for Qwest Corporation
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email/OTHER Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Craig A. Marks</td>
<td>Craig A. Marks, PLC</td>
<td>10645 N. Tatum Boulevard, Suite 200-676, Phoenix, AZ 85028</td>
<td><a href="mailto:craig.marks@azbar.org">craig.marks@azbar.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Michael M. Grant</td>
<td>Gallagher &amp; Kennedy</td>
<td>2575 East Camelback Road, Phoenix, AZ 85016</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmg@gknet.com">mmg@gknet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gregory Castle</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>525 Market Street, Room 2022, San Francisco, CA 94105</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ge1831@att.com">ge1831@att.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Charles H. Carrathers, III</td>
<td>Verizon, Inc.</td>
<td>HQE03H52, 600 Hidden Ridge, Irving, TX 75015-2092</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Chuck.carrathers@verizon.com">Chuck.carrathers@verizon.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tom Bade</td>
<td>Arizona Dialtone</td>
<td>6115 S. Kyrene Rd. #103, Tempe, Arizona 85283</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tombade@arizonadialtone.com">tombade@arizonadialtone.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Joan S. Burke</td>
<td>Osborn Maledon, PA</td>
<td>2929 North Central Avenue, Suite 2100, Phoenix, AZ 85012</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jburke@omlaw.com">jburke@omlaw.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lyndall Nipps</td>
<td>Time Warner Telecom</td>
<td>845 Camino Sur, Palm Springs, CA 92262</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lyndall.nipps@twtelecom.com">Lyndall.nipps@twtelecom.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Karen E. Nally</td>
<td>Moyes Sellers &amp; Sims, Ltd.</td>
<td>1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1100, Phoenix, AZ 85004</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kenally@lawms.com">kenally@lawms.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dennis D. Ahlers</td>
<td>Eschelon Telecom, Inc.</td>
<td>730 Second Avenue, Suite 900, Minneapolis, MN 55402</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddahlers@eschelon.com">ddahlers@eschelon.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nathan Glazier</td>
<td>Alltel Communications, Inc.</td>
<td>4805 E. Thistle Landing Drive, Phoenix, AZ 85044</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nathan.glazier@alltel.com">Nathan.glazier@alltel.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dennis D. Ahlers</td>
<td>Integra Telecom, Inc.</td>
<td>730 Second Avenue, Suite 900, Minneapolis, MN 55402</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ddahlers@eschelon.com">ddahlers@eschelon.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mr. Paul Castaneda
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Communication Workers of America
2501 West Dunlap, Suite 103
Phoenix, AZ 85021

Greg L. Rogers
Level 3 Communications, LLC
1025 Eldorado Boulevard
Broomfield, CO 80021