LAWYERS

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

ANCHORAGE BELLEVUE LOS ANGELES NEW YORK PORTLAND SAN FRANCISCO SEATTLE WASHINGTON, D.C. SHANGHAI

LARRY WEATHERS
DIRECT: (206) 628-7161
larryweathers@dwt.com

2600 CENTURY SQUARE
1501 FOURTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688

TEL (206) 622-3150
FAX (206) 628-7699
www.dwt.com

January 23, 2004

By E-Mail and Federal Express

Ms. Carole J. Washburn
Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Re: Docket No. UT-033044

Dear Ms. Washburn:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket, please find the original and 15 copies of:

(1) Direct Testimony of Patty Lynott on Behalf of McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc.; and

(2) Certificate of Service.

Please call with any questions. Thank you for your assistance.

Very truly yours,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

Larry J. Weathers
Paralegal

Enclosures
cc: Service List

SEA 1456927v1 46985-44
Seattle

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of Qwest Corporation to Initiate a Mass-Market Switching and Dedicated Transport Case Pursuant to the Triennial Review Order	)))))))	**Docket No. UT-033044**

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

PATTY LYNOTT

on behalf of

MCLEODUSA TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC.

Re Batch Hot Cut Process

January 23, 2004

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORT COMMISSION

DOCKET NO.UT-033044

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

PATTY LYNOTT

On Behalf of

MCLEODUSA TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC.

I. Introduction and Qualifications

1. **Q: Please state your name, business affiliation and address.**

A: My name is Patty Lynott. I am Director of Service Delivery-Line for McLeodUSA Incorporated, parent company of McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc. (McLeodUSA). My business address is 6400 C Street SW, PO Box 3177, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52406-3177.

2. **Q: Please describe your business experience and background.**

A: I obtained a Bachelor of Arts degree from Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa, with a major in Communications/Public Relations and a minor in Computers. I started my business career in the Provisioning and Service Delivery fields at Teleconnect, which was subsequently purchased by MCI. I joined McLeodUSA in 1993 and have worked in Service Delivery, Network Operations, Provisioning and ILEC Relations. I have 17 years of experience in the telecommunications industry.

3. **Q: Please describe your responsibilities as Director, Service Delivery-Line.**

A: I am responsible for all aspects of customer service delivery, including order entry, order management, coordination, provisioning, installation, testing and activation. I am responsible for managing a staff of approximately 150 employees. My duties also include setting departmental goals and expectations to achieve established corporate financial and operational targets. Finally, I am responsible for driving continuous process improvements in service delivery intervals, quality of delivered service and productivity.

II. Purpose of Testimony

4. **Q: What is the purpose of your direct testimony?**

A: The purpose of my direct testimony is to address three issues with respect to the Batch Hot Cut (BHC) process. First, I will highlight several key issues to McLeodUSA that remain in dispute resulting from the BHC collaborative that have been conducted on a Qwest region-wide basis with ILECs, CLECs, State Commissioners and staff over the past 2 months. Second, I will address the issue of whether the BHC process, if approved by the Washington Commission should apply to all Washington markets served by Qwest or only the Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) where Qwest is challenging the FCC's impairment finding in the unbundled switching case. Third, I will discuss the results of testing the proposed Qwest BHC processes by McLeodUSA during the past month.

5. **Q: What are the key issues in McLeodUSA's view that remain in dispute from the BHC collaborative?**

A: From a macro level, there are several key issues that are critical to accomplish the FCC's goal of devising an efficient, economical and seamless migration process that minimizes customer impact and maximizes effective and irreversible competition among CLECs and ILECs. Let me briefly list several key issues and then address each issue in more detail.

First, a BHC process must be economical. The FCC correctly identified a major impairment for facilities-based CLECs is the high non-recurring charges (NRCs) charged by ILECs.

Second, a BHC process must be scaleable and efficient in order to handle the volume of migrating (1) the existing, embedded UNE-P base, (2) future Qwest Retail-to-CLEC UNE-L orders, (3) CLEC to CLEC and (4) new customers that have never had service. In our opinion, a scalable and efficient process includes having the ability to cut large volumes of customers in one (1) central office (CO) per CLEC with minimal impact to customers. This would provide an opportunity for providers to wholesale local services to other carriers. An automated end-to-end process that results in shorter intervals for the customer is key to scalability.

Third, a BHC process should include intervals that are in parity with the ILEC's current UNE-P and retail intervals. Without parity, the value of a BHC process is significantly diluted.

Fourth, a BHC process must encompass IDLC loops and customer loops that have been requested for the first time. Degradation of voice service and unacceptable customer downtime result if CLECs do not have continued access to IDLC loops. Customers requesting new service at a location where there are no facilities to reuse should also be included in this process.

Fifth, a BHC process should be tested and performance measures should be established and easily incorporated into an approved remedy plan before a State Commission makes a finding of non-impairment.

Let me now address each of these issues in more detail that have been identified during the BHC collaborative meetings held during the last few months.

6. **Q: Do the NRCs proposed by Qwest in this Batch Hot Cut process meet your definition of "economical?"**

A: None of us know yet. Qwest's pricing and cost studies for the BHC process will not be filed until January 23, 2004. Based on the predominantly labor-intensive BHC process being proposed by Qwest, which is very similar to today's current hot cut process, I believe it is very likely that the proposed BHC NRCs will be a disputed issue.

Because competitive providers will not see Qwest's proposed pricing of NRCs until January 23, 2004, thereby limiting time to review, conduct additional discovery and investigate whether the proposed pricing is

TELRIC-compliant, McLeodUSA urges the Commission to conduct a separate proceeding to establish TELRIC-compliant NRCs for the BHC process.

To make UNE-L facilities-based service economically viable to the point that a valid finding of non-impairment can be made, McLeodUSA believes that the NRCs for any BHC process must at least be much closer, if not comparable, to the current UNE-P NRCs. Current NRCs for UNE-P and UNE-L in Washington are $34.07 and $59.81, respectively.

In addition, final Commission-approved NRCs for batch hot cuts must apply to (1) the embedded UNE-P base, (2) new Retail to CLEC customers, (3) CLEC to CLEC orders and (4) new customers with new service. The Commission must require Qwest's cost studies to address all four of these scenarios.

The FCC correctly identified that the current NRCs charged to CLECs to convert a customer from UNE-P to UNE-L are an economic barrier to facilities-based competition. Indeed, the current level of NRCs for UNE-L conversions formed one of the primary underpinnings of the FCC's national finding of impairment in the mass market switching case.

7. **Q: Do you contend that Qwest's proposed BHC process is <u>not</u> scaleable?**

A: Yes. We do not believe that Qwest's BHC process is scaleable based on past experience, results of recent testing of Qwest's proposed process that I will discuss in detail later in my testimony, and practical, common sense.

First, our company's experience with Qwest's current process, which involves a much smaller number of lines compared to the future volume of lines if UNE-P goes away, demonstrates that its current process is not scaleable. McLeodUSA has previously submitted orders to convert the embedded base in 47 COs in a Qwest state other than Washington in 2003. Our average order included between 25-50 lines per CO per day. Frequently, Qwest would delay our conversions due to "resource constraints." McLeodUSA has submitted Retail to UNE-L orders totaling 100 lines per day per CO in the past, and Qwest has denied these orders due to "resource constraints."

Furthermore, McLeodUSA has experienced poor quality on orders in other states when converting a retail customer from Qwest to McLeodUSA. The reason is due to Qwest focusing resources on converting the embedded UNE-P/M base for McLeodUSA. If UNE-P goes away, there will be a huge volume of embedded UNE-P lines that will need to be converted. Qwest's resources are constrained today. Its resources will be further constrained in the future.

Second, based on results from our recent testing of Qwest's proposed BHC process, we do not believe that Qwest can meet its 100-line per day per CO promise. I will further discuss our tests later in my testimony.

Third, common sense leads to the conclusion that Qwest's process is not scaleable. Qwest proposes a daily cap of 100 lines in total per central office for all CLECs. Such a limitation would prevent providers from even considering the opportunity to wholesale local services to other carriers. In addition, state commissions should require that any BHC process be available for new customers ordering new service. Qwest agrees that its BHC process applies to (1) the embedded UNE-P base, (2) new Retail to CLEC customers and (3) CLEC to CLEC orders. Expanding this process to include new customers ordering new service will increase the number of lines that must be processed. Churn in the mass market customer base is considerable and must also be incorporated into any analysis regarding the potential scalability of any proposed BHC process.

Finally, McLeodUSA believes that any pre-order, order or post-order functionality to support any BHC process must be developed in both EDI and GUI. Qwest has proposed to build the functionality of a status tool that identifies if an order is jepped, when the cut has started or is completed in a Web-based tool. Such a tool, however, is not tied to EDI, and Qwest has not agreed to develop the same functionality in EDI. McLeodUSA should not be forced to go outside of its primary OSS interface in order to utilize

this BHC process. Having dual systems creates inefficiencies in the process.

8. **Q: You previously mentioned intervals as a key issue to your Company when converting a customer onto McLeodUSA's switch and service. Does Qwest's proposed interval satisfy McLeodUSA?**

A: No. Qwest is currently proposing a 7-business day interval. This is too long. Instead, McLeodUSA believes that Qwest should set provisioning standards and intervals that are at parity with the existing UNE-P and retail processes in Washington. Qwest's current interval for UNE-P is 3 business days. Qwest's current interval for UNE-L non-coordinated hot cuts is 5 business days based on the existing Interconnection agreement. Therefore, Qwest's 7-business day proposed interval is a step backward in our goal to lower barriers to competition.

Furthermore, Qwest currently offers a product called "Quick Loop" that reuses existing facilities and converts lines to UNE-L in only three (3) days. Our understanding is that the Quick Loop product applies to all orders, except those that require (1) a coordinated hot cut, (2) a dispatch of a Qwest technician or (3) involve an IDLC loop. This current Quick Loop product is more efficient (3 days) than Qwest's proposed BHC proposal (7 days). McLeodUSA strongly recommends to Commissions to include customers that have never had service as part of the Quick Loop product.

Quick Loop would provide an opportunity to wholesale mass market service to other providers.

I think it is also important to emphasize that McLeodUSA has extensive experience with converting lines from UNE-P to UNE-L. In 2003, we completed approximately 99,000 conversions from our embedded UNE-P customer base, of which approximately 2,700 lines were in Washington. McLeodUSA completed these conversions in a 5 business day interval for coordinated hot cuts for business and residential customers. Therefore, Qwest's BHC proposal, which is supposed to result in a more efficient process, results in a less efficient process. This result should be unacceptable to state commissions.

Finally, let me propose a solution that would reduce Qwest's proposed interval from seven (7) days to four (4) days. In Exhibit 10 filed by Qwest in the collaborative meetings, Qwest proposes a 7-Business day interval. On day 1 the CLECs are asked to have translations ready for the cut. If there are any discrepancies on CFAs, Qwest will notify the CLEC on day 3 by noon and the CLEC could submit their supplemental changes by 7 PM on day 3. This would eliminate 1 day in the process. Qwest's Exhibit 10 also shows no work being performed on Day 5 and Day 6. These two additional days could be eliminated in the process, thereby reducing the interval from 7 days to 4 days.

9. **Q: Does McLeodUSA contend that the scope of the BHC must include IDLCs and new customer lines?**

A: Yes. A BHC process must include both IDLCs and new customers with new lines for several reasons. First, customer downtime will increase without IDLC access. McLeodUSA believes that timeframes for performance of the batch cuts should be based upon the preferences of end user customers, not traditional business hours. Qwest contends that IDLCs should not be included in a BHC process, because IDLCs require Qwest to send out a dispatch. In contrast, SBC must also send out a dispatch with IDLC cuts, but SBC correctly recognizes that IDLCs must be included in the scope of any BHC process.

In addition, customers that are currently on IDLC loops and being converted onto UDLC loops or home-run copper loops experience downtime of up to four (4) hours today. McLeodUSA suggests that customers should have the option of experiencing this downtime in off-hours that better meet their business needs. Qwest should be required to provide an off-hours option to minimize any customer impact.

Second, customers experience degradation of voice service and quality without IDLC access. When a customer on a connected-through copper loop or a UDLC system switches to McLeodUSA as a local service provider, that customer would typically remain on the same physical loop, and thus the quality of the loop received by McLeodUSA would generally be the same as the quality of the loop used by the RBOC to serve that same

customer. When a customer currently served by IDLC chooses to switch to McLeodUSA, however, that customer is removed from the IDLC and moved to either a connected-through copper loop, or a UDLC system.

The result is that customers experience a substantial degradation in service quality, for both voice and dial-up data service applications, such as fax machines, modems, and credit card validation machines. For standard voice services, moving the customer off IDLC typically results in reduced voice volume and clarity, leading to an increased number of customer complaints. Degradation affects not just what Qwest might characterize as "broadband" service, but standard dial-up services and facsimile transmissions as well. For example, a customer moved from IDLC to UDLC will experience a minimum of one "new" digital-to-analog (D/A) conversion, and is very likely to experience reduced modem speeds. It is also important to recognize that the loop qualification and makeup data does not provide a mechanism to anticipate these problems, since that data only pertains to the makeup of the customer's existing loop. In cases where the customer is moved from IDLC to either UDLC or a connected-through copper loop, no information is available to competitors about the characteristics of the loop to which the customer will be moved. The real-world effects, on both customers and competitors, of the refusal to allow access to IDLC-provided loops are tremendous.

Due to the resulting degradation of service, McLeodUSA has had to reconvert customers back onto UNE-P. McLeodUSA has experienced this

degradation of service in some other Qwest states. McLeodUSA proposes that facilities be reused when a customer is on an IDLC, so that the same level of service the customer experienced with Qwest is the same service they receive with all CLECs.

Finally, McLeodUSA also proposes that new customers that have never had service at their location also be included in the BHC process. This will ensure parity of service to all customers.

10. **Q: Do you believe that testing of a BHC process must be performed prior to a Commission making a final determination on impairment?**

A: Of course. Testing of any new process of this magnitude must be performed in order to ensure that consumers are not negatively impacted. McLeodUSA strongly suggests that all systems that Qwest is proposing and the new process be tested and results measured and provided to all CLECs and commissions prior to releasing this as a certified process. McLeodUSA also strongly suggests that through the LTPA additional measurements be incorporated as needed.

11. **Q: Regarding testing, you mentioned earlier that McLeodUSA has performed tests on Qwest's proposed BHC processes during the past month. What are your findings and recommendations?**

A: McLeodUSA accepted Qwest's offer to test its proposed BHC process. Let me first explain our reasoning and then describe the tests, the results of those tests and finally our recommendations to state commissions.

McLeodUSA agreed to test Qwest's proposed BHC process because we have a genuine desire to promote effective and irreversible competition by obtaining a result that leads to a scaleable, economic and efficient process to convert (1) the current embedded UNE-P base, (2) future Qwest retail to CLEC UNE-L orders, (3) CLEC to CLEC orders and (4) new orders for customers with new service. We participated in these tests with good-faith intentions and a willingness to test the proposed process, suggest recommendations for improvements and then retest the process to see if a workable and affordable solution was possible.

During a 4-week period starting in December, 2003, McLeodUSA participated in two different tests with Qwest to convert current lines from UNE-P to UNE-L. Trial #1 occurred from December 10 through December 18 and consisted of converting 25 lines per day in the Pillsbury, MN, central office. During this time, Qwest converted a total of 50 lines. We prepared a timeline, see Exhibit PL-1, Trial 1, that describes the steps followed by McLeodUSA and Qwest. The test lasted five business days, using the industry practice of counting the day an order was submitted as Day 0. On Day 0 (December 10), McLeodUSA issued LSRs (Local Service Requests) for 25 lines to be converted from UNE-P to UNE-L service in the Pillsbury CO. On December 11, we issued LSRs for an additional 25 lines in this same CO. On Day 0, Qwest issued a Service Order, completed the assignments and issued FOC (firm order commitment) dates to McLeodUSA. On Day 1, Qwest created a

spreadsheet in the QCCC. No work was performed from Day 2 through Day 4. Finally, on Day 5, Qwest (1) checked for CLEC dial tone, (2) conducted the pre-wiring, (3) performed the manual lift and lay process, (4) checked Qwest and CLEC dial tone, (5) updated the Order status via an email to McLeodUSA and (6) completed the Order. All of these procedures were consistent with the BHC process proposed by Qwest.

12. **Q:** **What were the results from Test #1 to convert 50 lines in total?**

A: The length of time to accomplish the highly manual process of converting 25 lines totaled approximately 4 hours. McLeodUSA never received any validation that all orders submitted in the batch were included on the Qwest spreadsheet created in the QCCC and sent to the CO. Consequently, the Qwest technician incorrectly sorted the spreadsheet by cable pair, which resulted in redoing the pre-wiring. Qwest supposedly queried an access data base every 30 minutes, but McLeodUSA did not receive updates every 30 minutes on the status of the batch. Qwest notified McLeodUSA at the beginning and end of the batch cuts, but not when individual lines were completed. The result of not receiving real time notification that the cut was completed was that customers were unable to receive incoming calls for up to 90 minutes.

13. **Q:** **Notwithstanding the results from Test #1, did McLeodUSA agree to participate in a subsequent testing with Qwest? If so, what were the results?**

A: Yes. After Test #1, we offered Qwest a list of ways to improve the process, including, but not limited to, reducing the time that customers were not able to receive incoming phone calls, adding a validation step to ensure that all orders get included on the spreadsheet prepared at the QCCC and receiving more timely updates on the status of the batch. Based, in part, on representations from Qwest that process improvements would be implemented, McLeodUSA participated in a second test.

Trial #2 began on January 12, 2004, and consisted of converting 26 lines in Burlington, Iowa, and 25 lines in Boise, Idaho. We prepared a second timeline, see Exhibit PL-1, Trial 2, that describes the process and steps completed by both McLeodUSA and Qwest. In comparing Exhibits PL-1 and PL-2, you will notice that the only process change implemented by Qwest dealt with the timing of performing the pre-wiring and checking for dial tone. In Trial #2, Qwest conducted the pre-wiring and checked for dial tone on Day 3. On Day 5, between 3 am – 11 am, Qwest performed (1) the manual lift and lay process, (2) checked for dial tone, (3) updated the Order status via an email to McLeodUSA and (4) completed the conversion process.

One key data point that we tracked very closely involved the length of time it took Qwest to convert each batch of 25 lines. Qwest had one team

I also want to highlight some positives that Qwest changed in Trial #2. Qwest implemented the dial tone check after the pre-wire, which eliminated the quality error in Trial 1. Qwest also performed the pre-wire on DVA (Day 2-3) in Qwest's Exhibit 10 to allow the CLECs an opportunity to fix any dial tone issues that occur before the day of cut.

14. **Q:** **Is there any other current product offered by Qwest that would be more efficient and economical to CLECs?**

A: Yes. Quick Loop is a product offered by Qwest that reuses existing facilities and converts lines to UNE-L in only three (3) days. The Quick Loop product applies to all orders, except those that: (1) require a coordinated hot cut, (2) require a technician dispatch or (3) involve an IDLC loop. We prepared a time line, see Exhibit PL-1, Trial 3, that describes this current Quick Loop product, which is more efficient (3 days) than Qwest's proposed BHC proposal (7 days). Until a more efficient and cost effective BHC process is devised, McLeodUSA strongly advocates that CLECs should be permitted to use Qwest's Quick Loop product to convert (1) the embedded UNE-P base, (2) future Qwest retail to UNE-L orders, (3) CLEC to CLEC orders and (4) new service for new customers. That being said, McLeodUSA does not believe that the Quick Loop product is adequate for BHC purposes.

15.**Q:** **Based on your results of testing Qwest's proposed BHC processes, what are McLeodUSA's recommendations to state commissions?**

A: We make the following recommendations. First, Qwest's BHC process is too manual and, therefore, is not scaleable. Our tests concluded that the Qwest process can only convert a maximum of 50 - 60 lines per day per central office. Second, the scope of any batch hot cut process must include (1) the embedded UNE-P base, (2) future Qwest retail to UNE-L orders, (3) CLEC to CLEC orders and (4) new service for new customers. Third, Qwest's Quick Loop product is more efficient (3 days) than the proposed BHC process (7 days). It is critical that state commissions ensure that the Quick Loop product applies to all four types of orders listed above. Finally, because we have not yet seen Qwest's proposed NRCs, we reserve the right to comment after further analysis.

16. **Q:** **Finally, Qwest might contend that the establishment of a BHC process is unnecessary for some, but not all, of its markets in Washington. Qwest's contention is likely based on the fact that Qwest is not contesting the FCC's national finding of impairment relating to ILEC provisioning of unbundled switching to serve "mass market" residential customers in all Colorado markets. Do you agree with Qwest's contention that a BHC process should apply only in certain MSAs?**

A: No. Regardless of where Qwest challenges the FCC's national impairment finding for unbundled switching to serve "mass market" customers, all

customers and competition throughout Washington will benefit by applying an efficient, economical and seamless BHC process in all markets served by Qwest.

McLeodUSA serves "mass market" customers in many of the additional Washington markets located throughout Washington. We serve these customers and utilize both the UNE-P and the UNE-L platforms. It is clear that policy makers are keen on encouraging UNE-L "facilities-based" competition and less reliance on UNE-P. McLeodUSA has been working towards this goal. By the end of 2003, McLeodUSA serves approximately one million access lines, of which 66% are UNE-L. In Washington, we have over 2,700 lines on UNE-L. In order to justify continued investment, however, competitive providers need a batch hot cut process in all markets throughout Washington that is efficient, economical and seamless. Without a BHC process across all Qwest markets throughout Washington at reasonable NRCs, the economics will likely favor continued use of UNE-P in those additional markets over UNE-L. To date, McLeodUSA has approximately 7,700 UNE-P lines in Washington. Again, a ruling that Qwest does not have to make the BHC process available to a CLEC outside of the non-impairment means that Qwest would be successfully forcing its competitor to use a less efficient, more costly process to compete with Qwest. Moreover, when the time comes to challenge the impairment finding in other markets, there will be that many more UNE-P CLEC customers to migrate that have been installed in the interim rather than on a

UNE-L platform. That result clearly seems contrary to the clear goal of promoting facilities-based competition.

17. **Q: Does this conclude your prepared direct testimony?**

A: Yes.

WUTC Docket UT-033044

EXHIBIT PL-1

Direct Testimony of Patty Lynott
on behalf of
McLeodUSA Telecommuncations Services, Inc.

re Batch Hot Cut Process

Exhibit PL-1 to Patty Lynott McLeodUSA Direct Testimony on Batch Hot Cut Testimony

TRIAL 1

	DAY 0	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 3	DAY 4	Day 5
CLEC	CLEC issues LSR's					
QWEST	Service Order Issued	Creation of the Spreadsheet in QCCC				CO Pre-wiring- DT troubles reported to CLEC via email.
	Assignments done (Design in Des Moines)					CO Lift & Lay- DT, ANI. Order status updated via email to CLEC.
	IMA/EDI FOC issued					Orders completed in WAFA

Trial 1

TRIAL 2

	DAY 0	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 3	DAY 4	Day 5
CLEC	CLEC issues LSR's	CLEC switch Translations by midnight				
QWEST	Service Order Issued			CO Pre-wiring- DT/ANI and Polarity troubles reported to CLEC via email.		CO Lift & Lay- DT, ANI. Order status updated via email to CLEC.
	Assignments done (Design in Des Moines)					Orders completed in WAFA
	IMA/EDI FOC issued					
	Creation of the Spreadsheet in QCCC					

Trial 2

CURRENT- Quickloop- Reuse- 3 day interval

	DAY 0	DAY 1	DAY 2	DAY 3	DAY 4	Day 5
CLEC	CLEC issues LSR's					
QWEST	Service Order Issued	CO Pre-wiring?		CO Lift & Lay- DT, ANI. Order status updated via phonecall to CLEC.		
	Assignments done (Design in Des Moines)			Orders completed in WAFA		
	IMA/EDI FOC issued					

Trial 3

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE - Docket No. UT-033044

I hereby certify that on the date given below the original and 15 copies of: (1) Direct Testimony of Patty Lynott on Behalf of McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc.; and (2) Certificate of Service in the above-referenced docket were filed via E-mail and by Federal Express, overnight delivery, to:

Ms. Carole J. Washburn, Secretary
Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW
Olympia, WA 98504-7250
e-mail: records@wutc.wa.gov

On the same date, a true and correct copy was sent via E-mail and regular U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, to:

Rebecca DeCook AT&T Communications 1875 Lawrence Street, Suite 1575 Denver, CO 80202 e-mail: decook@att.com	Brooks E. Harlow Miller Nash LLP 601 Union Street, Suite 4400 Seattle, WA 98101-2352 e-mail: brooks.harlow@millernash.com
Stephen S. Melnikoff Regulatory Law Office US Army Litigation Center 901 N. Stuart Street, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22203-1837 e-mail: Stephen.melnikoff@hqda@army.mil	Jonathan Thompson Gregory J. Trautman Assistant Attorney General 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW PO Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504-0128 e-mail: jthompso@wutc.wa.gov
Lisa A. Anderl Qwest Corporation 1600 – 7th Avenue, Room 3206 Seattle, WA 98191 e-mail: lisa.anderl@qwest.com	Arthur A. Butler Ater Wynne 601 Union Street, Suite 5450 Seattle, WA 98101 e-mail: aab@aterwynne.com
Simon ffitch Public Counsel Office of the Attorney General 900 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98164 e-mail: simonf@atg.wa.gov	Michel Singer Nelson MCI Inc. 707 - 17th Street, Suite 4200 Denver, CO 80202 e-mail: michel.singer_nelson@wcom.com
Lisa Rackner Ater Wynne LLP 222 SW Columbia, Suite 1800 Portland, OR 97201 e-mail: lfr@aterwynne.com	James I. Harlan Allegiance Telecom of Washington, Inc. 9201 N. Central Expressway Dallas, TX 75231 e-mail: james.harlan@algx.com
Timothy O'Connell Stoel Rives LLP 600 University Street, Suite 3600 Seattle, WA 98101 Email: tjoconnell@stoel.com	

DATED this 23rd day of January, 2004.

By: Larry J. Weathers
Larry J. Weathers

SEA 1456965v1 46985-44
Seattle