

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Petition of

QWEST CORPORATION

For Competitive Classification of  
Basic Business Exchange  
Telecommunications Services

DOCKET NO. UT-030614

INTEGRA TELECOM OF  
WASHINGTON, INC. –  
RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL  
REQUESTS RELATED TO  
COMMISSION STAFF MOTION  
REQUESTING THE  
COMMISSION ORDER CLECS TO  
PRODUCE INFORMATION

On June 12, 2003, Commission Staff filed a Motion requesting that the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) order Competitive Local Exchange Carriers (CLECs) to produce information the Commission Staff requires to determine whether Qwest's basic business services are competitive in Washington. Several parties filed comments. The Commission requested that the parties file responses to questions raised in the answers, and Integra Telecom of Washington, Inc. (Integra) responds, as follows:

- For CLECs who provide facilities-based service, would adequate information be provided if responses were based on Qwest exchanges, or other parameters, rather than Qwest wire centers?

**RESPONSE:** Yes. Qwest exchanges are easily identified and information based upon the Qwest exchanges may give the Commission a better sense of the state of competition in Washington. Information based upon wire center may skew the competitive analysis and will be more difficult for CLECs to obtain and compile. Further, rates are not based upon wire centers; in Washington, rates are based upon five deaveraged zones and defined exchanges.

- For CLECs that provide services based on Qwest's facilities, would Qwest be the logical provider of the information Staff seeks regarding location of services by wire center?

**RESPONSE:** Yes. Integra believes Qwest is the logical provider of all information regarding location of services by wire center that Qwest provides to the CLECs on Qwest facilities. Again, this information, however, is highly confidential to each of the Qwest CLEC customers and should be protected by an Extraordinary Protective Order as discussed below. The confidential customer and specific information from Qwest about the location of a CLEC's services by wire center is trade secret information and may disclose the CLEC's footprint in the Qwest serving territory.

- Is there any objection to the inclusion of additional or revised requests for information as proposed by Public Counsel?

**RESPONSE:** Yes. Please see the discussion below related to the additional requests of Public Counsel and WeBTEC.

- If a further protective order is entered in this proceeding, should it reflect the highly confidential provisions contained in the protective order entered in Docket

No.UT-000883, Second Supplemental - Protective Order, July 31, 2000? If not, why not? What further protective provisions, if any, would be appropriate?

**RESPONSE:** Yes. Integra believes that due to the nature of the information sought by Commission Staff from the CLECs, especially including the revisions and additional information that Public Counsel and WeBTEC proposed be requested, an Extraordinary Protective Order, similar to the one entered in Docket No. UT-000883, must be entered in this docket.

Similar to the arguments made by AT&T in Docket No. UT-000883, Integra believes that the information sought by Staff and in the revised requests proposed by WeBTEC and Public Counsel is trade secret information entitled to the highest protections of the law. Integra is a small privately held corporation. Information about Integra's network, services it provides, access lines, target customers, and areas of operation is highly sensitive and affects Integra's ability to provide services to the public. Disclosure of this type of information would be extremely beneficial to Integra's competitors and affect Integra's position in the marketplace, and its status and position among other carriers.

Disclosure of any this information, if the Commission elects to grant Staff's and Public Counsel and WeBTEC's requests, must be limited to only Staff and not to Qwest or other competitors, for Staff's analysis of competition in the Qwest exchanges in the State of Washington – which is the sole issue here - and should not be made available in any CLEC-specific disclosure.

- In light of AT&T and MCI's answer that they would need additional time to respond and in light of the possible need to request information from Qwest in circumstances where Qwest provides facilities upon which CLEC service is based, should the time frames for responses to Staff's motion be lengthened? What is a reasonable alternative deadline for production of information? Would Qwest be willing to lengthen its waiver of the statutory deadline for completion of the proceeding to accommodate the additional time needed?

**RESPONSE:** If the Commission elects to grant Staff's request for information from the CLECs and if the Commission elects to revise the information requests as proposed by Public Counsel and WeBTEC, Integra believes that the Commission must grant as much additional time as possible for the CLECs to respond as Integra has limited resources, will be reviewing Qwest's Direct Testimony, and will be gathering information to respond to the Requests and will be preparing its own Reply Testimony. Currently, Qwest must file its Direct Testimony by July 1, 2003. Staff, Public Counsel and the Intervenors must file their Reply Testimony August 6, 2003. Integra requests that the Commission extend the response date to at least July 18, 2003.

- Any other matter raised in the answers that the parties wish to address at this time.

**RESPONSE:** No, none other than set forth herein.

### **PUBLIC COUNSEL AND WeBTEC ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTS**

In their response to the Staff Motion Requesting CLECs to Provide Additional Information filed on June 17, 2003, Public Counsel and WeBTEC suggested certain revisions to Staff's requests for information.

**RESPONSE:** Integra objects to the proposed revisions to the extent that the information requested covers deregulated services, services that Qwest does not seek declassification of, or does not provide information relative to the provision of regulated telecommunications services to businesses in the State of Washington (Revised Request 1, 2, 7). Also, Integra objects to the revisions to the extent that Staff, itself, does not believe the proposed information assists Staff in its analysis of competition in the State of Washington (Revised Requests 8, 9) – specifically related to all proposed questions about CLEC purchases of services from Qwest and the costs, services, and provisioning thereof (Revised Requests 3, 4, 5, 6, 10). Further, Integra objects to the disclosure of trade secret, highly confidential and proprietary information to WeBTEC and Public Counsel.

Respectfully submitted, this 23rd day of June, 2003.

Integra Telecom of Washington, Inc.

By: */s/ Karen J. Johnson*  
Karen J. Johnson  
Corporate Regulatory Attorney  
WSBA # 26875  
19545 NW Von Neumann Drive  
Suite 200  
Beaverton, Oregon 97006  
(503)748-2048  
FAX (503) 748-1976

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I served a copy of the Response to Additional Requests on the following parties:

Public Counsel  
Simon ffitich  
Office of the Attorney General  
900 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98164-1912  
FAX (206) 3892058

Letty Friesen  
AT&T Law and Government Affairs  
1875 Lawrence Street Room 1575  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
(303)298-6301

Jonathan C. Thompson  
Lisa Watson  
Office of the Attorney General  
1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW  
PO Box 40128  
Olympia, WA 98504-0128  
FAX (360) 586-5522

Arthur A. Butler  
Ater Wynne, LLP  
601 Union Street, Suite 5450  
Seattle, WA 98101-2327  
FAX (206) 467-8406

Lisa A. Andrel  
Qwest Corporation  
1600 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 3206  
Seattle, Washington 98191  
FAX (206) 343-4040

Stephen S. Melnikoff  
General Attorney  
Regulatory Office  
US Army Litigation Center  
901 North Stuart Street, Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22203-1837  
FAX (703) 696-2960

Michel Singer-Nelson  
WorldCom, Inc.  
707-17<sup>th</sup> St., Suite 4200  
Denver, CO 80202  
FAX (303) 390-6333

I further certify that said copies were served by facsimile to the numbers so designated and by placing them in sealed envelopes addressed to said party's/attorneys' last know addresses as shown and deposited in the United States Mail at Beaverton, Oregon, and that the postage thereon was prepaid.

DATED this 23rd day of June, 2003.

*/s/ Karen J. Johnson*  
Karen J. Johnson, WSBA #26875  
Corporate Regulatory Attorney  
Integra Telecom of Washington, Inc.  
19545 NW Von Neumann Drive, Suite 200  
Beaverton, OR 97006  
Phone (503) 748-2048/ FAX (503) 748-1976