

1 BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
Case No. USW-T-00-3

2
3 In the Matter of U S WEST Communications, Inc.'s
4 Motion for an Alternative Procedure to Manage the
5 Section 271 Process

6 STATE OF IOWA
7 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
8 UTILITIES BOARD
9 Docket No. INU-00-2

10 IN RE:
11 U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

12 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE REGULATION
13 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
14 OF THE STATE OF MONTANA
15 Docket No. 20000.5.70

16 IN THE MATTER of the Investigation into
17 U S WEST Communications Inc.'s Compliance with
18 Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996

19 BEFORE THE NEBRASKA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
20 Case No. Docket C-1830

21 IN THE MATTER OF QWEST CORPORATION FILINGS, ITS
22 NOTICE OF INTENTION TO FILE SECTION 271(C)
23 APPLICATION WITH THE FCC AND REQUEST FOR
24 COMMISSION TO VERIFY QWEST CORPORATION'S
25 COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 271(C)

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION
Utility Case No. 3269

IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S SECTION
271 APPLICATION AND MOTION FOR
ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE TO
MANAGE THE SECTION 271 PROCESS

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Case No. PU-314-97-193

U S WEST Communications, Inc.
Section 271 Compliance
Investigation

1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WYOMING
Docket No. 70000-TA-00-599

2

3 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF
4 QWEST CORPORATION REGARDING 271 of
5 THE FEDERAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT
6 of 1996, WYOMING'S PARTICIPATION IN A
7 MULTI-STATE SECTION 271 PROCESS, AND
8 APPROVAL OF ITS STATEMENT OF
9 GENERAL AVAILABLE TERMS

6

7 BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES
8 AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

8 Docket No. UT-003022
9 In the Matter of the Investigation into

9

10 U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'s

10

11 Compliance With Section 271 of the
12 Telecommunications Act of 1996

11

12 Docket No. UT-003040
13 In the Matter of

13

14 U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'s

14

15 Statement of Generally Available Terms Pursuant to
16 Section 252(1) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996

16

VOLUME III

17

Pursuant to continuation, the Technical Works

18

was held at 8:11 a.m., August 16, 2001, at The

19

Warwick Hotel, Denver, Colorado, before facilitator

20

John Antonuk.

21

22

APPEARANCES

23

(As noted in the transcript.)

24

25

| | | |
|----|--------------------------|------|
| 1 | INDEX OF EXHIBITS | PAGE |
| | S9-QWE-CTI-1 | 4 |
| 2 | S9-QWE-CTI-2 | 109 |
| | S9-QWE-CTI-3 | 20 |
| 3 | S9-QWE-CTI-4 | 9 |
| | S9-QWE-CTI-5 | 109 |
| 4 | S9-NMAS-1 | 108 |
| | S9-QWE-MGW-1 | 136 |
| 5 | S9-QWE-MGW-2 | 137 |
| | S9-QWE-MGW-3 | 137 |
| 6 | S9-QWE-MGW-4 | 186 |
| 7 | | |
| | INDEX OF WITNESSES | |
| 8 | Carl T. Inouye | |
| | Cross by Mr. Kopta: | 4 |
| 9 | Cross by Ms. Barb Young: | 58 |
| | Cross by Ms. Doberneck: | 70 |
| 10 | Cross By Ms. Edna Young: | 129 |
| | Cross by Mr. Ripperger: | 135 |
| 11 | Cross by Mr. Griffing: | 150 |
| | Cross by Ms. Whitney: | 181 |
| 12 | Cross by Mr. Spinks: | 187 |
| | Cross by Ms. Hooper: | 190 |
| 13 | Redirect by Ms. Stang: | 201 |
| 14 | Nancy Lubamersky | |
| | Direct by Ms. Stang: | 219 |
| 15 | Cross by Mr. Kopta: | 221 |
| | Cross by Mr. Dixon: | 224 |
| 16 | Cross BY MR. WEIGLER: | 226 |
| | Redirect by Ms. Stang: | 229 |
| 17 | | |
| | Karen Stewart | |
| 18 | Direct by Ms. Stang: | 233 |
| | Cross by Mr. Dixon: | 259 |
| 19 | Cross BY MR. WEIGLER: | 263 |
| | Redirect by Ms. Stang: | 265 |
| 20 | | |
| | Michael Williams | |
| 21 | Direct by Ms. Stang: | 267 |
| | Cross by Mr. Cromwell: | 302 |
| 22 | Cross BY MR. WEIGLER: | 323 |
| | Cross by Ms. Earls: | 367 |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

1 on the facility.

2 Q And is that pursuant to an order?

3 A That's pursuant to FCC guidelines in the
4 supplemental order of clarification. I believe it
5 was issued in June of 2000.

6 Q So if a special access is converted to a
7 UNE, do you know if that is measured -- or any
8 unbundled network elements, do you know if it would
9 be measured with the ROC -- I should ask you are you
10 familiar with the ROC, performance indicator
11 definitions?

12 A Yes, I am.

13 Q Do you know if it would be measured in
14 those PIDs?

15 A Yes; and once again there is a variety of
16 UNEs they may choose depending on if the whole
17 circuit was converted or part of the circuit but the
18 type of UNEs they could be using, be it an EEL, that
19 combination of a loop and transport or an unbundled
20 loop or unbundled dedicated interoffice transporter
21 unit. They each contain disaggregated PID reporting
22 within various sides of the PIDs.

23 Q Do you know, Qwest is currently providing
24 EELs to carriers or to CLECs; is that correct?

25 A Yes, we as of approximately June 30th, we

1 provisioned approximately 4500 EELs in our 14-state
2 region.

3 MR. ANTONUK: I'm sorry, how many?

4 THE WITNESS: 4500.

5 MR. DIXON: That was region wide?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.

7 MR. ANTONUK: Before you go on, that
8 number sounds very high from what I remember from the
9 workshops we've had. So either a whole lot of EELs
10 have started showing up in the seven states or the
11 vast majority of these 4500 are not in the seven
12 states in the 271 proceedings I would assume; is that
13 correct?

14 THE WITNESS: I think you're correct on
15 both fronts and if I can elaborate. The volume has
16 grown rapidly in the last couple of months. So any
17 workshops that did not include June 30th data would
18 have shown a much lower number.

19 Number two, one of the largest states for
20 EEL conversions is Oregon and Oregon is not part of
21 the seven states.

22 MR. ANTONUK: Thank you.

23 MS. STANG: Those are all the questions
24 that I have.

25 MR. ANTONUK: I have one question just to

1 make sure things are clear.

2 Were you present for the seven-state
3 workshops that addressed the issue of special access
4 purchases by CLECs in lieu of EELs on the theory that
5 they had no choice because you weren't making EELs
6 available at the time?

7 THE WITNESS: Yes.

8 MR. ANTONUK: Okay. And do you recall
9 that Qwest made a voluntary concession to include a
10 provision about special access circuits in this
11 specific context in the SGAT?

12 THE WITNESS: Yes, I do. The specific
13 provision was due to the concerns over whether there
14 had been a delay in the ability of a CLEC to convert
15 a special access circuit. Since it was required,
16 Qwest made a voluntary offer that for four facilities
17 or new special access circuits that were installed
18 between October 9th, 1999 to May 16th, 2001 that
19 Qwest would convert those circuits from special
20 access to EELs without paying any type of termination
21 liability damages.

22 MR. ANTONUK: So your introductory comment
23 about the non-inclusion of special access circuits in
24 271 proceedings was meant to exclude that
25 circumstance we were just talking about?

