

**Tim Zawislak**

08/09/02 04:49 PM

To:

m

cc:

<nancyj@sprintnw.com>

Subject:

response

tre.e.hendricks.iii@mail.sp

"Nancy Judy"

UT-013058 follow-up on

Also, therefore, to answer Nancy's (telephone) question more specifically, I think Sprint does need to file a ne disaggregation plan not later than August 23, 2002, given the current order requirements.

Here are the costs that should be used:



Sprint-United Telephone Company.xls

Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at (360) 664-1294.

Thanks, Tim Z.

----- Forwarded by Tim Zawislak/WUTC on 08/09/02 04:10 PM -----

**Tim Zawislak**

08/09/02 04:02 PM

To:

cc:

Subject:

Order for consideration in UT-023031

sue.mckenzie@mail.sprin

Re: WUTC's Disaggregati

Hi Sue, Please forward this to Tre Hendricks.

Thanks,

Timothy W. Zawislak (a/k/a "Tim Z.")  
Senior Telecommunications Analyst  
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission  
TEL: (360) 664-1294  
FAX: (360) 586-1150  
EMA: tim@wutc.wa.gov  
WEB: <http://www.wutc.wa.gov/telecom>

----- Forwarded by Tim Zawislak/WUTC on 08/09/02 04:01 PM -----

**Tim Zawislak**

08/09/02 03:53 PM

To:

<nancyj@sprintnw.com>

cc:

Subject:

Order for consideration in UT-023031

"Nancy Judy"

Re: WUTC's Disaggrega

Hi Nancy, No, it would appear from reading the order that United Telephone Company (Sprint) was named as a party on page 1 of the order. Also, at paragraph 63 of the order the Commission refers to Rural ILECs which it sounds like Sprint still considers itself. If I remember right it seems like Sprint at one time may have received both High Cost Loop (HCL) support because it was a Rural Company as well as Interstate Access Support (IAS) because it was a Price Cap Company. Because Sprint may be both a Rural Company and a Price Cap Company it seems like BOTH proceedings do apply to Sprint. Sprint also filed a "Path 1" election on May 8, 2002, much like all of the other Rural ILECs, and the Commission in the Order directed Rural ILECs to file new disaggregation plans with the Commission not later than August 23, 2002, as you note below. If Sprint disagrees with the Commission's Order, or if Sprint is no longer a "Rural" ILEC then it may choose to file a petition for reconsideration (or clarification) by August 12.

**"Nancy Judy"**

**<nancyj@sprintnw.com>**

08/08/02 08:45 AM

To:

cc:

Subject:

Order for consideration in UT-023031

<tzawisla@wutc.wa.gov>

Re: WUTC's Disaggregation

Thanks, Tim. I saw the order on disaggregation yesterday. Since Sprint is a rural ILEC for purposes of USF, but doesn't receive any USF, am I correct in assuming that the order does not apply to Sprint? We will be collecting IAS, for which there already is a means of disaggregation in place under the FCC rules. I understand that staff wants to petition the FCC to change the method of disaggregation and that is what we will be discussing at the meetings.

Thanks,  
Nancy

-----Original Message-----

From: tzawisla@wutc.wa.gov <tzawisla@wutc.wa.gov>  
To: joan.gage@verizon.com <joan.gage@verizon.com>  
Cc: nancyj@sprintnw.com <nancyj@sprintnw.com>  
Date: Tuesday, August 06, 2002 1:06 PM  
Subject: WUTC's Disaggregation Order for consideration in UT-023031

>Here are some documents and spreadsheets that may assist your experts in  
>preparation for our Docket UT-023031 (Verizon and Sprint/United)  
>Disaggregation meetings in September and October:  
>  
>  
>The Commission's recent (8/2/02) Disaggregation Order and Attachment:  
> (See attached file: ORDER TEXT for UT-013058 and UT-023020.doc)  
> (See attached file: ORDER ATTACHMENT for UT-013058 and UT-023020.xls)  
>  
>  
>The Staff Methodology is more fully described in it's (7/26/02) Memo and  
>Attachments:

> (See attached file: 7\_26\_02 Staff Memo for UT-013058 and  
>UT-023020.doc)  
> (See attached file: 7\_26\_02 Staff Attachments (1-5) for UT-013058 and  
>UT-023020.xls)  
>  
>  
>Please call me at (360) 664-1294 if you have any questions.  
>  
>Thanks, Tim Z.