



# Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

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

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

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

May 9, 2006

**BY FEDERAL EXPRESS**

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

RECEIVED  
RECORDS MANAGEMENT  
06 MAY 10 AM 10:24  
STATE OF WASH.  
UTIL. AND TRANSP.  
COMMISSION

Re: Docket No. UT-053025

Dear Ms. Washburn:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket, please find the original and 12 copies of the Joint CLEC Petition for Administrative Review of Order No. 3.

Please call me with any questions regarding this filing. Thank you for your assistance.

Very truly yours,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

Mary A. Scarsorie  
Assistant to Gregory J. Kopta

Enclosures

cc: Interested Parties, via U.S. Mail (list attached)

## INTERESTED PARTIES LIST

### Docket No. UT-053025

(\*designates parties who have signed Protective Order for Confidential Information)

<p>* Lisa Anderl Qwest Corporation 1600 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 3206 Seattle, WA 98191 Email: <a href="mailto:lisa.anderl@qwest.com">lisa.anderl@qwest.com</a></p>	<p>* Art Butler Ater Wynne 601 Union Street, Suite 5450 Seattle, WA 98101-2327 Email: <a href="mailto:aab@aterwynne.com">aab@aterwynne.com</a></p>
<p>* Karen Clauson Eschelon Telecom, Inc. 730 Second Avenue South, Suite 1200 Minneapolis, MN 55402 Email: <a href="mailto:klclauson@eschelon.com">klclauson@eschelon.com</a></p>	<p>* Douglas Denny Eschelon Telecom, Inc. 730 Second Avenue South, Suite 900 Minneapolis, MN 55402 Email: <a href="mailto:dkdenney@eschelon.com">dkdenney@eschelon.com</a></p>
<p>* Gregory Diamond Covad Communications Company 7901 Lowry Blvd Denver, CO 80230 Email: <a href="mailto:gdiamond@Covad.com">gdiamond@Covad.com</a></p>	<p>Thomas D. Ellis TSS Digital Services LLC 525 Columbia Street NW, Suite 205 Olympia, WA 98501</p>
<p>* Carolyn Hammack Qwest Corporation 1801 California Street, Suite 4750 Denver, CO 80126</p>	<p>* Karen Johnson Integra Telecom 1201 NE Lloyd Blvd, Suite 500 Portland, OR 97232 Email: <a href="mailto:Karen.Johnson@integratelecom.com">Karen.Johnson@integratelecom.com</a></p>
<p>* Rex Knowles XO Communications 111 E. Broadway, Suite 1000 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Email: <a href="mailto:rex.knowles@xo.com">rex.knowles@xo.com</a></p>	<p>* Judith Krebs Public Counsel Attorney General Office 900 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98164 Email: <a href="mailto:Judyk@atg.wa.gov">Judyk@atg.wa.gov</a></p>
<p>Sue Lamb Lamb Communications Services 111 Teal Lane Sagle, ID 83860</p>	<p>David Mittle 208 Maynard Santa Fe, NM 87501 Email: <a href="mailto:dmittle@att.net">dmittle@att.net</a></p>
<p>* Timothy J. O'Connell Stoel Rives 600 University Street, Suite 3600 Seattle, WA 98101 Email: <a href="mailto:tjoconnell@stoel.com">tjoconnell@stoel.com</a></p>	<p>Jack Pestaner Tel-West Central Services 133 La Placita Ct. Santa Fe, NM 87505</p>

**INTERESTED PARTIES LIST**  
**Docket No. UT-053025**

(\*designates parties who have signed Protective Order for Confidential Information)

Richard Potter Verizon NorthWest PO Box 1003 Everett, WA 98206	* Mark Reynolds Qwest Corporation 1600 7 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Room 3206 Seattle, WA 98191 Email: <a href="mailto:mark.reynolds3@qwest.com">mark.reynolds3@qwest.com</a>
* Dennis Robbins Electric Lightwave 4400 NE 77 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Vancouver, WA 98662-6706	Ethan Sprague PacWest Telecom 1776 W. Mark Lane, Suite 250 Stockton, CA 95207 Email: <a href="mailto:esprague@pacwest.com">esprague@pacwest.com</a>
* Dave Teitzel Qwest Corporation 1600 7 <sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 3214 Seattle, WA 98191	Sarah Wallace Davis Wright Tremaine LLP 1300 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300 Portland, OR 97201-5630 Email: <a href="mailto:sarahwallace@dwt.com">sarahwallace@dwt.com</a>

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED RECORD MANAGEMENT 06 MAY 10 AM 10:24

STATE OF WASH. UTIL. AND TRANSP. COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Investigation )
Concerning the Status of Competition and )
Impact of the FCC's Triennial Review )
Remand Order on the Competitive )
Telecommunications Environment in )
Washington State. )
DOCKET NO. UT-053025
JOINT CLEC PETITION FOR
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OF
ORDER NO. 3

1. Pursuant to WAC 480-07-825, Covad Communications Company, Eschelon Telecom of Washington, Inc., Integra Telecom of Washington, Inc., McLeodUSA Telecommunications Services, Inc., and XO Communications Services, Inc. (collectively "Joint CLECs") petition the Commission to review Order No. 3, Initial Order Requiring Disclosure of Additional Information ("Initial Order"). The Joint CLECs respectfully assert that the order errs in failing to require Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") and Verizon Northwest Inc. ("Verizon") to use 2004 (rather than 2003) data in their calculations of business lines.<sup>1</sup>

DISCUSSION

2. The Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") adopted fiber-based collocation and business line counts as the triggers for determining whether impairment exists in a particular wire center. In paragraph 105 of the FCC's Triennial Review Remand Order ("TRRO"),<sup>2</sup> the FCC defines business lines as incumbent local exchange carrier ("ILEC") "ARMIS 43-08 business lines, plus business UNE-P, plus UNE-loops."

<sup>1</sup> Covad does not join the portions of this Petition that are specific to Verizon.
<sup>2</sup> In re Unbundled Access to Network Elements, FCC 04-290, WC Docket No. 04-313 & CC Docket No. 01-338, Order on Remand (rel. Feb. 4, 2005).

ORIGINAL

The TRRO did not specify the date on which these counts were to be made, but that order became effective on March 11, 2005. The determinations made pursuant to that order, therefore, should be based on data that is contemporaneous with that date.

3. Qwest and Verizon disagreed and provided data on the number of business lines as of December 2003 – over one year before the TRRO was issued and became effective. The Initial Order concluded that this is reasonable “because the FCC used this data to establish the non-impairment criteria and the companies used this data in providing lists of non-impaired wire centers to the FCC in March 2005.”<sup>3</sup> The Initial Order further concludes, “Applying data from different time periods to determine the initial list on non-impaired wire centers, as the Joint CLECs suggest, would be inconsistent.”<sup>4</sup> The Initial Order errs as a matter of law, misconstrues the Joint CLECs’ position, and inconsistently applies the very principle it adopts.

4. The Joint CLECs’ position is, and always has been, that *all* the data used to designate wire centers as non-impaired should be from as close to the March 11, 2005 effective date of the TRRO as possible – including ILEC ARMIS data, business UNE-P lines, UNE loops, and the number of fiber-based collocators. Qwest and Verizon apparently agree that data on the number of fiber-based collocators should be at least roughly contemporaneous with the effective date of the TRRO.<sup>5</sup> The ILECs, however, depart from this principle with respect to the number of business lines, which they calculate based on ARMIS and UNE data in existence as of December 31, 2003. Qwest and Verizon, not the Joint CLECs, inconsistently apply data from different time periods

---

<sup>3</sup> Initial Order ¶ 76 (Conclusion of Law Paragraph (2)).

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* ¶ 77 (Conclusion of Law Paragraph (3)).

<sup>5</sup> *See* Qwest and Verizon Responses to Bench Request No. 3.

to determine the initial list of non-impaired wire centers. By endorsing that approach, the Initial Order thus adopts the very inconsistency it concludes is unreasonable.

5. The Initial Order's conclusion also lacks any justification in the TRRO. The FCC did not state that its non-impairment test was to be applied to the data that was on file as of the date of the TRRO, and such intent cannot reasonably be implied. To the contrary, when describing the wire center data to be used to calculate business lines for determining non-impairment, the FCC expressly referenced its *FCC Report 43-08 – Report Definition* dated December 2004, obviously contemplating that 2004 (or later) ARMIS data compiled consistent with this report would be used.<sup>6</sup> The TRRO also expressly contemplates future non-impairment designations, which would be meaningless if only 2003 data could be considered. The Initial Order requires, “On a going-forward basis, however, Qwest and Verizon must submit the most recent ARMIS 43-08 data when seeking to add any new wire centers to the list of non-impaired wire centers the Commission resolves in this proceeding.”<sup>7</sup> That requirement is consistent with the TRRO and is no less applicable to initially designated wire centers.

6. Nor does the FCC's use of 2003 data to establish the wire center non-impairment criteria have any connection with determining how specific wire centers should be designated.<sup>8</sup> The FCC established its business line count thresholds for the wire center tiers based on a correlation between those line count levels and the number of fiber-based

---

<sup>6</sup> TRRO ¶ 105, n.303.

<sup>7</sup> Initial Order ¶ 24.

<sup>8</sup> The Initial Order also relies on the fact that Qwest and Verizon filed lists of wire center designations with the FCC in March 2005 based on 2003 business line count data, but that filing is irrelevant. The FCC has taken no action whatsoever on any of these lists, and the mere act of filing has no bearing on the issue of whether the ILECs can use 2003 data to designate wire centers as non-impaired.

collocators.<sup>9</sup> There is nothing in the TRRO, however, that indicates any nexus between the FCC's use of data to *establish* criteria and the *application* of the resulting criteria to specific wire centers. Standards apply to conditions and data that exist as of the time the standards become effective, not retroactively to the data used to develop those standards.

The Michigan Public Service Commission came to the same conclusion. SBC Michigan ("SBC"), like Qwest and Verizon, contended that the commission should use 2003 ARMIS data in applying the FCC's non-impairment criteria because that was the data that was publicly available when SBC listed the wire centers as non-impaired and use of later vintage data would be inconsistent with the TRRO. The Michigan Commission rejected those arguments, finding that SBC is required to use data that is as close as possible to the time at which SBC listed the wire center as non-impaired, even if SBC had not yet filed its FCC report containing that data:

The age of the data must be close enough in time to reflect conditions at the time that SBC claims that the wire center is no longer impaired. In this case, the Commission finds that SBC should have used the 2004 ARMIS data, which was available, even if not fully edited and incorporated in a report to the FCC. The analysis requires using data gathered for ARMIS calculations, not the calculations themselves.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *E.g.*, TRRO ¶ 114 ("We choose 38,000 business lines [for Tier 1 designation] because the record indicates that over two-thirds of wire centers above this threshold have four or more fiber-based collocators.") (footnote omitted); *id.* ¶ 118 ("we establish a business line threshold [for Tier 2 designation] of 24,000 business lines because over two-thirds of all wire centers above this threshold have three or more fiber-based collocators, signaling that sufficient revenue opportunities are very likely to exist in such wire centers to justify the provision of competitive transport").

<sup>10</sup> *In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to commence a collaborative proceeding to monitor and facilitate implementation of Accessible Letters issued by SBC MICHIGAN and VERIZON*, Case No. U-14447, Order at 5 (Sept. 20, 2005) (A copy of the order is attached for the Commission's convenience).

BellSouth, another regional Bell operating company, has interpreted the FCC requirements the same way and relies on 2004 ARMIS data for the business line count information it used to initially designate wire centers as non-impaired.<sup>11</sup>

7. The FCC and this Commission have consistently required that determinations under the Act be based on the most current data available. The Initial Order improperly departs from this principle and inappropriately permits Qwest and Verizon to use data from different time periods to designate wire centers as non-impaired. The Commission should correct this error.

---

<sup>11</sup> See, e.g., *In re Proceeding to Consider Amendments to Interconnection Agreements Between BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and Competing Local Providers Due to Changes of Law*, NC Utils. Comm'n Docket No. P-55, SUB 1549, Order Concerning Changes of Law at 38 (March 1, 2006) (“BellSouth has updated its wire center results to include December 2004 ARMIS data and the December UNE loop and UNE-P data so that the most current information is used to establish the wire centers that satisfy the FCC’s tests.”).




**CONCLUSION**

8. The Commission should modify the Initial Order to require the ILECs to produce and rely on data used to designate wire centers as non-impaired – including ARMIS 43-08 business line counts, UNE-P business line counts, UNE loop counts, and the number of fiber-based collocators – from as close to March 11, 2005, as possible.

DATED this 9th day of May, 2006.

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
Attorneys for Covad Communications  
Company, Eschelon Telecom of  
Washington, Inc., Integra Telecom of  
Washington, Inc., McLeodUSA  
Telecommunications Services, Inc., and XO  
Communications Services, Inc.

By  \_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Kopta  
WSBA No. 20519

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

\* \* \* \* \*

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to )  
commence a collaborative proceeding to monitor and )  
facilitate implementation of Accessible Letters issued )  
by **SBC MICHIGAN** and **VERIZON**. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. U-14447

At the September 20, 2005 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,  
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. J. Peter Lark, Chairman  
Hon. Laura Chappelle, Commissioner  
Hon. Monica Martinez, Commissioner

**ORDER**

On July 7, 2005, Covad Communications Company (Covad), a competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC) filed a self certification with SBC Michigan (SBC), asserting that Covad was entitled to unbundled DS1<sup>1</sup> loops pursuant to 47 USC 251(c)(3) at the Dearborn Fairborn wire center, a wire center that SBC had declared unimpaired under the provisions adopted by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in the *Triennial Review Remand Order (TRRO)*<sup>2</sup> and implementing rules. Pursuant to the dispute resolution procedures adopted in the Commission's

---

<sup>1</sup> Digital Signal Level 1.

<sup>2</sup> *In the Matter of Unbundled Access to Network Elements, WC Docket No. 04-313 and Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, CC Docket No. 01-338. (TRO Remand Order)*, rel'd February 4, 2005.

March 29, 2005 order in Case No. U-14447, SBC filed its challenge to Covad's certification on July 18, 2005.

On August 8, 2005, Covad and TDS Metrocom, LLC, XO Communications Services, Inc., and Talk America Inc. (the Joint CLECs), filed affidavits in support of Covad's self certification. On August 22, 2005, the Commission received briefs from the following: SBC, Covad, the Joint CLECs, and the Commission Staff (Staff). On August 29, 2005, reply briefs were filed by SBC and Covad.

### Legal Framework

47 CFR 51.319(a)(4)(i) provides in part:

Subject to the cap described in paragraph (a)(4)(ii), an incumbent LEC shall provide a requesting telecommunications carrier with nondiscriminatory access to a DS1 loop on an unbundled basis to any building not served by a wire center with at least 60,000 business lines and at least four fiber-based collocators. Once a wire center exceeds both of these thresholds, no future DS1 loop unbundling will be required in that wire center. A DS1 loop is a digital local loop having a total digital signal speed of 1.544 megabytes per second. DS1 loops include, but are not limited to, two-wire and four-wire copper loops capable of providing high-bit rate digital subscriber line services, including T-1 services.

In the *TRRO*, the FCC found that in most instances, CLECs would be impaired in their ability to compete without access to DS1 loops, except in certain circumstances. In reaching this conclusion, the FCC recognized that "stand-alone DS1 loops offer low revenue opportunities and are unlikely to be deployed competitively." *TRRO* ¶ 171. Therefore, the FCC adopted a scheme for determining the availability of high capacity unbundled network element (UNE) loops and dedicated interoffice transport "based upon objective and readily available facts, such as the number of business lines or the number of facilities based competitors in a particular market." *TRRO*, ¶ 234. SBC must provide Covad and other CLECs unbundled access to DS1 loops and transport if the CLEC self certifies that it is eligible to obtain the loops ordered. Thereafter, the

incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) may challenge the self certification, but will prevail only where both of two conditions exist: (1) the wire center in question serves more than 60,000 business lines, and (2) there are at least 4 unaffiliated fiber-based collocators at that wire center. *See*, 47 CFR 51.319(a)(4)(i).

The burden of proof is on the ILEC to demonstrate that CLECs are not impaired without access to unbundled DS1 loops at a particular wire center. Unless SBC can demonstrate that the Dearborn Fairborn wire center serves more than 60,000 business lines and houses at least 4 fiber-based collocators, its challenge will fail.

#### Line Count Issues

##### 1. Current Data Use

The *TRRO* adopts a calculation for business lines based on ARMIS 43-08 business lines, plus UNE-P<sup>3</sup> and UNE-L<sup>4</sup> loops. *Id.*, ¶ 105. SBC argues that its 2003 ARMIS 43-08 line counts, 2003 UNE-P business lines, and all 2003 UNE-L (whether used for business or residential service) should be used.

Covad takes the position that 2003 data is stale and should not be used. It argues that its self certification relates to the state of impairment that exists in the wire center today. Thus, it argues, the timeliness and vintage of the data that is used to resolve the challenge must be the latest data available in order to be relevant to the determination. Covad argues that SBC's data was nearly one and one half years old at the time of Covad's self certification. Covad states that it has obtained more recent wire center data, which it presented in its supporting affidavits.

---

<sup>3</sup> UNE-P refers to the unbundled network element platform, which includes the loop, unbundled local switching, and transport.

<sup>4</sup> UNE-L refers to an unbundled loop.

Although Covad acknowledges that this issue is not dispositive of the validity of SBC's challenge, it argues that the Commission should provide guidance for the parties that may face challenges in the future. Covad states that its more recent data reflects a significant decrease in business lines, which reflects a decreasing use of switched service through the wire center and shows that SBC cannot meet the 60,000 business line count in the near future (if it actually meets it now). Further, Covad argues, the new data evidences the low likelihood of economic revenue opportunities for CLECs to provide competitive services.

The Staff agrees with Covad that the most recent information available at the time of the CLEC's self certification (in this case June 5, 2005 data) should be used.

The Joint CLECs argue that SBC has created a fundamental mismatch of data by using figures as of December 31, 2003 for the number of lines and more recent data for the number of fiber-based collocators. They argue that to satisfy the FCC test, SBC must demonstrate that the wire center met the requirements of both prongs of the rule at the same time.

The joint CLECs argue that December 31, 2004 data was within SBC's possession, even if not yet tabulated, when SBC filed its challenge to Covad's self certification. These parties argue that SBC should have current data for both parts of the FCC test for the current time period.

SBC argues that the data for determining wire center impairment must be consistent with that available at the time at which SBC listed the wire center as unimpaired. SBC states that it relied upon the most recent ARMIS 43-08 data available, coupled with UNE data and collocation information of the same vintage. SBC argues that the approach suggested by Covad is not consistent with the *TRRO* and would violate federal law.

SBC states that the *TRRO* identified the data to be used for determinations concerning impaired wire centers to be the ARMIS 43-08 report, which is compiled annually and filed with

the FCC. SBC states that it used the most recent data available when it made its determination. It argues that the December 2004 ARMIS 43-08 report and the June 30, 2005 data had not yet been created for other regulatory purposes at that time. In fact, SBC argues that the latter data group will never be used for other regulatory purposes.

SBC argues that there is no doubt that the Dearborn Fairborn wire center exceeded both of the non-impairment thresholds and satisfied the standard for no required DS1 loop unbundling at the time that SBC filed its list of unimpaired wire centers with the FCC. As a result, SBC asserts, it may not be required in the future to provide DS1 loops in that wire center.

The Commission finds that for SBC to meet its burden to challenge a self certification, it must demonstrate that the wire center in question met the two prongs of the 47 CFR 51.319(a)(4) standard when SBC declared the wire center unimpaired. The language of the federal rule explicitly provides that once the criteria have been found to be met, SBC may not be required to provide DS1 loops from that wire center at any future point. The age of the data must be close enough in time to reflect conditions at the time that SBC claims that the wire center is no longer impaired. In this case, the Commission finds that SBC should have used the 2004 ARMIS data, which was available, even if not fully edited and incorporated in a report to the FCC. The analysis requires using data gathered for ARMIS calculations, not the calculations themselves. Once SBC can demonstrate that the wire center served more than 60,000 lines and had more than 4 collocators at the same time, it has met the criteria of 47 CFR 51.319(a)(4)(i).

Because SBC need not demonstrate a continuing state of meeting the criteria of the FCC rule, the fact that either factor is no longer met or may not be met in the near future is irrelevant as to whether SBC must now provide DS1 loops to competitors. The Commission is not free to

establish its own rules with respect to this issue. In the Commission's view, the language in the FCC's order and its rule are not ambiguous or subject to alternate interpretation.

## 2. Residential Lines

Covad and the Joint CLECs argue that SBC has impermissibly included residential lines in its count of lines for purposes of meeting the standards expressed in 47 CFR 51.319(a)(4). Although SBC removed residential UNE-P lines from this count, it included residential UNE-L lines. The Joint CLECs argue that SBC tacitly admits it can distinguish between UNE-L lines used to serve business customers and those used to serve residential customers. These parties argue that to include residential lines merely inflates the business line count in this wire center.

SBC responds that whether these lines are included in this case is immaterial, because even with the residential UNE-L lines removed from the count, there are still over 60,000 lines served by this wire center. Further, SBC argues, the *TRRO* requires inclusion of all UNE-L lines in the count of business lines. SBC argues that when the FCC created the definition of business line in 47 CFR 51.5, it required the inclusion of "the sum of all UNE loops" connected to that wire center, including UNE loops provisioned in combination with other unbundled elements." *Id.* SBC notes that the staff of the Illinois Commerce Commission (ICC) adopted SBC's position on this issue, concluding that requiring SBC to use a counting method inconsistent with that relied upon by the FCC is tantamount to modifying the FCC's impairment criteria. SBC insists that its method of counting lines is consistent with the *TRRO*, and the arguments supporting modifications to those criteria should be rejected.

The Staff points out that there is no disagreement with regard to UNE-P lines, because SBC removed residential lines from that count. The Staff agrees with Covad that only business UNE-L lines should be counted. Although not all ILECs have the ability to separate out business UNE-L

from residential UNE-L, SBC does have the ability to do so. In the Staff's view, SBC has provided no persuasive argument against using the most accurate information to determine the number of business lines served by the wire center.

The Commission finds that the first sentence of the FCC's rule defining business lines requires that, to be counted as a business line, the line must serve a business customer. The remaining portion of the definition presumes serving a business customer and clarifies that any loop, whether UNE-P, UNE-L, or leased line will be counted when it serves a business customer. SBC admits that it has the information necessary to remove the residential lines from this count and should do so. However, in this case, the residential line count is so small as to not affect the end result of this portion of the analysis.

### 3. Centrex Lines

SBC takes the position that each Centrex line should be counted as one business line. It argues that the instructions used to determine ARMIS 43-08 line counts provide that each Centrex line be counted as a business line. It points out that the ICC staff recently rejected a similar CLEC proposal to graft a line equivalency factor onto the FCC's rules. SBC states that it appropriately counted Centrex lines in accordance with the FCC's ARMIS reporting instructions.

On the other hand, Covad argues that the number of Centrex lines should be divided by nine (what it terms a Centrex line equivalency factor) to determine the number of business lines. It argues that Centrex service is functionally equivalent to a private branch exchange service, although Centrex requires more connections between the customer premises and the central office. Covad states that for purposes of access charges and universal service counts, the FCC has adopted a one to nine equivalency factor that counts nine Centrex lines as one business line.



Covad admits that the FCC rule defining business lines does not state that the Centrex equivalency factor should be applied. However, Covad argues that the rationale is equally applicable and justified in this proceeding. It argues that a business line is count that does not adjust for the Centrex equivalency factor provides a distorted picture of the actual revenue opportunities in a given wire center.

The Joint CLECs agree with Covad that Centrex lines should be subject to the equivalency factor. They argue that the theoretical merits of applying such a factor here are the same as in other contexts urged before the FCC. Because the rationale and reasoning employed in adopting an equivalency factor should apply equally here, the Joint CLECs urge the Commission to adopt the use of the factor to reduce the line count.

The Staff agrees with SBC that the definition of business lines found in the *TRRO* makes it appropriate to use the well established instructions for determining ARMIS 43-08 line counts to define Centrex lines. Those instructions provide that each Centrex line is counted as one business line.

The Commission finds that the *TRRO* requires that the line count include each Centrex line as one line, without a factor to reduce the number to one ninth. There is no provision in those rules or the *TRRO* that would permit the reduction by the Centrex equivalency factor as proposed by the CLECs. If the parties believe that such an equivalency factor is appropriate for use in the impairment analysis, they must prevail on that argument before the FCC.

## Number of Collocators

The resolution of issues related to the number of fiber-based collocators present in the Dearborn Fairborn wire center rests on the definition in 47 CFR 51.5, which provides in relevant part:

Fiber-based collocator. A fiber-based collocator is any carrier, unaffiliated with the incumbent LEC, that maintains a collocation arrangement in an incumbent LEC wire center, with active electrical power supply, and operates a fiber-optic cable or comparable transmission facility that

- (1) Terminates at a collocation arrangement within the wire center;
- (2) Leaves the incumbent LEC wire center premises; and
- (3) Is owned by a party other than the incumbent LEC, except as set forth in this paragraph. Dark fiber obtained from an incumbent LEC on an infeasible right of use basis shall be treated as non-incumbent LEC fiber-optic cable. Two or more affiliated fiber-based collocators in a single wire center shall collectively be counted as a single fiber-based collocator. For purposes of this paragraph, the term affiliate is defined by 47 USC 153(1) and any relevant interpretation in this Title.

### 1. Shared Facilities

SBC asserts that it has demonstrated that it has four unaffiliated fiber-based collocators at the Dearborn Fairborn wire center. SBC asserts that Covad and the Staff attempt to read into this definition a requirement that a fiber-based collocator own its own fiber-optic or equivalent transmission facility. Rather, SBC argues, the controlling fact is whether the party operates a fiber-optic or comparable transmission facility, something SBC claims that all of its counted fiber-based collocators do. In the *TRRO*, the FCC stated: “We define fiber-based collocation simply. For purposes of our analysis, we define fiber based collocation as a competitive carrier collocation arrangement, with active power supply, that has a non-incumbent LEC fiber-optic cable that both terminates at the collocation facility and leaves the wire center.” *Id.*, ¶ 61.

Covad argues that one of the collocators included on SBC's list of fiber-based collocators does not operate its own fiber-optic cable that terminates in and leaves the ILEC wire center. It argues that despite SBC's claim that certain facts are undisputed, SBC cannot show that this carrier operates a fiber-optic cable that both terminates at the collocation arrangement within and leaves the wire center. Rather, it argues, SBC is only able to show that this collocator has cross connected to a fiber of another fiber-based collocator on SBC's list. Covad asserts that a cross connect is not the same as operating a cable that terminates within and leaves the wire center.

Moreover, Covad argues, SBC has failed to demonstrate that the collocator uses the fiber pursuant to an indefeasible right of use arrangement, which might be counted as a fiber-based collocator. Covad insists that SBC has failed to meet its burden of proof that this cross-connected collocator meets the FCC definition of a fiber-based collocator. Moreover, Covad argues, the FCC required at least four fiber-based collocators to ensure that there would be multiple competitive fiber rings. Covad states that such fiber rings reduce dependency on the incumbent's facilities and establish the economic opportunity to provide service within the wire center.

The Joint CLECs agree with Covad on this issue. The Joint CLECs assert that counting the one fiber facility as two fiber-based collocators results in double counting, and is directly contrary to the plain language and intent of the *TRRO*. They argue that the *TRRO* provides that each collocator must maintain a collocation arrangement and operate a fiber-optic cable that terminates within the wire center and leaves the wire center. However, the Joint CLECs state, this collocator does not have an entrance fiber at its space or entrance fiber leaving the wire center. Rather, this collocator is connected to another collocation arrangement of a fiber-based collocator on SBC's list. Thus, the Joint CLECs argue, SBC is misapplying the rule when it attempts to treat such a provider as a fiber-based collocator when it does not operate a fiber optic cable. They argue that

the FCC contemplated that, to be counted, collocators should actually deploy and operate their own network facilities. It is the duplicity of deployment, the Joint CLECs argue, that the FCC held would demonstrate the competitive nature of the wire center and availability of multiple fiber rings.

The Staff agrees that counting two fiber-based collocators, where a CLEC shares the collocation facilities of a fiber-based collocator, impermissibly double counts collocators. In the Staff's view, each counted fiber-based collocator must have entrance and exit facilities. During an on-site visit, the Staff states, it was unable to identify four fiber-based collocators as defined by 47 CFR 51.5. Thus, it states, only one of these two collocators should count for purposes of the impairment analysis.

The Commission agrees with Covad, the Joint CLECs, and the Staff that SBC has failed to meet its burden to demonstrate that there are at least four fiber-based collocators at the Dearborn Fairborn wire center. The arrangement in which one CLEC cross connects to the facilities of another CLEC that is a fiber-based collocator does not increase the number of fiber-based collocators for purposes of this analysis. *See* 47 CFR 51.5. Contrary to SBC's arguments, the issue is not ownership, but rather control and operation of fiber facilities. There is no support for finding that this arrangement includes fiber to the collocation cage of the CLEC that cross-connects to the CLEC that does control and operate fiber facilities. Because there are only three fiber-based collocators at the Dearborn Fairborn wire center, the wire center is impaired and Covad is entitled to have its orders for DS1 loops filled.

## 2. Affiliates

For purposes of this analysis, SBC treated AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc. (AT&T), as an unaffiliated fiber-based collocator.

Covad asserts that AT&T should be considered an affiliate of SBC. It argues that SBC's position, that the two cannot be considered affiliate, until and unless the SBC/AT&T merger is completed, must be rejected. Covad asserts that the definition of affiliate adopted by the FCC for purposes of 47 CFR 51.5 is that provided in 47 USC 153(1), which provides:

The term "affiliate" means a person that (directly or indirectly) owns or controls, is owned or controlled by, or is under common ownership or control with, another person. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "own" means to own an equity interest (or the equivalent thereof) of more than 10 percent.

Covad argues that this definition permits affiliation to be shown either by ownership or control, whether directly or indirectly. It asserts that the January 2005 merger agreement, approved by both companies' shareholders, and both parties having sought approval of the merger should be sufficient to meet the FCC's broad definition.

The Joint CLECs agree with Covad and argue that an entity does not need to be directly owned to be an affiliate. Rather, they argue, the definition of affiliation includes any entity directly or indirectly controlled by another, regardless of any ownership share. They argue that the affidavit of Jason Wakefield and Michael Sharkey on behalf of Covad shows a substantial relationship between SBC and AT&T, sufficient to establish, at a minimum, indirect control and, thus, an affiliation between SBC and AT&T. They insist that the facts stated in Covad's affidavit indicate that AT&T's regulatory activity has dramatically dropped since the June 30, 2005 shareholder approval of the merger agreement and both companies have been acting in concert. Moreover, the Joint CLECs argue, the fact that AT&T could not operate successfully as an independent company speaks of the lack of robust competition. The Joint CLECs state that any reliance upon AT&T as an unaffiliated collocator should be rejected.

SBC responds that counting AT&T as an affiliate of SBC is inconsistent with the facts and applicable law. It argues that affiliation under 47 USC 153(1) does not turn on Covad's

interpretation of AT&T's regulatory strategies, or whether 31 of 36 state commissions have approved the merger. An agreement, which, if consummated, would result in AT&T becoming an affiliate of SBC is not the same thing as affiliation. SBC quotes the ICC staff statement that "Unless the agreement is consummated, SBC does not own or control, is not owned or controlled by, and is not under common ownership or control with, another person." SBC argues that compliance with federal law necessary to complete the merger is not a mere formality.

The Staff agrees with SBC's position that AT&T should not be considered an affiliate for purposes of this analysis. In the Staff's view, the claim that SBC and AT&T are not currently affiliated is irrefutable. The Staff states that until the companies are legally affiliated, they should not be treated as such. The Staff states that the FCC intended to have impairment determinations based on objective and readily obtainable facts. Thus, it argues, to open this issue to a different interpretation would be contrary to the FCC's chosen framework.

The Commission finds that this issue is not dispositive of whether the Dearborn Fairborn wire center is impaired under the analysis dictated by the FCC in the *TRRO* and implementing rules. The Commission declines to find on this record that AT&T should be considered an affiliate of SBC. This issue would benefit from more instruction from the FCC as to what it meant by the "indirectly controlled" portion of the analysis. It is apparent that AT&T and SBC have acted in concert to effectuate their agreement to merge. The FCC's definition of an affiliate seems to be broader than the normal legal definition of that term. If the FCC intended that an as yet incomplete merger should be found to establish an affiliate relationship, it may have the opportunity to speak on that issue before, if ever, it arises again at this Commission. However, without such instruction, the Commission will not find that AT&T is an affiliate of SBC until the merger is complete.

The Commission FINDS that:

a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended, MCL 484.2101 *et seq.*; the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 151 *et seq.*; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 *et seq.*; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1999 AC, R 460.17101 *et seq.*

b. SBC's challenge to Covad's self certification concerning the Dearborn Fairborn wire center should be denied, as the wire center is impaired under the analysis established in the *TRRO*.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that SBC Michigan's challenge to Covad Communications Company's self certification concerning the Dearborn Fairborn wire center is denied.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ J. Peter Lark  
Chairman

( S E A L )

/s/ Laura Chappelle  
Commissioner

/s/ Monica Martinez  
Commissioner

By its action of September 20, 2005.

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle  
Its Executive Secretary




Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION



---

Chairman



---

Commissioner



---

Commissioner

By its action of September 20, 2005.



---

Its Executive Secretary