

Du

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

1
2 WILLIAM A. MUNDELL
CHAIRMAN
3 JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER
4 MARC SPITZER
COMMISSIONER
5

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKETED COPY
 KEEP OR DISCARD
 DEC 28 2001
 DEC 31 2001
 RECEIVED
 DOCKETED BY *[Signature]*
 Director of Utilities

6 IN THE MATTER OF U. S. WEST
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S COMPLIANCE
7 WITH SECTION 271 OF THE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

DOCKET NO. T-00000A-97-0238

DECISION NO. 64300

ORDER

8
9 Open Meeting
December 20, 2001
Phoenix, Arizona

10 **BY THE COMMISSION:**

11 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the
12 Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that:

13 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

14 1. On March 9, 2001, the Commission issued Decision No. 63419, conditionally
15 approving Qwest's compliance with Section 271 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996
16 ("1996 Act") Checklist Item No. 3 – Poles, Ducts, Conduits and Rights-of-Way.

17 2. The 1996 Act added Section 271 to the Communications Act of 1934. The purpose of
18 Section 271 is to specify the conditions that must be met in order for the Federal Communications
19 Commission ("FCC") to allow a Bell Operating Company ("BOC"), such as Qwest Corporation
20 ("Qwest" or the "Company"), formerly known as US WEST Communications, Inc. ("US WEST")¹ to
21 provide in-region interLATA services. The conditions described in Section 271 are intended to
22 determine the extent to which local phone service is open to competition.

23 3. Section 271 (c)(2)(B) sets forth a fourteen point competitive checklist which specifies
24 the access and interconnection a BOC must provide to other telecommunications carriers in order to
25 satisfy the requirements of Section 271. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iii) requires a BOC desiring to make
26 an application pursuant to Section 271 to provide or offer to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to
27

28 ¹ For purposes of this Order, all references to US WEST have been changed to Qwest.

1 the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights of way owned or controlled by the [BOC] at just and reasonable
2 rates in accordance with the requirements of section 224.”

3 4. In Decision No. 63419, the Commission found that all issues raised in the Arizona
4 Workshops were resolved and that Qwest met the requirements of Checklist Item No. 3, subject to
5 Qwest updating its SGAT to incorporate language agreed upon by the parties in other region
6 workshops and resolution by the Hearing Division of how to treat issues arising in other jurisdiction
7 after the record in Arizona has closed.

8 5. On March 26, 2001, the Hearing Division issued a Procedural Order setting forth
9 procedures for supplementing the record in Arizona for impasse issues that arise in other jurisdictions
10 after the Workshop has concluded in Arizona. Pursuant to the March 26, 2001, Procedural Order a
11 party may request to supplement the record in Arizona by filing a brief within 10 business days from
12 the date the issue is first declared at impasse in another jurisdiction. Other parties file replies to the
13 request within 7 business days, and Staff files a report, including its procedural and substantive
14 recommendations for the resolution of the dispute.

15 6. On April 9, 2001, AT&T Communications of the Mountain States (“AT&T”) and
16 WorldCom, Inc. (“MCIW”) (collectively “Joint Intervenors”) filed a Request to Supplement the
17 Record Regarding Checklist Items Nos. 3, 7, and 10 with disputed issues raised in other region
18 workshops.

19 7. On April 17, 2001, Qwest filed a response to AT&T’s and MCIW’s Request to
20 Supplement the Record Regarding Checklist Items Nos. 3, 7, and 10.

21 8. On October 12, 2001, Qwest filed a Supplemental Response to AT&T’s and MCIW’s
22 Request to Supplement the Record Regarding Checklist Items Nos. 3, 7, and 10.

23 9. On November 5, 2001, Commission Staff filed its Supplemental Report on Checklist
24 Item No. 3.

25 10. On November 15, 2001, Qwest filed Comments on Staff’s Supplemental Report on
26 Qwest’s Compliance with Checklist Item No. 3.

27 11. The Joint Intervenors identified five issues that had gone to impasse in other
28 jurisdictions and which they sought to have resolved in Arizona.

1 12. The first supplemental impasse issue is whether Qwest's SGAT definition of
2 "Ownership and Control" is appropriate and consistent with the law.

3 13. The Joint Intervenors argue that under the 1996 Act and FCC Orders, the ownership
4 and control analysis that must be conducted under state law is to determine Qwest's ownership or
5 control to afford CLECs access to its right-of-way, easement or other interest in property, and not, as
6 Qwest suggests, to determine Qwest's legal right "to convey an interest" in property. They assert that
7 the ability to afford access based upon an ownership and control analysis may not rise to the level of
8 "conveying an interest." The Joint Intervenors recommend that SGAT Section 10.8.1.5 be revised as
9 follows:

10 The phrase "ownership or control to do so" means the legal right, as a
11 matter of state law, to convey an interest in real or personal property or to
12 afford the access to poles, ducts, conduits and rights-of-way contemplated
13 by the Act.

14 14. Qwest proposes that its Arizona SGAT Section 10.8.1.5 reflects the Facilitator's
15 recommendation in the Multi-State proceeding as follows:

16 The phrase "ownership or control to do so" means the legal right, as a
17 matter of state law, to (i) convey an interest in real or personal property, or
18 (ii) afford access to third parties as may be provided by the landowner to
19 Qwest through express or implied agreements, or through Applicable
20 Rules as defined in this Agreement.

21 15. Staff finds the Multi-State language to be acceptable and recommends that it be
22 adopted in Arizona. Further, to the extent there are other conforming amendments that need to be
23 made to other provisions of SGAT Section 10, Staff recommends that Qwest be required to include
24 those as well and submit all revised SGAT language for review by the parties.

25 16. We agree with Staff, Qwest's proposed definition of "ownership or control to do so"
26 addresses the CLECs' concerns and should be adopted.

27 17. The second supplemental impasse issue is whether Qwest's SGAT definition of
28 "Rights of Way" ("ROW") is consistent with FCC Orders.

 18. Qwest's proposed SGAT Section 10.8.1.3 provides:

 ROW means a real property interest in privately-owned real property, but
 expressly excluding any public, governmental, federal or Native
 American, or other quasi-public or non-private lands, sufficient to permit
 Qwest to place telecommunications facilities on such real property; such

1 property owner may permit Qwest to install and maintain facilities under,
 2 on, above, across, along or through private property or enter multi-unit
 3 buildings, within a multi-unit building, a ROW includes a pathway that is
 4 actually used or has been specifically designed for use by Qwest as part of
 5 its transmission and distribution network where the boundaries of the
 6 pathway are clearly defined either by written specifications or
 7 unambiguous physical demarcation.

8 19. The Joint Intervenors argue that ROW as contemplated by the 1996 Act and the FCC
 9 is not limited to "real property interests" as Qwest defines the term. Furthermore, they assert,
 10 Qwest's definition of ROW in an Multi- Dwelling Unit ("MDU") is not consistent with the FCC's
 11 *MTE Order*.²

12 20. Staff recommends a slight modification to the language Qwest proposed in the Multi-
 13 State proceeding (Staff's recommendation is in bold):

14 10.8.1.3 Rights of Way (ROW) – Where it has ownership or control to
 15 do so, Qwest will provide to CLEC, via an Access Agreement in the form of
 16 Attachment 4 to Exhibit D, access to available ROW for the purpose of placing
 17 telecommunications facilities. ROW includes land or other property owned or
 18 controlled by Qwest and may run under, on, above, along or through public or
 19 private property or enter multi-unit buildings.

20 10.8.1.3.1 ROW means **access to private property owned or controlled**
 21 **by Qwest**, but expressly excluding any public, governmental, federal or
 22 Native American, or other quasi-public or non-private lands, sufficient to
 23 permit Qwest to place telecommunications facilities on real property; such
 24 property owner may permit Qwest to install and maintain facilities under,
 25 on, above, across, along or through private property or enter multi-unit
 26 buildings. Within a multi-unit building, a ROW includes a pathway that is
 27 actually used or has been specifically designated for use by Qwest as part
 28 of its transmission and distribution network where the boundaries or the
 29 pathway are clearly defined either by written specification or
 30 unambiguous physical demarcation.

31 21. In its November 15, 2001 Comments to Staff's Supplemental Report, Qwest states that
 32 Staff's proposed modification could include all property owned or controlled by Qwest, including
 33 ladders, trucks, signage and Qwest offices. Qwest asserts that in its *MTE Order*, the FCC's definition
 34 does not include outright ownership of personal (as opposed to real) property.

35 ² First Report and Order and further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in WT Docket No. 99-217, Fifth Report and Order and Memorandum
 36 Opinion and Order in CC Docket No 96-98, and Fourth Report and Order and Memorandum Opinion and Order in CC Docket No. 88-57,
 37 Promotion of Competitive Networks in Local Telecommunications Markets, WT Docket No. 99-217, CC Dkt Nos. 96-98, 88-57, FCC 00-366
 38 (rel. Oct. 25, 2000)

1 22. In its *MTE Order*, ¶ 76, the FCC states that “rights-of-way in buildings means, at a
2 minimum, defined pathways that are being used or have been specifically identified for use as part of
3 a utility’s transmission and distribution network.” And further, “a right-of-way exists within the
4 meaning of Section 224, at a minimum, where (1) a pathway is actually used or has been specifically
5 designated for use by a utility as part of its transmission and distribution network and (2) the
6 boundaries of that pathway are clearly defined, either by written specification or by an unambiguous
7 physical demarcation.” The FCC’s definition does not limit the concept of right-of-way to real
8 property. It does state that it is a defined pathway. This concept is reflected in Staff’s proposed
9 language. Qwest’s concern that Staff’s language may give access to Qwest property such as “ladders,
10 trucks, signage and Qwest offices,” appears strained, and Qwest has not explained how these items
11 could be seen as part of a defined pathway. Personal property that is part of a pathway and
12 designated or used in the transportation and distribution network would be part of the right-of-way.
13 We believe Staff’s proposed language accurately captures the intent of the FCC Order, and should be
14 adopted. Qwest should revise its SGAT accordingly.

15 23. The third supplemental impasse issue is whether Qwest’s conditions under which it
16 will provide CLECs with access to agreements granting Rights-of-Way are contrary to law or a
17 barrier to entry.

18 24. The Joint Intervenors argue that Qwest’s proposal that it will provide a copy of any
19 ROW agreement in its possession that has not been recorded only after a CLEC has obtained consent
20 of the landowner to the disclosure of the ROW agreement is not required by law and is inconsistent
21 with sound public policy. They argue the consent requirement creates unreasonable costs and
22 imposes significant delays on CLEC access to ROW and provisioning of service using ROW.

23 25. On March 5, 2001, Qwest submitted a proposal in the subloop workshop that permits
24 CLECs to obtain MDU agreements (with landowner consent) so long as the CLEC uses the
25 agreements to make certain Checklist Item No. 3/subloop determinations and does not disclose the
26 agreements to its marketing, sales, or product management personnel.

27 26. Staff believes that requiring CLECs to obtain approval of the landowner in all
28 instances before the CLEC may obtain a copy of the underlying right of way or other landowner

1 agreement is an unreasonable burden on the CLEC. Staff recommends that Qwest should eliminate
 2 the requirement for prior landowner approval before disclosure of underlying landowner/right-of-way
 3 agreements.

4 27. In its November 15, 2001 Comments, Qwest asserts that Staff's concerns are
 5 misplaced given that landowner consent is only one of the two options Qwest proposed for CLECs
 6 desiring to review non-recorded third-party MDU agreements. Qwest explains that if a CLEC does
 7 not wish to execute the Consent to Disclosure form, the CLEC can agree to indemnify Qwest in the
 8 event of any legal action arising out of the disclosure. If the CLEC chooses this option, it is not
 9 required to obtain property owner consent. Qwest states that this is the solution the Multi-State
 10 Facilitator adopted. Qwest states that it has added a third option as well, which permits CLECs to
 11 enter into a protective order. Qwest's proposed SGAT language follows:

12
 13 10.8.2.27 For purposes of permitting CLEC to determine whether
 14 Qwest has ownership or control over duct/conduit or ROW within a
 15 specific multi-dwelling unit, if CLEC request a copy of an agreement
 16 between Qwest and the owner of a specific multi-dwelling unit that grants
 Qwest access to the multi-dwelling unit, Qwest will provide the agreement
 to CLEC pursuant to the terms of this Section. CLEC will submit a
 completed Attachment 1.A from Exhibit D that identifies a specific multi-
 unit dwelling or route for each agreement.

17 10.8.2.27.1 Upon receipt of a completed Attachment 1.A, Qwest will
 18 prepare and return an MDU information matrix, within ten (10) days,
 19 which will identify (a) the owner of the multi-dwelling unit as reflected in
 20 Qwest's records, and (b) whether or not Qwest has a copy of an agreement
 21 that provides Qwest access to the multi-dwelling unit in its possession.
 Qwest makes no representations or warranties regarding the accuracy of
 its records, and CLEC acknowledges that the original property owner may
 not be the current owner of the property.

22 10.8.2.27.2 Qwest grants a limited waiver of any confidentiality rights
 23 it may have with regards to the content of the agreement, subject to the
 24 terms and conditions in Section 10.8.2.27.3 and the Consent to Disclosure
 25 form. Qwest will provide to CLEC a copy of an agreement listed in the
 26 MDU information matrix that has not been publicly recorded after CLEC
 27 obtains authorization for such disclosure from the third party owner(s) of
 28 the real property at issue by presenting to Qwest an executed version of
 the Consent to Disclosure form that is included in Attachment 4 to Exhibit
 D of this Agreement. In lieu of submission of the Consent to Disclosure
 form, CLEC must comply with the indemnification requirements in
 section 10.8.4.1.3 or must agree to be bound by the terms and conditions
 of the Form Protective Agreement set forth in Attachment 5 to the Exhibit
 D of this Agreement.

10.8.2.27.3 (omitted)

10.8.2.27.4 In all instances, CLEC will use agreement only for the following purposes: (a) to determine whether Qwest has ownership or control over ducts, conduits, or rights-of-way within the property described in the agreement and the scope of such ownership or control; (b) to determine the ownership of wire within the property described in the agreement; (c) to determine the demarcation point between Qwest facilities and the Owner's facilities in the property described in the agreement; (d) to determine the legal description of any property interest of a third-party owner, including any metes and bounds of the property; (e) to determine the term of the agreement; and (f) to determine the parties to the agreement. CLEC further agrees that CLEC shall not disclose the content, terms, or conditions of any agreement provided pursuant to section 10.8 to any CLEC agents, or employees engaged in sales, marketing or product management efforts on behalf of CLEC.

28. We acknowledge that currently there might exist agreements between Qwest and a building owner that contain confidentiality or nondisclosure provisions that would purport to prevent Qwest from providing the agreements to a third party. In these cases, we believe that first Qwest should attempt to obtain the building owner's consent to disclose. Qwest should be allowed to recover its reasonable costs, if any, of obtaining the building owner's consent. CLEC's should have the option of obtaining the consent themselves or entering into a protective order or indemnifying Qwest. We also believe that agreements that contain such confidentiality provisions have an anti-competitive effect, and that on a going-forward basis Qwest should not enter into ROW agreements containing provisions that prevent disclosure by Qwest. We concur with Staff and the CLECs that Qwest should make all agreements that do not contain confidentiality provisions available without requiring CLECs to obtain property-owner consent or entering into indemnification or protective agreements. Qwest should revise its SGAT and exhibits to reflect that it is the general rule that CLECs do not need to obtain building owner consent prior to obtaining copies of ROW agreements, but that if existing agreements contain confidentiality provisions that prevent Qwest disclosure, CLECS have the option of requesting Qwest to attempt to obtain owner consent to disclose, obtaining owner consent themselves, indemnifying Qwest, or entering into the protective agreement. We also require Qwest to revise its SGAT to preclude its entering into ROW agreements that contain such confidentiality provisions. We do not intend this prohibition to extend to appropriate proprietary financial and marketing terms of the landowner agreements.

29. The fourth supplemental impasse issue is whether Qwest's requirement that CLECs

1 obtain the agreement of the landowner to provide Qwest with notice and an opportunity to cure
2 before Qwest will provide CLEC access to the ROW is lawful, necessary and/or burdensome.

3 30. In its Supplemental Report, Staff states that Qwest has agreed to eliminate this
4 provision in its Consent regarding Access Agreement. According to Staff, Qwest has agreed to this
5 change in the Multi-State proceeding and has submitted revisions to Section 10.8 and other
6 provisions of Exhibit D to delete references to that form.

7 31. Qwest confirms that it has eliminated the subject provision from its Consent form.
8 With Qwest's agreement, this impasse issue is closed.

9 32. The fifth impasse issue is whether there are circumstances under which Qwest may
10 extend its 45 day deadline for responding to requests for access to Rights-of-Way.

11 33. The Joint Intervenors assert that the timeline Qwest proposes in its Arizona SGAT
12 provides too much time for Qwest to respond to unusually large requests for access to poles, ducts,
13 conduits and rights-or-way, and that FCC rules require Qwest to respond to a request, regardless of
14 size without exception, in 45 days.

15 34. Qwest does not believe that the FCC's rules or decisions contemplate a blanket 45-day
16 response time for large requests. Qwest argues such a blanket requirement is unreasonable because it
17 is impossible to adequately and thoroughly respond to some large requests for access within 45 days.
18 Nonetheless, Qwest has stated that it will amend its SGAT, consistent with the conclusions in the
19 Multi-State workshop, to include a presumption that Qwest will respond to pole, conduit and right-of-
20 way requests in 45 days. Qwest argues that if a CLEC submits an unusually large request for access,
21 or legitimate circumstances prevent Qwest from meeting the 45-day deadline, Qwest should have the
22 opportunity to seek a waiver. The proposed SGAT would permit Qwest to seek relief from that
23 requirement on a case-by-case basis.

24 35. Staff agrees with the CLECs, relying on the FCC rules and orders that require a 45 day
25 response time without any express exceptions. Staff recommends that Qwest modify its SGAT
26 accordingly.

27

28

1 36. In the *Local Competition Reconsideration Order*,³ the FCC held “because time is of
 2 the essence in access requests, a utility must respond to a written request for access within 45 days. If
 3 access is not granted within 45 days of the request, the utility must confirm the denial in writing by
 4 the 45th day.” The FCC affirmed this Rule in *In the Matter of Cavalier Telephone, LLC v. Virginia*
 5 *Electric and Power Company*, 15 FCC Rcd. 9563, June 7, 2000. In *Cavalier*, the FCC was asked to
 6 address the numerous delays the complainant had suffered in obtaining the utility’s approval to attach
 7 to its poles. The electric company had argued it was only required to respond within 45 if it were
 8 going to deny the application. The FCC directed the electric utility to provide immediate access to all
 9 poles for which permit applications had been pending for greater than 45 days. With respect to large
 10 orders, the FCC in *Cavalier* states:

11 We have interpreted the Commission’s Rules, 47 CFR § 1.1403(b), to
 12 mean that a pole owner “must deny a request for access within 45 days of
 13 receiving such a request or it will otherwise be deemed granted.” We
 14 conclude that Respondent is required to act on each permit application
 15 submitted by Complainant within 45 days of receiving the request. To the
 16 extent that a permit application includes a large number of poles,
 17 respondent is required to approve access as the poles are approved, so that
 18 complainant is not required to wait until all poles included in a particular
 19 permit are approved prior to being granted any access at all.

20 FCC orders do not make a distinction based on the number of requests for access. Qwest cites no
 21 authority that would authorize its proposal.

22 37. In its November 15, 2001 Comments, Qwest agrees to adopt Staff’s recommendation
 23 that the SGAT provide no exceptions to Qwest’s obligation to respond to pole, conduit and right-of-
 24 way requests within 45 days.

25 38. With Qwest’s concession to revise its SGAT, this impasse issue is resolved. We
 26 believe Staff’s recommendation is consistent with FCC orders, is reasonable and should be adopted.

27 39. The parties have not identified any other impasse issues affecting Checklist Item No.
 28 3.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

³ *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, First Report and Order, CC Docket No. 96-98, 11 FCC Rcd 15499 (Aug. 8, 1996).

1 1. Qwest is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona
2 Constitution and A.R.S. Sections 40-281 and 40-282 and the Commission has jurisdiction over
3 Qwest.

4 2. The Commission, having reviewed the Supplemental Report on Qwest's Compliance
5 with Checklist Item No. 3, dated November 5, 2001, and conditioned upon Qwest's satisfactory
6 compliance with the findings adopted herein, and further subject to Qwest passing relevant
7 performance measurements in the third-party OSS test, concludes that Qwest has met the
8 requirements of Section 271 pertaining to Checklist Item No. 3, and the Commission hereby approves
9 and adopts the Supplemental Report on Qwest's compliance with Checklist Item No. 3, as modified
10 herein.

11 **ORDER**

12 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Supplemental Report on Qwest's Compliance with
13 Checklist Item No. 3, dated November 5, 2001, as modified herein, is adopted.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Qwest Corporation shall file within 20 days of the effective
15 date of this Order, a revised SGAT incorporating the Findings and Conclusions herein.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that CLECs and other interested parties shall have ten days
17 following Qwest Corporation's filing of the revised SGAT to file written comments concerning the
18 proposed SGAT language.

19 ...
20 ...
21 ...
22 ...
23 ...
24 ...
25 ...
26 ...
27 ...
28 ...


1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Commission Staff shall file within twenty days of Qwest
2 Corporat.on's filing, its recommendation to adopt or reject the proposed SGAT language and a
3 procedural recommendation for resolving any remaining dispute.

4 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Decision shall become effective immediately.

5 BY ORDER OF THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.

6 
7 
8 CHAIRMAN COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER
9 

10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive
11 Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have
12 hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
13 Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix,
14 this 28th day of December, 2001.

15 
16 BRIAN C. McNEIL
17 EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 SERVICE LIST FOR:

U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC. (SECTION
271)

2

3 DOCKET NO.:

T-00000A-97-0238

4

QWEST Corporation
1801 California Street, #5100
Denver, Colorado 80202

Michael W. Patten
ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF
400 E. Van Buren, Suite 800
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

5

6 Maureen Arnold
U S WEST Communications, Inc.
3033 N. Third Street, Room 1010
Phoenix, Arizona 85017

Charles Kallenbach
AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES INC
131 National Business Parkway
Annapolis Junction, Maryland 20701

7

8 Michael M. Grant
GALLAGHER AND KENNEDY
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

Karen L. Clauson
Thomas F. Dixon
MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORP
707 17th Street, #3900
Denver, Colorado 80202

9

10 Timothy Berg
FENNEMORE CRAIG
3003 N. Central Ave., Suite 2600
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

11

12 Mark Dioguardi
TIFFANY AND BOSCO PA
500 Dial Tower
1850 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Richard S. Wolters
AT&T & TCG
1875 Lawrence Street, Room 1575
Denver, Colorado 80202

13

14 Nigel Bates
ELECTRIC LIGHTWAVE, INC.
4400 NE 77th Avenue
Vancouver, Washington 98662

Joyce Hundley
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Antitrust Division
1401 H Street NW, Suite 8000
Washington, DC 20530

15

16 Thomas L. Mumaw
Jeffrey W. Crockett
SNELL & WILMER
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-0001

Joan Burke
OSBORN MALEDON
2929 N. Central Avenue, 21st Floor
P.O. Box 36379
Phoenix, Arizona 85067-6379

17

18 Darren S. Weingard
Stephen H. Kukta
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CO L.P.
1850 Gateway Drive, 7th Floor
San Mateo, California 94404-2467

Scott S. Wakefield, Chief Counsel
RUCO
2828 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1200
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

19

20 Thomas H. Campbell
LEWIS & ROCA
40 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Lyndon J. Godfrey
Patricia L. vanMidde
AT&T
111 West Monroe, Suite 1201
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

21

22 Andrew O. Isar
TRI
4312 92nd Avenue, N.W.
Gig Harbor, Washington 98335

Daniel Waggoner
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE
2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-1688

23

24 Bradley Carroll
Cox Arizona Telcom, L.L.C.
1550 West Deer Valley Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85027

Douglas Hsiao
Jim Scheltema
Blumenfeld & Cohen
1625 Massachuse Ave. N.W., suite 300
Washington, DC 20036

25

26 Richard M. Rindler
Morton J. Posner
SWIDER & BERLIN
3000 K Street, N.W. Suite 300
Washington, DC 20007

Raymond S. Heyman
Robert H. Warner
ROSHKA HEYMAN & DeWULF
400 E. Van Buren, Suite 800
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

27

28

1 Diane Bacon, Legislative Director
COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA
5818 North 7th Street, Suite 206
2 Phoenix, Arizona 85014-5811

3 Mark N. Rogers
Excell Agent Services, L.L.C.
2175 W. 14th Street
4 Tempe, Arizona 85281

5 Robert S. Tanner
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
17203 n. 42ND Street
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85032

7 Mark P. Trinchero
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2300
8 Portland, Oregon 97201

9 Jon Loehman
Managing Director-Regulatory
SBC Telecom, Inc.
5800 Northwest Parkway
10 Suite 135, Room 1.S.40
San Antonio, Texas 78249

11 Lyndall Nipps
Director, Regulatory
12 Allegiance Telecom, Inc.
845 Camino Sure
13 Palm Springs, California 92262

14 M. Andrew Andrade
5261 S. Quebec Street, Suite 150
Greenwood Village, CO 80111
15 Attorney for TESS Communications, Inc.

16 Todd C. Wiley
GALLAGHER & KENNEDY
2575 E. Camelback Road
17 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225

18 Laura Izon
COVAD COMMUNICATIONS CO
4250 Burton Street
19 Santa Clara, California 95054

20 Al Sterman
ARIZONA CONSUMERS COUNCIL
2849 E 8th Street
Tucson Arizona 85716

21 Brian Thomas
TIME WARNER TELECOM, INC.
22 520 S.W. 6th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, Oregon 97204

23 Christopher Kempsey, Chief Counsel
Legal Division
24 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
25 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

26 Ernest G. Johnson, Director
Utilities Division
20 ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
1200 West Washington Street
27 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

28

IN THE MATTER OF QWEST CORPORATION'S
SECTION 271 APPLICATION

ACC Docket No. T-00000A-97-0238

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON QWEST'S COMPLIANCE

With

CHECKLIST ITEM: NO. 3 - POLES, DUCTS, CONDUITS
AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY

NOVEMBER 5, 2001

DECISION NO. 64300

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On March 9, 2001 in Decision No. 63419, the Arizona Corporation Commission approved Checklist Item 3 - Poles, Ducts, Conduits and Rights-of-Way.

2. In the Conclusions of Law portion of the approved Order, Qwest¹ was required to update its SGAT language agreed to in other region Workshops and resolution by the Hearing Division /Commission of the issue of how to treat issues arising in other State Workshops which the parties would like to bring back to Arizona after the record has closed.

3. On March 26, 2001, the Hearing Division of the Commission issued a procedural order indicating that a party may request to supplement the record in Arizona on a checklist item by filing a brief within 10 business days from the date the issue is first declared at impasse in another jurisdiction. Other parties were ordered to file replies to the request within 7 business days, and Staff shall file a report, including its procedural and substantive recommendations for the resolution for the dispute.

4. On April 9, 2001, AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc. ("AT&T") and WorldCom, Inc. ("MCIW") (collectively referred to herein as "Joint Intervenor") filed a request to supplement the record regarding checklist items 3, 7 and 10 with disputed issues raised in other Region workshops.

5. The following issues have been disputed by AT&T and MCIW - access to private landowner/property owner agreements, time for responding to rights-of-way ("ROW") access requests, definitions of ROW and "ownership and control".

B. DISCUSSION

1. Checklist Item No. 3

a. Background

6. Section 271(c)(2)(B)(iii) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 requires a 271 applicant to provide or offer to provide: "[n]ondiscriminatory access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the [BOC] at just and reasonable rates in accordance with the requirements of section 224."

¹ As of the date of this Report, U S WEST has merged with Qwest Corporation, which merger was approved by the Arizona Commission on June 30, 2000. For purposes of this Report, all references to U S WEST have been changed to Qwest.

7. In the *Local Competition First Report and Order*, the FCC interpreted Section 251(b)(4) as requiring nondiscriminatory access to LEC poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way for competing providers of telecommunications services in accordance with the requirements of Section 224.

8. Section 224(f)(1) states that “[a] utility shall provide a cable television system or any telecommunications carrier with nondiscriminatory access to any pole, duct, conduit, or right-of-way owned or controlled by it.”

9. Notwithstanding this requirement, Section 224(f)(2) permits a utility providing electric service to deny access to its poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way, on a nondiscriminatory basis, “where there is insufficient capacity and for reasons of safety, reliability and generally applicable engineering purposes.”

10. Section 224(b)(1) authorizes the FCC to regulate the rates, terms, and conditions for pole attachments to ensure that such rates, terms and conditions are reasonable. Under Section 224(c)(1) the FCC’s jurisdiction does not extend to rates terms or conditions or access to poles, ducts, conduits and rights-of-way in any case where such matters are regulated by a State.

11. Pursuant to Section 224(e)(1), the FCC was required within 2 years of the date of enactment of the 1996 Act, to prescribe regulations to implement the provisions of the Act dealing with charges for pole attachments used by telecommunications carriers to provide telecommunications services to ensure that a utility charges just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory rates for pole attachments.

12. The FCC interpreted the requirements of Section 224 governing rates, terms, and conditions for telecommunications carriers’ attachments to utility poles in the *Pole Attachment Telecommunications Rate Order*.²

13. In its *Local Competition First Report and Order*³, the FCC established five rules of general applicability concerning poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way. First, in evaluating a request for access a utility may continue to rely on such codes as the National Electrical Safety Code (“NESC”) to prescribe standards with respect to capacity, safety, reliability, and general engineering principles. Second, Federal requirements, such as those imposed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (“OSHA”) will continue to apply to utilities to the extent such requirements affect requests for attachments to utility facilities under Section 224(f)(1). Third, the FCC considers State and local requirements affecting pole attachments. Fourth, where access is mandated, the rates, terms, and conditions of

² *In the Matter of Implementation of Section 703(E) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, 13 FCC Rcd. 6777 (rel. February 6, 1998) (“Pole Attachment Telecommunications Rate Order”).

³ *Implementation of the Local Competition Provision in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 15499 (rel. August 8, 1996), *vacated in part and aff’d in part sub nom. Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC*, 120 F.3d 753 (8th Cir. 1997), *overruled in part, AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.*, 119 S. Ct. 721 (1999).

access must be uniformly applied to all telecommunications carriers and cable operators that have or seek access. Except as specifically provided, the utility must charge all parties an attachment rate that does not exceed the maximum amount permitted by the FCC formula. Fifth, a utility may not favor itself over other parties with respect to the provision of telecommunications or video programming services. *Local Competition First Report and Order* at paras. 1151-1153; 1156 and 1157.

14. The FCC in the *BellSouth Louisiana II Order*⁴ specified four elements for establishing a prima facie case for Checklist Item 3:

- a. Evaluating facility requests pursuant to Section 224 of the Act and the *Local Competition First Report and Order*,
- b. Granting competitors nondiscriminatory access to information or facilities availability,
- c. Permitting competitors to use non-[RBOC] workers, and
- d. Compliance with State and Federal rates.

b. CLEC Position

1. Definition of "Ownership and Control"

15. Joint Intervenors argue that Qwest has proposed new definitions of "ROW" and "ownership and control" which are contrary to law and inappropriate.⁵ *Id.* at p. 5. Although Joint Intervenors still have a concern over Section 10.8.1.5 wherein the phrase "ownership or control to do so" means the legal right, as a matter of state law, to "convey an interest in real or personal property", with minor modifications this section would be acceptable. *Id.* at p. 18. Section 10.8.1.5 as revised and proposed by the Joint Intervenors would read as follows:

10.8.1.5 The phrase "ownership or control to do so" means the legal right, as a matter of state law, to convey an interest in real or personal property or to afford the access to poles, ducts, conduits and rights-of-way contemplated by the Act

Id. at p. 19. The recent Multi-state Order also reflects a revised version of Section 10.8.1.5 that is consistent with AT&T's proposal. *Id.*

⁴ *Application of BellSouth Corporation Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended to Provide In-Region InterLATA Services in Louisiana*, CC Docket No. 98-121, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 98-271 (rel. Oct. 13, 1998) ("*BellSouth Second Louisiana Order*").

⁵ AT&T's and WCom's April 6, 2001 Request to Supplement The Record Regarding Checklist Item 3, 7 and 10.

2. Definition of "Rights of Way" - ROW

16. Second, Joint Intervenors state that Qwest proposed revisions to various sub-sections of SGAT Section 10 which defines Rights of Way ("ROW") in a manner which is inconsistent with the FCC's *MTE Order*. *Id.* at p. 17. Specifically, Section 10.8.1.3.1 was revised to state:

10.8.1.3.1 ROW means a real property interest in privately-owned real property, but expressly excluding any public, governmental, federal or Native American, or other quasi-public or non-private lands, sufficient to permit Qwest to place telecommunications facilities on such real property; such property owner may permit Qwest to install and maintain facilities under, on, above, across, along or through private property or enter multi-unit buildings. Within a multi-unit building, a ROW includes a pathway that is actually used or has been specifically designated for use by Qwest as part of its transmission and distribution network where the boundaries of the pathway are clearly defined either by written specifications or unambiguous physical demarcation.

Id. at p. 17-18. ROW, as contemplated by the Act and the FCC is not limited to "real property interests", as Qwest defines that term. *Id.* Also, Qwest's definition of ROW in an MDU context is not consistent with the FCC *MTE Order*. *Id.*

3. Access to MDU Agreements

17. In the Colorado workshop on Checklist Item 3, an issue arose concerning Qwest's provisioning of nondiscriminatory access to ROW. CLECs have disputed Qwest's claim that the agreements Qwest has entered into with private landowners, at least in the multiple dwelling unit ("MDU") context, do not convey ROW and, therefore, Qwest has no obligation to satisfy under Section 251 (b)(4). *Id.* at p. 2. CLECs stated that access to these agreements with private landowners/property owners are vital to ascertaining what ROW Qwest owns or controls and the terms and conditions upon which Qwest has been afforded access. *Id.* at p. 3.

18. The Joint Intervenors contend that access to these agreements is an integral component of Qwest's compliance with Section 271 (c)(2)(B)(iii) and that the disputed issues that remain relating to such access must be considered and resolved before Qwest can be deemed to be in compliance with Checklist Item 3. *Id.*

19. In Colorado, it was agreed that CLECs would execute an Access Agreement (in lieu of the Quitclaim that is now appended to the Arizona SGAT of the record that was filed on July 21, 2000), although the precise content of the Access Agreement was not fully resolved. *Id.* at p. 3-4. In the Arizona SGAT, Qwest did not include any of the language relating to this Access Agreement. *Id.* Reference to the Access Agreement was included into the Multi-state SGAT filed by Qwest and should be incorporated into the Arizona SGAT. *Id.*

20. There are several disputed issues with respect to the Access Agreement. Id. at p. 4. While Qwest has agreed to provide CLECs with all copies of its ROW and MDU agreements, Qwest seeks to impose significant conditions that the CLECs must comply with before such agreements will be provided. Id. Qwest has proposed terms and conditions in the Access Agreement that require CLECs to go through the unnecessary and burdensome effort of gaining 1) the landowner's consent before access to the agreements will be afforded, in cases where the underlying agreement has not been recorded and 2) the landowner's agreement to provide notice and opportunity to cure before Qwest will afford CLECs access to ROW agreements. Id. at p. 4-5. These issues have gone to impasse in Colorado, Washington, Oregon and the Multi-state workshops. Id.

21. Qwest proposes to provide a copy of any ROW agreement in its possession that has not been recorded only after a CLEC has obtained the consent of the landowner to the disclosure of the ROW agreement. Id. at p. 8. CLECs argue that this consent requirement is not required by the law and is inconsistent with sound public policy. Id. Also, since such consent is not required of Qwest itself, or its affiliates, Qwest's consent proposals for CLECs are discriminatory, in violation of both state and federal law. Id. CLECs further argued that it would create unreasonable costs and impose significant delays on CLEC access to ROW and provisioning of service using such ROW, which would constitute a significant barrier to offering the tenants or other customers a competitive alternative. Id.

22. ROW agreements presented to CLECs in the workshops (including Qwest's own Agreement for New Multi-Tenant Residential Properties) do not explicitly require consent to the disclosure of the terms of the agreement to third parties, and do not explicitly require written and acknowledged prior consent. Id. at p. 8-9. Qwest's form agreement contains a restriction on assignment that prohibits the landowner, not Qwest, from assigning the contract. Id. Qwest's Form Agreement for New Multi-Tenant Residential Properties contains a provision that requires the landowner, not Qwest, to notify Qwest of a transfer of the subject property. Id. These agreements clearly contemplate that Qwest may assign ROW access without restraint. Id.

23. These agreements do not contain nondisclosure requirements. Id. at p. 9. Qwest's proposal creates a presumption that all such ROW agreements are confidential and subject to a prohibition against disclosure, which is inappropriate and imposes a needless burden on CLECs to obtain disclosure. Id.

24. Finally, Qwest's proposal does not address the issue of Qwest's obligation with respect to future ROW agreements. Id. at p. 10. In future ROW agreements that Qwest enters into, Qwest must be required to obtain a contractual provision that affirmatively allows the disclosure of these agreements to third parties without prior written consent. Id.

4. Cure of CLEC breaches

25. Qwest's requirement that CLECs obtain the agreement of the landowner to provide Qwest with notice and an opportunity to cure is unlawful, unnecessary and burdensome. *Id.* at p. 10. The law does not mandate that CLECs obtain an agreement from the landowner to provide Qwest with notice and opportunity to cure before Qwest must provide access. *Id.* at p. 11. Neither the Act nor the FCC's rules and orders impose any requirement for a CLEC to obtain the agreement of a landowner to provide notice and an opportunity to cure to Qwest or further agreement of a landowner for access to rights of way. *Id.* While Qwest asserts that this notice and opportunity to cure is required to protect Qwest's interests, CLECs state that there are numerous indemnification and liability provisions in the SGAT to protect Qwest in the event a CLEC acts or fails in a way that exposes Qwest to liability. *Id.* at p. 11-12.

26. Where Qwest demonstrates that certain ROW agreements expressly provide for obtaining the agreement of the landowner to provide notice and an opportunity to cure before permitting "assignment" or other transfer, the Joint Intervenors would not object to inclusion in the SGAT certain limited and reasonable provisions designed to obtain and expedite such landowner agreement wherever necessary. *Id.* However, such provisions must not be burdensome and must ensure that Qwest does not use its incumbent status to impose such landowner agreement requirements on landowners. *Id.* at p. 12-13.

27. CLECs also state that Qwest's consent and notice and opportunity to cure proposals are discriminatory because Qwest requires a CLEC to comply with obligations that are more burdensome to CLECs than to itself. *Id.* at p. 13.

28. Additionally, Qwest's argument ignores the fact that CLECs are similarly at risk of a "default" under ROW agreement by Qwest. *Id.* at p. 13. Qwest deems it unnecessary to require the agreement of the landowner to provide notice and opportunity to cure to the CLEC, nor does Qwest deem it necessary to expressly agree that CLEC can perform under the ROW agreement in the event of Qwest's default. *Id.* Qwest's proposal does not afford a CLEC any protection and such a proposal is discriminatory. *Id.*

29. Joint Intervenors stated that in the preliminary rulings on these issues, the administrative law judges in Washington and Oregon have both considered and rejected Qwest's requirements that CLECs obtain landowner consent before access to ROW and MDU agreements will be afforded. *Id.* at p. 14. For the same reasons as specified by these rulings, the Arizona Corporation Commission should reject Qwest's proposed consent and notice and opportunity to cure requirements and direct Qwest to provide CLECs with full and unconditional access to its ROW and MDU agreements. *Id.* at p. 17.

5. Large Request Response Time

30. Qwest seeks to limit its obligation to respond to requests for access to ROW beyond the 45-day time frame established by the FCC. *Id.* at p. 5. Joint Intervenor argued that Qwest must be required to grant or deny all requests for access to poles, ducts and rights-of-way within 45 days of the receipt of the request in order for the SGAT to be lawful. *Id.* at p. 20. In Section 10.8.4 of the SGAT, Qwest has proposed timelines for responding for requests for access to ROW that are contrary to the 45-day response established by the FCC. *Id.* In the SGAT filed in Arizona, Qwest proposes that it be permitted for large ROW requests to provide an initial response approving or denying a portion of the order no later than 35 days following receipt of the order and continue approval or denial on a rolling basis until it has completed its response to such order. *Id.* This proposal is contrary to law. *Id.* Under the Act, the FCC rules and relevant orders of the FCC, Qwest is required to respond to all requests for access to poles, ducts ROW within 45 days, and there is no basis for excepting large requests from any other request for access to poles, ducts, conduit or ROW. *Id.* Qwest's SGAT must be modified to require responses to all requests for access to poles, ducts and ROW within 45 days consistent with FCC Rule 1.1403. *Id.* at p. 21. Again, the administrative law judges in Washington and Oregon have considered and rejected Qwest's SGAT Section 10.8.4 and have enforced the 45-day response time found in the FCC Rule. *Id.* at p. 23. The Arizona Commission should reject Qwest's effort to alter its clear obligation under FCC Rules and Orders and direct Qwest to revise its SGAT to require it to respond to request for access by approving or denying such requests within 45 days of receipt of the request. *Id.* at p. 26.

c. Qwest Response⁶

1. Definition of "Ownership and Control"

31. The Joint Intervenor state that Qwest's definition of "ownership and control" is inappropriate and that the proper function of this definition is to determine whether Qwest has "ownership and control" to afford the Joint Intervenor *access* to Qwest's right-of-way, easement or other interest in property. *Id.* at p. 2. The Facilitator in the Multi-State proceeding struck a reasonable compromise on this issue that contains aspects of both the Qwest and AT&T proposed language. *Id.* at p. 3. The Facilitator determined that the SGAT should reflect instances in which "ownership or control" arises "by implication" under state law, and that the definition should not necessarily be based on Qwest's ability to receive compensation for providing access. *Id.* It was also determined that AT&T's proposed definition, also proposed in the Request to Supplement the Record, was too broad because it ignored that Qwest's access rights are defined by state law. *Id.*

⁶ Qwest's April 17, 2001 Response to AT&T's and WorldCom's Request to Supplement the Record Regarding Checklist Items 3, 7, and 10.

32. Qwest has agreed to implement the Facilitator's recommendation in the Multi-State proceeding, and neither Joint Intervenor opposes that language. *Id.* at p. 3. To resolve this issue in Arizona, Qwest will also agree to include the same language so long as no other Arizona CLEC objects. *Id.* Staff believes that this is a reasonable compromise and recommends adoption of the Multi-State recommendation.

2. Definition of "Rights of Way" - ROW

33. The Joint Intervenor's oppose the definition of right-of-way that Qwest proposed in the Multi-State proceeding in Section 10.8.1.3.1. *Id.* at p. 4. They claim, without any discussion or citation to a paragraph, that a ROW is not limited to "real property interests, as Qwest defines that term" and that the definition is somehow "not consistent" with the FCC's *MTE Order*. *Id.* Joint Intervenor's later seem to acknowledge the validity of Qwest's definition of a ROW when they state that "the ownership or control analysis that must be conducted under State law is to determine Qwest's ownership or control to afford the CLEC access to its *right-of-way, easement or other interest in property*". *Id.* Joint Intervenor's cryptic opposition to the definition of a ROW, which fails to cite any legal authority in support, does not meet their burden of proving that Qwest's Multi-State definition affects Qwest's compliance with Sections 251 and 271. *Id.*

3. Access to MDU Agreements

34. Qwest argued that there are two issues that are in dispute. First, even though it disagrees that the MDU agreements at issue convey a ROW", Qwest has agreed in other States to provide CLECs with copies of MDU access and ROW agreements Qwest has entered into with third-party property owners that convey a right of access to Qwest so that CLECs may determine if Qwest has access rights it may convey. *Id.* at p. 5. The Joint Intervenor's and Qwest disagree on whether a CLEC should be required to obtain the consent of the third-party property owner prior to Qwest's disclosure of non-recorded agreements, principally MDU agreements, and disagree on the uses to which those agreements could be put by the CLEC. *Id.*

35. On March 5, 2001, Qwest submitted a proposal in the subloop workshop that permits CLECs to obtain MDU agreements (with landowner consent) so long as the CLEC uses the agreements to make certain Checklist Item 3/subloop determinations and does not disclose the agreements to its marketing, sales, or product management personnel. *Id.* at p. 5.

4. Cure of CLEC breaches

36. Qwest proposed that CLECs obtain a landowner's consent to Qwest's notice of opportunity to cure defaults by CLECs or possible breaches by CLECs of the underlying right-of-way agreements as a condition of obtaining access to the right-of-way over which Qwest has ownership or control. *Id.* at p. 9. The Joint Intervenor's state that obtaining this notice and opportunity to cure is too burdensome for CLECs. *Id.*

Although Qwest disagrees with Joint Intervenors' claims, Qwest will delete the Consent Regarding Access Agreement form in Exhibit D that contained the notice and cure obligations. Id. Qwest has agreed to this change in the Multi-State proceeding and submitted revisions to Section 10.8 and other provisions of Exhibit D to delete references to that form. Id.

5. Large Request Response Time

38. The Joint Intervenors state that the timeline Qwest proposed in its Arizona SGAT provides too much time for Qwest to respond to unusually large requests for access to poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way and that FCC rules required Qwest to respond to a request, regardless the size and without exception, in 45 days. Id. at p. 10. Qwest does not believe a blanket 45 day response time for large requests is contemplated by the FCC's rules or decisions and moreover, such a blanket requirement is unreasonable because it is simply impossible to adequately and thoroughly respond to some large requests for access within 45 days. Id.

39. However, if the Commission believes that the schedule Qwest and Joint Intervenors negotiated is insufficient to demonstrate Qwest's compliance with Checklist Item 3, as an accommodation to the Joint Intervenors, Qwest will agree to amend the SGAT, consistent the conclusions reached in the Multi-State workshop, to include a presumption that Qwest will respond to pole, conduit, and right-of-way requests in 45 days. Id. The SGAT will permit Qwest to seek relief from that requirement on a case-by-case basis. Id.

40. In the Multi-State proceeding, AT&T still opposes this resolution, apparently asserting that there should be no exception to the 45-day rule. Id. at p. 11. Neither FCC rules nor the SGAT should require the impossible. If a CLEC submits a unusually large request for access, or legitimate circumstances prevent Qwest's meeting the 45-day deadline, Qwest should be given the opportunity to seek a waiver. Id. Since Qwest will have the burden of justifying the waiver, the Commission should accept this resolution as fully consistent with Qwest's Checklist Item 3 obligations.

e. Discussion and Staff Recommendations

1. Definition of "Ownership and Control"

41. With respect to the definition of "ownership and control", Qwest has agreed to implement the Facilitator's recommendation in the Multi-State proceeding, which Qwest claims neither Joint Intervenor opposes. Qwest states that its proposed definition was taken from the FCC's *Local Competition Order*⁵ and its recent order on access to multi-tenant environments that is very similar to what AT&T seeks herein. While AT&T opposed this language according to Qwest, the recent Multi-State Order

⁵ *Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, First Report and Order, CC Docket No. 96-98, 11 FCC Rcd 15499 (Aug. 8, 1996) ("*Local Competition Order*").

reflects a revised version of Section 10.8.1.5 to which neither AT&T or WorldCom objected. The revised Section 10.8.1.5 reads as follows:

The phrase "ownership or control to do so" means the legal right, as a matter of state law, to (i) convey an interest in real or personal property, or (ii) afford access to third parties as may be provided by the landowner to Qwest through express or implied agreements, or through Applicable Rules as defined in this Agreement.

42. Staff has reviewed the language and finds it acceptable and to be a reasonable compromise between the language proposed by the Joint Intervenors and Qwest. Further, given Qwest's representation that no CLEC objects to this language, Staff recommends its adoption in Arizona. Further, to the extent there are other conforming amendments that need to be made to other provisions of Section 10 of the SGAT (Attachment 2 to Qwest's Response to AT&T and WorldCom's Request to Supplement the Record, Staff recommends that Qwest be required to include those as well. Finally, Staff recommends that Qwest be required to submit all of its revised SGAT language for review by the parties before it is approved.

2. Definition of "Rights of Way" – ROW

43. With respect to the definition of ROW, the Joint Intervenors oppose the definition of ROW that Qwest proposed in the Multi-State proceeding in Section 10.8.1.3.1. The Joint Intervenors argue that a ROW is not limited to "real property interests, as Qwest defines that term" and that the definition is "not consistent" with the FCC's *MTE Order*.

44. Qwest claims that the definition it proposed in the Multi-State proceedings draws almost verbatim from paragraph 82 of the *MTE Order*. Qwest further states that there has been no evidence provided by Joint Intervenors which would indicate that Qwest's proposed language is inconsistent with its obligations under Sections 251 and 271 of the 1996 Act.

45. Staff has reviewed Qwest's proposed language changes to Sections 10.8.1.3, 10.8.1.3.1, 10.8.1.2.1 and 10.8.1.3.1 set forth on page 23 of the Multi-State Facilitator's March 19, 2001 Report and believes that the changes proposed by Qwest should satisfy AT&T's concerns with the two additions which Staff has added in bold print. The revisions read as follows:

10.8.1.3 Rights of Way (ROW) – Where it has ownership or control to do so, Qwest will provide to CLEC, via an Access Agreement in the form of Attachment 4 to Exhibit D, access to available ROW for the purpose of placing telecommunications facilities. ROW includes land or other property owned or controlled by Qwest and may run under, on, above

across, along or through public or private property or enter multi-unit buildings.

10.8.1.3.1 ROW means access to private property owned or controlled by Qwest, but expressly excluding any public, governmental, federal or Native American, or other quasi-public or non-private lands, sufficient to permit Qwest to place telecommunications facilities on such real property; such property owner may permit Qwest to install and maintain facilities under, on, above, across, along or through private property or enter multi-unit buildings.

10.8.1.2.1 The terms Duct and Conduit mean a single enclosed raceway for conductors, cable and/or wire. Duct and Conduit may be in the ground, may follow streets, bridges, public or private ROW or may be within some portion of a multi-unit building. Within a multi-unit building, duct and conduit may traverse building entrance facilities, building entrance links, equipment rooms, remote terminals, cable vaults, telephone closets or building riser. The terms Duct and conduit include riser conduit.

10.8.1.3.1 ROW means access to private property owned or controlled by Qwest, but expressly excluding any public, governmental, federal or Native American, or other quasi-public or non-private lands, sufficient to permit Qwest to place telecommunications facilities on such real property; such property owner may permit Qwest to install and maintain facilities under, on, above, across, along or through private property or enter multi-unit buildings. Within a multi-unit building, a ROW includes a pathway that is actually used or has been specifically designated for use by Qwest as part of its transmission and distribution network where the boundaries of the pathway are clearly defined either by written specifications or unambiguous physical demarcation.

46. Staff recommends that Qwest be required to modify Section 10 of its SGAT as set forth above. Staff recommends that Qwest be required to make conforming amendments to other Sections of the SGAT as necessary. Finally, Staff recommends that Qwest be required to submit any proposed SGAT language to the parties for review prior to its approval.

3. Access to MDU Agreements

47. With respect to access to MDU and other landowner agreements, on March 5, 2001, Qwest submitted a proposal in the subloop workshop that permits CLECs to obtain MDU agreements (with landowner consent) so long as the CLEC uses the

agreements to make certain Checklist Item 3/subloop determinations and does not disclose the agreements to its marketing, sales, or product management personnel.

48. Staff agrees with the Seven-State Facilitator that "[i]t is evident why a CLEC should be allowed an independent determination of those rights, and why it should have access to these agreements." See March 19, 2001 Multi-State Report, at p. 21. Staff, however, believes requiring the CLECs to obtain approval of the landowner in all instances before the CLEC may obtain a copy of the underlying right of way or other landowner agreement is an unreasonable burden on the CLEC. Qwest should be required to eliminate the requirement for prior landowner approval before disclosure of underlying landowner/right of way agreements.

4. Cure of CLEC Breaches

49. Regarding cure of CLEC breaches, Qwest has agreed to delete the Consent Regarding Access Agreement form in Exhibit D that contained the notice and cure obligations. Qwest has agreed to this change in the Multi-State proceeding and submitted revisions to Section 10.8 and other provisions of Exhibit D to delete references to that form. With that change proposed by Qwest, Staff considers this issue now closed.

5. Large Request Response Times

50. Regarding AT&T's and MCIW's concern that the timeline Qwest proposed in its Arizona SGAT provides too much time for Qwest to respond to unusually large requests for access to poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way, Qwest has agreed to amend the SGAT, consistent the conclusions reached in the Multi-State workshop, to include a presumption that Qwest will respond to pole, conduit, and right-of-way requests in 45 days. *Id.* The SGAT will permit Qwest to seek relief from that requirement on a case-by-case basis. AT&T opposes this resolution.

51. Staff agrees with the CLECs. The FCC's rule and orders require a 45 day response period without any express exceptions. Particularly persuasive is the FCC's decision in the *Cavalier Telephone Company* case. In that case, the FCC's decision is clear that the number of poles requested does not alter the requirement to grant or deny access to poles, ducts or rights-of-way within 45 days. *Cavalier Telephone* at para. 15.

52. Staff recommends that Qwest be required to modify its SGAT to be consistent with the above resolution. Staff recommends that Qwest be required to submit its revised SGAT to all parties for review prior to approval.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. 47 U.S.C. Section 271 contains the general terms and conditions for BOC entry into the interLATA market.

DECISION NO. 64300

2. Qwest is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. Sections 40-281 and 40-282 and the Arizona Commission has jurisdiction over Qwest.

3. Qwest is a Bell Operating Company as defined in 47 U.S.C. Section 153 and currently may only provide interLATA services originating in any of its in-region States (as defined in subsection (I)) if the FCC approves the application under 47 U.S.C. Section 271(d)(3).

4. The Arizona Commission is a "State commission" as that term is defined in 47 U.S.C. Section 153(41).

5. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 271(d)(2)(B), before making any determination under this subsection, the FCC is required to consult with the State commission of any State that is the subject of the application in order to verify the compliance of the Bell operating company with the requirements of subsection (c).

6. In order to obtain Section 271 authorization, Qwest must, inter alia, meet the requirements of Section 271(c)(2)(B), the Competitive Checklist.

7. Checklist Item No. 3 requires Qwest to provide "[n]ondiscriminatory access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the [BOC] at just and reasonable rates in accordance with the requirements of section 224."

8. Qwest's provision of access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the [BOC] at just and reasonable rates in accordance with the requirements of section 224 is no longer subject to dispute.

9. Based upon the testimony, comment and exhibits submitted, Qwest complies with the requirements of Checklist Item No. 3.