```
01358
 1
              BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
 2
                  TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
 3
   In re Application of US WEST, ) Docket No. UT-991358
    INC., and QWEST COMMUNICATIONS ) Volume XII
   INTERNATIONAL, INC. for an ) Pages 1358-1397
    Order Disclaiming Jurisdiction,)
   or in the Alternative,
   Approving the US WEST, INC. -
   OWEST COMMUNICATIONS
    INTERNATIONAL, INC. Merger.
 8
 9
10
                       A public hearing in the above
11
   matter was held on April 10, 2000, at 6:03 p.m., at
12
    4600 Columbia Way, S.E., Vancouver, Washington,
13
   before Administrative Law Judge DENNIS MOSS and
14
   COMMISSIONER RICHARD HEMSTAD and COMMISSIONER WILLIAM
15
   R. GILLIS.
16
17
                       The parties were present as
18
   follows:
19
                       US WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC., by
20
    James M. Van Nostrand, Attorney at Law, 600
21
   University Street, Suite 3600, Seattle, Washington
22
   98101.
23
                       THE COMMISSION, by Sally G.
    Johnston, Assistant Attorney General, 1400 S.
24
   Evergreen Park Drive S.W., P.O. Box 40128, Olympia,
    Washington 98504-0128.
25
```

```
01359
                       PUBLIC COUNSEL, by Simon ffitch,
   Attorney at Law, 900 Fourth Avenue, #2000, Seattle,
   Washington 98164.
 3
                       QWEST, by Gina Spade, Attorney at
   Law, Hogan & Hartson, 555 13th Street N.W.,
    Washington, D.C. 20004.
5
 6
 7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
   Barbara L. Nelson, CSR
25 Court Reporter
```

15

16 17

18

19

JUDGE MOSS: Good evening, everyone. My name is Dennis Moss. I am an Administrative Law Judge with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. Sitting to my right this 5 evening, we have Commissioner Richard Hemstad, and to his right, Commissioner Bill Gillis. They're two of the three Commissioners who are the decision-makers in this proceeding, and we all sit in a quasi-judicial capacity tonight, and that's why I'm 9 10 here, as the Judge, to preside over the hearing 11 tonight and to help the Commissioners as they solicit 12 comments from the public. 13

This is the second of four public comment hearings that are part of the Commission's formal hearing process as it considers whether to approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the proposed merger between Qwest Communications International, Inc. and US West, Inc. They hope to complete that merger later this year.

There are basically three things that I
want to do tonight during my time to speak. I want
to offer a few comments about the Commission's
hearing process, I want to introduce a couple more
folks who are sitting up front here, and I want to
explain briefly what you all can do to maximize the

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1 impact of your participation here tonight.

The hearing process. The Commission is a state administrative agency charged with the responsibility to regulate various public utilities, including telephone companies.

When one of those companies proposes a merger, the Commission views that as a change in ownership or control of the assets by which the company provides services to the public. Thus, under the statutes that spell out the Commission's authority, when a merger such as this is proposed, the Commission undertakes an inquiry, which may include formal hearings.

The purpose of the hearings is to provide the Commissioners with information on which they can base a decision about whether the proposed merger is consistent with the public interest.

18 Early in the process, certain Commission 19 employees are designated to work on the case as 20 advocates, and they participate in this formal 21 hearing process in the same sense that US West and 22 Owest participate as parties. These members of the Commission Staff, some of whom are here tonight, then 23 24 have no contact with the three Commissioners, who are 25 the ultimate decision-makers in the case, except

through these open public hearings that we conduct.

Other parties, who similarly have no

contact with the Commissioners outside the hearing

room, are, as I mentioned, the applicants, US West

and Qwest in this case, and various other

telecommunications companies that have chosen to

participate, and the Washington Attorney General's

Office of Public Counsel.

With those parties participating, the Commission completed its formal evidentiary hearings on March 21st. During that phase of the proceedings, the Commission heard testimony and received documents that provide a very significant body of evidence upon which they will ultimately base their decision in large part. But in addition, the Commission conducts hearing sessions, such as this one tonight, to solicit and hear from the -- solicit participation and hear from members of the public.

Your comments this evening will be given under oath and will be recorded just as the testimony during the evidentiary proceedings is sworn and recorded, and your comments will thus become part of the formal record in this case and part of the basis for the Commissioners' decisions.

Once all the public comment hearings are

concluded, and that will be on April 20th, the Commission will spend a period of time studying the record, considering and deciding the issues, and preparing a written order to announce its decision and explain the bases for its decision. That's most likely to occur later this spring or early in the summer.

In some cases, and this happens to be one of them, some or all of the parties will propose to resolve their disputes over various issues by negotiating a settlement agreement. The Commissioners then must decide whether to accept the settlement agreement as a reasonable resolution of the issues. That is, they must decide if the agreements the parties have reached are themselves in the public interest.

You'll hear more about that in a minute from Mr. ffitch, who is sitting here on my left. Mr. ffitch is an attorney who works for the State Attorney General's Office of Public Counsel. Among other things, he assists members of the public to present their comments during sessions such as these, that are a regular part of the Commission's regulatory processes.

In addition to Mr. ffitch, there are some

other folks here tonight that I'll just introduce briefly, and maybe they can rise or raise their hands or something to be recognized. US West and Qwest tonight are represented by several persons. 5 Jamie Van Nostrand is here, representing US West. And I notice Ms. Theresa Jensen is here, as well. She's a representative from the company, US West. Ms. Gina Spade is here with us for Qwest this 9 evening, along with a Mr. Matt Barkett, who's sitting 10 up there in the front. 11 Some of the Commission Staff who are 12 participating as parties are here tonight. Ms. 13 Sally Johnston is here. She's the Counsel for the 14 Commission Staff. And I saw Suzanne Stillwell 15 earlier, and perhaps one or two others, as well. 16 Now, the last point, I want to talk a 17 little bit about how you can maximize the impact of 18 your participation. Those of you who have come 19 tonight do play a key role in the overall process. 20 Let me explain that your time at the podium tonight 21 is not really an opportunity to ask questions about the case, but rather is the opportunity for you to 22 23 make a statement to express any concerns you might 24 have about the proposed merger between US West and 25 Qwest.

It's important that we hear everything that each speaker say, so we do ask you to come up to the podium and speak into the microphone. We ask that you speak up and that you speak slowly and carefully, 5 so that our court reporter can get everything you say down as part of the record. It's important that speakers not be interrupted by comments from others, 7 so please remain silent while others are speaking. 9 We've conducted quite a few of these over 10 the years, and our experience has told us that about 11 five minutes of time is adequate for any individual 12 speaker. You can say quite a lot in five minutes. 13 And of course, we want to give everybody an 14 opportunity to speak. We don't have a particularly large turnout tonight, but we'll still stick with our 15 16 limitation on time and ask that you keep your 17 comments down to that amount of time, and I'll alert 18 you if you are running over. 19 If another speaker has already said what 20 you thought you might want to say, you might just 21 want to refer to that. There's no reason to repeat. 22 You can simply adopt the prior speaker's comments, 23 and that will carry as much weight as if you did 24 repeat them yourself. 25 The Commission Staff, as I've indicated,

and some company representatives are available tonight and Mr. ffitch is available tonight, so at the conclusion of our proceedings, if you have some additional questions, you might take a minute or two, and those people will be available to you.

If you have additional questions later or you can't get answers tonight, you may call the Commission, and I'll put that number on the record. It's 360-664-1160, and just mention this case and your call will be routed to someone who can help you out.

You also have the opportunity to submit additional comments in writing. If you have questions about that opportunity, you can speak tonight with Ms. Penny Hansen, who's standing there at the back of the room, and she's a member of the Commission's public affairs staff and can help you out with that. Any written comments will have to be received by April 20th.

And with that said, we're ready to begin and we'll go through the formality by taking the appearance of Counsel, so I will ask Counsel to do that. Then Mr. ffitch will have a few comments for us. Following his comments, I will swear anyone who wishes to speak, all of you at once tonight. I'll

24

25

swear you in. Then Mr. ffitch will proceed to call you to the podium one at a time, those who wish to speak. And when you finish speaking, please remain 5 at the podium. Mr. ffitch may have a question for you or one of the Commissioners or I may have a 7 question for you. So we will ask you to do that and then we'll release you from the podium and Mr. ffitch will call the next speaker. 9 10 So let's take appearances of Counsel for 11 the record, and let's begin with the applicants. Mr. 12 Van Nostrand, can we have your appearance? 13 MR. VAN NOSTRAND: Thank you, Judge Moss. 14 On behalf of Applicant US West, James M. Van 15 Nostrand. 16 JUDGE MOSS: And Ms. Spade. 17 MS. SPADE: On behalf of Owest, Gina Spade. 18 JUDGE MOSS: Staff. 19 MS. JOHNSTON: Sally Johnston, Assistant 20 Attorney General. 21 JUDGE MOSS: And I don't believe we have 22 any intervenors represented tonight, so I believe 23 that brings us to you, Mr. ffitch.

MR. FFITCH: Simon ffitch, Assistant

Attorney General, for the Office of Public Counsel.

JUDGE MOSS: And the floor, sir, is yours. MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor. As the Judge has indicated, my name is Simon ffitch. I'm an Assistant Attorney General with the Washington State Attorney General's Office of Public Counsel. Public Counsel is the department of the AG's office with the responsibility of representing Washington telephone and electricity and gas customers in regulatory proceedings before the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission.

And my office is involved representing customers in the formal merger case in front of the Commissioners. And we, in general, focus our efforts on the interests of small business and residential telephone customers in this case. We are not a part of the Commission Staff. We are a separate agency, a separate department of the Attorney General's Office, with the specific mandate to speak on behalf of customers.

I think the Judge has done a good job of describing the procedure. Let me point you to some handouts that were made available at the front of the room, and if you didn't get one of these when you came in, I recommend picking one up so you can follow along.

12

13

14

15

24

25

Probably perhaps the most important tonight is the yellow handout, which contains really three main things. The first page is a discussion of the procedure and the status of this merger, the second page is a summary of the terms of the partial agreement that has been reached on some of the merger issues, and then the final sheet is about the schedule for public hearings and gives you names and addresses for getting more information about the case.

Also, for those who would like to read in more detail, a full copy of the partial settlement agreement is available in the back of the room, which you should also pick up. And the Commission also has made available a comment form in the back.

16 If you either don't want to speak tonight, 17 you just want to submit written comments, you can 18 fill out this form. You can hand it in tonight, you can take it home with you and send it in in the mail, 19 20 whatever you choose. Even if you do speak and you 21 have some second thoughts later and want to add them, 22 you can also send this in to the Commission office 23 after you get home tonight.

Finally, there is an information sheet in the back called Facts and Information, Filing an

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Informal Complaint. So if you've come in tonight and you have a particular service problem with either US West or Qwest, for example, that you feel warrants filing a complaint, there is a sheet for you and a complaint form that will help you take care of that. 5 6 I think what I'd mostly like to do with my 7 time this evening is to let you know what is in the partial settlement agreement. Just to give you a bit 9 of background, our office participates as a party to 10 the formal merger case. And we conducted information 11 gathering and filed formal testimony in the case, 12 making certain recommendations to the Commission 13 about conditions that we felt should be imposed on 14 the merger if it were to be approved, and we raised 15 some questions about US West's service quality and 16 other matters. 17

During that early part of the case, we also engaged in discussions, began to engage in settlement discussions with US West and Qwest, along with the Commission's own Staff.

The Commission's own Staff, as the Judge explained, also participates as a separate party in this case. They also filed testimony and made some recommendations about service quality improvements and other matters.

In any event, the result of these discussions was that we were able to reach what we felt was a fair resolution of our concerns with the issues that particularly relate to retail telephone customers. Let me walk you through those particular provisions, so that you know what's in the agreement. There's quite a few of them.

This is a summary overview. If you'd like to know more, you can speak with any of -- you can speak with me afterwards. There are also representatives of the company and the Commission Staff here, so you can get into more detailed questions.

And again, there's a full copy of the agreement in the back for you to read. But let me hit the high points, so that you have a feel for what has been agreed to by my office and the Commission Staff and the companies.

First of all, the agreement contains a service quality performance program, and under this agreement, Qwest will have to refund up to \$20 million per year to customers based on eight service quality standards, covering things like installation of new phone lines, repairing existing lines, answering customer calls promptly and so on. If the

standards outlined in the agreement are not met, then there is the potential for up to \$20 million worth of refunds to customers per year for failure to meet those standards.

Secondly, the agreement requires the adoption of a consumer bill of rights by the company, which will be filed with the Commission and become a part of the company's tariffs.

Thirdly, the company will implement an order confirmation number system so that customers will have an easier time following their order for a particular service with company representatives and so that company representatives themselves will have an easier time responding to customer questions as the order is being worked.

The next provision is a customer service guarantee program -- well, let me rephrase that. Existing customer service quarantees are retained. There are already in existence some customer service guarantees for US West, and those will continue to be honored. One example of those is, for example, if US West currently fails to meet a commitment to install phone service, a \$50 credit is issued to the affected customer. And that will continue in effect under this agreement.

Another important provision is that Qwest will agree to specific investments in the telephone network in the infrastructure in Washington, including upgrading of all analog switches to digital switches and the connection of all US West central offices or switches to the fiber -- to a fiberoptic network.

Some additional service problem protections are also contained in the agreement. Customers can receive a credit if there is no dial tone available to them in their exchange. Customers can also receive a credit if there's an excessive number of service problems or so-called trouble reports in the particular exchange.

In addition, for so-called held orders or unfilled orders, which really are delays in providing an ordered service to customers, and I'm flipping over onto the back of the outline sheet now, which, if you have that in front of you, Qwest has agreed to clear the current backlog of unfilled orders for service.

Qwest has also agreed to improve complaint response in Washington by using Washington-based employees to respond to customer complaints that are filed with the Utilities and Transportation

1 Commission.

The companies have agreed to provide annual service quality reports to consumers. Basically, letting consumers know how they're doing with respect to these various targets that are set out that we've been discussing.

Another significant provision of this agreement is that Qwest is prohibited from increasing regulated telephone rates before 2004, with some exceptions that are set out in the agreement for special circumstances.

In addition to the other provisions I've mentioned, the companies have agreed to spend no less than a million dollars per year for the next three years to extend service to areas that are not currently being served that are within the US West boundaries. These provisions will remain applicable. In the event that a subsequent merger occurs, the agreement provides that a purchaser of US West territories would have to purchase -- as part of that purchase, would have to agree to abide by the provisions of this settlement agreement.

And finally, the agreement provides that the companies will absorb the costs of the merger transaction, and that none of the costs associated

with the merger will be passed on to the ratepayers.

So that's a very quick overview. I've

given you quite a lot of detail there, even though

it's a summary, a lot of information, and hopefully

that gives you a general understanding of what's in

the partial settlement agreement. Again, I will be

here after the meeting and others will be to answer

more detailed questions.

A couple of things to explain about the settlement agreement. Again, I think Judge Moss mentioned this, but this agreement is between my office, the companies, and the Commission Staff. It has not been approved by the Washington UTC yet. That's one of the reasons for this hearing and the other hearings around the state, is to allow the Commissioners to hear comments from the public about this case, generally, and about this settlement. And they will be making a decision after the conclusion of all the hearings.

The other thing to remember is that this settlement does not resolve all the issues in the case. There are some issues still in debate regarding competition. There are other parties to the case, including competitive telephone companies and long distance companies, who have some concerns

about the effect of the merger on the introduction of competition in Washington State. And those issues were litigated at the hearing and are still before the Commission for resolution, so that's why this is referred to as a partial settlement.

I think the Judge, again, has described the procedure for calling witnesses here, but I'll just kind of sort of describe that for you. Again, I'm going to call the names of the people who've signed up, and you will simply then be able to come forward to the microphone and I'll just ask you a couple of basic questions about who you are and your type of telephone service and so on, and then give you an opportunity to make your statement about the merger to the Commissioners and make your statement for the court reporter.

The Administrative Law Judge will swear in everyone who wishes to testify in a group at the beginning of the public testimony portion. If you do have any written statements that you brought with you tonight, I'll be happy to receive those on your behalf, and they'll be submitted to the Commission as an exhibit and made a formal part of the record in the case. And that would include something that you would write out on the comment form tonight that

01377 you'd like to hand in or something -- perhaps a prepared letter or statement that you've brought in with you. So that, I think, gives you an overview of 5 the settlement and of the public testimony procedure for tonight, and at this point, I'll simply wrap up 7 and defer to the Judge for his next step. JUDGE MOSS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. ffitch. 9 I will ask at this time that anyone who would like to 10 give a statement tonight, if you'll please rise and 11 raise your right hand, I'll swear you at this time. 12 Whereupon, 13 All parties wishing to offer comments were duly 14 sworn by Judge Moss and testified as follows: 15 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. ffitch, your first 16 witness. 17 MR. FFITCH: Thank you, Your Honor. J.F. 18 MacDonald. Good evening, Mr. MacDonald. 19 MR. MacDONALD: Good evening.

20 MR. FFITCH: Could you state your full name 21 and spell your last name for the court reporter? 22 MR. MacDONALD: It's Joseph F. MacDonald, 23 M-a-c-D-o-n-a-l-d. 24

MR. FFITCH: And where do you live, Mr.

25 MacDonald?

```
01378
 1
              MR. MacDONALD: I live in Vancouver, at
    16209-B N.E. Eighth Street, Vancouver, 98684.
 3
              MR. FFITCH: And are you a US West
 4
    customer?
 5
              MR. MacDONALD: Yes, I have a private
 6
   phone.
 7
              MR. FFITCH: It's residential phone
 8
    service?
9
              MR. MacDONALD: Residential, right.
10
              MR. FFITCH: And are you testifying tonight
11
    on your own behalf?
12
              MR. MacDONALD: That's right.
13
              MR. FFITCH: Do you have a statement that
14
   you'd like to make regarding the merger?
15
              MR. MacDONALD: Oh, yes, I do. I want to
16
   thank you for the opportunity to come before you all.
17
   My main concern in the merger is where it would leave
18
   the public. I've read your partial agreement,
19
    settlement agreement with Qwest, and it seems like it
20
   was similar to one they had with US West. And as
21
    many people will probably testify, US West didn't
22
    live up to their agreement too well.
23
              So I have a suggestion to make.
                                               I suggest
24
    that, like any contractor, that Qwest post a bond.
25
    If I was going to work for the state and build a
```

23

24

25

bridge, the state would want me to post a bond for the value of that bridge. In the event I didn't finish it, I'd have to pay. They could use the bond to finish the bridge. 5 And I just kind of guessed at the value of the assets of US West here in Washington, but I think 7 somewhere near the value of like \$5 billion, which is a lot of money, of course. 9 MR. FFITCH: I'm sorry, what was the 10 number, five billion? 11 MR. MacDONALD: Five billion would be what 12 their assets in this state would be. I'm not 13 positive, but somebody will know. So that in the 14 event they don't live up to their promises, that we 15 have a bond to go against them with. I realize, in 16 your agreement, you have some provisions for them to 17 pay different sums of money, but in a company of that 18 size, \$20 million isn't really a lot of money. 19 In the recent years, especially in our 20 state to the south of us here, we've seen many 21 mergers. And in most cases, some of the officials of 22 those companies have walked away with quite a bit of

equity in the company. We so far haven't seen too

strong economy. But what's going to happen if our

much ill effect from this, because we've had such a

5

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

economy slows down?

In summary, I believe that a \$5 billion performance bond, that we, the people, would have some control over the company, either the old one or the new one. I can't understand why we should take any risks. We should put all the burdens on them. I personally don't care if they merge or not. Thank you very much.

MR. FFITCH: Thank you. Before you step away, see if there are any questions. I guess I was going to ask if you had a position on whether they should merge or not, and you answered it right at the end. You mentioned that this was similar to another agreement, and I just want to explore that a little better.

15 16 MR. MacDONALD: Well, some of the 17 provisions in your settlement agreement you had with 18 Qwest seemed very close to the provisions you had with US West, as far as the \$50 -- I remember the \$50 19 20 part of it, you know, and that they would provide 21 certain services like this. And just from what I hear from other people who have, like, moved into a 22 23 new home or something, it just doesn't seem like your 24 provision in the settlement that you had with US West 25 or your agreement carry much water with them, because

```
01381
   a lot of people have had a lot of problems.
              So I would just think that if they put up a
   tremendous bond, that they'd be in a hurry to get
   things done, and also, like any contractor, able to
 5
   put a bond up. And they are contracting with us to
   provide us a service. Any other questions?
              JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, Mr. MacDonald.
8
             MR. FFITCH: Appreciate your testimony.
9
   Mary Jo Shannon. Good evening. Would you state your
10
   full name and spell your last name for the record?
11
             MS. SHANNON: Mary Jo, two words, J-o, and
12
   Shannon, S-h-a-n-n-o-n.
13
             MR. FFITCH: And where do you live, Ms.
14
   Shannon?
15
             MS. SHANNON: I live in Seattle, 5024 49th
16
   Avenue South, Seattle, 98119.
             MR. FFITCH: And are you a customer of US
17
18
   West?
19
             MS. SHANNON: Yes.
20
             MR. FFITCH: Residential or business
21
   customer?
22
             MS. SHANNON: Residential.
23
             MR. FFITCH: And are you speaking on behalf
   of yourself or on behalf of an organization tonight?
24
```

MS. SHANNON: On behalf of the Washington

25

24

Coalition for Telephone Choice. MR. FFITCH: And could you describe the 3 organization, please? 4 MS. SHANNON: We are a consumer coalition 5 with an individual membership of over 200 consumers, an organizational membership numbering in the tens of 7 thousands, including Washington Citizen Action and Washington State Range, and our members also include many small businesses from across the state. 9 10 MR. FFITCH: And do you have a statement 11 that you want to make tonight? 12 MS. SHANNON: Yes. 13 MR. FFITCH: Would you please go ahead and 14 make your statement? 15 MS. SHANNON: Sure. Our main purpose, as a 16 coalition, has been to urge competition in the local 17 telephone market. The merger of US West and Owest 18 provides us with an opportunity to share our concerns 19 regarding service quality and competition. 20 21 in the agreement with the Attorney General's Public 22 Counsel Office, Staff of the WUTC, and US West and 23

We are pleased to see the issues dealt with Qwest. We think that service quality has the potential to be greatly improved if the Commission holds the incumbents to the letter of the agreement.

15

16

17

18 19

21

We want the Commission to approve the agreement and to enforce it, the partial agreement.

We are also asking the Commission to work through the impediments to the competition issues. 5 Our belief is that once there are several companies competing to offer services to residential and 7 business customers, service quality will quickly improve. There's nothing better than having a 9 competitor breathing down your neck in a business to 10 quickly improve the way people are treated and the 11 quality of the service rendered. 12

And the technology is changing so quickly, there are many actors wanting to get into the market. The consumer can only benefit from increased competition.

JUDGE MOSS: Ms. Shannon, let me ask you to just slow down just a tad, so the reporter can pick up what you're saying.

MS. SHANNON: Sure. We are also concerned 20 with regional companies offering services in our state. Our experience in the past few years has been 22 the removal of services from the state and consumers 23 often ending up dealing with people in Utah or 24 Colorado, who have no understanding of our local 25 problems.

Also, we're keenly interested in a continuing upgrading of equipment and services locally. It should be unheard of for people in our state not having access to a dial tone. Local people 5 know -- are going to know where growth and development are taking place in the state and where not to be offering second lines when first lines aren't operative. We need the right hand to know 9 what the left hand is doing, and we think that if 10 that is offered by people within our own state, that 11 we have a better chance on those issues. 12 We think that the merger has the potential 13 to improve service quality for consumers in 14 Washington State. We will continue to watch the progress closely and urge our members to attend these 15 16 hearings around the state. We will continue to 17 organize new members and we look forward to a time 18 when competition is really in place in Washington State. Our members want a choice. When we get one, we think we will all be better off. Thank you. 19 20 21 MR. FFITCH: Thank you. So can I ask you 22 to summarize your position on whether the merger 23 should be approved or not? Do you sort of have a 24 thumbs up or a thumbs down view on that or --25 MS. SHANNON: I think the partial agreement

that's been reached is good for consumers, and I think that that part I'm very happy with. I'm concerned about the fact that there's not any kind of agreement on the competition issue, and I would urge 5 the Commissioners to make sure that they're thinking of consumers around those competition issues when it comes time to vote on the merger. But I think the work that you and the Staff has done with the companies is putting us in a better 9 10 position than we are today. So for those reasons, 11 we're in favor of the merger, because we think it 12 brings more to the consumer. 13 MR. FFITCH: Thank you. 14 JUDGE MOSS: Ms. Shannon, thank you very 15 much. Appreciate your testimony. 16 MR. FFITCH: Next person signed up is 17 Susanne Schultz. Could you state your name and spell 18 your last name for the record, please? 19 MS. SCHULTZ: Susanne Schultz, 20 S-c-h-u-l-t-z. 21 MR. FFITCH: And where do you live? 22 MS. SCHULTZ: 520 S.E. Columbia River 23 Just down the road. Drive. 24 MR. FFITCH: You didn't have to come too 25 far tonight, then?

01386 1 MS. SCHULTZ: No. 2 MR. FFITCH: Are you a US West customer? 3 MS. SCHULTZ: I am, and I'm here 4 representing myself. 5 MR. FFITCH: And are you a business or 6 residential customer? 7 MS. SCHULTZ: I was a business customer, and I am now just a residential customer. 9 MR. FFITCH: Please go ahead and make your 10 statement. 11 MS. SCHULTZ: I would like the opportunity 12 to say that I believe that US West should go back and 13 make good from lack of service that they did not --14 that they were not able to issue in the last three 15 years. 16 I had a business located downtown 17 Vancouver, Jessica Klein Interiors, and my building 18 was sold and I was forced to liquidate that and be out in three weeks, and so I had contacted US West to 19 20 be sure I had phone service in the new place that I 21 was moving to. 22 I was without local and long distance 23 service, residential and business, for five months. 24 I received no restitution. I took it all the way to 25 -- don't quote me on this, but I believe it was New

25

York. I went to the Secretary of US West, as high as I could go. I worked every single day to try to get service. I was told many answers, they missed numerous appointments. I have this all documented. 5 It's in my storage, and I've been trying to dig it out, but I haven't gotten to it yet. But I have a very thick file of every single day, with notification of who I've talked to and how I've tried 9 to get this resolved. I did not get anywhere. As a 10 result, I did not own my business by the time I got 11 hooked up. My customers had no way of following me 12 or get in touch with me. 13 I think, to go forward, you have to be able 14 to take care of the customers that you've got before you can go on and, again, add second lines, add more 15 16 services, but yet I got called daily, you know, 17 asking if I would take another service after I got 18 hooked up with them. 19 I am still, to this day, waiting for a 20 credit from US West and I still have a mess of lines 21 in my home after trying to get hooked up right. 22 Numerous technicians, and none of them did the job. 23 And so I think the merger would be good. 24 I'm also concerned, in the end, about local

competition. I'm also an Excel Telecommunications

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

representative. We are going into local, we are coming into local in many areas, currently right now in Texas, so I'm concerned that if we come into the area with local long distance, as well as we're 5 already in long distance, that our customers will get hooked up equally and fairly and fast, but -- so 7 that's my major concern. MR. FFITCH: Have you had a chance to look 9

at the settlement -- partial settlement, and do you have an opinion on that?

MS. SCHULTZ: I did see just a little bit, but, no, I haven't had a chance to really study it. I did go as far as hiring an attorney to look into the case and see what they could do and join maybe others in a cooperative settlement, but he said that they had a non-default clause, so they couldn't do anything for me.

18 MR. FFITCH: Did you contact the Utility 19 Commission with your --

20 MS. SCHULTZ: I did. I went to the 21 Attorney General -- I contacted, as far as the Attorney General, asking, you know, where I could go, 22 23 what I could do next, but -- also, I might state that 24 in this complex straight down the road, there were 25 many people that moved in there that never got hooked

25

Mr. Read?

up for service. It was an absolute nightmare, and a lot of unhappy homeowners in there. There are still problems with the phone lines in that building as of right now. 5 So as the service goes forward and fiber-optics and a chance to get DSL technology and 7 all the new things that are coming, when we can't basically even have a good dial tone, is really a 9 concern to us. 10 MR. FFITCH: Okay. Thank you. 11 MS. SCHULTZ: Thank you. 12 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, Ms. Schultz. 13 MR. FFITCH: I'm having a bit of trouble 14 reading this name. I believe it's Dale Read. MR. READ: That is correct. 15 16 MR. FFITCH: It says you probably would 17 like to speak, but --18 MR. READ: I definitely do at this point. Thank you very much, Mr. ffitch. 19 20 MR. FFITCH: Okay. Please state your name 21 and spell your last name for the record. 22 MR. READ: Yes, my name is Dale Read, 23 R-e-a-d, Junior. 24 MR. FFITCH: Thank you. Where do you live, 01390 MR. READ: I live in Vancouver, I use the mailing address of my business, which is 2001 Main Street, Vancouver, Washington. MR. FFITCH: And are you a US West 5 customer? MR. READ: I'm a US West customer for two 7 businesses and one individual, a total of seven lines. 9 MR. FFITCH: Okay. 10 MR. READ: One family, I should say, one 11 household. 12 MR. FFITCH: And are you testifying on your 13 own behalf, then, this evening? 14 MR. READ: Solely on my own behalf. 15 MR. FFITCH: All right. Please go ahead 16 and make your statement. 17 Thank you. Thank you very much. MR. READ: I thank the Commission for having the hearing here. 18 19 Frankly, I have been appalled over the past several 20 years at what I consider to be absolute incompetence 21 and arrogance of US West. As I will indicate in a moment, I think that Owest shows every promise, 22 23 unfortunately, of being even worse than US West. I

do not see any benefits to the public in this.

Perhaps those benefits are there. Genuinely, I have

24

25

24

25

an open mind on it, I would love to hear about them, but I don't see it at this point. That is perhaps as much the fault of the media, in terms of what they have reported on this, 5 as it is the fault of the applicants themselves. With your permission, I would hand to you a 7 copy of a letter that, by coincidence, I had sent off to WUTC just last week. And then, a couple days 9 later, I saw the announcement of this hearing and 10 felt I should come in person, as well. By way of arrogance, or by way of 11 12 illustration for my point on arrogance, with US West, 13 I've had a couple of minor billing disputes with them 14 through the years. I have written six or eight letters, which have been totally ignored, over a 15 16 period of two years. It is at the point that I just 17 don't even worry about it anymore. I pay what I 18 think I owe and let it go at that. 19 I did have a situation a year ago, when I 20 tried to arrange telephone service for my father in a 21 nursing home, where he then was. They gave me a telephone number and said this is the number to use. 22 23 It was in the state of Washington, but not here in

Vancouver. And when I tried to call that number on

the date when the service was established, I got

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

someone else altogether and called Information, who gave me the original number.

And I then called US West, and I spent over two hours on the phone with US West before they even admitted that it sounded like they had made a mistake and they should look into it and see if they could correct it.

In fact, at that point, it was corrected within 48 hours. The problem is, I don't really think the mistake ever should have been made to begin with, and it certainly shouldn't have taken two hours of my time, or their time, either, to get them to admit and acknowledge that there was a mistake.

I could go on and on, and I have other examples in the letter there. I won't take anyone's time, unless you care, with other examples with US West.

18 Qwest, as I alluded earlier, in my opinion, 19 gives every promise and indication of taking this 20 poor level of service and taking it downhill. 21 a personal example earlier this year, January or February sometime, I did not note the date, where 22 23 they called me on my unlisted residential line. 24 fact, in our home, we have two lines, one listed and 25 one unlisted.

01393 MR. FFITCH: I'm sorry, who made the call 1 to you? MR. READ: Qwest themselves made the call to me. They had some wonderful new phenomenal long 5 distance service and rate plan that I should sign up for, they called it. And I inquired of them how it was that they had gotten my unlisted telephone line to call me for this. And they said, and this is 9 virtually a verbatim quote, We are the telephone 10 company, we have all of the numbers, we will call you 11 if we want to. 12 And I suggested to them that I did not want 13 to be called on my unlisted line and I maintained, in fact, a listed line for that very purpose, and by the 14 way, while they were at it, they could strike me from 15 16 the list for any unsolicited promotions of that 17 nature. If there was a problem with my line or with 18 their receipt of any payment on our line, then I would certainly want to know about it and solve the 19 20 problem.

And he said, We understand your concern, 22 Mr. Read. And I said, Will you promise not to call 23 me again. They said, No, we will not promise. And 24 in fact, it is very obvious why they would not 25 promise, because about one minute later, this very

same gentleman called me up and said, But you didn't even give us a chance to explain about our long distance service. You know, I mean, I don't know how to answer arrogance of that nature. I'll be quite 5 honest. 6 Just in the car tonight, coming to this 7 very meeting, I heard that over in Oregon, and I'm not sure whether it was the Oregon Utilities 9 Commission directly or some affiliate or adjunct 10 group within Oregon state government had, in some 11 manner, sanctioned or cited US -- I'm sorry, not US 12 West, Qwest for slamming. I mean, I thought 13 slamming, you know, went out a couple, three years 14 ago. But apparently Qwest is still at it in Oregon. 15 Yet these are the folks that want to improve our 16 telephone service here, you know, after having the 17 arrogance to bluntly say, We have all of the phone 18 numbers and we will call you if we want to. 19 JUDGE MOSS: Mr. Read, I'm going to have to 20 ask you to sum up now. 21 MR. READ: Thank you very much. I will be 22 happy to. I think the issue here is benefit to the 23 public. It is not corporate empire building or stock 24 trading or wheeling and dealing. I have seen no 25 evidence of benefit to the public. The proposed

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

1 partial settlement, I think, is nickel-dime kind of 2 remedies.

When US West had a nickel-dime remedy imposed on them earlier in my own case, they sent me 5 a rebate check, they gave me a credit on my bill, and we're talking only a couple dollars, and then, having given me the same benefit twice, they charged it back on the bill and, of course, that was a processing 9 cost every time, which increased their cost and 10 increased their base for their rate application. 11 And they never answered the Commission's 12 requests, when I reported this to the Commission. 13 The Commission sent me the e-mail on it, and they 14 were just as arrogant as they were on everything 15 else.

The burden of proof on this matter is clearly before the companies. It is not on the public. And unless there is clear, strong evidence of an attitude of service philosophy for the public of building system capacity so we don't get deadlines or other -- or all circuits are busy, even in making a local phone call, then I think they have not met their burden of proof, and the request should be denied. I thank you very much for your time and courtesy in listening to me this evening.

01396 1 MR. FFITCH: Thank you. 2 JUDGE MOSS: Thank you, Mr. Read. 3 MR. FFITCH: I have in front of me the sign 4 up sheets for people attending this evening, and my 5 review indicates there's no one else who expressed a wish to comment in person. Is there anyone who has 7 come in later, who signed up late or didn't sign up, who wishes to speak at this point? Your Honor, that concludes, I believe, 9 10 therefore, the public testimony portion. Again, if 11 you are here and wish to simply file written 12 comments, there are forms in the back and also the 13 yellow handout gives the addresses for sending in 14 letters after the fact. 15 JUDGE MOSS: I want to thank the witnesses 16 and thank you, Mr. ffitch, for assisting with the process. I would like to mention, with respect to 17 18 the written comments we received, Mr. ffitch received 19 from Mr. Read tonight, and any others that we 20 receive, these will be made part of the record during 21 the April 20th proceeding. They will be offered, and I expect without objection at that time, and will 22 23 become part of the record in the ordinary course. 24 Okay. 25 COMMISSIONER HEMSTAD: I'd just like to say

```
01397
   thank you all for coming. We appreciate your
   comments and appreciate your taking the time this
   evening to help us.
             JUDGE MOSS: With that, I believe our
 5
   public hearing can be brought to a conclusion. And
   again, thank you very much. We'll go off the record.
              (Proceedings adjourned at 6:51 p.m.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```