BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Joint Application of

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS INTERNATIONAL INC. AND CENTURYTEL, INC.

For Approval of Indirect Transfer of control of)
Qwest Corporation, Qwest Communications
Company LLC, and Qwest LD Corp.

Docket No. UT-100820

SPRINT NEXTEL CORPORATION'S AND T-MOBILE WEST CORPORATION'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO QWEST'S AND CENTURYTEL'S JOINT MOTION FOR SUPPLEMENT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER

Pursuant to the Commission's Notice of Opportunity to Respond to Joint Motion for Supplemental Protective Order dated July 19, 2010, Sprint Nextel Corporation ("Sprint Nextel") and T-Mobile West Corporation ("T-Mobile") file this Response in opposition to Qwest's and CenturyTel's Joint Motion for Supplement to Protective Order (the "Motion").

A. The Joint Applicants Have Failed to Justify the Extraordinary Restriction They Seek.

The Commission has not created a third tier of confidential protection in recent merger proceedings but has used, without incident, the two-tier confidential classification system in Order 01 in this docket.¹ The Motion provides no concrete justification for restricting access of highly relevant confidential information to "Staff's Eyes Only" ("SEO").

Instead, it claims the sort of generalized fear of "competitive harm" that is the basis for

¹ In the Matter of the Joint Application of EMBARQ CORPORATION and CENTURYTEL, INC., For Approval of Transfer of Control of United Telephone Company of the Northwest d/b/a Embarq and Embarq Communications, Inc., Docket UT-082119, Protective Order with "Highly Confidential Provisions (2009); In the Matter of the Joint Application of VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC. AND FRONTIER COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION, For an Order Declining to Assert Jurisdiction Over, or, in the Alternative, Approving the Indirect Transfer of Control of Verizon Northwest, Inc., Docket UT-090842, Protective Order with "Highly Confidential" Provisions(2010); In the Matter of the Joint Application of VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC., AND MCI, INC., For Approval of Agreement and Plan of Merger, Docket UT-050814, Protective Order (2005).

the already restrictive "Highly Confidential" designation in Order 01. This designation restricts access to outside counsel and consultants who warrant their lack of involvement in "competitive decision making", who agree to be bound by the restrictions of the Protective Order and who agree to use the Highly Confidential information only for the purpose of this case. The Joint Applicants do not explain why the foregoing protections are insufficient or present any prima facie case of actual competitive harm. The Commission should not establish a new, troubling precedent that limits a party's ability to participate in a major merger proceeding based only upon rank speculation.

- The alleged precedent cited by the Joint Applicants from Docket UT-030614 (Order No. 7) does not apply to a merger proceeding where the Commission must review the transaction for consistency with the public interest WAC 480-143-170. Docket No. UT-030614 dealt with Qwest's petition for competitive classification of its basic business exchange telecommunications services. The very essence of that proceeding was whether their services were subject to effective competition. The Commission, in Order No. 6 in Docket No. UT-030614, required all Washington competitive local exchange carriers ("CLEC's") to provide competitive information to Commission staff for data aggregation to ascertain the level of CLEC competition. The Commission entered Order No. 7 to protect the CLEC's company-specific market-sensitive data filed to comply with Order No. 6. Creation of a SEO approach was limited to the requirements of that case, which had a more narrow focus than the instant proceeding.
- In sum, the type of information the Joint Applicants want to designate as SEO is the same type of information protected by a "Highly Confidential" description in other merger proceedings. They present no persuasive reason why their merger proceeding should be treated differently.

3

B. The Proposed "SEO" Documents Have Relevance to this Proceeding.

The Joint Applicants claim that the SEO information has little or no relevance, so their requested restrictions are insignificant. To the contrary, much of the SEO information is relevant to the wholesale services provided to Sprint Nextel, T-Mobile and other interveners. See No.'s 13, 15, 18, 22, 24 and 25 from the List of Item 4(c) Attachments. Sprint Nextel and T-Mobile need this information to understand how the merger will impact the services they buy from the Joint Applicants. Not only should this information not be designated as SEO, it should be classified only as Confidential so Sprint Nextel and T-Mobile in-house counsel and staff have access to prepare their testimony. In addition, access charges are relevant to the Commission's public interest examination. The Commission must examine the factor of "[t]he impact on competition at the wholesale and retail level, including whether the transaction might distort or impair the development of competition." Therefore wholesale arrangements and access charges must be considered in this case. Documents relating to these issues should be made more accessible, not less, by use of SEO designations.

C. <u>A Third Category of Confidentiality Will Pose Unnecessary Administrative Burdens.</u>

The Joint Applicants underestimate the administrative burden of dealing with three levels of confidentiality with respect to the preparation of, dissemination of, and use at hearing of an additional super-secret SEO category. As noted above SEO information **is** relevant and will be discussed. Staff and Public Counsel would have to prepare four sets of testimony because of the restrictions sought by the Joint Applicants. The first would contain an unredacted version that would only be seen by the ALJ, the Commission, Staff

5

6

7

² See in the Matter of the Joint Application of Verizon Communications, Inc., and Frontier Communication Corporation For an Order Declining to Assert Jurisdiction Over, or in the Alternative, Approving the Indirect Transfer of Control of Verizon Northwest, Inc., Docket UT-090842, Order 06, Final Order Approving and Adopting, Subject to Conditions, Multiparty Settlement Agreements and Authorizing Transaction (April 16, 2010) at p. 53.

and Public Counsel. The hearing room would have to be closed any time SEO information is mentioned.

- The second set would have to be redacted to cover SEO, Highly Confidential and Confidential information. This could be disseminated and used by everyone.
- The third set would redact SEO, but not Highly Confidential and Confidential Information, for use by outside counsel and outside experts.
- The fourth set would redact SEO and Highly Confidential Information, but not Confidential Information for use by both inside and outside counsel and experts.

 Adhering to the proper descriptions at all times will create a logistical nightmare.

 Furthermore, the Joint Applicants' request puts additional burdens on the ALJ and the parties because the ALJ would be called upon to decide the competitive sensitivity of a document without any assistance from parties who would be in a better position to assess the sensitivity, from a business perspective. Yet the parties will not be able to see them and will have to rely upon the non-specific descriptions given to the documents by the Joint Applicants, who have every interest in providing vague descriptions.³

D. Conclusion.

The Motion should be denied for all the foregoing reasons.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 27th day of July, 2010.

GRAHAM & DUNN PC

Judith A. Endejan, WSBA# 11016, Tel. (206) 624-8300

Fax: (206) 340-9599

Email: jendejan@grahamdunn.com Attorneys for Sprint Nextel Corporation

³ A good example of the difficulty posed by the Motion are Items 10 and 11 on the List of Item 4(c) Attachments. They are virtually identical in description but only one would be labeled SEO. There would be no meaningful way to challenge this description based upon such scant information.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE Docket No. UT-100820

I hereby certify that on July 27, 2010, the original and 15 copies of Sprint Nextel Corporation's and T-Mobile West Corporation's Response In Opposition To Qwest's And Centurytel's Joint Motion For Supplemental Protective Order were sent by email and Federal Express to:

David S. Danner Secretary and Executive Director c/o Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Records Department 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW Olympia, WA 98504-7250

I hereby certify that I have this 27th day of July, 2010, served a true and correct copy of the Sprint Nextel Corporation's and T-Mobile West Corporation's Response In Opposition To Qwest's And Centurytel's Joint Motion For Supplemental Protective Order upon the parties of record, via the method(s) noted below, properly addressed as follows:

Arthur A. Butler	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
Ater Wynne LLP	Hand Delivered
601 Union Street, Suite 1501	Overnight Mail
Seattle, WA 98101-3981	Facsimile Transmission
Tel: 206.623.4711	xx Email
Tax: 206.467.8406	
Email: aab@aterwynne.com	
Eman. udo@uterwymie.com	
On behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC	
Greg Rogers	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
Senior Corporate Counsel	Hand Delivered
Level 3 Communications, LLC	Overnight Mail
1025 El Dorado Boulevard	Facsimile Transmission
Bloomfield, CO 80021-8869	xx Email
Tel: 720.888.2512	
Fax: 720.888.5134	
Email: greg.rogers@level3.com	
Elimin BrognoBergero and the second	
On behalf of Level 3 Communications, LLC	

U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email

Stephen S. Melnikoff U.S. Army Litigation Division Regulatory Law Office 901 N. Stuart Street, Suite 700 Arlington, VA 22203-1837 Fax: 703.696.2960 Email: Stephen.melnikoff@hqda.army.mil	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
On behalf of Department of Defense and All Other Federal Executive Agencies	
Katherine K. Mudge Director, State Affairs & ILEC Relations Covad Communications Company 7000 N. Mopac Expressway, 2 nd Floor Austin, TX 78731 Fax: 512.514.6520 Email: kmudge@covad.com On behalf of Covad Communications Company	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
Jennifer Cameron-Rulkowski State of Washington 1400 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW P.O. Box 40128 Olympia, WA 98504-7250 Email: jcameron@utc.wa.gov On behalf of Commission Staff	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
Michele Singer-Nelson Penny Stanley 360networks (USA) inc. 370 Interlocken Boulevard, Suite 600 Broomfield, CO 80021 Email: Mnelson@360.net Penny.stanley@360.net On behalf of 360networks	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email

Calvin Simshaw CenturyLink 805 Broadway Vancouver, WA 98660 Email: calvin.simshaw@centurylinkl.com On behalf of CenturyLink	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
Marguerite E. Friedlander 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250	xx U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission Email
Gregory J. Kopta Davis Wright Tremaine LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200 Seattle, WA 98101-3045 Fax: 206.757.7700 Email: gregkopta@dwt.com On behalf of Covad, XO, twtelecom Integra	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
Karen L. Clauson Integra Telecom, Inc. 6160 Golden Hills Drive Golden Valley, MN 55416 Fax: 763.745.8459 Email: klclauson@integratelecom.com On Behalf of Integra	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
Rex Knowles XO Communications Services, Inc. 13865 Sunrise Valley Drive Herndon, VA 20171 Fax: 801.983.1667 Email: rexknowles@xo.com On behalf of XO	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email

Lyndall Nipps Tw telecom 845 Camino Sur Palm Springs, CA 92262-4157 Email: lyndall.nipps@twtelecom.com On behalf of twetelecom	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
Gregory Merz Gray, Plant, Mooty, Mooty & Bennett, P.A. 500 IDS Center 80 South Eight Street Minneapolis, MN 55402 Fax: 612. 632.4257 Email: Gregory.merz@gpmlaw.com On behalf of Integra	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
James C. Falvey Senior Regulatory Counsel Pac-West Telecomm, Inc. 420 Chinquapin Round Road Suite 2-I Annapolis, MD 21401 Email: jfalvey@pacwest.com	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
On behalf of Pac-West K.C. Halm Davis Wright Tremaine LP 1919 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20006 Email: kchalm@dwt.com On behalf of Charter	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email
Michael R. Moore Charter Communications 12405 Powerscourt Drive St. Louis, MI 63131 Email: Michael.moore@chartercom.com On behalf of Charter Fiberlink	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid Hand Delivered Overnight Mail Facsimile Transmission xx Email

William Haas	U.S. Mail, Postage Prepaid
Vice President Regulatory and Public Policy	Hand Delivered
PAETEC Communications, Inc.	Overnight Mail
1 Martha's Way	Facsimile Transmission
Cedar Rapids, IA 52233	xx_ Email
Email: William.haas@paetec.com	
_	
On behalf of PAETEC	

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 27th day of July, 2010, at Seattle, Washington.

Rachel Acosta

Assistant to Judith A. Endejan