

Brooks E. Harlow
brooks.harlow@millernash.com
(206) 777-7406 direct line

December 15, 2004

VIA ELECTRONIC-MAIL & FEDERAL EXPRESS

Carole J. Washburn
Executive Secretary
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
Post Office Box 47250
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW
Olympia, Washington 98504-7250

Subject: Docket No. UT-043013

Dear Ms. Washburn:

Advanced TelCom, Inc., BullsEye Telecom, Inc., Covad Communications Company and KMC Telecom V Inc. (collectively the "Competitive Carrier Group"), through their attorneys and in response to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission's December 10, 2004 Notice Inviting Responses, hereby files this letter in support of the Joint Motion for Extension of Time to File Initial Briefs filed on December 9, 2004 by AT&T Communications of the Pacific Northwest, Inc. and AT&T Local Services on behalf of TCG Seattle, TCG Oregon (collectively "AT&T") and MCImetro Access Transmission Services LLC ("Motion for Extension") with additional time requested.

As anticipated in the Motion for Extension, the FCC has adopted new unbundling rules and has issued a press release regarding these new rules. A copy of the press release is attached to this letter. As demonstrated by the press release, the upcoming FCC order and rules (which could be released in a matter of days, weeks, or longer) will have a significant impact on the contract negotiations as well as the issues identified for briefing by the parties in this proceeding. Accordingly, it would be a waste of limited resources to brief existing issues by December 21, 2004 only to have go through the exercise again to incorporate the FCC's new rules.¹ As aptly stated by AT&T and MCI, "it makes little sense for the parties to brief issues and expect the ALJ to make decisions regarding those issues where the very foundation upon which such arguments and decisions are based may be altered so as to make them moot, or worse yet, illegal." Motion for Extension at 2.

¹ To underscore this point, the CCG is not aware of any other state commission that is requiring briefing at this stage, before the parties can review, interpret and negotiate the new rules.

Carole J. Washburn
December 15, 2004
Page 2

Although the Motion for Extension requests an extension until January 5, 2005, the CCG submits that this may not be sufficient time. Additional time will likely be necessary to consider the FCC's new rules, negotiate these new rules and identify issues for briefing. If the Commission is concerned with keeping to the established procedural schedule, the Commission should consider setting January 21, 2005 as the initial briefing date. The Commission had already set this date for initial briefs if hearings were required. Accordingly, the Commission should use this already-established date for initial briefs with responsive briefs due February 18, 2005 and the Arbitrator's Report and Decision due March 18, 2005. Such a minor modification would allow the parties additional time to consider and negotiate the FCC's new rules and still maintain the schedule adopted by the Commission.

For these reasons, the CCG respectfully requests that the Commission grant the Motion for Extension filed by AT&T and MCI, with the additional time discussed above, to allow the parties adequate time to consider and negotiate the FCC's new rules and prevent any waste of limited time and resources of the parties and the Commission.

Very truly yours,

Handwritten signature of Brooks E. Harlow, written in cursive, with the text "Brooks Harlow / by D. Rice" written over it.

Brooks E. Harlow

cc w/enc: All Parties of Record



NEWS

Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D. C. 20554

News Media Information 202 / 418-0500
Internet: <http://www.fcc.gov>
TTY: 1-888-835-5322

This is an unofficial announcement of Commission action. Release of the full text of a Commission order constitutes official action.
See *MCI v. FCC*, 515 F.2d 385 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
December 15, 2004

NEWS MEDIA CONTACT:
Mark Wigfield, 202-418-0253
Email: mark.wigfield@fcc.gov

FCC ADOPTS NEW RULES FOR NETWORK UNBUNDLING OBLIGATIONS OF INCUMBENT LOCAL PHONE CARRIERS

New Network Unbundling Rules Preserve Access to Incumbents' Networks by Facilities-Based Competitors Seeking to Enter the Local Telecommunications Market

Washington, D.C. – The Federal Communications Commission today adopted rules concerning incumbent local exchange carriers' (incumbent LECs') obligations to make elements of their network available to other carriers seeking to enter the local telecommunications market. The new framework builds on actions by the Commission to limit unbundling to provide incentives for both incumbent carriers and new entrants to invest in the telecommunications market in a way that best allows for innovation and sustainable competition.

The rules directly respond to the March 2004 decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit which overturned portions of the Commission's Unbundled Network Element (UNE) rules in its Triennial Review Order. We provide a brief summary of the key issues resolved in today's decision below.

- **Unbundling Framework.** We clarify the impairment standard adopted in the *Triennial Review Order* in one respect and modify its application in three respects. *First*, we clarify that we evaluate impairment with regard to the capabilities of a *reasonably efficient* competitor. *Second*, we set aside the *Triennial Review Order's* "qualifying service" interpretation of section 251(d)(2), but prohibit the use of UNEs for the provision of telecommunications services in the mobile wireless and long-distance markets, which we previously have found to be competitive. *Third*, in applying our impairment test, we draw reasonable inferences regarding the prospects for competition in one geographic market based on the state of competition in other, similar markets. *Fourth*, we consider the appropriate role of tariffed incumbent LEC services in our unbundling framework, and determine that in the context of the local exchange markets, a general rule prohibiting access to UNEs whenever a requesting carrier is able to compete using an incumbent LEC's tariffed offering would be inappropriate.
- **Dedicated Interoffice Transport.** Competing carriers are impaired without access to DS1 transport except on routes connecting a pair of wire centers, where both wire centers contain at least four fiber-based collocators or at least 38,000 business access lines. Competing carriers are impaired without access to DS3 or dark fiber transport except on routes connecting a pair of wire centers, each of which contains at least three fiber-based collocators or at least 24,000 business lines. Finally, competing carriers are not impaired without access to entrance facilities connecting an incumbent LEC's network with a competitive LEC's

network in any instance. We adopt a 12-month plan for competing carriers to transition away from use of DS1- and DS3-capacity dedicated transport where they are not impaired, and an 18-month plan to govern transitions away from dark fiber transport. These transition plans apply only to the embedded customer base, and do not permit competitive LECs to add new dedicated transport UNEs in the absence of impairment. During the transition periods, competitive carriers will retain access to unbundled dedicated transport at a rate equal to the higher of (1) 115% of the rate the requesting carrier paid for the transport element on June 15, 2004, or (2) 115% of the rate the state commission has established or establishes, if any, between June 16, 2004 and the effective date of this Order.

- **High-Capacity Loops.** Competitive LECs are impaired without access to DS3-capacity loops except in any building within the service area of a wire center containing 38,000 or more business lines and 4 or more fiber-based collocators. Competitive LECs are impaired without access to DS1-capacity loops except in any building within the service area of a wire center containing 60,000 or more business lines and 4 or more fiber-based collocators. Competitive LECs are not impaired without access to dark fiber loops in any instance. We adopt a 12-month plan for competing carriers to transition away from use of DS1- and DS3-capacity loops where they are not impaired, and an 18-month plan to govern transitions away from dark fiber loops. These transition plans apply only to the embedded customer base, and do not permit competitive LECs to add new high-capacity loop UNEs in the absence of impairment. During the transition periods, competitive carriers will retain access to unbundled facilities at a rate equal to the higher of (1) 115% of the rate the requesting carrier paid for the transport element on June 15, 2004, or (2) 115% of the rate the state commission has established or establishes, if any, between June 16, 2004 and the effective date of this Order.
- **Mass Market Local Circuit Switching.** Incumbent LECs have no obligation to provide competitive LECs with unbundled access to mass market local circuit switching. We adopt a 12-month plan for competing carriers to transition away from use of unbundled mass market local circuit switching. This transition plan applies only to the embedded customer base, and does not permit competitive LECs to add new switching UNEs. During the transition period, competitive carriers will retain access to the UNE platform (*i.e.*, the combination of an unbundled loop, unbundled local circuit switching, and shared transport) at a rate equal to the higher of (1) the rate at which the requesting carrier leased that combination of elements on June 15, 2004, plus one dollar, or (2) the rate the state public utility commission establishes, if any, between June 16, 2004, and the effective date of this Order, for this combination of elements, plus one dollar.

Action by the Commission, December 15, 2004 by Order on Remand (FCC 04-290). Chairman Powell, Commissioners Abernathy and Martin, with Commissioners Copps and Adelstein dissenting. Chairman Powell, Commissioners Abernathy, Copps and Adelstein issuing separate statements.

Wireline Competition Bureau Staff Contact: Jeremy Miller, 418-1507; Email: jeremy.miller@fcc.gov

-FCC-

News about the Federal Communications Commission can also be found
on the Commission's web site www.fcc.gov.

**SEPARATE STATEMENT OF
CHAIRMAN MICHAEL K. POWELL**

RE: Unbundled Access to Network Elements (WC Docket No. 04-313); Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (CC Docket No. 01-338)

Today's decision crafts a clear, workable set of rules that preserves access to the incumbent's network where there is, or likely will be no other viable way to compete. The rules have also been carefully designed to pass judicial muster, for I hope we have learned that illegal rules, no matter their other merits, are no rules at all. For eight years, the effort to establish viable local unbundling rules has been a litigation roller coaster. Regrettably, years of fierce battles to bend the rules entirely toward one sector or another without proper respect for the legal constraints have contributed to a prolonged period of uncertainty and market stagnation.

This item decidedly does not attempt to make all sides happy. Consequently, one will undoubtedly hear the tortured hand-wringing by incumbents that they are wrongly being forced to subsidize their competitors. They have a legal duty to provide access under limited conditions and they do protest too much in arguing for the end of vast portions of their unbundling requirements. Conversely, one can expect to hear dire predictions of competition's demise from those who wanted more from this item. Time will show this will not be so. Business models may change, but competition and choice for consumers in the information age will continue to grow and thrive.

After repeated defeats in court, the Commission has heeded the call to apply a meaningful impairment analysis to switching. Therefore, while commercial agreements can be established to offer UNE-P services, such services are no longer legally compelled. We recognize, however, that during the years of wrangling over the lawfulness of UNE-P, companies have sold phone service to significant numbers of consumers using this now thoroughly legally discredited business approach. While we cannot justify the continuation of this approach, we see the need and obligation to minimize the impact on consumers by providing a smooth transition of these customers to other alternatives. To accomplish this, we have adopted a significantly longer transition than first proposed. In addition to the six months already provided by our Interim Order, we will extend the transition into early 2006. We are confident this will mean less disruption for customers and provide time for quickly emerging alternatives—not the least of which include cable telephony, wireless and VoIP—to root in the market.

Facilities competitors are favored under the Act and Commission policy and we have attempted to permit wide unbundling for the key elements of loops and transport, where there is clear and demonstrable impairment. Recall that two years ago all five Commissioners stood together in requiring substantial unbundling of virtually all loops and transport. The Court rejected that effort. So today we have tried again to satisfy the court, while preserving access to incumbent's networks outside the most competitive and

densest business districts. Incumbents made forceful attempts to remove the majority of these elements, but the record and our analysis demonstrated that competitors still depended significantly on them in the overwhelming majority of markets and, thus, we have required unbundling in those circumstances. We did not just check off the CLEC holiday list, however, and were careful to draw the lines tightly, understanding the rigors of the statutory impairment test and the inevitable need to withstand judicial challenge. Where loops or transport are removed, we also provide substantial transition periods to avoid disruption.

Over the course of the past few months, the five commissioners have worked very hard together to craft a solution that all of the offices could support. Ultimately, although my colleagues' insights and proposals improved the final result, we could not bridge the gap to reach a unanimous result that I felt could pass judicial muster. Finally I would be remiss if I did not praise the extraordinary efforts and leadership of the Wireline Competition Bureau and our Office of General Counsel, particularly Jeff Carlisle, Austin Schlick, Michelle Carey, Tom Navin, Russ Hanser and Jeremy Miller. They have been tireless advocates for a rigorous decision that advances the public interest. We all owe them a debt of gratitude.

In 1996, no one could have guessed that nearly a decade later the FCC would be on its fourth attempt to develop local competition rules that are lawful. We hope to end that here and now, for the market cannot possibly continue another day plagued by an ever-shifting regulatory foundation. We can only hope that the fourth time is the charm.

**STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER KATHLEEN Q. ABERNATHY**

Re: Unbundled Access to Network Elements; Review of Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, WC Docket No. 04-313, CC Docket No. 01-338, Order on Remand (adopted Dec. 15, 2004).

Section 251 of the Communications Act directs the Commission to make unbundled network elements available to competitors, but it provides little guidance as to *which* elements should be made available in *which* markets. Three times in the past eight years the Commission has endeavored to answer those bedeviling questions, and three times our rules have been rejected as overbroad by the courts of appeals (including by the U.S. Supreme Court). Regardless of one's policy views regarding the appropriate degree of mandatory unbundling, we must put an end to the debilitating cycle of court reversals and the resultant marketplace uncertainty. As a veteran of the competitive sector, I have great sympathy for carriers that crafted business plans in compliance with our rules, only to have the rug later pulled out from under them. The only responsible solution to this problem is to adopt rules that comply faithfully with the decisions of the D.C. Circuit and the Supreme Court, so that we can *finally* move forward with stable rules in place.

Notwithstanding that non-negotiable constraint on our discretion, the Commission worked hard to find ways to make transmission facilities available wherever true bottlenecks exist, consistent with the court's guidance. Building on our earlier decisions to eliminate unbundling obligations for most broadband facilities and optical-capacity transport and loop facilities, we have phased out the unbundling of circuit switching and significantly curtailed unbundling of higher-capacity (DS-3 and dark fiber) transmission facilities. These decisions recognize, as the court directed, that the costs of unbundling outweigh its benefits in markets where high revenue potentials have already led to significant competition or create a strong potential for it to develop. At the other end of the spectrum, we have established an obligation to unbundle the vast majority of DS-1 loop facilities, and significant amounts of DS-1 transport, in light of the many factors that typically make duplication of such facilities uneconomic. In short, while the issues are extremely complex and defy facile solutions, the Order we are adopting succeeds in promoting facilities-based competition while faithfully complying with judicial mandates.

Where I part ways with my dissenting colleagues is my unwillingness to vote for proposals — such as nationwide impairment findings or tests that focus exclusively on actual competition, to the complete exclusion of potential competition — that are flatly inconsistent with the D.C. Circuit's decision in *USTA II*. That decision is unquestionably the law of the land, and we are duty-bound to adhere to it. Were it not for past overreaching, the D.C. Circuit in all likelihood would have accorded us greater deference and also refrained from *vacating* (as opposed to merely remanding) our unbundling rules. In any event, it would be a pyrrhic victory for competitive carriers if the Commission at this stage were to reinstitute unbundling frameworks that have already been rejected and cannot be sustained on appeal. The ensuing disruption and dislocation that would result

— particularly if the court did not permit a further freeze on unbundling requirements that are vacated once again — would prove crippling to the competitive industry. I am confident that this Order on Remand, by contrast, can serve as the blueprint for sustainable facilities-based competition, and, in turn, a high degree of innovation, choice, and other consumer benefits.

**STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL J. COPPS,
DISSENTING**

Re: *Unbundled Access to Network Elements, Review of the Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*, Order on Remand (WC Docket No. 04-313, CC Docket No. 01-338)

We are living in a new world when it comes to wireline competition. It is not a world of my making or my choosing, and I am deeply troubled by the conviction that this new world will be characterized by dramatic changes that will negatively impact American consumers. In decision after decision over the past three years, this Commission has taken actions curbing competition and limiting consumer choices, in the process straying far from the paradigms of competition laid out in the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

Our challenge today is to craft rules that will be acceptable to the courts and true to our statutory directives. I entered this remand proceeding hopeful that we could reach a compromise that would ensure some future for competition among wireline service providers and to provide a decent future for facilities-based carriers. We have had a long and serious dialogue over this item, extending through most of the night and right into today. I appreciate my colleagues' willingness to engage in this discussion and to make the effort to achieve consensus. Unfortunately, in the final analysis, consensus eluded us. I thought we were getting close, but we couldn't cross the finish line. I cannot support the decision that resulted.

What we have in front of us effectively dismantles wireline competition. Brick-by-brick, this process has been underway for some time. But today's Order accomplishes the same feat with all the grace and finality of a wrecking ball. No amount of rhetoric about judicially sustainable rules and economically efficient competitors can hide the bang-up job this Commission has done on competition. During its tenure, the largest long distance carriers have abandoned the residential market. And as a result of today's decision, other carriers will follow suit. In their wake we will face bankruptcies, job losses and customer outages. Billions of dollars of investment capital will be stranded. And down the road consumers will face less competition, higher rates and fewer service choices.

After having abandoned residential competition earlier, today the majority also hangs up on small business consumers. Small business likes competition. It has voted with its feet for competition. In fact, the Small Business Administration tells us that in metropolitan areas competitive carriers serve 29 percent of small businesses. The inroads competitive carriers have made in this community are important, because small business is the engine of our economy. Small businesses generate between two-thirds and three-quarters of all new jobs in this country. They represent over 90 percent of employers and they produce over half of the nation's private sector output. The savings they enjoy from competitive telecommunications services go straight to the bottom line. But the

majority's action today pulls the bottom out from under small business competition. It places restrictions on access to high-capacity loop and transport facilities that are vital for carriers serving small businesses. It imposes economically unsound tests. In short, it burns the bridges competitive carriers have made in serving the small business community.

For a Commission that has laced its decisions with praise for facilities-based competition, today's action is a funny way of showing its continued support. As a result of this decision there will be less competition, less choice and higher rates. The people who pay America's phone bills deserve better. I dissent.

Some would have us believe that this is the road we have to travel in the wake of court decisions. Yet it is this Commission that refused to seek review of the very court decisions they now claim constrain us.

Though I do not join this decision today, I wish to thank the Commission staff for their hard work on this item. This proceeding—and its predecessor—have not been easy. But throughout the Bureau has been helpful, candid and generous with their time. I am grateful for their devotion to the task at hand and hope that there is some well-deserved time for rest and relaxation in the weeks ahead.

**STATEMENT OF
COMMISSIONER JONATHAN S. ADELSTEIN,
DISSENTING**

Re: Unbundled Access to Network Elements, WC Docket No. 04-313; Review of Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers, CC Docket No. 01-338 (Dec. 15, 2004).

With this Order, the Commission officially cuts the cord on the local competition provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the companies and investors which sought to deliver on the promise of the Act, and the American consumers – to whom that promise was made. By fundamentally undermining facilities-based competition, the Commission relegates consumers to an inevitable future of higher rates and fewer choices. Regrettably, and unnecessarily, the Commission's action will ratchet up rates for both residential consumers and small businesses, which are so central to our nation's economic growth.

By not defending the Commission's prior decision before the Supreme Court, the majority placed itself in a box, in effect a coffin for telecom competition. Now, the majority buries telecom competition six feet under. The only choice I was given was where to pound in the nails. I cannot support this decision, because it will force consumers and businesses to pay higher prices and have fewer choices.

Throughout this proceeding, I have sought to take a careful and balanced view of the benefits and burdens of our unbundling rules. The record here, however, overwhelming demonstrates that competitors need access to critical bottleneck elements from the incumbents' legacy networks in order to connect their networks to their customers. Yet, today the Commission denies access to those elements with an overbroad decision that is divorced from the requirements of the statute, the direction of the courts, and the realities of providing telephone service.

Most stark is the Commission's treatment of local loops, which carry telephone traffic from customers' locations to a service provider's network. These local loops act as the on and off ramps to reach the alternative facilities-based networks that competitors have constructed at considerable expense. In this Order, the Commission adopts unbundling rules for these elements that are strangely disconnected from the operational and economic barriers a competitor would face if it had to duplicate the incumbent's legacy network. This blow to competition and choice comes with a certain slight of hand, couched by the majority as "inference tests" compelled by the courts. But "inferences" aside, there should be little doubt about the real-world implications of this Order. By cutting facilities-based competitors off from access to essential network elements, the Commission undermines choice for small and medium size business customers across the country, let alone all consumers. In my view, these small business customers have yet to realize the wave of rate increases to come.

Nowhere, though, will this disconnection be as pronounced as in the largest metropolitan markets. These are areas where competitors have been able to gain a tenuous but growing foothold, building out their own networks closer to consumers, just as this Commission repeatedly encouraged them to do. Investors, who have committed billions of dollars of private investment in facilities-based wireline competition, have argued persuasively that the type and

locations of their facilities were selected precisely to mesh with loop and transport elements leased from incumbent carriers as unbundled network elements pursuant to the Act. These investors have emphasized that their investments are “essentially worthless” and that “further investments will not be forthcoming,” without access to those elements leased from the incumbents. No “inferences” are required to understand the true effect of today’s decision on investment.

The message from the facilities-based competitive industry has been clear: this Order will be devastating. It will create dislocation not only for telecommunications companies and their employees, but it will disrupt service for thousands of businesses that rely on them. Given the importance of the cutting-edge services these upstarts provide, this decision is bound to be a drag on the growth of our overall economy. While some argue it will spur investment, it is more likely to diminish it, as competitors who would otherwise invest are forced out of business and incumbents face less pressure to respond to their offerings.

Today’s decision also marks the demise of UNE-based competition for residential consumers. For millions of residential consumers, that translates into fewer choices and higher prices. The majority concludes here that this residential competition, predicated on the availability of unbundled local switching, is unsustainable under existing legal precedent. Despite these protestations, the majority all but ensured this result.

I note with appreciation that the majority at least took some of our suggestions. Applying strict eligibility criteria to stand-alone UNE loops would have drastically limited competitors’ ability to provide data services, which this Commission has touted as the future of the telecommunications market. Also, I appreciate the majority’s willingness to extend slightly the transitions available to competitors who have invested so much in the effort to fulfill the goals of the 1996 Act. I would have supported relief more in line with the Commission’s transition approaches used in other proceedings, where the Commission has been granted great deference to fashion transitional remedies.

Moreover, I have serious concerns that consumers may experience unnecessary service disruptions as their providers of choice are forced to exit the marketplace or as carriers rush to convert to new systems. To safeguard against this upheaval, it will be imperative that our State commission colleagues monitor the re-absorption, like the proverbial rat in a python, of millions of consumers who have chosen competitive alternatives. Our failure to address this possibility more comprehensively shows unnecessary disregard for consumers who have signed up with competitors -- for such disruptions would come through no fault of their own.

While I strongly dissent from this Order, I want to thank my colleagues for their candor in approaching these issues. I am deeply disappointed that we cannot find common ground on this result, but I respect their opinions and our dialogue. Some may argue the dissenters drove too hard a bargain and let the perfect be the enemy of the good. I weighed heavily this concern but cannot agree. The disconnect between the Commission’s pro-competitive statements and the anti-competitive policies adopted here is too wide to sanction. The Commission’s lofty promises and assurances directed this summer at facilities-based competitors ring hollow in this Order. Beyond rhetoric, the harm to competition and consumers is too great a price for the constrained and ineffectual approach outlined in this Order. Finally, I find this Order dismissive of Congress’s vision that the 1996 Act would allow facilities-based competitors to grow and to get

a foothold in the market by relying on elements like loops and transport that they need to do business. For all these reasons, I respectfully dissent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
UT-043013

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been provided via electronic mail and U.S. Mail, postage prepaid to the following parties:

DIRECTOR – CONTRACT PERFORMANCE &
ADMINISTRATION
VERIZON WHOLESALE MARKETS
600 HIDDEN RIDGE
IRVING TX 75038

RICHARD POTTER
VICE PRESIDENT
VERIZON NORTHWEST INC
PUBLIC POLICY AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
1800 - 41ST STREET
EVERETT WA 98201

VICE PRESIDENT AND
ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL
VERIZON WHOLESALE MARKETS
1320 N. COURT HOUSE ROAD, FLOOR 8
ARLINGTON VA 22201

TIMOTHY J O'CONNELL
STOEL RIVES
600 UNIVERSITY ST.
STE 3600
SEATTLE WA 98101

AARON M PANNER
KELLOG, HUBER, HANSEN,
TODD & EVANS, P.L
1615 M STREET NW, STE 400
WASHINGTON DC 20036-3209

PRESIDENT
TEL WEST COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
3701 S. NORFOLK STREET, STE 300
SEATTLE WA 98118

GENERAL COUNSEL
T-MOBILE USA INC
12990 SE 38TH ST.
BELLEVUE WA 98006

JOHN P ANDRIST
PRESIDENT
NCI DATA.COM, INC.
700 B OKOMA DRIVE
OMAK WA 98841

IRINA ARMSTRONG
REGULATORY CONTACT
METROPOLITAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS
OF WASHINGTON
44 WALL STREET, FL 14TH
NEW YORK NY 10005

SCOTT BEER
ICG TELECOM GROUP, INC.
GOVERNMENT AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
161 INVERNESS DRIVE WEST
ENGLEWOOD CO 80112

ROBERT BENSON
TARIFF SUPPORT
FOX COMMUNICATIONS CORP.
5210 CARILLON POINT
KIRKLAND WA 98033

PENNY H BEWICK
NEW EDGE NETWORK, INC
D/B/A NEW EDGE NET
3000 COLUMBIA HOUSE BLVD., STE 106
VANCOUVER WA 98661

LON E BLAKE
DIRECTOR OF REGULATORY AFFAIRS
ADVANCED TELCOM, INC.
3723 FAIRVIEW INDUSTRIAL DR. SE.
SALEM OR 97302

KIMBERLEY A BRADLEY
SENIOR DIRECTOR OF REGULATORY AFFAIRS
WINSTAR COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
1850 M STREET, N.W., STE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20036

MICHAEL J BRADSHAW
POWERTELNET COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
PO BOX 1150
PROSSER WA 99350

STEVEN C CLAY
PRESIDENT
NEW ACCESS COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
801 NICOLLET MALL, STE 350
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55042

JOHN COONAN
WASHINGTON RSA NO. 8 LIMITED
PARTNERSHIP
C/O INLAND CELLULAR TELEPHONE COMPANY
PO BOX 171
ROSLAND WA 98941

CHRIS CROWE
PAC-WEST TELECOMM, INC.
1776 MARCH LANE
STE 250
STOCKTON CA 95207

BARBARA FILLINGER
REGULATORY MANAGER
IONEX COMMUNICATIONS NORTH, INC.
2020 BALTIMORE
KANSAS CITY MO 64108

RUDOLPH GEIST
O1 COMMUNICATIONS OF WASHINGTON, LLC
770 L ST., STE 960
SACRAMENTO CA 95814

BECKY GIPSON
DIRECTOR
EXCEL TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC
REGULATORY AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
1600 VICEROY DRIVE
DALLAS TX 75235

KEN GOLDSTEIN
METROCALL, INC.
6677 RICHMOND HIGHWAY
ALEXANDRIA VA 22306

BERNARD CHAO
COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY
110 RIO ROBLES
SAN JOSE CA 95134-1813

TOM COOK
COOK TELECOM, INC.
2963 KERNER BLVD.
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901

DALE CROUSE
PRESIDENT
PREMIERE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS, INC.
4509 INTERLAKE AVE. N
110
SEATTLE WA 98103

MICHAEL E DAUGHTRY
UNITED COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,
D/B/A UNICO
497 SW CENTURY DR., STE 200
BEND OR 97702

LETTY FRIESEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS
OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST
1875 LAWRENCE STREET, FL 15
DENVER CO 80202

MR GEOFF GEORGE
GENERAL MANAGER
MARATHON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
1550 N 34TH ST, # 200
SEATTLE WA 98109-2904

JOHN GLICKSMAN
VICE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL
ADELPHIA BUSINESS SOLUTIONS OPERATIONS
ONE NORTH MAIN ST.
COUDERSPORT PA 16915

ROBERT T HALE
PRESIDENT/CEO
GRANITE TELECOMMUNICATIONS, LLC
234 COPELAND STREET
QUINCY MA 02169

KEN HANKS
SENIOR TAX ANALYST
INTERNATIONAL TELCOM, LTD.
417 - 2ND AVENUE WEST
SEATTLE WA 98119

KARINE HELLWIG
SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6390 SPRING PKWY
MS: KSOPHT010-Z2400
OVERLAND PARK KS 66251-2400

SCHULA HOBBS
DIRECTOR OF REGULATORY AFFAIRS
DSLNET COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
545 LONG WHARF DRIVE, FL 5
NEW HAVEN CT 06511

KAREN JOHNSON
CORPORATE REGULATORY ATTORNEY
INTEGRA TELECOM OF WASHINGTON, INC.
19545 N.W. VONNEUMANN DR.
STE 200
BEAVERTON OR 97006

REX KNOWLES
XO WASHINGTON, INC
1111 EAST BROADWAY
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111

DEANNE LAIDLER
US CELLULAR:
8410 W. BRYN MAWR STE 700
CHICAGO IL 60631

ARTHUR L MAGEE
COMPTROLLER
BUDGET PHONE, INC.
PO BOX 19360
SHREVEPORT LA 71149

SAM G MAROPIS
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
REGULATORY/MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS
SBC TELECOM, INC.
1010 N. ST. MARY'S, ROOM 13K
SAN ANTONIO TX 78215

ROBERT E HEATH
VICE PRESIDENT
AMERICAN FIBER NETWORK, INC.
9401 INDIAN CREEK PARKWAY, STE 140
OVERLAND PARK KS 66210

TRE HENDRICKS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
UNITED TELEPHONE COMPANY
OF THE NORTHWEST
902 WASCO STREET
HOOD RIVER OR 97031

WILLIAM P HUNT III
VICE PRESIDENT, PUBLIC POLICY
LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
1025 EL DORADO BLVD
BROOMFIELD CO 80021

DENNIS KELLEY
DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS
(PROVISIONING)
1-800-RECONEX, INC. (T633)
2500 INDUSTRIAL AVENUE
HUBBARD OR 97032

GREGORY J KOPTA
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE
2600 CENTURY SQUARE
1501 FOURTH AVENUE
SEATTLE WA 98101-1688

TRUDY M LONGNECKER
TARIFF & REGULATORY ANALYST
RCN TELECOM SERVICES, INC.
105 CARNEGIE CENTER
PRINCETON NJ 08540

DIMITRI MANDELIS
PRESIDENT
COMPUTERS 5*, INC., D/B/A LOCALTEL
341 GRANT RD.
EAST WENATCHEE WA 98802

PAUL MASTERS
ERNEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
5275 Triangle Pkwy, STE 150
NORCROSS GA 30092-6511

FELICIA MAYO
POINT OF CONTACT
COMM SOUTH COMPANIES, INC.
REGULATORY AFFAIRS
8035 EAST R.L. THORNTON FREEWAY, STE 410
DALLAS TX 75228

DANIEL MELDAZIS
SENIOR MANAGER REGULATORY AFFAIRS
FOCAL COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION
OF WASHINGTON
200 NORTH LASALLE ST., STE 1100
CHICAGO IL 60601

ANDREW METCALFE
PRESIDENT
NORTHWEST TELEPHONE, INC.
1630 N. WENATCHEE AVE., STE 9
WENATCHEE WA 98801

JILL MOUNSEY
DIRECTOR-EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
AT&T WIRELESS SERVICES, INC.
7277 164TH AVE. NE
REDMOND WA 98052

CARL NICKENS
SR. COUNSEL
PACIFIC BELL WIRELESS NORTHWEST, LLC
5565 GLENRIDGE CONNECTOR, STE 1700
ATLANTA GA 30346

JON PESNELL
CONTROLLER
PREFERRED CARRIER SERVICES, INC. (T953)
14681 MIDWAY ROAD, STE 105
ADDISON TX 75001

JILL SANFORD
SENIOR ATTORNEY
ABOVENET COMMUNICATIONS, INC
360 HAMILTON AVENUE
WHITE PLAINS NY 10601

TIMOTHY M SEAT
Z-TEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
601 S. HARBOUR ISLAND BLVD, STE 220
TAMPA FL 33602

BOB MCCOY
GENERAL COUNSEL
WILLIAMS LOCAL NETWORK, INC.
4100 ONE WILLIAMS CENTER
TULSA OK 74172

BECKI MERKEL
COST ACCOUNTANT II
MCLEODUSA TELECOMMUNICATIONS SVCS.
6400 C ST., SW
P.O. BOX 3177
CEDAR RAPIDS IA 52405-3177

NICOLE MIZELL
REGULATORY SPECIALIST
VARTEC TELECOM, INC.
1600 VICEROY DRIVE
DALLAS TX 75235

CATHERINE MURRAY
MANAGER, REGULATORY AFFAIRS
ESCHELON TELECOM OF WASHINGTON, INC.
730 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH, STE 1200
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

WILLIAM OBERLIN
BULLSEYE TELECOM, INC.
25900 GREENFIELD ROAD, STE 330
OAK PARK MI 48237

DAVID M PIKOFF
VICE PRESIDENT
DPI-TELECONNECT, L.L.C.
2997 LBJ FREEWAY, STE 225
DALLAS TX 75234

THOMAS SAWATZKI
HIGHSPEED.COM LLC
6W ROSE ST.
STE 500
WALLA WALLA WA 99362

MICHEL SINGER NELSON
ATTORNEY
WORLD.COM, INC.
707 17TH ST., STE 4200
DENVER CO 80202

DAVID L STARR
DIRECTOR, REGULATORY COMPLIANCE
ALLEGIANCE TELECOM OF WASHINGTON, INC.
9201 NORTH CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY
DALLAS TX 75231

TERESA S REFF
SENIOR FINANCIAL ANALYST
GLOBAL CROSSING LOCAL SERVICES, INC.
REGULATORY AFFAIRS
1080 PITTSFORD VICTOR ROAD
PITTSFORD NY 14534

RICHARD STEVENS
PRESIDENT
CENTEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
PO BOX 25
GOLDENDALE WA 98620-0025

LANCE TADE
ELECTRIC LIGHTWAVE, INC
4 TRIAD CENTER, STE 200
SALT LAKE CITY UT 84180

MARY TAYLOR
REGULATORY MANAGER
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE
PACIFIC NORTHWEST
2120 CATON WAY SW, STE B
OLYMPIA WA 98502

MARY TAYLOR
TCG SEATTLE
2120 CATON WAY SW, STE 3
OLYMPIA WA 98502

BRIAN THOMAS
TIME WARNER TELECOM OF WASHINGTON LLC
223 TAYLOR AVENUE N.
SEATTLE WA 98109

DUDLEY UPTON
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP
1300 I ST. NW, STE 400
WASHINGTON DC 20005

ROWENA VALLE
NOS COMMUNICATIONS, INC. (T1022)
TARIFF AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
4380 BOULDER HIGHWAY
LAS VEGAS NV 89121-3002

RANDALL C MEACHAM
SENIOR MANAGER - GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
KMC TELECOM V, INC.
1755 N. BROWN ROAD
LAWRENCEVILLE GA 30043

SULTAN WEATHERSPOON
WEATHERSPOON TELEPHONE, LLC
16410 NE 32ND STREET
VANCOUVER WA 98682

RHONDA WEAVER
DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS &
TELEPHONE
COMCAST PHONE OF WASHINGTON, LLC
440 YAUGER WAY SW
OLYMPIA WA 98502-8153

RICK WEAVER
REGULATORY CONTACT
WESTGATE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC
PO BOX 1903
BREWSTER WA 98812

KAREN SHORESMAN FRAME
COVAD COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY
7901 LOWRY BLVD.
DENVER CO 80320

SIMON FFITCH
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
PUBLIC COUNSEL
900 4TH AVENUE STE 2000
SEATTLE WA 98164

EDWARD KIRSCH
SWIDLER BERLIN SHEREFF FRIEDMAN LLP
300 K STREET NW
STE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20007-5116

Genny Morelli
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN, LLP
1200 19TH STREET, NW
STE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20036

RICHARD A PITT
Representing Northwest Telephone, Inc.
12119 JACQUELINE DRIVE
P.O. BOX 667
BURLINGTON WA 98233

DATED at Seattle, Washington this 15th day of December, 2004.



Carol Mungerlyn, Secretary