

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Complaint and Request for Expedited Treatment of AT&T Communications of the Pacific Northwest, Inc. Against U S WEST Communications, Inc. Regarding Provisioning of Access Services))) _____)	Docket No. UT-991292 U S WEST’S REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO FILE A REPLY TO AT&T’S AND STAFF’S ANSWERS
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Pursuant to the provisions of WAC 480-09-425(3)(b), U S WEST Communications, Inc. (U S WEST) hereby requests permission to file a reply to AT&T’s and Commission Staff’s answers to U S WEST’s motion to dismiss. In accordance with that rule, U S WEST has attached its proposed reply to this request.

WAC 480-09-425(3)(b) states that requests for permission to file a reply to an answer should address whether the answer raises new material requiring response, or other reason why a reply is necessary. WAC 480-09-420(9)(b) requires a showing of cause before a reply will be authorized by the Commission.

U S WEST believes that good cause exists for filing a reply, and that AT&T’s answer raises new material requiring response. AT&T essentially admits the substance of U S WEST’s

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

motion to dismiss, agreeing that the vast majority of the services it complains about are interstate services. However, AT&T then goes on to raise legal and policy issues with regard to the Commission's ability to proceed to hear the complaint. These issues must be addressed on reply. These legal and policy arguments with regard to the Commission's jurisdiction over and ability to regulate the provisioning of interstate services are completely contrary to well-settled law at the federal level and in Washington. Staff's arguments are similarly flawed. AT&T's arguments are also contrary to AT&T's own advocacy less than two years ago before the Illinois Commission.

DATED this 7th day of October, 1999.

U S WEST Communications, Inc.

Lisa A. Anderl, WSBA No. 13236