

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of An Inquiry to Determine ) DOCKET NO. UT-990582  
Whether There is a Need for Commission )  
Rules for the Provisioning of Collocation )

**FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS OF U S WEST**

In its initial comments in this docket, U S WEST Communications (“USWC”) stated that there is currently no need for Commission rules for the provisioning of collocation facilities in light of all of the existing rules governing collocation. These include:

standards for physical collocation and virtual collocation, FCC’s 1<sup>st</sup> Report and Order, CC Docket 96-325, § 51.323 (8/96), provisions emanating from Washington Docket UT-960323, -326, -337 regarding collocation space evaluation criteria (9/98), determinations from the 17<sup>th</sup> Supplemental Order in Washington Docket UT-960369, -370, -371 , recently released federal collocation rules, FCC 706 Rules Order, CC Docket 98/147 (3/99), and collocation provisions contained in each of the interconnection agreements.

USWC also related that it has implemented policies and processes that are in compliance with the currently effective rules, including the revision of a number of policies and practices to be in compliance with the recently released FCC 706 collocation rules. Ultimately, USWC requested that the Commission allow the new rules to work before making a determination as to

whether more rules are necessary.

Other parties, including the Joint Commenters (NEXTLINK, ELI, AT&T, TCG, ATG, GST, and MCI Worldcom), argued, among other things, that the Commission should, at a minimum, codify its Order in Docket No. UT-960232, -326, -337, and adopt the FCC's Advanced Services Order. Although USWC still believes that rulemaking at this point in time is premature, it submits that attached draft rules (Attachment A) for consideration in the event that the Commission does proceed with the adoption of rules. USWC would note that its draft rules are consistent with its prior advocacy and with the request for supplemental comments in that they encompass both the Commission's previous order on collocation and the FCC's recently released Advanced Services Order. USWC's draft rules also incorporate provisions from the FCC's Local Competition Order (1<sup>st</sup> Report and Order, CC Docket 96-325, § 51.323 (8/96)) and from recently implemented USWC collocation policies that have evolved during 3 years of negotiating collocation terms and conditions. Although USWC believes that its draft rules are substantially more than is required to ensure adequate administration of the collocation processes, the rules do serve as an integrated repository of collocation requirements from different timeframes and jurisdictions.

The Commission should resist adopting rules that go far beyond the scope of collocation. For example, ACI, in their initial comments argues that the Commission should require ILECs to provide expanded extended links (EELs). An EEL consists of a local loop, local transport and, where required, multiplexing. This arrangement is intended to allow collocators that ability to access loops in distant central offices without establishing collocation installations. Likewise, Covad's initial comments include a request for the sharing of line cards in remote switching units and terminals. Both of these proposals are actually requests for unbundled network elements and should be dealt with in accordance with the bona fide request process contained in

interconnection agreements between the parties.

The Commission should also dismiss the unnecessary and unwarranted waiver processes proposed by ACI and Joint Commenters regarding noticing requirements for “out-of-space” situations. To date, USWC has been forthright and forthcoming in providing this Commission with timely information regarding all aspects of its central office space determination processes. Furthermore, USWC has provided all parties with the opportunity to tour facilities, even before any requirements to do so. Finally, USWC has implemented the reporting requirements outlined by this Commission in its Collocation Order for all competitive providers, not just for those that were parties to the proceeding.

In summary, USWC reiterates its position that considering the wide range of existing rules concerning collocation, including those contained in the recently released Advanced Services Order by the FCC, it is premature to adopt yet another set of rules on collocation. If the Commission does decide to proceed with rules, it should adopt USWC’s proposed rules because they integrate the currently effective state and federal collocation requirements with collocation policies emanating from the negotiations process. USWC cautions the Commission against adopting rules not directly related to collocation, but rather aimed at providing services that should be the province of negotiations.

-