



Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

ANCHORAGE BELLEVUE CHARLOTTE HONOLULU LOS ANGELES NEW YORK PORTLAND SAN FRANCISCO SEATTLE
WASHINGTON, D.C. SHANGHAI

GREGORY J. KOPTA
Direct (206) 628-7692
gregkopta@dwt.com

2600 CENTURY SQUARE
1501 FOURTH AVENUE
SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688

TEL (206) 622-3150
FAX (206) 628-7699
www.dwt.com

August 21, 2002

VIA FACSIMILE 360-586-1150
ORIGINAL VIA US MAIL

Marjorie R. Schaer, Administrative Law Judge
Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia WA 98504-7250

Re: AT&T v. Verizon, Docket No. UT-020406

Dear Judge Schaer:

AT&T Communications of the Pacific Northwest, Inc. ("AT&T") cannot agree to the schedule that was proposed during the prehearing conference on August 13, 2002, in the above-referenced docket. AT&T seeks disposition of its complaint within a reasonable period of time, and conducting hearings over one year after the complaint was filed is not reasonable in light of the narrow scope of the issues raised by the complaint.

I have discussed AT&T's concerns with the other parties. Verizon anticipates that its responsive filing will include cost studies and testimony comparable to the rate design portion of a rate case, *i.e.*, addressing costs and pricing for all of Verizon's regulated services in Washington, and Verizon states that it cannot make such a filing before early December. While Verizon certainly has the right to address the allegations in AT&T's complaint, rate design for all of Verizon's regulated services is far beyond the scope of AT&T's complaint. My understanding in speaking with counsel for Commission Staff and Public Counsel is that these parties share at least some of AT&T's concern with regard to the scope of Verizon's proposed responsive filing, and that both Staff and Public Counsel would be agreeable to a much shorter schedule if these proceedings are limited to addressing the allegations in AT&T's complaint.

Accordingly, AT&T requests that you convene a telephone conference with the parties to discuss the scope of this proceeding and to revisit scheduling issues. In anticipation of such a

Marjorie R. Schaer
August 21, 2002
Page 2

conference, AT&T proposes that the Affidavit of Lee L. Selwyn filed with the complaint be considered AT&T's direct testimony (or, if necessary, AT&T can convert that affidavit into prefiled testimony format within a short period of time). AT&T further proposes that the remainder of the schedule be established as follows:

October 1, 2002	Response Testimony
November 26, 2002	Reply Testimony
December 16-20, 2002	Evidentiary Hearings
January 31, 2003	Simultaneous Post-Hearing Briefs

I will be out of the office August 28-30 and request that the telephone conference that AT&T has requested be conducted prior to those dates. AT&T appreciates your cooperation and efforts in resolving these issues.

Very truly yours,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

Gregory J. Kopta

cc: Service List