

March 19, 2001

**NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF COMMISSION BENCH REQUESTS
(April 2, 2001)**

RE: In the Matter of the Continued Costing and Pricing of Unbundled
Network Elements and Transport and Termination
Docket No. UT-003013

TO THE PARTIES:

Please prepare and file written responses to the following Bench Requests no later than Monday, April 2, 2001.

Bench Requests for Verizon Northwest, Inc.

Bench Request No. 14

At paragraph 203 of the 17th Supplemental Order, Docket No. UT-960369, the Commission provided a chart that identified whether GTE treated certain expenses as common or attributable expenses. For each expense and investment account, please provide a chart that indicates how accounts were classified in ICM (direct, common, or attributable), as well as in the cost studies sponsored by GTE in UT-960369. For each of the accounts, please provide the dollars associated with the account. Please include in the response a narrative that explains how the application of the common cost factor developed in UT-960369 (Seventeenth Supplemental Order, para. 204) to ICM is consistent with the Commissions findings at para. 176.

Bench Request No. 15

In Docket No. UT-960369, GTE provided the Commission with information regarding switch processor utilization (see para. 279 of the 8th Supplemental Order).

- a. Provide the processor utilization factor information identified in para. 279 of the 8th Supplemental Order.
- b. Update the processor utilization factor utilization information identified in para. 279 of the 8th Supplemental Order.

Bench Request No. 16

Paragraph 280 of the 8th Supplemental Order ,Docket No. UT-960369, states: “Charging for vertical features is also inconsistent with the manner in which the equipment is currently acquired. Rather, the inclusion of features in the cost of the port is consistent with the structure of the ILEC’s contracts with their vendors. See, for example, U S WEST’s Response to BCH 02-0001; GTE Response to BCH 2-001; Tr. 1152-53.” Has the pricing structure of Verizon’s switching contracts changed since the Commission issued its 8th Supplemental Order resulting in more explicit charges in its contracts for vertical services? If so, please explain how and provide supporting documentation.

Bench Requests for Verizon Northwest, Inc., and Qwest Corporation

Bench Request No. 17

In Docket No. UT-960369, the Commission requested data about the companies’ switching vendor contracts (BCH 02-001).

- a. Please provide a copy of the company’s response to BCH 02-001.
- b. Please update the response to BCH-02-001 to reflect the company’s current contract(s).

Please identify and provide the section of the current contracts that addresses the pricing of ISDN-BRI, ISDN-PRI, and analog (POTS) equipment. Include in the response a description of how the charge from the vendor is or is not a function of (1) CCS; (2) call attempts; or (3) other factors (please identify and describe the other factors) for each of these types of port terminations. For example, is the vendor’s price for an analog line a function of: the average busy season CCS (e.g., \$120 per analog line if Busy-Hour CCS is less than 3; \$150 per analog line if Busy-Hour CCS is greater than 3, etc.); the High Day CCS; or is the price of the equipment just a percentage discount of the list price (e.g., 30% off the list price for all material, such as the line group controller, and E-NET)?

Bench Request No. 18

Provide a copy of the Company’s response to Bench Request 01-0003 in Docket No. UT-960369 (showing busy-hour originating and terminating calls and CCS per working line for each switch). If possible, provide these documents in electronic and paper format.

Bench Request No. 19

Provide the current busy-hour originating and terminating calls and CCS per working line for each switch in the company’s Washington network. If possible, provide these documents in electronic and paper format.

Bench Request for Joint Intervenors (AT&T of the Pacific Northwest, Inc., et al.)

Bench Request No. 20

In reference to Klick/Pitkin Response Testimony, dated October 23, 2000, page 46, lines 7 to 9, identify the “emerging technology” that “often permits deloading without adversely affecting the quality of voice grade service.” Include in the response any literature that describes pertinent technological capabilities and limitations. Also, please identify telecommunications carriers that are using this technology.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE J. BERG
Administrative Law Judge