Before the

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED
NOV 20 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	CC Docket No. 96-98
	)	
Interconnection between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers	)	CC Docket No. 95-185
	)	
Area Code Relief Plan for Dallas and Houston, Ordered by the Public Utility Commission of Texas	)	NSD File No. 96-8
	)	
Administration of the North American Numbering Plan	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
	)	
Proposed 708 Relief Plan and 630 Numbering Plan Area Code by Ameritech-Illinois	)	IAD File No. 94-102

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MFS COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC. RESPONSE TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION OF SECOND REPORT AND ORDER

David N. Porter
Vice President, Government Affairs
MFS COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC.
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7709

Andrew D. Lipman
Russell M. Blau
SWIDLER & BERLIN, Chartered
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500
Fax (202) 424-7645

Attorneys for
MFS Communications Company, Inc.

Table of Contents

I. TOLL DIALING PARITY RULES 2

A. The Procedures for Filing Toll Dialing Parity Implementation Plans with the FCC Should be Clarified 2

B. The "Automatic Assignment" Rule Should Apply Only to New Customers 3

II. NONDISCRIMINATORY ACCESS RULES 4

A. LECs Should Not Be Permitted to Treat Requesting Carriers Less Favorably Than Themselves 4

B. Nondiscriminatory Access to Customer Guides and Information Pages Should Remain Subject to Arbitration 5

III. NUMBERING ADMINISTRATION RULES 7

A. The 10-Digit Dialing Rule for NPA Overlays Should Be Retained 7

B. The Method of Cost Recovery for Numbering Administration Should Not Be Changed 8

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	CC Docket No. 96-98
	)	
Interconnection between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers	)	CC Docket No. 95-185
	)	
Area Code Relief Plan for Dallas and Houston, Ordered by the Public Utility Commission of Texas	)	NSD File No. 96-8
	)	
Administration of the North American Numbering Plan	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
	)	
Proposed 708 Relief Plan and 630 Numbering Plan Area Code by Ameritech-Illinois	)	IAD File No. 94-102

MFS COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, INC.
RESPONSE TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION
OF SECOND REPORT AND ORDER

MFS Communications Company, Inc. ("MFS"), by its undersigned counsel, hereby responds to certain of the various petitions filed with the Commission for reconsideration and/or clarification of the *Second Report and Order* in the above-captioned dockets, FCC 96-333, released August 8, 1996 (the "*2nd R&O*").[1]

[1] Petitions for reconsideration or clarification are cited by name of party only. MFS is responding only to certain issues in certain petitions, and neither supports nor opposes any request for relief that is not specifically addressed in this Response.

I. TOLL DIALING PARITY RULES

A. The Procedures for Filing Toll Dialing Parity Implementation Plans with the FCC Should be Clarified

GTE (at 10-12) requests clarification of the provisions of 47 CFR § 51.213(c) requiring a LEC to file toll dialing parity implementation plans with this Commission if it determines that a state commission either will not review the plan, or will not complete its review of the plan on a timely basis. For LECs that begin providing "in-region, interLATA or in-region, interstate toll service" before August 8, 1997, this filing must be made by December 5, 1996.

MFS agrees with GTE's petition on this issue. It may be impossible for some LECs to comply with the rule as promulgated, since a LEC simply may not know by December 5, 1996, whether a state commission will review its plan or will complete that review on a timely basis. MFS believes that its local exchange carrier subsidiaries are subject to the December 5 filing deadline. At this time, however, MFS has not yet filed toll dialing parity implementation plans with any State commission (although it is preparing to do so) and therefore cannot determine whether the conditions requiring it to file these plans with the FCC have been (or will be) satisfied.

GTE does not suggest a specific resolution of this problem, although it does ask the Commission for clarification. MFS proposes that the Commission should amend § 51.213(c) to provide as follows:

> (c) A LEC must file its implementation plan with the state commission for each state in which the LEC provides telephone exchange service, except that if a LEC determines that a state commission has elected not to review the plan or will not complete its review in sufficient time for the LEC to meet the toll dialing parity implementation deadlines in § 51.211, the LEC must file its plan with the Commission <u>no later than 14 days after making that determination, except that a LEC need not file its plan with the Commission earlier than</u>:

(1) ~~no later than~~ 180 days before the date on which the LEC will begin providing toll dialing parity in the state, or ~~no later than~~ 180 days before February 8, 1999, whichever comes first; or

(2) for LECs that begin providing in-region, interLATA or in-region, interstate toll service (*see* § 51.211(f)) before August 8, 1997, ~~no later than~~ 90 days after these rules are published in the Federal Register.

Also, MFS requests that the Commission act on this issue on an expedited basis, since the filing deadline for some LECs is extremely imminent.

MFS also supports GTE's request that the Commission provide procedural guidance on other issues related to review of these implementation plans. (GTE at 12.)

B. The "Automatic Assignment" Rule Should Apply Only to New Customers

GTE (at 4-6) and USTA (at 7-8) request that 47 CFR § 51.209(c), which prohibits a LEC from automatically assigning local exchange subscribers either to its own or to another carrier's intraLATA toll services in the absence of an affirmative choice, only applies to "new" customers who subscribe to local exchange service after the implementation of intraLATA toll dialing parity. MFS agrees. The rule as adopted is inconsistent with the Commission's decision in para. 80 of the *2nd R&O* not to adopt detailed balloting and customer notification procedures, as well as with the explicit statement in para. 81 that the prohibition on automatic assignment was intended to apply to "*new* customers who do not affirmatively choose a toll provider." (Emphasis added.) MFS concurs that the language of the rule should be amended, as proposed by GTE, to make it consistent with the discussion in paras. 80 and 81.

On the other hand, NYNEX (at 5-7) urges that the Commission reconsider its decision on this issue and eliminate § 51.209(c) altogether, in favor of deferring to the State commissions to determine whether a LEC should be permitted to default new customers to its own intraLATA toll

services. MFS opposes NYNEX's request. It is not very difficult for a LEC to ask new customers to choose an intraLATA toll provider at the time they sign up for local exchange service. Although NYNEX suggests that problems could occur if a customer were not assigned an intraLATA carrier, this seems unlikely if the LEC provides a clear written or oral reminder to the customer that "IF YOU DO NOT SELECT ONE OF THESE COMPANIES TO BE YOUR INTRALATA TOLL PROVIDER, YOU WILL NOT BE ABLE TO PLACE ANY INTRALATA TOLL CALLS WITHOUT FIRST DIALING AN ACCESS CODE. IS THIS WHAT YOU REALLY WANT?" It is reasonably probable that the vast majority of customers will select an intraLATA toll carrier after receiving this warning and question, and those who do not will make that choice deliberately.

II. NONDISCRIMINATORY ACCESS RULES

A. LECs Should Not Be Permitted to Treat Requesting Carriers Less Favorably Than Themselves

Ameritech (at 7-11) seeks reconsideration of the Commission's interpretation of "nondiscriminatory access," as used in Section 251(b)(3), as meaning that a LEC must provide requesting carriers with access to the services identified in that subsection "that is at least equal in quality to the access that the LEC provides to itself." *2nd R&O*, para. 101. Ameritech made the same argument in its comments on the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, which was expressly considered and rejected by the Commission (*see* para. 99), and should be rejected again on reconsideration.

Ameritech's argument, in essence, is that because Congress specifically required in Section 251(c)(2)(C) that incumbent LECs provide interconnection to requesting carriers that is "at least equal in quality" to what they provide themselves, it must have intended to adopt a lower standard whenever it used the word "nondiscriminatory" elsewhere in the statute without specifically

including the "at least equal in quality" phrase. This interpretation would turn the meaning of the statute on its head. The clear purpose of subsections (b) and (c) of Section 251 was to ensure that requesting carriers would have access to those bottleneck facilities and functions of the local exchange network that they will need in order to compete on even terms with incumbent LECs. It would be starkly inconsistent with this clear purpose to interpret paragraph (b)(3), or, for that matter, any other provision in these subsections, as allowing a LEC to provide requesting carriers with some kind of inferior or restricted access to essential facilities as long as it treats all of its competitors equally unfairly.

Ameritech's statutory construction arguments, which focus on the placement of individual words and phrases within the statute, ignore the underlying purpose of statutory construction which is to effectuate the intent of Congress.[2] The Commission's interpretation is correct because it considers the meaning of the words used in the context of the statute as a whole, while Ameritech's contrary interpretation would take those words out of context and twist their meaning to the opposite of what Congress intended.[3] Therefore, Ameritech's petition should be denied.

B. Nondiscriminatory Access to Customer Guides and Information Pages Should Remain Subject to Arbitration

NYNEX (at 7-8) asks the Commission to "clarify" that incumbent LECs are not required to provide competitors with access to customer guide and informational pages in their published

---

[2] "Our objective in a case such as this is to ascertain the congressional intent and give effect to the legislative will." *Philbrook v. Glodgett*, 421 U.S. 707, 713 (1975).

[3] *Id.*; *see also Richards v. United States*, 369 U.S. 1, 11 (1962) ("We believe it fundamental that a section of a statute should not be read in isolation from the context of the whole Act, and that in fulfilling our responsibility in interpreting legislation, 'we must not be guided by a single sentence or member of a sentence, but (should) look to the provisions of the whole law, and to its object and policy.'") (footnotes omitted).

directories. This request should be denied, because the *2nd R&O* already provides sufficient guidance on this issue.

As NYNEX correctly states, the Commission declined to adopt any mandatory rules regarding access to customer guides and informational pages. *2nd R&O,* para.137. Rather, the Commission adopted a "minimum standard" that the term "directory listing" includes "subscriber list information."[4] Although NYNEX suggests that the term "minimum standard" is unclear, MFS submits that this language correctly recognizes the authority of State commissions, when acting as arbitrators under Section 252, to determine the full scope of nondiscriminatory access to directory listing services.[5] Because directory publishing practices vary from State to State, it would be impractical and cumbersome for the Commission to attempt to promulgate nationally uniform rules on this subject.

The "clarification" sought by NYNEX would in fact work a substantive change in the Commission's rules, and would improperly limit the discretion of State commissions acting as arbitrators to impose appropriate conditions to fulfill the requirements of Section 251(b)(3). NYNEX's motion should therefore be denied.

---

[4] MFS has separately petitioned for reconsideration of this definition on other grounds, as stated in its Petition for Limited Reconsideration and Clarification.

[5] NYNEX also argues that Section 271(c)(2)(B)(viii) establishes that incumbent LECs are "only" required to provide White Pages listings to requesting carriers. That provision says no such thing. Section 271 only applies to the BOCs, not to all incumbent LECs, and it only establishes conditions that must be satisfied for a BOC to enter the interLATA market. Compliance with Section 271 does not necessarily imply full compliance with Section 251, nor vice versa, except where one of these provisions expressly references or incorporates the other.

III. NUMBERING ADMINISTRATION RULES

A. The 10-Digit Dialing Rule for NPA Overlays Should Be Retained

MFS opposes the requests of NYNEX (at 13-15), the New York Department of Public Service ("DPS") (at 3-10) and the Pennsylvania PUC (at 2-5) that the Commission reconsider its decision to require 10-digit dialing as a condition of any future NPA overlay.[6] As MFS has explained in more detail in its own Petition for Limited Reconsideration and Clarification, 10-digit dialing is a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for competitive neutrality in NPA overlay plans.[7]

The New York and Pennsylvania regulators argue that interim and (later) permanent number portability will ameliorate the anti-competitive effects of overlays, since customers can switch to a new LEC while retaining their old telephone number (and area code). These arguments, however, ignore both the limitations of interim number portability, and the effect of an overlay on customers who cannot retain an old telephone number (either because they are new customers, are obtaining additional lines, or are moving to a location in a different exchange area). The latter group of customers would likely be assigned a number in the new (overlay) area code; and the Commission correctly concluded that such numbers are likely to be perceived as undesirable, especially in the first few years of an overlay plan.

The New York DPS suggests that the incumbent LEC, rather than new entrants, is likely to assign more new telephone numbers in the overlay area code, but its analysis is faulty. The DPS fails to consider the fact that telephone numbers are not assigned to LECs; NXX codes are. Each

---

[6] MFS takes no position on whether the 10-digit dialing rule should apply to the existing 917 NPA overlay in New York City, which predates the *2nd R&O*. MFS also takes no position on whether 10-digit dialing should be required for numbers in the 555 NXX code which are assigned on a nationwide basis.

[7] *See also* TCG Petition at 8-11; Cox Communications Petition at 4.

NXX code contains 10,000 telephone numbers, and once that code is assigned all of those numbers are reserved for one LEC whether they are used or not. Once all of the NXX codes in an area are assigned, NPA relief becomes necessary, regardless of how many or how few numbers within each NXX code are actually being used. Therefore, when an overlay plan is implemented, the incumbent LEC, by virtue of having been assigned the vast majority of the NXX codes in the old area code, will very likely have a large reserve of unassigned numbers within those NXX codes which it can continue to assign to new customers for some period of time. New entrants generally will not have such a reserve (or at best will have a much smaller pool of reserve numbers from which to draw). Therefore, new entrants will be forced to assign undesirable numbers in the overlay area code much sooner than will incumbents, and will be put at a competitive disadvantage.

For the reasons stated in MFS' Petition, the Commission should reconsider its decision to permit overlays at all in the absence of permanent number portability. If, however, the Commission continues to permit overlays, then it should retain the 10-digit dialing requirement.

B. The Method of Cost Recovery for Numbering Administration Should Not Be Changed

MFS opposes the petitions of BellSouth (at 7), NYNEX (at 2-5), and USTA (at 5-6) seeking reconsideration of the Commission's decision that the costs of numbering administration should be recovered from all carriers using the same method as the current assessments for the TRS Fund and for the Commission's annual regulatory fees; that is, based on gross receipts minus payments made to other telecommunications carriers. *See 2nd R&O* paras. 342-343.

The petitioners argue that the Commission's assessment method is not competitively neutral and that the Commission should instead base its assessment on gross "retail" revenues; that is, all revenues from end user customers but not from carrier/reseller customers. This argument is factually

wrong. NYNEX itself actually demonstrates numerically that the Commission's assessment method *is* competitively neutral, although it confuses the issue by providing a variety of different (and irrelevant) calculations before performing the correct one. In NYNEX's example, Carrier A has gross revenues of $2 billion from retail sales to end users, and $1 billion from sales to Carrier B. Carrier B has gross revenues of $2 billion, all from retail sales. Under the Commission's assessment method, Carrier A would be subject to assessment on all $3 billion of its revenues, while Carrier B would be assessed based on $1 billion (gross revenues of $2 billion less payments of $1 billion to Carrier A). If total numbering administration costs were $50 million, then Carrier A would pay $37.5 million and Carrier B would pay $12.5 million. In order to recover this cost, Carrier A would have to increase its rates by 1.25% ($37.5 million divided by $3 billion). This additional charge would be passed through to all of Carrier A's customers, including Carrier B, which would pay an additional $12.5 million (1.25% of $1 billion). Carrier B would have to recover from its customers *both* the $12.5 million it would pay to Carrier A, and another $12.5 million it would pay directly for its share of numbering administration costs. Thus, Carrier B would have to recover a total of $25 million, which would amount to a surcharge of 1.25% on its total revenues—exactly the same as the burden on Carrier A.

A surcharge based on gross retail revenues, as urged by the petitioners, would in theory yield the same assessment base and the same net burden on all carriers as the Commission's method, but in practice it would be more difficult to implement. Every carrier already has the information it needs to compute (and report) its assessment base under the Commission's method—its gross telecommunications service revenues, and its total payments to other carriers for telecommunications services. This information is already required to be collected for purposes of the TRS Fund and annual regulatory fee assessments, so there would be no added burden on carriers to report this

information for purposes of recovering numbering administration costs. By contrast, carriers do not have the information needed to determine which of their revenues are "retail" and which are "wholesale," because they do not always know whether a customer intends to resell the services it purchases. Collection of this information would require carriers to create entirely new reporting and record-keeping systems and would impose substantial additional compliance burdens. Furthermore, since carriers would be forced to rely upon their customers to report accurately whether they intend to resell services, there would be an increased risk of fraud and consequent under-reporting of revenues under this approach.

For these reasons, the Commission's assessment method is superior to that proposed by the petitioners, and should not be reconsidered.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew D. Lipman
Russell M. Blau
SWIDLER & BERLIN, Chartered
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7500
Fax (202) 424-7645

Attorneys for
MFS Communications Company, Inc.

David N. Porter
Vice President, Government Affairs
MFS COMMUNICATIONS
COMPANY, INC.
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 424-7709

174921.1

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 20th day of November 1996 copies of MFS Communications Company, Inc.'s Response To Petitions For Reconsideration of Second Report and Order were served on the attached service list by first class mail, postage prepaid.

Celia Petrowsky

Celia Petrowsky

WILLIAM F. CATON
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 222
Washington, D.C. 20554

REGINA KEENEY
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 500
Washington, D.C. 20554

RICHARD WELCH
Chief, Policy and Program Planning Division
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 544
Washington, D.C. 20554

GERALDINE MATISSE
Chief Network Services Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
2000 M Street, N.W., Room 235A
Washington, D.C. 20554

JANICE MYLES** (via diskette + 4 copies)
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 544
Washington, D.C. 20554

INTERNATIONAL TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE**
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 246
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mr. Reed E. Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 814
Washington, D.C.

Mr. James H. Quello
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 802
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Rachelle B. Chong
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 844
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Susan Ness
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Room 832
Washington, D.C.

360° Communications Company
Kevin C. Gallagher, Sr. Vice President
-- General Counsel and Secretary
8725 West Higgins Road
Chicago, IL 60631

Ad Hoc Coalition of Corporate Telecommunications Managers
Rodney L. Joyce
Ginsburg, Feldman and Bress
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Ad Hoc Telecommunications Users Committee
Laura F. H. McDonald
Levine, Blaszak, Block & Boothby
1300 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036-1703

AirTouch Communications, Inc.
David A. Gross
Kathleen Q. Abernathy
1818 N Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

Alabama Public Service Commission
Mary E. Newmeyer
John Garner
100 N. Union Street
P.O. Box 991
Montgomery, AL 36101

Alaska Public Utilities Commission
Don Schröer
1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 400
Anchorage, AK 99501

Alliance for Public Technology
Dr. Barbara O'Connor, Chairwoman
Mary Gardiner Jones, Policy Chair
901 15th Street, Suite 230
Washington, DC 20005

ALLTEL Telephone Services Corporation
Carolyn C. Hill
655 15th Street, N.W., Suite 220
Washington, DC 20005

American Communications Services, Inc.
Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Steve A. Augustino
Marieann K. Zochowski
Kelley Drye & Warren
1200 19th Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

American Mobile Telecommunications Association, Inc.
Alan R. Shark, President
1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20036

American Network Exchange, Inc. and U.S. Long Distance, Inc.
Danny E. Adams
Steven A. Augustino
Kelley, Drye & Warren, LLP
1200 19th Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

American Personal Communcations
Anne P. Schelle, Vice President,
External Affairs
One Democracy Center
6901 Rockledge Drive, Suite 600
Bethesda, MD 20817

American Public Communications Council
Albert H. Kramer
Robert F. Aldrich
Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin, LLP
2101 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526

American Public Power Association
James Baller
Lana Meller
The Baller Law Group
1820 Jefferson Place, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036

Ameritech
Antoinette Cook Bush
Linda G. Morrison
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom
1440 New York Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20005

Anchorage Telephone Utility
Paul J. Berman
Alane C. Weixel
Covington & Burling
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
P.O. Box 7566
Washington, DC 20044-7566

Arch Communications Group, Inc.
Carl W. Northrop
Christine M. Crowe
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., 10th Floor
Washington, DC 20004

Association for Local Telecommunications Services
Richard J. Metzger
Emily M. Williams
1200 19th Street, NW, Suite 560
Washington, DC 20036

AT&T Corporation
Mark E. Haddad
James P. Young
Sidley & Austin
1722 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Bay Springs Telephone Co., Inc.,; Crockett Telephone Co.; National Telephone Company of Alabama; Peoples Telephone Company; Roanoke Telephone Company; and West Tennessee Telephone Company
James U. Troup
Arter & Hadden
1801 K Street, N.W., Suite 400 K
Washington, DC 20006

Bell Atlantic
Michael E. Glover
Leslie A. Vial
James G. Pachulski
Lydia Pulley
1320 North Court House Rd, 8th Floor
Arlington, Va 22201

Bell Atlantic Nynex Mobile, Inc.
John T. Scott, III
Crowell & Moring
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004

BellSouth
M. Robert Sutherland
Richard M. Sbaratta
A. Kirvin Gilbert III
Suite 1700
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Buckeye Cablevision
Mark J. Palchick
Stephen M. Howard
Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease
1828 L Street, N.W., Suite 1111
Washington, DC 20036

Cable & Wireless, Inc.
Danny E. Adams
John J. Heitmann
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association
Michael F. Altschul, Vice President, General Counsel
Randall S. Coleman, Vice President for Regulatory Policy and Law
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036

Centennial Cellular Corp.
Richard Rubin
Steven N. Teplitz
Fleischman and Walsh, L.L.P.
1400 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036

Cincinnati Bell Telephone
Thomas E. Taylor
Jack B. Harrison
Frost & Jacobs
2500 PNC Center
201 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Colorado Independent Telephone Association
Norman D. Rasmussen
Executive Vice President
3236 Hiwan Drive
Evergreen, CO 80439

Colorado Public Utilities Commission
Robert J. Hix, Chairman
Vincent Majkowski, Commissioner
1580 Logan Street, Office Level 2
Denver, CO 80203

Communications and Energy Dispute Resolution Associates
Gerald M. Zuckerman
Edward B. Myers
International Square
1825 I Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006

Competition Policy Institute
Ronald J. Binz, President
Debra Berlyn, Executive Director
1156 15th Street, N.W., Suite 310
Washington, DC 20005

Consumer Federation of America (CFA) and Consumers Union (CU)
Bradley C. Stillman, Esq.,
Consumer Federation of America
1424 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Department of Defense, Office of the Secretary
Rebecca S. Weeks, Lt Col, USAF
Staff Judge Advocate
Carl W. Smith, Chief Regulatory
Counsel Telecommunications, DOD
Defense Information Systems Agency
701 S. Courthouse Road
Arlington, VA 22204

Department of Justice
Anne K. Bingaman, Assistant Attorney General
Antitrust Division
555 4th Street, N.W., Room 8104
Washington, DC 20001

Competitive Telecommunications Association
Robert J. Aamoth
Wendy I. Kirchick
Reed Smith Shaw & McClay
1301 K Street, NW, Suite 1100 East Tower
Washington, DC 20005

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control
Reginald J. Smith, Chairperson
10 Franklin Square
New Britain, CT 06061

Cox Communications, Inc.
Werner K. Hartenberger
Leonard J. Kennedy
Laura H. Phillips
J.G. Harrington
Dow, Lohnes & Albertson
1200 New Hampshire Avenue, NW, Ste. 800
Washington, DC 20036

Department of Defense
Robert N. Kittel, Chief Regulatory Law Office
Cecil O. Simpson, Jr., General Attorney
Office of the Judge Advocate General
U.S. Army Litigation Center
901 N. Stuart Street, Suite 713
Arlington, VA 22203-1837

District of Columbia Public Service Commission
Lawrence D. Crocker, III
Acting General Counsel
450 Fifth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Excel Telecommunications, Inc.
Thomas K. Crowe
Law Offices of Thomas K. Crowe, P.C.
2300 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

Florida Public Service Commission
Cynthia Miller
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Frontier Corporation
Michael J. Shortley, III
180 South Clinton Avenue
Rochester, NY 14646-0700

General Communication, Inc.
Kathy L. Shobert
Director, Federal Affairs
901 15th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005

General Services Administration
Emily C. Hewitt, General Counsel
Vincent L. Crivella, Associate General
Counsel, Personal Property Division
18th & F Streets, N.W., Room 4002
Washington, DC 20405

Georgia Public Service Commission
Dave Baker, Chairman
B.B. Knowles, Director of Utilities
244 Washington, Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30334-5701

GTE Service Corporation
Richard E. Wiley
R. Michael Senkowski
Jeffrey S. Linder
Wiley, Rein & Fielding
1776 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Guam Telephone Authority
Veronica M. Ahern
Nixon Hargrave Devans & Doyle LLP
One Thomas Circle, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005

GVNW Inc.
Robert C. Schoonmaker, Vice Pesident
P.O. Box 25969
(2270 La Montana Way)
Colorado Springs, CO 80936 (80918)

Home Telephone Company, Inc.
H. Keith Oliver, Accounting Manager
200 Tram Street
Moncks Corner, SC 29461

Idaho Public Utilities Commission
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0074

Illinois Independent Telephone Association
Dwight E. Zimmerman, Executive Vice President
RR 13, 24B Oakmont Road
Bloomington, IL 61704

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
Robert C. Glazer, Director of Utilities
Indiana Government Center South
302 West Washington, Suite E306
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Information Technology Industry Council
Fiona Branton, Director, Government Relations and Regulatory Counsel
1250 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Intelcom Group (U.S.A.), Inc.
Albert H. Kramer
Robert F. Aldrich
Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin, LLP
2101 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037-1526

Intermedia Communications, Inc.
Jonathan E. Canis
Reed Smith Shaw & McClay
1301 K Street, NW
Suite 1100 East Tower
Washington, DC 20005

International Communications Association
Brian R. Moir
Moir & Hardman
2000 L Street, NW, Suite 512
Washington, DC 20036-4907

Iowa Utilities Board
William H. Smith, Jr., Chief
Bureau of Rate and Safety Evaluation
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319

John Staurulakis, Inc.
Michael S. Fox, Director, Regulatory Affairs
6315 Seabrook Road
Seabrook, MD 20706

Jones Intercable, Inc.
Christopher W. Savag
Navid C. Haghighi
Cole, Raywid & Braverman, LLP
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Ste. 200
Washington, DC 20006

Kansas Corporation Commission
David Heinemann, General Counsel
Julie Thomas Bowles, Asst. Gen. Counsel
1500 SW Arrowhead Road
Topeka, KS 66604

Kentucky Public Service Commission
May E. Dougherty
PO Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602

LCI International Telecom Corp.,
Robert J. Aamoth
Reed Smith Shaw & McClay
1301 K Street, NW, Suite 1100, East Tower
Washington, DC 20005

LDDS Worldcom, Inc.
Peter A. Rohrbach
Linda L. Oliver
Kyle Dixon
Hogan & Hartson, LLP
555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004

Lincoln Telephone and Telegraph Company
Robert A. Mazer
Albert Shuldiner
Mary Pape
Vinson & Elkins
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004-1008

Lucent Technologies, Inc.
Stephen R. Rosen
Theodore M. Weitz
475 South Street
Morristown, NJ 07962-1976

Maine Public Utilities Commission
Joel B. Shifman, Esq.
242 State Street, State House Station No. 18
Augusta, ME 04333-0018

Maryland Public Service Commission
Bryan G. Moorhouse, General Counsel
Susan Stevens Miller, Asst. General Counsel
6 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

Massachusetts Attorney General Scott Harshbarger
Daniel Mitchell, Asst. Attorney General
Regulated Industries Division, Public Protection Bureau
200 Portland Street, Fourth Floor
Boston, MA 02114

Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities
John B. Howe, Chairman
Mary Clark Webster, Commissioner
Janet Gail Besser, Commissioner
100 Cambridge Street, 12th Floor
Boston, MA 02202

MCI Telecommunications Corporation
Don Sussman
Larry Fenster
Charles Goldfarb
Mark Bryant
Mary L. Brown
1801 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006

Metricom, Inc.
Henry M. Rivera
Larry S. Solomon
J. Thomas Nolan
Ginsburg, Feldman & Bress, Chtd.
1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036

Michigan Exchange Carriers Association
Glen A. Schmiege
Mark J. Burzych
Foster, Swift, Collins & Smith, P.C.
313 South Washington Square
Lansing, MI 48933

Michigan Public Service Commission
John G. Strand
Ronald E. Russell
John L. O'Donnell
6545 Mercantile Way
Lansing, MI 48911

Minnesota Independent Coalition
Richard J. Johnson
Michael J. Bradley
Moss & Barnett
4800 Norwest Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129

Missouri Public Service Commission
Harold Crumpton, Commissioner
P.O. Box 360
Jefferson City, MO 65102

MobileMedia Communications, Inc.
Gene P. Belardi, Vice President
2101 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 935
Arlington, VA 22201

Montana Public Service Commission
Karen Finstad Hammel, Esq.
1701 Prospect Avenue
P.O. Box 202601
Helena, MT 59620-2601

Municipal Utilities
James N. Horwood
Scott H. Strauss
Wendy S. Lader
Spiegel & McDiarmid
1350 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Natl. Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners
Paul Rodgers
Charles D. Gray
James Bradford Ramsay
1201 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Suite 1102
1102 ICC Building
P.O. Box 684
Washington, DC 20044

National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (NASUCA)
Martha S. Hogerty
1133 15th Street, N.W., Suite 550
Washington, DC 20005

National Cable Television Association, Inc.
Daniel L. Brenner
Neal M. Goldberg
David L. Nicoll
1724 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc.
Joanne Salvatore Bochis
100 South Jefferson Road
Whippany, NJ 07981

National Wireless Resellers Association
Douglas L. Povich
Kelly & Povich, P.C.
1101 30th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007

Nextlink Communications, L.L.C.
J. Scott Bonney, Vice President, Regulatory
External Affairs
155 108th Avenue, NE
Bellevue, WA 98004

Nextel Communications, Inc.
Robert S. Foosaner, Sr. Vice President, Gen. Couns.
Lawrence R. Krevor, Director
Laura L. Holloway, General Attorney
800 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1001
Washington, DC 20006

North Carolina Public Utilities Commission Public Staff
Antoinette R. Wike, Chief Counsel
PO Box 29520
Raleigh, NC 27626-0520

North Dakota Public Service Commission
Bruce Hagen, Commissioner
Susan E. Wefald, President
Leo M. Reinbold, Commissioner
State Capitol Building
12th Floor
Bismarck, ND 58505

Northern Telecom
Stephen L. Goodman
Halprin, Temple, Goodman & Sugrue
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 650, East Tower
Washington, DC 20005

NYNEX Telephone Companies
Saul Fisher
William J. Balcerski
1111 Westchester Avenue
White Plains, NY 10604

Office of the Ohio Consumers' Counsel
David C. Bergman
Thomas J. O;Brien
77 South High Street, 15th Floor
Columbus, OH 43266-0550

Ohio Public Utility Commission
Steven T. Nourse
Jodi Jenkins Bair
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215-3793

Oklahoma Corporation Commission
Ernest G. Johnson, Director
Public Utility Division
John Gray, Senior Asst. General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
Maribeth D. Snapp, Deputy General Counsel
PO Box 25000-2000
Oklahoma City, OK 73152-2000

Omnipoint Corporation
Mark J. Tauber
Mark J. O'Connor
Piper & Marbury, L.L.P.
1200 19th Street, N.W., Seventh Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Oregon Public Utility Commission
W. Benny Won
Public Utility Section
1162 Court Street, NE
Salem, OR 97310

Pacific Telesis Group
Marlin D. Ard
Randall E. Cape
John W. Bogy
140 New Montgomery Street
Room 1625
San Francisco, CA 94105

Margaret E. Garber
1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Paging Network, Inc.
Judith St. Ledger-Roty
Paul G. Madison
Reed Smith Shaw & McClay
1301 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-3317

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Maureen A. Scott, Assistant Counsel
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Personal Communications Industry Association
Mark J. Golden, Vice President
-- Industry Affairs
Robert R. Cohen
500 Montgomery Street, Suite 700
Alexandria, VA 22314-1561

ProNet Inc.
Jerome K. Blask
Daniel E. Smith
Gurman, Blask & Freedman, Chtd.
1400 Sixteenth St., NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

Puerto Rico Telephone Company
Joe D. Edge
Richard J. Arsenault
Tina M. Pidgeon
Drinker, Biddle & Reath
901 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005

Roseville Telephone Company
George Petrutsas
Paul J. Feldman
Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, P.L.C.
1300 North 17th Street, 11th Floor
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Rural Telephone Coalition
Margot Smiley Humphrey
NRTA
Koteen & Naftalin, LLP
1150 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Ste. 1000
Washington, DC 20036

SBC Communications Inc.
James D. Ellis
Robert M. Lynch
David F. Brown
175 E. Houston, Room 1254
San Antonio, TX 78205

Scherers Communications Group, Inc.
Susan Drombetta
Manager - Rates and Tariffs
575 Scherers Court
Worthington, OH 43085

SDN Users Association, Inc.
Reginald R. Bernard, President
P.O. Box 4014
Bridgewater, NJ 08807

Small Business Administration
Jere W. Glover, Esq., Chief Counsel
David W. Zesiger, Esq., Assistant
Chief Counsel
Office of Advocacy
409 Third Street, S.W., Suite 7800
Washington, DC 20416

Small Cable Business Association
Eric E. Breisach
Christopher C. Cinnamon
Howard & Howard
107 W. Michigan Ave., Suite 400
Kalamazoo, MI 49007

South Carolina Public Service Commission
R. Glenn Rhyne, Manager-Research Dept.
111 Doctors Circle (P.O. Drawer 11649)
Columbia, SC 29203 (29211)