ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

OCT - 5 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

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

In the Matter of		
	)	CC Docket Nos. 98-147, 98-11,
Deployment of Wireline Services Offering	)	98-26, 98-32, 98-15, 98-78, 98-91
Advanced Telecommunications Capability	)	and CCB/CPD No. 98-15, RM-9244
	)	

OPPOSITION OF MCI WORLDCOM, INC.

MCI WorldCom, Inc. (MCI WorldCom), by its attorneys, hereby files its opposition to the petitions for reconsideration filed by Bell Atlantic and SBC Communications, Inc., in the above-captioned proceedings.[1]

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

It is patently clear, with their instant petitions that follow the Commission's findings in the Memorandum Opinion and Order, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Order or NPRM), Bell Atlantic and SBC are simply trying to hold hostage the deployment of advanced capabilities -- and the resulting benefits to consumers. These petitions are a bald attempt by these BOCs, on behalf of the incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs), to control and eliminate competition in advanced capabilities by denying competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) the essential facilities needed to compete in the provision of such capabilities.[2]

---

[1] See Petition of Bell Atlantic for Partial Reconsideration or, Alternatively, for Clarification, CC Docket Nos. 98-147 *et al.* (Bell Atlantic Petition) (filed Sept. 8, 1998); see also Petition for Reconsideration of SBC Communications Inc., Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Pacific Bell, and Nevada Bell, CC Docket Nos. 98-147 *et al.* (SBC Petition) (filed Sept. 8, 1998).

[2] This anticompetitive attitude is more than a bit incongruous when one considers that both Bell Atlantic and SBC have pending before the Commission merger applications in which they claim that they intend to bring full-blown competition to local markets.

No. of Copies rec'd 0+4
List A B C D E

In its Order, the Commission correctly determined that -- in keeping with the ILEC obligations under section 251(c) and in order to encourage the deployment of advanced capabilities -- ILECs must provide CLECs with interconnection and access to unbundled, xDSL-conditioned loops.[3] Indeed, contrary to petitioners' contentions, the Eighth Circuit did not overrule the Commission's finding that ILECs are obligated to provide local loops in a condition that permits them to be used for advanced services.[4] Moreover, because the ILECs are conditioning loops to provide xDSL services themselves, xDSL-conditioned loops cannot be deemed superior to what the ILECs provide themselves.

Further, the Commission rightly concluded that section 706 does not constitute an independent grant of forbearance authority.[5] Accordingly, all requests for forbearance from sections 251(c) and 271 must be evaluated in accordance with section 10 of the Act, to ensure that such requirements are not subverted or diminished prior to the ILECs opening their local markets.

Petitioners' sole purpose here is the perpetuation of the ILECs' fight to retain monopoly control over the local loop and all capabilities and services offered over that loop, including advanced capabilities. In order to encourage and not discourage the deployment of advanced

---

[3] Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, CC Docket Nos. 98-147 *et al.*, FCC 98-188, Memorandum Opinion and Order, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (Order or NPRM) (rel. Aug. 7, 1998) at ¶¶ 52, 53.

[4] See Iowa Utilities Bd. v. FCC, No. 96-3321, 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 1043 (8th Cir. Jan. 22, 1998) (writ of mandamus granted); Iowa Utilities Bd. v. FCC, 120 F.3d 753 (8th Cir. 1997), amended on reh'g, 1997 U.S. App. LEXIS 28652 (8th Cir. Oct. 14, 1997), cert. granted, 118 S. Ct. 879 (1998).

[5] See Order at ¶ 69.

capabilities, the Commission must reject the petitions. Access to unbundled elements and the critical loop necessary to provide advanced services will ensure that CLECs have a meaningful opportunity to compete in the provision of advanced capabilities.

II. CLEC ACCESS TO xDSL-CONDITIONED LOOPS IS NOT "SUPERIOR ACCESS"

CLECs are not seeking any more than the ILECs are already required to provide. There can be no question that the nondiscrimination requirement of section 251(c)(2) entitles CLECs to access to xDSL-conditioned loops when an ILEC is providing xDSL services itself over xDSL-conditioned loops, particularly because loops in a condition to support xDSL services already exist in the ILECs' current networks. Indeed, petitioners' argument makes sense if, and only if, ILECs are not providing xDSL services themselves. If they are (and in fact they are), then they must be conditioning loops that are not already xDSL capable. Thus, MCI WorldCom and other CLECs are not asking for superior access -- they are asking for nondiscriminatory access, the same access ILECs provide themselves for their own xDSL services.

A. Bell Atlantic and SBC Misinterpret the Eighth Circuit's Decision

Contrary to the arguments of Bell Atlantic and SBC, ILEC provision of interconnection and unbundled access to xDSL-capable loops to CLECs, even if conditioning is required to make the loops xDSL-capable, does not give CLECs interconnection or access that is superior to the quality of interconnection and access ILECs provide themselves. Actually, an xDSL-capable loop is an existing plain copper pair capable of transmitting a broadband signal, stripped of loading coils, bridged taps and other electronics that interfere with the loop's ability to transmit broadband signals. Indeed, xDSL technology simply permits carriers to deploy advanced

capabilities and services over the same local loop that is currently used for traditional voice service, and the ILECs are already required to unbundle network elements and condition the local loop for CLECs.[6] Accordingly, the ILECs' provision of xDSL-capable loops to CLECs is not "superior" at all and falls squarely within the ILEC unbundling obligations upheld by the Eighth Circuit.

Access to the existing loop -- not an unbuilt superior one -- is exactly what new entrants are seeking. Indeed, the Eighth Circuit expressly endorses the notion that interconnection and access to UNEs includes modifications to ILEC infrastructure to accommodate these requirements, and the court states that the ILECs acknowledge this fact. .[7] Further, contrary to petitioners' arguments, Ameritech stated in its comments to the Commission's NPRM that it provides nondiscriminatory access to xDSL-capable loops. Moreover, Ameritech stated that the Commission's finding requiring conditioning is consistent with the Local Competition Order, and conditioning is "reasonable modification" under the Act.[8]

Bell Atlantic and SBC misinterpret the Eighth Circuit's decision regarding superior quality service. When the ILECs provide CLECs with the xDSL-capable loops necessary to deploy advanced capabilities, they are not providing CLECs with superior quality interconnection and unbundled access to those loops, even if conditioning is necessary to make

---

[6] First Report and Order, Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, FCC 96-325 (Local Competition Order) (rel. Aug. 8, 1996) at ¶¶ 377-84.

[7] See 120 F.3d at 813 n.33.

[8] See Comments of Ameritech, CC Docket No. 98-147 (filed Sept. 25, 1998) at 10-12.

some loops as xDSL-capable as others in the ILECs' networks. The network used to provide xDSL capabilities is not an unbuilt superior network. Indeed, one of the key details of xDSL service is that it makes use of the existing loop plant.

Further, in the Universal Service Order the Commission defined the loop as including voice grade access, based on a loop design that does not include loading coils or otherwise "impede the provision of advanced services."[9] As a result, ILECs should already be providing loops that meet this requirement in order to continue receiving universal service funds. Simply stated, CLECs are asking for access to that existing -- not a superior -- loop.[10] Indeed, ILECs are currently provisioning, without complaint, conditioned loops similar to those utilized in xDSL services, including the loops used to provide Basic Rate ISDN, Group 3 fax and even 28.8/33.2 modem services.

Moreover, the Commission's decisions regarding the definition of "technically feasible" and the interpretation of the "necessary" and "impairment" standards were upheld by the Court of Appeals.[11] Specifically, the Eighth Circuit expressly rejected the ILECs' argument that giving competing carriers unbundled access to the ILECs' networks would drastically reduce the ILECs' incentive to innovate.[12] As the Commission recognized in the Local Competition

---

[9] Universal Service Order at ¶ 250.

[10] See Rural Electrification Loan Restructuring Act of 1993, Pub. L. No. 103-129 (codified as amended at 7 U.S.C. § 935 (1993)) (requiring rural LECs that receive federal grants to deploy a basic local loop "able to receive . . . data at a rate of at least 1,000,000 bits of information per second").

[11] 120 F.3d at 809-12.

[12] Id. at 812, 816.

Order,[13] just the opposite is true: competition is the best way to promote innovation. Monopolists making supracompetitive profits from T1 data service may well choose not to develop a competing technology that could provide this same service at a lower cost. The best way to assure that xDSL service is deployed is to allow competitors access to the copper loop that makes xDSL service possible.

B. Granting the Petitions would Permit the ILECs to Control Innovation and Impede the Timely Deployment of Advanced Capabilities and Services

In their attempts to manipulate the Commission, petitioners present conflicting arguments: (i) the Commission must act to encourage reasonable and timely deployment of advanced capabilities; and (ii) CLECs should not receive access to xDSL-capable loops until the ILECs decide to offer advanced capabilities. In effect, Bell Atlantic and SBC are unilaterally attempting to dictate the terms of competition in advanced capabilities.

To the extent that the ILECs are implying that they will slow or even stop deployment of their own advanced capabilities if they are required to honor their existing obligations under section 251(c) to provide CLECs with reasonable access to network elements including xDSL-conditioned loops, the Commission should not be deterred from enforcing section 251(c). All of the ILECs are deploying xDSL services and have publicized plans to accelerate and expand this deployment. If the ILECs believe that it is in their business interests to provide these services, they will do so, and nothing in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 or in the Commission's implementing orders makes unprofitable deployment that would otherwise be profitable. If the ILECs cut back on their own plans, that would only make it more important to enforce section

---

[13] Local Competition Order at ¶ 378.

251(c) so that CLECs can provide services that the ILECs choose for their own reasons not to provide. The resulting competition from CLECs will spur ILEC deployment. Conversely, any retreat from the procompetitive principles embodied in the Commission's order will slow the development of competition in advanced services, particularly for residential and small business customers.

The instant petitions reveal the true anticompetitive motives behind the ILECs' endorsement of facilities-based competition. The danger in permitting the ILECs to avoid their obligation to unbundle the local loop is clear. Failure by the ILECs to provide CLECs with efficient, nondiscriminatory access to xDSL-capable loops at cost-based rates will make it difficult, if not impossible, for CLECs to bring the benefits of broadband competition to residential and small business customers. Accordingly, the Commission must deny the petitions and ensure that the ILECs continue to meet their statutory obligation to provide CLECs with unbundled access to the network elements necessary to provide advanced capabilities especially for residential and small business customers.

III. THE COMMISSION CORRECTLY CONCLUDED THAT SECTION 706 IS NOT AN INDEPENDENT GRANT OF FORBEARANCE AUTHORITY

As the Commission correctly concluded in the Order, section 706 does not constitute an independent grant of forbearance authority, and thus all forbearance requests must be evaluated in accordance with section 10.[14] In their petitions, Bell Atlantic and SBC argue erroneously that the plain language of the Act makes clear that exercising the forbearance standard under section

[14] See Order at ¶ 69.

706 is not dependent on meeting the forbearance provisions of section 10(a).[15] Such a view is misguided and inconsistent with well-established principles of statutory interpretation. Although the congressional objectives of section 706 facilitate the reasonable and timely deployment of advanced capabilities, they do not invalidate the procompetitive requirements of sections 251(c) and 271. Indeed, the Commission is statutorily precluded from granting any forbearance that results in the practical equivalent of forbearance from sections 251(c) and 271 prior to full implementation of those requirements.

Section 706 is not an independent grant of forbearance authority. Rather, section 706 merely refers to the Commission's forbearance authority -- contained in section 10 -- that permits the Commission to exercise "regulatory forbearance, measures that promote competition in the local telecommunications market, or other regulating methods" in order to encourage the deployment of advanced telecommunications capability.[16] In section 10(d), Congress laid out specific limitations on the Commission's forbearance authority. Nothing in section 706 indicates that Congress intended this provision to override those limits contained in section 10(d). Indeed, granting forbearance requests that would permit the ILECs to exercise monopoly control over advanced capabilities would result in the exact opposite of the congressional goals contained in section 706 of the Act: widespread, rapid deployment of advanced capabilities.

Although section 706(a) states that the Commission "shall encourage the deployment" of advanced telecommunications to "all Americans," section 706(a) places specific emphasis on the

---

[15] See Bell Atlantic Petition at 6; see also SBC Petition at 5-9.

[16] 47 U.S.C. § 706(a).

timely deployment of such services to "in particular, elementary and secondary schools and classrooms." Given that focus, it is hard to imagine that Congress intended section 706's reference to regulatory forbearance to override the specific limitations on forbearance contained in section 10, and not just for schools and classrooms but for all consumers.

Moreover, the petitioners' interpretation of section 706 as an independent grant of forbearance authority is inconsistent with the overall structure of the Act.[17] The petitioners' reading of the phrase "regulatory forbearance" in section 706 would directly contradict the procompetitive purpose of the Act, including sections 10, 251, 271 and 272.[18] Congress included the strict limitations in section 10(d) to control the types and degrees of forbearance afforded to the BOCs, in order to ensure that the requirements of sections 251(c) and 271 are not subverted or diminished prior to the BOCs meeting those statutory conditions. Accordingly, the Commission should refuse to grant forbearance from the requirements of sections 251(c) and 271 until it determines that such requirements have been fully implemented.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, MCI WorldCom urges the Commission to reject the petitioners' requests for reconsideration.

---

[17] See generally Tataronowicz v. Sullivan, 959 F.2d 268, 276 (D.C. Cir. 1992) ("[C]ongressional intent can be understood only in light of the context in which Congress enacted a statute and the policies underlying its enactment.")

[18] In fact, if section 706 trumps all other provisions in the Act, including, as Bell Atlantic and SBC argue, the regulatory forbearance limitations set out in section 10, then it should trump the limitations on unbundling and access requirements that the Eighth Circuit inferred, and the Commission should exercise its power to require ILECs to provide CLECs with access to unbundled, xDSL-capable loops.

Respectfully submitted,

MCI WORLDCOM, INC.

Kecia Boney
R. Dale Dixon, Jr.
Lisa B. Smith
1801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 887-3040

Catherine R. Sloan
David N. Porter
Richard L. Fruchterman III
Richard S. Whitt
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dated: October 5, 1998

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lonzena Rogers, do hereby certify that on this fifth day of October, 1998, I served by first-class United States mail, postage paid, a true copy of the foregoing Opposition, upon the following:

Honorable William E. Kennard*
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 814
Washington, D.C. 20554

Susan Ness*
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 832
Washington, D.C. 20554

Harold Furchtgott-Roth*
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 802
Washington, D.C. 20554

Michael K. Powell*
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 844
Washington, D.C. 20554

Gloria Tristani*
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 826
Washington, D.C. 20554

Jason Oxman*
Policy and Program Planning Division
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 534-W
Washington, D.C. 20554

Linda Kinney*
Policy and Program Planning Division
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 538-C
Washington, D.C. 20554

Carol Mattey*
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 544
Washington, D.C. 20554

Janice M Myles
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 539-A
Washington, D.C. 20554

Richard Taranto
Farr& Taranto
1850 M Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036

Robert B. McKenna
Jeffery A. Brueggeman
US West, Inc.
1020 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ronald L. Plesser
Mark J. O'Connor
Stuart P. Ingis
Piper & Marbury LLP
Counsel for Commercial Internet
Exchange Association
1200 Nineteenth Street, NW
Seventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036

Bartlett L. Thomas
James J. Valentino
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris
Glovsky & Popeo
Counsel For Xcom Technologies, Inc.
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2608

James R. Young
Edward D. Young, III
Michael E. Glover
Bell Atlantic
1320 North Court House Road
Eighth Floor
Arlington, VA 22201

John T. Lenahan
Christopher Heimann
Frank Michael Panek
Gary Phillips
Ameritech
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive
Room 4H84
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Charles C. Hunter
Hunter Commercial Law Group
Counsel for Telecommunications
Resellers Association
1620 I Street, NW
Suite 701
Washington, D.C. 20006

Jonathan E. Canis
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
Counsel for Intermedia Telecommunications
& Excel Telecommunications, Inc.
1200 Nineteenth Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20554

Christopher W. Savage
James F. Ireland
Cole Raywid & Braverman LLP
Counsel for APK Net, LTD. Cyber Warrior
Helicon Online Inforamp Internet Connect
Company MTP LLC d.b.a JAVANET
& Proaxis Communications
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20006

Jonathan Jacob Nadler
Squire Sanders & Demsey
Counsel for Information Technology
Association of America
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Box 407
Washington, D.C. 20044

Henry Geller
Alliance for Public Technology
901 Fifteenth Street, NW
Suite 230
Washington, D.C. 20005

National Association of Commissions
For Women
1828 L Street, NW
Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20036

Leon M. Kestenbaum
Jay C. Keithley
Sprint Corporation
1850 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

United Homeowners Association
1511 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

National Hispanic Council on Aging
2713 Ontario Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20009

National Association of Development
Organizations
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20001

Linda Kent
Keith Townsend
United States Telephone Association
1401 H Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005

Gail Polivy
GTE Service Corporation
1850 M Street, NW
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20036

Colleen Boothby
Levin Blaszak Block & Bootbhy LLP
Counsel for the Internet Access Coalition
2001 L Street, NW
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20036

Peter Rohrbach
Hogan & Hartson LLP
Counsel for LCI International Corp.
Columbia Square
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

Douglas W. Kinkoph
Bob Matthew
LCI International Corp.
8180 Greensboro Drive
Suite 800
McLean, VA 22102

Linda L. Oliver
Hogan & Hartson LLP
Counsel for LCI International Corp.
Columbia Square
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

David L. Sieradzki
Hogan & Hartson LLP
Counsel for LCI International Corp.
Columbia Square
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

World Institute on Disabililty
510 Sixteenth Street
Suite 100
Oakland, CA 94612

Terrence K. Ferguson
Senior Vice President & General Counsel
Level 3 Communications, Inc.
3555 Farnam Street
Omaha, NE 68131

Russel M. Blau
Richard M. Rindler
Swidler & Berlin CHTD
3000 K Street, NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007

Randall B. Lowe
Piper & Marbury LLP
Counsel for Transwire Communications
1200 Nineteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C.

Genevieve Morelli
General Counsel
The CompTel Association
1900 M Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

J. Manning Lee
Vice President Regulatory Affairs
Teleport Communications Group
Two Teleport Drive
Staten Island, NY 10311

Cheryl L. Parrino
Chairman
Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
P. O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

Richard D. Marsk, Esq.
Vinson & Elkins LLP
Counsel for Computer & Communications
Industry Association
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20004-1008

Room 3252J1
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

M. Robert Sutherland
BellSouth Corporation
1155 Peachtree Street, NE
Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

George Vrandenburg, III
America Online, Inc.
1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

G. Richard Klein
Commissioner
Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission
302 W Washington
Suite 306-E
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Issue Dynamics, Inc.
901 Fifteenth Street, Suite 230
Washington, D.C. 20005

Jeffery A. Campbell
Stacey Stern Albert
Compaq Computer Corporation
1300 I Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Thomas M. Koutsky
Assistant General Counsel
Covad Communications Company
35670 Bassett Street
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Mark C. Rosenblum
Ava B. Kleinman
AT&T Corporation
295 North Maple Avenue

Riley M. Murphy
American Communications Service, Inc.
131 Natiional Business Parkway
Suite 100
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Jeffery Blumenfeld
Christy Kunin
Blumenfeld & Cohen
Counsel for Rhythms NetConnections, Inc.

1615 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036

Howard J. Symons
Michelle M. Mundt
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky & Popeo
Counsel for NextLink Communications, Inc.
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004

Gordon M. Ambach
Executive Director
Council of Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C.

Mark J. Tauber
Teresa S. Werner
Piper & Marbury LLP
Counsel for Omnipoint Communications
1200 Nineteenth Street, NW
Seventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036

Steven Gorosh
Vice President & General Counsel
Northpoint Communications, Inc.
222 Sutter Street
San Francisco, CA 94108

1730 Rhode Island Avenue, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036

Daniel Gonzalez
Director Regulatory Affairs
Nextlink Communications, Inc.
1730 Rhode Island Avenue, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20036

Thomas J. Sugrue
Halprin Temple Goodman & Sugrue
Counsel for NYSernet
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 650 East
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dr. David Lytel
NYSernet, Inc.
125 Elwood Davis Road
Syracuse, NY 13212

Joseph W. Waz, Jr.
Vice President External Affairs
& Public Policy Counsel
Comcast Corporation
1500 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pa 19102

Cedar City
Iron County Economic Development
110 North Main Street
P. O. Box 249
Cedar City, UT 84720

R. Gerard Salemme
Senior Vice President External Affairs
and Industry Relations
Nextlink Communications, Inc.

Charles D. Gray
General Counsel
NARUC
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 608
P.O. Box 684
Washington, D.C. 20044

D. Robert Webster
Bamberger & Feibleman
Counsel for The National Black Chamber of Commerce
54 Monument Circle, Suite 600
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Jeffery Blumenfeld
Christy c. Kunin
Michael D. Pecht
Blumenfeld & Cohen
Access Telecommunications Alliance
1615 M Street, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036

Karlyn D. Stanley
Cole Raywid & Braverman LLP
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20006

James R. Coltharp
Senior Director Public Policy
ComCast Corporation
1317 F Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Albert H. Kramer
Michael Carowitz
Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP
Counsel for ICG Telecom Group, Inc.
2101 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037-1526

Counsel for Next Level Communications
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 650 East
Washington, D.C. 20005

Christopher J. White
Deputy Assistant Ratepayer Advocate
The State of New Jersey
Division of the Ratepayer Advocate
31 Clinton Street
Eleventh Floor
Newark, N.J. 07101

John Hanes
Chairman
House Corporation
Wyoming State Legislature
213 State Capitol
Cheyenne, WY 82008

Cherie R. Kiser
Michael B. Bressman
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky and Popeo
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004

Jack Crews
Cheyenne Leads
1720 Carey Avenue
Suite 401
P. O. Box 1045
Cheyenne, WY 82003-1045

Chapin Burks
President
St George Area Chamber of Commerce
97 East St George Boulevard
St George, UT 84770

Joel Berstein
Halprin Temple Goodman & Sugrue

C. Bennett Lewis
Executive Director
Aurora Chamber of Commerce
3131 South Vangnway
Suite 426
Aurora, CO 80014

Thomas Gann

Sun Microsystems, Inc.
1300 I Street, NW
Suite 420 East
Washington, D.C. 20005

Robert D. Boyseh
President
Laramie Economic Development Corp
1482 Commerce Drive
Suite A
Laramie, WY 82070

Karen Peltz Strauss
Legal Counsel for Telecommunications Policy
National Association for the Deaf
814 Thayer Avenue
Silver Spring, MD 20910-4500

Rodney L. Joyce
J. Thomas Nolan
Shook Hardy & Bacon
Counsel for Network Access Solutions, Inc.
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004-2615

Ronald L. Plesser
Piper & Marbury LPP
Counsel for Psinet
1200 Nineteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

A. Daniel Scheinman
Laura K. Ipsen
Cisco Systems, Inc.
170 West Tasman Drive
San Jose, CA 95134-1706

John Windhausen, Jr.
General Counsel
Competition Policy Institute
1156 Fifteenth Street, NW
Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20005

National Assoication of Development Organizations
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20001

Scott Truman
Executive Director
Utah Rural Development Council
Administration Building 304
Southern Utah University
Cedar City, UT 84720

Thomas J. Dunleavy
NY Dept. Of Public Service Commission
Three Empire State Plaza
Albany, NY 12223-1350

Gerald Stevens--Kittner
CAI Wireless Systems, Inc.
2101 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 100
Arlington, VA 22201
William J. Rooney, Jr.
Global NAPS, Inc.
Ten Winthrop Square
Boston, MA 02110

Russell Staiger
Bismark Mandan Development Assn
400 East Broadway Avenue
Suite 417
Bismark, ND 58502

Joseph K. Witmer
Pennsylvania PublicUitlity Commission
P. O. Box 3265
Commonwealth Avenue & North
Room 116
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Ellen Deutsch
Senior Counsel
Electric Lightwave, Inc.
8100 Northeast Parkway Drive
Suite 200
Vancouver, WA 98662

National Association of Community
Action Agencies
1100 Seventeenth Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036

J. Jefrey Oxley
Minnesota Department of Public Service
1200 NCL Tower
445 Minnesota Street
St Paul, MN 5510-2130

Thomas Hatch
House of Representatives
State of Utah
P. O. Box 391
Panguitch, UT 84759
Economic Strategy Institute
1401 H Street, NW
Suite 750
Washington, D.C. 20005

Electric Lightwave, Inc.
Legal Counsel
4400 Seventy-Seventh Avenue
Vancouver, WA 98662

Gene Vuckovich
Executive Director
Montana Rural Development Partnership
115 East Seventh Street
Suite 2A
Anaconda, MT 59711

Mark C. Rosenblum
AT&T Corporation
295 North Maple Avenue
Room 5460C2
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Brad E. Mutschelknaus
Marieann Z Machida
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP
1200 Nineteenth Street, NW
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20036

Barbara A. Dooley
Executive Director
Commercial Internet Exchange Assoc.
1041 Sterling Road
Suite 104A
Herndon, Va 20170

Keith Towsend
United States Telephone Assocation
1401 H Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
Riley M. Murphy
Vice President & General Counsel
E. Sprire Communications, Inc.
131 National Business Parkway
Suite 100
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Robert W. McCausland
Vice President Regulatory and
Interconnection Allegiance Telecom
1950 Stemmons FreeWay
Suite 3026
Dallas, TX 75207-3118

Kevin Timpane
Vice President Public Policy
Firstworld Communications, Inc.
9333 Genessee Avenue
Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92121

Peter Arth, Jr.
William N. Foley
Mary Mack Adu
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Angela Ledford
Keep America Connected
P. O. Box 27911
Washington, D.C. 20005

Competitive Pricing Division
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 518
Washington, D.C. 20554

Steven M. Hoffer
95 Mariner Green Drive
Corte Madera, CA 94925

W. Scott McCollough
McCollough & Associates PC
1801 North Lamar
Suite 104
Austin, TX 78701

Lmarie Guillory
National Telephone Cooperative Association
2626 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

Maureen Lewis
General Counsel
Alliance For Public Technology
901 Fifteenth Street, NW
Suite 230
Washington, D.C. 20038-7146

Emily M. Williams
ALTS
888 Seventeenth Street, NW
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dr. Janet K. Poley
University of Nebraska
C218 Animal Sciences
P. O. Box 830952
Lincoln, NE 68583-0952

David W. Zeisiger
Donn T. Wonnell
Independent Telephone &
Telecommunications Alliance
1300 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036

William T. Lake
John Harwood
Jonanathan Frankel
Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering
2445 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037

James Ellis
SBC Communications
One Bell Plaza
Room 3703
Dallas, TX 75202

Carol Weinhaus
Telecommunications Industries
Analysis Project
Meeting House Offices
121 Mount Vernon Street
Boston, MA 02108

Mitchell Lazarus
Fletcher, Heald
1300 North Seventeenth Street
Arlington, VA 22209

Lonzena Rogers

Lonzena Rogers

*Hand Delivered