

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL RECEIVED

OCT - 5 1998

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

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

In the Matters of

Deployment of Wireline Services Offering  
Advanced Telecommunications Capability, et al

CC Docket Nos. 98-147, 98-11,  
98-26, 98-32, 98-15, 98-78, 98-91  
and CCB/CPD No. 98-15, RM 9244

TO: The Commission

**OPPOSITION OF COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
ASSOCIATION TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION**

The Competitive Telecommunications Association ("CompTel"), by its attorneys, hereby opposes the petitions for reconsideration filed by the Bell Atlantic and SBC telephone companies regarding the Memorandum Opinion and Order ["MO&O"] portion of the FCC's decision in the above-captioned proceedings on August 7, 1998. See Memorandum Opinion and Order, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket Nos. 98-147, et al., FCC 98-188, rel. Aug. 7, 1998. Bell Atlantic and SBC raise two issues. First, they ask the FCC to reconsider its decision that incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs") must condition local loops that are purchased as unbundled network elements ("UNEs") so requesting carriers can provide advanced communications services. See Bell Atlantic Petition at 2-5; SBC Petition at 2-5. Second, they ask the FCC to reconsider its decision that Section 706 does not constitute an independent grant of forbearance authority. See Bell Atlantic Petition at 6; SBC Petition at 5-9. For the reasons stated below, the FCC should deny the petitions.

## I. **CONDITIONED LOCAL LOOPS AS UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS**

SBC and Bell Atlantic raise similar but slightly different points. They are similar in that each one argues that the FCC's requirement that ILECs provide conditioned local loops as UNEs is contrary to the Eighth Circuit's holding that the FCC may not require ILECs to provide superior-quality UNEs to requesting carriers. Iowa Utilities Board v. FCC, 120 F.3d 753, 812-813 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) ("Iowa Utilities Board"). They are different in the breadth of the ruling they seek. SBC argues that even if it conditions some local loops for the provision of advanced services, it cannot be required to provide a conditioned local loop as a UNE unless it previously has conditioned that particular local loop for itself. By contrast, Bell Atlantic appears to argue only that it cannot be required to condition a local loop in ways that it declines or fails to do for any other local loops. Both contentions should be rejected because they stem from a misreading of Iowa Utilities Board and would defeat Congress' goals in adopting Section 251(c)(3).

### *A. The FCC Should Reject SBC's Contention*

SBC's contention need not detain the FCC long. In effect, SBC contends that it can provide local loops of different quality based solely upon its own prior decision whether to condition the specific loops in question. That contention is flatly contrary to Sections 51.311(a)-(b) of the FCC's rules. Section 51.311(a) states:

"The quality of an unbundled network element, as well as the quality of the access to the unbundled network element, that an incumbent LEC provides to a requesting telecommunications carrier shall be the same for all telecommunications carriers requesting access to that network element."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 51.311(a).

Similarly, Section 51.111(b) states:

“[T]o the extent technically feasible, the quality of an unbundled network element, as well as the quality of the access to such unbundled network element, that an incumbent LEC provides to a requesting telecommunications carrier shall be at least equal in quality to that which the incumbent LEC provides to itself.”<sup>2</sup>

Under these provisions, if an ILEC has provided any conditioned local loops as UNEs to itself or another carrier, it must condition all local loops as UNEs upon request where technically feasible.

The Eighth Circuit did not vacate or otherwise question the lawfulness of these straightforward provisions in Iowa Utilities Board. To the contrary, the Court recognized that ILECs must provide UNEs “on rates, terms, and conditions that are nondiscriminatory” in order to “prevent[] an incumbent LEC from arbitrarily treating some of its competing carriers differently than others.” 120 F.3d at 813. The Court’s holding tracked the language of Section 251(c)(3) itself, which requires the ILECs to offer “nondiscriminatory access to network elements . . . on rates, terms and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory.” 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(3). SBC’s petition must be rejected because it would write the non-discrimination provisions out of Section 251(c)(3) and the FCC’s rules.

Lastly, SBC’s position would lead to the absurd result that new entrants could not offer advanced communications services through UNEs except to subscribers who already have received a conditioned loop from the ILEC and, therefore, presumably are ILEC customers for advanced services. In effect, SBC reads Iowa Utilities Board to eliminate all competition to the ILECs for first-time advanced services customers. Plainly, that result would undermine competition and harm consumers contrary to Congress’ objectives in adopting Section 251(c)(3).

---

<sup>2</sup> Id. § 51.311(b).

*B. The FCC Should Reject Bell Atlantic's Contention.*

Unlike SBC, Bell Atlantic does not argue that it should be free to decline to provide a conditioned local loop even though it provides similarly conditioned local loops to itself or other carriers as UNEs. Rather, Bell Atlantic argues that it cannot be required to condition local loops for a requesting carrier in ways that are different from how it conditions the local loops it provides to itself or other carriers. While less extreme than SBC's position, Bell Atlantic's contention also misreads Iowa Utilities Board and contravenes Section 251(c)(3).

Like SBC, Bell Atlantic reads Iowa Utilities Board to mean that ILECs need not lift a finger in providing UNEs to a requesting carrier beyond what they have already decided to do for themselves or agreed to do for other carriers. In fact, the Court deliberately stopped short of such a far-reaching holding. The Court stressed: "[W]e endorse the Commission's statement that 'the obligations imposed by sections 251(c)(2) and 251(c)(3) include modifications to incumbent LEC facilities to the extent necessary to accommodate . . . access to network elements.'" 120 F.3d at 813 n.33 (citing Local Competition Order, 11 FCC Rcd 15499, ¶ 198 (1996)).<sup>3</sup> The Court did not object to the FCC's determination that ILECs must take certain "affirmative steps" when providing UNEs to requesting carriers (MO&O at ¶ 53); the Court objected to a broad requirement that ILECs provide requesting carriers with access to a "yet unbuilt superior" network. The question is whether the FCC's decision that ILECs must provide conditioned loops – even if they do not provide similarly conditioned loops to itself or other carriers – is a lawful "modification" necessary to accommodate access to UNEs, or an unlawful

<sup>3</sup> The petitioners note that the FCC identified conditioned local loops as a type of superior-quality access. Local Competition Order, 11 FCC Rcd at 314 n.680. However, the Court did not indicate whether conditioned local loops constituted an "as yet unbuilt superior" network (which obligation may not be imposed upon ILECs) or a "modification" to accommodate access to UNEs (which ILECs can be required to undertake).

requirement that the ILEC build a superior network to the one in place today. CompTel submits that it is the former rather than the latter.<sup>4</sup>

The Court's rationale for striking down the superior-quality rule was its belief that requesting carriers should not be able to force ILECs to develop something that does not exist today. As regards loop conditioning, the question is whether a requesting carrier is asking the ILEC to perform tasks that it does not currently have the capability to perform. The answer to that question does not depend upon whether the ILEC currently provides such conditioning to itself or any other carrier. If a conditioning request can be fairly accommodated by an ILEC acting within its current technical capabilities, then it is the type of modification that the Court found acceptable. Certainly, neither petitioner disputes that the types of conditioning ordered by the FCC – *e.g.*, removing loading coils, bridged taps and other electronic impediments (MO&O at ¶ 53) – are clearly within the current capabilities of ILECs.

Bell Atlantic's position would lead to untenable results. According to Bell Atlantic, if a competing carrier develops a new service that requires the ILEC to condition loops in a slightly different way than it does today, the ILEC is entitled to deny the request even though it can perform the task easily within its current capabilities. An ILEC should not be permitted to reject conditioning requests on such spurious grounds. Moreover, Bell Atlantic's position would lead to interminable disputes and litigation – all to the detriment of new entry and local competition – over precisely what types of local loop conditioning an ILEC currently provides for itself or

---

<sup>4</sup> Other ILECs accept the lawfulness of a requirement to provide conditioned local loops as UNEs to requesting carriers. *E.g.*, Comments of Ameritech, CC Docket No. 98-147, filed Sept. 25, 1998, at 11-12 (“Ameritech agrees that an ILEC is required to make reasonable modifications to its existing facilities, such as conditioning, to the extent necessary to accommodate interconnection or access to network elements”).

other carriers. Neither Congress nor the Court contemplated that ILECs should be able to defeat the pro-competition and pro-consumer benefits of the statute in that manner.

The problems identified by Bell Atlantic as potential grounds to reject a request for conditioned loops (e.g., interference and incompatible uses) relate to technical feasibility rather than to superior-quality access to the network. Certainly, there is no reason to believe that possible interference or incompatible uses presents the ILECs with conditioning tasks which are beyond their current technical capabilities. At a minimum, the burden should be on an ILEC to justify denial of a request for conditioned loops on the ground that it lacks the capability to comply with the request.

## **II. THE COMMISSION SHOULD REAFFIRM THAT SECTION 706 IS NOT AN INDEPENDENT GRANT OF FORBEARANCE AUTHORITY**

Both petitioners challenge the FCC's determination that Section 706 does not constitute an independent grant of forbearance authority to the FCC. Neither petitioner has raised anything new, and the FCC addressed that issue comprehensively in the MO&O (at ¶¶ 69-79). After a thorough examination of the statutory language, legislative history and congressional intent, the FCC correctly concluded that Congress adopted Section 706 to encourage the FCC to promote the development of advanced communications services through, inter alia, the FCC's forbearance authority under Section 10.

The petitioners rely upon Section 10(d), which limits the FCC's ability to exercise forbearance authority under Section 10 but does not mention Section 706. 47 U.S.C. § 160(d). They read into that provision the negative implication that Congress meant to free the FCC to use Section 706 to accomplish what Congress expressly prohibited the FCC from doing under Section 10. That interpretation makes absolutely no sense. Congress did not expressly apply the

forbearance limitation to Section 706 because there was no need to do so -- Section 706 is not an independent grant of forbearance authority. When Congress intended to exclude provisions from Section 10(d)'s forbearance limitation, it said so expressly in the opening clause -- "[e]xcept as provided in section 251(f)." If Congress had intended the interpretation put forward by the petitioners, it would have said "[e]xcept as provided in section 251(f) and section 706." It did not, and the petitioners' argument falls of its own weight.

### CONCLUSION


For the foregoing reasons, the FCC should reject the petitions for reconsideration filed by Bell Atlantic and SBC.

Respectfully submitted,

COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
ASSOCIATION

Genevieve Morelli  
Executive Vice President  
and General Counsel  
COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
ASSOCIATION  
1900 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20036

By

  
Robert J. Aamoth  
KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP  
1200 19th Street, N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 955-9600

Its Attorney

October 5, 1998

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Marlene Borack, hereby certify that on this 5th day of October, 1998, I caused true and correct copies of the **OPPOSITION OF COMPETITIVE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION TO PETITIONS FOR RECONSIDERATION** to be served via first class mail, postage prepaid, upon those persons listed below:

Richard Taranto  
Farr & Taranto  
1850 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20036

Ronald L. Plesser  
Mark J. O'Connor  
Stuart P. Ingis  
Piper & Marbury LLP  
Seventh Floor  
1200 Nineteenth St., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

James R. Young  
Edward D. Young III  
Michael E. Glover  
Bell Atlantic  
1320 North Court House Road  
8th Floor  
Arlington, Va 22201

Jonathan E. Canis  
Erin M. Reilly  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
1200 19th Street, N.W., Ste 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Anthony C. Epstein  
Jenner & Block  
601 Thirteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Robert B. McKenna  
Jeffrey A. Brueggeman  
US West Inc  
1020 19th St., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

Bartlett L. Thomas  
James J. Valentino  
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky And Popeo  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Ste 900  
Washington, DC 20004-2608

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

Christopher W. Savage  
James F. Ireland  
Cole Raywid & Braverman LLP  
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Ste 200  
Washington, DC 20006

Jonathan Jacob Nadler  
Squire Sanders & Demsey  
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Box 407  
Washington, DC 20044

Henry Geller  
Alliance For Public Technology  
901 15th St., N.W., Ste 230  
Washington, DC 20005

Kecia Boney  
Dale Dixon  
Lisa Smith  
MCI Telecommunications Corporation  
1801 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Leon M. Kestenbaum  
Jay C. Keithley  
Sprint Corporation  
1850 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

National Hispanic Council On Aging  
2713 Ontario St., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20009

Linda Kent  
Keith Townsend  
Mary Mcdermott  
United States Telephone Association  
1401 H Street N.W., Ste 600  
Washington, DC 20005

Colleen Boothby  
Levin Blaszak Block And Boothby LLP  
2001 L Street, N.W., Ste 900  
Washington, DC 20036

Terrence K. Ferguson  
Sr. VP and General Counsel  
Level 3 Communications Inc.  
3555 Farnam Street  
Omaha, Ne 68131

National Association Of Commissions For  
Women  
1828 L Street, N.W., Ste 250  
Washington, DC 20036

Kevin Sievert  
Glen Grochowski  
Local Network Technology  
MCI Communications  
400 International Parkway  
Richardson, Tx 75081

United Homeowners Association  
1511 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

National Association Of Development  
Organizations  
444 North Capitol St., N.W., Ste 630  
Washington, DC 20001

Gail L. Polivy  
GTE Service Corporation  
1850 M Street, N.W.  
Ste 1200  
Washington, DC 20036

World Institute On Disability  
510 16th St.  
Ste 100  
Oakland, Ca 94612

Anne K. Bingaman  
Douglas W. Kinkoph  
Bob Mathew  
LCI International Corp  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 800  
McLean, Va 22102

David N. Porter  
Worldcom Inc.  
1120 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Ste 400  
Washington, DC 20036

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

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

M. Robert Sutherland  
BellSouth Corporation  
1155 Peachtree St., N.E.  
Atlanta, Ga 30309-3610

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

Riley M. Murphy  
American Communications Services Inc.  
131 National Business Parkway  
Ste 100  
Annapolis Junction, Md 20701

Gordon M. Ambach  
Executive Director  
Council Of Chief State School Officers  
One Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20001

Russell M. Blau  
Richard M. Rindler  
Swidler & Berlin, Chtd.  
3000 K Street, N.W.  
Ste 300  
Washington, DC 20007

Richard D. Marks, Esq.  
Vinson & Elkins LLP  
1445 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20004-1008

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

Mark C. Rosenblum  
Ava B. Kleinman  
AT&T Corp.  
295 North Maple Avenue  
Room 3252J1  
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Geore Vradenburg III  
America Online Inc.  
1101 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Ste 400  
Washington, DC 20036

Jeffrey A. Campbell  
Stacey Stern Albert  
Compaq Computer Corporation  
1300 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005

Howard J. Symons  
Michelle M. Mundt  
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky And Popeo  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004

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

R. Gerard Salemm  
Senior Vice President External  
Affairs And Industry Relations  
Daniel Gonzalez  
Director Regulatory Affairs  
Nextlink Communications Inc.  
1730 Rhode Island Ave., N.W.  
Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. David Lytel  
Nysernet Inc.  
125 Elwood Davis Road  
Syracuse, Ny 13212

D. Robert Webster  
Bamberger & Feibleman  
54 Monument Circle, Ste 600  
Indianapolis, In 46204

Christopher W. Savage  
James F. Ireland  
Karlyn D. Stanley  
Cole Raywid & Braverman LLP  
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20006

Albert H. Kramer  
Michael Carowitz  
Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP  
2101 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037-1526

Mark J. Tauber  
Teresa S. Werner  
Piper & Marbury LLP  
1200 19th St., N.W., Seventh Floor  
Washington, DC 20036

Cedar City/Iron County Economic Dev.  
110 N. Main Street  
P.O. Box 249  
Cedar City, UT 84720

Thomas J. Sugrue  
Halprin Temple Goodman & Sugrue  
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 650 East  
Washington, DC 20005

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

Jeffrey Blumenfeld  
Christy C. Kunin  
Michael D. Specht  
Blumenfeld & Cohen  
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036

James R. Coltharp  
Senior Director Public Policy  
Comcast Corporation  
1317 F Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004

Joel Bernstein  
Halprin Temple Goodman & Sugrue  
1100 New York Ave., N.W.  
Suite 650 East  
Washington, DC 20005

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

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

Thomas Gann  
Manager Federal Affairs  
Sun Microsystems Inc.  
1300 I Street, N.W., Ste 420 East  
Washington, DC 20005

Karen Peltz Strauss  
Legal Counsel For Telecommunications Policy  
National Association For The Deaf  
814 Thayer Ave  
Silver Spring, Md 20910-4500

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

National Association Of Development  
Organizations  
444 North Capitol Street NW  
Ste 630  
Washington, DC 20001

Chapin Burks  
President  
St. George Area Chamber Of Commerce  
97 East St. George Blvd.  
St. George, UT 84770

Christopher J. White  
Deputy Assistant Ratepayer Advocate  
The State Of New Jersey  
Division Of The Ratepayer Advocate  
31 Clinton Street, 11th Floor  
Newark, NJ 07101

Cherie R. Kiser  
Michael B. Bressman  
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glovsky And Popeo  
PC  
701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Ste 900  
Washington, DC 20004

C. Bennett Lewis  
Executive Director  
Aurora Chamber Of Commerce  
3131 South Vaunway, Ste 426  
Aurora, Co 80014

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

Rodney L. Joyce  
J. Thomas Nolan  
Shook Hardy & Bacon  
801 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.  
Washington DC 20004-2615

John Windhausen, Jr.  
General Counsel  
Competition Policy Institute  
1156 15th St., N.W., Ste 310  
Washington, DC 20005

Thomas J. Dunleavy  
New York Department Of Public Service  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223-1350

William J. Rooney Jr  
Global Naps Inc  
Ten Winthrop Square  
Boston, Ma 02110

Joseph K. Witmer  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
P.O. Box 3265  
Commonwealth Ave. & North  
Room 116  
Harrisburg, Pa 17105-3265

Ellen Deutsch  
Senior Counsel  
Electric Lightwave Inc  
8100 Ne Parkway Drive  
Suite 200  
Vancouver, Wa 98662

J. Jeffrey Oxley  
Minnesota Department Of Public Service  
1200 NCI Tower  
445 Minnesota Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101-2130

Economic Strategy Institute  
1401 H Street, N.W.  
Suite 750  
Washington, DC 20005

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

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

Gerald Stevens-Kittner  
CAI Wireless Systems Inc  
2101 Wilson Boulevard, Ste. 100  
Arlington, Va 22201

Russell Staiger  
Bismark/Mandan Development Assn.  
400 E. Broadway Ave., Ste 417  
Bismark, ND 58502

Issue Dynamics Inc  
901 15th Street, Ste 230  
Washington, DC 20005

National Association Of Community Action  
Agencies  
1100 17th St., N.W., Ste 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Thomas Hatch  
House Of Representatives  
State Of Utah  
PO Box 391  
Panguitch, UT 84759

Electric Lightwave Inc  
Legal Counsel  
4400 77th Ave.  
Vancouver, WA 98662

Harold Furchgott-Roth\*\*  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M St., N.W., Room 802  
Washington, DC 20554

Janice M. Myles\*\*  
Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Rm 544  
Washington, DC 20554

Michael K. Powell\*\*  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 844  
Washington, DC 20554

James D. Schlichting\*\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 518  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Lawrence Strickling\*\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 658  
Washington, D.C. 20554

James D. Ellis  
Robert M. Lynch  
Durward D. Dupre  
Darryl W. Howard  
One Bell Center  
Room 3528  
St. Louis, MO 63101

William E. Kennard\*\*  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 814  
Washington, DC 20554

Gloria Tristani\*\*  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M St., N.W., Room 826  
Washington, DC 20554

Susan Ness\*\*  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, New Room 832  
Washington, DC 20554

Kathryn C. Brown\*\*  
Chief, Common Carrier Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 500  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Carol Matthey\*\*  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Room 544  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Mark L. Evans  
Sean A. Lev  
Rebeca A. Beynon  
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen,  
Todd and Evans  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1000 West  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Brad E. Mutschelknaus  
Marieann Z. Machida  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP  
1200 19th Street, N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Riley M. Murphy  
Vice President And General Counsel  
E.Spire 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, Ste. 3026  
Dallas, Tx 75207-3118

Cindy Z. Schonhaut  
Senior Vice President Of Government Affairs  
& External Affairs  
ICG Communications Inc  
161 Inverness Drive  
Englewood, Co 80112

Charles C. Hunter  
Catherine M. Hannan  
Hunter Communications Law Group  
1620 I Street, N.W., Ste 701  
Washington, DC 20006

W. Scott McCollough  
McCollough And Associates PC  
1801 North Lamar, Ste 104  
Austin, Tx 78701

Lawrence W. Katz  
1320 North Court House Road  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201

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

Catherine R. Sloan  
Richard L. Fruchterman III  
Richard S. Whitt  
WorldCom Inc.  
1120 Connecticut Ave. N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036

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

David J. Newburger  
Newburger & Vossmeier  
One Metropolitan Square  
Suite 2400  
St Louis, Mo 63102

Anthony C. Epstein  
Jenner & Block  
601 Thirteenth Street  
12th Floor South  
Washington, DC 20005

Kevin Sievert  
Glen Grochowski  
MCI Communications  
Local Network Technology  
400 International Pkwy  
Richardson, Tx 75081

Steven M. Hoffer  
Coalition Representing Internet Service  
Providers  
95 Mariner Green Dr.  
Corte Madera, Ca 94925

Lawrence G. Malone  
General Counsel  
State Of New York Department Of Public  
Service  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, Ny 12223-1350

Robert W. McCausland  
Vice President Regulatory And Interconnection  
Allegiance Telecom Inc.  
1950 Stemmon Freeway, Ste 3026  
Dallas, Tx 75207-3113

International Transcription Services Inc  
1231 20th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

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

Peter A. Rohrbach  
Linda L. Oliver  
David L. Sieradzki  
Hogan & Hartson LLP  
555 Thirteenth St., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20004

M. Robert Sutherland  
Stephen L. Earnest  
BellSouth Corporation  
1155 Peachtree St., N.E.  
Ste 1700  
Atlanta, GA 30309-3610

Dana Frix  
Kemal M. Hawa  
Swidler & Berlin Chtd.  
3000 K Street, N.W., Ste 300  
Washington, DC 20007-5116

Thomas M. Koutsy  
Assistant General Counsel  
Covad Communications Company  
6849 Old Dominion Drive, Suite 220  
McLean, Va 22101

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

Maureen Lewis  
General Counsel  
Alliance For Public Technology  
901 15th St., N.W., Ste 230  
Washington, DC 20038-7146

Competitive Pricing Division  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W. - Rm 518  
Washington, DC 20554

Richard J. Metzger  
Emily M. Williams  
Association For Local Telecommunications  
Services  
888 17th St., N.W., Ste 900  
Washington, DC 20006

Charles D. Gray  
General Counsel  
National Association Of Regulatory Utility  
Commissioners  
1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, Ste 608  
P.O. Box 684  
Washington, DC 20044

Eric R. Olbeter  
Economic Strategy Institute  
1401 H Street, N.W., Ste 750  
Washington, DC 20005

Randall B. Lowe  
J. Todd Metcalf  
Piper & Marbury LLP  
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

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, N.W., Ste 600  
Washington, DC 20036

Unable To Serve The Following Due To Lack Of Mailing Address On Pleading Submitted To  
FCC:

Charles Conrad  
Organizations Concerned About Rural Education

Dan Gifford  
Washington Economic Development Council

  
Marlene Borack

---

\*\* via hand delivery