

**RECEIVED**

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

JUN 25 2001

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

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Federal-State Joint Board on	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service	)	
	)	
1998 Biennial Regulatory Review –	)	CC Docket No. 98-171
Streamlined Contributor Reporting	)	
Requirements Associated with Administration	)	
of Telecommunications Relay Service, North	)	
American Numbering Plan, Local Number	)	
Portability, and Universal Service Support	)	
Mechanisms	)	
	)	
Telecommunications Services for Individuals	)	CC Docket No. 90-571
with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, and the	)	
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990	)	
	)	
Administration of the North American	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
Numbering Plan and North American	)	NSD File No. L-00-72
Numbering Plan Cost Recovery Contribution	)	
Factor and Fund Size	)	
	)	
Number Resource Optimization	)	CC Docket No. 99-200
	)	
Telephone Number Portability	)	CC Docket No. 95-116

**COMMENTS**  
**OF THE**  
**UNITED STATES TELECOM ASSOCIATION**

*Its Attorneys:*

Lawrence E. Sarjeant  
Linda L. Kent  
Keith Townsend  
John W. Hunter  
Julie E. Rones

1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 326-7375

June 25, 2001

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY .....	i
I. INTRODUCTION .....	2
II. ASSESSMENT OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE CONTRIBUTION .....	4
A. Assessment Base .....	4
B. Exemptions.....	6
1. <i>De Minimis</i> Carriers .....	6
2. Cable Modem Service Providers.....	7
C. Fund Sufficiency .....	8
D. Carrier Reporting.....	8
E. Enforcement and Auditing .....	9
F. Transition .....	9
III. RECOVERY OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE CONTRIBUTION .....	10
A. Lifeline Exception.....	10
B. Recovery Limitations for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers.....	10
C. Legal Authority .....	11
IV. CONCLUSION.....	11

## SUMMARY

In the *Notice*, the Commission seeks comments on whether and how to streamline and reform both the manner in which it assesses carrier contributions to the federal universal service fund and the manner in which carriers may recover those costs from their customers. USTA strongly advocates that the Commission conclude other outstanding proceedings affecting expenses of telecommunications carriers and the size of the federal universal service fund before it resolves the issues raised in this *Notice*, which affect carriers' revenues and related obligations under the universal service program.

Should the Commission proceed with the issues raised in the *Notice*, USTA advocates that, under current policies, assessment of carriers' universal service contribution should be made annually and on the basis of a carrier's interstate and international retail revenues. Alternatives are problematic, and specifically, flat fee assessments are *per se* unlawful.

USTA also believes that the current *de minimis* carrier exemption and the lifeline exception should be retained. Furthermore, cable television operators or their affiliates that offer cable broadband transmission service should be required to contribute to the universal service fund.

Burdensome quarterly carrier reporting and resultant rate changes for recovery should be replaced with an annual factor and recovery mechanism that could correspond to carriers' annual tariff filings based on a July 1-June 30 period.

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Federal-State Joint Board on	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
Universal Service	)	
	)	
1998 Biennial Regulatory Review –	)	CC Docket No. 98-171
Streamlined Contributor Reporting	)	
Requirements Associated with Administration	)	
of Telecommunications Relay Service, North	)	
American Numbering Plan, Local Number	)	
Portability, and Universal Service Support	)	
Mechanisms	)	
	)	
Telecommunications Services for Individuals	)	CC Docket No. 90-571
with Hearing and Speech Disabilities, and the	)	
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990	)	
	)	
Administration of the North American	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
Numbering Plan and North American	)	NSD File No. L-00-72
Numbering Plan Cost Recovery Contribution	)	
Factor and Fund Size	)	
	)	
Number Resource Optimization	)	CC Docket No. 99-200
	)	
Telephone Number Portability	)	CC Docket No. 95-116

**COMMENTS  
OF THE  
UNITED STATES TELECOM ASSOCIATION**

The United States Telecom Association (“USTA”)<sup>1</sup> hereby submits its comments on the issues raised in the *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking* in the above-

---

<sup>1</sup> The United States Telecom Association, formerly the United States Telephone Association, is the nation’s oldest trade organization for the local exchange carrier industry. USTA represents more than 1200 telecommunications companies worldwide that provide a full array of voice, data and video services over wireline and wireless networks. USTA members support the concept of universal service and are leaders in the deployment of advanced telecommunications capabilities to American and international markets.

captioned proceedings.<sup>2</sup> The Commission seeks comments on whether and how to streamline and reform both the manner in which the Commission assesses carrier contributions to the universal service fund and the manner in which carriers may recover those costs from their customers. The Commission states that it is initiating this inquiry in light of recent developments in the telecommunications marketplace. In considering potential changes to the universal service contribution system, the Commission acknowledges that any such modifications must be consistent with the provisions of Section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, (“the Act”)<sup>3</sup> governing the universal service program.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The Commission has instituted a number of outstanding proceedings whose outcome will directly impact the expenses of telecommunications carriers, including as a result of potential increases to the size of the federal universal service fund. Specific proceedings include: intercarrier compensation;<sup>4</sup> Multi-Association Group (“MAG”) proposal relating to interstate access reform for rate-of-return carriers;<sup>5</sup> and Federal-State

---

<sup>2</sup> FCC 01-145, 66 Fed. Reg. 28,718 (2001) (“Notice”).

<sup>3</sup> 47 U.S.C. § 254.

<sup>4</sup> Developing a Unified Intercarrier Compensation Regime, CC Docket No. 01-92, *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking*, FCC 01-132, released April 27, 2001; Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-98, Intercarrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Traffic, CC Docket No. 99-68, *Order on Remand and Report and Order*, FCC 01-131, released April 27, 2001.

<sup>5</sup> Multi-Association Group (MAG) Plan for Regulation of Interstate Services of Non-Price Cap Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and Interexchange Carriers, CC Docket No. 00-256.

Joint Board review of the definition of supported services.<sup>6</sup> Until the Commission resolves the issues raised in those proceedings and determines with more certainty what the obligations from an expense side of the telecommunications carriers are, the issues raised in the *Notice* are premature. In short, USTA believes that the Commission is “putting the cart before the horse” by asking the questions in the *Notice* at this time. USTA believes that the Commission should conclude the proceedings described in this paragraph before it proceeds with the issues raised in the *Notice*, since such revenue issues will necessarily have to be revisited and further revised at the conclusion of the other proceedings.

However, under these circumstances where the Commission is seeking comments on issues that affect carriers’ revenues and related obligations under current policies, USTA advances the positions contained in this pleading on the issues raised in the *Notice* that are necessarily tied to current policies and would necessarily have to be reevaluated as to their continued validity upon modification through the other proceedings cited above. In this regard, USTA has filed a petition for reconsideration of the Commission’s *Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration*<sup>7</sup> modifying the current base for federal universal service support and increasing the reporting requirements from twice per year to five time per year. If the Commission in this proceeding does not elect to immediately transition on January 1, 2002 from current quarterly factors to an annual factor, USTA urges the Commission defer further examination of the issues raised in the *Notice* until it

---

<sup>6</sup> CC Docket No. 96-45, Twelfth Report and Order, Memorandum Opinion and Order, and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 15 FCC Rcd 12208, 12238 (2000).

<sup>7</sup> Petition for Reconsideration of the *Report and Order and Order on Reconsideration*, CC Docket No. 96-45, 66 Fed. Reg. 16145 (2001) filed on April 23, 2001 (“*Reconsideration Petition*”).

has completed outstanding proceedings that may result in increases to the size of the federal universal service fund.

## II. ASSESSMENT OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE CONTRIBUTION

### A. Assessment Base

The Commission seeks comment on whether to continue using revenues as a measure of interstate telecommunications service and, if so, how to ensure that a revenues-based methodology remains consistent with the Act over time.<sup>8</sup> The Commission also seeks comment on a proposal to assess universal service contributions on a flat-fee basis, such as a per-line or per-account charge.<sup>9</sup>

Revenues are a common thread for the assessment of many federal and state funded programs. In its *Recommended Decision*, the Federal-State Joint Board noted that:

Commenters advocate a variety of contribution methodologies, and the majority recommend some kind of revenues-based mechanism.<sup>10</sup>

In the *Notice*, the Commission acknowledged that revenues are the proper assessment base when it stated:

...Section 254 of the Act requires providers of “interstate telecommunications services” to contribute to universal service on an equitable and nondiscriminatory basis. Thus, in establishing a universal service contribution methodology, the Commission must choose a way to measure the amount of interstate telecommunications services provided by each carrier, so that the Commission can equitably and nondiscriminatorily assess contributions. As previously

---

<sup>8</sup> *Notice* at ¶¶17-24.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* at ¶¶ 17, 25-30.

<sup>10</sup> Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, *Recommended Decision*, CC Docket No. 96-45, 12 FCC Rcd 87, 490-91 (1996) (“*Recommended Decision*”).

mentioned, the Commission has chosen revenues to gauge the amount of interstate telecommunications service provided by each carrier....<sup>11</sup>

Assessment on any other basis does not adequately measure the amount of interstate telecommunications services on which to assess contributions. Revenues are finite and easily measured, with clear and well-defined jurisdictional definitions.

A flat charge would include both intrastate and interstate revenues out of necessity, because the mere existence of a customer account offers absolutely no information about either the existence or amount of interstate service that a particular customer has. Furthermore, the existence or amount of interstate service varies widely depending on whether the carrier is a local exchange or interexchange carrier. The assessment basis must be equitably and nondiscriminatory, pursuant to Section 254 of the Act. Flat fee assessments would necessarily involve some type of artificial industry averaging process that are an inadequate substitute for actual interstate billed revenues billed by carriers for interstate and international service. Thus, flat fee assessments are regressive, and would not meet the requirements of the Act.

Most importantly, the flat fee approach was specifically disallowed by the Fifth Circuit in *Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel v. FCC*.<sup>12</sup> The Fifth Circuit reversed the Commission's decision to assess contributions based on the intrastate revenues of universal service contributors. Thus, any proposal to assess universal service contributions on a flat fee basis is *per se* unlawful and should not even be raised or seriously considered by the Commission in this proceeding.

---

<sup>11</sup> Notice at ¶ 17 (footnote omitted).

<sup>12</sup> 183 F.3d 393, 448 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999).

## B. Exemptions

### 1. *De Minimis* Carriers

Section 254(d) of the Act grants the Commission authority to exempt a carrier or class of carriers from the requirement to contribute to the federal universal service fund if the carrier's telecommunications activities are limited to such an extent that the level of such carriers' contribution to the preservation and advancement of universal service would be *de minimis*.

USTA believes that the contributions from carriers currently classified by the Commission as *de minimis* would also be *de minimis* when compared to the current fund as a whole. For example, using 1999 revenue data from the Commission's *Telecommunications Industry Revenues: 1999*,<sup>13</sup> the total interstate and international revenues for 2,708 filers that were *de minimis* or otherwise exempt from universal service support requirements was \$143,000,000 out of a base of about \$80,000,000,000 or .00179 percent ( $\$143,000,000/\$80,000,000,000$ ). USTA estimates that if these *de minimis* carriers did contribute in 2000, their contribution would have been approximately \$8,151,000 ( $\$143,000,000 \times .0570$  percent), based on an average contribution factor for 2000 of .00570 percent.<sup>14</sup> The \$8,151,000 represents approximately .00181 percent of the fund of about \$4,500,000,000 ( $\$8,151,000/\$4,500,000,000$ ).

USTA continues to support the current Commission policy set forth in Section 54.798 of the Commission's rules<sup>15</sup> that exempts from the obligation any interstate and

---

<sup>13</sup> Released September 25, 2000, Table 4.

<sup>14</sup> This percentage was calculated as follows:  $.058770 + .057101 + .055360 + .056688 \div 4 = .0570$ .

<sup>15</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 54.798.

international telecommunications carrier whose annual universal service contribution would be less than \$10,000. The only interstate and international telecommunications revenues of the majority of USTA members that fall in the *de minimis* category are those carriers' interstate subscriber line revenues.

USTA's position is consistent with the Federal-State Joint Board's *Recommended Decision* and the Joint Explanatory Statement that s "the *de minimis* exemption applies only to those carriers for which the cost of collection exceed the amount contribution."<sup>16</sup> USTA is not aware any changes in the status of these *de minimis* carriers to remove their current exemption.

## **2. Cable Modem Service Providers**

On September 26, 2000, USTA filed a *Petition for Declaratory Ruling* with the Commission requesting that cable television operators or their affiliates that provide telecommunications services be required to contribute to the universal service fund. Such a finding is consistent with the Ninth Circuit's determination in *AT&T Corporation v. City of Portland*<sup>17</sup> that found that cable broadband transmission service offered by cable operators over cable systems is a telecommunications service. As such, those cable operators are obligated to comply with Section 254(d) of the Act and contribute to the universal service fund. USTA again urges the Commission to act favorably on its petition.

---

<sup>16</sup> *Recommended Decision* at 498 (footnote omitted).

<sup>17</sup> 216 F.3d 871 (2000).

### **C. Fund Sufficiency**

The Commission would satisfy the Section 254(d) requirements of a specific, predictable, and sufficient mechanism that would preserve and advance universal service if it adopts an annual contribution factor based on current, gross-billed interstate and international (*i.e.*, retail) revenues. Such an approach would require carriers to file FCC Form 499 once a year with an annual true-up to assist USAC in determining any under or over assessments in the fund. The Universal Service Administration Company (“USAC”) has been given the responsibility by the Commission to administer the universal service support mechanism in an efficient, effective and competitively neutral manner.<sup>18</sup> USAC’s experience should allow it to recommend to the Commission accurate estimates of the appropriate level of carrier contributions. Furthermore, any current year shortfalls could be offset by adjusting the next year’s contribution factor and any over assessments could be deducted from the next year, thus avoiding the need for a reserve fund.

### **D. Carrier Reporting**

As set forth in Section (I) above,<sup>19</sup> USTA has filed a *Reconsideration Petition* seeking a change in the carrier reporting requirement recently adopted by the Commission so that carriers would file their annual retail revenues to USAC and that the quarterly requirement would be eliminated. USTA again urges the Commission to adopt that request.

---

<sup>18</sup> 47 C.F.R. Part 54, Subpart H.

<sup>19</sup> See n.7, *infra*.

## **E. Enforcement and Auditing**

If the Commission adopts USTA's recommendation to move from quarterly factors to an annual factor as sought in its *Reconsideration Petition*, this would remove the advantage, if any, of underreporting of revenues in one quarter and over-reporting of revenues in another quarter to reduce a carrier's contribution obligations. USTA believes that USAC and the Commission currently have the necessary oversight authority and responsibilities to monitor all interstate and international telecommunications carriers' compliance with the reporting and contribution requirements of the federal universal service program. USTA is of the opinion that the current Section 54.707 of the rules,<sup>20</sup> "Audit Controls," provides the fund administrator with the necessary authority to audit contributions and carrier reporting of revenues data to the administrator. In addition, the Commission with its enforcement rules is in a position to enforce Section 54.707. Furthermore, USTA believes that Section 254(d) of the Act and Section 54.706 of the rules<sup>21</sup> provide sufficient authority to collect assessed contributions from carriers.<sup>22</sup>

## **F. Transition**

Since USTA is not advocating a major change from the current contribution assessment methodology, a transition would not be required if USTA's position is adopted.

---

<sup>20</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 54.707.

<sup>21</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 54.706.

<sup>22</sup> See PTT Telekom, Inc., *Forfeiture Order*, FCC 01-187, released June 15, 2001.

### **III. RECOVERY OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE CONTRIBUTION**

#### **A. Lifeline Exception**

USTA believes it would be inconsistent with the current principles and purpose of the lifeline support program to recover a portion of the federal universal service program cost from this group of consumers. Therefore, USTA supports the continuation of the current provisions associated with the recovery of universal service contribution from lifeline customers found in Section 54.401 of the rules.<sup>23</sup>

USTA's position on low-income and/or low-volume consumers is to continue to recover a portion of the federal universal service support cost. USTA is not aware of any method to identify low-income consumers except through the lifeline support program. Low-volume consumers may or may not be low income consumers. Furthermore, some consumers' low-volume status could change from month to month. USTA is currently not aware of a definition for a low-volume consumer and questions whether it would be appropriate to base a definition on a dollar amount for local service, long distance service, non-regulated services, or a combination of all services.<sup>24</sup> For instance, a low-volume consumer to a USTA member company could very well be a high-volume consumer to a calling card carrier.

#### **B. Recovery Limitations for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers**

As advocated in Sections (II) (C) and (D) above, the Commission should fix a flawed process that requires burdensome quarterly rate changes for recovery of universal service contributions. The Commission should adopt an annual factor for all carriers, or

---

<sup>23</sup> 47 C.F.R. § 54.401.

<sup>24</sup> Furthermore, public disclosure of such information would very likely be a violation of 5 U.S.C. § 552.

allow carriers to develop their universal service charges on an annual basis that would be sufficient to satisfy their obligations to the universal service fund. This could correspond to the carriers' annual tariff filings based on a July 1-June 30 period. Although an annual factor could create the potential for under or over-recovery, the fund administrator should be given the authority to manage the fund by allowing for cash reserve, borrowing, or other cash management tools typically used in such circumstances. This would reduce administrative burdens for the Commission, USAC, and carriers, as well as decrease customer confusion by limiting changes in the level of an end user charge to an annual basis, rather than a quarterly basis.

Alternatively, the Commission should give the incumbent local exchange carriers the same flexibility as the rest of the industry to recover their universal service contributions. They should be allowed to adopt an annual universal service charge. Any shortfall or over-recovery in the revenues as compared to the payments due to the fund administrator would be added to, or subtracted from, the following year's rates.

### **C. Legal Authority**

USTA maintains that the Commission's authority to enact the changes to the recovery mechanism proposed herein by USTA is contained within the parameters of the Act. However, USTA takes no position with regard to the Commission's legal authority to adopt other, more far-reaching proposals contained in the *Notice*.

## **IV. CONCLUSION**

USTA believes that the Commission should conclude other outstanding proceedings affecting expenses of telecommunications carriers and the size of the federal universal service fund before it resolves the issues raised in this *Notice* affecting carriers'

revenues and related obligations under the universal service program. However, should the Commission proceed, USTA advocates that, under current policies, assessment of carriers' universal service contribution should be made annually and on the basis of a carrier's interstate and international retail revenues. USTA also advocates that the current *de minimis* carrier exemption and the lifeline exception be retained, and that cable television operators or their affiliates offering cable broadband transmission service be required to contribute to the universal service fund.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES TELECOM ASSOCIATION

By  \_\_\_\_\_

*Its Attorneys:*

Lawrence E. Sarjeant  
Linda L. Kent  
Keith Townsend  
John W. Hunter  
Julie E. Rones

1401 H Street, N.W.  
Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 326-7375

June 25, 2001

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Meena Joshi, do certify that on June 25, 2001, Comments of The United States Telecom Association was either hand-delivered, or deposited in the U.S. Mail, first-class, postage prepaid to the attached service list.

  
Meena Joshi

Chairman Michael K. Powell  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 8-B201  
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Susan Ness  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 8-B115  
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Harold Furchtgott-Roth  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 8-B302  
Washington, DC 20554

Commissioner Gloria Tristani  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 8-C302  
Washington, DC 20554

Linda Kinney  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 8-A302  
Washington, DC 20554

Sarah Whitesell  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 8-C302  
Washington, DC 20554

Kevin Martin  
Rebecca Beynan  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 8-C302  
Washington, DC 20554

Steve Burnett  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-B418  
Washington, DC 20554

Lisa Boehley  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-B544  
Washington, DC 20554

Linda Armstrong  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 8-A302C  
Washington, DC 20554

Andrew Firth  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-A505  
Washington, DC 20554

Bryan Clopton  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-A465  
Washington, DC 20554

Genaro Fullano  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-A623  
Washington, DC 20554

L. Charles Keller  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20554

Robert Loubé  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-B524  
Washington, DC 20554

Katie King  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-B550  
Washington, DC 20554

Brian Miillin  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-A525  
Washington, DC 20554

Mark Nadel  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-B551  
Washington, DC 20554

Richard D. Smith  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-B448  
Washington, DC 20554

Elizabeth H. Valinoti  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-C408  
Washington, DC 20554

Stuart Polikoff  
Stephen Pastorkovich  
OPASTCO  
21 Dupont Circle, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Jack Zinman  
Federal Communications Commission  
445-12th Street, SW  
Room 5-A663  
Washington, DC 20554

Ann Dean  
Maryland Public Service Commission  
Six Paul Street  
16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Susan Stevens Miller  
Maryland Public Service Commission  
Six Paul Street  
16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Carl Johnson  
New York Public Service Commission  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223

Rowland Curry  
Texas PUC  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
P.O. Box 13326  
Austin, TX 78701

Bridget Duff  
Florida PSC  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Thor Nelson  
Colorado Office of Consumer Counsel  
1580 Logan Street  
Suite 610  
Denver, CO 80203

Kevin Schwenzfeier  
NYDPS  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223

Tiane Sommer  
Georgia PSC  
244 Washington Street, SW  
Atlanta, GA 30334

The Honorable Julia Johnson  
Chairman  
Florida Public Service Commission  
Capital Circle Office Center  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

The Honorable Kenneth McClure  
Vice Chairman  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
301 W. High Street  
Suite 530  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

The Honorable Kenneth McClure  
Vice Chairman  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
301 W. High Street  
Suite 530  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

The Honorable Kenneth McClure  
Vice Chairman  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
301 W. High Street  
Suite 530  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Martha S. Hogerty  
Public Counsel for the State of Missouri  
P.O. Box 7800  
Harry S. Truman Building  
301 West High St. #250  
Room 250  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Deonne Bruning  
Nebraska Public Service Commission  
300 The Atrium  
1200 N Street  
Lincoln, NE 68509

Larry D. Barnes  
Eclipse Telecommunications Inc.  
1122 Capital of Texas Hwy South  
Suite 100  
Austin, TX 78746

Charles Bolle  
Nevada Public Utilities Commission  
1150 E. Williams Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

Lori Kenyon  
Alaska Public Utilities Commission  
1016 West Sixth Avenue  
Suite 400  
Anchorage, AK 99501

Doris McCarter  
Ohio Public Utilities Commission  
180 East Broad Street  
Telecommunications - Third Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215

Mark Long  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard  
Gerald Gunter Building  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Arthur H. Stuenkel  
Arkansas Public Service Commission  
P.O. Box 400  
Little Rock, AK 72203-0400

Sandra Makeeff Adams  
Iowa Utilities Board  
850 Maple Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Peter Bluhm  
Vermont Public Service Board  
Drawer 20  
112 State Street - Fourth Floor  
Montpellier, VT 05620

Philip F. McClelland  
Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate  
555 Walnut Street  
Forum Place - Fifth Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Michael A. McRae  
DC Office of People's Counsel  
1133 15th Street, NW  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20005

Anthony Myers  
Maryland Public Service Commission  
Six St. Paul Street  
19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Diana Zake  
Texas Public Utility Commission  
1701 N. Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78711

Tim Zakriski  
New York Department of Public Service  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223

David Dowds  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oaks Blvd.  
Gerald Gunter Bldg.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Don Durack  
Barry Payne  
Indiana Office of Consumer Counsel  
100 North Senate Avenue  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Greg Fogleman  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oaks Blvd.  
Gerald Gunter Bldg.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399

Brad Ramsay  
Paul Rodgers  
Charles D. Gray  
NARUC  
1101 Vermont Avenue, N.W. Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20005

Tom

Ellen Levine  
Lionel B. Wilson  
Peter Arth, Jr.  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Allen P. Stayman  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Office of the Secretary  
Washington, DC 20240

Kweisi Mfume  
NAACP  
4805 Mt. Hope Drive  
Baltimore, MD 21215

Ted Schultz  
Nebraska Association of Hospitals and Health Sys.  
1640 L Street  
Suite D  
Lincoln, NB 68508

Lawrence C. St. Blanc  
Gayle T. Kellner  
Louisiana PSC  
P.O. Box 91154  
Baton Rouge, LA 70821

Karen Finstad Hammel  
Montana PSC  
1701 Prospect Avenue  
P.O. Box 202601  
Helena, MT 59601

Governor William J. Janklow  
State of South Dakota  
State Capitol  
500 East Capitol  
Pierre, SD 57501

Philip L. Verveer  
Brian A. Finley  
Willkie Farr & Gallagher  
Three Lafayette Centre  
1155 21st Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Paul W. Schroeder  
American Foundation for the Blind  
401 N. Michigan Avenue  
Suite 308  
Chicago, IL 60611

Norman D. Rasmussen  
Colorado Independent  
Telephone Association, Inc.  
3236 Hiwan Drive  
Evergreen, CO 80439

Joe Dudick  
Pennsylvania Rural Development Council  
Room 506 Finance Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Kenneth Sofferahn  
James A. Burg  
South Dakota PUC  
500 East Capitol Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501

Maggie Murphy  
STAR Program  
300 Centennial Building  
658 Cedar Street  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Adrienne G. Southgate  
State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations  
Public Utilities Commission  
100 Orange Street  
Providence, RI 02903

Adrienne G. Southgate  
State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations  
Public Utilities Commission  
100 Orange Street  
Providence, RI 02903

Edward H. Salmon  
State of New Jersey Board of Public Utilities  
CN-350  
Trenton, NJ 08625

Kathleen F. O'Reilly  
The Michigan Consumer Federation, etal  
414 A Street, SE  
Washington, DC 20003

Jeff Beck  
Beck & Ackerman  
Four Embarcadero Center  
Suite 760  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Virginia J. Taylor  
Richard A. Elbrecht  
California Department of Consumer Affairs  
400 R Street  
Suite 3090  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Amy E. Dougherty  
Kentucky PSC  
P.O. Box 615  
Frankfort, KY 40602

William B. Hill  
Keystone-Arthur Telephone Company  
P.O. Box 240  
Keystone, NE 69144

Robert D. Carlitz  
Information Renaissance  
600 Gran Street  
Suite 4680  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

John E. Cawthorne  
National Urban League  
106 Campion Hall  
Boston College  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02146

Stuart Blake  
Kinko, Inc..  
World Headquarters  
255 West Stanley Avenue  
Ventura, CA 93002

Laura L. Wilson  
Florida Cable Telecommunications Association  
310 North Monroe Street  
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Patrice McDermott  
Information Policy Analyst  
OMB WATCH  
1742 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20009

Fiona Branton  
Information Technology Industry Council  
1250 Eye Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

B. Robert Piller  
Gerald A. Norlander  
Public Utility Law Project of New York, Inc..  
90 State Street  
Suite 601  
Albany, NY 12207

**Benjamin Perez**  
**Gerald M. Zuckerman**  
**Mark J. Becker**  
**Abacus Communications Co.**  
**1801 Columbia Road, NW - Suite 101**  
**Washington, DC 20009**

**Tom Udall**  
**Richard Weiner**  
**New Mexico Attorney General's Office**  
**P.O. Box Drawer 1508**  
**Santa Fe, NM 87504**

**Martin Avery**  
**Navajo Nation**  
**1101 17th Street, NW**  
**Suite 250**  
**Washington, DC 20036**

**Ronald K. Greenhalgh**  
**National Rural Electric Cooperative Association**  
**4301 Wilson Boulevard**  
**Arlington, VA 22203**

**Donald L. Howell, II**  
**Idaho PUC**  
**P.O. Box 83720**  
**Boise, ID 83720**

**James T. Coyle**  
**Shawnee Telephone Co.**  
**P.O. Box 69**  
**Equality, IL 62934**

**Ronald A. Gagon**  
**NOBLE**  
**26 Cherry Hill**  
**Danver, MA 01923**

**Jeffrey C. Ogden**  
**Merit Network**  
**4251 Plymouth Road**  
**Ann Arbor, MI 48105**

**Ronald L. Plessner**  
**James H. Halpert**  
**Mark J. O'Connor**  
**Piper & Marbury, LLP**  
**1200 19th Street, NW - Seventh Floor**  
**Washington, DC 20036**

**J.D. Williams**  
**Cheyenne River Sioux Telephone Authority**  
**100 Main Street**  
**Eagle Butte, SD 57625**

**Richard A. Finnigan**  
**Oregon Independent Telephone Association**  
**2405 Evergreen Park Drive, SW**  
**Suite B-01**  
**Olympia, WA 98502**

**Mary J. Sisak**  
**Mary L. Brown**  
**MCI WorldComm., Inc.**  
**1133 19<sup>th</sup> Street, NW**  
**Washington, DC 20036**

**Adam Turner**  
**Commonwealth of Northern Marianas**  
**2121 R Street, NW**  
**Washington, DC 20006**

**John G. Strand**  
**John C. Shea**  
**State of Michigan PSC**  
**6545 Mercantile Way**  
**P.O. Box 30221**  
**Lansing, MI 48909**

Blossom A. Peretz  
NJ Department of Treasury  
31 Clinton Street - 11th Floor  
P.O. Box 46005  
Newark, NJ 07101

Encarnita Catalan-Marchan  
Maria Pizarro-Figueroa  
Telefonica Larga Distancia de Puerto Rico, Inc..  
Metro Office Park  
Building No. 8 - Street No. 1  
Guaynabo, PR 00922

Gayle T. Killner  
Louisiana PSC  
P.O. Box 91154  
Baton Rouge, LA 70821

Mark D. Wilkerson  
Brantley & Wilkerson, PC  
P.O. Box 830  
Montgomery, AL 36101

Harold M. Thompson  
Iowa Communications Network  
P.O. Box 587  
Johnston, IA 50131

Mark Savage  
Stevan Rosenzweig  
Carmela Castellano  
Public Advocates, Inc..  
1535 Mission Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Carolyn Pucell  
Department of Information Resources  
P.O. Box 13564  
Austin, TX 78711

Curtis T. White  
Allied Communications Group, Inc...  
4201 Connecticut Avenue, NW  
Suite 402  
Washington, DC 20008

Danny E. Adams  
Steven A. Augustino  
Kelley Drye & Warren  
1200 19th Street, NW  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Brad E. Mutschelknaus  
John J. Heitmann  
Kelley Drye & Warren  
1200 19th Street, NW  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20036

Robert A. Hart IV  
Hart Engineers & CEO of 21st Century Telesis, Inc..  
4615 North Boulevard  
Baton Rouge, LA 70806

Charles D. Cosson  
AirTouch Communications, Inc..  
One California Street - 29th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105