Amy L. Alvarez
District Manager
Federal Government Affairs

Suite 1000
1120 20th Street, NW
Washington DC 20036
202-457-2315
FAX 202-263-2601
email: alalvarez@att.com

February 26, 2003

Via Electronic Filing
Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room TWB-204
Washington, DC 20554

Re: *Application by Verizon Maryland, Verizon Washington, D.C., and Verizon West Virginia for Authorization to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Maryland, Washington, D.C., and West Virginia, Docket 02-384*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On Tuesday, February 25, 2003, David Levy and the undersigned, both representing AT&T, met with William Maher, Chief of the Wireline Competition Bureau, and Scott Bergmann, Jeffrey Carlisle, Gail Cohen, Jeff Dygert, Rich Lerner, and Victoria Schlesinger of the Bureau Staff. Chris Nurse, also of AT&T, participated via telephone.

During the meeting AT&T reiterated its position that Verizon has failed to meet the certain competitive checklist items. In particular, we discussed Verizon's "GRIPs" policy, which violates its duty to provide interconnection at any technically feasible point; Verizon's failure to provide nondiscriminatory access to billing functions and high capacity loops; and Verizon's unjust and unreasonable policies concerning returned collocation space. As part of that discussion, we referenced AT&T's February 11, 2003 ex parte that addresses Verizon's improper use of a 12-year depreciation life when calculating refunds to CLECs for vacated collocation space. In addition, we also referred to the attached list (posted by Verizon on its website) in which Verizon identifies the estimated total amount of space available for physical collocation in certain central offices in Massachusetts.

As AT&T has stated previously, the West Virginia PSC has ordered Verizon to post on its website 'the central offices in which collocation arrangements have been returned, and to timely update that information." *West Virginia Consultative Report* at 12. The PSC recognized that this is part of Verizon's duty, under the holding of the *Local Competition Order*, to provide general information to CLECs regarding the location and characteristic of its facilities because such information is in Verizon's

possession. Verizon's claim that posting such information is "administratively burdensome" has already been rejected by the West Virginia PSC.

AT&T further explained that, to date, Verizon has not made clear whether it will post the information required by the West Virginia PSC for central offices in Washington, DC and Maryland, and not merely those in West Virginia. Because the West Virginia PSC has already required Verizon to post such information on its website, the additional cost and burden of posting the information for Maryland and Washington, DC would be, at best, minimal.

One electronic copy of this Notice is being submitted to the Secretary of the FCC in accordance with Section 1.1206 of the Commission's rules.

Sincerely,

cc: Scott Bergmann
Jeffrey Carlisle
Gail Cohen
Jeff Dygert
Rich Lerner
Victoria Schlesinger
Gary Remondino