

KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.

SUMNER SQUARE
1615 M STREET, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-3209

(202) 326-7900

FACSIMILE:
(202) 326-7999

December 11, 2006

Via ECFS

Marlene Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554

Re: WC Docket No. 06-172

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On behalf of Verizon, attached is an Opposition to Motion for Extension of Time for filing in the above-captioned proceeding. Please contact me at (202) 326-7930 if you have any questions regarding this filing.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Evan Leo', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the left.

Evan Leo

Attachment

cc: Best Copy and Printing, Inc.
Janice M. Myles
Renee Crittendon
Jeremy Miller
Tim Stelzig
Diane Griffin
Marcus Maher
Julie Veach

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Petitions of the Verizon Telephone Companies)	WC Docket No. 06-172
for Forbearance Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c))	
in the Boston, New York, Philadelphia,)	
Pittsburgh, Providence and Virginia Beach)	
Metropolitan Statistical Areas)	

OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

The Commission should deny Comptel's Motion for Extension of Time. *See* Motion for Extension of Time, filed by Comptel, WC Docket No. 06-172 (filed Dec. 6, 2006).

Comptel's Motion is further evidence that the main strategy of competing carriers in this proceeding is to withhold evidence for as long as possible in order to deprive the Commission of an adequate record on which to rule. These carriers first sought to exclude evidence that Verizon submitted with its petitions. Now they seek an open-ended extension to forestall additional comment and response.

The parties have already been granted one extension and have now had more than three months to respond to Verizon's submission and provide data of their own. Further delay could prevent action prior to the statutory deadline and risks compressing the time the *Commission* has for its review even under that deadline. It also increases the risk that the Commission will need to extend the initial one-year period for ruling on Verizon's petition by an additional 90 days, which would prejudice not only Verizon but also consumers in the MSAs at issue. Such harms far outweigh the reason that Comptel gives

for an extension – which is to avoid the risk of its lawyers doing too much (or too little) work in the event the Commission grants other pending motions.

Comptel argues that the Commission should extend the comments deadline until after it rules on the pending Motion to Compel, because parties will need additional time “to digest and analyze any new information Verizon makes available.” *Id.* at 3. But as Verizon has previously explained, Comptel and other parties already have all the information they need meaningfully to comment on Verizon’s forbearance petition. Even if the Commission requires Verizon to share one carrier’s carrier-specific data with other carriers, it is unlikely that Carrier A will be able to provide more meaningful analysis of Carrier B’s confidential data than Carrier B itself. If that *were* likely to be the case, as Comptel’s argument presumes, such carriers could have traded approval to view each other’s data, which to date no carrier has done. Indeed, it is strange at best that these carriers have asked the Commission to compel Verizon to give them each other’s information in the first place, since they can simply share it directly with another under non-disclosure agreements. In any event, even if a party thinks it has something to contribute with respect to another party’s data, it has ample opportunity to do so in subsequent comments or ex parte filings.

Comptel also argues that “it would be far more expedient for the Commission to postpone the filing deadlines until after it has resolved the issues raised in the Motion to Dismiss.” *Id.* at 2. That is not true. Between the alternatives of delaying the filing of comments and maintaining the current schedule the former is obviously *less* expedient. That approach would compress the time for all subsequent filings and, consequently, delay the creation of a complete record on which the Commission will eventually rule.

Avoiding this result is far more important than ensuring that a few extra days of lawyers' work isn't rendered futile.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth herein, the Commission should deny the Motion for Extension of Time.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael E. Glover
Of Counsel

Edward Shakin
Sherry Ingram
Verizon
1515 North Court House Road
Suite 500
Arlington, Virginia 22201
(703) 351-3065

Evan T. Leo
Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd,
Evans & Figel, P.L.L.C.
1615 M Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 326-7930

Attorneys for Verizon

Dated: December 11, 2006