



December 19, 2007

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W., TW-A325
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ex Parte Notice: Correction for NJDRC/Washington Public Counsel/NASUCA Comments in CC Docket 07-204, *In the Matter of Petition of Qwest Corporation For Forbearance from Enforcement of the Commission's ARMIS and 492A Reporting Requirements Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 160(c)*

Dear Ms. Dortch:

The comments filed in this docket on December 6, 2007 on behalf of the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel, the Washington Public Counsel, and the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates referred to two Appendices. It has come to our attention that the Appendices were inadvertently not filed with the comments. Copies of the Appendices are being filed with this letter.

Appendix 1 was introduced at pp. 24-25 of the comments in this docket: "Rate Counsel has previously submitted to the Commission a comprehensive analysis of the cable-telecommunications duopoly and the implications of this duopoly for consumers. This paper is attached to these comments as Appendix 1." Footnote 60 cited the Appendix as "'The Cable-Telco Duopoly's Deployment of New Jersey's Information Infrastructure: Establishing Accountability,' Susan M. Baldwin, Sarah M. Bosley and Timothy E. Howington, Prepared for the Public Advocate of New Jersey, January 19, 2007." Appendix 1 is also referred to at subsequent other points in the comments. The paper was submitted to the Commission as an attachment to Rate Counsel's comments in the "broadband deployment" docket, WC 07-45.¹ See

¹ *In the Matter of Inquiry Concerning the Deployment of Advanced In the Matter of Telecommunications Capability to All Americans in a Reasonable and Timely Fashion, and Possible Steps to Accelerate Such Deployment Pursuant to Section 706 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, WC Docket 07-45.

http://gulfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6519411712.

Appendix 2 was introduced at pp. 35-36 of the comments, referring to the FCC's separations docket, CC Docket 80-286²: "Among other things, an affidavit submitted in support of NASUCA's and Rate Counsel's comments stated..." Footnote 90 on p. 36 cited that affidavit as Appendix 2 to the comments. Like Appendix 1, Appendix 2 is also referred to at subsequent other points in the comments. As indicated, the affidavit was filed on August 22, 2006 with the NASUCA/Rate Counsel comments in CC Docket 80-286; see

http://gulfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6518439162.

As noted, both Appendices are being filed with this letter. We apologize for any inconvenience this error might have caused.

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Bergmann
Assistant Consumers' Counsel
Chair, NASUCA
Telecommunications Committee
Office of the Ohio Consumers'
Counsel
10 West Broad Street, Suite 1800
Columbus, OH 43215-3485
Phone (614) 466-8574
Fax (614) 466-9475
bergmann@occ.state.oh.us

NASUCA
8380 Colesville Road, Suite 101
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Phone (301) 589-6313
Fax (301) 589-6380

² *In the Matter of Jurisdictional Separations and Referral to the Federal-State Joint Board*, CC Docket 80-286.