

COPY

March 16, 2004

VIA HAND DELIVERY and ELECTRONIC MAIL

Luly E. Massaro, Commission Clerk
Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission
89 Jefferson Boulevard
Warwick, RI 02888

**Re: Docket No. 3550: DPUC Implementation of FCC's Triennial Review Order
Docket No. 2681: In re Review of Bell Atlantic's TELRIC Studies**

Dear Ms. Massaro:

I write on behalf of AT&T to bring to the Commission's attention a decision yesterday by the Michigan Public Service Commission denying SBC's motion to stay that state's UNE impairment investigation. SBC had raised much the same arguments put forward in Verizon's pending motion to stay. The Michigan PSC's well-reasoned decision rejects those arguments.

Because the Michigan ruling provides useful guidance and perspective regarding the issues raised by Verizon's pending motion to stay, I enclose a copy for the Commission's convenience.


AT&T again respectfully urges the Commission to deny Verizon's Motion to Stay. Should the Commission nonetheless decide to allow that motion, however, AT&T urges the Commission to issue only a temporary stay, so that the decision on whether to proceed with the impairment investigation can be revisited when the United States Supreme Court decides whether or not to grant *certiorari* and review the D.C. Circuit's March 2, 2004 opinion in *USTA II*. In addition, if the Commission were to grant a stay, the order to temporarily stay proceedings should specifically provide that current unbundling requirements must remain in place at the current rates until the appeal of *USTA II* is fully resolved. Such an assurance would be critically important to protect Rhode Island consumers against any attempt by Verizon to interrupt their service and competitive options long before there has been any finding of "non-impairment" under

federal law, and long before this Commission has had an opportunity to determine the extent to which Verizon should be required to provide unbundled mass market switching as a matter of Rhode Island law and policy.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

BROWN RUDNICK BERLACK ISRAELS LLP

By: 
William M. Dolan III

/dm

Enclosure

cc: Service List (w/enclosure)

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion,)	
to facilitate the implementation of the Federal)	
Communications Commission's Triennial Review)	Case No. U-13796
determinations in Michigan.)	
_____)	

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion,)	
to investigate and to implement, if necessary)	Case No. U-13891
a batch cut migration process.)	
_____)	

At the March 15, 2004 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing,
Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. J. Peter Lark, Chair
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner
Hon. Laura Chappelle, Commissioner

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO TEMPORARILY STAY

On March 9, 2004, SBC Michigan (SBC) filed a motion to temporarily stay all Triennial Review proceedings. The foundation for SBC's motion was the ruling by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit that several aspects of the Federal Communications Commission's (FCC's) Triennial Review Order (TRO) are unlawful, including the FCC's sub-delegation of certain impairment decisions to state commissions.¹ SBC argues that because this Commission has initiated these proceedings pursuant to the FCC's rules that have been declared unlawful, it would be wasteful and imprudent to proceed at this time. Specifically, SBC requests that all of the

¹ See, United States Telecom Ass'n v FCC, Nos. 00-1012 (consol.), 2004 WL 374262 (CADDC March 2, 2004) (USTA II).

Commission's Triennial Review proceedings be stayed until the later of the denial of any petition for rehearing en banc or until May 1, 2004 (the expiration of the stay ordered by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, 60 days from the issuance of USTA II). Furthermore, SBC requests that the Commission establish a status hearing to be held in 60-90 days to discuss how to proceed. SBC contends that no party will be harmed or prejudiced by a temporary delay.

On March 12, 2004, numerous parties filed responses to the motion. Without exception, the responding parties urged the Commission to deny SBC's motion to temporarily stay these proceedings.² The reasons in favor of denying SBC's motion generally fall into four broad categories.

First, several parties express concern that Administrative Law Judge James N. Rigas (ALJ) does not possess the requisite authority to grant the motion given that the proceeding was commenced by the Commission. AARP, ¶ 1; Joint CLECs, pp. 2-6; CLECA, p. 1; Sage, pp. 1-3. Absent Commission action, they argue, the case should proceed.

Second, many parties assert that the USTA II opinion is not yet effective and, most likely, further stays will be sought and granted. AARP, ¶ 2; Joint CLECs, pp. 7-10; Joint Commenters, p. 3; Bullseye, ¶¶ 3 and 4; MCI, pp. 1-4; Sage, p. 3; Coalition, pp. 2-4. There are numerous examples cited where parties have publicly stated their desire to appeal the USTA II decision, including Commissioner Nelson on behalf of the NARUC Telecommunications Committee.

²Parties responding in opposition to SBC's motion are: AARP; AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc., TCG Detroit, and Covad Communications Company (collectively, Joint CLECs); ACN Communications Services, Inc., Z-Tel Communications, Inc., and Talk America, Inc. (collectively, Joint Commenters); Bullseye Telecom, Inc. (Bullseye); the Competitive Local Exchange Carriers Association of Michigan (CLECA); MCImetro Access Transmission Services LLC, and MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc., and Brooks Fiber Communications of Michigan, Inc. (collectively, MCI); Sage Telecom, Inc. (Sage); LDMI Telecommunications, Inc., TelNet Worldwide, Inc., Quick Communications, Inc., d/b/a Quick Connect USA, Superior Technologies, Inc., d/b/a Superior Spectrum, Inc., CMC Telecom, Inc., and Zenk Group, LTD, d/b/a Planet Access (collectively, Coalition).

Moreover, while the opinion is stayed, parties contend that the FCC's rules remain in effect and SBC's motion is premature.

Third, certain parties argue that the Commission has the ability to conduct these proceedings on its own and has much to learn from them. AARP, ¶¶ 3 and 4, Joint CLECs, pp. 6-7, 10-15; Joint Commenters, p. 3; Bullseye, ¶¶ 5-7; CLECA, p. 1; MCI, pp. 4-5; Sage, pp. 5-7; Coalition, p. 5. Arguably, the USTA II opinion addresses the sub-delegation of decision-making authority to the state commissions, not the conduct of proceedings. Consequently, this Commission may continue with its proceedings and rely upon that information in advising the FCC and in making its own state determinations. The opposing parties contend that the Commission has worked hard to develop pro-competition policies in this state and that staying these proceedings will deny the Commission an opportunity to consider important unbundling issues. Moreover, the Commission has independent state authority to move forward.

Fourth, many parties argue that they have already made significant investments in this proceeding and it would be prejudicial, harmful, and wasteful for it not to be completed. AARP, ¶ 5; Joint CLECs, p. 15; Joint Commenters, p. 2; Bullseye, ¶ 8; MCI, pp. 5-6; Sage, p. 7, Coalition, p. 2. The parties have already conducted discovery, pre-filed their testimony, and the hearings are set to begin. All that remains will be briefing and the Commission's consideration of the issues. To stop now, the opposing parties contend, would leave several factual disputes unresolved and would leave the Commission without critical input on important unbundling decisions. Additionally, to re-start these proceedings at some later point will necessarily mean that information will become stale, necessitating some duplication of effort to update the record.

On March 15, 2004, the Commission presided over an oral argument whereby the parties largely reiterated the positions presented in their motions. The Commission has found the

arguments to be insightful and helpful in making its determinations. After reviewing SBC's motion and the responses thereto, along with the oral arguments presented, the Commission finds that the motion to temporarily stay these proceedings should be denied.

Particularly key to the Commission's decision today is the consensus that there is no legal impediment for these proceedings to continue. SBC concedes this point. While there is a debate as to the legal implications of the stay of the vacatur in the USTA II decision on the FCC's TRO,³ all parties agree that the decision does not prevent state commissions from continuing to gather facts on the state of telephone competition and from continuing to provide whatever advice to the FCC that the FCC wishes to receive. Without regard to the current legal standing of the FCC's TRO, there is ample independent federal and state authority for these proceedings to continue.⁴

With that said, however, this Commission believes that it is no small consequence that the USTA II decision has been stayed and may, in fact, never take effect. While SBC cites authority that it believes stands for the proposition that USTA II is binding law upon publication, regardless

³Of considerable debate both in the pleadings and during oral argument is the legal effect of the USTA II decision in light of the fact that the court stayed its vacatur for 60 days. SBC argued that the USTA II ruling that certain aspects of the FCC's TRO are unlawful is authoritative despite the fact that the mandate has not yet issued. SBC's Motion, pp. 6-7, citing, Chambers v United States, 22 F3d 939, 942 n. 3 (CA9 1994); Yong v INS, 208 F3d 1116, 1119 n. 2 (CA9 2000); Finberg v Sullivan, 658 F2d 93, 97 n. 5 (CA3 1981); McClellan v Young, 421 F2d 690, 691 (CA6 1970); AT&T Communications v BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., C/A No. 3:97-2164-17, slip op. at 14 (D. S.C. Aug. 14, 2000). The Joint CLECs and others, however, assert that the USTA II decision finding that certain aspects of the FCC's TRO are unlawful is not final until the mandate issues. Joint CLECs, pp. 7-8, citing, Bryant v Ford Motor Co., 888 F2d 1526, 1529 (CA9 1989) (quoting Mary Ann Pennsiero, Inc. v Lingle, 847 F2d 90, 97 (CA3 1988)); First Gibraltar Bank, FSB v Morales, 42 F3d 895 (CA5 1995); Clarke v United States, 915 F2d 699, 707 (CADC 1990); Alphin v Henson, 552 F2d 1033, 1035 (CA4 1977); cf. Qualcomm, Inc. v FCC, 181 F3d 1370, 1378-79 (CADC 1999). See also, Sage, pp. 5-6 and Coalition, pp. 2-4.

⁴See, Joint CLECs, pp. 13-15, Bullseye, ¶¶ 5-7, MCI, pp. 4-5; Sage, pp. 6-7, citing various provisions of the Michigan Telecommunications Act, MCL 484.2101 et seq., and the federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 151 et seq. Additionally, the USTA II opinion itself provides that "a federal agency may turn to an outside entity for advice and policy recommendations." USTA II, p. 17 (slip op.).

of whether the court's mandate has actually issued, other parties take issue with SBC's analysis.⁵ The Commission finds the critiques of SBC's authority well taken. The fact that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit decided to stay its vacatur is an important aspect of our decision today despite our finding that we have independent authority to proceed. The Commission believes it important to proceed on the law as it stands today.

The Commission also found insightful SBC's election to focus not so much on the legal ramifications of the USTA II decision, but on the significant waste of resources proceeding at this time would entail. While SBC conceded that fact-finding about the state of telephone competition in Michigan is an appropriate task for this Commission, SBC was concerned with the uncertain legal standard to which those facts would be applied. Consequently, SBC argued that any record developed today would necessarily require a supplemental filing once the legal standards become clearer. SBC argued that it would be less wasteful for the Commission to wait for greater legal clarity before continuing.

The Commission notes, however, that the parties are ready to proceed today with the previously scheduled hearing. A significant amount of discovery has been conducted, volumes of testimony have been pre-filed, and expert witnesses have been prepared and have traveled to Michigan to begin today's hearing. Much of the work that SBC argues will be wasted by continuing has already been performed. In fact, AARP argued that 85-90% of the evidence has been prepared and is simply awaiting input into the record. Moreover, the competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs) are uniform in their commitment to proceed and argue that the real waste of resources would come if SBC's motion were granted.

⁵See, Sage, pp. 5-6 and Coalition, pp. 2-4.

The Commission finds the CLECs' position to be more persuasive. The Commission does not believe that the work performed thus far should be lost or that continuing would require an unreasonable use of additional resources. Delaying these proceedings would necessarily mean that information would become stale and the investment required to prepare for today's hearings would need to be re-invested. The Commission also believes that there may be great benefit from learning what these proceedings will show about the state of telephone competition in Michigan. Consequently, the Commission directs the ALJ to continue with the docketed hearings for the purpose of developing a useful record.

The Commission FINDS that:

a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 USC 151 et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1999 AC, R 460.17101 et seq.

b. The March 9, 2004 motion to temporarily stay all Triennial Review proceedings should be denied.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the March 9, 2004 motion to temporarily stay all Triennial Review proceedings is denied.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ J. Peter Lark
Chair

(S E A L)

/s/ Robert B. Nelson
Commissioner

/s/ Laura Chappelle
Commissioner

By its action of March 15, 2004.

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle
Its Executive Secretary

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chair

Commissioner

Commissioner

By its action of March 15, 2004.

Its Executive Secretary

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion,)
to facilitate the implementation of the Federal)
Communications Commission's Triennial Review)
determinations in Michigan.)

Case No. U-13796

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion,)
to investigate and to implement, if necessary)
a batch cut migration process.)

Case No. U-13891

Suggested Minute:

“Adopt and issue order dated March 15, 2004 denying SBC Michigan’s motion to temporarily stay all Triennial Review proceedings, as set forth in the order.”

Docket 3550 – Implementation of the Requirements of the FCC Triennial
Review Order
Service List Updated 2/25/04

Name Address	E-Mail	Telephone Facsimile
Alexander W. Moore, Esq. Verizon Rhode Island 185 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110-1585	alexander.w.moore@verizon.com keefe.b.clemons@verizon.com	617-743-2265 617-737-0648
Theresa O'Brien, Dir. Regulatory Affairs Verizon Rhode Island 234 Washington Street Providence, RI 02903	theresa.obrien@verizon.com	401-525-3060 401-525-3064
Ms. Barbara Landry Verizon Rhode Island 125 High Street Oliver Tower, Floor 7 Boston, MA 02110	barbara.landry@verizon.com	617-743-5252 617-743-4833
Leo Wold, Esq. Dept. of Attorney General 150 South Main Street Providence, RI 02903	lwold@riag.state.ri.us brian.kent@ripuc.state.ri.us steve.scialabba@ripuc.state.ri.us	401-222-3370 401-222-3016
Kenneth W. Salinger, Esq. Palmer & Dodge LLP 111 Huntington Ave. at Prudential Center Boston, MA 02199-7613	ksalinger@palmerdodge.com	617-239-0100 617-222-4420
Dr. Patricia Jacobs AT&T Communications of NE, Inc. 99 Bedford Street, 4 th Floor Boston, MA 02111	pjacobs0@lga.att.com jegruber@lga.att.com hdauidow@att.com	617-574-3149 617-574-3274
William M. Dolan III, Esq. Brown Rudnick Berlack Israels LLP 121 South Main Street Providence, RI 02903	wdolan@brbilaw.com	401-276-2600 401-276-2601
Scott A. Sawyer, VP – Regulatory Affairs Conversent Communications of RI LLC 222 Richmond Street, Suite 301 Providence, RI 02903	ssawyer@conversent.com	401-490-6379 401-272-9751
Alan M. Shoer Director of Regulatory Affairs and Counsel Conversent Communications of RI LLC 222 Richmond Street, Suite 301 Providence, RI 02903	ashoer@conversent.com	401-490-6370 401-490-6350

Name Address	E-Mail	Telephone Facsimile
Brian T. FitzGerald, Esq. LeBoeuf, Lamb, Greene & MacRae LLP One Commerce Plaza, Suite 2020 99 Washington Avenue Albany, NY 12210-2820	brian.fitzgerald@llgm.com	518-626-9000 518-626-9010
Jennifer Marrapese, VP Regulatory Affairs Cox Rhode Island Telecom LLC 9 J.P. Murphy Highway West Warwick, RI 02893	jennifer.marrapese@cox.com	401-615-1161 401-615-1587
	robert.howley@cox.com	
Robert J. Munnelly, Jr. Murtha Cullina LLP 99 High Street – 20 th Floor Boston, MA 02110-2320	rmunnelly@murthalaw.com	617-457-4000 617-482-3868
Kevin Donohue Director, UNE Provisioning InfoHighway Communications Corporation 1333 Broadway, Suite 1001 New York, NY 10018	kdonohue@infohighway.com pkaroczka@infohighway.com	646-536-6944 212-695-9680
Michael S. Tenore, Esq. RNK Inc. 333 Elm St., Suite 310 Dedham, MA 02026	mtenore@rnktel.com	781-613-6119 781-297-9836
Alan D. Mandl, Esq. Mandl & Mandl LLP 10 Post Office Square, Suite 630 Boston, MA 02109	alan@mandlaw.com	617-556-1998 617-422-0946
Patrick J. Donovan, Esq. Swidler Berlin Shereff Friedman, LLP 3000 K Street, NW, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20007	pjdonovan@swidlaw.com pjmacres@swidlaw.com rwdelsesto@swidlaw.com	202-424-7500 202-424-7645
Nego Pile Lightship Telecom, LLC 1301 Virginia Drive, Suite 440 Fort Washington, PA 19034	npile@lightship.net	215-641-0894 215-641-0531
Anthony Hansel, Sr. Counsel Covad Communications Co. 600 14 th Street, NW, Suite 750 Washington, DC 20005	thansel@covad.com	202-220-0410 202-220-0401
Craig Eaton, Esq. Adler Pollock & Sheehan 2300 Financial Plaza Providence, RI 02903	Ceaton@apslaw.com	401-274-7200 401-751-0604
Andrew M. Klein, Esq. Kelley Drye & Warren LLP 1200 19 th St., N.W. Washington, DC 20036	AKlein@KelleyDrye.com	

Name Address	E-Mail	Telephone Facsimile
Tom Weiss Weiss Consulting Inc. 405 Crossway Lane Holly Springs, NC 27540	TWeiss1@NC.RR.com	919-557-8116 919-557-8117
File original & nine (9) copies: Luly Massaro, Commission Clerk Public Utilities Commission 89 Jefferson Boulevard Warwick, RI 02888	lmassaro@puc.state.ri.us	401-941-4500 401-941-1691
	sfrias@puc.state.ri.us	

#50205179 v\1 - medeird - w2kb011.doc - 23663/4