Dorothy Menasco

From:

Snow, Brenda [Brenda.Snow@ruden.com]

Sent:

Friday, November 18, 2011 4:55 PM

To:

Filings@psc.state.fl.us

Subject:

Docket No. 090538-TP- Qwest Communications Company, LLC - Statement Regarding Disputed Issues 5, 6, 7,

8h

Attachments: 3747_001.pdf

From: Bryson, Arlene On Behalf Of Cooke, Michael

Sent: Friday, November 18 2011 4:51 PM

To: Cc: Subject:

Docket No.:

Docket No. 090538-TP – Amended Complaint of Qwest Communications Company, LLC against MCImetro Access Transmission Services (d/b/a Verizon Access Transmission Services); XO Communications Services, Inc.; tw telecom of florida, I.p.; Granite Telecommunications, LLC; Broadwing Communications, LLC; Access Point, Inc.; Birch Communications, Inc.; Budget Prepay, Inc.; Bullseye Telecom, Inc.; DeltaCom, Inc.; Ernest Communications, Inc.; Flatel, Inc.; Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC; Navigator Telecommunications, LLC; PaeTec Communications, Inc.; STS Telecom, LLC; US LEC of Florida, LLC; Windstream Nuvox, Inc.; and John Does 1 through 50, for unlawful discrimination.

Person Filing:

Michael G. Cooke Ruden McClosky P.A. 215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 815 Tallahassee, FL 32301 (850) 412-2005 (850) 412-1305 facsimile Michael.Cooke@Ruden.com

Filed on behalf of:

Qwest Communications Company, LLC

Total number of pages:

Eight (8) including this e-mail

Description:

Qwest Communication Company, LLC's - Statement Regarding Disputed Issues 5, 6, 7, 8h

Brenda Snow Word Processor



401 East Jackson Street Suite 2700 Tampa, FL 33602 Direct 813-222-6606 | Fax 813-314-6906 Brenda.Snow@ruden.com | www.ruden.com

To subscribe to our advisories, please click here.

NOTICE: This e-mail message and any attachment to this e-mail message contains confidential information that may be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not review, retransmit, convert to hard copy, copy, use or disseminate this e-mail or any attachments

= 81 VNV 18 =

to it. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by telephone at 954-764-6660 and delete this message. Please note that if this e-mail message contains a forwarded message or is a reply to a prior message, some or all of the contents of this message or any attachments may not have been produced by the sender.



401 EAST JACKSON STREET SUITE 2700 TAMPA, FLORIDA 33602

(813) 222-6685 FAX: (813) 314-6985 MICHAEL.COOKE@RUDEN.COM

November 18, 2011

Ms. Ann Cole, Director Commission Clerk and Administrative Services Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 090538-TP, Qwest Communication Company, LLC d/b/a CenturyLink QCC

Dear Ms. Cole:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced docket is Qwest Communication Company, LLC d/b/a CenturyLink QCC's Statement Regarding Disputed Issues 5, 6, 7 and 8h.

Thank you for your assistance with this filing and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Michael G. Cooke

Muchal & Cooks

MGC/ Enclosure

RM:8170199:J

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Amended Complaint of QWEST COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY, LLC, Against MCIMETRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, LLC (D/B/A VERIZON ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES), XO COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INC., TW TELECOM OF FLORIDA, L.P., GRANITE TELECOMMUNICATIONS, LLC, BROADWING COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, ACCESS POINT, INC., BIRCH COMMUNICATIONS, INC., BUDGET PREPAY, INC., BULLSEYE TELECOM, INC., DELTACOM, INC., ERNEST COMMUNICATIONS. INC., FLATEL, INC., LIGHTYEAR NETWORK SOLUTIONS, LLC, NAVIGATOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS, LLC, PAETEC COMMUNICATIONS, INC., STS TELECOM, LLC, US LEC OF FLORIDA, LLC, WINDSTREAM NUVOX. INC., AND JOHN DOES 1 THROUGH 50, For unlawful discrimination.

Docket No. 090538-TP

Filed: November 18, 2011

QWEST COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY'S STATEMENT REGARDING DISPUTED ISSUES 5, 6, 7 AND 8H

At the direction of the Prehearing Officer, Qwest Communications Company, LLC d/b/a CenturyLink QCC ("QCC") hereby submits its brief written statement concerning disputed Issues 5, 6, 7 and 8(h). QCC respectfully urges the Prehearing Officer to adopt QCC's version of Issues 5-7 and to delete issue 8(h).

With Commission Staff's facilitation, the parties have largely reached consensus on the tentative issues list. Throughout the process, QCC has shown tremendous flexibility in an attempt to limit controversy and accommodate the unwavering demands of the CLEC respondents. As to Issues 5-7 and 8(h), however, for the reasons set forth below QCC feels that it simply cannot acquiesce.

1. Issues 5-7

Issues 5-7 are critical, as they summarize each of QCC's three claims for relief set forth in the Amended Complaint. The parties' diverging proposals are displayed in Appendix A.

The disagreement over these issues focuses on the CLECs' position that any relief awarded to QCC should be limited to actions prior to July 1, 2011, when Ch.2011-36 took effect. By explicitly limiting QCC's theories to Sections 364.01, .08 and .10, the CLECs hope to foreclose the Commission's ability to make a determination regarding QCC refunds for any post-July 1, 2011 conduct. In this respect, the CLECs are

DOCUMENT NUMBER-PATE

misusing the issue ID process. In addition, the CLECs' inappropriately narrow statements of the issues do not adequately reflect the Amended Complaint.

The Amended Complaint comprehensively states QCC's claims for relief. In ¶ 4, QCC asserts that the Commission "has jurisdiction over telecommunications companies regarding all matters set forth in Chapter 364 *** including complaints against CLECs for unreasonably prejudicial, anti-competitive or discriminatory conduct. *** This includes exercising exclusive jurisdiction to ensure that all telecommunications providers are treated fairly by preventing unreasonable preferential, discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior." QCC cited Section 364.01(4)(g), which has since been recodified as Section 364.16(2). The quoted allegation is restated and incorporated regarding each of the three claims for relief, which are succinctly summarized in QCC's issues 5-7. See Amended Complaint, ¶¶11-19.

QCC's recitations of Issues 5-7 simply refer the Commission to the Amended Complaint itself, without expanding or limiting QCC's claims. In contrast, the CLECs' statements of the Issues seek to restrict the Commission's consideration to the statutes *they* recite. Whether or not the Commission may or will determine that the CLECs engaged in behavior that was unreasonably preferential, discriminatory or anti-competitive either before or after July 1, 2011 is an issue for the Commission to address as part of its final ruling on Qwest's Complaint. The purpose of the issue identification process is not to alter or limit the complainant's causes of action, yet this is precisely what the CLECs seek to do. Nor is there any need for QCC to amend its complaint to change the reference from 364.01(4)(g) to 364.16(2). The CLECs insist that they are entitled to notice of those statutes they are being accused of violating. QCC agrees, and QCC's Issues 5-7 squarely point the CLECs and the Commission back to the Amended Complaint by use of the phrase, "as alleged in Qwest's ____ Claim for Relief."

Further, QCC's Issues 5-7 are far more streamlined than the CLECs' variants. They also more fairly permit each party to lodge their respective arguments, as framed by the Amended Complaint and the CLECs' Answers. QCC's Issues 5-7 do not preclude any party from making its arguments, and do not re- or mischaracterize the complaint or the answers. Nor do they preclude any parties' ability to seek relief from the Commission should another party make a procedurally-inappropriate argument. QCC's Issues 5-7 should be adopted.

2. Issue 8(h)

Issue 8 summarizes the CLECs' affirmative defenses and provides a catch-all for any yet-unarticulated affirmative defense (see issue 8(i)).

Issue 8(h) is inappropriate for two reasons. First, it is unnecessary, as the Issue 8(i) catchall will permit the CLECs to raise this issue should they so desire. Second, as worded, Issue 8(h) is confusing and suggests that a finding has been made elsewhere, or should be made in this case, that the secret switched access agreements are "void, illegal or unenforceable." This case is not a civil contract dispute whereby one party seeks to disavow its contractual obligation by convincing the court that the contract is unenforceable as a matter of contract law. And, contrary to the CLECs' wording of Issue 8(h), no finding has been made elsewhere that the subject contracts are void or unenforceable.\(^1\) To QCC's knowledge, none of the respondent CLECs has pursued such civil relief or has refused to abide by their contractual obligations under the secret discount agreements. Yet, Issue 8(h) suggests otherwise. Because it is disingenuous and misleading, and because the issue is irrelevant to the Commission's resolution of QCC's claims, the issue should simply be deleted. At bare minimum, the Commission should replace the CLEC-proposed language with the compromise language suggested during the issue identification process by Staff. See Appendix A. While QCC would prefer the issue simply be deleted, if the Prehearing Officer concludes that it should be included, adoption of Staff's suggested language will ensure a more neutral and straightforward presentation of the issue.

s/Adam L. Sherr

Adam L. Sherr (not admitted in Florida)

Associate General Counsel

Owest

1600 7th Avenue, Room 1506

Seattle, WA 98191 Tel: 206-398-2507

Fax: 206-343-4040

Email: Adam.Sherr@qwest.com

s/Michael G. Cooke

Michael G. Cooke

(Fla. Bar No. 0979457)

Ruden McClosky

401 E. Jackson St., Suite 2700

Tampa, FL 33606

Telephone: (813) 222-6685

Facsimile: (813) 314-6985

michael.cooke@ruden.com

As the CLECs frequently repeat, QCC made such an allegation in a Minnesota state civil complaint in 2007. That case was dismissed and, as CLEC counsel is aware, no finding was entered that the contracts are void, illegal or unenforceable. The Colorado PUC reached this exact conclusion earlier this week in its final order granting QCC's complaint in a parallel proceeding. See Decision No, C11-1216, Colorado PUC Docket No. 08F-259T (mailed Nov. 15, 2011), ¶105-107.

APPENDIX A

(Summary of Disputed Issues 5-7, 8h)

isties: 7		
QCC	CLECs	
5) Has the CLEC engaged in unreasonable rate discrimination, as alleged in Qwest's First Claim for Relief, with regard to its provision of intrastate switched access?	5) Did a CLEC's alleged failure to provide Qwest the same pricing for switched access service as the CLEC provided in any CLEC/IXC agreement for switched access service: a) constitute extending an advantage, benefit or privilege not regularly and uniformly extended under like circumstances for like or substantially similar services, and, if so, did it violate Section 364.08(1), Florida Statutes (2010), or b) constitute an undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any person or subject Qwest to undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage, and, if so, did it violate Section 364.10(1), Florida Statutes (2010)?	
6) Did the CLEC abide by its Price List in connection with its pricing of intrastate switched access service? If not, was such conduct unlawful, as alleged in Qwest's Second Claim for Relief?	6) Did any CLEC/IXC agreement for switched access service in this case deviate from the CLEC's published price list? If so, did such deviation violate 364.04(1) and (2), F.S. (2010)?	
7) Did the CLEC abide by its Price List by offering the terms of off-Price List agreements to other similarly-situated customers? If not, was such conduct unlawful, as alleged in Qwest's Third Claim for Relief?	7) Did any CLEC named in Count III have a switched access price list that required the CLEC to offer Qwest the lowest agreement rate for switched access service, and if so, under what conditions (e.g., must Qwest be similarly situated to the IXCs that received the lowest rates; did Qwest, among other things, request the lowest rates; etc.)? Were these conditions met, and, if they were met, did a failure on the part of the CLEC to offer Qwest the lowest agreement rate violate Section 364.04(1) and (2), (2010), Florida Statutes?	

QCC	CLECs	Staff	
[delete issue]	Are QCC's claims barred or limited, in whole or in part by: *** a finding that a switched access service agreement between any separate service agreement between a CLEC and IXC is void, illegal, or unenforceable.	unenforceability of the switched	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 090538-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by electronic delivery and/or U.S. Mail this 18th day of November, 2011, to the following:

Florida Public Service Commission
Theresa Tan
Florida Public Service Commission
Office of General Counsel
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850
ltan@psc.state.fl.us

Qwest Communications Co., LLC.
Jason D. Topp, Corporate Counsel
Qwest Communications Co., LLC
200 S. Fifth Street, Room 2200
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Jason.topp@qwest.com

MCImetro Access Transmission Service d/b/a VerizonAccess Transmission Services Dulaney O'Roark VerizonAccess Transmission Services Six Concourse Pkwy, NE, Ste 800 Atlanta, GA 30328 De.oroark@verizon.com

Granite Communications, LLC
BullsEye Telecom, Inc.
Andrew M. Klein
Allen C. Zoraki
Klein Law Group, PLLC
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20036
aklein@kleinlawpllc.com
azoracki@kleinlawpllc.com

Qwest Communications Co., LLC Adam Sherr Associate General Counsel Qwest Communications Co., LLC 1600 7th Avenue, Room 1506 Seattle, WA 98191 adam.sherr@qwest.com tw telecom of florida, l.p.

XO Communications Services, Inc.
Windstream NuVox, Inc.
Birch Communications, Inc.
DeltaCom, Inc.
Matthew J. Feil
Gunster Yoakley & Stewart, P.A.
215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 618
Tallahassee, FL 32301
mfeil@gunster.com

Broadwing Communications, LLC
Marsha E. Rule
Rutledge, Ecenia & Purnell
P.O. Box 551
Tallahassee, FL 32302-0551
marsha@reuphlaw.com

XO Communications Services, Inc.
Jane Whang
Davis Wright Tremain
Suite 800
505 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, California 94111-6533
JaneWhang@dwt.com

STS Telecom, LLC
Alan C. Gold
1501 Sunset Drive
2nd Floor
Coral Gables, FL 33143
agold@acgoldlaw.com

Navigator Telecommunications, LLC
Michael McAlister, General Counsel
Navigator Telecommunications, LLC
8525 Riverwood Park Drive
P. O. Box 13860
North Little Rock, AR 72113
mike@navtel.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 090538-TP Page 2

Access Point, Inc.
Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC Navigator
Telecommunications, LLC PAETEC
Communications, Inc.
US LEC of Florida, LLC d/b/a PAETEC
Business Services
Eric J. Branfman
Philip J. Macres
Bingham McCutchen, LLP
2020 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006-1806
eric.branfman@bingham.com
Philip.macres@bingham.com

Lightyear Network Solutions, Inc.
John Greive, Vice President of Regulatory
Affairs & General Counsel
Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC
1901 Eastpoint Parkway
Louisville, KY 40223
john.greive@lightyear.net

Access Point, Inc.
Richard Brown
Chairman-Chief Executive Officer
Access Point, Inc.
1100 Crescent Green, Suite 109
Cary, NC 27518-8105
Richard.brown@accesspointinc.com

PAETEC Communications, Inc. and US LEC of Florida, LLC d/b/a PAETEC Business Services
John B. Messenger, Vice President and Associate General Counsel PAETEC Communications, Inc.
One PaeTec Plaza
600 Willowbrook Office Park
Fairpoint, NY 14450
john.messenger@paetec.com

Flatel, Inc. c/o Adriana Solar 2300 Palm Beach Lakes Blvd. Executive Center, Suite 100 West Palm Beach, Florida 33409 Ernest Communications, Inc. General Counsel 5275 Triangle Parkway Suite 150 Norcross, GA 30092

Budget Prepay, Inc. c/o NRAI Services, Inc. 2731 Executive Park Drive, Suite 4 Weston, Florida 33331 and Budget Prepay, Inc. General Counsel 1325 Barksdale Blvd., Suite 200 Bossier City, LA 71111

> s/ Michael G. Cooke Michael G. Cooke