

Cheryl R. Winn

Attorney At Law

August 10, 2006

Ms. Beth O'Donnell
Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard
P. O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40601

Re: Petition To Establish Docket To Consider Amendments To
Interconnection Agreements Resulting From Changes of Law
KPSC No. 2004-00427

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

On July 27, 2006, the Competitive Carriers of the South, Inc. ("CompSouth") filed with the Commission a copy of an Order entered July 18, 2006 by a Federal District Court upon review of an Order by the Maine Public Utilities Commission, *Verizon New England, Inc. v. Maine Public Utilities Commission*, Civil No. 05-53-B-C, (Order Granting Defendant's Motion For Summary Judgment and Denying Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment Or, Alternatively, For Judgment On The Pleadings) (D. Me. 2006) ("Maine Order"). In its letter, CompSouth requested that the Commission take notice of this decision, and contended that it is significant to the resolution of the issues in the above-identified case (i.e., the change of law proceeding). Specifically, CompSouth states that the Maine Order is "significant to the issues pending before the Kentucky Commission as it addresses the selfsame arguments offered here by BellSouth."¹ CompSouth's letter, however, does not provide an accurate representation of the actual ruling of the federal court or of the significance (or lack thereof) of that case to the issues currently under consideration by the Kentucky Commission. Viewed properly, the above-described federal court Order amounts to a ruling that is unpersuasive, and that turns upon different arguments than those presented by the parties herein. Furthermore, that decision has been appealed by Verizon.²

CompSouth maintains that the Maine Order includes decisions on two critical points:

¹ CompSouth Letter, p. 2.

² See Docket Sheet, First Circuit Court of Appeals, attached hereto as Attachment 1.

[1] [T]he Court has definitively concluded that, as a matter of law, a state public service commission possesses the jurisdiction to set rates for unbundled network elements required by Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. [2] The court also specifically concluded that Federal law does not preempt a state commission requirement that elements required by Section 271 be provided at TELRIC rates pending approval of permanent rates for those elements.³

CompSouth neglects, however, to mention the basis of the Court's ruling.

In the Maine Order, the Court acknowledged the position of Verizon that whether a Public Service Commission can lawfully set rates for elements required by 271 depends on whether "Congress conferred on state commissions the authority to regulate and enforce the Section 271 obligations."⁴ The Court disagreed with this assessment, however, and noted that the State of Maine has granted the Maine PUC broad authority to make services available on rates that are just and reasonable.⁵ Based on this conclusion, the Maine Order states that Verizon could only successfully challenge this exercise of state-delegated authority by demonstrating that this authority has been preempted by Federal law. As the Court noted, "Verizon failed to make the argument in its Motion for Summary Judgment."⁶ The Court then went on to consider TELRIC rates specifically, and found that "on this issue, Verizon presents no new facts and makes no additional arguments to those it offered in seeking preliminary injunctive relief."⁷

Thus, the Maine Order is not a sweeping declaration that federal law does not preempt state law on matters related to 271. Instead, the Court simply found that Verizon failed to make the preemption argument that the federal court believed to be necessary to prevail on this point. The more important point, however, is that the federal court did not decide that the Maine PUC had been delegated federal authority to interpret the Act, but rather that it could set rates for § 271 offerings under state-delegated authority.

This Maine Order is, of course, not binding on this Commission. Rather the Commission may adopt the approach of the federal court in Maine, or not, depending on whether it finds the logic of the Maine Order to be persuasive. BellSouth submits that this Commission should decline to rule as the Maine Court did for three reasons, each

³ CompSouth Letter, p. 1.

⁴ Maine Order, p. 6.

⁵ Id.

⁶ Maine Opinion, p. 6. The Court did note in dictum that Verizon presented a preemption argument in support of its request for preliminary injunctive relief, and that the Court did not believe that a preemption argument would have been successful even if Verizon had made this argument in its Motion for Summary Judgment.

⁷ Id.

of which is independently compelling: (1) the Maine Order is patently illogical; (2) it is contrary to the overwhelming weight of authority and (3) it turns on a point of law that is not only not before this Commission, but that CompSouth expressly decided not to rely upon.

First, although the court asserted that states can set rates for purposes of § 271, it cited no federal law granting such authority. Instead, the court concluded that state law grants the authority to set rates for purposes of § 271. However, § 271 is a provision of federal law, and states have no presumed or inherent authority to implement federal law. As the Eighth Circuit has explained, “[t]he new regime [under the 1996 Act] for regulating competition in this industry is federal in nature . . . and while Congress has chosen to retain a significant role for the state commissions, the scope of that role is measured by federal, not state, law.” (*Southwestern Bell Telco v. Connecticut Communications Corp.*, 225 F. 3d. 942, 947 (8th Cir. 2000) (emphasis added)). The contrary conclusion in the Maine Order, that state authority can confer the power to interpret or implement federal law, is both legally unsupported and illogical.

Second, federal law is clear that implementation of § 271 is a task delegated to the FCC, not to State Commissions. Consistent with the plain language of § 271, courts have concluded that “it is the prerogative of the FCC . . . to address any alleged failure by [a BOC] to satisfy any statutorily imposed conditions to its continued provision of long distance service” and, accordingly, that § 271 does *not* authorize state commissions to impose unbundling obligations. *BellSouth v. Mississippi PSC*, 368 F. Supp. 2d at 566; *accord BellSouth Telecomms., Inc. v. Cingery Communications Co.*, No. 03:05-CV-16-JMH, slip op. at 12 (E.D. Ky. Apr. 22, 2005) (“The enforcement authority for § 271 unbundling duties lies with the FCC and must be challenged there first.”) As the Seventh Circuit has put it, the 1996 “Act reserves to the FCC the authority to decide whether to grant a section 271 application.” *Indiana Bell Tel. Co. v. Indiana Util. Reg. Comm’n*, 359 F.3d 493, 495 (7th Cir. 2004).

To date, twenty-seven State commissions have reached the same conclusion. Commissions in Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, and the District of Columbia have all agreed that they do not have authority to implement § 271 obligations. In contrast, only ten State Commissions (including Maine) have reached the contrary result.⁸

Third, CompSouth asserts that the decision of the federal court in Maine addresses a central issue in this case, i.e., whether state Commission’s rate-making authority under State law allows it to set rates for § 271 offerings.⁹ In reality,

⁸ See “Attachment 2” hereto for a listing of all 37 states that have ruled on this issue and a description of those rulings.

⁹ CompSouth Letter, p. 2.

CompSouth specifically declined to make this an issue in the change of law proceeding. The argument that CompSouth did make in this case is that “the terms and conditions for the checklist items in 271 must be in an approved interconnection agreement.”¹⁰ CompSouth also argued that under the federal statutory scheme, “the interconnection agreements incorporating Section 271 checklist items are subject to the Section 252 state commission arbitration process if the parties do not reach agreement, as well as subject to state commission review and approval if negotiated by the parties.”¹¹ If there is any doubt that CompSouth’s argument in the instant proceeding is based on its interpretation of federal law, and not on state-delegated ratemaking authority, then this doubt is dispelled by a clear declaration in CompSouth’s Post-Hearing Brief: “CompSouth also contends that the Commission may include network elements in ICAs pursuant to state law authority, but it is not requesting that the Commission exercise such authority in this proceeding.”¹² At the same time, CompSouth does not claim (nor can it) that the Maine Order supports, or even comments upon, the legal theory that CompSouth actually did advance in this proceeding.

Viewed accurately, the Maine Order is nothing more than a non-binding and unpersuasive decision to uphold the Maine PUC’s unique interpretation of the parameters of state law. This Order does not even address the legal arguments upon which CompSouth relies in the change of law proceeding, and it has no significance to this proceeding. BellSouth respectfully submits that if this Commission seeks guidance from the rulings of other tribunals, then the better course of action would be to follow the lead of the twenty-seven State Commissions that have interpreted the Act not to empower state Commissions to implement § 271.

One paper copy of this filing is provided for filing in case 2004-00427. The attached certification for case 2004-00427 certifies that this filing was filed electronically today and served by email on parties of record. Parties of record can access the information at the Commission’s Electronic Filing center located at <http://psc.ky.gov/efs/efsmain.aspx>.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/
Cheryl R. Winn

Attachments

cc: Parties of Record
645258

¹⁰ CompSouth’s Post Hearing Brief, p. 30.
¹¹ Id.
¹² Id., p. 25 (emphasis added).

CERTIFICATION FOR 2004-00427

I hereby certify that the electronic version of this filing made with the Commission this 21st day of April 2006 is a true and accurate copy of the documents filed herewith in paper form on April 21, 2006, and the electronic version of the filing has been transmitted to the Commission. An electronic copy of the Read1st document has been served electronically on parties.

/s/ _____
Cheryl R. Winn

ELECTRONIC SERVICE LIST - KPSC 2004-00427

Frankfort Electric & Water Plant Board

Ed Hancock
Box 308
Frankfort, KY 40602
ehancock@fewpb.com

Sprint Communications Company, L.P.

Edward Phillips
14111 Capital Boulevard
Mailstop NCWKFR0313
Wake Forest, NC 27587-5900
edward.phillips@mail.sprint.com

John N. Hughes, Esq.
Attorney at Law
124 West Todd St.
Frankfort, KY 40602
jnhughes@fewpb.net

**Counsel for Frankfort Electric
And Water Plant Board & Sprint**

Douglas F. Brent, Esq.
Stoll Keenon Ogden, PLLC
2000 PNC Plaza
500 West Jefferson Street
Louisville, KY 40202-3377
Douglas.brent@skofirm.com

**Counsel for Time Warner, Covad
Verizon Communications, Inc.
Telephone, Dialog Telephone,
USLEC of TN, Big River Telephone
Company, LLC, Cinergy Communications
Company, & CompSouth**

Verizon Communications, Inc.

Dulaney L. O'Roark, III
Six Concourse Parkway, Suite 600
Atlanta, GA 30328
de.oroark@verizon.com

Time Warner Telecom of Ohio, LP

Pamela Sherwood
P. O. Drawer 200
Winter Park, FL 32790-0200
pamela.sherwood@twtelecom.com

US LEC of Tennessee Inc.

Terry Romine
Morrocroft III
6801 Morrison Blvd.
Charlotte, NC 28211
trordine@uslec.com

Dialog Telecommunications, Inc.

James Bellina
745 Tyvola Road, Suite 100
Charlotte, NC 28217
jim@calldialog.com

Network Telephone Corporation

Margaret Ring
margaret.ring@networktelephone.net
Access Integrated Networks
Sharyl Fowler
sharyl.fowler@accesscomm.com

Dieca Communications, Inc.

d/b/a Covad Communications Company
Charles Watkins
gwatkins@covad.com

C. Kent Hatfield, Esq.
Stoll Keenon Ogden, PLLC
2650 Aegon Center
400 West Market Street
Louisville, KY 40202-3377
Kent.hatfield@skofirm.com

**Counsel for AT&T Communications of the
South Central States, LLC and TCG Ohio,
Cinergy Communications Company, and
CompSouth**

**AT&T Communications of the
South Central States LLC and TCG Ohio**

David Eppsteiner
1230 Peachtree Street
4th Floor, Room 4W26
Atlanta, GA 30309
eppsteiner@att.com

Cinergy Communications Company

Robert A. Bye, Vice Pres. & Gen. Counsel
8829 Bond Street
Overland Park, KS 66214
bye@cinergycom.com
John Chuang, Corporate Counsel
8829 Bond Street
Overland Park, KS 66214
chuang@cinergycom.com

Verizon Select Services Inc.

Anthony P. Gillman
General Counsel
FLTC0007, 201 N. Franklin Street
P.O. Box 110
Tampa, FL 33601-0110
Anthony.Gillman@verizon.com

Telcove, Inc.

Keith Pado
121 Champion Way
Canonsburg, PA 15317
Keith.pado@telcove.com

FDN Communications

Matthew Feil
General Counsel
2301 Lucien Way, Suite 200
Maitland, FL 32751
mfeil@mail.fdn.com

Lightyear Network Solutions, LLC

Linda Hunt
Manager of Regulatory Affairs
1902 Eastpoint Parkway
Louisville, KY 40223
linda.hunt@lightyear.net

NewSouth Communications Corp/NuVox Communications, Inc.

Mary Campbell
2 North Main Street
Greenville, SC 29601
mcampbell@nuvox.com
John Fury
16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Suite 500
Chesterfield, MO 63017
jfury@nuvox.com
Ed Cadieux
16090 Swingley Ridge Road, Suite 500
Chesterfield, MO 63017
ecadieux@nuvox.com
Susan J. Berlin
2 North Main Street
Greenville, SC 29601
sberlin@nuvox.com

Xspedius Communications, LLC on behalf of itself and its operating subsidiaries, Xspedius Management Co. Switched Services, LLC, Xspedius Management Co. of Lexington, LLC, and Xspedius Management Co. of Louisville, LLC

James Falvey
14405 Laurel Place, Suite 200
Laurel, MD 20707-6102
Jim.falvey@xspedius.com

KMC Telecom V, Inc. and KMC Telecom III LLC

Marva Brown-Johnson
1755 North Brown Road
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
mabrow@kmctelecom.com

Chad Pifer
1755 North Brown Road
Lawrenceville, GA 30043
rpifer@kmctelecom.com

John J. Heitmann
Kelley Drye & Warren
1200 19th Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036
jheitmann@kelleydrye.com
Garret R. Hargrave
Kelley Drye & Warren
1200 19th Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036
ghargrave@kelleydrye.com
Scott A. Kassman
Kelley Drye & Warren
1200 19th Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036
skassman@kelleydrye.com

John E. Selent
Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP
1400 PNC Plaza
500 W. Jefferson Street
Louisville, KY 40202
John.selent@dinslaw.com

Holly C. Wallace
Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP
1400 PNC Plaza
500 W. Jefferson Street
Louisville, KY 40202
Holly.Wallace@dinslaw.com

Counsel for Nuvox/NewSouth, Xspedius and KMC**Inter Mountain Cable d/b/a MTS Communications ("MTS")**

James Campbell
P. O. Box 159
5 Laynesville Road
Harold, KY 41635
jcamp@mis.net
John C. Schmoltdt
P. O. Box 159
5 Laynesville Road
Harold, KY 41635
schmoltdt@mis.net

U-Dial of Kentucky, Inc.

Ellis Falkoff
800 E. Reelfoot Avenue, Suite 200
Union City, TN 38261
Efalkoff@usit.net

DukeNet

arcocker@duke-energy.com

pharris@duke-energy.com

atorning@duke-energy.com

Henry C. Campen, Jr., Esq.

Parker Poe

Wachovia Capitol Center

150 Fayetteville Street Mall Suite 1400

P.O. Box 389

Raleigh, NC 27602-0389

henrycampen@parkerpoe.com

Counsel for DukeNet

SouthEast Telephone, Inc.

Liz Thacker

SouthEast Telephone, Inc.

106 Power Drive

Pikeville, KY 41502-1001

Liz.thacker@setel.com

Jonathon N. Amlung

1000 Republic Building

429 W. Muhammad Ali Blvd.

Louisville, KY 40202-2347

Jonathon@amlung.com

Counsel for SouthEast Telephone

e-Tel

Renee Hayden

601 Broadway, Suite B

Paducah, KY 42001

renee@e-tel-llc.com

Big River Telephone Company, LLC

kyreg@bigrivertelephone.com

Attorney General

Dennis Howard

Assistant Attorney General

1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200

Frankfort, KY 40601-8204

dennis.howard@ag.ky.gov

Aero Communications, LLC

Kristopher E. Twomey

LOKT Consulting

1519 E. 14th Street, Suite A

San Leandro, CA 94577

kris@lokt.net

Todd Heinrich

1301 Broadway, Suite 100

Paducah, KY 42001

todd@hcis.net

Ganoco, Inc. dba American Dial Tone

Larry Wright

2323 Curlew Road, Suite 7C

Dunedin, FL 34698

lwright@americandialtone.com

AmeriMex Communications Corp.

Glenn S. Richards

Shaw Pittman LLP

2300 N Street, NW

Washington, DC 20037

glenn.richards@shawpittman.com

**Counsel for AmeriMex
Communications Corp.**

PowerNet Global Communications

Eric J. Branfman

Robin F. Cohn

Swidler Berlin LLP

The Washington Harbor

3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300

Washington, DC 20007-5116

ejbranfman@swidlaw.com

rfcohn@swidlaw.com

Counsel for PNG

Navigator Telecommunications, LLC

Michael McAlister

8525 Riverwood Park Drive

P. O. Box 13860

North Little Rock, AR 72113-0860

mike@navtel.com

CompSouth

Bill Magness

Casey, Gentz, & Magness, LLP

98 San Jacinto Blvd., Ste. 1400

Austin, TX 78701

bmagness@phonelaw.com

Deborah Eversole

Stoll, Keenon & Park, LLP

2650 Aegon Center

400 West Market Street

Louisville, KY 40202-3377

deborah.eversole@skp.com

Counsel for CompSouth