



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. STIPULATION WITH HBA .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III. CLARIFICATION OF IMPACT OF RECENT LEGISLATION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>IV. RESPONSES TO OPTION 2 CONTACTORS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>V. SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>10</b>

1

**I. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE**

2

**Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, TITLE AND ADDRESS.**

3

A. My name is Laura L. Scholl. I am employed by Qwest Services Corporation as

4

the Utah Director of Regulatory Affairs for Qwest Corporation (Qwest).

5

**Q. ARE YOU THE SAME LAURA SCHOLL WHO PREVIOUSLY FILED**

6

**DIRECT, REBUTTAL AND SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS**

7

**DOCKET?**

8

A. Yes, I am.

9

**Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL SURREBUTTAL**

10

**TESTIMONY?**

11

A. I respond briefly to certain elements of the surrebuttal testimony filed by Mr.

12

Allen on behalf of Clear Wave and Mr. Bodine on behalf of SBS. However,

13

most importantly, I want to alert the Public Service Commission (Commission)

14

that Qwest has successfully negotiated a stipulation with The Salt Lake Home

15

Builders Association (HBA). I also clarify statements made in my surrebuttal

16

testimony about the impact of 1<sup>st</sup> Substitute SB 108 on this proceeding.

17

**II. STIPULATION WITH HBA**

18

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE STIPULATION REACHED BETWEEN QWEST**

19

**AND THE HBA.**

20

A. The stipulation states that the HBA has no objection to the discontinuation of

21

Option 2 of the LDA. It outlines the modifications Qwest is making to its facility

22 placement processes and ensures the opportunity for continued input by HBA  
23 members into Qwest's processes. A copy of the stipulation is attached to this  
24 testimony as exhibit LLS –SSR1. It was also separately filed with the  
25 Commission on March 30, 2005.

26 **Q. WHY DID QWEST PURSUE AN AGREEMENT WITH THE HBA?**

27 A. Qwest believes the HBA is an actual party in interest to the LDA process, unlike  
28 the Option 2 contractors. The HBA represents approximately 170 builders and  
29 developers, in one of the critical geographic areas of single-family development in  
30 the State. Satisfying the needs of such developers is key to Qwest's success in the  
31 marketplace. Qwest believes the most effective approach is direct communication  
32 with the HBA, not a process convoluted by a third party with adverse interests,  
33 such as the Option 2 contractors.

34 Additionally, after reviewing proposals made by the Division of Public Utilities  
35 (DPU), Qwest sought to reach an agreement with the HBA that made sense to the  
36 HBA and to Qwest in terms of timeliness, effectiveness and cost.

37 Qwest's choice of approach has since been reinforced by the actions of SBS in  
38 response to the HBA entering into the stipulation. As I discuss below, rather than  
39 working fairly to forward the interests of developers, SBS has unfairly portrayed  
40 the stipulation in a seemingly desperate attempt to preserve Option 2 at all costs.  
41 Qwest should simply not have to rely on entities who can be so antagonistic for  
42 the placement of its facilities.

43 **Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS**

44 A. Representatives of Qwest met formally with the executive committee of the HBA  
45 board on two occasions. There were also numerous informal conversations and  
46 discussions to fine tune the provisions of the stipulation. It is my understanding  
47 that the executive committee sought and received approval from the full board of  
48 the HBA and also sent a copy of the stipulation to all of its members for comment  
49 before the president signed it.

50 **Q. WHAT DO YOU CONCLUDE?**

51 A. I conclude that a key real party in interest to this proceeding has been satisfied  
52 and that the Option 2 contractors do not represent the interests of the  
53 homebuilders and developers as they claimed.

54 **III. CLARIFICATION OF IMPACT OF RECENT**  
55 **LEGISLATION**

56 **Q. WHAT CLARIFICATION DID YOU WANT TO MAKE REGARDING**  
57 **THE IMPACT OF 1<sup>ST</sup> SUBSTITUTE SB108?**

58 A. In my surrebuttal testimony, I stated that as a result of the legislation, “the issues  
59 in this case may be essentially moot.”. Having now read the pre-hearing brief  
60 submitted by Qwest, I believe that a more correct characterization would be that  
61 the legislative policy statements update the framework under which Qwest is  
62 regulated in Utah. Under that updated regime, Qwest is allowed to make changes  
63 to its offerings on five days notice with any challenge coming after the fact.  
64 Qwest believes that once the legislation becomes effective on May 2, 2005,

65 consistent with legislative intent, Qwest will have the ability to modify the LDA  
66 Option 2 without prior Commission approval. I would like to note, however, that  
67 given the protracted history of this dispute, Qwest believes it is prudent to  
68 continue with this process to allow for a full hearing and PSC determination on  
69 the issues and Qwest's right to control the placement of its own network.

70 **IV. RESPONSES TO OPTION 2 CONTRACTORS**

71 **Q. IN REGARDS TO THE SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM**  
72 **BODINE AND STEPHEN ALLEN, HAVE EITHER ONE OF THEM**  
73 **PROVIDED ANY COMPELLING PUBLIC POLICY REASONS WHY**  
74 **OPTION 2 SHOULD REMAIN?**

75 A. No. Their arguments are based primarily upon self interest. They claim to also  
76 speak in the interest of developers (and even Qwest). However, as demonstrated  
77 in my surrebuttal testimony, what once appeared to be a large number of  
78 developer interveners continue to evaporate. No developer has had any  
79 meaningful participation in this docket to support the Option 2 contractors'  
80 position, and the HBA has entered into a stipulation with Qwest. Finally, the  
81 Option 2 contractors certainly do not speak in the best interests of Qwest.

82 All Qwest seeks in this proceeding is to regain the ability to handle the placement  
83 of its own facilities by itself or through its own contractors. Despite the claims of  
84 Mr. Allen (e.g., pages 4-5) and Mr. Bodine (e.g., page 15) that hardly seems  
85 "arrogant" or seeking to act in "total disregard" for Commission authority,

86 especially when it is something that all of Qwest's competitors enjoy. Indeed,  
87 there ought to be an extreme countervailing public interest in order for the  
88 Commission to prevent Qwest from managing its own facility placement.

89 They also add a new twist that Qwest hadn't previously addressed, and that is  
90 extremely troubling. Both Clear Wave and SBS say Qwest should appreciate the  
91 marketing services Option 2 contractors provide, and cite the example of the  
92 Traverse Ridge development for their hard work attempting to win placement  
93 opportunities for Qwest. Qwest has serious concerns with having its marketing  
94 carried out by parties who, in their surrebuttal testimony, variously refer to Qwest  
95 or its representatives as being "false and misleading," of committing "failings and  
96 abuses," of not being "sincere" (Bodine pages 20-21), of having a reputation of  
97 "delaying projects and being uncooperative," of having "arrogance and pride,"  
98 and of not being "trustworthy" (Allen pages 2-4, 6). It is easy to imagine  
99 conversations with developers where these Option 2 contractors sell their services  
100 without necessarily speaking of Qwest in glowing terms. Indeed, Qwest doesn't  
101 need to rely on informed judgment to see how Option 2 contractors interface with  
102 developers. In response to the stipulation with the HBA, SBS sent an email  
103 communication to members of the HBA characterizing the HBA's action as a  
104 selling "down the river" "for a handful of beads," strongly implying that Qwest's  
105 promises regarding its future dealings with developers are essentially worthless.  
106 A copy of the email is attached as exhibit LLS-SSR2. Essentially calling Qwest's  
107 proposals empty promises is both unfair and inaccurate, and is destructive of

108 Qwest's relationship with developers. Qwest can do without such "marketing."  
109 To me it seems patently unfair to require Qwest to have its facilities placement  
110 handled by parties as antagonistic as some Option 2 contractors can be.

111 **Q. ON PAGE 19 OF HIS TESTIMONY, MR. BODINE CLAIMS THAT SBS**  
112 **HAS PROVIDED TAX RETURNS THAT PROVE SBS MAKES LITTLE**  
113 **MONEY. HAS QWEST RECEIVED SUCH DOCUMENTS?**

114 A. No. SBS initially offered to supply tax returns rather than directly answer  
115 questions regarding SBS's profits and the financial benefits it provides to its  
116 principals. Qwest agreed (subject to requesting further information if the tax  
117 returns did not provide adequate information). However, the tax returns have  
118 never been supplied. This may simply have been a logistical issue on getting the  
119 returns to Qwest, but whatever the case Qwest has not seen the returns. Further,  
120 SBS has flatly refused to answer Qwest's data requests seeking information about  
121 things such as SBS's labor costs (which would be important information about a  
122 company like SBS, where the principals apparently also provide the labor and  
123 where profits could therefore be characterized as expenses). If the tax returns that  
124 SBS was planning to supply would accurately demonstrate SBS's true financial  
125 condition, Qwest wonders why SBS would refuse to provide information on labor  
126 costs. In sum, to date SBS has provided no meaningful information about its  
127 financial condition.

128 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY FINAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT MR. BODINE'S**  
129 **SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

130 A. Just one. Mr. Bodine makes statements in his testimony to the effect that if things  
131 were as bad as Qwest states under Option 2, Qwest would have the proof in the  
132 form of legal judgments (e.g., pages 4, 20). The argument goes something like, if  
133 Option 2 contractors are as bad as Qwest asserts (I note in this regard, Qwest has  
134 been careful not to paint all Option 2 contractors—including Clear Wave—as  
135 being as uncooperative as SBS) why doesn't Qwest just sue for violation of the  
136 LDA contract? Putting aside the fact that Qwest has no contractual relationship  
137 with Option 2 contractors (a fundamental flaw in Option 2), I found it very telling  
138 that SBS's recommendation to Qwest for handling Option 2 problems is to sue. I  
139 thought these statements by Mr. Bodine offered a nice snap shot of much of the  
140 problem with Option 2.

141 The proposals Mr. Pappas identified in earlier testimony to shorten the tariff time  
142 intervals, allow developers to pay for conduit placement if they require expedited  
143 treatment, and require Qwest to pay for conduit placement if it fails to meet the  
144 tariff timelines, provide ample protection for developers' interests. Qwest's  
145 proposals, in addition to held-order rules and the pressures of the competitive  
146 market, provide ample protection for Qwest's customers. There is simply no  
147 public interest in requiring Qwest to maintain Option 2.

148 **Q. MR. ALLEN DISCUSSES THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCE OF**  
149 **HAVING AN OPTION 2 LDA. DOES HE IDENTIFY THE REAL ISSUE?**

150 A. No. Mr. Allen misstates Qwest's reference to "unintended consequences." He  
151 alleges that the unintended consequence was merely that developers began to use  
152 Option 2, which is false. The problem was with the option being interpreted as  
153 providing an excessive, flat-rate, per-lot price (at 125% of the distribution portion  
154 of Qwest's average loop investment) that sent perverse economic signals both to  
155 developers and to the Option 2 contractors seeking to use the tariff for profit (in  
156 the case of Clear Wave, eventually charging \$255 per lot for labor). Under this  
157 interpretation, the people choosing to use Option 2 (the developers) had no  
158 incentive to control costs, while the people with the incentive to control costs  
159 (Qwest) had no control over or relationship with the contractors placing the  
160 facilities. When combined with the other problems attendant to a situation where  
161 the contractors do not work for Qwest (e.g., failing to observe tariff timelines), the  
162 result has been an "unintended" mess.

163 **Q. MR. ALLEN TALKS ABOUT THE BENEFITS THAT OPTION 2**  
164 **CONTRACTORS PROVIDE TO THE DEVELOPER, THE END USER**  
165 **AND QWEST. PLEASE COMMENT ON THESE STATEMENTS.**

166 A. As Mr. Pappas has testified, the end user enters the game so late in the  
167 construction cycle of the development itself that they have no idea who placed the  
168 facilities. Unless there are disputes that prevent Qwest from assuming ownership

169 of facilities under Option 2, the end-user is essentially never impacted by the  
170 decision to use one option or the other.

171 Mr. Allen also misstates the position when he claims that “Qwest also benefits by  
172 acquiring customers purchasing at least 56% of the new homes without having to  
173 market their services.” (Page 8.) The statement shows a lack of understanding  
174 about how many CLECs operate using Qwest’s facilities. Facilities placement  
175 does not guaranty that Qwest will obtain customers.

176 As for a “marketing” benefit to Qwest, as stated above marketing should be left to  
177 those Qwest employees responsible for building and advancing relationships with  
178 developers and end-users. In light of their different interests and apparently  
179 negative view of Qwest, entities such as SBS or Clear Wave should not do  
180 Qwest’s marketing. Yet that is an almost inescapable by-product of Option 2, as  
181 the Option 2 contractors market their own services. This is a compelling reason  
182 not to force Qwest to maintain Option 2.

183 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY FINAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT MR. ALLEN’S**  
184 **SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY?**

185 A. Yes. Mr. Allen dismisses the proposal Qwest made to the HBA (which has since  
186 become an executed stipulation, filed with the Commission) that if successful in  
187 eliminating Option 2 Qwest will do certain things to ensure that it is responsive to  
188 developers’ needs. Mr. Allen implies that such a proposal would require  
189 developers to blindly trust Qwest to meet their needs. Mr. Allen is wrong for

190 several reasons. First, if Qwest fails to meet its tariff intervals developers can  
191 have conduit placed (paid for by Qwest)—they do not need to “trust” that Qwest  
192 will meet the schedule. Second, clarifying and shortening the timelines in the  
193 tariff does not leave developers to simply trust Qwest—Qwest is legally bound by  
194 the terms of its offering documents (e.g., tariffs and price lists) and is subject to  
195 Commission jurisdiction. Finally, Qwest has agreed to meet with developers in  
196 the future to determine how a revised LDA tariff is working, and cooperate in  
197 reaching any needed changes.

198 Despite Mr. Allen’s skepticism, the HBA has entered the stipulation with Qwest  
199 whereby the HBA does not oppose the elimination of Option 2. This  
200 demonstrates the ability of Qwest and developers to work together to meet their  
201 mutual needs without Option 2. It is now crystal clear that Option 2 contractors  
202 do not really speak for developers in this proceeding—they speak only for their  
203 own interests in maintaining a lucrative tariff provision. As the stipulation further  
204 attests, Qwest has every incentive to work with developers and to ensure a good  
205 relationship with them in a competitive marketplace.

206 **V. SUMMARY**

207 **Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CLOSING THOUGHTS?**

208 A. Qwest believes the stipulated agreement with the HBA and the revised tariff  
209 proposals made in earlier testimony address the key objectives set forth by the  
210 DPU in its testimony as well as being responsive to the needs of the real parties in

211 interest, the home builders. Given the stipulation, in addition to the evidence  
212 already offered by Qwest in multiple rounds of testimony, Qwest asks that the  
213 Commission allow Qwest to remove Option 2 as an offering, consistent with its  
214 revised tariff and the conditions in the stipulation, and finally and completely  
215 resolve the issues disputed in this docket.

216 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL SURREBUTTAL**  
217 **TESTIMONY?**

218 **A.** Yes, it does.