



Qwest
421 Southwest Oak Street
Suite 810
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-242-5420
Facsimile: 503-242-8589
e-mail: carla.butler@qwest.com

Carla M. Butler
Lead Paralegal

June 22, 2007

Vikie Bailey-Goggins
Oregon Public Utility Commission
550 Capitol St., NE
Suite 215
Salem, OR 97301

Re: New Docket Filing – UM

Dear Ms. Bailey-Goggins:

Enclosed for filing please find an original and (5) copies of Qwest Corporation's Petition For Commission Approval of 2007 Additions to Non-Impaired Wire Center List, and Motion For Expedited Issuance of Protective Order.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to give me a call.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Carla".

Carla M. Butler

CMB:
Enclosures
L:\Oregon\Executive\Duarte\UM 1251 (TRRO)\UM____ Transmittal Ltr.doc

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

UM _____

In the Matter of

QWEST CORPORATION

Petition for Commission Approval of 2007
Additions to Non-Impaired Wire Center List

**QWEST CORPORATION'S PETITION
FOR COMMISSION APPROVAL OF
2007 ADDITIONS TO NON-IMPAIRED
WIRE CENTER LIST AND MOTION
FOR EXPEDITED ISSUANCE OF
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Pursuant to OAR 860-013-0020, Qwest Corporation (“Qwest”) hereby petitions the Commission to open a docket for approval of Qwest’s 2007 *additions* to its non-impaired wire center list as set forth in the Commission’s Order No. 07-109 in the Commission’s initial *TRRO* non-impaired wire center proceeding, docket UM 1251 (“Order”), and the joint settlement agreement between Qwest and a coalition of CLECs (“the Joint CLECs”) that Qwest has concurrently filed for Commission approval in docket UM 1251. In addition, pursuant to the Order and aforementioned settlement agreement filed for approval in docket UM 1251, Qwest requests that the Commission issue on an *expedited basis* a protective order based on the model protective order attached hereto as Attachment A. Qwest and the Joint CLECs in docket UM 1251 negotiated and agreed to this protective order in order to allow Qwest to file confidential wire center information regarding “business line” counts and the number of “fiber-based collocators” as defined in the FCC’s *Triennial Review Remand Order* (“*TRRO*”),¹ in the Order, and in the settlement agreement filed in docket UM 1251 for which the parties seek Commission approval.

¹ Order on Remand, *In the Matter of Review of Unbundled Access to Network Elements, Review of Section 251 Unbundling Obligations of Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers*, CC Docket No. 01-338, WC Docket No. 04-313 (FCC rel. February 4, 2005) (hereafter “*Triennial Review Remand Order*” or “*TRRO*”).

INTRODUCTION AND PERTINENT BACKGROUND

On February 15, 2006, the Joint CLECs submitted a letter to the Commission requesting a proceeding for the purpose of determining the business line counts and numbers of collocators in Oregon wire centers, explaining that these determinations were necessary to implement the FCC's rulings in the *TRRO* relating to unbundled dedicated transport and high-capacity loops. The Commission docketed this request as docket UM 1251. Qwest then filed a response on February 28, 2006 and agreed that a proceeding for these and other related purposes was necessary, but also described how Qwest differed from the CLECs in some respects concerning the nature of the proceeding and the issues that the Commission should address.

The primary purpose of docket UM 1251 was for the Commission determine the quantities of business lines and fiber collocators in Oregon wire centers so that carriers can implement the Section 251(d)(2) impairment standards set forth in the FCC's *TRRO* for high-capacity dedicated transport and loops. The docket also addressed other issues and disputes relating to the *TRRO*, including the process for identifying and adding in the future new wire centers to the non-impaired wire center list. The parties then filed testimony on these issues.

Thereafter, on March 20, 2007, after the parties waived the evidentiary hearing, and after the filing of post-hearing briefs, the Commission issued its Order resolving certain issues and disputes between Qwest and the Joint CLECs. The Order included a ruling relating to the requirements for adding wire centers to the list of non-impaired wire centers in the future.² The Commission's Order requires, among other things, that Qwest provide five days' advance notice to alert CLECs that Qwest will be providing confidential data on the number of UNEs those

² Docket UM 1251 remains pending because the Commission required additional information regarding costs for the nonrecurring charge (NRC) that Qwest intends to charge to CLECs for orders to convert from

CLECs have in the affected wire centers, thus allowing CLECs time to object to the disclosure of confidential information. Order, pp. 12-13.³

**SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT FILED WITH COMMISSION IN DOCKET UM 1251
AND PETITION FOR ADDITIONS TO NON-IMPAIRED WIRE CENTER**

Qwest and the Joint CLECs recently negotiated and executed a settlement agreement in docket UM 1251 and throughout the Qwest region that addresses all issues in docket UM 1251 and the other *TRRO* wire center dockets in Qwest's region.⁴ Qwest has filed the settlement agreement in docket UM 1251 concurrently with this filing, and the parties in that docket (Qwest and the Joint CLECs) seek Commission approval of the agreement.⁵ As set forth in the settlement agreement that has been submitted for Commission approval in docket UM 1251, the parties to the settlement agreement agree that Qwest may request the addition of non-impaired wire centers based in whole or in part upon line counts at any time up to *July 1st* of each year, based on prior year line count data, and using an agreed-upon methodology.⁶ The parties to the settlement agreement also agreed that at least *five (5) business days prior to filing* new non-impairment or tier designations for Commission review, Qwest will request a *protective order*

unbundled network elements ("UNEs") to alternative products, services or facilities at wire centers that the Commission has determined to be non-impaired.

³ On May 21, 2007, Qwest filed a motion for reconsideration and/or clarification on issues not relevant to the issues here. The Joint CLECs did not oppose Qwest's motion for reconsideration or clarification, but the Commission has not yet ruled on the motion.

⁴ Some or all of the Joint CLECs were parties to similar Joint CLEC filings at the state utility regulatory commissions in Arizona (Docket Nos. T-03632A-06-0091, T-03406A-06-0091, 03267A-06-0091, T-03432A-06-0091, T-04302A-06-0091 and T-01051B-06-0091), Colorado (Docket No. 06M-080T), Minnesota (Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211), and Utah (Docket No. 06-049-40). The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (WUTC) investigated Qwest's initial non-impairment list in an existing docket (number UT-053025) established to review the impacts of the *TRRO* on local competition.

⁵ The settlement agreement includes an agreement on the nonrecurring charge (NRC) for conversions from UNEs to alternative services, products or facilities at wire centers the Commission has declared to be non-impaired that is still pending before this Commission in docket UM 1251.

⁶ With respect to fiber-based collocators, Qwest may request the addition of non-impaired wire centers to the Commission-approved wire center list at any time based on the number of fiber-based collocators.

from the Commission to govern the handling of confidential information during this new non-impairment proceeding.⁷ The parties also agree to seek from the Commission approval of a standing protective order, which is a new protective order, based on an agreed-upon model protective order. Qwest is attaching the model protective order as Attachment A to this petition.

Consistent with this process and the requirements of the Order and settlement agreement, Qwest intends to file with the Commission, on Friday, June 29, 2007, the data supporting its list of additional non-impaired wire centers, along with a request for Commission approval of the list. Assuming that the Commission has issued the protective order described above by that date, Qwest will also provide the data supporting the updated list to all CLECs that have signed the protective order. To facilitate this process and to comply with the requirement in the settlement agreement that Qwest seek Commission approval of a protective order at least five (5) business days prior to filing changes to the list, Qwest now seeks the Commission's *expedited issuance* of either a standing protective order or a new protective order based on the model protective order attached as Attachment A. Expedited issuance of the protective order will permit CLECs that sign the order to begin reviewing the confidential wire center data promptly after Qwest files the data on June 29th.

The wire centers that Qwest is seeking to add to the list of non-impaired wire centers based on the confidential data it will file on June 29, 2007 are as follows:

⁷ The requirement in the settlement agreement that Qwest will request a protective order from the Commission at least five (5) business days prior to filing new non-impairment or tier designations for Commission review in order to govern the handling of confidential information during this new non-impairment proceeding is consistent with the Commission's Order. See Order, pp. 12-13.

STATE	WIRE CENTER	CLLI	TIER	Non-IMPAIRMENT FOR
OR	Eugene 10th Ave	EUGNOR53	Tier 1	DS1 and DS3 Transport; Dark Fiber ; DS3 Loops
	Roseberg	RSBGOR57	Tier 2	DS3 Transport and Dark Fiber
	Salem-Main	SALMOR58	Tier 1	DS1 and DS3 Transport; Dark Fiber; DS3 Loops

REASON FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Finally, the reason that a protective order is needed in this new proceeding is that the information that Qwest will file will include certain highly-confidential wire center data, including highly-confidential CLEC-specific data. Qwest and the Joint CLECs in docket UM 1251 have agreed these data should be protected by a protective order that contains protections and limited disclosures of highly-confidential information. Specifically, Qwest seeks this protective order because Qwest will be filing CLEC-specific wire center data in this proceeding for the purposes of counting business line counts and fiber-based collocators in specific wire centers, and because the parties in docket UM 1251 agree that a protective order is needed here.

Accordingly, Qwest submits with this petition (Attachment A) a model protective order that the parties in docket UM 1251 agreed to in their settlement agreement (based on a Minnesota protective order). Qwest respectfully requests that the Commission issue either a standing protective order, or a new protective order, based on the model protective order in Attachment A as soon as possible. Alternatively, Qwest notes that the Commission previously issued a modified protective order in docket UM 1251 (Order No. 06-141) that it may wish to consider in this new proceeding.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, Qwest respectfully requests the Commission to open a docket for approval of Qwest's 2007 additions to its non-impaired wire center list listed above for which Qwest will file supporting data on June 29, 2007, and that it issue a protective order, based on the model protective order in Attachment A, as soon as possible.

Dated: June 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

QWEST CORPORATION



By _____

Alex M. Duarte, OSB No. 02045

QWEST

421 SW Oak Street, Room 810

Portland, OR 97204

(503) 242-5623

(503) 242-8589 (facsimile)

Alex.Duarte@qwest.com

Attorney for Qwest Corporation



STATE OF MINNESOTA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
100 Washington Square, Suite 1700
100 Washington Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401-2138

TELEPHONE: (612) 341-7600
TTY: (612) 341-7346

VIA E-MAIL AND U.S. MAIL

June 28, 2006

23

To: All Parties on the Attached Service List

Re: *In the Matter of CLECS' Request for Commission
Approval of ILEC Wire Center Impairment Analysis*
PUC Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211

and

*In the Matter of a Commission Investigation Identifying
Wire Centers in which Qwest Corporation Must Offer
High-Capacity Loop or Transport UNEs at Cost-Based
Rates*
PUC Docket No. P-999/CI-06-685

OAH Docket No. 11-2500-17274-2

Based upon recent e-mail communications from counsel in this matter, it is my understanding that the parties all concur in the use of the draft Protective Order I sent you last week. Accordingly, I have signed that Protective Order, and a copy is hereby served upon each of you.

Sincerely,

BARBARA L. NEILSON
Administrative Law Judge
Telephone: (612) 341-7604

Encl.

Providing Impartial Hearings for Government and Citizens
An Equal Opportunity Employer

OAH Docket No. 11-2500-17274-2
MPUC Docket No. P-5692, 5340, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211
MPUC Docket No. P-999/CI-06-685

**In the Matter of CLECs' Request for Commission Approval
of ILEC Wire Center Impairment Analysis
and
In the Matter of a Commission Investigation Identifying
Wire Centers in which Qwest Corporation Must Offer
High-Capacity Loop or Transport UNEs at Cost-Based Rates**

Administrative Law Judge's Service List as of June 28, 2006

Commission and Administrative Law Judge

Dr. Burl W. Haar (15) Executive Secretary Public Utilities Commission Suite 350 121 Seventh Place East St. Paul,, MN 55101-2147	John J. Lindell Analyst Public Utilities Commission Suite 350 121 Seventh Place East St. Paul, MN 55101-2147	Barbara L. Neilson (Original) Office of Administrative Hearings Suite 1700 100 Washington Square Minneapolis, MN 55401-2138
--	---	--

Parties

Linda Chavez (4) Telephone Docketing Coordinator Department of Commerce Suite 500 85 Seventh Place East St. Paul, MN 55101-2198	Karen A. Finstad Hammel Assistant Attorney General Suite 1500 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, MN 55101	Joan C. Peterson Jason D. Topp Corporate Counsel Qwest Corporation Room 2200 200 South Fifth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402
Dan Lipschultz Attorney at Law Moss & Barnett, P.A. Suite 4800 90 South Seventh Street Minneapolis, MN 55402-4129	Joy Gullikson Corporate Counsel Onvoy, Inc. Suite 700 300 South Highway 169 Minneapolis, MN 55426	Mary T. Buley Sr. Regulatory Manager Onvoy, Inc. Suite 700 300 South Highway 169 Minneapolis, MN 55426

Court Reporter

Janet Shaddix Elling
Shaddix & Associates
Suite 122
9100 W. Bloomington
Freeway
Bloomington, MN 55431

**Email service list
Parties**

burl.haar@state.mn.us
john.lindell@state.mn.us
barbara.neilson@state.mn.us
karen.hammel@state.mn.us
linda.chavez@state.mn.us
joan.peterson@qwest.com
jason.topp@qwest.com
LipschultzD@moss-barnett.com
joy.gullikson@onvoy.com
mary.buley@onvoy.com

Court Reporter

jshaddix@janetshaddix.com

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

LeRoy Koppendraye	Chair
Marshall Johnson	Commissioner
Phyllis A. Reha	Commissioner
Kenneth A. Nickolai	Commissioner
Thomas Pugh	Commissioner

In the Matter of CLECs' Request for
Commission Approval of ILEC Wire Center
Impairment Analysis

MPUC Docket No. P-5692, 5340,
5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211

In the Matter of a Commission
Investigation Identifying Wire Centers in
which Qwest Corporation Must Offer High-
Capacity Loop or Transport UNEs at Cost-
Based Rates

MPUC Docket No. P-999/CI-06-685

OAH Docket No. 11-2500-17274-2

PROTECTIVE ORDER

The purpose of this Protective Order ("Order") is to facilitate the disclosure of documents and information during the course of these proceedings and to protect Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information. Access to and review of Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information by parties other than government agencies shall be strictly controlled by the terms of this Order. The parties other than government agencies have represented and agree that Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information as defined in this Order constitute "trade secret information" under Minn. Stat. § 13.37, subd. 1(b), and "nonpublic data" under Minn. Stat. § 13.02, subd. 9. The parties other than government agencies have

acknowledged that the government agencies involved in this docket, which include the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission ("Commission"), the Office of Administrative Hearings ("OAH"), the Minnesota of Commerce ("Department"), and the Office of Attorney General ("OAG") and Office of Attorney General-Residential and Small Business Utilities Division ("OAG-RUD") are subject to the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act ("MGDPA")¹ and records retention requirements of Minn. Stat. §§ 138.163-138.226. The parties other than government agencies, which parties are hereinafter referred to as "parties", "persons" or "entities" have further agreed to the terms of paragraphs one through twelve below, and, upon that agreement, and all the files, records and proceedings herein, it is hereby ordered:

1. (a) Confidential Information. All documents, data, studies and other materials furnished pursuant to any requests for information, subpoenas or other modes of discovery (formal or informal), and including depositions, and other requests for information, that are claimed to be of a trade secret, proprietary or confidential nature (herein referred to as "Confidential Information"), shall be so marked by the providing party by stamping the same with a "NONPUBLIC DOCUMENT – CONTAINS TRADE SECRET DATA" designation. All copies of documents so marked shall be made on yellow paper. In addition, all notes or other materials that refer to, derive from, or otherwise contain parts of the Confidential Information will be marked by the receiving party as "NONPUBLIC DOCUMENT – CONTAINS TRADE SECRET DATA." Access to and review of Confidential Information shall be strictly controlled by the terms of this Order.

¹ Minn. Stat. Chapter 13.

(b) Use of Confidential Information – Proceedings. All persons who may be entitled to review, or who are afforded access to any Confidential Information by reason of this Order shall neither use nor disclose the Confidential Information for purposes of business or competition, or any purpose other than the purpose of preparation for and conduct of proceeding in the above-captioned docket or before the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), and all subsequent appeals ("proceedings"), and shall keep the Confidential Information secure as trade secret, confidential or proprietary information and in accordance with the purposes, intent and requirements of this Order.

(c) Persons Entitled to Review. Each party that receives Confidential Information pursuant to this Order must limit access to such Confidential Information to (1) attorneys employed or retained by the party in proceedings and the attorneys' staff; (2) experts, consultants and advisors who need access to the material to assist the party in proceedings; (3) only those employees of the party who are directly involved in these proceedings, provided that counsel for the party represents that no such employee is engaged in the sale or marketing of that party's products or services. In addition, access to Confidential Information may be provided to the government agencies, their counsel, employees, consultants and experts.

(d) Nondisclosure Agreement. Any party, person, or entity that receives Confidential Information pursuant to this Order shall not disclose such Confidential Information to any person, except persons who are described in section 1(c) above and who have signed a nondisclosure agreement in the form which is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A. Court reporters whose activities

are not regulated by Minn. Stat. Ch. 13 shall also be required to sign an Exhibit A upon written request of a party and to comply with the terms of this Order.

The nondisclosure agreement (Exhibit A) shall require the person(s) to whom disclosure is to be made to read a copy of this Protective Order and to certify in writing that they have reviewed the same and have consented to be bound by its terms. The nondisclosure agreement shall contain the signatory's full name, employer, business address and the name of the party with whom the signatory is associated. Such agreement shall be delivered to counsel for the providing party before disclosure is made, and if no objection thereto is registered to the Commission within five (5) days, then disclosure shall follow. An attorney who makes Confidential Information available to any person listed in section 1(c) above shall be responsible for having each such person execute an original of Exhibit A and a copy of all such signed Exhibit As shall be circulated to all other counsel of record promptly after execution.

2. (a) Notes. Limited notes regarding Confidential Information may be taken by counsel and experts for the express purpose of preparing pleadings, cross-examinations, briefs, motions and arguments in connection with this proceeding, or in the case of persons designated in section 1(c) of this Protective Order, to prepare for participation in this proceeding. Such notes shall then be treated as Confidential Information for purposes of this Order, and shall be destroyed after the final settlement or conclusion of the proceedings in accordance with section 2(b) below.

(b) Destruction. All notes, to the extent they contain Confidential Information and are protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine, shall be destroyed after the final settlement or conclusion of the proceedings.

The party destroying such Confidential Information shall advise the providing party of that fact within a reasonable time from the date of destruction.

3. Highly Confidential Trade Secret Information. Any person, whether a party or non-party, may designate certain competitive Confidential Information as "Highly Confidential Trade Secret Information" (herein referred to as "Highly Confidential Information") if it determines in good faith that it would be competitively disadvantaged by the disclosure of such information to its competitors. Highly Confidential Information includes, but is not limited to, documents, pleadings, briefs and appropriate portions of deposition transcripts, which contain information regarding the market share of, number of access lines served by, or number of customers receiving a specified type of service from a particular provider or other information that relates to marketing, business planning or business strategies.

Parties must scrutinize carefully responsive documents and information and limit their designations as Highly Confidential Information to information that truly might impose a serious business risk if disseminated without the heightened protections provided in this section. The first page and individual pages of a document determined in good faith to include Highly Confidential Information must be marked by a stamp that reads:

NONPUBLIC HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL TRADE SECRET
INFORMATION—USE RESTRICTED PER PROTECTIVE ORDER
IN MPUC DOCKET NOS. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211
AND P-999/CI-06-685

Placing a "Highly Confidential" stamp on the first page of a document indicates only that one or more pages contain Highly Confidential Information and will not serve to protect the entire contents of a multi-page document. Each page that contains Highly

Confidential Information must be marked separately to indicate Highly Confidential Information, even where that information has been redacted. The redacted versions of each page containing Highly Confidential Information, and provided under seal, should be submitted on paper distinct in color from non-confidential information and Confidential Information described in section 1 of this Protective Order.

Parties seeking disclosure of Highly Confidential Information must designate the person(s) to whom they would like the Highly Confidential Information disclosed in advance of disclosure by the providing party. Such designation may occur through the submission of Exhibit B of the nondisclosure agreement identified in section 1(d). Parties seeking disclosure of Highly Confidential Information shall not designate more than (1) a reasonable number of in-house attorneys who have direct responsibility for matters relating to Highly Confidential Information; (2) five in-house experts; and (3) a reasonable number of outside counsel and outside experts to review materials marked as Highly Confidential. Disclosure of Highly Confidential Information to Commissioners, Hearing Officers and Commission Advisory Staff members shall be limited to persons to whom disclosure is necessary. The Exhibit B also shall describe in detail the duties or responsibilities of the person being designated to see Highly Confidential Information and the person's role in the proceeding. Highly Confidential Information may not be disclosed to persons engaged in strategic or competitive decision making for any party, including the sale or marketing of products or services on behalf of any party.

Any party providing either Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information may object to the designation of any individual as a person who may review Confidential Information and/or Highly Confidential Information. Such objection shall be

made in writing to counsel submitting the challenged individual's Exhibit A or B within three (3) business days after receiving the challenged individual's signed Exhibit A or B. Any such objection must demonstrate good cause to exclude the challenged individual from the review of the Highly Confidential Information. Written response to any objection shall be made within three (3) business days after receipt of an objection. If, after receiving a written response to a party's objection, the objecting party still objects to disclosure of either Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information to the challenged individual, the Commission shall determine whether Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information must be disclosed to the challenged individual.

Copies of Highly Confidential Information may be provided to the in-house attorneys, in-house consultants, outside counsel and outside experts who have signed Exhibit B, and to the Department and OAG-RUD, their employees and counsel, and to their consultants and experts who have signed Exhibit B.

Persons authorized to review the Highly Confidential Information will maintain the documents and any notes reflecting their contents in a secure location to which only designated counsel and experts have access. No additional copies will be made, except for use during hearings and then such disclosure and copies shall be subject to the provisions of this Order. Any testimony or exhibits prepared that reflect Highly Confidential Information must be maintained in a secure location until removed to the hearing room for production under seal. Unless specifically addressed in this section, all other sections of this Protective Order applicable to Confidential Information also apply to Highly Confidential Information.

4. Small Company. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Order,

persons authorized to review Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information on behalf of a company with less than 5,000 employees shall be limited to the following: (1) a reasonable number of in-house attorneys who have direct responsibility for matters relating to Highly Confidential Information; (2) a reasonable number of outside counsel; (3) the company's employees and witnesses; and (4) independent consultants acting under the direction of the company's counsel or senior management and directly engaged in this proceeding. Such persons **do not** include individuals primarily involved in marketing activities for the company, unless the party producing the information, upon request, gives prior written authorization for that person to review the Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. If the producing party refuses to give such written authorization, the company may, for good cause shown, request an order from the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") allowing that person to review the Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. The producing party shall be given the opportunity to respond to the company's request before an order is issued.

5. Masking. Information or documents provided in this proceeding showing the identity of any fiber-based collocators in a wire center must be designated as Confidential. Similarly, any information or documents provided in this proceeding showing the identity of a telecommunications carrier's business lines or line counts must be provided in a "masked" format, identifying the information using a code, and must be designated as Confidential. Each individual carrier will be provided its own code to verify data concerning that carrier. The government agencies will be provided a code for each carrier identified in the information or documents provided.

6. Objections to Admissibility. The furnishing of any document, data, study or other materials pursuant to this Protective Order shall in no way limit the right of the providing party to object to its relevance or admissibility in proceedings before this Commission.

7. Challenge to Confidentiality. This Order establishes a procedure for the expeditious handling of information that a party claims is Confidential or Highly Confidential. It shall not be construed as an agreement or ruling on the confidentiality of any document. Any party may challenge the characterization of any information, document, data or study claimed by the providing party to be Confidential in the following manner:

(a) A party seeking to challenge the confidentiality of any materials pursuant to this Order shall first contact counsel for the providing party and attempt to resolve any differences by stipulation;

(b) In the event that the parties cannot agree as to the character of the information challenged, any party challenging the confidentiality shall do so by appropriate pleading. This pleading shall:

(i) Designate the document, transcript or other material challenged in a manner that will specifically isolate the challenged material from other material claimed as confidential; and

(ii) State with specificity the grounds upon which the documents, transcript or other material are deemed to be non-confidential by the challenging party.

(c) A ruling on the confidentiality of the challenged information,

document, data or study shall be made by a Hearing Officer after proceedings in camera, which shall be conducted under circumstances such that only those persons duly authorized hereunder to have access to such Confidential materials shall be present. This hearing shall commence no earlier than five (5) business days after service on the providing party of the pleading required by section 7(b) above.

(d) The record of said in camera hearing shall be marked "CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN MPUC DOCKET NOS. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 AND P-999/CI-06-685." Court reporter notes of such hearing shall be transcribed only upon agreement by the parties or order of the Hearing Officer and in that event shall be separately bound, segregated, sealed, and withheld from inspection by any person not bound by the terms of this Order.

(e) In the event that the Hearing Officer should rule that any information, document, data or study should be removed from the restrictions imposed by this Order, no party shall disclose such information, document, data or study or use it in the public record for five (5) business days unless authorized by the providing party to do so. The provisions of this subsection are intended to enable the providing party to seek a stay or other relief from an order removing the restriction of this Order from materials claimed by the providing party to be Confidential.

8. (a) Receipt into Evidence. Provision is hereby made for receipt into evidence in this proceeding materials claimed to be confidential in the following manner:

(i) Prior to the use of, or substantive reference to, any Confidential or Highly Confidential Information, the parties intending to use such information shall make that intention known to the providing party.

(ii) The requesting party and the providing party shall make a good-faith effort to reach an agreement so the information can be used in a manner which will not reveal its trade secret, confidential or proprietary nature.

(iii) If such efforts fail, the providing party shall separately identify which portions, if any, of the documents to be offered or referenced shall be placed in a sealed record.

(iv) Only one (1) copy of the documents designated by the providing party to be placed in a sealed record shall be made.

(v) The copy of the documents to be placed in the sealed record shall be tendered by counsel for the providing party to the Commission, and maintained in accordance with the terms of this Order.

(b) Seal. While in the custody of the Commission, materials containing Confidential Information shall be marked "CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN MPUC DOCKET NOS. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 AND P-999/CI-06-685" and Highly Confidential Information shall be marked "HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL – USE RESTRICTED PER PROTECTIVE ORDER IN MPUC DOCKET NOS. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 AND P-999/CI-06-685," and shall not be examined by any person except under the conditions set forth in this Order.

(c) In Camera Hearing. Any Confidential or Highly Confidential Information that must be orally disclosed to be placed in the sealed record in this proceeding shall be offered in an in camera hearing, attended only by persons authorized to have access to the information under this Order. Similarly, any cross-

examination on, or substantive reference to, Confidential or Highly Confidential Information (or that portion of the record containing Confidential or Highly Confidential Information or references thereto) shall be received in an in camera hearing, and shall be marked and treated as provided herein.

(d) Access to Record. Access to sealed testimony, records and information shall be limited to the Hearing Officer and persons who are entitled to review Confidential or Highly Confidential Information pursuant to section 1(c) above and have signed an Exhibit A or B, unless such information is released from the restrictions of this Order either through agreement of the parties or after notice to the parties and hearing, pursuant to the ruling of a Hearing Officer, the order of the Commission and/or final order of a court having final jurisdiction.

(e) Appeal/Subsequent Proceeding. Sealed portions of the record in this proceeding may be forwarded to any court of competent jurisdiction for purposes of an appeal, or to the FCC, but under seal as designated herein for the information and use of the court or the FCC. If a portion of the record is forwarded to a court or the FCC, the providing party shall be notified which portion of the sealed record has been designated by the appealing party as necessary to the record on appeal or for use at the FCC.

(f) Return. Unless otherwise ordered, Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information, including transcripts of any depositions to which a claim of confidentiality is made, shall remain under seal, shall continue to be subject to the protective requirements of this Order, and shall be returned to counsel for the providing party within thirty (30) days after final settlement or conclusion of the proceedings. If the

providing party elects to have Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information destroyed rather than returned, counsel of the receiving party shall verify in writing that the material has in fact been destroyed.


9. Use in Pleadings. Where references to Confidential or Highly Confidential Information in the sealed record or with the providing party is required in pleadings, briefs, arguments or motions (except as provided in section 7), it shall be by citation of title or exhibit number or some other description that will not disclose the substantive Confidential Information contained therein. Any use of or substantive references to Confidential or Highly Confidential Information shall be placed in a separate section of the pleading or brief and submitted to the Hearing Officer or the Commission under seal. This sealed section shall be served only on counsel of record and parties of record who have signed the nondisclosure agreement set forth in Exhibit A or B. All of the restrictions afforded by this Order apply to materials prepared and distributed under this section.

10. Summary of Record. If deemed necessary by the Commission or ALJ, the providing party shall prepare a written summary of the Confidential or Highly Confidential Information referred to in the Order to be placed on the public record.

11. The provisions of this Order are specifically intended to apply to all data, documents, studies, and other material designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential by any party to MPUC Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 and P-999/CI-06-685. In addition, experts and consultants of government agencies are subject to the provisions of this Protective Order that are applicable to experts and consultants of parties.

12. This Protective Order shall continue in force and effect after these dockets are closed.

Dated: June 28, 2006.



BARBARA L. NEILSON
Administrative Law Judge

EXHIBIT A

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

I have read the foregoing Protective Order dated _____ 2006, in MPUC Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 and P-999/CI-06-685P-421/CI-05-1996, and agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of this Order.

Name

Employer

Job Title and Job Description

Business Address

Party

Signature

Date

EXHIBIT B

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

I have read the foregoing Protective Order dated _____ 2006, in MPUC Docket Nos. P-5692, 5340, 5643, 5323, 465, 6422/M-06-211 AND P-999/CI-06-685, and agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of this Order.

Name

Employer

Job Title and Job Description

Business Address

Party

Signature

Date

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

UM _____

I hereby certify that on the 22nd day of June, 2007, I served the foregoing QWEST CORPORATION'S PETITION FOR COMMISSION APPROVAL OF 2007 ADDITIONS TO NON-IMPAIRED WIRE CENTER LIST and MOTION FOR EXPEDITED ISSUANCE OF PROTECTIVE ORDER in the above entitled docket on the following persons via U.S. Mail, by mailing a correct copy to them in a sealed envelope, with postage prepaid, addressed to them at their regular office address shown below, and deposited in the U.S. post office at Portland, Oregon.

*Covad Communications Co.
Gregory Diamond
7901 E. Lowry Blvd.
Denver, CO 80230

Greg Kopta
Davis Wright Tremaine
1501 4thAve., Suite 2600
Seattle, WA 98101-1688

*Karen L. Clauson
Eschelon Telecom, Inc.
730 2nd Avenue S
Suite 900
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2489

*Jay Nusbaum
Integra Telecom of Oregon, Inc.
1201 NE Lloyd Blvd.
Suite 500
Portland, OR 97232

William A. Haas
McLeod USA
Telecommunications Svcs, Inc.
P.O. Box 3177
6400 C. Street, SW
Cedar Rapids, IA 52406-3177

John M. Devaney
Perkins Coie, LLP
607 Fourteenth St., NW
Suite 800
Washington DC 20005-2011

*Rex Knowles
XO Communications Svcs., Inc
111 E. Broadway
Suite 1000
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

*Douglas Denney
Eschelon Telecom, Inc.
730 2nd Avenue S
Suite 900
Minneapolis, MN 55402-2489

Kevin Saville
Frontier Communications of
America, Inc.
2378 Wilshire Blvd.
Mound, MN 55364

DATED this 22nd day of June, 2007.

QWEST CORPORATION



By: _____

ALEX M. DUARTE, OSB No. 02045
421 SW Oak Street, Suite 810
Portland, OR 97204
Telephone: 503-242-5623
Facsimile: 503-242-8589
e-mail: alex.duarte@qwest.com
Attorney for Qwest Corporation