

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

ARB 671

In the Matter of QWEST CORPORATION'S)	
Petition for Arbitration of Interconnection)	
Rates, Terms, Conditions, and Related)	ARBITRATOR'S DECISION
Arrangements with UNIVERSAL TELE-)	ERRATA
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.)	

The Arbitrator's Decision in this case, issued February 2, 2006, is amended by the issuance of this Errata incorporating the following revisions:

On page 5, the following passage and its associated footnote are deleted:

Qwest also takes issue with Universal's characterization of the Commission's rulings in the *Wantel* order. The Commission, in Qwest's view, was only examining the impact of the *WorldCom* case on a preexisting agreement when it found that 'an important legal rationale underlying the decision in Order No. 01-809 to exclude ISP-bound traffic from the RUF has been found to be contrary to federal law...' and, therefore, 'it cannot provide the basis for interpreting the Pac-West/Qwest ICA.' Qwest therefore calls Universal's conclusion that ISP-bound traffic continues to fall under Section 251(b)(5) on a forward-going basis 'false,' and discusses two Colorado federal court decisions ignored by Universal to support its position.

On page 7, the following passage is deleted:

construed by the Oregon District Court in the *Universal* case, does not apply to transport obligations.²² Thus, the Commission retains jurisdiction over the compensation regime for local direct trunked transport of ISP-bound traffic.

²² Order No. 05-1219, entered November 18, 2005, p. 7, citing Order No. 05-874, entered July 26, 2005.

As noted above, the FCC determined that ISP-bound traffic is “information access traffic,” and not “telecommunications traffic,” local or otherwise.

In the identical place on page 7, the following passage is inserted:

...construed by the Oregon District Court in the *Universal* case, does not apply to transport obligations.²²

Furthermore, as noted above, the FCC determined that ISP-bound traffic is “information access traffic,” and not “telecommunications traffic,” local or otherwise.

On page 11, the last line of text before the footnote is amended to read as follows:

of federal law.”

Dated at Salem, Oregon, this 6th day of February, 2006.

Allan J. Arlow, Arbitrator

ARB 671 Arbitrator’s Decision Errata

²² Order No. 05-1219, entered November 18, 2005, p. 7, citing Order No. 05-874, entered July 26, 2005.