Case Assignment and Scheduling Record

Section 1 - Division of Records and Repr g (RAR) Completes

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/96)

fficial Filing Date: ast Day to Suspend:		Evnirat	ion:									
eferred to: '()" indicates OPR)	ADM	AFA .		AF (CMU)		GCL	LEG X	RAR	RRR	WAW		
ection 2 - OPR Completes and	returns to	RAR in	10 workdays					e Sched	ule	-		
ogram/Module A19			l					,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,				
Staff As	signments		FOR UPI	THIS SCHED	CT THE	RECORDS	VE AND SECTIO	<u>SUBJECT</u> N: (904	TO REV) 413-6	<u>ISION</u> 770		
			Current	CASR revis	_	eı				D.	<u>Due D</u>	
			1								revious	Current
***************************************			2									
aff Counsel			4.									
			0.									
-			9. —							-		
()			10.									
			13.							-		
()		-	15.							-		
			1 1/.							- 1		
MATERIAL PROPERTY (ACT OF THE PARTY OF THE P			10.									
()			22.				***************************************			-		
			24.							_		
			26.							1		
			28.									
commended assignments for he	earing		30.									
d/or deciding this case:	niccion Dano	1	33.							_		
Full Commission Comm Hearing Examiner Stat	ff	_	35.									
te filed with RAR:			0/.							1		
itials: OPR Staff Counsel			00.									
ction 3 - Chairman Completes	5			s are as f						THE STATE OF THE S		and the second second second second second
- Hearin	ng Officer(s)	ASS TYTIMETTE	.s are as r	orrows.		- Prehe	earing (Officer		DOC	UMENT
Commissioner		Hrg.	Staff					ssioner		ADM	1	
ALL CL DS 3	IN KS GR	- Exam.				CL		JN K				
						-					1	

* COMPLETED EVENTS

Docket No	96084	6-TP		Date Do	cketed	: 07/23	3/1996	Title:	Petit	ion by	MCI Met	ro Acc	ess T	ransm	nissio	n Servi	ces, Ir	c. for
Company:	BellSou MCI Met	uth Te ro Ac	lecom		ons, I	nc.			arbit agree	ration ment wi connect	of cert th Bell	ain te South	rms a	ind co	nditi nicati	ons of ons, In ecommun	a propo	sed
Official I Last Day 1	Filing D to Suspe	ate: end:			E	Expirati	on:											
Referred (PR)			ADM	AFA	APP	CAF	(CMU)	EAG	GCL	LEG X	RA	R —	RRR	WAW		
Section 2	- OPR C	omple	tes a	nd returr	ns to F	RAR in 1	0 workd	ays.			**************************************	<u>Ti</u>	me Sc	hedul	<u>e</u>			
Program/Mo	odule A	19																
				Assignmer			FOR	UPDATES	CONTAC	JLE IS T CT THE F ion leve	RECORDS	VE AND SECTI	SUBJ ON: (ECT T 904)	0 REV 413-6	<u>ISION</u> 770	Due	Dates
OPR Staff	<u>M</u> R	Norte	on, A	Chase, S Shelfer	Greer,				0							Pr	evious	
	_						1. <u>T</u>	estimor otice o	y - MC	I earing a	and Hea	ring					IONE	08/21/1996 09/04/1996
Staff Cour	n lead	Canz	200				3. T	estimon	y - Bel	llSouth						N	IONE	09/09/1996
	iset D	Cariza	ano				5. P	reheari	ng Stat	outtal - tements	- ALL						IONE IONE	09/16/1996 09/20/1996
OCRs ()	_						6. P	reheari ranscri	ng nts Due	e - Preh	nearing						IONE IONE	10/03/1996 10/03/1996
	_						8. H	earing	10/9-11	1/96						N	IONE	10/09/1996
	-						9. <u>T</u>	<u>ranscri</u> riefs D	pts Due	- Hear	ring						IONE	10/14/1996 10/22/1996
()	_						11. S	taff Re	commend	dation						_ N	IONE	12/05/1996
	-						12. A	genda -	Regula	ar						_	IONE IONE	12/17/1996 01/06/1997
	_						14.				464						IONE	01/00/1997
()							10.				in the second second							
()	_						17.											
	_						18.											
	_		-			-	20.									_		
()	_						21							- Control of the Cont				
	-						23.						-			_		
	_						24.											
()							26.									-		
	_						21.									_		
	_						28. <u></u>									_		
				1			30.											
Recommende and/or dec	_			nearing			31.									-		
5 11 0					_		33.											
Full Com Hearing	mıssıon Examine	r _X_	St	ommission taff	Panel		54.					aliana de la compania				_		-
				1007			36.											
Date filed	with K	AR: <u>U</u>	3/21/	1996		-	3/.									_		
Initials:		0					39											
	Starr	Lounse					1 40									_		
Section 3	- Chair	man Co	omplet	tes		,	Assignme	ents ar	e as fo	ollows:								acs
г		-	Hear	ring Offi	cer(s)	1	T					- Pre	neari	ng Of	ficer		7	
		Commi	ssion	ners		Hrg. Exam.	Staff					Comm	ission	ners		ADM		
	ALL	CL	DS	JN KS	GR	LAGIII.					CL	DS	JN	KS	GR			
	Χ											X						

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/96)

the identical panel decides the case.

Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman;

Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

* COMPLETED EVENTS

Approved: SC/

Date: <u>08/21/1996</u>

Date Docketed: 07/23/1996 Title: Petition by MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro

Access Transmission Services, Inc. for arbitration of

Section 1 - Division of Records and Reporting (RAR) Completes

Docket No. 960846-TP

Company: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. certain terms and conditions of a proposed agreement with MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. concerning MCI Telecommunications Corporation interconnection and resale under the Telecommunications Act Official Filing Date: Last Day to Suspend: Expiration: Referred to: ADM AFA APP CAF (CMU) EAG GCL LEG RAR RRR WAW ("()" indicates OPR) X X Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to RAR in 10 workdays. Time Schedule Program/Module A20(b) WARNING: THIS SCHEDULE IS AN INTERNAL PLANNING DOCUMENT. IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO REVISION. Staff Assignments FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770 Current CASR revision level Due Dates M Sirianni, R Norton, OPR Staff W Stavanja, R Widell Previous Current 1. Testimony - BST Direct SAME 11/10/1997 2. Testimony - Intervenor Direct SAME 11/25/1997 3. Testimony - Rebuttal All 12/09/1997 SAME Staff Counsel M Barone Prehearing Statements SAME 12/09/1997 5. Notice of Prehearing and Hearing 01/07/1998 SAME OCRs () 6. Prehearing SAME 01/14/1998 7. Prehearing Transcripts Due SAME 01/22/1998 8. Hearing 1/26-27/97 01/26/1998 SAME 9. Hearing Transcripts Due SAME 02/10/1998 10. Briefs Due SAME 02/17/1998 11. Staff Recommendation SAME 03/26/1998) 04/07/1998 12. Agenda - Regular SAME 13. Standard Order 04/27/1998 14. 15. 16.) 17. 18. 19. 20. 21.) 22. 23. 25. 26. () 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. Recommended assignments for hearing and/or deciding this case: 33. Full Commission X Commission Panel 34 Hearing Examiner 35. Staff 36. Date filed with RAR: 09/18/1997 37 38. Initials: OPR 39. Staff Counsel 40 CSRA Section 3 - Chairman Completes Assignments are as follows: - Hearing Officer(s) - Prehearing Officer Commissioners Hrg. Staff Exam.

Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman; the identical panel decides the case. Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is assigned the full Commission decides the case.

KS

GR

		ADM			
JN	DS	CL	KS	GR	
		Х			

Approv	ved: Am
Date:	09/19/1997

ALL

Х

JN

DS

CL

Case Assignment and Scheduling Record

Section 1 - Di	vision of R	ecords ar	nd Report	ing (RA	R) Con	pletes					1				
Docket No. 96			Docketed:		/1996	Title:	Acces	s Transi	mission	Servi	ces, In	c. for a	rbitra	ation of	
Company: Bell MCI MCI	Metro Acces Telecommuni	s Transmi	ission Se	rvices,	Inc.		BellS	outh Te	lecommun	nicatio	ons, In	c. conce	rning	reement wunication	
Official Filin Last Day to Su	g Date: spend:		Exp	iration	: _										
Referred to: ("()" indicate	s OPR)		ADM	AFA	APP	CAF	(CMU)	EAG	GCL	LEG X	RAR	RRR	WAW		
Section 2 - OP	R Completes	and retu	urns to R	AR in 1	0 work	days.			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Tin	ne Sched	dule			
Program/Module		f Assignm	nents		IT IS	NG: THIS	VE AND	SUBJECT	TO REV	/ISION.	<u>.</u>				
ODD Stoff						ent CASE				.CITON.	. (650)	415-011	U	Due	Dates
OPR Staff	M Siriann W Stavanja	a, R Wide	ell.				1]						Previous	
					2.	Testimor Testimor	ny - Int	tervenor	Direct	:			_ _	SAME SAME	11/10/1997 11/25/1997
Staff Counsel	M Barone				3.	Testimor Preheari	ny - Reb	outtal /	All			-	_ _	SAME SAME	12/09/1997 12/09/1997
					5.	Notice o	of Prehe	earing a	and Hear	ing			_ _	SAME	01/07/1998
OCRs ()					7.	Preheari	ing Trar	nscripts	Due				_	SAME SAME	01/14/1998 01/22/1998
		William			8.	Hearing Hearing	1/26-28	3/97						SAME	01/26/1998 02/10/1998
()	100000000000000000000000000000000000000				10.	Briefs D Staff Re)ue							SAME SAME	02/17/1998
()					12.	Agenda -	Regula	ar						SAME	03/26/1998 04/07/1998
					15.	Standard	urder							SAME	04/27/1998
()					15.										
()					17.										
				*	10.									2	
()	***************************************				20.										
()					22.										
					23.								_		
	And a principal action and an action and action and action and action action and action actio				25.		-						_ _		
()					26.										
	***************************************				28.			-					_		
					30.										
Recommended as: and/or deciding			ng		31.								_ -		
Full Commiss	ion Y	Commissi	on Panel		33.								_ _		
Hearing Exam		Staff	OII Failet		35.								_ _		
Date filed with	n RAR: <u>09/18</u>	3/1997			77								_ -		
Initials: OPR					38.								_ _		
	ff Counsel				40.										
Section 3 - Cha	airman Comp	letes	-1			150			day	10	hear	mg			CSRA
	- Не	earing Of	ficer(s)	,	Assign	ments ar	e as fo	ollows:		- Preh	earing	Officer			
	Commissi			Hrg.	Staf	f					ssioner		ADM		
ALI			KS GR	Exam.	Star				JN	DS		S GR	AUM		
Х											х				
Where panels as	e assigned	the seni	or Commi:	ssioner	is Pa	 nel Chai	rman:			1		0 01	1		
the identical where one Commissigned the fu	oanel decide issioner, a	es the ca Hearing	se. Examiner	or a S					Appro		5/1997	1/m			-

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 7/97)

Date: <u>10/15/1997</u>

Case Assignment and Scheduling Record

Section 1 - Division of Records and Report (RAR) Completes

Docket No. Company:	BellSou MCI Met	ith Te	cess	Date Doo municatio Transmiss tions Con	ons, Ir sion Se	nc. ervices,		Title:	Access certa BellSo	s Transm in terms outh Tel connecti	MCI Tele mission s and co lecommun ion and	Servio nditio icatio	ces, 1 ons of	nc. 1 f a pr	for ar ropose concer	bitrat d agre ning	ion of ement w	ith
Official F Last Day t	iling D o Suspe	ate: end:			Exp	oiration	: _											
Referred t		PR)			ADM	AFA	APP	CAF	(CMU)	EAG		LEG X	RAR	R F	RRR	WAW		
Section 2	- OPR C	omple	tes a	nd return	ns to R	AR in 1	0 workd	days.				Tin	ne Sch	edule	2			
Program/Mo		<u>S1</u>		Assignmer R Nortor			IT IS FOR UP	TENTATI	VE AND	THE REC	AN INTER TO REV CORDS SE	ISION.					Due [<u>Dates</u>
OFR Starr	<u>W</u>	Stava	anja,	R Widell			1. 1	Γestimor	2 ny - BS1	Direct	:						revious	Current
Staff Coun	sel M						3. <u>1</u>	restimor Preheari	ng Stat	outtal A tements	Direct					11/2	25/1997 SAME SAME	11/13/1997 12/09/1997 12/09/1997
OCRs ()	-						6. <u>P</u> 7. <u>P</u> 8. H	reheari reheari Hearing	ng ng Tran 1/26-28	nscripts 3/97	and Hear Due						SAME SAME SAME	01/07/1998 01/14/1998 01/22/1998 01/26/1998
()							9. <u>H</u> 10. <u>B</u> 11. <u>S</u> 12. <u>A</u>	Hearing Briefs D Staff Re Agenda - Standard	Transcr ue commend Regula l Order	dation	ie					02/	SAME 17/1998 SAME SAME SAME	02/10/1998 03/03/1998 03/26/1998 04/07/1998 04/27/1998
()	_						16 17											
()							20 21 22.											
()	_						24 25 26											
Recommended and/or dec				hearing			29 30 31 32									_		
Full Com Hearing	mission Examine	<u>X</u>		ommission taff	Panel	_	34											
Date filed Initials:	OPR			1997			37. 38. 39.											
	Staff						40	_						9 . 4			T-0	
Section 3	- Chair	man Co	omple	tes		i	Assignm	ments ar	e as fo	ollows:	PSC	- 7	7-1	503	5 - P	CO-	7 0	
			Неаг	ring Offi	cer(s)							- Preh	earin	g Off	icer		_	
		Commi	ssion	ners		Hrg. Exam.	Staff	f				Commi	ssion	ers		ADM		
	ALL	JN	DS	CL KS	GR						JN	DS	CL	KS	GR			
Where pane						ssioner	is Par	nel Chai	rman;				Х		,			
the identic Where one (assigned th	cal pan Commiss	el ded ioner	ides , a He	the case earing Ex	aminer	or a S					Appro		7/100	79	12			7-0-7-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-
DSC/DAD 15			100 I UI	- decrues	the C	use.		* COM	IDI ETED	EVENTS	Date:	10/2	. 7 177	,			,	

Date Docketed: 07/23/1996 Title: Petition by MCI Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro

Access Transmission Services, Inc. for arbitration of

Date: <u>01/15/19</u>98

Section 1 - Division of Records and Reporting (RAR) Completes

Docket No. 960846-TP

the identical panel decides the case.

PSC/RAR-15 (Rev. 1/98)

assigned the full Commission decides the case.

Where one Commissioner, a Hearing Examiner or a Staff Member is

Company: BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. certain terms and conditions of a proposed agreement with MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. concerning MCI Telecommunications Corporation interconnection and resale under the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Official Filing Date: Last Day to Suspend: Expiration: Referred to: ADM AFA (CMU) LEG WAW ("()" indicates OPR) _X Section 2 - OPR Completes and returns to RAR in 10 workdays. Time Schedule Program/Module A20(b) WARNING: THIS SCHEDULE IS AN INTERNAL PLANNING DOCUMENT. IT IS TENTATIVE AND SUBJECT TO REVISION. FOR UPDATES CONTACT THE RECORDS SECTION: (850) 413-6770 Staff Assignments Current CASR revision level Due Dates M Sirianni, R Norton, OPR Staff W Stavanja, R Widell 3 Previous Current 1. Prehearing 01/14/1998 NONE 2. Prehearing Transcripts Due 01/22/1998 3. Hearing 1/26-28/98 NONE 01/26/1998 Staff Counsel M Barone 4. <u>Hearing Transcripts Due</u> NONE 02/10/1998 5. 02/17/1998 Briefs Due 03/03/1998 OCRs (03/26/1998 6. Staff Recommendation 03/25/1998 04/07/1998 7. Special Agenda 04/06/1998 8. Standard Order 04/27/1998 04/26/1998 9. 10.) 11. 12. 13. 14. 15.) 16. 17. 18. 19 20. 21.) 24 25. 26.) 27 28. 30 Recommended assignments for hearing 31. and/or deciding this case: 32. 33 Full Commission X Hearing Examiner Commission Panel 34. 35. Staff 36. Date filed with RAR: 01/15/1998 37. 38. Initials: OPR 39. Staff Counsel 40. CSRA <u>Section 3 - Chairman Completes</u> Assignments are as follows: - Hearing Officer(s) - Prehearing Officer Commissioners Commissioners Hra. Staff ADM Exam. GR JC ALL JN DS CL JN DS CL GR JC Where panels are assigned the senior Commissioner is Panel Chairman;

* COMPLETED EVENTS

LAW OFFICES

MESSER, CAPARELLO, MADSEN, GOLDMAN & METZ

A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

215 SOUTH MONROE STREET, SUITE 701
POST OFFICE BOX 1876
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32302-1876

TELEPHONE: (904) 222-0720
TELECOPIERS: (904) 224-4359; (904) 425-1942

RECEIVED AUG U & 1996

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

July 31, 1996

Ms. Blanca Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 960846-TP

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Please add this firm to the mailing list for Docket No.960846-TP directing all pleadings, orders, notices, or other materials to the undersigned. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Yours very truly,

Floyd R./Self

FRS/amb

DOCUMENT NO.

13954-64



125 SOUTH GADSDEN STREET, SUITE 200 . TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301 . (904) 222-5050 . FAX (904) 222-1355

July 31, 1996

----VIA FACSIMILE----

Blanca S. Bayó, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 960846-TP

Dear Ms. Bayó:

The Florida Public Telecommunications Association, Inc. requests that it be included on the mailing list as an interested entity in the above-referenced docket. Please address all correspondence as follows:

Angela B. Green, General Counsel Florida Public Telecommunications Association, Inc. 125 South Gadsden Street, Suite 200 Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

2000

Angela B. Green General Counsel

RUTLEDGE, ECENIA, UNDERWOOD, PURNELL & HOFFMAN

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

STEPHEN A. ECENIA
KENNETH A. HOFFMAN
THOMAS W. KONRAD
R. DAVID PRESCOTT
HAROLD F. X. PURNELL
GARY R. RUTLEDGE
R. MICHAEL UNDERWOOD
WILLIAM B. WILLINGHAM

POST OFFICE BOX 551, 32302-0551 215 SOUTH MONROE STREET, SUITE 420 TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301-1841

> TELEPHONE (904) 681-6788 TELECOPIER (904) 681-6515

August 1, 1996

PATRICK R. MALOY
AMY J. YOUNG
AUG 0 2 1996

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Ms. Blanca Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Betty Easley Conference Center Room 110 Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Florida PSC Docket No. 960846-TP; Petition by MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc. for arbitration of certain terms and conditions of a proposed agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. concerning interconnection and resale under the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Bayo:

The undersigned represents GTE Mobilnet ("GTE"). GTE is interested in the above-referenced docket. Please provide copies of all notices, CASRs, orders, staff recommendations, pleadings and other documents filed, served or issued in the above-referenced docket to the following:

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

enneth A. Hoffma

KAH/rl



FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING



8/5/96

Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

Re: Docket No. 960846-TP Petition by MCI Metro Access Transmission Services, Inc. for arbitration of certain terms and conditions of a proposed agreement with BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. concerning interconnection and resale under the Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Bayo,

Time Warner Communications, on behalf of Time Warner AxS, L.P. and Digital Media Partners requests that it be included on the mailing list as an interested entity in the above-referenced docket. Please address all correspondence as follows:

Jill Butler, Director of Regulatory Affairs Time Warner Communications 2773 Red Maple Ridge Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Sincerely,

Jill Butler



Florida Cable Telecommunications Association

Steve Wilkerson, President

August 6, 1996



FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

Ms. Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

RE: FPSC Docket No. 960846-TP

Dear Ms. Bayo:

I am writing to request that the Florida Cable Telecommunications Association, Inc. ("FCTA") be placed on the mailing list of persons interested in monitoring the above-referenced docket. Please send all mailings to the following:

Laura L. Wilson
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
& Regulatory Counsel
Florida Cable Telecommunications Association, Inc.
310 North Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32301
904/681-1990 Tel.
904/681-9676 Fax
E-Mail Address: FCTAINC@aol.com.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please contact me with any questions.

Yours very truly,

Laura L. Wilson

Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

& Regulatory Counsel

LLW:baw

CC:

Mr. Steven E. Wilkerson

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.

LEGAL DEPARTMENT

4300 Southern Bell Center 675 W. Peachtree Street Atlanta, Georgia 30375



FAX: (404) 614-4054

FPSC-RECORDS/REPORTING

TO: Blanca S. Bayo PHONE NO: FAX NO: 904-413-7118 FROM: Nancy White	NO. PAGES: 3 (Incl. cover)
PHONE NO:	
URGENT[]	NORMAL []
Mesovic.	

This facsimile contains privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the Addressee(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this facsimile, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination or copying of this facsimile is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original facsimile to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.

Naney B. White General Attorney A FELLEGICIE

BallSauth Talacommunications, Inc. Legal Department - Suite 4300 675 West Peachtree Street Atlanta, Georgia 30375-0001 Telephone: 404-335-0710 Facsimile: 404-614-4054

August 22, 1996

VIA FACSIMILE

Donna Canzano Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399

RE: Docket No. 960833/960846-TP

Dear Donna:

In response to your request, the following constitutes BellSouth's argument as to why the issue cited below should not be included as an issue in this docket. AT&T has requested that an issue be included to read:

Should BellSouth be required to provide copies of all interconnection agreements entered into between BellSouth and other carriers, including other LECs and including those agreements entered into before the Act was enacted?

BellSouth opposes inclusion of this issue on several bases.

First, this issue is the subject of Docket No. 960290-TP, in which the Commission has issued Order No. PSC-96-0959-FOF-TP. This Order held that only those interconnection agreements between LECs competing in the same geographic markets entered into before or after the enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 should be filed with the Commission and those between competitive carriers in the same geographic markets that have not yet been filed by the incumbent LEC should be filed with the Commission. The Order was issued as a Notice of Proposed Agency Subsequently, AT&T filed a protest to this Order. In Action. adding this matter as an issue in the above captioned matters, ATET is merely attempting to get another "bite at the apple." This should not be allowed. Docket No. 960290-TP is the appropriate docket to revisit this issue, particularly in light of the recent order issued by the Federal Communications Commission.

Second, AT&T is not entitled to these agreements under the Telecommunications Act. Section 252(a)(1) of the

Telecommunications Act specifically requires parties to seek Commission approval of agreements negotiated upon receiving a request for an interconnection pursuant to Section 251 of the act. The process clearly begins with the request for interconnection services or unbundled elements pursuant to Section 251. The parties then negotiate. And if an agreement is reached as a result of that request for interconnection, then that agreement is submitted to the Commission for approval.

It is that agreement negotiated pursuant to a Section 251 request that needs to be filed. The reference to existing agreements occurs in the context of that agreement negotiated pursuant to a request under Section 251. The Telecommunications Act is not intended to require submission of agreements existing between noncompeting carriers for approval. We do agree with the staff that that could include agreements like BellSouth's agreement with FCTA and Teleport that BellSouth and these parties negotiated under the Florida competition statute may be covered by this requirement.

This interpretation of the federal act is consistent with the purposes of the act. The act was designed to remove barriers to entry to facilitate competition, and these sections are designed to apply to agreements resulting from a request to an incumbent LEC to fulfill its obligations under the act.

AT&T has targeted agreements between noncompeting local exchange companies entered into at a time when the world was a different place. Incumbent local exchange companies operated in totally separate geographical areas. They did not compete with one another. They were all rate of return regulated. Often these agreements were entered into for purposes of implementing orders that the Commission issued, such as EAS.

Sincerely.

Nancy B. White

cc: Tr

Tracy Hatch
Richard Melson
Blanca S. Bayo
Commissioner Deason

Charles Rehwinkel (aid to Commissioner Deason)

MEMORANDUM

AUGUST 9, 1996

960846

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (CANZANO)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 960833-TP - PETITION BY AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF A PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. CONCERNING INTERCONNECTION AND RESALE UNDER THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS

ACT OF 1996.

DOCKET NO. 960846-TP \(-\) PETITION BY MCI METRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF A PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. CONCERNING INTERCONNECTION AND RESALE UNDER THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

PSC-96-1039-PCO-TP

Attached is an ORDER ON CONSOLIDATION AND PROCEDURE to be issued in the above-referenced docket. (Number of pages in Order - 6)

THIS ORDER MUST BE ISSUED TODAY. Thank You!

MUST COTERA

DC/clp

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications (Reith)

I: 960833c1.dc

Sh y

TNO.

DOCUMENT NO.

113954-04

DOCUMENT NUMBER-DATE

08363 AUG-98

FPSC-RECOFDS/REPORTING

MANCY B. WHITE General Attorney

BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 150 South Monroe Street Room 400 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 (404)335-0710

September 9, 1996

Mrs. Blanca S. Bayo Director, Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399

RE: Docket No. 960846-TP

Dear Mrs. Bayo:

Enclosed are an original and fifteen copies of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.'s Direct Testimony of William V. Atherton, D. Daonne Caldwell, Gloria Calhoun, Dr. Richard D. Emmerson, W. Keith Milner, Anthony V. Pecoraro, Walter S. Reid, Robert C. Scheye, and Alphonso J. Varner. Please file these documents in the captioned docket.

A copy of this letter is enclosed. Please mark it to indicate that the original was filed and return the copy to me. Copies have been served on the parties shown on the attached Certificate of Service.

ACK	were more than the control of control of the contro	1
AFA		Nan
APP	Fncl	osures
CAF	EII-I	Osares
CMU	cc:	All Parties of Record A. M. Lombardo
CTR		R. G. Beatty
ÉAG	New he will the high real and the second	W. J. Ellenberg
LEG		
LIN	who are a market and of the link in barrier	
		RECEIVED & FILED
		S.
WAS		EPSC-BUREAU OF RECORDS

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE DOCKET NO. 960833-TP DOCKET NO. 960846-TP

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via Federal Express this 9th day of September, 1996 to the following:

Tracy Hatch
AT&T Communications of the
Southern States, Inc.
101 North Monroe Street
Suite 700
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(904)425-6364
(904)425-6343 (fax)

Donna Canzano
Florida Public Service
Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(904)413-6204

Robin D. Dunson, Esq. 1200 Peachtree Street, NE Promenade I, Room 4038 Atlanta, GA 30309 (404)810-8689

Mark A. Logan, Esq. Brian D. Ballard, Esq. Bryant, Miller & Olive, P.A. 201 S. Monroe Street Tallahassee, FL 32301 (904)222-8611

Richard D. Melson, Esq. Hopping Green Sams & Smith 123 South Calhoun Street Tallahassee, FL 32314 (904)222-7500

Nam bowhite

M E M O R A N D U M

May 22, 1997

RECEIVED

MAY 23 1997

FPSC - Records/Reporting

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (BARONE)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 960846-TP - PETITION BY MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION AND MCI METRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF A PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. CONCERNING INTERCONNECTION AND RESALE UNDER THE

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

PSC-97-0602-FOF-TP

Attached is an ORDER ON AGREEMENT BETWEEN MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION, MCI METRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC. AND BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC., to be issued in the above referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 8)

MMB/cc

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I:960846ag.mmb

su 2 Company of Colo

DOCUMENT NO. 05220-97 5/27/97

LANDERS & PARSONS, P.A.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

CINDY L. BARTIN
DAVID S. DEE
JOSEPH W. LANDERS, JR.
JOHN T. LAVIA, III
FRED A. McCORMACK
PHILIP S. PARSONS
ROBERT SCHEFFEL WRIGHT

HOWELL L. FERGUSON OF COUNSEL

VICTORIA J. TSCHINKEL
SENIOR CONSULTANT
(NOT A MEMBER OF THE FLORIDA BAR)

May 22, 1997

BY TELECOPIER

310 WEST COLLEGE AVENUE
POST OFFICE BOX 271

TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32302

TELEPHONE (904) 681-0311

TELECOPY (904) 224-5595

RECEIVED

MAY 22 1997

FPSC - Records/Reporting

Blanca S. Bayo, Director Division of Records and Reporting Florida Public Service Commission 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0850

FPSC Docket No. 960846, Petition by MCI
Telecommunications Corporation and MCI Metro
Access Transmission Services, Inc for
Arbitration of Certain Terms and Conditions
of a Proposed Agreement with BellSouth
Telecommunications, Inc. Concerning
Interconnection and Resale Under the
Telecommunications Act of 1996

Dear Ms. Bayo:

Please add the following to the list of interested persons for the above-captioned docket.

Jill Butler
Director, Regulatory Affairs
Cox Communications, Inc.
4585 Village Avenue
Norfolk, Virginia 23502
Telephone (757) 552-6524
Telecopier (757) 857-6716

Robert Scheffel Wright
Landers & Parsons, P.A.
310 West College Avenue (ZIP 32301)
Post Office Box 271
Tallahassee, Florida 32302
Telephone (904) 681-0311
Telecopier (904) 224-5595

On behalf of Cox Communications, Inc.

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you have any questions, please give me a call.

Cordially yours,

Robert Scheffel Wrig

RECEIVED

MEMORANDUM

June 19, 1997

JUN 19 1997

FPSC - Records/Reporting

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (PELLEGRINI) CONB

RE:

DOCKET NO. 960846-TP - PETITION BY MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION AND MCI METRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF A PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. CONCERNING INTERCONNECTION AND RESALE UNDER THE

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.

PSC-91-0723-FOF-TP

are julo

Attached is an ORDER APPROVING AGREEMENT, to be issued in the above referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 3)

CJP/anr Attachment

cc: Division of Communications

I: 960846ao.cjp

ser all parts

DOCUMENT NO. 06159-97 (4/19/97

MEMORANDUM

RECEIVED

June 25, 1997

JUN 26 1997

FPSC - Records/Reporting

TO:

DIVISION OF RECORDS AND REPORTING

FROM:

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES (PELLEGRINI)

RE:

DOCKET NO. 960846-TP - PETITION BY MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION AND MCI METRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF A PROPOSED AGREEMENT WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. CONCERNING INTERCONNECTION AND RESALE UNDER THE

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

PSC-97-0723A+ FOF-TP

Attached is an <u>AMENDATORY ORDER</u> to be issued in the above referenced docket. (Number of pages in order - 2)


CJP/clp

Attachment

cc: Division of Communications (Greer, Norton, Shelfer)

I: 960846am.cjp

10/0



STATE OF FLORIDA

Commissioners: JULIA L. JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN J. TERRY DEASON SUSAN F. CLARK DIANE K. KIESLING JOE GARCIA



DIVISION OF RECORDS & REPORTING BLANCA S. BAYÓ DIRECTOR (850) 413-6770

Public Service Commission

RECEIVED DEC 08 1997

FPSC - Records/Reporting

December 5, 1997

Robert A. Mossing, Clerk United States District Court United States Courthouse 110 East Park Avenue Room 122 Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Re: Case No. 4:97CV141-RH - MCI Telecommunications Corporation vs. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. and Florida Public Service Commission (Docket No. 960846-TP)

Dear Mr. Mossing:

The record in the above-referenced case, consisting of five boxes, is forwarded for filing in the Court. Please note that Box 5 is sealed and contains documents considered by the Commission to be confidential, and should be maintained as confidential pending a ruling by the Court on BellSouth's motion for protective order.

I have enclosed a copy of the record index for your use. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions concerning the record. All parties will be notified of today's filing by copy of this letter.

Sincerely.

Kay Flynn, Chief Bureau of Records

Kay Flyn

PLEASE STAMP AND SIGN TO INDICATE RECEIPT: 1

DATE Enclosure SIGNATURE

cc:

David Smith

Carolyn A. Raepple William W. Deem Nancy B. White

CAPITAL CIRCLE OFFICE CENTER •2540 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD •TALLAHASSEE, FL 32399-0850 Internet E-mail CONTACT@PSC.STATE.FL.US

1au

An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer



Aublic Service Commission -M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: October 23, 2001

TO: E. LEON JACOBS, JR., CHAIRMAN

J. TERRY DEASON, COMMISSIONER LILA A. JABER, COMMISSIONER BRAULIO L. BAEZ, COMMISSIONER

MICHAEL A. PALECKI, COMMISSIONER

WILLIAM D. TALBOTT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MARY A. BANE, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/TECH.

HAROLD MCLEAN, GENERAL COUNSEL

WALTER D'HAESELEER, DIRECTOR OF COMPETITIVE SERVICES

TIM DEVLIN, DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC REGULATION

CHARLES HILL, DIRECTOR OF POLICY ANALYSIS & INTERGOVERNMENTAL

LIAISON

BLANCA BAYO, DIRECTOR OF THE COMMISSION CLERK AND

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

FROM: DAVID E. SMITH, DIRECTOR OF APPEALS

RE: AT&T v. BELLSOUTH AND FPSC, CASE NO. 00-16459 (11TH CIR. OCTOBER 11,

2001)

Attached is a copy of the opinion issued by the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals in the above case. The appellate court reversed the district court's finding that the Telecommunications Act of 1996 required BellSouth to resell its local service to AT&T without operator services. The salient points of the court's analysis are as follows:

BellSouth is required to provide operator services as part of its universal service obligation. Allowing AT&T to purchase local service without operator services included would give it a competitive advantage since BellSouth would continue to have to provide operator services and incur the associated costs. AT&T has no obligation to provide universal service and would be able to undercut BellSouth's rates. The court concluded that this situation would produce a "distortion" in the competitive scheme implemented by the Act.

The appeals court noted that the district court reversed the Commission's original order based on findings that operator services constituted "other costs" under 47 U. S. C. §252 (d) (3) and that the customized routing provisions of the Act, 47 C.F.R. §51.319 (c) (1) (iii) (B), and the language of paragraph 536 of the First Report and Order supported a requirement that operator services costs be removed from resold local service. The district court erred on both points, according to the Eleventh Circuit.

13423 00123

FPSD-COMMISSION CLERK

MEMORANDUM October 23, 2001 Page -2-

Operator services are part of BellSouth's universal service obligation and a required element of its local telephone service. As such, operator services cannot be categorized as ancillary services such as billing and collection and marketing. The costs associated with operator services thus cannot be viewed as avoidable. Moreover, the district court erred in not recognizing that principles of statutory construction require that the term "other costs" be construed to include activities similar in structure and function to marketing, billing and collection. Operator services cannot be so characterized. The district court also improperly focused on AT&T's proposed business plan to offer its own operator services rather than on what the Act's resale provisions required BellSouth to offer.

The appeals court found several problems with the district court's conclusion that customized routing is the "functional equivalent of requiring BellSouth to provide AT&T local service without operator services". The primary problem with the district court's decision was that it "essentially conflated an incumbent's obligations under the unbundled access provisions with the separate and distinct obligations imposed under the resale provisions of the Act." That is, it failed to recognize that the rule requiring customized routing, 51 C.F.R. §319(C)(1)(iii)(B), and paragraph 536 of the First Report and Order pertain only to the unbundling requirements of the Act, not the resale provisions.

The appeals court also found that the district court's blurring of the distinction between unbundling and resale would have serious cost implications, if accepted. First, it would effectively require the incumbent to recombine network elements to provide a customized service for the requesting carrier. That is contrary to the Act's requirement that the requesting carrier do the the recombining, and would allow a competitor such as AT&T to shift the cost of recombination to BellSouth. AT&T would obtain the functional equivalent of unbundling through the Act's resale provisions.

The appeals court remanded the case to the district court for further proceedings consistent with its opinion. Presumably, that means that the district court's decision overturning the Commission on this issue will be vacated.

Attachment

cc:

Cindy Miller David Dowds Sally Simmons

ATTSUMM.DES

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

	FILED
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT	U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
	ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
AND THE RESERVE OF THE PARTY OF	OCTOBER 11, 2001
	THOMAS K. KAHN
NI 00 16450	CLERK
No. 00-16459	
D. C. Docket No. 97-00262-CV-4-R	1:1

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES, INC.,

Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Cross-Claimant-Appellee,

versus

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.,

Defendant-Counter-Claimant-Counter-Defendant-Appellant,

Defendants-Cross-Defendants-

FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION and COMMISSIONERS OF THE FLORIDA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, in their official capacities,

	Appellants.
4 4	ne United States District Court orthern District of Florida
(0	October 11, 2001)

Before EDMONDSON, BIRCH and WILSON, Circuit Judges.
BIRCH, Circuit Judge:

This appeal requires us to address whether, under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, an incumbent local exchange carrier must exclude its operator services from its local telephone services package offered to new market entrants for resale. Because we disagree with the district court's determination that an incumbent carrier does have to exclude operator services from its complete services package made available for resale, we REVERSE.

I. BACKGROUND

Congress enacted the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the "Act")¹ to instigate competition in local and long distance telephone markets by "lifting the shackles of monopoly regulation." H.R. Rep. No. 104-204, at 48 (1995), reprinted in 1996 U.S.C.C.A.N. 10, 11. Accordingly, the Act imposes certain duties upon incumbent local exchange carriers. These carriers who historically had a monopoly over local markets because they owned the physical networks needed in supplying telecommunication services. Of particular importance to this appeal is the "resale" duty, which requires incumbents to provide their complete retail package of services to prospective entrants in the intrastate telephone market. 47

¹Pub. L. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996) (codified in scattered sections of 47 U.S.C.).

U.S.C. § 251(c)(4) (Supp. V 1999). Entrants then can compete with incumbents by reselling these services to their own customers. <u>Id.</u>

To effectuate their resale and other enumerated duties under the Act, incumbents must negotiate interconnection agreements with prospective market entrants. § 252. Incumbent carriers and new entrants are first to enter into good faith negotiations to detail the terms for such interconnection. § 252(a). Should the parties fail to reach agreement on all terms, the Act provides for binding arbitration before the relevant state public service commission. § 252(b)-(c). Once the state commission approves the arbitration agreement, an aggrieved party may bring an action in district court "to determine whether the agreement . . . meets the requirements" of the Act. § 252(e)(6).

Appellant, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., ("BellSouth"), is an incumbent carrier in the Florida intrastate telephone market, and Appellee, AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc., ("AT&T"), is a prospective entrant into that market. Pursuant to the 1996 Act, BellSouth and AT&T began negotiations over an interconnection agreement, but the parties could not agree on all terms, including the particular services BellSouth would offer to AT&T for resale. As a result, AT&T and BellSouth entered into binding arbitration before the Florida Public Service Commission (the "Commission" or "FPSC"). The

Commission concluded, among other things, that if AT&T wanted to purchase

BellSouth's local telephone services for resale, it would have to purchase

BellSouth's operator services, which were part of the basic package of telephone
services BellSouth offered to its own retail customers.

Unsatisfied with the FPSC's conclusions, AT&T commenced this action under § 252(e)(6) against BellSouth, the FPSC, and the FPSC commissioners in their official capacities in the Northern District of Florida. The district court reversed the FPSC on the operator services issue based on its interpretation of the 1996 Act and on accompanying Federal Communication Commission ("FCC") regulations. The district court concluded that BellSouth had to eliminate its operator services from its services package offered to AT&T for resale. Upon entry of judgment, BellSouth, the FPSC, and the FPSC commissioners sought review from this court on the limited question of whether the district court erred with regard to the operator services issue.

II. DISCUSSION

A. The Standard of Review

Whether the 1996 Act and accompanying FCC regulations require operator services to be eliminated from an incumbent's local telephone services package offered to new entrants for resale is a purely legal question. Consequently, we

review <u>de novo</u> the district court's determinations on this issue. <u>United States v.</u>

<u>Plummer</u>, 221 F.3d 1298, 1302 (11th Cir. 2000).

B. The Telecommunications Statutory Landscape

Historically, states exclusively regulated intrastate telephone service, and the FCC generally lacked jurisdiction over such service. See 47 U.S.C. § 152(b)(1). States like Florida treated local telephone service networks as natural monopolies and granted certain exchange carriers exclusive franchises for providing local services. As the FCC explains, "[i]n the old regulatory regime government encouraged monopolies. . . . State and federal regulators devoted their efforts over many decades to regulating the prices and practices of . . . [telecommunications] monopolies and protecting them against competitive entry."²

In return for an exclusive franchise, Florida local carriers had their telephone rates regulated and were required to provide "universal service," which "mandates

² First Report and Order, <u>In re Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996</u>, 11 F.C.C.R. 15499, 15505, ¶1 (1996) ("First Report and Order"), <u>aff'd in part, vacated in part, Iowa Utils. Bd. v. FCC</u>, 120 F.3d 753 (8th Cir. 1997), <u>aff'd in part, rev'd in part, AT&T Corp. v. Iowa Utils. Bd.</u>, 525 U.S. 366, 119 S. Ct. 721 (1999).

³ "[T]he term 'universal service' means an evolving level of access to telecommunications services that, taking into account advances in technologies, services, and market demand for essential services, the commission determines should be provided at just, reasonable, and affordable rates to customers, including those in rural, economically disadvantaged, and high-cost areas." 13B Fla. Stat. Ann. § 364.025(1) (1999). For a concise history of state implementation of universal service mechanisms prior to the Act, see Peter W. Huber et al., Federal Telecommunications Law § 6.2 (2d ed. 1999).

lower-than-market local phone rates" based on the "policy that local phone service should be affordable by all who wish it" and "subsidized from some other source, including long-distance and business service." See AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. v. Marks, 515 So.2d 741, 742 (Fla. 1987). Florida implemented its universal service framework through "tariff" agreements instituted between the FPSC and local carriers. Under this tariff regime, monopoly carriers were to provide affordable local telephone service to residential customers where the expense would otherwise create economic discentives to providing service. This rate / subsidy framework ensured that affordable telephone service was available in all locales throughout the state.

The telecommunications structure premised on exclusive franchises and subsidized local services began to undergo rapid change in the 1990s. The goals of the Act included opening local telephone markets to competition and eliminating the exclusive franchise system. See 47 U.S.C. § 253(a). The Act aimed "to shift monopoly markets to competition as quickly as possible." H.R. Rep. No. 104-204, at 89, reprinted in 1996 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 55. In lieu of exclusive local carriers, the

[&]quot;A 'tariff' is a public document setting forth the services of the [telecommunications] carrier being offered, the rates and charges with respect to the services and the governing rules, regulations and practices relating to those services." <u>International Tel. & Tel. Corp. v. United Tel. Co. of Fla.</u>, 433 F. Supp. 352, 357 n.4 (M.D. Fla. 1975).

Act institutes a regulatory framework that encourages new entrants to enter local markets. To facilitate new entry, the Act provides three distinct entry paths for potential competitors. First, the new entrant can build new network facilities to compete with the facilities already owned by incumbent local carriers. AT&T, 525 U.S. at 371-73 & n.1, 119 S. Ct. at 726-27 & n.1. Second, it can buy access to network elements owned by incumbents on an unbundled basis by purchasing access to individual pieces of an incumbent's telecommunications network, such as local loops and local switching devices, that can then be used by the entrant to offer competing local services. 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(3) (unbundled access provision). Third, it can buy retail telephone services offered by incumbents and then resell these services to its own customers. § 251(c)(4) (resale provision). Because the unbundled access provision and resale provision are particularly significant to this case, we will discuss each in turn.

Under the unbundled access provision, incumbent carriers have "[t]he duty to provide[] to . . . [new entrants] nondiscriminatory access to network elements on an unbundled basis at any technically feasible point." § 251(c)(3). "[N]etwork element[s]" are defined broadly to include any "facility or equipment used in the provision of a telecommunications service," as well as "features, functions, and capabilities provided" by any "facility or equipment." § 153(29). Unbundled

access "permit[s] new entrants to offer competing local services by purchasing from incumbents *at cost-base prices*, access to elements which they do not already possess, unbundled from those elements that they do not need." 11 F.C.C.R. at 15617-18, ¶ 231 (emphasis added). To use a simple analogy, the unbundled access provision is akin to requiring one car manufacturer to sell a competitor access not to one of its completed vehicles, but to the individual elements of the vehicle, such as the engine, radiator, and tires, all of which the manufacturer has unbundled, or segregated out, for the competitor's convenience.

Additionally, the Act provides a distinct pricing mechanism for purchase of network elements from incumbents. New entrants are to obtain access to these elements at "rates, terms, and conditions that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory." § 251(c)(3). In turn, these rates are to be "based on the cost (determined without reference to a rate-of-return or other rate-based proceeding) of providing" network elements and "may include a reasonable profit." § 252(d)(1)(A)(1) & (B).

The resale provision creates a separate set of duties for incumbents.

Incumbent carriers must "offer for resale *at wholesale rates* any telecommunications service that the carrier provides at retail to subscribers who are not telecommunications carriers. § 251(c)(4)(A) (emphasis added). To continue

our previous analogy, the resale provision is akin to requiring the car manufacturer only to provide its competitor access to the completed vehicle itself without permitting separate, unbundled purchase of individual vehicle parts.

Congress also provided a completely separate and distinct pricing methodology for the resale provision. This methodology provides that incumbent carriers are to recoup the full retail rate they currently charge customers for complete telephone services minus "any marketing, billing, collection, and other costs that will be avoided by the local exchange carrier" in selling at wholesale to a new entrant. § 252(d)(3). Thus, unlike the pricing rule for the unbundled access provision, the resale pricing rule begins with the current retail rate as the proper baseline for calculation, not with cost.

The Act and its introduction of these new entry paths into local telecommunications markets revolutionized the telecommunications industry. The Act's implementation, however, continues to operate against a backdrop of state tariff arrangements and universal service mechanisms that create a potential "patchwork quilt" of state subsidies "intended to promote telephone subscribership." 11 F.C.C.R. at 15506, ¶ 5. Indeed, although Congress intended for the Act to facilitate competition, at the same time it specifically codified its commitment to universal service mechanisms. See 47 U.S.C. § 254. The Act itself

contemplates a federal-state partnership to sustain universal service. See § 254(b)(5) ("There should be specific, predictable and sufficient Federal and State mechanisms to preserve and advance universal service."); § 254(f) ("Every telecommunications carrier that provides intrastate communications services shall contribute . . . in a manner determined by the State to the preservation and advancement of universal service in that State."). Thus, even in the present deregulatory climate, states still play a major role in implementing tariff agreements that ensure universal service in intrastate telephone markets.

Like other states, Florida continues in its commitment to universal service.

See 13B Fla. Stat. Ann. § 364.025(1) ("It is the intent of the Legislature that universal service objectives be maintained after the local exchange market is opened to competitively provided services."). Consequently, Florida law requires that "[f]or a period of 8 years after January 1, 1996, each local exchange telecommunications company . . . furnish basic local exchange telecommunications service within a reasonable time period to any person requesting such service within the company's service territory." Id. "Basic local telecommunications service" includes, among other things, 911 emergency services, directory assistance, and operator services. § 364.02(2) (emphasis added). Moreover, telecommunications carriers still must file tariff schedules detailing the rates

charged for service and the carriers' service obligations with the FPSC. See § 364.04; 25 Fla. Admin. Code Ann. r. 25-4.034(1). Local telephone rates also remain subject to FPSC oversight.

In sum, although the Act fosters competition, the Act continues to operate in a Florida telecommunications landscape affected by a history of universal service implemented through required tariff filings. This clash between the Act and traditional state pricing regimes can distort competition. As the FCC has noted, "[s]ome policies that traditionally have been justified on universal service considerations place competitors at a disadvantage. Other universal service

⁵ Section 364.04(1) provides: "Upon order of the commission, every telecommunications company shall file with the commission, and shall print and keep open to public inspection, schedules showing the rates, tolls, rentals, contracts, and charges of that company for service to be performed within the state."

⁶ 25 Fla. Admin. Code Ann. r. 25-4.034(1) provides in part: "Each telecommunications company shall maintain on file with the Commission tariffs which set forth all rates and charges for customer services, the classes and grades of service available to subscribers, the conditions and circumstances under which service will be furnished, and all general rules and regulations governing the relation of customer and utility."

Florida local exchange carriers can opt for regulation under FPSC "price cap" rules pursuant to § 364.051 or continue under "rate-of-return" rules and other requirements associated therewith pursuant to §§ 364.03 (reasonableness of rates, performance of service, and maintenance of facilities), 364.035 (rate fixing), 364.037 (telephone directory advertising revenues), 364.05 (changes in rates), 364.055 (interim rates), 364.14 (readjustment of rates), 364.17 (required reports, accounts, records and memoranda), and 364.18 (inspection of accounts and records). For a discussion differentiating "price cap" and "rate-of-return" regulatory methodologies, see Federal Telecommunications Law § 2.2.3.

policies place the incumbent . . . at a competitive disadvantage." 11 F.C.C.R. at 15506, ¶ 5.

This distortion is particularly cogent when a new entrant gains access to an incumbent's retail services package under the Act's resale provision. For instance, new entrants can target for purchase an incumbent's retail services in Florida markets where the incumbent historically has charged above-cost rates because of universal service objectives. Then the entrant can resale those services at a rate that undercuts the incumbent's artificially high rates. While good for certain consumers, this entry strategy undercuts the incumbent's ability to subsidize and recover its historical investments in markets where universal service commitments led to below-cost pricing.

Conversely, new entrants can use the resale provision to take advantage of artificially low prices in Florida markets where service traditionally has been subsidized. Because the resale pricing rule uses retail rates as the baseline for determining the compensation owed to incumbents, entrants can purchase from incumbents those complete services offered in markets where retail prices are artificially low because of the historical subsidy system. Thus, the new entrant potentially can use the resale pricing mechanism to obtain a cost advantage over an incumbent in markets where retail prices are lower than they otherwise would be

absent Florida's traditional commitment to universal service as reflected in the FPSC set tariff.

C. Operator Services Relevant to this Case

Against this statutory backdrop, the district court interpreted the Act's resale provision to require the incumbent carrier, BellSouth, to eliminate operator services from its retail telephone services package offered to the new entrant, AT&T, for resale. AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. v. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., 122 F. Supp. 2d 1305, 1314-16 (N.D. Fla. 2000) ("AT&T Communications"). The court concluded that the FPSC erred by failing to require BellSouth to exclude the cost of such services from the price charged to AT&T for access to BellSouth's complete services package. Id.

The district court reached this conclusion for two reasons. First, the court determined that operator services constitute "other costs" under 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(3) and consequently should be eliminated from BellSouth's complete services package offered to AT&T for resale. <u>Id.</u> at 1315. Second, the court relied on two FCC customized routing provisions, 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(c)(1)(iii)(B) and 11 F.C.C.R. at 15772-73, ¶ 536, as a basis for requiring BellSouth to eliminate operator services from its resold services package. <u>Id.</u> We reject the district court's reasoning.

1. "Other Costs" under 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(3)

The district court premised its decision in part on its finding that operator services are "other costs" under 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(3), the pricing rule for the resale provision. AT&T Communications, 122 F. Supp. 2d at 1315. Section 252(d)(3) provides that "marketing, billing, collection, and other costs that will be avoided" by the incumbent should be eliminated from the price of retail services offered to new entrants for resale. (emphasis added). The court analogized operator services costs to billing costs and concluded that, like the latter, the former are costs that BellSouth can avoid when it offers its services at wholesale to AT&T rather than at retail to consumers. Id. at 1315. This conclusion is untenable for several reasons.

Of primary importance is the district court's failure to interpret the Act's resale provision in light of the backdrop of historical state universal service commitments and accompanying tariff filing requirements. We have explained that traditional state universal service objectives can distort competition and offer competitive advantages to new entrants like AT&T who strategically use the resale provision. AT&T can purchase access to BellSouth services offered in markets where rates are artificially high because of a history of subsidized universal service, and then AT&T can resell those services at a reduced rate. Thus, AT&T

can undercut BellSouth's ability to use an above-cost pricing structure to recover historical investments in other Florida markets where services have been offered at rates below-cost. Conversely, AT&T can obtain the benefits of Florida's traditional universal service framework by using the Act's resale provisions to acquire access to BellSouth's services offered in markets where the retail rate is artificially low because of a history of subsidy arrangements. Therefore, AT&T can obtain potential cost advantages over BellSouth.

AT&T's strategy in this case suggests that it plans to use the Act's resale provisions to exploit these advantages. Regarding the operator services issue, AT&T has insisted on proceeding under the resale provision and its retail rate pricing methodology. AT&T proceeds in this manner despite the fact that BellSouth concedes that if AT&T proceeded under the unbundled access provision, BellSouth would have to exclude operator services facilities from other network elements offered to AT&T for resale. AT&T's refusal to so proceed suggests that the company is taking advantage of competitive distortions caused by Florida's history of universal service and accompanying tariff regimes.

Although AT&T is attentive to how artificial prices caused by a history of universal service in Florida can accrue to its benefit under the resale provision,

AT&T simultaneously ignores this framework whenever it might suggest a need

for constrictions on its entry path. Thus, in AT&T's argument over whether operator services constitute "other costs" under § 252(d)(3), the history of universal service in Florida goes unmentioned. We find that just the opposite should be the case. The meaning of "other costs" should be historically contextualized and read in view of the costs imposed on local carriers because of a history in Florida of universal service and an accompanying tariff regime.

Otherwise, new entrants like AT&T can benefit from traditional state subsidy arrangements while ignoring the costs they impose on BellSouth and other local carriers. Such a result would conflict with the Act's commitment to ensuring that incumbents receive fair compensation for providing access to their services for resale. See 47 U.S.C. § 252.

Consequently, in determining whether operator services constitute "other costs" under § 252(d)(3), we must consider BellSouth's universal service commitments under Florida law. As part of Florida's commitment to universal service, each local carrier in Florida is required to provide basic local telephone service within a reasonable time to anyone who requests it within the carrier's service area for an eight-year period after January 1, 1996. 13B Fla. Stat. Ann. § 364.025(1). Basic local phone service includes operator services. § 364.02(2). At oral argument, counsel for BellSouth stated that BellSouth's tariff agreement

requires it to provide operator services in Florida. That operator services are a required element of BellSouth's local telephone services package indicates that such services are not mere costs akin to "marketing, billing, [and] collection" under 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(3). It instead suggests that operator services are an essential component to BellSouth's local service, inextricably interwoven with the proper transmission of telephone communications, not a cost rightly viewed as avoidable or ancillary to basic telephone service. Section 364.02(2) also states that Florida considers operator services a necessity, an integral service conducive to the smooth operation of a carrier's telecommunication platform. It follows that the district court erred in conflating operator services with more peripheral costs like marketing, billing and collection by requiring BellSouth to extricate operator services from its complete services package made available to AT&T for resale.

Apart from our decision based on the tradition of universal service in Florida, we conclude that the district court misinterpreted § 252(d)(3) for two additional reasons. The first is based on a proper interpretation of that section according to the principle that "general terms following a series of more specifically enumerated terms refer to items similar in structure and function to the enumerated terms." <u>United States v. Sepulveda</u>, 115 F.3d 882, 886 n.8 (11th Cir. 1997). In view of this principle, the specifically enumerated terms under §

252(d)(3)—marketing, billing, and collection—should encompass the scope of what constitutes "other costs." That is, "other costs" should be read as referencing activities "similar in structure and function," Sepulveda 115 F.3d at 886 n.8, to the three specific activities listed. Marketing, billing, and collection are activities that center on the promotion of telephone services and on generating and collecting revenue from such services. Operator services are not similar in structure or function to promotional or revenue-related activities; such services instead are activities that shore up the smooth operation and transmission of telecommunications over the service network. It follows that operator services cannot be deemed "other costs" under § 252(d)(3).

We also disagree with the district court because, in interpreting § 252(d)(3), the court improperly focused on the resold services package the new entrant, AT&T, wanted to offer to its own customers, not on the services package offered by the incumbent, BellSouth, to its current retail customers. The district court observed that operator services generate costs akin to billing because "[b]oth are features that a reseller might reasonably choose to provide for itself." AT&T Communications, 122 F. Supp. 2d at 1315(emphasis added). Section 253(d)(3), however, states that "other costs" include only those "that will be avoided by the local exchange carrier," here BellSouth. (emphasis added.) As the FCC has

explained, other costs are "those that an incumbent . . . would no longer incur if it were to cease retail operations and instead provide all of its services through resellers." 11 F.C.C.R. at 15956, ¶911.8 Thus, the standard for what constitutes "other costs" is the services package offered by the incumbent to its current retail customers, irrespective of the services package the new entrant wants to offer to its own customers when it resells incumbent's services. It is undisputed that BellSouth offers operator services as part of its basic services package to retail customers. Whether AT&T wants to offer its own operator services to prospective customers does not change this fact. The district court therefore erred in its interpretation of § 252(d)(3) by focusing on AT&T's desire to offer its own operator services instead of on BellSouth's current retail package, which includes such services.

2. "Customized Routing" under 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(c)(1)(iii)(B) and 11 F.C.C.R. at 15772-73, ¶ 536

⁸ The Eighth Circuit vacated the FCC cost methodology because it focused on costs avoidable in theory versus costs actually avoided in practice. See Iowa Utils. Bd. v. F.C.C., 219 F.3d 744 (8th Cir. 2000), 755, cert. granted on other grounds, __ U.S. __, 121 S. Ct. 877 (2001). This distinction, however, does not affect our present discussion.

Beyond the "other costs" argument under § 252(d)(3), the district court relied on 47 C.F.R. § 51.319 and 11 F.C.C.R. at 15772-73, ¶ 5369 to justify its decision regarding operator services. The court observed that under these two FCC provisions, BellSouth, as an incumbent carrier, has a duty to provide new entrants like AT&T with "customized routing." AT&T Communications, 122 F. Supp. 2d at 1315. From the district court's perspective, customized routing is "the functional equivalent of requiring BellSouth to provide AT&T local service without operator services" for resale. Id. The district court's reliance on the two customized routing provisions in concluding that BellSouth had to eliminate operator services from its resold services package, however, is misplaced.

⁹In August 1996, the FCC issued its First Report and Order on the Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Act. Challenges to the rules were consolidated and assigned to the Eighth Circuit under 28 U.S.C. § 2112(a)(3). The Eighth Circuit vacated all of the FCC's pricing regulations on jurisdictional grounds as well as several nonpricing provisions. Iowa Utils. Bd., 120 F.3d at 819 & n.39. The Supreme Court reversed on the jurisdictional issue and held that the FCC had jurisdiction to issue pricing regulations. AT&T, 525 U.S. at 385, 392-96, 119 S. Ct. at 733, 736-38. The Court's decision in effect reinstated almost all of the FCC's pricing and nonpricing regulations. On remand, however, the Eighth Circuit struck down the FCC's pricing methodology rules on the merits. Iowa Utils. Bd., 219 F.3d 744. The Court granted certiorari to review the Eighth Circuit's determination regarding the pricing regulations for the unbundled access provision, but not the pricing regulations for the resale provision. ___ U.S. ___, 121 S. Ct. 877. The panalopy of challenges to the FCC's First Report and Order does not affect the operator services issue or the specific FCC provisions addressed in this case.

¹⁰"Customized routing" refers to the process by which incumbent carriers route calls to operators of competing carriers. Such routing occurs when a competitor's customers who are served over the incumbent's telecommunications facilities request to speak with the competitor's operators. See Brief for Appellant BellSouth Communications, Inc., at 8.

The primary problem with the district court's customized routing discussion is that such routing is an obligation placed on incumbents under the unbundled access provision, not the resale provision, and so it is inapplicable to the present action. We turn first to 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(c)(1)(iii)(B). Section 51.319 does address an incumbent's customized routing obligations to new entrants, 11 but the section is titled "Specific *unbundling* requirements." (emphasis added). This reference to "unbundling" contextualizes § 51.319 because "unbundling" is a term of art under 47 U.S.C. §§ 251-52; the reference indicates that the FCC is discussing an incumbent's obligations when a new entrant purchases access to the incumbent's facilities under the unbundled access provision, not the resale provision. Indeed, § 51.319 is contained in subpart D of the FCC interconnection rules, but "the rules governing resale of services by an incumbent . . . are set forth in subpart G [§§ 51.601-51.617]." § 51.201. It follows that § 51.319(c)(1)(iii)(B)

¹¹⁴⁷ C.F.R. § 51.319(c) states that "an incumbent . . . shall provide nondiscriminatory access, in accordance with § 51.311 and section 251(c)(3) of the Act, to local circuit switching capability." "Local circuit switching capability," § 51.319(c)(1), includes, but is not limited to, "any technically feasible customized routing functions provided by the switch," § 51.319(c)(1)(iii)(B). In citing to particular subsections of § 51.319, we have used the subsections as they are delineated in the 2000 version of the C.F.R. AT&T and Bellsouth negotiated and entered into their interconnection agreement in 1996-97. As a result, we have reviewed the version of § 51.319 applicable at that time. Although the substantive language of § 51.319 at issue here is the same in the earlier version, the internal organization of the section is different. We have used the current subsection delineations for the convenience of the reader.

is inapplicable to the present dispute over operator services between BellSouth and AT&T, a dispute that only concerns the Act's resale provision.

We reach a similar conclusion with regard to 11 F.C.C.R. at 15772-73, ¶
536. Paragraph 536 provides that "incumbent[s]... must unbundle the facilities and functionalities providing operator services and directory assistance from resold services and other unbundled network elements to the extent technically feasible."

Id. at 15773. (emphasis added). As with § 51.319, the reference here to "unbundle" indicates that paragraph 536 refers to an incumbent's obligations under the unbundled access provision. Unlike § 51.319, however, there is reference in paragraph 536 to "resold services," which at first glance might suggest that the paragraph also creates incumbent obligations under the resale provision. Upon closer inspection, this suggestion proves erroneous.

Paragraph 536 is found in section V of the FCC First Report and Order, entitled "ACCESS TO UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS," not section VIII, entitled "RESALE." The reference to the term of art "unbundled" in the section title again suggests that paragraph 536 only concerns obligations under the unbundled access provision. Moreover, if the FCC meant the paragraph to impose obligations under the resale provision, the paragraph would have appeared, or one

akin to it would have appeared, in section VIII, "RESALE." There is no paragraph, however, that is analogous to 536 found in the "RESALE" section.

In fact, in AT&T's own comments to the FCC's proposed order, AT&T called for the FCC to adopt a rule directing incumbents to make local service available for resale without operator services. See Reply Brief for Appellant BellSouth, Addendum at 81 n.123, (Comments of AT&T Corp. in In re Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC. Docket No. 96-98, (FCC May 16, 1996)) ("The Commission should . . . consider adopting a rule requiring that resellers be permitted to provide their own operator services in conjunction with resale of the [incumbent's] local service. . . . "). The FCC explicitly took note of AT&T's request, but the FCC referenced it in paragraph 870 of section VIII, "RESALE," not in paragraph 536 of section V. 11 F.C.C.R. at 15933, ¶ 870 ("AT&T specifically argues that it should be allowed to purchase local exchange service without operator services."). Further, the FCC specifically refused to grant AT&T's request: "We need not prescribe a minimum list of services that are subject to the resale requirement." Id. at 15934, ¶ 872. That the FCC specifically referenced the operator services issue in the "RESALE" section, yet explicitly declined to settle the matter, strongly

militates against reading paragraph 536, which is vague and amorphous compared to paragraph 872, as dispositive of the same issue.

We therefore conclude that the district court erred in interpreting paragraph 536 of the FCC First Report and Order as bearing upon the operator services issue in the resale context. Instead, we read the paragraph as stating that when a new entrant, pursuant to the unbundled access provision, seeks to purchase access to elements of an incumbent's telephone network, the incumbent, when technically feasible, must unbundle operator services from other network elements and from the complete service it has otherwise made available for resale. Put another way, paragraph 536 states that, irrespective of whether operator services were included in the incumbent's services package offered for resale, if the new entrant seeks network elements under the unbundled access provision, then the incumbent must segregate out operator services elements so that the new entrant has more options in choosing which elements to include in its own network. Paragraph 536 does not speak to the fate of operator services under the resale provision, and so, by extension, does not speak to the case at bar.

The district court, by misinterpreting an incumbent's customized routing obligations under 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(c)(1)(iii)(B) and 11 F.C.C.R. at 15772-73, ¶ 536, essentially conflated an incumbent's obligations under the unbundled access

provision with the separate and distinct obligations imposed under the resale provision of the Act. The court's conflation of an incumbent's obligations under the two provisions, besides resting on a misinterpretation of the relevant FCC regulations, fails to give effect to an integral difference between those two provisions and leads to serious cost implications, which we now address.

With regard to unbundled access, 47 U.S.C. 251(c)(3) states that "[a]n incumbent local exchange carrier shall provide such unbundled network elements in a manner that allows the *requesting carriers* to combine such elements in order to provide such telecommunications service." (emphasis added). Section 251(c)(3) permits a new entrant to purchase access to individual parts of the incumbent's network elements, but to do so the entrant itself must incur the costs of "rebundling" these individual pieces into a complete service offered to its own local customers. Thus, under the unbundled access provision, BellSouth must set apart operator service elements and offer AT&T access to individual parts of its local telephone network, but, in turn, AT&T must bear the costs of recombining those parts into a services package that it then can market to its own customer base.

In contrast, with regard to the resale provision, incumbents are only required to offer to new entrants the local telephone services package they already offer to their customers "at retail." 47 U.S.C. § 251(c)(4)(A). That is, the resale provision

only requires incumbents to offer bundled, or prepackaged, services to new entrants. Thus, if an incumbent like BellSouth does not offer a services package to its retail customers that lacks operator services, it is not required to offer to new entrants a services package that lacks such services. Otherwise, incumbents would be forced to offer to new entrants a telephone services package different from that offered at retail, which collapses the distinction between the unbundled service elements offered under the unbundled access provision and the bundled service elements offered under the resale provision.

Eliminating the distinction between unbundled and bundled services has serious cost implications. We have explained that a new entrant, pursuant to the unbundled access provision, is entitled to purchase access to individual pieces of an incumbent's service network, but the entrant must incur the costs of rebundling those pieces to form its own network. If the new entrant instead can use the resale provision to require incumbents to offer services packages for resale different from the complete packages incumbents already offer to retail customers, the entrant can shift the costs of rebundling to the incumbent. In effect, the incumbent would have to unbundle its current services package offered at retail and then bear the costs of rebundling its service elements to fit the new entrant's specifications.

Such cost shifting under the resale provision would undercut the cost methodology

of unbundled access, a methodology under which new entrants are to incur the costs of creating new service configurations out of unbundled network elements provided by the incumbent.

Applying these considerations to the case at hand, we find that AT&T should not be able to circumvent the costs imposed by unbundled access by attempting to require BellSouth to unbundle operator services under the resale provision. If AT&T desires individual parts of BellSouth's local network without operator service elements, it must incur the costs of recombining those parts into a workable telecommunications system. What AT&T cannot do is proceed under the resale provision and require BellSouth to unbundle its current retail services package—which both parties agree does not include a services package lacking operator services— and then require BellSouth to reconfigure that package to exclude operator services per AT&T's own desired specifications. This costshifting ploy would permit AT&T to obtain unbundled services at the bundled services price. Not only would AT&T be able to take advantage of any artificialities in price created by a history of universal service in Florida, which we have explained, but also it would simultaneously obtain the functional equivalent of unbundling in the resale context. We refuse to interpret the distinct unbundled access and resale provisions under 47 U.S.C. § 251 in a manner that would create

such an inequitable and anticompetitive result. Consequently, we hold that the district court erred in interpreting FCC customized routing provisions to require BellSouth to unbundle its operator services from its complete services package offered to AT&T for resale.

III. CONCLUSION

This appeal involved a challenge to a final judgment in which the district court held that, under the Act, BellSouth, as an incumbent local exchange carrier, had to exclude its operator services from its complete services package offered to AT&T for resale. As we have explained, the district court erred in so holding because the court, failing to interpret the resale provision in view of the historical backdrop of universal service and its accompanying tariff regime in Florida, improperly concluded that operator services constitute "other costs" under 47 U.S.C. § 252(d)(3). In addition, we have concluded that the district court improperly linked operator services to the customized routing obligations enunciated in 47 C.F.R. § 51.319(c)(1)(iii)(B) and 11 F.C.C.R. at 15772-73, ¶ 536. Accordingly, we REVERSE the judgment and REMAND for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.



Public Service Commission

-M-E-M-O-R-A-N-D-U-M-

DATE: August 6, 1998

TO:

Parties of Record and Interested Persons in Dockets 920260-TL, 950737-TP, 950778-

TL, 950985-TP, 951069-TL, 960100-TP, 960757-TP, 960786-TL, 960833-TP(960846-

TP, 961346-TP, 970730-TP, and 980671-TL

FROM: Blanca S. Bayó, Director of Records and Reporting

RE: Contact Regarding Employment

Section 5.02 B.1.c. of the Commission's Administrative Procedures Manual requires all parties and interested persons in affected dockets to be notified if a staff member involved in any of those dockets indicates he or she has been approached regarding employment by a party in the dockets.

As a party in the referenced docket(s), you are hereby notified that Maryrose Sirianni, Supervisor in the Division of Communications, has advised the Commission that she was contacted by BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. regarding employment.

BSB:kf

cc:

Walter D'Haeseleer Sally Simmons William D. Talbott James A. Ward Mary A. Bane Robert D. Vandiver

Maryrose Sirianni



Florida Cable Telecommunications Association N - 6 AM 10: 27

Steve Wilkerson, President

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION REPORTING	920260
LEGAL DEPARTMENT	950737
PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL	950984
IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL MARTHA IMMEDIATELY	950985 960100
TELEPHONE:(850) 681-1990 FAX: (850) 681-9676	
	\$60757
TO: Records	960786
FAX NUMBER: 413-7118	160847
FROM: LAURAL GALLACHER Martha Tohnson	960932
	980000 A
DATE: 1/6/99 #OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:	980000 B
COMMENTS: Please Change the name	Sprano C
Laura Wilson to "Michael Gross"	180696
Laura Wilson to Michael Gross"	980770
Thank you.	981444
	Jone
. AND REPORT OF THE PROPERTY O	1/06/99
THIS COMMUNICATION IS INTENDED FOR THE NAMED ADDRESSEE ONLY. IT MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED CONFIDENTIAL, ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT OR OTHER PRIVATE INFORMATION.	2
IF YOU ARE NOT THE NAMED ADDRESSEE AND HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION FROM THE NAMED ADDRESSEE, PLEAE TELEPHONE THIS OFFICE	
IMMEDIATELY AND RETURN THIS DOCUMENT TO FLORIDA CABLE TELELCOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCATION, INC. UNAUTHORIZED USE OR DISCLOSURE OF THIS COMMUNICATION CAN	
RESULT IN CIVIL LIABILITY.	



elle latel ce

Florida Cable Telecommunications Association

Steve Wilkerson, President

FCTA CHANGE OF ADDRESS

TO:

Vendors

FROM:

Steve E. Wilkerson, President

DATE:

October 10, 2000

RE:

Move to New FCTA Headquarters

As of Monday, October 16, 2000, the Florida Cable Telecommunications Association headquarters is moving to a new location. While our phone and fax numbers, as well as e-mail and web site address, will remain the same (see below), our mailing address will change.

Please note this new information below on all correspondence:

Florida Cable Telecommunications Association 246 East 6th Avenue Tallahassee, Florida 32303 - 620 850/681-1990 (tel) 850/681-9676 (fax) fcta@fcta.com (e-mail) www.fcta.com (web site)

1-6-00 1-1/2/11-6-00

Please also be aware that this move will o over the course of a few days, beginning Friday, October 13, and ending (hopefully) by Wednesday, October 18, so it is possible that there will be interruptions in phone, fax and computer services. If you are unable to reach the office during this time, please try either 850/322-3034 or 850/212-9072 as alternatives.

Thanks for your patience while this transition is underway. Please call with any questions or concerns.

M/ 310 North Monroe Street Zullahannen FC 32301-7636

Hong Wang

From: Sent:

Martha J [marthaj@fcta.com] Tuesday, October 31, 2000 3:48 PM

To: Subject:

Hong Wang Change of address

FYI

We have moved, our new address is

246 E. 6th Avenue Tallahassee, FL 32303

Please change your records accordingly.

Thanks

Martha 681-1990 920260, 960100, 960786, 960846, 960846, 960847, 980253, 981444, 981834, 990321, 990455, 990517, 990546, 990649, 990378, 991930, 000028, 000075, 000121, 000399, 000636, 000649, 001332

Done "102/00





July 11, 2002

Public Service Commission 2540 Shurmard Oak Blvd. Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850 960100, 960786,9607864,960786B,96083; 960846,981444,981834,990455,990649,99064 990649B, 991473, 200121, 000121A 010/96, 010743, 010774, 011077

Attention: Nonnye Grant

Dear Ms. Grant:

TX 029 + Noticitate "T"

Per our telephone conversation today, please make the following changes for the FLORIDA PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION:

Please send all mail to:

M/ms. angela B Freen Via President/Dennal Counsel 2292 Wednesday Street, Suite 1 Jallahasser FL 32308-4334 abgreen@nettally.com

David Tobin, Esq. - General Counsel Tobin & Reves 7251 West Palmetto Park Road

Suite 205

Boca Raton, FL 33433 -3487

(561) 620-0656 Phone:

Fax: (561) 620-0657

E-mail:

dst@tobinreves.com

Our second contact is:

pt same is above P- 850) 222-5050 F-850)2221355

Rick Lubbehusen, Executive Director

Phone:

(850) 222-5050

Fax:

(850) 222-1355

E-mail:

rick@fpta.com

Thank you, Nonnye, for your help. If you need any further information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Jan McBride-Smith Office Manager

Inohe is ms. Mr Bride-Smith, received with titles of contacts, plus they want t

1140 Capital Circle SE, Suite 11, Tallahassee, FL 32301 - 3836

NH, NP, NW "T"

Phone (850) 222-5050, Fax (850) 222-1355, Email: jan@fpta.com

September 23, 2002

BY HAND DELIVERY

Blanca Bayó, Director Florida Public Service Commission Division of Commission Clerk and Administrative Services 2540 Shumard Oak Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Re: Change of Address

Dear Ms. Bayó,

960786, 9607864, 96078613, 960833, 960846 Re: Change of Address

971140, 971478, 980499, 980986, 981121, 981444

1s. Bayó,

981834, 990455, 990649, 990649A, 990649B, 00000

1n compliance with the Commission rules, WorldCom hereby files its change of 011077, 02012

20CT -3 AM 10: 05

contact information for the certificated entities listed below. Starting today, September 23, 2002, I am moving to a new address, and also will have new phone and fax numbers. \$\mathre{D} \in 649, \$\mathre{D} \in 70 I would appreciate it if you could update the Master Commission Directory with the new papers information.

I am the regulatory liaison for the following certificated entities and my new information is set forth below:

UPDATED REGULATORY LIAISON CONTACT INFORMATION:

Donna Canzano McNulty 1203 Governors Square Blvd. Suite 201 Tallahassee, FL 32301

Phone: (850) 219-1008 Fax: (850) 219-1018

UPDATED CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THESE CERTIFICATED **ENTITIES:**

VTI731 - MCI WorldCom Network Services, Inc. (IXC)

∨ TE644 – MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. (PP)

✓ TA020 – MCI WorldCom Network Services, Inc. (ALEC)

√ TA005 – MCImetro Access Transmission Services, LLC (ALEC)

∨ TS185 – MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. (STP)

∠TA047 – MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. (ALEC)

✓ TI724 - TransCall America, Inc. d/b/a ATC Long Distance

one 9/25/02

- ✓ TJ032 MCI WorldCom Communications, Inc. (IXC)
- ✓ TA012 Metropolitan Fiber Systems of Florida, Inc. (ALEC)
- √TE165 Telecom*USA, Inc. (PP)
- VTI906 Telecom*USA, Inc. (IXC)
- ~TI907 SouthernNet Systems, Inc. (IXC)
- √TS173 Intermedia Communications Inc. (STP)
- ✓ TI857 Intermedia Communications Inc. (IXC)
- ✓ TA001 Intermedia Communications Inc. (ALEC)
- √TS171 Access Network Services, Inc. (STP)

If you have any questions, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Donna Canzano McNulty

cc: Walter D'Haeseleer
Harold McLean
Beth Keating
Bev DeMello
Rick Moses

Roberta Bass